

# THE ECONOMY OF THE COVENANTS BETWEEN GOD AND MAN.

COMPREHENDING A COMPLETE BODY OF DIVINITY.

BY HERMAN WITSIUS, D.D.

## THE ECONOMY OF THE COVENANTS BETWEEN GOD AND MAN



COMPREHENDING A COMPLETE BODY OF DIVINITY

VOLUMES. 1 & 2

BY HERMAN WITSIUS



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

FAITHFULLY TRANSLATED FROM THE LATIN, AND CAREFULLY REVISED, BY  
WILLIAM CROOKSHANK, D.D.

A NEW EDITION, WITH THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR. IN TWO VOLUMES. VOL. I. & II

LONDON: T. TEGG & SON, CHEAPSIDE; R. GRIFFIN AND CO., GLASGOW; T. T. AND  
H. TEGG, DUBLIN; ALSO J. AND S. A. TEGG, SYDNEY AND HOBART TOWN.

MDCCCXXXVII.

## Table of Contents

A PACIFIC ADDRESS .....	6
THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR.....	12
THE ECONOMY OF THE DIVINE COVENANTS - BOOK I.....	21
Chapter I: Of the Divine Covenants in General.....	22
Chapter II: Of the Contracting Parties in The Covenant of Works.....	28
Chapter III: Of the Law or Condition of the Covenant of Works.....	35
Chapter IV: Of the Promises of the Covenant of Works .....	43
Chapter V: Of the Penal Sanction.....	51
Chapter VI: Of the Sacraments of the Covenant of Works .....	66
Chapter VII: Of the First Sabbath.....	75
Chapter. VIII: Of the Violation of the Covenant of Works on the Part of Man .....	87
Chapter IX: Of the Abrogation of the Covenant of Works on the Part of God .....	98
THE ECONOMY OF THE DIVINE COVENANTS - BOOK II .....	104
Chapter I: Introduction to the Covenant of Grace.....	105
Chapter II: Of the Covenant between God the Father and the Son .....	107
Chapter III: The Nature of the Covenant between the Father and the Son more fully explained.....	115
Chapter IV: Of the Person of the Surety.....	126
Chapter V: Of the Suretiship and Satisfaction of Christ.....	133
Chapter VI: What Sufferings of Christ are Satisfactory .....	139
Chapter VII: Of the Efficacy* of Christ's Satisfaction .....	155
Chapter VIII: Of the Necessity of Christ's Satisfaction .....	162
Chapter IX: Of the Persons for whom Christ Engaged and Satisfied.....	170
Chapter X: After what manner Christ Used the Sacraments .....	181
THE ECONOMY OF THE DIVINE COVENANTS - BOOK III.....	187
Chapter I: Of the Covenant of God with the Elect.....	188
Chapter II: Of the ONENESS of the Covenant of Grace, as to its Substance .....	195
Chapter. III: Of the different Economies or Dispensations of the Covenant of Grace .....	206
Chapter IV: Of Election .....	218
Chapter V: Of Effectual Calling .....	231
Chapter VI: Of Regeneration .....	240
Chapter VII: Of Faith.....	251
Chapter VIII: Of Justification .....	264

Chapter IX: Of Spiritual Peace .....	289
Chapter X: Of Adoption.....	299
CHAPTER XI: Of the Spirit of Adoption.....	309
CHAPTER XII: Of Sanctification .....	318
CHAPTER XIII: Of Conservation* .....	355
CHAPTER XIV: Of Glorification .....	372
THE ECONOMY OF THE DIVINE COVENANTS - BOOK IV.....	389
CHAPTER I: Of the Doctrine of Salvation in the first age of the World.....	390
CHAPTER II: Of the Doctrine of Grace under Noah.....	404
CHAPTER III: Of the Doctrine of Grace from Abraham to Moses .....	413
CHAPTER IV: Of the Decalogue.....	427
CHAPTER V: Of the Doctrine of the Prophets .....	445
CHAPTER VI: Of the Types .....	446
CHAPTER VII: Of the Sacraments of Grace down to Abraham .....	475
CHAPTER VIII: Of Circumcision.....	484
CHAPTER IX: Of the Passover.....	496
CHAPTER X: Of the extraordinary Sacraments in the Wilderness .....	511
CHAPTER XI: Of the Blessings of the Old Testament.....	534
CHAPTER XII: Of the Imperfections falsely ascribed to the Old Testament.....	540
CHAPTER XIII: Of the real defects of the Old Testament .....	567
CHAPTER XIV: Of the Abrogation of the Old Testament .....	578
CHAPTER XV: Of the Benefits of the New Testament.....	596
CHAPTER XVI: Of Baptism.....	607
CHAPTER XVII: Of the Lord's Supper .....	623

## RECOMMENDATIONS

THE famous HERMAN WITSIUS, Professor of Divinity at Utrecht, in Holland, and the author of a treatise entitled, "The Economy of the Covenants between God and Man," and various other learned and theological tracts, was a writer, not only eminent for his great talents and particularly solid judgment, rich imagination, and elegancy of composition, but for a deep, powerful, and evangelical spirituality and savour of godliness: and we most heartily concur in the recommendation of his Works to serious Christians of all denominations, and especially to Ministers, and candidates for that sacred office.

JOHN GILL, D.D.

JOHN WALKER, LL. D.

THOMAS HALL.

JOHN BRINE.

WILLIAM KING.

THOMAS GIBBONS, M. A.

The late reverend, learned, and pious Mr. JAMES HERVEY, in his "Theron and Aspasio," vol. ii. p. 366, having mentioned a work of the above WITSIUS, adds, "The Economy of the Covenants, written by the same hand, is a body of divinity, in its method so well digested, in its doctrines so truly evangelical, and (what is not very usual with our systematic writers) in its language so refined and elegant, in its manner so affectionate and animating, that I would recommend it to every student in divinity. I would not scruple to risk all my reputation upon the merits of this performance: and I cannot but lament it as one of my greatest losses, that I was no sooner acquainted with this most excellent author, all whose works have such a delicacy of composition, and such a sweet savour of holiness, that I know not any comparison more proper to represent their true character, than the golden pot which had manna, and was outwardly bright with burnished gold, inwardly rich with heavenly food."

Extract of a Letter from a Clergyman in the Country to the Publisher

"———The sale of WITSIUS'S 'Economy of the Covenants' increases among my friends. The translation is very just, and the excellency of the work merits a place in every Christian's library: I shall do my utmost to recommend it at all times, and on all proper occasions. No pious person on earth can forbear reading the third book without wonder, rapture, and devotion. It exceeds all commendation. Hervey might well say, 'I would not scruple to risk all my reputation upon the merits of this performance.' For my own part, I am not ashamed nor afraid of any scorn and ridicule, that may be poured on me from any quarter, whilst I constantly aver, that the work has not its equal in the world."

## A PACIFIC ADDRESS

To the very reverend, learned, and celebrated Professors of Divinity in the Universities of the United Provinces of Holland, Pastors of the Reformed Churches, and zealous Defenders of the Faith once delivered to the Saints.

THE present age furnishes such a number of books that the world is almost weary of them, and the church certainly groans under their weight; as this never flourished more than when, in the pure simplicity of faith and love, and without any fondness for disputations, it regarded the doctrine of our Lord alone, and drew the pure and undefiled truth from those writings only, which could make "David wiser than all his teachers," and "the man of God perfect, thoroughly instructed to every good work." It is, indeed, very difficult in the present time, to write any thing which can please; for so great is every where the fruitfulness of learning, or the vain imagination of science; so obstinate the attachment to once-received hypotheses; so obstinate the attachment of men to their own opinions; and so malevolent the judgment passed on other people's works (which even sometimes affects the minds of good men against their wills), that whoever thinks by his writings to satisfy your delicate minds, or those who are engaged in a more general search after knowledge, seems to attribute too much to his own capacity, and to be ignorant of the disposition of the times. From indulging the first opinion, I am prevented by a consciousness of the slenderness of my own abilities; from the last, by my knowledge of the world. It therefore seems proper to assign some reasons for my appearing in public again, and to show the design of the work I now offer to the churches.

And to whom, reverend and learned sirs, should I render these reasons rather than to you, who are competent judges of what I write, and by whom, next to God and my own conscience, I wish to have my studies approved. In the first place, then, I sincerely declare, that it is not an incurable itch of writing, a raging thirst after vain-glory, an envious disposition of mind, a detestable desire of widening the wounds already made in the churches, the odious pleasure of blackening another's character, by giving a wrong turn to what is really right; nor, lastly, the infamous desire to make, increase, or continue strifes, which have occasioned my writing at this time. Besides my own declaration to the contrary, the whole work itself, though but slightly attended to, will acquit me of acting on such motives.

To see the minds of the godly disturbed by the inconsiderate assertions and the unusual interpretations of the Scriptures of the some writers, or by the suspicions of others (not all times dictated by charity, whatever share prudence may have in the case), gave me indeed the greatest concern. And forasmuch as the doctrine of the covenant of grace, by which the manner of the reconciliation of sinners to God is shown, and the different manifestations of that covenant, have been the unhappy object of controversy in the Netherlands, so that whatever points are now disputed upon (if we except the new method of interpreting the prophecies, and the opinions of the modern philosophy, which are imprudently introduced into the present system of divinity), may and ought to be referred to this. I have thought this subject deserving my notice in the first place, but I have treated it in that manner which is agreeable to the truths hitherto received in the churches, and without that levity or severity which is not consistent with the law of love. On which account, I have not confined myself to bare disputations, which are generally unprofitable;

and, if it were not that they were seasoned with a degree of acrimony, would be destitute of every kind of elegance.

I have chosen to enter on this subject from its very beginning, and have endeavoured, as far as I could, to explain it methodically and clearly, enlightening the obscurer passages of Scripture, carefully examining the phrases used by the Holy Ghost, and referring the whole to the practice of faith and godliness, to the glory of God in Christ, that my exposition might be the more useful and entertaining. And as nothing was more profitable and delightful to myself, so nothing could more evidently and fully convince the mind of others, than a clear and sober demonstration of the truth to the conscience; which, by pleasing steps, beginning with plain and acknowledged truths, and connecting them together, gradually leads to the more abstruse points and forces an assent to them, not less strongly than to those we are obliged to agree to at the first view; and at the same time by its efficacy presents to the inmost soul some truths before unknown, fixing it with a degree of astonishment in contemplation on the admirable perfections of God.

I have found it absolutely necessary to oppose different opinions; both those of the public adversaries of the reformed churches, amongst whom I reckon, first, the Socinians and the Remonstrants, who, by their daring comments have defiled the doctrine of God's covenants; and those of some of our brethren, who have enterprised the formation of new hypotheses, and have thereby almost rooted out all true divinity. I persuade myself it is not in the power of malice to deny that I have acted with candour and modesty: I have stated the controversy justly, not attributing to any one any opinion which he would not allow to be his own, and have made use of such arguments as had before satisfied my own conscience, as if these were not of themselves convincing, I could not think that any force would be added to them by the warmth of the disputant; especially, I considered that the opinions of our brethren were to be treated with candour, and I have never sought after any inaccurate word, harsh phrase, or crude expression, in order to criticise them; esteeming it much better to point out how far all the orthodox agree, and how the more improper ways of expression may be softened, remarking only on those sentiments which are really different; and these, I dare affirm, will be found to be fewer and of less moment than they are generally thought to be, provided we examine them without prejudice. Yet, I cannot pass over in silence some uncouth expressions, foreign interpretations, or contradictory theses, and occasionally I note the danger attending them, but without any malevolence to their authors; for I confess, I am of their opinion who believe that the doctrine of the covenant has long since been delivered to the churches on too good a foundation to stand in need of new hypotheses, in which I cannot find that solidity or usefulness which is necessary to establish their divinity.

The observation of the threefold covenant of grace; the first, under the promise, in which grace and liberty prevailed, without the yoke, or the burden of an accusing law; the second, under the law, when the Old Testament took place, subjecting the faithful to the dominion of angels, and the fear of death all their lives, and last of all, to the curse, not allowing to the fathers true and permanent blessings; the third, under the Gospel, when the godly began to be set at liberty from the dominion of the angels, from the fear of temporary death, and the curse which an exact observance of the ceremonial law carried with it, and at length enjoy true and lasting blessings, the circumcision of the heart, the law written there, the full and true remission of sins, the spirit of adoption, and such like things; this observation, I say, does not seem to me worthy of being insisted on in so many academical lectures, so many sermons, and such a number of books, as

have been published in the Latin and our own languages, as though the whole of theological learning consisted in these. For, in the following work I have shown that, however those doctrines are explained, they are horrible to be mentioned, and are not to be defended without wresting the Scriptures.

But I esteem as much more dangerous, the opinions of some men, in other respects very learned, who deny that a covenant of works was made with Adam; and will scarce allow that by the death with which he was threatened in case he sinned, a corporeal death is to be understood; and deny that spiritual and heavenly blessings, such as we now obtain through Christ, were promised to Adam on condition of perfect obedience: and by an antiquated distinction, dividing the sufferings of Christ into painful and judiciary, affirm that the latter only, or, as they sometimes soften the expression, chiefly, were satisfactory; excluding by this means his sorrows in the garden, the sentence passed on him both by the Jewish council and the Roman governor, the stripes with which his body was wounded, his being nailed to the cursed cross, and last of all his death itself. On these subjects I have given my mind freely and candidly, as became a defender of the truth and an opposer of falsehood: which laudable character was given of the emperor Constantine the fourth, by the sixth Œcumenical Synod at Constantinople; and which is what all of our order ought to endeavour to deserve.

I have also made remarks on some things of less moment, which did not seem to have a solid scriptural interpretation, or are less accurately conceived of than they ought to be. Nor has my labour been without profit. Amphilochius is justly commended by Basilius, because he thought that "no word which was used concerning God should be passed over without the most careful inquiry into its meaning." But I have done this without rancour or raillery: "not with a view of reproving the authors, but that the studious reader might be benefited by having their errors shown him," as I remember Polybius somewhere expresses himself. And I hope it will not be taken ill by the learned and ingenuous, to whom I grant the same liberty I myself take, if (to use nearly the same words which Augustine uses, when he declares his dissent from Cyprian), whilst "I cannot arrive at their degree of merit, acknowledge my writings inferior to many of theirs, love their ingenuity, am delighted with what they say, and admire their virtues; yet I cannot in all things agree with them, but make use of the liberty wherewith our Lord has called us." Especially when they see that I have willingly adopted their own ingenious inventions, what they have happily found out by searching into the original languages, have learnedly recovered from the reliques of hitherto unknown antiquity, have judiciously confirmed or clearly explained; and have highly recommended them to the reader.

They will also find that, wherever I think them right, however they may be censured by others, I have cordially defended them, and have wiped off the stamp of absurdity and novelty. And this I have done so frequently and solicitously that, without doubt, some will say, I have done it too much. But I cannot yet allow myself to be sorry for having dealt so ingenuously with them. For how could any one have done otherwise, who is not attached to a faction, or is not a slave to his own or another's affections; but has dedicated himself to truth alone, and regards not what any particular person says, but what is said. He who loves the peace of Jerusalem, had rather see controversies lessened than increased; and will with pleasure hear that several things are innocent, or even useful, which had sometimes been made the matter of controversy.



All good men are, indeed, justly offended with that wantonness of wit, which, in the present day, rashly aims to overturn wise opinions; and, after having attacked the dogmas of religion, then insolently offers a bold, and often ludicrous, interpretation of prophecy, ridiculously including that under the name of prophecy which contains nothing but the doctrine of our common faith and holiness; by which the public and our sacred functions are not a little abused: and it is not to be wondered at, if the warmer zeal of some has painted this wantonness as it deserves, or perhaps, in too strong colours. But yet, a medium is to be regarded in all things; and I do not approve the pains of some, who, whilst they discourse on our differences, not only make them amount to decades, but even centuries; and frequently with bitter eloquence are very violent on some innocent subjects. Whether this method of disputing greatly conduces to the promoting of saving knowledge, or the edification of souls, I will not now say; but I am certain of this: the enemies of our church are hereby greatly delighted, and secretly rejoice, that there are as many and as warm disputes amongst ourselves, as against them. And this not very secretly either: for they do not, nor will ever, cease to cast this reproach upon us; which, I grieve to say, is not so easily wiped away.

O! how much better would it be to use our utmost endeavours, to lessen, make up, and, if it could be, put an end to all controversy! Make this, reverend and learned Sirs, your great concern. This all the godly who mourn for the breaches in Joseph; this the churches who are committed to your care; this Jesus himself, the King of truth and peace, require and expect from you; in the most earnest manner they entreat it of you. "If, therefore, there be any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies, fulfil ye my joy," fulfil ye the joy of all saints, fulfil ye the joy of our Lord Jesus himself, "that ye may be like-minded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind." There have been already more than enough quarrels, slanders, and suspicions; more than enough of contentions amongst brethren, which, I engage for it, will afford no just cause of triumph; more than enough intestine divisions, by which we destroy one another; and more than enough of passion. Let the love of divisions, a thirst after pre-eminence and schismatical names, be henceforward banished from amongst us. Let all litigious, satirical, and virulent writings be blotted out; "as they only serve to revive the fires of strife-engendering questions." But if we must write on those controversies, let us lay aside all evil dispositions, which are hinderances to us in our inquiries, and mislead our readers. Let us fight with arguments, not railings, bearing in our minds this saying of Aristophanes, "It is dishonourable, and by no means becoming poets, to rail at each other." How much less does it become Christians to do so! The streams of divinity are pure: they rise only from the fountain of sacred learning, and should be defiled with none of the impure waters of the ancient or modern philosophy. Let us abstain from harsh and unusual expressions, and from crude and rash assertions; from whence arise "envy, strife, railings, and evil surmisings." The writings of both testaments should be handled diligently by all, but with sacred fear and trembling. Let none please himself with his commentaries, because they contain something new and unknown by our predecessors. Let him who thinks he has found out something preferable to the received opinion, offer it to the public with modesty, without vilifying the brethren; not asserting or determining rashly, but submitting his thoughts to the censure of the learned, and the judgment of the church; not forcing them on the common people to the distraction of their minds; nor hastily offering them to incautious youth, who are improper judges of such weighty matters. Nor let any reject, on account of its novelty, what is agreeable to the meaning of the words, to Scripture phrases, to the analogy of faith, or to the relation the text bears to others. Cajetan, who

is commended by our Chameir, has not badly expressed himself on this head: "If a new sense of the text offers itself, though it be different from that of divines in general, let the reader judge of it for himself." And in another place he says, "Let none refuse assenting to a new sense of sacred writ, because it differs from that given by the ancients; for God has not bound himself to the truth of their expositions of the Scriptures." Let the depths of prophecy be also diligently searched into; but reverently, without wresting the Scriptures, without violating those bounds wherewith it has pleased God to keep them from human intuition; lest he who attempts to search into the majesty should be overwhelmed by the glory.

Let no one, of however great name, by his authority bind the free consciences of the faithful; but, as Clemens Romanus once said, "Let the truth be taken from the Scriptures themselves:" by these alone it should stand or fall in religious affairs; by these are all controversies to be settled. And it was by the sacred and undefiled Gospels of our Lord Jesus Christ, that the ancient councils were influenced. Nevertheless, let not any one inconsiderately on this pretence, withhold his assent to those forms of expression which are taken from the word of God, and are agreeable to the Scriptures, are the bonds of church union, the marks of orthodoxy, the bars of heresy, and the limits of wanton wits; as though they were the remains of the Babylonish tower, in the construction of which men were obliged to think and speak alike in religion.

Let no one choose for himself a guide out of the modern divines; all whose dictates he is determined to receive and defend as celestial oracles; as one who is given as "a new teacher and light of the world," as the ancients said of Basilius; and in comparison of whom all others appear as little children or dwarfs; when he himself perhaps protests, that he would not be thought the author of any thing new, and made the head of a sect. On the other hand, let no one despise such a man, as if nothing true or good, nothing useful to the understanding of the Scriptures, could be learned from him; for God has not put it into the heart of any pious persons to search the Scriptures night and day, without opening to them those treasures of his sacred wisdom.

Let us preach the good tidings of the Gospel; let us congratulate the church on account of them, and make the best use of them ourselves we can. Let no one who has in general expressed the truth in eloquent language, be heinously censured on account of an improper word or harsh expression which has slipped from his pen: "Poison does not lie hidden in syllables; nor does truth consist in sound, but in the intention; nor godliness in the tinkling of brass, but in the meaning of the things signified." Yet, let us all endeavour to express ourselves as accurately as possible, and not take upon us to defend what has been imprudently said by our friends or ourselves, lest others blame us for it; but as far as ingenuousness, truth, charity, and all good men will allow of it, let us pass by, cancel, or correct any mistakes; which has been the practice of some great men, both amongst the ancients and moderns, to their very great credit. Let none of our brethren be stigmatized with the brand of heresy, on account of what is supposed to follow from any of their expressions, when they themselves deny and detest the consequence. Solid learning, manners conformable to Christian sanctity, a peaceable disposition, and a faithful discharge of our duty without noise and confusion, will procure favour much more than inconsiderate warm zeal, and the violent efforts of a passionate mind; which are designed, for the most part, to heighten our own glory and seeming importance, though the cause of God be made the pretence for them.

Let some liberty also be given to learned men, in explaining texts of Scripture, in the choice of arguments for the defence of the common truth, in the use of phrases and terms, and in resolving problematic questions (for in this our state of dark ness it is not to be expected that all men should think and speak alike); but let this liberty be confined within the bounds of modesty, prudence, and love; lest it degenerate into petulant licentiousness, and turn our Zion into a Babel.

These, reverend and learned Sirs, are my earnest wishes; these my sentiments, which I recommend to your prudence, faith, and piety; as I do yourselves and your pious labours, to the grace of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ; "who can make you perfect to every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight;" and at last, when you have fought the good fight of faith, can bless you with an everlasting crown of glory. This was long since, and is now, the most earnest wish of,

Reverend and learned Sirs,

Your fellow-labourer, and

Servant in the Lord,

H. WITSIUS.

Utrecht,

Oct. 20, 1693.

## THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR

HERMAN WITS (or, as he is commonly called, Witsius) was descended from reputable parents. His father, Nicolaus Wits, was a gentleman universally esteemed by his fellow-citizens at Enkhuisen, to whom he endeared himself by his fidelity, modesty, justice, benevolence, and unaffected piety, in every character he sustained, either in the church or in the city; for in the former he was first a deacon, and afterwards a ruling elder, and treasurer in the latter. His mother was Johanna, a gentlewoman of great piety and prudence, the daughter of Herman Gerhard; who, after many dangers and distresses, obtained a calm and secure settlement in the church at Enkhuisen; where he preached the gospel for upwards of thirty years, with great reputation; and such was the affection he bore to his church, that he rejected the most profitable offers that were made to him.

The parents of our Witsius, having vowed to devote a child to the ministry, did, upon the birth of this son, call him after his grandfather, praying that in Herman, the grandson, might be revived the spirit of the grandfather; and that, endued with equal, if not superior talents, he might imitate his example.

Herman Witsius was born on the 12th of February, 1636, at Enkhuisen, a town of West Friesland; one of the first that threw off the Spanish yoke, asserted their own liberty, and, once enlightened with the truths of the gospel, retained the purity of worship ever after, and in the very worst times of Arminianism, continued, above many, stedfast in the faith. And though it was a place noted for trade and navigation, yet it produced men famous in every branch of literature. So that Witsius, even in his native place, had illustrious patterns to copy after.

The care which these pious parents took of young Witsius during his tender infancy, was not intermitted as he began to grow; for, being still mindful of their vow, they brought him up in a very pious manner, instructing him in the principles and precepts of religion and Christian piety. In his sixth year they sent him to the public school of the town, to learn the rudiments of the Latin tongue; from which, after spending three years, and being advanced to the highest form there, his maternal uncle, Peter Gerhard, a person well skilled in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and philosophy, took him under his own private and domestic tuition. The uncle, whose principal study had been divinity, disengaged from all public business, and being as fond of his nephew as if he had been his own son, taught him with that assiduity, that before he was fifteen he made no small proficiency in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Hebrew, and acquired such knowledge in logic and other parts of philosophy, that, when he was afterwards removed to the university, he could study without a master. At the same time he learned the ethic compendiums of Wallæus and Burgersdicius, with so much care, as to be able to repeat most of the sentences very frequent in Burgersdicius, from the ancients, both Greek and Latin. He also perused his elements of physics, and dipped a little into metaphysical subtleties; and committed to memory most of the theological definitions and distinctions from Wendelin. As his uncle was a man of exemplary piety, and was wont to apply almost to every common occurrence of life some striking passages of both Testaments, which he often repeated, either in Hebrew or Greek, while rising, dressing, walking, studying, or otherwise employed; so, by his example and admonitions, he stirred up his nephew to the same practice. Whence it was, that at those tender years he had rendered familiar

to himself many entire passages of the Hebrew and Greek Testament, which he was far from forgetting when more advanced in life.

Being thus formed by a private education, in 1651, and the fifteenth year of his age, it was resolved to send him to some university. Utrecht was pitched upon, being furnished with men very eminent in every branch of literature, with a considerable concourse of students, and an extraordinary strictness of discipline. What principally recommended it, were the famous divines, Gisbert Voetius, Charles Maatsius, and John Hernbeckius, all of them great names, and ornaments in their day. Being therefore received into that university, he was, for metaphysics, put under the direction of Paul Voetius, then professor of philosophy; and being, moreover, much taken with the study of the Oriental languages, he closely attended on the celebrated John Leusden, who taught those languages with incredible dexterity, and under him he construed almost the whole Hebrew text, as also the Commentaries of Solomon Jarchi, Aben Ezra, and Kimchi on Hosea, and the Chaldee Paraphrase of Jonathan on Isaiah, and of Onkelos on a part of the Pentateuch. Moreover, under the same master, he just touched on the mysteries of the Masora, and the barbarous diction of the Talmud; namely, the parts published by John Cocceius, under the title of Sanhedrin and Maccoth, and by Constantine Lempereur, under that of Babha Bathraë; under the same master he learned the elements of the Syriac and Arabic languages; which last, however, he afterwards less cultivated than the others. What proficiency he made in the Hebrew, appeared from a public specimen he gave, at the instigation of Leusden, of a well-written Hebrew oration about the Messiah of the Jews and Christians, in 1654. But though giving unremitted attention to those studies, he by no means neglected the study of divinity, to which he knew all the others were only subservient; but in that sublime science he diligently used, as masters, the greatest men, and best acquainted with the sacred scriptures, whose most laudable memory no lapse of time shall ever be able to obliterate; namely, Gisbert Voetius, John Hernbeckius, Gualterus Bruinicus, and Andrew Essenius. By whose instructions, together with his own extraordinary application, and true piety towards God, what proficiency he made, the reader may easily judge for himself. However, he had a mind to see Groningen, to have the benefit of hearing the famous Samuel Maresius; whither he went in 1654, after the summer vacation; chiefly applying to divinity: under whose direction he made exercises in French, by which he gave so much satisfaction to this great man, that notwithstanding his many avocations, he deigned to correct and purge those declamations of Witsius from their solecisms and other improprieties, before they were recited in the college. Having thus spent a year at Groningen, and obtained an honourable testimonial from the theological faculty, he next turned his thoughts to Leyden. But the plague then raging there, he resolved to return to Utrecht, in order to build farther on the foundation he had there so happily laid; and, therefore, he not only carefully heard the professors in divinity at this time, as before, both in public and private, but cultivated a peculiar familiarity with the very reverend Justus van den Bogaerdt, whose piety, prudence, and admirable endowments he had such a value for, that he imagined, perhaps from youthful inexperience, no preacher equal to him. From his sermons, conversation, and example, he learned the deeper mysteries of the kingdom of God, and of mystical and spiritual Christianity. From him he understood how great the difference is between any superficial knowledge, which scholastic exercises, books learnedly written, and a close application, may procure to minds quite destitute of sanctification; and that heavenly wisdom, which is acquired by meditation, prayer, love, familiar converse with God, and by the very relish and experience of spiritual things; which proceeding from the Spirit of God, internally illuminating, convincing, persuading, and sealing,

gloriously transforms the whole man to the most holy image of Christ. In a word, he owns, that by means of this holy person he was introduced by the Lord Jesus to his most secret recesses, while before, he too much and too fondly pleased himself in tarrying in the porch; and there, at length, he learned, disclaiming all vain presumption of science, to sit humbly at the feet of the heavenly Master, and receive the kingdom of heaven as a little child. But that it may not be thought he so applied to the formation of his mind to piety, as to neglect for the future all academical studies, the theses he wrote on the Sacred Trinity, against the Jews, from their own writings, may, and ought to be, a proof to the contrary. These he published in the month of October, 1655, to be disputed under the moderation of the famous Leusden; and though they were warmly attacked by the most experienced academicians, yet the moderator thought the respondent acquitted himself so well as to supersede his interposition on any account; and when, according to custom, he returned solemn thanks to the moderator for his trouble, this last very politely and truly made answer, He had stood in no need of his help.

The time now seemed to require, that our Witsius, very famous at two universities, should be employed in the public service of the church, and give, as is usual, specimens of his proficiency. Therefore, in the month of May, 1656, he presented himself at Enkhuisen to a preparatory examination, as it is called, together with his then fellow-student, John Lasdragerus, with whom he had a familiarity from his youth, and whom he afterwards had for his most intimate colleague and faithful fellow-labourer, first in the church of Leovaarden, and then at Utrecht. And upon this occasion he was admitted to preach publicly, which he did with uncommon applause, and gave so general satisfaction, that there was scarce a country church in North Holland, where he then resided, which wanting a minister, did not put his name in the number of the three candidates, from which the election is usually made. And, at the instigation of the reverend John James le Bois, minister of the French church at Utrecht, he ventured, upon leave given, to preach publicly to the French church at Dort, in their language. And from that time he often preached in French, both at Utrecht and Amsterdam; as also sometimes in the course of his ministry at Leovaarden. But because he imagined, there was still something wanting to the elegance of his language, he proposed very soon to take a tour to France, and pay his respects to the great men there, and at the same time have the pleasure of hearing them, and improving in their language.

But Providence disposed otherwise; for, the following year, 1657, and the twenty-first of his age, being lawfully called by the church of West Wouden, he was ordained there on the 8th of July. This village lies almost in the mid-way between Enkhuisen and Horn, and is united with the parish of Binne-Wijsent. And here, for four years and upwards, he laboured with the greatest alacrity of a youthful mind; and with no less benefit: for, by frequent catechising, and with the greatest prudence suiting himself to the catechumens, both boys and girls, they, who before were grossly ignorant, could not only give proper answers on the principal heads of our religion, but prove their assertions by suitable texts of scripture, and repeat a whole sermon distinctly, when examined on it, to the joy as well as shame of their parents and older people. The reputation of so faithful and dexterous a pastor being thus widely spread, the church of Wormer, in the same tract of North Holland, sufficiently numerous and celebrated, but then too much distracted by intestine commotions, imagined they could not pitch upon a fitter guide to allay their heats, and form their minds. This call Witsius not only accepted, passing to that charge in October, 1661, but spent there four years and a half, doing every thing in his power to promote Christian unanimity and the common salvation; and as he saw the extensive fruits of his labours among them, so he was

universally beloved. Wherefore he could not bear to remove from them to the people of Sluice in Flanders, who offered him great encouragement to preach; but the people of Goese in Zealand succeeded in their call, and he repaired to them about Whitsuntide, 1666, and was so acceptable to all by his doctrine, manners, and diligence, as to live there in the most agreeable peace and concord, with his learned, pious, and vigilant colleagues, two of whom he revered as his fathers; and the third, who was younger, he loved as his brother. He was much delighted with this settlement, and often wished to grow old in this peaceful retreat. But the people of Leovaarden in West Friesland interrupted these thoughts; who, in November, 1667, called him, with a remarkable affection, to that celebrated metropolis of his native country, that he might prove a shining light, not only in the church, court, and senate of that place, but to all the people of Friesland, who flocked thither from all parts to the assembly of the States; but the people of Goese, doing all they could to hinder his removal, it was April, 1668, before he went to Leovaarden. And it is scarcely to be expressed, with what vigilance, fidelity, and prudence he conducted himself. In a time of such difficulty, when the enemy had made such incursions into Holland, and made themselves masters of most of its towns, and struck a panic into all, a man of such spirit and resolution was absolutely necessary. Nor do I know of any before or since, whose labours were more successful, and who was more acceptable to the church, the nobility, and the court. And therefore he was for some time tutor to Henry Casimir, the most serene prince of Nassau, hereditary governor of Friesland, too untimely snatched away by death; and with remarkable success he instructed, in the doctrines of religion, his most illustrious sister, Amelia, a very religious princess, afterwards married to the duke of Saxe Eisenach; and he presided at the profession of faith, which both princes publicly made, to the great edification of the church, in the presence of the princess mother, Albertina of Orange.

It is not, therefore, to be wondered, that when, through the injury of the most calamitous times, and the decease both of the venerable and aged Christian Schotanus, and of John Melchior Steinbergius, scarce installed in the professorship, the theological interests of the university of Franequer seemed to be fallen to decay; and the extraordinary and truly academical endowments of our Witsius were perfectly well known in Friesland, by an experience of seven whole years; that, I say, he was appointed to the ordinary profession of divinity, in the year 1675, in the academy of his native country, thus happily to be restored. Which opportunity also the church of Franequer prudently laid hold on, being then without a second minister, very cheerfully to commit to him, now appointed professor, that sacred charge. Having, therefore, accepted both these calls, he came to Franequer; and, after being declared doctor of divinity in the academical assembly, by the divine his colleague, he was, on the 15th of April, installed professor of the same; after delivering a solemn oration, with the greatest applause of a concourse of people from all parts; in which he excellently expressed the character of a genuine divine; and as such he soon after demeaned himself, together with the venerable and aged Nicolaus Arnoldus, his most intimate colleague.

In the pulpit Witsius addressed himself with so much gravity, elegance, piety, solidity, and usefulness, that the general inattention of the people was removed, and religious impressions made both on great and small. The academical chair also gained a warmth from his sacred fire, to which, from the different and most distant parts of Europe, the youth, intended for the ministry, resorted in great numbers. And not to be wanting in his duty, or disappoint the intention of those who called him, in any particular, he no sooner entered the university, than, notwithstanding his

many daily public and private labours, in both his offices, he set himself to write, and in a very little time published, besides his "Select Academical Disputations," mostly tending to establish the peace of the church, and a smaller dissertation, two works, pretty large and learned, which went through several editions, and were spread over Europe; being every where read with universal approbation. And besides, there was nothing of extraordinary importance to be transacted against the schismatic followers of Labadie, who had then fixed their principal residence in West Friesland, which both the nobility and the overseers of the church did not think proper should be dispatched by our author.

About this time, Mr. J. Mark, on his return from his studies at Leyden, commenced his acquaintance with Witsius, who recommended him as pastor to the church of Midlumen, between Franequer and Harlingen; and afterwards procured him the degree of doctor in divinity; and, by his interest with his serene highness and others, doctor Mark was appointed third ordinary professor of divinity.

But, the justly renowned character of our Witsius was such, that others, envying the happiness of the people of Friesland, wanted to have the benefit of his labours themselves. This was first attempted by the overseers of the university of Groningen, who, to procure a worthy successor to the deceased James Altingius, as well in the theological and philological chairs, as in the university church, about the close of the year 1679, sent to Franequer a reverend person, to offer the most honourable terms, in order to prevail on Witsius. But that attempt proved unsuccessful. For, communicating the affair to his serene highness the prince, and the other overseers of the university, they protested his services were most acceptable to them, and he excused himself in a handsome manner to the people of Groningen. But those of Utrecht very soon followed the example of Groningen, in the beginning of the year 1680; when, upon the decease of the celebrated Burmannus, they judged it necessary to have a great man, to add to the reputation of their university, and to maintain the ancient piety of their church; and being well assured that none was fitter for all those purposes than Witsius, who was formerly one of their own students, they therefore dispatched a splendid deputation to Franequer, to entreat him to come and be an ornament to their university and church, to which he consented with little difficulty, notwithstanding the opposition made by those of Friesland, who were loth to part with one who had been so useful among them; for his obligations to the university of Utrecht were such, that he thought he could not show his gratitude more than by accepting of their invitation. Accordingly, after a most honourable dismissal from the afflicted Frieslanders, he came to Utrecht, and was admitted into the ministry of that church, on the 25th of April, and four days after, into the professorship of the university, after delivering a most elegant oration on the excellence of evangelical truth, which fully answered universal expectation. And it can scarce be expressed, how happily he lived in credit, and laboured above full eighteen years of his most valuable life, with these celebrated men: Peter Maestricht, Melchior Leideckerus, Hermannus, and Halenius, after the example of the doctors his predecessors, whom he always had in the highest veneration. In the ministry he had several colleagues, men of learning, piety, peace, and zeal for God; among whom were his ancient colleagues in the church of Leovaarden Peter Eindhovius, and John Lasdragerus. In the university, besides the forementioned divines, he had not only his own John Leusden, an excellent philologist, but Gerhard de Uries and John Luitsius, famous philosophers, who, for the benefit of the church, prepared the youth intended for the ministry. Before his pulpit he had a Christian magistracy and the whole body of the people, who admired and experienced



the power of his elocution, their minds being variously affected with religious impressions. Before his academical and private chair, he had not only a large circle of promising youths from all parts of the world, who admired his most learned, solid, prudent, and eloquent dissertations; but doctors themselves daily resorted in great numbers to learn of him. And therefore, he declined no labour, by which, even at the expence of many restless nights, he might be of service to the university and church. Nor did he think it sufficient by sermons, lectures, conferences, and disputations to produce his useful and various stock of learning, but he exposed his treasures to the whole world, present and to come, in many public and excellent writings, to last for ever, and never to decay, but with the utter extinction of solid learning and true piety itself. And to the commendation of the people of Utrecht be it spoken, that, not only in ecclesiastical assemblies, they always acknowledged his abilities and prudence, seasonably calling him to the highest dignities in synods; but even the nobility, both by deeds and words, testified, that his endowments were perfectly well known to, and highly esteemed of them. And therefore they honoured him twice with the badges of the highest office in their university, in 1686 and in 1697. And we must by no means omit, that when in 1685, a most splendid embassy of the whole united provinces was decreed to be sent to James king of Great Britain, afterwards unhappily drawn aside and ruined by the deceitful arts of the French and Romish party; which embassy was executed by the most illustrious Wassenaar, lord of Duvenvorden, and the ordinary ambassador, his excellency, Citters, with the most noble and illustrious Weed, lord of Dykveld; that, I say, this last easily persuaded his colleagues of legation to employ none but Witsius for their chaplain; a divine whom, to the honour of the Dutch churches, they might present in person to the English nation, without any apprehension, either of offence or contempt. Nor was Witsius himself against the resolution of these illustrious personages, for he went cheerfully, though indisposed in body; and on his return, in a few months after, owned that having conversed with the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishop of London, and with many other divines, both episcopal and dissenters in discipline, he observed not a few things, which made an increase to his stock of learning, and by which he was better qualified to act prudently on all future occasions. And the English, from that time, owned, that being thus better acquainted with Witsius, he ever after justly deserved their regard and applause.

The reputation of Witsius, thus spread all over the world, made the most illustrious overseers of Leyden, with the Burgomasters, resolve to give a call to this great man, in 1698; in order to make up the loss, which was apprehended from the decease of the great Spanhemius, which seemed to be drawing near. And this resolution was approved of by our gracious stadtholder, William III. king of Great Britain, of immortal memory, from that constant piety he entertained towards God, and that equal fidelity and prudence he exercised towards our church and university. Nor was there the least delay, either in determining or executing that call to the professorship of divinity, or in his accepting thereof. For, though the people of Utrecht could have wished otherwise, yet our Witsius had several weighty reasons, why he thought it his duty to comply with the Leyden invitation; judging it was entirely for the interest of the church, equally as for his own, that hereafter exempted from the labours of the pulpit, he might, with the greater freedom, devote the rest of his aged life to the benefit of the university. But especially, as he was made acquainted with his majesty's pleasure, by the illustrious pensioner Heinsius. And when his majesty admitted him into his royal presence, he signified the satisfaction he had with his accepting the call to the chair of Leyden. He entered on his office the 16th of October, after delivering a very grave and elegant oration, in which he pourtrayed the character of the Modest Divine. And with what

fidelity he discharged this office for the space of ten years; and with what assiduity he laboured, with what wisdom and] prudence he taught, with what elegance he spoke, with what alacrity he discoursed in disputations, with what piety he lived, with what sweetness of temper he demeaned himself, with what gracefulness he continued to write, with what lustre he adorned the university, are things so well known to all, as may supersede any particular enlargement.

But he had scarce passed a year at Leyden, when the high and mighty states of Holland and West-Friesland did, on the recommendation of the overseers of the university, in the room of Mark Essius, the piously deceased inspector of their theological college, in which ingenious youths of the republic are reared, for the service of the church, commit the superintendency thereof to our Witsius, as the mildest tutor they could employ for their pupils; without detriment to all the honour and dignity of his professorship, which he enjoyed in conjunction with the celebrated Anthony Hulsius. When he was installed in this new office, the illustrious president of the supreme court of Holland, and overseer of the university, Hubert Roosenboomius, lord of Sgrevelsrecht, did in a most elegant Latin discourse, in the name of all the nobility, not only set forth the praises of the new inspector, but also exhorted all the members of that college to a due veneration for him, and to show him all other becoming marks of respect. Witsius accepted, but with reluctance, this new province; for, had he not judged a submission to the will of the states, and his laying himself out for the service of the church, to be his duty, he would not have complied with it. However, he executed this great charge with the greatest fidelity and care for the advantage of, and with an affection for, his pupils, equally with that of his professorship in the university; till, in the year 1707, on the 8th of February, on account of his advanced age and growing infirmities, he, with great modesty, in the assembly of the Overseers and Burgomasters, notwithstanding all their remonstrances and entreaties to the contrary, both in public and private, and all the great emoluments arising therefrom to himself, resigned this other office; being at the same time also discharged, at his own desire, from the public exercises of his professorship in the university; for executing which in the old manner his strength of body was scarce any longer sufficient; the vigour of his mind continued still unaltered, but as he often declared, he had much rather desist from the work than flag in it.

And it is not to be thought, that Witsius would have been equal to so many and great labours, and the church and university have enjoyed so many and great benefits by him, had he not found at home the most powerful cordials and supports; particularly in the choicest and most beloved of wives, Aletta van Borkhorn, the daughter of Wesselvan Borkhorn, a citizen and merchant of good character, at Utrecht, and a worthy elder of the church, and of Martina van Ysen, whom he married in the middle of the summer of 1660, after three years spent in the sacred ministry. She was eminent for meekness, and every civil and religious virtue; she loved [and honoured her husband in an uncommon degree; with her he lived in the greatest harmony and complacency, about four and twenty years, in North-Holland, Zealand, Friesland, and at Utrecht; and at length, in the year 1684, after many great and long infirmities of body, she was taken from him by a truly Christian death. He was no less happy in his offspring, especially in three surviving daughters, Martina, Johanna, and Petronella, who were endued with every accomplishment that can adorn the sex, but especially in their duty and affection to their father, which they showed, not only before, but more especially after the death of their mother.

From what has been said, the admirable endowments and virtues of this man may sufficiently appear. How great was the force of his genius in apprehending, investigating and illustrating, even the most abstruse subjects; the accuracy of his judgment in distinguishing, determining, and arranging them; the tenacity of his memory in retaining and recollecting them; what readiness of the most charming eloquence in explaining, inculcating, and urging them home, were well known to those who ever saw or heard him. Nor was his gracefulness in a Latin style, as is most apparent from all he wrote and said, less than his readiness in the Dutch; in which, discoursing from the pulpit, with a peculiar decency of gesture and voice, he ravished the minds of the faithful to a holy assent, and unbelievers and the vicious themselves he filled with astonishment, shame, and terror. There was no branch of learning, necessary to adorn a divine, in which he did not greatly excel. He so increased his knowledge of philosophy, when at the university, that none of the quirks or sophisms of infidels could ensnare him, nor any artifice induce him to make shipwreck of the faith, or embrace or encourage any of the errors of the times. He was master of the whole compass of sacred philology, Greek and Hebrew; he was well acquainted with the elegancies of profane literature, Latin, Greek, and Oriental; skilfully borrowing from thence whatever might serve to explain, in a becoming manner, the sacred Scriptures; prudently avoiding every extreme. He was perfectly well skilled in history, both ancient and modern, ecclesiastical and civil, Jewish and Christian, domestic and foreign; and from it he always selected, with the greatest care, what might principally be of present use. He thoroughly learned divinity in all its branches, being as expert in the confirmation and vindication of doctrines, and in showing their connexion, as in confuting errors, discovering their origin, and distinguishing their importance. Above all, he was in love with, revered, and commended the Holy Scriptures, as that from which alone true wisdom is to be derived; and which, by long practice, he had rendered so very familiar to himself, as not only to have the original words upon all occasions very readily at command, but to be able directly, without hesitation, to explain the most difficult. Nor did he, in this case, rest on any man's authority; most rightly judging such a conduct to be inconsistent with the divine glory of the Christian faith, declaring and demeaning himself the most obsequious disciple of the Holy Spirit alone. Hence he had neither a disdain for old, and an itch for new things; nor an aversion to new, and a mad and indolent fondness for old things. He would neither be constrained by others, nor constrain any one himself; being taught neither to follow nor to form a party. That golden saying pleased him much: "Unanimity in things necessary, liberty in things not necessary, and in all things prudence and charity;" which he professed was his common creed. Nor can we have the least doubt of his zeal for the "faith once delivered to the saints," and for true piety towards God, which he expressed in his writings, when at Leovaarden and Franequer, against some dangerous opinions then starting up both in divinity and philosophy; of which also he gave a proof at Utrecht and Leyden, when publicly testifying in writing, that he could not bear the authority of reason to be so extolled above Scripture, as that this last should be entirely subject to its command, or be overturned by ludicrous interpretations. His zeal, in his latter days, was greatly inflamed when he observed all ecclesiastical discipline against those who would overthrow the Christian faith, and even right reason itself, publicly trampled upon under the most idle pretences, and every thing almost given up to a depraved reason, to the subverting the foundations of Christianity, while some, indeed, mourned in secret, but were forced to be silent; and therefore he declared his joy at his approaching dissolution, on account of the evils he foresaw were hanging over the church, and often called on those who should survive, to tremble when the adversary was thus triumphing over the doctrines of salvation and all true piety, to the destruction both of church and state by men whom it least

became, and who still artfully dissembled a regard for religion, and for ecclesiastical and civil constitutions, unless God, in his wonderful providence, averted the calamity, and more powerfully stirred up the zeal of our superiors against Atheism, Pelagianism, and their latent seeds. I do not speak of those smaller differences in the method of ranging theological matters observable for some time past in the modes of expression. All are well apprised with what equity and moderation Witsius ever treated these differences in opinion, and if ever any was inclined to unanimity and concord with real brethren, he was the man who never did any thing to interrupt it; but every thing either to establish or restore it, and to remove all seeds of dissention. This is that to which the genuine Christianity he had imbibed prompted him, and what the singular meekness of his temper inspired; by which he was ready to give way to the rashly angry, and either made no answer to injurious railers, or repaid them even with those ample encomiums which, in other respects, they might deserve. Thus lived our venerable Witsius, giving uneasiness to none, but the greatest pleasure to all with whom he had any connexion, and was not easily exceeded by any in offices of humanity and brotherly love. There was at the same time in him a certain wonderful conjunction of religious and civil prudence, consummated and confirmed by long experience, with an unfeigned candour. Neither was any equal to him for diligence in the duties of his office, being always most ready to do every thing by which he could be serviceable to the flocks and pupils under his care, for the benefit of the church. He did not withdraw from them in old age itself, nor during his indisposition indulge himself too much. His modesty was quite singular, by which he not only always behaved with that deep concern in treating the Holy Scriptures and its mysteries, but also, by which he scarce ever pleased himself, in the things he most happily wrote and said: and when his best friends justly commended his performances, he even suspected their sincerity. Nor could any under adversities be more content with his lot, even publicly declaring at Utrecht, that he would not exchange his place in the university and church, either with the royal or imperial dignity. And to other virtues, or rather in the compass of one to comprise all; he was not in appearance, but in reality, a true divine, ever covering his heavenly wisdom by a sincere piety towards and his Saviour. For he was constant in the public acts of worship, unwearied in the domestic exercises of piety, giving, in this, an example for the imitation of others in the fear of the Lord, incessantly taken up in heavenly meditation, and instant in prayer, both stated and ejaculatory; in fine, his chief care was, by avoiding evil and doing good, to demean himself both towards God and man, as became one who had obtained redemption through Christ, and, by divine grace, the hope of a blessed eternity in heaven; which he constantly panted after, with the utmost contempt for the things in the world.

His writings are numerous, learned, and useful: in 1660, almost at his entrance on the ministry, he published his *Judaus Christianizans*, on the principles of faith, and on the Holy Trinity. When at Wormer, he put out in Low-Dutch, 1665, *The Practice of Christianity*, with the spiritual characters of the unregenerate, with respect to what is commendable in them; and of the regenerate, as to what is blameable and wants correction. At Leovaarden, he gave also in Low-Dutch, *The Lord's Controversy with his Vineyard*, and at the same time, briskly defended it against opponents. Of his Franequer labours we have, besides smaller works, afterwards comprised in larger volumes, his *Œconomia fœderum Dei cum hominibus*, translated into Low-Dutch by Harlingius; and his *Exercitationes sacræ Symbolum Apostolorum*, translated also into Low-Dutch, by Costerus. At Utrecht, came out his *Exercitationes Sacræ in orationem dominicam*; his *Ægyptiaca* and *Decaphylon*, with a dissertation on the *Legio fulminatrix Christianorum*; and the first volume of his *Miscellania Sacra*, and a good deal of the second,

besides some smaller works also. And at Leyden, he published at last the second volume of his *Miscellanea Sacra*, complete; and at this last place he set on foot what he calls his *Meletemeta Leidensia*, to be occasionally enlarged with a number of select dissertations. Indeed, all these writings are justly in great repute, their style being polite, the subjects useful, and the whole replenished with various branches of learning and a beautiful strain of piety, all which may deservedly commend them to the latest posterity.

He had been often, formerly, afflicted with racking and painful diseases; whence sometimes arose the greater apprehension of a far earlier departure by death. And nothing, under divine providence, but his vigour of mind, joined to his piety, could have preserved him so long to the world; and that with so perfect an use of his senses, that not long before his death he could read, without hesitation, the smallest Greek characters by moon-light, which none besides himself could do. But with his advanced years he sometimes had cruel fits of the gout, and stone in the kidneys; and once in the chair, in the midst of a lecture, a slight touch of an apoplexy. These disorders were, indeed, mitigated by the skill of the famous doctor Frederic Deckers; but now and then, by slight attacks, threatened a return; for his wavering and languishing state of health, indicating the past disorders not to be entirely extirpated, gave apprehensions of a future fatal distemper, which was occasioned by the sudden attack of a fever on the evening of the 18th of October. This fever, though very soon removed, left his body exceeding weak, and his mind in a state of lethargy, an indication that his head was affected. The good man himself, considering these symptoms, with great constancy and calmness of mind, told the physician and his other friends then present, that they could not fail to prove mortal. Nor did the slightness of the disease make any change in his opinion as to its fatal issue; while he foresaw that the consequences of an advanced age, and of the greatest weakness, could admit of no other event. Nor indeed without cause; for his senses were gradually weakened by repeated slumbers; however, about his last hour, he sensibly signified to Doctor Marck, who attended him, his blessed hope, and his heavenly desires, as he had frequently done before; and then about noon, on the 22nd of October, 1708, he sweetly departed this life, in the 73rd year of his age, and entered into the joy of his Lord.

## **THE ECONOMY OF THE DIVINE COVENANTS - BOOK I**

## Chapter I: Of the Divine Covenants in General

WHOEVER attempts to discourse on the subject and design of the Divine Covenants, by which eternal salvation is adjudged to man, on certain conditions equally worthy of God and the rational creature, ought, above all things, to have a sacred and inviolable regard to the heavenly oracles, and neither, through prejudice nor passion, intermix any thing, which he is not firmly persuaded is contained in the records, which hold forth these covenants to the world. For, if Zaleucus made it a condition to be observed by the contentious interpreters of his laws: "That each party should explain the meaning of the lawgiver in the assembly of the thousand, with halters about their necks; and that what party soever should appear to wrest the sense of the law, should, in the presence of the thousand, end their lives by the halters they wore," as Polybius, a very grave author relates, in his history, book xii. c. 7; and if the Jews and Samaritans in Egypt, each disputing about their temple, were admitted to plead before the king and his courtiers on this condition only, that "the advocates of either party, foiled in the dispute, should be punished with death," according to Josephus in his antiquities; book xiii. 6, certainly he must be in greater peril, and liable to sorer destruction, who shall dare to pervert and wrest the sacred mysteries of the Divine Covenants; our Lord himself openly declaring, that "whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven," Matt. 5:19. It is, therefore, with a kind of sacred awe I undertake this work; praying God, that, laying aside every prejudice, I may demean myself a tractable disciple of the Holy Scriptures, and with modesty impart to my brethren, what I think I have learned from them: if happily this my poor performance may serve to lessen the number of disputes, and help to clear up the truth; than which nothing should be accounted more valuable.

II. As it is by words, especially the words of those languages in which God was pleased to reveal his sacred mysteries to men, that we can, with hopes of success, come to the knowledge of things, it will be worth while more accurately to inquire into the import both of the Hebrew word ברית, and the Greek διαθήκη, which the Holy Spirit makes use of on this subject. And first, we are to give the true etymology, and then the different significations, of the Hebrew word. With respect to the former, the learned are not agreed: some derive it from ברע, which in Piel signifies to cut down; because, as we shall presently observe, covenants were solemnly ratified by cutting or dividing animals asunder. It may be also derived from the same root in a very different signification; for as ברא properly signifies to create, so, metaphorically, to ordain or dispose, which is the meaning of διατιθέναι. And hence it is, that the Hellenist Jews make use of το κτισθαι. Certainly it is in this sense that Peter, 1 Pet. 2:13, calls ἐξουσία, power appointed by men, and for human purposes, ἀνθρωπίνην κτίσιν, "the ordinance of man;" which, I think, Grotius has learnedly observed on the title of the New Testament. Others had rather derive it from ברח (as שבית from שבה), signifying, besides other things, to choose. And in covenants, especially of friendship, there is a choice of persons, between whom, of things about which, and of condition upon which, a covenant is entered into: nor is this improperly observed.

III. But ברית is variously taken in Scripture: sometimes improperly, and sometimes properly. Improperly, it denotes the following things:—1st. An immutable ordinance made about a thing: in this sense God mentions "his covenant of the day, and his covenant of the night," Jer. 33:20. That is, that fixed ordinance made about the uninterrupted vicissitude of day and night, which, chap. 31:36, is called חק, that is, statute, limited or fixed, which nothing is to be added to, or

taken from. In this sense is included the notion of a testament, or of a last irrevocable will. Thus God said, Numb. 18:19 "I have given thee and thy sons, and thy daughters with thee עילם להק ברית, by a statute for ever: it is a covenant of salt for ever." This observation is of use, more fully to explain the nature of the covenant of grace, which the apostle proposes under the similitude of a testament, the execution of which depends upon the death of the testator, Heb. 9:15, 16, 17. To which notion both the Hebrew ברית, and the Greek διαθήκη, may lead us. 2dly. A sure and stable promise, though not mutual. Exod. 34:10: "ברית ברית אבני הנה" behold, I make a covenant; before all thy people I will do marvels." Isa. 59:21: "This is my covenant with them, my spirit shall not depart from them." 3dly. It signifies also a precept; and to cut or make a covenant, is to give a precept. Jer. 34:13, 14: "I made a covenant with your fathers, saying, At the end of seven years let ye go every man his brother." Hence it appears in what sense the decalogue is called God's covenant. But properly, it signifies a mutual agreement between parties with respect to something. Such a covenant passed between Abraham, Mamre, Escol, and Aner, who are called, אברם ברית בעלי "confederates with Abraham," Gen. 14:13. Such also was that between Isaac and Abimelech, Gen. 26:28, 29; between Jonathan and David, 1 Sam. 18:2. And of this kind is likewise that which we are now to treat of between God and man.

IV. No less equivocal is the διαθήκη of the Greeks, which, both singularly and plurally, very often denotes a testament; as Budæus shows, in his Comment. Ling. Græc. from Isocrates, Æschines, Demosthenes, and others. In this sense, we hinted, it was used by the apostle, Heb. 9:15. Sometimes, also, it denotes a law, which is a rule of life; for the Orphici and Pythagoreans denominated the rules of living, prescribed to their pupils, διαθήκαι, according to Grotius. It also often signifies an engagement or agreement; wherefore Hesychius explains it by συνωμοσία, confederacy. There is none of these significations but will be of future use in the progress of this work.

V. Making a covenant, the Hebrews call ברית בראת, to strike a covenant, in the same manner as the Greeks and Latins, ferire, icere, percutere fœdus; which doubtless took its rise from the ancient ceremony of slaying animals, by which covenants were ratified. Of which rite we observe very ancient traces, Gen. 15:9, 10. This was, then, either first commanded by God, or borrowed from some extant custom. Emphatical is what Polybius, book iv. p. 398, relates of the Cynæthenses, ἐπὶ τῶν σφασιῶν τοὺς ὄρκους καὶ τὰς πίστεις ἐδίδουσαν ἀλλήλοις, "over the slaughtered victims they took a solemn oath, and plighted faith to each other:" a phrase plainly similar to that God uses, Ps. 50:5, זבח עלי, בריתי כרתי "those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." They also used to pass in the middle between the divided parts of the victim cut asunder, Jer. 34:18. Whoever wants to know more about this rite may consult Grotius on Matt. 26:28, and Bochart in his Hierozoicon, book ii. 33, p. 325, and Owen's Theolog., book iii. 1. It was likewise a custom, that agreements and compacts were ratified by solemn feasts. Examples of which are obvious in Scripture. Thus Isaac, having made a covenant with Abimelech, is said to have made a great feast, and to have eaten with the guests, Gen. 26:30. In like manner acted his son Jacob, after having made a covenant with Laban, Gen. 31:54. We read of a like federal feast, 2 Sam. 3:20; where a relation is given of the feast which David made for Abner and his attendants, who came to make a covenant with him in the name of the people. It was also customary among the heathen, as the learned Stuckius shows in his Antiquitates Convivales, lib. i. 40.

VI. Nor were these rites without their significancy. The cutting the animals asunder denoted, that in the same manner the perjured and covenant-breakers should be cut asunder, by the vengeance of God. And to this purpose is what God says, Jer. 34:18, 19, 20: "And I will give the men that have transgressed my covenant, which have not performed the words of the covenant which they had made before me, when they cut the calf in twain, and passed between the parts thereof—I will even give them into the hands of their enemies, and their dead bodies shall be for meat unto the fowls of the heaven, and to the beasts of the earth." See 1 Sam. 11:7. An ancient form of these execrations is extant in Livy, book i.: "The Roman people do not first break these conditions; but if they should, avowedly, and through treachery, break them, do thou, O Jupiter, on that day, thus strike the Roman people, as I do now this hog; and be the stroke the heavier as thy power is the greater." By the ceremony of the confederates passing between the parts cut asunder, was signified, that being now united by the strictest ties of religion, and by a solemn oath, they formed but one body, as Vatablus has remarked on Gen. 15:10. These federal feasts were tokens of a sincere and lasting friendship.

VII. But when God, in the solemnities of his covenants with men, thought proper to use these or the like rites, the significancy was still more noble and divine. They who made covenant with God by sacrifice, not only submitted to punishment, if, impiously revolting from God, they slighted his covenant; but God likewise signified to them, that all the stability of the covenant of grace was founded on the sacrifice of Christ, and that the soul and body of Christ were one day to be violently separated asunder. "All the promises of God in him are yea, and in him amen," 2 Cor. 1:20. His blood is the "blood of the New Testament," Matt. 26:28, in a far more excellent manner, than that with which Moses sprinkled both the altar and the people entered into covenant, Exod. 24:8. Those sacred banquets, to which the covenanted were admitted before the Lord, especially that instituted by the Lord Jesus under the New Testament, do most effectually seal or ratify that intimate communion and fellowship there is between Christ and believers.

VIII. There are learned men, who from this rite would explain that phrase, which we have, Numb 18:19 and 2 Chron. 14:5, of a covenant of salt, that is, of a covenant of friendship, of a stable and perpetual nature, "which seems to be so denominated, because salt was usually made use of in sacrifices; to signify that the covenant was made sure upon observing the customary rites," says Rivet on Genesis, Exercit. 136. Unless we would rather suppose a regard to be here had to the purity of salt, by which it resists putrefaction and corruption, and therefore prolongs the duration of things, and, in a manner, renders them everlasting. For that reason, Lot's wife is thought to have been turned to a pillar of salt; not so much, as Augustine remarks, "to be a warning to us," as a lasting and perpetual monument of the divine judgment. For all salt is not subject to melting: Pliny says, that some Arabs build walls and houses of blocks of salt, and cement them with water, Nat. Hist. book xxxi. 7.

IX. Having premised these things in general about terms of art, let us now inquire into the thing itself, viz. the nature of the covenant of God with man; which I thus define: "A covenant of God with man is an agreement between God and man, about the way of obtaining consummate happiness; including a commination of eternal destruction, with which the contemner of the happiness offered in that way, is to be punished."



X. The covenant does, on the part of God, comprise three things in general. 1st. A promise of consummate happiness in eternal life. 2dly. A designation and prescription of the condition, by the performance of which man acquires a right to the promise. 3dly. A penal sanction against those who do not come up to the prescribed condition. All these things regard the whole man, or *ολοκληρος*, in Paul's phrase, as consisting of soul and body. God's promise of happiness is to each part, he requires the sanctification of each, and threatens each with destruction. And so this covenant makes God appear glorious in the whole man.

XI. To engage in such a covenant with the rational creature, formed after the divine image, is entirely worthy of, and by no means unbecoming of God. For it was impossible, but God should propose himself to the rational creature, as a pattern of holiness, in conformity to which he ought to frame himself and all his actions, carefully keeping, and always exerting the activity of that original righteousness, which he was, from his very origin, endowed with. God cannot but bind man to love, worship, and seek him, as the chief good: nor is it conceivable, how God should require man to love and seek him, and yet refuse to be found by man, loving, seeking, and esteeming him as his chief good, longing, hungering, and thirsting after him alone. Who can conceive it to be worthy of God, that he should thus say to man: I am willing that thou seekest me only, but on condition of never finding me; to be ardently longed for above every thing else with the greatest hunger and thirst, but yet never to be satisfied. And the justice of God no less requires, that man, upon rejecting the happiness offered on the most equitable terms, should be punished with the privation of it, and likewise incur the severest indignation of God, whom he has despised. Whence it appears, that, from the very consideration of the divine perfections, it may be fairly deduced, that he has prescribed a certain law to man, as the condition of enjoying happiness, which consists in the fruition of God; enforced with the threatening of a curse against the rebel. In which we have just now said, that the whole of the covenant consisted. But of each of these we shall have fuller scope to speak hereafter.

XII. Thus far we have considered the one party of the covenant of God: man becomes the other, when he consents thereto, embracing the good promised by God; engaging to an exact observance of the condition required; and, upon the violation thereof, voluntarily owning himself obnoxious to the threatened curse. This the Scripture calls, *יהוה בבדיה עבד*, "to enter into covenant with the Lord," Deut. 29:12, and "to enter into a curse and an oath," Neh. 10:29. In this curse (Paul calls it, 2 Cor. 9:13, *ὁμολογια*, "professed subjection,") conscience presents itself a witness, that God's stipulation or covenant is just, and that this method of coming to the enjoyment of God is highly becoming; and that there is no other way of obtaining the promise. And hence the evils, which God threatens to the transgressors of the covenant, are called "the curses of the covenant," Deut. 29:20; which man, on consenting to the covenant, voluntarily makes himself obnoxious to. The effect of this curse on the man, who stands not to the covenant, is called, "the vengeance of the covenant," Lev. 26:25. The form of a stipulation or acceptance we have, Psal. 27:8: "When thou saidst, Seek ye my face; my heart said unto thee, Thy face, Lord, will I seek." Where the voluntary stipulation, or acceptance, answers to the stipulation, or covenant, made in the name of God by conscience his minister.

XIII. Man, upon the proposal of this covenant, could not, without guilt, refuse giving this stipulation or acceptance. 1st. In virtue of the law, which universally binds him, humbly to accept every thing proposed by God; to whom it is the essential duty of every rational creature to

be subject in every respect. 2dly. On account of the high sovereignty of God, who may dispose of his own benefits, and appoint the condition of enjoying them with a supreme authority, and without being accountable to any; and at the same time enjoin man, to strive for the attainment of the blessings offered, on the condition prescribed. And hence this covenant, as subsisting between parties infinitely unequal, assumes the nature of those which the Greeks called *προστάγματα*, or *συνθήκαι ἐκ τῶν ἐπιταγμάτων*, injunctions, or covenants from commands; of which Grotius speaks in his *Jus Bell. et Pacis*, l. ii., c. 15, §. 6. Hence it is, that Paul translates the words of Moses, Exod. 24:8, "Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you," thus, Heb. 9:20: Τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, ἧς ἐνετείλατο πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεός. "This is the blood of the testament, which God hath enjoined unto you." It is not left to man, to accept or reject at pleasure God's covenant. Man is commanded to accept it, and to press after the attainment of the promises in the way pointed out by the covenant. Not to desire the promises, is to refuse the goodness of God. To reject the precepts, is to refuse the sovereignty and holiness of God. And not to submit to the sanction, is to deny God's justice. And therefore the apostle affirms of the covenant of God, that it is *νενομοθετηται*, reduced to the form of a law, Heb. 8:6, by which man is obliged to an acceptance. 3dly. It follows from that love which man naturally owes to himself, and by which he is carried to the chief good; for enjoying which there remains no method besides the condition prescribed by God. 4thly. Man's very conscience dictates, that this covenant is in all its parts highly equitable. What can be framed, even by thought itself, more equitable, than that man, esteeming God as his chief good, should seek his happiness in him, and rejoice at the offer of that goodness; should cheerfully receive the law, which is a transcript of the divine holiness, as the rule of his nature and actions; in fine, should submit his guilty head to the most just vengeance of heaven, should he make light of this promise, and violate the law? From which it follows, that man was not at liberty to reject God's covenant.

XIV. God, by this covenant, acquires no new right over man; which, if we duly consider the matter, neither is nor can be founded on any benefit of God, or misdemeanor of man, as Arminius argues; nor in any thing distinct from God; the principal or alone foundation of it being the sovereign Majesty of the Most High God. Because God is the blessed and self-sufficient Being, therefore he is the only Potentate; these two being joined by Paul, 1 Tim. 6:15. Nor can God's power and right over the creatures be diminished or increased by anything extrinsic to God. This is rightly deemed unworthy of his sovereignty and independance, of which we shall soon treat more fully. God, in this covenant, merely shows what right he has over man. But man, upon his accepting the covenant, and performing the condition, does acquire some right to demand of God the promise. For God has, by his promises, made himself a debtor to man. Or, to speak in a manner more becoming God, he was pleased to make his performance of his promises a debt due to himself, to his goodness, justice, and veracity. And to man in covenant, and continuing stedfast to it, he granted the right of expecting and requiring, that God should satisfy the demands of his goodness, justice, and truth, by the performance of the promises. And thus to man, as stipulating or consenting to the covenant, God says, that he will be his God, Deut. 26:17. That is, he will give him full liberty to glory in God, as his God, and to expect from him, that he will become to, in covenant with him, what he is to himself, even a fountain of consummate happiness.

XV. In Scripture, we find two covenants of God with man: the Covenant of Works, otherwise called, the Covenant of Nature, or the Legal and the Covenant of Grace. The apostle teacheth us

this distinction, Rom. 3:27, where he mentions the law of works, and the law of faith by the law of works, understanding that doctrine which points out the way in which, by means of works, salvation is obtained; and by the law of faith, that doctrine which directs by faith to obtain salvation. The form of the covenant of works is, "The man that doth these things shall live by them," Rom. 10:5. That of the covenant of grace is, "Whosoever believeth in him shall not be ashamed," Rom. 10:11. These covenants of mercy agree, 1st. That, in both, the contracting parties are the same, God and man. 2dly. In both, the same promise of eternal life, consisting in the immediate fruition of God. 3dly. The condition of both is the same, viz., perfect obedience to the law. Nor would it have been worthy of God to admit man to a blessed communication with him, but in the way of unspotted holiness. 4thly. In both, the same end, the glory of the most unspotted goodness of God. But in these following particulars they differ: 1st. The character or relation of God and man, in the covenant of works, is different from what it is in the covenant of grace. In the former, God treats as the Supreme Lawgiver, and the Chief Good, rejoicing to make his innocent creature a partaker of his happiness. In the latter, as infinitely merciful, adjudging life to the elect sinner consistently with his wisdom and justice. 2dly. In the covenant of works there was no mediator. In that of grace, there is the mediator, Christ Jesus. 3dly. In the covenant of works, the condition of perfect obedience was required to be performed by man himself, who had consented to it. In that of grace, the same condition is proposed, as to be, or as already performed, by a mediator. And in this substitution of the person consists the principal and essential difference of the covenants. 4thly. In the covenant of works, man is considered as working, and the reward to be given as of debt; and therefore, man's glorying is not excluded, but he may glory, as a faithful servant may do, upon the right discharge of his duty, and may claim the reward promised to his working. In the covenant of grace, man, in himself ungodly, is considered in the covenant as believing; and eternal life is considered as the merit of the mediator, and as given to man out of free grace, which excludes all boasting, besides the glorying of the believing sinner in God, as his merciful Saviour. 5thly. In the covenant of works, something is required of man, as a condition which, performed, entitles him to the reward. The covenant of grace, with respect to us, consists of the absolute promises of God, in which the mediator, the life to be obtained by him, the faith by which we may be made partakers of him, the benefits purchased by him, and the perseverance in that faith, in a word, the whole of salvation, and all the requisites to it, are absolutely promised. 6thly. The special end of the covenant of works was, the manifestation of the holiness, goodness, and justice of God, conspicuous in the most perfect law, most liberal promise, and in that recompense of reward, to be given to those who seek him with their whole heart. The special end of the covenant of grace is, "the praise of the glory of his grace," Eph. 1:6, and the revelation of his unsearchable and manifold wisdom: which divine perfections shine forth with lustre in the gift of a mediator, by whom the sinner is admitted to complete salvation, without any dishonour to the holiness, justice, and truth of God. There is also a demonstration of the all-sufficiency of God, by which not only man, but even a sinner, which is more surprising, may be restored to union and communion with God. But all this will be more fully explained in what follows.

## Chapter II: Of the Contracting Parties in The Covenant of Works

I. WE begin with the consideration of the covenant of works, otherwise called, of the law and of nature; because prescribed by the law, requiring works as the condition, and founded upon and coeval with nature. This covenant is an agreement between God and Adam, formed after the image of God, as the head and root, or representative of the whole human race; by which God promised eternal life and happiness to him, if he yielded obedience to all his commands; threatening him with death if he failed but in the least point: and Adam accepted this condition. To this purpose are these two sentences, afterwards inculcated, on the repetition of the law, Lev. 18:5, and Deut. 27:26.

II. The better to understand this subject, these four things are to be explained: 1st. The contracting parties. 2dly. The condition prescribed. 3rdly. The promises. 4thly. The threatening.

III. The contracting parties here, are God and Adam. God, as Sovereign and supreme Lord, prescribing with absolute power, what he judges equitable: as goodness itself, or the chief good, promising communion with himself, in which man's principal happiness lies, while obeying and doing what is well-pleasing to him: as justice itself, or sovereignly just, threatening death to the rebel. Adam sustained a two-fold relation: 1st. As man. 2dly. As head and root, or representative of mankind. In the former relation, he was a rational creature, and under the law to God, innocent, created after the divine image, and endued with sufficient powers to fulfil all righteousness. All these things are presupposed in man, to render him a fit object for God to enter into covenant with.

IV. Man, therefore, just from the hands of his Maker, had a soul, shining with rays of a divine light, and adorned with the brightest wisdom; whereby he was not only perfectly master of the nature of created things, but was delighted with the contemplation of the supreme and uncreated truth, the eyes of his understanding being constantly fixed on the perfections of his God; from the consideration of which he gathered, by the justest reasoning, what was equitable and just, what worthy of God and of himself. He also had the purest holiness of will, acquiescing in God as the supreme truth, revering him as the most dread majesty, loving him as the chief and only good; and, for the sake of God, holding dear whatever his mind, divinely taught, conceived as pleasing to Him, and like to, and expressive of his perfections; in fine, whatever contributed to the acquiring an intimate and immediate union with him; delighting in the communion of his God, which was now allowed him; panting after further communion, raising himself thereto by the creatures, as so many scales or steps; and finally setting forth the praises of his most unspotted holiness as the most perfect pattern, according to which he was to frame both himself and his actions to the uttermost. This is, as Elihu significantly expresses it, Job 34:9, "delighting himself with God." This rectitude of the soul was accompanied with a most regular temperature of the whole body, all whose members, as instruments of righteousness, presented themselves ready and active at the first intimation of his holy will. Nor was it becoming God to form a rational creature for any other purpose than his own glory; which such a creature, unless wise and holy, could neither perceive nor celebrate, as shining forth in the other works of God; destitute of this light, and deprived of this endowment, what could he be but the reproach of his Creator, and every way unfit to answer the end of his creation? All these particulars the wisest of

kings, Eccl. 7:29, has thrown together with a striking simplicity, when he says: "Lo! this only have I found, that God hath made man upright."

V. What I have just said of the wisdom of the first man, ought, I think, to be extended so far, as not to suppose him, in the state of innocence, ignorant of the mystery of the Trinity. For it is necessary above all things, for the perfection of the human understanding, to be well acquainted with what it ought to know and believe concerning its God. And it may justly be doubted, whether he does not worship a God entirely unknown, nay, whether he at all worships the true God, who does not know and worship him, as subsisting in three persons. Whoever represents God to himself, in any other light, represents not God, but an empty phantom, and an idol of his own brain. Epiphanius seems to have had this argument in view, when, in his Panarius, p. 9, he thus writes of Adam: "He was no idolater, for he knew God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: and he was a prophet, and knew that the Father said to the Son, 'Let us make man.' "

VI. These last words furnish a new argument: for since God, in the work of the creation, manifested himself a Trinity, "the Father made the worlds by the Son," Heb. 1:2, the Holy Ghost cherished the waters by brooding upon them, and the whole Trinity addressed themselves, by mutual consultation, to the creation of man, it is not therefore credible that this mystery should be entirely unknown to the Protoplast or first parent; unless we can suppose Adam ignorant of his Creator, who was likewise the Son and the Holy Ghost. It cannot certainly be without design, that the Scripture, when speaking of man's Creator, so often uses the plural number: as Isa. 54:5, עשׂיך בעליך, which literally signifies, "thy husbands, thy makers;" Ps. 149:2, בעשׂו ישראל ישׂמה, "Let Israel rejoice in his makers;" nay, requires man to attend to this, and engrave it on his mind, Eccl. 12:1, בודאיך את זכר, "Remember thy creators." It is criminal when man neglects it; and says not, Job 35:10, עשי אלוה איה, "Where is God my makers?" Which phrases, unless referred to a Trinity of persons, might appear to be dangerous. But it is impossible to suppose Adam ignorant concerning his Creator, of that which God does not suffer his posterity to be ignorant of at this time; especially as God created man to be the herald of his being and perfections in the new world. But it certainly tends to display the glory of God, that he should particularly celebrate, not only the divine perfections, but likewise how they subsist in the distinct persons of the Deity, and the manner and order of their operation. Admirably to this purpose speaks Basil of Seleucia, Sermon II.: "Take particular notice of that expression, 'Let us make man.' Again, this word used plurally, hints at the persons of the Godhead, and presents a trinity to our knowledge. This knowledge, therefore, is coeval with the creation. Nor should it seem strange, that afterwards it should be taught: since it is one of those things, of which mention is made in the very first creation."

VII. I own, Adam could not, from the bare contemplation of nature, without revelation, discover this mystery. But this I am fully persuaded of, that God revealed some things to man, not dictated by nature. For, whence did he know the command about the tree of Knowledge, and whence the meaning of the tree of life, but by God's declaring it to him? Whence such a knowledge of his wife's creation as to pronounce her flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone, but from divine revelation? Seeing, then, God had revealed to man many things, and those indeed not of such moment, can we believe he would conceal from him a thing, the knowledge of which was so highly expedient to the perfection of man, and the glory of God? That learned man, therefore, was mistaken, who insisted, that the knowledge of the Trinity exceeded the happiness of Adam's

state, which was merely natural. For it was not so merely natural, that Adam only knew what the alone consideration of nature could suggest. The contrary we have just shown. And it must be deemed natural to that state, that innocent man, who had familiar intercourse with his God, should learn from his own mouth what might render him fitter to celebrate his praises. The learned Zanchius observes, in his book *De Creat. Hom. 1. i. 1. § 12.*, that "most of the fathers were of opinion, that Adam, seeing he was such, and so great a friend of God before his fall, had sometimes seen God in a bodily appearance, and heard him speak." And adds, "But this was always the Son of God." And, a little after, "Christ, therefore, is the Jehovah, who brought Adam, and placed him in Paradise, and spoke with him." Thus the ancients believed that the Son of God did then also reveal himself to Adam, and conversed with him.

VIII. And it seems rather too bold to affirm, that the economy subsisting between the three persons, is so principally taken up in procuring the salvation of mankind, that the knowledge thereof could not pertain to the state of innocence; in which there was no place either for salvation or redemption. For, Moses declares the economy of the divine persons at the very creation. And, while the gospel explains that admirable economy, as taken up in procuring the salvation of mankind, it, at the same time, carries our thoughts up to that economy as manifested in the first creation of the world. If now, it is so useful and pleasant to think, that the Son of God, our Saviour, "is the beginning of the creation of God," Rev. 3:14, "by whom were created thrones and dominions, things visible and invisible, that he might have the pre-eminence in all things," Col. 1:16–18, both of the works of nature and of grace; and that the Holy Spirit, now fitting up a new world of grace in our hearts, did at first brood on the waters, and make them pregnant with so many noble creatures; and thus to ascend to the consideration of the same economy in the works of creation and nature, which is now revealed to us in the works of salvation and grace; who can refuse that Adam in innocence had the same knowledge of God in three persons, though ignorant what each person, in his order, was to perform in saving sinners? Add to this, that though in that state of Adam, there was no room for redemption, yet there was for salvation and life eternal. The symbol of which was the Tree of Life, which even then bore the image of the Son of God (see Rev. 2:7), "for in him was life," John 1:4; which symbol had been in vain, if the meaning thereof had been unknown to Adam.

IX. In this rectitude of man principally consists that image of God, which the Scripture so often recommends; and which Paul expressly places in knowledge, Col. 3:10; "in righteousness and true holiness," Eph. 4:24. In which places he so describes the image of God, which is renewed in us by the spirit of grace, as at the same time to hint, that it is the same with which man was originally created. Neither can there be different images of God; for, as God cannot but be wise and holy, and, as such, be a pattern to the rational creature; it follows, that a creature wise and holy is, as such, the expression or resemblance of God. And it is a thing quite impossible, but God must own his own likeness to consist in this rectitude of the whole man, or that he should ever acknowledge a foolish and perverse creature to be like him; which would be an open denial of his perfections. It is finely observed by a learned man, that *ὁσιότης της αληθειας*, true holiness, is not only opposed to *τη ὑποκρισει*, hypocrisy or simulation, or to *τη τυρικῃ καθαροτητι*, typical purity, but that it denotes a holy study of truth, proceeding from the love of God; for, *ὁσιος*, to which answers the Hebrew *יָדַח*, signifies in Scripture, one studious in, and eager after good. This *ὁσιότης της αληθειας*, true holiness, therefore denotes such a desire of pleasing God as is agreeable to the truth known of and in him, and loved for him.

X. But I see not, why the same learned person would have the δικαιοσύνη, righteousness, mentioned by Paul, Eph. 4:24, to be a privilege peculiar to the covenant of grace, which we obtain in Christ, and of which Adam was destitute; meaning by the word righteousness, a title or right to eternal life; which, it is owned, Adam had not, as his state of probation was not yet at an end. In opposition to this assertion, I offer these following considerations. 1st. There is no necessity, by righteousness, to understand a right to eternal life; for that term often denotes a virtue, a constant resolution of giving every one his due: as Eph. 5:9, where the apostle, treating of sanctification, writes, "For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness, righteousness, and truth." The learned person himself was aware of this, who elsewhere speaks thus (on Gen. 5 § 9), "Righteousness is, first, the rectitude of actions, whether of the soul or of the members; and their agreement with sound reason: namely, that they may easily avoid condemnation or blame, and obtain commendation and praise. So Titus. 3:5, 'Works of righteousness.' And hence the denomination of just, or righteous, denotes a blameless or a praiseworthy person." Since, then, that word signifies elsewhere such a rectitude, why not here too? Especially as it is indisputable that such righteousness belonged to the image of God in Adam. 2dly. It ought not to be urged, that here righteousness is joined with holiness, and therefore thus to be distinguished from it; as that the latter shall denote an inherent good quality, and the former a right to life. For, it may be answered, first, that it is no unusual thing with the Holy Spirit to express the same thing by different words. "It is to be observed," says Ursinus, qu. 18, Cat., "that righteousness and holiness were in us the same thing before the fall; namely, an inherent conformity to God and the law." Nor does the celebrated Cocceius himself speak otherwise on Ps. 16. § 2. "But צדק, righteousness, if you consider the law of works, signifies, in the largest sense, every thing that is honest, every thing that is true, every thing that is holy." 2dly, Suppose we should distinguish righteousness from holiness, it follows not, that it is to be distinguished in this manner; for there are places in which no such distinction can take place: as Luke 1:74, 75, "Serve him—in holiness and righteousness before him;" and 1 Thess. 2:10, "Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily and justly, and unblameably, we behaved ourselves among you that believe;" and 1 Kings 3:6, "He walked before thee in truth and in righteousness, and in uprightness of heart;" where righteousness, though added to holiness, can signify nothing but a virtue of the soul, and the exercise of it. Thirdly, if we must absolutely distinguish these two things; it may be done many ways. 1st. So as to refer holiness to God; righteousness to men. Thus Philo, concerning Abraham, says, "Holiness is considered as towards God; righteousness as towards men." And the emperor Antonius, book vii. § 66, says of Socrates, "In human things just; in divine, holy." 2dly. Or so as to say, that both words denote universal virtue (for even righteousness is spoken of the worship of God, Luke 1:75; and holiness referred to men. Maximus Tyrius, Dissert. xxvi. says of the same Socrates, pious towards God, holy towards men), but in a different respect; so as holiness shall denote virtue, as it is the love and expression of the divine purity, as Plato explains holiness by the love of God; righteousness, indeed, may signify the same virtue, as it is a conformity to the prescribed rule, and an obedience to the commands of God: "whether it be δίκαιον, right, (righteous) to hearken unto God," Acts 4:19. 3rdly, Ursinus quest. 6, Catech., speaks somewhat differently, saying, that righteousness and holiness, may, in the text of Paul, and in the catechism, be taken for one and the same, or be distinguished; for righteousness may be understood of those internal and external actions, which agree with the right judgment of mind, and with the law of God; holiness be understood of the qualities of them. So that there is nothing to constrain us to explain righteousness here of a right to life; but there are many things to persuade us to the contrary. For, 1st. That image of God, which is renewed in us by

regeneration, consists in absolute qualities, inherent in the soul, which are as so many resemblances of the perfections of God; but a right or title to life is a mere relation. 2dly. The image of God consists in something which is produced in man himself, either by the first or the new creation; but the right to life rests wholly on the righteousness and merits of Christ, things entirely without us; Phil. 3:9, "Not having my own righteousness." 3rdly. The apostle, in the place before us, is not treating of justification, were this right should have been mentioned; but of sanctification, and the rule thereof; where it would be improper to speak of any such thing. 4thly. They who adhere to this new explanation of righteousness, appear without any just cause to contradict the Catechism,\* quest. 6, and with less force to oppose the Socinians, who maintain that the image of God, after which we are regenerated in Christ, is not the same with that after which Adam was created. And yet these learned men equally detest his error with ourselves. These considerations make us judge it safer to explain righteousness, so as to make it a part of the image of God, after which Adam was created.

XI. But if we take in the whole extent of the image of God, we say, it is made up of these three parts. 1st. Antecedently, that it consists in the spiritual and immortal nature of the soul, and in the faculties of understanding and will. 2dly. Formally and principally, in these endowments or qualities of the soul, viz., righteousness and holiness. 3rdly. Consequentially, in the immortality of the whole man, and his dominion over the creatures. The first of these was, as one elegantly expresses it, as precious ground on which the image of God might be drawn, and formed: the second, that very image itself, and resemblance of the divinity: the third, the lustre of that image widely spreading its glory; and as rays, not only adorning the soul, but the whole man, even his very body; and rendering him the lord and head of the world, and at the same time immortal, as being the friend and confederate of the eternal God.

XII. The principal strokes of this image, Plato certainly knew, who defines happiness to be ὁμοίωσιν τῷ Θεῷ, "the resemblance of God:" and this resemblance he places in piety, justice, and prudence; this last to temper and regulate the two former. His words are excellent, and deserve to be here transcribed:—"τὴν δὲ θνητὴν φύσιν, καὶ τόνδε τὸν τόπον, τὸ κακὸν περιπολεῖ ἐξ ἀνάγκης: διὸ καὶ πειρᾶσθαι χρὴ ἐνθένδε ἐκεῖσι φεύγειν. Ὅτι τάχιστα φυγὴ δὲ ὁμοίωσις Θεῷ κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν. Ὁμοίωσις δὲ δίκαιον καὶ ὄσιον μετὰ φρονήσεως γενέσθαι." "This mortal nature, and this place of abode, are necessarily encompassed with evil. We are, therefore, with the utmost expedition to fly from it. This flight is an assimilation to God as far as may be; and this assimilation is justice and piety, accompanied with prudence." Vid. Lipsii Manuduct. ad Stoicam Philosophiam, Lib. ii. Dissert. 13.

XIII. God gave to man the charge of this his image, as the most excellent deposit of heaven, and, if kept pure and inviolate, the earnest of a greater good; for that end he endowed him with sufficient powers from his very formation, so as to stand in need of no other habitual grace. It was only requisite that God, by the continual influx of his providence, should preserve those powers, and excite them to all and each of their acts. For, there can be no state conceived in which the creature can act independently of the Creator; not excepting the angels themselves, though now confirmed in holiness and happiness.

XIV. And thus, indeed, Adam was in covenant with God, as a man, created after the image of God, and furnished with sufficient abilities to preserve that image. But there is another relation,



in which he was considered as the head and representative of mankind, both federal and natural. So that God said to Adam, as once to the Israelites, Deut. 29:14, 15, "Neither with you only do I make this covenant, and this oath; but also with him that is not here with us this day." The whole history of the first man proves, that he is not to be looked upon as an individual person, but that the whole human nature is considered as in him. For it was not said to our first parents only, "Increase and multiply;" by virtue of which word the propagation of mankind is still continued. Nor is it true of Adam only, "It is not good that the man should be alone." Nor does that conjugal law, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and they shall be one flesh," concern him alone; which Christ still urges, Matt. 19:5. Nor did the penalty, threatened by God upon Adam's sinning, "Thou shalt surely die," affect him alone; but, "death passed upon all men," according to the apostle's observation, Rom. 5:12. All which loudly proclaim, that Adam was here considered as the head of mankind.

XV. This also appears from that beautiful opposition of the first and second Adam, which Paul pursues at large, Rom. 5:15, &c. For, as the second Adam does, in the covenant of grace, represent all the elect, in such a manner that they are accounted to have done and suffered themselves what he did and suffered in their name and stead; so likewise the first Adam was the representative of all that were to descend from him.

XVI. And that God was righteous in this constitution, is by no means to be disputed. Nor does it become us to entertain any doubts about the right of God, nor inquire too curiously into it; much less to measure it, by the standard of any right established amongst us despicable mortals, when the matter of fact is evident and undisputed. We are always to speak in vindication of God; "that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest," Ps. 51:4. He must, surely, be utterly unacquainted with the majesty of the Supreme Being, with his most pure and unspotted holiness, which in every respect is most consistent with itself, who presumes to scan his actions, and call his equity to account. Such a freedom no earthly father would bear in a son, no king in a subject, no master in a servant. And do we, mean worms of the earth, take upon us to use such freedom with the Judge of the whole universe? As often as our murmuring flesh dares to repine and cry out, "The ways of the Lord are not equal;" so often let us oppose thereto, "Are not thy ways unequal?" Ezek. 18:25.

XVII. However, it generally holds, that we more calmly acquiesce in the determinations of God, when we understand the reasons of them. Let us, therefore, see, whether here, also, we cannot demonstrate the equity of the divine right. For what if we should consider the matter thus? If Adam had, in his own and in our name, stood to the conditions of the covenant; if, after a course of probation, he had been confirmed in happiness, and we, his posterity, in him, if fully satisfied with the delights of animal life, we had, together with him, been translated to the joys of heaven; none, certainly, would then repine, that he was included in the head of mankind; every one would have commended both the wisdom and goodness of God: not the least suspicion of injustice would have arisen on account of God's putting the first man into a state of probation in the room of all, and not every individual for himself. How should that, which in this event would have been deemed just, be unjust on a contrary event? For, neither the justice nor injustice of actions is to be judged of by the event.

XVIII. Besides, what mortal can now flatter himself, that, placed in the same circumstances with Adam, he would have better consulted his own interest? Adam was neither without wisdom, nor holiness, nor a desire after true happiness, nor an aversion to the miseries denounced by God against the sinner; nor, in fine, without any of those things by which he might expect to keep upon his guard against all sin: and yet he suffered himself to be drawn aside by the craft of a flattering seducer. And dost thou, iniquitous censurer of the ways of the Lord, presume thou wouldst have better used thy free-will? Nay, on the contrary, all thy actions cry aloud, that thou approvest, that thou art highly pleased with, and always takest example from that deed of thy first parent, about which thou so unjustly complainest. For, when thou transgressest the commands of God; when thou settest less by the will of the Supreme Being than by thy lusts; when thou preferrest earthly to heavenly things, present to future; when, by thine own choice, thou seekest after happiness, but not that which is true, and, instead of taking the right way, goest into by-paths; is not that the very same as if thou didst so often eat of the forbidden tree? Why, then, dost thou presume to blame God for taking a compendious way, including all in one; well knowing, that the case of each in particular, when put to the test, would have proved the same?

### Chapter III: Of the Law or Condition of the Covenant of Works

I. HITHERTO we have treated of the Contracting Parties; let us now take a view of the condition prescribed by this covenant. Where, first, we are to consider the Law of the Covenant, then the Observance of that law. The law of the covenant is twofold. 1st. The law of nature, implanted in Adam at his creation. 2ndly, The symbolical law, concerning the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

II. The law of nature is the rule of good and evil, inscribed by God on man's conscience, even at his creation, and therefore binding upon him by divine authority. That such a law was connate with, and as it were implanted in, the man, appears from the relics which, like the ruins of some noble building, are still extant in every man; namely, from those common notions by which the heathens themselves distinguished right from wrong, and by which "they were a law to themselves, which shows the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness," Rom. 2:14, 15. From which we gather, that all these things were complete in man, when newly formed after the image of God.

III. Whatever the conscience of man dictates to be virtuous or otherwise, it does so in the name of God, whose vicegerent it is in man, and the depository of his commands. This, if I mistake not, is David's meaning, Ps. 27:8 לִבִּי אָמַר לְךָ, "to thee," that is, for thee, in thy stead, "my heart says," or my conscience. This conscience, therefore, was also called a God by the heathen; as in this Iambic, Βροτοῖς ἅπασιν ἡ συνείδησις Θεός: "In all men conscience is a God." Plato, in Philebus, calls reason a God dwelling in us. And hence we are not to think that the supreme rule in the law of nature is its agreement or disagreement with the rational nature, but that it is the divine wisdom manifested to, or the notion of good and evil engraven by God, on the conscience. It is finely said, by the author of the book, "De Mundo," c. xi., "God is to us a law, tending on all sides to a just equilibrium, requiring no correction, admitting no variation." With this Cicero agrees, "De Legibus," lib. ii. "The true and leading law, which is proper both to command and to forbid, is the right reason of the Supreme Being."

IV. That author appears not to have expressed himself with accuracy, who said, "We here call the law the knowledge of right and wrong, binding to do what is right, and to avoid what is wrong." For law, properly, is not any knowledge, but the object of knowledge. This law, we say, is naturally known to man; but it would be absurd to say, knowledge is naturally known. Knowledge is our act, and is indeed to be squared by the rule of the law. The law is a rule prescribed by God for all our actions.

V. That other author is far less accurate who thus determines, "Prior to the fall there was properly no law; for then the love of God prevailed, which requires no law." There (as the same author elsewhere explains himself) "a state of friendship and love obtained, such as is the natural state of a son with respect to a parent, and which is what nature affects. But when that love is violated, then a precept comes to be superadded; and that love, which before was voluntary (as best agreeing with its nature; for that can scarcely be called love, unless voluntary), falls under a precept, and passes into a law, to be enforced then with commination and coercion; which rigour of coercion properly constitutes a law."

VI. But this way of reasoning is far from being the effect of thought and attention. For, 1st. It is not the rigour of the enforcement properly that constitutes a law, but the obligatory virtue of what is enjoined, proceeding both from the power of the lawgiver, and from the equity of the thing commanded, which is here founded on the holiness of the divine nature, so far as imitable by man. The apostle James, 1:25, commends "the perfect law of liberty." 2dly. Nor is there any absurdity to affirm, that the natural state of a son with respect to a parent is regulated by laws. It is certain, Plato, De Legib. lib. iii. says, that "the first mortals practised the customs and laws of their fathers," quoting that sentence of Homer, θεμιστέναι δε εκαστος παιδῶν, "every one makes laws for his children." 3rdly. Nor is it repugnant to do a thing by nature, and at the same time by a law. Philo Judæus de Migratione, explaining that celebrated old saying of the philosophers, says, that "to live agreeably to nature is done when the mind follows God, remembering his precepts." Crysippus, in like manner, as commended by Laertius, lib. vii. on Zeno, says, that "person lives agreeably to nature, who does nothing prohibited by the common law, which is right reason." In a sublimer strain almost than one could well expect from a heathen, Hierocles says, on Pythagoras's golden verses, "To obey right reason and God is one and the same thing. For the rational nature being illuminated readily embraces what the divine law prescribes. A soul which is conformed to God never dissents from the will of God; but, being attentive to the divinity and brightness with which it is enlightened, does which it does." 4thly. Nor can it be affirmed, that, after the breach of love, or, which is the same thing, after the entrance of sin, that then it was the law was superadded; seeing sin itself is ἀνομια, the transgression of the law. 5thly. Nor is love rendered less voluntary by the precept. For, the law enjoins love to be every way perfect, and therefore to be most voluntary, not extorted by the servile fear of the threatening, 1 John 4:18. Nor does he give satisfaction when he says, that what is called love scarce deserves that name, unless voluntary; he ought to say, is by no means charity, unless voluntary. For love is the most delightful union of our will with the thing beloved; which cannot be so much as conceived, without the plainest contradiction, as any other than voluntary. If, therefore, by the superadded law, love is rendered involuntary and forced, the whole nature of love is destroyed, and a divine law set up, which ruins love. 6thly. In fine, the law of nature itself was not without a threatening, and that of eternal death. I shall conclude in the most accurate words of Chrysostom, Hom. xii. to the people of Antioch: "When God formed man at first, he gave him a natural law. And what, then, is this natural law? He rectified our conscience, and made us have the knowledge of good and evil, without any other teaching than our own."

VII. It is moreover to be observed, that this law of nature is the same in substance with the decalogue; being what the apostle calls την εντολην την εις ζωην, "a commandment, which was ordained to life," Rom. 7:10; that is, that law, by the performance of which life was formerly obtainable. And, indeed, the decalogue contains such precepts, "which, if a man do, he shall live in them," Lev. 18:5. But those precepts are undoubtedly the law proposed to Adam, upon which the covenant of works was built. Add to this what the apostle says, that that law, which still continues to be the rule of our actions, and whose righteousness ought to be fulfilled in us, "was made weak through the flesh," that is, through sin, and that it was become impossible for it to bring us to life, Rom. 8:3, 4. The same law, therefore, was in force before the entrance of sin; and, if duly observed, had the power of giving life. Besides, God in the second creation inscribes the same law on the heart, which in the first creation he had engraven on the soul. For what is regeneration, but the restitution of the same image of God, in which man was at first created? In

fine, the law of nature could be nothing but a precept of conformity to God, and of perfect love, which is the same in the decalogue.

VIII. This law is deduced by infallible consequence from the very nature of God and man, which I thus explain and prove. I pre-suppose, as a self-evident truth, and clear from the very meaning of the words, that the great God has a sovereign and uncontrollable power and dominion over all his creatures. This authority is founded primarily and radically, not on creation, nor on any contract entered into with the creature, nor on the sin of the creature, as some less solidly maintain, but on the majesty, supremacy, sovereignty, and eminence of God, which are his essential attributes, and would have been in God though no creature had actually existed; though we now conceive them as having a certain respect to creatures that do, or at least might exist. From this majesty of the divine nature the prophet Jeremiah, 10:6, 7, infers the duty of the creature: "For as much as there is none like unto thee, O Lord: thou art great, and thy name is great in might. Who would not fear thee, O king of nations, for to thee doth it appertain? For if God is the prime, the supreme, the supereminent, it necessarily follows, that all creatures do in every respect depend on that prime, supreme, and supereminent God, for existence, power, and operation. This is of the essence of creatures, which if not entirely dependent, were not possible to be conceived without the most evident contradiction. But the more degrees of entity there are in any creature, the more degrees also of dependance on the Supreme Being are to be attributed to it. In the rational creature, besides a metaphysical and physical entity, which it has in common with the rest of the creatures, there is a certain more perfect degree of entity, namely, rationality. As, therefore, in quality of a being it depends on God as the Supreme Being, so also as rational on God as the supreme reason, which it is bound to express, and be conformable to. And as God, as long as he wills any creature to exist, necessarily wills it to be dependent on his real providence (otherwise he would renounce his own supremacy by transferring it to the creature); so, likewise, if he wills any rational creature to exist, he necessarily wills it to be dependent on his moral providence, otherwise he would deny himself to be the supreme reason, to whose pattern and idea every dependent reason ought to conform. And thus a rational creature would be to itself the prime reason, that is, really God, which is an evident contradiction.

IX. 'Tis in vain, therefore, that frantic enthusiasts insist, that the utmost pitch of holiness consists in being without law; wresting the saying of the apostle, 1 Tim. 1:9, "the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient." Certainly that passage does not destroy our assertion, by which we evinced that the human nature cannot be without the divine law; but highly confirms it. For since the ungodly are here described as lawless, who would fain live as without law; and disobedient, who will not be in subjection: it follows, that the acknowledging the divine law, and the subjection of the understanding and will to it, is the character of the righteous and the godly. In the law of God, since the entrance of sin, we are to consider two things: 1st. The rule and direction to submission. 2dly. The power of bridling and restraining by terror and fear, and lastly, of justly condemning. When therefore the apostle declares, that the law was not made for a righteous man, he does not understand it of the primary and principal work of the law, which is essential to it, but of that other accidental work which was added to it on account of, and since the entrance of sin, and from which the righteous are freed by Christ.

X. Nor does it only follow from the nature of God and of man, that some law is to be prescribed by God to man in common, but even such a law, as may be not only the rule and guide of human

actions, but of human nature itself, considered as rational. For, since God himself is in his nature infinitely holy, and manifests this his holiness in all his works; it hence follows, that to man, who ought to be conformed to the likeness of the divine holiness, there should be prescribed a law, requiring, not only the righteousness of his works, but the holiness of his nature; so that the righteousness of his works is no other than the expression of his inward righteousness. Indeed, the apostle calls that piety and holiness which he recommends, and which undoubtedly the law enjoins, "the image of God," Eph. 4:24. But the image should resemble its original. Seeing God therefore is holy in his nature, on that very account it follows, that men should be so too.

XI. A certain author has therefore advanced with more subtlety than truth, that "the law obliges the person only to active righteousness, but not the nature itself to intrinsic rectitude; and consequently, that original righteousness is approved indeed, but not commanded by the law: and on the contrary also, that original unrighteousness is condemned, but not forbidden by the law." For the law approves of nothing which it did not command—condemns nothing which it did not forbid. The law is תורה, the doctrine of right and wrong. What it teaches to be evil, that it forbids; what to be good, it commands. And therefore it is deservedly called the law of nature, not only because nature can make it known, but also because it is the rule of nature itself.

XII. To conclude, we are to observe of this law of nature, that at least its principal and most universal precepts are founded, not in the mere arbitrary good will and pleasure of God, but in his unspotted nature. For if it is necessary that God should therefore prescribe a law for man, because himself is the original holiness; no less necessary is it he should prescribe a law which shall be the copy of that original. So that the difference between good and evil ought to be derived, not from any positive law, or arbitrary constitution of the divine will, but from the most holy nature of God himself; which I thus prove.

XIII. Let us take the summary of the first table: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," &c. Should this command be said to be founded in the arbitrary good pleasure of the divine will, and not in the very nature of God; it may with equal propriety be said, that God might dispense with the necessity of loving himself. A thing entirely impossible, as appears hence: it is natural to God to be the chief good; it is included in the notion of God, that he is the very best. Now it is natural to the chief good, to be supremely amiable; it is natural also to reason and will to be unable, without a crime, not to love what is proposed as worthy of the highest affection. Whoever therefore shall affirm, that the necessity of loving God flows not from the very nature of God, advances the following contradiction: God is in his nature the chief good, and yet in his nature not supremely amiable. Or this other: God is worthy of the highest love; and yet it is possible, that he who loves him not does nothing unworthy of God.

XIV. But to proceed: if the command to love God is founded, not in his nature, but in his arbitrary good pleasure; he might have enjoined the hatred of himself. For in things in their own nature indifferent, whoever has the right of commanding, has also that of forbidding, and of requiring the contrary. To assert, that God can command the hatred of himself, not only conveys a sound grating on the ear, but labours under a manifest contradiction; as will appear from a proper explication of the terms. God, the chief good, supremely amiable, are terms equivalent; at least, the last is an explication of the preceding. To hate, is to esteem a thing not the chief good, nay, not so much as any good at all, and therefore so far from loving it, we are averse from it.

Would it not therefore be a manifest contradiction, should any one suppose the great and good God thus speaking to his creature: I am really the chief good, but my will is, not to be esteemed a good in any respect: I, indeed, am worthy of the highest love, but it is my will, that you deem me worthy of your hatred? A man must be blind who sees not a contradiction here.

XV. Moreover, I would ask, if any are otherwise minded, whether it is not naturally good, even antecedently to any free determination of the divine will, to obey God, when he commands any thing? If they own this, we have gained our point: if not, I ask further, whence then the obligation to obey? They cannot say, it is from any command. For the question is, what binds me to obey that command? Here we must necessarily come to that sovereign majesty and supreme authority of God, to whom it is a crime in nature to refuse obedience. Again, if not to obey God is good in nature, then, it follows, God can command that none may obey him. A proposition not only inconsiderate, but also contradictory. For to command, is to bind one to obedience. To say, Obey not, is to dispense with the bond of obligation. It is therefore most contradictory to say, I command, but do not obey.

XVI. What we have proved concerning the love of God, the summary of the first table of the law; namely, that it is good in nature; might be also proved from the summary of the second table, the love of our neighbour. For he who loves God cannot but love his image too, in which he clearly views express characters of the Deity, and not a small degree of the brightness of his glory. Again, whoever loves God will, by virtue of that love, seriously wish, desire, study, and as much as in him lies be careful, that his neighbour, as well as himself, be under God, in God, and for God, and all he has be for his glory. Again, whoever loves God will make it his business that God may appear every way admirable and glorious; and as he appears such most eminently in the sanctification and happiness of men, 2 Thess. 1:10, he will exert himself to the utmost that his neighbour make advances to holiness and happiness. Finally, whoever sincerely loves God will never think he loves and glorifies him enough; such excellencies he discovers in him, sees his name so illustrious, and so exalted above all praise, as to long that all mankind, nay all creatures, should join him in loving and celebrating the infinite perfections of God. But this is the most faithful and pure love of our neighbour, to seek that God may be glorified in him, and he himself be for the glory of God. Hence it appears, that the love of our neighbour is inseparably connected with that of God. If, therefore, it flows from the nature of God, to enjoin us the love of himself, as was just proved; it must likewise flow from the nature of God, to enjoin us the love of our neighbour.

XVII. To conclude, if we conceive all holiness to be founded on the arbitrary will of God, this greatest of all absurdities will follow, that God our lawgiver can, by commanding the contrary of what he had done before, without any regeneration or renovation of the inward man, make of the wicked and disobedient, for whom the law is made to condemnation, persons holy and righteous: a shocking position!

XVIII. From what has been said, it is astonishing, that a certain learned person should approve of the following assertion; namely, "that on the will of God not only things themselves depend, but also every mode of a thing, the truth, order, law, goodness; nor can any goodness of the object either move the divine will, or put a stop to it." It is indeed certain, that no bounds or rules can be set to the will of God by any thing out of God himself; that being repugnant to his sovereign pre-

eminence. Yet something may and ought to be conceived, flowing from God himself, and his intrinsic perfections, which hinders the act of the divine will, and this is not therefore good, because God wills it; but God wills it, because it is good: for instance, the love of God, as the chief good. And they do not consider things regularly, who make the holiness of God to consist only in the exact conformity of his actions with his will; "which will," say they, "is the rule of all holiness," and so of the divine. On the contrary, as the natural holiness of God ought to be conceived prior to his will, so it is rather the rule of the will, than to be ruled by it. For this holiness of God is the most shining purity of the divine perfections, according to which, agreeably to the most perfect reason, he always wills and acts. By this opinion, which we are now confuting, every distinction between what are called moral and positive precepts is destroyed, and Archelaus' exploded paradox brought up anew; namely, τὸ δίκαιον εἶνα, καὶ τὸ ἀσχηρὸν οὐ φύσει, ἀλλὰ νόμῳ. "The distinction of good and evil was not from nature, but of positive institution;" adopted by Aristippus and Theodorus, surnamed the Atheist. "Than which opinion," says Cocceius, in his Summa Theolog. c. xxiv. s. 6, "none can be devised more pernicious, and none more effectual for undermining all religion, striking at the very root of the divine justice and the necessity of a Saviour, cutting out the vitals of piety."

XIX. And thus we have proved these three things concerning the law of nature, on which the covenant of works is founded: namely, 1st. That it flows from the nature of God and man, that some law be prescribed to man. 2dly. Such a law is to be the rule and standard, not only of our actions, but also of our nature. 3dly. That the most universal precepts thereof at least are founded on the nature of God. Let us now consider the other, the symbolical law.

XX. We find this law, Gen. 2:16, 17, "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Concerning this tree, three things are chiefly to be taken notice of. 1st. That it is not quite certain, whether it was a single tree; since a whole species of trees might be forbidden to man: we shall afterwards repeat this remark, when we speak of the Tree of Life. 2dly. There seems to be a twofold reason for this appellation. 1. In respect to God, who by that tree would try and know, whether man would continue good and happy by persevering in obedience, or swerve to evil by disobedience. In which sense God is said to have tried Hezekiah, 2 Chron. 32:31, "that he might know all that was in his heart." 2. In respect of man, because, if from love to God he obeyed this law of probation, he was to come to the fruition of that beatific good, which is never perfectly known but by the enjoyment: on the contrary, if disobedient, he was to know by sad experience into what plunge and abyss of evils he had brought himself.

XXI. 3dly. The tendency of such a divine precept is to be considered. Man was thereby taught. 1. That God is lord of all things; and that it is unlawful for man even to desire an apple, but with his leave. In all things, therefore, from the greatest to the least, the mouth of the Lord is to be consulted, as to what he would or would not have done by us. 2. That man's true happiness is placed in God alone, and nothing to be desired, but with submission to God, and in order to employ it for him. So that it is HE only on whose account all other things appear good and desirable to man. 3. Readily to be satisfied without even the most delightful and desirable things if God so command; and to think, there is much more good in obedience to the divine precept, than in the enjoyment of the most delightful thing in the world. 4. That man was not yet arrived



at the utmost pitch of happiness, but to expect a still greater good after his course of obedience was over. This was hinted by the prohibition of the most delightful tree, whose fruit, of any other, was greatly to be desired; and this argued some degree of imperfection in that state, in which man was forbid the enjoyment of some good. See what follows, chap. vi § 19.

XXII. Thus far of the Laws of the Covenant, both that of nature and of this other symbolical and probatory one. It now follows, that according to what we proposed, §. I. of this Chapter, we consider the observation of those laws. Accordingly, a most perfect obedience to all the commands of God is required; agreeable to that stated rule, Lev. 18:5, "which if a man do he shall live in them." And as life was likewise promised upon obedience to the symbolical law about the Tree of Knowledge, which doubtless was a positive institution; so, to observe by the way, it appears, that by this representation, moral precepts, as they are called, cannot be so distinguished from positive, as if to the former alone this sentence belonged, "which if a man do he shall live in them," and not to the latter.

XXIII. This obedience does in the first place, suppose the most exact preservation of that original and primitive holiness, in which man was created. For, as we have already said, God, by this law, does above all things require the integrity and rectitude of man's nature to be cherished and preserved, as his principal duty, flowing from the benefit he has received. In the second place, from that good principle, good works ought to be produced: "Charity, out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience," 1 Tim. 1:5. In the third place, there ought to be a certain ready alacrity to perform whatever God shall reveal to man as his good pleasure and appointment, that in all things he may be ready to say, "Speak Lord, for thy servant heareth."

XXIV. A threefold perfection is required. 1st. Of Parts, both with respect to the subject, as that the whole man shall, in soul and body, and all the faculties of both, employ himself in the service of God, 1 Thess. 5:23 (for man is then  $\alpha\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omega\varsigma$  perfect, when the outward man corresponds with the inward, the actions with the thoughts, the tongue and hands with the heart, Ps. 16:3, 4, and Ps. 37:31, 33), and with respect to the object, as that all and each of the precepts are observed, without any sin of commission or omission, Gal. 3:10. Jam. 2:10. 2dly. Of Degrees. In the estimation of obedience it excludes all  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\iota\kappa\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$ , pardon and connivance, strictly requiring obedience to be performed "with all the heart, with all the soul, with all the mind," Matt. 22:37. "With all our might," Deut. 6:5. "Thou hast commanded us to keep thy precepts diligently," Ps. 119:4. In the third place, Of Perseverance, without interruption or period. God insists upon this with rigour, Ez. 18:24, pronouncing, that "all his righteousness that he had done, shall not be remembered, when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness," which was fulfilled in Adam. This is emphatically expressed, Deut. 27:26, "Cursed is he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them."

XXV. Such a perfect observance of the laws of the covenant, up to the period which God had fixed for probation, had given man a right to the reward. Not from any intrinsic proportion of the work to the reward, as the grosser Papists proudly boast; but from God's covenant and engagement, which was no ways unbecoming him to enter into. Nor had man, before the consummation of his obedience, even in the state of innocence, a right to life. He was only in a state of acquiring a right, which would at length be actually acquired, when he could say, I could

have fulfilled the conditions of the covenant, I have constantly and perfectly done what was commanded; now I claim and expect that thou, my God, wilt grant the promised happiness.

XXVI. How absurdly again do the Papists assert, that Adam, as he came from the hands of his Creator, had a right, as the adopted Son of God, to supernatural happiness, as to his paternal inheritance; which, according to Bellarmine, de Justificat. l. v. 17. "is due to the adopted Son of God, in right of adoption, previous to all good works." But this is truly a preposterous way of reasoning. For the right of adoption belongs to the covenant of grace in Christ Jesus: "the adoption of children is by Jesus Christ," Eph. 1:5. Besides, was this opinion true, good works could not be required, as the condition of acquiring a right to eternal life; but could only serve to prevent the forfeiture of the right of a son: by this means, the whole design of the covenant of works, and all the righteousness which is by the law, are quite destroyed. In fine, what can be more absurd, than the trifling manner in which these sophisters talk of the grace of adoption, as giving Adam a right to enter upon an heavenly inheritance, in a legal covenant: when, on the other hand, they so stiffly contend for the merits of works, under a covenant of grace. It is only there (to wit, under the covenant of grace) that we are to apply the above sentiment, that the inheritance is due to an adopted Son of God, in right of adoption, previous to all good works.

## Chapter IV: Of the Promises of the Covenant of Works

I. HAVING thus considered the condition of the Covenant of Works, let us now inquire into the promises of that covenant. And here, first, the Socinians come under our notice, who obstinately deny all promises. For, thus Volkelius, *de vera religione*, lib. ii. 8, says, "Scarce, if at all, was any general promise made to the men of that age; but rather threatenings and terrors were then set before them. Nor do we see God, promising upon Adam's abstaining from the fruit of that tree, any reward of obedience, but only denouncing destruction if he did not obey, Gen. 2:17." For this he assigns the following reason: "Moreover, the reason why God at that time would be obeyed, without proposing almost any general reward, seems to be this; because, at the very beginning of the world, he would show to all that he owed nothing to any, but was himself the most absolute lord of all".

II. To this I answer, as follows: 1st, Man's natural conscience teaches him, that God desires not to be served in vain, nor that obedience to his commands will go unrewarded, and for nought. The very heathens were also apprised of this. Arian, in his *Dissert.* lib. i. c. 12, introduces Epictetus, speaking thus: "If there are no Gods, how can it be the end of man to obey the Gods? But if there are, and they be yet regardless of every thing; how is the matter mended? But if they both are, and take care of human affairs; but men have no recompence to expect from them, and have as little; the case is still worse." Let us add, Seneca, *Epist.* xcv. "God does not want servants. Why so? He ministers himself to mankind; being every where present and at hand. Whoever conceives not of God as he ought, dealing all things, bestowing his benefits freely, will never make the proper proficiency. Why are the Gods so beneficent? It is owing to their nature. The first article of the worship of the Gods, is to believe that they are: then, to render them the honour of their majesty, and of their goodness, without which there is no majesty: to know, that they preside over the world, govern all things by their power, take special care of mankind, without neglecting individuals." In like manner, we find it among the articles of the Jewish faith, as a thing naturally known, that "there are rewards as well as punishments with God;" according to that common saying, "God defrauds no creature of its reward." The worship of God presupposes the belief of this: "For, he that cometh to God, must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him," Heb. 11:6.

III. 2dly, Besides, this faith is not merely a certain persuasion of the mind, arising from reasoning, and the consideration of the goodness of God; but, to render it a genuine faith, it must rest on the word and promise of God: "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," Rom 10:17. 3rdly, This was the intent of the tree of life, which the Socinians themselves, in *Compend. Socinian.* c. ii. s. 5. "allow to have been a kind of symbol, though obscure, of eternal life." But that symbol, proposed to Adam, could have been of no use, unless he understood it, and considered it as a seal of the promise made by God. It had been a mere farce, to have prohibited man from access to and eating of this tree after the fall, unless thereby God had given him to understand, that he would forfeit the thing promised, and, consequently, become unworthy of the use of that symbol and sacrament. 4thly, If no promise had been made, they might have lived without hope; for the hope which maketh not ashamed is founded on the promises. But this is the character of the woful calamity of those "who are without God in the world, that they have no hope," Eph. 2:12. 5thly, God represents to Cain a thing known long before, even by nature, much more by paternal instruction: "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be

accepted?" Gen. 4:7. But, did this maxim begin to be true, and to be known only after the fall? 6thly, The very threatening infers a promise, the language of which at least is, that he was to be deprived of that happiness which otherwise he would continue to enjoy; we may, therefore, most certainly infer, that man had no occasion to be afraid of losing that happiness, as long as he kept himself from sin. 7thly, By this assertion of our adversaries, according to their own hypothesis, all the religion of the first man is destroyed; seeing, as our author writes at the beginning of that Chapter, "the promise of rewards, for well-doing, is closely interwoven with religion." 8thly, The reason he gives for this assertion is foolish, and to no purpose. For, do these many and liberal promises of eternal life, which God hath given us in Christ, make it now less evident, that God is indebted to none, and is the most absolute lord of all things? Does the Supreme Being, by his gracious promises, derogate anything from his most absolute dominion? Must it not be known in all ages, that God owes nothing to any? How then comes it, that God did not always equally forbear promising?

IV. Let this therefore be a settled point, that this covenant was not established without promises. We now inquire, what sort of promises God made to Adam. Accordingly, we believe, God promised Adam life eternal, that is, the most perfect fruition of himself, and that for ever, after finishing his course of obedience; our arguments are these:

V. 1st, The apostle declares that God, by sending his Son in the flesh, did what the law could not do, "in that it was weak through the flesh," Rom. 8:3. But it is certain, Christ procured for his own people a right to eternal life, to be enjoyed in heaven in its due time. This the apostle declares the law could not now do, not of itself, or because it has no such promises, but because it "was weak through the flesh." Had it not therefore been for sin, the law had brought men to that eternal life, which Christ promises to and freely bestows on his own people. This appears to me a conclusive argument.

VI. 2dly, It is universally allowed, that Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans and Galatians, where he treats on justification, does, under that name, comprise the adjudging to eternal life: he in many places proves, that a sinner cannot be justified, that is, lay claim to eternal life, by the works of the law; but never by this argument, because the law had no promises of eternal life, but because man is by the law brought to the acknowledgment of sin, and the confession of deserved damnation, Rom. 3:19, 20. He insists on this point with great labour and pains, though otherwise he might have very easily cut short the whole dispute, by just saying, that a title to eternal life was to be sought for by faith in Christ; that it is in vain to rest upon any law, though kept ever so perfectly, in regard it has no promises of eternal life annexed to it. On the contrary, the apostle teaches, that "the commandment, considered in itself, was ordained to life," Rom. 7:10; that is, was such, as by the observance thereof, life might have once been obtained; which, if the law could still bestow on the sinner, "verily righteousness should have been by the law," Gal. 3:21; that is, the right to that same happiness, which now comes from faith on Christ. For the dispute was concerning κληρονομία, the inheritance of eternal life, which was to be entered upon; whether now, by means of the law, or by the promise of the gospel, ver. 18. And he owns it would be by the law, could the law ζωοποιήσαι, "make alive." And this could be done by that law, "which was ordained to life," Rom. 7:10. But when? In innocence, before it was "made weak by the flesh." If Adam therefore had persevered in obedience, the law would have brought him to that same inheritance, which now in Christ is allotted, not to him that worketh, but to him

that believeth. And this argument, if I mistake not, is plain to any person of thought and attention.

VII. 3rdly, We are above all to observe, how the apostle distinguishes the righteousness which is of the law, from the evangelical. Of the first he thus speaks, Rom. 10:5: "Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law; that the man which doth those things, shall live by them." Of the second, he writes as follows, Rom. 1:17: "The just shall live by faith." On both sides, the promise of life is the same, and proposed in the very same words. Nor does the apostle in the least hint, that one kind of life is promised by the law, another by the Gospel. Which, if true, ought for once at least to be hinted, as the doing this would have ended the whole dispute. For in vain would any seek for eternal life by the law, if never promised in it. But the apostle places the whole difference, not in the thing promised, but in the condition of obtaining the promise; while he says, Gal. 3:11, 12: "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident; for the just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith: but the man that doth them, shall live in them." That very life, therefore, is promised by the law to the man that worketh, which he now receives through the faith of Christ. But to what man, thus working, were the promises made? Was it to the sinner? Was it not to man in a state of innocence? And was it not then, when it might truly be said, If thou continuest to do well, thou shalt be heir of that life upon that condition? And this could be said to none but to innocent Adam. Was it not, then, when the promise was actually made? For after sin, there is not so much a promise, as a denunciation of wrath, and an intimation of a curse, proposing that as the condition of obtaining life, which is now evidently impossible to be performed. I therefore conclude, that to Adam, in the covenant of works, was promised the same eternal life, to be obtained by the righteousness which is of the law, of which believers are made partakers through Christ. But let none object, that all these arguments are fetched, not from the history of man in innocence, but from Paul's reasoning; for it is no matter whence arguments are taken, if they contain a demonstration to the conscience, which, I think, is here evident. Undoubtedly, Adam knew a great deal more than is contained in that very short account of him by Moses. Nor does it appear to be without a mystery, that Moses is most sparing on most of the particulars of that covenant, and throws so little light as on the shadow of a transient image, to denote that it was to vanish.

VIII. Once more, 4thly, It was entirely agreeable, that God should promise Adam by covenant something greater and better, to be obtained after finishing his course of obedience, than what he was already possessed of. What kind of covenant would it have been, to have added no reward to his obedience, and his faithful compliance with the conditions of the covenant, but only a continuation of those blessings which he actually enjoyed already, and which it was not becoming God to refuse to man, whom he had created? Now, Adam enjoyed in Paradise all imaginable natural and animal happiness, as it is called. A greater, therefore, and a more exalted felicity still awaited him; in the fruition of which, he would most plainly see, that "in keeping the divine commands, there is רב עקב, μισθαποδοσιαν μεγαλην, great reward," Ps. 19:11. Let none object the case of the angels, to whom, he may pretend, nothing was promised by God, but the continuance of that happy state in which they were created. We are here to keep to the apostle's advice, Col. 2:18. "not to intrude into those things we have not seen." Who shall declare unto us those things which are not revealed concerning the angels? But, if we may form probable conjectures, it appears to me very likely, that some superior degree of happiness was conferred on the angels, after they were actually confirmed, and something more excellent than that in

which they were at first created: as the joy of the angels received a considerable addition, upon beholding the divine perfections, so resplendent in the illustrious work of redemption; and at the consummation of all things, the happiness of all the elect, both angels and men, will be complete; when Christ's whole body shall appear glorious, and God be glorified and admired in all his saints.

IX. It still remains doubtful whether the life promised to Adam upon his perseverance, was to be enjoyed in paradise or in heaven. The latter appears more probable. 1st, Because paradise is in scripture represented as a type of heaven; and heaven itself is called paradise, Luke 23:43, by that exchange of names which is very common between a sacrament or sign, and the thing signified thereby. But is it in the least probable that paradise should be made a sacrament, after man's ejection? 2dly, It is fit that man, when raised to consummate happiness, should reside there, where God does most brightly display the rays of his glorious majesty; which doubtless he does in heaven, where he has fixed his throne, Isai. 66:1. 3rdly, As the earthly paradise was furnished with all the delights and pleasures appertaining to this animal life, of which there is no necessity in that most perfect and immediate fruition of God, all that external entertainment being in the highest degree excluded thence; heaven ought to be deemed a much more suitable habitation for glorified man, than the earthly paradise. However, we would not deny that happiness does not depend on place; and there being scarce anything to demonstrate this in scripture, we ought not to contend strenuously about such a question.

X. This therefore is settled, God promised to Adam eternal life. But here it may be, and is usually asked, whence this promise flows, whether from the mere good pleasure of the divine will, so that God would have acted nowise unworthy of himself had he made no such promise to man; or, whether God's making the covenant with man, in this manner, was from the divine nature, and from what was suitable to it? Here indeed, I think we are to be modest; I shall therefore propose what I imagine I know, or may reasonably think or believe, concerning my God, with fear and trembling. O my God, grant that what I shall speak on this point may be managed with a holy awe, and in a manner becoming thy majesty!

XI. And first, I lay this down as an acknowledged truth, that God owes nothing to his creature. By no claim, no law, is he bound to reward it. For, all that the creature is, it owes entirely to God; both because he created it, and also because he is infinitely exalted above it. But where there is so great a disparity, there is no common standard of right by which the superior in dignity can become under an obligation to give any reward, Rom. 11:35, 36.

XII. I approve on this subject of Durandus's reasoning, which Bellarmine was unable to refute. "What we are, and what we have, whether good acts, or good habits, or practices, are all from the divine bounty, who both gives freely and preserves them. And because none, after having given freely, is obliged to give more, but rather the receiver is the more obliged to the giver; therefore, from good habits, and good acts or practices given us by God, God is not bound by any debt of justice to give anything more, so as not giving, to become unjust; but rather we are bound to God."

XIII. Whatever then is promised to the creature by God, ought all to be ascribed to the immense goodness of the Deity. To this purpose Augustine speaks well, serm. 16, on the words of the

apostle: "God became our debtor, not by receiving anything, but by promising what he pleased. For, it was of his own bounty that he vouchsafed to make himself a debtor." But as this goodness is natural to God, no less than holiness and justice; and as it is equally becoming God to act, agreeably to his goodness, with a holy and innocent creature; as agreeably to his justice, with a sinful creature; so, from this consideration of the divine goodness, I imagine the following things may be very plainly inferred.

XIV. 1st, That it is unbecoming the goodness, I had almost ventured to add, and the justice of God, to adjudge an innocent creature to hell torments. A paradox, which not only some scholastic divines, but which I am very sorry to say a great divine of our own, with a few followers, has not scrupled to maintain. Be it far from us to presume to circumscribe the extensive power of God over his creatures, by the limits of a right prescribed to us, or by the fallacious reasoning of a narrow understanding. But be it also far from us to ascribe anything to him which is unbecoming his immense goodness and unspotted justice. Elihu with great propriety joins these together, Job 37:22, 23: "With God is terrible majesty. Touching the Almighty, we cannot find him out: he is excellent in power and in judgment, and in plenty of justice: he will not afflict." For, if God could thus afflict an innocent creature, he would show he was not pleased with the holiness of his creature; since he would not only deprive him of communion with himself, but also give him up to the cruel will of his enemies. When he destroys the wicked, he makes it plainly appear he is not delighted with wickedness, nay, in scripture phrase, Ps. 5:5, hates it. Should he therefore in the same manner torment the pious, he would testify by this that he did not delight in piety, but rather hated it; which none without blasphemy can conceive of God. And what else are the pains of hell? Are they not a privation of divine love? A sense of divine hatred? The worm of conscience? Despair of recovering God's favour? But how is it possible, without a manifest contradiction, to conceive this ever to be the case of an innocent creature? And I own I was struck with horror, when I observed the most subtle Twiss, in order to defend this paradox, choose rather to maintain, it were better to be eternally miserable, and endure the torments of hell, than not to exist at all; and when he objected to himself the authority of our Saviour, plainly affirming of Judas, "It had been good for that man if he had not been born;" Matt. 26:24, that he did not blush to answer, that "many things are said in Scripture in a figurative and hyperbolical manner, nay, a great deal accommodated to the sense of the vulgar, and even to human judgment, though erroneous;" all which he applies to this sentence of our Saviour, *de Elect.*, P. II., lib. i., §. 4, pp. 178, 179. To what length is not even the most prudent hurried, when he gives too much way to his own speculations! I, for my own part, think Sophocles formed a sounder judgment than the very acute Twiss, when he said, "Better not be, than to live miserable;" and Æschylus, in *Ixion*, "I think it had been better for that man who suffers great pains never to have been born, than to have existed." Bernard speaks excellently to the same purpose, *ad Eugen. de Consider.*, lib. 5: "It is not to be doubted but it will be much worse with those who will be in such a state [of misery], than with those who will have no existence." For, as he says in his *Sermon on Solomon's Song*, "the soul, placed in that state, loses its happiness without losing its being, whereby it is always constrained to suffer death without dying, failure without failing, and an end without a period."

XV. 2dly, Nor can God, on account of this his goodness, refuse to communicate himself to, or give the enjoyment of himself, to an innocent, an holy creature, or to love and favour it in the most tender manner while it has a being, and continues pure according to its condition. For a

holy creature is God's very image. But God loves himself in the most ardent manner, as being the chief good; which he would not be, unless he loved himself above all. It therefore follows, he must also love his own image, in which he has expressed to the life himself, and what is most amiable in him, his own holiness. With what show of decency could he command the other creatures to love such as are holy, did he himself not judge them amiable? Or, if he judged them so, how is it possible he should not love them himself?

XVI. Further, God does not love in vain. It is the character of a lover to wish well to, and to do all the good in his power to, the object of his love. But in the good will of God consists both the soul's life and welfare. And as nothing can hinder his actually doing well by those whom he wishes well to, it follows, that a holy creature, which he necessarily loves from the goodness of his nature, must also enjoy the fruits and effects of that divine love.

XVII. Besides, it is the nature of love to seek union and communion with the beloved. He does not love in reality, who desires not to communicate himself to the object of his affection. But every one communicates himself such as he is. God, therefore, being undoubtedly happy, makes the creature whom he loves, and honours with the communion of himself, a partaker of his happiness. I say, he makes the creature happy in proportion to the state in which he would have it to be. All these things follow from that love which we have shown God does, in consequence of his infinite goodness, necessarily bear to the creature who is innocent and holy.

XVIII. The same thing may be demonstrated in another manner, and, if I mistake not, incontestably, as follows: The sum of the divine commands is this: Love me above all things; that is, look upon me as thy only chief good; hunger and thirst after me; place the whole of thy happiness in me alone; seek me above all; and nothing besides me, but so far as it has a relation to me. But how is it conceivable that God should thus speak to the soul, and the soul should religiously attend to and diligently perform this, and yet never enjoy God? Is it becoming the most holy and excellent being, to say to his pure unspotted creature, such as we now suppose it, Look upon me as thy chief good; but know, I neither am, nor ever shall be, such to thee. Long after me, but on condition of never obtaining thy desire; hunger and thirst after me, but only to be for ever disappointed, and never satisfied; seek me above all things, but seek me in vain, who am never to be found. He does not know God, who can imagine that such things are worthy of him.

XIX. After all, if it cannot be inferred from the very nature of the divine goodness, that God gives himself to be enjoyed by a holy creature proportionable to its state; it is possible, notwithstanding the goodness of God, that the more holy a creature is, the more miserable. Which I prove thus: the more holy any one is, he loves God with the greater intenseness of all his powers; the more he loves, the more he longs, hungers, and thirsts after him; the more intense the hunger and thirst, the more intolerable the pain, unless he finds wherewith to be satisfied. If therefore this thirst be great to the highest degree, the want of what is so ardently desired will cause an incredible pain. Whence I infer that God cannot, consistent with his goodness, refuse to grant to his holy creature the communion of himself. Unless we yield this, it will follow that, notwithstanding the goodness of God, it is possible for the highest degree of holiness to become the highest pitch of misery.



XX. But let it be again observed here, of which we gave a hint, § VIII., that this communion of God of which we are speaking, which the goodness of the Supreme Being requires to be granted to a holy creature, is not all the promise of the covenant here; which is at length to be given upon fulfilling this condition. For what God gives his creature now, before he has performed the conditions of the covenant, is not to be reckoned among the promises of the covenant. Another and a far greater thing is promised after the constancy of his obedience is tried, to which the creature acquires some right, not simply because it is holy (for such it came out of the hands of its Creator), but because it has now added constancy to holiness, being sufficiently tried to the satisfaction of its Lord. The promises, therefore, of the covenant contains greater things than this communion and fruition of God, of whatsoever kind it be, which Adam already enjoyed whilst still in the state of trial. A farther degree of happiness, consisting in the full and immediate enjoyment of God, and in a more spiritual state, to last for ever, was proposed to him, which the Scripture usually sets forth under the title of eternal life.

XXI. And this is the proper question: Whether the promise of eternal life, to be entered upon by all after a complete course of obedience, flows from the natural goodness of God, or whether it is of free and liberal good pleasure? Indeed, I know not, whether the safest course be not to suspend the decision of this, till, coming to see God face to face, we shall attain to a fuller knowledge of all his perfections, and more clearly discern what is worthy of them. For, on the one hand, it appears to me hard to affirm, and somewhat too bold for any one obstinately to insist, that it would have been unbecoming God and his perfections to enter into covenant with man in this manner: namely, If thou keepest my commands, thou shalt certainly have my favour and most endearing love; I will not only save thee from all uneasiness, but also load thee with every benefit, and even bless thee with the communion of myself; till having performed thy part, and being amply enough rewarded, I shall at length say, Now return to that nothing out of which thou wast created; and my will is, that this my last command be no less cheerfully obeyed than the others, lest thou shouldst forfeit, by this last act of disobedience, all the praise of thy former obedience. Has the creature any cause to complain of such a stipulation? Nay, rather may it not give him joy, since it is far better to have existed a few ages in a state of holiness and happiness, than never to have existed at all.

XXII. On the other hand, I can scarce satisfy myself in my attempts to remove some difficulties. For since (as we before proved) God does, by virtue of his natural goodness, most ardently love a holy creature, as the lively image of himself, how can this his goodness destroy that image and undo his own work? "Is it good unto thee that thou shouldst despise the work of thine hands" without deserving such treatment? Job 10:3. If it was good and for the glory of God to have made a creature to glorify Him, will it be good and for the glory of God to annihilate that creature who thus glorifies him; and thus in fact to say, thou shalt not glorify me for ever? Besides, as God himself has created the most intense desire of eternity in the soul, and at the same time has commanded it to be carried out towards himself as its eternal good; is it becoming God to frustrate such a desire, commanded and excited by himself? Further, we have said it was a contradiction to suppose God addressing himself to a holy soul in the manner following: Hunger after me, but thou shalt not enjoy me. Yet in the moment we conceive the holy creature just sinking into annihilation, it would, in consequence of that divine command, hunger and thirst after God without any hope of ever enjoying him again. Unless we should choose to affirm, that God at length would say to that soul, Cease longing for me any more, acquiesce in this instance

of my supreme dominion, by which I order thee to return to nothing. But I own it surpasses my comprehension, how it is possible a holy creature should not be bound to consider God as its supreme good, and consequently pant after the enjoyment of him.

XXIII. O Lord Jehovah, how little do we, poor miserable mortals, know of thy Supreme Deity, and incomprehensible perfections! How far short do our thoughts come about thee, who art infinite or immense in thy being, thy attributes, thy sovereignty over the creatures! What mortal can take upon him to set bounds to this thy sovereignty, where thou dost not lead the way? Lord, we know that thou art indebted to none, and that there is none who can say to thee, What dost thou, or, Why dost thou so? That thou art also holy, and infinitely good, and therefore a lover and rewarder of holiness. May the consciousness of our ignorance in other things kindle in our hearts an ineffable desire of that beatific vision by which, knowing as we are known, we may in the abyss of thy infinity behold those things which no thought of ours at present can reach!

## Chapter V: Of the Penal Sanction

I. IT remains that we consider the Penal Sanction, expressed by God in these terms, Gen. 2:17, "For in the day that thou eatest thereof" (the tree of knowledge of good and evil) "thou shalt surely die."

II. Several things are here to be distinctly noted: 1st. That all that God here threatens is the consequence and punishment of sin, to be only inflicted on the rebellious and disobedient; and therefore Socinus and his followers most absurdly make the death mentioned in the threatening a consequence, not so much of sin, as of nature: but God's words are plain to any man's conscience, that death flows from eating of the forbidden tree. 2dly. That the sin, here expressed, is a violation, not of the natural, but of the symbolical law, given to man for the trial of his most perfect obedience. But even from this, he might easily gather, that if the transgression of a precept, whose universal goodness depends only on the good pleasure of God, is thus to be punished, the transgression of that law, which is the transcript of the most holy nature of God, deserves much greater. 3dly. That it is altogether agreeable to God's authority and most righteous will, that there be a certain connexion between the sin and the punishment denounced by these words. This also is indicated by the ingemination in the original, "dying thou shalt die," that is, thou shalt most certainly die. So that it is not possible for the sinner to escape death, unless perhaps a proper sponser (of which this is not the place) should undergo it in his stead. 4thly. That the words of the threatening are general, and therefore, by the term death, we ought here to understand whatever the Scripture any where signifies by that name. For who will presume to have a right of limiting the extent of the divine threatening? Nay, the words are not only general, but ingeminated too, plainly teaching us, that they are to be taken in their full emphasis or signification. 5thly. That they are spoken to Adam in such a manner as also to relate to his posterity: a certain evidence that Adam was the representative of all. 6thly. That on the very day the sin should be committed, punishment should be inflicted on man; justice required this, and it has been verified by the event. For in the very moment when man sinned, he became obnoxious to death, and immediately, upon finishing his sin, felt the beginnings both of corporal and spiritual death. These things are here expressed with far greater simplicity than in the fictions of the Jewish doctors, according to Ben Jarchi, on Dan. 7:25; where he speaks thus: "A thousand years are as one time and one day in the sight of the holy and blessed God, according to Ps. 90:4, 'For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday,' and our doctors of blessed memory said, that Gen. 2:17, 'For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,' is to be understood of the day of the holy and blessed, that therefore the first man did not complete his day (not arrive at his thousandth year), that of that day he wanted seventy years." But this is far fetched, and savours of rabbinical dotage.

III. It will be far more useful a little more accurately to examine, what is here meant by the word death. And first, it is most obvious, that by that term is denoted that bad disposition of the body now unfit for the soul's constant residence, and by which the soul is constrained to a separation from it. By this separation the good things of the body, which are unhappily doted on, the fruits of sin, and the sinner's ill-grounded hope, are snatched away at once. God intimates this, Gen. 3:19, "till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." That is, thy body, which was formed out of the earth, shall return to its principles, and be reduced to earth again, unto which by its nature it is resolvable, as being taken

out of it. And the reason why it is actually to be resolved unto earth is, because it really is what God said, "thou art dust," now corrupted with earthly desires, a slave to a body prone to sin, and taken from dust. In this sense Abraham confesses himself "to be dust and ashes," Gen. 18:27, that is, a mortal sinner. And David says, Ps. 103:14, "he knoweth יצרנו our frame" (called, Gen. 8:21, הרע יצר, an evil frame, which passage Kimchi directs to be compared with this,) "he remembereth that we are dust," attached to the ground, and viciously inclined to the good things of the earth. From this consideration the prophet amplifies the mercy of God in exercising it towards sinners, in whom he finds nothing to deserve his love. And by dust is clearly signified, Is. 65:25, the sinful body. Where it is said of the serpent, the devil, now overcome by the kingdom of the Messiah, dust shall be his food, he shall only have the pleasure to destroy the body, and men of carnal dispositions. Whereas then, after Adam sinned, God condemned him to the death of the body for his sin, it is not to be doubted but he also comprised this death in the commination. Unless we will venture to affirm, that God has inflicted greater punishment on the sinner than he threatened before the commission of sin.

IV. There is nothing so surprising but what may be devised by a luxuriant fancy. There is a certain learned man, who, in the words of Moses above explained, can find an extraordinary promise, and even clearer and more pregnant with consolation than the prophecy concerning the seed of the woman. He thinks here is pointed out the period and boundary of toils; that the meaning is, "till thou shalt return to this land," Paradise, the state of happy souls, from which לקחת, "thou wast carried captive." For thus Solomon, למות לקחים, "captivated to death," and Jeremiah, לקחו, "thy children carried unto captivity." And he thinks that the opinion of the Jews concerning the gathering of the souls of the pious into paradise, has no other passage or foundation to support it. But this is nothing but the sally of a wanton imagination. Whereas for our part we take pleasure only in what is sound and sober, and yields satisfaction to the conscience. But to return to our subject.

V. It is no ways strange, that the Socinians, whose practice it is to wrest the Scriptures, should contradict this truth, and deny that the death of the body is the punishment of sin. Their other perverse hypotheses make this necessary. For, by denying this, they imagine they can more easily answer our arguments for original sin taken from the death of infants, and for the satisfaction of the Lord Christ, from his death. And as they impiously deny the true godhead of Christ, they allege as the most excellent sign of his fictitious divinity, that he was the first preacher, author, and bestower of immortality; but their blasphemies have been largely and solidly refuted by others. But I am sorry that any learned person of our own should deny, that by the death denounced, Gen. 2:17, the death of the body ought to be understood; and who thinks he grants a great deal when he writes as follows:—"From which place, if any insist they can prove a manifold kind of death, eternal, spiritual, and corporal, and other afflictions, I can easily bear their fighting with these weapons against the enemies, so they can extort from them what they want." These are none of the best expressions. Why, without necessity, grant so much to our adversaries? Is it at all commendable for us to weaken those arguments which have been happily made use of in defence of the truth? This learned person owns that death is the punishment of sin, and that it may be evidently proved from the sentence pronounced upon Adam, Gen. 3:19. What reason is there then not to believe, that the same death was proposed to man in the preceding threatening? Are not the words general, and ingeminated to give them the greater emphasis? Is not the death of the body expressly set forth by the very same phrase? 1 Kings 2:37;

where Solomon tells Shimei מות מות, "thou shalt die the death." Is not the very sound of the words such as a man cannot but have this death of the body come into his mind; unless a prejudiced person should refuse to understand here by death what every one else does when death is spoken of? Is it not also highly becoming the divine goodness and justice, to inflict nothing by a condemnatory sentence on man, which was not previously threatened against sin; lest man should plead an excuse, he did not know that God would so highly resent and so severely punish sin? And seeing this learned person would have death eternal here meant, does not that include the death of the body? Is the former ever inflicted on man but after the latter, by raising him from that death, that the whole man, soul and body, may be eternally miserable? Why are thus suspicions entertained, of which, alas! we have but too many? I could wish we all spoke with caution, "with fear and trembling!" This learned person will, it is hoped, not take amiss, if I here suggest to him the very prudent advice of Cocceius, which in a like case he inculcates on Gen. 3 §. 190. "Those of our party," says he, "wish that we should employ stronger arguments against the Jews. And certainly, that admonition is good; namely, when we have to do with infidels we are to make use of cogent arguments, lest we become the derision of infidels, and confirm them in error. But as to the inculcating that rule, it is neither safe nor prudent readily and frequently to oppose it on the arguments of other Christians. For, if thereby we refute them, N. B. we then go over to the party of the adversaries, and we arm them and teach them to cavil. But if we do not refute them, but only inculcate that admonition, an injury is certainly done both to the disputant and the bearer, and we seem to give our own opinion as an argument. Let every one therefore argue with the utmost solidity; and if any manifestly abuses Scripture, let him be corrected in a brotherly manner, upon pointing out his fault. As for the rest, let the arguments of believers be thoroughly tried, and not hissed off the stage."

VI. Secondly, by death is here understood, all that lasting and hard labour, that great sorrow, all the tedious miseries of this life, by which life ceases to be life, and which are the sad harbingers of certain death. To these things man is condemned, Gen. 3:16–19. The whole of that sentence is founded on the antecedent threatening; such miseries Pharaoh himself called by the name death, Ex. 10:17; and David, Ps. 116:3, calls his pain and anguish, מות הבלי, "the bands (sorrows) of death;" by these death binds and fastens men, that he may thrust them into and confine them in his dungeon. Thus also Paul, 2 Cor. 11:23, "In deaths often," and 2 Cor. 4:11, "Are always delivered unto death;" *ibid.* 12, "Death worketh in us." As life is not barely to live, but to be happy, so death is not to depart this life in a moment, but rather to languish in a long expectation, dread, and foresight of certain death, without knowing the time which God has foreordained. Correctly to this purpose says Picus Mirandula, in his treatise de Ente et uno: "For we begin, should you haply not know it, to die then, when we first begin to live; and death runs parallel with life; and we then first cease to die when set free from this mortal body by the death of the flesh."

VII. Thirdly, death signifies spiritual death, or the separation of the soul from God. Elegantly has Isidorus, *Pelusiota* iii. 232, defined it: "The death of the immortal soul is the departure of the Holy Spirit from it." This is what the apostle calls, Eph. 4:18, "being alienated from the life of God, which illuminates, sanctifies, and exhilarates the soul. For the life of the soul consists in wisdom, in pure love, and the rejoicing of a good conscience. The death of the soul consists in folly, and through concupiscence in a separation from God, and the tormenting rackings of an evil conscience. Hence the apostle says, Eph. 2:1, "We are dead in trespasses and sins."

VIII. But I would more fully explain the nature of this death, not indeed in my own, but in the words of another, because I despaired to find any more emphatical. Both living and dead bodies have motion. But a living body moves by vegetation while it is nourished, has the use of its senses, is delighted, and acts with pleasure; whereas the dead body moves by putrefaction to a state of dissolution, and to the production of loathsome animals. And so in the soul, spiritually alive, there is motion, while it is fed, repasted, and fattened with divine delights, while it takes pleasure in God and true wisdom, while, by the strength of its love, it is carried to and fixed on that which can sustain the soul and give it a sweet repose. But a dead soul has no feeling; that is, it neither understands truth nor loves righteousness, wallows, and is spent and tired out in the sink of concupiscence, breeds and brings forth the worms of impure and abominable thoughts, reasonings, and affections. Men, therefore, alienated from that spiritual life, which consists in the light of wisdom and the activity of love, who delight in their own present happiness, are no better than living carcases, 1 Tim. 5:6, "dead whilst living;" and hence in Scripture are said to be spiritually dead.

IX. The word נבל, ἄφρων, which the Scripture applies to such, is both emphatical and of a very fertile signification. For it denotes, 1st. A fool, corrupt in all the faculties of the soul, void of that spiritual wisdom, the beginning of which is the fear of the Lord. "Nabal is his name, and folly is with him," is Abigail's character of her husband, 1 Sam. 25:25. This נבל is opposed to חכם, wise, Deut. 32:6, "O foolish people and unwise." 2dly. It also denotes a wicked person, Ps. 74:18, "the foolish people have blasphemed thy name." 3dly and lastly, It signifies one in a dead and withered state; the root נבל denoting to wither and die away, Is. 40:7: "The flower fadeth." נבלה is a dead body, Isa. 26:19: "Thy dead men shall live." All which conjointly denote a man devoid of the wisdom of God, overwhelmed with sin, and destitute of the life of God; in a word, faded and breeding worms, like a dead body: in all which spiritual death consists.

X. This spiritual death is both sin, and the natural consequence of the first sin, being at the same time threatened as the punishment of sin. For, as it renders man vile, and entirely incapable to perform those works which alone are worthy of him, as it makes him like the brute creatures, nay, and even like the devil himself, and unlike God, the only blessed being, and, consequently, renders him highly miserable, so it must be an exceeding great punishment of sin.

XI. Fourthly, and lastly, Eternal death is also here intended. The preludes of which, in this life, are the terrors and anguish of an evil conscience, the abandoning of the soul, deprived of all divine consolation, and the sense of the divine wrath, under which it is miserably pressed down. There will ensue upon this the translation of the soul to a place of torments, Luke 16:23–25, where shall be the hiding of God's face, the want of his glorious presence, and a most intense feeling of the wrath of God, for ever and ever, together with horrible despair, Rev. 14:11. At last will succeed, after the end of the world, the resurrection of the body to eternal punishment, Acts 24:15.

XII. And here again, the Socinian divinity, adopted by the remonstrants, thwarts the truth; maintaining, App. p. 57, that by these words, "thou shalt surely die," or by any others elsewhere, "Adam was not threatened with eternal death, in the sense of the Evangelists (or Protestants); so as to comprise the eternal death of body and soul, together with the punishment of sense; but directly corporal death only, or a separation of soul and body; which, all the evils disposing to

death, do precede; and upon which, at length, the eternal punishment of loss, that is, the privation of the vision of God, or of grace and glory, will ensue." Another of that class, who examined in French the doctrine of Amyraldus and Testard, violently contends, that in the law there is no mention of the sense of infernal pains, but that it is peculiar to the Gospel, and threatened at last, against the profane despisers thereof, p. 59 and 114, though elsewhere he adds, those "who stifle the light of reason, or hold the truth in unrighteousness, the more freely to fulfil the lusts of the flesh." As to others, he thinks, "a middle state is to be assigned them, into which they may be received, different from the kingdom of heaven, and the damnation of hell-fire: such as, perhaps, that they are for ever to remain in the dust, to which they are to be reduced, and from thence never to arise." Curcellæus dissert. de necess. Cognit. Christian. §. 5.

XIII. But this is the rankest poison. For, either they would insinuate, that the soul of a sinner is to be cut off, destroyed, and annihilated; like some of the Jews; and Maimonides himself, as quoted by Abarbanel on Mal. 4 who place eternal death in this, "that the soul shall be cut off, shall perish, and not survive; from which leaven of the Epicureans and Sadducees, the Socinians profess themselves not averse; or else they assert, what is the most absurd, repugnant, and tends to weaken the authority and meaning of the whole Scripture. For, it is impossible to conceive the soul of man, in a state of existence, excluded from the beatific vision of God, deprived of the sense of his grace and glory, and not be most grievously tortured with the loss of this chief good; especially as conscience shall incessantly upbraid the soul which, through its own folly, was the cause of all this misery, and torment it with the most dire despair of ever obtaining any happiness. And seeing God does not exclude man from the vision of his face, where is fulness of joy, without the justest displeasure, a holy indignation, and an ardent zeal against sin and the sinner; the privation of this supreme happiness arising from the wrath of God, cannot but be joined with a sense of the divine displeasure and malediction. These things flow from the very nature of the soul, and deserve a fuller illustration.

XIV. The soul of man was formed for the contemplation of God as the supreme truth, truth itself; and to seek after him with all its affection as the supreme good, goodness itself: and it may be said truly to live, when it delights in the contemplation of that truth, and in the fruition of that goodness. But when, by the just sentence of a despised Deity, it is excluded that most pleasant contemplation of truth, and most delightful fruition of goodness, then it must certainly own itself to be dead. And as it is so delightful to enjoy a good most desirable and desired, so it must be afflicting and painful to be disappointed of it. But since the soul, which is a spiritual substance, endued with understanding and will, cannot be without the active exercise of these faculties, especially when let loose from the fetters of the body; it must necessarily perceive itself miserable, by being deprived of the chief good; and, being conscious of its misery, must bitterly lament the want of that good, which it was formed to seek after. To suppose a soul that has neither understanding nor will, is to suppose it not to be a soul: just as if one supposed a body without quantity and extension. Again, to suppose a soul sensible of its misery, and not grieved because of it, is contrary to the nature, both of the soul, and of misery. It is certainly, therefore, an absurd and contradictory fiction, to suppose the human soul to be under the punishment of loss, without the punishment of sense at the same time.

XV. Further, as the soul cannot be ignorant that God is infinitely good, and that it is the nature of goodness to be communicative; it thence certainly gathers, that something exceedingly contrary

to God must be found in itself, which he has the most perfect detestation of, and on account of which he, who is infinitely good, can have no communion with his creature; and that, therefore, this non-communion is the most evident sign and sad effect of the divine displeasure, depriving the man of the fruition of that good, by which alone he could be happy. And thus, in this punishment of loss, there is an exquisite sense of the wrath of God, with which no torments of the body by material fire can be compared.

XVI. Besides, the soul, being conscious to itself of having by its sins been the cause of this misery, becomes enraged against itself, accuses, abhors, tears itself, acts the tormentor against itself, and under this lash more severely smarts, than any criminal under the hands of the most unrelenting executioner. Add that, all hope of a happy restitution failing, and being racked with horrid despair, it is appointed to eternal misery. All these things are so closely connected, as to make themselves manifest to every conscience, upon the least attention.

XVII. The same things the Scriptures expressly teach, when they speak of "eternal punishment," Matt. 25:46, "and torments," Luke 16:23, 28, of "the worm that dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched," Mark 9:44, and the like; expressions too strong to be understood of the punishment of loss only, without that of sense.

XVIII. And it is absurd to say, that this punishment is threatened only against the contemners of the Gospel, seeing Paul testifies that Christ is to come "in flaming fire, taking vengeance, not only on them that obey not the Gospel, but on them that know not God," 2 Thess. 1:8; compare 1 Thess. 4:5, "the Gentiles which know not God." Such, namely, who would not know God even from the works of creation, and "did not like to retain God in their knowledge," Rom. 1:28. The very power of truth obliged Curcellæus to say, in the place above cited, "these are altogether inexcusable before God, and therefore it is not to be wondered, if, hereafter, they be consigned to the punishment of eternal fire." And our adversaries will not say, that the Gospel was preached to those of Sodom and Gomorrha, and the neighbouring cities. And yet, concerning them, Jude writes, ver. 7, that "they are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." Words not to be restricted to that fire wherewith those cities were burnt, but to be extended to the flames of hell, with which the lewd inhabitants of those cities are, at this very day, tormented. These things are to be distinguished, which the nature of the things teaches to be distinct. Thus, we are to understand, "giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, of the inhabitants and not of the towns." But it is true of both, that they were burnt with fire; which, with respect to the towns, may in some measure, be said to be eternal; they being so consumed, as that they never shall or can be restored. But it is truly eternal with respect to the inhabitants, who, by the vengeance of God, were not annihilated; but at the time when the apostle was writing, having been cast headlong into everlasting pain and torment, they suffered the punishment of that fire, of which "whoremongers shall have their part in the lake, which burneth with fire and brimstone," Rev. 21:8. So, these cities are an emblem or type of eternal fire; but their wicked inhabitants "suffer the vengeance of eternal fire," and so both are for an example (Peter says, 2 Epist. 2:6, an ensample), by which we are reminded what whoremongers are to expect.

XIX. Christ also expressly declares to the same purpose, Matt. 25:41, that all who shall be placed on his left hand, and not declared heirs of eternal life, shall, by a righteous sentence, be



condemned to "everlasting fire, which is prepared for the devil and his angels;" which fire, ver. 46, is explained to be κόλασιν αιώνιον, "everlasting punishment." We cannot approve what Curcellæus, in the said Dissertation, § 6, has written, that in "Matthew is not described a judgment in every respect universal, of all who ever had existed; but only of those who made a profession of the Christian religion, some of whom behaved becoming the Gospel, others not." These are expressions not of the best stamp. For, shall not that judgment be universal, which our Lord extends to "all nations," Matt. 25:32? To "all the tribes of the earth," Matt. 24:30? In which "every eye shall see Christ the judge," Rev. 1:7? In which, according to Paul, Acts 17:31, "he will judge the world?" In which, both "sea, and death, and hell will deliver up their dead to be judged," Rev. 20:13? In which shall be accomplished the prediction which God solemnly confirmed by oath, saying, "Every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God," Rom. 14:11? In which even "the men of Nineveh, and the queen of the South, shall rise to condemn the wicked Jews," Matt. 12:41, 42; and their portion of torment be assigned to those of Tyre, and Sidon, and Sodom, Matt. 11:22, 24? In which shall be inflicted on that "servant who knew not his master's will, and did commit things worthy of stripes," his due measure of stripes, Luke 12:48? In which, in fine, "they who have sinned without law, shall perish without law," Rom. 2:12? To restrict all this to those to whom the Gospel has been preached, is to make sport with Scripture; but God will not be sported with.

XX. But should Curcellæus perhaps reply, that he denies not an universal judgment to come, but that it is not described either in Matt. 25, or in those passages in which the men to be judged are divided into two classes; as John 5:28, 29; 2 Thess. 1:6, &c.; I answer: 1st, That the Scripture makes mention but of one judgment, to be held on the last day; and nowhere teacheth us, that a different tribunal is to be erected for those to whom the Gospel was not preached, and for those to whom it was. Paul was preaching, Acts 24:25, of the judgment to come, in the singular number; in like manner, Heb. 6:2, of eternal judgment. 2ndly, The passages alleged have the marks of universality affixed to them. For, John 5:28, it is said, "All that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the son of man:" and ver. 29, this universality is not to be divided into those who either by faith received the Gospel preached to them, or perversely rejected it; but into those who have done good or evil, without mentioning the Gospel in the least. And 2 Thess. 1:6, &c., the punishment of eternal destruction will be inflicted by the sentence of the Judge, not only on those who were disobedient to the Gospel, but also on those who knew not God, viz. "God the Creator, to the knowledge and worship of whom nature alone might have led men, unless they had extinguished its light through their wickedness," as Curcellæus himself explains it. 3rdly, Nor is it any thing singular, to distribute the persons to be judged into two classes, but common in every judgment concerning all mankind; of which there are but two dissimilar bodies, either of those to be acquitted, or those to be condemned. An intermediate state the Scripture knows nothing of.

XXI. The only thing specious adduced by Curcellæus, is this: that Christ cannot upbraid those, who knew nothing of his will; with these words, I was an hungry, &c. But we answer: 1st, That Christ, in what he here speaks, takes not in the whole process of the judgment, but only mentions this by way of example. For who can doubt that more things are to be considered in this judgment, even with respect to those to whom the Gospel was preached, than barely those effects of charity towards the godly when afflicted? 2ndly, The Scripture declares, that all the actions of all persons shall be tried in this judgment, Eccl. 12:14, 2 Cor. 5:10, Rom. 2:5, 6, &c.; even words, Matt. 12:37, both the idle, and hard, Jude 15; nay, even the secrets of the heart, Rom.

2:15, 16, 1 Cor. 4:5. 3rdly, It is not our business to determine with what the Judge may justly upbraid the damned. It is plain, he will upbraid them with those things at least which they shall hear with the most dreadful amazement. And seeing all the damned have discovered many evidences of an unrelenting, unmerciful, and unbeneficent disposition; who of us shall dare to censure Christ for interpreting this their conduct, as if they would have shown himself no kind of compassion, had he come among them in person? 4thly and lastly, Granting that Christ may not upbraid all the wicked with this, yet it does not follow, that they are not to come to judgment; because there are many other things that shall be tried in this judgment, and for which they shall be condemned, which the Scripture elsewhere declares, though, in this summary, Christ makes no mention of them. There is nothing to constrain us to believe, that every thing relative to this judgment is to be learned from this passage alone: other testimonies of Scripture are to be consulted, which treat on the same subject.

XXII. It remains that we inquire, whence this penal sanction is to be derived; whether from the mere good pleasure of the divine will only, or rather from the natural and immutable justice of God, to which it would be unbecoming to have ordered otherwise? I shall not now repeat what the antagonists of the Socinians have fully and happily illustrated, concerning vindictive justice as an essential property of God, and the necessity of its exercise in case of sin. First, I shall only propose some arguments, by which this general proposition may, I think, be most evidently demonstrated, that it is agreeable to God's very nature and immutable right, not to let sin go unpunished; and then more especially inquire into the eternity of punishment.

XXIII. And first, let us duly consider the infinite majesty of God, and his supreme authority over all things; which is so illustrious, that it obliges rational creatures, capable of knowing it, to obey and serve him, as we proved, chap. II., § VIII. As often, then, as they in the least deprive him of this obedience, they directly incur the guilt of high treason against the divine majesty, and consequently are bound over to a punishment adequate to this crime, for neglect of obedience. For "the sinner," as Thomas [Aquinas] justly said, "as much as in him lies, destroys God and his attributes," slighting that majesty of God, to which it is necessary that all things be subject, from the consideration both of God and the creatures. But it is altogether impossible that God should not love, in the tenderest manner, both himself, his majesty and his glory. Now, he cannot but resent an injury done to what he thus loves; and, therefore, he calls himself אֱלֹהִים קַנָּא a jealous God, and declares that this is his name, Exod. 34:14. But קַנָּא denotes resentment for the dearest thing; and hence jealousy and great fury are joined together, Zech. 8:1. But above all things, he is jealous for his name, that is, that it be made known to men, as it is, Ez. 39:25, "and will be jealous for my holy name." In which name even this is contained, "and will by no means clear the guilty," Exod. 34:7.

XXIV. We may likewise argue from the majesty of God in this manner. It is altogether "impossible, that God should deny himself," 2 Tim. 2:13. That is, that he should conceal his own perfections, or do any thing to make him appear to be, what he is not, or that he is not possessed of properties truly divine; and that because he is himself the archetype and exemplar of the intelligent creature, to whom he is to discover in his works his nature, dignity, prerogative, and excellence. He would therefore deny himself did he conceal his majesty, much more did he suffer man to slight it, which is done by every sin. For the sinner behaves so in his presence, as if there was no God to whom he owed obedience: nay, as if himself was God, who had a right to

dispose of himself, his faculties, and other things with which he sins, at his own pleasure and without any control, saying, "Who is lord over me?" Ps. 12:5. This is indeed to usurp the majesty of the Supreme Being. But, how can God suffer this to go unpunished; unless we can suppose, he can bear any to be equal to him, which would have been an open denial of his supremacy, majesty, and excellency? But he then appears glorious in the eyes of sinners, when he inflicts punishment on those who throw contempt upon his majesty. Thus, Numb. 14:20, he swears, "that all the earth shall be filled with the glory of God;" namely, by destroying in the wilderness those who did not believe, though they had seen the glory of God and his signs. The glory of God, in this passage, signifies the manifestation of his jealousy against those who despised him, for he will not suffer himself to be mocked. And, therefore, as he cannot but seek his own glory, so he cannot suffer any to profane his majesty and go unpunished.

XXV. Secondly, There are also several ways by which this may, as evidently, be made appear from the holiness of God.

XXVI. 1st, God's holiness is such, that he cannot admit a sinner to union and communion with himself, without satisfaction first made to his justice. For, "τις γαρ μετοχη, what fellowship (participation), hath righteousness with unrighteousness?" 2 Cor. 6:14. Whoever touches what is unclean, can have no communion with God, ver. 17. Every one whom God unites to himself, he causeth to cleave to himself as a girdle, that he may be unto him for a name, and for a praise, and for a glory, Jer. 13:11. But were he thus to unite the sinner to himself, without a previous satisfaction made for removing the guilt of sin, holiness itself would, in that case, be united to, clothed, and attended with sin; which is a plain contradiction. It is indeed true, that God had set all these things before sinful Israel; but that was done by virtue of the covenant of grace, which supposes a due satisfaction. Nor are we to imagine, that this union, which God describes in such magnificent language, was the lot of any others in its full emphasis and spiritual import, but of those who were internally in covenant: compare Deut. 16:19. Should any object, that though it is really unbecoming the holiness of God to favour the sinner with a communion of friendship, while he continues such; yet he may certainly, out of his goodness, take away sin, and so admit to his fellowship him who was before a sinner:—I answer, that without satisfaction, it is not consistent with the holiness of God even to sanctify the sinner, and thereby prevent him with that greatest effect of his love. For, if the beginning of such a communion of God with the sinner be not unbecoming his holiness, why do all allow it as to the progress thereof? It is plain, it is not suitable to the holiness of God to cultivate a friendship with the sinner, so long as he continues such. But before sanctification he is nothing but a sinner, nay, he is sin itself. Nor can a greater instance of friendship be given to man than that by which he is sanctified; and, therefore, it is not consistent with the holiness of God, without any satisfaction, to grant so great a favour to the sinner who is most worthy of his wrath. If it be still urged, that though God cannot consistently with his holiness love the sinner with a love of complacency, yet nothing hinders him from loving him with a love of benevolence, which may so transform him as to render him a fit object of the love of complacency. I answer, that this is spoken a random; for those effects of the love of benevolence by which we are regenerated, are proposed to us in Scripture as consequences of the engagement and satisfaction of Christ, and of our reconciliation with God, Tit. 3:4, 5; 1 Cor. 6:11; 1 Pet. 1:3. Faith, without which it is impossible to please God, is freely bestowed on the elect, "through the righteousness of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ," 2 Pet. 1:1. Whatsoever way you interpret this, it at least appears that the gift of faith is founded on Christ and his

satisfaction. If, therefore, the satisfaction of Christ was previously requisite to the sinner's being blessed with those effects of the love of benevolence, it is rashly asserted, that it was becoming the holiness of God to bestow them on the sinner without satisfaction. Besides, God must needs punish those to whom he cannot grant union with himself, for the greatest punishment consists in the want of this union. This is that death with which the law threatens the sinner, as we have already made appear.

XXVII. 2nd, The holiness of God is so unspotted, that "he cannot behold evil, and look on iniquity," Hab. 1:13, that is, bear it in his sight. He cannot, therefore, "lift up the light of his countenance upon him," Ps. 4:7, in which the salvation of men consists; but the privation of this is the highest punishment. As long as David refused to admit his son Absalom into his presence, though almost reconciled to him, this appeared to Absalom more intolerable than any death, 2 Sam. 14:32. So that in a nature conscious of its unhappiness, a punishment of sense cannot but accompany a punishment of loss.

XXVIII. 3rd, From the holiness of God flows a mortal and implacable hatred of sin. It is as much the nature of holiness to "hate iniquity, as to love righteousness," Ps. 45:8. "Sin is an abomination to his soul," Prov. 6:16, that is, to his very essence and essential holiness; and neither sin only, but also the sinner, is the object of his hatred. "For, all that do such things, and all that do unrighteously, are an abomination to the Lord thy God," Deut. 25:16. He therefore separates from himself, and from his chosen people, all whom he cannot make partakers of his favour; and so he cannot but inflict upon them that punishment which is the effect of his hatred. According to Solomon's reasoning, Prov. 16:5, "Every one that is proud in heart is an abomination to the Lord." And the consequence is, "He shall not be unpunished." In the same manner David reasons, Ps. 5:4, 5, 6, "Thou art not a God that hast pleasure in wickedness." Thou hatest sin, and the sinner too, because of it: "Thou hatest all the workers of iniquity." And surely the fruit of this must be exceeding bitter: "Thou shalt destroy them that speak leasing." And thus, from the holiness of God arises a hatred of sin and the sinner; from hatred, punishment.

XXIX. 4th, It is doubtless diametrically opposite to the holiness of God, that he should become like unto the sinner. For as his image consists in a holiness every way perfect, it is a contradiction that it should consist in sin; but if God was unwilling to punish sin, he would then become like unto the sinner. This is what we may learn from himself, Ps. 50:21. When he would tell the sinner, Thou thoughtest that I would not punish thy sin, he thus expresses it: Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thyself. But, says he, I will show the contrary. And how? I will reprove thee, or punish thee. And by that I will in effect show, that I am not like unto thee. Whence I conclude, that not to punish sin would very much resemble the sinner; on the contrary, to punish sin in its proper time, is to show himself most unlike to the sinner. Unless then God reproves the sinner, he will be like unto him and deny himself; for, since God is a pattern to man, and man was made in order that God may be glorified in him; and every thing that God hath made has a tendency to this, namely, that man may from them know what a God he is: if God should by no method show, that sin deprives man of communion with him and of his kingdom, nay, should he make the sinner eternally happy, while it is the highest degree of punishment to be accounted unworthy of it, God would certainly, in that case, testify himself not worthy to be loved, desired, and glorified, and that sin is not an object unworthy of man's delight.

As it is then impossible that God should be altogether like unto the sinner, it is likewise so that he should let sin go unpunished.

XXX. 5th, Hence God says, "he is sanctified when he punishes," Lev. 10:3. On which place, Crellius himself, de Vera Relig. lib. i. c. 28, makes this annotation: "Which some learned men explain," (and himself agrees with them,) "I shall appear holy, that is, shall inflict punishment on them." The same thing he owns in the same Chapter, "that neither the holiness nor the majesty of God can in any respect bear to have his commands violated with impunity." Such is the power of truth, that even the most obstinate are constrained to confess it! And the sense of this word is very evident, Ezek. 38:16, where the punishment of Gog is foretold in these words: "That the heathen may know me, when I shall be sanctified in thee," viz., by thy punishment, "before their eyes." More clearly still, Is. 5:16, "God that is holy, shall be sanctified in righteousness," by inflicting on sinners the punishments threatened in the foregoing verses, and by not pardoning the elect, but only on account of the righteousness of Christ, in whose sufferings and death he displayed his most unspotted holiness and his hatred of sin before the whole world, nay, even before hell itself. It is therefore as necessary that God should punish sin as that he should be holy, lest he should seem to give up with his holiness. I shall conclude in the words of Joshua, 24:19: "For he is an holy God." What then? "He is a jealous God." And what does he infer hence? "He will not forgive your transgressions, nor your sins." And thus from his holiness flows his jealousy, and from his jealousy his vengeance.

XXXI. Thirdly, This may also be inferred from that attribute of God which is usually called vindictive justice. That it is the property of this to punish sin, the Scriptures tell us in a thousand places; and heretics impudently cavil, when they assert it to be the work, not so much of divine justice, as of wrath and passion. They unadvisedly disjoin what the apostle has conjoined, who speaks of "the day of wrath, and of the righteous judgment of God," Rom. 2:5. And is God's wrath any other, than that ready disposition of the divine mind to do that which his hatred of sin, justice towards the sinner, and his character as the supreme Judge do require? I omit a thousand other considerations, which occur every where. I shall rather show where the stress of the whole lies. First, that this perfection is as natural to God as infinity, holiness, omnipotence. Secondly, that in virtue of it, God cannot suffer sin to go unpunished.

XXXII. The former of these I thus prove. That perfection must belong to the nature and essence of God, and cannot be referred to the good pleasure of his will, if what is opposite to it cannot be conceived without a contradiction. But it is contradictory to conceive of God under any character opposite to that of just, or, as unjust, Job 34:10. But it is not contradictory, if I conceive of God even contrary to those things, which depend on the mere good pleasure of his will. For instance, it was from the free will and pleasure of God, that he chose Israel for his peculiar people; if therefore, I conceive of God as having never been the God of Israel, I shall doubtless have formed a false conception, but nothing that by an evident contradiction destroys the nature of God; for he might have been God, and yet not the God of Israel, but, if he had so pleased, the God of the Egyptians or Chaldeans. But whoever says that God is, and asserts that he is unjust, speaks contradictory things; for the first conception of the Deity is, to be perfectly and infinitely good. But justice, in giving to every one his due by a suitable compensation, belongs to this goodness; especially when we consider, that as he is the Lord of rational creatures, so he cannot

be their Judge. Whoever therefore says that any is unjust, or not just, denies such to be God, of whom he thus speaks.

XXXIII. The latter I make out thus: the justice of God requires, that whatever is his righteous judgment be done, for it is necessary that God do himself justice; who, properly speaking, owes nothing to any one but to himself. As that is "the judgment (righteousness) of the law," Rom. 8:4, which the law demands, and which, without injustice, cannot be denied the law; what God requires is, the judgment of God, and cannot be denied him, unless he would be unjust to himself. But it is "the (judgment) of God, that they which do evil are worthy of death," Rom. 1:32; and therefore, there is a connexion between sin and worthiness of death, not only in virtue of the will, but of the justice of God. Moreover, as "the judgment of God is always according to truth," Rom. 2:2, he must pronounce the person unworthy of life, and worthy of death, who is worthy of it, consequently condemn him, unless a satisfaction intervene. To act otherwise would be unworthy the just God. The apostle intimates this, Rom. 3:25, 26, declaring, that "God set forth Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." By which words he shows, if God should justify the wicked and admit them to happiness without the atonement of the blood of Christ, he would not be just, at least his justice would not be displayed.

XXXIV. Jeremiah has a most memorable passage, in which God says, chap. 9:9, "Shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord, and shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" The meaning is, shall I be Jehovah, nay, shall I not deny myself, if I bear with those things in my people? It is impossible I should do this, and that in virtue of my soul, that is, of my very essential holiness and Deity. Should I have a divine soul, that is, a divine nature, and just, and not be avenged of sin? For the soul of God denotes the most holy nature of God, or, which is the same, the essential holiness of God. As appears from comparing Amos 4:2 with Amos 6:8. In the former it is said, "The Lord hath sworn by his holiness;" in the latter, "The Lord hath sworn בנפשו by (his soul) himself."

XXXV. Crellius, therefore, trifles, de Vera Relig. lib. i. 28, when he ridiculously said, that to punish is God's foreign and strange work; as if to show mercy was God's proper work, but to punish his strange work. To that end wresting, Is. 28:21, "that he may do his work," which he thus translates: "his strange work; that he may do his work, foreign (or strange) is his work to him." We freely own, that by that foreign and strange work we ought to understand his vengeance against the rebellious Jews. But it is said to be strange and foreign in a quite different sense from what this perverter of Scripture would have it. It was strange and foreign, because altogether uncommon and extraordinary. For it was "a great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to that time," Matt. 24:21. Likewise, because any would think it strange that God should deal thus with his own covenant people, on whom he had multiplied so many favours, and make examples of them in a manner he had not done to his enemies, who were strangers to his covenant. What he had done in Mount Perazim against the Philistines, 2 Sam. 5:21, and in the valley of Gibeon, could scarcely be compared to this. It is likewise so called, because such an extraordinary punishment from God, as strange and unusual things very commonly do, would fill any with such astonishment as they would be obliged to take notice of the hand of God in it. Thus the miseries of the Jews struck Titus himself with horror; and on viewing the walls and towers of Jerusalem, he confessed that, without God, such a city could

never be taken. It is very remarkable what Philostratus relates in the life of Apollonius Tyanæus, lib. v. 14. When the neighbouring nations came, according to custom, to adorn Titus with crowns for his conquest of the Jews: he said, "that he deserved no such honour; that he did not achieve those things, but only was the instrument of God, who was then displaying his wrath." In like manner also, because it was strange and foreign to the Israelites, who, that the Romans might not come and destroy their city, brought upon themselves the guilt of that wickedness against the Lord Jesus, which was the cause of so great a destruction. It was, therefore, strange and foreign, not to God (for the text says no such thing), but in itself and to men. Or if we would say that it was altogether strange and foreign to God, it must be meant, because God delights not either in destruction, or in the destruction of his creatures as such, but (to speak after the manner of men) is rather inclined to acts of goodness and mercy. But this is so far from being of service to the heretic, that, on the contrary, it furnishes us with a new and solid argument. Thus,

XXXVI. Fourthly, It is certain that penal evil, as such, is not in itself desirable even to God, because it is connected with the destruction of his own work. "Is it good unto thee that thou shouldst oppress; that thou shouldst despise the work of thine hands?" Job 10:3. Nay, God confirms by an inviolable oath, that "he has no pleasure in the death of the wicked," Ezek. 33:11. It must, then, be something else which renders it desirable that God declares that he exults in it, and derives great consolation from it, as being that alone which can, as it were, be sufficient to mitigate his grief, and appease his indignation occasioned by sin. Nothing can be imagined stronger than the Scripture phrases on this subject, some of which I shall exhibit: Hos. 10:10, "It is in my desire that I should chastise them;" Amos 5:9, "That refreshes himself by desolation (strengtheneth the spoiled) against the strong;" Deut. 28:36, "The Lord will rejoice over you to destroy you;" Isa. 1:24, "I will ease me of my adversaries, and avenge me of my enemies." God, you see, desires to punish sinners. Whenever he pours out desolation upon them, he refreshes (strengtheneth) himself: nor slightly only, but he both rejoices and exults; and that with such a joy as may be capable of mitigating the pain caused by sin, and consequently, of yielding consolation to God. What can it be which makes that evil of the creature so desirable to the Creator? What other, but that by inflicting punishment he preserves inviolable the glory of his supremacy, holiness, and justice, which sin would wholly obscure? For all the usefulness of punishment, as Crellius himself speaks, must needs regard God. But we can conceive here no advantage redounding to God, unless his rejoicing in the declaration of his glory, shining forth in that judgment, the justice of which the holy angels acknowledge with applause, Rev. 11:17, and Rev. 16:5, 6, and even the damned themselves, though unwilling and gnashing their teeth, are constrained to confess. It is, indeed, impossible that God should set light by this his most excellent glory, of which he is so jealous. As it is then necessary that God should prefer the destruction of his wicked creature to that of his own glory, so it is necessary that he should punish the wicked. God, indeed, loves his creatures; but he does, as he ought, much more himself. He would act inconsistently with that love, were he not to recover his glory which his sinful creature has, by horrible sacrilege, robbed him of, by inflicting punishment upon it.

XXXVII. Fifthly and lastly, We shall use arguments ad hominem. Socinus owns, de Servato, p. i. l, "that not to pardon the impenitent is certainly right and agreeable to the divine nature, and consequently to rectitude and equity." Crellius, in like manner, de Vera Relig., lib. i. 23, says, "that it is unworthy of God to suffer the crimes of the obstinate to escape unpunished. Let us here a little examine these concessions. They say, it is "unworthy of God not to punish the obstinate;"

nay, it is due to the nature of God not to pardon them. Why, pray? Is it because they are stubborn and obstinate? But obstinacy is not punished on its own account, because there is a good and laudable obstinacy or constancy. It is, therefore, only punished because of the evil that is in it; it is then necessary that sin be punished on its own account, and obstinacy only because of the sinfulness of it. And if it be necessary to punish sin on its own account, therefore, wherever it is to be met with, it must necessarily be punished. Besides, all men, after having once sinned, obstinately persevere in sin, unless they are brought to repentance by the preventing grace of God. But how can they obtain this without a previous satisfaction, if it be a debt which the divine nature owes to itself not to grant them pardon?

XXXVIII. We likewise readily admit what Crellius advances in the very same Chapter: "By the same claim of right that we owe obedience to God, by the same also we become liable to punishment for neglect of obedience and service; for punishment succeeds, as it were, in the place of the duty omitted, and if possible, ought to atone for it." But doubtless, by a claim of natural right, obedience is due to God; and it would be repugnant to the divine perfections not to require it of a rational nature. I speak without reserve; he is not God who cannot demand obedience from his rational creature. And the very same thing, according to Crellius's very just hypothesis, is to be affirmed of punishment. I am well aware that Crellius founds both claims, as well to obedience as to punishment, on the dominion of God as Lord; though this ought rather to be founded on the essential majesty and supremacy of God, which is the foundation of his sovereign dominion. But he is forced to confess that this sovereign dominion is so natural to God, that he cannot renounce it; nay, indeed, that "without it, it is scarce intelligible how he can be God; since it is on account of that very authority, and the power from which it flows, he is said to be God." It therefore stands firm, that the penal sanction of the covenant is founded in the supereminent, most holy and just nature of God, and not in the mere good pleasure of the divine will only.

XXXIX. We might here further inquire, whether the eternity of punishment is to be derived from this natural right of God; or, which is the same thing, whether a punishment, justly equivalent to each sin, ought necessarily to be eternal, according to God's natural right; so that, to maintain the contrary, would be unworthy of God, and consequently impossible. A difficult question this, because to determine concerning this absolute right of God in special cases seems to be above human reach. "God is greater than man, he giveth not an account of his matters," Job 33:12, 13. Let us, however, try whether, from the consideration of the divine perfections, we may not gather what may in this case be worthy of God.

XL: I now pre-suppose there is in sin, committed against the infinite majesty of God, a malignity in its measure infinite, and therefore a demerit of punishment in its measure infinite also. I say there is in sin a malignity, only in its measure infinite; for it cannot be called infinite in an absolute sense: if we consider the entity of the act in itself, an act infinitely intense cannot be produced by a finite creature: if the irregularity and the privation of moral good adhering to the act, it is a privation of a finite rectitude, which is all that can be found in a creature; if, in fine, we consider the whole complex, namely, sin in the concrete, as they speak, neither in that case will its malignity be absolutely infinite. For neither are all acts of sin equally vicious, there being a great difference among them, which could not be if they were infinite. However, the malignity of sin is in its measure infinite: 1st, Objectively, because committed against an infinite good. 2dly,



Extensively, in respect of duration, because the blot or stain of sin endures for ever, unless purged away by the blood of Christ. There is not, therefore, in sin a desert of punishment absolutely infinite, as to intensesness of torments. 1. Because such a punishment is absolutely impossible; for a finite creature is not capable of infinite torments. 2. Because it would follow that God could never satisfy his justice by inflicting condign punishment on the wicked, because they are incapable of this punishment. It is then absurd to say, that any punishment is of right due to sin, which God could never inflict. 3. Because it would follow an equal punishment was due to all sins, or that all in fact were to be punished alike, which is an absurdity, and against Matt. 11:22–54. The reason of this consequence is, because there neither is nor can be any disparity between infinities. Nevertheless, there is in sin a desert of punishment, in its measure infinite; namely, in the same manner that the malignity of it is infinite. That is, 1st. Objectively, so as to deprive man of the enjoyment of the infinite good, which is God. 2dly, Extensively, so that the punishment shall last for ever. And thus I consider this desert of eternal punishment so far only as to conclude, that God does nothing contrary to equity and justice when he punishes the sins of men with eternal torments both of soul and body; which the event shows, as I have made appear, § XVII.

XLI: But I know not if it can be determined, whether this eternity ought necessarily to consist in the punishment of sense, or whether the justice of God may be satisfied by the eternal punishment of loss, in the annihilation of the sinful creature. This, I apprehend, may be said with sufficient probability and sobriety: if God shall be pleased to continue for ever in existence the sinner, it is necessary (without a satisfaction) that he for ever inflict punishment on him, not only the punishment of loss, but likewise that of sense. The reason is, because not only the guilt of sin always remains, but also the stain with which sin, once committed, infects the soul, and which can never be purged out but by the blood of Christ. But it is impossible, as we proved §. 22, 23, 24, that God should admit man, stained with sin, to communion with himself; and it cannot be, that a rational creature, excluded the enjoyment of the divine favour, should not feel this indignation of God with the deepest anguish. Conscience most severely lashes the wretches for having deprived themselves of the chief good; which with no small care we have also shown, §. 13, and the following sections.

XLII. But whether it is necessary that God should continue for ever the sinful creature in a state of existence, I own I am ignorant. May it not, in its measure, be reckoned an infinite punishment, should God please to doom man, who was by nature a candidate for eternity, to total annihilation, from whence he should never be suffered to return to life? I know God has now determined otherwise, and that with the highest justice. But it is queried, whether, agreeably to his justice, he might not have settled it in this manner: If thou, O man, sinnest, I will frustrate thy desire of eternal happiness, and of a blessed eternity, and, on the contrary, give thee up to eternal annihilation. Here at least let us hesitate, and suspend our judgment.

## Chapter VI: Of the Sacraments of the Covenant of Works

I. IT hath pleased the blessed and Almighty God, in every economy of his covenants, to confirm, by some sacred symbols, the certainty of his promises, and, at the same time, to remind man, in covenant with him, of his duty: to these symbols ecclesiastical practice has long since given the name of Sacraments. These symbols were certainly appointed with an excellent design by the all-wise God. For, 1st. What God has made known concerning his covenant is, by this means, proposed to man's more accurate consideration; since he is not only once and again instructed in the will of God by a heavenly oracle, but frequently, and almost daily, beholds with his eyes those things which, by heaven, are granted him as pledges of the greatest blessings: what believers see with their eyes usually sink deeper into the soul, and leave deeper impressions of themselves than those only which they hear with their ears. Elegantly to this purpose says Herodotus—"Men usually give less credit to the ears than to the eyes." 2dly. These symbols also tend to confirm our faith. For though nothing can be thought of that deserves more credit than the word of God, yet where God adds signs and seals to his infallible promises, he gives a twofold foundation to our faith. Thus "he more abundantly shows unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel: that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation," Heb. 6:17, 18. 3dly. By means of this institution, a holy man does, by the sight, touch, and taste of the sacred symbols, attain to some sense of eternal blessings, and accustoms himself, under the symbols, to a contemplation and foretaste of these things, to the plenary and immediate fruition of which he shall, one time or other, be admitted without any outward signs. 4thly and lastly. The man has in these something continually to remind him of his duty; and as, from time to time, they present to his thoughts and give him a foretaste of his Creator, so at the same time they put him in mind of those very strong obligations by which he is bound to his covenant-God. And thus they are both a bridle, to restrain him from sin; and a spur, to quicken him cheerfully to run that holy race which he has happily entered upon.

II. God also granted to man such symbols under the covenant of works; concerning which we are now to speak, that nothing may be wanting in this treatise; and if I mistake not, they were four in all, which I reckon up in this order. 1. PARADISE. 2. THE TREE OF LIFE. 3. THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD AND EVIL. 4. THE SABBATH. In speaking of each of these, I shall distinctly show, First, What good they signified and sealed to man with respect to God. Secondly, What duty and obligation they reminded him of.

III. But I must previously observe, that it is altogether foreign to this treatise, and out of its place, to propose such significations either of Paradise, or of the Tree of Life, or of the Sabbath, as relate to the Gospel, the grace of Christ, and to glory as freely given to the elect by the mediator, and Spirit of grace. For here I observe, that men of learning in other respects have stumbled, who, when explaining the nature of those Sacraments, too incautiously blend things belonging to a quite different covenant. Nothing is here to be brought in which does not belong to the covenant of works, the promises of that covenant, and the duties of man under the same; all which are most distinct from the covenant of grace. Here we are to say nothing of Christ, nothing of justifying faith in him, nothing of our ceasing from our own works as impure, nor any thing of that rest after the miseries of this life. All these belong to another covenant. I do not, however, deny, that the unsearchable wisdom of God did appoint and order these symbols in such a

manner that the remembrance of them, after the fall, might be able to instruct man in many things relating to the covenant of grace and its mediator. As that, according to Paul, the first Adam himself was a type of the second; Eve, curiously formed out of Adam's rib while asleep, was a type of the church, as it were, taken from Christ in virtue of his death; and that the first marriage represented that great mystery which regards Christ and the church. These things, however, were neither known nor thought of in a state of nature; nor to be mentioned in a discourse on the Sacraments of the covenant of works. Having premised these things, let us now inquire into each particular with all the care possible, beginning with Paradise.

IV. It is far from our design elaborately to inquire into the situation and topography of Paradise. Let it suffice to observe, that it was a garden and a most agreeable inclosure, planted by God himself, toward the east, in Eden, a most fertile region and abounding in all kinds of delights, as very learned men think, near Haran, the mart of Arabia, at the confluence of the Euphrates and Tigris, not far from Mesopotamia. It was watered with four rivers, washing by many windings and meanders the most fertile orchard. When man was formed from the earth out of Paradise, he was introduced by God as a new guest, to till the ground, and give an account of his stewardship and care. Here was every thing that could contribute to the proper pleasures of this life, God frequently revealing himself to man, and familiarly admitting him to the sweetest fellowship with himself. Moses also mentions the gold and the precious stones of that country, as of the best kind and in the greatest plenty. And what now was the meaning, or mystical signification of all these things?

V. First, In general, the pleasantness of this place, which every moment set before man the most profuse bounty of the Deity, exhibiting the same to the enjoyment of all his senses, assured him, that he was to expect another residence far more noble and grand, where he should not, as now, enjoy his God through and in the creatures, but immediately delight in his Creator, in a full satisfaction with his likeness. For, if God now conferred upon him such things while here, before the course of his appointed trial was finished, what might he not, nay, what ought he not, to promise himself from that immense munificence, after he had acted his part well, when he had acquired a right to come with boldness to his rewarder, and ask for his most ample recompence? Was not the Lord, amidst this abundance that lacked nothing pertaining to this animal life, (as it were) frequently addressing him, How shall I one day place thee among my sons, if thou constantly continuest obedient to my voice? If there is so much sweetness in these created rivulets of my goodness, in which now thou swimst with so much pleasure, what will there not be in myself, the unexhausted fountain, and the most plentiful spring? Ascend, O man, by the scale of the creatures, to me the Creator; and from a foretaste of these first-fruits, conclude what I have prepared for thee against that time, when I myself shall be thy exceeding great reward. And certainly, unless we suppose Adam to have been stupid and devoid of all divine light, such thoughts must needs have arisen in his mind.

VI. The Scriptures declare, that by Paradise is signified a place of perfect bliss, when they call heaven, the habitation of the blessed, by the name of Paradise, Luke 23:43; 2 Cor. 12:4. A manner of expression commonly used by the Holy Ghost, by which the names of the sign and the thing signified, of the type and antitype, are mutually exchanged. The Jews themselves saw this, with whom it is usual to call the place of absolutely perfect happiness, עֵדֶן and עֵדֶן רַךְ, "Eden" and "the garden of Eden;" and no wish was more frequent among them, than this, let his rest, that is,

the place of his rest, be Eden. There is also a most suitable analogy between Paradise and heaven, which we are now more expressly and particularly to show.

VII. 1st, Paradise was a garden planted by God himself to be the residence of man, formed after the divine image. Heaven is a place made and prepared by God for the eternal abode of man, after he has added constancy to his other virtues, and so has in himself the full image of God, where his holiness shall be unchangeable. As therefore it was incumbent on him to acknowledge the hand, and most munificent bounty of his God in this terrestrial habitation, so he was still far more evidently to experience the same in the celestial abode of his heavenly father. 2dly, Paradise exceedingly surpassed all the other parts of the earth in respect to the pleasantness of it, for it was planted in Eden, a place of all kinds of delight. Whence the most pleasant countries in the world are said to be "as the garden of God," Gen. 13:10. And Ezekiel, 36:35, prophesying of the future extraordinary plenty of the earth, says, that the earth, which before that was lying waste, should be as "the garden of Eden." And what is grander than that promise of Isaiah, 51:3, "For the Lord shall comfort Zion; he will comfort all her waste places, and he will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord; joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving and the voice of melody." From which words it is clear, that nothing was wanting in Paradise, in its primitive state, to give the completest pleasure to man. But much less will any thing be wanting in heaven to the most absolutely perfect happiness; the pleasures of which will far more exceed those of this terrestrial garden, than heaven itself exceeds the earth in its height. For, Paradise had those things which discovered its imperfection, such as those things that belonged to this animal life, all which will be altogether excluded heaven, where "is fulness of joys, שמחות שבע," Ps. 16:11, 3dly, In Paradise flowed the most limpid streams, watering and fertilizing the garden wherever it was necessary. In heaven there is "a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God," Rev. 22:1. By which circumlocution are signified the gifts of the Holy Spirit, a few drops of which are indeed granted here, but with which the blessed will be intoxicated to a perfect joy. 4thly, Moses also mentions gold, bdellium, and the onyx-stone, which were found in that region, Gen. 2:11, 12. In heaven there will be spiritual treasures, with which no gold, no topaz, nor any of the precious stones of the whole earth, can any ways be compared. 5thly, In Paradise there were trees, both beautiful and useful. In heaven there are precious things, both pleasant to the sight, and excellent for use. Above all, there were the two trees of knowledge and of life. But in the heavenly kingdom, there is true and perfect knowledge, and that life, which is really and emphatically so. 6thly, Man, being first created in the earth, was translated into Paradise as the better residence; for, if I mistake not, the words of Moses intimate this, Gen. 2:8. "And there he put the man, that he had formed." Compare Gen. 3:23, where after his sin, he is said "to be sent forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground, from whence he was taken." In like manner also, man was in due time to be translated from that natural and animal state, in which he was created, to another altogether supernatural and heavenly, of which this desirable translation from earth to Paradise reminded him; which Zanchius also observed on Gen. 2:15, as also Musculus. 7thly, Had not man been innocent, he would have had no place in Paradise. This garden did not suffer him when once tainted with sin. So, "nothing that defileth can enter into heaven," Rev. 21:27; that being "the habitation of God's holiness and glory," Is. 63:15. 8thly, In Paradise man enjoyed the familiar fellowship of his God; and in this sense, Paradise might also be styled the garden of God, as God dwelt there, delighting himself in the work of his hands, and especially in man himself. As it was a pleasure to man, to be thus near and familiar with his Maker, so it was a delight to God. But in

heaven, the habitation of his majesty, God will be always present with man, and give himself, in the most familiar manner possible, to be seen and enjoyed by him.

VIII. As Paradise might set forth all these things to man, so in like manner the use of this pledge reminded him of several duties. And first, he might hence learn, that he ought not to seek for his good and felicity in any thing upon earth, which, when appearing even most perfect, discovers its own imperfections; thus, this animal life in Paradise was to be recruited continually with meat, drink, and a succession of sleeping and waking. By which means he was taught to aspire after a greater happiness, namely, the immediate fruition of his God; in the seeking after this happiness, the principal holiness of a traveller consists; for, you love God above all things, if you ardently pant after an intimate union with him.

IX. Secondly, As this Paradise was given man to be cultivated and kept, the Lord thereby reminded him, that he took no pleasure in a lazy idleness, but in an active industry. His will was, that man should employ his labour and care upon the garden, that he might have something to do, in which he might continually experience the goodness and providence of his Creator. He did not choose that angels themselves should be idle, whom he made ministering spirits. And so he assigned man the care of cultivating and keeping Paradise, that he might have something to employ himself in the works of God, just as a king's son has some office assigned him, lest he should become indolent by an excess of pleasures, honour, and riches. Thus it became him to be conformed to his God by a most holy diligence, and be employed about the very work of God's hands, till he should come to enjoy an eternal sabbath with himself.

X. Thirdly, This also had a further respect to himself. For, 1st, As Paradise was the pledge of heaven, so the careful keeping of it reminded him to have heaven continually in his thoughts. 2dly, The labour and culture of Paradise taught him, that only he that labours and does that which is acceptable to God, can get to the heavenly habitation. 3dly, He was also instructed to keep his soul for God, as a most pleasant garden cultivated like the Paradise of God, and show forth those trees of virtues which God planted as producing the most excellent fruits; that is, works proceeding from good habits, that so the Lord might come into this his garden, "and eat his pleasant fruits," Cant. 4:16. 4thly, It pointed out to him that he should, above all things, solicitously keep his soul, that garden of God, lest any wild beasts of depraved passions should break in to lay every thing waste. And when God said to him, Keep this my garden, may he not at the same time be supposed to say, "Keep thy heart with all diligence," or above all keeping, Prov. 4:23. 5thly, The keeping of Paradise virtually enjoined him of all things to be anxiously concerned not to do any thing against God, lest, as a bad gardener, he should be thrust out of the garden, and in that discern a melancholy symbol of his own exclusion from heaven. We then conclude, that when man was with joy and exultation admitted into Paradise, he was bound, and Was willing to be bound, to perform all these things to God, and so upon entering into Paradise he bound himself, as by a sacrament, to these duties.

XI. We now proceed to consider the TREE OF LIFE; but whether a single tree, or an entire species of trees, is a question among the learned. Some think that the former, which is indeed the common opinion, is founded on no probable reason, and suppose it more suitable to the goodness of God, that such a beautiful useful tree should be in the view of his favourite in as many parts of the inclosure as possible. They also allege the divine benediction, Gen. 1:11, 12, by which God

conferred on all trees the virtue of multiplying themselves. But they chiefly insist on Rev. 22:2, where John pitches the Tree of Life on each side of the river, which they compare with Ezek. 47:12. Others, on the contrary, do not think it probable that it was an entire species: first, because the universal particle, לֵּאמֹר all, is not added as before, when Moses would express many things of the same species, or many species themselves: next, because it is said to have been placed in the middle of the garden, so as to have the other trees surrounding it in order. To the passages alleged from the Revelations and Ezekiel, they answer, that John speaks only in the singular number, both in that place, and Rev. 2:7, and that one tree could properly be said to stand in the midst of the street and on both sides of the river, because the river ran through the midst of the street, and because that single tree extended its roots and branches to each side, so that there was no defect on either side. They likewise conclude from its being a type, that it must be a single one, because Christ is one. But Ezekiel saw many on the bank of the river representing the church militant; because, though one Christ quickens the church, yet it is by several means he now communicates life to the elect. These are the arguments on both sides: if any should desire our judgment, we are of opinion, that the arguments of neither side have the force of a demonstration; but from the consideration of its being a type, we rather incline to the more common opinion.

XII. Whether this tree was endowed with a singular virtue above others, so as perfectly to cure the disorders of the body, who, with certainty, can either affirm or deny? To ascribe to it a medicinal virtue against diseases, does not appear suitable to the state of innocent man. For diseases, and such like infirmities, are only the effects of sin. But nothing sure is more ridiculous, than the paradoxical and altogether untheological assertion of Socinus, that Adam, by the benefit of that food, would have prolonged his life to a much longer time, than God chose he should, had he not been deprived of the opportunity of reaching forth his hand to that tree. As if God, when he expelled man out of Paradise, and said, "lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and live for ever," Gen. 3:22, was apprehensive, that man, upon tasting again of that tree, should live for ever, notwithstanding his will and threatening; which is down right blasphemy. For, by these words, God only intended to restrain the vain thoughts of man, now become such a fool, as to imagine that, by the use of that tree, he could repair the loss he had sustained by sin; or, as if the bare use of the sacrament, or the opus operatum, as it is called, could be of any advantage, without the thing signified. And by driving man from that outward sign of immortality, he cut him off from all hopes of salvation by that covenant, of which that tree was a symbol. However, there must be some great reason why that tree obtained this designation; which we will now enquire into.

XIII. The tree of life signified the Son of God, not indeed, as he is Christ and Mediator, that consideration being peculiar to another covenant; but inasmuch as he is the life of man in every condition, and the fountain of all happiness. And, how well was it spoken by one, who said, that it became God from the first to represent, by an outward sign, that person whom he loves, and for whose glory he has made and does make all things; nay, "to whom he showeth all things that he doth, that he may also do likewise," John 5:19, as the author of life to man; that man even then, might acknowledge him as such; and afterwards, when he was to be manifested as his saviour and physician, Adam and his posterity might bring him to remembrance, as exhibited by a symbol at the very beginning. As in fact it has happened, that they, who believe Moses, the Prophets, and the Gospel, avow, that in the beginning there was no life but in him, for whose

glory to be displayed in the work of salvation the earth was also made. Wherefore, Christ is called, "the Tree of Life," Rev. 22:2. What indeed he now is by his merit and efficacy, as Mediator, he would have always been, as the Son of God, of the same substance with his Father. For, as by him man was created, and obtained an animal life, so, in like manner, he would have been transformed by him, and blessed with a heavenly life. Nor could he have been the life of the sinner, as Mediator, unless he had likewise been the life of man in his holy state, as God; having life in himself, and being life itself.

XIV. The fruit of this tree, charming all the senses with its unparalleled beauty, signified the pleasures of divine love, with which happy man was one day to be fully regaled, and which never cloy, but with their sweet variety do always quicken the appetite. In this sense, wisdom is said to be "a Tree of Life to them that lay hold of her," Prov. 3:18. Because the study and practice of true wisdom fill the soul with an ineffable pleasure.

XV. Moreover, it was man's duty, 1st. Attentively to consider this tree, "as pleasant to the eyes," Gen. 3:6, and to contemplate therein, the perfections of the Son of God, whose brightest vision was one day to complete his happiness. 2dly, By the use and enjoyment of this tree, to testify his communion with the Son of God, and acknowledge him, as the author of the life he longed for; which, though innocent, he was to seek after, not in himself, but in God, as a liberal rewarder. 3dly, He himself, in imitation of the Son of God, and as in communion with him, ought to be as a tree of life to his wife and posterity, by giving them holy advice and example, as a plant of the garden of God, a partaker of the divine life, and as ministering to the life of his neighbour. "The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life," Prov. 11:30.

XVI. Besides the tree of life, Moses speaks of another tree, deriving its name from the knowledge of good and evil, concerning whose name and use we began to speak, chap. iii §. xx, xxi. That it was designed for man's probation is undoubted; but whether it was also a symbol of the covenant, is disputed. I freely own, I see no reason why this should be denied. For, all the requisites to constitute a symbol of a covenant here concur. We have an external and visible sign, instituted by God; we have the thing signified, together with a beautiful analogy; we have, in fine, a memorial of man's duty: all which fully constitute the nature of a sacred symbol, or sacrament.

XVII. The external sign was a certain tree "in the midst of the garden good for food, pleasant to the eyes, and to be desired to make one wise," Gen. 3:3, 6. The use of this sign was twofold. 1st, That it might be attentively viewed and considered by man, while he carefully meditates on the mystical signification of this tree. For that end it was so beautiful and so desirable to the view, and placed in the midst of the garden, where man most frequently resorted. 2dly, That from a religious obedience, he should abstain from eating of it, and thereby acknowledge God's absolute dominion over him, and his expectation of another world, in which he should be forbid nothing truly desirable.

XVIII. The thing signified was in like manner twofold, the sealing both of the promise and the threatening of the covenant. For, its being called "the tree of knowledge of good," intimated, that man, if from a principle of love he obeyed this probationary precept, should come to the knowledge, sense, and fruition of that good which is truly and excellently so, and the full

knowledge of which is only obtained by sense and enjoyment. On the other hand, when called "the tree of the knowledge of evil," thereby is signified, that man, if found disobedient, should be doomed to the greatest calamity, the exceeding evil and wretchedness of which he should at last know by experience. And even they, who, in other respects, would not have this tree called a symbol of the divine covenant, do confess this.

XIX. There was here a very plain memorial of duty. For, this tree taught, 1st, That man was sincerely to contemplate and desire the chief good; but not to endeavour after it, but only in the manner and way prescribed by heaven; nor here, to give in to his own reasonings, how plausible soever they might appear. 2dly, That man's happiness was not to be placed in things pleasing to the senses of the body. There is another and a quite different beatifying good, which satiates the soul, and of itself suffices to the consummation of happiness. 3dly, That God was the most absolute lord of man, whose sole will, expressed by his law, should be the supreme rule and directory of all the appetites of the soul, and of all the motions of the body. 4thly, That there is no attaining to a life of happiness, but by perfect obedience. 5thly, That even man in innocence was to behave with a certain religious awe, when conversing with his God, lest he should fall into sin. To these add, what we have already observed, chap. iii sect. xxi.

XX. That very accurate and great divine Hieronimus Zanchius, after giving a history of these trees, expresses their mystical signification in these words; De Creat. Hom. lib. i. c. i. §. 8. "Moreover, these two trees, in the midst of Paradise and near each other, were very evident types of the law and Gospel, or of Christ. The law declares what is good, and what is evil: Christ is the true and eternal life. Both were in the midst of Paradise, because the law and Christ, in the midst of the church, are always to be proposed to the posterity of Adam. One near the other, because the law leads to Christ." I cannot fully express, what regard I pay to this great divine, whose commentaries I exceedingly prefer to the new fangled comments, with which the minds of students are at this day distracted and led astray. Nevertheless, these expressions seem to be more ingenious, than solid and judicious. For, under the covenant of works, Adam neither had, nor was it necessary he should have, any sacraments, which respected Christ, the Gospel and grace. This however, may be said in excuse of these and the like things, which often occur even in the most learned authors, that though these things were not proposed at first to man in innocence, in order to represent to him the grace of Christ, yet they were so wisely ordered by God, that man, by reflecting upon them, could, after the fall, discover in them some dark resemblance of those things, which God afterwards, by a new promise, was pleased to reveal.

XXI. Other learned men have not thought proper to reckon the tree of knowledge among the symbols and seals of the covenant of works; for these following reasons. 1st, Because all sacraments are given for use; but man was forbid the use of this tree. 2dly, Because sacraments are signs of a blessing, which they seal to those who use them in a proper way; but this tree sealed no blessing to any who should use it, but rather a curse. These considerations, however, are not of that weight, that we should therefore depart from the more received opinion. And it is easy to answer both these arguments, not only from the truth of the thing itself, but also from the very hypotheses of these learned men.

XXII. It is, indeed, true, that all sacraments were given for use; but it is also certain, that the external use of all sacraments is not after one and the same manner: all are not granted to the



mouth and palate. There are sacraments, whose use consists in the contemplation of the sign, and meditation on the thing signified. Some learned writers maintain, that the rainbow was not a symbol only of the œcumenical or general covenant with the whole earth, but also of the covenant of grace in Christ; and they think that the colours of the rainbow, the red, the fiery, and the green, denote, that by blood, holiness and mercy are united. But we can conceive no other sacramental use of the rainbow, besides the contemplation of it. In like manner, they place the brazen serpent among the sacraments of the Old Testament, whose use consisted only in the beholding of it. Nay, they are of opinion concerning the tree of life itself, that it was not promiscuously to be used by man, since, "to him alone that overcometh, it is given to eat of the tree of life," Rev. 2:7. "Whence," say they, "it does not appear that Adam touched it before the fall; nay, the contrary is rather evident." And yet they say, that it was the first and most ancient representation of the Son of God, and of the life to be possessed through him. Why then may not the tree of knowledge also be called a symbol of the covenant, though proposed only to be looked at by man, and of which he was never to eat.

XXIII. I go a step farther, and say, that there is no absurdity, should such a sacrament be appointed, whose use should consist in a religious abstinence. Nor, should those learned men, if consistent with themselves, be averse to this opinion. The deluge, say they, from which Noah was preserved, must needs be reckoned among the types. But the use of the waters, in respect to Noah, consisted in this, that they were neither to touch him and his, to their hurt; nor force themselves into the ark, in which he was shut up: the waters of the Red sea, likewise signified the same thing, in the same manner, to Israel. Nay, what may seem strange, these learned men say, that the first sacrament of the covenant of grace was the ejection of Adam out of Paradise, and the barring up his access to the tree of life: or, as one is pleased to express himself, "the first sacrament was the tree of life, which tho' at first it regarded the covenant of works, and the exclusion from it was the punishment of fallen man: nevertheless, that very exclusion was, at the same time, a sign of the grace and goodness of God." I would beg of those very learned men, to explain, in what the sacramental use of the tree of life was to have consisted under the covenant of grace, after man was expelled Paradise, and that tree was no longer to be in his view? There is here no other use but a mystical abstinence and deprivation. And thus, we imagine, we have fully answered the first argument.

XXIV. Let us now consider the second: and we say, it is not inconsistent with the nature of sacraments, to seal death and condemnation to those who unduly and irregularly use them: for, the covenant of God with man is ratified, not only by the promises, but also by certain threatenings belonging to it; but sacraments are the seals of the whole covenant, not excepting the threatenings to the profane abusers of them. When a man partakes of the sacraments, he comes under an oath and curse, and makes him self liable to punishment, if he deals treacherously, To say nothing of the sacraments of the covenant of works, the very sacraments of the covenant of grace are "the savour of death unto death" to hypocrites and profane persons, who, in the bread and wine of the Eucharist, "eat and drink damnation to themselves," 1 Cor. 11:27, 29. But it is not true, that the tree of knowledge sealed only death; for it also sealed life and happiness. It was the tree of knowledge, not only of evil, but of good. As these learned men themselves acknowledge, while they write: "that, had Adam obeyed, he would, upon his trial, have come to the knowledge and sense of his good, to which he was called, and had a natural desire after; even eternal life and consummate happiness." Whence we conclude, that,

notwithstanding these reasonings, we may justly reckon the tree of knowledge among the sacraments of the covenant of works.

## Chapter VII: Of the First Sabbath

I. WE said that the first Sabbath was the fourth sacrament of the covenant of works. In order to treat somewhat more fully on this, it will not be improper to make it the subject of a whole Chapter: Moses gives us the history of it, Gen. 2:2, 3, in these words: "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made; and God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." The more fully to understand these words, and from them to answer our design, we shall distinctly discuss these three things. 1st. Inquire whether what is here said about sanctifying and blessing the seventh day, ought to be applied to that first day, which immediately followed upon the six days of the creation, and which was the first that shone on the works of God when completed; or whether it be necessary to have recourse to a prolepsis, or anticipation by which we may look upon those things as spoken of the day, on which, many ages after, the manna was given in the wilderness. 2dly. We shall explain the nature of that first Sabbath. 3dly. and lastly, Point out in what respect it was a sacrament.

II. There is no occasion to mention, that the first of these points has been matter of great dispute among divines, without coming to any determination to this day; nor do I choose to repeat what they have said. I shall only observe, that perhaps the parties might easily agree did we know what we are to understand by sanctifying and blessing the seventh day mentioned by Moses. But if we suppose, in general, that God rested on the seventh day from his work, that is, not only desisted from creating new species of creatures, but acquiesced and took complacency in the work which he had now finished, especially in man, who was formed after his image, and furnished with those faculties by which he was enabled to acknowledge and celebrate the perfections of God shining forth in his works; and that he set this his resting before man as a pattern by which he should be taught to acquiesce in nothing but in God, for whom he was created; please himself in nothing but in glorifying God, which is the end of his creation: moreover, that he sanctified this day, of which we are speaking, by commanding it to be employed by man for that sacred work, adding a promise that all that time thus employed by man should be highly blessed to him; if, I say, we thus in general suppose as all these things are evidently truth, there is good hope that all equitable judges will allow that we adhere to the simplicity of the letter, and interpret this history of Moses as the narrative of a thing done at that time, which the holy prophet was then describing.

III. I am glad to find the celebrated Cocceius assents to this. His words are these, on Gen. 2 §. 6. Some imagine that "this verse (namely 2) is put by way of anticipation. But it is not probable that Moses, in recording this blessing and sanctification, did by no means speak concerning the original Sabbath, but only concerning the Jewish sabbath. This is plainly doing violence to the text, if one day be understood, which God blessed and sanctified, and another on which he rested from his work." And the very eloquent Burman, though inclining to an anticipation, yet owns that "the words of Moses may be understood of that perpetual sabbath, the seventh day after the creation, which first saw the works of God perfected, and most auspiciously shone on the world; whence it is said to be peculiarly blessed by God, and afterwards to be celebrated and sanctified by men for all ages to come," Synops. Theol. lib. ii. c. 5. §. 11. See the same author, de œconomia fœderum Dei, §. 208, 209. We shall say no more on this, as we could rather wish to

see the orthodox agreeing among themselves than contending with one another. And indeed this must be acknowledged if we would properly explain in what manner this sabbath was a sacrament of the covenant of works.

IV. The best Hebrew authors, on whose authority those of the opposite opinion are wont to build upon, agree with us in this dispute. For in the Talmud they inquire, why man was created on the evening of the sabbath? and of the three reasons they give, this is the last, "that he might immediately enter on performing the command." The famous Ludovicus de Dieu, mentioning these words, on Gen. 1:27, adds, by way of explication, "for since the sabbath immediately succeeded the creation of man, he immediately entered on the command of sanctifying the sabbath." Baal Hatturim, after various interpretations of this passage, also subjoins this other; "in the hour that he created the world he blessed the sabbath and the world." Jarchi also mentions this opinion, though himself was otherwise minded, "what would the world have been without rest; on the coming of the sabbath came rest, and thus at length the work was finished and completed." By which he intimates that the institution of the sabbath was joined to the completing of the works of God. There are also some Jews, who will have Ps. 92, whose title is a Psalm or Song for the Sabbath-day, to have been composed by Adam. For thus the Chaldee paraphrases, "a hymn and song, which the first man said of the sabbath." And R. Levi, in Bereschith Rabba, §. 22, at the end; "the first man spoke this psalm, and from his time it was buried in oblivion, but Moses came and renewed it." Now I bring these testimonies to show that they speak too confidently who assert that it is running counter to the unanimous opinion of the Jews for any to insist that the precept of the sabbath was enjoined on the first man. Whoever wants more to this purpose may consult Selden de jure naturæ, &c. lib. iii. 13.

V. These things supposed, we are further to inquire, in what the nature of the first sabbath did consist. Here again, the learned run into very different opinions. I now take it to be my province to lay down such propositions, to which it is to be hoped that the orthodox, who are lovers of truth, will, without difficulty, give their assent.

VI. We are to distinguish first, between the rest of God, and the rest of man, which God enjoined upon him, and recommended by his own example: in this manner also Paul distinguishes, Heb. 4:10, "he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his."

VII. The rest of God consisted not only in his ceasing from the work of any new creation, but also in that sweet satisfaction and delight he had in the demonstration of his own attributes and perfections, which were gloriously displayed in the work he had now finished, especially after he had added a lustre to this inferior world by bestowing upon it a most excellent inhabitant, who was to be a careful spectator, and the herald and proclaimer of the perfections of his Creator, and in whom God himself beheld *ου μικρον της δοξης αὐτοῦ απαυγασμα*, "no small effulgence of his own glory." Wherefore it is said, Exod. 31:17, "and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed;" not as if he was fatigued, but as rejoicing in his work so happily completed, and in which he beheld what was worthy of his labour.

VIII. God having rested on the seventh day, sanctified it, as well by example as by precept. By example, in as much as he brought man, whom he had newly formed, to the contemplation of his works, and revealed to him, both himself and his perfections, that he might love, thank, praise,

and glorify him. And indeed, because God rested on the seventh day from all other works, and was only intent upon this, we may conclude that he sanctified it in an extraordinary manner. He likewise sanctified it by precept, enjoining man to employ it in glorifying his Creator. "To sanctify" (as Martyr, whom several commend, says well), "is to set apart something for the worship of God, as it is also taken here." And it was very justly observed by Calvin, "that it was the will of God his own example should be a perpetual rule to us." Rabbenu Nissim, quoted by Abarbanel, on the explication of the law, fol. xxi. col. 3, is of the same opinion: "and this is the sanctification of the sabbath, that, on that day, the soul of man be employed on nothing profane, but wholly on things sacred."

IX. God's blessing the seventh day may be also taken in a twold sense: First, for his declaring it to be blessed and happy, as that in which he had peculiar pleasure to enjoy by observing all his works in such order as to be not only to himself, but to angels as well as men, a most beautiful scene, displaying the glory of his perfections. This is what David says, Ps. 104:13, "the glory of the Lord shall endure for ever, the Lord shall rejoice in his works." Thus God himself rejoiced on that day, and consequently blessed it. For as to curse a day is to abhor and detest it, as unfortunate and unhappy, as afflictive and miserable, Job 2:14; Jer. 20:14: so, by the rule of contraries, to bless a day, is to rejoice in it, as delightful and prosperous. And indeed what day more joyful, more happy than that which saw the works of God perfected, and yet not stained by any sin, either of angels, or probably of men? There has been none like it since that time, certainly not since the entrance of sin. Secondly, It was also a part of the blessing of this day, that God adjudged to man, if he religiously imitated the pattern of his own rest, the most ample blessings, and likewise in that very rest, the earnest of a most happy rest in heaven; of which more fully presently. Elegantly said the ancient Hebrew doctors, that "the blessing and sanctifying the sabbath redound to the observers thereof, that they may be blessed and holy themselves."

X. The rest here enjoined and recommended to man comprises chiefly these things: in general, that he shall abstain from every sin through the whole course of his life, that giving nothing but uneasiness both to himself and his God. As the Lord complains, Isa. 43:22, "thou hast been weary of me, O Israel," and verse 24, "thou hast wearied me with thine iniquities." By sinning, we dreadfully transgress against the rest of God, who cannot delight in a sinner, of whom and his work he says, Isa. 1:14, "they are a burthen to me,\* I am weary to bear them." But more especially, it is likewise man's duty, that as he is the concluding part of the works of God, and the last of all the creatures that came out of the hands of his Creator, not so to harass and fatigue himself about the creatures, as to seek his happiness and good in them; but rather, by a holy elevation of mind, ascend to the Creator himself, and acquiesce in nothing short of the enjoyment of his unbounded goodness, of the imitation of the purest holiness, and of the expectation of the fullest rest and intimate union with his God. This, indeed, is the true and spiritual rest, always to be meditated upon, sought after, and to be observed by man.

XI. Moreover as man, even in the state of innocence, was to perform solemn acts of piety, together with his consort and children, and to be their mouth in prayer, thanksgiving, and praises; it was necessary at that time, that laying aside all other occupations, and all cares about what related to the support of natural life, and ordering those about him to rest, he might, without any hinderance from the body, religiously apply himself to this one thing, which I hope none of my

brethren will refuse. At least the celebrated Cocceius readily allows it. Whose words are these, Sum. Theol. c. xxi. §. 10: It is right in itself, and a part of the image of God, that man should, as often as possible, employ himself in the worship of God (that is, laying aside the things pertaining to the body and its conveniences, be wholly taken up in those duties which become a soul, delighting in God, glorifying him and celebrating his praise) and that too in the public assembly, for the common joy and edification of all.

XII. After man had sinned, the remembrance of God's resting and sanctifying the seventh day ought to rouse him from his slowness and dulness in the worship of God, in order to spend every seventh day therein, laying aside, for a while, all other employment. But it will be better to explain this in Calvin's words: "God therefore first rested, and then he blessed that rest, that it might be ever afterwards holy among men; or he set a part each seventh day for rest, that his own example might be a standing rule. Martyr speaks to the same purpose: "Hence men are put in mind that, if the church enjoins them to set apart a certain day in the week for the worship of God, this is not altogether a human device, nor belongs only to the law of Moses, but likewise had its rise from hence, and is an imitation of God." All this is also approved of by Cocceius, whose excellent words we will subjoin from the place just quoted, §. 12: "The consequence of these things in the sinner is, that if encompassed with the infirmities of the flesh, and exposed to the troubles of life, he may at least each seventh day recollect, and give himself up to far preferable thoughts, and then cheerfully, on account of that part of the worship of God which cannot be performed without disengaging from business, abstain from the work of his hands, and from seeking, preparing, and gathering the fruits of the earth." And as this celebrated expositor approves of this, I know not why he should disapprove the elegant observation of Chrysostem, on Heb. §. 13; "That hence, as by certain preludes, God hath enigmatically taught us to consecrate and set apart for spiritual employment each seventh day in the week." If we all agree, as I hope we may, in these positions, which seem not unhappily to explain the nature of the first sabbath; I truly reckon, that a way is paved, and a great deal done, to compose those unhappy disputes about the sabbath of the decalogue, which, for some years past, have made such noise in the Dutch universities and churches.

XIII. Having thus explained the nature of the first sabbath, we proceed to inquire into its spiritual and mystical signification; from whence it will be easy to conclude, that we have not improperly called it a sacrament; or, which is the same, a sacred sign or seal (for why should we wrangle about a word, not scriptural, when we agree about the thing?) of the promises of salvation made by God to Adam. We have Paul's authority to assert, that the sabbath had some mystical meaning, and respected an eternal and happy rest, Heb. 4:4–10. And this is justly supposed by the apostle as a thing well known to the Hebrews, and which is a corner-stone or foundation point with their doctors. It was a common proverb, quoted by Buxtorf, in *Florilegio Hebræo*, 299, "The sabbath is not given but to be a type of the life to come." To the same purpose is that which we have in *Zohar*, on Gen. fol. v. chap. 15: "What is the sabbath day? A type of the land of the living, which is the world to come, the world of souls, the world of consolations." These things, indeed, are not improper to be said in general; but as you will not readily find any where the analogy between the sabbath and eternal rest especially assigned, can it be thought improper, if, by distinguishing between the rest of God, the rest of man, and the seventh day, on which both rested, we should distinctly propose the mystical meaning of each?

XIV. The rest of God, from the work of the creation, was a type of a far more glorious rest of God from the work of the glorification of the whole universe. When God had created the first world, so as to be a commodious habitation for man during his probation, and an illustrious theatre of the perfections of the Creator; he took pleasure in this his work, and rested with delight. For he bestowed upon it all the perfection which was requisite to complete that state. But he had resolved, one day, to produce a far more perfect universe, and, by dissolving the elements by fire, to raise a new heaven and a new earth, as it were, out of the ashes of the old: which new world, being blessed with his immutable happiness, was to be a far more august habitation for his glorified creatures; in which, as in the last display of his perfections, he was for ever to rest with the greatest complacency. And besides, as God, according to his infinite wisdom, so wisely connects all his actions, that the preceding have a certain respect to the following; in like manner, since that rest of God after the creation was less complete than that other, when God shall have concluded the whole, and which is to be followed by no other labour or toil; it is proper to consider that first rest of God as a type, and a kind of prelude of that other, which is more perfect. In fine, because it tends to man's greatest happiness, that the whole universe be thus glorified, and himself in the universe, that God may altogether rest in him, as having now obtained his last degree of perfection, he is said "to enter into the rest of God," Heb. 4:10.

XV. This rest of God was, after the creation, immediately succeeded by the rest of man. For, when he had formed man on the sixth day (as possibly may be gathered from the simplicity of Moses's narrative), he brought him into Paradise on the seventh, "עָדָן בְּגֵן יְנֻחָהוּ" and put him, or, as others think the words may be translated, he made him rest in the garden of Eden," Gen. 2:15; was not this a most delightful symbol or sign to Adam, that, after having finished his course of labour on this earth, he should be translated from thence into a place far more pleasant, and to a rest far more delightful than that which he enjoyed in Paradise? And when, at certain times, he ceased from tilling the ground in Paradise, and gave himself wholly up to the religious worship of God, with a soul delighting in God; was not this a certain earnest and a prelibation to him of that time, in which, exempted from all care about this animal life, he should immediately delight himself in the intimate communion of God, in being joined with the choirs of angels, and in doing the works of angels?

XVI. May not this rest both of God and man, falling upon the seventh day, after the six of creation, properly denote, that the rest of the glory of God is then to be expected, after the week of this world is elapsed? And that man is not to enter into rest till he has finished his course of probation, and God, upon strictly examining it by the rule of his law, finds it complete, and in every respect perfect? And are we to reject the learned observation of Peter Martyr, that "this seventh day is said to have neither morning nor evening, because this is a perpetual rest to those who are truly the sons of God?"

XVII. It is indeed true, that, upon Adam's sin, and violation of the covenant of works, the whole face of things was changed: but all these things [we have been speaking of] were such, as might have been signified and sealed by this sabbath to Adam, even in the state of innocence, and why might it not really have been so? For the apostle expressly declares, that "God's resting from his works, from the foundation of the world," Heb. 4:3, had a mystical signification. It is therefore our business to find out the agreement between the sign and the thing signified; for the greater analogy we observe between them, we shall the more clearly and with joy discover the infinite

wisdom and goodness of God, manifesting themselves in various ways. It cannot but tend to the praise of the divine architect, if we can observe many excellent resemblances between the picture given us by himself, and the copy. Indeed, I deny not, that Paul, when discoursing of the sabbath, leads us to that rest, purchased for believers by the sufferings of Christ. But it cannot thence be inferred, that, after the entrance of sin, God's sabbath borrowed all its mystical signification from the covenant of grace. For, as to the substance of the thing, the glorious rest promised by the covenant of works, and now to be obtained by the covenant of grace, is one and the same, consisting in a blessed acquiescence or rest of the soul in God. As this was sealed to man in innocence by the sabbath, under the covenant of works; so likewise it is sealed by the sabbath under the covenant of grace, though under another relation, and under other circumstances. For God, having perfect knowledge that man would not continue in the first covenant, had, from all eternity, decreed to set on foot a quite different order of things, and bring his elect, by a new covenant of grace, to the most peaceful rest. Accordingly, he settled, in his unsearchable wisdom, whatever preceded the fall, in such a manner, that man, viewing them after the fall with the enlightened eyes of faith, might discover still greater mysteries in them, which regarded Christ and the glory to be obtained by him. But we are not to speak of this here. Whoever desires a learned explanation of those mysteries, may consult Mestresat's sermons on the fourth Chapter to the Hebrew.

XVIII. This sabbath also put man in mind of various duties to be performed by him, which, having pointed out above, §. 10, 11, I think needless to repeat now. And thus we have executed what we promised concerning the sacraments of the covenant of works.

XIX. And here I might conclude, did not a very learned man come in my way; whose thoughts on the first sabbath being widely different from the commonly received notions, I intend, with his permission, calmly to examine. He therefore maintains, that Adam, on the very day of his creation, being seduced by the devil, had involved himself and the whole world in the most wretched bondage of corruption; but that God, on the seventh day, restored all things, thus corrupted by the devil and by man, by his gracious promise of the Messiah: upon this restoration he rested on that very day; and that rest, upon the reparation of the world, being peculiar to the seventh day, may be the foundation of the sabbath. Doubtless, "on the sixth day, the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them," Gen. 2:1. And God, beholding the works of his creation so perfect, pleasantly rested in them. This was the rest of the sixth day. But on the same day Satan corrupted all; for, upon losing heaven, of whose host he was one, and which he greatly diminished by associating many other angels to himself, and so far rendered that habitation a desert; and on earth, by means of a calumnious lie, he rendered man, the prince of the terrestrial host, a subject to himself, a rebel to God, and destitute of life. This was the corruption of the earth. And thus heaven and earth, so beautifully finished by God on the sixth day, were on the same basely defiled by Satan and by man. This occasioned God to be engaged in a new work on the seventh, even to restore what had been thus defiled and corrupted, and to complete them anew; which he did on the seventh day, when the Mediator, God-man, was revealed by the Gospel, whom, in the promise, he appointed to triumph over Satan, the corrupter of all, and so to restore all things; both of the earth, where he began the restoration by delivering the elect of mankind from the bondage of corruption; and of heaven, by bringing the same chosen people into the heavenly habitation, in order to its being again re-peopled with that colony of new inhabitants: in this manner he will complete the restoration. Which completion Moses intimates,



verse 2; "and on the seventh day God ended his work, which he had made." This finishing of the *לצורה* made, is very distinct from the finishing of the creation, mentioned verse 1. When God had done all this, upon giving his Son to men for a Mediator and Redeemer, he himself rested in this his last work, as this is "the man of his delight," Is. 42:1. And this rest was the only foundation for instituting the sabbath. This institution consists of a twofold act: the first is of blessing, by which God blessed that very day, by a most distinguishing privilege, to be the day devoted to the Messiah, who was revealed in it by the Gospel. For, this is the honour of the sabbath, that it is "the delight, on account of the holy of the Lord being glorified," Is. 58:13. The other act is that of sanctification, by which he set it apart for a sign and memorial of that benefit, because through and for the holy of the Lord, he chooses to sanctify the elect. This is the sum of that opinion. Let us now consider whether it be solid, and can be proved by scripture.

XX. The whole foundation of this opinion is, that Adam fell on the very day in which he was created; which the scripture no where says. I know that some Jewish doctors, with boldness, as is their way, assert this; and, as if they were perfectly acquainted with what God was about every hour, declare that man was created the third hour of the day, fell the eleventh, and was expelled Paradise the twelfth. But this rashness is to be treated with indignation. The learned person deems it his glory to be wise from the scriptures alone; and justly, for thus it becomes a divine. But, what portion of scripture determines any thing about the first sin? We have here scarce any more than bare conjectures, which at best are too sandy a foundation on which any wise architect will ever presume to build so grand an edifice.

XXI. Nay, there are many things, from which we rather incline to think that man's sin happened not on the sixth day. For it was after God had, on that day, created the beasts; after he had formed Adam of the dust of the earth; after he had prescribed him the law concerning the tree of knowledge of good and evil; after he had presented to him the beasts in Paradise, that, upon inquiring into the nature of each (which also he performed with great accuracy, as the great Bochart has very learnedly shown, Hierozoic. lib. i. c. 9,) he might call each by their proper names; after Adam had found there was not among them any help meet for him, for the purposes and convenience of marriage; and after God had cast Adam into a deep sleep, and then at last formed Eve from one of his ribs; all these things are not of a nature to be performed, like the other works of the preceding days, in the shortest space of time possible, and as it were in a moment; but succeeded one another in distinct periods, and during these, several things must have been done by Adam himself. Nay, there are divines, of no small note, who insist that these things were not all done in one day; and others postpone the creation of Eve to one of the days of the following week: but we do not now engage in these disputes. After all these things, the world was yet innocent, and free from all guilt, at least on the part of man. And God, contemplating his works, and concluding his day, approved of all, as very good and beautiful. He had yet no new labour for restoring the fallen world, which would have been no ways inferior to the work of the creation. But what probability is there, that in those very few hours which remained, if yet a single hour remained, Adam should have parted from Eve, who had been just created, exposed his most beloved consort to an insidious serpent, and that both of them, just from the hands of the Creator, should so suddenly have given ear to the deceiver? Unless one is prepossessed in favour of the contrary opinion, what reason could he have, notwithstanding so many probabilities to the contrary, prematurely thus to hurry on Adam's sin. Since, therefore, the whole of this foundation is so very weak, what solid superstructure can we imagine it be capable of.

XXII. Let us now take a nearer view of the superstructure itself, and examine whether its construction be sufficiently firm and compact. The very learned person imagines he sees a new labour or work on the seventh day, and a new rest succeeding that labour, which is the foundation of the sabbath. The labour was, a promise of the Messiah, by which the world, miserably polluted with sin, was to be restored; and that Moses treats of this chap. 2:2, "And on the seventh day God ended his work, which he had made." The rest was, the satisfaction and delight he had in that promise, and in the Messiah promised. But let us offer the following considerations in opposition to this sentiment: 1st, If God, on the seventh day, performed the immense work of recovering the fall—a work which, if not greater, yet certainly is not less than the creation of the world out of nothing, and he was again to rest, when he had finished it; certainly, then, the seventh day was as much a day of work to God, and no more a sabbath, or day of rest, than any of the preceding days. For God, having finished the work of each day, rested for a while, and delighted in it. 2dly, Moses, in the second verse, makes use of the same word, by which he had expressed the finishing of the world in the first. But, the finishing in the first verse, as the learned person himself owns, relates to the finishing of the creation; what necessity then can there be for giving such different senses to one and the same word, in the same context, when there is not the least mark of distinction? 3rdly, Hitherto, Moses has not given the least imaginable hint of the fall of our first parents: is it then probable, that he would so abruptly mention the restitution of the world from the fall; and that in the very same words, which he had just used, and was afterwards to use for explaining the first creation? What can oblige, or who can suffer us to confound the neatness of Moses's method, and the perspicuity of his words, by this feigned irregularity and ambiguity? 4thly, It may be doubted, whether we can properly say, that, by the promise of the Messiah, all things were perfected and finished, since God, if we follow the thread of Moses's narrative, did, after this promise, punish the world with a deserved curse: and the apostle still says, of the world, that "the creature was made subject to vanity, and groans under the bondage of corruption," Rom. 8:20, 21. It is indeed true, that the promise of the Messiah, which could not be frustrated, was the foundation of the comfort of the fathers; but the Scripture no where declares that, by this promise, as immediately made after the fall, all things were finished; nay, even this promise pointed out that person, who, after many ages, and by various acts, not of one and the same office, was to effect the true consummation.

XXIII. Our learned author urges the following reason, why those two finishings are not to be looked upon as the same: 1st, It would be a tautology, if not an inexcusable battology, or idle repetition, in such a compendious narrative; and either the first verse, or the beginning of the second, would be superfluous. 2dly, The finishing, or ending, verse 2, is annexed to the seventh day, by a double article, in the same manner as the rest is. "And on the very seventh day God ended his work, which he had made; and he rested on the very seventh day from all his work which he had made." So that, if the former verb *ויכל* be rendered by the preterpluperfect, and he had ended, the latter *ויישבת* must be rendered so too, and he had rested; but this is incongruous. Nay, since on the other days we reject the preterpluperfect tense, lest the works of the following day should be referred to those of the preceding, contrary to historical truth, it ought not then here to be admitted on the seventh day. 3rdly, When the third verse shows the cause of this rest, it speaks of distinct finishings, the latter of which is that of the seventh day: "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work, which God *בדא* created and made." By two verbs he describes two actions; *ברא* denotes to create, and *עשה*, to adorn, to polish: these words are frequently of the same import; yet, when joined together, they

are to be distinguished; as is owned, not only by christian, but by Jewish interpreters. (Thus it is, Is. 43:7; where another word is added, יצד, to form; and, as to all the three, ברא certainly signifies the creation of the soul, but יצד, the formation of the body, and עשה, reformation by grace.) But these two actions are so described, that עשיה, making, immediately precedes resting, and was the work of the seventh day; but בריאה, creation, the work of the six preceding days. 4th, To the same purpose is the recapitulation of verse 4, which repeats and confirms the distinction just now mentioned: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth, when they were created; in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." Thus he recites the generations both of the first six days, in which the heavens and the earth, with their respective hosts, were created, and of the beginning of that one day, namely, the seventh, which is that of operation, in which he made, and polished, inverting the order; first the earth, then the heavens. Thus far our very learned author.

XXIV. But we cannot assent to these things, and therefore we answer each in order. To the first, I would earnestly entreat our brother, both to think and speak more reverently of the style of the Holy Ghost, nor charge those simple and artless repetitions of one and the same thing, even in a concise narrative, with an inexcusable tautology, if not a battology, or vain and useless repetitions. It does not become us, the humble disciples of the Divine Spirit, to criticise on the most learned language, and the most pure style of our adorable Master. It is very frequent in the sacred writings, more than once to repeat the same thing, in almost the same words, at no great distance asunder. This very second Chapter of Genesis, of which we now treat, gives us various examples of this. The reason of the sanctification of the seventh day, namely, the rest of God upon that day, is proposed in nearly the same words in the second and third verses. This learned person himself calls the fourth verse a recapitulation of what was just said. And what is the whole of the second Chapter, but a fuller explication of the formation of man, which indeed we have plainly, but more briefly, related in the first Chapter? Shall we therefore say that a part of the first Chapter, or the whole of the second, is in a great measure superfluous? Or shall we dare to charge God with tautologies, if not with inexcusable battologies? Is it not more becoming to tremble with awe at his words, and rather return him thanks, that, on account of the dulness of our apprehension, he has vouchsafed to propose, two or three times, the same truths, either in the same, or in a variety of words, having all the same meaning? For my own part, I would act in this manner without any doubt of acting as it becomes me.

XXV. To the second, I would answer: 1st, The words of Moses may be taken in this sense; namely, that God finished the work of the sixth day, and consequently of all the six days, in the very moment in which the seventh began. Thus the ancient Hebrews, and after them, R. Solomo, explains this manner of speaking; as thereby to intimate, that God, in the very moment in which he entered on the sabbath, finished his work; for God alone knows the moments and least parts of time in a manner totally distinct from the knowledge possessed by man. 2ndly, "Nor is it an improper observation of Aben Ezra, "that the finishing of the work is not the work itself," but only means the ceasing from work, and that the text explains itself thus: and he finished, that is, and he rested; having finished his work, he worked no longer. 3rdly, But we need not insist on this. Drusius speaks to excellent purpose on this place: "The preterperfect Hebrew may be as well rendered by the preterpluperfect as otherwise. It is really so: the Hebrews have only one preterperfect, which they use for every kind of past time; and therefore, according to the connexion, it may be rendered sometimes by the preterperfect, and at other times by the

preterpluperfect." Let it therefore be rendered here by the preterpluperfect, and he had finished, as the Dutch translation has also done, and all the difficulty will disappear. Our learned author may insist, that if this be granted, then the following וישבה must be also rendered by the preterpluperfect. But it does not follow; for we are to consider the nature of the subject, and the different circumstances. The learned person insists that the word finishing is used in a different sense in the first, from what it is in the second verse; and shall we not be allowed to interpret a preterperfect, which by the genius of the language is indeterminate, sometimes by the preterperfect, and at other times by the preterpluperfect, as the subject shall require? And if elsewhere we justly reject the preterpluperfect tense, it is not because the genius of the Hebrew tongue does not admit of it, but because, as the learned person himself observes, such an interpretation is contrary to the truth of the history. Which not being the case here, such a reason cannot be urged. I will only add, if Moses wanted to say, what we imagine he has said, et consummaverat die septima, &c.; et cessavit, &c.; and, on the seventh, God had finished, &c., and rested, &c.; could he have possibly expressed in other words, or more aptly, according to the genius of the language, this sense? Were the learned person himself to render into Hebrew, word for word, these Latin words, he would certainly have rendered them in the same tense and mood as Moses has done.

XXVI. To the third reason, I reply: 1st, The word עשה is very general, and signifies, to do a thing any how, well or ill. It is said, of penal or physical evil, Amos 4:13, עיפה שהר עשך, who maketh the morning darkness; and Ezek. 35:6, אעשך לדם I will prepare (make) thee unto blood. And of moral evil, Mic. 2:1, when the morning is light they practise it, יעשוה. We shall give more instances presently. Hence it appears, that the learned person too much restricts the meaning of this word, when he explains it by the words, to adorn, or polish; especially, if he would precisely confine it to the reformation by grace. 2dly, The same word עשה is often expressive of the six days work; as Gen. 1:31. "And God saw את כל אשר עשה all that he had made;" and Exod. 20:11, "In six days the Lord עשה made heaven and earth:" likewise Ezek. 46:1, תמעשה ימי ששת, the six working days, are opposed to the Sabbath. Neither does the learned person deny that the words ברא and עשה are often equivalent. And why not here also? Is there any necessity, or probable reason, for taking עשיה for the work of the seventh day, and בריאה for the work of the six preceding days. 3rdly, I think he goes a little too far, when he asserts that both Christian and Jewish interpreters admit that these words, when joined together, have distinct significations. Truly, for my own part, of the several interpreters both Jewish and Christian, whom I have consulted, I never found one who distinguishes the appearing of these words, as this learned author has done. See Facius on Gen. 1:1. Menasseh Ben Israel, de Creat. Probl. 4. Cocceius Disput. select. p. 70. § 72. Let us, in this case, hear the learned De Dieu, who thus comments on this passage. "It appears to be an usual Hebraism, whereby the infinitive, לעשות, added to a verb, including a like action, is generally redundant: such as Judges 13:19: And acting he acted wondrously: that is, he acted wondrously: 1 Kings 14:9: And doing, thou hast done evil; that is, thou hast done evil. 2 Kings 21:6: And working, he multiplied wickedness; that is, simply, he multiplied wickedness, or, he wrought much wickedness. 2 Chron. 20:35: He doing, did wickedly, doing is redundant. Ps. 126:2: The Lord doing, has done great things for them, doing is again redundant. Eccl. 2:11: On the labour, that doing I had laboured; that is, simply, I had laboured. Which last passage is entirely parallel with this in Genesis; for, whether you say, עשה לעשות, he doing, laboured ברא לעשות he making, created, you say the same thing: unless that ברא signifies to produce something new, without any precedent or pattern, and which had no

existence before: therefore, he making, created, is no other than, he made something new." These things neither could, nor ought to be unknown to this learned person, considering his great skill in Hebrew learning. 4thly, He ought not to have made such a distinction, barely and without any proof between the words ברא, יצר and עשה, which are used by Isaiah 43:7; as if the first intends the creation of the soul; the second, the formation of the body, and the third, the reformation by grace: there not being the least foundation for it in scripture. For, 1. ברא sometimes signifies reformation by grace, as Ps. 51:10: לי ברא "Create in me a clean heart." 2. יצר is sometimes applied to the soul, Zech. 12:1: "And ארם רוּחַ יצַר formeth the spirit of man within him:" and Ps. 33:15: לבם יחד היצר "and fashioneth their hearts alike;" sometimes too it denotes formation by grace; as Is. 43:21: "This people יעשתי have I formed for myself; they shall show forth my praise." 3. עשה is more than once used for the first formation of man; as Gen. 1:26, נעשה, "Let us make man;" and Gen. 2:18: אעשה, "I will make him an help meet for him." Jer. 38:16: עשה אשר "that made us this soul," says king Zedekiah to Jeremiah, without having any thoughts of a reformation by grace. As therefore all these words are so promiscuously used in Scripture, ought we not to look upon him who distinguishes them in such a magisterial manner, as one who gives too much scope to his own fancy? And what if one should invert the order of our author, and positively assert, that ברא here denotes reformation by grace, as Ps. 51:10; יצר the production of the soul, as Zech. 12:1; and עשה the formation of the body, as Gen. 2:8; what reply could the learned person make? But these are weak arguments. It is more natural to take these words in Isaiah as meant of the new creation and reformation by grace. And this accumulation or multiplying of words is very proper to denote the exceeding greatness of the power of God, and his effectual working in the sanctification of the elect. There is a parallel place, Eph. 2:10: "For we are his מעשה, workmanship נבראים created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God יצר, hath before ordained, that we should walk in them: as Isa. 22:11: מרחוק יצרה "fashioned it long ago," which properly προσηκουσασε he hath before ordained. From all this it appears, that this passage in Isaiah can be of no service to our learned author. 5thly, But if we must distinguish between ברא and עשה, nothing, I think, is more to the purpose than the interpretation of Ben Nachman. "He rested from all his works, which ברא, he created, by producing something out of nothing, לעשות, to make of it all the works mentioned in the six days: and lo! he says, he rested from creating and from working; from creating, as having created in the first day, and from working, as having completed his working in the remaining days."

XXVII. The fourth reason coincides with the foregoing, only that it is still more cabalistical. 1st. It is a strange interpretation to say, that by תולדות the generations of heaven and earth, we are to understand not only their first creation, but their restoration by the promise of the Messiah. For it is quite foreign to the subject to tell us, that by the sin of the angels a state of corruption was introduced into the heaven of heavens, and thereby the throne of the divine majesty was basely defiled; for though by the angelic apostasy corruption had been introduced into heaven, yet by their ejection, whereby they were hurled into hell, the heavens were purged from that corruption. Nor was there any new heaven made by the promise of the Messiah that was given on the sixth day; for that promise made no alteration there, but only foretold, that after many years some elect souls were to be received into that holy and blessed habitation. 2dly, As to the order, in which the earth is put before the heavens, it is well known that the scripture does not always relate things in the same order. Nor from the mere order of the narrative, which is an arbitrary thing, can any arguments be formed. However, Junius's observation is not to be rejected. "Earth and heaven are mentioned in an inverted order, because the formation of the earth preceded that of

the heavens; for the earth was perfected on the third day of the creation, heaven on the fourth." 3dly, It is doing manifest violence to the text, if we understand the formation of the earth and heavens, of their reformation by grace, in virtue of the promise of the Messiah, made on the seventh day; because Moses treats of that formation of earth and heaven, which was prior to that of plants and herbs; as appears from the connexion of verse 3 with verse 4. For thus the words run: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth, when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and heavens, and every plant of the field, before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field," &c. Or, as the learned De Dieu shows, they may otherwise be very properly rendered: "in the day that the Lord made the heavens and the earth, there was yet no plant of the field created," &c. So that this formation of the earth and heavens was prior to man's own creation, much more to the fall, and to the restitution from the fall. And this verse wholly overturns the distinction which this learned person has invented.

XXVIII. And as we have thus shown, that the words of Moses neither mention nor intimate any work by which God restored all things from the fall on the seventh day; so neither of any rest from the work of restoration, which is the foundation of the rest of the sabbath. For, 1st, It is irrational to suppose, that when God promised the Messiah, he then rested from the work of the gracious reformation of the universe; because that promise was a prophecy of the sufferings, conflicts, and at the last of the death of Christ, by which that reformation was to be brought about and accomplished. 2dly, How can it be said that God rested, immediately after having made that promise, from all his work, when directly upon it he pronounced and executed sentence upon Adam, Eve, and the earth, that was cursed for their crime, and expelled them Paradise? Which work (to speak after the manner of men, compare Isa. 28:21) was truly a greater labour to God than the very creation of the world. And thus, instead of a sabbath, which Moses describes, this day is made one of the most laborious to God. 3dly, The sabbath day, after the publication of the first Gospel promise, was doubtless sacred to the Messiah, and to be celebrated to his honour by the saints with a holy exultation of soul. Nor shall I be much against the learned person, should he choose to translate Isa. 58:13, "that the Sabbath may be called a delight, on account of the holy of the Lord being glorified:" but it cannot, with any probability, be inferred from this, that the promise of the Messiah was the foundation of the first sabbath; since the sabbath, as well as other things, did not acquire that relation till after the fall. 4thly, The Scripture, in express terms, declares that the rest of God from the work of the first creation, which was completed in six days, was the foundation of the sabbath. "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day; wherefore he blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it." Exod. 20:11. Which being plain, it sufficiently, if I mistake not, appears, that it is much safer to go in the old and beaten path, which is the king's high way, than in that other untrodden and rough one, which the learned person, whose opinion we have been examining, has chosen to tread in. And so much for this subject.

## Chapter. VIII: Of the Violation of the Covenant of Works on the Part of Man

I. AS the Scripture does not declare how long this covenant, thus ratified and confirmed, continued unbroken, we are satisfied to remain in the dark; and we would have a holy dread of presuming rashly to fix the limits of a time which is really uncertain. It is however evident that man, wickedly presuming to eat the fruit of the forbidden tree, incurred the guilt of violating the covenant. Nor ought that to be deemed a small sin (as the apostle, Rom. 5 calls it, the offence, disobedience, and transgression), because it may seem to have been committed about a thing of no great importance; for the meaner the thing is from which God commanded to abstain, and for which man despised the promise of the covenant, the more heinous it makes his transgression; as may be illustrated by the profaneness of Esau, which was so much the greater as the mess was of so little value for which he sold his birth-right, Heb. 12:16. In that sin, as divines generally observe, there was, as it were, a kind of complication of many crimes. But it is our chief purpose to show that this was the violation of the whole covenant; for not only that tree which, as we proved above, was a sacrament of the covenant, the abuse of which ought to be looked upon as a violence done to the whole; not only the precept concerning that tree, which was the trial of universal obedience; but likewise the covenant in its whole constitution was violated by that transgression: the law of the covenant was trampled upon, when man, as if he had been his own lord and master in all things, did, in defiance of his Lord, lay hold on what was not his property, and throw off the yoke of obedience, that was due to God: the promises of the covenant were set less by than a transitory gust of pleasure, and the empty promises of the seducer; and that dreadful death, which the author of the covenant threatened the transgressor with, not considered and thought of in all its dreadful effects; but he presumed to act in opposition to it. And thus "Adam transgressed the covenant," Hos. 6:7.

II. Though Eve had the first hand in this crime, yet it is usually in Scripture ascribed to Adam: "By one man sin entered into the world", according to Paul, Rom. 5:12; whom, verse 14, he declares to be Adam. For Adam was the head of the covenant, with whom, even before the creation of Eve, God seems to have transacted. Adam was the root of all mankind, and even of Eve herself, who was formed out of one of his ribs: neither is it customary to deduce a genealogy from a woman. Nor was the covenant judged to be entirely broken, till Adam also added his own crime to that of his wife's. Then it was that the Creator, first acting in the character of a judge, summoned to his bar the inconsiderate pair, already condemned by their own conscience. But we are not to think that this inheritance of sin was so derived from our father Adam, as to excuse our mother Eve from that guilt; for as by marriage they were made one flesh, so far they may be considered as one man. Nay, Adam is not considered as the head and root of mankind, but in conjunction with his wife. To this purpose is what Malachi, 2:15, says, that God, seeking a godly seed, made one: one pair—two into one flesh.

III. It was doubtless a wicked spirit who seduced man to this apostasy, and who, tormented with the horrors of his guilty conscience, envied man his happiness in God, and God the pleasure he had in man, seeking a wretched consolation to his misery in having a companion in evil. And the more easily to insinuate himself into man's favour by his ensnaring discourse, he concealed himself in the serpent, the most subtle of all animals, and at that time not less acceptable to man than the rest of the obsequious creatures. The great Du Moulin, disput. iii. de Angelis, §. xliv. conjectures, that this serpent was of a conspicuous form, with fiery eyes, decked with gold, and

marked with shining spots, so as to draw the eyes of Eve to it; and that he had, before that time, more than once insinuated himself, by his soothing sound, into Eve's favour; in order, that having pre-conceived a good opinion of him, she might be brought the more readily to yield to him. In fine he was such, that what Moses says of the subtlety of the serpent, must be applied to him only, and not to the whole species. To this conjecture it is also added, that Eve perhaps, such was her simplicity, did not know whether God had bestowed the use of speech on any other animals besides man. Laurentius Karimez, in his *Pentecontarch*. c. i. quoted by Bochart, *Hierozoic*. lib. i. c. vi. p. 30, goes a step farther, and feigns that Eve was wont to play with the serpent, and adorn her bosom, neck, and arms with it: and hence, at this day, the ornaments for those parts have the resemblance of serpents, and are called ὄφεις, serpents, by the Greeks.

IV. But all this is apocryphal. We are not to advance such romantic things, without any Scripture authority. Whether this was the first or the only apparition of the serpent with the use of speech, I shall neither boldly affirm, nor obstinately deny. But what we are told, as probable, of some extraordinary serpent so curiously spotted and set off, and now made familiar to Eve, by an intercourse repeated several times, are the pleasing amusements of a curious mind. The subtlety of serpents is every where so well known, that among many nations they are proposed as the distinguishing character and hieroglyphic of prudence. Bochart, in his *Hierozoic*, lib. i. c. iv. has collected many things relating to this, from several authors. To this purpose is what our Saviour says, Matt. 10:16. "Be ye wise as serpents". It is also injurious and reproachful to our mother Eve, to represent her so weak, and at so small a remove from the brute creation, as not to be able to distinguish between a brute and a man, and to be ignorant that the use of speech was the peculiar privilege of rational creatures. Such stupid ignorance is inconsistent with the happy state of our first parents, and with the image of God, which shone so illustriously also in Eve. We are rather to believe that the devil assumed this organ the more easily to recommend himself to man as a prudent spirit; especially since this looked like a miracle, or a prodigy at least, that the serpent should speak with human voice. Here was some degree of probability that some spirit lay concealed in this animal, and that, too, extraordinarily sent by God, who should instruct man more fully about the will of God, and whose words this very miracle, as it were, seemed to confirm. For, that serpents have a tongue unadapted to utter articulate sounds, is the observation of Aristotle, *De Part. anim.* lib. ii. c. 17. See Vossius *de Idol.* lib. iv. c. 54.

V. As this temptation of the devil is somewhat like to all his following ones, we judge it not improbable, that Satan exerted all his cunning, and transformed himself, as he usually does, into an angel of light, and addressed himself to Eve, as if he had been an extraordinary teacher of some important truth not yet fully understood. And therefore he does not openly contradict the command of God, but first proposes it as a doubt, whether Adam understood well the meaning of the divine prohibition; whether he faithfully related it to Eve; whether she herself, too, did not mistake the sense of it; and whether at least that command, taken literally, was not so improbable, as to render it unnecessary to think of a more mysterious meaning. And thus he teaches to raise reasonings and murmurings, which are the destruction of faith, against the words of God.

VI. Next, he undermines the threatening annexed to the command, "Ye shall not surely die," says he: God never meant, by death, what you in your simplicity are apt to suspect. Could death be supposed to hang on so pleasant and agreeable a tree? Or, do you imagine God so envious, as to



forbid you, who are his familiars and friends, to eat the fruit of this delicious tree, under the dreadful penalty of death? This is inconsistent with his infinite goodness, which you so largely experience, and with the beauty of this specious tree, and its fruit. And therefore there must be another meaning of this expression, which you do not understand. And thus he instilled that heresy, the first, indeed, which was heard of in the world, into the unwary woman, that there is a sin which does not deserve death, or, which is the same thing, a venial sin. The false prophet, the attendant on Antichrist, "who hath horns like a lamb, and speaketh as a dragon," Rev. 13:11, does, at this very day, maintain this capital heresy in the church of Rome; and nothing is still more usual with Satan than, by hope of impunity, to persuade men to sins.

VII. He adds the promise of a greater happiness: "Your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." He pre-supposes, what in itself was true and harmless, that man had a desire after some more perfect happiness, which he made to consist in his being made like to God, which John affirms to be, as it were, the principal mark of salvation, that "we shall be like God," 1 John 3:2. He says, further, that this likeness was to be joined with the opening of their eyes, and a greater measure of knowledge. Now, this is not unlike the doctrines of the Scripture, which affirm, that we "shall see God, and that as he is; and shall know him, even as we ourselves are known." And thus far, indeed, it might appear that Satan spoke not amiss, blending many truths, and those evident to the conscience, with his own lies, the more easily to deceive under the appearance of a true teacher. But herein the fraud lies concealed: 1st, That he teaches them not to wait for God's appointed time, but unadvisedly and precipitantly to lay hold on the promised felicity. Man cannot indeed too much love and desire perfection, if he does it by preparation and earnest expectation, preparing himself in a course of holy patience, and subjection to the will of God, desiring not to anticipate, even for a moment, the good pleasure of God. 2dly, That he points out a false way, as if the eating of that tree was either a natural, or, more probably, a moral mean, to attain the promised bliss, and as if God had appointed this, as a necessary requisite, without which there was no possibility of coming to a more intimate communion with himself, and a more perfect degree of wisdom; nor, in fine, of obtaining that state in which, knowing equally good and evil, they would be no longer in danger of any degree of deception. And it is most likely he perverted the meaning of the name of the tree. But all these were mere delusions.

VIII. At last this disguised teacher appeals to the knowledge of God himself: "God doth know". Most interpreters, both Jewish and Christian, ancient and modern, interpret these words as if Satan would charge God with open malignity and envy, forbidding this tree lest he should be obliged to admit man into a partnership in his glory. And indeed, there is no blasphemy so horrid, that Satan is ashamed of. But we are here to consider, whether such a shocking and bare-faced blasphemy would not rather have struck man with horror, who had not yet entertained any bad thoughts of God, than recommend itself by any appearance of probability. For is it credible that a man in his right senses could be persuaded that the acquisition of wisdom and a likeness to God depended on a tree, so that he should obtain both these by eating of it, whether God would or not? And then, that God, whom man must know to be infinitely great and good, was liable to the passion of envy, a plain indication of malignity and weakness; in fine, that there was such a virtue in that tree that, on tasting it, God could not deprive man of life? For all these particulars are to be believed by him, who can imagine that out of envy God had forbidden him the use of that tree. It does not seem consistent with the subtlety of Satan, to judge it advisable to propose

to man things so absurd, and so repugnant to common notions, and the innate knowledge which he must have had of God. May it not be more proper to take that expression for a form of an oath? As Paul himself says, 2 Cor. 11:11, "God knoweth." And thus the perjured impostor appealed to God as witness of what he advanced.

IX. Some think that Adam was not deceived, and did not believe what the serpent had persuaded the woman to; but rather fell out of love to his wife, whom he was unwilling to grieve; and therefore, though he was conscious of a divine command, and not exposed to the wiles of Satan, yet, that he might not abandon her in this condition, he tasted the fruit she offered, probably believing that this instance of his affection for the spouse whom God had given him, if in any measure faulty, might be easily excused. To this they refer the apostle's words, 1 Tim. 2:14: "For Adam was not deceived; but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." But this carries us off from the simplicity of the divine oracles. The design of the apostle is plainly to show that the woman ought not to exercise any dominion over her husband, for two reasons, which he urges. 1st. Because Adam was first created as the head; and then Eve, as a help meet for him. 2dly. Because the woman showed she was more easily deceived; for, being deceived first, she was the cause of deceiving her husband; who was likewise deceived, though not first, but by her means. For we commonly find, in Scripture, that some things seem to be absolutely denied, which we are to understand only as denied in a restrictive sense. John 6:27, and Phil. 2:4, are instances of this. Nor can we conceive how Adam, when he believed that what he did was forbidden by God, and that if he did it he should forfeit the promised happiness, nay, incur most certain death (for all this he must know and believe, if he still remained uncorrupted by the wiles of Satan), would have taken part in the crime, only to please his wife. Certainly, if he believed that the transgression of the divine command, the contempt of the promised felicity, and his rashly exposing himself to the danger of eternal death, could be excused only by his affection for his wife, he no less shamefully erred, nor was less deceived, yea, perhaps he was more, than his consort herself. Nor can it be concluded from his answer to God, in which he throws the blame, not on the serpent's deceit, but on the woman whom God had given him, that the man fell into this sin, not so much by an error in the understanding, as giving way to his affection. For this subverts the whole order of the faculties of the soul; since every error in the affection supposes some error in the understanding. This was doubtless an error, and indeed one of the greatest, to believe that a higher regard was to be paid to his affection for his wife, than to the divine command. It was a considerable error, to think that it was an instance of love to become an accomplice in sin, because it is the duty of love to convince the sinner, and, as far as may be, restore him to the favour of God; which certainly Adam would have done, had he been entirely without error. In whatever light, therefore, we view this point, we are obliged to own that he was deceived. The only apology Adam would make, seems to be, that his beloved consort had, by her insinuations, which she had learned from the serpent, persuaded him also; and that he was not the first in that sin, nor readily suspected any error or deception by her, who was given him as an help by God.

X. It cannot be doubted that Providence was concerned about this fall of our first parents. It is certain that it was foreknown from eternity: none can deny this, but he who sacrilegiously dares to venture to deny the omniscience of God. Nay, as God, by his eternal decree, laid the plan of the whole economy of our salvation, and preconceived succession of the most important things, presupposes the sin of man, it could not therefore happen unforeseen by God. And this is the

most evident, because, according to Peter, "he (Christ) was foreordained before the foundation of the world," and that as the Lamb whose blood was to be shed, 1 Pet. 1:19, 20; which invincible argument Socinus knew not how otherwise to elude, but by this ridiculous assertion, "that after men had sinned, Christ indeed came to abolish their sins; but that he would have come, notwithstanding, though they had never sinned." But as this idle assertion is unscriptural, nay antiscritptural, so it is not apposite to this place. For the order of Peter's words obliges us to interpret them concerning Christ's being foreknown as a lamb to be slain—to shed his blood—to be the price of our redemption. And he likewise speaks, Acts 5:23, of this "determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," according to which Christ was delivered into the hands of wicked men. Since, therefore, Christ was foreknown from eternity, as one to be slain for the sins of men, man's sin was also necessarily foreknown.

XI. And if foreknown, it was also predetermined: thus Peter, in the place just quoted, joins together the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. Nor can God's prescience of future things be conceived, but in connexion with his decree concerning them.

XII. From all this may be inferred, by a plain consequence, that man could not but fall on account of the infallibility of the divine prescience, and of that necessity, which they call a necessity of consequence. For it is inconsistent with the divine perfection, that any decree of God should be rendered void, or that the event should not be answerable to it. It is the prerogative of Jehovah to say, "My counsel shall stand," Is. 46:10. His "counsels of old are faithfulness and truth," Is. 25:1. God himself has ratified the stability of his purposes by an oath, the more certainly to declare "the immutability of his counsel," Heb. 6:17. "The Lord of hosts hath sworn, saying, Surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand," Is. 14:24.

XIII. The infallibility of the event, as to man's sin, may be proved by another argument, if we only attend to that subordination by which all creatures depend on God, in their operations. For it is not possible that God should, by his almighty concurrence, influence any creature to act, and yet that creature suspend its acting. And if God should not influence to the moral goodness of that natural action, the creature could not, without that influence, perform that action morally good. This is evident from the nature of God and the creature: as he cannot ineffectually influence his creatures to act, so they cannot but act when under his influence. These things being supposed, as they are evident to any person of attention, it is impossible that man can abstain from reasoning, willing, and eating, where God influences to these acts by his almighty concurrence. Nor is it any more possible that man can reason, will, and eat in a holy manner, if God, by his almighty concurrence, does not influence the holiness of it. Supposing, therefore, that God had afforded his influence to the natural act of reasoning, willing, eating, as he actually did, but not the moral goodness of those acts, as he did not; it could not otherwise be, but that man should act at that time, and perform his action wrong. All this holds true, not only of this first sin of man, but of all other sins. I see not, therefore, why we may not boldly maintain these things, as they are evidently true; and more especially, as they tend to the glory of God, and to demonstrate his supereminence, and the absolute dependance of the creatures upon him, as much in their operations, as in their existence. Should those of the contrary Pelagian sentiments pervert these truths, it will be at their peril. Nor ought we so much to regard that, as to be induced to conceal the truth on their account.

XIV. However, it will not be amiss to insist a little longer on this subject; that all the apparent harshness of this doctrine may be entirely removed by an evident demonstration of the truth; which we think we shall be able to effect, by beginning with the more evident truths, flowing from each other in one continued chain of arguments, in such a manner, as to gain the assent even of the most obstinate.

XV. And first, I think, it will be readily granted, that there is but one first cause; that all other causes so depend upon that, both in existing and acting, as without it to be able neither to exist nor to act. Paul inculcated this upon the Athenians, Acts 17:28: "In him we live, and move, and have our being." Nor, indeed, can the most powerful monarch in the world, such as the Assyrian was in the time of Isaiah, any more move without God, than the axe without him that heweth therewith, or "the saw without him that shaketh it," Is. 10:15.

XVI. Reason, in this, concurs with Scripture. For if there were any cause besides God which could act independently of him, it would follow, there were more first principles than one; as Thomas Aquinas reasons well in his *Secund. sentent. distinct. 37, quæst. 2. art. 2.*; whose reasoning, as it is both solid, and very much to the purpose, we shall not scruple to give in his own words. "It is," says he, "essential to the first principle, that it can act without the assistance and influence of a prior agent; so that if the human will could produce any action of which God was not author, the human will would have the nature of a first principle."

XVII. Though they endeavour to solve this, by saying that, notwithstanding the will be of itself capable of producing an action without the influence of a prior agent, yet it has not its being from itself, but from another; whereas the nature of a first principle is to be self-existent. But it seems inconsistent to say that what has not its being of itself can yet act of itself; for what is not of itself cannot continue of itself. For all the power of acting arises from the essence, and the operation from the power; consequently, what has its essence from another, must also have its power and operation from that other. Moreover, though this reply denies that it is simply the first, yet we cannot but see that it is the first agent, if its acting cannot be referred to some prior agent as the cause. Thus far Thomas Aquinas.

XVIII. Nor does God only concur with the actions of second causes when they act, but also influences the causes themselves to act; because the beginning of actions depends, if not more, at least not less, on God, than their progress. This opinion is not unhappily expressed in the Roman Catechism, published by the decree of the council of Trent, at the command of Pope Pius V. Part I. on the first article of the Creed, No 22, to this purpose: "But God not only by his providence preserves and governs all things that exist; but he likewise, by a secret energy, so influences those that move and act to motion and action, that, though he hinders not the efficiency of second causes, yet he prevents or goes before it; seeing his most secret power extends to each in particular: and, as the wise man\* testifies, reaches powerfully from one end to the other, and disposes all things sweetly. Wherefore it was said by the apostle, when declaring to the Athenians the God whom they ignorantly worshipped, He is not far from every one of us; for in him we live, and move, and have our being."

XIX. Moreover, as a second cause cannot act unless acted upon, and previously moved to act by the preventing and predetermining influence of the first cause; so, in like manner, that influence

of the first cause is so efficacious, as that supposing it, the second cause cannot but act: for it is unworthy of God to imagine any concurrence of his to be so indifferent, as at last only to be determined by the co-operation of second causes; "as if the rod should shake him who lifts it up, or as if the staff should lift up what is not wood," Is. 10:15;—for so the words properly run; and the meaning is, that it is highly absurd to ascribe to an instrument of wood the raising and managing of what is of a more excellent nature, namely spirit. By this allegory is intimated the absurdity of that opinion which makes God to be determined in his actions by the creature.

XX. Didacus Alvarez, de Auxiliis Divinæ Gratiae, lib. iii. disput. 21, p. 163, makes use of the following argument against this, namely, the manner of concurring by a will of itself indifferent to produce this or the other effect, or its opposite, is very imperfect; because, in its efficacy, it depends on the concurrence of a second cause; and every dependance imports, in the thing which depends, some imperfection and inferiority in respect of him on whom it depends: therefore such a manner of concurrence cannot be ascribed to God, or agree with his will, which is an infinite and most perfect cause.

XXI. And then this insolvable difficulty likewise remains: If the second cause determines the concurrence of God, in itself indifferent in that act of determination, it will be independent of God, and so become the first cause. And if in one action it can act independently of God, why not in a second? If in the beginning of the action, why not also in the progress? Since the transition from non acting to acting, is greater than the continuing an action once begun.

XXII. As these things are universally true, they may be applied to those free actions of rational creatures in which there is a moral evil inherent; namely, that creatures may be determined to those actions by the efficacious influence of God, so far as they are actions, according to their physical entity. Elegantly to this purpose Thomas Aquinas, in the place just quoted. Since the act of sin is a kind of being,—not only as negations and privations are said to be beings, but also as things which in general exist are beings, because even these actions in general are ranked in that order; and if the actions of sin [as actions] are not from God,—it would follow that there would be some being which had not its essence from God; and thus God would not be the universal cause of all beings: which is contrary to the perfection of the first being.

XXIII. Neither does God only excite and predetermine the will of men to vicious actions, so far as they are actions; but he likewise so excites it, that it is not possible but, thus acted upon, it shall act. For if, upon supposition of that divine influence, it was possible for the created will not to act, these two absurdities would follow: 1st, That the human will could baffle the providence of God, and either give to or take from the divine influence and its efficacy. 2dly, That there could be some act in the creature of such weight as to resist the divine influence, and be independent of God. Nor do I imagine they will say that God concurs to the production of that action whereby his influence is resisted. But we have already refuted any concurrence as in itself indifferent, to be determined by the free will of the creatures.

XXIV. Further, the free will of man excited to actions cannot, according to its physical essence, give them a moral and spiritual goodness, without the divine providence influencing and concurring to that goodness. This is evident from what has been said. For, as moral goodness is a superior and more perfect degree of entity than a physical entity alone, and man in the physical

entity of his actions depends on God; so it is necessary he should much more depend on God in producing the moral goodness of his actions, so that the glory thereof may be rendered to God, as the first cause.

XXV. If all these truths, thus demonstrated, be joined and linked together, they will produce that conclusion which we laid down sect. xiii. For if all creatures depend on God in acting; if he not only concurs with them when they act, but excites them to act; if that excitation be so powerful as that, upon supposing it, the effect cannot but follow; if God with that same efficacy influences vicious actions, so far as they are physical; if the creature cannot give its actions their due moral goodness without God;—it infallibly follows, that Adam, God himself moving him to understand, will, and eat, could not but understand, will, and eat; and God not giving goodness to those actions, man could not understand and will in a right manner. Which was to be proved.

XXVI. But it does not follow that man was obliged to what was simply impossible. For it is only a consequential and eventual infallibility and necessity which we have established. God bestowed sufficient powers on man, even such as were proper for a creature, by which he could have overcome the temptation. But then he could not proceed to action without presupposing the divine concurrence. Who can deny, that man has a locomotive faculty, so sufficient in its kind that he requires no more? For will any affirm, without discovering his ignorance of the supremacy of God and the subordination of man, that man, by this locomotive faculty, can actually move independently of God, as the first cause? In like manner we affirm, that though God granted him such sufficient abilities to fulfil all righteousness, that he had no need of any further habitual grace, as it is called; yet all this ability was given him in such a manner, that he could act only dependently of the Creator and his influence, as we hinted, chap. ii. sect. xiii.

XXVII. Much less should it be said that man, by the above-mentioned acts of Divine Providence, was forced to sin: for he sinned with judgment and will; to which faculties, liberty, as it is opposed to compulsion, is so proper, nay essential, that neither judgment nor will can exist without it. And when we affirm that God foreordained and infallibly foreknew that man should sin freely, the sinner could not but sin freely; unless we would have the event not answer to the preordination and prescience of God. And it is so far from the decree of God, in the least to diminish the liberty of man in his acting, that, on the contrary, this liberty has not a more solid foundation than that infallible decree of God.

XXVIII. To make God the author of sin is such dreadful blasphemy, that the thought cannot without horror be entertained by any Christian. God, indeed, created man mutably good, infallibly foresaw his sin, foreordained the permission of that sin, really gave man sufficient powers to avoid it, but which could not act without his influence: and though he influenced his faculties to natural or physical actions, without influencing the moral goodness of those actions—all which appear from the event; yet God neither is, nor in any respect can be, the author of sin. And though it be difficult, nay impossible, for us to reconcile these truths with each other; yet we ought not to deny what is manifest, on account of that which is hard to be understood. We will religiously profess both truths, because they are truths, and worthy of God: nor can the one overturn the other; though in this our state of blindness and ignorance of God, we cannot thoroughly see the amicable harmony between them. This is not the alone nor single difficulty, whose solution the sober divine will ever reserve for the world to come.

XXIX. This is certain, that by this permission of sin, God had an opportunity of displaying his manifold perfections. There is a fine passage to this purpose in Clemens, Strom. lib. i.: "It is the greatest work of Divine Providence not to suffer the evil, arising from a voluntary apostasy, to remain unuseful, or in every respect to become noxious. For it is peculiar to divine wisdom and power, not only to do good (that being, so to speak, as much the nature of God, as it is the nature of fire to warm, or of light to shine), but much more to make the evil devised by others answer a good and valuable end, and manage those things which appear to be evil, to the greatest advantage."

XXX. It remains now, lastly, to consider how, as Adam in this covenant was the head of mankind, upon his fall all his posterity may be deemed to have fallen with him, and broken the covenant of God. The apostle expressly asserts this, Rom. 5:12: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον."

XXXI. To illustrate the apostle's meaning, we must observe these things: 1st, It is very clear to any not under the power of prejudice, that, when the apostle affirms that all have sinned, he speaks of an act of sinning, or of an actual sin; the very phrase, to sin, denoting an action. It is one thing to sin, another to be sinful, if I may so speak. 2dly, When he affirms all to have sinned, he under that universality likewise includes those who have no actual, proper, and personal sin, and who, as he himself says, "have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," verse 14. Consequently, these are also guilty of some actual sin, as appears from their death; but that, not being their own proper and personal sin, must be the sin of Adam, imputed to them by the just judgment of God. 3rdly, By these words, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, for that all have sinned, he gives the reason why he had asserted, that by the sin of one man death passed upon all. This, says he, ought not to astonish us, for all have sinned. If we must understand this of some personal sin of each, either actual or habitual, the reasoning would not have been just, and worthy of the apostle, but mere trifling; for his argument would be this: that by the one sin of one all were become guilty of death, because each in particular had, besides that one and first sin, his own personal sin; which is inconsequential. 4thly, The scope of the apostle is to illustrate the doctrine of justification he had before treated of. The substance of which consisted in this, that Christ, in virtue of the covenant of grace, accomplished all righteousness for his chosen covenant people, so that the obedience of Christ is placed to their charge, and they, on account thereof, are no less absolved from the guilt and dominion of sin, than if they themselves had done and suffered, in their own person, what Christ did and suffered for them. He declares that in this respect Adam was the type of Christ, namely, as answering to him. It is therefore necessary that the sin of Adam, in virtue of the covenant of works, be so laid to the charge of his posterity, who were comprised with him in the same covenant, that, on account of the demerit of his sin, they are born destitute of original righteousness, and obnoxious to every kind of death, as much as if they themselves, in their own persons, had done what Adam did. Unless we suppose this to be Paul's doctrine, his words are nothing but mere empty sound.

XXXII. The last words of this verse, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, are differently explained by divines, because the Greek phraseology admits of various significations: The principal explanations are three: 1st, Some render them, in so far, or, because all have sinned. For it is allowed that ἐφ' ᾧ frequently admits this sense; and thus it seems to be taken, 2 Cor. 5:4: ἐφ' ᾧ οὐ θέλομεν

ἐκδύσασθαι, not for that we would be unclothed; as if written, as Frobenius prints it, ἐπειδή, though Beza here greatly differs. 2dly, Others observe, it may be explained, with whom, i.e., who sinning, all have sinned. For ἐπὶ in a similar construction denotes a time in which something was done. Thus we say in Greek, ἐπ' ἔμοι μαιρακίω τοῦτο γέγονε, when I was a boy, this happened; and ἐπὶ κυνὶ, in the dog-days; and the apostle, Heb. 9:15, ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ, under the first testament. And then the meaning would be, that upon Adam's sinning, all are judged to have sinned. 3dly, Augustine and most of the orthodox have explained it, in whom. Which Erasmus in vain opposes, saying, that ἐπὶ, when signifying upon or in, is joined to the genitive case; as, ἐπ' οἴκου καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας also when denoting time; as, ἐπὶ καίσαρος Ὀκταβίου. In all this he is strangely mistaken. For, not to say anything now of time, it is certain that ἐπὶ, when joined to the dative, denotes in; as Matt. 14:8, ἐπὶ πίνακι, in a charger; and in this very context of Paul, verse 14, ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιωματι, in the similitude. And, which is more, ἐφ' ᾧ cannot sometimes be otherwise explained than by in which [or in whom]: as Matt. 2:4, ἐφ' ᾧ ὁ παράλυτος κατεκείμετο, wherein the sick of the palsy lay; and Luke 5:25, ἄρας ἐφ' ᾧ κατεμίειτο, took up that whereon he lay. Nor is it taken in this sense in the sacred writings only; but he might learn from Budæus, Commentar. ling. Græc. p. 506, that Aristotle used this phraseology in the same sense: Ἐφ' ᾧ μὲν ἡ θήλεια, ἐπὶ θατέρῳ δὲ ὁ ἄρρην ἐπιάζει· in the one the female, in the other the male, breeds. However, though we reckon none of these explanations to be impertinent, as they are all nearly to the same purpose; yet we give the preference to the last, because most emphatical, and very applicable to the apostle's scope. It is a bad way of interpreting Scripture to represent it as speaking in the feeblest sense; for the words are to be taken in their full import, where there is nothing in the context to hinder it.

XXXIII. Grotius really prevaricates, when he thus comments on the passage before us. "It is a common metonymy in the Hebrew, to use the word sin instead of punishment, and to sin instead of to undergo punishment; whence, extending this figure, they are said, by a metalepsis, *שׁוּט* to sin, who suffer any evil, even though they are innocent: as Gen. 31:36, and Job 6:24; where *שׁוּט* is rendered by *δυσπραγεῖν*, to be unhappy. Ἐφ' ᾧ here denotes through whom, as ἐπὶ with the dative is taken, Luke 5:5, Acts, 3:36, 1 Cor. 8:11, Heb. 9:17. Chrysostom on this place says, 'On his fall, they who did not eat of the tree are from him all become mortal.' "

XXXIV. This illustrious person seems to have wrote without attention, as the whole is very impertinent. 1st, Though we allow that sin does sometimes metonymically denote the punishment of sin, yet we deny it to be usual in Scripture, that he who undergoes punishment, even while innocent, may be said to sin. Grotius says it is frequent, though he neither does nor can prove it by any one example; which is certainly bold and rash. Crellius, confuting his book on the satisfaction of Christ, brings in the saying of Bathsheba to David, 1 Kings 1:21, "I and my son Solomon shall be counted offenders;" that is, says he, we shall be treated as offenders, or, be ruined. But a sinner, or even sin, and to sin, are different things. The former is said of Christ, 2 Cor. 5:21; but not the latter, on any account. Moreover, to be a sinner does not signify, in the passage alleged, to undergo punishment, without any regard to a fault or demerit, but to be guilty of aiming at the kingdom, and of high treason, and as such to be punished. The testimonies advanced by Grotius are so foreign, that they seem not to have been examined by that great man. For neither in the Hebrew do we find *שׁוּט*, to sin, nor in the Greek version, *δυσπραγεῖν*; nor do the circumstances admit that what is there said of sin, or mistake, can be explained of punishment. It is necessary, therefore, to suppose that either Grotius had something else in his



view, or that here is a typographical error. 2ndly, Though we should grant, which yet we do not in the least, that to sin sometimes denotes to undergo punishment, yet it cannot signify this here; because the apostle in this place immediately distinguishes between death as the punishment, and sin as the meritorious cause, "and death by sin." And by this interpretation of Grotius, the apostle's discourse, which we have already shown is solid, would be an insipid tautology. For where is the sense to say, "So death passed upon all, through whom all die?" 3dly, Grotius discovers but little judgment in his attempt to prove that ἐφ' ᾧ signifies through whom: certainly Luke 5:5, ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματί σου does not signify through thy word, but at thy word, or, as Beza translates, at thy command. And, Heb. 9:17, ἐπὶ νεκροῖς does not signify through the dead, but when dead, and rather denotes a circumstance of time. Acts 3:16 is alleged with a little more judgment, and 1 Cor. 8:11 not improperly. But it might be insisted, that ἐπ' ἐμοί ἐστὶ signifies, it is owing to me, that the meaning should be, to whom it was owing that all sinned. Which interpretation is not altogether to be rejected. Thus the Scholiast, ἐφ' ᾧ Ἀδάμ, δι' ὃν. And if there was nothing else couched under this, I would easily grant Grotius this explanation of that phraseology. 4thly, It cannot be explained, consistently with divine justice, how without a crime death should have passed upon Adam's posterity. Prosper reasoned solidly and elegantly against Collator, c. 20: "Unless, perhaps, it can be said that the punishment, and not the guilt, passed on the posterity of Adam; but to say this is in every respect false. For it is too impious to judge so of the justice of God; as if he would, contrary to his own law, condemn the innocent with the guilty. The guilt therefore is evident, where the punishment is so; and a partaking in punishment shows a partaking in guilt; that human misery is not the appointment of the Creator, but the retribution of the judge." If, therefore, through Adam all are obnoxious to punishment, all too must have sinned in Adam. 5thly, Chrysostom also is here improperly brought in, as if from Adam he derived only the punishment of death, without partaking in the guilt. For the homily from which the words are quoted begins thus: "When the Jew shall say, How is the world saved by the obedience of one, namely, Christ? You may reply, How was the world condemned by one disobedient Adam?" Where it is to be observed, 1st, That he supposes the miseries of mankind to proceed from God, as a judge, who cannot justly condemn, but for sin. 2ndly, That he compares the condemnation of the world by Adam's disobedience with its salvation by Christ's obedience. But this last is imputed to believers, and deemed to be theirs; and therefore Adam's sin is in like manner imputed to all. As also Gregory of Nazianzen, quoted by Vossius, Hist. Paleg. lib. ii. P. 2. p. 163, said, that Adam's guilt was his. "Alas! my weakness!" says he, "for I derive my weakness from the first parent."

XXXV. But we only understand this of Adam's first sin. We cannot agree with those who absurdly tell us that Adam's other sins were also imputed to us; for Paul, when treating on this subject, Rom. 5, every where mentions transgression in the singular number; nay expressly, verse 18, one transgression, by which guilt passed upon all. And the reason is manifest; for Adam ceased to be a federal head when the covenant was once broken, and whatever sin he was afterwards guilty of was his own personal sin, and not chargeable on his posterity, unless in so far as God is sometimes pleased to visit the sins of the fathers on the children: in which Adam has now nothing peculiar above other men. So much for the violation of the covenant by man.

## **Chapter IX: Of the Abrogation of the Covenant of Works on the Part of God**

I. HAVING sufficiently considered the violation of the covenant by sin, let us now inquire whether, and how far, it is made void or abrogated by God himself.

II. And first, we are very certain that there are many things of immutable and eternal truth in this covenant; which we reckon up in this order. 1st, The precepts of the covenant, excepting that probatory one, oblige all and every one to a perfect performance of duty, in what state soever they are. 2dly, Eternal life, promised by the covenant, can be obtained upon no other condition than that of perfect, and in every respect complete, obedience. 3dly, No act of disobedience escapes the vengeance of God, and death is always the punishment of sin. But these maxims do not exclude a surety, who may come under engagements in man's stead, to undergo the penalty and perform the condition. But we shall speak of this afterwards, and now proceed to what has been proposed.

III. It is indeed a most destructive heresy to maintain that man, sinful and obnoxious to punishment, is not bound to obedience. For by no misconduct of man can God forfeit his right and supremacy. But the right and supremacy of God requires that man, and even every creature, be subject in all respects to God, so far as possible. Moreover, the rational creature, such as sinful man is, and does continue to be, can be subject, not only to the natural, but also to the moral providence of God; nor only to his vindictive justice, but also to his legislative authority: and as he can, so he ought to be subject to him, as to the obligation of obedience; because every possible subjection is essential to the creature.

IV. If the sinner, who deserves punishment, were not subject to the law, he could no longer sin; and therefore by one sin he would set himself free from the danger of further sinning. For where no law is binding, there is no transgression, no sin, which John defines to be ἀνομία, "the transgression of the law," 1 John 3:4. But nothing can be imagined more absurd, than that man by sin has acquired an impeccability.

V. Moreover, according to this hypothesis, all sinners would be equal, and an equal degree of punishment remain for every one: which is contrary both to sound reason and scripture, where the inequality of sins and punishment is so often inculcated.

VI. There is a plain passage, Gal. 5:3, which confirms, that even by the promulgation of the new Gospel covenant, the breakers of the covenant, who are without Christ, are not set free from that obligation of the law which demands perfect obedience, but continue "debtors to do the whole law."

VII. Nay, even in a human court, the penal compact is deemed an additional compact, adding to the principal convention, and consequently not abrogating, but accumulating, the former obligation. Much less at the bar of God can the obligation to punishment, arising from the violation of the covenant, abrogate the primary and principal obligation of the law, whereby the covenant was ratified.

VIII. Arminius, therefore (in *epist. præstantium virorum*, p. 173), very absurdly denies that God, when man once fell from the state of innocence, and became obnoxious to punishment, can of right require obedience of man; as if God had forfeited his right by man's disobedience. He makes use of these arguments: 1st, Because when man is in a state of sin, he is not in covenant with God; therefore, there is no contract between God and man by which he can require obedience: for by what reward, what punishment, can he give sanction to the law, since man, for the disobedience already committed, has forfeited the reward, and is become obnoxious to punishment? 2dly, As God has, because of sin, deprived man of ability and power to fulfil the law, so, by this very thing, he has signified that he will no longer require man to fulfil it, unless he restore his ability; nay, he cannot in justice do it. If any shall say, could therefore the creature be exempted from the right or authority of the Creator, as no longer to be bound to obey him? he answers, yes, indeed, if the creature be accursed, and the Creator reckon it unworthy to require obedience from it; for it is the highest punishment so to conclude the sinner under sin as not to require any more obedience from him, that being an evidence of irreconcilable anger; namely, in that state. 3dly, The law itself, to be performed, is such as it would be unbecoming it should be performed by a sinner who is out of the favour of God. He is commanded to have God for his God; to love, honour, and adore him; to put his trust in him, to use his name with reverence, &c. Is it probable that such an obedience is required of him who is under the curse of God? Thus far Arminius, whose arguments deserve to be carefully examined.

IX. We begin with the first. Arminius supposes a great many things in this argument, which we cannot admit; such as, that all the obligation of man arises from the covenant; that the law does not oblige but in so far as it is enforced by rewards and punishments; that God cannot threaten a greater punishment, after man is once become obnoxious to the penalty. Now, since we deny all this, so, if we prove them to be false, as we hope to do, there will not remain the least appearance of force in this argument. The obligation of man to obedience is not founded, first and principally, on a covenant, but in the supereminent sovereignty, majesty, and holiness of God; and every rational creature, from a consideration of these, is bound to be subject to his sovereignty, adore his majesty, and form himself according to the example of his holiness. God would not be the absolute sovereign, if any rational creature existed which was not bound to take the rule of its actions from him, and which therefore, in regarding its actions, was not subject to God. God would not be the Supreme Majesty, if there were any rational creature who was not bound to acknowledge, worship, adore, and be subject to him in every respect. God would not be perfect in holiness, if any rational creature existed who was not bound to acknowledge that holiness, as most worthy of its imitation. As God is such a being, he cannot but require to be acknowledged to be so. The creature cannot acknowledge him in this manner without owning its obligation, at the same time, to obey him, who is the first, the most high and most holy God. Which we have already explained and proved more fully, chap. iii. sect. viii. Moreover, it is not true, that the law is not binding, but because of the sanction of rewards and punishments. The principal obligation of the law arises from the authority of the lawgiver, and the perfect equity of all his commands. Though God had enforced his law neither by rewards nor punishments, we had been no less bound to obedience: lest self-love, whereby we are led to obtain the reward and avoid the penalty, should be the only motive to stir us up to obey God, the reverence of the Supreme Being, and the love of holiness, are to hold the chief place here. In fine, it is also false, that no further punishment will be inflicted, after that man, having once broken the covenant, is become obnoxious to the penalty; for there are degrees in condemnation. And if that were true, it

would not take off the obligation to obedience. It would not be lawful for a robber, condemned to be burnt alive, or broken on the wheel, or to the most cruel death that man can devise, to commit, in the mean time, a new capital crime. For, as we have said, the obligation arises neither primarily nor chiefly from the penal sanction, but from the authority of the lawgiver.

X. To the second, I answer: 1st, Man himself is not only the meritorious, but also the physical, cause of his own impotence, which he brought upon himself by his misconduct: as if an insolent and naughty servant should put out the candle, by which he ought to carry on his master's business; or, by drinking to excess, willingly render himself unfit for the service of his master. In this case, that master does by no means forfeit his right of requiring every piece of service properly due to him, and of punishing that naughty servant for non-performance. 2dly, Though God, as a just judge, had deprived man of ability to fulfil the law, yet, on that account, he both will in point of right, and can, require the performance of it by man. He can very justly; because no wickedness of man, justly punished by God, can diminish God's authority over him; otherwise, it would be in man's power, at his own pleasure, either to extend or limit the authority of God; which is contrary to the immutable perfection and blessedness of God. He also does require this for wise reasons; of which this is one, that sinful man may, by that means, be convinced of his irreparable misery, upon finding such things justly required of him, which he has rendered himself incapable to perform. And since he is as unwilling as unable to obey God, he is the more inexcusable, the more clearly the duty of the law is inculcated upon him. 3dly, It is absurd to say, that it is the greatest punishment that God inflicts on man, not to require obedience from the rebellious creature. It is indeed true, that the creature ought to reckon it a part of its happiness, to have the glory of obeying. And it is the punishment of the creature, if, by the just judgment of God, it is condemned never to perform what is incumbent, and may be acceptable to God. But it is another thing to say, that God will not require obedience from it. If God requires not obedience, the creature owes none; if it owes none, it does not act amiss by disobeying; and if it does not amiss by disobeying, that cannot be the highest punishment for it. And thus Arminius destroys his own argument. He would have spoken rightly, had he said, that to be condemned by the just judgment of God, not to perform that obedience which God, consistently with his justice and holiness, requires of it, is the greatest punishment which can be inflicted on the creature. 4thly. Should we deal more closely with a bold disputant, we might say, that there is a contradiction in the adjunct, when he supposes God addressing the creature thus, I will not have thee to perform any obedience to me. For if any calls for obedience, he presupposes, not only some authority by which he can require it, but also a command which requires obedience, and which must be obeyed. Whoever, by his authority, gives such a command, requires that obedience be yielded to it. If he should give another command to this purpose, I will not have you to obey me, he would then contradict himself; nay, contradict the nature of the command, which consists in an obligation to obedience. 5thly. It is the highest absurdity imaginable, that a creature shall, by its sin, obtain exemption from the authority of the Creator, and be no longer bound to obey him. If this is true, then the first of all deceivers spoke truth, that man, by eating the forbidden fruit, would become as God. Whoever is exempted from the authority of the Creator, is under the authority of none; is at his own disposal; in fine, is God. For to be at one's own disposal, is to be God. How ridiculous is this!

XI. The third argument is no less weak. For, 1st, The sum of the law is, to love God with all the heart, mind, and strength, and our neighbour as ourselves. As this is reasonable in itself, so it

cannot but be proposed as such by God to man; for conscience itself, even that of the most abandoned, will bear witness with God to the reasonableness of this. What! Is it not certain, that God is the chief good; consequently, the most amiable? Can he be unwilling that any should acknowledge him as the chief good, or to be what he really is, what he cannot but be? Is he not the supreme majesty? Can he be unwilling to be honoured as such, with the most submissive reverence? 2dly, Arminius urges, that the law also commands us to trust in God. It does so: what can be more right, what more becoming, than that man, even a sinner, should be bound to believe the testimony of God; should give him this glory, namely, that he alone both can and will justify the ungodly; that he should seek him even when angry; hunger and thirst after his righteousness; and willingly endeavour to live for his glory, namely, that God may be glorified and admired in him by his justification and glorification by free grace; and that he should neither neglect the salvation which God has most surely revealed, nor despise or reject the Saviour? This is to trust in God: and will any pious person ever doubt of the probability, nay, even of the most infallible certainty, that man, under the curse of God till now, is called upon to thus trust? 3dly. He will still urge, that when he speaks of trusting in God, he means thereby that full assurance of mind whereby we hold God to be our God; that at least this is also enjoined by the law. We are to consider this more distinctly. When the law enjoins us to take God for our God, it is to be understood in this manner,—to take him for our Creator, Preserver, Lawgiver, and Supreme Lord. This is absolutely and without distinction enjoined upon all men. But if we understand it thus—to take him for our saving good, this is enjoined upon none, but in that method which the revealed will of God prescribes. And this is the way either that man shall obtain the salvation of God by a most perfect personal obedience, as proposed to Adam in innocence—which is now impossible for the sinner; or, that sinful man be converted, and united by faith to Christ; then examine himself, whether he be in the faith and in Christ; which being discovered, he may then indeed glory and exult in God his Saviour: this is the way that is now proposed in the Gospel. But the law enjoins us to embrace every truth by faith, which God either has revealed or shall reveal, and to walk agreeably to that truth. But the law nowhere enjoins the impenitent sinner to look upon God as the God of his salvation. Nay, the law, as it was given to Adam himself, enjoins him to believe the contrary. And thus I imagine I have fully dispatched the quaint subtleties of Arminius; that it is of immutable right that man, even under sin and guilt, is still under obligation to obey the law.

XII. We proceed a step further, to show, that man, even after the violation of the covenant, continues bound not only to obedience, but to a perfect performance of duty. Paul said of those who are without the covenant of grace, Gal. 5:3, that they are "debtors to do the whole law." Nor can it be otherwise. For the law of the covenant, as to the natural precepts, is immutable, being the transcript of the image of God, which is no less immutable than God himself. For, if the image which had the nearest resemblance is changed, and yet continues still to resemble its archetype or original, the archetype itself must also necessarily be changed. But the law of the covenant did undoubtedly require perfect obedience.

XIII. Besides, if we imagine any abatement and relaxation of the law after sin, we are to conceive that God addressed sinful man after this manner: "I formerly commanded thee to esteem me as the supreme truth, thy chief good, and thy sovereign Lord; and consequently to assent, with the fullest assurance of faith, to all my precepts; to love me with all thy soul, and all thy strength, and esteem nothing preferable to that which is acceptable to me; to employ thy all

in my service, at all times and in all things; to be at my command and beck, and never venture on any thing that is not agreeable to my will. But now, since thou hast once presumed to disobey me, I require no more for the future, but that thou esteem me indeed to be the truth, but not infallible; to be thy good, but not the chief; to be thy lord, but not the supreme: and I allow thee to doubt of some of my testimonies; to love other things besides and above me; to place thy happiness in other things besides my favour; in fine, to depend on me in some things, but in other things to act at thy own discretion." If all these be absurd and unworthy of God, as they certainly are, it is also absurd and unworthy of God to abate and relax any thing of his law. But if these general propositions are of immutable truth; that as God is the chief good, he is at all times and by all persons to be loved with the whole heart; as he is the supreme lord, none can ever, under any pretence, act but according to his command; the most perfect performance of every duty must be the manifest consequence of all this.

XIV. Again, to perform duty perfectly, as every one will allow, is better than to do it in a slight manner. For all the goodness of duty consists in its agreement with the rule and directory of it. There must therefore be a certain rule, enjoining that perfection, which is a greater degree of goodness. If God has prescribed such a rule, it must certainly bind man to conform himself to it.

XV. The conscience of man, upon due attention, cannot but assent to these things. To make this appear, I shall adjoin two excellent passages, one from Epictetus, the other from the emperor Julian. The former speaks thus, Dissertat. lib. ii. c. 11: "Having found a rule. let us keep it inviolably, and not extend so much as a finger beyond it." The latter thus, Orat. 1: "There is an ancient law given by him who first taught mankind philosophy, and which runs thus: that all, who have an eye to virtue and to honesty, ought, in their words and actions, in society and in all the affairs of this life, both small and great, to endeavour altogether after honesty." The law therefore of the old covenant continues to bind all mankind, without exception, to a perfect performance of duty.

XVI. The second thing, which we said, sect. II. was immutable in the covenant of works, was this; that eternal life was not obtainable on any other condition, but that of perfect obedience: as may thus be invincibly proved; for, by virtue of this general rule, it was necessary for Christ to be "made under the law," Gal. 4:4, and to "fulfil all righteousness;" and that for this end, "that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled," Rom. 8:4. But if this righteousness had not been sacred and inviolable, Christ would have been under no necessity to submit to the covenant of the law, in order to merit eternal life for his people. This therefore is evident, that there ought to be a merit of perfect obedience, on which a right to eternal life may be founded. Nor is it material whether that perfect obedience be performed by man himself, or by his surety.

XVII. The third thing which we affirmed, as an unchangeable truth, regards the penal sanction; for that immutable and indispensable justice, which we already defended by so many arguments, chap. v. §. xviii. seq., certainly requires this; so that there is no occasion to add any thing further.

XVIII. Since then these three things, the law, the promise, and the threatening, constitute the entire nature of the covenant as proposed by God, if they stand firm, one may conclude that, though man has really, on his part, broken the covenant, yet no abrogation of the covenant is made on the part of God. But, on duly weighing the matter, we must also acknowledge some

abrogation on the part of God: as may be evidently inferred from the substitution of the new covenant of grace. For thus the apostle has taught us to reason, Heb. 8:13: "In that he saith, a new covenant, he hath made the first old." For, though the abrogation of the old does not necessarily infer the substitution of a new; yet the substitution of a new does certainly import the abrogation of the old. It is indeed true, that the apostle, in this place, does not speak precisely of the covenant of works, but of the old economy of the covenant of grace, which he says is abrogated. But yet we properly build on his reasoning, which we may also and ought to apply to this subject, namely, that every substitution of a new covenant supposes the abrogation of an old one.

XIX. That abrogation on the part of God consists in this, that God has declared that no man can, by virtue of this covenant, have friendship with him, or obtain eternal life; so that he has declared all to have forfeited the promise of the covenant, and the hope of enjoying that promise according to that covenant. This is what the apostle says, "There is not now a law which can give life, as that righteousness should be by the law," Gal. 3:21. To this purpose is the phrase, "what the law could not do," Rom. 8:3.

XX. And that covenant is so really abrogated, that it can on no account be renewed. For, should we imagine God saying to man, "If, for the future, thou canst perfectly keep my law, thou shalt thereby acquire a right to eternal life," God would not by such words renew this very covenant of works; for sin is now pre-supposed to exist, which is contrary to that perfection of obedience which the covenant of works requires. God would therefore transact here with man on a different condition, whereby, forgiving the former sin, he would prescribe a condition of an obedience less perfect than that which he stipulated by the covenant of works; which, excluding all sin, knew nothing of forgiveness of sin. Nay, such a transaction would be so far from a renewal of the covenant of works, that it would rather manifestly destroy it; for the penal sanction makes a part of that covenant, whereby God threatened the sinner with death: so that, if he forgave him without a due satisfaction, he would act contrary to the covenant and his own truth.

XXI. The law therefore remains as the rule of our duty, but abrogated as to its federal nature; nor can it be the condition, by the performance of which man may acquire a right to the reward. In this sense the apostle says, "We are not under the law," Rom. 6:14; namely, as prescribing the condition of life. There is indeed still an indissoluble connexion between perfect righteousness and eternal life, so that the last cannot be obtained without the first. But after that man, by falling from righteousness, had lost all his hope of the reward, God was at liberty either to punish the sinner, according to his demerit, or give him a surety to fulfil all righteousness in his stead.

XXII. There are learned men, who, besides this abolition of the covenant of works, which regards the possibility of giving life and justification, enumerate four other degrees of abolition in this order:—1st, Of condemnation, by Christ being proposed in the promise, and apprehended by faith. 2ndly, Of terror, or the power of the fear of death and bondage, by the promulgation of the new covenant, after the expiation of sin: which being once accomplished, they who are redeemed are under the law of the Redeemer. So that the same law, abolished in the Redeemer as the law of sin, becomes the law of the Saviour, and adjudges righteousness to those who are his. 3dly, Of that war or struggle with sin, by the death of the body. 4thly, Of all the effects of it, by the resurrection from the dead.

XXIII. But let us give our reasons, why we have hitherto doubted, whether these things are conceived and digested with sufficient accuracy. 1st, All the particulars here mentioned belong to the covenant of grace. But the covenant of grace does not abrogate, but supposes the abrogation of the covenant of works; because there could be no place for this, without the abrogation of the other, in the sense now mentioned. 2ndly, The covenant of grace is not the abolition, but rather the confirmation of the covenant of works, in so far as the Mediator has fulfilled all the conditions of that covenant, so that all believers may be justified, and saved, according to the covenant of works, to which satisfaction was made by the Mediator. This is the apostle's meaning, Rom. 3:31: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." And again, Rom. 8:4: "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us." "Which signifies," as the learned person whose opinion we are now examining comments on this place, "that what the law accounts for righteousness is fully bestowed on us; and consequently, that what merits the reward of the law becomes perfectly ours." 3dly, The very law of the covenant, which gave up the human sinner to sin, when his condition is once changed by union with Christ the surety, does now, without any abolition, abrogation, or any other change whatever, absolve the man from the guilt and dominion of sin, and bestow on him that sanctification and glorification, which are gradually to be brought to that perfection, which he shall obtain at the resurrection of the dead; as being constrained to bear witness to the justification of the covenant of grace. This is what the learned person not improperly says, in the words we have just quoted: "So that the same law, abolished in the Redeemer as the law of sin, becomes the law of the Saviour, and bestows righteousness on those who are his;" which he has at large and learnedly explained on Rom. 8:2. In a word, the same law, which was to man in innocence a commandment to life, and is to man in sin the law of sin, giving him up to the dominion and guilt of sin, becomes again in the Redeemer the law of the spirit of life, testifying that satisfaction was made to it by the Redeemer, and bestowing on man, who by faith is become one with the Redeemer, all the fruits of righteousness for justification, sanctification, and glorification. All the change is in the state of the man, none in the law of the covenant, according to which man, in whatever state he is, is judged. Which things seem not to have escaped the observation of the learned person himself, when, Summa Theolog. c. xxxi. §. 1, he speaks to this purpose: "Nevertheless when we say this, we mean, that this fourfold abolition and removal of the covenant concerning works to be done, which is connected with our own happiness, is founded on the same law: not that this could be done by virtue of the law in itself alone, but that the intervention of a surety and Redeemer made it, at last, possible to the law." I allow that what he calls the abolition of the covenant concerning works, is founded in the law of works: but I leave it to the reader's consideration, whether it is not a strange way of talking, to say, that "the abolition and removal of the law, is founded on the law itself, and that the intervention of a surety and Redeemer made it at last possible to the law;" namely, that itself should effect its own absolution and removal? From all which I conclude, that it would be more proper to treat of these things, when we speak of the fruits and effects of the covenant of grace, than when considering the abolition of the covenant of works: which is, on no account, abolished, but in so far as it is become impossible for man to attain to life by his own personal works.

## **THE ECONOMY OF THE DIVINE COVENANTS - BOOK II**



## Chapter I: Introduction to the Covenant of Grace

I. WHEN the covenant of works was thus broken by the sin of man, and abrogated by the just judgment of God, wretched man was cast headlong into the deepest gulf of ruin, whence there could be no escape. For, listening to the solicitation of the devil, and giving way to his own reasonings, he, in a most violent manner, withdrew himself from God, that he might be at his own disposal; and, like the prodigal son, Luke 15:12, throwing off his rightful subordination to God, sold and enslaved himself to the devil. All which were acts of the highest injustice; for man had no right thus to dispose of himself, nor the devil to accept of what was God's. Yet God, considering that by this rash and unjust action man was justly punished, did, by his righteous judgment, ratify all this for his further punishment; gave him up to himself, as the most wretched and foolish of masters; and to sin, as a cruel tyrant, which would continually force him to every abominable practice. "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient," Rom. 1:28. He also "gave them up unto vile affections," verse 26; that so "they might receive that recompence which was meet," verse 27. In fine, he delivered them up as slaves to the devil, to be "taken captive by him at his will," 2 Tim. 2:26. And all this according to that most equitable law: "Of whom a man is overcome, of the same he is brought in bondage," 2 Pet. 2:19.

II. Moreover, when man was no longer in covenant with God, he then became "without God and without hope in the world," Eph. 2:12. For it was impossible for him to devise any method, becoming to God, whereby, consistently with divine truth, justice, and holiness, he could be reconciled to God, and return again to his favour. The law of sin was also just, by which man was enslaved to sin, to the dominion and condemnation of it, and given up to the devil, as his tormentor. In which sense, he is said to be not only the captive of the devil, of the strong man, mentioned Matt. 12:29, but also the lawful captive, Isa. 49:24; for he had "the power of death," Heb. 2:14, and that by the law, 1 Cor. 15:56, "the strength of sin is the law" Nor could man contrive any way, whereby sin, condemning by a most equitable law, could itself be justly condemned by God.

III. But it pleased God, according to the riches of his unsearchable wisdom, to lay this breach of the legal covenant as a foundation for his stupendous works; for he took occasion to set up a new covenant of grace; in which he might much more clearly display the inestimable treasures of his all-sufficiency, than if every thing had gone well with man according to the first covenant: and thus he discovered what seemed to surpass all belief and comprehension, that God, who is true, just, and holy, could, without any diminution to, nay rather with a much more illustrious display of, his adorable perfections, become the God and Salvation of the sinner; for he found out that admirable way to reconcile the strictest vindictive justice with the most condescending mercy, so that the one should be no obstruction to the other. For so illustrious an exercise of these perfections there could have been no place under the covenant of works.

IV. If, therefore, any thing ought to be accounted worthy of our most attentive consideration, certainly it is the covenant of grace, of which we now attempt to treat. Here the way is pointed out to a Paradise far preferable to the earthly, and to a more certain and stable felicity than that from which Adam fell. Here a new hope shines upon ruined mortals, which ought to be the more acceptable, the more unexpectedly it comes. Here conditions are offered, to which eternal

salvation is annexed; conditions, not to be performed again by us, which might throw the mind into despondency; but by him, who would not part with his life, before he had truly said, It is finished! Here, with the brightest splendour, shine forth the wonderful perfections of our God—his wisdom, power, truth, justice, holiness, goodness, philanthropy, or goodwill to man, mercy, and what tongue can rehearse them all? Never were they before displayed on a more august theatre, to the admiration of all who behold them. Whoever, therefore, loves his own salvation, whoever longs to delight himself in the contemplation of the divine perfections, he must come hither, and deeply engage in holy meditations on the covenant of grace, which I think may not improperly be thus defined:—

V. The covenant of grace is a compact, or agreement, between God and the elect sinner; God on his part declaring his free good-will concerning eternal salvation, and every thing relative thereto, freely to be given to those in covenant, by and for the mediator Christ; and man on his part consenting to that good-will by a sincere faith.

## Chapter II: Of the Covenant between God the Father and the Son

I. IN order the more thoroughly to understand the nature of the covenant of grace, two things are above all to be distinctly considered. First, the covenant which intervenes between God the Father and Christ the Mediator. Secondly, That testamentary disposition by which God bestows, by an immutable covenant, eternal salvation, and every thing relative thereto, upon the elect. The former agreement is between God and the Mediator: the latter, between God and the Elect. This last pre-supposes the first, and is founded upon it.

II. When I speak of the compact between the Father and the Son, I thereby understand the will of the Father, giving the Son to be the head and Redeemer of the elect; and the will of the Son, presenting himself, as a sponsor or surety for them; in all which the nature of a compact and agreement consists. The Scriptures represent the Father, in the economy of our salvation, as demanding the obedience of the Son even unto death, and, upon condition of that obedience, promising him in his turn that name which is above every name, even that he should be the head of the elect in glory; but the Son, as presenting himself to do the will of the Father, acquiescing in that promise, and in fine, requiring by virtue of the compact, the kingdom and glory promised to him. When we have clearly demonstrated all these particulars from Scripture, it cannot, on any pretence, be denied, that there is a compact between the Father and the Son, which is the foundation of our salvation. But let us proceed distinctly. 1st, By producing such places of Scripture as speak only in general, but yet expressly, of this compact. 2dly, By more fully unfolding the particulars which complete or constitute this compact. 3dly, By invincibly proving the same from the nature of the sacraments, which Christ also made use of.

III. Christ himself speaks of this compact, in express words, Luke 22:29: Καὶ γὰρ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν, καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ μου βασιλείαν, "And I engage by covenant unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath engaged by covenant unto me." In which words the Lord Jesus says, that by virtue of some covenant or disposition he obtains a kingdom, as we also obtain it by virtue of the same.

IV. And, Heb. 7:22, where he is said to be "a surety of a better covenant," or testament. But he is called the surety of a testament, not principally on this account, because he engages to us for God and his promises, or, because he engages for us, that we shall obey; as Moses intervened as a surety between God and the Israelites, Exod. 19:3–8. For by how much Christ was greater than Moses, in so much he was also a surety, in a more excellent manner. His suretiship consists in this, that he himself undertook to perform that condition, without which, consistently with the justice of God, the grace and promises of God could not reach unto us; but being once performed, they were infallibly to come to the children of the covenant. Unless then we would make void the suretiship of Christ, and gratify the Socinians, the very worst perverters of Scripture, it is necessary we conceive of some covenant, the conditions of which Christ took upon himself; engaging in our name with the Father, to perform them for us; and that having performed them, he might engage to us for the Father, that we should certainly have grace and glory bestowed upon us.

V. Moreover, Gal. 3:17, Paul mentions a certain διαθήκη, covenant, or testament, "that was confirmed before of God in Christ." Where the contracting parties are, on one side God, on the

other Christ; and the agreement between both is ratified. But lest any should think that Christ is here only considered as the executor of the testament bequeathed to us by God, the apostle twice repeats, that Christ was not promised to us, or that salvation was not promised to us through Christ, though that be also true; but that the promises were made to Christ himself, verse 16. That Christ was that seed, ὃ ἐπαγγίλται, to which he had promised, or, to which the promise was made; namely, concerning the inheritance of the world and the kingdom of grace and glory. It is evident, therefore, that the word διαθήκη does here denote some covenant or testament, by which something is promised by God to Christ. Nor do I see what can be objected to this, unless by Christ we should understand the head, together with the mystical body, which with Christ is that one seed, to which the promises are made. This indeed we shall not refuse, if it also be admitted that Christ, who is the head, and eminently the seed of Abraham, be on no account excluded from these promises, especially as the promises made to his mystical body ought to be considered as made to himself; since he also himself hath "received gifts for men," Ps. 68:19.

VI. Nor ought those places to be omitted in which explicit mention is made of the suretiship of Christ; as Ps. 119:122: "Be surety for thy servant for good;" that is, as surety receive him into thy protection, that it may be well with him. In like manner, Isa. 38:14: "I am oppressed, undertake for me," be to me a surety and patron. And that none but Christ alone could thus undertake, God himself says, Jer. 30:21, "Who is this, לבו את ערב that engaged his heart," or appeased his heart by his suretiship, or sweetened his heart by a voluntary and fiducial engagement, or, in fine, pledged his very heart, giving his soul as both the matter and price of suretiship (for all these things are comprised in the emphasis of the Hebrew language) "to approach unto me," that he may expiate sin? These words also show what that suretiship or undertaking was which David and Hezekiah sought for, namely, a declaration of will to approach unto God, in order to procure the expiation of sins.

VII. In fine, we may refer to this point Zech. 6:13, "The counsel of peace shall be between them both;" namely, between the man whose name is The Branch and Jehovah, for no other two occur here. It will not be foreign to our purpose to throw some light on this place by a short analysis and paraphrase. In this and the preceding verse, there is a remarkable prophecy concerning the Messiah, whose person, offices, and glory, the prophet truly describes in a short, but lively manner, subjoining at last the cause of all these; namely, why the Messiah appeared as such a person, executed such offices, and obtained such a glory; namely, because of that counsel which was between him and the Father, the fruit of which, with respect to us, is "peace." Of the person of the Messiah he says, that he is איש, the "man," that is, true man; see Hos. 2:15; and, indeed, the most eminent among men; not אנוש or אדם, which words denote "wretched man," but איש ימינך, "the man of thy right hand." Ps. 80:17. Because Christ is not here considered as in the abasement of his misery, but as in the excellence of his glory. His name is the Branch, because sprung from God, Isa. 4:2, Zech. 1:12. A new root of a new offspring, or of the sons of God according to promise and regeneration—the second Adam; and, indeed, a branch which shall blossom from under himself; Aben Ezra, מאליו, from itself, which shall not be produced or propagated by any sowing or planting of man's hand, but shall spring from a virgin, by the peculiar power of the Deity. His office is to build the temple of the Lord, that is, the church of the elect, "which is the house of God," 1 Tim. 3:15; which Christ κατεσκεύασε framed, Heb. 3:4; and built, Matt. 16:18. Laying the foundation in his cross, and cementing it with his blood. But because, in the same breath, it is twice said, "he shall build the temple of the Lord," it may

suggest to our minds whether, besides the building of the church, which is the mystical body of Christ, the resurrection of Christ's own natural body may not be intended, which is called, "the building of the temple," John 2:19, 21; which being done, he will receive majesty, a name above every name, and sit on the throne of God, to execute his kingly and priestly office in glory. For a king to sit on a throne, is nothing strange, but for a priest, very much so; being contrary to the custom of the ancient priests in the Old Testament, who stood daily, often offering the same sacrifices; because their labour was ineffectual to remove the guilt of sin, Heb. 10:11, But Christ, having once offered up the one sacrifice of himself, and by it obtained eternal redemption, sat down for ever at the right hand of the Father, never to rise to offer a second time, Heb. 1:3, 9:12, 14. He now does what his session gives him a right to do—he makes intercession for his people, Rom. 8:34; as was ingeniously observed by James Altingius, Hept. iii. Dissert. 6. § 49. But whence does all this proceed, and what is the origin of such important things? "The counsel of peace," which is between "the man whose name is the Branch," and Jehovah, whose temple he shall build, and on whose throne he shall sit, Rev. 3:21. And what else can this counsel be, but the mutual will of the Father and the Son, which, we said, is the nature of the covenant? It is called a "counsel," both on account of the free and liberal good pleasure of both, and of the display of the greatest wisdom manifested therein. And a counsel of "peace," not between God and Christ, between whom there never was any enmity; but of peace to be procured to sinful man with God, and to sinners with themselves.

VIII. It seems, two things may be objected, to which we are briefly to answer. 1st. That by those two we are not to understand the Father and the Son, but the Jews and the Gentiles. 2dly. That here it is not the counsel, which is the original and cause of all these things, and which ought to have been expressed in the preterperfect or present tense; but the counsel, which is the fruit of Christ's intercession, of which the prophet speaks in the future tense. To the first, I answer, that this exposition is asserted but not proved. There is no distinct mention made of Jews and Gentiles in the preceding verses of this Chapter. And it is not lawful for us to add any thing to the text. What others allege concerning a priest and king, or the office of priest and king, or about the Jews of Jerusalem and Babylon, is quite forced. "Our explication," says the very learned De Dieu, who here is of the same opinion with us, "appears simple and plain." Neither is it new, since Jerome tells us that this verse was understood of the Father and the Son. To the second I reply, that nothing can oblige us to assent to it; as the words, by our analysis and explanation, yield a very just and profitable sense, and this covenant could not be expressed by a more significant term than that of a mutual counsel between the Father and the Son. What is added, with respect to the difference of tenses, seems to be of small moment; for that the tenses in Hebrew are often put one for the other, and the future for the present, none can be ignorant of, but they who are indifferently skilled in that language: Ps. 17:3, תמצא בל צרפתני "Thou hast tried me, and thou dost (or didst) find nothing;" literally, "thou shalt find." Such changes of tenses often occur in the same Psalm. Besides, something is then said to be done in Scripture, when it is declared to be solemnly done; of which instances are to be met with every where, see Acts 2:36. We will therefore fully explain the words thus: "The counsel of peace is between both." And if you entirely insist on the future tense, the meaning will be this: At the exaltation of Christ, and the peace advanced by him from heaven, there will be a manifest execution of this counsel. But we need not come to this; for if by this counsel we understand that agreement which subsisted between the Father and Christ—God-man—when, assuming human nature, he appeared as the surety, the Prophet might and ought to speak of it in the future tense; and he does so in a

beautiful order, ascending from the effects to the cause, in the following manner: Christ—God—man—shall build the spiritual temple of the Lord; for which he shall receive as a reward glorious majesty, and shall sit on the throne of God. And this needs not seem strange: for Christ, clothing himself with human flesh, will, by a certain compact, on which our peace is founded, promise to the Father that he will do all this. The Father, on the other hand, will promise thus to reward that service. In this manner every thing runs smoothly. See more of this, chap. III. §. 2–4.

IX. It is also a proof of this, that Christ, often in the Psalms and elsewhere, calls God the Father his God. See among other places, Ps. 22:4, and 45:8; Is. 49:4, 5 and John 20:17. Which is the form or manner of the covenant. In this sense Jacob promised, that "the Lord should be his God," Gen. 28:21; that is, that he would so frame his whole life as became one in covenant with God. The Israelites, also, when they solemnly renewed the covenant, Jos. 24:18, said, "We will serve the Lord, for he is our God." In like manner God promises, in the covenant, that he will be the God of his covenant people; that is, display the riches of his all-sufficiency for their salvation, Jer. 31:33: "This is my covenant, that I will make with the house of Israel: I will be their God." Deut. 26:17: "Thou hast avouched the Lord (thou hast made the Lord say), this day to be (that he will be) thy God." The very meaning of the word, which we render God, implies this: for אלה Eloah, derived from אלה, he swore or adjured, denotes him, whose prerogative it is to bind us, by oath, to love and faithful obedience to him, and to whom we ought, by oath, to give all obedience; and who on his part engages, that he will be all-sufficient to his faithful servants for salvation. He, therefore, who professes Eloah to be his God, does, at the same time, by virtue of the covenant of God, call himself the servant of God: for עבד servant, is the correlate of אלה Eloah, or אלהים Elohim; as Ps. 86:2. אלהי אתה עבדך הושע, "preserve thy servant, O thou my God." And in this manner the Father calls Christ, in many places, his servant, Is. 49:5, 6. Besides, such a one professes, that he only depends on the promise and testimony of that covenant: in these things the whole nature and design of the covenant consists. As therefore Christ calls God the Father his God; and on the other hand, the Father calls Christ his servant, both of them do, by that name, indicate a compact of obedience and reward.

X. But we come now more particularly to discuss all the parts of this covenant, that it may not only appear, there subsists some covenant between Christ and the Father, but what that covenant is, and of what nature. The Contracting parties are, on the one hand, the Father, whom Christ calls my Lord, Ps. 16:2. On the other hand, the Son, whom the Father calls his servant, Is. 53:11. The law of the covenant is proposed by the Father, John 10:18: "This commandment have I received of my Father;" and John 12:49, "The Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment." To that law a promise is added by the Father, Is. 53:10–12, "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin [when his soul shall make itself an offering for sin], he shall see his seed," &c.: and Is. 49:6–8, "It is a light thing, that thou shouldst be my servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob," &c. On performing that law, the Son acquires a right to ask the reward, Ps. 2:8, "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Thus far the proposal of the covenant on the part of the Father. The acceptance on the part of the Son consists in this: that he willingly submitted himself to the law of the covenant; Ps. 40:7–9, "Mine ears hast thou (bored) opened;" that is, thou hast engaged me as a willing servant to thyself, having agreed about the reward. "Then said I, Lo! I come. I delight to do thy will; yea, thy law is within my heart:" see also John 14:31. Nor did the Son only undertake this, but actually performed it, being "made of a woman, made under the law," Gal.

4:4. John 15:10, "I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love;" and John 8:29: "I do always those things that please him." Nor did he part with his life, till he had truly said, "It is finished," John 19:30. In the course of this obedience, the Son comforted himself in the faithfulness of the Father, to accomplish his promises. "I said, surely my judgment (reward) is with the Lord, and (the recompense of) my work with my God," Is. 49:4. And when he drew near the end of his course, he claimed, with great confidence of mind, the promised reward, John 17:4, 5. "I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." What then can be supposed wanting to complete the form of a covenant, which we have not here?

XI. In fine, all these things may be confirmed from this, that Christ likewise made use of the Sacraments; not only as to the matter of these institutions, as they were divine commands, the observance of which was to him meritorious; but as to the form, as they were signs and seals of the covenant; God the Father, by the use of them, sealed the federal promise concerning justification from sins, not his own personal sins, either of commission or omission (for such he had none, 2 Cor. 5:21; 1 Pet. 2:18), but from those which by at voluntary engagement, he took upon himself as his own, and from which, as surety, he was "justified in the spirit," 1 Tim. 3:16; and also concerning life eternal, to be bestowed on him and his; God the Son, in the use of them, acknowledged himself a debtor to fulfil all righteousness: as these things have been learnedly observed and explained by the celebrated Voetius, *Disput. de fide Christi, ejusque sacramentorum usu. Disput. T. II. p. 160*; and Essenius, *de subjectione Christi ad legem divinam, c. x. §. 11*. But let us illustrate this by an example. In the baptism of Christ, there was an evident sealing of the covenant of both sides. Christ declared, that it was his province "to fulfil all righteousness." To that he bound himself by baptism; telling John, upon his refusing to baptize him, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness, Matt. 3:16. The Father declared, that he accepted the suretiship: "In thee I am well pleased," Luke 3:22: and put him in mind of the inheritance; "Thou art my Son." And all these things he sealed by the symbol of the Holy Ghost descending upon him.

XII. As these things are evident, and contain a demonstration of the truth to the conscience; I would not have Ps. 16:2 strained to this purpose: "Thou hast said unto the Lord, Thou art my Lord: מרבתי עלֶיךָ בל מוֹבְתִי my goodness (is not upon thee) extendeth not to thee." As if in these words there was an address of God the Father to the Son, to this purpose: I require nothing more of thee, as a satisfaction to me, in order to display my grace; for thus a learned author paraphrases these words, "Thou hast said to the Lord," &c. Thou, son of man, hast acknowledged that Jehovah is the Lord, and hast engaged thy obedience to him. Thou, by loving and obeying as a servant, even unto death (to which thou offerest thyself) hast declared me to be Lord, and honoured me with a perfect obedience. As to any advantage to be obtained, "my goodness," my grace, and the benefits depending thereon, "extendeth not to thee," (is not upon thee) that is, thou art *τετελειωμένος*, an absolute and perfect Saviour. What was laid upon thee, or what thou wast bound by suretiship to perform, that my goodness might extend to mankind, that thou hast performed, and I accept of the whole. Thus על generally denotes something due, both among the Hebrews, and in the sacred writings.

XIII. But I think these things are strained, and do not run with that smoothness one could wish. For, 1st, There is nothing which obliges us to imagine, unless we incline so to do, that there is, in these words, an address of God the Father to the Son; since the whole of this Psalm has not the least appearance of a dialogue, but only represents a single person speaking in one continued discourse, whom Piscator, by weighty arguments, proves to be the Lord Jesus. The learned person himself speaks thus: "It is certain this discourse may be ascribed to the Son, as addressing himself." And therefore, I say, it is certainly possible that this discourse cannot contain the approbation of the Father, acquiescing in the obedience of the Son. For if the Son addresses his own soul, which said to Jehovah, "Thou art my Lord, and my goodness extendeth not to thee;" doubtless the Son said this to the Father, and not the Father to the Son. 2dly, I own that these words, which the Son says to the Father, or the Father to the Son, are so emphatical, that they cannot, in their full signification, be supposed to be spoken by either of them to the other, on account of the peculiar excellence which is in the Son, Heb. 1:4. But I question whether any can be easily persuaded, that the approbation of the most perfect obedience of the Son, and the acquiescence of the Father therein, are expressed in such slender terms. "Thou hast said, Thou art my Lord." I appeal to any, who "teaches the good knowledge of the Lord," as it is said of the Levites, 2 Chron. 30:22, whether those words of Scripture be such as that nothing can be devised more proper to illustrate that sense which the very learned person elsewhere requires, before he acquiesces in the meaning assigned, Sum. Theol. c. 3. §. 30. 3dly. It is very true, that עָל sometimes, among the Hebrews, signifies something due. The very learned De Dieu, on Gen. 16:5, has long ago observed this, from the writings of the Hebrews, and also of the Arabs. But that signification does not seem proper to this place; for Christ was neither indebted to God for his goodness or grace, and the blessings depending upon it; nor did he, properly, owe the grace of God to believers. But it was by virtue of a compact, that he owed obedience to God; on performing which, God owed to Christ, and to them who are Christ's, the reward promised by the compact, which is given to Christ as a due debt. The signification of being due might be insisted upon, had it been said my law, or satisfaction to my justice, or something to that purpose, "is no more upon thee, no longer extendeth to thee." But we must fetch a strange compass to make these words, "my goodness extendeth not to thee" (is not upon thee) to signify, "Thou art no longer indebted to my goodness;" and again, that the meaning of them should be, "Thou hast done every thing to which thou wast bound, that my goodness might be extended to men." And I verily doubt, whether it could ever come into any one's mind, that such an explication is the fullest, the most simple, and most suited to the connection; in fine, that it is such, that none, who compares it with the words of Scripture, can devise a more happy manner of expressing the thing; and that therein, an inexpressible degree of light, truth, and wisdom may be discovered." For these are laws of interpretation, which the very learned person himself has laid down, Sum. Theol. c. 6. §. 38.

XIV. 4thly. Another sense may be fairly brought from the words of the Psalm, which has nothing either harsh or strained, and contains what is becoming the wisdom of God, as thus: The Lord Jesus being deeply engaged in holy meditations, addresses his soul, or himself; and declares, that while in his meditation, he said to Jehovah the Father, "Thou art the Lord," all-sufficient to and by thyself for all happiness. And therefore by this whole work of my mediation, and consequently by all my obedience, no accession of new or greater happiness is made to thee, nor canst thou be enriched by my satisfaction: "my goodness extendeth not to thee:" Thou receivest no benefit thereby: all the fruit of my satisfaction redounds to the pious and chosen people. See



Job 22:2 and 25:7. The comment of Ben Nachman on the former place is elegant, agreeing very much with the phraseology in our text; he declares, "That no addition of good is made to God, when any good is done." All which words contain a salutary truth, instructing us concerning the all-sufficiency of God, to whom no new good can accrue from any quarter, and concerning the fruit of Christ's satisfaction, as redounding to the godly; and are most adapted to the words and analogy of the whole Psalm. For על many times signifies the same as אל, to. I shall produce a place or two, which occurred to me when meditating on these things in reading the Scriptures: Micah says, chap. 4:1, עמים עליו נהרו, "and people shall flow unto it:" This Isaiah expresses as follows, chap. 2:2, הנוהם כל אליו נהדו, "and all nations shall flow unto it." Where על and אל are taken in the same signification. In like manner, 2 Chron. 30:1 "Wrote letters על אפרים," that is, to the Ephraimites. It is still more to the purpose, what we have 1 Sam. 1:10; יהוה על תתפלל, "prayed unto the Lord;" and Ps. 18:41: "They cried על יהוה, unto the Lord, but he answered them not." Sometimes it signifies the same thing as עד up to, or quite to, as 2 Chron. 32:5, המגדלות על ויעל, "and raised (the wall) up to the towers:" not that it is credible, the wall exceeded the towers in height. Jer. 4:18, לבך על נגע, "it reacheth unto thine heart." You may add other instances from Glassius Phil. Sacra. p. 773. As, therefore, the use of this particle is very extensive, we have no reason to restrain its signification to owing or being due, which seems less adapted to this place.

XV. I speak not these things, with a view to detract any thing from the due praises of the very learned interpreter, to whom I profess myself greatly indebted; but because nothing is dearer to me than to search out the true meaning of the Spirit speaking in the Scriptures. And while I am wholly intent upon this, I cannot avoid sometimes examining the opinions of others, even of those for whom I have otherwise the greatest veneration. Faith is none of those things which may be imposed by any human authority; neither is any injury done even to the greatest of men, when we declare our dissent in a modest manner: whether we have done so here or not, must be left to the determination of the impartial reader, who may also judge whether, by these observations, I have deserved that severe language which the very famous person, Dr. John Van der Waeyen, was pleased to throw out against me in Sum. Theol. Christ. lib. i. c. iv. v. 267, seq. He very much complains that I called that explication of the celebrated Cocceius harsh and forced, and that the words of the Psalm were wrested to that meaning. I own indeed, I had formerly written in this manner, out of my simplicity, nor did I imagine there was either reproach or injury contained in these words. But there is no force of argument in the tartness of language: and that the least appearance of that may not remain, I now alter it, and instead of wrested, say, harsh, not running so smoothly. The rest I cancel. I freely forgive the ill language of my reprover, as becomes a Christian. It does not belong to him, but to our common Lord, to pass a judgment on my intention. As to the subject itself, I beseech the reader to compare my reasonings with his; and if he thinks that mine are solidly confuted, I am not against his differing, in every respect, from me, as I differ from him; and the simple explication of the words, which I maintain, with the generality of expositors, began the more to please me, the more I saw my reprover stand in need, for the defence of his opinion, of such a compass of words, and so far-fetched and intricate subtleties. I have no inclination minutely to consider the rest. Each one has his own temper, his own way of writing; which if I cannot commend, I endeavour to bear with. But I return from this unwilling digression.

XVI. As the doctrine of the covenant between the Father and the Son is so expressly delivered in Scripture, it is unjustly traduced as a new and a late invention. Though I find few among the

more ancient who have professedly handled this subject, yet some of the greatest divines have occasionally made mention of this covenant. I say nothing now of Arminius, who does not carelessly discourse on this covenant, in his oration for the degree of doctor; from which the very accurate Amesius produces and commends some things in *Rescriptione ad Grevinchovium*, c. 1. Amesius himself, in *Anti-Synodalibus, de morte Christi*, c. 1. §. 5, charges a certain distinction of the remonstrants with this absurdity, that "it denies that the covenant entered into with Christ ('He shall see his seed, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand') had been ratified." Gomar, treating of the baptism of Christ, on Matt. 3:13, says, that it was the "sign and seal of the covenant between God and Christ; namely, that God would be his God, and the bestower of salvation; but he himself was bound to perform obedience from a principle of perpetual gratitude." In like manner, on Luke 2:21, of the circumcision of Christ, he says, that it was "a sign and seal of the covenant with God; which covenant consisted in this: partly, that God was the God of Christ, according to the general promise, made also to him, Gen. 17:7, as to the seed of Abraham, Gal. 3:16, and according to the singular character given of him, Ps. 45:7, Heb. 1:9; partly, that Christ was bound to obey the will of God, John 6:38, Matt. 5:17." See his *disput. de merito Christi*, §. 1. The very learned Cloppenburgius, *disput. 3 de fœdere Dei*, not only slightly mentions this subject, but fully and accurately handles it. The very famous Vœtius, *disput. T. ii. p. 266*, says, "He (Christ) was subject for us to a special law of paying our debt by a condign punishment, as our Mediator and surety, according to the tenour of the covenant entered into with the Father." Essenius, formerly his scholar, and afterwards his colleague, *de subjectione Christi ad legem*, c. 10. §. 2, says, "The federal sealing of the divine promise did also really take place in Christ, according to Is. 53:10, 11." Dr. Owen handles this very subject at large, on Heb. T. i. *Exercit. 4. p. 49*. Nor was this doctrine unknown to the popish doctors. Tirinus, on Is. 53:11, thus comments, That the Prophet there explains the compact agreed on between God the Father and Christ, by which, on account of the sufferings and death of Christ, redemption, justification, and glorification were appointed to be the rewards of all those who faithfully adhere to Christ. Thus it appears, that these sentiments concerning the covenant between the Father and Son are not to be treated with contempt.

### **Chapter III: The Nature of the Covenant between the Father and the Son more fully explained**

I. AS the covenant between the Father and the Son is the foundation of the whole of our salvation, it will not be improper to stop here a little, and in our further meditation inquire, 1st, From whence the beginning of this covenant ought to be taken, and in what periods of time it was completed. 2ndly, What the law of the covenant contains, how far, and to what it binds the Son. 3dly, Whether the Son might not have engaged in this covenant, or have withdrawn himself from it, and had no more to do with it. 4thly, What and how great a reward was promised to the Son, and which he was to obtain in virtue of the covenant.

II. I consider three periods, as it were, of this covenant. Its commencement was in the eternal counsel of the adorable Trinity: in which the Son of God was constituted by the Father, with the approbation of the Holy Spirit, the Saviour of mankind; on this condition, that, in the fulness of time, he should be made of a woman, and made under the law; which the Son undertook to perform. Peter has a view to this, when he says, 1 Pet. 1:20, that Christ was foreordained before the foundation of the world. To this purpose is also what the supreme wisdom testifies concerning itself, Prov. 8:23: "I was set up (anointed) from everlasting;" that is, by my own, and the will of my Father, which is one and the same, I was appointed to the performance of the mediatorial office in time. Paul likewise declares, that "we were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world," Eph. 1:4. And consequently, Christ himself was constituted, from everlasting, the head of those that were to be saved, and they were given unto him, John 17:6, for whom he was to merit salvation, and in whom he was to be glorified and admired. From this constitution the Son, from everlasting, bore a peculiar relation to those that were to be saved. Hence the book of life is especially appropriated to the Lamb, Rev. 13:8, as containing a description of the peculiar people assigned to the Lamb from all eternity. Hence also it was, that God, by his amazing wisdom, so ordered many things in man's state of innocence, that the attentive remembrance of them after the fall, and the comparing them with those things which were afterwards revealed, might have reminded him of this divine counsel; as we have shown, chap. vi. §. 3.

III. The second period of this covenant I place in that intercession of Christ, by which, immediately upon the fall of man, he offered himself to God, now offended, in order actually to perform those things to which he had engaged himself from eternity; saying, thou hast given them to me, and I will make satisfaction for them: and so he made way for the word of grace to be declared to, and the covenant of grace to be made with them. Thus Christ was actually constituted Mediator, and revealed as such immediately upon the fall; and, having undertaken the suretiship, he began to act many things belonging to the offices of a Mediator. As a PROPHET, and the interpreter of the divine will, he even then, by his Spirit, revealed those things relating to the salvation of the elect, and by his ministers published them, Is. 48:15, 1 Pet. 1:11, and 3:19. Nay, he himself sometimes appeared in the character of an angel, instructing his people in the counsel of God. As a KING, he gathered his church, and formed to himself a people, in whom he might reign by his word and Spirit. For it was the Son of God who said to Israel, Ex. 19:6, "And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests," and who, with more than royal pomp, published his law on Mount Sinai, Acts 7:38, and whom Isaiah saw sitting as king upon a throne, chap. 6 compared with John 12:41. As a PRIEST, he took upon himself the sins of the elect, that he

might expiate them by the sacrifice of his body, which was to be prepared for him in the fulness of time. In virtue of this, as a faithful surety, he likewise interceded for the elect, by declaring his will, that they might be taken into favour, saying, "Deliver them from going down to the pit, I have found a ransom," Job 33:24. But what angel could speak thus, but the Angel of the Covenant? Who even then was called an angel, before his coming in the flesh, because he was accomplishing what depended upon that future mission. He is one of a thousand, the captain of the host of angels, that guards each believer, the chiefest of (the standard bearer above) ten thousands, Cantic. 5:10. In like manner, the archangel Michael, (and who is this, but the Lord Jesus Christ?) Dan. 10:13, is called, הדאשנים חשרים אחד, "one of the chief princes," that is, the unparalleled among the chiefs, because he is הנדול חשר "the great prince," Dan. 12:1. It is he who declares to man his righteousness, both the righteousness of God and of man. It is he who is כפר the "propitiation," Rom. 3:25; see also Zech. 1:12, 13.

IV. The third period of this covenant is that, when, on his assuming human nature, he suffered his ears to be bored; compare Ps. 40:7, with Heb. 10:5; that is, engaged himself as a voluntary servant to God, from love to his Lord the Father, and to his spouse the church, and his spiritual children (for the ears of such voluntary servants were bored, Ex. 21:5, 6), was "made under the law," Gal. 4:4, by subjecting himself to the law: which he solemnly testified by his circumcision on the eighth day after his birth, whereby he made himself "a debtor to do the whole law," Gal. 5:3.

V. The law, proposed to the Mediator, may be considered in a twofold view: 1st, As the directory of his nature and office. 2dly, As the condition of the covenant. The Mediator himself may be considered these three ways. 1st, As God. 2dly, As Man. 3dly, As Mediator, God-man. We are distinctly to compare these things together.

VI. The Son, as God, neither was, nor could be subject to any law, to any superior; that being contrary to the nature of Godhead, which we now suppose the Son to have in common with the Father. "He thought it no robbery to be equal with God." No subjection, nothing but the highest super-eminence, can be conceived of the Deity. In this respect he is "King of kings, and Lord of lords." 1 Tim. 6:15. The emperors Gratian, Valentine, and Theodosius said, long ago, that "he is a true Christian, who believes that the Deity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is one in equal power; that, under the same majesty, there is one Deity; and he who teaches the contrary is a heretic;" Cod. lib. i. tit. 1.

VII. Nor is it any objection against this, that the Son, from eternity, undertook for men, and thereby came under a certain peculiar relation to those that were to be saved. For, as that engagement was nothing but the most glorious act of the divine will of the Son, doing what none but God could do, it implies therefore no manner of subjection: it only imports that there should be a time when that divine person, on assuming flesh, would appear in the form of a servant. And by undertaking to perform this obedience, in the human nature, in its proper time, the Son, as God, did no more subject himself to the Father, than the Father with respect to the Son, to the owing that reward of debt, which he promised him a right to claim. All these things are to be conceived of in a manner becoming God.

VIII. Nor ought it to be urged, that the Son, even before his incarnation, was called מלאך the Angel, Gen. 48:16; Ex. 23:20. For that signifies no inferiority of the Son, before the time appointed for his incarnation; but only a form resembling the appearances of angels, and prefiguring his future mission into the world.

IX. As man, he was, doubtless, subject to the moral law, as it is the rule both of the nature and actions of man. For, it is a contradiction, as we proved before, to suppose a rational creature, such as is the human nature of Christ, to be without law: and in this manner, he was really bound by the law: 1st, To preserve the holiness implanted into his nature from his first conception, unspotted and pure. 2ndly, To express it in the most perfect manner in his life and actions, from all his heart, all his soul, and all his strength. 3dly, Constantly to persevere therein, without yielding to any temptations, to the end of his course.

X. And as Christ was not only a man, and a common inhabitant of the world, but also an Israelite, that is, a member of the church of the Old Testament, and a citizen of the commonwealth of Israel; he was also subject to the ceremonial and political laws, which were then still in force, according to the divine institution. By virtue of these laws, Christ made use of the sacraments of the Old Testament, observed the festivals, repaired to the temple, and behaved as an obedient subject under a lawful magistracy. He initiated himself by circumcision to the obedience of the ceremonial law; and declared his obedience to the political laws by paying tribute, Matt. 17:24, 25.

XI. It may be objected, that as to the ceremonial laws, Christ declared himself "greater than the temple," Matt. 12:6. And "Lord of the sabbath," ver. 8. As to the political, that, being the Son of God, he was exempted from paying tribute, Matt. 17:26, 27. But this may be solved from the different relations which Christ sustained; for, as God, and the Son of God, he was Lord of the law, the lawgiver himself, who, on account of his divine nature, had authority to dispense with precepts of a mutable and positive institution: and if, when he became man, he had insisted on his being the Son of God, and for that reason had acted as equal to God, in that respect neither the officers of the temple, nor the questors of the emperor, could have demanded any thing of him as an inferior. But Christ did not think proper to insist on this his right: but rather to behave as "a Servant of rulers," Is. 49:7.

XII. But further, as Mediator and Surety, he is under the law in another manner, and that two ways. 1st, As enjoining the condition of perfect obedience, upon which he and his were to partake of happiness, 2dly, As binding to the penalty, due to the sins of the elect, which he had taken upon himself.

XIII. As to the former: had the Son of God been pleased to appear in our nature, but not in the quality of a surety, he would necessarily have been a holy person, and conformed to the law of God, prescribed to the human nature. For every man, as such, is bound to be subject to God, in all righteousness and holiness, which is exactly described in the divine law. But by the personal covenant engagement of the Mediator to that absolute subjection of nature, which is eternally to continue without end, there is another obligation to subjection, limited to a certain period of time, which the apostle, Heb. 5:7, calls "the days of his flesh;" during which, Christ, when obeying the law, was meriting that happiness which he was not in possession of; considering this law, not

only as a rule of life, but also as prescribing the condition of acquiring happiness. For, if we seclude the procuring of our salvation, nothing hindered him from the possession of glory and happiness, from the very beginning of his conception. For by being the Son, he was heir of all things. But it was owing to his voluntary covenant-engagement, that "though he was rich," 2 Cor. 8:9, and might have acted as equal to God, from the very beginning of his incarnation, "yet for our sakes he became poor." That this subjection to the law, as enjoining the condition of happiness, is to be distinguished from that other absolute subjection to it, as the rule of holiness, appears hence, that Christ has laid aside the first, while this last continues, and will continue to eternity.

XIV. The usefulness of this distinction is considerable, in order to the solving that problem—How the active obedience of Christ, so called, though not so properly, may be imputed to us; seeing, as man, he owed it for himself. For, besides that on our account he was made man, it was not barely from his being man that he was under the necessity of meriting eternal life by the legal covenant: nay, and considered as God-man, abstracted from his suretiship-engagement, he might have exempted himself from all indigence, and all necessity of meriting; and consequently might have gloriously exercised all power in heaven and in earth, in and by the human nature, from the first moment of his incarnation; for this flows from the union of the humanity with the person of the Son of God. But his subjecting himself to the law, as prescribing the condition of happiness, is wholly from his voluntary covenant-engagement, which he entered into on our account, which, by every right or just title, may and ought to be imputed to us. The very ingenious and judicious divine, Francis Gomarus, seems to have had this in his view, when he thus comments on Phil. 2:9: "For our sake, he also veiled his glory for a time, which he might justly enjoy, and submitted to the cursed death of the cross; which, if we consider his merit and power, he might have declined.

XV. Besides, the Son of God was, in virtue of the covenant, subject to "the curse of the law, being made a curse for us," Gal. 3:16. For, as the law likewise required punishment to be inflicted on the transgressor, and Christ bound himself, by his engagement, to fulfil the whole law; it was necessary, he should come "in the likeness of sinful flesh, to condemn sin in the flesh," Rom. 8:3. Which likeness of sinful flesh consists in this, that Christ, from his birth, was obnoxious to various miseries, both of soul and body; and at last to that death, by which he concluded the course of his painful life, and in which the most evident signs of every kind of curse appeared; for it was just that the sinner should thus live and die. Now Christ, considered simply as a righteous person, might have been exempted from these miseries, and from such a death; but after having once, by a voluntary engagement, submitted himself to the law for us, he became bound to satisfy also this sanction of the law, which threatened death to sinners; for all these things arise from the mediatorial covenant, and belong to Christ as Mediator.

XVI. But since in Christ, as Mediator, there is an union of the divine and human natures, this difficulty remains to be discussed, whether both natures were in some measure subject to the law. We may easily affirm this of the human, as we have already so often shown; but it seems, from what we have confirmed, §. 6, it must be denied with respect to the divine. However, as the human nature does not, without the divine, complete the person of the Mediator, it does not appear that the Mediator, as such, did not engage to be subject to the law, without bringing his divine nature likewise to share in that subjection.

XVII. In order to remove this difficulty, we are accurately to distinguish between both natures, considered separately, and the same natures united in the person of God-man. It was proper, that both natures should act suitably to themselves and their distinct properties. Since the divine nature, as subsisting in the Son, could not truly and really be subject; therefore, by virtue of the covenant, it did not exert or display all its majesty, in the assumed form of a servant; nor hinder that nature, to which it was united by the hypostatical union, from being truly subject to the law, both as to the condition of the reward, and as to the penal sanction; which, indeed, was neither a real renunciation nor degradation of the divine superiority, but only a certain economical veiling of it for a time.

XVIII. The human nature was really and properly subject to the law: Nay, from the hypostatical union there was superadded a certain peculiar obligation upon the human nature of Christ, considered in relation to the suretiship undertaken for us, as his brethren. For, as men are bound to love God in such a manner as above all things to seek his glory, which shines most illustriously in the justification and sanctification of the sinner; and so to love their neighbour as to desire to deliver their brother from sin and misery, even at their own peril, if possible: so, though no mere man can effect this, yet the man Christ, who is likewise true God, and so able, by his obedience and suffering, to promote this glory of God and the salvation of his brethren, was therefore obliged to undertake and undergo all those things, in which he might show forth this most intense love of God and his neighbour: since he only could do this, so he only was bound to do it. What others were obliged to do conditionally, as we observe a spark of this love in Moses, Ex. 32:32; and in Paul, Rom. 9:3; was incumbent on the man Christ absolutely; because being God-man, he could absolutely perform it.

XIX. We commonly ascribe to the person, God-man, the relation of an inferior to a superior, by a constitution or appointment; that, both by doing and suffering, those things might be accomplished, according to the condition of each nature, which were requisite to our salvation: so that the very obedience and sufferings themselves, are not only to be appropriated to the human nature, but to be considered as truly performed and suffered by the God-man. If this were not the case, they would not be of infinite value and dignity, nor sufficient for our redemption. Hence he, who is "in the form of God," is said to have "made himself of no reputation, and became obedient unto death," Phil. 2:6, 7, 8; and to be the Lord of glory, who was crucified, 1 Cor. 2:8.

XX. It is here usual to inquire, whether Christ, as Mediator, is inferior to the Father and subordinate to him. But this controversy, it seems, may be easily settled among the orthodox: if the Mediator be considered in the state of humiliation and the form of a servant, he is certainly inferior to the Father, and subordinate to him. It was not of his human nature only, but of himself in that state, that he himself said, John 14:28. "The Father is greater than I." Nay, we may look upon the very mediatorial office in itself, as importing a certain economical inferiority or subordination; as being to be laid down, when all things shall be perfectly finished, and "God himself shall be all in all," 1 Cor. 15:28. Nevertheless this undertaking and mediation, and the bringing of fallen man to God, to grace, and glory, is not so much beneath the excellency of the Deity, but we may, without the least hesitation, affirm, that this glory of mediation is incommunicable to any creature. It is the glory of Jehovah to be the righteousness of Israel. This glory he gives to none who is not God: to be Mediator does not merely denote a servant of God,

but the great God and Saviour; who, as the first and principal cause of saving grace, equal to the Father, works by his own power, our reconciliation with God, by means of the subjection and obedience of his human nature, without which the co-equal Son could neither perform his service, nor obey the Father.

XXI. The third thing we promised to inquire into, was this: Could the Son refuse to undertake, or withdraw himself from this covenant? To which question we are again to answer distinctly. 1st, If the Son be considered as God, the whole of this covenant was of his own most free will and pleasure. There neither was, nor could be any necessity, to bind the Son of God, as such, to this covenant. Here is nothing but mere good pleasure, philanthropy unmerited, and altogether liberal, pure and unmixed grace. 2dly, If he be considered as man, though he indeed entered into this engagement of his own accord, without being constrained; yet he could not, without sin, from which he is at the greatest distance, withdraw from this agreement: Which we prove in the following manner.

XXII. 1st, The human nature of Christ, as we have often said, could not be without law. The law under which it naturally is, is the royal law of love. Which does not indeed formally, as it was made for man in innocence, but yet eminently it does contain this precept, which John inculcates, 1 Ep. 3:16, "That one lay down his life for the brethren." I say, the law of love, as given to man in innocence, contains not this precept formally; death being inconsistent with that state, and perfect obedience, which is all summed up in love, frees man from all necessity of dying, according to the promise, "He who doth those things, shall live in them." And therefore we have shown, that if Christ be considered in himself as a holy person, without respect to the decree of God, and his own engagement for his miserable brethren, he was, by virtue of his perfect holiness, under no necessity of dying and suffering. But the law of love does, supposing the requisite circumstances, eminently contain the command of dying for our brethren. For, it enjoins us to love God above all, and our neighbour as ourselves. And he who loves God above all, does not only delight in God his Creator, Benefactor, Lord, and example; not only studies to please him, but endeavours to promote his glory, and direct all things that are God's to that end. And as he ought to have a tender regard for the glory of God above his own advantage, he also ought to be ready to undergo every thing by which the glory of God may be most illustrated. And supposing such a one has brethren in distress, from which he can deliver them by his death, so that God shall, in an eminent manner, appear glorious in them; the love of our brethren, together with the love of God, enjoins him not to decline dying for them; especially, if he himself, becoming a conqueror over death, shall thereby obtain a most distinguishing reward at last. Since therefore Christ, as man, could not but be under the law of love; and as a holy man, as doubtless it became him to be, cannot be conceived as destitute of love, much less as having a contrary disposition, it follows, that he could not, in such circumstances, withdraw himself from his agreement to satisfy for men; because the law of love eminently contains such an obligation.

XXIII. 2dly, The Son of God had from eternity engaged to satisfy this covenant, by assuming human nature, and obeying in it, as we showed above, §. 2. If the human nature, personally united to him, could have withdrawn itself from, and renounced the covenant, it was possible that the Son of God himself might have violated his covenant engagements. And in that case, Christ would either not be the true and faithful God, who cannot lie, or not be God omnipotent; because he who, from eternity, willingly engaged in this undertaking, could not, in time, induce the



human nature to execute that for which it was assumed at first. Nor do I see what reply can be made to this argument, unless one shall venture to say, that it is contrary to the nature of liberty that the will should be thus bent, or brought over, by a superior cause; and that, in such a case, the human nature, declining to stand to that covenant, would be deprived of the honour of the hypostatical union, and another be assumed in its stead. But besides that this overthrows the inseparability of the hypostatical union, admitted on both sides, the same difficulty must recur with respect to the nature newly assumed; because, equal liberty is to be ascribed to it.

XXIV. 3dly, God had, by an eternal and irrevocable decree, appointed, promised, and confirmed by oath, the inheritance of all blessings in Christ, Heb. 6:13–18; Luke 1:73. But if Christ could have withdrawn himself from the covenant, then the decree of God would have become void, his promises been deceitful, and his oath falsified; and therefore the whole counsel of God concerning the economy of our salvation, so often inculcated in the prophetic writings, would have become of no effect: which is indeed blasphemy to imagine. There is no occasion to suggest, as one has done, that God could, without the payment of any price, have remitted the debt of sin, and, among some thousand methods, have found out another way of saving mankind, had this method proved unsuccessful. For as this is very much more than we can readily yield to, so, it is nothing to the purpose. For God did not only in general decree, promise, and confirm by oath, salvation to his elect; but salvation to be obtained by Christ and his obedience; which decree, promise, and oath could be accomplished no other way; not to say, how unworthy it is of God to be obliged to make new decrees after the former had miscarried. And this is the very bane of the remonstrant divinity.

XXV. 4thly, Let us suppose that the human nature of Christ, to speak plainly, could have withdrawn itself from this covenant; yet it could not, at least without a horrible sin, after the pre-ordination of God, the eternal will of the Son, the promise and oath had been discovered to him. Nay, it had been a more dreadful sin than that of the first Adam, for him obstinately to oppose all these considerations, and prefer his own private advantage to the glory of God and salvation of the elect, and by this means, we should be reduced, by this hypothesis, we are now contending against, to the shocking blasphemies of some schoolmen, who affirm that Christ could have sinned, and consequently have been damned. These are the depths of Satan, which all Christians ought to pronounce accursed.

XXVI. Hence we see what we are to think of the divinity of the remonstrants on this head, who, in chap. xvii. p. 187, of their apology or remonstrance, say, that "the obedience of Christ was of a different nature from ours; but agreeing in this, that it was altogether free. Christ obeyed the will of his Father, not as we obey the law of God, under the threatening of eternal death, in case of disobedience: God forbid! but as an ambassador is said to obey his sovereign, or a beloved son his father, when his sovereign or father confers on either an honourable office to be executed by them, adding the promise of some extraordinary reward, if they will freely, and on their account undertake it. Whoever obeys in this manner, that is, willingly takes that office upon himself, he indeed properly and freely obeys; not that he would properly sin, did he not undertake it; or when undertaken, lay it down again, with the good-will of the Father; much less that he would deserve eternal punishment, if he did not undertake it, or excuse himself from undertaking, or bearing the burden thereof; as it is most certain, that when we disobey God and his law, we deserve punishment. But no such threatening of punishment was made to Christ; but he could either not

undertake it, or when he undertook it, resign his charge, and so not enjoy, or forfeit the promised reward."

XXVII. In this discourse there are as many faults, as sentences. We will now chiefly remark these following things. 1st, The leading error of the remonstrants, from whence their other errors flow, is their making the liberty of the will to consist in indifference, so as one may or may not obey; whereas it is to be placed in the free good pleasure of the mind. Unless one would affirm either of these things, that it was either possible, or lawful, for the holy angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect, nay, Christ himself exalted, not to do the will of God. 2dly. They distinguish not the person of the Son of God, and the grace by which he humbled himself to undertake obedience in the assumed human nature, from the human nature itself, and obedience of Christ, now in his state of humiliation. The grace of the Son of God was so free, that he could not be against this humiliation, or emptying of himself, that he might come under an obligation to obedience. There is no reason, but the most free good pleasure of the divine will, why this future humiliation was decreed by the adorable Trinity, and consequently by the Son himself. Yet, upon supposing this free decree, the human nature assumed by the Logos, or Word, could not decline, or draw back from the office assigned to Christ, and now undertaken by the Logos himself, without sin and disobedience. 3dly. They do not consider, that the human nature of Christ was bound, by an indispensable necessity, to that holiness which is the image of God: since they compare the whole of Christ's obedience with the undertaking of some office, which a sovereign confers on his ambassador, or a father on his son. For, as an ambassador, in the quality of a subject, and a son, as such, are bound by the law of nature itself, to perform to a sovereign and a father, an obedience distinct from that which arises from their willingly undertaking this honorary office; so, in like manner, the human nature of Christ was, and still continues to be, bound to perform obedience to God, in order to maintain this conformity with the holiness of God; which obligation is distinct from his undertaking the mediatorial office. 4thly. They falsely place the essential difference between the obedience of Christ and ours, in that we obey being awed by the threatening of death; but Christ not so. For that threatening does not properly belong to obedience, which really ought not to be extorted from us by the fear of punishment, but to come freely from a reverence to the divine command, and a love to holiness. Our obedience will be no less obedience in heaven, when the threatening of eternal death shall no longer have any place. Moreover, the same law, which is proposed to us, was the rule of the life and actions of Christ. But that law had the sanction of eternal death, which it was incumbent on Christ to believe to be just and right; tending to inform the conscience of God's hatred to sin, and to inflame it likewise with a hatred of sin and unrighteousness. And thus far, after Christ had humbled himself for us, he obeyed the law even under the threatening, and acknowledged the same to be just; and that very threatening of the law, produced in Christ a sense of the wrath of God, when he suffered for us. 5thly. They absurdly pretend that Christ could, with the Father's consent, decline the office committed to him, or resign it, after he had undertaken it: as if one should say that a son could have the consent of a virtuous father, to make him a liar and guilty of perjury. For God the Father had promised, and solemnly confirmed by oath, that he would procure our salvation by the Son. 6thly. Nor is it less absurd, that they perceive no inconvenience flowing from the non-susception, or from the resignation of that office, but this one, that in that case Christ would not enjoy, or would forfeit the promised reward; since the very salvation of all the elect, and, which is above all, the whole of the glory of God, would then fall to the ground. I would also fain know what reward Christ would, according to that hypothesis, have forfeited;

whether the honour of the hypostatical union, or eternal salvation itself, and the communion of the divine love and glory; or whether that sublime glory, in which he is now eminently placed above the rest of the creatures: also, whether it is not blasphemy to say, that either the hypostatical union is dissolved, or that any nature hypostatically united to the Son of God, can have no share in eternal salvation; or, if in a state of happiness, has not "a more excellent name" than the rest of the creatures: in like manner, whether the loss of so great a happiness can, in an intelligent nature, be without an eternal sensation of the most bitter anguish: in fine, whether it is not much better, and more worthy of God and his Christ, to believe that Christ could not but undertake the office assigned unto him by the Father, and never withdraw from it, than run headlong into such absurdities.

XXVIII. We shall briefly dispatch the fourth thing remaining; namely, the reward which the Son was to obtain, in virtue of this covenant, by inquiring first, what reward was promised the Son; and then, what relation his obedience had to this reward.

XXIX. The reward promised to the Son is the highest degree of glory, John 17:1: "Father, glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee." But this glory may be considered distinctly with respect to the humanity, to the Deity, and to the whole person. In the humanity, I observe these three degrees of glory: 1st. That, together with the elect, his fellows, Ps. 45:7, and co-heirs, Rom. 8:17, it is blessed in the perfect fruition of God. 2dly. That it is exalted above all creatures, on account of the dignity of the hypostatical union. 3dly. That the glory of his Godhead shines forth therein, with a more illustrious refulgence than in the days of the flesh; so that the man Christ cannot be seen, but he must appear to be the glorious Son of God, and his glory be "as the glory of the only begotten of the Father," John 1:14.

XXX. As the Deity of the Son could not properly be humbled, so neither could it acquire any new increase of glory, For as the humiliation of Christ, with respect to his Godhead, consisted in this, that under the human form of a servant, which he assumed, the brightness of his glory was covered as with a veil; so the glorification of the Deity consists in this, that all the magnificence of the glorious majesty of God beautifully discovers itself, and becomes more conspicuous. And this is what Christ prayed for, John 17:5: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."

XXXI. The whole person of the Mediator obtains, for a reward, 1st. That "God hath (*ὑπερύψωσε*, over-raised) highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name," Phil. 2:9. "Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come," Eph. 1:21. 2dly, That the whole church is given him as his peculiar possession, Ps. 2:8; Is. 53:10. And that he himself is given as "head over all things to the church," Eph. 1:22; and "all power given him in heaven and in earth," Matt. 28:18; that he may govern all things for the benefit of the church. 3dly, That, on account of the most intimate union of the church, as his mystical body, with himself, he receives all those gifts which he merited, and on that account are bestowed on the elect. For the church united to Christ, the body together with the head, is called Christ, 1 Cor. 12:12. And thus literally run the words, Ps. 68:18, באדם מתכית לקחת, "thou hast received gifts in men;" as the Septuagint also renders them, ἐλαβεξ δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώποις. Instead of which the apostle, Eph. 4:8, not translating literally, but giving the sense of the words, says, ἔδωκε δόματα

τοις ανθρώποις, "he gave gifts to men." For, as Christ is supposed to receive them, when they are given to his members, so he gives his members what he received of the Father, Acts 2:33.

"Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth that which ye now see and hear."

XXXII. The obedience of Christ bears to these blessings, not only the relation of antecedent to consequent, but of merit to reward: so that his obedience is the cause, and the condition now fulfilled, by virtue of which he has a right to the reward, as several express passages of Scripture declare. Ps. 45:7: "Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness," (which is a description of the obedience of Christ) "כִּן עֵל, therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Which words contain the reward, intimating the most joyful entrance of Christ into the kingdom of his glory and delight. The relation of obedience to the reward is set forth by the word, therefore, which denotes the cause, and not a mere antecedent. In like manner, Is. 53:12: "לִכֵּן, therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong, אֲשֶׁר תָּחַת because he hath poured out his soul unto death." Where the relative particles, אֲשֶׁר תָּחַת and לִכֵּן expressly indicate that commutative justice, whereby the reward due bears a reciprocal relation to the obedience performed. Phil. 2:8, 9: "He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross: διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερυψώσε, wherefore God also hath highly exalted him." Heb. 12:2, "ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς ὑπέμεινε σταυρόν, who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross." Where there is an express commutation, or interchange, of obedience and reward.

XXXIII. And the thing speaks for itself, For, as there is a covenant between the Father and the Son; "when thou shalt make his soul (if the soul of the Son shall devote himself) an offering for sin," Is. 53:10, upon performing the condition, the Son acquired a right to the reward, and so has a merit according to the covenant. Nay, as it is not the obedience of a mere man, but of Christ, God-man, an infinite person, it is also of an infinite value, consequently bears the justest proportion to the greatest corresponding glory; and thus far it is a merit of condignity, as it is called; such as no mere creature is capable to acquiring.

XXXIV. The passages of Scripture which represent the humiliation of Christ as the antecedent to the subsequent glory, are not contrary to this doctrine. For every cause is an antecedent, though every antecedent is not a cause. And the merit of Christ for himself is so far from being prejudicial to his merit for us, that, on the contrary, they are inseparably conjoined. For, if he merited for himself, in order to be the head of the elect in glory, and to receive gifts for them, he certainly, at the same time, merited for the elect, in order to their being glorified and enriched with gifts, becoming the mystical body of Christ. Neither by this doctrine is the excellency of the love of Christ towards us diminished, though in his state of humiliation he had likewise an eye to his own exaltation. For he might have been glorious as to himself, without going to it by this way of death and the pains of hell. Besides, he looked upon his own glory as the beginning and cause of ours, and whose fruit was all to redound to us. And it was the highest pitch of love, that he would not be glorious without us. Nor should the word χαρίζεσθαι, given, which the apostle uses, Phil. 2:9, be urged too closely, as if the rewards there mentioned were of mere grace, freely given to Christ, without any regard to his obedience, as the cause of his right or title to them. For Paul there expressly asserts, that they were given to Christ on account of his obedience: and that term does not always denote mere grace. Hesychius, that very excellent master of Greek,

explains it by δρᾶν τὰ κεχαρισμένα, "to do what is acceptable." But those things also are called acceptable which are due: the Greeks say, Θεοῖς κεχαρισμένα ποιεῖν. "to do what is acceptable to the Gods." Whence the same thing which here, in respect to Christ, is called χάρισμα is, Is. 49:4, called פעלתו "his work", or the reward of his work, adjudged to him by the just judgment of God. "My judgment is with the Lord, and my work with my God." So that the plain meaning of this passage in Paul is this: Because Christ submitted himself to the Father, by free or voluntary obedience, the Father therefore also rewarded him by giving him a name above every name.

## Chapter IV: Of the Person of the Surety

I. HAVING, with some degree of care, explained the nature of the covenant between the Father and the Son, it is fit we treat a little more distinctly of the Surety himself, concerning whom these are the principal particulars; and first, we shall consider the Person of the Surety, and what is requisite to constitute such; and then that satisfaction which he undertook to make by his suretiship; the truth, necessity, effects, and extent of which we shall distinctly deduce from the Scriptures.

II. These four things are required, as necessary to the Person of a Surety, that he might be capable to engage for us. 1st, That he be true man, consisting of a human soul and body. 2dly, That he be a righteous and holy man, without any spot of sin. 3dly, That he be true and eternal God. 4thly, That he be all this in the unity of person. Of each severally and in order.

III. That our surety ought to be true man, is what Paul declares more than once, Heb. 2:10, 11, 16, 17, "Ἐπρεπε, it became him (it behoved him, it was becoming God) that he who sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, be all of one," of one human seed, so that they might call each other brethren. "In all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren," in order to be their Goel or kinsman-redeemer: "for verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham," (did not take upon him to deliver angels, but to deliver the seed of Abraham.)

IV. This assumption, or taking, does not seem to me to denote the assuming human nature into personal union, but the assuming of the elect, in order to their deliverance. For, 1st, The causal conjunction for indicates that the apostle uses this middle term [or this as an argument] to prove what he had said ver. 14, about the partaking of flesh and blood, and which, ver. 17, he deduces by the illative particle, wherefore. But the middle term must be distinguished from the conclusion; and so there is no tautology in the apostle's very just inference. 2dly, Since the assumption of the human nature was long before the apostle wrote those things, he would not speak of it in the present tense, as he does here, but in the preterperfect, as he did ver. 14. 3dly, As it would be an uncouth expression to say, the Son of God assumed or took man, if we suppose he only meant that the Son of God assumed human nature; and in like manner this other expression would appear harsh, the Son of God did not assume angels, to denote that he did not assume the nature of angels. 4thly, In the Scripture style *επιλαμβάνεσθαι* signifies to deliver, by laying hold of one: thus Matt. 14:31, "And immediately Jesus stretched forth his hand and *επελαβετο* αὐτου caught him;" and this signification is most apposite to the context. For, in the preceding verse, the apostle had said, that Christ "delivered them, who though fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage," alluding, it seems, to the bondage of Egypt. But God is represented to us in Scripture, as, with a stretched-out hand, laying hold on and bringing his people out of Egypt. Jer. 31:32: "In the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt." Which the apostle expresses by saying, "in the day when I took them by the hand, to lead them out of the land of Egypt;" where we have the same word *επιλαμβάνεσθαι*. And in profane authors, it denotes to claim something as one's property, and say, according to Virgil, These are mine. Thus Plato, XII. de Legibus, "ὅτι ἂν τις κεκτημένος ᾗ, καὶ μηδεὶς ἐπιλάβηται, if one is in possession of any thing, and none claims it as his own." To this answers the Hebrew לָקַח. Which makes me, with many learned men, think that these words of the apostle,

whose genuine sense we have been inquiring into, rather contain an argument for the incarnation of Christ, than assert the incarnation itself.

V. Moreover, it may be proved by invincible arguments, that it was necessary our surety should be man. Let us pause a little here, and see whether we may not possibly search this truth to the bottom. The legal covenant, entered into with the first man, is founded on the very nature of God; at least with respect to the commands of the covenant, and the threatenings annexed to them. So that it would be a contradiction, if these precepts of the law of nature should not be proposed to man, or if man, after the violation of them, should be saved without a satisfaction; which I now pre-suppose, as having proved it before, and shall further confirm it in the sequel. I therefore proceed. This satisfaction can be nothing else but the performing the same precepts, and the undergoing the same penalty, with which God had threatened the sinner. Because, from our hypothesis, it appears to be unworthy of God to grant life to man, but on condition of his obeying those precepts; and that it is not possible for the truth and justice of God to be satisfied, unless the punishment, which the sinner deserved, should be inflicted. I add, that as those precepts were given to man, so no creature but man could perform them. This appears, 1st, Because the law, which is suited to the nature of man, requires that he love God with all his soul, and serve him with all the members of his body, seeing both are God's. None can do this but man, who consists of soul and body. 2dly, The same law requires the love of our neighbour; but none is our neighbour but man, who is of the same blood with us. To this purpose is that emphatical saying of God to Israel, Is. 58:7, "that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh." And thus our surety ought to cherish us, as one does his own flesh; and consequently we ought to be "of his flesh and of his bone," Eph. 5:30. 3dly, It requires also, that we lay down our lives for our brethren, which, we have shown, was contained in the royal law of love; and none but man can do this. For who else is our brother? or who besides could lay down his life for us? No other creature but man could undergo the same sufferings, as hunger, thirst, weariness, death. It became God to threaten sinning man with these things; that even the body, which was the instrument of sin, might also undergo its share of the punishment. And after the threatening, the truth of God could not but inflict these things, either on the sinner, or on the surety. The dignity of the sufferer might indeed sufficiently compensate for the duration of the punishment; but the truth of God admits of no commutation of the species of punishment. Wherefore our surety was "partaker of flesh and blood, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death," Heb. 2:14. All these things put together incontestably prove that our surety ought to be man, that he might satisfy the law for us.

VI. This is what the apostle means, when joins these two together by an inseparable connexion, Gal. 4:4, "made of a woman, made under the law." For he intimates that the principal and immediate scope and end of Christ's incarnation was, that, in the human nature, he might be subject to the law, to which it is under obligation; and so that God, according to the same right, might renew with him the same covenant, which he had before entered into with the first man; which he could not have done with any other created nature, without a contradiction.

VII. There is this further consideration: Our surety ought to have such a nature, in order to our being united to him in one body. For it is necessary that the satisfaction of one be as it were the satisfaction of all, and that the Spirit, who fits for a holy and happy life, should flow from him, as the head, to us, as his members; and so, that he become "the Saviour of the body," Eph. 5:23.

The Scriptures frequently call this mystical union a marriage. But it is the inviolable law of marriage, that the persons married be of the same nature: "And they two shall be one flesh," Gen. 2:24. Paul hath taught us that the mystery of the spiritual marriage of the church with Christ lies concealed in these words, Eph. 5:31, 32.

VIII. We observed, that the second condition required in the surety was, that he be a righteous and holy man: "in all things like unto his brethren, yet without sin," Heb. 4:15. This holiness required that, from the first moment of his conception, he should be free from all guilt and stain of sin of his own; and on the contrary, be endowed with the original rectitude of the image of God: that, moreover, through the whole course of his life, he should keep himself from all sin, and perfectly fulfil all righteousness; and in fine, constantly persevere in that purity to the end, without yielding to any temptation.

IX. And this also is clear from what has been already said. For, seeing our surety ought to save us, according to the first treaty of the covenant, whereby perfect holiness was required of man, it also behoved him to be perfectly holy. And as sin shut the gates of heaven, nothing but holiness could set them open again. This the apostle urges, Rom. 5:19: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." But that obedience excludes all sin. And then how could a sinner satisfy for others, who cannot satisfy for himself; for by one sin he forfeits his own soul? "For who is this (from among sinful men) that can engage his heart to approach unto me?" says God, Jer. 30:21. Or who but one who is pure from every sin, can be our priest, familiarly to approach to God, and offer an acceptable sacrifice and prevalent intercession to him? "Such an High-Priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners," Heb. 7:26. He then can offer himself, as a lamb "without blemish and without spot," 1 Pet. 1:19; whose offering may be to God "for a sweet-smelling savour," Eph. 5:2. For none else, who cannot offer himself to God "without spot," can "purge the conscience from dead works," Heb. 9:14. This was formerly signified by the legal purity of the High Priest, without which it was such a crime for any to intermeddle in holy things, that he was to be punished by death; and by the purity of the beasts, which were to be without any blemish. And seeing it is well known, that "God heareth not sinners," John 9:31, whose prayers "are an abomination to him," Prov. 28:9, who else can be the general intercessor and advocate of all with the Father, but he who is eminently righteous? 1 John 2:1. In fine, how could he, who is himself impure, "sanctify" the church, and "present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish?" Eph. 5:26, 27: there cannot be more in the effect, than there is in the cause. Since, then, all these things ought to be done by the surety, it appears necessary that he be a holy man.

X. But here the adorable wisdom of our God shines forth: our surety ought not only to be man, but also taken from among men, that he might be "the son of man;" for, if his human nature was created out of nothing, or out of the earth, he would certainly be true man, yet not our kinsman, not our brother. In order to this therefore, it became him, like other "children," to be "a partaker of flesh and blood," Heb. 2:14, and to be "born of a woman," Gal. 4:4. But it seemed inconsistent with the unspotted holiness of the surety, that he should be descended of the posterity of Adam, who all derive hereditary pollution from him: for, "who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" Job 14:4. Here let us adore the unsearchable wisdom of God. Though he would have a surety to be born of a woman, yet she was to be a virgin. This, if there was nothing else intended,



was at least an evidence of these two things: 1st, That the surety was not from Adam's covenant, as not being born according to the law of nature, and, consequently, not under the imputation of Adam's sin. 2dly, That he could not be so much as considered as existing in Adam when Adam sinned; seeing he was not born in virtue of that word, whereby God blessed the state of marriage before the fall—"Increase and multiply"—but in virtue of the promise concerning the seed of the woman, which was made after the fall. And thus he was created a second Adam, in opposition to the first. "For the Lord hath created a new thing in the earth, גבר תסורב נקבה a woman shall compass a man," Jer. 31:22. We are, it seems, to take this in the utmost signification the words can admit of: that "a woman," who is only such, and without any thing of a woman but the sex, "should compass," not by embrace, but by conception—for such a compassing is meant as is the work of God alone, and not the voluntary operation of man—a male; denoting the more excellent sex; as Rev. 12:5; "And she brought forth a male child." This then is a new thing, and a creation altogether divine. On this depend the blessing of the earth, and the satiating the weary soul, which are promised in the following verses.

XI. It may here be inquired, whether the miraculous nativity from a virgin does, of itself, and from the nature of the thing, secure to the human nature of Christ immunity from sin; or whether indeed, it was only appointed by God as a symbol? I shall here present the reader, for his more accurate meditation, with the words of two great men, who conceive differently of this matter. One of them speaks thus: "That miraculous nativity from the virgin really bears no other relation to the holiness of the conception and nativity of Christ, but that of a symbol, appointed by God, whereby he was separated from sinners: nor could that miracle of itself alone, namely, the impregnation of the virgin's womb, secure in the least an exemption to the flesh of Christ from the inheritance of sin; for the origin of sin is not derived from the male sex alone, or male seed; nor did the apostle, Rom. 5, so understand one man Adam, as to exclude Eve: which is here the leading error of some." The other of these learned men reasons in this manner: "He could be born of the virgin without any pollution: because, what is in the body of a sinner, as it is God's creature, is no wise under curse and pollution, but in so far as it is a part of the sinner, when he is to be punished, or is the instrument of sin, or the means of the ordinary propagation of nature, as that something should be born resembling what generates. There might therefore be something in the virgin's body that was not under a curse; as the sweats and other evacuations from the human body are not under curse or guilt, nor a means of transferring guilt; but are parts of matter created by God, and are no longer any part of man." Perhaps, the same learned person has elsewhere expressed himself more clearly, as follows: "He who was born, not of father and mother, but of a virgin, was not under guilt and condemnation. For he only received from his mother what was prepared by God; that thence the Son of God might take to himself the materials for building a temple. For though what belongs to the sinner is, on account of the sinner to whom it belongs, under the same condemnation with the sinner himself; yet, that which is so contained in the substance of the sinner, as that it cannot be a part of his substance, but prepared by God for an extraordinary generation, is not under condemnation solely because the redeemer and redeemed partake of flesh in common. And therefore it is rightly said to be sanctified, that is, preserved from the common condemnation of the sons of Adam. For the word sanctified, cannot in that case signify purified, or delivered from impurity, as it signifies when applied to the other sons of Adam." Which of these two opinions is the more simple or the more solid, we leave to the judgment of the prudent reader to determine. The words of both seemed however to us worthy of being inserted here.

XII. Thirdly, It is further required in our surety, that he be true and eternal God. "I will help thee, saith the Lord, יְשׁוּעָה וְגֹאֲלְךָ and thy redeemer, the holy one of Israel," Is. 41:14. "I, even I am the Lord, and there is no Saviour besides me," Is. 43:11. Salvation is not such work, that it can be said, "and the Lord hath not done all this," Deut. 32:27. It is peculiar to the true Saviour to say of himself, what Isaiah prophesied, chap. 45:24, "יְבוֹא עִדּוֹ וְעוֹז צְדָקוֹת אֵמַר לִי בִיהוָה אֲךָ" surely in the Lord, (he said to me, or concerning me, namely, the Father who beareth witness of Christ, John 8:18,) are righteousness and strength; even to him shall men come:" and the reasons are evident.

XIII. None but God can restore us to true liberty. If any creature could redeem and deliver us, we should become the peculiar property of that creature. For he who sets us free, makes a purchase of us for his property and possession, 1 Cor. 6:19, 20. But it is a manifest contradiction, to be freed, and to be free, and yet at the same time to be the property and servant of any creature. True liberty consists in subjection to God alone; so that all things are ours, and we belong to God, and Christ himself, 1 Cor. 3:22, 23. Adam, before the fall, was subject to none but God. If, by our deliverance from the fall, we were put under the dominion of any creature, that would rather be a change of servitude than a deliverance. Therefore our Lord says, "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed," John 8:36.

XIV. None but God can give us eternal life; which consists in the most intimate union with God; nay, in having God for our inheritance, possession, and treasure, and even "our portion for ever," Ps. 73:26. But what creature can possibly bestow God upon any? None but God can give God. He gives himself. Hence, these two are joined: "the true God and eternal life," 1 John 5:20.

XV. None but God can give us ἐξουσίαν, power or right to become the sons of God; and even this belongs to the office of surety, John 1:12. For who but God can bestow the Spirit, by whom we become the sons of God by regeneration; so that, "of him the whole πατρία, family, in heaven and earth may be named," Eph. 3:15. Who but God could give us these "great and precious promises, by which we might be partakers of the divine nature?" 2 Pet. 1:4. Who else but God, who alone is Lord of heaven, can bequeath, by testament, the heavenly inheritance? And who but God can give us that Spirit, who is so the Spirit of the Father, as to be also the Spirit of the Son: by whom we may cry, "Abba, Father," Gal. 4:6, and who, "beareth witness with our spirit," concerning the future inheritance? Rom. 8:16, 17.

XVI. In fine, for man to glory in any one as his Saviour, and give him the honour of the new creation, to resign himself to his pleasure, and become his property, and say to him, Thou art lord of my soul, is an honour to which no mere creature can have the least claim. "In Jehovah shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory," Is. 45:25. "My spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour," Luke 1:47. Whom we acknowledge to be our Saviour, we must likewise acknowledge to be our Judge, our Lawgiver, and our King, Is. 33:22. A holy soul can only thus rejoice in God; "The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad," Ps. 97:1.

XVII. It appears, then, that none but he who is true God could possibly be surety; but the question is, was it absolutely necessary that he should be Son of God, and the second person in the Trinity? And here we cannot commend the rashness of the schoolmen, who too boldly measure the things of God by the standard of their own understanding. No better reason can be assigned for the Son's undertaking the suretiship, than the holy good-pleasure of the adorable

Trinity. But when it is revealed to us, it is our duty to observe, and proclaim the wisdom and goodness of God in this constitution.

XVIII. Did not God most wisely order, that he who created man, should restore, and as it were create him anew? That he, who is the personal Word of God, who commanded light to shine out of darkness, and by whom all things were made, John 1:3, should be that great publisher of the word of the Gospel, whereby God shines in the hearts of the elect, and new creatures, not yet existing, are effectually called, and, by that call, brought as it were into being? Further, as the second person alone is the Son, and our salvation consists in adoption, was it not proper that the Son of God should become the Son of man, that, having obtained a right of adoption by him, we might be made his brethren and co-heirs? Moreover, let it be observed, that the Son alone is called "the image of the Father," Col. 1:15, Heb. 1:3; and, by way of eminence, "the beloved of the Father," Matt. 3:17; Col. 1:13. Seeing man therefore had, by sin, shamefully defaced the image of God, which he received in the first creation, and thereby most justly exposed himself to the hatred of God; was it not worthy of God to restore that image by his own essential image, in the human nature he had assumed; in order, by that means, to open a way for our return to the favour and love of the Father? In fine, could the philanthropy and love of the Father be more illustriously displayed to us, than in giving his only-begotten Son to us and for us, that in him we might behold the Father's glory? Christ himself lays this before us, John 3:16.

XIX. The last condition requisite in the surety is, that he should be God-man; God and man, at the same time, in unity of person: "One mediator between God and man," 1 Tim. 2:5. For, as it was necessary he should be man, and also God, and one surety; it was necessary he should be both these in unity of person; "God manifested in the flesh," 1 Tim. 3:16. "The word made flesh," John 1:14. "Of the seed of David according to the flesh, in such a manner, as at the same time to be the Son of God with power," Rom. 1:3, 4. Which may be further made appear.

XX. Had he been God only, he could neither have been subject, nor have obeyed, nor suffered: if mere man, his obedience, subjection, and suffering would not have been of sufficient value for the redemption of the elect. Nay, a mere creature is so bound to fulfil all righteousness for itself, that its righteousness cannot be imputed and imparted to others; and should we suppose a man, truly and perfectly holy, but yet a mere man, who, according to the law of love, offered himself even to die for his brother, he himself would doubtless obtain a reward by his righteousness, but could merit nothing for a guilty person, unless perhaps exemption from punishment, at most. And therefore it behoved our surety to be man, that he might be capable to submit, obey, and suffer; and at the same time God, that the subjection, obedience, and suffering of this person, God-man, might, on account of his infinite dignity, be imputed to others, and be sufficient for saving all to whom it is imputed.

XXI. Moreover, a mere creature could not support himself under the load of divine wrath, so as to remove it, and rise again when he had done. "Who knoweth the power of thine anger? even according to thy fear, so is thy wrath," Ps. 90:11; see Nah. 1:6. It was therefore necessary for our surety to be more than man, that, by the infinite power of his Godhead, he might support the assumed human nature, and so be able to bear the fierceness of divine wrath, and conquer every kind of death.

XXII. I shall not conceal what is objected to this argument; namely, that God could have so supported the human nature, though not personally united to himself, by his divine power, as to have rendered it capable to endure and conquer all manner of sorrows. I dare not refuse this. But yet that would not be sufficient in the present case. Because, by that hypothesis, it would be God himself who, by the surety, would have vanquished his enemies. But it is necessary that our surety should do this by his own power, that "his own arm should bring salvation unto him," Is. 63:5; and therefore be "the mighty one of Jacob," Is. 60:16; "the mighty God," Is. 9:6; himself "stronger than the strong man," Luke 11:21, 22; "having life in himself," John 5:26; and having "power to take his life again," John 10:18. To which is required "the exceeding greatness of his power," Eph. 1:19; and so should be "declared to be the Son of God with power," Rom. 1:4.

XXIII. These are the tremendous mysteries of our religion, "which were kept secret since the world began, but are now made manifest, and, by the scriptures of the Prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith," Rom. 16:25, 26. From hence the divinity of the Christian religion appears with evidence. What penetration of men or angels was capable of devising things so mysterious, so sublime, and so far surpassing the capacity of all created beings? How adorable do the wisdom and justice, the holiness, the truth, the goodness, and the philanthropy of God, display themselves in contriving, giving, and perfecting this means of our salvation! How calmly does conscience, overwhelmed with the burden of its sins, acquiesce in such a surety, and in such a suretiship; when here, at length, apprised of a method of reconciliation, both worthy of God, and safe for man! Who, on contemplating these things in the light of the Spirit, would not break out into the praises of the most holy, the most righteous, the most true, the most gracious, and the most high God? O the depth of the wisdom and knowledge of God! O the height of mysteries, "which angels desire to look into!" Glory to the Father, who raised up, accepted, and gave us such a surety. Glory to the Son, who, clothing himself in human flesh, so willingly, so patiently, and so constantly performed such an engagement for us. Glory to the Holy Ghost, the revealer, the witness, and the earnest of so great happiness for us. All hail, O Christ Jesus, true and eternal God, and true and holy man, all in one, who retainest the properties of both natures in the unity of thy person. Thee we acknowledge, thee we worship, to thee we betake ourselves, at thy feet we fall down, from thy hand alone we look for salvation. Thou art the only Saviour; we desire to be thy peculiar property; we are so by thy grace, and shall remain such for ever. Let the whole world of thine elect, with us, know, acknowledge, and adore thee, and thus at length be saved by thee. This is the sum of our faith, and hope, and this the top of all our wishes. Amen.

## Chapter V: Of the Suretiship and Satisfaction of Christ

I. HAVING thus spoken of the person of the surety, so far as the nature of our design requires, now is the time and place to treat a little more accurately of the satisfaction itself, which by his suretiship he undertook to give. For he is called the Surety of the Covenant or Testament, Heb. 7:22. Not only, nor principally, because he engaged to us in the name of God, to fulfil the promises contained in that testament, if we obeyed his commands, as Curcellæus, treading in the footsteps of his master, Socinus, artfully pretends; but because he engaged to God for us, to perform all those conditions in our stead, upon which we were to receive the testamentary inheritance. When Hezekiah desired the saving fruit of this suretiship, he prayed, Is. 38:14, "I am oppressed, עֲרַבְנִי undertake for me." And God himself, when he gives to his Son all the glory of this suretiship, expresses himself thus: Jer. 30:21, "For who is this that עָרַב engaged his heart to approach unto me? saith the Lord." That is, what mortal, nay, what creature, dares engage to perform all those things which are incumbent on the priest, who shall have a right to approach to me for himself and his people? Our surety, therefore, thus engaged to God for us. To what purpose is such a surety, who should only engage to us in the name of God? If Christ be a mere man, such as they represent him, could his engagement give us a greater assurance of the truth of the divine promises, than if we heard them immediately from the mouth of God himself? Was it not necessary that God, who cannot lie, should first of all engage to us that the man Christ would be true in all his sayings, before we could with sure confidence rely upon them? Is it not much better, and more safe, to rely upon the oath of the infallible God, by which he has abundantly "confirmed to the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel," Heb. 6:17, than on the declaration of a mere man, let him be ever so true and faithful? And what peculiar excellency would Christ have had above others in this case, to the honour of being the alone surety, had he only, by the publication of a saving doctrine, which he confirmed by his martyrdom, assured us of the certainty of the promises of grace; seeing the other prophets and apostles of Christ did the very same, not scrupling to undergo the most cruel death, in order to seal with their blood the truth of God's promises, which they had declared? What can vilify Christ, or make void his suretiship, if this does not?

II. Christ therefore is called our surety, because he engaged to God to make satisfaction for us. Which satisfaction again is not to be understood in the Socinian sense, as if it only consisted in this—that Christ most perfectly fulfilled the will of God, and fully executed every thing God enjoined him, on account of our salvation, and so in the fullest manner satisfied God, and that for us, that is, on our account, for our highest and eternal good: as Crellius, when making the greatest concessions, would fain put us off with these fair words: but it consists in this—that Christ, in our room and stead, did, both by doing and suffering, satisfy divine justice, both the legislative, the retributive, and the vindictive, in the most perfect manner, fulfilling all the righteousness of the law, which the law otherwise required of us, in order to impunity, and to our having a right to eternal life. If Christ did this, as we are immediately to show he did, nothing hinders why we may not affirm, he satisfied for us in the fullest sense of the word. For to what purpose is it superciliously to reject a term so commodious, because not to be met with on this subject in Scripture, if we can prove the thing signified by it?

III. We find his engaging to make this satisfaction, Ps. 40:6–8, expressed in these words by Christ: "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened: burnt offering

and sin offering thou hast not required. Then said I, Lo! I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me: I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my (bowels or) heart." Where observe: 1st, The covenant between the Lord Christ and the Father, by virtue of which Christ calls the Father his God. 2dly, That Christ freely, and of his own accord, entered into this covenant with the Father; since he compares himself to a servant, whose ears were bored, or digged through, in order voluntarily to serve his beloved Lord. 3dly, That by virtue of this covenant, Christ presented himself to do the acceptable רצון will of his God. 4thly, That that will was expressed by a law, which Christ has within his bowels, or heart, which he loves from his soul, and is to keep with all his heart. 5thly, That that law requires, not only perfect righteousness, in order to obtain a right to eternal life, but also deserved punishment to be inflicted on the sinner. For all this was signified by the sacrifices, gifts, burnt-offerings and sin-offerings of the law. For when the sinner offered to God beasts or corn, which were given to himself for food, and was careful to have them consumed by fire, as it were in his own room, he thereby confessed that, on account of his sin, he deserved the most dreadful destruction, and even the eternal flames of hell. 6thly, That these external ceremonies of sacrifices could never, without a respect to the thing signified, please God, nor "purge the conscience from dead works:" therefore Christ offered himself, in order to accomplish that will of God, by which we are sanctified, Heb. 10:10; both by fulfilling all the righteousness prescribed by the law, and by enduring the guilt of our sins, that he might atone for them as an expiatory sacrifice. All these things are contained in the suretiship of Christ described by David.

IV. Christ could, without any injury, undertake such a suretiship; 1st, Because he was the lord of his own life, which, on account of his power over it, he could engage to lay down for others; John 10:18, "I have power to lay it down. 2dly. Because, being God-man in one person, he was able to perform what he undertook, by enduring condign punishment, by fulfilling all righteousness, and, in both, performing an obedience of such value, as to be more than equivalent to the obedience of all the elect. 3dly, Because, by that means, he gave an instance of an extraordinary and incomprehensible degree of love, both to the glory of God, and the salvation of men. 4thly, Nor has his human nature any reason to complain, because a creature could have no greater glory than to be hypostatically united with a divine person, and be subservient to him for accomplishing the greatest work, which the whole choir of elect angels will, with astonishment, celebrate through eternity; especially, seeing it was assured, that after its sufferings, which were indeed the greatest that could be, yet of a short duration, that which was "made a little lower than the angels," should obtain a name above every name.

V. It was also worthy of God the Father, both to procure and accept of this suretiship of his Son; because, in the execution of it, there is a manifestation of the truth of God, exactly fulfilling every thing he had promised in his law to his justice, and had threatened against sin; and of the goodness of God, reconciling to himself sinful and wretched man, on giving and admitting a proper mediator; and of the justice of God, not clearing the guilty without a sufficient satisfaction; nay, accepting a far more excellent satisfaction than could ever be given by man himself, because of the more excellent obedience of Christ, and his more meritorious sufferings, Rom. 3:25; and of the holiness of God, not admitting man unto a blessed communion with himself, unless justified by the blood, and sanctified by the Spirit of Christ; in fine, of the all-sufficiency of God, who, as what seemed a thing almost incredible, is, by this means, become, without any diminution to his perfections, the God and salvation of the sinner. Hence it is, that

the Lord Jesus, in the execution of his undertaking, professes he manifested the "name," that is, the perfections of God, John 17:6; particularly those we have just now mentioned. Ps. 40:10: "I have not hid thy righteousness within my heart; I have declared thy faithfulness and thy salvation; I have not concealed thy loving-kindness and thy truth from the great congregation." As, then, nothing can be thought more worthy of God, than the manifesting, in the most illustrious manner, the glory of the divine perfections, and these perfections shine forth nowhere with greater luster than in the satisfaction of Christ, it was altogether worthy of God to procure and admit his undertaking such a satisfaction.

VI. Nor by the admission of such suretiship is there any abrogation of, or derogation to, the divine law; as little any contradiction of, or substitution of another, but only a favourable construction put upon it, because the law, as it stood, but only taken in a favourable sense, was most fully satisfied by the Redeemer, who was in the closest union with us, when he paid the due ransom. Whence the apostle said, Rom. 8:4, the righteousness of the law was fulfilled by Christ. We shall not improperly conceive of the whole in the following manner: The law declares, there is no admission for any to eternal life, but on the account of a most perfect and complete righteousness; also, that every sinner shall undergo the penalty of death, and be under its dominion for ever. However, it is a doubtful matter, not explained by the law, whether that perfect righteousness must necessarily be performed by the very person to be saved, or whether a surety may be admitted, who shall perform it in his room. Again, it is doubtful whether it was necessary the sinner should in his own person undergo the deserved punishment, or whether he could truly undergo it in the person of a sponsor. In fine, it is a matter of doubt whether he who was to undergo the penalty ought to do so to an infinite degree, with respect to duration, or whether that dominion of death could be abolished by the sufficient dignity and worth of the person who should undergo it, and so death be swallowed up in victory. Strict justice would, as the words seem to import, at first view, demand the former; but the favourable construction, which, according to Aristotle, *Ethic. lib. v. c. 10*, is "an amendment of the law, where it is deficient, on account of its universality," admits of the latter, where it can be obtained; as really was and is the case with Christ and Christians. Thus, therefore, that in which the law seemed to be defective from its universality, comes to be corrected; not as to the intention of God the lawgiver, which is altogether invariable, and always most perfect; but as to the express form of the words: almost in the same manner, as if a father should be admitted to pay an equivalent fine for his son, and instead of silver, make payment in gold. This would be a favourable interpretation of the law.

VII. Nor was it unjust for Christ to be punished for us; seeing Socinus himself and Crellius own that the most grievous torments, nay, death itself, might be inflicted on Christ, though most innocent; which also appears from the event. For God, in right of his dominion, could lay all those afflictions on Christ, especially with the effectual consent of the Lord Jesus himself, who had power over his own life. The whole difficulty lies in the formality of the punishment. But as Christ most willingly took upon himself our transgressions, and the trespasses we had committed against the divine majesty, and offered himself as a surety for them; God, as the supreme governor, could justly exact punishment of Christ in our room, and actually did so. And thus "the chastisement of our peace"—that exemplary punishment inflicted on Christ, in which God, by the brightest example, showed his implacable hatred to sin, "was upon him" Is 53:5, who brought pardon and peace unto us. For מוֹסֵר, was upon him, here is that exemplary punishment, in which

God's wrath against sin is discovered, which is well adapted to deter others from it. Thus Jer. 30:14, "אכזרי מריסר the punishment of a cruel one," and Prov. 7:22, "אוייל מיסר the exemplary punishment of a fool," and Ez. 5:15, "So it shall be a reproach, and a taunt, an instruction, מוסר (example), and an astonishment."

VIII. But we certainly take too much upon us, when we presume to examine the equity of the divine government by the standard of our reason; when the fact is plain, we are always to vindicate God against the sophistry of our foolish reasonings. That man is certainly the author of a monstrous, horrible, and detestable heresy, and discovers a profane arrogance, who, like Socinus, is not ashamed to write as follows: "As for my part, indeed, though such a thing should be found, not once, but frequently in the sacred records, I would not on that account believe it to be so." But modesty should teach us rather to say, "That truly for my part, though my reason, which I know is blind and foolish, and apt to be clamorous against God, should a thousand times gainsay it, I would not therefore presume to call in question what I find but once in the sacred records; or, by seeking some other interpretation, would I force on the words of Scripture any meaning more consonant to my reason." When, therefore, we shall have proved from holy writ that the Lord Christ has made satisfaction to the justice of God, we may and ought to rest assured that there is no injustice in it: according to the maxim which nature itself dictates, that "all the ways of God are righteousness and truth."

IX. No Christian questions that Christ fulfilled all righteousness. The multitude of the Jews, Mark 7:37, testified concerning him, "He hath done all things well." And he declared this truly, as he did everything else concerning himself: "For I do those things that please him," John 8:29. And hence he boldly appealed to his enemies, ver. 46, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" Nay, even to his Father himself, Ps. 69:5: "O God, thou knowest my foolishness; and my sins are not hid from thee:" for I suppose this Psalm contains a prayer of the Lord Christ, as appears from several parts of it being often quoted in the New Testament. And these words, I think, contain a protestation of the Lord Jesus to his Father, of his own innocence; of which Theodorus, in Catena, has given no improper paraphrase: "Whether I have been guilty of any fault against thee, thou thyself knowest, and art my witness, I have done nothing. But I think the meaning may be more fully expressed, thus: It is true, my God, I have taken guilt upon me, and am made a curse; but thou knowest all my sins, even to the slightest offence, for which I suffer; that in all there is not the least fault of mine, by which I have violated thy law, so as to restore what I have taken. The truth of this protestation the Father attests, when, Is. 53:11, he calls Christ his "righteous servant," and "justified him in the Spirit," 1 Tim. 3:16, declaring that, as man, he was innocent of every crime falsely laid to his charge; on the contrary, he honoured his Father by his perfect obedience; and, as mediator, so diligently executed his office, that he was deficient in nothing.

X. It is also allowed, that the most holy obedience of Christ was for our good; because therein we have, 1st, A confirmation of his heavenly doctrine; the works of his most perfect holiness, no less than his miracles, being a demonstration that he was a preacher of divine truth sent down from heaven. 2dly, A living law and most perfect pattern of holiness, worthy of God and of the children of God, of which we had an exact delineation in the written law; but its shining forth in its lively image and native light in Christ and his actions, is fitted to stir up every man to love it, who beholds it with a spiritual eye. Mankind wanted this even to discern the unspotted image of



the divine holiness in one of their brethren; which at length they obtained in Christ, who "left us an example, that we should follow his steps." 1 Pet. 2:21. 3dly, A pointing out of the way to heaven: Christ teaching us not only by his words, but his actions, that "without holiness no one shall see the Lord," Heb. 12:14.

XI. But we must proceed a step further, and affirm, that the obedience of Christ was accomplished by him, in our room, in order thereby to obtain for us a right to eternal life. The law, which God will have secured inviolable, admits none to glory but on condition of perfect obedience, which none was ever possessed of but Christ, who bestows it freely on his own people. This is what the apostle declares, Rom. 5:16: "But the free gift of Jesus Christ is of many offences unto justification:" that is, though we want those works, for which the reward may be due; nay, though for so many sins we may have deserved an eternal curse; nevertheless, there is something sufficient, not only for abolishing many offences, but likewise to be the meritorious cause of righteousness; namely, the obedience of one; and it becomes ours by gratuitous gift. More clearly still, ver. 19, "For as by one man's disobedience many were made [constituted] sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made [constituted] righteous." The former "one man" was Adam, the root and federal head of mankind. By his disobedience, all mankind, as belonging to him, were involved in the guilt of the curse: and as he sustained the person of all, what he did amiss is accounted as done by all. The other is the "one man" Christ, who neither sinned in and with Adam, nor had the dominion of sin and death passed upon him, and who is worthy to be both lord and head, a second Adam, and the origin and source of the inheritance to be devolved on his brethren. He is possessed of an obedience, even to the whole law of God, which enjoined him to have a perfect love for the glory of his Father, and for the salvation of his brethren. By that obedience, the collective body of those who belong to him are constituted righteous; that is, are judged to have a right to eternal life, no less than if every one had performed that obedience in his own person.

XII. Nor should it be thought strange that the obedience of Christ is sufficient to acquire to all a right to eternal life; even though it became him, as man, to yield obedience for himself. For we are here to consider the dignity of the person obeying; who being man in such a manner, as at the same time to be the eternal and infinite God, is much more excellent than all the elect, taken together; and therefore his obedience is deservedly esteemed of such value, as may be imputed to all, for obtaining a right to a blessed immortality. And although the divinity, in the abstract, did not obey; yet he who did is God; and thus the divinity of the person contributes very much to the dignity of the obedience. It is certain that, as man, he owed obedience for himself; but since he became man on our account, he also performed that obedience in our room. Moreover, as man, he was not necessarily under the law, as prescribing the condition of happiness; because, if we set aside the condition of the suretiship undertaken for us, he would have enjoyed all manner of happiness, from the first moment of his incarnation, on account of the union of the humanity with the Godhead; as we have more fully shown, chap. III. §. 13, 14.

XIII. It would likewise be false to infer from this, that "if Christ performed obedience for us, we ourselves are under no necessity of obeying, because no demand can be made on the principal debtor, for what the surety has performed in his room." Our obedience may be considered, either as it is the duty of the rational creature, with respect to his sovereign Lord; or as it is a condition of acquiring a right to eternal life: in the latter respect Christ accomplished it for us; and

therefore, under that relation, it neither is nor can be required of us, as if for want of perfect obedience we could be excluded from eternal life. But in the former respect, we by all means owe obedience, and the obligation to it is rather increased than diminished by this instance of Christ's love. For what more proper, than by this to show our gratitude, and declare, not so much by words as actions, that we acknowledge him for our Lord, who has purchased us for himself? And in fine, that as adopted sons we decline no obedience to our heavenly Father, whom his natural Son, and of the same substance with himself, so cheerfully obeyed.

XIV. But besides, Christ satisfied the vindictive justice of God, not only for our good, but also in our room, by enduring those most dreadful sufferings, both in soul and body, which we had deserved, and from which he, by undergoing them, did so deliver us, that they could not, with the wrath and curse of God, as the proper punishment of our sin, be inflicted on us. If there is any point in our divinity accurately proved, and solidly defended against the exceptions of the Socinians, by illustrious persons in the church, it is certainly this: which I choose not to repeat, desiring the reader to fetch the arguments from a Grotius, a Junius, a Turretine, a Hornbeck, an Essenius, and the like renowned heroes, which will baffle all the efforts of the adversaries properly to answer.

## Chapter VI: What Sufferings of Christ are Satisfactory

I. BUT it is really to be lamented, that, in these our days, a new question should be started among the orthodox; namely, which of the suffering of Christ ought to be deemed satisfactory in our room. There is one in particular, who seems to acknowledge none of the sufferings of Christ to be satisfactory for us, but those which Christ underwent during the three hours of the solar darkness, while he was upon the cross, and before he expired; excluding from the number of satisfactory sufferings, that agony and horror, which he endured in the garden of Olivet\* the night in which he was apprehended, and that blood which he shed before and when he was crucified, and after he expired on the cross. He had not, says he, commenced his satisfactory actions, when, by a word, he levelled his enemies with the ground, cured Malchus, and promised paradise to the thief: no expiation was yet made, when an angel came to strengthen him. Nay, he affirms that Christ did not suffer corporal death as our surety, and in our room, and that consequently it belongs not to the satisfaction which he made to the justice of God, if indeed he then fully satisfied God, when he died. But in case Christ should seem to have suffered all these things in vain, the learned person concludes, that they were done in order to satisfy the veracity of God, which had foretold that thus it should be, and to fulfil the types by which they were prefigured in the Old Testament; distinguishing, moreover, between convincing and compensating punishments, between warlike sufferings and judiciary. He calls those compensating and judiciary, which Christ endured during the three hours of darkness: the others only convincing and warlike sufferings; having this tendency, that Christ might become a merciful High Priest.

II. But it will be worth while to trace the hypothesis of this very learned person from the foundation, which he has done himself very accurately, in a letter to a friend, published after the first and second editions of my work. For he maintains: 1st, That when God threatened man, if he sinned, with death, he meant that death, which our first parents incurred on the very day they sinned, and which Christ the surety underwent in the room and stead of some, and which the damned themselves, who are without a surety, shall suffer and be forced to undergo for themselves. But that is the death of the whole man; because the subject of it is man, made up of soul and body united; and consists, not only in the privation of the sense of God's favour, and of communion with him, and of a joyful delight in the enjoyment of him, but it is also attended with all the torture and racking pain, which the almighty wrath of God can inflict. 2dly, Our first parents underwent that death immediately upon their sin: for in the cool of the same day in which they sinned, when drawing towards the evening, they heard the voice of the Lord continually walking in the garden. It was not that articulate voice which Adam was before accustomed to hear, and was afterwards pleased with its sound, but such as was heard at Sinai, Ex. 19:16, 17; and described Ps. 29 and 77:18, 19. The voice of thunder and lightning, a token of God's powerful wrath, which the guilty creature could neither bear nor avoid, which made Adam and Eve hide themselves in the thickest of the trees of the garden, just as the damned will desire to do, Rev. 6:15. 3rdly, While our first parents endured this threatened death, satisfaction was made to the veracity of God, but not to his justice, demanding a plenary and sufficient compensation. But, on account of the mediatorial covenant between the Father and Son, there intervened the long-suffering of God, or a deferring of his wrath, which removed that death from man, and deferred it to the day of wrath and the last judgment. 4thly, Christ the surety, in the fulness of time, underwent this same death of the whole man, in soul and body united: while on the cross he

was forsaken of God, and, at the same time, had the sensation of his most dreadful wrath, who, while demanding payment of him, was pleased to bruise him; a bruising not inflicted by men, but immediately by God, who punished him with affliction and imprisonment, which will be the punishment of the damned; as it was of Christ, who is said to be *מעונה* and *עצר* afflicted and in prison, Is. 53:4–8. 5thly, Men were not able to behold this dreadful part of his punishment; for a most horrid and outward darkness concealed Christ from every eye. His whole man suffered this death, till divine justice was satisfied; and it sufficiently appeared to have been satisfied, when God removed the darkness, that the creature, who had before acted as an enemy against him, on whom God was taking vengeance, might again refresh himself, and when he likewise comforted him with such a sense of his paternal love, as now to be able to call God his Father, and commend his spirit into his hands, &c. 6thly, Moreover, he felt and properly bore this death on the cross, when he cried out, "My God! why hast thou forsaken me?" He dreaded this death in the garden, as he saw it coming upon him, and this, therefore, is called the antepassion; and he was delivered from it, when he said, "It is finished!" 7thly, The mediator, Christ, was bound, by his covenant engagement, to this alone, and neither to spiritual death, which supposes a want of rectitude, nor to corporal death. For when he was made known in the first Gospel promise, Gen. 3:15, no mention was yet made of corporal death, till verse 19. He therefore could not be bound to that by any vicarious title. The apostle tells us what his corporal death was, Heb. 10:20. When the blood of the sacrifice was shed for sin, atonement was made; but in order to present it to God, the priest carried the blood, which procured the atonement, into the holy of holies; the veil, which denoted the separation by sin, being made to give way. In like manner, also, when Christ completed his death, or endured the whole load of anguish and wrath, having obtained eternal redemption, which he testified by his saying, "It is finished;" he was to carry his blood, or soul, into the heavenly sanctuary. The veil standing in the way was his human nature, which, upon taking upon him the sins of the elect, kept him at a distance from God; but after satisfaction made, that veil was rent asunder by the separation of soul and body, and conveyed his spirit, by an open way, to the presence of God. And thus the corporal death of Christ belongs not to the meritorious (which may be done by the alone death of man, not separated with respect to his essential parts), but to the representing satisfaction. Thus far this learned person. And who can deny, but these things are ingeniously devised, and learnedly connected? But whether they are as solid as they are uncommon, I imagine I may, with the consent of the lovers of truth, modestly inquire.

III. I remember to have learned, in the communion of the reformed church, to the following effect: 1st, That the death wherewith God threatened man for sin, comprises, in its whole extent, all that misery which, by the justest displeasure of God, has followed upon sin, and to which the sinner man is obnoxious all his life, and whose principal part consists in the want of the favour of God, and in the keenest sense of the divine curse, to be chiefly inflicted when it shall so please God. 2dly, That Christ, by the interposition of his engagements for the elect, took upon himself all that curse which man was liable to on account of sin: hence it was, that, in order to the payment of the debt he engaged for, he led a life in the assumed human nature, subject to many vicissitudes of misery, just like the life of a human sinner. 3rdly, That as God uses much forbearance with respect to sinners, and moderates the bitterness of life with some sweetness of patience, till the day of vengeance, and of the retribution of his righteous judgment, when the whole weight of the curse shall light upon the condemned sinner; so also Christ, when in the form of a servant, had not always a sense of the painful effects of the sins that were laid upon

him, but sometimes rejoiced in an eminent mixture of favour, till the hour and power of darkness came, when, being called to the bar, he had every thing dreadful to undergo. 4thly, That as the death, which consists in the separation of soul and body, is inflicted on the sinner man, as the sad effect of the wrath of God; so, in like manner, Christ underwent the same death, that in this respect also, making satisfaction to divine justice, he might remove all the curse of that death from the elect. 5thly, In fine, that as all those miseries taken together are what sin deserves; so Christ, who by his engagement took upon himself all the debt of the elect, did, by all these miseries, to which he was subject all his life, satisfy divine justice; so that, taken altogether, they constitute the ransom which was due for our sins. This, if I mistake not, is the common opinion of our divines, which our Catechism has also expressed, quest. 37; namely, that all the sufferings which Christ endured both in soul and body, through the whole course of his life, constitute his one and perfect satisfaction; though it be certain that those were the most grievous sufferings with which he encountered on the last night and day; and that what he bore in his body were far exceeded by those that oppressed his soul: Just as the whole of Christ's most holy obedience is imputed to us for righteousness, though he gave an eminent demonstration of it when he was obedient to his Father to the death, even the death of the cross; which consisted in a voluntary submission of soul, rather than in any thing he endured in the members of the body, directed by his holy soul. Which we prove from Scripture in the following manner:—

IV. 1st, When the Scripture speaks of the satisfaction of Christ, it ascribes it to the sufferings of Christ in general, as Is. 53:4, "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows;" that is, he hath suffered all the pains and sorrows due to us for sin; and that not only for our good, but in our stead. For, ver. 5. "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities;" so that these sins were the meritorious cause of the griefs and anguish of Christ; because the Lord בּוֹ הַפְּגִיעַ "made them to light or rush upon him," v. 6; and for these "he was afflicted," ver. 7, when the iniquity of us all שָׁגַג was exacted by God, as judge and avenger. But that affliction even then lay upon him, and our iniquity was exacted of him, when he was "brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers, was dumb:" which certainly happened before the three hours of darkness, ver. 7. He therefore gives too great scope to his fancy, who restrains the things which are affirmed of the afflictions, griefs, and anguish of Christ in general, to the three hours' sufferings.

V. Add what the apostle writes, Heb. 2:10: "For it became him to make the captain of their salvation perfect (to consecrate) through sufferings." So that those sufferings which Christ endured (and who shall pretend to except any, the apostle speaking in such general terms?) were requisite, in order to Christ's being a perfect Saviour to us, and a sacrifice consecrated and acceptable to God; for this τελείωσις or perfecting of Christ, signifies the performing of all those things to which he bound himself by his suretiship, and especially of those required to the full accomplishment of his sacerdotal expiation. And the apostle applies the sufferings of Christ to this perfecting or consecrating. Whence Chrysostom concludes well: "Wherefore the sufferings are the perfecting and the cause of salvation." Nay, the sacred writer had here in view all those sufferings "by which he learned obedience; for being made perfect by them, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him," Heb. 5:8, 9. But he learned obedience not only by his three hours' sufferings, but in general by all his suffering; from which he learned and experienced the full extent of that obedience to which he voluntarily submitted: nay, indeed, he principally learned obedience from his foregoing sufferings, for by these, as by certain

principles, he was trained up to undergo those that were extremely painful. And thus the cause of our salvation is ascribed to all the sufferings which Christ endured in the days of his flesh.

VI. Peter, 1 Epist. 2:21, speaks the same language: "Christ ἐπαθεν ὑπερ ὑμῶν suffered for us." To suffer here denotes to be in affliction; for all those sufferings are here intended in which Christ has left us an example of patience. These sufferings he affirms to be for us, that is, undergone as well in our stead, as for our good. For this is ordinarily the signification of the word ὑπερ: as in Euripides in Alceste, μη θνησχ' ὑπερ τοῦ δ' ἀνδρὸς, οὐδ' ἐγὼ πρὸ σοῦ, "Die not for this man, as little shall I for thee;" which is to be understood in no other sense but that of substitution; as the subject of the tragedy, exhibiting the wife dying in the room of her husband, plainly shows. In the same manner, Demosthenes in Corona, says, ἐρώτησον τοῦτους, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐγὼ τοῦθ' ὑπερ σοῦ ποιήσω, "Ask these, or rather I shall do it for you." And that this is the true meaning of Peter, we conclude hence, that in chap. 3:18, he says, Christ suffered for sins; namely, that he might be "the propitiation for our sins," 1 John 4:10. But the sufferings which Christ underwent in our room, I imagine, may be said to be satisfactory.

VII. In fine, as "the likeness of sinful flesh," or the sorrowful and contemptible condition of Christ, runs parallel with the whole course of his life, and he took it upon him for sin; so that God did therefore condemn sin, and declare it had no manner of right over believers, either to condemn them or reign over them, Rom. 8:3; it is manifest, that the Scripture ascribes the satisfaction of Christ to the whole of his humiliation: consequently, they do not take the Scriptures for their guide, who confine it to the sufferings only of those three hours.

VIII. 2dly, The Scriptures so expressly declare, that Christ's death, even his corporal death, is to be esteemed a part of his satisfaction, that it is astonishing how any one could deny it. Thus, Is. 53:10, "When thou shalt make his soul (when his soul shall make itself)  $\delta\psi\alpha$  an offering for sin;" which Christ himself, Matt. 20:28, calls, "to give his life a ransom for many," and he says, John 10:15, "I lay down my life for the sheep." But "to give his life," is to die a corporal death, which the resurrection puts an end to. For, thus Christ explains it, verse 17, "I lay down my life, that I may take it again." And John says, chap. 19:30, when describing the corporal death of Christ, "he gave up the ghost." The argument will still be stronger, if we consider, that here an allusion is made to that typical satisfaction, which was effected by shedding the blood of the victim, so separated from the body, as to be accompanied with death. But the blood is given for the life. And therefore, a true satisfaction was made by the separation of the soul from the body of Christ, in order to keep up the resemblance between the type and antitype.

IX. Add what Paul writes, Heb. 10:20, "By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh;" the flesh of Christ was doubtless the veil, which hindered our access. For, while it still continued entire, it was an indication that sin was not yet abolished, nor the curse removed. It was therefore necessary, that the veil or flesh of Christ should be rent, which was done, when the spirit quitted the flesh; for, then the body, ceasing to be a system of organs, became a heap of dusty particles, soon to return to dust, unless a speedy resurrection prevented it. And thus a new way was consecrated for us, that is, complete liberty purchased, and full right to the heavenly sanctuary. This was signified and sealed by that rending of the veil in the temple, at the very instant of Christ's death, Matt. 27:51. Hence the body of Christ is said to be broken for us, 1 Cor. 11:24. It is not improperly observed by the learned

person, that upon shedding the blood of the sacrifice, expiation was made, which was afterwards to be presented to God by bringing the blood into the holy of holies. But I wish he would consider, what I have just hinted, the separation of the soul of Christ from the body answered to the shedding of the blood, which is the rending of the veil, and breaking of the body; as the bringing the soul into heaven, to present to God the satisfaction made by death, answers to the introduction of the blood into the holy of holies.

X. And what is more evident than that passage? 1 Pet. 3:18, "Christ hath suffered once for sins, being put to death in the flesh," that is, in the body; where the death of the body is set forth as a part of those sufferings, which Christ endured for sins; and Col. 1:20, 22, "He hath reconciled you in the body of his flesh through death:" Rom. 5:10, "We were reconciled to God by the death of his son:" Heb. 9:15, "that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." And what death does Paul here mean? Doubtless that which must intervene for the confirmation of the testament, verses 16, 17, which certainly is the death of the body: Rom. 8:34, "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died." To explain all this in such a manner, as by death not to understand what, in every language, the death of a man signifies, namely, the separation of soul and body, is harsh and unreasonable.

XI. 3dly, Besides, both Isaiah and Peter affirm, that our healing is, in a more especial manner, owing to the stripes of Christ, as a part of his sufferings, Is. 53:5, 1 Pet. 2:24; while they say, "By (or with) his stripes we are healed." For, by that cruel scourging, whereby the whole body of the Lord Jesus was so mangled, as in a manner to become one continued stripe, together with his other sufferings, he merited that we should be delivered from the sufferings of Satan, and the strokes of divine vengeance. And when we further contemplate the sufferings of Christ, and, among them, that cruel scourging whereby the Lord Jesus was made a spectacle to men and angels, we then understand what the holiness of God is; what God requires, in order to the remission of sins; what the sinner must undergo, if he would make satisfaction to God and to his holiness; what a dreadful thing sin is; and, in fine, how much we are indebted to Christ, for enduring so much for us. And this healing from sin is ours, if we dread the wrath of God, are in love with his holiness, and make returns of love to Christ. And thus it appears, though we say we are healed by the stripes of Christ as by an example; yet there is in the scourging of Christ, a demonstration of the justice of God, that we may know it; and, by knowing it with due affection, be restored to the likeness of God. In these stripes there is שלומינו מוסר, an exemplary punishment bringing peace to us: as we lately showed that wood imports.

XII. 4thly, Nothing can appear more absurd than to exclude from the satisfactory sufferings of Christ, by way of eminence, that sorrow of his soul, that great trouble and heaviness, that horror and amazement, that exceeding great sorrow, even unto death, those clots of bloody sweat, those prayers and supplications, with tears and strong cries, the result of all this agony; which the Holy Ghost so circumstantially describes. This exceeding trouble and agony did not arise only from the sympathy of the soul with the body, nor from the mere horror of impending death; it was something else that afflicted the soul of Christ; namely, his bearing the sins, not of one, but of all the elect. He had beheld the awful tribunal of God, before which he was presently to appear, in order to pay, what he took not away; he saw the Judge himself armed with all the terrors of his incomprehensible vengeance, the law brandishing all the thunders of its curses, the devil and all

the powers of darkness, with all the gates of hell just ready to pour in upon his soul; in a word, he saw justice itself, in all its inexorable rigour, to which he was now to make full satisfaction: he saw the face of his dearest Father, without darting a single ray of favour upon him, but rather burning with hot jealousy in all the terrors of his wrath against the sins of mankind, which he had undertaken to atone for; and whithersoever he turned, not the least glimpse of relief appeared for him, either in heaven or on earth, till, with resolution and constancy, he had acquitted himself in the combat. These, these are the things which, not without reason, struck Christ with terror and amazement, and forced from him his groans, his sighs, and his tears. And if all this was not for the expiation and satisfaction for our sins, what reason can be assigned, why the other sufferings of Christ, within the three hours of darkness, should be accounted so?

XIII. He certainly forms too slender a judgment of them, who affirms that those horrors and this anguish were, in comparison of the more grievous tortures, which Christ endured on the cross itself, only to be deemed an antepassion, or a kind of prelibation or foretaste. But neither do the Scriptures, which represent these things with such a flow of words, nor our expositors on Heb. 5:7, speak in this manner, though a certain person perverts their words to that purpose. And it would be difficult to point out what the soul of Christ endured on the cross itself, which could so vastly exceed these horrors. There he complained of sorrow, here he was not silent; there he bore the curse due to us, here he almost sunk under it; there he complained of being forsaken of his Father, here he almost fainted away on taking the most bitter cup of wrath: nay, greater signs of consternation could scarce be observed on the cross, than what appeared here. We shall presently reply to what we read about the comforting angel. It must indeed have been an exceeding great distress, at the first onset of which, resolution and constancy itself began to "be amazed, in heaviness, and exceeding sorrowful even unto death," that made him offer prayers and supplications to him, who could preserve him from death, with strong cries and tears; that made him struggle with so much agony, as rendered the appearance of a comforting angel necessary, and made his sweat trickle down his body, like clots of blood falling to the ground: this discovered a commotion of the spirits and blood, as we scarce, if ever, meet with a similar instance in history. Let us therefore beware, that we take not upon us, with too much confidence, to determine what sufferings of Christ, and in what degree, some were more grievous than others: let us rather prize all of them, and acknowledge their proper weight and satisfactory value. This is far more suitable to the glory of Christ, and to the sincerity of our faith.

XIV. 5thly, and lastly, Christ endured all those sufferings, either as a surety, or in some other respect. If as a surety, we have what we plead for; for he engaged to satisfy divine justice, not only for our good, but in our room, by undergoing the punishment of our sins, the guilt of which he voluntarily took upon himself. This is a fundamental point among the orthodox: nor will the learned person, whose opinion we have taken in pieces, deny it. If we seclude the consideration of a suretiship, Christ can be no otherwise considered than as innocent and perfectly holy. But it does not seem to be very consistent with the justice of God, that an innocent person, as such, should be punished, to the shedding of his blood, to cruel and inexpressible agony of soul, in a word, to death itself. Or, should God, at any time, be pleased to expose an innocent creature to such dreadful torturer, in order to show his incontestable authority; it is not likely he would choose to give such a proof of it in the person of his only-beloved Son, who fully acknowledges the right or authority of the Father. And then, of what use were those sufferings of Christ, if not undergone in our room? Was it, in order to confirm his doctrine? Or to give a pattern of patience,



and show us the way by which, through straits and difficulties, we might reach to things noble and divine? Or was it, that, being made a merciful High Priest, he might readily afford assistance to the tempted? Or was it to fulfil the truth of the prophecies, and answer the signification of the types? But all these particulars, the blasphemous Socinus, with his followers, will easily admit. And if we here stop short, we allow no greater value to the sufferings of Christ, than what has been done by these worst perverters of our religion, and of the hope and consolation of believers.

XV. But the very learned person takes a far different course, whose observations, which lately came to hand on account of their late publication, deserve a particular hearing. Seeing the sinner, man, says he, was, according to what God had threatened, become liable to death, till he had satisfied divine justice, Gen. 2:17, and was brought into that condition by the devil, who conquered man, and thereby became his lord, 2 Pet. 2:19, under whose dominion and captivity man afterwards lived; in order to deliver, and perfectly restore him, it was necessary, because he could do neither of these things himself, both that another should undergo and conquer for him the death which he deserved, and that another should rescue him from the power of the devil, and deliver him by force and military prowess. The former requires a surety, who, taking guilt upon himself in man's name, should willingly and patiently undergo the just penalty from the hands of the most righteous judge to his full satisfaction. The latter calls for a Redeemer,\* who, by a just claim, may rescue slaves out of the hands of an unjust tyrant, such as is he who, by fraud and violence, acquires a dominion; and, by opposition and resistance, injures the innocent. For both these purposes God appointed his own Son, whom, by an eternal covenant, he chose to the mediatorial office; and revealed in his word, that he should be the valiant conqueror of the serpent, and the deliverer of some men, Gen. 3:15; also, a vicarious surety, and afterwards, a sacrifice, which was pointed out by clothing our first parents with skins, verse 21. The sufferings of Christ therefore are twofold; one judicial, which he endured as surety, justly on the part of God, for the debts of others, which he had undertaken to pay, and which being done, a reconciliation is the consequence; the other warlike, which he endured as deliverer or redeemer, unjustly from the hands of his enemies, Satan and his instruments, because he will bring to salvation those whom he redeems by his ransom. Both these kinds of sufferings belong to the perfecting of Christ.

XVI. In this discourse of the very learned person, every thing savours of learning: much also is genuine and solid, which I heartily approve; for it is certain, that Christ is not only our surety, but also our deliverer: what merits our consideration here is only this, whether, when Christ, by his judicial sufferings as surety, fully satisfied divine justice, other sufferings are also requisite, by which, as Redeemer, he might overcome Satan, and bring the redeemed to heaven by his ransom? To me the matter appears in this light; namely, as all the sufferings of men arise from the demerit of their sins, no matter whether immediately inflicted by God, or by means of Satan and his instruments, Jer. 2:15, 16, 17; so, in like manner, all the sufferings of Christ arose from the demerit of our sins: and when he had satisfied divine justice for these, he merited deliverance for his own, not only from the wrath of God, but also from the tyranny of the devil; but, in order to deliver his redeemed from these, there is no occasion for sufferings of another kind, but only for his power and authority. It is sufficient for this, that he is "the mighty God," Is. 9:6: "the mighty one of Jacob," Is. 60:16: "stronger than the strong man," Luke 11:21, 22. I own Christ had to struggle with the devil, which he could not do without sufferings: but even this very thing was owing to the demerit of our sins. For, when man had suffered himself to be overcome by

Satan, and when God had, by a just sentence, delivered him up as a slave to his tyranny; it was necessary that Christ, as man's surety, should be exposed to and harassed by the devil, that in that respect also he might satisfy divine justice: nor could the devil and his instruments ever have been able to give any vexation to Christ, had he not been charged with the guilt of our crimes, and by God, the most righteous Judge, exposed to injuries from them, Acts 2:23. But we are to speak more at large of this presently.

XVII. And thus we are come to the examination of those distinctions, by which the learned person explains and maintains his cause; namely, he distinguishes between compensating and convincing punishments, between judiciary and warlike sufferings. The meaning of the distinctions, if I rightly take them, is this: compensating punishment is that whereby satisfaction is made to divine justice, of which Rom. 2:5, 6, 8, 9, and called "the wrath to come," Matt. 3:7, 1 Thess. 1:10. Convincing punishment is that which is only inflicted in order thereby to convince man of his sin, though by undergoing it no satisfaction is made to divine justice, nor any guilt removed, but still remains to be further avenged. Such punishment the Scriptures call הַמָּה תְּבַחֵת convictions of wrath, "furious rebukes," Ezek. 5:15. Of these it is said, Ps. 50:21, "אוֹכִיחֶךָ I will convince, reprove thee, and set them in order before thine eyes." Judiciary sufferings are those which are inflicted by God, as an impartial Judge, for a compensation or satisfaction to his justice, and in which there is wrath; and thus they are the same with compensating punishments. Warlike sufferings are those to which Christ was exposed when conflicting with the devil, who persecuted him immediately upon his birth by means of Herod, afterwards tempted him in the wilderness, and many ways reviled and maltreated him by the enraged ministers of his malice, according to what God says, Gen. 3:15, "And I will put enmity," &c. In these, with respect to Christ, there was no wrath of God; but rather they tended to grace and glory, when as one suffers for righteousness, sake, 1 Pet. 4:14.

XVIII. To this we reply as follows: No doubt a distinction is to be made between the calamities whereby God brings believers and his elect to the knowledge and sense of their sins, and which spring from love, and are called, Heb. 12:6, "fatherly chastisements;" and the calamities, which are inflicted on the wicked who are under the wrath and curse of God. But to make some of the punishments of the wicked only convincing, and others compensating, has neither the countenance of Scripture nor reason.

XIX. The Scripture, indeed, speaks of "the wrath to come," which, doubtless, is compensating; but they also frequently mention a present wrath and curse, Ps. 56:8, and Ps. 59:25 compare 2 Thess. 2:16, John 3:36, "the wrath of God abideth on him." Wherefore unregenerate sinners are called, Eph. 2:3, "τέκνα ὀργῆς, children of wrath," not only because they are liable to the wrath to come, but also on account of the wrath and curse of God actually hanging over them, while they are not translated into the kingdom of his dear Son. "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men," Rom. 1:18. Which wrath of God against the wicked, being very different from that with which he is said to be angry against the sins of his own children, no reason can be assigned why it may not be deemed compensating, as it is the beginning of the eternal curse, from which it differs not in essence, but only in degree.

XX. Add, that this present wrath is a judiciary punishment, inflicted by the righteous sentence of God on the wicked. The obstinate unbeliever "ἤδη κερταί, is condemned already," John 3:18.

God, in punishing the wicked in this life, "ובהמה באף שפטים" executes judgments in anger and in fury," Ezek. 5:15: as in Egypt, he executed "גדלים שפטים" great judgments," Ex. 6:6, and 7:4, that all may know, "בארץ שפטים אלהים" that he is a God that judgeth in the earth," Ps. 58:11. But why may not a judiciary punishment be also deemed compensating?

XXI. And then those punishments of the wicked, called in Scripture "תיכחות" rebukes," are sometimes so described as that they must be compensating. For what else is a compensating punishment, but the vengeance of an offended God on those that despise him, in order to manifest his hatred against them? But all this is contained in those convincing rebukes, which the Lord denounces against the Philistines, Ezek. 25:17: "And I will execute great vengeance upon them with furious rebukes; and they shall know that I am the Lord, when I shall lay my vengeance upon them."

XXII. Convincing or rebuking punishments are also no less compensating. Who shall deny that it is a compensating punishment, when God consumes the wicked in his fury? For that, in the highest degree convinces them of their guilt. Ps. 59:13: "Consume in wrath, consume them, that they may not be; and let them know, that God ruleth in Jacob unto the ends of the earth." And surely nothing can convince the wicked more of the heinousness of their sins, than a punishment heightened to the greatest degree, as a compensating punishment is, and in which there is a most evident demonstration of the wrath of God. Deservedly, therefore, we reject that distinction, which has not any foundation in Scripture, and whose parts are contrary to the rules of sound logic.

XXIII. But though we should admit that distinction in general, how is it applicable to the sufferings of Christ? Here I own I do not fully understand the learned author's meaning. To what purpose is this distinction of convincing and compensating punishments? Is it, that, as the punishments which the wicked endure in this life are only convincing; and a compensating punishment will at length be inflicted at the day of wrath and judgment; so also the sufferings which Christ underwent during the whole time of his life answer to those convincing punishments, and the three hours' sufferings to the compensating punishment? But what necessity to exact convincing punishments of Christ, seeing he both perfectly owned and voluntarily confessed the guilt of those sins he had taken upon him, and most willingly performed every thing by which he might expiate that guilt? Was it perhaps with this view, that, from a sight of the sufferings of Christ, believers might be convinced of their sins? But that cannot be done more effectually than when they consider them as punishments due to their sins, and as a satisfaction for them. As, therefore, no punishments of Christ can be said to be merely convincing, it remains, that all of them are compensating or satisfactory; which is what we contend for.

XXIV. The distinction between judiciary and warlike sufferings is no less impertinent. For Christ incurred no sufferings but by the sentence of God the judge. When Christ "was afflicted, the iniquity of us all נגש, was exacted," Is. 53:7. But that was the exaction of the judge. When Satan with his infernal powers assaulted Christ, then was "the power of darkness," Luke 22:53. God, in consequence of a determinate sentence, permitted the prince of darkness to harass Christ; and Christ, in preparing himself for that conflict, had in view that sentence or commandment of God, as he himself speaks, John 14:31.

XXV. What else is that very word of God, from which the original of the warlike sufferings is derived, than the sentence of God the judge against the serpent, who was to be destroyed by Christ, and against Christ's human nature, in which he trod the earth, which was to be harassed and slain by the serpent? I would fain know, if what is foretold concerning the bruising of his heel, does not also comprise those sufferings of Christ which are judiciary. If not, the first gospel promise does not explain the method of obtaining salvation by the satisfaction of a Mediator; and, if the words contain an enigmatical summary of our belief, we must then be obliged to believe that they signify less than they can, or is proper that they should; but if, as is certainly right, we allow that the satisfactory sufferings of Christ are comprehended in these words, it is wrong to build this new distinction upon them.

XXVI. Let us dwell a little longer on this meditation. Whatever power the devil has to harass wicked men, before they are dragged to eternal death, he has it by the righteous sentence of the judge. Peter mentions the consequence of this, 2 Pet. 2:19. The elect themselves, as sinners, were also subject to that power, and, on that account, are truly said to be not only the "prey of the mighty," but Is. 49:24 are likewise called, "lawful captives," he having a right over them by the sentence of the supreme judge. But as Jesus the surety came in their room, so in virtue of the same sentence he became subject to the buffetings of Satan. And by this means all he suffered from the devil was in the most proper sense judiciary.

XXVII. It is no objection to this truth, that those conflicts with Satan proved glorious to Christ, as having endured them, because of the justice and for advancing the glory of God. For all Christ's sufferings, even those which according to this new hypothesis we shall call judiciary, if the cause and event be considered, were highly glorious to him. He never more gloriously displayed his love to God and man, he never undertook a more excellent work, which the whole choir of angels beheld with great applause, and God the Father himself was never more pleased with it, than when, hanging on the cross, he resolutely struggled with the horrors of eternal death. But if we consider this thing as an evil contrary to nature, which is earnestly bent upon its own advantage, certainly in these harassings of Satan, there was the wrath of God against sin, which Christ had taken upon himself.

XXVIII. And why should not those sufferings be called warlike, which, according to this hypothesis, are judiciary? For who will deny that Christ, when hanging on the cross, was as it were wrestling with the infernal powers, and the horrors of eternal death? Indeed, Paul testifies that Christ had then "spoiled principalities and powers, made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in the cross," Col. 2:15. But who can refuse, that there was first a conflict before such a noble triumph and victory? From all these things we conclude, that the distinction of punishments into convincing and compensating, and of sufferings into warlike and judiciary, is both unscriptural, antisciptural, and irrational.

XXIX. Let us now come to the arguments of the opposite side, as far as they have come to our knowledge. Some of them are general against all the sufferings of Christ, and others more special against some parts of his sufferings. The general are partly taken from Scripture, partly from the Apostles' Creed, and partly from the Catechism.

XXX. From Scripture they argue in the following manner: 1st, That the sin of the whole earth shall be removed in one day, according to Zech. 3:9. And Paul several times affirms, that the one offering of Christ, once made on the cross, was that expiatory sacrifice, by which all the elect are perfected, Heb. 9:28. and 10:10, 12, 14; and therefore, the preceding sufferings of Christ were not satisfactory. 2dly, Farther, that Christ, from the beginning of his life, was neither a priest who could offer an expiatory sacrifice, nor a sacrifice which could be offered. Not a priest, because he could not lawfully be one before the thirtieth year of his age; not a sacrifice, as a lamb could not be such before the seventh day. But the truth of the types ought to appear in Christ. 3rdly, Moreover, that Christ through the whole of his life, except for a few hours, was in the favour of God, Luke 2:52, "increased in favour with God:" Matt. 3:17, was declared to be the beloved Son of God: Matt. 17:2, was glorified in the mount: Luke 10:21, "rejoiced in spirit." But at the time in which he was in the favour of God and rejoiced, he did not bear the wrath of God.

XXXI. From the Creed it is observed, that professing our faith concerning the satisfactory sufferings of Christ, we do not barely say that "he suffered," but that "he suffered under Pontius Pilate;" words never to be disjoined, to teach us that only those sufferings were satisfactory which he endured under Pilate.

XXXII. From the [Heidelberg] Catechism are quoted Questions 31, 67, 70, 75, 80, where the impetration of our salvation is referred to the one offering of Christ, once made on the cross. But as to what is alleged to the contrary, from Question 37, where it is said, that "for the whole time of his life which he lived upon earth, especially at the end thereof, he sustained the wrath of God against the sin of all mankind, both in body and soul;" they answer, that, to sustain the wrath of God there cannot signify to feel the wrath of God, but to be bound to endure it. They illustrate and prove this explication by Question 84, where it is declared, concerning unbelievers and hypocrites, that "the wrath of God and eternal damnation do lie on them so long as they go on in their sins," which cannot be understood of a compensating punishment, unless we would suppose, that the wicked by suffering on earth make satisfaction to divine justice, which is absurd. It therefore follows, that we explain this of their being obnoxious to divine wrath and eternal damnation. Since in the same sense our Lord declares, John 3:36: "He that believeth not the Son, the wrath of God abideth on him," that is, he is obnoxious to wrath.

XXXIII. To these arguments we humbly reply, as follows: and to the first we say, that all Christ's sufferings together ought to be esteemed one full accomplishment of that sacerdotal office, which our Lord undertook, in order to expiate our sins, which was at last fully completed, when Christ, dying on the cross, offered himself to the Father for a sweet-smelling savour—then the uttermost farthing was paid; this being done, God declared he was satisfied to the full, and on that day he blotted out the sins of the whole earth, and crossed them out of his book. But from this it cannot be inferred, that the preceding sufferings of Christ were not satisfactory; but that then only the satisfaction was completed, of which completion this was the fruit, that on that very day the sins of all the elect were blotted out. And this is the mind of God in Zechariah. But what Paul so often speaks of the one offering, by which we are perfected, is to be understood in the same sense: namely, since the sufferings of Christ, when on the cross, were the most grievous, and the complement of the whole, therefore, the Scriptures commonly ascribe the expiation of our sins to the cross of Christ; because without that, his foregoing sufferings had not been

sufficient, as the payment of the utmost farthing completes the satisfaction, which is immediately followed by tearing the hand-writing, and giving a discharge.

XXXIV. To the second we reply, That here are many things asserted, which we can by no means yield to. 1st, It is not true, that Christ was not a priest from the beginning of his life. For from the beginning of his life he was the Christ, that is, the Lord's anointed, no less to the sacerdotal than to his other offices. And since, when he lay in the manger, he was saluted King by the wise men, and, when twelve years old, he showed himself a Prophet amidst the doctors; who will, after all this, presume to deprive him of the honour of his priesthood? And as it belonged to the priests "to stand in the house of the Lord," Ps. 134:1; was there not some display of his sacerdotal office in that apology to his parents, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" Luke 2:49. Nay, even before his incarnation, he exhibited some prelude of his sacerdotal function by his intercession for the church, Zech. 1:12, 13. We own, indeed, that Christ was publicly inaugurated in the thirtieth year of his age to his mediatorial office; but we can no more infer from that that Christ was not a priest, than that he was not mediator, before that time.

XXXV. I cannot but here subjoin the very solid reasoning of the celebrated Cloppenburg, from his *Disputat. de Vita Christi Privati*, §. 15, 16: "It could not be, but that, in the daily practice of piety, and the obedience due to God, which he performed in the days of his flesh, Christ, who knew his unction from a child (as appears from Luke 2:49), should offer prayers and supplications for the salvation of the church, whose king and Saviour he was born: compare Luke 2:11, with Heb. 5:7. And there is no reason why we may not extend the words of the apostle to all the days of his flesh, and all the sufferings he endured from his infancy, because by these he learned obedience; and so it was altogether the constant apprenticeship or novitiate of the mediatorial office of Christ, who walked from a child with God; wherein he from day to day fulfilled, by a persevering obedience, the work which the Father had given him for the redemption of the church, which was to be fully completed by crowning his whole obedience with the offering up of himself a sacrifice, when he should be publicly called thereto." John 17:4, Acts 2:23.

XXXVI. 2dly, Neither is it true, that Christ was not a sacrifice from the beginning of his life. For though his offering was completed on the cross and by his death, yet he was even before that "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world," John 1:29. The iniquities of us all were laid upon him; and it was for no other cause that he took upon him the form of a servant, and the likeness of sinful flesh; and though he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor; and in fine, was exposed from his very infancy to griefs, sorrows, and persecutions. All these calamities proceeded from this, that, as both priest and sacrifice, he took our sins upon himself, in order to their being at last fully abolished by his death.

XXXVII. 3dly, The proof of this paradoxical assertion, taken from the types of the Old Testament, is, in many respects defective. For, 1. There is no solid foundation for that hypothesis, that all the circumstances of the types ought, in the same manner, to be found in the antitype. For then it would follow, that Christ must have been slain at a year old, according to the type of the paschal lamb. 2. It is also a rash assertion, that none could act as a priest before his thirtieth year. There is no such command in sacred writings. The Levites, indeed, were, by the annal law\*, not admitted before their twenty-fifth year, Numb. 8:24, nor before their thirtieth

year, to the full exercise of their function, Numb. 4:3. "But, indeed, I find no where among the rabbins," says Selden, de Succession, ad Pontificat. Ebræor. lib. ii. c. 4. "that the years of the Levites, as Levites, indicated the legal age of the priests. And I very much wonder that great men should admit of this, even while they sharply criticise upon others." It is the constant tradition of the Hebrews, that a priest is fit for his office at his thirteenth year, after his years of puberty, though he is not bound to take his turn with the rest before his twentieth year. See Outram de Sacrific. lib. i. c. 5. §. 3. Josephus relates of Aristobulus, "that when a young man, and out of his seventeenth year, he by the law ascended the altar to officiate." It is astonishing the very learned person did not attend to these things, which, from his skill in the Hebrew ritual, he could not be ignorant of. 3. If this argument is to be urged, it would thence follow, that Christ could have been a sacrifice after the seventh day from his birth, and immediately upon his thirtieth year be a priest; which is contrary to what is supposed in the sentiment we here oppose.

XXXVIII. To the third, we reply, 1st, That the question is not, whether Christ did, all his life long, so endure the wrath of God as in the meantime to be favoured with no consolation or joy of the comforting Spirit: none will affirm this. But the question is, whether all those sufferings which Christ at any time endured, and all that form of a servant which he assumed, belong to the perfection of his satisfaction? A thing that cannot be overthrown by some shining intervals of joy, now and then. 2dly, To be the beloved Son of God, and at the same time to suffer the wrath of God, are not such contrary things, as that they cannot stand together. For, as Son, as the Holy One, while obeying the Father in all things, he was always the beloved; and indeed, most of all, when obedient even to the death of the cross; for that was so pleasing to the Father, that on account of it he raised him to the highest pitch of exaltation, Phil. 2:9; though, as charged with our sins, he felt the wrath of God, burning, not against himself, but against our sins, which he took upon himself. Who can doubt that Christ, even hanging on the cross, was in the highest love and favour of God, so far as he was Son, though at the same time he was made a curse for our sins? 3dly, It has never been proved, that it was a thing improper and inconsistent for Christ to have some mitigation granted him, while he satisfied for our sins, by means of some rays of consolation, at intervals, shining in upon him, by which he might be animated resolutely to acquit himself in the conflict. Nor is it credible that he had always the sensation of divine wrath, or that it was always equally intense, even on the very cross itself; or that it was always equally intense, even on the very cross itself; or that he was as much pressed down by his agonies, when he made a promise of Paradise to the thief, and spoke so affectionately with his mother and John, as when he complained he was forsaken of God. See that kind address of God the Father to Christ, when "despised by every one," and "abhorred by the nation," and "a servant of rulers," Is. 49:7.

XXXIX. What is argued from the Creed, scarce deserves any answer. For when Christ is said to have suffered under Pontius Pilate, it was with no such intention, as to distinguish the satisfactory sufferings of Christ from those which are not—a fiction, I imagine, that none ever thought of—but simply to specify the time in which Christ completed his sufferings, and the person by whose authority he was condemned to the cross. Nor will the maintainer of this paradox affirm, that all the sufferings, which Christ endured under Pilate, or by his authority, were satisfactory; for if the satisfaction must be restricted to the three hours of darkness, then both the scourging, and those indignities which Christ suffered in the pretorium, and his condemnation, nay, his very crucifixion and death, must be excluded.

XL. It is certain a violence is done the Catechism, which refers the impetration of our salvation to the one offering of Christ, with no other design, than what Paul does, whose meaning I have already explained. The words of Quest. xxxviii. appear to be perverted and misinterpreted. 1st, Because it is an answer to this question: "What believest thou, when thou sayest, He suffered?" But that expression, "he suffered," does not signify the bare susception of guilt, but the enduring of sorrows. 2dly, If to endure the wrath of God does not there signify to feel it, but only to take its guilt upon himself, or be exposed to it, it would follow that even at the close of his life he did not feel the wrath of God. For in the same sense the Catechism affirms, that very thing of the whole of Christ's life, and of the close thereof. 3dly, Ursinus is a more faithful interpreter of the Catechism, when he writes, "Under the appellation of suffering are understood all the infirmities, miseries, griefs, racking tortures of soul and body, to which, on our account, Christ was obnoxious, from his nativity to his last breath," &c. 4thly, It is in vain to seek for any pretence to this forced sense from Quest. lxxxiv., and John 3:36. For it is not an obnoxiousness to the wrath of God that alone hangs over unbelievers and hypocrites, but they are really in a state of wrath and curse; and that curse which they are now under is the beginning and a part of those pains which they shall suffer for ever.

XLI. The more special arguments or exceptions, either regard the death of Christ, or his agonies in the garden, or are taken from the beginning and end of the solar eclipse; which I shall set in such a light as at the same time to refute them.

XLII. If any shall say, that the Scripture, when ascribing our redemption to the death of Christ, means, by that death, those very intense pains of eternal death, which Christ endured both in soul and body together, when he complained that he was forsaken of God; I answer, that indeed they are not, on any account, to be secluded from the compass or extent of the word death; but the death of Christ is not to be confined to them, so as to exclude the death of the body, or the separation of soul and body. For Peter speaks expressly of his being put to "death in the flesh," 1 Pet. 3:18, and the whole Scripture ascribes our ransom to that death; from which Christ arose from by his resurrection; and in fine, Paul makes the sacrifice which Christ offered, to consist in a death, which is like to that which is appointed for all men once to undergo, Heb. 9:27, and which, verse 26, is a sacrifice, and was shadowed forth by the slaying of the legal sacrifices. And we have already mentioned several places which cannot, without manifest violence, be so explained as to exclude the death of the body from being included in his death.

XLIII. If you object that Christ had before said, "It is finished," I answer, it ought to be understood of his finishing all those things which he was to suffer and do in life, so that nothing remained but to conclude the whole by a pious death. Just as Paul said, 2 Tim. 4:7, "I have finished my course." And Christ himself, John 17:4, "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do." Whence one would absurdly infer, that there remained for Christ, on saying this, nothing further to be done or suffered; when he was still to be made perfect by his last sufferings. The meaning is evident; namely, that Christ, in discharging his office, had perfectly performed all he was thus far to perform.

XLIV. If you insist upon it, that his death was calm and gentle, without the appearance of any pains of eternal death, having already undergone these; I answer, it was a gentle death indeed, in so far as the faith of Christ, now victorious over all temptations, was well apprised that he had



surmounted the greatest pains, and was secure about his resurrection and the promised reward; but yet he died a cursed death, inflicted by the wrath of God against sin, and the curse of it was typically figured by his hanging on the tree, which still continued in and after death. For while he hung on the tree, so far he was doubtless under the curse, according to Gal. 3:13. By which it signified, that his punishment ought to be taken as holding forth guilt, and the curse of God.

XLV. But, say you, believers are still to die; and therefore Christ did not satisfy for them by his death. I answer, the Catechumens have been taught to answer this objection from Quest. 42 of the Heidelberg Catechism.\* By the death of Christ, death hath ceased to be, what it was before, the punishment inflicted by an offended judge, and the entrance into the second death, and is become the extermination of sin, and the way to eternal life; and at the last day it shall be altogether abolished. And if you go on to argue in this manner, I shall easily make it appear from your own hypothesis, that even that very anguish of Christ, when he complained of his being forsaken of God, was not satisfactory for us; for believers themselves often complain of spiritual desertion. But Zion said, "יהוה עזבני" the Lord hath forsaken me," Is. 49:14. Where we have the very same word which the Lord Jesus uses, Ps. 22:2. And Zion says so truly, with respect to the sense of grace, and the influence of spiritual consolation. The difference between the desertion, whereby Christ was forsaken of his Father, and that of believers, consists in this, that, in the former, there was the wrath and curse of God, and the formal nature of punishment, which are not in the latter; neither are these in their death.

XLVI. What is objected to our argument, taken from the agonies of Christ in Gethsemane, is very inconsistent. They say, that these sufferings were not satisfactory, because then an angel appeared to comfort him; whereas a good angel could not have done this without a most grievous sin against God, if Christ was then actually making satisfaction; especially as he was to tread this wine-press alone, and it was foretold that, while making satisfaction, he should be deprived of all consolation. Ps. 69:20, "there is none to take pity, comforters I found none;" for, 1st, That angel did not tread the wine-press together with the Lord Jesus; nor bear any part of his sufferings; nor, by any natural influence, did he assist Christ in carrying that burden. He strengthened Christ only in a moral sense, by setting before him the glorious issue of the conflict he had undertaken, and by other arguments to the like purpose. 2dly, There is no reason why some small share of comfort should not be administered to Christ while in the act of making satisfaction; especially if with a view to preserve him for more, and not fewer sufferings. The words of Ps. 69 are not to be taken in such a general sense, as to exclude all manner of consolation and pity; for "a great company of people and of women bewailed him," Luke 23:27, as did also "all the people that came together to that sight, and smote upon their breasts," ver. 48, and the beloved disciple John, and above all his pious mother, "whose soul then a sword pierced," Luke 2:35. Nor is there any thing in the words of the Psalm which obliges us to confine these things to the three hours of darkness. It treats of that time in which "they gave him gall for his meat, and in his thirst gave him vinegar to drink," ver. 21, which was not done during the darkness. 3rdly, It cannot be inferred, that God the Father, in sending that angel, had not then either begun to act, or, at that time, ceased to act, as a strict and impartial judge; any more than it can be inferred, that the disposition of Christ's enemies was softened to pity, when they laid the cross on Simon of Cyrene in order to carry it after him. For both was done with a view lest Christ, sinking under his present pains, should escape those that were to ensue. 4thly, We shall by this be better able to form a judgment of the incredible load of anguish with which that mighty lion of the tribe of

Judah was so pressed down, that he appeared almost ready to sink under it, unless he was, in some manner at least, encouraged. 5thly, Nor on any pretence can that angel be accused of any sin in strengthening Christ, while satisfying for us; since, by that consolation, he neither intended to rob Christ of his glory, to whom alone the praise of satisfying remains entire; nor to oppose the decree of God, for he animated Christ to execute that with resolution; not to put any bar in the way of our salvation, for he encouraged our Lord to acquire the right to that by constancy in his sufferings.

XLVII. To pretend to infer from the beginning and end of the solar eclipse, during the passion of Christ, the beginning and end of his satisfaction, is a cabalistical fancy, founded neither on Scripture, nor solid reason. I do not deny, that, in that darkness, there was a kind of type of the very thick darkness, with which the greatly distressed soul of the Lord Jesus was then overwhelmed, without a single ray of consolation breaking in upon him, but what his unshaken faith, grounded on the inviolable promises of his father, and not staggering as to the certainty of the future reward, darted in at times upon his trembling soul. But the question is not, whether Christ was then actually satisfying! This we all allow: the question is, whether then only?

XLVIII. But let us now conclude this debate, which has so much disquieted the mind of this very learned person, as his friends wished the world know from letters, published after his death. But God and my conscience are my witnesses, that nothing but the love of truth, which is only to be derived from, and defended by the Scriptures, obliged me to enter upon this subject. I know not in what I can be blamed, unless in the liberty I have taken to dissent from the author. But if, by taking a wrong path, I have strayed from the truth, how acceptable will the kind admonition be! How readily shall I own and correct the error! I heartily wish we could generally endeavour to please ourselves less, in order to please God more. I ever had a veneration for this learned person, though, after our dispute, I found he was much disgusted. But I thought this should be no hinderance to my profiting by his learned commentaries, which I own I did; with a just commendation of the author, as my other writings abundantly testify.

## Chapter VII: Of the Efficacy\* of Christ's Satisfaction

I. THE efficacy of Christ's satisfaction is twofold. The first regards Christ himself; the other, the elect. Christ, by his satisfaction, obtained for himself, as Mediator, a right to all the elect, which the Father willingly and deservedly bestows upon him, Ps. 2:8, "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." "This is Christ's פְּעִלָּה, work with his God, that he should not only be his servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; but that he should be given for a light to the Gentiles, that he might be God's salvation unto the end of the earth,' Is. 49:4, 6. It appears also, from that promise, Is. 53:10, "If his soul shall make itself an offering for sin, he shall see his seed." And thus we become "his inheritance," Eph. 1:11: "his peculiar treasure," Ps. 135:4: "his peculiar people," Tit. 2:14, and 1 Pet. 2:9.

II. Besides, it is not possible, but Christ should exercise that right, which he acquired at so dear a rate. For when, according to the determinate counsel of God, the time of the gracious visitation of every one of the elect is come, he actually delivers them, as his property, by an outstretched arm. And why should he not, seeing he can easily effect it by the power of his Spirit, turning and inclining their heart? Is it credible he should suffer those who are his lawful right to be and to remain the slaves of Satan? Is it worthy of Christ, that he should not be actually glorified in the sanctification and happiness of those, for whom he underwent so much infamy; or should suffer any of those to perish, whom he purchased for his own possession by his precious blood? Christ himself hath taught us thus to reason, John 10:16, "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice." Because these sheep were of right his property, it therefore became him, actually to lay hold of them as his own, and bring them into his fold. Nor can the right of Christ be made ineffectual, or remain without actual possession; especially as he was not promised by the Father a bare right, but also a possession by right, upon his making satisfaction, as the places above quoted evince.

III. The Lord Jesus obtained for the elect, by his satisfaction, an immunity from all misery, and a right to eternal life, to be applied unto them in effectual calling, regeneration, sanctification, conservation, and glorification, as the Scripture declares. Thus Matt. 26:28, "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins." Gal. 1:4, "He gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father." Tit. 2:14, "Gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Eph. 5:25, 26, 27, "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify it, that he might present it to himself a glorious," &c. In a word, "This is that faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners," 1 Tim. 1:15. By these and many other passages to the same purpose, which it would be needless to mention here, it evidently appears, that the effect of Christ's satisfaction was not a bare possibility of the remission of our sins, and of our reconciliation with God, but an actual remission and reconciliation, an abolition of the dominion of sin, and at length salvation itself: and it is not possible, the elect should have no share in this, unless Christ should be deemed to have satisfied for them to no purpose. It is certainly incumbent on us never to weaken the force of the words of the Holy Ghost; especially in those places and expressions of Scripture where the subject of our salvation is treated of, nor to detract in any thing from the value of the satisfaction of our Lord.

IV. This truth also appears from those places of Scripture in which the satisfaction of Christ is called ἀπολύτρωσις a redemption, made by the payment of λύτρον, a ransom, or ἀντιλύτρον, a price of redemption. For the proximate effect of redemption, and of the payment of a ransom, is the setting the captive at liberty, and not a bare possibility of liberty. It is neither customary nor equitable that, after paying the price, it should still remain uncertain whether the captive is to be set free or not. A true redeemer procures the restitution of liberty to the miserable captive, wherever good faith and an agreement are of force. One may possibly be upon terms about the price, though uncertain of the event; but it is neither prudent nor just to make any payment, before what is stipulated be made sure and firm. The Scripture itself declares, that the proximate effect of redemption is the actual remission of sins, and restoration to liberty, Rom. 3:24, "Justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Eph. 1:7, "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;" and Col. 1:14, to the same purpose: in like manner, Heb. 9:12, "By his own blood obtained eternal redemption for us;" the fruit or effect which is eternal liberty and salvation.

V. Of the like nature are those phrases, by which the elect are said to be bought with a price, purchased with blood, redeemed by Christ's subjection to the law: as 1 Cor. 6:20, "Ye are bought with a price." Acts 20:28, "To feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Gal. 4:4, 5, "Made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law." But whoever makes a purchase of any thing has an unquestionable right to it; and it not only may, but actually does, become his property, in virtue of his purchase, upon paying down the price. And herein consists our liberty and salvation, that we are no longer our own, nor the property of sin, nor of Satan, but the property of Christ. Whence it appears, that the effect of Christ's satisfaction is not a bare possibility of our salvation, but salvation itself.

VI. A right to all the benefits of the covenant of grace is purchased at once to all the elect by the death of Christ, so far as that, consistently with the truth and justice of God, and with the covenant he entered into with his Son, he cannot condemn any of the elect, or exclude them from partaking in his salvation; nay, on the contrary, he has declared, that satisfaction being now made by his Son, and accepted by himself, there is nothing for the elect either to suffer or do, in order to acquire either impunity or a right to life; but only that each of them, in their appointed order and time, enjoy the right purchased for them by Christ, and the inheritance arising from it. And this is what the apostle says, 2 Cor. 5:19, "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." That is, seeing God accepted of the offering of his Son, when he gave himself up to death for his people, he received at the same time into favour, not only the preserved of Israel, but all nations, and all families of the earth, which, in other respects, lay in wickedness, and were liable to the wrath of God, declaring that satisfaction was now made to him for their sins, and that these could no longer be imputed to them for condemnation, nor for excluding from his saving grace.

VII. We have a further proof of this, Zech. 3:9, "For behold the stone, which I have laid before Joshua: upon one stone shall be seven eyes; behold I will engrave the graving thereof, saith the Lord of Hosts, and I will remove the iniquity of that land in one day." The stone here is, doubtless, the Lord Jesus Christ, as Dan. 2:34, Ps. 118:22, on which the church is built, on which it is founded, and by which it is supported. It is laid before Joshua, and his companions, the priests, as architects, to lay it for the foundation of faith, acknowledge it as the corner-stone, and

build thereon both themselves and other believers. This stone is but one: "For other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ," 1 Cor. 3:11. Upon this stone there are seven eyes, either of God the Father, viewing it with care and pleasure, or of the church universal, looking to it by faith. Its gravings, engraved by God, represent those very clear indications or characters, by which he may and ought to be distinguished, as one given by the Father to be a Saviour; among these characters were those sufferings by which he was to be made perfect. These things being done, to show that all the signs of the Messiah were in him, God declares that "he would remove the iniquity of all that land" (clearly signifying the whole world, according to the synecdoche just explained) "in one day," at once, in the last day of Christ's passion: and thus, by Christ's satisfaction we are taught, that deliverance from sin, and all the happy effects of that immunity, were purchased at once for all the elect in general.

VIII. It is however certain, that true saving benefits are bestowed on none of the elect, before effectual calling, and actual union to Christ by a lively faith: nevertheless, Christ did, by his satisfaction, purchase for all the elect at once a right to those benefits, that they might have and enjoy them, in their appointed time. Nay, before actual conversion, and the possession of saving blessings, they are favoured with no contemptible privileges above the reprobate, in virtue of the right which Christ purchased for them. Such as, 1st, That they are in a state of reconciliation and justification\* actively considered, Christ having made satisfaction for them, as we see from 2 Cor. 5:19. That is, that God considers them as persons for whom his Son has satisfied, and purchased a right to eternal life. 2dly, That God loves them with a peculiar love of benevolence, according to the decree of election; which love of benevolence will, at the appointed time, certainly issue in a love of complacency. For, as it was from a love of benevolence that Christ was given to be their Saviour; so, satisfaction being made, God, in consequence of the same love, will form them, so as he may deservedly acquiesce in them as fit objects of his love of complacency. May we not refer to this what God says, Jer. 31:3, "I have loved thee with an everlasting love, therefore with loving-kindness have I drawn thee?" 3rdly, To this also it is owing, that they have the means of salvation, the preaching of the Gospel, &c. with some internal illumination, and some incitement to good, though not yet saving: and yet for this end, that, in their appointed time, they may be effectually converted by those means. 4thly, From all this it likewise follows, that God preserves them, while living under the means of salvation, from the sin against the Holy Ghost; from which there is no conversion. 5thly and lastly, They have the Spirit, rendering those means effectual, to their actual and complete regeneration, and to unite them to Christ by working faith in them, that they may enjoy benefits truly saving.

IX. As matters stand thus, we may easily gather what judgment we are to form of the notions of Arminius and his followers, on this point. Arminius proposes his sentiments in Exam prædestin. Perkins, p. 75, 76, as follows: "Let us add to all these things, by way of conclusion, the proper and immediate effect of the death and passion of Christ. But it is not an actual removal of sin from this or that particular person, nor actual remission of sins, nor justification, nor the actual redemption of this or that person, which none can have without faith and the Spirit of Christ; but the reconciliation of God, the impetration of remission, justification, and redemption from God: hence God now may, notwithstanding his justice, which is satisfied, forgive the sins of men, and bestow the Spirit of grace upon them; though he was really inclined before, from his own mercy (for from that he gave Christ to be the Saviour of the world), to confer these things on sinners, yet his justice prevented the actual communication of them. However, God still has a right to

bestow those benefits on whom he pleases, and on what conditions he thinks proper to prescribe. But, on the contrary, if we agree to such a method of mediation, as you, Perkins, seem to approve of, namely, that the sins of all the elect were actually removed from them, and laid upon Christ, who, having suffered for them, did actually deliver them from punishment; and that obedience was required of him, who accordingly performed it, and thereby merited eternal life, not for himself, but for them; and that, just as if we ourselves had appointed this mediator in our room, and by him had paid our debts to God: nay, we must now likewise believe that, according to the very rigour of God's justice and law, impunity and eternal life are due to the elect, and that they may demand those benefits from God, in right of payment and purchase made, and yet God have no manner of right to demand of them faith in Christ, and conversion to God. But all the absurdities of this opinion cannot easily be expressed. I will confute it only by one argument, but a very cogent one, and taken from the writings of the apostles. The righteousness wrought out by Christ is not ours, as wrought out, but as imputed to us by faith, so that faith itself is said to be "imputed to us for righteousness," Rom. 4:5. Thus far Arminius, whose very words almost we have exhibited, omitting only those which are not to the purpose in hand. His followers have things of the like nature, in their Scripta Synodalia, adding, that the impetration is such, that "from the nature of the thing it may remain entire, and be every way perfect, though there were none to apply it to, or none to enjoy the benefit of it."

X. There are many things in this discourse which are consistent neither with scholastic accuracy, or with the other tenets of the remonstrants, nor with theological truth; which we are now to show in order. 1st, Arminius does not speak accurately in saying, that the proper effect of the death and passion of Christ is not the actual remission of sins, nor justification, nor actual redemption of this or that person, &c.; but the impetration of remission, justification, and redemption from God. For the members of this distinction are not properly opposed: actual remission, and actual justification, are not opposed to the impetration of remission and of justification; but a possible remission, and a possible justification. And thus Arminius ought to have expressed himself, in order to speak accurately and fairly. 2dly, Nor is it an accurate way of speaking, to say, that the effect of the passion and death of Christ is impetration of remission and of justification. He ought to say, it is remission and justification itself, whatever that be. For so Arminius himself hath taught us to speak with accuracy, p. 72: "A distinction may be made between the act, by which reconciliation is obtained, and the effect of that act, which is reconciliation. The act impetrating reconciliation, is the offering which Christ made on the cross; the effect is the reconciliation itself." And so he ought to have said here: in the death and passion of Christ, the impetrating act is that voluntary susception of all kinds of sufferings, which he undertook both from his love to God and men; the effect is remission and justification. The impetrating act is the satisfaction of Christ; the effect is immunity from debt. In this manner Arminius spoke, before he had degenerated to worse opinions, Disput. privat. xxxv. §. 7. "The effects of the priestly office are reconciliation with God, impetration of eternal redemption, remission of sins, the Spirit of grace, and eternal life." 3dly, Nor has that expression a just meaning, at least it is not accurate, that by the passion of Christ God can forgive sin; as if some new, some greater and more extensive power of God was the effect of the sufferings of Christ. The power of God is infinite, and altogether incapable of increase. And then what is impetrated from any one, ought previously to be in his power. The remonstrants have more accurately expressed their sentiments in their Synodalia, in these words: "The effect of reconciliation or

propitiation is the impetration of divine grace, that is, restitution to such a state," &c. So that a change in our state, and not an increase of God's power, is the effect of the satisfaction of Christ.

XI. Besides, Arminius is in this discourse consistent, neither with himself, nor with his adherents. Not with himself: for his whole design is to show, that the proper and immediate effect of the death of Christ is only a possibility of remission of sin; and yet he asserts, that the proper effect of the death of Christ is the reconciliation of God, and the impetration of remission, justification, &c. But how do those things agree, seeing a possibility of remission of sins may consist with a perpetual enmity between God and man? What kind of reconciliation is that, when an eternal enmity may notwithstanding subsist? What sort of impetration of remission, if, nevertheless, it be possible that sins may never be pardoned? Nor does Arminius here better agree with the hypothesis of his followers, who expressly assert, that God cannot, on account of his vindictive justice, remit sins without a previous satisfaction. I now omit noticing the laboured disputation of Vorstius on this head against Sibrandus Lubbertus. Thus the remonstrants profess, in express terms, in their apology, p. 466, drawn up in the name of all, "that to suppose the vindictive justice of God to be so essential to him, that in virtue of it he is bound and necessitated to punish sins, is highly absurd and unworthy of God."

XII. From this also we may by a very evident consequence infer, that the death and sufferings of Christ were in vain, and without any fruit or effect; which I thus demonstrate: if there is in God, even before and exclusive of the satisfaction of Christ, a power of remitting sins, notwithstanding his vindictive justice, Christ has therefore done nothing, by suffering and dying, in order to the existence of such a power in God. But the remonstrants strenuously declare and maintain, that God can, without satisfaction, and without the violation of his essential justice, let sins go unpunished, and that the contrary is highly absurd. Christ therefore procured nothing by his death; for what he is said to have obtained by it, did already exist without it. "God could have saved us without the satisfaction of Christ, but did not choose to do it," says Corvinus, in his *Censura Anatom. Molinæi*, p. 436.

XIII. In a word, this assertion of Arminius is inconsistent with theological truth. For, 1st, The Scripture no where declares, that the fruit of Christ's death is a possibility of the remission of sins: Nor does Arminius produce any passage of Scripture to that purpose. But to speak of the fruit of Christ's death without Scripture is untheological. 2dly, Nay, the Scripture asserts the contrary, as we have at large shown, §. 3, 4, 5. 3dly, It is also contrary to all reason to say, that the proper effect of Christ's most perfect satisfaction was, that God might let the captive go free, yet so that the captive might always remain in prison and be liable to pay the debt. How absurd!—that God should receive full satisfaction, by the death of his Son, for the sins of any particular person, and yet, notwithstanding this plenary satisfaction of Christ, that man is to be sent to eternal fire, there to satisfy, in his own person, for those very sins, which Christ had fully satisfied for already! 4thly, Such a bare possibility of remission, which from the nature of the thing may never become actual, overturns the unchangeable covenant between the Father and the Son; the sum of which Arminius himself has well expressed in his oration *de Sacerdotio Christi*, p. 14: "God required of Christ, that he should make his soul an offering for sin, give his flesh for the life of the world, pay the price of redemption for the sins and captivity of mankind; and promised, if he did so, that he should see his seed, and become an eternal priest. The priest accepted this condition," &c. Christ, relying on this infallible promise, did willingly give himself

up to death. But, from this assertion of Arminius and the remonstrants, it was possible that Christ, after having paid the ransom, should see no seed, be a king without any kingdom of grace, an everlasting Father without any children, a bridegroom without a bride, a head without a body! All which are most abominable.

XIV. Arminius, however, defends his opinion by three arguments. The first is this: "God has fully right to impart those benefits to whom he thinks proper, and on what conditions he is pleased to prescribe." Whence it follows, that Christ has not merited the bestowing those benefits actually upon any one; for this is the tendency of these words of Arminius. I answer: 1st, We deny, that God may not impart those benefits which Christ has merited, to those for whom he died. God might, indeed, appoint the persons Christ was to die for, but this appointment being once settled, God is not at liberty to withhold that grace and glory which was purchased by the death of Christ from those for whom he died. 2dly, Arminius is further mistaken when he says, that God had a full right to impart those benefits on what conditions he pleased to prescribe, supposing that the performance of these conditions, namely, faith and repentance, or the grace necessary to the performance of them, was not among those blessings which Christ had merited for us by his passion. For it was agreed in that covenant between the Father and the Son, by which Christ gave himself up to death, that all adult persons should, in the way of faith and repentance, come to the saving enjoyment of the other blessings of it; nor can any other conditions be now settled by agreement. Besides, it was also fixed, that the Father should, from the consideration of Christ's merit, grant the Spirit of grace for faith and repentance to those for whom Christ had died, as we have already seen Arminius himself orthodoxly reckoning the Spirit of grace among the effects of the sacerdotal office of Christ. For seeing God "hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in Christ," Eph. 1:3, that is, through and for the merits of Christ, and the gift of faith is one of the most excellent of these blessings, Phil. 1:29, that likewise must certainly come to us on account of his merits. 3rdly, Nor is it agreeable to Scripture language to say, that faith and repentance are requisite conditions, before any effects of Christ's death are communicated to a person. Certainly, they are not required previous to our regeneration and revivification from the death of sin, and our deliverance from this present evil world, which are reckoned among the effects of Christ's death by Paul, Eph. 2:5, and Gal. 1:4. We may therefore say, if you will, that these are conditions requisite for applying to our consciences that consolation which is purchased by the death of Christ, yet in such a manner as it is from the merit of Christ that the grace, that is powerfully and abundantly effectual to perform those conditions, must flow.

XV. Arminius's second argument is this: "If the actual remission of sins, &c., be the effect of Christ's death, we must then allow, that, according to the very rigour of God's justice and law, both an eternal life and an immunity from punishment are due to the elect, and that, therefore, they are entitled to ask those benefits of God in right of the payment and purchase made, without God's having any right to require of them faith in Christ and conversion to God." I answer: 1st, We are wholly of opinion, that one who is renewed may come boldly to the throne of grace, and ask for those blessings at God's hand, in right of the payment and purchase made by Christ. For why should we not venture to ask of God, that he would perform for us what he was pleased to make himself a debtor to his Son and to his merits? This is the *παρρησία*, or boldness of our faith, to expect the crown of righteousness from God, as a merciful and gracious Giver, in respect of our unworthiness; but as a just Judge, in respect to the merits of Christ, 2 Tim. 4:8.



2ndly, It is an invidious reflection of Arminius, to say, "without God's having any right to require of us faith in Christ, and conversion to himself." For it is impossible for any who approach to and ask those blessings from God, not to perform those duties; for how can any ask those benefits of God in the name of Christ, and without conversion to the Father and the Son? 3rdly, But to speak plainly. If we admit of Christ's satisfaction, and of the ratification of the covenant of Grace, and New Testament, then God can, by no right, require faith and conversion from the elect, as conditions of the covenant of grace, in the sense of Arminius and the remonstrants: namely, 1st, To be performed by us, without grace working them in us supernaturally, effectually, and invincibly; 2ndly, As, by some gracious appointment of God, coming in the place of that perfect obedience to the law which the covenant of works required. For in this manner Arminius explains these things, that instead of perfect obedience, which the covenant of works required, the act of faith succeeds in the covenant of grace, to be, in God's gracious account, imputed to us for righteousness; that is, to be our claim of right to ask eternal life. But the nature of the covenant of grace admits of no such conditions, however framed, on which to build a right to life eternal, either from the justice or the gracious estimation of God. And thus far Arminius concludes well, if the Mediator has so satisfied for us, as if we ourselves had by him paid our debts, no condition can by any right be required of us, which in any respect can be reckoned instead of payment. The whole glory of our right to eternal life must be purely ascribed to the alone merit of our Lord, and on no pretence be transferred to any one of our acts.

XVI. There is still one argument, which Arminius imagines to be very cogent. "The righteousness," he says, "wrought out by Christ is not ours as wrought out, but as imputed to us by faith." I answer: 1st, What does Arminius infer from this? Does he conclude, that, besides the satisfaction of Christ, faith is also necessary to salvation? And what then? Therefore Christ did not obtain for us the actual remission of sins? We deny the consequence. For faith is not considered as impetrating, but as applying the impetrated remission. And as the presupposed object of saving faith is remission, already impetrated for all the elect by Christ, it must certainly be the proper effect of the death of Christ. 2dly, This righteousness of Christ was really his, as it was wrought out by him; and it is ours, as it was wrought out for us: therefore, in a sound sense, even ours before faith, being the meritorious cause of that grace which is effectual to produce faith in us. It is ours, I say, in respect of right, because both in the decree of God the Father, and the purpose of the Son, it was wrought out for us, and in the appointed time to be certainly applied to us; though it was not yet ours by possession, as to our actual translation from a state of wrath to a state of grace, and our acknowledgment and sense of so great a benefit vouchsafed unto us. The distinction between active and passive justification is well known.\* The former is that sentence of God, by which he declares his having received satisfaction from Christ, and pronounces, that all the elect are made free from guilt and obligation to punishment, even before their faith, so far as never to exact of them any payment. The latter is the acknowledgment and sense of that most sweet sentence, intimated to the conscience by the Holy Spirit, and fiducially apprehended by each of the elect. The one precedes faith, at least as to that general article which we just proposed; the other follows it. Thus we have defended the value and efficacy of Christ's satisfaction against the cavils of Arminius.

## Chapter VIII: Of the Necessity of Christ's Satisfaction

I. HAVING explained, from Scripture, the value and efficacy of the satisfaction of our Lord Jesus Christ, to the glory of God, and for the consolation of the elect, it will not be unseasonable to treat of the necessity of this satisfaction; seeing what we have shown, §. 21, from the apology of the remonstrants, naturally leads to this. And here we choose not to state the controversy in the manner we observe the otherwise great Chamierus has done in his "Pancratia," namely, "whether God could not, by an act of his absolute power, grant remission of sin, without any satisfaction." We are not willing to enter into any dispute about the absolute power of God, since the consideration of that seems not to suit this recent controversy. For this debate is not to be explained and finally determined from the attribute of the power of God, but from those of his holiness, justice, and the like. Some, when they consider the power of God alone, affirm every thing about it; not reflecting that God can do nothing but what is consistent with his justice, holiness, veracity, wisdom, immutability,—in a word, with all his other perfections. The lawyer, Papinian, ff. lib. 28, Tit. 7, Leg. 15, has said well concerning a good man, that we are to believe that he "neither does, nor can do, any thing prejudicial to piety, reputation, modesty, and in general, that is contrary to good manners." This, certainly, ought much more to be affirmed of the Great God, that whatever is not a display of, or whatever throws a slur on, any perfection, or on the glory of God, cannot be the work of God. Origen has judiciously pleaded this cause against Celsus, lib. 3, p. 174: "According to us, God, indeed, can do all things consistently with his Deity, wisdom, and goodness. But Celsus, not understanding how God may be said to do all things, affirms, he cannot will any thing unjust; granting he can do what is so, but not will it. But we say, that as what is capable of imparting its natural sweetness to other things cannot embitter any thing, because that would be contrary to its nature; nor as what naturally enlightens, can as such darken; so neither can God act unjustly. For the power of acting unjustly is contrary to his very Deity, and to every power that can be ascribed to God." And therefore, we think it very unbecoming, on every question about the most sacred right of God, to appeal to his absolute power. We would rather state the controversy thus: Whether God's requiring Christ to give him satisfaction, before he restore sinners to his favour, was owing to the mere good pleasure of the divine will; or whether the essential holiness, the justice, and the like perfections of God, which he cannot possibly part with, required a satisfaction to be made? We judge the last of these to be more true and safe.

II. In the preceding book, cap. v. §. 19, seq. we proved at large, that the very nature and immutable right of God could not let sin go unpunished; which we may now lay down as a foundation. At present, we will subjoin other arguments more nearly relating to the satisfaction of Christ itself.

III. And first, we may certainly form no contemptible argument, a posteriori, from the event. For as God does not needlessly multiply beings, what probable reason can be assigned, why, without any necessity, he should make his beloved Son, in whom he was well pleased, a curse for us? Let us insist a little on this thought. The infinite wisdom of God contrived the admirable union of the human nature with one of the divine persons; so that God himself might be said to obey, to suffer, to die, in a word, to make satisfaction. That person was "holy, harmless, and undefiled," the man of God's delight, his only-begotten and only-beloved Son. Him the most affectionate Father exposed to the greatest reproaches, to the most cruel sufferings and to an accursed death,

as a ransom for the redemption of sinners. These sufferings were, a long time before, predicted in various obscure ways, and also prefigured by the whole train of sacrifices appointed by Moses. He permitted the world, after so many other crimes, to be stained with the guilt of deicide, from the view of which the very sun shrunk back and withdrew his rays;—a crime, indeed, truly inexpiable, and in the guilt of which the whole Jewish nation is involved. Would not all this, to speak with reverence, seem a kind of solemn farce, if God, by a single breath, could dispel all our sins as a cloud? Is it not contrary to the goodness, the wisdom, and the holiness of God, without any necessity, and, to speak so, in a mere arbitrary way, to proceed in this manner? If he could have reached his end in a direct and compendious way, why did he take such a wide and perplexed compass?

IV. I would not have any reply here, that God acted in this manner in order to manifest, that his infinite right or authority over the creature was such, that he might inflict the most grievous torments even on the innocent. If, did it so please him, God could claim that right and authority, yet surely he scarce, if ever, has made use of it: and if at any time he has, it was in suffering of a far more gentle and mild nature, than what Christ Jesus our Lord underwent. In a word, if, for the display of that right, he might at times inflict such grievous torments, yet he would withhold his hand from his most beloved and only Son, in whom he so clearly testified that he was well pleased.

V. To insist upon it, that the whole of this affair was otherwise ordered by the arbitrary will of God, for confirming the saving doctrine of Christ by this exemplary martyrdom, is contrary both to reason, Scripture, and experience. For God had many other means, of a far more easy nature, by which he could confirm the doctrine of salvation, than by the dreadful passion of his beloved Son. And the Scripture shows us that this was done by Christ's miracles accompanying his most effectual preaching: and the native demonstration of the truth evidenced the divinity of his doctrine. By these things he approved himself to John's disciples, Matt. 11:5; and even to the whole multitude, Luke 7:16, and John 6:14. And lastly, we gather, both from Scripture and experience, that the cross of Christ was "unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness," 1 Cor. 1:23.

VI. Nor are we to say, it was necessary we should be taught in so laborious a manner, or even by the very example of the Son of God, that it is through many tribulations we are to enter into the kingdom of heaven. For if nothing else was intended, we might have been sufficiently taught all this by the examples of other martyrs. And then, further, there is scarce one in a thousand of those who are saved, who in the way to salvation, secluding the curse of God, have been called to suffer so many dreadful and great indignities as Christ did. Why, then, were we all to be taught, by the example of the Son of God, that the gate of heaven is on no other terms open, but by passing through those hard sufferings? Unless we say, that satisfaction was made to the justice of God by the sufferings of Christ, and that in no other way satisfaction could he made thereto, there can no other just, holy, and wise reason, and worthy of God, be ever assigned for them. Certainly, for my own part, I never remember to have heard of any.

VII. If any affirm, that no satisfaction was necessary on account of the justice of God, but that he exacted it on account of some other perfections, namely, to declare his power and will to punish sin, which he might suffer to go unpunished; I answer: such power and will are scarcely to be

called perfections in God; seeing Christ, Matt. 5:45, 48, reckons God's mercy, long-suffering, and bounty towards men, even the unjust, among his perfections. Which would certainly be most laudable, if God could at pleasure let sin go unpunished, and if that impunity were no ways inconsistent with his most holy nature, and his law, which is the transcript of that nature. Nay, if God can, consistently with his highest glory, not punish sin, it might be questioned whether he can consistently with this inflict punishment at all: because, in that case, he seems to afflict the sinner without a reason, and ill-treat the work of his hands; and to do any thing without a reason, can on no account be for the honour of God.

VIII. Perhaps some will judge it the safest course not to intrude into the depths of the unsearchable wisdom and infinite power of God, and to say: God, indeed, was pleased for wise and good reasons, though known to himself alone, on no other terms, to set us at liberty, but by the satisfaction of his Son; but yet could in a far different way bring us to salvation, nay, could redeem us by a word or sign. And, indeed, the great Augustine formerly spoke in this strain, *de Agone Christiano*: "God could have done all things, had he so willed; but did not, and that for wise reasons, though unknown and incomprehensible to us: but though he had done otherwise, yet he would equally have displeased your folly." And again, *de Trinitate* lib. xiii. c. 10: "Let us maintain, that this method, by which God sees proper to deliver us by a mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, is perfectly good and for the honour of God: but also let us acknowledge, that God was at no loss for another possible method, as all things are equally subject to his power; but yet none was more adapted to deliver us from our misery, neither was any necessary." I am certainly much pleased with that extreme modesty, by which we dare not determine any thing rashly concerning the reasons and ends of the actions of God, and judge inconsiderately about his ways, because there is that in them, the reasons whereof our ignorance cannot unfold; nay, which seems, to our presumptuous folly, to be against reason. But when we are able to know and give such reasons for the divine conduct as tend to set the glory of his adorable justice, wisdom, holiness, and goodness in the clearest light; it is no longer modesty, but rather tends to darken the glory of the perfections of God, not to acknowledge them: which is the case here. The reason why God, willing to save elect sinners, chose to do it by the satisfaction of his Son, is, because, in his wisdom, he saw no other way by which satisfaction could be made to his essential holiness and justice. And by affirming this, we derogate nothing from the power of God, who doubtless cannot but act agreeably to his holiness and justice: and we admirably proclaim his wisdom, which found a means, which appeared impossible to every created understanding, whereby satisfaction might be made to his justice; and the sinner, consistently with his holiness, be saved. In order the more clearly to illustrate, and at the same time the more firmly to establish, all this, let us attentively consider what the Scripture declares concerning the impulsive and final cause of giving Christ.

IX. The sacred writers, on several occasions, inculcate, that God's not sparing his own proper Son, but giving him to us, and delivering him up to death for us, was the effect of his unspeakable love to mankind, John 3:16, Romans. 5:8, 1 John 4:10. But if we could be saved any other way than by the sufferings of the Son of God, the love of God would not shine with such lustre in that method. For love is truly great, and inexpressible to the last degree, when implacable justice having demanded the punishment of mankind, God's love to man and free purpose of salvation have nevertheless prevailed, by finding out for that end, in the treasures of divine wisdom, an amazing method of reconciling justice with mercy; but it was such as could

have no effect, without giving up the most beloved Son to the most cruel torments for us. But if, without any prejudice to justice, our salvation could be procured many other ways than this, and even by a single word or nod, what great ardency of love was there in his giving the Son? It would certainly have been an instance of a very singular and notable mercy, to have forgiven our sins: but to have effected this by the death of his Son, when, without any urgent necessity, with equal advantage he could have scattered our sins some other more compendious way, by a nod or sign, as some affirm; why is that urged by Christ and his apostles, as an argument of such inconceivable love?

X. The apostle declares, that the end of Christ's satisfaction was a declaration of the righteousness of God, Rom. 3:25: "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation (propitiatory, mercy-seat) through faith in his blood, εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, to declare his righteousness." God set forth his Son, both to himself, delighting in him, Is. 42:1, as having appointed him, in his eternal counsel, to be the Mediator, and viewing him as thus appointed; and to us, placing him in open view, and setting him on a throne of grace and glory, in the sight of all. He set him forth as "a propitiation," propitiatory mercy-seat; where the apostle alludes to the cover laid upon the ark of the covenant, called כפרת, ἱλαστήριον, the propitiatory mercy-seat: signifying that by which God was reconciled to man, in which he dwells and rests, and from which he gives gracious answers. Moreover, it is not called the propitiatory, mercy-seat, unless it be sprinkled with blood, to be applied to us by faith. That is, Christ reconciled us to the Father only by sufferings. In the tabernacle was שֹׁעִיר בַּדָּם כַּפֶּרֶת, a mercy-seat in the blood of the goat, that is, sprinkled with the blood of the goat, Lev. 16:15. So that here nothing did avail but the blood of him who is set forth to be a propitiation, unless we would here translate ἱλαστήριον, an atonement; an appellation given to Christ, because he is the sacrifice to be offered for sin; which, coming in the room of the guilty, was to bear their punishment, and not only merit their freedom from punishment, but reconcile God, who before was offended, satisfaction being made to vindictive justice by this vicarious punishment. But, to what purpose was all this? "To declare the righteousness of God διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν, for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." God had so passed by and not punished the sins of believers in former times, that, notwithstanding these, he called them to enter upon the heavenly inheritance. But it was necessary to show, that this was done without any injury to the justice of God. Now it is evident, that no satisfaction was made to divine justice, either by the repentance of believers, or the typical pomp of sacrifices, or by the blood sprinkled on the golden mercy-seat. It was therefore necessary that the righteousness of God should be manifested in the propitiation and blood of Christ; by which was plainly shown, that God, agreeably to his justice, suffers not the sins of any to go unpunished. But if God, without injury to his justice, without any difficulty and trouble, and without a satisfaction, can pardon sins; the whole appears to have been an empty show, and by no means worthy of God, without any necessity, to appear with such terrible majesty in the most cruel death of his most beloved Son. Which being so horrid to think of; we conclude, from this discourse of Paul, that it was not possible but God must punish sin; unless he intended to set forth Christ as a propitiation, and so declare his righteousness: because not to punish sin, without a propitiatory atonement, would be a disapprobation of divine justice. For when justice is not manifested, it is disapproved of; especially in this grand work of our salvation. For so God himself speaks, Is. 56:1. "My salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed."

XI. Some perhaps will say, that the righteousness of God here means, as in other places, his veracity and constancy in performing his promises; the apostle only intended that God therefore set forth his Son to be a propitiation, in order to fulfil his prophecies and promises, and thus showed himself just, that is, faithful. But it is quite otherwise; for the righteousness of God here denotes that rectitude by which, according to his law, by inflicting condign punishment, he discovers the demerit of sin and his hatred to it, and how unbecoming it is for him to have fellowship with the sinner, at the expense of his own glory. And that this is the meaning is plain, because the apostle, having to explain in what manner God, without any injury to his justice, had foreborne sinners, and passed by their sins, most beautifully shows, that all regard was paid to the honour of divine justice, in the propitiation by Christ's blood to be made and revealed in due time; for it was in virtue of this that the sins of the believers in past times were forgiven. But the other explication does not remove this difficulty just mentioned. The design of the whole is to show, that God is just when justifying the sinner for the merits of Christ.

XII. It likewise deserves our consideration, what the apostle has expressly said and often repeated, that the legal sacrifices could never abolish the guilt of sin, Heb. 10:1, 4, 11. But why might not a thing so easily to be removed without atonement, be expiated by the death of legal sacrifices? And it is to be carefully observed, that the apostle denies this, from a consideration of the nature of the thing. It is said they could not do it, not because it seemed otherwise to God, but because sin is of a nature that no blood of bulls or of goats can wash out its stain; which the light of nature itself will readily yield to, as a thing certain. And indeed, the church of the Old Testament confessed, that their sins could not be expiated by any blood of calves or rams, not though multiplied to thousands; by any libations of oil, though ten thousand rivers thereof were poured out; nay, not by the death of their first-born, Mic. 6:6, 7.

XIII. And we must not omit the apostle's inference, whereby, from the inability of legal sacrifices to make satisfaction, he concludes the necessity of the alone sacrifice of Christ. For after he had said, "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins, he immediately subjoins, "wherefore when he cometh into the world he saith," &c., adding, "he taketh away the first," the offering of beasts, "that he may establish the second," the offering of the body of Christ. But that inference would not hold, could there be some third way of expiation, or if no satisfaction was necessary. But now the apostle argues, supposing it a thing granted by the Jews, that sins cannot be forgiven without a proper atonement; but as this could not be effected by the legal victims, it certainly follows, that it is to be sought for in the offering of Christ, without which the stain of sin remains for ever indelible. The justness of this inference of the apostle arises from the nature of God, and of the thing itself; for if we are to infer the necessity of the offering of Christ from the free and arbitrary good pleasure of the divine will, the apostle's reasoning would have been to no purpose, the good pleasure of God only was to be insisted upon.

XIV. In like manner the same apostle argues, Rom. 3:19–21, &c. Where he lays it down as a fundamental truth, that the whole world is subject to condemnation before God. Whence he infers, that none can be justified by the works of the law. And from that concludes, that we can be justified no other way but by the blood of Christ: which is doubtless a very trifling way of arguing, if God, by his mercy alone, by his bare nod, can take away sin, and adjudge the sinner to life. For the Jews would very readily answer, that there is another far more compendious way of

justification, it the infinite mercy of God, and in the most free act of his power, without exposing the Messiah to reproach. And to mention it once more, we are not to have recourse to the most free disposition of the divine will, as if that was the alone cause of this necessity. For if the apostle makes any such supposition, there is an end of all further reasoning. He would have gained his point, just by mentioning that disposition. And if he does not suppose this, his argument is of no force. Which is far from being the case.

XV. We must not here omit that expression of the apostle, by which he cuts off those who have sinned against the Holy Ghost, from all hope of salvation, by this argument; because, having rejected Christ's expiation, "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin," Heb. 10:26. For when he would intimate that there was no hope of pardon, he asserted that there remained no more sacrifice, laying it down as an undoubted truth, that the offering of a sacrifice necessarily goes before pardon. If this was not the case, why might not man, who wanted a sacrifice, hope for pardon, without any satisfaction from the infinite mercy of God?

XVI. To the same purpose is what the apostle says, Heb. 6:6, "It impossible to renew those again unto repentance, who crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Which last words are variously explained by divines, but doubtless are intended to give a reason, why those who have made the crucifixion of Christ of no use to themselves, are excluded from all hopes of salvation; because, without that, it is impossible to obtain salvation. The very learned Moses Amyraldus, in *Disputat. de peccato in Spiritum Sanctum*, §. 40, thus expounds it: Since those apostates have no further interest in the sacrifice already offered, because they have rejected it, therefore, if they would be saved, they must look out for another. And because none could offer a true expiatory sacrifice, besides that of Christ alone; if they will be saved, it is necessary they give up Christ to be crucified afresh, and again exposed to open shame. But it is impious to design such a thing, which on no account can be obtained of God, Rom. 6:9, 10. If this exposition be admitted, it presents us with a very strong argument for our opinion; because it supposes such an absolute necessity for the satisfaction of Christ, that if what he has already done be of no avail, a new satisfaction must be made, before the sinner can have any hopes of mercy.

XVII. Moreover, our sentiment tends to display the glory of the divine perfections. It sets off the holiness of God, by reason of which he can in no respect become like a sinner, or, without due satisfaction, allow him to have communion with himself, and the inhabitation of his Spirit. It exalts the justice of God, which is implacably inclined to punish sin. It preserves inviolable the majesty of God, which, as zealous for his honour, can suffer no contempt to be put upon it by sin, a contempt which all sin effects, to go unpunished. It glorifies the unsearchable wisdom of God, which found out a way, above the reach of all created understanding, by which justice and mercy might be happily reconciled, and the honour of them both maintained pure. In a word, it magnifies the inestimable grace and love of our God, who, when there were no other means of our salvation, spared not his own Son, but gave up him for us all. And who would not heartily embrace an opinion, that displays, in such an eminent manner, the glory of God?

XVIII. Nor is it less subservient to the promotion of piety. It teaches us to tremble before the majesty of the most high God, who, from his being God, cannot clear the guilty. It heightens the horror of sin, which it becomes us to believe is of so atrocious a nature, that nothing short of the

blood of a most holy and truly divine Sacrifice, could wash it away. It sets before us the unspotted holiness of God for our pattern, that, like him, we may entertain a mortal hatred to sin, and have no manner of fellowship with it. In a word, it inflames our hearts with the most deserved returns of love, willingly to devote ourselves to his service who, out of pure grace, delivered up his Son for us unto death, without which we should have remained miserable through eternity. And thus our opinion is that true doctrine which is according to godliness.

XIX. And it does not derogate in the least from any of the divine perfections. Not from his absolute power; because, doubtless, God cannot deny himself and his own perfections; nor, by his actions, testify sin not to be contrary to his nature; nor ever behave as if he took pleasure in it, by communicating himself to the sinner. Not from his most free will: as God neither wills, nor can will, any thing, but what tends to his glory, which requires his appearing as unlike the sinner as possible. Seneca spoke well, quest. Nat. lib. 1: "God is not hereby less free or less powerful; for he is his own necessity. Nor does it derogate from the liberty of those actions of God which are called *ad extra*, or without him. For though he is, by no necessity of nature, constrained to external operations, considered in the gross or together; yet, supposing the existence of one operation without him, many others necessarily follow. For instance: God was at liberty to create a world out of nothing; but having done it, it became necessary that he should govern the same in a way agreeable to his justice, holiness, wisdom, and goodness. In like manner, here, God was at liberty to permit sin; but then, having permitted it, his essential justice requires it to be punished. He was also at liberty to save some sinners; yet, having declared his will with respect to this, there was a necessity for a suitable satisfaction to intervene, on account of those immutable divine perfections which he cannot, in any of his actions, disavow. As little does this derogate from the wise counsel of God, in ordering the punishment of it, as to the time, the degree, and the persons. For though we do not think that God inflicts punishment from his nature, in such a manner as fire burns (though even in this respect he compares himself to fire, Is. 27:4, and Deut. 4:24), yet his nature is a strong reason why he orders and inflicts punishment in a most wise manner. Now the nature of God requires, that he so display the glory of his justice, as that he may likewise manifest the riches of his grace. Nor does it derogate from the infinite goodness of God, as if by that he could grant repentance to the sinner, and so receive him into favour, without any satisfaction. For the bestowing of the spirit of regeneration is an effect of the highest love. But that God should so much love a sinner, continuing still impenitent, without the consideration of a satisfaction, is a conduct inconsistent with his other perfections, as we have already so frequently shown. God cannot but take his Spirit from him, who maketh a mock of him. It is not becoming to grant repentance by means of the same Spirit, without the intervention of the sacrifice of the priest, whereby sin may be expiated.

XX. Seeing, therefore, both the nature and actions of God, and the reasoning of the sacred writers, teach us the necessity of a satisfaction; since by that doctrine the eminent perfections of God are placed in the most shining light; because the right observance thereof tends very much to promote piety; and as thereby there is no derogation made from any of the divine perfections, we conclude it is the safest course soberly to embrace it.

XXI. Yet we must observe, when speaking in general of the necessity of a satisfaction, or of such a punishment of sin, wherein the righteous and holy God may be justified and sanctified, we set no bounds to the time, the degree, or the special manner of the punishment. The history of the



life and death of Christ makes it very evident, that dispensations and mitigations, at least a compensation by an equivalent, took place here, and consequently could justly take place. And who will assert, or, if he should presume to say so, can plainly prove, that it was impossible that Christ, in order to make satisfaction, should undertake and submit to sufferings, fewer in number, shorter in duration, less intense in quantity, as to the parts of the body, and faculties of the soul, the moments and periods of his life spent here upon earth? And here let that saying of Paul, Rom. 12:3, be ever a rule to us: "Not to think more highly than we ought to think, but to think soberly."

## Chapter IX: Of the Persons for whom Christ Engaged and Satisfied

I WE should have no certainty of all those things which it is proper for us to know, for the glory of our Lord Christ, and our own consolation, concerning this suretiship and satisfaction, did it not also appear for whom he satisfied, according to his covenant-engagement. The solution of this question is indeed of very great moment, but it does not appear so very difficult, if we only carefully attend to the nature of Christ's suretiship and satisfaction, which we have already explained, proved, and defended. For since Christ did, by his engagement, undertake to cancel all the debt of those persons for whom he engaged, as if it was his own, by suffering what was meet, and to fulfil all righteousness in their room; and since he has most fully performed this by his satisfaction, as much as if the sinners themselves had endured all the punishment due to their sins, and had accomplished all righteousness: the consequence is, that he has engaged and satisfied for those, and those only, who are actually saved from their sins; as is evident to reason. For Christ neither engaged nor satisfied but for those whose person he sustained. Which Arminius himself, *Adversus Perkinsum*, p. 72, frankly owns. Moreover, that any of those whose person Christ sustained, and for whom he satisfied as their surety, should be obliged to satisfy for the same debt by eternal death, is most inconsistent with and contrary to the faithfulness and justice of God. Nor can we, on any account, think it possible that any one should in earnest plead, that Christ died for all and every one in particular, till he has weakened the force of that expression, "to die for any one," by which, as we lately made appear against the Socinians, is denoted a substitution in the place of another. But it is worth while distinctly to set forth the true doctrine in these following positions.

II. We therefore conclude: 1st, That the obedience and sufferings of Christ, considered in themselves, are, on account of the infinite dignity of the person, of that value, as to have been sufficient for redeeming, not only all and every man in particular, but many myriads besides, had it so pleased God and Christ, that he should have undertaken and satisfied for them.

III. 2dly, That Christ, as man, subject to the law of love, did in a holy manner love all men without distinction, as his neighbours, heartily wished them well, seriously lamented the ruin of those that perished, whom yet, as God, he knew were reprobates, and for whom, as Mediator, he had not engaged. Yet he submitted this human affection, commanded by the law, common to us and to Christ, to the divine appointment, and restricted it to the purpose of the decreeing will of God; in this manner proving the holiness of his will, in the glorifying of the divine counsel, and in due subjection thereunto. This appears from the tears which Christ, as man, shed over the calamities that were coming upon that abandoned city, which had partly slain and partly loaded with contempt and ignominy the Prophets;—nay, had been the only butchery in the whole world for them; and was at length, by a most horrid parricide, to devote itself, with its unhappy posterity, to the lasting curse of God, Luke 19:41.

IV. 3dly, The suretiship and satisfaction of Christ have also been an occasion of much good, even to the reprobate. For it is owing to the death of Christ, that the Gospel is preached to every creature; that gross idolatry is abolished in many parts of the world; that wicked impiety is much restrained by the discipline of the word of God; that they obtain at times, many and excellent, though not saving, gifts of the Holy Spirit; that "they have escaped the pollutions of the world, through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," 2 Pet. 2:20. And who can in short

enumerate all those things which they enjoy, not through accident only, and beside the intention of God and of Christ, but by the appointment of God? Not, indeed, with a design and purpose of saving them according to the testament; but from a view to make known his long-suffering towards the vessels of wrath, that is, those who are to perish, who dwell among those who are to be saved. For nothing falls out by accident, with respect to the intention of God; every thing being according to his determinate counsel.

V. 4thly, That the obedience and sufferings of Christ are of such worth, that all, without exception, who come to him, may find perfect salvation in him: and it was the will of God, that his truth should, without distinction, be proposed both to them that are to be saved, and to them that are to perish; with a charge not to neglect so great salvation, but to repair to Christ with true contrition of soul; and with a most sincere declaration, that all who come to him shall find salvation in him, John 6:40.

VI. 5thly, That, nevertheless, Christ, according to the will of God the Father, and his own purpose, did neither engage nor satisfy, and consequently in no manner die, but only for all those whom the Father gave him, and who are actually saved. This is that truth which is controverted, and which we are now to confirm, in a concise but solid manner, from the sacred writings.

VII. The scripture declares, that Christ satisfied for the whole body of the elect, when it declares, that he "died for all," and "by him reconciled all things," as, 2 Cor. 5:15, Heb. 2:9, Col. 1:20. And as this is not to be understood of all and every man in particular, it must be meant of all and every one of the elect. That it cannot be understood of all and every individual, I prove from the passages quoted in the following manner. That "all" for whom Christ is said to "have died," 2 Cor. 5:15, are those "who are also dead," namely, as to the old man, whom, in virtue of the crucifixion of Christ, they have crucified, Rom. 6:6, and who "live not to themselves, but to Christ," and to Christ, indeed, "who rose again" for them. But these things can be applicable only to the elect. None but they are dead to themselves, to the world, and to sin; none else live to Christ. In a word, according to the very hypothesis of the remonstrants, the efficacy of Christ's resurrection is restrained to believers alone. In like manner, the "all," for whom Christ is said, by the grace of God, to have tasted death," Heb. 2:9, are "sons brought," or to be brought, "unto glory," who have Christ for the "captain of their salvation;" who "are sanctified;" whom "he calls his brethren, which God gave him," ver. 10, 11, 13. These things can be applied, not to the reprobate, but only to the elect. In like manner, the "all things," who are said to be "reconciled to God, by the peace made through the blood of Christ," Col. 1:20, can only mean the elect. The thing is self-evident. For reconciliation and peace with God are peculiar to elect believers, Rom. 5:1. On the contrary, the reprobate are perpetual enemies to God; "the wrath of God abideth on them," John 3:36. By "those things which are on earth," are understood believers, who are still in the world; as by "those things which are in heaven", are meant, not angels, but men in the state of bliss, who enjoy, in the fullest manner, the fruits of Christ's atonement and reconciliation.

VIII. Let us add that remarkable passage, 1 Tim. 2:4, 6: "God will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge (acknowledgment) of the truth: Christ gave himself a ransom for all." Where by "all," we are not to understand all and every one in particular, but the elect of whatever nation and condition; which I make evidently to appear in this manner. 1st, They, for whom Christ gave himself a ransom, are actually rescued from the dominion of Satan, are

brought to perfect liberty, and can never be thrust into an eternal prison, in order to satisfy again for those debts which Christ paid to the utmost farthing. This we must certainly maintain, unless we would have Christ's payment go for nothing; for all, and every one in particular, are not set free from the dominion of Satan. Many are, and do still remain, "children of disobedience, in whom that impure spirit worketh," Eph. 2:2, and who are for ever "held captive at his will, in the snare of the devil," and these shall be forced to satisfy for their own guilt. Christ, therefore, did not give himself a ransom for them. 2dly, Paul speaks of all those, who have Christ for their Mediator. But he is Mediator, both by the offering of his body and blood, and by his powerful intercession. This latter part of his mediation can, on no account, be excluded here, when the apostle is treating concerning our prayers, of which we have a most perfect pattern in the prayers of Christ. Besides, the remonstrants acknowledge that Christ's intercession is not for all and every man in particular; therefore, he is not the perfect Mediator of all and every individual. 3dly, What is here spoken is concerning all those "whom God will have to be saved, and come to the knowledge (acknowledgment) of the truth." But this is not his will concerning every man in particular, because he will have unbelievers condemned, John 3:36. And the acknowledgment of the truth, or faith, is not the privilege of all, 2 Thess. 3:2, but of the elect, Tit. 1:1. Nor is it the will of God it should be. "He hardeneth whom he will," Rom. 9:18. Besides, it is unworthy of the divine majesty to imagine, that there is an incomplete, unresolved and ineffectual volition in God, Ps. 115:3. And it is mere trifling and mean, to understand a bare will of precept, enjoining all to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling, and, with all diligence to seek the knowledge of the truth; or, a will of his good pleasure, approving what is according to the precept: they with whom we now argue do not take it in that light. 4thly, The persons here meant are all those for whom we are to pray; but we are not to pray for all and every one in particular: not certainly for those, who are already damned; not for the salvation of all who are now alive, collectively taken; because we cannot do it in faith; and we are sure, that many of them will be damned: nor, in fine, for those "who have sinned the sin unto death," 1 John 5:16. 5thly, and lastly, It is acknowledged, that these words are made use of by the apostle, as a motive for the prayers which he requires, and which shall not be in vain. But the words of the apostle would infer no such thing, if they only meant that Christ has, by his satisfaction, obtained no more than a possibility for God to be reconciled to all and every one in particular, though, by the nature of that impetration, it is possible none may be actually saved; because, if that death has only procured a possibility of salvation, and if our desires after that salvation might be ineffectual, we could neither be sure of their being heard, nor have that hope of audience which maketh not ashamed. We must then conclude, that Christ gave himself a ransom for all the elect, of whatever nation and condition, and that it is the will of God they all should be saved; consequently, that it is our duty to be subservient, by our prayers, to this counsel of God; and as we know not how to distinguish the elect from the reprobate, we should pray indiscriminately for all, referring it to God to distinguish those who are his; especially, because we are certain, we shall not pray in vain for those whom God wills to be saved, and for whom Christ gave himself.

IX. The Scripture inculcates the same truth when it says, that "Christ gave his flesh for the life of the world," John 6:51, that he is "the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world," 1 John 2:2. "That God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," 2 Cor. 5:19. That "Christ is the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world," John 1:29. And other passages to the like purpose. Where by the term world, cannot, nay ought

not, to be understood the whole of mankind, but the elect. Which we prove by the following arguments.

X. It is clear that, in Scripture, things are sometimes said of the world, which agree only to the elect and to believers. Thus Christ prays, John 17:21, "that the world may believe, that thou hast sent me;" and verse 23, "that the world may know, that thou hast sent me." But these things belong to that sacerdotal intercession of Christ, "concerning which we may, with the greatest certainty, conclude, that it will never be rejected," says Arminius, in *Oratione de sacerdotio Christi*, and which, it is certain, is not made for the world of reprobates, Christ having expressly declared that, verse 9, and they, with whom we argue, do not refuse it. It is therefore necessary that by "the world," we here understand the world of the elect, who believe on Christ, and know him by faith, by virtue of the intercession of Christ, and by means of the ministry, together with the holy and glorious example of believers.

XI. Moreover, many texts which speak of salvation, not only as impetrated, but as applied, ascribe it to the world. Thus Christ declares, John 3:17: "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world, through him, might be saved." But the intention of God, in sending his Son, is not to save all, but "that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life," as Christ explains himself in the foregoing verses. In like manner, John 6:33: "The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." But Christ gives life only to the elect; to the sheep, and not to the goats, John 10:27, 28. Thus Christ, in prosecuting his discourse above quoted, John 6, restrains the term, world, to those whom the Father gave him, who see the Son and believe on him, ver. 39, 40.

XII. These expressions likewise, the "father of those that believe," and, "the heir of the world," denote the same thing, in the promise made to Abraham, Rom. 4:11, 12, 13. Abraham is "the father of those that believe," 1st, As a pattern of faith. 2dly, As a pattern of the blessing, or of justification by faith. 3dly, On account of Christ, who descended from him, and by whose spirit the elect are born again: hence Christ, along with his mystical body, is called "the seed of Abraham," Gal. 3:16. He is "the heir of the world," that is, of all the families of the earth, who are blessed in him as in the pattern of faith and of the blessing by it, and in his seed Christ, as the fountain of every blessing. For this is that world which Christ receives for an inheritance, as also Abraham, and consequently every believer, who is his seed, in Christ; or who becomes Christ's own possession, and with whom Abraham and every believer have communion, exulting in the good things which are bestowed upon them, 1 Cor. 3:21, 22. For that strict union and sincere love which subsist between them are the reason, that every one rejoices in and glorifies God, on account of the benefits bestowed on his neighbour, as if bestowed on himself. And thus we have made it appear, that the term world, sometimes in Scripture, denotes the collective body of believers, or of the elect.

XIII. We add, that the Holy Ghost speaks in this manner, with great propriety, and for several substantial reasons. For, 1st, The term world, generally in the common way of speaking, denotes any large body or multitude of men whatever. Thus, "The Pharisees said among themselves, Perceive ye, how ye prevail nothing? Behold! the world is gone after him," John 12:19. We have a like phraseology in Horajot. c. iii. In Gemara, "When Rabbi Simeon the son of Gamaliel entered (namely into the Synagogue), the whole world rose up before him;" that is, all who were

present in the synagogue. Why, then, should not a very large and almost infinite multitude of the chosen people from among all nations, "that great multitude which no man can number," Rev. 7:9, be elegantly designed by the appellation world? 2dly, Elect believers, considered in themselves, and before effectual calling, are a part of "the world lying in wickedness," 1 John 5:19. "In time past they walked in trespasses and sins, according to the course of this world," Eph. 2:1; 2; and so far they belong to that "world, which is become guilty before God," Rom. 3:19. But this tends to illustrate the glory of the love of God and Christ, and to the humiliation to believers, that, while they were a part of the wicked world, Christ was given to be their Redeemer. 3dly, Elect believers, after effectual calling, considered as beautified with divine grace, are, though the less, yet the best part of the world. "The saints, and the excellent that are in the earth," Ps. 16:3. "The holy seed," which "is the substance (support) of the earth." Is. 6:13. And as the Jews are wont to speak, "the just are עולמים, the pillars of the world." But what is more usual, what is more suitable, than that the whole should, by a synecdoche, signify the better, as sometimes the greater part? It is therefore not without its emphasis, and yields useful instructions, when we hear the collective body of the elect, designed by the name of the world.

XIV. Now, let us apply these things to the passages we have already quoted, §. 5. Christ indeed says, when speaking of impetration, John 6:51, that he will give his flesh for the life of the world: but, in the same Chapter, v. 33, when speaking of the application, he says that "he giveth life to the world:" and so he explains what, in the subject of redemption, he would have us to understand by "the world." For it is a capital truth, that the application of redemption extends no further than to believers and the elect.

XV. When John writes, 1 John 2:2, that Christ is the propitiation, not only for our sins, but also for the sins of the whole world;" he shows us by these words who they are that can take comfort to themselves from the intercession of Christ, and the remission purchased by him. But elect believers alone can do this; he is their advocate with the Father, and not that of the reprobate. To them, and not to the reprobate, "God hath set him forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood," Rom 3:25. Moreover, this consolation belongs not only to the elect from among the Jewish nation, such as John was, but also to the elect from among the Gentiles, whom Paul expressly points out by the name of "the world," Rom. 11:12, 13: by a phraseology very usual among the Hebrew doctors, who call the Gentiles עולמים אומות, the nations of the world. Nor does this saving truth yield comfort to those believers only who lived at that time, and to whom, as to his children, John was writing; but also to those who lived in the antediluvian world, and under the Mosaical dispensation, whose sins were no otherwise expiated than by the blood of Christ; and in fine, to those believers who, from John's days, were "to be brought" to Christ out of all nations whatever, "to the end of the world:" which very great multitude is deservedly designed by the name of "the whole world." For it is very certain, that by the whole world is not denoted the collective body of all mankind; for John expressly discriminates himself and those to whom he is writing from the whole world, and yet he could not seclude them from being a part of the collective body of mankind.

XVI. When Paul says, 2 Cor. 5:19, that "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," he immediately subjoins, that this was, "by not imputing their trespasses unto them:" to teach us, that reconciliation, and non-imputation, are of equal extent. But the latter is the privilege of the elect, and of believers alone, and of those in whose heart there is no guile. For David declares

those blessed, to whom God imputeth not iniquity, Ps. 32:1, 2, Rom. 4:6, 8. Therefore, by the world, the world of the elect is signified.

XVII. John 1:29, Christ is called "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." But, like the scape-goat, on which the iniquity of the children of Israel was laid, he taketh them away by taking them upon himself, by satisfying for them as if they were his own, and by taking them away from his people, as to their guilt, by justification, and as to their dominion and stain, by sanctification: see 1 Pet. 2:24. But as these things point to the impetration of salvation, so as at the same time to include its application, they can extend no farther than to the world of the elect believers. "Blessed is פֶּשַׁע נִשְׂוִי אֲשֶׁרֵי he, whose transgression is taken away," (forgiven) Ps. 32:1.

XVIII. And thus we have shown, that though the Scripture, when speaking of the world of the redeemed, really designs some collective body, yet it is that of the elect only. Which Prosper elegantly expressed, de Vocat. Gent. lib. i. c. iii, or in another edition, c. ix.: "In the elect, even those foreknown and discriminated from every generality, or collective body, there is deemed to be a certain peculiar kind of universality; so as that a whole world seems to be delivered out of a whole world, and all men to be redeemed from among all men."

XIX. Let us now more especially show, that Christ made satisfaction for the elect only. To this purpose are those passages of Scripture in which the death of Christ is restricted to "his sheep," "his church," "his people," nay, and "his peculiar people," John 10:15, Acts 20:28, Eph. 5:25, Tit. 2:14. From which we thus argue: what the Scriptures restrict to some certain kind of men, to the manifest exclusion of the rest, ought not to be extended absolutely to all men. But the Scriptures, in the passages quoted, limit the death of Christ to a certain kind of men, so as manifestly to exclude the rest. Therefore, &c. The truth of the major, or first proposition, is evident from the terms: that of the minor, from the passages quoted. In order to illustrate this, we are to show these two things: 1st, That the subject matter is the impetration of salvation, which is the act of Christ; and not the fruition alone, which is our act. 2dly, That the death of Christ is so restricted to those who are there described, as to exclude the rest of mankind. The remonstrants, not being able otherwise to resist the force of this argument, deny both these.

XX. As to the former, namely, that the impetration of salvation is here intended, I thus prove. 1st, The very terms which the Holy Spirit uses in the passages quoted, to lay down his life for some, to purchase some, to give himself for some, import satisfaction, impetration, and acquisition. Nor do the Scriptures usually speak in any other strain, when the subject is evidently concerning impetration. 2dly, In the passages quoted, we have a clear description of what Christ has done, both without us and without our concurrence; whereas the real fruition or enjoyment, concerning which the remonstrants will have those passages to be understood, is our act. These two differ much both in nature and time. In nature: for the one resembles a mean appointed for some end; the other, an external end, or rather the use or enjoyment of that for which that mean is appointed. In time: for these propositions were completely verified the moment in which Christ laid down his life; but the actual enjoyment or application is a thing accomplishing gradually for a long tract of time in all the elect. 3dly, The remonstrants themselves produce similar phrases from Scripture, of dying for some, purchasing some, &c. when they contend, that the impetration of the grace of God reaches to others besides the elect: with what colour or

pretence, then, do they deny that impetration is here the subject-matter? 4thly, They show, that they lay no stress on these passages, when they afterwards affirm, they cannot refer to believers alone, and maintain that, by the church, we are not to understand the elect alone, or that Christ gave himself for them only. Therefore, I say, to purchase and give himself for a person, cannot here be understood of real enjoyment, which is peculiar to believers only. 5thly and lastly, By making this exception, the answer of the remonstrants amounts only to a begging the question; for we maintain, and are directly to prove it by the strongest arguments, that the application of saving grace is as extensive as its impetration: and we own, the question here is not concerning such an impetration as may have its plenary effect, though never applied; for such an impetration we judge absurd, untheological, and highly unworthy of Christ.

XXI. The second, namely, which respects the exclusion of the rest of mankind, when distinct mention is made of the sheep, the church, a peculiar people, I shall make evident; first, by showing, that by these appellations, "sheep," "church," "peculiar people," cannot be understood all men in general; and then that which is here asserted of the "sheep," "church," "peculiar people," flows from that extraordinary love of Christ, which he has not for the rest of mankind. The first has no great difficulty in it: for, Christ expressly says to some, John 10:26, "Ye are not of my sheep." And therefore, he divides mankind into sheep and goats; of whom, the last are undoubtedly reprobate, the former, certainly the elect, and heirs of eternal life, Matt. 25:33.

XXII. Our opponents themselves will not affirm that all belong to the church. They indeed say, that the visible church is meant, in which there are others besides the elect. But, it sufficiently answers our purpose, 1st, That all and every one in particular cannot be understood. 2dly, That what is said of the visible church is sometimes of such a nature as can be understood only of the elect therein: as when the apostle, writing to the visible church of the Ephesians, Eph. 1:4, says, "he hath chosen you in him;" and in like manner; 1 Thess. 1:4: and we shall presently show, that what is said of the church in the places quoted, is of the same nature.

XXIII. In a word, the term all cannot be applied to the people of God, for God himself makes this clear, when he ordered some to be called, לֹא עַמִּי Lo-ammi, "Ye are not my people," Hos. 1:9. And they who dissent from us take a wrong course, when by people they understand the Jews; for there were reprobates even among them. Thus we learn from Paul, that, with respect to spiritual privileges, they are not all accounted Israel who are of Israel, and therefore not to be reckoned the people, Rom. 11:1, 2.\*

XXIV. But it is not enough to have shown, that the names sheep, church, people, do not comprehend every individual of mankind; for it is possible that, on a particular occasion, something might be said of some persons which certainly agree to them, but not to them only. The question is not, whether Christ died for the elect, but whether for them only. Our adversaries say, this cannot be concluded from those passages, where the particle only is not added. We must therefore show, that these things are so appropriated to the elect, as to exclude the rest of mankind; I prove it thus: all the passages quoted tend to amplify the extraordinary love of Christ towards his sheep, for whom he laid down his life; towards the church, which he purchased with his own blood; towards his people, for whom he gave himself. But if in this, the sheep, the church, the people of Christ have nothing peculiarly distinguishing beyond all other men, what



probable reason can be assigned, why that infinite love of Christ, in laying down his life, shedding his blood, and giving himself, should especially be appropriated to them?

XXV. To this reasoning our adversaries absurdly oppose Paul's glorying, who, While writing Gal. 2:20, that Christ was given for him, does not exclude others from a share in the same love. For in that text Paul does not speak of any divine love, whereby God peculiarly distinguished him from others, who had the like precious faith with himself; nor does he consider himself as Paul, but as an elect person, and a believer, proposing himself there, as an example, in the name of all believers: and we are so far from being able to infer from this, that what Paul affirms of himself was peculiar to him, that quite the reverse ought to be concluded. This instance therefore does not suit the case.

XXVI. But let us consider each passage apart: when Christ publicly declares, that "he lays down his life for his sheep," he thence infers, that he must bring them to hear his voice, that there may be one fold and one shepherd, John 10:15, 16, 17. But it is certain, that these last assertions agree to elect believers only, and therefore also the first, from which the others are deduced. For it would not be a just inference, to say, I lay down my life for my sheep, therefore I must bring them to hear my voice, &c., did he lay down his life for some, whom he never brings, &c.

XXVII. When Paul said, that Christ purchased his church with his own blood, Acts 20:28, he more distinctly explains, in his Epistle to the Ephesians. 5:25, what he means by the church, which Christ loved and gave himself for, namely, the spouse of Christ, whom alone he loves with a conjugal affection, and sanctifies and presents glorious to himself. But that love of Christ, which was the motive of his giving himself, and of the sanctification and glorification of the church, which is the fruit of that donation, belongs to elect believers only: therefore also the very giving itself, which is the consequence of that love, and the cause of the sanctification of the church. Moreover, that this conjugal love of Christ, whereby he purchased the church, as his spouse, by his own blood, has the general assembly of the elect alone for his object (to waive other considerations) may be hence also inferred, because Paul proposes it here as a pattern of the conjugal love of the husband for the wife. But this love ought doubtless to reach no farther than the wife.

XXVIII. Lastly, when Paul reminds his son Titus, that "Christ gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works," Tit. 2:14, he evidently shows what was fruit of Christ's giving himself; namely, redemption from iniquity, and the purification of a peculiar people, &c. And consequently they who are not redeemed from iniquity, nor purified, nor made his peculiar people, &c., cannot glory in this, that Christ gave himself for them.

XXIX. What the apostle writes in this Chapter ver. 11, that "the grace of God, that bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men, teaching us that denying ungodliness," &c. neither avails our adversaries, nor is any ways detrimental to the truth we maintain. For, 1st, The preaching of the gospel, by which the saving grace of God is offered, and which is here intended by that expression, had not reached all mankind without exception, nay, nor every nation, in the days of Paul. 2dly, The preaching of the gospel reaches the ears of a great many more than of those who are the objects of that love of Christ which bringeth salvation. For it is only an external mean, by

which the elect, out of every nation, are brought to the communion of Christ. And therefore the gospel is to be preached to every nation, without distinction, that the elect therein may hear it. 3dly, We should observe the apostle's scope, which is to encourage servants to the exercise of universal piety, that, by their holy conversation, they may adorn the doctrine of Christ in all things. The reason he gives for this is, because the saving grace of Christ has appeared, both to masters and servants, teaching us, &c. As if he had said, "That all men, of whatever rank, professing the gospel, ought to reckon it their duty to adorn its doctrine by the purity of their manners; for, as to the doctrine itself, it so plainly, so expressly, and so efficaciously instructs us all in goodness, as none but they who wilfully stop their ears can be ignorant of. And therefore all the professors of it, as well masters as servants, should take care, least they bring a scandal on this most perfect of all rules, by lives which have little or no conformity to it." This is the full import of these words, so that any may see, that they make nothing for the universal efficacy of Christ's death.

XXX. If we search the matter to the bottom, we shall most clearly discern, that it never was Christ's intention to satisfy for all in general. Certainly he satisfied only for those he engaged for. But he engaged "to do the will of his Father," Ps. 40:9. But this is the will of his Father, not that every man should be saved, but those that were given him, that is, the elect out of every nation, who are to receive the gift of faith. Those the Father gave him for an inheritance by an irrevocable testament. For thus Jehovah speaks, Is. 49:6: "It is a light thing that thou shouldst be my servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth." And Christ himself still more clearly, John 6:39: "This is the Father's will, which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing." But all are not given to Christ, only those that come to him, ver. 37: "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me." He therefore only engaged for these, according to the will of the Father: took their sins upon him, carried them on his heart, when he offered himself to the Father; claims them as his peculiar property, in virtue of his merit, according to agreement, challenges them for his own, and will at length, in due time, present them holy and glorious to his Father, saying, "Behold I and the children which thou hast given me," Heb. 2:13. All those things naturally flow from the very nature of the covenant which subsists between the Father and the Son, as formerly explained.

XXXI. And these particulars may be further illustrated and confirmed from Aaron's typical priesthood. The High Priest, on the solemn day of expiation, slew one of the goats, on which the sins of all Israel were laid, and sent the other into the wilderness. All these things were typical. The High Priest, the sacrifice, the scape-goat, all set forth Christ. But who were typically designed by Israel? Not indeed all men. For what is more absurd than that Israel should be a type of the Edomites and Egyptians, and of all that world, out of which they were chosen, and from which, on so many accounts, they were distinguished? We therefore conclude that they were typical of the elect, who are the true Israelites, Jews inwardly, and in the Spirit, and whom the apostle loves to distinguish by the name of the election, Rom. 11:7. For the nature of the type consisted in this, that the people of Israel were chosen by an external pomp of ceremonies, were redeemed, and in their measure were a holy priesthood. They therefore prefigured those who were truly chosen, redeemed, and consecrated a royal priesthood to God; as Peter seems not obscurely to signify, 1 Pet. 2:5. As therefore the High Priest formerly offered an atoning sacrifice, not for the Egyptians or Canaanites, but for the typical Israel only; So our High Priest,

according to the order of Melchizedek, offered himself once, not for abandoned reprobates, but for mystical Israel, that is the truly chosen.

XXXII. This truth will appear very plain, if we attend to some of the inseparable effects of Christ's satisfaction. It would carry us to far too enumerate all: let us consider some of the principal. "If they who were enemies to God were reconciled by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, they shall be saved by his life," Rom. 5:10. For whom God, not sparing his own Son, gave him up unto death, "with him freely he gives them all things," Rom. 8:32. We, for whom Christ died, may boldly say, "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth?" &c. ver. 33, 34. They Whom Christ "redeemed from the curse of the law," are not under the curse, but "the blessing of Abraham cometh upon them," Gal. 3:13, 14. But this is not true of all and every one, but of elect believers only, that they are saved by the life of Christ; that with Christ God freely gives them all things; that none can lay any thing to their charge, or bring an accusation against them; that upon them is come the blessing of Abraham. Therefore, they alone are the persons of whom the foregoing things may be truly affirmed.

XXXIII. That fictitious satisfaction for the reprobate, and those who perish, is altogether a vain and useless thing. For whom does it profit? Not certainly God, who by no act can be rendered happier than he is. Not Christ himself, who, as he never seeks them, so he never receives them, for his peculiar property; and neither is he enriched by possessing them, though supposed to have purchased them at a dear rate. Not believers, who, content with their portion in God and in Christ, and fully redeemed by Christ, enjoy a happiness in every respect complete. In fine, not those that perish, who are constrained to satisfy in their own persons for their sins to the utmost farthing. But to affirm the satisfaction of Christ to be a vain and useless thing, is absurd, and borders upon blasphemy. Remigius, formerly bishop of Lyons, said extremely well, when discoursing at large on this controverted point, "The blood of Christ is a great price; such a price can, in no respect, be vain and ineffectual, but rather is filled with the superabundant advantage arising from those blessings for which it was paid," See Forbes. Instruct. Hist. lib. viii. c. xvi.

XXXIV. Nor are we to say, that therefore the reprobate have no benefit by the satisfaction of Christ, because the condition of faith and perseverance which the reprobate do not perform, is necessary to that purpose. For, first, it is not true, that faith and perseverance are prerequisite conditions, before a person can have any of the fruits of Christ's satisfaction. For regeneration itself, and effectual calling, which go before actual faith; justification, adoption, and sanctification, which precede final perseverance in the faith, are the fruits of Christ's most excellent satisfaction. And then, from the want of faith and perseverance in those that perish, we have a most effectual proof, that the blood of the new covenant was not shed for them; for by that Christ has merited for his people the continuance of the new life in faith and love; Seeing he is "the Mediator of that better covenant, which was established upon better promises," Heb. 8:6. But these promises are, sanctification, ver. 10: "I will put my laws into their mind;" and the continuance thereof, "I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people." For in the new covenant, to be a God to any is to be an everlasting Saviour, as we gather from Matt. 22:32, and which the opposition made between the new and the old covenant, in like manner, shows, Heb. 8:8, 9. These promises, being graciously and actually conferred on the elect, in virtue of Christ's

satisfaction, would have certainly been conferred on the rest of mankind, had Christ equally satisfied for them.

XXXV. Nay, the satisfaction of Christ for the reprobate had not only been useless, but highly unworthy both of God and of Christ. Unworthy of the wisdom, goodness, and justice of God, to exact and receive satisfaction from his most beloved Son for those whom he neither gave nor wanted to give his Son, and whom he decreed to consign to everlasting confinement, to suffer in their own persons according to the demerit of their crimes. Unworthy of Christ, to give his blood a price of redemption for those whom he had not in charge to redeem. And if we may speak freely, this also, in some respect, would be for Christ to account the blood of the new covenant, or the new covenant itself, in which he was sanctified, a common or unholy thing.

XXXVI. I should now refute the arguments of those on the other side of the question; but this has been done at large, and with so much judgment, by very learned men, that we can scarce make any addition. The very accurate dissertation of Gomarus on this head, which is inserted in his commentaries on the Epistle to the Galatians, may especially be consulted.

## Chapter X: After what manner Christ Used the Sacraments

I. Thus far we have at large treated of those things that relate to the covenant between Christ and the Father; and might seem to have completely finished that subject, were it not proper to add something concerning the Sacraments by which that covenant was confirmed. The apostle has observed, Heb. 7:20, 21, that "not without an oath" Christ was made priest and surety of a better testament. As this manifested the stability of the covenant, and the immutability of God's counsel; so it likewise contributed to the full assurance of Christ the Mediator. It moreover pleased God to confirm that covenant by certain external symbols, and indeed the very same by which the covenant of grace was sealed to believers, under the different dispensations of it. We have already hinted something on this subject, which we are now to enlarge upon more distinctly.

II. It is evident, that the Lord Jesus was circumcised on the eighth day from his birth, Luke 2:21, that he kept the passover with his disciples, Luke 22:8, 11, and was baptized by John, Matt. 3:13. Though the evangelist do not, indeed, expressly assert that he also partook of the holy supper; yet they relate what, we think, may make it more than probable he did.

III. 1st, It is certain that our Lord, in the institution and use of the mystical supper, borrowed most of the rites from the Jewish passover. The very learned Joseph Scaliger, Ludovicus Capellus, and most particularly Buxtorf in a peculiar dissertation, have made this as clear as noon-day. Thus our Lord took the bread and cup distinctly, separately blessed them both, and gave them to his disciples, after the Jewish manner. It was, besides, a custom among the Jews for the master of the family to eat first of the bread after blessing: to this purpose Maimonides in Hilcot Berachat, c. vii., says, "The guests were not to eat or taste any thing, till he who broke had tasted first." Nor was it permitted, at festivals and solemn feasts, for any of the guests to drink of the cup, till after the master of the family had done it first, according to an express passage quoted by Buxtorf from the Talmud, where it is said "to be an excellent precept, that he who sanctifies or blesses should first taste, and after, all the guests, sitting down, tasted; every one took a draught." See the above dissertation, §. 76. In this manner Christ acted at the paschal supper, Luke 22:15, 17; and why not so at this new mystical supper?

IV. 2dly, This observation will be more cogent if we consider, that the same phraseology used by Christ of the paschal cup, Luke 22:18, "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come," is also, according to Matt. 26:29, made use of concerning the cup at the holy supper. Whence we infer, that then Christ likewise drank of the cup with his disciples.

V. 3dly, We may add, that no reason can be assigned, why Christ should not partake of the supper, as he did of baptism, and consecrate, in his own person, these two Sacraments of the New Testament.

VI. 4thly, Nay, this seems requisite from the mutual union between Christ and believers, and that intercourse of intimate familiarity which, among other things, was sealed in this mystical feast, and which our Lord himself has very elegantly proposed, under the similitude of a mutual supper, Rev. 3:20: "I will sup with him, and he with me."

VII. This also was the opinion of the Fathers: As of Jerome in Epist. ad Hedibiam quest. 2: "Not Moses, but the Lord Jesus gave us the true bread: he himself at once the entertainer and the entertainment; the eater and the food." Of Augustine, de Doctrina Christiana, lib. ii. c. iii: "And having first tasted the Sacrament of his body and blood, he signified his meaning." Of Chrysostom, Homil. 83, in Matt.: "He also drinks thereof, lest, on hearing his words, they should say, And do we then drink blood and eat flesh? And therefore, in order to prevent this, he himself sets them an example," &c.

VIII. This use of the Sacraments was not a matter of choice to Christ, but a part of his righteousness, and a duty incumbent upon him. For he himself declared, when John refused to baptize him, "Suffer it to be so now; for thus *πρέπον ἐστίν*, it becometh us, to fulfil all righteousness," Matt. 3:15. Where by righteousness he means the obedience due to the command of God, and it became both John and Christ to fulfil all, and consequently this part. The part of Christ was to present himself to be baptized by John, and John's duty not to deny Christ in this; thus it became both of them: nor was it a matter of mere fitness in this place, as if baptism was a thing unnecessary; (it being, as I have already said, a part of the righteousness which Christ was to fulfil) but it signified every duty incumbent, and the performance of every such duty is an ornament to the saints, and renders them beautiful in the eyes of God: as the Psalmist sings, Ps. 93:5: "Holiness (*הַקְּדוּשָׁה* is the beauty of) becometh thine house, (or those that frequent thy house)." In this sense Paul said, Eph. 5:3, "as *πρέπει*, becometh, saints; and 1 Tim. 2:10, *ὁ πρέπει*, which becometh, women professing godliness; and Heb. 2:10, for *ἔπρεπε*, it became him." The rectitude, beauty, or comeliness of God, who is adorned with rectitude and beauty, *הַקְּדוּשָׁה*, Ps. 89:8, (which rectitude he can neither deny, nor act contrary to) required, that the Captain of our salvation should be made perfect by sufferings; "such a High Priest became us," Heb. 7:26. From which it appears, that the baptism of Christ was a part of his duty, by which he rendered himself comely both in the eyes of God and men.

IX. But besides this, the Sacraments which Christ made use of had still a further respect. They are not only to be considered as acts of obedience, enjoined by the law, but also as signs and seals of the covenant, whereby the mutual engagements of the contracting parties are sealed. For God did not institute the Sacraments with a view that any should place virtue and holiness in the bare exercise of those acts, but that they might be seals of spiritual things. Nor does he make a proper use of the Sacraments, who does not apply them to that end. But doubtless Christ made use of these institutions agreeably to the intention of God who appointed them, as was proper to be done by that most perfect and excellent Servant, in whom God was well pleased. There was, therefore, in the use of the Sacraments, a confirmation of the promises, both of those made by the Father to the Son, and by the Son to the Father.

X. But then, the promises made to Christ were of various kinds: some were made to him as a particular man, born holy, who was to be justified and made happy, upon constantly persevering in the course of his commenced purity. For Christ was indeed a holy creature; but to make a holy creature happy, who preserves its holiness untainted, is so agreeable to the divine goodness, that it is scarce, if at all, possible it could be otherwise, as we have proved at large, book I. chap. IV. sect. XII. seq. And these promises are legal, and belong to the Covenant of Works. But there were other promises made to him as surety and mediator, by which his person, and his office, and works, as Mediator, should be acceptable to God, and were successful: and a twofold effect

was certainly to ensue, one for himself, viz. a most excellent degree of glory; the other, for the elect who were to be united to him, namely, their salvation. And these last are properly the promises of the covenant we are now upon, of which we have given a specimen, book II. chap. III. sect. xxix. seq.

XI. We may now inquire, whether both these kinds of promises were sealed to Christ, by the ordinary Sacraments of the Old and New Testament, which he partook of. But we must not determine any thing rashly with respect to this; and therefore I shall modestly propose what I think most probable. There is, indeed, no reason why Christ, as a holy man, and who, as such, was to be made happy, might not be confirmed in the faith of this promise by some certain Sacraments, as appears from the Sacraments of the Covenant of Works given to Adam before the fall. But that such Sacraments were, for that purpose, granted to Christ, does not appear from Scripture. Moreover, I dare not affirm that the ordinary Sacraments, which Christ made use of, were subservient to the confirming the legal promises, belonging to the Covenant of Works, because they are Sacraments of the Covenant of Grace. And it does not seem consistent, that the promises of the Covenant of Works should be sealed by the Sacraments of the Covenant of Grace.

XII. I cannot indeed refuse, that there is a great difference in some circumstances, relative to the signification of the sacraments, as made use of by Christ, and as used by believers. For to the latter they seal regeneration, the mortification of the old, and the vivification of the new man, the remission of sins. But as there neither was nor could be any occasion for these with respect to Christ, the holy one of God, so they could not, in this manner, be seals to him. Christ also, by the Sacraments, engaged to perform obedience otherwise than believers do; for he engaged to perform the most perfect obedience, without any defect, and bound himself to bear the curse of the law, in order to satisfy divine justice. But though believers, in the use of the Sacraments, engage to perform obedience, yet not that which is absolutely perfect (for that would be to be guilty of a formal lie), neither do they bind themselves to bear the curse, nor promise any thing by which, of themselves, they may satisfy the justice of God. So that all the same things, at least not in the same manner, were not sealed to Christ by the Sacraments, which by these are sealed to believers.

XIII. That very accurate divine, Gomarus, having duly examined these things, has presented us with a certain general signification of the Sacraments, which he maintains to have been applicable to Christ. According to him, the Sacraments were "a sign and seal of his covenant with God and communion with the church, that God should be his God, and the bestower of salvation: and that he himself was bound to perform perpetual grateful obedience to him, and to be joined in communion with the church." On Matt. 3:13. Though there is no impropriety in these things, and they were doubtless signified in the Sacraments which Christ made use of, yet they do not seem to come up to the full signification of the Sacraments; because the proper, proximate, and principal end, and consequently the very nature of these Sacraments, is especially to be a seal of the new covenant. And here holds what is commonly said in the schools, the principal act specifies, as the great Voetius, Disput. tom. ii. p. 161, has accurately observed.

XIV. I therefore conclude, that the promises, made to Christ, as Mediator, were principally sealed to him by the Sacraments. Christ, indeed, obtained these in virtue of his merits, or, to

speak with Paul, because he fulfilled the righteousness of the law; yet in themselves, and as they relate to believers, they are promises of the covenant of grace. By them it was declared, that Christ should be highly exalted, and become the head of believers, and that they should be redeemed by his satisfaction, justified by his merits, and at length made perfectly happy with him, that so he might for ever exult for joy with them, and in them, as his glorious inheritance.

XV. The justification of the Lord Jesus is contained in these promises, concerning which he himself says, Is. 50:8, 9, "He is near that justifieth me, who will contend with me? Who is he that shall condemn me?" And Paul, 1 Tim. 3:16, "he was justified in the spirit." This justification does not only consist in his being declared innocent of those crimes, with which he was falsely accused, and for which he was condemned by men; nor in the Father's declaring him to be holy and righteous, and worthy of his favour, on account of the perfect holiness of his nature and actions; but in his being, as Mediator, declared to have performed every thing he was bound to for the payment of the debt he had taken upon himself. So that he, who had before appeared "in the likeness of sinful flesh," Rom. 8:3, was now to be seen "χωρίς ἁμαρτίας, without sin, by those that look for him unto salvation."

XVI. Yet I dare not say with a certain divine, in other respects very sound, that the remission of those sins which Christ as surety took upon himself, was sealed to him. For the Scripture nowhere speaks in this manner; besides, the remission of sins is the forbearance or removal of the punishment due to them. Which cannot be said of Christ, because he suffered the punishment due to us, and, in the fullest manner, satisfied the justice of God. Our sins are forgiven us, on account of the satisfaction of Christ. But neither Scripture nor reason will authorise us to say, that sin was forgiven to Christ.

XVII. However, agreeably to both we may say, that the regeneration of the elect, the remission of their sins, their sanctification and glorification, in a word, all those benefits which, by virtue of the covenant of grace, are bestowed upon them, were promised and sealed to Christ by the Sacraments. For since, by virtue of the mystical union, founded on the decree of God, Christ and the elect are one spiritual body, he received those gifts in the elect which are given to them; as we have several times hinted from Ps. 68:18.

XVIII. May we not here also refer what Paul writes, Eph. 1:23, that the church is "πληρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμένου the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Fulness, I say, not only to be completed by Christ, but also in its measure, which makes Christ complete, who himself seems not to be completed without his whole body. So that the promises made to the elect may so far be looked upon as made to Christ, and thus sealed to him by the Sacraments.

XIX. Moreover Christ, on the other hand, promised the Father, in the use of the Sacraments, faithfully and perseveringly to perform all he bound himself to by agreement. For, in the use of the Sacraments, there is, as it were, a kind of renewal of the covenant, and, if we may thus speak, a repeated solemnization thereof. Christ, therefore, by that act, publicly protested before God and the church, that he would not fail in any part of his duty.

XX. Some perhaps may think, to what purpose this mutual sealing of the promises by Sacraments? For neither was the faith of Christ subject to any vicious flaw of weakness, to



render such a confirmation necessary; nor the Father under any doubt as to the fidelity of his engaging Son. But the answer is easy. 1st, The institution and use of Sacraments do not, from the nature of the thing, presuppose sin, or any weakness of faith, as appears from the Sacraments instituted before the fall; and are not therefore to be esteemed a vain institution: for that would be injurious to the wisdom of God, who appointed them. 2dly, Though the faith of Christ had no stain, yet it was but human, and depended on the influence, support, and corroboration of the Deity; and as he usually does this by the means he has appointed for that purpose, it was the duty of the man Christ to obey this will of the Deity, and carefully apply the means adapted to that end, some of which are the Sacraments. 3dly, None, I imagine, will deny, that Christ preserved, exerted, and strengthened his own faith by devout prayers, pious meditation on the word of God, an attentive observation of the ways of God towards himself and other believers, the contemplation of the divine perfections, and by a full exercise of instituted worship. For as these are things inseparable from the duty of a pious man, so they very much contribute to preserve and strengthen faith. Why should we not then believe, that they had the same effect on Christ, which by their nature they are adapted to have? And if, by these means, the faith of Christ was supported, why not also by the Sacraments? 4thly, Nay, as often as a more bitter temptation or dreadful affliction assaulted him, he was confirmed in the faith of the promises by extraordinary means; such as the appearance of God at Jordan, the descent of the Holy Spirit, Matt. 3:16, 17; the ministry of angels, Matt. 4:11; the glorious transfiguration on the holy mountain, Matt. 17:1, &c.; a voice from heaven, John 12:28; and an angel strengthening him in his agony, Luke 20:43. From this I conclude, that since it was fit Christ should at times be confirmed in faith by extraordinary means, it was no ways unfit to allow the ordinary means of the Sacraments to be applied for the same purpose.

XXI. Nor was it less proper that Christ should so solemnly reiterate his engagements in the use of the Sacraments, though the Father was fully persuaded of his veracity and fidelity. For, 1st, That free and often-repeated profession of Christ's alacrity, to perform every thing he engaged for, contributed to the glory of the Father. 2dly, The zeal of Christ himself, though never viciously languid, was yet roused, and kindled to a flame by that repetition of his obligation. 3dly, It was highly useful to believers, who either were eye-witnesses of his actions, or otherwise acquainted with them, attentively to consider that open declaration of Christ; for thus they were both strengthened in the faith of Christ, and excited to a like alacrity of zeal. Whence we conclude, that the use of the Sacraments was neither a vain nor an empty thing to Christ.

XXII. Having premised these things in general concerning the Sacraments which Christ used, let us briefly take a view of each. And the first is his circumcision, intimated, Luke 2:21. Which signified and sealed to Christ, 1st, That he was acknowledged by the Father as the promised seed of Abraham, in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed. 2dly, That his death and cutting off out of the land of the living, Is. 53:8, should be the means of the preservation and life of his whole mystical body, as the cutting off of the foreskin, in the Jews, was a mean for the preservation of the whole person. For they who neglected this were threatened to be cut off from among their people, Gen. 17:14. 3dly, That his people were to derive from him the circumcision made without hands, consisting of putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, to be begun in regeneration, carried on in sanctification, and consummated in the glorification both of body and soul, Col. 2:11.

XXIII. On the other hand, Christ promised in circumcision, 1st, That he would in general perform all righteousness, see Gal. 5:3. And on his coming into the world, he proclaimed this by this solemn token, "Lo! I come to do thy will, O God," Ps. 40:8, 9. 2dly, More especially that he was ready and prepared to shed his blood, and undergo those sufferings by which he was under obligations to satisfy the justice of God. For he entered upon life by undergoing pain and shedding his blood on the eighth day. And 3dly, Most of all, that being now made flesh of our flesh, Eph. 5:30, he would willingly, at the appointed time, give himself up to death, and to be cut off out of the land of the living, in order thereby to be the saviour of his mystical body, Eph. 5:13.

XXIV. Of a like nature is the consideration of the baptism of Christ. In which, 1st, The Father openly declared, that he acknowledged the Lord Jesus for his Son, whose person and offices were most acceptable to him. 2dly, That Christ should be filled with the gifts of the Spirit, not only to be furnished with them in the fullest manner, for the executing his office, but for believers to derive abundantly from his fulness. This was signified both by the water of baptism, Ezek. 36:25, 27, and by the symbol of the descending dove. 3dly, That in the appointed time Christ should, by a glorious resurrection, come out of the waters of tribulation, and lift up his head, Ps. 110:7, and Ps. 40:3, as the baptized persons ascends out of the water. 4thly, On the other hand, Jesus declared his readiness to plunge into the torrents of hell, yet with an assured faith and hope of a deliverance.

XXV. In the passover was signified to the Lord Jesus, 1st, His being acknowledged by the Father as the Lamb without spot or blemish, and separate from sinners. 2dly, That by his blood, he was certainly to obtain for believers deliverance from the destroying angel, like the Israelites in Egypt, by the blood of the passover. On the other hand, Jesus made a declaration of his readiness to undergo the most bitter things for his people, prefigured by the bitter herbs of the passover, and to shed his blood, and be slain and scorched in the fire of the divine anger burning against our sins; in a word, to give himself wholly for us, as the Gospel Lamb was all of it to be consumed.

XXVI. Here I cannot omit, what the celebrated Buxtorf has observed in the dissertation above quoted, §. 54, that the circumcision of Christ and his death on the cross were very elegantly and exactly prefigured by the manner of slaying the paschal lamb, as described in the Talmud on the passover, chap. v. in Mishna, in these words: "How did they hang up and excoriate (or flay off) the skin of the lamb to be slain? Iron hooks, or nails, were fixed in the walls and pillars; on which nails they hanged up and excoriated (or flayed) the lamb. If, on account of the number of the slayers, there was not room enough on the nails, they had recourse to slender smooth sticks, upon one of these a person took up the lamb and laid it on his own and his neighbour's shoulders, thus they hung up and excoriated the lamb." And much to the same purpose is what Bochart has remarked in his Hierozoicon, lib. ii. c. v, from Maimonides in his book de Paschate, chap. viii. §. 13: "When they roast the paschal lamb, they transfix it from the middle of the mouth to the pudenda, with a wooden spit or broach, and, placing fire underneath, suspend it in the middle of the oven." In order therefore to roast it, they did not turn it on an iron spit, in the manner used by us, but suspended it transfixed with one made of wood, which, in some measure, represented Christ hanging on the cross. Especially, if what Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, mentions is true: "The roasted lamb was made into the figure of a cross, by impaling or

spitting it from head to tail, and then from one shoulder to the other, with a skewer, on which last were extended the fore feet, and thus it was roasted." And why may we not give credit to this relation of a man not only pious, but also well skilled in the Jewish customs, having been born at Sichern, and the son of a Samaritan? Since, then, the passover presented such a clear resemblance of the crucifixion; Christ, when he partook of it, promised an obedience even unto the cross.

XXVII. The signification of the Holy Supper is much the same: by it was sealed to Christ, 1st, That he should be to the elect the sweetest food, meat, and drink, for their spiritual and eternal life. 2dly, That the virtue of his merits should be celebrated by believers, till his return again to judgment. 3dly, That, together with believers, he should enjoy a heavenly feast, never to have an end. But then, again, Christ promised the breaking of his body and the shedding of his blood. And thus in all and each of the Sacraments which Christ made use of, there was a solemn repetition and a sealing of the covenant entered into between him and the Father.

## **THE ECONOMY OF THE DIVINE COVENANTS - BOOK III**

## Chapter I: Of the Covenant of God with the Elect

I. THE plan of this work, formerly laid down, has now brought us to treat of GOD'S COVENANT WITH THE ELECT, founded on the compact between the Father and the Son. The nature of which we shall first unfold in general, and then more particularly explain it in the following order, as first to speak of the Contracting Parties; then inquire into the Promises of the Covenant, and moreover examine whether, and what, and how far, any thing may be required of the Elect, by way of a condition in the Covenant: in fine, to debate whether this covenant has its peculiar threatenings.

II. The Contracting Parties are, on the one part, GOD; on the other, the ELECT. And God is to be considered, 1st, As truly all-sufficient for all manner of happiness, not only to himself, nay, nor only to the innocent creature, but also to guilty and sinful man. He himself impressed this upon Abraham at the renewal of the covenant, when God emphatically called himself אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִרָם the Almighty God, or God all-sufficient, Gen. 17:1, אֱלֹהִים denotes powerful, and sometimes too, in the abstract, power, as Prov. 3:27, אֱלֹהֵי יָדְךָ, power of thine hand. It therefore denotes him who is endowed with such power, as that "he is able to do exceeding abundantly, above all that we ask, or think," Eph. 3:20; without whom we can do nothing, and in whom we can do all things: אֱלֹהֵי signifies sufficient, whether we suppose it compounded of the relative אֱלֹהֵי and אֱלֹהִים, so as to denote one who is sufficient; or whether derived from אֱלֹהֵי, signifying both a pap or breast, and desolation or ravage. We may join each of these together, and say, that God is so powerful and so sufficient, as that himself is in want of nothing, and from his plentiful breast all things derive their being, their life, and their motion; which breast being once withdrawn, all things relapse into desolation. This is what he declares himself to be to his chosen people, in the covenant of grace, for whose benefit he is possessed of this most powerful all-sufficiency. That name, therefore, is often repeated to the Patriarchs, as the fountain of every blessing, Gen. 28:3, 35:11, and 43:14. 2dly, As most merciful and gracious, rejoicing to communicate himself to the sinful creature, Exod. 34:6, 7. 3dly, And at the same time as most just, not entering into a state of friendship with the sinner, but in a way consistent with his holiness, and after having obtained full satisfaction to his justice; for "he will by no means clear the guilty." 4thly and lastly, As most wise, having found out an admirable mixture of his mercy and justice, without infringing the rights of either. For by this means, "unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places, is made known by the church ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ, the manifold wisdom of God," Eph. 3:10.

III. But here men are considered, 1st, As sinners, miserable and lost in themselves, who could not be restored by their own, or by any other created power; in a word, possessed of nothing on account of which they could please God, Ezek. 16:1–6, Tit. 3:3, 4. 2ndly, as chosen by God to grace and glory, according to his most absolute good pleasure, and so appointed heirs of eternal life, and are that little flock, to whom it is the Father's good pleasure to give the kingdom, Luke 12:32. 3rdly, As those for whom Christ engaged, or made satisfaction; for this ought to be considered as necessary, before ever it could be worthy of God to make mention of his grace to sinful man.

IV. The economy of the persons of the Trinity in the covenant of grace, claims also our attention. The Father is held forth as the principal author of it, "who was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," 2 Cor. 5:19, and appointed the Elect to be heirs of himself, and joint heirs with his Son,

Rom. 8:17. The Son is not only Mediator and executor of the covenant, but is himself also the testator, who, by his death, ratified the testament of grace, Luke 22:29, Heb. 9:16, and the distributor of all the blessings of it. "I give unto them eternal life," John 10:28. The Spirit brings the Elect to Christ, and, in Christ, to the possession of the benefits of the covenant, and intimates to their consciences τὰ ὅσια τοῦ Δαβιδ τα πιστα, the holy pledges, the sure mercies of David, and is the seal and earnest of their complete happiness, 1 Cor. 12:3, 11, 12, Eph. 1:13, 14.

V. Moreover, as we restrict this covenant to the Elect, it is evident we are speaking of the internal mystical and spiritual communion of the covenant. For salvation itself, and every thing belonging to it, or inseparably connected with it, are promised in this covenant, all which none but the Elect can attain to. If, in other respects, we consider the external economy of the covenant, in the communion of the word and sacraments, in the profession of the true faith, in the participation of many gifts which, though excellent and illustrious, are yet none of the effects of the sanctifying Spirit, nor any earnest of future happiness; it cannot be denied that, in this respect, many are in covenant, whose names, notwithstanding, are not in the testament of God.

VI. And thus we come to mention some things concerning the promises of the covenant, which, in general, may be included under the terms of grace and glory, as is done by the Psalmist, Ps. 48:9, 11: "The Lord will give grace and glory." Which are commonly so distinguished by divines as to refer grace to this life, and glory to that which is to come; though the grace of this life be glorious, and the glory of the future life gracious. We may likewise not improperly say, that in the covenant of grace are promised both salvation itself, and all the means leading to it, which the Lord hath briefly comprised, Jer. 31:33, "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." And again, chap. 32:38, 39, 40, "And they shall be my people, and I will be their God: and I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them, and of their children after them. And I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me."

VII. Here we are to observe a remarkable difference between the promises of the covenant of works, and those of the covenant of grace. The same eternal life is promised in both, which can be but one, consisting in the communion and enjoyment of God; but it is promised in a manner quite different in the one from what it is in the other. In the covenant of works God promised life to man, on condition of perfect obedience; but he did not promise to produce or effect this obedience in man. In the covenant of grace, he not only promises life eternal, but also at the same time faith and repentance, and perseverance in holiness, without which life cannot be attained, and which being granted, life cannot but be obtained. And even in this sense it may be said, that the covenant of which Christ is the Mediator is "more excellent, and established on better promises," Heb. 8:6; because it does not depend on any uncertain condition, but is founded on the suretyship and actual satisfaction of Christ, does infallibly secure salvation to the believer, and as certainly promise faith to the Elect.

VIII. Divines explain themselves differently as to the conditions of the covenant of grace. We, for our part, agree with those who think that the covenant of grace, to speak accurately, with

respect to us has no conditions, properly so called; which sentiment we shall explain and establish in the following manner.

IX. A condition of a covenant, properly so called, is that action which, being performed, gives a man a right to the reward. But that such a condition cannot be required of us in the covenant of grace, is self-evident: because a right to life neither is nor indeed can be founded on any action of ours, but on the righteousness of our Lord alone; who having perfectly fulfilled the righteousness of the law for us, nothing can, in justice, be required of us to perform, in order to acquire a right already fully purchased for us. And, indeed, in this all the orthodox readily agree.

X. Further, the apostle more than once sets forth the covenant of grace under the appellation of a testament, which is God's immutable purpose, not suspended on any one condition: and as it is founded on the unchangeable counsel of God, and ratified by the death of the testator, so it is not possible it should be made void by any unbelief of the elect, nor acquire its stability from any faith of man; for in this very testament God has immutably determined concerning faith, as salvation. Thus, Gal. 3:15, we see the covenant of God with Abraham is called a testament; the ratification of which must also be the same with that of a testament. And the covenant to be made with Israel, Jer. 31 has the same appellation, Heb. 8:10; as also that covenant with Israel mentioned by Moses, Exod. 24 and the declaration of the manner of enjoying the love of God through faith in Christ, Heb. 9:15, 20. And likewise, the compact of the Father with the Son, Luke 22:39, "In which passage, first, the will of God is published, by which he decreed, that the Son should, by the divine power of the Father, obtain the inheritance of the world, and a kingdom: secondly, the will of Christ, that the apostles and others given him should, through faith, become heirs of righteousness, and of the heavenly kingdom and of that of the world." Compare Gal. 3:8. "But why should the apostle call the covenant of Abraham, and that mentioned, Heb. 8:10, a testament, and whether it ought not to be so taken, Matt. 26:18, and in other places, shall be considered in its place."—Cocceius de Fœder. §. 4. And, in a word, I know not whether Paul, when speaking of the covenant of grace, did at any time or in any passage give it any other name than that of a testament. "But at that time," at least if we give in to Cocceius's opinion, "that word signified, neither to Greeks, nor Hellenist Jews, nor to the Hebrews, any other thing but a testament." Cocceius ad Gal. 3 §. 134. I do not assert these things, as if I wanted to confound the notions of a covenant and a testament; but to show that the covenant of grace is testamentary, and to be distinguished from a covenant founded on a compact agreement, or law. Nor do I conceal that I found this in Cocceius de Fœd. §. 87; which made me wonder that a certain learned person, who is a great admirer of Cocceius, should find fault with these things.

XI. The famous Cloppenburg, formerly the ornament of the university of Friesland, has accurately observed the same thing, whose words I shall subjoin from Disputat. 3, de Fœderibus, Thes. 29: "The other disposition of the covenant [which regards us] is testamentary, whereby the grace by which we are saved comes to us from the most perfect merit of Christ the surety. For we are reckoned to be in covenant with God by the new covenant of grace, without having superadded to the covenant confirmed with Christ, the surety, by the renewal of the old agreement, any condition by which God should transact with us, but giving a gratuitous call to the inheritance of the promises whose testament Christ ratified by his death, and whose mediator he now is in heaven; namely, of full reconciliation with God and of eternal life." Junius, in like manner, in his Theses, Disputat. 25, §. 29, "The conditions being fulfilled by the Angel of the

Covenant, the catholic church was, through and for him, constituted heir of eternal life, without any condition."

XII. Besides, when God proposes the form of the covenant of grace, his words to this purpose are mere promises, as we have lately seen, Jer. 31 and 32. Our divines, therefore, who, in consequence of the quirks of the Socinians and Remonstrants, have learned to speak with the greatest caution, justly maintain, that the Gospel, strictly taken, consists of pure promises of grace and glory.

XIII. And indeed, if we were to take the promises of the covenant of grace altogether without exception, we could not, so much as in thought, devise any thing in us as the condition of these promises. For whatever can be conceived as a condition, is all included in the universality of the promises. Should God only promise eternal life, there might be some pretence for saying that repentance, faith, and the like, were the conditions of this covenant. But seeing God does in the same breath, as it were, ratify both the beginning, progress, uninterrupted continuance, and in a word, the consummation of the new life; nothing remains in this universality of the promises, which can be looked upon as a condition of the whole covenant. For we here treat of the condition of the covenant, and not concerning any thing in man, which must go before the actual enjoyment of consummate happiness.

XIV. It is, however, certain that God has, in a very wise and holy manner, so ordered it, that none should come to salvation but in a way of faith and holiness; and so ranged his promises that none should attain to the more principal or more perfect happiness, but they who should first be made partakers of the preceding promises. Whence we gather, that none can take comfort in the infallible hope of happiness, who has not sincerely applied himself to the practice of faith and godliness. And the Scripture now and then assures us, that it is impossible for any to please God without faith, or see him without holiness. From this, many were induced to call faith and a new life the conditions of the covenant; whereas to speak accurately, and according to the nature of this covenant, they are, on the part of God, the execution of previous promises, and the earnest of future happiness, and on the part of man, the performance of those duties which cannot but precede the consummate perfection of a soul delighting in God. Or if we will insist upon it, to call these things conditions, they are not so much conditions of the covenant, as of the assurance that we shall continue in God's covenant, and that he shall be our God. And I make no doubt but this was exactly the meaning of those very learned divines, though all of them have not so happily expressed themselves.

XV. Let us again hear our own Cloppenburg on this subject, to whose accuracy on this point I have nothing to add. Disputat. 4, de Fœder. Thes. 26, 27: nor do the conditions of the new covenant, enjoined by a law adapted thereto, as repentance, faith, and the practice of love to God and our neighbour, destroy this evangelical display of the grace of the new covenant, which the testamentary donation, made on account of death, demands. For these conditions of the new covenant are inserted in such a manner in the testament, as to exclude the impenitent, the unbelieving, and the ungodly from inheriting the promises; but not as if the dispensation and donation of salvation depended on these, or that by our works of obedience to the law-giver we obtain a right to the promise of the inheritance. What then? Conditions of new obedience are inserted into the testament of the new covenant, under a legal form, indeed, as the rule of our

self-examination, and of becoming gratitude, lest, without having the undoubted characters of the sons of God, we should, without any ground, think ourselves sure of the inheritance. However, repentance itself, consisting in the mortification of sin and the practice of good works, is also promised under another form, to wit, as the gift of God, which he himself works in us, that by this sign or evidence we may, from the time of our truly repenting and believing, perfectly hope in that grace, which is brought to us, at the revelation of Jesus Christ, 1 Pet. 1:13; having eternal life already begun in ourselves, together with the new creation of the new spiritual life, by the Spirit of God. Thus far Cloppenburg, the accuracy of whose dissertation nothing can exceed.

XVI. We are not to think, that by this sentiment the nature of a covenant is destroyed, which consists in a stipulation, and restipulation. For there is no absurdity should we maintain, that that disposition of the new covenant which was made to the surety, retained the proper notion of a covenant, signifying a compact between two parties of mutual faith; but that the other disposition made to us, comes nearer to the form of a testament, and is rather unilateral, or appointed by one party. Nor is the word ברית any obstacle, which we have shown, book i. chap. i. sect. 3, is of various significations, and often denotes the same as חק, a constitution, or signifies a certain promise, though not mutual.

XVII. Moreover, God, by a certain wonderful act of condescension, publishes the promises of his grace to his covenant-people in this manner, to show that it was his will, that they seek for and expect from him what he promises, just as if it was a promise of reward, and proceeded from covenant and agreement, and was irrevocable on the account of the right of him who sues for the performance of it; which is, indeed, an astonishing degree of the Lord's goodness: nevertheless, we are not to use it as an argument for conditions of the covenant of grace, properly so called.

XVIII. But, which is the principal thing, we imagine, the best way to conceive of this constitution of the covenant is as follows: since the covenant of grace, or the Gospel, strictly so called, which is the model of that covenant, consists in mere promises; it prescribes nothing properly as duty, requires nothing, commands nothing; not even this, believe, trust, hope in the Lord, and the like; but declares, sets forth, and signifies to us what God promises in Christ, what he would have done, and what he is about to do; all prescription of duty belongs to the law: as, after others, the venerable Voetius has very well inculcated, Disput. Tom. 4 p. 24, seq. And we are by all means to maintain this, if, with the whole body of the reformed, we should constantly defend the perfection of the law, which comprehends all virtues, and all the duties of holiness. But the law, adapted to the covenant of grace, and, according to it, inscribed on the heart of the elect, enjoins to receive all those things which are proposed in the Gospel with an unfeigned faith, and frame our lives suitably to that grace and glory which are promised. When God, therefore, in the covenant of grace, promises faith, repentance, and consequently eternal life to an elect sinner, then the law, whose obligation can never be dissolved, and which extends to every duty, binds the man to assent to that truth, highly prize, ardently desire, seek, and lay hold on those promised blessings. Moreover, since the admirable providence of God has ranged the promises in such order, as that faith and repentance go before, and salvation follows after: man is bound, by the same law, to approve of and be in love with this divine appointment, and assure himself of salvation only according to it. But when a man accepts the promises of the covenant in the order they are proposed, he does by that acceptance bind himself to the duties contained in the foregoing promises, before he can assure himself of the fulfilment of the latter. And in this



manner the covenant becomes mutual. God proposes his promised in the Gospel in a certain order. The man, in consequence of the law, as subservient to the covenant of grace, is bound to receive the promises in that order. While faith does this, the believer, at the same time, binds himself to the exercise of a new life, before ever he can presume to entertain a hope of life eternal. And in this manner it becomes a mutual agreement.

XIX. But let none here object, that life is promised in the new covenant, to him that believes and repents, no less than it was in the old covenant to him that worketh; in order thence to conclude, that faith and repentance are now, in the same manner, conditions of the covenant of grace, that perfect obedience was the condition of the covenant of works. For when life is promised to him that doeth any thing, we are not directly to understand a condition, properly so called, as the cause of claiming the reward; God is pleased only to point out the way we are to take, not to the right, but to the possession of life. He proposes faith as the instrument by which we lay hold on the Lord Jesus, and on his grace and glory; good works, as the evidences of our faith and of our union with Christ, and as the way to the possession of life.

XX. But we must not forget to observe, that faith has quite a different relation with respect to the blessings of the covenant of grace, from what the other works of the new life have. In this, indeed, they agree, that both, conjointly, are the way to the promised bliss; but faith has something peculiar. For as faith is an stipulation, or assent given to the divine truth, it includes in it the acceptance of the benefit offered by the covenant, and makes the promise firm and irrevocable." "Here is my Son," says God, "and salvation in him." I offer him to whoever desires him, and believes that he shall find his salvation in him. Who desires him? Who believes this?" "I do," says the believer, "I greatly long for him. I believe my salvation to be laid up in him. I take him as thus offered to me." "Be it so," saith the Lord. And in this manner the promise is accepted, the truth of God sealed, the donation of Christ and of salvation in him becomes irrevocable. From all which it is evident, that faith has a quite different relation in the new covenant, from what works formerly had in the old. What the difference is between giving and receiving, such seems to be the difference between a condition of works and of faith: which the celebrated Hornbeck has not unhappily explained in Socin. Confut. Tom. 2 p 280.

XXI. Let us now lastly consider the threatenings, whether there be any such in this covenant. It cannot indeed be denied, but that, in the doctrine of Christ and the apostles, we frequently meet with very many comminations, which have their peculiar respect to the covenant of grace, and which could not have thus been set before us if there had been no such covenant. For instance,—whoever shall not believe in Christ— whoever shall despise the counsel of God against his own soul— whoever shall not obey the Gospel, shall be condemned. And these threatenings seem to be distinguished from those which are evidently legal; such as the following: "Cursed is he that continueth not in all things," &c. Yet, if we would weigh the matter narrowly, the covenant of grace has no threatenings so peculiar to itself, but what may well be referred to the law, from which every curse proceeds.

XXII. Which I would explain thus: we no where hear of any threatenings which may and ought not to be deduced from that threatening, which doubtless is purely legal, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things," &c. In this most general threatening are included the other more particular ones. Moreover, when salvation by Christ alone is proposed, in the covenant of

grace, as the principal truth, the law, which enjoins man to embrace with a firm faith every truth made known to him by God, obliges him to receive this truth in particular, and be delighted with the glory of God shining forth in it, and that his own salvation is connected with the glory of God. Should we deny that the law lays us under this obligation, we should then affirm that the law does not enjoin us to acknowledge God as true, and that there is a holy love of God and of ourselves which the law does not command; all which are most absurd. I go further: When man, as the law prescribes, receives the truth of the Gospel with a lively faith, then not the law, but the Gospel, promises salvation to him. For the law knows of no other promise, than what depends on the condition of perfect obedience. But should man slight and obstinately reject that truth proposed to him, he sins against the law, and so incurs its curse, according to the general rule so often inculcated. And since we have supposed the Gospel declaring that salvation flows from the faith of Christ alone, the law enjoins that all who desire salvation should seek it by the faith of Christ alone; and consequently it cannot but thunder the curse against those who, rejecting the Gospel, believe not on Christ. As, therefore, unbelief, or the rejecting the Gospel, is a sin against the law, which is the only perfect rule of all virtue (it can be called a sin against the Gospel, only objectively), so every threatening of the curse and of wrath against unbelievers and the despisers of the Gospel, must come from and be reduced to the law; but then it is to the law as now subservient to the covenant of grace.

XXIII. In the discourses of the Prophets, Christ, and his apostles, there is a certain mixture of various doctrines, which, indeed, are closely connected, and mutually subservient; each of which ought to be reduced to their proper heads, so that the promises of grace be referred to the Gospel, all injunctions of duty and all threatenings against transgressors to the law.

## **Chapter II: Of the ONENESS of the Covenant of Grace, as to its Substance**

I. IT is a matter of the greatest moment, that we learn distinctly to consider the covenant of grace, either as it is in its substance or essence, as they call it, or as it is in diverse ways proposed by God, with respect to circumstantials, under different economies. If we view the substance of the covenant, it is but only one, nor is it possible it should be otherwise. There is no other way worthy of God, in which salvation can be bestowed on sinners, but that discovered in the Gospel. Whence the apostle, Gal. 1:7, has beautifully said, "which is not another." And that testament which was consecrated by the blood of Christ, he calls "everlasting," Heb. 13:20, because it was settled from eternity, published immediately upon the fall of the first man, constantly handed down by the ancients, more fully explained by Christ himself and his apostles, and is to continue throughout all ages, and, in virtue of which, believers shall inherit eternal happiness. But if we attend to the circumstances of the covenant, it was dispensed "at sundry times and in divers manners," under various economies for the manifestation of the manifold wisdom of God. In considering this, we are first to discourse on those general things which appertain to the substance of the covenant, and have continued in every age; and then explain the different economies or dispensations, and the new accessions made to each; which we will, first, do in a general and concise manner, in this and the following Chapter; then gradually descend to the more special considerations.

II. We therefore maintain, agreeable to the sacred writings, that to all the Elect, living in any period of time: 1st, One and the same eternal life was promised. 2dly, That Jesus Christ was held forth as the one and the same author and bestower of salvation. 3dly, That they could not become partakers of it any other way, but by a true and lively faith in him. If we demonstrate these three things, none can any longer doubt, but that the covenant of grace must be, as to its substance, only one from the beginning. For, if the salvation be the same, and the author of it the same, the manner of communion with him the same, it is certain, the covenant itself cannot be more than one.

III. The Scriptures so plainly declare, that eternal life was promised to the Elect from the beginning, that it is astonishing any Christians could venture to deny it; who, indeed, are much blinder than the Jews themselves; of whom our Lord testifies, John 5:39. "Ye do search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life:" and that they were neither rash nor erroneous in thinking that the promises of eternal life, and the manner of enjoying them, were contained in the Scriptures they had, we prove by the most cogent arguments. 1st, Because, not only the Lord Jesus does not charge them, in this respect, with the least error, but makes use of that as a reason to recommend to them the search of the Scriptures. But it is very inconsistent with the great sincerity of the Lord Jesus, and the divine dignity of the Scriptures, to recommend them by arguments not genuine, or to recommend their value and usefulness from Jewish forgeries. Nay, had the Jews falsely persuaded themselves, that the promises of eternal life were contained in the Old Testament records, our Lord ought not, by any concession, to have cherished that mistake, which would have hindered them from acknowledging the excellence of his doctrine, and consequently the divinity of his person; but rather to have exclaimed against them: "In vain do you search the Scriptures, in hopes of finding eternal life in them; attend rather to me and my doctrine, who am the first who came into the world as a preacher of eternal life." But every one may see how inconsistent this was from the design of the Lord Jesus. 2ndly, To

this we add, that Paul's hope was founded on the Law and the Prophets, as well as the expectation of the Jews, Acts 24:14, 15, "Believing all things, which are written in the Law and the Prophets; and have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." He testifies, that the Jews expected a resurrection of the dead; he professes the same belief and hope with them; and that he did not do so out of a vain presumption, but from a faith resting on the Law and the Prophets, which they also, in their manner, carefully read, and from which they had derived the same expectation with him. 3dly, The Jews were so far from judging amiss in this respect, that, on the contrary, the Lord Jesus reprov'd the Sadducees, as ignorant of the Scriptures, because from them they had not learned life eternal and the resurrection, Matt. 22:29.

IV. But let us argue from the very books of the Old Testament: and first, after the example of our Lord, who, Matt. 22:31, 32, speaks to this purpose: "But, as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." This inference appear'd so evident to the multitude, that they were astonished at his doctrine, and the Sadducees were put to silence, ver. 33, 34. And, indeed, if the words of Moses, quoted by Christ, be accurately weigh'd, the evidence of this argument will easily appear to the attentive reader.

V. For, 1st, That expression, to be God to any, in its full import, includes life eternal, For, when God becomes the sinner's God, he then becomes to him what he is to himself. But, what is he to himself? Doubtless, the fountain of eternal and complete blessedness. When God, out of his grace, gives himself to man, he gives him all things; for himself is all things. Such a man finds in God "a shield" against every evil, and an "exceeding great reward," Gen. 15:1. And what can he desire more in order to his perfect happiness? Accordingly, the apostle joins these two, Heb. 11:16, God to be the God of any one, and to have prepared for them a city. And seeing the "gifts" of God's grace, especially when he gives himself, "are without repentance", Rom. 11:29; hereby also the eternity of this happiness is established.

VI. 2ndly, Moreover, this covenant is not made with the soul, but with the man; and God not only requires the worship of the soul, but also the submission of the body, as redeemer of both, in order to his being glorified in both: accordingly he appointed a sign of his covenant to be in the body, Gen. 17:13. And consequently, when he calls himself the God of the whole man, he promises his salvation, not to the soul alone, but to the body also.

VII. 3dly, These considerations will be more cogent, if we reflect, that the words from which our Lord argues were spoken of the Patriarchs, who had been dead long before, Exod. 3:6. But as God is not the God of persons who have no existence, it was first evident, that their souls survived, and enjoyed the beatific vision of God; and since, as we have just said, their bodies also were comprehended in the covenant, it follow'd, that, at the appointed time, their very bodies, when raised from the dust, should be reunited to their souls, in order to partake of the same happiness.

VIII. 4thly, To be the God of any one, signifies, in the usual style of Scripture, deliverance from enemies; compare Ps. 3:7, 8. But death is our greatest and last enemy, 1 Cor. 15:26. As therefore

God delivers those, whose God he is, out of the hand of their enemies, he cannot be the God of those who always remain under the power of death; but all who have him for their God, must, after death is swallowed up, exultingly sing that song of triumph, "O death! where is thy victory?"

IX. 5thly, It is beyond all controversy, that God promised to those illustrious patriarchs, when he called himself their God, something highly excellent, and by which they were to be peculiarly distinguished above others, who were not so eminent in the service of God. But they obtained nothing so very distinguishing above other men, in this world, that could equal the greatness of this promise. Many wicked men lived more happily in the land of Canaan, and elsewhere. It follows, then, that these things regard concerns of a superior nature, and belong to eternal life in heaven.

X. 6thly and lastly, If we are benefactors to any here, for the sake of another, we will much more do good to him, on whose account we do good to them, if it is in our power. But God wants no power. And he declares he will be a benefactor to the posterity, for the sake of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; much more, then, he is and will be a benefactor to themselves. But they could not be capable of receiving any good, if they did not exist; nor of the highest benefit, if they were for ever to be under the power and dominion of death. It therefore follows, that, when these words were spoken, their souls were in being, and at the time appointed, were to be restored to life, that God, in a distinguishing manner, might be their benefactor. All these things follow from the words of Moses by an easy consequence.

XI. What Volkelius says is to no purpose, when, being pinched by this passage, he requires us, lib. iii. c. 11, to produce testimonies, in which this benefit is promised to us [viz. in the Old] in as clear and evident terms as in the New Testament; for he denies that the passage we are now treating of can on any account be of that number, as appears from this, that, "before Christ explained it, none ever ventured so much as to suspect it contained any such thing. Nor is it credible that the Pharisees, who were very well skilled in the divine law, and who, as it seems, frequently and warmly disputed with the Sadducees about the resurrection of the dead, would have passed over this place in silence, if they had imagined it to contain a testimony to that purpose."

XII. All this is trifling, for, 1st, The question is not whether the testimonies concerning eternal life are expressed in such plain and clear words in the Old Testament as in the New, which none of us affirm, who own that these economies differ exceedingly in the degrees of their clearness; but whether any testimonies at all concerning eternal life are to be found in the Old Testament, which the heretics obstinately deny. For Volkelius, at the beginning of the same Chapter, says, "It appears that that promise of eternal life was [not at all] made in that old covenant." How unfair then is it, to require us to produce such plain and clear testimonies!

XIII. 2dly, He is of a different opinion from Christ, in commending the Pharisees for being very skilful in the divine law, for he reproves them, Matt. 23:16, 17, as "blind and foolish guides," and charges them with taking away the key of knowledge, Luke 11:52; and of them Paul testified, "a veil was upon their heart, that in reading Moses and the Old Testament, they did not understand." 2 Cor. 3:14, 15.

XIV. 3dly, And we are little concerned after what manner or from what topics they formed their arguments; since it appears that Christ, which impudence itself will not dare to deny, reasoned judiciously. Nor will our adversary be able, in any manner, to show that they never argued from this passage; for who has given us a history of all their disputations?

XV. 4thly, Whatever it be with the Pharisees, certainly Philo, an ancient Jew, seems to have had something like this in his mind; whose words the illustrious Grotius, a name no ways unacceptable to our adversaries, adduces in his commentaries on Matt. 22:32, to this purpose: "To say, that God is eternal, is the same as to say, he is one who bestows grace, not at some certain times only, but incessantly at all times." The celebrated Lightfoot, in his *Specilegia in Exodum*, sect. 5, has observed, that our Lord's argument would appear with greater evidence, if compared with the mind and doctrine of the Jews. For Rabbi Simeon Ben Jochai said, "The blessed and holy God does not put his name on the righteous who are alive, but on those who are dead. As it is said, Ps. 16:3: 'To the saints that are in the earth.' When are they saints? When they are laid in the earth. For the holy and blessed God does not put his name upon them all the days they live. Why so? Because the holy and blessed God does not confide in them, as if they could not be turned away from the right path by evil affections; but when they are dead, the holy and blessed God puts his name upon them." See Tanchum on Gen. 28 and Menachem on Exod. 3; which comes to this purpose, that God, in a far more excellent manner, is said to be the God of those who are dead, than of those who still live in the mortal body. And what reason can possibly be assigned for this, but that the separate soul enjoys a more excellent life? Aben Ezra, among the moderns, had the same view of this, who, on Levit. 18:4, explains those words, "I am the Lord thy God," as containing a promise of life in both worlds. And Manasseh Ben Israel, de resurrect. Mortuor. lib. i, c. 10, uses our Lord's very argument.

XVI. What can be more evident than that testimony by which the apostle, Heb. 11:10, recommends the faith of Abraham? "He looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God:" adding the other patriarchs; "for they that say such things, declare plainly that they seek a country," v. 14: "but now they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly," v. 16. The perverting of these things to a bare expectation and a vain persuasion, "founded only on conjectures," as Smalcius expresses it, does an injury to these pious heroes, and contradicts Paul, who, in this respect, celebrates their faith. But it would not have been a faith founded on the word of God alone, but a culpable temerity, to hope for so great things to themselves without a promise from God. Franzius, *Disput. 7. Thes. 55*, uses here a most excellent climax or gradation. "How could they have hoped had they not believed? How could they have believed what they had not heard? How could they have heard, unless it had been preached to them? But how could any have preached to them had not God sent them for that purpose, and expressly commanded them to preach this very thing?" As the apostle of the Gentiles, Rom. 10 argues in a like case.

XVII. But lest they should cavil, that we borrow our arguments only from the New Testament (though none can better instruct us in the contents of the Old Testament than Christ and his apostles), we shall consider some passages of the Old Testament, and free them from the misconstructions of our adversaries. And, first, we have that swanlike song of Jacob, Gen. 49:18. יהוה קויתי לישועתך "I wait for thy salvation, O Lord." The aged Prophet was now at the point of death; and, being full of the Spirit of God, he, in the midst of his prophecies, in which he foretels what was to befall his children and latest posterity, breaks out into these words; which were not

spoken without the Spirit of God, so as, with Smalcius, to be referred to a vain persuasion, nor possibly to be wrested to any other but this spiritual and eternal salvation.

XVIII. Here, again, let a certain Jew put the followers of Socinus, if possible, to the blush: in opposition to whom we produce this paraphrase of the Jerusalem Targumist. "Our father Jacob said, My soul does not expect the redemption of Gideon, the son of Joaz, that being only momentary; nor the redemption of Samson, because a transient redemption; but the redemption thou hast mentioned in thy word, or by thy word, which is to come to thy people, the children of Israel; my soul, I say, expects this thy redemption." Is not this a very clear testimony of the most certain persuasion and the fullest assurance of their salvation?

XIX. Nor must we omit the celebrated passage of Job 19:25, 26, 27; where, in very clear terms, he declares his belief of a future resurrection: For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he will stand at the latter day [over the dust] upon the earth. And though, after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another, though my reins be consumed within me." On this confession of faith, I would make the following remarks.

XX. 1st, That it is something very great that Job here treats of, appears both from the sacred loftiness and majesty of the style, and the preface with which he ushers them in; namely, his earnest desire that these his words might be written "and printed in a book, and graven with an iron pen and lead, in the rock for ever." And nothing was more becoming such a desire than the profession of his faith in the Messiah, and his hope of a blessed resurrection.

XXI. 2ndly, Job clears his innocence against the accusations of his friends, who condemned him as "a wicked person," and one "who did not acknowledge the strong God," Job 18:21. "I am so far (says he) from being such as you reproachfully represent me, that, on the contrary, I am fully possessed of the hope of the righteous, and know both God and my redeemer, and expect greater blessings at his hands than all the things of this world can possibly afford." This, indeed, was far more powerful to silence the accusations of his friends, than if he had spoken of some extraordinary happiness in this life.

XXII. 3rdly, He speaks of a thing he was certain of, and which therefore ought to be built on the infallible promise of God. But it does not appear any promise was made him of being restored in this life to his former state. Nor are there any general promises, from which this could be certainly concluded. Nay, there are not a few things which persuade us that Job had such expectation; for he wishes, ch. 6:1, 9, 11; and 7:7, 8, "that it would please God to grant him the thing he longed for," that is, death, and to destroy him. For says he, "what is my strength, that I should hope out? or what is mine end, that I should prolong my life?"

XXIII. 4thly, All the words of the text direct us to the blessed resurrection of believers in Christ. He speaks of his גוֹאֵל goel, who, as the redeemer of believers, and, as Theodotion translates it, their next of kin, had the right of consanguinity to redeem them. He declares that he liveth, being the true God and eternal life, 1 John 5:20. And who has taught us to reason from his life to our own, John 14:19. "Because I live, ye shall live also." Though he was really once to die, nevertheless he says, "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold! I am alive for evermore,"

Rev. 1:18. And this is what Job adds, "He shall stand at the latter day, upon the earth [over the dust]." After having triumphed over all his enemies, he will manifest himself in the field of battle, both alive and a conqueror; or, he shall stand upon the earth, or over the dust, the receptacle of death, as an enemy prostrate under his feet, as 1 Cor. 15:26, 27: "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet." He considered this resurrection of Christ as an earnest of his own. "And though, after my skin, worms destroy this body (which he pointed to with his finger), yet in my flesh shall I see God," namely, that "great God and Saviour Jesus Christ," at that time to be manifested in his glory, 1 John 3:2; whom he was to see "for himself," for his own salvation and Consummate joy, in like manner also as David foretold, Ps. 17:15: "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." This vision, therefore, was different from that of which he speaks Chap. 42:5, 6; which affected him with grief, and humbled him to dust and ashes. Nor was it possible, but such a firm hope of so great happiness must excite an ardent longing after the enjoyment of it. And this is what he adds, "my reins are consumed (that is, are wasted and languish through my longing; see the signification of this word כלה Ps. 84:2, 119:81) within me." In the same manner, also, as the apostle ardently longed to "know the power of Christ's resurrection; if by any means he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead," Phil. 3:10, 11. All these things most exactly agree with Job's design, with the force and magnificence of the style, with the whole tenour of Scripture, and, were it not for prejudices, could never be perverted to any other meaning.

XXIV. We therefore conclude in the words of Jerome to Pammachius, concerning the error of John of Jerusalem. "What is more evident than this prophecy? None after Christ speaks so plainly of the resurrection, as he before Christ."

XXV. Let us subjoin the prophecy of Daniel, 12:2. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. On this place I observe these following things: 1st, That a general resurrection of all, and among these of the righteous, to life eternal, can scarcely be described in more evident terms. Indeed, under the New Testament, the Lord Jesus, speaking of this very mystery, uses almost the very same words, John 5:28, 29. I appeal to any conscience, had Daniel been appointed to prophecy of the resurrection of the dead, whether he could have described it in clearer language?"

XXVI. 2dly, It is no objection, that Daniel says, many of them that sleep shall be raised. For, not to mention that many sometimes signifies the same thing as all (as Rom. 5:15, compared with 12) it is evident, that Daniel divides the whole collective body of those that sleep in the dust of the earth into two classes, one of which shall rise again to life, the other to shame.

XXVII. 3dly, And this most august prophecy cannot be explained to signify nothing but a temporal and corporal deliverance from the oppression of Antiochus. For how did transgressors rise out of the dust after Antiochus, seeing they were then rather dead, and rendered contemptible? For, during the life of Antiochus, they even flourished. And how were the pious and persevering delivered to eternal life, for they all doubtless died again? Will you affirm, with Volkelius, that this is to be understood of those who constantly adhered to the law of God, and to whom that deliverance was to turn to an eternal glory? Then, I say, we have an evident promise of eternal life in the books of the Old Testament: which is what we contend for. But if we allow



eternal glory to have been promised to them, why not, too, the resurrection of the dead, which precedes consummate glory?

XXVIII. 4thly, Nor ought it to be urged, that these things agree not with the time of which Daniel prophesied, namely, the tyranny of Antiochus, and the deliverance therefrom. For should we grant that Daniel speaks, in the verses immediately preceding, of Antiochus, yet it does not follow that he could not in this speak of the resurrection of the dead; for the prophet was here showing that God, after having displayed so illustrious an instance of his glorious power, would proceed in the extraordinary deliverances of his people, till all should terminate in the happy resurrection of the dead. If you insist, that the things here foretold were to exist at that time about which he had hitherto been speaking, I answer, first, that this is not in the text. This verse, indeed, is connected with the foregoing by the particle, ו and, where the words concerning that time are found. But nothing is more frequent in the prophets, than thus to join two things, which are to exist at very different times: of which we have unexceptionable instances, Matt. 24. It has likewise been observed by very learned men, that the particle ו sometimes signifies at length, or afterwards. Secondly, it may also be said, that *היהיא בעת* denotes after that time: as Jos. 5:5, *בצאתם* signifies, after they came forth. And the promise of the resurrection ought not to be thought a thing foreign to the times of Antiochus; because it is certain that they who continued steadfast in the ways of piety might comfort themselves by that hope, under all their dreadful torments, as may be seen, 2 Maccab. 7:6, 11, 14, and Heb. 11:34.

XXIX. But nothing hinders us, with very excellent expositors, to refer the things which Daniel prophesies of towards the close of the Chapter to the New Testament Antichrist, or to the Roman emperors, subservient to Antichrist, in promoting the mystery of iniquity. Cunradus Graserus has very learnedly handled this sentiment in a peculiar treatise. And thus the resurrection of the dead would be joined with the destruction of Antichrist, as is likewise done, Rev. 20:10, 13.

XXX. This being the case, we may justly be surprised that a person, in other respects very learned and orthodox in the main of this inquiry, could not find the general resurrection of the just, in the second verse, when he could find, in the first, the war of the English with the Dutch, of the Danes with the Swedes, of the Tartars in China, of the Chinese in Florida, of the Portuguese with the Castilians, and a great many other things of a modern date. But let these things suffice to show that, even under the Old Testament, eternal life was promised to believers.

XXXI. Our writers have distinctly answered whatever heretics have advanced to the contrary. The whole comes to this: when the apostle, Heb. 8:6, calls the promises of the New Testament better, that may be understood in various respects; if referred to eternal life, it does not regard so much the thing promised, as the plainness and certainty of the promise, which is not now wrapt up in certain obscure words, shadows, and ceremonies, but distinctly proposed; does not depend on some uncertain condition, but, in the fullest manner, is confirmed by the blood of the testator, as the apostle himself suggests, ver. 9, 10.

XXXII. When it is said, 2 Tim. 1:10, that "Christ hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel," it cannot be understood of the first promise of eternal life, unless any shall say, that it was not made before the resurrection of Christ, which is what is here spoken of. But none will say so. The plain meaning is, that the Lord Jesus, being risen from

the dead, showed to the whole world, both Jews and Gentiles to whom the Gospel was preached, that he was the true author of life and immortality; namely, that, on his coming forth out of the grave, the light of this truth was very widely diffused, even among those who before sat in darkness, and in the shadow of death.

XXXIII. When the same apostle affirms that our "salvation at the first began to be spoken by the Lord," Heb. 2:3, it is clear he speaks of the Gospel completed, and of the Messiah, the author of salvation, already exhibited; which Gospel the Lord first published, with respect to the apostles, evangelists, and the other ordinary preachers that followed them. For otherwise who can deny that Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, and Mary the mother of our Lord, and the angels who proclaimed his nativity, and the aged Simeon, and John the Baptist, were preachers of salvation before the Lord? Of the Fathers the apostle himself affirms, that they were *ευαγγελισμοι*, gospelized, or that "the Gospel was preached unto them as well as unto us," Heb. 4:2.

XXXIV. When it is written, Heb. 9:8. "That the way unto the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing;" the apostle indeed intimates, that the manner of obtaining salvation was, in some measure hid, in comparison of the brighter lustre of the Gospel. For then, doubtless, the way to life was clouded with much pomp of ceremonies and figures; which being now dispelled, we behold with open face, and ardently desire, heavenly and spiritual things. But from this it no ways follows, that those under the Old Testament had no knowledge of salvation; any more than it can be concluded, we know nothing of our glorious state, because John says, "It doth not yet appear what we shall be," John 3:2. We may almost, in the same manner, answer the other objections advanced by our adversaries. But it is no part of our design to examine each in particular.

XXXV. Now let us proceed to the second thing, which we undertook to prove; that in Christ, and in virtue of his suretyship, the fathers of the Old Testament also obtained salvation even as we. Which Peter declares almost in so many words, Acts 15:11: "But we believe that, through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we shall be saved even as they." Where the pronoun they is to be referred to the fathers, on whose neck an insupportable yoke of ceremonies was put, as appears both from the grammatical consideration of the gender, from the connexion and the force of the apostles argument. For, since *καὶ κείνοι* is masculine and *τα ἔθνα*, the Gentiles, mentioned ver. 7, is neuter, it is not so properly referred to the Gentiles as to the fathers. And we are not here, without necessity, to have recourse to an enallage of gender. And then, too, what method of commenting is it, to imagine so wide an hyperbaton or transposition, and to bring from verse 7 a noun, to which, after the interposition of so many other things, a pronoun shall at length answer in eleventh verse, and which yet does not answer; because, in the words immediately preceding, you may find a noun, with which the pronoun in question may be very well joined? In fine, it will either be nonsense, or, very insipid, if the words be so construed. For, what manner of reasoning is it, if we suppose the apostle to have said: "The yoke of ceremonies ought not to be put on the necks of the Gentiles, because, we Jews and apostles believe, that we shall be saved in the same manner as they, by the alone grace of the Lord Jesus Christ?" For besides this, it was improper to propose the Gentiles, to the Jews and apostles, as a pattern of salvation, because it appears, that the contrary should be done; and we could only conclude from that position, that the apostles and Jews were not bound to circumcision, and the other ceremonies, any more than

the Gentiles. But that was not the thing in dispute. But according to our interpretation, the apostle argues in the strongest manner: "You ought not to put the yoke of ceremonies on the necks of the disciples, who are converted from among the Gentiles, because the fathers themselves, who were under that yoke, really felt the uneasiness of it, but did not find salvation in it, and yet they were saved, not in consequence of these ceremonies, but by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. Neither are we, nor any of the human race, to take any other way to attain salvation. They therefore are under a mistake, who tell the disciples, if you will be saved, you must be circumcised, and keep the law of Moses." To sum up the whole, then, in short, the apostle here declares three things. 1st, That the fathers were saved. 2dly, By the very same covenant that we are. 3dly, Through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ: intimating likewise by all this reasoning, that there can possibly be but ONE way of salvation.

XXXVI. This is likewise confirmed by that famous passage, Heb. 13:8, "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day and for ever." In the foregoing verse the apostle admonished them to keep fresh in their memory "the word," which their guides had spoken unto them, whose faith they should follow. Now, he gives this for the reason of that admonition, because "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever;" constantly preached by all the teachers of the truth, believed on by all, and to be believed on by those that come after, if they will imitate the faith of their predecessors. The same doctrine therefore is always to be retained, because Christ, who was always both proposed, and believed, as the author of salvation, changeth not. But the particles, yesterday, to-day, and for ever, denote all the differences of times. Nor does yesterday here signify something of a late date, as we usually say, yesterday or lately; but all the time past: as the phrase to-day denotes the time of grace under the New Testament. For, this is compared to some one present day, as chap. 3:13. "While it is called to-day:" and chap. 4:7. "Again, he limiteth a certain day, saying in David, To-day," &c.; of which 2 Cor. 6:2, "Behold! now is the accepted time, behold! now is the day of salvation." As, therefore, Christ is to-day, under the New Testament, acknowledged the alone author of salvation, and will be acknowledged as such for ever; so, in like manner, yesterday, under the Old Testament, which day is now past, he was the same, and as such was declared and acknowledged.

XXXVII. Let us also add what we have in Heb. 9:15, "And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that, by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Where we have an open declaration, that the death of Jesus Christ was effectual for the redemption of transgressions committed under the Old Testament. For thus the apostle proceeds. He supposes that the fathers of the Old Testament were saved, notwithstanding their sins; which Socinus, with his followers, dare not deny. He says further, that the blood of bullocks and of goats, and consequently of all sacrifices whatever, could not really, and before the tribunal of God, expiate sin, and purify the conscience. Yet since, as he declares, without shedding of blood there can be no remission, verse 22, he concludes, it was necessary that the death of Christ should indeed be undergone, in order not only to the establishment of the New Testament, but by virtue of which the redemption of former sins might also be obtained. This is the genuine meaning of the sacred writer.

XXXVIII. And, indeed, Grotius shamefully shuffles, when, to favour the Socinians, he thus writes on this place: "His death intervened for this end, that men might be delivered from those

sins, which generally prevailed, before Christ, among those called God's people." Is it really so? Would thus "the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament," denote such an action of Christ, whereby succeeding ages would abstain from the like sins, as were formerly committed? God forbid we should ever pervert Scripture thus. Redemption is  $\text{כִּפּוּר}$  an expiation of sin, upon paying a ransom. Christ paid this for all the sins of his elect, at whatever time they lived. And upon the credit of that payment, to be made at the appointed time, believers, even under the Old Testament, obtained redemption.

XXXIX. Moreover, since it is evident that Old Testament saints were saved, it must likewise be evident that they were saved through Christ. For our Saviour himself says, John 14:6: "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." And Peter, Acts 4:12: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Nothing can be plainer than these words, which seem to be written as with a sun-beam. Yet the itch of contradiction has found something to say, but that something is less than nothing.

XL. Our adversaries except, that these passages should be understood of those who live under the New Testament, and therefore that both Christ and Peter speak in the present, and not in the past time; of us, and not of the Old Testament saints; of the times when Christ was exhibited, and not of the Old Testament times. We answer: 1st, As both texts are expressed in universal terms, they are not to be limited without cause and necessity, as there is none in this case. For if salvation could be obtained formerly without Christ, equally as now through Christ, what need had we of Christ's coming? Or, what so very great matter do we obtain in Christ? 2dly, There are very solid reasons, why they neither ought nor can be thus restricted. Because they who were "without Christ, were strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." Eph. 2:12. 3dly, The quibbling about the verbs being of the present time is idle, because verbs of that time or tense may equally refer to all times. And whatever expression had been used, whether denoting the future or past time, there might always be room left for such cavils. Besides, no reason can be assigned, why the past time should be excluded any more than the future, if that verb of the present tense is thus to be racked. If this is not false reasoning against the Supreme Being, and a childish abuse of one's genius and parts, what can be called so?

XLI. That which, in the third and last place, we promised to prove, namely, that there is no other means of communion with Christ but faith, appears from that very noted passage of Habakkuk, so often quoted by the apostle, "But the just shall live by his faith," or the faith of him, namely, of the promised Messiah, Hab. 2:4. From which Paul, at different times, proves our justification, who live under the New Testament, through faith. And then, Moses declares concerning Abraham: "And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness," Gen. 15:6; which the apostle quotes for the same purpose, Rom. 4:3. David likewise declares the man "blessed that putteth his trust in him," the Son, Ps. 2:12. And Isaiah counsels the sinner to "take hold of the strength of the Lord," and thus "make peace with him," Is. 27:5. But what is it to take hold of the fortress of the Lord, but to believe in the Lord? And finally, Paul, by a long enumeration of examples, which he took from the Old Testament fathers, attempts to prove this general truth, Heb. 11:6: "Without faith it is impossible to please God."

XLII. Our adversaries object, that the passages above mentioned treat only of a general faith in God, and not of a special faith in Christ. We deny not, that as Christ was then more obscurely

revealed, so believers had likewise a less distinct knowledge of him; yet we boldly affirm, that they had some knowledge, and sufficient for their time, upon the authority of our Lord, who says, "Abraham saw my day, and rejoiced," John 8:56, and of Paul, who testifies concerning Moses, Heb. 11:26, "that he esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt," and concerning the other fathers, ver. 13, that "they saw the promises afar off, and embraced them," and lastly of Peter, who tells us, 1 Pet. 1:11, that the prophets "searched what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified before hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." Since, then, these things were said of the heroes of that time, it will not be hard to determine, what we are to judge concerning other believers according to their rank and station. And the patriarchs and prophets had not acted the part of honest men, if they had enviously concealed from other believers, such an excellent talent, which was committed to their trust.

XLIII. The apostle writes nothing in opposition to this truth, when he says, Gal. 3:23. "But before faith came, we were kept under the law." For it is far from the apostle's intention to deny, that faith in Christ prevailed before his coming in the flesh, because, in the same Chapter, he had highly commended the faith of Abraham, and proposed it as a pattern to us all, ver. 6, 7, 9. But by faith we here understand either the object of faith, the doctrine of the Gospel, as chap. 1:23, and the Lord Jesus himself, believed on in the world, 1 Tim. 3:16, or, the faith of the redemption already actually wrought out, as contradistinguished from the hope of the Old Testament saints, who, with earnest longing, as it were, expected the coming of the Lord, "waiting for the consolation of Israel," Luke 2:25. And thus we have now shown, that the Old Testament saints had the same promises of eternal life with us, to be obtained by the same Christ, and the same faith in him, and consequently also had the same covenant of grace with us.

### **Chapter. III: Of the different Economies or Dispensations of the Covenant of Grace**

I. IT nevertheless pleased God, at sundry periods of time, and in diverse manners, to dispense the same covenant of grace. We shall exhibit, in this Chapter, a short representation of these dispensations, in such a method, as, first, simply to explain what in this matter seems to us most exactly agreeable to the whole tenor of Scripture; then, freely but calmly weigh the reflections of other learned men.

II. This diversity of economies is comprised under two principal heads, which the apostle calls by the names of the Old and New Testament, where we are to note, that by the Old Testament, we are by no means to understand the legal covenant, of obtaining salvation by our own works; that being very different from the covenant of grace. But, according to us and Paul, the Old Testament denotes the testament [or covenant] of grace under that dispensation which subsisted before the coming of Christ in the flesh, and was proposed formerly to the fathers under the veil of certain types, pointing out some imperfections of that state, and consequently that they were to be abolished in their appointed time; or, as Calvin has very well expressed it, *Institut. lib. ii. c. 11. Sect. 4*: "The Old Testament was a doctrine involved in a shadowy and ineffectual observation of ceremonies, and was therefore temporary, because a thing in suspense, till established on a firm and substantial bottom." The New Testament is the testament [or covenant] of grace under that dispensation which succeeded the former, after being consecrated and established by the blood of Christ. For this reason Christ calls the cup, which he reached to his disciples in the supper, "the cup of the new testament in his blood," *Matt. 26:28*. To signify, that then at length the New Testament would be perfected, when sealed by the blood of the testator, which he shed at his death.

III. It is carefully to be observed, that the difference of these testaments is not to be placed in the substance of the promised inheritance; as if, under the Old Testament, was allotted the inheritance of the land of Canaan, and the inheritance of heaven under the New. Nothing can be imagined less accurate and just. The allotment of the heavenly inheritance proceeds from the testament of grace, absolutely considered, which remains invariably one and the same under every economy. Only the same inheritance is proposed in a different manner. In the Old Testament under shadows, and in a certain period thereof, under the pledge of the land of Canaan, and which at the appointed time was to be purchased by the death of the testator. In the New Testament clearly, without a pledge, to which any regard was to be had, and as now purchased by the death of the testator, the promise of the common salvation, which is in Christ, whether formerly made to the fathers, or to us at this day, does not belong to the Old and New Testament as such, but absolutely to the testament or covenant of grace. The difference of the testaments consists in the different manner of dispensing and proposing the same saving grace, and in some different adjuncts and circumstances. Whatever was typical in that dispensation and denoted imperfection, and an acknowledgement that the ransom was not yet paid, belongs to the Old Testament. Whatever shows, that the redemption is actually wrought out, is peculiar to the New Testament. Without carefully adverting to this, it is not possible that we can have a distinct knowledge of the nature of both testaments.

IV. But let us insist a little further on this point, if possibly we may advance what may set the truth in a clear light. Three things are to be distinguished: the testament of grace, the Old, and New Testament. To each its own inheritance is to be assigned. That of the testament of grace is eternal salvation, with every thing belonging to it, through Jesus Christ; which is equally common to believers in all ages. The Old and New Testament, being different economies of this one testament of grace, which they comprise, suppose also and include the same heavenly inheritance. But in so far as they are different, the inheritance also, attributed to each, is different; but that difference consists chiefly in two things: first, in the different manner of proposing it, which I hope, I have now clearly explained: then, in the circumstantial adjuncts of the principal inheritance; which in the Old Testament are, the inheritance of the land of Canaan, as a pledge of heaven, with a bondage to the elements of the world, and the exclusion of the Gentiles, and a less measure of the Spirit of grace. In the New Testament, the inheritance of the Gentiles, with liberty, and a more plentiful measure of grace.

V. We begin the economy of the Old Testament immediately upon the fall, and the first promise of grace, and end it in Christ; as both the nature of the thing and Scripture direct us to do. We argue from the nature of the thing, in this manner: Since believers had the covenant of grace proposed and confirmed to them, immediately after the fall, by such signs as contained a confession that guilt was not yet expiated, and which therefore were, at the time appointed, to be abrogated by the introduction of the New Testament; there can be no reason why the promise, thus proposed and ratified, should not be the Old Testament. We do not reckon the promise of the seed of the woman bruising the serpent's head, and of the enmity established between the seed of both, as belonging to the Old Testament, for these things absolutely belong to the covenant of grace in general; but the sacrifices which are added, and by the blood of which that testament was confirmed, belong indeed to the Old Testament. It appears, from the Mosaic history, more than probable to us, with some very learned men, that, immediately upon the promulgation of the covenant of grace, Adam, at the command of God, slew beasts for sacrifice, whose skins were, by the favour of God, granted to him and his wife for clothing: which was not without its mystical signification, as shall be explained in its proper place. It is certain, we have an express account of sacrifices, Gen. 6:2, seq. which account, in the opinion of chronologers, happened, about the year of Adam, 129. Seeing, therefore, these sacrifices belong to the testament [or covenant] of grace, and typically seal the blood of Christ, which was to be shed in due time, and likewise reminded of guilt not yet expiated, they can be referred to nothing but the Old Testament. For, whatever is thus joined to the covenant of grace cannot possibly be referred to the New Testament, the very force of the words requires its being said of the Old Testament. To this argument a certain very learned person objects as follows: "Adam, the deluge, and the rainbow were types, and previous to the actual performance of redemption, and yet they belong not expressly to the Old Testament. For this last was abrogated with all its shadows. But those others cease not to be types of greater and spiritual things to us." But the answer seems to be easy. The deliverance of the Israelites out of Egypt; the passage through the Red Sea; their wonderful support in the wilderness by manna, and water from the rock; the fall of Jericho; the expulsion of the nations out of Canaan; the carrying away of the Israelites into Babylon; their return from Babylon; and many other things of the like nature (for it would be endless to recount all), do they not all belong to the Old Testament economy? But these very things certainly cease not, according to the sentiments of very learned men, to be all of them types of the greatest things to the Christian church. The city of Jerusalem itself, the very temple with its whole pomp

of ceremonies, though no longer in being, any more than Adam and the deluge, yet ought also to be considered by us Christians as types of the heavenly city, and temple not made with hands. In a word, the whole of the Mosaic law, though abrogated as to any obligation of observance, ceases not to exhibit to us, for our instruction, a type of spiritual things.

VI. There is another reason, taken from Paul; who reduces all these institutions of God to the Old Testament, Heb. 8:13: "Which decay and wax old, and are ready to vanish away." But it is certain, that not only those things which were first ordained by Moses, but those also which were in force long before Moses, as sacrifices and circumcision, were abrogated by the introduction of the New Testament. But these were not abrogated, because, as the learned person would have it, they were reduced by Moses, with the rest of his constitutions, into one obscure system, but because they were of the same nature with the Mosaic; namely shadows, which were to give place to Christ, the substance. And they were so, not from their being renewed by Moses, but from their first institution.

VII. Nor do we speak without Scripture when we reckon all that time, from the fall to the coming of Christ, to the Old or former Testament. For thus we have the apostle's authority, Heb. 9:15: "And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they, which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." But it is evident, that by the death of Christ, the transgressions, not only of those believers who lived under the Mosaic economy, but also of the elder patriarchs, were expiated from the foundation of the world; to which the apostle's reasoning leads us, as by the hand, ver. 26. And therefore to their time also the first testament belongs. And no reason can be given, why the apostle should make particular mention of any determinate period, seeing the efficacy of Christ's death equally extends to all believers backward. Which was also finely observed by Cocceius himself, in his comment on this place: "Those very sins, therefore, which have been and were not remitted under the first testament, seeing that sin which all men have in common, because all are said to have sinned when Adam sinned, Rom. 5:12; and all other sins his children were guilty of; as also the sins of those who expected Christ, in order that the testament, which gives remission and the inheritance, might be ratified; ought to be expiated by the death of the Mediator, as by a ransom."

VIII. We will again consider and examine the very learned person's exception; and thus he speaks: "From the time that sin was imputed, to wit, from the time of the law, there being made, by the law of Moses and the Mosaic institutions, a commemoration and exprobation or charge, or accusation of sin, and a hand-writing exacted, Heb. 10:3; Col. 2:14: hence all the preceding sins, committed during all the time, ἀνοχῆς, of the forbearance, are said to have been, in a peculiar manner, under the Old Testament. Not that the Old Testament was from the time in which sin was first committed; but that those committed before the Old Testament are said, in a peculiar manner, to have then chiefly existed when they were imputed, commemorated, and exprobated or charged. Nor did it contribute a little to heighten the virtue of Christ's death, expressly to have observed, that sins not only not imputed when there was no law, but also very often imputed and charged, were yet, by the death of Christ, entirely removed, so that there is no more remembrance of them."



IX. These things are so subtle (for I hardly dare call them obscure and perplexed, lest the learned person should be offended), that I own I do not understand them all; I will however attempt it. He supposes with me, and with all the orthodox, that the virtue of Christ's redemption extends to the removing all the sins of all the elect, from the beginning of the world. This being so, he inquires, why Paul called those sins "the transgressions that were under the first testament?" The reason of which he will not have what we contend for; namely, that the Old Testament was from the time in which sin was to be expiated by Christ, but that all the preceding sins, committed from the beginning of the world, are said, in a peculiar manner, to have been and to have existed under the Old Testament, or Mosaic economy. But why did those very old sins exist under the Old Testament? Because then they were imputed and charged by that remembrance of sin, that was made by the law of Moses. From this reasoning I first assert, that, by the transgression under the first testament, are understood all the preceding sins, which were committed during the whole time of the forbearance. Whence by a very easy consequence it follows, that the times of the forbearance, in the sense the learned person uses that expression, that is, the ages which went before the coming of the Messiah, and of the first testament, are of equal extension. No, says he: but the very old sins, suppose of Adam, Enoch, Noah, are said to have existed under the Mosaic covenant or testament. Where, learned sir? Where, I say, is it said, that the sins committed before the Old Testament existed in a peculiar manner, upon the introduction of the law of Moses? Not certainly in these words of Paul. For the very word, existing, is not to be found there, much less in the sense you frame to yourself. I imagine the learned person had in his eye, Rom. 5:13: "For until the law sin was in the world." But in what manner soever this may be explained, the apostle never and no where says, that I know, that the sins for instance committed by the inhabitants of the first world, existed, in a peculiar manner, under the economy of the Mosaic testament. And in what sense, pray, should they be said to have then existed? Because, says he, they were then imputed and charged. But to whom? Not certainly to those very persons who, dying in the faith, were received into heaven. And how imputed and exprobated by the introduction of the Mosaic testament? Seeing it was so much later than their death and salvation, it does not greatly regard those departed pious and happy persons, at least as to its rigour. I deny not, that the Israelites were convinced of their sins by the Mosaic law, and that a remembrance of sin was made, and that all mankind was condemned in the Israelites: but that the sins of the more ancient believers were then imputed and charged, and then in a peculiar manner existed; is neither affirmed in Scripture, nor consonant to reason.

X. But this also deserves consideration; that he would have the apostle expressly mention the Mosaic testament, because that tended to amplify the virtue of Christ's death, as peculiarly shining forth therein; seeing it has removed all remembrance of those very sins, which were often imputed and charged upon them by the law. Which does not indeed appear to me to be very pertinent to that matter. For since the commemoration and remembrance of sins are made in the repeated offering of the same sacrifices, which could not take away sins, and seeing sacrifices of that kind began to be used immediately upon the promulgation of the Testament of grace; these very sins were commemorated and charged by sacrifices before the Mosaic economy took place. But if, on the introducing the law of Moses, that exprobatation or charging of sin was more frequent and strong, the promise, in the same law, was likewise more frequent and strong, as likewise the sign and seal of the remission of sins which the Messiah was to procure. For the same institution which commemorated sin, signified also and sealed the future expiation of it by the Messiah. If, therefore, on one hand, it may seem strange that those very sins were also

expiated by Christ, which were so often commemorated and charged; on the other hand, the expiation of those sins, which was so often signified and sealed appears less strange. But the pious meditation of the redemption purchased by Christ stands in no need of any such subtleties of idle disputation. It is sufficient to say with Paul, that the efficacy of the death of Christ, who is the mediator of the New Testament, is such that it has purchased for the elect, in every age, the redemption of those transgressions, which could never be expiated by any blood of bulls or goats. Our argument, therefore, remains in its full force, and is in vain attacked by the windings and mazes of a perplexed discourse. The transgressions under the first testament are sins committed from the most ancient period of the world; therefore the first testament comprises all the ages from the first origin of the world.

XI. Moreover, in this economy of the Old Testament, several periods are distinctly to be observed. For "God, at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake unto the fathers," Heb. 1:1. The first period reaches from Adam to Noah, and comprehends the whole time of the first world; in which every thing was very simple and plain. The first gospel promise was published by God, received by faith by our first parents, was inculcated on their children by incessant catechising or instruction, sealed by sacrifices offered in faith. The death of the Messiah, the righteous one, the most beloved of God, who was to be slain by his envious brethren, was prefigured in the person of Abel, who was murdered by Cain. His ascension into heaven, with all his faithful people, was foreshown in the type of Enoch, who also, according to Jude, ver. 14, prophesied of his return to judgment with ten thousands of his saints; and, in fine, the separation of the sons of God from the sons of men for the pure worship of God.

XII. The second period begins with Noah, in whom his father Lamech seems to have beheld a certain type of the Messiah, when he said, "this same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands," and therefore he called his name Noah, which signifies "rest," Gen. 5:29. He was a just and upright man in his generation, and "a preacher of righteousness," 2 Pet. 2:5: By him Christ "preached to the spirits in prison," 1 Pet. 3:19. He was not only "heir of the righteousness of faith," Heb. 11:7, but the head and restorer of a new world, and in that respect an eminent type of Christ. For the same purpose the ark was built by him; the sacrifice of a sweet-smelling savour offered to God; God's gracious covenant, entered into with the habitable world after that sacrifice, and sealed by the rainbow; and many other things of the like kind, full of mystical sense, which shall be explained in due time. This second period reaches down to Abraham.

XIII. To this succeeds the third period, from Abraham to Moses. There were, indeed, very great and precious promises made to Abraham; as of the multiplying his seed, of giving that seed the land of Canaan, of the Messiah to spring from his loins, of the inheritance of the world, and the like. The covenant of grace was solemnly confirmed with him, and sealed by the New Sacrament of circumcision; and himself constituted the father of all the faithful, both of his own seed according to the flesh, and of the Gentiles, Rom. 4:12 Melchizedek, priest and king of righteousness and peace, meets him fatigued after the overthrow and pursuit of his enemies, who also blessed him, and presented to him in himself, as in an eminent type, a view of the Messiah. Hence was kindled in Abraham a desire of seeing still more clearly the day of Christ, which he both saw and rejoiced at, John 8:56. This favour of the Supreme Being was continued to Abraham's son and grandson, Isaac and Jacob, to whom he often made himself known by

repeated revelations, which confirmed to them the promises made to that great patriarch, and proposed them to future generations as the chiefs of his covenant. And thus the old promises of the covenant of grace were enlarged with many additions, and enriched with a fuller declaration.

XIV. But things put on a quite different aspect under the fourth period, which was introduced by the ministry of Moses. The people were delivered out of Egypt by an out-stretched arm, and by tremendous prodigies. The Son of God, before all the congregation of the people, declared himself to be the King of Israel, by the solemn manner in which he gave the law from Mount Sinai, amidst thunderings and lightnings. The tabernacle and the ark of the covenant, with the propitiatory or mercy-seat, the gracious residence of God, were constructed with wonderful art. An incredible number of ceremonies was added to the ancient simplicity. So many myriads of men (strange to relate) were fed with manna from heaven, in the horrid and scorched deserts of Arabia, for forty years, and supplied with water from the rock which Moses struck with his rod. Whole nations were cast out before them, and devoted to destruction. Israel, as the favoured inheritance of God, was introduced, after a very great destruction of their enemies, to the promised possession of Canaan; and who can pretend to enumerate all the things with which this period was ennobled above the others, "of which we cannot now speak particularly," Heb. 9:5.

XV. Seeing all the institutions of former ages were renewed under the direction of Moses, and enlarged with very many additions, and reduced to a certain form of worship, and as it were into one body or system; and the covenant was solemnly renewed with Israel, both at Mount Sinai, and in the plains of Moab; therefore it is, that, in the sacred writings, the Old Testament covenant is ascribed to Moses, and to his ministry and times, Heb. 8:9, from Jer. 31, 32. Not that, either at that time all these things, on which the Old Testament depended, were first instituted, or that, on no account, it is to be referred to the preceding times; for the religion of both times, namely both before and after Moses, was the same; and many rites the very same, as sacrifices, the distinction of clean and unclean beasts circumcision and many others; but that when the confirmation both of old and new rites was reduced into a certain form of a ritual, and that period was so distinguished by a solemn renovation of the covenant, and by many additions, that it seemed to swallow up as it were all that went before. We likewise at other times read, that something is said to be given by Moses, which was long before Moses's time. Our Lord says, John 7:22, "Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision, not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers." God also is said, Ezek. 20:11, to have "given Israel in the wilderness his statutes, which if a man do, he shall even live in them." Yet we could not from thence conclude, that the origin of those statutes was only to be derived from that time; seeing it is plain, that they were cotemporary with man, and from the beginning made known to all believers by the teaching of the Spirit of God. Though under the kings David and Solomon, there was a great accession of magnificence made to the public worship, by the superb structure of the temple, and the appointment of its ministry, yet this Mosaic period continued even to the Lord Jesus, or his forerunner John. For thus we are taught, John 1:17: "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ;" and, Luke 16:16: "The law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached."

XVI. When the OLD Testament vanished, the NEW succeeded, whose beginning and epoch divines do not fix in one and the same point of time. Some begin the New Testament from the birth of Christ, because of that expression of the apostle, Gal. 4:4, in which he asserts the fulness

of time was come, when God sent his Son, made of a woman; to which they add, that, on that, very day, the angels proclaimed the gospel concerning Christ manifested, Luke 2:10, 11. Others begin the New Testament from the year of Christ's preaching, alleging Mark 1:1, where the evangelist seems to refer the beginning of the gospel to that year in which John and Christ began to preach, which is more clearly taught in that passage, just cited from Luke 16:16. Others again place the beginning of the New Testament at the moment of Christ's death, upon the authority of the apostle, who says, that the New Testament was ratified by the death of Christ the testator, Heb. 9:17. Some, in fine, on the day of Pentecost, or the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the apostles, on which the new was, as it were, sealed, and its law came out of Zion, Isa. 2:3.

XVII. But all these things are easily reconciled, if we allow some latitude to that fulness of time in which the New succeeded the Old Testament. God, indeed, began to prepare for the New Testament from the very birth of Christ, on which very day the Gospel of Christ began to be preached to the shepherds; those beginnings were very small, but were soon after more illustrious by the preaching of John, proclaiming the kingdom of heaven to be at hand, Matt. 3:2; and of Christ himself, asserting it was already come, and even among the people of the Jews, Luke 17:21. Yet the kingdom of heaven did not directly and all at once attain to its full state of maturity, but by slow degrees acquired strength, till Christ, having finished the work which the Father gave him to do, completed all by his death, and ratified the New Testament. By this death of Christ, the Old Testament was of right abrogated. Yet there was an accession of greater solemnity to the New, when, after the death, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord, upon the plentiful effusion of the Spirit on the apostles, the doctrine of salvation was proclaimed over all the habitable world, God, at the same time, bearing witness by signs and wonders, and various virtues and gifts of the Holy Ghost. Nevertheless, the church did not enjoy the full liberty of the New Testament, till after God had rejected the people of Israel, who stiffly adhered to their ceremonies, till their temple was burnt, and their whole land was smitten with a curse, which time of full liberty the apostle in his day, Heb. 2:5, called "the world to come."

XVIII. Hence we see, that the close of the Old Testament gradually vanishing away, and the beginning of the New gradually gaining ground, both centered in one point of time. For, as on the birth of Christ a more joyful period shone forth, and the songs of the pious were heard, concerning the truth of God's covenant confirmed by the accomplishment of the promises; so Christ acknowledged himself to be subject to the laws of the Old Testament by his circumcision, and the rites following upon it. And as the kingdom of heaven, which is a kingdom of liberty, was preached by our Lord, John 4:21, 23, so he ordered, in the mean time, the person cleansed of his leprosy to offer the sacrifice enjoined by the law of Moses, Matt. 8:4; which is an evident indication of the Old Testament still maintaining its ground. Of right it was entirely abrogated, when, upon Christ's death, the veil of the temple was rent, and the holy of holies, before hid and concealed, was then set open to all; and by the blood of a dying Christ the New Testament was sealed. However, for some time the apostles themselves apprehended that there was a sanctity in the ceremonies, till Peter was better taught by a heavenly vision, Acts 10:11, &c. In fine, the church struggled with the observance of these ceremonies, now in pangs of death, till Jerusalem was taken and destroyed by the Romans, and the temple set on fire; then, together with these, all remains of the Old Testament, which were long before condemned to death, quite expired, and made way for a New Testament, blazing forth in the full lustre of its liberty.

XIX. And here again we are to observe various periods, which are distinctly described in the prophetic writings, especially in the mystical revelation of John; the church has already experienced some of them, and expects the rest with faith and patience. Periods, I say, not relating to any new worship, either instituted or to be instituted by God, after the preaching of the everlasting gospel; but respecting very different vicissitudes in the church, and times either more adverse, or more prosperous, in which truth and piety were either oppressed, and forced to conceal themselves in deserts, being wounded and spent by many persecutions, or then victoriously triumphed over their enemies, and were placed on an illustrious throne, which dazzled the eyes with the refulgent beams of light. Of all these we are to speak in their place.

XX. And though we imagine we have reckoned up properly enough, and agreeably to the sacred writings the economies of the times, yet some very learned men have thought otherwise, who are better pleased with the trichotomy, or threefold division, than with the received dichotomy, or twofold distribution. They therefore consider the administration of the covenant of grace, 1st, Under the promise, and before the law, which they contend to have been a promise of mere grace and liberty, without any yoke or burden of an accusing law. 2dly, Under the law, where they will have the Old Testament begin. 3dly, Under the Gospel, where the New begins. This diversity would not have been of that importance, as to oblige us therefore to throw up the cause we plead for, if it consisted only in the computation of times. But seeing a vast difference is made between these economies, it will not be from the purpose more minutely to examine these thoughts.

XXI. It appears that the fathers living before the Mosaic law, were loaded with a much lighter burden of ceremonies than the Israelites were under Moses; yet it does not appear that they enjoyed full liberty, without any yoke and burden of an accusing law. For, not to mention the law of nature, which, with its appendages of curses, was handed down by constant instruction, they had precepts concerning sacrifices, not indeed binding them to a certain time and place, but yet enjoining sacrifices (which indeed were not will-worship), and distinguishing clean from the unclean beasts. This, I imagine, the very learned persons will not deny. At least the celebrated Cocceius finds fault with Grotius, who affirms, that the offering of Abel was made "without any command of God, from the dictates of reason only," and he insists, that Abel could not have offered in faith "without the word of God;" and that he did not offer "according to his own pleasure and fancy, but by the direction of the Holy Spirit, Adam doubtless being the interpreter, and setting an example here." The same thing he proves at large, in Sum. de Fœd. § 305: On Gen. 4 § 14, 19, 20. And another of those, whose opinion we are now examining, writes to this purpose: "The sacrifices of believers were doubtless of divine institution:" which after he had proved by various arguments, he thus concludes: "In fine, if God made a distinction between clean and unclean animals before the deluge, which was done on account of sacrifices, doubtless God also appointed sacrifices." But in every sacrifice there was a remembrance of sins not yet expiated, and as Athanasius speaks, *ὀνειδισμός*, a reproaching of, and a hand-writing against, the sacrifices. For the reproaching with sin consists not only in this, that the offering of sacrifices was limited to a certain time and place, as was done under Moses; but in the very offering of the sacrifices; for when a man slew and burnt the animals, which God granted him for food, he thereby signified that he himself deserved destruction; nay, and to perish in avenging flames for ever; and that he, who by the one offering of himself was truly to expiate the sins of all the elect, was not yet come; and that when he offered frolicsome animals, who are apt to go astray from

the flock, unless kept by the shepherd, thereby he signified the guilt of sin and our going astray, as very learned men have observed from Isa. 53:6.

XXII. It is therefore strange that a great man, in answer to this question, whether Abel's sacrifice was propitiatory or eucharistical, should say, "that before Moses's time sacrifices for sins were not instituted by God, the design of which was to accuse of sin." That this is said without proof, appears plain: 1st, Because, in that case no sacrifices were instituted before Moses, to be types of the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ. For, as it was necessary there should be an agreement between the type and the antitype, those sacrifices which shadowed forth the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ were also, in their measure, propitiatory; that is, they so expiated sin to the cleansing of the flesh, as at the same time to condemn sin, and to show that they were not sufficient for its real expiation, because they were to be often repeated. Neither do the learned doubt, but that the sacrifices even of the oldest patriarchs were sacraments and types of Christ's sacrifice; for they write, in express words, that "the fathers offered before Moses's time the same sacrifices with Moses, and apt to signify the same things." 2dly, It also appears, that Job, who it is probable, lived before, certainly without, the Mosaic polity, offered, עֹלֹת burnt-offerings for his children and friends, in order to expiate the sins they had committed, Job 1:5, and 42:8. But the end of a burnt offering is to be "accepted for him that offers, to make atonement for him," Lev. 1:4. And by such sacrifices the believers of that time testified (which is the learned person's own observation) that they acknowledged that such a satisfaction was due to God, which was not possible for themselves to make. This was a charge of guilt and inability, which the same great man could not conceal, when he treats of the burnt-offerings offered by Job, at the command of God, for his friends; and expresses himself thus: "For, though many sacrifices were slain, and the man, indeed, upon offering a beast, was no longer deemed a sinner, but a righteous person among men, yet conscience was accused of sin, and consequently offerings were to be accumulated and repeated without end." See the same author on Job, 9:28; but especially on Job 7:1. "Job complains not (says he) of that servitude whereby we obey God; but of that laid on the fathers, which is a heavy yoke of fear, and of the terror of the law, with the greatest incumbrance of ceremonies.—But though Job seems to have lived before the law of Moses, and not to have been loaded with so many ceremonies as the Israelites, yet his condition was no better than theirs." There were therefore in the sacrifices which God enjoined from the beginning, a reproaching with and an accusation of sin; and consequently a yoke, not consistent with that liberty of the fathers which these learned men imagine.

XXIII. And what will they say with respect to circumcision? Was not that also a yoke, since it was not to be performed without blood, and mixed with much pain and shame? Was there not in it an accusation of sin, when the new-born infant could not enter into God's covenant without first shedding his blood? Hence this sacrament was performed on the genital member, to denote the original stain; and by the cutting of a small part of the flesh, the whole man was declared to be worthy of death. Let the learned persons here acknowledge their own words. And what is more plain from the writings of the New Testament, than that circumcision was considered by the apostles as the principal part of the heavy yoke? Acts 15:5, compared with ver. 10. Nevertheless, it does not appear that Moses made any addition of rigour to it; seeing it was long before enjoined upon Abraham at first under pain of being cut off. We conclude, therefore, that the condition of the ancient patriarchs is too much extolled above that of the Jewish churches, when it is insisted that they lived in liberty, without any charge of sin, without any yoke; though

we readily grant, that the servitude was heightened and the yoke made heavier by the Mosaic polity. And this is what we had to say on the first period.

XXIV. They make the law to be the second period, under which they would have the Old Testament to begin; which they define to be "the will and purpose of God, whereby he determined to give to some of Abraham's posterity, as his own people, the inheritance of the land of Canaan as his own land; adding, that this testament "commenced from the exodus out of Egypt and from Mount Sinai;" which a very learned person endeavours to prove by several arguments, briefly joined together in the following manner: The Scripture says, Jer. 31:32, that God made the Old Testament with the fathers when he brought them out of Egypt: that is, called them to the inheritance of the land, as of a pledge, &c. In like manner Paul, Gal. 4:24, says, that the two testaments were signified by Hagar and Sarah, and that the first was truly from Mount Sinai. The same Paul says, Heb. 9:18, "Neither the first testament was [initiated] dedicated without blood." He has his eye on Exod. 24:8. He says, ἐγκεκάνισται, it was initiated, therefore that testament then became καινη, new. Consequently, that testament was then introduced. Nay, Deut. 5:2, 3, it is said, "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb: the Lord made not this covenant with our fathers." How can we conceive that the fathers had that which, we are told, had not been intimated to them?

XXV. We shall make the following reflections on this subject, which we submit to the examination of the learned: 1st, They seemed to confine the Old Testament within too narrow bounds, who define it only by the destination of the land of Canaan as a pledge of heaven; as we showed, sect. 2. Doubtless, according to the Old Testament, the inheritance of the land of Canaan was given to the Israelites; but this does not complete the whole substance of the Old Testament. Paul clearly enough declares, Gal. 4 and Heb. 9 without speaking anything of the land of Canaan, that it consisted in a typical exhibition of the heavenly inheritance, and comprised every thing that imports a typical servitude, and was to be abolished upon the introduction of the New Testament.

XXVI. 2dly, When learned men say, that the Old Testament commences from the exodus out of Egypt, and from Mount Sinai, and call it the will and purpose of giving the land of Canaan, they understand not, by that will, or that purpose, the counsel or decree of God from eternity; nor the execution of that decree, which was not effected at Mount Sinai, but forty years after, when, under the conduct of Joshua, they were introduced into the land; but they understand the declaration of the counsel of God by an irrevocable promise. But that promise was not first made at Mount Sinai, but long before, even to the patriarch Abraham, four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law, Gen. 12:7, "Unto thy seed will I give this land." And it was confirmed by solemn signs, and sealed by the blood of sacrifices, Gen. 15:7. We therefore conclude, that, if the Old Testament be the declaration of the will of God about giving the land of Canaan, it did not commence from Moses, but from Abraham.

XXVII. 3dly, Hence it appears what answer ought to be given to Jer. 31:32, and Gal. 4:24; namely, that the first institution of the Old Testament is not treated of in these places, but the solemn renewal and confirmation of it, and the accession of many new rites, which we mentioned, sect. 18. For God himself often testified concerning that time, that he did those things in virtue of his covenant entered into with Abraham, Exod. 2:24, "And God remembered his

covenant with Abraham," &c.; and chap. 6:8, "And I will bring you into the land, concerning the which I did swear to give it to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and I will give it you for an inheritance." It therefore remains that the testament about giving the land of Canaan, was not then first published, but solemnly renewed, when God was now about to accomplish it. And this is what Jeremiah and Paul intend in the places quoted.

XXVIII. 4thly, What the apostle says, Heb. 9:18, "Neither the first Testament was [initiated] dedicated without blood," is very general, and may be extended to the first sacrifices, which were slain at God's command. The very learned Cloppenburg, in *Schola Sacrificiorum*, Problem, 1. §. iii. would prove, from the same passage of Paul, that there was no interval of time between the first promise of the future seed of the woman, and the first sacrifice. "The apostle, (says he,) confirms this our opinion, when he says that the Old Testament was not dedicated without blood, and that without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. For hence it follows, that, with that promise about the future seed of the woman, there was either no solemnizing of the spiritual covenant of God with man, by which he might hope for and believe the remission of sins, or that there was none without shedding of blood." The apostle, indeed, mentions what we have in Exod. 24 as an example. But it does not follow that no other example of that truth could be given before that; or that any would mistake the subject, who should add to the apostle's argument what we find, Gen. 15 about the beasts which were slain by Abraham.

XXIX. And the term dedicated ought not to be so insisted upon, as if that necessarily inferred that the testament thus dedicated was entirely new. For even that may be said to be dedicated, which is again solemnly dedicated, though the thing itself was in being long before. Thus the author of the First Book of Maccabees, 1 Maccabees, chap. 6, writes about the temple profaned by Antiochus, *καὶ ἐνεκαίνισθη τὸ ἅγιασμα ὡς τὸ προτερον*, "And the sanctuary was dedicated as before." Yet Antiochus had only profaned, but not destroyed the sanctuary, so as to make it necessary to build one entirely new, which Judas Maccabeus purified, chap. 4:43, and thus dedicated it to God. From this was *τὰ ἐγκαίνια* the feast of the dedication, John 10:22. On which place Grotius comments; *ἐγκαίνιζεν*, to dedicate, whence the appellation, *ἐγκαίνια*, and feast of dedication, in Hebrew *חגן*, is used of any dedication, whether the first, or that which is renewed. And indeed, when the apostle was saying, Heb. 10:20, that Christ *ἐνεκαίνισε*, consecrated a way to heaven, he by no means intimated, that there was no way to heaven before that time.

XXX. But let us allow, the Old Testament was then new; and that this may be proved by the word *ἐγκαίνιζεν*; let us also allow that the apostle, speaking of the shedding of blood, with which the testament was dedicated, does not look back to any time prior to that described, Exod. 24; yet nothing will be concluded in favour of the hypothesis. For the Old Testament was certainly new at that time, not absolutely, and in its whole substance, but only with respect to those circumstances under which it was proposed to Israel, promising them the immediate possession of the land of Canaan for an inheritance, together with the imposition of so many new rites. We ought to be upon our guard against being guilty of the sophism, called arguing from what is hypothetical to what is absolute. As these things are neither unskilfully nor improbably observed by very learned men, I could have wished that hard saying had not dropped from the learned person, that they who thus proceed "wrest this passage contrary to the meaning of the Holy Ghost." Cannot such a dispute as this be determined, without such warmth and vehemence of language?



XXXI. On Deut. 5:2, 3, many things have been taken notice of by interpreters. I imagine nothing appears more simple and solid than what the very learned Dutch interpreters have observed, to the following purpose: that this covenant was not entered into with the fathers, in the same manner, with all its circumstances and particular laws, and in that form (as we use to speak) in which it was revealed to Israel at Sinai or Horeb. For even the believing patriarchs had the substance of the moral and ceremonial law, and, by the grace of God, managed their religious worship according to it. This exposition is confirmed chiefly by two reasons. 1st, That it is no new thing in the sacred writings, for something to be said not to be mentioned before, and to be revealed at that time, when it is more clearly discovered, and some new addition made to it. Thus the apostle writes, Rom. 16:25, 26: "Which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest:" and yet the same apostle says, "preached before the gospel to Abraham," Gal. 3:8, and to the other ancient fathers, Heb. 4:2. It was therefore kept secret, not simply, but in a comparative sense; not preached in the same manner as now. The apostle himself thus explains the matter, Eph. 3:5: "Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy apostles." What God here says may be taken in the same sense, that he did not make this covenant with their fathers, namely, in the same manner and form, by speaking to them from the midst of thunderings and lightnings, giving them the law of the covenant written with his own hand, with an addition of so many ceremonies. 2dly, It also appears, that these words of God not only may, but ought, to be explained in this manner. For since the decalogue, which constitutes the principal part of the fœderal precepts, was likewise, with respect to its substance, given to the ancient patriarchs, as God's covenant-people, for a rule of gratitude and a new life; and the sum of it was comprised in those words, spoken to Abraham which God expressed when he formerly entered into covenant with him, Gen. 17:1, "I am the Almighty God, walk continually before me, and be thou perfect [sincere];" it cannot therefore absolutely be denied, that that covenant, whose first and principal law is the decalogue, was also entered into with the ancient patriarchs. Neither, as has been often hinted, do all the ceremonies owe their original to Sinai or Horeb. From the whole I conclude, that it cannot be proved from the alleged passages, that the Old Testament took its first commencement from the exodus out of Egypt, or from Mount Sinai, and that it is more probable, and more agreeable to the analogy of Scripture, to adhere to the received opinion. But how great the difference between the economy of the Old and New Testament, and what prerogatives the last has above the first, we shall carefully explain, in its time and place.

## Chapter IV: Of Election

I. WE are now first of all to consider those benefits which belong to the covenant of grace, taken absolutely and in itself, and therefore common to all those in covenant, under what economy soever; which we enumerate in the following order: 1. Election. 2. Effectual calling to the communion of Christ. 3. Regeneration. 4. Faith. 5. Justification. 6. Spiritual Peace. 7. Adoption. 8. The Spirit of Adoption. 9. Sanctification. 10. Conservation, or preservation. 11. Glorification. The devout meditation of all these things cannot fail to be glorious to God; agreeable, delightful, and salutary to ourselves.

II. The beginning and first source of all grace is Election, both of Christ the Saviour and of those to be saved by him. For even Christ was chosen of God, and by an eternal and immutable decree given to be our Saviour, and therefore is said to be "foreordained before the foundation of the world," 1 Pet. 1:20. And they whom Christ was to save were given to him by the same decree, John 17:6. They are therefore said to be "chosen in Christ," Eph. 1:4; that is, not only by Christ, as God, and consequently the elector of them, but also in Christ, as Mediator, and on that account the elected, who, by one and the same act, was given to them to be their head and lord, and at the same time they were given to him to be his members and property, to be saved by his merit and power, and to enjoy communion with him. And therefore the book of election is called, "the book of life of the Lamb," Rev. 13:8; not only because life is to be obtained in virtue of the Lamb slain, but also because the Lamb takes up the first page of that book, is the head of the rest of the elect, "the first-born among many brethren, and joint-heirs with him." Rom. 8:17, 29. But we before treated of this election of Christ the Mediator, book II. chap. iii. §. viii. and now we are to speak of the election of those to be saved.

III. We thus describe it: Election is the eternal, free, and immutable counsel of God, about revealing the glory of his grace, in the eternal salvation of some certain persons. Most of the parts of this description are in these words of the apostle, Eph. 1:4, 5, 6: "According as he hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy, and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children, by Jesus Christ to himself, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved."

IV. We call election, "the counsel of God," by which term we mean that which is commonly called decree. Paul, on this subject, calls it the *προθεσις*, the purpose, of God. This term appears selected by the apostle, and frequently made use of by him to denote a sure, firm, and fixed decree of God, which he can never repent of, and which depends on nothing out of himself, but is founded only in his good pleasure. All this is intimated, 2 Tim. 1:9: "who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace." To this purpose also, Eph. 1:11, "we are predestinated according to the purpose of him, who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." And elsewhere the same apostle also speaks of *προθεσις* "the purpose of election," Rom. 8:28, "who are called according to his purpose," and Rom. 9:11. "the purpose of God according to election." And thus we distinguish this internal election and of counsel, from the external and of fact, which signifies the actual separation of believers from unbelievers, by effectual calling. In this sense the Lord Jesus said to his apostles, John 15:19, "but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." But the eternal and internal decree of God could not be the cause of this hatred, but only as

it discovered itself by the event, and by the actual separation of the apostles from the world. To this we may also, it seems, apply what the apostle writes, 1 Cor. 1:26, 27, "Ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men, &c. But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise," &c. Where he seems to take calling and election for the same thing. Nor does this internal election and of counsel, differ from the external and of fact but only in this, that the last is the demonstration and execution of the first.

V. It is likewise clear, that we are not here speaking of an election to any political or ecclesiastical dignity, 1 Sam. 10:24, and John 9:70, nor even to the privilege of an external covenant with God; in the manner that God chose all the people of Israel, Deut. 4:37, "he loved thy fathers, and chose their seed," compared with Deut. 7:6, 7; but of that election, which is the designation and enrolment of the heirs of eternal salvation: or as Paul speaks, 2 Thes. 2:13, by which "God hath, from the beginning, chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth."

VI. For this purpose the BOOK OF LIFE is so frequently mentioned in Scripture: it will not then be improper, here, to inquire, what is intended by that appellation. That God has no book, properly so called, is self evident: but as men write down those things in books which they want to know and keep in memory; so the book of God denotes the series of persons and things, which are most perfectly known to God. Moreover, the Scripture speaks of several books of God. 1st, God has a book of common providence, in which the birth, life, and death of men, and every thing concerning the same, are inserted; Ps. 139:16, "in thy book all my members were written." 2ndly, There are also books of judgment, in which the actions, good or bad, of every man in particular are written, Rev. 20:12, "And the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." These books are mentioned in the plural number, as if each particular person had his own peculiar book assigned him, lest the good or bad behaviour of one should be put to the score of another, and thence any confusion should arise. By which is signified the most exact and distinct knowledge of God. And because, in other respects, God knows all things at one intuitive view of his understanding, this very book is mentioned in the singular number, Mal. 3:16, "A book of remembrance was written before him." 3dly, There is also the book of life; which is three-fold. 1, Of this natural life, of which Moses speaks Exod. 32:32. Where, entreating the face of the Lord, who had said he would consume Israel in the wilderness, and make Moses a great nation, Moses prays, that God would preserve his people, and bring them into the inheritance of the land of Canaan, offering himself, at the same time, instead of the people: "Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin: and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book, which thou hast written." As if he had said, "I accept not the condition offered of preserving me alive, and increasing me greatly after the destruction of Israel: I choose rather to die an untimely death, than that Israel should be destroyed in the wilderness." 2, Of a federal and ecclesiastical life, consisting in communion with the people of God. Which is the register, not only of those internally, but of those externally in covenant, mentioned Ezek. 13:9, "They shall not be in the assembly of my people, neither shall they be written in the writing of the house of Israel;" and Ps. 87:6. "The Lord shall count, when he writeth up the people, that this man was born there." 3, Of life eternal, mentioned, Is. 4:3. Dan 12:1. Phil. 4:3. Luke 10:20. Rev. 3:5. 13:8. 20:12: and 21:27; which book signifies the register of those predestinated to life eternal.

VII. Further, as the book of God denotes not one and the same thing; so the writing of persons in any of these is not always the same. The writing of some is only imaginary, consisting in a fallacious judgment concerning ourselves or others, too easily presuming either our own, or the election of others, such as was that of those who cried out, Jer. 7:4, "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these;" and of the people of Sardis, who were said to live, though they were really dead, Rev. 3:1. There is another inscription which is indeed true, but it is only human, in the book of the fœderal life, done either by the man himself, by a profession of the faith, subscribing as with his own hand, "I am the Lord's," Is. 45:5; or by the guides of the church, inserting such a person in the list of professors, and acknowledging him for a member of the church, of the visible at least. There is, in fine, a writing of God himself, made by his eternal and immutable decree; of which the apostle says, 2 Tim. 2:19, "The Lord knoweth them that are his." The observation of these things throws much light on many places of Scripture, and will immediately prove also of use to us.

VIII. This election to glory is not some general decree of God about saving the faithful and the godly, who shall persevere in their faith and piety to the end of their life; but a particular designation of certain individual persons, whom God has enrolled as heirs of salvation. It is not consistent with the perfection of God, to ascribe to him general and indeterminate decrees, which were to receive any determination or certainty from men. We read, Acts 2:23, of the determinate counsel of God, but never of a general and indeterminate decree. Neither does the Scripture ever describe election, as the determination of any certain condition, by and without which salvation is or is not obtained. It is nowhere said, that faith is chosen by God, or written down in the book of life, or any thing like that; but that men, indeed, are chosen by God. Let us refer to Rom. 8:29, 30, "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate. Whom he did predestinate, them he also called," &c. It is not said in the text, persons so qualified, that it might be applied to the designation of any condition, but certain persons are appointed as the objects of the acts there mentioned.

IX. The very term, προορίειν, to predestinate, which the apostle more frequently uses on this subject, does not obscurely discover this truth. For, as ὀρίζειν signifies to point out, or ordain a certain person (Acts 17:31. "By that man whom ὠρίσε, he hath ordained," and pointed out by name; and Acts 10:42. "ὁ ὠρίσμενος, which was ordained of God to be the judge;" and Rom. 1:4, "ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ declared to be [determinately marked out as] the Son of God," who was, by name, and particularly declared to be so by God, by a public nomination); so προορίζω, as applied to the heirs of eternal life, must signify, to enrol, or write down some certain persons as heirs, in the eternal testament.

X. This is what Christ said to his disciples, Luke 10:20, "Rejoice, because your names are written in heaven." Where he speaks to them by name, and assures them of their election, and bids them rejoice on that account. Which is certainly of much greater import, than if he had said in general, "Rejoice because God has established, by an eternal decree, that he would make all believers happy in heaven, though he has thought nothing of you by name:" for in this manner, according to the opinion of our adversaries, these words were to be explained.

XI. What the apostle, Phil. 4:3, expressly asserts concerning Clement and his other fellow-labourers, that their names were in the book of life, ought to be sufficient for determining this

inquiry: since impudence itself dares not wrest that to a general decree of some condition. For, 1st, The name of a person is one thing, the condition of a thing another. He who determines to enlist none but valiant men for soldiers, does not write down the names of some soldiers in the roll. 2dly, The condition of salvation is but one, but the Scripture always speaks in the plural number of the names written in the book of life. Therefore the writing down of the names is one thing, the determination of some condition another. 3dly, It is certain, that the apostle, and other sacred writers, when they say that some men, or the names of some, are written in the book of life, do always, by that very thing, distinguish them from others, who are not inserted. But, according to the opinion of our adversaries, the appointment of this condition imports no actual distinction between men. Because notwithstanding that decree, about saving believers and those who obey it, it may be possible, according to their principles, that none should believe, obey, or be saved. 4thly, All these things will be more cogent, if we attend to the original of this metaphorical expression. The similitude is taken from a genealogical catalogue or register, especially among the people of God; in which the names of every particular person, belonging to any family, was written; and, according to this catalogue, at the time of the jubilee or other solemnity when the paternal inheritance was restored to any family, every one was either admitted or rejected, according as his name was or was not found there. We have an example of this, Ezra 2:61, 62, when after the Babylonish captivity the posterity of Habaiah, Koz, and Barzillai, not being able to prove their descent by the genealogical registers, were put from the priesthood. In the same manner, the book of life contains the names of those who belong to the family of God; in which he who is not written, whatever he may presume or pretend, will be deprived of the inheritance.

XII. To conclude, I would ask our adversaries, when the apostle says, 2 Tim. 2:19, "the Lord knoweth them that are his;" and the Lord Jesus, John 13:18, "I know whom I have chosen," whether there is nothing ascribed to God or to Christ in these words, but what the least in the school of Christ knows, that they who believe in and obey Christ are the peculiar property of God and of Christ? Has not that language a grander sound? and does it not intimate, that God has the exactest account of all in whom he will be glorified as his peculiar people? We yield to what our adversaries declare in Compend. Socin. c. 4. §. 1. "Admitting the infallible prescience of all future contingents, Calvin's doctrine of the predestination of some by name to life, of others to death, cannot be refuted." But that prescience of God has as many witnesses, as he has constituted prophets. It follows, therefore, that election is a designation or appointment of some certain persons.

XIII. This designation was made from eternity; as were all the counsels or decree of God in general; for, "known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world," Acts 15:18; "who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will," Eph. 1:11. And all the foreknowledge of future contingencies is founded in the decree of God: consequently he determined with himself, from eternity, every thing he executes in time. If we are to believe this with respect to all the decrees of God, much more with regard to that distinguishing decree, whereby he purposed to display his glory, in the eternal state of men. And I shall add, what ought, in the fullest manner, to establish this truth, that "we are chosen in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world," Eph. 1:4.

XIV. And hence appears the gangrene of the Socinian heretics, who, distinguishing between predestination, which they define the general decrees of God, concerning the salvation of all those who constantly obey Christ, and between Election, which is of particular persons; they say, indeed, that the former is from eternity, but the latter made in time, when a person performs the condition contained in the general decree of predestination. And they make the excellence of the Lord Jesus and a part of his divinity to consist in this, that he was foreknown by name from eternity. But as Peter writes, 1 Epist. 1:20, that Christ "was foreordained before the foundation of the world;" so we have just heard Paul, testifying by the same expression, that "we were chosen before the foundation of the world." But neither the subject, as we have just shown, nor the apostle's words, which describe not an election of holiness as the condition of life, but an election of some certain persons to holiness, which, in virtue of that election, they had already in part obtained, and were afterwards in the fullest manner to obtain, will not suffer us to pervert this to some general decree of saving saints.

XV. We are here to explain what our Saviour declares he will pronounce on the last day of judgment, Matt. 25:34, "Inherit the kingdom prepared for you ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, from the foundation of the world:" he does not say, "before the foundation of the world," as is said, Eph. 1:4. If by this preparing we understand God's decree, we must say with many expositors, that this phrase, "from the foundation of the world," is equivalent to that other, "before the foundation of the world:" just as, "from the beginning of the world," Acts 15:18, and "before the world," 1 Cor. 2:7, denote the very same thing. Similar expressions of eternity may be compared, Prov. 8:23, "מְעוֹלָם, from everlasting; מֵרֵאשִׁית, from the beginning; אֶרֶץ מִקְדָּמָי, or ever the earth was. Or if we would rather distinguish these, and explain that expression, "from the foundation of the world," to signify, not eternity, but the remotest period of time (as it is taken, Luke 11:50: "The blood of all the prophets which was shed from the foundation of the world;" that is, from the remotest antiquity, beginning with the blood of Abel, ver. 51. and Heb. 4:3), we shall say, that by preparing the kingdom is meant the formation of heaven, which is the throne of glory; and that the elect are invited to enter in to the inheritance of that habitation which was created at the very beginning of the world, in order to be their eternal residence. And who can doubt but what God created in the beginning, in order to be the blessed abode of the elect, was appointed by him from eternity for that purpose?

XVI. And we must not omit that illustrious passage, Rev. 13:8: "Whose names are not written in the book of life of the lamb, slain from the foundation of the world." The last of these words are so placed, that they may stand in a threefold connexion with the preceding, as to mean, that Christ was "the lamb slain from the foundation of the world;" that is, either from all eternity in the decree of God, which, importing a certain futuration of events, to use a scholastic term, is the reason that things future may be considered as already existing; or from the remotest antiquity of the world, not only in the members of his mystical body, but also in the promise of God in the type of sacrifices, and of Abel, slain by his envious brother; and, in fine, in the efficacy of his death, which extended itself to the first of the human race. For unless the death of Christ, which he was once to undergo in the fulness of time, could have extended its virtue to the first men in the world, "Christ must often have suffered since the foundation of the world," Heb. 9:26. God did many things before Christ could die, which could not consistently have been done, unless with a view to Christ's death, which was to ensue in its appointed time; and with respect to these, he is said to be slain before the foundation of the world. Nay, the foundation of the earth itself

was not laid without a view to the death of Christ. For since the manifestation of his glorious grace in man, through Christ, was the chief end of God in creating man, we must look upon the foundation of the earth for a habitation of the good as a means to that end. Nor would it have been consistent with God to form the earth for a habitation of sinful man, unless that same earth was at one time or other to be purged by the blood of Christ, as the sanctifier and glorifier of his elect. For all these reasons, the slaying of Christ and the foundation of the world are not improperly connected. Secondly, those words, "from the foundation of the world," may be referred to what goes before, are written; to signify, whose names are not written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of that lamb slain. Which sense was preferred by Junius, Piscator, Gomarus, and other great divines. And indeed, we observe, Luke 4:5, an instance of a transposition not unlike this. And John himself is found to have so ranged these very words, as to omit entirely what is here inserted about the lamb slain, Rev. 17:8, "Whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world." And then this phrase would denote the eternity of the divine decree, as we showed in the foregoing paragraph, that it might be explained. Thirdly and lastly, The words may be so construed as to point to men who have lived since the foundation of the world, and whose names are not written in the book of life. And then the usual and most common sense of that phraseology will be retained, so as to denote the first times of the world.

XVII. We are also to inquire into the genuine sense of that saying in 2 Tim. 1:9, and which is commonly brought as a proof of the eternity of election: "Saved us according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." Two things are here especially to be inquired into. 1st, What is to be understood by the giving of grace. 2dly, What by, "before the world began." The saving grace of the New Covenant is given to those who are to be saved. 1. In the decree of God. 2. In the promise. 3. In the actual gift of it. The decree of God is the original source of grace: the promise is the manifestation of the decree: the actual gift is the execution of both. But because it is impossible for the decree of God to fail, or the promise of God to deceive, the person to whom God decrees and promises to give any thing may be as certain that it shall be given as if he was already in the actual possession of it. And on account of that certainty of the promise of God, the benefit decreed or promised may be considered as already given. But it is plain that the apostle speaks not here of actual bestowing, therefore it ought to be understood of giving, either in the decree or in the promise. But which of these explications is to be preferred, depends on the meaning of the following phrase: *πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων*, "before the world began."

XVIII. If there be any, who by *χρόνους αἰωνίους*, "before the world began," understand absolute eternity, they refute themselves. For seeing Paul here relates something done before the world began, something must be imagined more eternal than eternity itself, than which nothing can be more absurd. It is better that we thereby understand all that time which commenced with the creation of the world (when *αἰῶνες ἐκτίσθησαν*, "the worlds were framed," Heb. 11:3) which then run on, and will run through all ages without end and limit. But what is it, "before the world began?" Is it what precedes all time, and so is eternal, as most divines think, who from hence directly conclude the eternity of our election, and interpret this giving of the giving contained in the decree? But we are to consider whether we can firmly maintain that exposition against the exceptions of those of the opposite opinion. Indeed, the very subtle Twiss himself, *Vindiciæ Gratiaë*, lib. i. p. I. Digress. ii. sect. 4, p. 64, cavils: "That it is not necessary directly to believe,

that what is said to be before the foundation of the world, signifies to be before all time, but only before many ages." But that very learned person, as frequently on other occasions, so also on this, appears to have given too much scope to his wit and fancy. If this exposition of his be retained, there is nothing of which it may not, one time or other, be said that it was done "before the foundation of the world," a regard being had to following ages. Which is, in a remarkable manner, to weaken the force and majesty of the apostle's expression. And I would not willingly make such concessions to our adversaries. Since χρόνοι αἰώνιοι, "the beginning of the world," commenced at that beginning, in which αἰῶνες ἐκτίσθησαν, "the worlds were framed;" what was done, πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, "before the foundation of the world," seems altogether to have been done before the creation of the world, and consequently from eternity: unless we should be under a necessity to limit that phrase. And none can doubt but in its full import it may signify this. Why then may it not be explained in its full emphasis if there be nothing to hinder it? But what is here said of giving grace is no such hinderance: "For because all things are present to God, and that what God has decreed to be future, shall certainly come to pass; therefore God is said to have done from eternity what is revealed to us in its appointed time;" as the venerable Beza has well observed on Tit. 1:2. And let this be said for those who understand this giving of the giving in the decree, and explain that expression, "before the foundation of the world," so as to mean the same thing as "from eternity."

XIX. Yet other divines explain it of the giving in the promise; on comparing Tit. 1:2, "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised, πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, before the world began." "Hence we see," says a celebrated expositor of our day, "that the promise, which was made בראש דורות, in the beginning of ages," Is. 41:4, "before any age had passed away; and so when there was no secular time, or time of this world, when the second age was not yet called forth. We see, I say, that the promise was said to be given forth before the world began. Here, therefore, we do not only understand a giving by decree or purpose, but also by promise, that is, by assignation." Which is given unto us, that is, "the effect of which grace is assigned to us by promise, which is almost coeval with this world." These things are much more plausible than what we just heard from Twiss. Indeed, from that passage in Titus, it seems that we might conclude, that πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, "before the world began, neither always, nor necessarily, denotes absolute eternity. For because the apostle there treats of the promise, he does not so comprehend all ages, as to lead us beyond the creation of the world, as Calvin himself has observed: but he points out the beginning of the first age, in which the promise of salvation was made to our first parents immediately upon the fall, which our Dutch commentators have also adopted. Whence it appears, that they are guilty of no absurdity, who so explain this giving as to include the promise of grace made before the flux of any age. And then, in the apostle's discourse there are these three things proposed in order: first, the purpose of God, which is the source of all grace; then the promise made from the remotest antiquity, which he expresses by the term, giving; and lastly, the actual bestowing and manifestation by the glorious coming of our Saviour Jesus Christ. Nor would I make much opposition, if any should explain the apostle's expression in this manner.

XX. But whatever way you interpret, there is a strong argument in the said passage of Paul for the eternity of election. For, if you explain the giving of the decree, and say, that before the world began is equivalent to eternity, you will conclude directly; and I think both may be defended. For indeed, the phrase, "before the world began," in its full emphasis, signifies so much: nor can it be much weakened by Titus. 1:2. For the subject is different: in the one place,



the apostle speaks of the purpose of God, and of giving from his purpose; in the other, of the promise. But the same predicate is often to be differently explained, according to the diversity to the subjects. For instance, when Peter says, Acts 15:18, "known unto God are all his works," ἀπ' αἰῶνος, from the beginning of the world;" ἀπ' αἰῶνος doubtless signifies, from eternity. For, if all his works, certainly also, that of the first creation, prior to which was nothing but eternity; but when the same apostle, Acts 3:21, says, "which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, ἀπ' αἰῶνος since the world began;" he means nothing by these words, but the most ancient times, in which the prophets existed. Why therefore may not πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων be explained one way in 2 Tim. 1:9. and another Tit 1:2. But let us grant, that the apostle, by the giving of grace before the world began, understands the promise made in the beginning of the first age; seeing he says, that "the purpose of God was the source of it," certainly that purpose was prior to the promise. But none, I imagine, will say, that it was made, when God created man; it must therefore have been from eternity. "According to the eternity purpose, which he proposed in Christ Jesus our Lord," Eph. 3:11. That must certainly be an eternal purpose, since the effect of it is grace given before the foundation of the world.

XXI. Let us add another passage of Paul, which, we think, is a testimony to the eternity of election; namely, 2 Thess. 2:13, "but we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, from the beginning, chosen you to salvation." The apostle distinguishes that election of which he speaks, from the call by the Gospel, ver. 14. And, therefore, with great propriety, we understand it of the election of counsel and purpose. This, he says, was "ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, from the beginning," that is, from eternity. For that phrase is often taken in that sense: thus what John 1:1, says in his Gospel, "ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν, in the beginning was," in 1 John 1:1, he says "ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, was from the beginning. But to have been already in the beginning, signifies to be from eternity. For, what was already בראשיתו ἐν' ἀρχῇ, in the beginning, when all things were made, must have been self-existent, and from eternity. But, lest any should cavil, that the new world of grace was here intended, John speaks of "the beginning of things made," because he speaks of the existence of him by whom the world was made, and that very world which knew him not, ver. 10. By comparing the alleged passages, it appears, that in the beginning and from the beginning, are equivalent terms. We have this sense more clearly, Mic. 5:2. Where the prophet describes at least a twofold going forth of the Messiah; the one from Bethlehem, which is after the flesh, and relates to his being born of the virgin Mary; the other, which is after the Spirit, and is expressive of his eternal generation; of which last he says, "וְיָצְאוּ מִיְמֵי מִקְדָּשׁוֹ וּמוֹצָאוֹהִי" whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." Which the Septuagint translate, "καὶ ἐξοδοὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἐξ ἡερῶν αἰῶνος· and his goings forth from the beginning, from everlasting." What can be more evident, than that ἀπ' ἀρχῆς there denotes eternity? The son of Sirach also, Ecclesiasticus 24:9, may show us in what sense the Hellenists were wont to use this expression, when he joins, as synonymous, πρὸ ποῦ αἰῶνος and ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. As, then, the apostle speaks of the election of purpose, as distinct from that of execution, which is made by effectual calling, and since ἀπ' ἀρχῆς signifies eternity, we very properly infer the eternity of election.

XXII. Here again Twiss comes in our way, who confidently affirms, that there is no place in all the Scripture, where this word signifies eternity: nay, he thinks it may be put out of all controversy, that it never is, or can be, so used in the sacred writings, according to right reason, l. c. p. 60. And he applies the election mentioned here, to some external declaration of internal

election, and thinks the apostle alludes to that remarkable promise made to Adam after the fall, of the seed of the woman bruising the serpent's head. For, says he, God himself has pointed out, in that place, a remarkable difference between the elect and the reprobate: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed," &c. p. 63. I cannot but wonder at the confidence of this very learned person. It is, indeed, true, that "from the beginning," does not always in Scripture denote eternity; as John 8:44, and 1 John 3:8, where the signification is to be determined by the subject treated of. But from the places above quoted it is plain, that sometimes it can admit of no other sense. And I hope, the learned person did not desire to wrest out of our hands those passages, by which our divines have, so happily, defended the eternity of the Logos, or Word, against the Socinians. I would rather believe, that he did not attend to the places we have mentioned. Besides, I could wish he could show where, in the sacred writings, the first promise of grace is called election; which I imagine, he will never be able to do: we are not to forge significations. Moreover, though in that promise there is some general indication of a difference made between the elect and reprobate; yet it is not credible, the apostle here had any eye to that; who gives thanks to God, not because he chose some men, but most especially because he chose the Thessalonians. But the election of the Thessalonians cannot be inferred from that general declaration of God, the truth of which might have remained, though none of those, who then dwelt at Thessalonica, had been chosen. We therefore conclude, that the received explication of divines is perfectly well-grounded.

XXIII. There is another learned person, who asserts, that this place of Paul is to be understood "of that beginning in which God began to make the Gentiles heirs of salvation; seeing the Thessalonians were almost among the first of these, they are said to be chosen, separated from the beginning. Or also the beginning of the Gospel may be understood, of which Mark 1:1, Phil. 4:15; or of the salvation which was preached by Jesus, Heb. 3. He hath chosen you from the beginning. That is, from the beginning of preaching the Gospel, and of salvation manifested and proclaimed." But even these things are not satisfactory: for, 1st, We have shown, that Paul treats here of election in purpose, or intention, and not in execution. 2dly, It is, indeed true, that the term beginning ought to be explained in a way suitable to the subject it treats of; but I do not think, that "from the beginning," absolutely taken, does any where signify the beginning of the Gospel preached, much less the beginning of the inheritance of the Gentiles; nor do the places alleged prove it. 3dly, Nor does it agree with history, that the Thessalonians were the first-fruits of the Gentiles brought to the inheritance of salvation; for the people of Antioch, both in Syria and Pisidia, and the people of Lystra and Derbe, and the Philippians, had already received the Gospel, and the apostles had acquainted the brethren at Jerusalem with the conversion of the Gentiles, Acts 15:3, before ever Paul preached the Gospel at Thessalonica, as appears from the Acts of the Apostles. Nor do I think the learned person was unacquainted with this; and therefore he said, the Thessalonians were almost among the first; which diminutive particle does not a little weaken the force of the expression "from the beginning." 4thly. Much less can it be said, that the Thessalonians were separated from the beginning of that salvation which Jesus published; which beginning Paul makes prior to the confirmation of the Gospel, made by those who heard it from the mouth of Jesus himself, that is, to the preaching of the apostles, Heb. 2:3. For it is plain, Christ was the minister of circumcision, and did not preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. Nothing, therefore, appears more easy and solid, than that explication we have already given.

XXIV. Having said enough concerning the eternity of election, let us now consider its FREENESS; which consists in this, that God, as the absolute Lord of all his creatures, has chosen out of mankind whom, and as many as, he pleased; and indeed, in such a manner, as that no good which he foresaw in any man was the foundation of that choice, or the reason why he chose one rather than another. This appears, 1st, Because the Scripture asserts, that the most free will of God was the supreme reason or cause of election, Matt. 11:26, "Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight." Luke 12:32, "It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." Above all, the apostle is full in vindicating this absolute power of God, Rom. 9; where among other things he says, ver. 21: "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?" 2dly, At the same time, also, that the Scripture refuses the consideration of any good foreseen in man, it maintains this most free and gracious good pleasure of God, Rom. 9:11; "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth," &c. 2. Tim: 1:9, Not according to our works, but according to his own purpose."

3dly. Neither faith, nor holiness, nor any thing truly good can be considered in man, unless bestowed out of divine grace. Phil. 1:29, "Unto you is given to believe on Christ." Eph. 2:8. Faith, not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." But the bestowing of this favour can proceed from no other cause than the election of grace, and the benevolent good pleasure of his will. And consequently these benefits cannot be presupposed as preparatory to divine election.

4thly. The Scriptures expressly declare, that we are chosen to faith, holiness, and to perseverance in both, which, being the consequents and fruits of election, cannot be the antecedent conditions of it, Eph. 1:4, "He hath chosen us that we should be holy and without blame," or have it begun on earth, and consummated in heaven, John 15:16, "I have chosen you and ordained you, that you should bring forth fruit." I have chosen you from eternity, called and ordained you in the appointed time. 2 Thess. 2:13, "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." Election is as well to the means, as to the end. All these passages, and many others of a like nature, have been so fully and solidly defended by our divines, against the objections of the Remonstrants, that I have scarce any thing to add.

XXV. This counsel of God, as it is free, so it is also immutable from eternity, 1st. Immutability belongs to all the decrees of God, in general, Is. 14:27, "the Lord of Hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it?" Is. 46:10, "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." Rom. 9:19, "Who hath resisted his will?" To affirm with Crellius, that these things are to be understood of the absolute decrees of God, not of his conditional, is begging the question. For we deny that any decree of God depends on a condition: if the thing decreed be suspended on a condition, the condition itself is at the same time decreed. These texts speak nothing of Crellius's distinction, nor lay any foundation for it: and even reason is against it. For if any decree of God could be changed, it would be, because God either would not or could not effect the thing decreed, or because his latter thoughts were wiser and better than his first: all which are injurious to God. You will answer; God, indeed, wills what he has decreed to be done, but on condition the creature also wills it, whose liberty he would nowise infringe. I answer, is God so destitute either of power or of wisdom, that he cannot so concur with the liberty of second causes, which he himself gave and formed, as to do what he wills, without prejudice to and consistently with their

liberty? God is far more glorious, in our opinion, and more to be had in reverence, than for us to believe any such thing of his power and wisdom. And here the very heathen poets and philosophers themselves, who at times have spoken more devoutly of their gods, may put the heretics to the blush: for thus Homer introduces Jupiter, saying,

—Οὐ γὰρ ἐμὸν παλινάγρετον οὐδ' ἀπατηλὸν,

Οὐδ' ἀτελεύτητον ὅτι κ' ἐν κεφαλῇ κατανεύσω.

—Nec enim mutabitur unquam

Quod capite annuero, nec falsum fine carebit.

"Nor is it mine to recall, nor to be false in, nor leave unfinished, whatever I shall have signified by my awful nod." And Maximus Tyrius, who quotes these words of Homer, Dissert. 29, adds of his own in the following dissertation: "To be changeable and to repent is unworthy, not to say, of God, but even of an honest man." And he argues much in the same manner as we. 2dly, More especially the Scriptures ascribe immutability to the divine election: Rom 9:11, "That the purpose of God according to election might stand." 2 Tim. 2:19, "The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them who are his." Is. 49:15, 16, "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet I will not forget thee. Behold! I have graven thee on the palms of my hands." Rev. 3:5, "I will not blot out his name out of the book of life." Isa. 4:3, "And it shall come to pass, that he that is left in Zion, and he that remaineth in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem." Our adversaries have scarce any thing to oppose to such express passages, but their stale musty distinctions of election peremptory and not peremptory, and the like, which are contrary both to the glory of God, and to the simplicity of the Scriptures.

XXVI. But we must say something on Ps. 69:28; where the Lord Jesus denounceth a curse against the Jews, the obstinate despisers of his grace, and his sworn enemies: "Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous." And it cannot be doubted, but this imprecation of our Lord had its full effect: and hence it is concluded, that some are blotted out of the book of the living. But we have already, §. 6 and 7, spoke somewhat largely on this head, which may throw no small light on this passage. For, 1st, By the "book of life", here, we may very well understand the list of those who live on earth, with respect to this animal life. For the wicked Jews were blotted out of that book, by the tremendous judgment of God, when, in their last wars with the Romans, many myriads of them were slain in a shocking manner, whose number Lipsius, de Constant. lib. ii. c. 21, has collected to amount to twelve hundred and thirty thousand, who were cut off in less than full seven years. 2dly, By the book of the living may be understood, the book of God's covenant-people, out of which the Jews were erased, when God publicly disowned and rejected them; and it was said to them "lo-Ruhama" and "lo-Ammi," according to the prophecy of Hosea, 1:6, 9. This was done when the Gospel, which the Jews rejected, was preached to the Gentiles, and eagerly received by them; and the wretched remains of the Jews were dispersed among the nations. 3dly, If we should understand it of the book of election, it may be said, they were blotted out of that book, as to that writing by

which they presumptuously wrote themselves down therein, falsely boasting that they were the dearly beloved children of God and of Abraham: our Lord Jesus justly imprecates against them, that this their boasting may be found actually vain. 4thly, But if this blotting out is to be absolutely understood of the writing of God himself in the book of election, we shall say, that the blotting out was not private but negative, and that the latter part of the verse is an explication of the former; so that the blotting out is a declaration of their not being written down. Kimchi, among the Jewish doctors, also observed this, who writes, "the verse is double, the same sense being proposed in different words." And he adds, "let them be blotted out, signifies, let them not be written in the book of life." From which it appears, that our adversaries argue falsely from this passage, against the immutability of God's election.

XXVII. As this is fixed and settled with respect to God, so the believer may also attain to a certain assurance thereof, and, from infallible marks, know that he is one of the chosen. If it was not so, Peter had to no purpose admonished believers "to make their calling and election sure," 2 Pet. 1:9, 10. That is, to endeavour, by evident signs, to be fully persuaded in their own mind. Vain also would have been Paul's glorying, 1 Thess. 1:4, "Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God." For by the same evidences that Paul could have known this of the Thessalonians, the Thessalonians could have known it with respect to themselves. In fine, believers could not possibly, in faith, give thanks to God for their election, unless they could be assured of it in their own mind; and yet they do give thanks to God for it, Eph. 1:3, 4.

XXVIII. But in what manner do believers attain the assurance of their election? Who hath ascended into heaven? Or who, with a prying eye, hath perused the volumes of God's decrees and secrets? Who hath looked into the heart of God? We are here, indeed, to guard against rash presumption. But what God has, from eternity, determined about the salvation of his people, he declares to them in time by signs that cannot deceive them. He has given them two books, from which they may gather what is sufficient to know, that they are written in the book of life: namely, the book of Scripture and the book of Conscience. In the book of Scripture, the distinguishing marks of election are drawn out with great exactness. In the book of Conscience, every one may read, if he gives that proper diligence which a matter of such importance requires, whether these marks are with him. The Scripture shows that the marks of Election are, 1st, Effectual calling by the word and Spirit of God, Rom. 8:30. 2dly, Faith in God and Christ, 2 Thess. 2:13. 3dly, Hatred and eschewing of evil, 2 Tim. 2:19. 4thly, The sincere and constant study of holiness, Eph. 1:4; 2 Thess. 2:13. And when it is well understood and known what effectual calling is, what faith in God and Christ, what eschewing of evil, and what the study of genuine godliness are; the conscience is then to be examined, whether these can be found in itself; and, upon discovering that they are, the believing soul may, from these undoubted fruits, be assured of his election. And it frequently happens, that God favours his chosen people with the ravishments of his most beneficent love, that while they are inebriated with those spiritual and unspeakable delights, which earthly souls can neither conceive nor relish, they are no less persuaded of their election, than if they had seen their names written by the very hand of God himself. These things make them, with exultation, cry out to their infernal enemies, who in vain resist their faith, "Know that the Lord hath set apart him that is godly for himself." Ps. 4:3. Especially if (which then is not usually wanting) the internal witness of the Spirit to their adoption is superadded, of which in Rom. 8:16, and which is by way of seal, Eph. 1:13. But there will be occasion to speak of this hereafter.

XXIX. And it is the interest of believers to endeavour earnestly after this assurance of their election. For, 1st, It is not possible, they should have a life of joy and exultation in the Lord, while they are ignorant of this. They may, no doubt, happily fall asleep in the Lord, and, through death, reach to eternal life, though they are not assured of their election. For our salvation depends not on this full assurance of faith; but on our union and communion with Christ, which may remain safe and secure without that. But a man who has his salvation at heart, as he ought, cannot live in secure joy, so long as he doubts of his election. 2dly, Nor does this assurance greatly contribute to our joy only, but also very much to the glory of God. For then it is that we properly value the riches of divine love, and are sweetly swallowed up in the immense ocean of his goodness, when we ascend, in our minds and in our praises, to the original fountain of all grace; and, in imitation of Paul, celebrate his free love, by which "He hath chosen us in Christ Jesus, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved," Eph. 1:6. 3dly, Nay, this certainty of the election which we preach likewise promotes the careful study of piety, and kindles a fervent zeal therein; so far is it from opening a wide door to ungodliness and carnal security: which none dare assert, but they who are ignorant of the good ways of God, or malignant perverters of them.

XXX. Here, then, is the meditation of one who is thus fully persuaded, and this is his language to his God: "Didst thou, O Lord, from eternity, entertain thoughts of glorifying me, a miserable wretch, who am less than nothing; and shall I not again carry thee for ever in my eyes, and always in my bosom? Shall I not delight in meditating on thee? Shall I not cry out, 'How precious also are thy thoughts unto me, O God! how great is the sum of them!' Ps. 139:17. Shall I not, with the most sincere repentance, bewail that time, in which so many hours, days, weeks, months, and years have passed over my head, without one single holy and pleasing thought of thee? Didst thou, out of mere love, choose me to salvation? And shall not I again choose thee for my Lord, my king, my husband; for the portion of my soul; for my chief, or rather my only, delight? Didst thou choose me from among so many others, who, being left to themselves, have eternal destruction abiding them; and shall not I exert myself to the utmost, to excel others in love, in thy worship, and in all the duties of holiness? Didst thou predestinate me to holiness, which is so amiable in itself and so necessary for me, that without it, there can be no salvation; and shall not I walk therein? Shall I presume to cavil with thee, thou brightest Teacher of truth; that, separating the end from the means, I should securely promise myself the end, as being predestinated thereto, in a neglect of the means to which I was no less predestinated? Is thy purpose concerning my salvation fixed and unchangeable; and shall I change every hour—at one time giving my service to thee, and at another time to the devil? Shall I not rather cleave to thee with such a firm purpose, as sooner to choose a thousand deaths rather than perfidiously forsake thee? Shall I not be 'steadfast, immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as I know my labour shall not be in vain in the Lord?' 1 Cor. 15:58. Wilt thou by thy Spirit assure me of thy love, which passeth all understanding; and I not love thee again with all my heart, all my mind, and all my strength? Wilt thou give me the assurance of my salvation; and shall not I, 'having this hope, purify myself, as thou art pure?' 1 John 3:3." Who that understands these things, can deny that the doctrine of Election, as we have explained it, affords ample matter to a pious soul for these and such like meditations? And who also can deny, that in the practice of these meditations consists the very kernel of piety and holiness?

## Chapter V: Of Effectual Calling

I. THE first immediate fruit of eternal election, and the principal act of God by which appointed salvation applied, is EFFECTUAL CALLING; of which the apostle saith, Rom. 8:30, "whom he did predestinate, them he also called." And this CALLING is that act by which those who are chosen by God, and redeemed by Christ, are sweetly invited, and effectually brought from a state of sin, to a state of communion with God in Christ, both externally and internally.

II. The term from which they are called, is a state of sin and misery in which all men are involved, ever since the sin of our first parents. "Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart," Eph. 4:18. For we are brought to such a pass, that we are wholly excluded from the saving communion of God and Christ. Being sunk in the deep gulf of misery, and having lost all notion of true happiness, we wallow in the mire of the wickedness and vanities of this world without end and without measure, and are enslaved to the devil, to whom we have submitted as conquered captives; "for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God," Rom. 3:23. But out of this darkness of ignorance, sin, and misery, "God calleth us unto his marvellous light," 1 Pet. 2:9; "and delivers us from this present evil world," Gal. 1:4. And we are never to forget our former state. "Remember that, at that time, ye were without Christ, being aliens from the common-wealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world," Eph. 2:12. The meditation of this tends to humble us the more deeply before God, who calleth us, the more to prize the riches of his glorious grace, and the more to quicken us to walk worthy of our calling, and of God, by whom we are called.

III. The term to which we are called, is Christ, and communion with him. For this he calls out, Is. 45:22, אֵלַי פִּנוּ, "look to me (or incline yourselves to me) and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth." In this communion with Christ consists that mystical and most delightful marriage of the elect soul with Christ, to which he invites him with all the allurements of his gospel, and whose exalted nuptial song Solomon sung: "Wisdom hath builded her house.—She hath sent forth her maidens, she crieth upon the highest places of the city,—turn in hither,—come eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled," Prov. 9:1–5.

IV. From this communion results the communication of all the benefits of Christ, both in grace and in glory, to which we are likewise called. "Hearken diligently unto me, and eat that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in farness. Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live, and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David." Isa 55:2, 3. Thus he calleth us to his kingdom and glory, 1 Thess. 2:12.

V. And since Christ cannot be separated from his Father and his Spirit, we are, at the same time, called to the communion of the undivided Trinity. "That our fellowship may be with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ," 1 John 1:3; to which Paul joins "the communion of the Holy Ghost," 2 Cor. 13:14. And it is the very summit of our of our happiness, to exult in God as ours, and sing aloud to him, my God, while he himself calls to us, my people, Hos. 2:23.

VI. Moreover, as all the elect are partakers of one and the same grace, they are all likewise called to mutual communion with one another, "that ye also may have fellowship with us," 1 John 1:3.

Believers of the New Testament with those of the Old, the Gentiles with the Jews, "being all of the same body," Eph. 3:6, "in Christ, who hath made both one," Eph. 2:14. Nay, those on earth with those in heaven: "for all things are gathered together in one in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him, in whom also we have obtained an inheritance," Eph. 1:10, 11. And this is that blessed state to which, by the holy and heavenly calling, we are invited; namely, communion with Christ, and, by him, with the undivided Trinity, and consequently with all the saints, both militant and triumphant, not even excepting the praising assembly of angels; in order with them to exult in the most delightful fruition of all the blessings of God. For all who obey this call "are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant," Heb. 12:23, 24. What grander things can be spoken, what more noble and divine can be conceived, than these?

VII. But this calling is given, partly externally, by a persuasive power, called moral suasion; partly internally, by a real supernatural efficacy, which changes the heart. The external call is, in some measure, published by the word of nature, but more fully by that of supernatural revelation, without which every word of nature would be insufficient and ineffectual. The internal comes from the power of the Holy Spirit working inwardly on the heart; and without this every external revealed word, though objectively very sufficient, as it clearly discovers every thing to be known, believed, and done, yet is subjectively ineffectual, nor will ever bring any person to the communion of Christ.

VIII. Nature itself is not silent, but many ways calls on man to lay aside his too eager care and pursuit of earthly things, and of this animal life, and to endeavour after the far better things of heaven and eternity. For when, with attentive eyes, he surveys that glittering canopy on high, bespangled with so many constellations, and sparkling with so many stars, above which, according to the general belief of mankind, the throne of the Supreme Being is placed, he feels a certain strong desire excited in his breast, that, when he leaves this earthly dross, he may, hereafter, ascend on high, be admitted into the inmost recesses of nature, and received into fellowship with God. And when his thoughts pursue the several beauties of the starry heavens, he then takes a secret pleasure to look down with contempt on the pavements of the rich, nay, on this whole earth, with all its gold, not only that which it has already produced, but that which still lies concealed for the avarice of posterity. And when he further traverses the whole universe, he learns to despise the most stately porticoes, ceilings inlaid with ivory, woods formed by art, and rivers conveyed home, and looking down from on high on this small terrestrial globe, a great part of which is covered with the sea, and much of what remains greatly uncultivated, many places being either scorched with heat, or frozen with cold, he thus says to himself, "Is this that insignificant spot, which so many nations divide among themselves by fire and sword? When thou hast been engaged in the contemplation of these things truly great, then, as oft as thou shalt espy armies with banners displayed, and, as if some great event was in agitation, the horse now advancing to gain intelligence, again pouring forth from the flanks, it may remind thee of the excursion of ants, toiling within a scanty compass. Whereas there are vastly extensive regions above, into the possession of which the soul is admitted; and thus, although it has suffered some inconvenience from the body, yet if, by being content with little, it has dropped all its dross, it is now light and ready to depart: unless, then, I be admitted into these regions, my birth has been in



vain. For why should I rejoice for being numbered among the living? Without this inestimable good, life is not of such value, that I should sweat and fatigue myself therein. O! how contemptible is man, unless he is advanced above what is human!" Thus the book of nature, thus the contemplation of the heavens, taught Seneca both to think and speak. In Præfat. Quest. Natur.

IX. But seeing the same nature teacheth us, that God is far more excellent than those very heavens, which are his throne and the work of his hands, that he is both the creator and ruler of the heavens; the same works invite man to seek after the communion of God himself above all things. For happiness cannot consist in barely dwelling in heaven, unless one enjoys the fellowship and communion of God there. Thus by the voice of nature men are invited "to seek God, if haply they might feel after him," Acts 17:27. "He left not himself without witness, in that he did good;" Acts 14:17; and that by discovering himself to be the fountain of all good, both the greatest and the best of Beings, whose communion alone can render any perfectly blessed. It is therefore an old saying, and handed down from our ancestors to mankind, "that all things were both framed by God and in him consist; and that no nature can be sufficient for its own safety, which is only entrusted with its own preservation, without God." Thus the author of the book "de mundo," extant among Aristotle's works, c. 11, and who concludes with these excellent words: "Whoever would attain to a blessed and happy life, must partake of the Deity from the very beginning."

X. But God not only invites men by the light of nature to seek him, but also gives some hope of enjoying him. For why else should he forbear sinners, with so much long-suffering, unless he had decreed to take pity on some of them? Would it be worthy of the most pure Deity to have preserved now for so many ages, the world subjected to vanity by the sins of men, unless there were some of mankind to whom he was willing to show himself glorious in their happiness? "The Lord is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance," 2 Pet. 3:9. And as this consideration of the Divine patience and forbearance, shining forth in the whole government of the world, yields some hope of salvation, "and the long-suffering of our Lord ought to be accounted salvation," ib. ver. 15. "so this goodness of God should lead every one to repentance," Rom. 2:4.

XI. For nature also teaches, that it is not possible any one can enjoy converse and familiarity with God, who does not sincerely endeavour after purity and holiness, and, as the emperor Marcus Antoninus speaks, lib. ii. §. 5, labours not "to live a life resembling God." For like delights in like, and rejoices to communicate itself thereto. Plato, de Legibus, lib. iv, says well, "What practice is it that is agreeable to, and in imitation of God? This, and that ancient one, that like delights in like." Thus man is invited to the practice of the strictest purity, by the voice of nature herself, in order to the enjoyment of God. I cannot forbear adding the gradation of Agapetus, which is really fine, and strictly true. Thus he says to the emperor Justinian: "For he who knows himself shall know God. But he who knows God, shall be made like to God. He shall be like God, who is worthy of God. He shall be worthy of God, who does nothing unworthy of God, but meditates on the things of God, and what he thinks he speaks, and what he speaks he acts."

XII. All these things the royal Seer, Ps. 19:1–4, has exhibited in a concise but very strong manner. "The heavens declare the glory of God;" for as they are his throne, curiously framed, so

they display his power, majesty, greatness and holiness, before which the heavens themselves confess they are not clean: however their very excellence invites men to endeavour, within their circuit, to the utmost, after the enjoyment of communion with the great and good God. "And the firmament showeth his handy-work," proclaiming, that by his word only, it was framed together. "Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge." These vicissitudes of light and darkness mutually corresponding in so exact and constant an order, prove a most wise Director. And there is no day nor night but speaks something of God, and declares it to the next, as the scholar of the preceding and the master of the following. "There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard." If they were words, the instruction would cease with their sound; but now what the heavens declare, they do it always, and in the same manner. If speeches, and sentences deduced with much subtlety from their reasons and causes, they would labour under obscurity; if their voice was heard, it would stun us with its noise. But now the heavens instruct both constantly, clearly, and sweetly. For though their voice is not heard, yet they have a voice, no less strongly adapted to strike the mind, than the sound of a trumpet, or of thunder; seeing they exhibit to the eyes of all the magnificence of their Creator so clearly, as to escape the observation of none but the wilfully blind. Or possibly this may be the meaning: "There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard." Though people differ in languages, and the Greek understands not the barbarian; yet the heavens have a common language adapted to the instruction of all alike and nothing but a culpable carelessness can hinder the most distant people from improving by the instruction, as it were, of one teacher. "Their line is gone out through all the earth." The instruction of the heavens resembles that of school-masters, who teach children their letters by drawing their strokes before them. Thus the heavens draw lines or strokes with their rays, and as it were letters of the alphabet, from which, combined and variously joined together, an entire volume of wisdom is formed. This is the signification of קו, as Isa. 28:10, "line upon line:" from which the Greek φθογγος, which the apostle uses, Rom. 10:18, does not differ much, denoting not only a sound, but also a letter of the alphabet, as Plutarch, in fabio, notes, as Scapula has observed in his lexicon. Nor is it necessary to say, that the text is here corrupted, or that the Septuagint read קולם their voice. And this line "is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world." All mankind, whether in a habitable or desert country, are taught by this master. There is no corner of the world, where the figures of the heavens, as so many arguments of the divine perfections, are not to be seen. And this is the reason why I have just now proposed the reasonings of those (if you except the quotation from Agapetus, a deacon of the church of Constantinople) who had no other master but nature.

XIII. But though the invitation, which nature gives to seek God, be sufficient to render them without excuse who do not comply with it, Rom. 1:20; yet it is not sufficient, even objectively, for salvation. For it does not afford that lively hope, which maketh not ashamed;" for this is only revealed by the gospel; whence the Gentiles are said to have been "without hope in the world," Eph. 2:12. It does not show the true way to the enjoyment of God, which is no other than faith in Christ. It does not sufficiently instruct us about the manner in which we ought to worship and please God, and do what is acceptable to him. In short, this call by nature never did, nor is it even possible that it ever can, bring any to the saving knowledge of God; the gospel alone "is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth." Rom. 1:16.

XIV. We cannot agree with those, whether they be ancients, a list of whom Casaubon, Exercit. I. ad Appar. Annal. Baronii, and after him Vossius, Histor. Pelag. lib. iii. p. 3. Thes. 11, have

drawn up; or whether they be moderns, who maintain, that good men, among the Gentiles, were brought to salvation by this call of nature, without the knowledge of Christ. And we think some of our brethren ascribe too much to nature, who tell us "that men, if not wilfully blind, could, by what is known of God, have attained to some knowledge of the divine mercy, by which they might obtain salvation, in a manner perhaps unknown to us; though destitute of the distinct knowledge of some mysteries, which they could no way discover of themselves," Amyraldus, *Specim. Animad. in Exerc. de Gratia. Univ. P. 2. p. 133.* For we are persuaded, there is no salvation without Christ, Acts 4:12: no communion of adult persons with Christ, but by faith in him, Eph. 3:17: no faith in Christ, without the knowledge of him, John 17:3; no knowledge, but by the preaching of the Gospel, Rom. 10:14: no preaching of the Gospel in the works of nature. For it is that "mystery, which was kept secret since the world began." Rom. 16:25.

XV. To what purpose then, you will say, is this call by the light of nature? Not to speak of the being without excuse, just now mentioned, which, indeed, may be the end of him who calls, though not of the call itself: that calling serves to prepare the way for a further, a more perfect, and a more explicit call by the Gospel, and as a prelude of a fuller instruction. For as grace supposes nature, and makes it perfect, so the truths revealed in the Gospel are built on those made known by the light of nature. When a person, under that glimmering light, has discovered that there is a God; that happiness consists in communion with him, and that in comparison of him all things are nothing; and that he is the rewarder of those who seek him; and that, if he is sought in a proper way and manner, he is not sought in vain; he has now a foundation laid, on which to build the gospel, which declares what that God is, in what manner he becomes propitious to men in Christ, how he is to be sought, and in what method he will certainly be found. And thus the knowledge he learns from nature being sanctified by the Spirit, better prepares the mind for embracing those truths which, though they surpass, are yet so far from destroying, that they perfect nature. And it is very expedient for believers, who live under the Gospel, to have always the book of nature before their eyes: which furnishes them with useful instructions, and lashes the conscience with continual reproaches, unless they love, worship, and celebrate the Deity, who is every where present. Which the heathens themselves, as Epictetus and others, have represented in their own way.

XVI. We must therefore add the other call by the word of God, supernaturally revealed, either immediately from God's own mouth, as was formerly done to the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and others; or mediately by the ministers of God, whether they preached it by word of mouth, or consigned it to writing. Thus Paul says, Rom. 10:14, "How shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher?" And here indeed both parts of the word are to be made use of; thus the law convincing man of sin, Rom. 3:20, awakens him to a sense of his misery, drives the sinner out of himself, stirs him up to desire deliverance, and makes him sigh in this manner, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of death!" Rom. 7:24. Therefore the law ought certainly to be preached, in its full vigour and force, that "knowing the terror of the Lord, we may persuade men." 2 Cor. 5:11. But yet the principal part is performed by the Gospel, which revealing Christ, and the fulness of all grace and salvation in him, allures, by its endearing sweetness, awakened and concerned sinners to communion with God. Nothing more powerfully sinks into the inmost soul, than that most alluring invitation of Jesus, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," Matt. 11:28. "Let him that is athirst come, and whosoever will, let him take the

water of life freely." Rev. 22:17. This word is "the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth," Rom. 1:16. If the law only was preached, it would, by its horrors, harden souls, driven to despair, into a hatred of God, as a severe avenger of sin. But by adding the Gospel, which makes a bright hope of grace to shine, even on the most abandoned and wretched sinner, if, displeased with himself, he heartily desires it: obstinate hearts come to relent, and to be melted down into a love of God, and of his Christ. And therefore, nothing ought to be more sweet and dear to us than the most delightful word of the Gospel, in which are rivers of honey and butter. Job 20:17.

XVII. This word of grace, though variously dispensed, was published in the world from the very first sin of man. Heb. 1:1. But in such a manner, as to be sufficient for the instruction of the elect to salvation, in all ages, according to that measure of grace and knowledge, which the providence of God distributed in each period of time. When the revelation was more sparing and obscure, God being satisfied with a less measure of knowledge, did, by the secret power of his Spirit, unite the elect to Christ, and keep them united by an almost invisible band, which yet no force could break asunder. But when he had more brightly discovered himself, he called for a more exact knowledge and faith. And as he clearly teaches his people, how they ought to walk and to please God, so he also requires them to "abound more and more." 1Thess. 4:1.

XVIII. We do not agree with those who think, that by the unwritten word of God, those only were called to salvation through faith in Christ, who were eminent for the spirit of prophesy, but the rest of the church was so rude and ignorant, that they were brought to an unknown Christ, by the help of the law of nature alone, without the spirit of faith. For, down from Adam, the true church had one and the same precious faith, and the same common salvation with the prophets. God did not only speak to the prophets, for their private use, but by the Prophets to the fathers, Heb. 1:1. The prophets would have acted perfidiously, had they put the candle that was lighted for them under a bushel, and indolently wrapt in a napkin the talent intrusted with them. Nor is it consistent with the piety of the ancient fathers, not to have inculcated, with care and diligence, upon their children, what they themselves had learned about the promised seed of the woman. So that though we are not to determine any thing rashly, as to the manner and measure of knowledge, yet we are not to doubt, but that the revelation of a Saviour was made to the elect from the beginning.

XIX. This Gospel-call was never given universally to all men, unless in the beginning of the world, just springing from Adam, or rising again from Noah. Though, even then, God gave warning of the seclusion of some from his grace, by the distinction he made between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent; and by separating Ham from his brethren by a dreadful curse, and the ancient prophecy of alluring, in after times, the posterity of Japhet into the tents of Shem, which insinuated that the posterity of Japhet should, for some time, be aliens from the communion of the people of God. Afterwards, the greatest part of mankind were left to themselves; and though God vouchsafed the word of his grace to the posterity of Abraham, yet not to them all. In fine, when he claimed Israel to himself for a people, he rejected the other nations, and suffered them all to go on in their own ways, Acts 14:16. And though, upon breaking down the wall of partition, the apostles were enjoined to preach the Gospel to every creature, without distinction, yet it was never so universally preached, but that there were always very many nations, and still are at this day, whom the report of the Gospel never reached. They

are therefore mistaken who, having feigned an universal redemption by Christ, and an universal objective grace, as it is called, have at the same time devised, for supporting it, an universal call to Christ.

XX. This call contains the command of faith, by which all men without exception, to whom God vouchsafes the same, are enjoined to believe in Christ, in that way and manner which is revealed in the Gospel, Isa. 45:22, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth." But the method of believing is this: first, that a person do heartily acknowledge all men, without exception, and himself among the rest, to be liable to condemnation because of sin: and then, that he embrace the principal truths of the Gospel; namely, that there is no salvation but in Christ, nor any communion with Christ, but by a true and lively faith: moreover, that he do not neglect so great salvation, but renouncing all earthly enjoyments, and every false remedy for his sins that, he only desire the righteousness of Christ, receive him as his Saviour, give himself up wholly to him, not doubting but, in so doing, he shall find rest to his soul. All, and every one in particular, therefore, to whom the Gospel is preached, are not commanded directly to believe, that Christ died for them. For that is a falsehood: but are commanded to proceed in that method, I have now described; and not to take comfort to themselves from the death of Christ, before, having acknowledged their own misery, and renounced every thing but Christ, they have given themselves up sincerely to him. We cannot therefore conclude from this general call, who they are for whom Christ died; but only this, that there is no other name given under heaven, in which we can be saved; and that in him, as an all-sufficient Saviour, every believer shall have life.

XXI. But that external call will bring none to communion with Christ, unless it be accompanied with the internal, which is accomplished not only by persuasion and command, but by the powerful operation of the Spirit. There is a certain call of God, whereby he makes the things he calls, to exist by that very call. By such a call "he calleth those things which be not, as though they were," Rom. 4:17. For when he said, "Let there be light," immediately "there was light," Gen. 1:3. Not unlike this is that internal call of the Spirit, of which the apostle writes, 2 Cor. 4:6, "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts." But when he says to the elect, in the hour of their happy visitation, "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light," Eph. 5:14, it is no more possible for them to remain any longer in the sleep of death, than it was possible for Lazarus to continue in the grave, after Christ had said to him, "Lazarus, come forth," John 11:43.

XXII. Here God exerts his infinite power, by which he converts the soul no less powerfully than sweetly. While the Gospel is externally proposed to his chosen people, "He gives them the eyes of their understanding to be enlightened, that they may know what is the hope of their calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints," Eph. 1:18; "he openeth their heart, that they may attend unto the things which are spoken," Acts 16:14; and causes them "to receive the word with all readiness of mind," Acts 17:11. He writes his laws on their heart, Jer. 31:33: puts the reverence of himself there, Ezek. 11:20: and not only calls them from darkness to his marvellous light, but also, by the call, draws them, not to stand still in the path of doubtful deliberation, but to run after him, Cant. 1:4; not only puts them in an equal poise, but turns them, Jer. 31:18; not only advises, but persuades, and "he is stronger and prevails," Jer. 20:7. Nor does he solicit, but translate, Col. 1:13; not by an ordinary, but by that mighty power, by which he raised Christ from the dead, Eph. 1:20. Let changeable human nature put on what form it will, it

must be obliged to confess, that in this matter, these are so many displays of divine omnipotence, like so many thunderbolts thrown out to bring down its pride.

XXIII. Nevertheless, God deals here with the rational creature in such a manner, that the liberty of the human will is not, in the least, affected: which he is so far from destroying, by the energy of his power, that, on the contrary, he rescues and maintains it. He put, indeed, into the heart of Titus the earnest care of going, yet so as to undertake the journey of his own accord, 2 Cor. 8:16, 17. It is a violence, indeed, but that of heavenly love, the greater the sweeter. A certain kind of compulsion, but that of the most charming friendship, to the end that the soul being loosed from the chains of sin and Satan, may rejoice in the most delightful liberty. God does not drag along the unwilling by head and shoulders, but makes them willing, Phil. 2:13. bringing his truths so clearly to their understanding, that they cannot but assent, so effectually gaining upon their will by the charms of his goodness, that they are not able to reject them; but yield themselves conquered, and that with the highest complacency; exulting with joy, "O Lord, thou hast enticed me, and I was enticed; thou art stronger than I, and hast prevailed," Jer. 20:7. "I may well exult in this victory and triumph over the devil, for that I myself am conquered by thee." And who can be so rude as to complain of any violence done to human liberty, by this winning power (so to speak) of the Deity?

XXIV. It was certainly inconsistent with the power and majesty of God, to attempt any thing and leave it in suspense, and not bring it to a final issue; it was likewise unworthy both of his goodness and wisdom, so to vex and distress a man endowed with reason and will, as, in a matter of the far greatest moment act, to without knowledge or against his will, by a certain fatal and blind instinct of his own. He therefore employs the highest degree of force, thereby to conquer the highest degree of the corruption of nature; but a pleasant force, a force under the direction of wisdom, as became an intelligent and rational nature; which is so willingly overcome, as not only not to resist, because nothing can resist God, when he comes to convert the soul; but also because, should it resist, it would think itself most unhappy. But yet we are here to distinguish between the beginning and accomplishment of the call; as also between the object and the end, or that in which it terminates. For at the beginning of the call, man necessarily resists, and cannot but resist, because the object is an unbelieving and rebellious sinner, and a child of disobedience: but in the consummation, he necessarily makes no resistance, and cannot now resist, because the end of this call, or that in which it terminates, is a Believer, who owns himself conquered, and glories in the obedience of faith. This is what the Greek authors emphatically call *πειθανάγκη*, the contracting persuasion, of God who calls.

XXV. The many admonitions, promises, and threatenings by which we are invited, make nothing against this truth; for, as they inform us of our duty, so they are made effectual to conversion by the internal operation of the Spirit. Nor ought the complaints of God and of Christ, of the unwillingness of people to be converted, be objected to it; because these do not speak of any inward power that would bring about their conversion, as if they were able to weaken that, but of the external ministry of the word, against which the wicked harden their heart. Neither are we to urge what we elsewhere find about grieving the Spirit of God: because we are to distinguish between the common operations of the Spirit of God, and the special operations of the Spirit of grace: between the moral and the supernatural actions of the Spirit of grace. Between some more feeble impulses to certain exercises of virtue and piety, and that grand attempt of the Spirit when

he goes to convert an elect person. They grieve the Spirit of God, because they rather choose to obey the impulses of the flesh and of the devil, than his holy admonitions, which are partly proposed externally by the word, partly insinuated into their mind by conscience. Believers themselves also grieve the Spirit of grace whereby they are sealed, as often as they refuse to comply with his holy admonitions; and though conscience, in which the Spirit has set up his throne, in vain struggles with them, yet they suffer themselves to be carried away by the flesh and the world: and likewise every time that, with a becoming reverence of soul, they refuse to receive, cherish, and follow his holy impulses, when he quickens them to duty. Whence nothing can be concluded against the invincible efficacy of God, when he calls internally, and effectually undertakes the conversion of his people.

XXVI. We ought then attentively to consider, carefully hearken to, and willingly comply with the call of God, both the external by the light of nature and revelation, and the internal by the Spirit; so that, upon being brought to communion with God and Christ, "we may show forth the praises of him, who hath called us out of darkness into his marvellous light," 1 Pet. 2:9.

## Chapter VI: Of Regeneration

I. BY that same word, whereby the elect are called to communion with God and his Christ, they are also regenerated to a far more excellent life. For thus James saith, 1:18, "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures." It is therefore proper we proceed from the subject of effectual calling to that of Regeneration.

II. But here all things are deep, and wrapt up in mystery. Who can unfold to us the secrets of his own corporal birth? Who can distinctly declare in what manner he was poured out like milk, and curdled like cheese within the bowels of his mother. The prophet himself, as if he was seized with a holy amazement, cried out, "I will praise thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvellous are thy works, and that my soul knoweth right well. My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect," Ps. 139:14–16. But if these things, which regard the origin of our body, and the beginnings of this animal life, are involved in such darkness as to frustrate the inquiries of the most sagacious; how much more involved are the things that constitute our spiritual regeneration, which none can doubt to be altogether mysterious.

III. But yet this is so necessary, that our Saviour declares, that without it there is no entering into the kingdom of heaven, John 3:3, 5. It therefore deserves to be inquired into; that, if we have perhaps attained to it, we may celebrate with becoming praises the glorious perfections of God our Father, which shine so conspicuously in this illustrious work, and properly valuing our happiness, we may frame the whole tenour of our lives in a manner suitable to it.

IV. We give this definition of it: Regeneration is that supernatural act of God, whereby a new and divine life is infused into the elect person, spiritually dead, and that from the incorruptible seed of the word of God, made fruitful by the infinite power of the Spirit.

V. We are "all dead in Adam," 1 Cor. 15:22, through the poison of the tempting serpent. This "murderer from the beginning", John 8:44, had such success attending his endeavours, that all men who now exist are by nature "dead in trespasses and sins", Eph. 2:1. That is, 1st, They are separated at the greatest distance from God and his Spirit, who is the soul of their soul, and life of their life; or in the language of Paul, "alienated from the life of God", Eph. 4:18. 2dly, They are spiritually insensible of all spiritual things, destitute of all true feeling: they do not rightly consider the load of their sins, because they are in them as in their element: nor have a right knowledge of their misery, "being past feeling," Eph. 4:19, nor any relish for divine grace, because it has not yet been conferred upon them; nor any longing after heavenly things, being ignorant of their worth. 3dly, They are wholly incapable of every act of true life: "Not sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves," 2 Cor. 3:5. The understanding is overspread with dismal darkness, Eph. 4:18; "hath not set God before it," Ps. 86:14; "receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can it know them," 1 Cor. 2:14; the will has no tendency to things unknown: and thus all the things of God are despised by it as mean. And if at times it seem to perform any things that have some appearance of vital actions, this proceeds not from a principle of life, but resembles those automatical or artificial motions, by which statues, ingeniously framed, counterfeit living animals.



VI. But as a dead carcase swarms with vermin, arising from putrefaction, in which the briskest life is observed, though of another order and kind from that life which was formerly in that body; so, in like manner, there is a kind of life in a man spiritually dead, but it is carnal, hellish, and diabolical, at the greatest distance from true life, and the more vigorous it is, it gives the more evident signs of the most deplorable death. The apostle has elegantly joined this death and life; Eph. 2:1, 2, "When ye were dead in trespasses and sins ye walked in them, as is the life of this world:" so Beza translates. In the Greek it runs, κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα του κοσμου τουτου. Philo., in Alleg., lib. i., defines this death well: "When the soul is dead as to virtue, it lives the life of vice." Not unlike to what Macarius says, Homil. 12, "When Adam began to entertain evil thoughts and devices, he perished as to God: we say not he perished altogether, was destroyed and quite dead; but that, though as to God he was dead, yet he was alive as to his own nature." What Macarius affirms of Adam is universally true of all; for in a man spiritually dead, there is really a natural or animal life, which, though not active in that which is good, is doubly active in that which is evil. The understanding, not apprehending the wisdom of God, looks upon it as foolishness, 1 Cor. 2:14; and yet, when it would find wisdom in the things of God, it so transforms them by its mad presumption, and compels them, even against their nature, to a conformity to the notions of its trifling presumptuous self-wisdom, that while it impiously presumes to correct the wisdom of God, it transforms it in a dreadful manner into downright folly. The will, not finding any thing in God wherewith it can take delight, seeks it either in the creatures without God, or, which is more abominable, in the very perpetration of wickedness. The affections, shaking off the reins of reason, rush on in full career. The body, with all its members, is the throne of mad and furious lusts. And the whole man, being so averse from God, and infatuated with the fond love of himself, sets himself up for an idol, makes his own advantage his supreme end; his own pleasure, his most infallible law. This is the life of the soul, which "is dead while living", 1 Tim. 5:6.

VII. And thus it is with the elect before regeneration: but by regeneration a new life is put into them, resulting from a gracious union with God and his Spirit. For what the soul is to the body, that God is to the soul. Moreover, this spiritual life may be considered, either by way of faculty, and in the first act, in the usual language of the schools; or by way of operation, and in the second act. In the former respect, it is that inward constitution of the soul whereby it is fitted to exert those actions which are acceptable to God in Christ, by the power of the Spirit uniting it to God: whether such actions immediately flow from that principle, or whether they lie concealed for some time as fruits in their seed. In the latter respect, it is that activity of the living soul by which it acts agreeably to the command of God, and the example of Christ.

VIII. If we consider this first principle of life, there is not the least doubt but regeneration is accomplished in a moment. For there is no delay in the transition from death to life. No person can be regenerated so long as he is in the state of spiritual death: but in the instant he begins to live, he is born again. Wherefore no intermediate state between the regenerate and unregenerate can be imagined so much as in thought, if we mean regeneration in the first act; for one is either dead or alive; has either the Spirit of the flesh and the world, or the Spirit of God actuating him; is either in the state of grace or in the state of malediction; either the child of God or of the devil; either in the way to salvation or damnation. There neither is nor can be any medium here. The Holy Scripture divides all mankind into two classes—"sheep and goats," Matt. 25:2, 3; and compares their goings to two ways; whereof the one, which is broad, leads to destruction; the other, which is narrow, to life, Matt. 7:13, 14; and there is no one who does not tread in one or

other of these ways. And what if he, whom some imagine to be in an intermediate state, should depart this animal life before he be fully brought to the spiritual life, would such a one be received into heaven? But heaven is open only to the actually regenerate, John 3:3. Or would he be thrust into hell? But hell is allotted only for the goats, and for those who, all their life long, have walked in the broad way. Or perhaps such will be received into some intermediate place, where, being free from the pains of hell and deprived of the joys of heaven, they will delight themselves in I know not what degree of natural happiness? As some popish doctors, discoursing in the council of Trent, of infants dying without baptism, pleased themselves with these fond sportings of their imagination, which the author of the history of that council, lib. ii. p. 157, has not dismissed without a good deal of acrimony and sharpness. Or you will say, perhaps, it is a case which never happens that any one should die in that intermediate state. But produce me the vouchers of such an assertion, whereby security is given to those in this intermediate class, of retaining their lives till they shall have declared of what class they choose to be. I do not remember to have read any thing on that head in Scripture. And if that intermediate state has such an indissolvable connexion with salvation, it will be no longer intermediate, but a state of grace. For it is grace alone to which the attainment of glory is infallibly assigned. I own there are various degrees of regeneration in the second act; and that the seed of it sometimes lies hid under the earth, or at most, exerts some slender and initial, and, as it were, infantile operations, differing very much with respect to perfection from those which a more advanced spirit of sanctification produces; yet seeing the former also have their rise from the fountain of the new life, it is plain that they who exert them are to be ranked among the regenerate. For we must say one of these two things; either that these operations ascribed to the intermediate state proceed from the powers of nature and common grace; and thus there is nothing in them which may not be found in the reprobate, and those entirely unregenerate; or that they proceed from the indwelling Spirit of grace, and so are effects of regeneration, to which the beginnings of the new life are owing.

IX. Hence it appears, there are no preparations antecedent to the first beginning of regeneration; because, previous to that, nothing but mere death in the highest degree is to be found in the person to be regenerated. "When we were dead in sins, he hath quickened us together with Christ," Eph. 2:5. And indeed the Scripture represents man's conversion by such similitudes, as show that all preparations are entirely excluded; sometimes calling it a new generation, to which, certainly, none can contribute any thing of himself; but yet, as natural generation presupposes some dispositions in the matter, so that we may not imagine any such thing to be in ourselves but from God, we have this held forth by the similitude of a resurrection; in which a body is restored from matter, prepared by no qualifications: yet because here certainly is matter, but in the resurrection of the soul there is nothing at all, therefore we have added the figure of a creation, Ps. 51:10, Eph. 2:10; by which we are taught that a new creature exists from a spiritual nothing, which is sin: but as there was not something in nothing to assist and sustain creation, so there was nothing to oppose and resist; but sin is so far from submitting to what God does, that it is reluctant thereto, and in a hostile manner at enmity with him; accordingly, the other images did not fully complete the idea of this admirable action, till at length it is called the victory of God—victory, I say, over the devil, who maintains his palace, Luke 11:21, and effectually worketh "in the children of disobedience," Eph. 2:2. All these operations of God, which Alexander Moore has, in an elegant order, ranged one after another, de Victoria Gratia, Diss. 1, Thess. 10, tend to exclude, as far as possible, all preparations from the beginning of our regeneration.

X. The semi-pelagians, therefore, of Marseilles were mistaken, who insisted, that a man comes to the grace, whereby we are regenerated in Christ, by a natural faculty, as by asking, seeking, knocking; and that, in some at least, before they are born again, there is a kind of repentance going before, together with a sorrow for sin, and a change of the life for the better, and a beginning of faith, and an initial love of God, and a desire of grace; it is true, they did not look on these endeavours to be of such importance as that it would be said, we were thereby rendered worthy of the grace of the Holy Spirit, as Pelagius and Julian professed; but yet they imagined, they were an occasion by which God was moved to bestow his grace; for they said, that the mercy of God is such, that he recompenses this very small beginning of good with this illustrious reward; as Vossius, *Hist. Pelag. lib. iv. p. 1, Thess. 1*, has refined this their opinion. The Remonstrants are likewise mistaken, in *Collatione Hagiensi, editionis Brandianæ, p. 302*, when they write, "Some work of man, therefore, goes before his vivification; namely, to acknowledge and bewail his death, to will and desire deliverance from it; to hunger, thirst, and seek after life; all which, and a great deal besides, is required by Christ in those whom he will make alive." But there is little accuracy in the reasonings of these men. For, 1st, Since our nature is become, after having eaten of the forbidden fruit, like an evil tree, it can produce no fruit truly good and acceptable to God, and do nothing by which it can prepare itself for the grace of regeneration, unless a person can be thought to prepare himself for grace by sin. 2dly, It has been found, that they who in appearance were in the best manner disposed for regeneration, were yet at the greatest distance from it, as the instance of that young man, *Matt. 19:21, 22*, very plainly shows. He appeared to be full of good intentions, and inflamed with a desire after heaven, and a blameless life before men, to a degree, that Jesus himself, beholding him, loved him; but notwithstanding all these dispositions, he parted with our Lord sorrowful. 3dly, And on the other hand, they who had not even the least appearance of any preparation, as the publicans and harlots, went into the kingdom of God before those who were civilly righteous and externally religious; "for these last believed not John, declaring the way of righteousness; but the publicans and the harlots truly believed," *Matt. 21:31, 32*. 4thly and lastly, God testifies, that in the first approach of his grace, "he is found of them, that sought him not, and asked not for him," *Isa. 65:1*, Fulgentius, *lib. i., de veritat. prædest. p. 62*, says extremely well: "We have not certainly received grace, because we are willing; but grace is given us, while we are still unwilling."

XI. There have been likewise some among ourselves, who have spoken of preparations to regeneration or conversion, but in a quite different sense from the favourers of Pelagianism. In persons to be regenerated they have assigned, 1st, A breaking of the natural obstinacy and a flexibility of the will. 2dly, A serious consideration of the law. 3dly, A consideration of their own sins and offences against God. 4thly, A legal fear of punishment and a dread of hell, and consequently a despairing of their salvation, with respect to any thing in themselves. For in this order, Perkins, *Cas. Conscient. c. v. quæst. 1, sect. 1*, reckons up these preparations; and Ames, in the same manner, *Cas. Conscient. lib. ii. c. iv*. And the British divines explained themselves almost to the same purpose in the synod of Dort, *p. 139, of the Utrecht edition, 1620, folio*, "1st, There are some external works ordinarily required of men before they are brought to a state of regeneration or conversion, which are wont sometimes to be freely done, sometimes freely omitted by them, as going to church, hearing the word preached, and the like. 2dly, There are some internal effects, previous to conversion or regeneration, excited by the power of the word and Spirit in the hearts of those who are not yet justified; as the knowledge of the will of God, sense of sin, dread of punishment, anxiety about deliverance, some hope of pardon." But they

differ from the favourers of Pelagianism in this manner: 1st, That they are not for having these things to proceed from nature, but profess them to be the effects of the spirit of bondage, preparing a way to himself for their actual regeneration. 2dly, That they are not for God's bestowing the grace of regeneration from a regard to, and moved by occasion of, these preparations, much less by any merit in them; but they imagine, that God in this manner levels a way for himself, fills up vallies, depresses mountains and hills, in order the better to smooth the way for his entrance into that soul. Nay, the British divines add, *Thess. vi.*: "That even the elect themselves never behave in these acts preceding regeneration, in such a manner, as that, on account of their negligence and resistance, they may not justly be abandoned and forsaken of God." Yet they call them rather preparations for grace, than the fruits and effects of grace; because they think, that even the reprobate may go as far as this; and they affirm, "that these antecedent effects, produced by the power of the word and Spirit in the minds of men, may be, and in many usually are, stifled and entirely extinguished through the fault of the rebellious will," *Ibid. Thess. v.* But we really think they argue more accurately, who make these and the like things in the elect, to be preparations to the further and more perfect operations of a more noble and plentiful spirit, and so not preparations for regeneration, but the fruits and effects of the first regeneration: for as these things suppose some life of the soul, which spiritually attends to spiritual things, and are operations of the Spirit of God when going about to sanctify the elect, we cannot but refer them to the Spirit of grace and regeneration. Nor is it any objection, that the like, or the same may be also said to be in reprobates, for they are only the same materially, but not formally. Reprobates also have some knowledge of Christ, some taste of the grace of God, and of the powers of the world to come. Yet it does not follow, that the knowledge of Christ as it is in believers, and that relish of grace and glory they have, is not the gift of the Spirit of grace and of glory. And, indeed, the things mentioned by Perkins, and the other British divines, are no preparations for regeneration in the reprobate, either from the nature of the thing, or the intention of God. Not the former, for however great these things may appear to be, yet they are consistent with spiritual death; and the reprobate are so far from being disposed thereby to a spiritual life, that, on the contrary, deceived by those actings which counterfeit spiritual life, they are the more hardened in a real death, and fondly pleasing themselves, are at a greater distance from inquiring after true life, which they falsely imagine they have obtained. Not the latter, for no intention of God can be rendered void. It is therefore necessary, that all these things be in another manner in the elect, than in the reprobate.

XII. If this matter be more closely considered, we shall find that the orthodox differ more in words, and in the manner of explaining, than in sense and reality. For the term regeneration is of ambiguous signification; sometimes it is blended with sanctification, and by regeneration is understood that action of God, whereby man, who is now become the friend of God, and endowed with spiritual life, acts in a righteous and holy manner from infused habits. And then it is certain, there are some effects of the Spirit, by which he usually prepares them for the actings of complete faith and holiness; for a knowledge of divine truths, a sense of misery, sorrow for sin, hope of pardon, &c. go before any one can fiducially lay hold on Christ, and apply himself to the practice of true godliness. God does not usually sanctify a man all at once, before ever he has had any thought about himself and God, and any concern about his salvation. And this is what the British divines seem to have intended, when, in *Confirmatione Secundæ Theseos*, they thus speak: "Divine grace does not usually bring men to a state of justification, in which we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by a sudden enthusiasm, but first subdues and

prepares them by many previous acts by the ministry of the word." By which words they sufficiently show, that, by regeneration, they mean the state of passive justification. But sometimes regeneration denotes the first translation of a man from a state of death to a state of spiritual life; in which sense we take it. And in that respect none of the orthodox, if he will speak consistently with his own principles, can suppose preparatory works to the grace of regeneration. For, either he would maintain, that these works proceeded from nature; and so, by the confession of all the orthodox, are but dead works and splendid sins. But none in his right mind will affirm, that any can be disposed for the grace of regeneration, by those things which are sinful. Or he would maintain, that these works proceeded from the Spirit of God. But if thus far he does not operate in another manner in the elect, than in the reprobate; these works, notwithstanding this his operation, may be reckoned among dead works, for the orthodox look upon all the actions of the reprobate to be sinful, let them be ever so much elevated by divine assistance. Thus the British divines, l. c. p. 143: "An evil tree, which naturally brings forth evil fruit, must itself be first changed to a good tree before ever it can yield any good fruit. But the will of an unregenerate person is not only an evil, but also a dead tree." I now infer, the reprobate are never regenerated, and therefore continue evil trees, without ever producing any other than bad fruit. And so there can be no preparation in such works for regeneration, for the reason above explained. If you say, that these works which you call preparatory, are different in the elect, I ask, in what respect? No other answer can be given but this, that they proceed from the spirit of grace and life; right: but then they are not preparations for the first regeneration, but effects of it; for regeneration is the first approach of the spirit of grace and life, effectually working in the elect.

XIII. You will say then, are there no preparatory dispositions to the first regeneration? I confidently answer, there are none; and agree with Fulgentius, de Incarnat. et Gratia Christi, c. xix.: "With respect to the birth of a child, the work of God is previous to any will of the person that comes into the world; so also in the spiritual birth, whereby we begin to put off the old man." I own, indeed, spiritual death has its degrees, but with a distinction; what is privative therein, or what it is destitute of, namely, the want of the life of God, is equal or alike in all, and in this respect there are no degrees less or more. But what is possible, or as it were positive therein, namely, those evil habits, these indeed are very unequal. In infants there are only those evil habits which come into the world with them: in the adult there are others, contracted and deeply rooted by many vicious acts and a course of wickedness. These again greatly differ, according as by the secret dispensation of God's providence, the affections of men are more or less restrained; for, though every kind of wickedness, like a certain hydra, lurks in the heart of all, yet God suffers some to give loose reins to their vices, and to be hurried on, as by so many furies; while he moves others with a sense of shame, and a reverence for the laws, and some kind of love to honour and honesty; who, in that respect, may be said not to be at such a distance from sanctifying grace as they who are guilty of horrid crimes, which are more opposite thereto than a civil and external honesty of life. But yet, whatever length any before regeneration has advanced in that honesty, he nevertheless remains in the confines of death in which there is no preparation for life.

XIV. Nor do we agree with those, who so inconsiderately assert, that man is no more disposed for regeneration than a stone, or an irrational animal. For there are naturally such faculties in the soul of man, as render him a fit subject of regeneration, which are not to be found in stones or

brutes. Thus a man can be regenerated, but a brute or a stone cannot. In that sense Augustine, *de Predest. sanct. c. 5*, said, "the capacity of having faith and love is of the nature of man; but to have them, of the grace of believers." Vossius has proved by proper arguments, that this is to be understood, not of the proximate, but remote capacity, in so far as man has naturally those faculties, in which faith and love may be wrought; *Histor. Pelag. lib. 4. P. I. p. 418*.

XV. But we must not here omit, that the elect, before their actual regeneration, are honoured by God with various, and those indeed very excellent privileges above the reprobate, which are intended, according to the purpose of God, to be subservient for promoting their regeneration, in his appointed time. For as God has a love of special benevolence for them, according to the degree of election; and they are redeemed by Christ, and in a state of reconciliation with God, and of justification, actively taken; it follows: 1st, That God often preserves them from those base and scandalous crimes, which are repugnant to common humanity, and that by some assistance of light, of divinity, of conscience, and civil honesty, with an accession of some grace operating internally, and laying a restraint on the wickedness of their nature. 2dly, That all and every one of them, who are brought to the acknowledgment and the common illumination of the truth of the Gospel, are kept from the sin against the Holy Ghost. 3dly, That, by the ministry of the word, and other operations of God's special providence towards them, many evident principles of divine truth are understood by the natural mind, and also imprinted on the natural memory, the meditation of which, immediately after they are regenerated, conduces very much to the confirmation of their faith. And thus, without knowing it, they have collected a very valuable treasure, the excellence and genuine use of which they come not to see, till they are born again. But as these things do not, of their own nature, dispose man for regeneration, though, by the appointment of God, they are so disposed, as that regeneration is certainly to follow, they cannot but very remotely be called preparations, and they will be such more from the intention of God, than from the virtue of the thing.

XVI. Now after a principle of spiritual life is infused into the elect soul by regeneration, divine grace does not always proceed therein in the same method and order. It is possible, that for some time, the spirit of the life of Christ may lie, as it were, dormant in some (almost in the same manner as vegetative life in the seed of a plant, or sensitive life in the seed of an animal, or a poetical genius in one born a poet), so as that no vital operations can yet proceed there-from, though savingly united to Christ, the fountain of true life, by the Spirit. This is the case with respect to elect and regenerate infants, whose is the kingdom of God, and who therefore are reckoned among believers and saints, though unqualified through age actually to believe and practise godliness.

XVII. Moreover, this spirit of a new life will even sometimes exert itself in vital actions, in those who have received it in their infancy, as they gradually advance in years, and are qualified to raise their thoughts above the objects of sense. Accordingly it has often been observed, that, in children of five or six years of age, some small sparks of piety and devotion have shone forth in holy longings, ardent little prayers, and in a certain extraordinary tenderness of conscience, not daring to do any thing with respect to God, themselves, or their neighbour, which they have been taught to be displeasing to God: as also it appears in their discourses concerning God and Christ, which have been full of a holy and unfeigned love and breathing, of a heavenly nature, which I have not words to express. Thus sometimes God is pleased, "out of the mouths of babes and

sucklings to ordain strength." Ps. 8:2. This has been especially observed in some dying children, to the great astonishment of all present.

XVIII. But when the foundation is laid, divine grace does not always grow up in the same manner. It often happens, that this principle of spiritual life, which had discovered its activity in the most tender childhood, according to, and sometimes above, the age of the person, God, in his singular grace, preceding the full maturity of the natural faculties, grows up by degrees with the person, after the example of our Lord, who "increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man," Luke 2:52; and of John the Baptist, who "grew and waxed strong in spirit." Luke 1:80. Such persons make continual progress in the way of sanctification, and grow insensibly "unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Eph. 4:13. We have an illustrious example of this in Timothy, "who from a child had known the Holy Scriptures," 2 Tim. 3:15; and who, in his tender youth, to Paul's exceeding joy, had given evident signs of an unfeigned faith, with tears of the most tender piety bursting out at times, 2 Tim. 1:4, 5.

XIX. On the other hand, sometimes these sparks of piety, especially which more sparingly shone forth in childhood, when in a manner covered with the ashes of worldly vanities, and carnal pleasures of youth, will appear to be almost extinguished. The allurements of the deceitful flesh, and the sorceries of a tempting world, assaulting the unadvised unwary heart with its deceitful pleasures, almost stifle those small beginnings of piety; and for months, sometimes for years together, so violently overpower them, that all their attempts against them seem to be in vain. Yet there are still, in these persons, remorse of conscience, awakening them at times, languid resolutions, and vanishing purposes, of reforming their lives, till, by the infinite efficacy of divine grace, insinuating into the languid and decaying breast, they awake as from a deep sleep, and, with the greatest sorrow for their past life, and utmost seriousness, apply to the careful practice of piety; the warmth of their zeal then breaks forth, being exceedingly desirous to show, by brighter flames, its having been unwillingly kept smothered under the ashes. Augustine has given us, in his own person, a representation of this state, in the excellent book of his confessions.

XX. But the elect are not all favoured with regenerating grace in their infancy. There are some adult persons whom God regenerates, and at once effectually calls, and converts, in the second act, from a worldly and hypocritical condition, or even from a state of profligate wickedness. Thus it is with those, who are born and brought up without God's covenant, or even of those, who, living where this covenant is dispensed, have sold themselves wholly to sin, Satan, and the world. The regeneration of these is usually followed with great consternation of soul, and sorrow for sin, with a dread of God's fiery indignation, and incredible desires after grace, together with an inexpressible joy, upon finding salvation in Jesus, and a wonderful alacrity in the service of the Lord, which they can scarcely contain. All this may be observed in the jailer, of whom we read, Acts 16.

XXI. On this depends the solution of that question, whether we are to look upon any as born again, but those who can specify the time, manner, and progress of their regeneration. None, indeed, are here to be flattered, or soothed, as to think it lawful for them securely to presume on their regeneration: but then the consciences of believers are not to be racked with too severe a scrupulosity. We cannot determine this point without a distinction: we have just shown, that the

progress of regeneration is various. Adult persons, who are brought altogether from a carnal to a spiritual life, indeed may, and ought exactly to know the beginning and manner of so great a change. They who, though regenerated in infancy, have yet been carried away by the entanglements of the world, and for some time have struggled, as it were, with destruction, but afterwards have been roused by the grace of God, made to renounce the world, and give themselves wholly to piety, such as we described, sect. 17, may, and it is their duty to recollect, not so much the beginning of their very first regeneration, as the process of that actual and thorough conversion. But it would be wrong to require those, who being regenerated in their infancy, have grown up all along with the quickening Spirit, to declare the time and manner of their passage from death to life. It is sufficient, if they can comfort themselves, and edify others, with the fruits of regeneration, and the constant tenour of a pious life. It is, however, the duty of all to recollect, not in a careless manner, the operations of the Spirit of grace on their hearts; which is highly useful, both for our glorifying God, and for our own comfort and excitement to every duty.

XXII. There cannot be the least doubt of God's being the author of our regeneration. For we become his sons by regeneration, being born of God, John 1:12. And even in this respect, the sons of God by grace, bear some resemblance to him, who is the Son of God by nature: observing only the difference between the infinite excellency of our Lord, and that dark resemblance of it in us. Why is the Lord Jesus called the Son of God? Because begotten of the Father. Ps. 2:7. Wherein consists that generation of the Father? In this, that "as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." John 5:26. And why are we, in communion with Christ, called the sons of God? Because his father is our father. John 20:17. How is he our father? "He hath begotten us." James 1:18. 1 John 5:4, 11. Wherein does that generation consist? "He hath made us partakers of a divine nature," 2 Peter 1:4. Thus we are even transformed into his likeness, and have upon us no contemptible effulgence of his most glorious holiness.

XXIII. But there is here a special consideration of Christ: Who, as God, is, together with the Father and Spirit, the principal, but economically considered the meritorious and exemplary cause of our regeneration. For when he cast a veil over the majesty of the Son of God, took upon him human form, and came in the "likeness of sinful flesh," Rom. 8:3, he thereby merited for all his elect their advancement to the illustrious dignity of the sons of God; sons, I say, not only by adoption, but by a spiritual and heavenly generation. The holy and glorious life of Christ is also the most perfect pattern of our new life, all the excellence of which consists in a conformity with the life of Christ, who is the "first-born among many brethren," Rom. 8:29. And we may add, that Christ, as the second Adam, is become, not only by merit, but also by efficacy, "a quickening spirit," 1 Cor. 15:45. So that the regenerate do not so much live themselves, as feel, acknowledge, and proclaim Christ living in them, Gal. 2:20; Phil. 1:21.

XXIV. What Christ declares of the Spirit, the author of regeneration, deserves our consideration. John 3:5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Here interpreters inquire what we are to understand by water, and what by the Spirit? There is one who, by water understands the origin of our natural birth; comparing with this place what we have Isa. 48:1, where the Israelites are said to have come forth out of "the waters of Judah;" and Ps. 68:26, "from the fountain of Israel;" and then the meaning will be; besides that



birth, whereby we are born men, there is still another requisite, whereby we are born the sons of God, which appears both simple and agreeable to Scripture language. There is another who understands by water, Christ's obedience; we doubt not but that is the meritorious cause of our regeneration; but we question whether it is ever called water in Scripture; for no such thing appears from the Scriptures they bring to prove it, Heb. 10:22; 1 John 5:6, 8; Ezek. 36:25. By water, in these places, we are more properly to understand the Holy Spirit with his operations. And it is evident our Lord himself explains the passage in Ezekiel in this manner. The common explication, therefore, is to be preferred, that one and the same thing is meant by water and the Spirit, as it is by the Spirit and fire, Matt. 3:11. For nothing is more common in the sacred writings than to represent the Holy Spirit under the emblem of water. See among other passages, Isa. 44:3, "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods among the dry ground; I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed:" where the former figurative expression is explained by the subsequent one, which is plain.

XXV. The seed of regeneration is the word of God. For thus: 1 Pet, 1:23, "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible," διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ, καὶ μένοντος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα which may be translated, "by the word of God, who liveth and abideth for ever;" or, "by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." But this seed does not operate always in the same manner: for adult persons are born again by the word of God laying before them the deformity, horror, and misery of their natural life, or rather of their living death; and at the same time, the excellence of that spiritual life, of which Christ is the author, fountain, and pattern; pressing them also, by the most powerful exhortations, that, denying all carnal lusts and appetites, they may give themselves up to be new moulded and formed by the Spirit of God. And in this manner the word is to them a moral instrument of regeneration, by teaching and persuasion. But the case is otherwise with elect infants, being incapable of teaching and persuasion. If they also be thought to be regenerated by the seed of the word, it is to be understood, not of the word externally propounded, which they understand not, but of the truths contained in the word, the efficacy of which is imprinted by the Holy Spirit upon their minds, which they will come to the actual knowledge of when they grow up, but the word operates effectually in none, unless when impregnated by the efficacy of the Spirit. To the external world must be added the internal, which is no less effectual than that word of God whereby he commanded light to shine out of darkness.

XXVI. It is therefore incumbent on every person who would not profanely despise his salvation, diligently to read, hear, and meditate on the word of God, and constantly attend on the public worship and assemblies of his people. For though, before his regeneration, he cannot savingly hear, read, or meditate on the word of God; yet how can he know which may be the happy hour of his gracious visitation; what part of Holy Scripture, what sermon and what instrument the Lord is to render effectual for his regeneration by the supernatural efficacy of his Spirit? Experience teaches this, that men are born again there where the word of God is preached; a thing which is not the case in those parts of the world, which God favours not with the preaching of the gospel. And though we dare not assure any one that if he continues in hearing the word he shall certainly be born again; yet we justly insist upon this, that there is a brighter hope of the wished-for conversion for those who, in the best manner they can, use the means which God has prescribed, than for such as forwardly neglect them. While Ezekiel was prophesying to the dry

bones, behold, a shaking was observed among them, and "the breath (spirit) came, and they lived," 37:7, 10.

XXVII. Let none think it absurd, that we now speak of means for regeneration, when, but a little before, we rejected all preparations for it. We have above sufficiently proved, that none can contribute any thing to his own regeneration; yet God commands every one to "make himself a new heart and a new spirit," Ezek. 18:31: to "awake from sleep and arise from the dead," Eph. 5:14: and to "flee from the wrath to come," Matt. 3:7. And what then? Shall we, insignificant mortals, pretend to reply to God, as if by our sophistry we could catch and entangle the Almighty? Shall we say to what purpose we are enjoined to what none of us can comply with? Shall we exclaim against the counsel of God, and cry out: "Since we can contribute nothing to our regeneration, is it not the best course we can take to put our hands in our bosom, and securely wait till he himself regenerate us?" But would not this be with our vain and carnal reasonings to argue with God, whose foolishness will be ever found wiser than our most exalted wisdom? How much better is it when one hears these commands of God, and, at the same time, is sensible of his own incapacity, to learn a holy despair of self, and in sorrow, anxiety, and a longing desire of soul and in the use of the means, to wait patiently for the coming of the grace of God?

XXVIII. Moreover, when a person touched with an unfeigned sense of his misery, and a sincere desire after his salvation, cries out with the jailer, "What must I do to be saved?" Acts 16:30; even then some pious emotions begin to arise, which proceed from an inward but a very tender principle of new life, and which are solicitously to be cherished. For which purpose it is expedient, 1st, That he frequently, and in as affecting a manner as possible, set before his eyes the most wretched condition of all unregenerate persons, and how himself also, while he continues in the state of nature, has nothing to expect but eternal destruction, a deprivation of the divine glory, and intolerable torments both of soul and of body; and all this unavoidable, unless he be born again in the image of God. 2dly, That affected by this consideration, he cry, pray to, be earnest with God, and not give over crying till he has obtained his grace. Let him often represent himself to himself, as now standing on the very brink of the infernal lake, with the devil standing by him, who, should the Supreme Being permit, would instantly hurry him headlong into hell; and in this anguish of his distressed soul, importune God, and, as it were, extort pardon by the warmest prayers, sighs, and tears. 3dly, Let him, moreover, go on to hear, read, and meditate on the word of God, expecting the farther motions of the Spirit, as the diseased waited for the angel to move the waters of Bethesda. 4thly, Let him join himself in society with the godly, and, in the exercise of piety, endeavour to catch the flame of devotion from their instruction, example, and prayers.

## Chapter VII: Of Faith

I. WE now proceed to explain the nature of true faith in God by Christ, which is the principal act of that spiritual life implanted in the elect by regeneration, and the source of all subsequent vital operations. But it is not any one particular act or habit, nor must it be restricted to any one particular faculty of the soul, for it is a certain complex thing, consisting of various acts, which, without confusion pervade, and by a sweet and happy conjunction, mutually promote and assist one another; it imports a change of the whole man, is the spring of the whole spiritual life, and in fine, the holy energy and activity of the whole soul towards God, in Christ. And therefore its full extent can scarcely be distinctly comprehended under any one single idea.

II. And we need not wonder, that under the name of one Christian virtue so many others are at once comprehended. For as, when any person speaks of life, he signifies by that term something that, diffusing itself through the whole soul and all its faculties, is also communicated to the body, and extends itself to all the actions of the living person: so when we speak of faith, which is the most fruitful spring of the whole spiritual life, we understand by it that which pervades all the faculties, and is well adapted to unite them with Christ; and so to enliven, sanctify, and render them blessed.

III. There are many things both in naturals and morals, which are almost by general consent allowed to extend to the whole soul, without being restricted to any one faculty. In naturals, free-will, which as will is referred to the understanding; as free, rather to the will: so that as Bernard somewhere speaks, "Let man be his own freeman on account of his will; his own judge on account of his reason." In morals, the image of God and original righteousness; which are to be placed neither in the understanding alone nor in the will alone, but may justly belong to both these faculties.

IV. Should we not then at last see every difficulty removed, and the whole of that controversy among divines, about the subject of faith, settled, if, as we justly may, we should refuse that there is any real distinction of understanding and will, as well from the soul as from each other? For what is the understanding but the soul understanding and knowing? What else the will, but the soul willing and desiring? We must on no account conceive of the soul as of a thing in itself brutish and irrational, which at length becomes intelligent and rational, when something else is given to it. What some affirm, that the understanding comes from the soul by a certain kind of emanation, is what we can scarcely conceive. For if the soul, in its proper and formal conception, does not include the power of reasoning, it can never produce it; for we are in vain to expect from a cause what it contains neither formally nor eminently. If the soul is of itself endowed with the faculty of reasoning, no necessity requires that some other faculty be superadded to that wherewith the soul is of itself endowed. The like holds with respect to the will, which is not really distinct from the soul any more than the understanding, but is the very soul itself, as God has given it a natural aptitude to desire good. Since both these faculties are only modally (or in our manner of apprehension) distinct from the soul, so in the same sense they are also distinct from each other. For if the will be so distinct from the understanding as in itself to be blind, it is not possible to explain how it can perceive and so rationally desire the object discovered by the understanding, as good. And for what reason, pray, should we make a real difference between these two? Is it because the object is different? But the object of both is really the same; namely,

a true good, though the manner of our consideration differs. For the understanding considers the good as true; and the will desires this true thing as it is good. And do not the objects of the speculative and practical understanding differ far more among themselves? And yet philosophers generally agree that they are but one and the same power of the soul. Is it because their acts are different? But every difference of acts does not infer a difference of power. Indeed, simple apprehension differs from judgment and discourse or reasoning; which yet are all the acts of the same faculty.

V. This ought not to be looked upon as a new assertion. Scotus long ago maintained, that the understanding and will differed neither among themselves, nor from the soul, in 2 dist. xv. qu. 1. Scaliger, in like manner, whose words we shall not scruple to transcribe from his Exercitat. 307 §. 15: "Although the understanding and will," says he, "are one thing, yet they are distinguished by the manner in which we conceive them. For they are proper and not accidental affections of the soul, and one thing with it. As one, good, and true are the affections of entity or being; nay, one and the same thing with being itself. But they are distinguished from it, and among themselves by definition in this manner: because being itself is placed in the first nature or essence, which nature does in some measure display itself, and is the cause of that one, true, and good. Which is a formality different from the first formality, Because the notion of being is one thing, as it is being, and another, as it is one. For the latter follows and arises from the former; but not without it, for it is one thing. Thus soul, understanding, and will are one thing. Yet the soul denotes the essence; the understanding that very essence as it apprehends; the will, the same with that intelligent essence tending to enjoy the thing known or understood." Thus far Scaliger. Durandus was of opinion, that indeed, the faculties differ really from the soul, but not from each other. An opinion which Vossius is above all pleased with, de Idolat. lib. iii. e. 42. Which is sufficient for our present purpose: as we are not then to separate those faculties, there is no wonder that we place faith in both.

VI. Meanwhile we observe, that among those acts which we are about to describe, there is one principal act, in which we apprehend the very essence and formal nature of faith consists, as it unites us with Christ and justifies us. This is to be carefully taken notice of in the matter of justification, lest any one should look upon some acts of love, which, in different ways, are implied in the exercise of faith, as the causes of justification.

VII. Moreover, we are likewise to maintain, that those things which we shall, for the greater accuracy, explain distinctly in particular, stand various ways mutually connected in the very exercise of faith. While the whole soul is engaged in this work of God, very many actions may all at once tend towards God and Christ, without observing any certain method; and which the believer engaged in this work itself, has neither leisure nor inclination to range in their proper order; nay, sometimes it is impossible to do it. Yet it is expedient that we attend to the natural process of faith, whereby its entire nature and manner may be the more thoroughly perceived.

VIII. The first thing which faith either comprehends or presupposes, is the knowledge of the thing to be believed. This appears in opposition to Popish triflers. I. From express passages of Scripture, which so speak concerning faith as manifestly to intimate, that knowledge is included in its very notion and exercise, Is. 53:11. John 17:3, compared with Heb. 2:4. John 6:69. 2 Tim. 1:3. II. From the nature of faith itself, which, as it doubtless means an assent given to a truth

revealed by God, necessarily presupposes the knowledge of these two things. (1.) That God has revealed something. (2.) What that is to which assent is given, as a thing divinely revealed. For it is absurd to say, that a person assents to any truth which he is entirely ignorant of, and concerning which he knows of no testimony extant worthy of credit. III. From the manner in which faith is produced in the elect, which is done externally by preaching and hearing of the Gospel, Rom. 10:17, revealing that which ought to be believed, with the demonstration of the truth to every man's conscience, 2 Cor. 4:2; and internally by the teaching of God the Father, John 6:45. If, therefore, faith be generated in the heart by a teaching both external and internal, it must of necessity consist in knowledge; for knowledge is the proper and immediate effect of such instruction. IV. From the consequence annexed, which is confession and ἀπολογία, or giving an answer, Rom. 10:9, 10, 1 Pet. 3:15. But it is impossible that this should be without knowledge. Hilary saith well, "for none can speak what he knows not, nor believe what he cannot speak."

IX. But, indeed, it must be confessed that, in the present dark state of our minds, even the most illuminated are ignorant of a great many things; and that many things are believed with an implicit faith, especially by young beginners and babes in Christ, so far as they admit in general, the whole Scriptures to be the infallible standard of what is to be believed, in which are contained many things which they do not understand; and in as far as they embrace the leading doctrines of Christianity, in which many other truths centre, which are thence deduced by evident consequence, and which they believe in their foundation or principle, as John writes concerning believers, "that they knew all things," 1 John 2:20; because they had learned by the teaching of the Spirit, that foundation of foundations to which all saving truths are reduced, and from which they are inferred. But I go a step farther: it is possible that one to whom God, who distributes his blessings as he pleases, has measured out a small degree of knowledge, may yet be most firmly rooted in the faith, even to martyrdom. But then it no ways follows, that faith is better described by ignorance than by knowledge: or that they do well who cherish ignorance among the people as the mother of faith and devotion, contrary to Col. 3:16; for we can by no means believe what we are quite ignorant of, Rom. 10:14. And all should strive to have their faith as little implicit and as much distinct as possible; as becometh those who are "filled with all knowledge," Rom 15:14. For the more distinctly a person sees by the light of the Spirit a truth revealed by God, and the rays of divinity shining therein, the more firm will be his belief of that truth. Those very martyrs who in other respects were rude and ignorant, most clearly and distinctly saw those truths, for which they made no scruple to lay down their lives, to be most certain and divine: though perhaps they were not able to dispute much for them.

X. Moreover, those things which are necessary to be known by the person who would believe, are in general the divinity of the Scriptures, into which, faith must be ultimately resolved; more especially those things which regard the obtaining of salvation in Christ, which may summarily be reduced to these three heads. 1st, To know, that by sin thou art estranged from the life of God, and art "come short of the glory of God," Rom. 3:23. That it is not possible that either thou thyself, or an angel from heaven, or any creature in the world, nay, or all the creatures in the universe, can extricate thee from the abyss of misery, and restore thee to a state of happiness. 2dly, That thou shouldst know Christ, this Lord to be "full of grace and truth," John 1:14, "who is that only name given under heaven whereby we can be saved," Acts 4:12, "and in the knowledge of whom consists eternal life," John 17:3. 3dly, That thou shouldst know, that in order to thy

obtaining salvation in Christ, it is necessary that thou beest united to Christ by the Spirit and by faith, and that thou givest up thyself to him, not only to be justified, but also sanctified and governed by his will and pleasure, "proving what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God," Rom. 12:2.

XI. To this knowledge must be joined assent, which is the second act of faith, whereby a person receives and acknowledges as truths, those things which he knows, "receiving the testimony of God, and thus setting to his seal that God is true," John 3:33. This assent is principally founded on the infallible veracity of God, who testifies of himself and of his Son, 1 John 5:9, 10. On which testimony revealed in Scripture, and shedding forth all around the rays of its divinity, the believer relies with no less than if he had been actually present at the revelation of these things. For when the soul, enlightened by the Spirit, discerns those divine truths, and in them a certain excellent theopropy, or beauty worthy of God, and a most wise and inseparable connexion of the whole, it cannot but assent to a truth, that forces itself upon him with so many arguments, and as securely admit what it thus knows, for certain, as if it had seen it with its own eyes, or handled it with its own hands, or had been taken up into the third heavens, and heard it immediately from God's own mouth. Whatever the lust of the flesh may murmur, whatever vain sophists may quibble and object, though perhaps the soul may not be able to answer or solve all objections, yet it persists in the acknowledgement of this truth, which it saw too clearly, and heard too certainly, as it were from the mouth of God, ever to suffer itself to be drawn away from it by any sophistical reasonings whatever: "For I have not followed," says the believing soul, "cunningly devised fables, when I believed the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but in the Spirit was eye witness of his majesty, and heard his voice from heaven," 2 Pet. 1:16, 18. And this faith is accompanied with ὑπόστασις, substance, and ἔλεγχος, evidence, Heb. 11:1, and πληροφορία, full persuasion or assurance, Rom. 4:21. It will not be unprofitable to consider a little the meaning of these words.

XII. The apostle speaks more than once of πληροφορία, plerophory or full assurance: as Col. 2:2, πληροφορία συνεσέως, the full assurance of understanding, Heb. 6:11; πληροφορία της ελπίδος, the full assurance of hope, Heb. 10:22; πληροφορία πίστεως, full assurance of faith. According to its etymology the word plerophory, denotes a carrying with full sail, a metaphor, as it should seem, taken from ships, when all their sails are filled with a prosperous gale. So that here it signifies the vehement inclination of the soul, driven forward by the Holy Spirit towards an assent to the truth it is made sensible of. Hesychius, that most excellent master of the Greek language, explains it by Βεβαιότητα, firmness. And in that sense, πληροφορία πίστεως, plerophory of faith, is nothing but στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως, the stedfastness of faith in Christ, as the apostle varies those phrases, Col. 2:2, 5; and πεπληροφορημένα πράγματα, are things most surely or firmly believed, Luke 1:1. So firm, therefore, must the believer's assent be to divine truth.

XIII. The term ὑπόστασις hypostasis, substance, is also very emphatical, which the apostle makes use of when he speaks of faith, Heb. 11:1. Nor have the Latins any word that can fully express all its force and significancy. 1st, Ὑπόστασις, hypostasis, denotes the existence, or, as one of the ancients has said, the extantia, the standing up of a thing; in which sense philosophers say, that a thing that really is, has an ὑπόστασις, that is, a real existence, and is not the fiction of our own mind. And, indeed, faith makes the thing hoped for, though not actually existing, to

have, notwithstanding, an existence in the believer's mind, who so firmly assents to the promises of God, as if the thing promised was already present with him. Chrysostom had this in his mind when he thus explained this passage: Ἡ ἀνάστασις οὐ παραγέγονεν, οὐδέ ἐστὶν ἐν ὑποστάσει, ἀλλ' ἡ ἐλπίς ὑφίστησεν αὐτὴν ἐν ἡμετέρα ψυχῇ· "the resurrection does not yet exist in itself, but hope (let us say faith) presents it to, and makes it extant in our soul." A Greek scholiast, cited by Beza, has most happily expressed the same thing: Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ ἐν ἐλπίσιν ἀνυπόστατά ἐστιν, ὡς τέως μὴ παρόντα, ἡ πίστις, οὐσιά τις αὐτῶν καὶ ὑπόστασις γίνεται εἶναι αὐτὰ καὶ παρεῖναι τρόπον τίνα παρασκευάζουσα, διὰ τοῦ πιστεῦειν εἶναι·, "as things hoped for are not yet extant, as not being present, faith becomes a kind of substance and essence of them, making them, in some measure, extant and present with us, in that it believes them to be." 2dly, Ὑπόστασις also signifies a base or foundation, in which sense Diodorus Siculus, quoted by Gomarus, has said, ὑπόστασις τοῦ τάφοῦ, that is, the foundation of the sepulchre. And Calvin's interpretation looks this way, "Faith," says he, "is hypostasis, that is, a prop or possession, on which we fix our feet." 3dly, It also denotes subsistence or constancy, without yielding to any assault of the enemy. Thus Plutarch in Demetrius: Οὐδενὸς ὑφιστιμένου τῶν ἐναντιῶν, ἀλλὰ φευγόντων· "none of the enemy standing their ground, but all giving way." And Polybius, in his description of Horatius Cocles, they feared οὐχ' οὕτω τὴν δύναμιν, ὡς τὴν ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῦ· "not so much his strength, as his firmness and resolution, not to give way." And indeed, there is something in faith that can, with intrepidity, sustain all the assaults of temptations, and not suffer it to be moved from an assent to a truth once known. Now if we join all this together, we may assert that faith is so firm an assent to divine truth, that it sets things future before us, as if they were present, and that it is a prop to the soul, on which it fixes its foot, without yielding to any assault whatever.

XIV. Nor ought it to be omitted, that the apostle calls faith ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων, the evidence of things not seen. But ἔλεγχος denotes two things. 1st, A certain demonstration. Aristotle, Rhetoric. c. 14. says, "Ἐλεγχος δὲ ἐστὶν, ὁ μὲν μὴ δυνατὸς ἄλλως ἔχειν, ἀλλ' οὕτως ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν· demonstration is what cannot possibly be otherwise, but must necessarily be as we affirm." 2dly, Conviction of soul arising from such a demonstration of the truth: as Aristophanes in Pluto, σύ γ' ἐλέγξαι μ' οὐπο δύνασαι περὶ τούτου, "you cannot convince me of that." There is therefore in faith, if it be ἔλεγχος [an elenchus], a demonstration, a certain conviction of soul, arising from that clear and infallible demonstration. But this demonstration of truth rests on the testimony of God, who cannot deceive, from which faith argues thus: Whatever God, who is truth itself, reveals, cannot but be most true, and worthy of all acceptance, though perhaps I may not be able to see it with my eyes, or fully conceive it in my mind.

XV. All this tends to instruct us that the assent, which is in faith, has a most certain assurance which no certainty of any mathematical demonstration can exceed. Wherefore they speak very incautiously, who maintain, there may be falsehood in divine faith, since the proper object of faith is the testimony of God; which is necessarily true and more certain than any demonstration. Nor can any places of Scripture be brought, in which any thing that is not true is proposed to man's belief.

XVI. But we are here to remove another difficulty: if faith is such a certain and firm assent, are those then destitute of true faith who sometimes waver even with respect to fundamental truths? I answer, 1st, We describe faith, considered in the idea, as that Christian virtue or grace, the perfection of which we all ought to aspire after; and not as it sometimes subsists in the subject.

2dly, There may at times be waverings, staggerings, and even inclinations to unbelief, in the best of believers, especially when they are under some violent temptation, as is evident from the waverings of Asaph, Jeremiah, and others about the providence of God: but these are certain defects of faith, arising from the weakness of the flesh. 3dly, Faith presently wrestles with those temptations; it never assents to those injections of the devil, or the evil desires of the carnal mind, nor is ever at rest, till, having entered the sanctuary of God, it is confirmed, by the teaching Spirit of faith, in the contemplation and acknowledgment of those truths, about which it was staggered. There, at length, and nowhere else, it finds rest for the soles of its feet.

XVII. That which follows this assent is the love of the truth thus known and acknowledged; and this is the third act of faith, of which the apostle speaks, 2 Thess. 2:10. For since there is a clear manifestation of the glory of God in saving truths, not only as he is true in his testimony, but also as his wisdom, holiness, justice, power, and other perfections shine forth therein, it is not possible but the believing soul, viewing these amiable perfections of the Deity in those truths, should break out into a flame of love to exult in them, and glorify God. Hence the believer is said to "give glory to God," Rom. 4:20, and to "love his praise" (glory), John 12:43. Above all, the soul is delighted with the fundamental truth concerning Christ. Loves it as an inestimable treasure, and as a pearl of great price: it is precious to believers, 1 Pet. 2:7, yea, most precious. It is indeed true that love, strictly speaking, is distinguished from faith; yet the acts of both virtues, or graces, are so interwoven with one another, that we can neither explain nor exercise faith without some acts of love interfering; such as is also that of which we now treat. This also is the observation of some of the greatest divines before me; as, not to mention others at present, Chamierus, Panstrat. T. 3. lib. xii. c. 4, No. 16; Wendelin, Theol. lib. ii. c. 24. ad Thes. 8. And both of them cite Augustine in their favour, who, asking, What is it to believe in God? answers, "It is by believing to love." See also Le Blanc, a divine of Sedan, in Thes. de fidei justificantis natura, &c. sect. 95. But if any will call this love, according to the gloss of the schools, an imperate or commanded act of faith, he is indeed welcome to do so for us; if he only maintain that it is not possible but the believing soul, while in the exercise of faith, must sincerely love the truth as it is in Christ, when known and acknowledged, rejoicing that these things are true, and delighting itself in that truth: far otherwise than the devils and wicked men, who, what they know to be true, they could wish to be false.

XVIII. Hence arises a fourth act of faith, a hunger and thirst after Christ. For the believing soul knowing, acknowledging, and loving the truths of salvation, cannot but wish that all those things, which are true in Christ, may also be true to him, and that he may be sanctified and blessed in and by those truths: and he seriously desires that, having been alienated from the life of God through sin, he may be again sealed unto the glory of God by free justification, and in that by sanctification. This is that hunger and thirst after righteousness, mentioned Matt. 5:6. And what reason can be given why he, who believes and feels himself a most miserable creature, and is fully persuaded that he can be delivered from his misery by nothing either in heaven or on earth; who sees, at the same time, the fulness of that salvation, which is in Christ, and is assured he can never obtain salvation, unless he be united to Christ; who, from his very soul, loves that truth that treats of the fulness of salvation which is in Christ alone, and in communion with him; how is it possible, I say, that such a person should not seriously and ardently desire to have Christ dwelling in him, seek and pant after this, and indeed with such longings, as nothing short of the possession of the thing desired can satisfy, as hunger and thirst are only allayed by meat and drink?



XIX. This hunger and thirst are followed by a receiving of Christ the Lord for justification, sanctification, and so for complete salvation, which is the fifth, and indeed, the formal and principal act of faith. Thus the heavenly Father freely offers his Son to the sick and weary soul, and Christ the Lord offers himself with all his benefits, and the fulness of salvation which is in him, saying, "Behold me, behold me," Is. 65:1. And the soul, now conscious of its own misery, and with joy and hope observing the fulness of salvation that is in Christ, and earnestly desiring communion with him, cannot but lay hold on and receive, with the highest complacency of soul, that extraordinary blessing thus offered, and thus by receiving, appropriate or make it his own; and by this act, at length, Christ becomes the peculiar property of the believing soul. Thus it lays claim to whatsoever is Christ's, which is offered at the same time with Christ; and above all, the righteousness of Christ, which is the foundation of salvation. And in this manner, by apprehending Christ, he is united to him; and being united to him, he is judged to have done and suffered what Christ, as his surety, did and suffered in his room and stead. And thus it is easy to understand, how we are justified by faith on Christ.

XX. The scripture more than once represents this act of faith in express terms. Remarkable is the passage, John 1:12, "As many as received him," which is equivalent to "them that believe on his name;" and Col. 2:6, "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord:" to which may be added what the Lord has very emphatically said, Isa. 27:5, במעוֹי יחזק, "Let him take fast hold of my strength, or my tower," so as not to let it go. For החזיק, take fast hold of, and שלח, let go, are opposed, Prov. 4:13.

XXI. But because the soul, thus apprehending Christ for salvation, does, at the same time, recline and stay itself upon him, therefore this act of faith is explained by this metaphor also, as Psalm 71:6, "By thee נסמכתי עליך have I been holden up" (stayed). Isa. 48:2, "Stay themselves upon the God of Israel," pretending to and feigning a true faith: נשען "He is stayed," is another term used, Isa. 50:10, "Stay upon his God;" add Isa. 10:20, 2 Chron. 16:7, 8. If you would subtly distinguish this act of the believing soul, thus reclining and thus staying itself upon Christ, from the act of receiving Christ, and make it posterior thereto, I shall not oppose it. Let us therefore call this the sixth act of faith.

XXII. Which we think is very significantly expressed by the Hebrew word האמין, which properly signifies, to throw oneself, in order to be carried, on the truth and power of another, as an infant throws itself to be carried on the arms of its nurse. For it is derived from אמן, which properly signifies to carry: hence אומן, a carrier, a nursing father, Numb. 11:12; carry them in thy bosom, as האמן, a nursing father beareth the sucking child: and האמן signifies to be carried, Isa. 60:4, thy daughters shall be nursed (carried) at thy side. Instead of which it is said, Isa 66:12, תנשאֵר צד על, ye shall be borne upon her sides. And Christ really ישא בחיקו, carries, believers as nurslings, in his bosom, Isa. 40:11; for Moses also uses that similitude, "The Lord thy God bare thee, as a man doth bare his son," Deut. 1:31; "Underneath are the everlasting arms," Deut. 33:27. האמין, therefore, in virtue of its signification, denotes to give up oneself to be carried by Christ, and so to cast himself into his bosom and arms. By which similitude the activity of the believing soul towards Christ is most elegantly expressed.

XXIII. Moreover, when the believer so receives Christ and leans upon him, he not only considers him as a Saviour, but also as a Lord. For he receives a whole Christ, and receiveth him just as he

is: but he is no less Lord than a Saviour. Yea, he cannot be a Saviour, unless he be likewise a Lord. In this doth our salvation consist, that we neither belong to the devil, nor are our own, nor the property of any creature, but of Christ the Lord. Faith therefore, "receives Christ the Lord," Col. 2:6. Nor does Christ offer himself as a husband to the soul upon any other condition, but this, that he acknowledge him as his Lord, Ps. 45:10, 11. And when the soul casts himself upon Jesus, he, at the same time renounces his own will, and surrenders himself up to the will of Jesus, to be carried whithersoever he pleaseth. Whence there is also in faith a humble surrender and giving up oneself, whereby the believer, as in duty bound, yield himself and all that is his, to Christ, who is freely given him. "I am my beloved's, and my beloved is mine," Cant. 6:3; 2 Cor. 8:5, "Gave their own selves to the Lord." Almost in the same form as Amasai, with his companions, gave themselves up to David, 1 Chron. 12:18, "Thine are we, David, and on thy side, thou son of Jesse." And this our surrender to Christ, which we account the seventh act of faith, is the continual fountain and spring of all true obedience, which is therefore called "the obedience of faith," Rom. 1:5.

XXIV. After the believing soul has thus received Christ, and given himself up to him, he may and ought thence to conclude that Christ, with all his saving benefits, are his, and that he shall certainly be blessed by him, according to this infallible syllogism or reasoning of faith: "Christ offers himself as a full and complete Saviour to all who are weary, hungry, thirsty, to all who receive him, and are ready to give themselves up to him: but I am weary, hungry, &c. Therefore Christ has offered himself to me, is now become mine, and I his, nor shall any thing ever separate me from his love." This is the eighth and the reflex act of faith, arising from consciousness or reflection, Gal. 2:20, 2 Tim. 1:12, Rom. 8:38.

XXV. Hence, in fine, the soul, now conscious of its union with Christ by faith, obtains trust or confidence, tranquillity, joy, peace, and bold defiance to all enemies and dangers whatever, a glorying in the Lord, a glorying in adversity; while the soul leans (stays itself) with delight on its beloved; with stretched-out arms throwing itself, or with its elbow sweetly leaning upon him (מרפק signifies according to the Talmudists, the arm-pit), being assured of mutual communion and mutual love, while it sings, "I am my beloved's, and his desire is towards me," Song 7:10; it piously exults and delights itself in its Lord, is inebriated with his love, rejoices "with joy unspeakable and full of glory," 1 Pet. 1:8, and savingly melts at the glowing flames of reciprocal love; in one word, "rejoices in the hope of the glory of God," Rom. 5:2.

XXVI. We shall now briefly comprise, as it were in one view, what we have so largely explained. Faith comprehends the knowledge of the mystery of God, and of Christ in the light of grace, the truth of which mystery the believer acknowledges with full assent of mind, on the authority of the testimony of God. And not only so, but he is also in love with that truth, exults therein and glorifies God; he likewise ardently desires communion with Christ, that the things which are true in Christ, may be also true to him for salvation: wherefore, when Christ is offered to him by the word and Spirit, he receives him with the greatest complacency of soul, leans and rests upon him, and gives and surrenders himself to him; which done, he glories that Christ is now his own, and most sweetly delights in him, reposing himself under the shadow of the tree of life, and satiating himself with its most delicious fruits. This is the "faith of God's elect," Tit. 1:1, an invaluable gift—the bond of our union with Christ; the scale of paradise; the key of the ark of

the covenant, with which its treasures are unlocked; the never-ceasing fountain of a holy, quiet, and blessed life.

XXVII. If any imagines that he speaks more exactly, when he distinguishes these acts of faith, so as to think some of them precede or go before faith strictly so called, as the knowledge of revealed truth, to which some excellent divines add a pious affection of the will towards God; that other acts belong to the very form or essence of faith, as assent, hunger and thirst after righteousness, the receiving Christ as Lord and Saviour, and the soul's flying to him for refuge; and that others are accidental, which agree only to a confirmed and strengthened faith, as the certainty or assurance that Christ is now become mine, and the most delightful reliance upon him as mine, joined with exultation and glorying in him: we see no reason why such a person may not enjoy his accuracy, without any displeasure to us: for we only intended to show, that all these things concur in the full practise and exercise of faith.

XXVIII. From what has been said, it is evident that the faith usually called historical and temporary, though I question the propriety of that name, very widely differs from saving faith, which we have thus far described. They call an historical faith a naked assent to the things contained in the word of God, on the authority of God, by whom they are asserted, but without any pious motion of the will. But since this assent may be given not only to the historical parts of Scripture, but also may extend to the precepts, doctrines, promises, and threatenings, the character historical given to that faith, seems to be too restricted. Unless perhaps it be so called, with respect to the manner in which it is conversant about its object. For, as he who reads histories of transactions, with which he has no concern, barely contemplates them, without being inwardly moved or affected by them; so they who have that kind of faith do only, in an idle and careless manner, observe and think of those things which are taught in the word of God, but do not reduce them to practice: though it is not universally true, that even the most ancient histories, and the things which concern another world, are read without any affection, emotion, and application. It had therefore been better to call this faith theoretic, or a naked assent.

XXIX. Our Lord, Matt. 13:21, calls that a temporary faith, which, besides that general assent, exults in the known and acknowledged truth, makes profession thereof, and stirs up many emotions in the heart and actions in the life, which exhibit some appearance of piety; but for a time only, while every thing is prosperous under the Gospel; but falls off, when the storms of persecution assault it. This is wisely called by our Lord πρόσκαιρος, temporary, or for a while. But as it may, and even does, frequently happen, that, in the prosperous state of the church, men may persevere to the end of their life in this profession of faith and imaginary joy, and in such a course of life, as they suppose to be sufficient for the purposes of piety; so this being a constant but not saving, is not so properly called temporary faith, that being the title which our Lord only gave to the faith of apostates. We might rather perhaps better call it a presumptuous faith.

XXX. But it is needful for our consolation, that we distinctly know, how this may be distinguished from a true, lively, and saving faith, which it boldly, though falsely resembles. And first, there is no small difference in the acknowledgment of revealed truths; to which, as to truths, this presumptuous faith really assents, but as it is destitute of the true light of the Spirit, it sees not the proper form or beauty of these truths, and as they are truths in Christ; it does not observe the perfections of God shining in them; does not rightly estimate their value: when it begins first

to know them, it is indeed taken with the novelty and rarity of them, but neither burns with an ardent love to them, nor labours much to have them expressed in life and conversation, as well as impressed upon the soul: and as often as other things present themselves to the mind, which flatter it with a great pretended show of pleasure or profit, it easily suffers the ideas of those truths, which oppose that advantage, to be blotted out, and almost wishes these were no truths, which, in spite of itself, it is constrained to acknowledge for such. But these things are quite the reverse in true faith, as we showed, Thes. XVII.

XXXI. Secondly. There is a great difference in the application of the promises of the Gospel. For presumptuous faith does not proceed in the right method; it rashly imagines, that the salvation, promised in the Gospel, belongs to itself; but this is either upon no foundation, or upon a false one. For sometimes these persons, without any trial or self-examination, which they avoid as too troublesome, and inconvenient to their affairs, foolishly flattering themselves, proudly lay claim to the grace of our Lord; and securely slumber in this vain dream, without either inquiring, or being willing to inquire, what foundation they have for this their imagination. Sometimes, again, they lay for a foundation of their confidence, either that perverse notion concerning the general mercy of God, and easy way to heaven, of which nothing, that I know of, is mentioned in the Gospel covenant; or an opinion of the sufficiency of their own holiness, because they are not so very vicious as the most profligate: or the external communion of the church in religious worship; or the security of their sleeping conscience, and the pleasing fancies of their own dreams, which they take for the peace of God and the consolation of the Holy Spirit. With these and the like vanities of their own imagination they deceive themselves, as if these things were sufficient marks of grace. But true believers, from a deep sense of their misery, panting after the grace of the Lord Jesus, and laying hold of it with a trembling humility, dare not boast of it as already theirs, till, after a diligent scrutiny, they have found certain and infallible evidences of grace in themselves. It is with a profound humility, a kind of sacred dread, and a sincere self-denial, that they approach to lay hold on the grace of Christ. Nor do they, boast of having laid hold of this, till, after an exact examination, first of the marks of grace, and then of their own hearts. But it is otherwise, in both these respects, with presumptuous persons; who rashly lay hold on what is not offered them in that order (for God does not offer security and joy to sinners, before the soul is affected with sorrow for the guilt of its past sins, and a due solicitude about salvation), and then presumptuously boast of their having laid hold on grace; but they cannot produce any necessary arguments to make the same appear.

XXXII. The third difference consists in that joy, which accompanies or follows both sorts of faith, and that is twofold; 1st, In respect to the rise. 2dly, In respect of the effect of that joy. In presumptuous faith, joy arises partly from the novelty and rarity of the things revealed (for the knowledge of a truth, which is more rare and abstruse gives, delight to the understanding; as the enjoyment of a good does to the will) partly from that vain imagination, that the good things offered in the Gospel, belong to them; of which they have, from the common gifts of the Holy Spirit, some kind of taste, but a very superficial one, affecting only the outside of their lips. But in a living faith, there arises a joy much more noble and solid, from a love of those most precious truths, by the knowledge of which the soul, taught of God, rightly esteems itself most happy; from a hope that maketh not ashamed, and a sure persuasion of its own spirit, with the superadded testimony of the divine Spirit concerning the present grace of God and future glory; and lastly, from a most sweet sense of present grace, and a real foretaste of future glory. And as

the causes of both these joys are so diverse, no wonder, though the effects are very different too. The first makes the soul full of itself, leaves it empty of the love of God, and, by a vain tickling of its own imagination, heightens the sleep of carnal security. But the latter strikes believers with an incredible admiration of the unmerited philanthropy, or love of God to man, inflames them with a mutual return of love to the most kind and bountiful Jesus, and inspires them with a solicitous care, lest they commit any thing unworthy of that infinite favour of God, or grieve the Spirit of grace, who hath dealt kindly with them.

XXXIII. The fourth difference consists in the fruits. For presumptuous faith either sinks men in the deep sleep of security, which they increase by indulging the flesh; or brings with it some outward change of conduct for the better, and makes them, in a certain measure, to "escape the pollutions of the world, through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," 2 Pet. 2:20; or when it operates in the brightest manner, it excites some slight and vanishing purposes, and endeavours after a stricter piety, but does not purify the heart itself, nor introduce new habits of holiness; and whenever either the allurements of the world and flesh, or some inconveniences attending Gospel piety, assault them more strongly than usual, they immediately grow weary in that course of goodness they had entered upon, and return as "swine that were washed, to their wallowing in the mire." By that superficial knowledge of evangelical truth, and of a good, so pleasing and useful, as well as honourable, which is held forth by the Gospel, and which is not deeply imprinted on their minds, they are, indeed, stirred up to some amendment of life: but when the matter stands either upon the acquisition of some present good, or the avoiding some imminent calamity, the ideas of true and of good, which the Gospel had suggested to them, are so obliterated and defaced, that they prefer the obtaining a present pleasure or advantage, or the avoiding a present impending evil, to all the promises of the Gospel and all evangelical piety. But a living faith impresses on the soul, in such deep characters, the image of what is right and good, that it accounts nothing more lovely than, to endeavour after it, to the utmost of its power; it paints in such lively colours the most shining holiness of the Lord Christ, that while the soul beholds it with supreme affection, it is transformed into its image, 2 Cor. 3:18; it so pathetically represents the love of a dying Christ, that the believer accounts nothing dearer than, in return, both to live and die to him, Gal. 2:20; the meditation of the promised happiness is so deeply engraved on his mind, that he is ready, for the sake of it, to try all things, to bear all things, 2 Cor. 4:16–18; and thus it purifies the heart itself, Acts 15:9, in order to the practice of a sincere and constant piety; which, in consequence of a more lively or more languid faith, is itself either more lively or more languid.

XXXIV. Having considered these things concerning the nature of a living faith, and how it differs from that which is presumptuous, let us now further inquire, how a person may be conscious of his own faith. Now that it is both possible and frequent for believers to have a consciousness of their own faith, Paul not only teacheth us by his own example, 2 Tim. 1:12, "I know whom I have believed," but also by that admonition directed to all, 2 Cor. 13:5, "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves." Which admonition would have been in vain, was it impossible for them, by examining and proving themselves, to attain to the knowledge of what they search after. Yea, that it is possible, he expressly enough insinuates, by adding, "know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you?"

XXXV. Nor is it difficult to understand, how this consciousness of faith may arise in believers: for first it becomes them to be well instructed, from the word of God, about the nature of saving faith. Nor is it necessary to harass the minds of the weak with a multiplicity of marks; only let the principal and essential acts of a true faith be explained to them in a simple and clear manner, let the difference between a strong and weak faith be inculcated; between a lively and a languid; between a calm faith, and that shaken by many temptations; and let them be put in mind, that not only a weak, a languid, and a shaken faith is nevertheless genuine and true; but also that, in examining themselves, a weak faith is not to be tried by the idea of a strong faith; nor a languid by that of a lively; nor that which is shaken by the idea of a calm and quiet faith; but that each is to be compared with its own proper idea. This being well observed, let every one examine himself, whether he puts forth acts agreeable to what we have now described. Which none who attends to himself can be ignorant of: as every one is immediately conscious to himself of what he thinks and wills, for this very reason that he thinks and wills it: for faith is an act of the understanding and will.

XXXVI. But some one may, perhaps, reply, if it is so very easy to have a consciousness of one's own faith, whence then is it, that very many believers are tormented with such troublesome waverings about this matter? There is more than one reason for this: 1st, It often happens, that they have either formed to themselves a wrong notion of saving faith, or unadvisedly taken up with what others have as incautiously drawn up to their hand. Thus we have learned by experience, that not a few afflicted souls have thought, that the essence of faith consists in the assured persuasion, and delightful sense of divine love, and in the full assurance of their own salvation. And not observing these things in themselves, they have, by an unfavourable sentence, crossed themselves out of the roll of believers. But these very persons being better informed of the nature of faith, and taught that these things were rather glorious fruits of an established, than essential acts of a true faith, have gradually returned to a more composed mind. 2dly, It also sometimes happens, that believers being tossed with so many storms of temptations, do but little, nay, are unable to distinguish the proper acts of their own souls: for, while they are in that case, they perform every thing in such a confused, such a feeble and inconsistent manner, that, during that disorder, they cannot clearly discern the state and frame of their own heart; while the thoughts of their mind, and the emotions of their will succeed and cross each other with a surprising variety. 3dly, Sometimes too it is difficult, especially in an afflicted state of soul, to compare their own actions with the description of true faith, or, to speak more clearly, to compare the rule with that which they want to bring to it, especially when one has proposed to himself the idea of a lively faith, and finds in himself only a languid one. In that case, it can scarcely be otherwise, but that, when he sees so little agreement, nay, the greatest difference between the two, he must form a less favourable judgment of his own faith.

XXXVII. It is not, indeed, absolutely necessary to salvation, that one should know that he believes: for the promise of salvation is annexed to the sincerity of faith, Mark 16:16; John 3:16; not to the knowledge one may have of his faith. Yet it is nevertheless expedient, that every one should, by an accurate scrutiny, inquire into the sincerity and truth of his faith. 1st, In order to render due thanks to God for this invaluable gift. For if Paul did so often return thanks to God for the faith of others, Eph. 1:15, 16; Phil. 1:3; Col. 1:3, 4; 1 Thess. 1:2, 3; 2 Thess. 1:3, how much more incumbent is it to do so for one's own faith? But he cannot do this, unless he knows that he does believe. 2dly, That he may have strong consolation in himself: for the consciousness of our

faith gives us assurance of salvation; thus the apostle joins these two together, 2 Tim. 1:12: "I know whom I have believed, and I am persuaded he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." 3dly, That with the greater alacrity he may run the race of piety: for he who is assured that he acts from faith, is also assured that "his labour shall not be in vain in the Lord;" and this assurance makes the believer "steadfast, immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord," 1 Cor. 15:58.

## Chapter VIII: Of Justification

I. THAT faith, which we have in the last Chapter treated of, as saving, is usually also called justifying in the divinity schools. And since justification is its first memorable effect, it will by no means be improper to speak of it now, and that with the greater accuracy, as it so nearly concerns the whole of religion, that we stumble not in explaining this article. The doctrine of justification diffuseth itself through the whole body of divinity, and if the foundation here is well laid, the whole building will be the more solid and grand; whereas a bad foundation or superstructure threatens a dreadful ruin. The pious Picardians, as they were called in Bohemia and Moravia, valued this article at its true price, when, in their Confession of Faith, Art. 6, speaking of Justification, they thus write: "This sixth article is accounted with us the most principal of all, as being the sum of all Christianity and piety. Wherefore our divines teach and handle it with all diligence and application, and endeavour to instil it into all." Let us, to the utmost of our power, imitate them in this, beginning with its name.

II. To justify, in Hebrew **הצדיק**, in Greek **δικαιοῦν**, is very frequently and ordinarily used in a declarative sense, and signifies to account, declare, prove any one just. Which is manifest from those places of Scripture, where it occurs as the act of a judge, as Ps. 82:3, "**הצדיק** do justice to (justify) the afflicted and needy;" and this is especially the case when it is opposed to condemnation, as Deut. 25:1; Prov. 17:15; Isa. 5:22, 23.

III. And doubtless this word has such a signification, when God is said to be justified, as Ps. 51:4: "That thou mightest be justified when thou speakest:" that is, that thou mightest be declared, proved, acknowledged to be just, when thou pronoucest sentence. In like manner, Matt. 11:19, "Wisdom is justified of her children:" that is, they who are truly regenerated of God by the Gospel, have accounted the wisdom of God, which the Scribes and Pharisees falsely accounted foolishness, to be, as it really is, the most consummate wisdom, and cleared it from the calumny of folly with which it was branded. In the same sense it is said, Luke 7:29, "All the people and the publicans justified God."

IV. Nor can this word have any other than a forensic signification, when Christ is said to be "justified," 1 Tim. 3:16: and still more fully, Isa. 50:8, where the Lord himself thus speaketh: "He is near that justifieth me, who will contend with me? Let us stand together; who is mine adversary? Almost in the same manner as the apostle speaks of the elect, Rom. 8:33, 34. How was Christ justified? 1st, When the Father declared that he was holy and without spot, according to his mind and will, and even such "in whom he was well pleased," Matt. 3:17, and 17:5. 2dly, When he pronounced him innocent of all the crimes with which he was falsely accused, and for which he was unjustly condemned. 3dly, When he declared that he had made full satisfaction to his justice, and was no longer under the guilt of those sins which, as surety, he took upon himself. The two former acts of justification respect Christ as man; the last, as mediator. And in this view, he is called "the righteous or just servant of God," Isa. 53:11; not only as holy and without sin in himself, but as one who had also fulfilled all that righteousness to which he bound himself by his voluntary engagement, whereby, though he was the son, yet he became the servant of God, and by his resurrection was declared to have performed the whole, and so was exalted to that state, that he might be able to justify many, or procure righteousness for many, by virtue of his own righteousness.



V. But we are not to imagine we have accomplished any great matter, when we have shown that justification is often taken in a forensic or law sense. For scarce any who love to be called Christians have such a bold front or stubborn mind as to deny it. Certainly the popish doctors themselves generally own it: Bellarm. de Justificat. lib. i. c. 1, Becan. Sum. Theol. T. II., Tract. 4, c. 3, Tirin. Controvers. xv. No. 1. Nor do they deny that Paul himself sometimes treats of justification in that sense: Estius, in Comm. ad Rom. 2:13, observes, that to be justified there is the same thing as to be "adjudged, declared, accounted righteous, according," says he, "to the most usual language of Scripture." Which interpretation Ruardus Tapperus also approves, ad Art viii. p. 32. I will do my\* townsman the honour to quote his words. "As to what was aforesaid," says he, "it is to be considered that, in Scripture, to be justified not only signifies to be endowed and adorned with righteousness, but sometimes also to be pronounced, declared, adjudged, allowed, and esteemed just or righteous. According to which interpretation blessed Augustine explains the apostle Paul's expression." The doers of the law shall be justified; "that is," says he, "shall be accounted and esteemed just." In like manner, Cornelius a Lapide, on Rom. 8:33. "It is God that justifieth," thus comments: "It is God that acquits these elect persons; namely, his faithful people and true Christians from their sins, and absolves from the charge brought against them by sin and the devil, and pronounces them just or righteous. The state of the controversy, therefore, between us and the doctors of the church of Rome, is not whether justification be sometimes taken in a forensic or law sense; for that is confessed on both sides.

VI. What then? Are we thus to state the question? Namely, whether the term, to justify, has always in Scripture a forensic sense? But the most eminent protestant divines do not affirm this, and therefore it would be too harsh and inhuman to charge them with prevarication on that account. Beza on Tit. 3:7, thus comments: "I take the term justification in a large sense, as comprehending whatever we obtain from Christ, as well by imputation as by the efficacy of the Spirit in our sanctification, that we may be ἄπιοι, that is, perfect and complete in him. Thus also the term justify is taken, Rom. 8:30. Much to the same purpose Thysius in Synops. Purior. Theolog. Leyden. Disput. xxiii. §. 3: "Nor yet do we deny, that on account of their very great and close connexion justification seems sometimes to comprise sanctification also, as a consequent. Rom. 8:30, Tit. 3:7, &c." I shall add one testimony more, namely, Chamierus Panstrat. T. III. lib. x. c. i. No. 6, who speaks to this purpose: "We are not such ridiculous judges of words as not to know, nor such impertinent sophisters as not to allow, that the terms justification and sanctification are put one for the other; yea, we know that they are called saints principally on this account, that in Christ they have remission of sin. And we read in the Revelations, 'let him that is righteous be righteous still;' which can only be understood of the progress of inherent righteousness; and we deny not that there may be a promiscuous use of the words perhaps in other places."

VII. And indeed, this ingenuousness of these very great men is not to be too much canvassed, who, though they have granted so much to their adversaries, have yet, in the main question, happily triumphed over them. Nevertheless we see no sufficient reasons why they should have been so liberal to them. There had been no violence put on the alleged passages, if in them the term justification should be taken in the sense in which Paul commonly takes it; nor doth it appear that all things would have flowed less agreeably.

VIII. What should hinder us from explaining Rom. 8:30, in this manner? "Whom he did predestinate;" that is, whom by his most free and immutable decree he has chosen to grace and glory, "them he also called;" that is, by his word and Spirit he sweetly invited, and powerfully drew them from a state of sin and misery to communion with Christ, and being endowed with faith regenerated them: "and whom he called, them he also justified;" that is, as soon as they were united to Christ by the Holy Spirit and by faith, he, on the account of the merits of Christ imputed to them, acquitted them from the guilt of sin, and adjudged them to have a right to all the good things of Christ, as well in grace as in glory: "and whom he justified, them he also glorified;" that is, he not only gave them a right but also put them in actual possession of the greatest blessings, 1st, By sanctifying them, and transforming them more and more to his own image, and making them partakers of a divine nature, which doubtless is a great degree of glory. 2dly, By plentifully pouring in upon them the sweetest consolations of his Spirit, which are, as it were, the preludes of joy and happiness. 3dly and lastly, By making them perfectly happy, first in soul, and then in soul and body together.

IX. But we think it far more proper to comprise sanctification under glorification, than to refer it to justification. For it is familiar to the Holy Spirit, to delineate holiness under the names of beauty, ornament, and glory. Thus Ps. 93:5, "Holiness becometh thine house." Ps. 110:3, "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness". Nay, by the very term glory, holiness and righteousness are expressed: Ps. 45:13, "The king's daughter is all glorious within." But what else is meant there by that glory but the genuine holiness of believers? Or as Peter speaks, 1 Epist. 3:4, "The hidden man of the heart in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price:" add Isa. 62:2. "And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory." Where these two words are used alternately one for the other, and justly, for the highest pitch of our glory consists in a perfect conformity to God, 1 John 3:2. But holiness is the image of God, Eph. 4:24; so that saints who accurately express or resemble that image, are on that account called the "glory of Christ," 2 Cor. 8:23. Why then should we not account our conformity to God in holiness, as no contemptible first-fruits of glory? Certainly, Paul calls the progress made in sanctification a transformation, or a being changed from glory to glory," 2 Cor. 3:18.

X. It is plain that with the same propriety, we may understand by justification, Tit. 3:7 absolution from guilt, and an adjudging to eternal life. For, the first work of a man, who is regenerated by the Holy Spirit, is the work of faith, the infallible consequent of which is, the remission of sins; this is either succeeded by, or attended with, the hope of the inheritance of eternal life. What probable reason is there then to make us depart from this sense? And if we would have sanctification contained in any of the words which the apostle makes use of, why shall we not rather refer it to "regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Ghost?" For really, sanctification differs no otherways from the first regeneration and renovation, than as the continuance of an act differs from the beginning of it. And we are sure, that the apostle exhorts the Romans, who had been for some time regenerated, to a progress in sanctification, when he writes, Rom. 12:2, "be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds," and in like manner, Eph. 4:23, "be renewed in the spirit of your mind." As the beginning of this renovation goes before justification, strictly so called, so the progress of it serves to promote the certainty and the sense of justification; and in both respects it was excellently well said by the apostle, that the elect are regenerated by the Holy Spirit shed on them abundantly; that being thus justified by his grace, that is, acquitted

from sin, and conscious to themselves of absolution, they might lawfully, yea, in full assurance, hope for the inheritance of eternal life.

XI. As to Rev. 22:11, "He that is righteous, let him be righteous still," it does not appear that any fuller sense can be put on these words than if we thus explain them: whoever is reputed righteous before God by faith on Christ, should think it his duty or concern to verify by his actions, this his justification before men and to his own conscience; and so by faith and the exercise of it, and by studying the word of God, he may have a more abounding consolation concerning his righteousness. And by this reasoning too, the forensic use of this term is still retained.

XII. Others also allege, 1 Cor. 6:11, "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." But even this testimony does not prove that justification is equivalent to sanctification, rather the contrary. For, after the apostle had said, that the "Corinthians were washed," that is, delivered from the power of sin, he more particularly shows, wherein that washing consisteth. Now the power of sin over man is twofold. 1st, That it compels him to the servile works of wickedness. 2dly, That it condemns him. The dominion is destroyed by sanctification: the power of condemning by justification. Both these are bestowed on the elect "in the name of the Lord Jesus;" that is, on account of his merits, and by his authority and will, "and by the Spirit of our God," who is the author of sanctification, and sweetly insinuates the sentence of justification into the minds of believers. Both these benefits are sealed in baptism, to the washing of which there is here an evident allusion. Nor should it offend us, that sanctification is here put before justification; a diligent enquirer cannot but know, that the Scripture does not always exactly observe that order, as that things first in time are set in the first place. Thus even Peter puts vocation before election, 2 Pet. 1:10. Besides, justification consists of various articles, as we shall show more distinctly in its place.

XIII. However, I cannot conceal that there are two places in which the term הצדיק justify, may seem to denote something more than a mere declaration of righteousness, though that be also included. The first is, Is. 53:11. "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant יצדיק לרבים justify many." It is indeed true, that our Lord Jesus Christ is constituted judge by the Father, and consequently empowered to absolve his elect, who were given him: but here he is not represented as a judge, pronouncing sentence, but as the cause, which, both by merit and efficacy, brings and gives to his own people that righteousness, on account of which, they may be absolved at the bar of God; and the unusual construction of the word with ל, the article, of the dative case, calls for our notice. It is therefore the same as if the prophet had said, "הצדקה יעשה לרבים, he will make a righteousness unto many," that which he himself performed as the cause of righteousness, he will communicate to many; and thus, "δικαιοσύνη, his righteousness, will redound to many, and unto justification of life," as the apostle speaks, Rom. 5:18, which I would have to be compared with this passage.

XIV. The other testimony I hinted at, is Dan. 12:3, where the faithful preachers of the gospel are said to be "הרבים מצדיקו, justifying many." None doubts that it belongs to the office of the ministers of the gospel to publish, in the name of God, absolution from sin to the contrite in heart. But the compass of their function is much more extensive, namely, that by their preaching, example, and prayers, they may bring as many as possible to such a state, as remission of sins may be preached, and that with special application unto them, who, by faith and repentance, are

reconciled unto God, and are diligent in the practice of holiness. The ministry of reconciliation with which they were intrusted comprises all this. They who are diligent in the performance of these things, are said to justify many, because they stir them up to repentance, which is the beginning of righteousness or holiness; to faith, whereby they lay hold on the righteousness of Christ, on account of which they may be pardoned; to the practice of a holy life, which when they prove by their works, they may obtain fuller assurance of their justification by the ministers in the name of God.

XV. We have been the fuller on the signification of this word justify, that, at the same time, we might show the force of various testimonies of Scripture, nothing being more pleasant and useful than the study of this. But when treating of justification, we shall always take that term in the declarative sense. Which being observed once for all, let us now address ourselves to the more distinct examination of the thing itself.

XVI. The declaration of God concerning men, either regards some of their particular actions, or their whole state. The actions of men are considered, either in relation to the rule of the divine will, or in comparison with the actions of others, whether more or less evil. God pronounces absolutely on actions, when he declares them either evil, condemning man in them; as Nathan said to David in the name of God, 2 Sam. 12:9. "Thou hast despised the commandment of the Lord, to do evil in his sight," or good, justifying a man in them; in which sense David, having his eyes intent on the justice of his cause against his enemies, prays, Ps. 7:8: "Judge me, O Lord, according to my righteousness, and according to mine integrity that is within me." Thus God justified Job, when he declared that he "spoke of him the thing which is right," Job 42:8.

XVII. The example of Phinehas is here very memorable, Ps. 106:30, 31: "Then stood up Phinehas and executed judgment; and so the plague was stayed. And that was accounted unto him for righteousness, unto all generations for ever more." The fact of Phinehas was thus: Zimri, one of the princes of the tribe of Simeon, brought into his tent, with an incredible impudence, Cozbi, a daughter of the king of Midian, in the sight of the princes of his people, with an intent to pollute her and himself with whoredom; while Moses, with the whole congregation, stood in tears at the door of the tabernacle, to deprecate the vengeance of God already broke out. Phinehas, son of Eleazar, the high-priest, and himself a priest, could not bear this sight; but being inflamed with a mighty zeal, and moved with the indignity of the action, rushed from amidst the congregation, and taking up a javelin, thrust them both through in the very act of their whoredom.

XVIII. There were many things in this action, which to outward appearance were faulty. 1st, Phinehas was a priest, whom it did not become to imbrue his hands in human blood. For if it brought guilt on a priest, to be expiated by sacrifice, to have touched a dead body, much more to have made a living man a dead carcass. 2dly, He was none of the judges of Israel, whom Moses, at the command of God himself, deputed to punish the guilty, by hanging them up before the Lord, Numb. 25:4, 5. 3dly, He did not observe the due order or course of justice, because he began with the execution. 4thly, The whole seemed to breathe an enraged passion of mind, rather than a zeal tempered with due lenity. For these reasons, Phinehas might be thought to have been guilty of a horrid murder, and, on that account, to have forfeited the honour of the priesthood.

XIX. But it is plain, it appeared otherwise in the sight of God, who pronounced the action right, commending this zeal of his, and declaring, that he was so pleased with it, that therefore he averted his great wrath from the children of Israel. And Phinehas was so far from being divested of the priesthood on that account, that, on the contrary, God adjudged to him and his seed after him a perpetual priesthood, by a covenant of peace that was to last for ever, Numb. 25:11, 12, 13. And this is what David sings, "it was counted unto him for righteousness," that is, it was judged that he had acted in a due and regular manner, and was therefore more worthy of praise and reward, than of blame and punishment.

XX. And as this man was justified in that absolutely, so others are justified in their actions, comparatively, or when compared with the actions of others which are worse. In this sense it is said, Jer. 3:11, "the backsliding Israel hath justified herself more than treacherous Judah." That is, by her works hath showed herself more righteous and innocent, professing according to the sentiments of her heart, and not acting so hypocritically and deceitfully as the prevaricating and dissembling Judah, who would appear, as if she was converted to me, while in the mean time she profanes my name. In like manner, Ezek. 16:31: "Thou hast justified thy sisters in all thine abominations, which thou hast done." Thou hast behaved in such a manner, that, in comparison of thee, they may seem to be innocent.

XXI. Thus much for the declaration of God concerning the actions of men. On the other hand, his declaration as to their state, is of several kinds. For either God considers them as they are in themselves, according to inherent qualities, either vicious through corrupt nature, or holy and laudable through reforming grace; or as they are reputed in Christ the surety.

XXII. God can neither consider nor declare men to be otherwise than as they really are. For "his judgment is according to truth," Rom. 2:2, and therefore they, who are still under the dominion of sin, and walk with delight, according to their depraved lusts, are judged and declared by God to be unregenerate, wicked, and slaves of the devil, as they really are; for "by no means does he clear the guilty," Exod. 34:7; but they who are regenerated by his grace, created anew after his image, and heartily give themselves up to the practice of sincere holiness, are by him absolved from the sin of profaneness, impiety, and hypocrisy; and are no longer looked upon as dead in sins, slaves to the devil, children of the world; but as true believers, his own children, restored to his image and endowed with his life. It was thus he justified his servant Job, declaring, "That there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God and esheweth evil," Job 1:8.

XXIII. And this is still the case of all believers. The devil indeed, who is the accuser of the brethren, frequently charges them with hypocrisy before God, as if they did not serve him in sincerity; and he not only thus accuses them before God, but he also disquiets their conscience, as if all their faith and piety were only a mask and outward show, by which they have hitherto imposed, not only on others, but also on themselves. In order to calm the consciences of believers, when thus shaken by the false accuser, they have need to be absolved from this accusation, and justified from this false testimony before God; which God also daily does, assuring the elect of the sincerity of their conversion, by the testimony of his Spirit, and thereby showing, that the praise of a true Jew is of him, Rom. 2:29. This justification is, indeed, very different from that other, of which we shall presently treat, wherein the person is absolved from

sins whereof he is really guilty, and which are forgiven him on Christ's account. In this we are speaking of, he is acquitted of sins, which he is not chargeable with, and is declared not to have committed.

XXIV. The foundation of this justification can be nothing but inherent holiness and righteousness. For as it is a declaration concerning a man, as he is in himself, by the regenerating and sanctifying grace of God, so it ought to have for its foundation, that which is found in man himself: "He that doth righteousness is righteous," says John, 1 John 3:7; and Peter says, Acts 10:34, 35, "of a truth, I perceive, that, in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with God." And Luke, in the name of God, gives this testimony to the parents of John the Baptist, that "They were righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless," Luke 1:6. But yet inherent righteousness is not the foundation of this justification, from its own worthiness, or because it is a holiness exactly commensurate with the rule of the law, but because it is the work of the Holy Spirit in the elect, which God cannot but acknowledge and delight in as his own, and because the failings with which it is always stained in this world, are forgiven for Christ's sake.

XXV. In this sense we think the apostle James speaks of justification, in that much controverted passage, James 2:21, 24, where he declares, that "Abraham was not justified by faith only, but also by works," and insists upon it, that every man ought to be justified in this manner. For the scope of the apostle is to show, that it is not sufficient for a Christian to boast of the remission of his sins, which indeed, is obtained by faith only, but then it must be a living faith on Christ: but that besides, he ought to labour after holiness, that, being justified by faith only, that is, acquitted from the sins he had been guilty of, on account of Christ's satisfaction, apprehended by faith, he may likewise be justified by his works, that is, declared to be truly regenerated, believing and holy; behaving as becomes those who are regenerated, believing and holy. Thus our father Abraham behaved, who, having been before now justified by faith only, that is, obtained the remission of his sins, was afterwards also justified by his works. For when he offered up his son to God, then God said to him, "Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me," Gen. 22:12. And James insists upon it, that this last justification is so necessary to believers, that, if it be wanting, the first ought to be accounted only vain and imaginary.

XXVI. These things are evident from Scripture: but, lest any, after the manner of the world, should ridicule this, I inform the more unskilful, that this is no invention of mine, but that the most celebrated divines have, before me, spoken of such a justification according to inherent righteousness and of works. Bucerus, in altero Colloquio Ratisbonensi, p. 313, says, "We think that this begun righteousness is really true and living righteousness, a noble and excellent gift of God; and that the new life in Christ consists in this righteousness, and that all the saints are also righteous by this righteousness, both before God and before men, and that, on account thereof, the saints are also justified by a justification of works, that is, are approved, commended, and rewarded by God." Calvin teaches much the same, Instit. lib. iii. c. 17, sect. 8, which concludes with these words, "The good works done by believers, are counted righteous, or, which is the same, are imputed for righteousness." The very learned Ludovicus de Dieu has at large explained and proved this opinion, in Comment. ad Rom. 8:4. And he quotes, as agreeing with him herein, Daniel Colonius, formerly regent or professor of the French college at Leyden. The same is also

maintained by the Rev. Dr. Peter de Witte, that very able defender of the truth, in *Controversia de justificatione adversus Socinianos*. And Triglandius explains the passage of James to the same purpose with us, making use of the very same distinction of justification, in *Examine Apologiæ Remonstrantium*, c. 21, p. 316.

XXVII. Let us now at length proceed to treat of the justification of man as a sinner, but considered as in Christ the surety. As this subject is the foundation of all solid comfort, so it is full of mysteries and perplexed with many controversies: nevertheless it is clearly delivered in the Scriptures, if men would only be satisfied with their simplicity, and not shut their eyes against the light which so freely shines upon them, nor give way to curious niceties, and the roving of a luxuriant fancy. We thus define the Gospel justification of a sinner: it is a judicial but gracious act of God, whereby the elect and believing sinner is absolved from the guilt of his sins, and hath a right to eternal life adjudged to him, on account of the obedience of Christ received by faith.

XXVIII. This is evident that all men, considered in themselves, are abominable sinners before God, and obnoxious to eternal death. Paul before proved both Jews and Gentiles to be all under sin; so that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God, Rom. 3:9, 19. But since, as we observed before, the judgment of God is always according to truth, it cannot be otherwise but that God declare those, who in themselves are sinners and liable to death, to be really so in themselves; yet the Scripture declares that God justifies sinners, that is, acquits them from sin and from being liable to eternal death, and adjudges them a right to eternal life. And unless this were the case, the salvation and hope of all mankind had been at an end. But certainly, God does this agreeably to his truth and justice. It is therefore necessary that they, who are sinners in themselves, should appear in another light to a justifying God, namely as considered in another, whose perfect righteousness may be so imputed to them as, in virtue thereof, they may be reputed righteous. And this is the mystery of our justification in the faith of Christ.

XXIX. After all had sinned in Adam, and come short of the glory of God, the only-begotten son of God offered himself as surety to the Father, and promised, that, at the time appointed, he would fulfil all the demands of the law for the elect. And he also executed this with all fidelity: he was born of a virgin, without any spot of sin, being conceived by the Holy Ghost, and endowed with original righteousness, in order to remove the guilt of original sin, and make up the defect of original righteousness, which the elect are born without. Besides, from his very infancy, and through the whole course of his life, especially at the close thereof he endured all manner of sufferings, both in soul and in body, humbling, nay emptying himself, and being obedient to the Father unto death, even the death of the cross; that he might bear, in their stead, the punishment due to the sins of his chosen people; the dignity of the person who suffered abundantly compensating what was wanting in the duration of the punishment, which otherwise must have been eternal. In fine, he fully performed for his people all that the law required, in order to obtain a right to eternal life. Had the elect themselves, in their own persons, performed what Christ did for them, there is no doubt but they would have obtained that, for which they might have been justified by God, nay, they must have been so, at least according to the covenant.

XXX. Moreover, since whatever of this kind Jesus performed, he did it by a voluntary undertaking with the Father's approbation, in the room and stead of the elect: it is deservedly imputed to them, and placed to their account: just as what a surety pays for a debtor, or in his stead, is accounted as paid by him to the first creditor. Paul, in the fifth Chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, has handled this point in an excellent and divine manner, the sum of which is contained, ver. 19: "As by one man's disobedience many were made (constituted) sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made (constituted) righteous."

XXXI. Moreover, to set the ground of this imputation in a clearer light, we must observe that Christ, according to the eternal counsel of the Father, not only undertook all these things for the elect, and fulfilled them agreeably to his undertaking, but also that the elect, before the righteousness of Christ is imputed to them for justification of life, are so closely united to him by faith, as to be one body, 1 Cor. 12:13, and which is still more indivisible, or indissoluble, one spirit with him, 1 Cor. 6:17; nor are they only united, but he and they are one, and that by such an unity or oneness, in which there is some faint resemblance of that most simple oneness whereby the divine persons are one among themselves, John 17:22, 23. But in virtue of this union or oneness, which the elect have with Christ by faith, they are accounted to have done and suffered, whatever Christ did and suffered for them.

XXXII. Elect sinners, destitute of any righteousness of their own, that is, not having in themselves that for which they have a right to eternal life, are by faith found in Christ, having that righteousness, which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith, Phil. 3:9: and that in this manner—they are acquitted from obnoxiousness to eternal death, on account of the voluntary sufferings of Christ, which were completed by a most cruel and dreadful death. Original sin is pardoned, and the soul presented unspotted before God, on account of his most pure nativity, being conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the virgin. Eternal life is adjudged to be communicated to them in certain degrees of it, on account of the most perfect obedience of his whole life. This is the sum of this mystery, which, being comprehended in a few words, we have thought proper thus to lay before the reader's contemplation, as it were, in one view. But there are not a few things which require fuller explication.

XXXIII. The JUDGE in this cause is God, Rom. 8:33, Is. 43:25. For he is "that one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy," James 4:12. And as he alone has a right and power to inflict due punishment on the sinner, so likewise he alone has a right to acquit him, because he is "the judge of the whole world," Rom. 3:6.

XXXIV. What is in general said of God, essentially considered, is especially appropriated to the Father, considered hypostatically or personally, who is "the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus," Rom. 3:26, and "who was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them," 2 Cor. 5:19. Where the distinction made of God from Christ sufficiently shows, that God the Father is there meant. Reason also requires, that justification be especially ascribed to God the Father. For Jesus Christ, the Son of God, appears in judgment in behalf of the guilty, as surety, as advocate, and in fine, as furnishing them with those evident proofs, by which they may be able to demonstrate that divine justice has been satisfied for them. The Holy Ghost, by working faith in the guilty, makes them to lay hold on and present the surety and his satisfaction in judgment. And in this respect both stand on the side of the guilty. But the Father



acts as Judge, who righteously, and at the same time mercifully, absolves the guilty, on account of the satisfaction of the Son, apprehended by the power of the Holy Spirit.

XXXV. But a certain person has rashly asserted, that the Son and Holy Ghost cannot, for the reasons above mentioned, act the part of Judge, and pronounce sentence; for in the economy of our salvation, the persons in the Trinity sustain various relations, which are to be reconciled with, and not placed in opposition to, each other. He who sometimes is described as surety, is at other times represented as Judge, John 5:27. And indeed, Christ himself claims the power of forgiving sins, Matt. 9:2. And, in the day of the general judgment, himself will peremptorily pronounce the justifying sentence upon the elect. Nor is it inconsistent for one and the same person to be both the meritorious cause of justification, and the advocate of the guilty, and at the same time, the Judge of the cause. All these relations agree in one Christ, and teach us that fulness of salvation which is to be found in him.

XXXVI. The Holy Ghost also hath his own proper office in this matter, for it is he who brings in and seals that sentence of absolution, pronounced in the court of heaven, to and upon the believing soul in the court of conscience, and so pacifies and cheers it; he shows it "the things that are freely given to it of God," 1 Cor 2:12, and "bears witness with the spirit of believers," Rom. 8:16, that they are reconciled to God. Hence it appears, that none of the divine persons is to be excluded from pronouncing sentence.

XXXVII. That thing for which we are justified, and which some call the matter of our justification, is the perfect righteousness of Christ alone; this Christ finished for his elect, "for their sakes sanctifying himself," John 17:19. The Father imputes the same to his chosen people, as he imputed their sins to Christ: "he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him," 2 Cor. 5:21. But it is impossible to explain how Christ was made sin for us, unless in that sense, in which our sins are imputed to him, that he might suffer for them; and we are made righteousness in him in the same manner that his righteousness is imputed to us, that, on account of it, we may receive the crow. It is evident that in Scripture, the righteousness of Christ is called our righteousness; for, he is "the Lord our righteousness," Jer. 23:6: "he of God is made unto us righteousness," 1 Cor 1:30. Now it is ours inherently, or by imputation, for there can be no third way: it is not ours inherently; for, in that sense, Paul opposes it to ours, Phil. 3:9, nor does the nature of the thing admit, that acts, performed by Christ, can inherently be ours. It therefore remains, that it is ours by imputation; God imputing to man righteousness without works, Rom. 4:6.

XXXVIII. Arminius, by his subtlety, frames vain empty quibbles, when he contends, that the righteousness of Christ cannot be imputed to us for righteousness, because it is righteousness strictly speaking; laying this down as a foundation, that what is imputed to us for righteousness, is not properly righteousness. Which none will admit who has considered, that every judgment of God is according to truth; whence it follows, that nothing can be imputed to any one for righteousness, which is not really righteousness. But it is imputed to us, that is, put to our account as if it was ours; for, though it was not performed by us, yet it was performed by Christ for us, and in our room. Nor in doing this, does God judge otherwise than as the thing is; for, he judges not, that we in our own persons have fulfilled that righteousness, which is not true; but

that Christ has so fulfilled it for us, as that, by the merit thereof, we may justly be rewarded. This is so true, that it is the sum of the whole gospel.

XXXIX. And whereas that righteousness of Christ is in every respect complete, and God has acknowledged, that full satisfaction was made to his law to the very utmost, when he raised Christ from the dead, and called him his righteous servant; it is not necessary that any thing should come from us to acquire either freedom from punishment, or a right to life. I add, that it could not in justice be demanded of us; for the least farthing cannot be demanded by the principal creditor, after the surety has paid him in full for the debtor. It therefore appears, that they do injury both to the satisfaction of Christ and to the justice of God, who contend, that any thing is to be done by men, that is to be added to the merits of Christ as the matter of our justification. For if by the satisfaction of Christ, the demand of the law, which prescribes the condition of life is perfectly fulfilled, nothing can or ought to be joined thereto, that the glory may remain pure and entire to Christ alone. If there were but the least thing wanting in Christ's satisfaction, which the law required for righteousness, it would not deserve even the name of satisfaction; nor would Christ have merited any thing, either for himself or for us. For nothing is admitted in this judgment, but what answers all the demands of the law.

XL. The Scripture confirms this truth, when it sets the grace of Christ in diametrical opposition to our works, maintaining, that there can be no mixture of the one with the other. "If righteousness comes by the law," saith the apostle, that is, if, by our works, we can acquire a right to life eternal, "then Christ is dead in vain," Gal. 2:21. And more clearly, Rom. 11:6. "And if by grace, then it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace; otherwise work is no more work." In order clearly to discern the force of the apostle's inference, it is to be observed, that there are but two ways by which we can come to the possession of salvation, according to the two covenants entered into between God and man: either one has a right to life because he has fully satisfied the demand of the law, according to the covenant of works, and to him that thus "worketh is the reward reckoned of debt," Rom. 4:4; or he hath a right to life, because the surety of a better testament has made satisfaction for him, which of pure grace and most unmerited favour is imputed to him, who worketh not, in order to acquire that right, ver. 5, according to the covenant of grace. As these covenants do in the whole essence of them differ, and in this respect are contradistinguished from, and set in opposition to, each other, it is evident they conjoin inconsistencies, who would join together our works with the grace of God, our righteousness with the righteousness of Christ, in the matter of justification.

XLI. And, indeed, the apostle expressly declares, that there is nothing in us which can here come into the account, Rom. 3:24. "justified freely by his grace." In respect of God, it is of pure grace, which, as we just said, admits of no partnership with our works. In respect of us, it is freely, without any thing in us as the cause of it. For the adverb δωρεάν, freely, signifies this: not so much hinting here, that justification is a free gift, as the apostle calls it, Rom. 5:16, (for that the following words denote, τῆ ἀποτοῦ χάριτι, by his grace), as that there is nothing in us by which to obtain it. The Greek word, δωρεάν, freely, answers to the Hebrew תנח, that is, without a cause, which in that case is found to be false and feigned; as Ps. 69:4, "הנם שנאי they that hate me without a cause," which is the same thing as, "שקר איבי, my lying enemies." The former is translated by the Septuagint, or Greek interpreters, μισοῦντες μὲ δωρεάν. Just as John 15:25:

"ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν, they hated me without a cause." In like manner, Ps. 35:7, "ἔκρυψάν, δωρεάν, without a cause have they hid for me their net in a pit." Where δωρεάν does not signify any donation or gift, but the absolute denial of any cause, which could render a man deserving of such treatment. When the apostle therefore says, we are justified δωρεάν, freely, he teaches us, that there is nothing in us, upon which to found the gracious sentence of our justification, or for which we can be justified. Excellently well says the Greek Scholiast: "Δωρεάν, τουτεστιν ἀνευσων κατορθωμάτων, freely, that is, without any merit in thee."

XLII. And this reason may be added, that nothing can avail, in the business of justification, but what is entirely perfect, and can answer the law of God in all things. For in justification there is "a declaration of the righteousness of God," Rom. 3:25, 26. But that requires "the righteousness of the law to be fulfilled," Rom. 8:4. The righteousness of the law cannot be fulfilled, but by a perfect obedience. Chrysostom speaks well on this place: "What is righteousness? It is the end, the scope, the righteous action. For what does the law want, what does it always command? To be without sin." But no person pretends to this, but the presumptuous and the liar, 1 John 1:8. We therefore conclude, that a sinner cannot be justified by any act of his own.

XLIII. The FORM of justification consists in these two acts. 1st, The discharging of unrighteousness. 2dly, The adjudging of righteousness.

XLIV. Unrighteousness or sin has a double power over the sinner. 1st, A power of condemnation. 2dly, A power of dominion. The law asserts both these powers: the former, by declaring him, who sins, to be guilty of death, Rom. 1:32; the other, by giving up the conquered, by a just sentence, to the conqueror, 2 Pet. 2:19. Wherefore it is said, that "the law is the strength of sin," 1 Co. 15:56. Because sin has its power from the law, which pronounces the sinner accursed, and the servant of corruption. Nay, the most holy law of God itself is called by Paul, "the law of sin and of death," Rom. 8:2. Not as if it allowed of any sin, much less commanded it; but because, by its righteous sentence, it gives up the sinner and his children to sin, that it may tyrannize over them as unworthy of the life of God both in holiness and glory. Now sin does this, both by pushing the sinner on to farther degrees of wickedness, and by hastening and aggravating his condemnation. Who can doubt but all these things are justly determined by God against the sinner? Why, then, should not this sentence, which is founded on the law of the covenant of works, be called a law? And seeing sin exercises, according to this law, a dominion over the sinner, and condemns him to death, very appositely and emphatically has Paul called it "the law of sin and death". Sin, therefore, in the judgment of God, insists upon two things against the sinner, that it may condemn him, and for ever have dominion over him; and alleges for itself the righteous law of God. And indeed the law, so long as satisfaction is not made to it, cannot, in this action or process, condemn sin, that is, silence or extenuate its accusation, lay aside its claim, and pronounce it partial or unjust.

XLV. But now the satisfaction of Christ being substituted and apprehended by faith, by which the whole righteousness of the law is fulfilled, the man is then justified, and sin condemned, both its claims being rejected. God declares, 1st, That there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, that all their sins are pardoned, and that none of them shall avail to condemnation; because the surety has, in the fullest manner, undergone the punishment due to them. And in that respect, forgiveness of sin is called justification, Rom. 4:6, 7. 2dly, That sin shall no longer reign

in their mortal body; for since Christ did also, of his own accord, subject himself to those laws, which were the handwriting of sin, they are no longer under the law of sin, but under grace, Rom. 6:14. This justifying sentence of man, and condemning sentence of sin, are founded on the same law of God, which, if the satisfaction of Christ be set aside, is "the law of sin and death;" but if that satisfaction be supposed, it is "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus," delivering man with a liberal hand. For after Christ has once obeyed "in the likeness of sinful flesh" for the elect, God declares, that every thing which sin could possibly demand was done according to the law, and pronounces a sentence of liberty from sin to those who by faith receive this grace of the Lord Christ, both with respect to its condemning and dominant power, as the apostle, Rom. 8:1, 2, 3, divinely illustrates.

XLVI. This deliverance from the guilt and dominion of sin has, indeed, an indissoluble connexion with happiness; therefore they "whose iniquities are forgiven," are declared "blessed," Rom. 4:7: nevertheless this alone is not sufficient to happiness. For he who now is set free from sin, has not immediately a right to life; as is manifest in Adam while innocent, who, as long as he continued such, had no condemnation to fear, nevertheless had not yet acquired a right to eternal life. It is therefore necessary, that that right be also adjudged to man in justification. Which God does on account of a perfect obedience, agreeably to that promise of the law: "The man that doth these things shall live in them," Lev. 18:5. But what Christ has done for his people, they are accounted, as we have already often said, to have done in their own person. And in this manner "grace reigneth through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord," Rom. 5:21.

XLVII. The MEAN, by which we receive the righteousness of Christ, and justification depending thereon, is faith, and that only. For if there were any thing besides faith, it would by our own works, proceeding from the other Christian virtues. But Paul will have them entirely excluded, Gal. 2:16: "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Rom. 3:28, "Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." All the Christian virtues or graces are contained in these two, faith and love, which comprehend every affection of a pious soul. It is the property of love to give up and offer oneself and all he has to God; of faith, to receive and accept of God freely giving himself to us. And, therefore, faith alone is adapted to receive and appropriate the righteousness of Christ, on account of which we are justified. And this is a truth so certain and clear, that not a few of the doctors of the school of Rome, and they the principal and of greatest reputation among them, have acknowledged it, from the very same passages of Scripture which we have advanced. Titelmannus, in his Paraphrase on Gal. 2, says: "We then firmly believe, that none can be justified before God by the works of the law, but only by faith in Christ." Estius, in like manner: "It is evident, that the particle but is in Scripture often taken adversatively, to denote but only," adding, that all the interpreters, both Greek and Latin, agree in this interpretation, and that it is gathered from what follows, and from Rom. 3:28. Sasbout is also express to the same purpose, who maintains, that Paul's expression is an Hebraism, and that, according to the Hebrews, the negative particle not is to be repeated from what went before: "A man is not justified by works, not but by faith." And he adds: "if you ask, whether it may be rightly concluded from that proposition, a man is not justified but by faith, therefore we are justified by faith alone? we are to say, It may." A little after he adds: "In this our day the Catholic writers can, on no account, bear

that proposition, imagining that there is poison concealed in that particle only, and therefore to be disused. Yet the ancients had no such aversion to that particle, nor Thomas Aquinas: if any, says he, were righteous under the old law, they were not righteous by the works of the law, but only by the faith of Jesus Christ. Paul's true meaning is, not unless by faith, that is, by no merits of our own." Thus Sasbout on Gal. 2:16.

XLVIII. But we are farther to inquire, how faith justifies. Not certainly in that sense, as if God graciously accepts the act of faith, and new gospel obedience flowing therefrom, in the room of the perfect obedience which, from the rigour of the law, we are bound to perform in order to justification; as the Socinians, and Curcellæus, who imitates them in this respect, explains it; understanding by faith the "observance of the precepts of the gospel, which God has prescribed by Christ." For this is to make void the whole gospel. The gospel has not substituted our faith, but Christ's obedience, by which the righteousness of the law is fulfilled, in the room of that perfect obedience which the law required in order to justification. It is also false, that faith and new obedience are one and the same thing. I own that faith is a virtue or grace, commanded by the law of God; and that a believer, by his very believing, obeys God. I likewise confess, that we are to look upon nothing as a true and living faith, which is not fruitful in good works. But yet faith is one thing, and the obedience flowing from it quite another, especially in the matter of justification, of which we now speak, where Paul always contradistinguishes the obedience of all manner of works to faith. For it is a rash attempt to confine to a certain species or kind of works, what the apostle says concerning them all in general. The force of truth extorted from Schlichtingius this assertion: "Faith, in its strict and proper signification, bears the same relation to obedience, as the cause to the effect, as the tree to the fruit, as the mother to the daughter," contra Meisnerum, p. 325. In fine, neither the truth nor the justice of God allow our faith and our obedience, which are imperfect, to be admitted as perfect. For it is the will of God, that the righteousness of the law be fulfilled in our justification, and not that any thing be derogated from it, as we proved sect. xlii.

XLIX. Others think proper to say, that faith is here considered as a condition, which the covenant of grace requires of us, in order to our justification. A certain learned divine of ours, in a volume of disputations lately published, speaks thus: "Nothing can be said with greater probability, simplicity, and more agreeable to Scripture, than that justification is therefore ascribed to faith; because faith is the condition which the gospel requires of us, in order to our being accounted righteous and innocent before God." And a little after: "Yea, since we affirm, that faith alone justifies, we do not intend, that the alone act of believing, taken precisely as it is opposed to acts of love and hope, and distinguished from repentance, is the condition which the new covenant or the gospel requires, in order to obtain remission of sin, and be absolved from them on account of Christ. For the hope of pardon, and love to God, sorrow also for sin, and purpose of a new life; in a word, all the acts requisite to a genuine and serious conversion, are also somewhat necessary, and altogether prerequisite, in order for any to be received into the favour of God, and from thenceforward to be accounted a justified person; yea, that a living faith that works by love, which we affirm alone to justify, includes and implies all these things." And the learned person imagines these are such truths, as the doctors both of the Romish and reformed schools receive with common consent. He also adds: "As often as the apostle affirms, that we are not justified by works, but by faith, he intends nothing else, but that none can, on any account, be justified by such observance of the law as the legal covenant requires, in order to obtain life thereby, and

escape the curse of God: but that God accounts as righteous, and out of mere grace freely forgives all the sins of those, who with sincerity receive the gospel, and from faith perform obedience thereto." These things justly call for our animadversion.

L. 1st, With this very learned person's leave, I doubt whether he can persuade any, who is not altogether unskilled in theological matters, that what he has proposed, is the received opinion of the reformed school. I find nothing of this in their confessions and catechisms; but there is a great deal, which does not differ much from the words of the learned person, in the writings of those, whose unhappy names and heretical principles, I from my very heart believe are detestable to him.

LI. 2dly, When the discourse is about the relation which faith bears to justification, the learned person does not seem with sufficient caution, to repeat so often the act of believing. For, it is well known, that the reformed churches condemned Arminius and his followers, for saying that faith comes to be considered in the matter of justification, as a work or act of ours; whereas, the Dutch confession speaks far more accurately; namely, that "faith is here instead of an instrument, whereby we are joined together with Christ in a partnership or communion of all his benefits." I am well aware, that this is not very agreeable to the learned person, who maintains, that faith can be said to be the instrument of justification no other way, but as it is a kind of condition prerequisite on our part thereto. But when the remonstrant apologists, in order to relieve themselves from that strict expression of our confessions by their softening interpretations, wrote; that faith is therefore said to be the instrument of justification, "as it is a work performed by us according to the command and by the grace of God. For a condition, so far as it is performed, may in some measure be said to become a mean or instrument, whereby we obtain the thing promised on such a condition." Apolog. p. 112 a, the reformed protested, that they were displeas'd with this explication. They deny not, that our master, Christ himself, says, John 6:29, that faith is a work: neither do they refuse that, in the matter of justification, the apprehending and receiving Christ is an act of faith; and that faith ought to be so far considered as active. Yet they deny, that faith justifies as it is an act prescribed by God (for thus it would stand in the same relation with the other works enjoined by the law); but they affirm, that we are justified by that act, as by it we apprehend Christ, are united to him, and embrace his righteousness. Which they usually explain by this similitude: a beggar's stretching forth his hand, by which, at the command of a rich man, he receives the free gift of his charity, is the act of the beggar prescribed by the rich; but it doth not enrich the beggar, as it is an act, but as by this means he applies the gift to himself, and appropriates it or makes it his own. These things are too evident to be obscured by any quibbles or subtleties whatever.

LII. 3dly, Nor do I think it an accurate way of speaking, that faith is the condition which the gospel requireth of us, in order to be accounted righteous and without guilt before God. The condition of justification, properly speaking, is perfect obedience only; this the law requires: nor does the gospel substitute any other; but declares that satisfaction has been made to the law by Christ our surety; moreover, that it is the office of faith to accept that satisfaction offered to it, and, by accepting, appropriate the same. Which is quite a different thing from saying, (as the Socinians and Remonstrants do, and which I know not whether the learned person would choose to say), that, in the room of perfect obedience, which the law prescribed as the condition of justification, the gospel now requireth faith, as the condition of the same justification. Though

some of the reformed have said, that faith is a "condition sine qua non, without which we cannot" be justified; yet they were far from being of opinion, that faith is a condition properly so called, on performing which man should, according to the gracious covenant of God, have a right to justification as to a reward. This is very far from the mind of the truly reformed. See what the celebrated Triglandius has fully, solidly, and perspicuously reasoned against the subtle trifling of the Remonstrants in *Examine Apologiæ*, c. xx., xxi.; and Isaac Junius in *Antapologia*, p. 236.

LIII. 4thly, Neither is it according to the mind of the reformed church, that the acts of hope and love, nay, all those which are required to a true and serious conversion, are included in justifying faith as justifying, and concur with faith, strictly so called, to justification. When the Remonstrants said in their confession, that "faith contains in its compass the whole of a man's conversion prescribed by the gospel; nay, the prescript of faith can here be considered in no other light than as, by its natural propriety, it includes the obedience of faith, and is as a fruitful parent of good works, and the fountain and source of all Christian piety and holiness," c. x. §. 2, 3: the Leyden professors in their censure remarked, that "the adversaries, who write in this manner, and throw off the mask, ascribe to faith the Socinian-Popish faith of justification, which Peter Bertius, a principal asserter of this, found to be the way to popery." And this assertion of theirs they make out by solid arguments. And when the Remonstrant apologist foolishly said, that this his opinion differed not from the common doctrine of the reformed churches, the venerable Triglandius replied, that "it was clearer thin noon-day, that this was too barefaced an assertion." The whole comes to this, that no faith justifies, but that which is living and fruitful in good works; that acts of love and holiness are required a fruits of faith, as testimonies of Christ dwelling in us, as marks of our regeneration, as what go before salvation, and without which there can be no full assurance of it. But that those acts of love, holiness, and conversion concur with faith to justification, and are included in justifying faith, as such, is a strange way of speaking to reformed ears, nor agreeable to Scripture, which always, in the matter of justification, sets faith in opposition to all works whatever.

LIV. 5thly, Some time ago I read in Socinus, before the sentiments of this celebrated person came to hand, the same exception which he makes, that by the works which Paul excludes from justification, is understood the perfect observance of the law, such as the legal covenant requires. For thus he says, *de Servat. P. 4. c. ix.*: "The works to which faith is opposed are not every kind of works, nor taken and considered in every light; but, as we have observed elsewhere, these works denote an absolute and perpetual observance and performance of the divine law, through the whole course of life." But our divines openly declared against this exposition, who contend that all works, however considered, are opposed to faith. The apostle's words are plain, "he that worketh not, but believeth;" and his mind or intention, as Lubbertus has learnedly observed, is to be considered from the state of the controversy then in debate. But the state of the controversy was not, whether a man could be justified by a perfect observance of the law, if there were any one who could keep it perfectly? This none in his senses will deny. Neither was it whether there are many who, since Adam's first sin, have for the whole of their life done nothing amiss, but have attained to every perfection both of parts, degrees, and perseverance? Which none in his right mind will affirm. But the matter in question was, whether the Jews could be justified by that observance of the law, which they were able to perform? They certainly thought, that they could be justified if they only observed the moral law to the utmost of their power, and gave those satisfactions for their failings which the ceremonial law had prescribed. But the apostle

denies this, resting his argument on that maxim, that the righteousness which can be valid at God's tribunal, must be perfect in all its parts: but since none can pretend to any such works, he concludes that no works, of what kind soever, can contribute any thing to obtain justification. The apostle, doubtless, excludes those works in which they commonly trusted, who endeavoured to establish their own righteousness. But it is not credible, that any of them could say, that he kept himself pure, through the whole course of his life, from every, even the least, stain of sin. These things are evident.

LV. But I would not have it wrested to the worst sense, in that I have, in some things, compared the opinion of this celebrated person with that of Socinus and the Remonstrants. It was not with the view, to rank a man, in other respects orthodox, and usefully employed in the service of the church of God, with those perverters of our faith. This of all things is farthest from my mind and manner. But my design was only to warn those under my care, and who may reap benefit by the very learned labours of this person, with considerable increase of knowledge, against these and the like expressions; in which, through a disgust for controversy, and a too eager desire of laying disputes aside, he seems to yield rather too much to our adversaries. Peace, indeed, is to be pursued, but by no means at the expense of truth.

LVI. The genuine opinion of the reformed is this: that faith justifies, as it is the band of our strictest union with Christ, by which all things that are Christ's become also ours, as we explained Sect. XXXI. Or, which is the same thing, as it is the acceptance of the gift offered, rendering the donation firm and irrevocable. And this is what the apostle intended when he wrote, Rom. 4:5, that "faith is counted for righteousness," that is, faith is judged to be that with which the right of demanding the reward is connected; a way of speaking borrowed from merchants: thus in the book of God's accounts there is set down what he hath given to us, and what we are indebted to him. But when in the other page our complete obedience, and the payment of the debt, could not be inserted, what is written there to balance the account? In the first place, our righteousness, or the righteousness of Christ wrought out for us: then our faith,\* by which we receive that righteousness offered to us, and present it to God as ours.

LVII. It is moreover to be observed, that justification, if we take in whatever can be comprised under that name, consists of various articles or periods, which we will describe in the most pointed manner we can. And first, God's sentence of absolution regards either all the elect in general collected into one mystical body, or relates to each in particular. I observe two articles with respect to that general sentence: the first of which commenced immediately upon the fall, when Christ, having entered into suretiship-engagements for elect sinners, obtained by his covenant, which the Father was assured he would most faithfully perform, that Satan should be condemned in the serpent; his right over man, which he acquired by wicked arts, be made void as to the elect; and the elect, on the other hand, who are comprehended under the seed of the woman, be declared, in Christ their Head, no longer friends or subjects, but enemies and conquerors, of the devil. For all these things are contained in the first gospel-promise; which presupposes that suretiship of Christ whereby he took upon himself all the sins of the elect, and on account of which God declared, he never intended to exact them from any of his chosen: because, on admitting a surety, the principal debtor is freed from all obligation to make satisfaction. And this is the first effect of Christ's suretiship, the declaration of that counsel of



God, by which he had purposed to justify the ungodly, and not to impute sin to those who are inserted as heirs in the testament.

LVIII. The other article of this general justification relates to the time, in which God declared that full satisfaction was made to his justice by a dying Christ. Of which Paul treats, 2 Cor. 5:19. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." He, together and at once, reconciled to himself the whole world of his elect; and declared that he would not impute their trespasses to any of them, on account of the perfect satisfaction of Christ. For when he raised Christ from the dead, he gave him a discharge, in testimony that the payment was made; and when he rent the veil of the temple he also tore the hand-writing consisting in ordinances, which till that time loudly proclaimed that payment was not yet made. But who can doubt, that a creditor, tearing the hand-writing or bond, and giving a discharge to the surety, declares, he will not, and even in law cannot, demand any satisfaction of the principal debtor?

LIX. But justification is not confined to these bounds. Besides that general declaration of God, there is also another, applied to every believer in particular. And this again has its distinct articles. The first is, when the elect person, who is redeemed, regenerated, and united to Christ by a living faith, is declared to have now actually passed from a state of condemnation and wrath to a state of grace or favour. For the elect sinner, though redeemed by Christ, and so far reconciled to God, as that He declares he is never actually to be condemned; yet that right, purchased by Christ, is not applied to him till he is regenerated, and united to Christ by faith. Till then he is in "the present evil world," Gal. 1:4; "alienated and an enemy," and "under the power of darkness," Col. 1:13, 21. But immediately on his receiving Christ by faith, God declares in the court of heaven, that he is no longer under wrath, but under grace; though perhaps the justified person may yet be ignorant of it. And in this sense God is said to "justify the ungodly," Rom. 4:5; him who is so in himself, and actually continues such till he is born again, when that faith is freely bestowed on him for which he is immediately justified.

LX. The second article is, when that sentence of God, which was pronounced in the court of heaven is intimated and insinuated to the conscience by the Holy Spirit; so that the believer knows, feels, and experiences that his sins are forgiven. To this David has an eye, Ps. 32:5. "And thou forgavest (or thou hast taken away) the iniquity of my sin;" that is, thou madest me to know and experience this, by speaking to my heart.

LXI. The third article is, when the sinner, being actively and passively justified, is admitted to familiar converse with God, and to the mutual participation of the most delightful friendship. For it may happen, that God may have removed the tokens of his anger from the elect sinner, and given him assurance of it, and yet not directly have admitted him to an intercourse of familiarity: in the same manner, almost, as David had forgiven Absalom's parricide, and declared it by Joab, by ordering his return from Geshur to Jerusalem; yet he did not immediately admit him to court, much less to his presence-chamber, and least of all to the kisses of his mouth, 2 Sam. 14. David himself is an example of this. Nathan had told him, in the name of God: "The Lord hath put away thy sin," 2 Sam. 12:13; and yet for some time he was racked with grievous sorrows, crying out from the bottom of a contrite heart, and a sense of broken bones: "Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving-kindness; according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions," Ps. 51:1. That is, as he explains it, ver. 12, "restore unto me the joy of thy

salvation." This near and intimate access to God, as the author of his most joyful exultation, is the real declaration of his justification. And it is to be observed, that such a declaration is often repeated. [For instance], when a believer happens to fall into some grievous sin, or into a languid and drowsy frame of soul, then his familiarity with God is not a little interrupted; but after he is roused out of that sin or from that drowsy frame by the preventing grace of God, and has been sufficiently exercised with the stings of conscience, then God applies that general sentence of the pardon of all his sins, which was pronounced immediately upon his regeneration, to this particular act or state, and suffers himself to be prevailed on at length to renew this most delightful friendship.

LXII. The fourth article is immediately after death; when God assigns to the soul, on its departure from the body, an eternal mansion in his own blessed habitation, Heb. 9:27: "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment."

LXIII. The fifth and last article is at the last day, which is therefore called "the day of judgment," Matt. 12:36; when the elect shall be publicly justified, and, in the view of the whole world, declared heirs of eternal life. Which justification, indeed, may be called universal, as all those who are to be justified shall appear together before God's tribunal; nevertheless it will be most particular, as every one shall be recompensed according to his works. "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad," 2 Cor. 5:10.

LXIV. Let us briefly explain the whole manner of this justification in the next world. Christ, the Judge, being delegated to that office by the Father, Acts 10:42; 17:32, will pronounce two things concerning his elect: 1st. That they are truly pious, righteous, and holy; and so far this justification will differ from the former: for by that "the ungodly is justified," Rom. 4:5; whereas here God, when he enjoins his angels to summon one of the parties to be judged, says, "Gather my saints together," Ps. 50:5; if, as many suppose, these words refer to the last judgment. See Matt. 13:40, 41, 43, 49. 2dly. That they have a right to eternal life, Matt. 25:35.

LXV. The ground of the former declaration is inherent righteousness, graciously communicated to man by the Spirit of sanctification, and good works proceeding therefrom. For on no other account can any person be declared pious and holy, but because he is endowed with habitual holiness, and gives himself to the practice of godliness. Matt. 12:37, "By thy words thou shalt be justified," that is, be declared just or righteous; because words are indications of the mind, and signs either of the good or bad treasure of the heart. "When the Lord will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart; and then shall every man have praise of God," 1 Cor. 4:5.

LXVI. The foundation of the latter can be no other than the righteousness of Christ the Lord, communicated to them according to the free decree of election, which is succeeded by adoption, which gives them a right to take possession of the inheritance. The very sentence of the Judge himself leads us to this: "Come, ye blessed of my Father," whom, on my account, he freely loved (for in Christ all the nations of the earth are blessed, Gen. 22:18. Eph. 1:3), "inherit"—possess by hereditary right, as the adopted sons of God, who, because ye are sons, are also heirs, Rom. 8:17, "the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world;"—ordained for you from

eternity, whose palace was fitted up in the beginning for that purpose, by the hands of God the Creator.

LXVII. Meanwhile, in this respect, too, there will be room for mentioning good works, for they shall be produced, 1st, As proofs of faith, of the union of believers with Christ, of their adoption, of that holiness without which none can see God, and of friendship with God and brotherhood with Christ. 2nd, As signs of that sacred hunger and thirst, with which they desired happiness, and of that strenuous endeavour by which, not regarding the advantages of this life, and despising carnal pleasures, they had sought the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness: and it is inconsistent with the perfection of the infinitely holy God, to disappoint this hunger and thirst, and seeking after his kingdom. 3rd, As effects of divine grace, to which, the communication of divine glory will answer, in most wise proportion, when shall come to crown his own gifts. For the more abundant measure of sanctification any one has obtained in this life, and the more he has gained by the talent intrusted to him, it is also credible that the portion of glory will be the more exuberant which the Divine bounty hath appointed for him. And in this sense, we imagine, it is so often said in Scripture, that every one shall be recompensed according to his works, not that these works are, on any account, the cause of any right they will have to claim the reward; but as they are evidences of our adoption and of our seeking the chief good, and as they show that proportion of grace according to which the proportion of future glory will be dispensed.

LXVIII. In this judgment, therefore, there will also be grace mixed with justice. Justice will appear, because none will be admitted to the possession of the kingdom of heaven but he who can show, by undoubted evidences, that he is a partaker of Christ and his righteousness. Grace also will appear, because eternal happiness will be adjudged to him who has done nothing to acquire a right to it; because works, stained with so many infirmities, as justly make believers themselves blush, will then be celebrated with so great an encomium by the Judge. And, indeed, the apostle does in express words make mention of the mercy that will be shown on that day, 2 Tim. 1:18, "The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day." It is certainly true, that by mercy is there understood the reward of that mercy which Onesiphorus had shown to Paul; but the reward of our mercy is not reckoned of "debt, but of grace," Rom. 4:4. And as it is not merited on the part of him who receives it, so neither is it due from him who bestows it. For what doth God owe to man, but that of which he hath made himself a debtor to man by his gracious promises; or rather was willing to owe to his own goodness and truth, that man might expect from him a retribution for his holiness? Which debt is not opposed to, but supposes grace; it is to be derived from the "alone gracious will and truth of God the Father, who hath promised an unmerited reward to the labour of obedience which is the duty of all, and will have this to be only due on account of his promise." As becomes a reformed teacher to speak, who returns to his sound mind.

LXIX. Whence it appears, that they do not speak rightly who affirm, that in the "last justification mere justice will take place, without any mixture of grace." It is said, indeed, Heb. 4:10, "God is not unrighteous to forget your work," &c. But that the reward of our works is of mere justice, without any mixture of grace, is language that sounds harsh in reformed ears, and is diametrically repugnant to our catechism, Quest. 63\*. Ludovicus de Dieu, on Luke 1:2, 57, and on Luke 16:19, and on Rom. 3:4, has proved at large, that in the Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic languages, justice and truth denote one and the same notion, and generally are put one for the

other. Thus צדקה, justice, or righteousness, when affirmed of God, in many places denotes his truth. But also אמת truth, is translated by the Septuagint, δικαιοσύνη, justice, or righteousness, Gen. 24:49; Isa. 38:19. And Grævius has proved, that the same phraseology obtained among the ancient Greeks, in his *Lectiones Hesiod.* And what is more suitable than by "the mammon of unrighteousness," Luke 16:9, to understand the riches not true, such as the spiritual and heavenly are, for, ver. 11, the unrighteous mammon is opposed to the true riches. Is not that signification of the word clear from 1 John 1:9, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins;" that is, faithful and true? For who will say that God owes the pardon of sins in justice, without any mixture of grace, to him that confesseth them? So also in the place just quoted: "God is not unrighteous," that is, deceives not in his gracious promises, by which he has adjudged a reward of grace to our labours of love. The celebrated Iac. Altingius gives us an excellent commentary on this place, as follows: "the obligation to the reward depends on the truth of the promiser, who is a debtor to himself, that what he was once pleased, in the promise, to determine the consequence of the work and reward, might always please him in the performance; thus the just and righteous God forgives the sins of the penitent (1 John 1:9), is the justifier of him that believeth," Rom. 3:26. And a little after, "Every consideration of merit, therefore, is at an end; but a debt remains, which justice will have discharged in respect of what God has promised; who, on account of his truth, which is without repentance, or unchangeable, is debtor to himself to perform his promises (Rom. 3:3, 4; Deut. 7:9). This is the justice meant in this place, and God is denied to be unrighteous to forget good works, though he has decreed and promised, out of mere grace and mercy, that recompence." All this is judicious, solid, and orthodox.

LXX. This manifestation of mere justice is not more strongly concluded from that day being called "the day of the righteous judgment," Rom. 2:5. For, 1st, It is there called "the day of wrath." And yet wrath will not be exercised only, without a manifestation of mercy. 2ndly, Even in the justification of a sinner, in this world, there is "a declaration of the righteousness of God," Rom. 3:25; where, notwithstanding, as Paul expressly affirms, ver. 24, and all own, grace has the principal place; so also here, "Grace reigneth through righteousness unto eternal life," Rom. 5:21. 3dly, As God will justly inflict punishments on the impenitent, so in like manner, agreeably to his justice, he will distribute rewards, and show grace to the godly, as we explained, sect. LXVIII. Justice and grace are here not to be opposed, but joined together.

LXXI. What is asserted, Rom. 2:11, viz. that with God there is no "respect of persons," is still less sufficient to confirm this opinion. For because God does all things without respect of persons, does it follow that he exercises no grace? When Peter took notice of the piety and faith of Cornelius, and said, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons," Acts 10:34, did he ever intend, by these words, to deny that grace was shown to Cornelius? A non-respect of persons, excludes, indeed, injustice, and the consideration of these things, which ought to have no place in judgment; but it no ways excludes grace and mercy. These things have been so often confuted, that there is no occasion to consider them again.

LXXII. It is a new opinion and an extraordinary postulatam, to say that the works of those who are to be justified, and according to which they shall be judged, will be "perfect, yea, most perfect, that nothing may derogate from the righteousness of the judgment of that day." It is a certain truth, that the persons then to be justified, will be perfect: 1st, In Christ, on account of his most perfect righteousness imputed to them, Col. 2:10. 2ndly, In themselves, being then perfectly

sanctified; for they who had died before that time are called "just men made perfect," Heb. 12:23; and they who shall, at that day, be alive, "shall be changed," 1 Cor. 15:51, 52, and doubtless, obtain perfect holiness by that change, which the others obtained at death. But that the works which they performed in this life can then be said to be most perfect, is neither consonant with Scripture nor reason.

LXXIII. The scripture declares, that the works which were done by believers in this life, were not without blemish, because they who performed them had the old man still remaining, who mixed and tainted them with some corruption of his own, Rom. 7:22, 23, 24; Gal. 5:15. This is without dispute. But the Scripture nowhere says that these works shall appear otherwise at the last judgment than they did in this life; nay, it asserts the contrary, when it testifies that every one shall be judged "according to that he hath done in his body," 2 Cor. 5:10; but it is certain that the things done in the body were imperfect. It is also contrary to reason, to say that actions, which were imperfect while they were performing and actually existing, should be declared to be perfect when they were no more; and perfect not only in the estimation of God the judge, but also by, I know not what sanctification really perfecting them, when they had no further existence. No doubt habits, which are holy when first infused, are perfected by a further sanctification; but that actions, which were imperfect while they existed, should become perfect, after they have ceased to be, is inconceivable.

LXXIV. Seeing what we are taught in Scripture concerning the perfection of believers by a progressive sanctification, and the death of the body, regards their persons, about the perfection of which there is no dispute, it is erroneous to apply it to their antecedent works. That God refines those works like gold, purging away all their tin and dross, so as to be altogether pure in his eyes, is an unscriptural fancy. The passages, Is. 1:25, Zech. 13:9, Mal. 3:3, do not treat of works but of persons, nor speak of their absolute perfection, nor have a reference to the day of the last judgment, but relate to the condition of the present life, as will plainly appear to any one who will peruse them; and can, therefore, with no probability be wrested to this sense.

LXXV. Indeed, the good works of those who die (in the Lord) are said to follow them, Rev. 14:13; but they are such as they were performed here, and they follow, not in themselves, but in their fruits and effects; in so far as God, in regard of their good works, does good to the pious even after death. For this end it is not requisite that they be perfect; it is sufficient that they be performed in faith, and by the spirit of Christ. I do not remember that the Scripture says that good works shall rise with them. They who speak thus mean no more, at least they ought to mean no more by that phrase, but that, in the resurrection of the just, the pious shall rejoice in the gratuitous reward of their holiness. It is said, indeed, that he who "hath begun a good work in believers, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ," Phil. 1:6. But by a good work is there meant the communication of the grace of Christ, revealed in the Gospel, as appears from ver. 5, which God perfects in certain degrees, till the finishing hand is put to it at the last day. There is nothing in that passage relating to the perfection of our actions, which are already over and gone.

LXXVI. In the last place, if good works are there to appear perfect, there can be no reason why they should not be meritorious. For that is certainly meritorious which satisfies every demand of the law; if merit is to be ascribed to such a work, which when a man does, he is to live therein, according to the law of the covenant of works. It is not required to meritorious works in the sense

now in debate, that they are not due and properly our own, that is, that they are done in our own strength without the grace of God. For the papists themselves readily acknowledged that there are no such meritorious works. But by those meritorious works which are the present subject of dispute, are understood such actions, on performing which one has a right to life. But the only, or at least the principal reason why our works are not meritorious, is what the catechism assigns, because they are imperfect and stained with sin.\*

LXXVII. Nor will the righteousness of the judgment of that day be in the least diminished, though the works of believers, by which they shall be judged, are imperfect. For they will not be mentioned as the causes of their right to claim the reward, to which perfection is requisite; but as effects and signs of grace, and of union with Christ, and of a living faith, and of justification by faith, and of a right to life, for which their unfeigned sincerity is sufficient. We, therefore, conclude, that the justification in the next world is not to be so very much distinguished from the justification in this world.

LXXVIII. As this doctrine of free justification, on account of the righteousness of Christ, apprehended by faith alone, is founded on clear testimonies of Scripture, so it proves itself to every pious conscience, by its most excellent uses and fruits.

LXXIX. 1st, It tends much to display the glory of God, whose most exalted perfections shine forth with an eminent lustre in this matter. It sets forth the infinite goodness of God, by which he was inclined to procure salvation freely for lost and miserable man, "To the praise of the glory of his grace," Eph. 1:6. It displays also the strictest justice, by which he would not forgive even the smallest offence, but on condition of the sufficient engagement or full satisfaction of the mediator, "That he might be just, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus," Rom. 3:26. It shows further the unsearchable wisdom of the Deity, which found out a way for the exercise of the most gracious act of mercy, without injury to his strictest justice and infallible truth, which threatened death to the sinner: justice demanded that the soul that sinned should die, Rom. 1:32. Truth had pronounced, "Cursed is he that continueth not in all things," Deut. 27:26. Goodness, in the mean time, was inclined to adjudge life to some sinners, but by no other way than what become the majesty of the most holy God. Here wisdom interposed, saying, "I will fully satisfy my goodness, and say to mine elect, 'I, even I am he that blot out thy transgressions for mine own sake,' Isa. 43:25. Nor shall you, my justice and my truth, have any cause of complaint, because full satisfaction shall be made to you by a mediator." Hence the incredible philanthropy of the Lord Jesus shineth forth, who, though Lord of all, "was made subject to the law, not to the obedience of it only, but also to the curse; made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him," 2 Cor. 5:21.

LXXX. Ought not the pious soul who is deeply engaged in the devout meditation of these things, to break out into the praises of a justifying God, and sing with the church, Mic. 7:17, " 'Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by transgression?' O the purity of that holiness, which chose rather to punish the sins of the elect in his only begotten Son, than suffer them to go unpunished! O the abyss of his love to the world, for which he spared not his dearest Son, in order to spare sinners! O the depth of the riches of unsearchable wisdom, by which he exercises mercy towards the penitent guilty, without any stain to the honour of the most impartial Judge! O the treasures of love in Christ, whereby he became a curse for us, in order to deliver us

therefrom." How becoming the justified soul, who is ready to dissolve in the sense of this love, with full exultation to sing a new song, a song of mutual return of love to a justifying God!

LXXXI. 2dly, This doctrine is likewise calculated for the humility of the sinner; from whom it cuts off all boasting, that the glory may remain unstained to God alone. "What hast thou, O man, to boast of? What wherewith thou canst stand before the tribunal of God? Good works? 'But all thy righteousnesses are as filthy rags,' Isa. 64:6. If thou leanest on them, they are, Pope Adrian VI. himself being judge, like the staff of a reed, which shall break, and pierce thy leaning hand. Perhaps thou wilt boast of thy faith, as if by the excellency of that thou canst please God. But even that is like a shaken and shattered reed, to which thou canst not safely trust; and whatever it be, it is the gift of God. Phil. 1:29: 'Thou hast received: why dost thou glory, as if thou hast not received?' 1 Cor. 4:7. Thou hast nothing of thine own to present to God. Indeed thou east a great deal of thine own: but it is either sin, or at east what is stained with sin; for which, if thou hast deserved any thing, it is only hell, or that which is worse than hell, if any such thing can be. And canst thou, O most wretched creature, boast of any such vanity? Rom. 3:27."

LXXXII. 3dly, It conduces above all to the consolation of the afflicted soul, bewailing his sins with godly sorrow; whom we may address in this manner, from the very genius or nature of this doctrine: "Indeed, thy sins are both more numerous and greater than thou canst either conceive or express; but 'behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world.' Every thing in thee is infected with much sin; but thanks be to God, the cause of thy justification is not to be sought for in thee: 'We are justified freely by his grace.' Thou hast to do with a most righteous Judge, who will not clear the guilty: but behold Jesus, the surety, who, by a full expiation, has brought it to pass, that he can justify the ungodly, without any violation of his justice. Having such a leader and guardian, approach without fear to this Judge, being assured, that Jesus, thy patron or powerful friend, will so plead thy cause, that thou shalt not be cast. Canst thou not yet venture? What should hinder? Do thy sins, thy nakedness, and thy pollution, affright thee? But take shelter behind Christ; hide thyself in his wounds; wrap thyself in his death and blood; receive, with the hand of faith, the offered fine linen, the righteousness of the saints. Is thy faith itself so weak that thou art ashamed and grieved? But again, thanks be to God, that thou art not to be justified for thy faith, or for any worthiness that is in it; but if it is true and sincere, however weak, it is the band of thy union and communion with Christ. And being united to him, present thyself to God without fear; undauntedly also before the devil, and all who take pleasure to accuse thee. Humbly confess whatever sin may be objected against thee; but add, that they shall no doubt triumph in the judgment, when they shall make it appear that the merits and satisfaction of Christ are not sufficient to atone for and remove them, or thou not suffered to plead those merits of Christ in judgment. I challenge the devil and all his accomplices: 'Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth,' &c. Dost thou believe these things? Thou dost, but with faltering and hesitation. Fight manfully against all the temptations of unbelief, and even now thou shalt receive that white stone and new name written thereon which none knoweth but he who received it; and the hidden manna, which having tasted, thou wilt enjoy thy life in patience, and death in desire." This is comfort indeed: they, who build not on these foundations, are certainly, like Job's friends, miserable comforters. It is memorable, what the reverend Voetius, Disput. ii. p. 754, relates of John Frederick, duke of Saxony, who acquainted Luther that George duke of Saxony comforted his son John in the agonies of death, with the righteousness of faith, desiring him to look to Christ alone, and disclaim his own merits

and the invocation of saints. And when the wife of the aforesaid John (who was sister to Philip Landgrave of Hesse) asked duke George why these things were not thus publicly taught, he made answer, "O daughter, such things are to be said to the dying only." O the force of truth, breaking forth even from the breasts of those who are set against it.

LXXXIII. 4thly, This doctrine is exceedingly powerful to promote godliness. 1. Because it lays, as a foundation, a submissive humility of soul, presuming nothing of itself, without which there is no holiness that deserves the name. 2. Because we teach that no faith justifies but what is the fruitful parent of good works. And can any one really believe, that he who is himself a most unworthy sinner, who is, without any merit of his own, received into the favour of God, delivered from the expectation of hell, and favoured with the hope of a blessed eternity, shall not be in every respect, and by all means, be obedient to so benevolent a Lord? Can he believe that God the Father spared not his own Son, that he might spare this slave: that God the Son bore so many things grievous to mention, and hard to suffer, that he might procure pardon for the guilty, and a right to life: that God, the Holy Ghost, should enter his heart, as the messenger and earnest of so great a happiness, and love those so ardently who had no love for him? Can he then provoke the Father by disobedience? Trample on the Son by his wickedness, and profane his blood? Can he grieve the Spirit, the comforter? Indeed, such a one knows not what faith is, who imagines that it consists in a strong persuasion, destitute of good works. 3dly, Because it teacheth a sublime pitch of holiness, by which a person, laying aside every mercenary affection, can love God and virtue for itself, direct every thing to the glory of God alone, and securely trust him with the free reward of his works. Here now we appeal to the conscience of our adversaries, which is the safer way, whether that which we point out to our people, or what they would have theirs to walk in? We both agree, that without good works none shall be saved. Now whether is it safer to say, do good works with a presumption of merit, or do them with all diligence and energy of soul, because you cannot be saved without them; yet, having done all, own thyself to be an unprofitable servant, and look for heaven as a free gift? If works merit nothing, doubtless he offends God who boasts of his merits. But if they deserve any thing, yet I, though performing them diligently, dare not arrogate any thing to myself from merit: of what detriment, pray, will that humility be? We conclude that a doctrine, whose advantages are so many and so considerable, cannot but be true.



## Chapter IX: Of Spiritual Peace

I. RECONCILIATION stands in close connexion with justification, the consummation of which is a spiritual, holy, and blessed peace: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ," Rom. 5:1.

II. This peace is "a mutual concord between God and the sinner, who is justified by faith; so that the heart of God is carried out towards man, and, in like manner, the heart of man towards God, by a delightful inclination of friendship. God thus addresses the church, when reconciled to him: "Thou shalt no more be termed forsaken, neither shall thy land be any more termed desolate: but thou shalt be called Hephzi bah (my delight), and thy land, Beulah (married): for the Lord delighteth in thee, and thy land shall be married," Isa. 62:4. And the church, in her turn, replies, "I will love thee, O Lord, my strength," Ps. 18:1.

III. This blessed peace pre-supposes that unhappy and destructive war, which the inconsiderate sinner had raised between God and himself; concerning which the prophet says, "Your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you," Isa. 59:2. By sin man lost the favour and friendship of God, and incurred his righteous hatred and displeasure, which "is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men," Rom. 1:18; and is threatened by the curse of the law, Deut. 27:26; felt in the conscience, which trembles at every voice of God, Gen. 3:8, and is the bitter source of all that anguish which is the forerunner of eternal destruction. And on the other hand, man is carried out to a dreadful hatred of God, Rom. 1:30. After sin became his delight, he became an enemy to all holiness, and consequently a most bitter enemy to God, because He is the most unspotted holiness. Whatever wisdom he has, it is enmity against God, Rom. 8:7. He hath joined himself to the devil, under whose banner he fights against God. "He stretcheth out his hand against God, and strengtheneth himself against the Almighty: he runneth upon him, even on his neck, upon the thick bosses of his bucklers," Job 15:25, 26. If any thing is propounded to him out of the law of God, he the more boldly acts contrary to it, Rom. 7:8. Whenever he feels the effects of divine indignation, he, with the most reproachful words, reviles the most holy justice of God, Is. 8:21. And almost goes so far as to wish, that either there was no God, or that he did not punish sin. The first of these tends to destroy the existence of God; the other his holiness, without which (horrid to think!) he would be a wicked spirit. But seeing "God is greater than man," Job 33:12, this war cannot but prove fatal to man. "God is wise in heart and mighty in strength: who hath hardened himself against him, and hath prospered?" Job 9:4.

IV. In this very grievous war, all hopes of an uniting peace seem to be entirely cut off. For it cannot be devised in what manner, either God can be reconciled to man, or man to God. The holiness of God does not suffer him to allow the sinner communion with himself, lest he should seem to be like him, Ps. 50:21. The justice of God demands punishment, Rom. 1:32. The truth of God threatens death, Gen. 3:3. And it is on no account to be expected, that God would make a peace in favour of man, who despises him, to the prejudice of any of his own perfections: for "he cannot deny himself," 2 Tim. 2:13. And man, on his part, is no less averse to peace; for though he will find nothing but ruin in this war, and all manner of good in this peace, yet he is so infatuated, so much an enemy to himself, that he madly hardens himself to his own destruction. Being subjected to the power of sin and Satan, he freely and fully serveth them. These blind the

eyes of his understanding, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ should shine unto him, 2 Cor. 4:4; and so lead him captive at their will, that he neither can nor dare think in what manner he may recover himself out of the snare of the devil, and be reconciled to God, 2 Tim. 2:26.

V. But God, whose understanding there is no searching out, Isa. 40:28, was able to find out a method and way whereby all these difficulties could be surmounted. For he hath a Son, who, being given to be the mediator and surety, made satisfaction to his holiness, justice, and veracity, and thus on his part God is reconciled, 2 Cor. 5:19. Moreover, that Son has a Spirit, far more powerful than the infernal spirit, who, by his turning and inclining efficacy, can expel the hatred of God out of our hearts, and shed abroad the love of God there; to whose guidance and influence if man gives himself up, that blessed peace will be soon procured of which we are now to treat.

VI. Hence it appears, that the rise and beginning of this peace is from God: accordingly it is called "the peace of God;" and God himself, "the God of peace," Phil. 4:7, 9. The Father hath established "the counsel of peace," Zech. 6:13. And therefore it is ascribed to him, as the original of it, that having made peace, he reconciled all things unto himself, Col. 1:20. The Son hath executed that counsel of peace; and, by shedding his precious blood, removed all obstructions, and actually obtained for the elect the grace and favour of his Father, which was long before designed for them. He therefore calls this his own peace; and declares that he gives it, John 14:27; nay, he is called "the Prince of peace", Isa. 9:5, and "King of peace," prefigured by Melchizedek, Heb. 7:2; and "the peace," Mich. 5:5; and "our peace," Eph. 2:14. The Holy Spirit, the messenger of so great a happiness, like Noah's dove with an olive-branch, flies, at the appointed moment of grace, to the elect, and effectually offers and brings home to them the peace decreed by the Father, and purchased by Christ: hence peace is said to be by the Holy Ghost, Rom. 14:17.

VII. The fountain of this peace, and the first cause of it, can be nothing but the infinite mercy and philanthropy of God: and this is the reason, why the apostles, in their Epistles, wishing peace to believers, usually set grace before it, as the spring of that peace. Which is the more evident, because as there was nothing in man that could invite God to make peace with him ("for, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son," Rom. 5:10), so in like manner, God, who is all-sufficient to himself for all happiness, could gain nothing by this peace. The whole advantage thereof redounds to man: the glory of so great a work is due to God alone.

VIII. Man ought surely not to hear the least report of this peace, without being directly carried with the greatest vigour of soul, to obtain it for himself. And though he should be obliged to go to the utmost end of the earth, for instruction in the manner how to procure it, he should undertake the journey with the utmost diligence and readiness. But behold the incredible benevolence of the Deity, who not only in his word sufficiently instructs men in the excellency of so great a blessing, but also fully informs them in what manner they may enjoy it, by putting the word of reconciliation in the mouth of his servants, 2 Cor. 5:19. "I create the fruit of the lips; Peace, peace to him that is far off, and to him that is near, saith the Lord," Isa. 57:19. But this is not all, for he also is the first who sends ambassadors to men to offer peace. Would it not have been inestimable grace, if, after many and solicitous entreaties, he had suffered himself to be at length prevailed upon by us, as Herod, who with difficulty granted peace to the Tyrians after

their most earnest requests? See Acts 12:20. But he not only freely offers, but also solicits and affectionately entreats and beseeches men by his ambassadors, that they would not refuse to be reconciled to him, 2 Cor. 5:20. And though his tremendous majesty has been often scornfully despised, and though he has for a long time addressed himself to their ears by his most alluring invitations, and all to no purpose; yet he does not desist, but again and again presses, over and over urges that affair of peace, and compels with so much gentleness the most obstinate to partake of his friendship and love, Luke 14:23. Such is the infinite goodness of the Supreme Being.

IX. But he does not stop here; for as the word of grace, though preached in the most pathetic manner, actually draws none without the secret operation of the Spirit of God, so he graciously bestows that Spirit on man; who at length opens the eyes of the understanding, that wretched men may see how bad their case is while they continue in that dreadful hostility, and on the other hand what superabundant happiness the peace so often tendered will bring along with it. He tames the wild and savage hearts, and subdues them to the obedience of God and of Christ. First he strikes them to the heart with a view of their sins, and with some sense of divine indignation; upon this, he presents them with some distant hope of obtaining peace; after this, he declares with greater earnestness the loving-kindness of God to the trembling soul; and then excites the greatest longings after the enjoyment of it, and thus, by little and little, he disposes the inmost powers of the soul, to hate whatever is contrary to God, to declare war against his enemies, submissively to entreat his favour, cheerfully to accept of it when actually offered, and give themselves up, without reserve, to be governed by the Spirit, who procures so great a happiness for them. Thus at length the man is translated into such a state, that, all enmity being on both sides blotted out, God lays aside the remembrance of past offences, appears no more as an enemy to him, but, being reconciled, deals with him as a friend: the man, likewise, being grieved for having formerly offended God, now endeavours with all care to please him. And these are the beginnings of the spiritual peace with God.

X. But these are beginnings only; for, no sooner is the man in covenant with God, but he becomes the confederate and the friend of that great King, James. 2:23, John 15:14, 15. The gates of the heavenly palace are set open to him; and free access in the Spirit is granted him at all times, by night or by day. He may behold the King of glory nigh at hand, pour out all the oppressing grievances of his soul into his bosom, confidently make known his stammering requests for a fuller measure of grace; while God, instead of forbidding him, does even, by his condescending goodness, give him encouragement to attempt it. Cant. 1:14. He may often be earnest for the same things, and with a friendly and agreeable importunity wrestle with God (with reverence of his majesty be it spoken!), who condescends, as it were, to solace himself with us, till we have in a manner forced the blessings we stand in need of out of his hands. Moses is an example of this, Exod. 33:12, and following verses.

XI. God also himself sometimes descends from heaven by his grace, and graciously visits the soul whom he loves, and who is filled with love for him, John 14:23; speaks to his heart, Hos. 2:14; displays the riches of his supereminent goodness, and "what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints," Eph. 1:18. He comforts him when dejected, and wipes away his tears with his own hand, Rev. 7:17, and puts them as a precious liquor into his bottle, Ps. 57:8. He gives "beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the

garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness," Isa. 61:3. "Kisses" the soul "with the kisses of his mouth," Cant. 1:2; and if, at any time, she is sick of love, "his left hand is under her head, and his right hand doth embrace her," Cant. 2:6. In fine, whatever good he is possessed of (and what is there he is not?), he liberally communicates all in that time, order, and degree which his wisdom knows to be most expedient. And what will he not give, who gives himself, as "an exceeding great reward?" Gen. 15:1.

XII. Who can doubt, but they who taste this incredible sweetness of divine love do infinitely prefer the friendship of God to all other things? Hence when they gratefully acknowledge the things they have been so graciously favoured with, beyond what they deserve, they carefully avoid every thing unworthy of such friendship, and which may mar such a propense favour of the Deity by any coldness. Whereas they most readily perform what they know to be acceptable to God; and then at length it is they seem to themselves to live, when in the whole tenour of their lives they approve themselves to God. And seeing they know that love deserves love; and that true friendship consists in this, that friends choose and refuse the same things; they stir up all their powers to make returns of love, and submit their will to that of God, and give it up to be swallowed up, as it were, in the divine will, and thus at length, with the King of angels, they bear the sweet yoke of love. "The love of God begets the love of the soul, and attracts it to himself. God loves, in order to be loved. When he loves, he desires nothing more than to be loved again, knowing those to be happy in love who love him. The soul that loves, renounces all its affections, and minds nothing but love, that it may give love for love. And when it has poured out itself wholly in love, what is that to the constant flow of the fountain?" So Augustine piously speaks, Manual c. 20.

XIII. During these transactions in the soul, and while the daily contest of mutual friendship between it and God is renewed, it cannot but enjoy the most delightful peace of conscience. When the conscience discovers the favourable sentence of God concerning man, and intimates the same to itself, and at the same time bears testimony to his unfeigned piety towards God, it spreads a surprising serenity and calm over the whole soul. Consequently, the peace of God necessarily brings with it peace of conscience, and much confidence in God, Rom. 14:7; Eph. 3:12. The soul nowhere reposes itself more comfortably, than in that bed of tranquillity, and in the bosom of Jesus, its loveing, lovely spouse, singing at that time to its adversaries; "Know that the Lord hath set apart him that is godly for himself. I will both lay me down in peace, and sleep; for thou, Lord, only makest me dwell in safety." Ps. 4:3, 8. "I laid me down and slept; I awaked; for the Lord sustained me." Ps. 3:5.

XIV. There is also a friendship with all the other friends of God; not only with holy men, who mutually help and comfort one another by communion of prayers and other duties of brotherly love, Ps. 16:3, and who, without envy, mutually congratulate each other on the gifts conferred on every one in particular, by their common Friend; but also with the blessed angels, who were formerly enemies to man when he was the enemy of God, and kept our first parents from all access to paradise, Gen. 3:24, but now minister to man with the greatest complacency and readiness, Heb. 1:14—"encamp round about him," Ps. 34:7—"keep him in all his ways, bear him up in their hands, lest he dash his foot against a stone," Ps. 91:11, 12, till at the command of God they convey the reconciled soul to the blessed choir of the inhabitants of heaven. And though at present they do not usually appear in a visible form, yet they familiarly surround and

guard the friends of God, avert very many evils, procure good, and acknowledge them for their fellow-servants, Rev. 19:10. On this account the apostle testifies, that believers, even in this world, are come to myriads [an innumerable company] of angels, Heb. 12:22. And can mortals have any thing more glorious, than, next to God, to be admitted into the bonds of fellowship and friendship with these most noble spirits whom the apostle, Col. 1:16, calls thrones, dominions, principalities and powers.

XV. I add, that, peace being made with God, none of the creatures can exercise any acts of hostility against believers, to the prejudice of their salvation. According to the promise, Job 5:23, 24: "Thou shalt be in league with the stones of the field; and the beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee. And thou shalt know that thy tabernacle shall be in peace." Which is repeated, Hos. 2:18: "And in that day will I make a covenant for them with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven, and with the creeping things of the ground." The plain meaning of these passages seems to be this: rocks and stones shall be soft to the friends of God, they shall not hurt their feet; they shall not be molested by any rocky dismal places, where either robbers usually lie in wait, or in which the beasts of the field are harboured. For God so restrains them that they are not able to hurt them, but are compelled to submit and be subservient to hurt them; the ravenous fowls themselves and poisonous reptiles, and they who are emblematically represented by these, as well men as malignant spirits, shall have no power to do them harm, Ps. 91:13, Mark 16:18. It is true, they cannot have any amicable peace with the enemies of God, the world and the devil; and it is certain that they are then most grievously harassed by their persecutions when they cultivate peace with God; nevertheless, all the attempts of hell and the world against them are in vain: "Behold, all they that were incensed against thee shall be ashamed and confounded; they shall be as nothing, and they that strive with thee shall perish: thou shalt seek them, and shalt not find them, even them that contended with thee; they that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of nought." Isa. 41:11, 12: add Isa. 54:14–17.

XVI. And the efforts of their enemies are not only in vain, but without their knowledge and against their will they promote their salvation, and the devils are constrained to bring the friends of God nearer to heaven, from which they themselves shall be for ever banished. Thus the chief master of pride became by his buffetings a teacher of humility to Paul, 2 Cor. 12:7. So true it is, "that all things work together for good to them that love God," Rom. 8:28.

XVII. Abundance of all salutary good things flows from this peace, which the Psalmist, Ps. 144:13, describes to the life. And though it often happens, that the friends of God, as to the outward man, drag a life, which scarce deserves that name, amidst poverty, contempt and diseases; yet since the least good thing they enjoy in all these calamities, is bestowed upon them by the special love of God, is the most noble fruit of the cross of Christ, and gives them to taste the infinite goodness of the Deity, therefore, "that little that a righteous man hath, is better than the riches of many wicked," Ps. 37:16. For he has it from, and with the favour of God, who is the inexhausted fountain of all desirable things. Nay, the very evils with which they are overwhelmed turn to their advantage, for they serve to humble them, to build them up in faith, patience, and self-denial, and wean them from the vanities of the world and carry them towards heaven. Hence in their very adversities they find matter of joy and glorying, Rom. 5:3, John. 1:2.

XVIII. From what we have said the excellency of this peace is easily concluded, which the apostle, Phil. 4:7, describes "as passing all understanding;" it is therefore worthy to be sought after with the utmost diligence, kept when obtained, and renewed when interrupted.

XIX. God indeed graciously tenders it in the word of the gospel; but not as if the sinner is to do nothing before he enjoys the inward sense of it. For this purpose it is necessary, 1st. That he confess that, on account of his very many and very heinous offences, he is altogether unworthy of the peace and friendship of God, and seriously grieve for them, Luke 15:21, Ps. 32:5, 6, Prov. 28:13. 2dly, With sorrow observe and declare that he can do nothing that is able to appease the justly provoked Deity, Mic. 6:6, 7; but put all his hopes in the blood of Christ alone, the application of which depends on the good pleasure of the Lord himself. 3dly, Give himself up humbly to God, thus thinking with himself: "Since without peace with God there is nothing but ruin, I will approach to the throne of grace, humbly begging for pardon and mercy; if he is pleased to reach out his golden sceptre of grace to me, I will eternally praise him; but if in anger he turns away his face, I will confess his justice, and proclaim it worthy of all praise though it should be rigid to my destruction, and say, I will die at his feet without repining." See Esth. 4:16. This absolute resignation and surrender, cannot but be acceptable to God, and salutary to man. 4thly, That he add to his devout prayers, reformation of life; sincerely keep his heart and actions from what he knows to be contrary to God; declare war against God's enemies; will love and do what becomes the friends of God. In this way let him "draw nigh to God, and God will draw nigh to him," James. 4:8.

XX. No less diligent care is necessary to preserve the peace thus obtained, and daily to increase in intimacy with the divine favour and friendship. For this there is required: 1st. A daily exciting of his love to God by devout meditation, both on the divine perfections, on account of which he is most highly amiable in himself, and on his infinite love, wherewith he first loved us, and the inestimable benefits flowing from that infinite love. For God cannot possibly suffer himself to be exceeded in love by man. John 14:21: "He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him." 2dly. Frequent intercourse with God; so that worldly cares being for a little laid aside, and a pleasant retirement sought out, you may, by frequent and repeated exercises of reading, meditation, and prayer, with a modest boldness, obtain familiarity with God, Job 22:21: "Acquaint now thyself with him, and be at peace; thereby good shall come unto thee." It was a fine advice of Jerome to Eustachius, de Custodia Virginitatis: "Let the privacy of thy chamber always keep thee; let thy bridegroom always delight himself within thee; when thou prayest, thou speakest to thy bridegroom; when thou readest, he speaketh to thee: let foolish virgins wander abroad, be thou within with thy bridegroom; because, if thou shuttest thy door, and according to the precept of the gospel, prayest to thy Father in secret, he will come and knock, and say: Behold, I stand at the door and knock." 3dly, The practice of inoffensive and strict godliness, with an attentive watchfulness against the sins that so easily beset us. These things flow from the love of God, and without them none can have familiar converse with him. John 14:23: "If a man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." The exercise of Christian virtues or graces, is that chain of the spouse with which the heart of the Lord is ravished, Cant. 4:9. "The work of righteousness shall be peace, and the effect of righteousness, quietness, and assurance for ever," Isa. 32:7, compare Isa. 64:5. 4thly, Because in this imperfect state of our sanctification it cannot altogether be avoided, but at times the godly may fall, and turn a little either to the right hand or

to the left; they are, in that case, presently to rise from their fall and return to their God, unless they would greatly impair their familiarity with him. When he calls us, "Return, ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backslidings;" we are directly to answer: "Behold, we come unto thee, for thou art the Lord our God," Jer. 3:22. 5thly. It also contributes very much to preserve the sense of the divine friendship, if in all things you commit yourself to the conduct of his Providence, always approving his will towards thee, to be just, holy, wise, and good; and saying with Job 34:12, "Yea, surely God will not do wickedly." In whatever befalls thee give him thanks; and, denying all thy own desires, give up thy will to be swallowed up in his. "Be careful for nothing—and the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." Phil. 4:6, 7.

XXI. Although it is not possible that any who is admitted into peace and friendship with God should altogether fall from it (for the covenant of divine peace, which stands firmer than the mountains and hills, shall never be removed, Isa. 54:10), yet the sense and relish thereof are often interrupted. For, 1st, God doth not always show his pleasant countenance to his friends; sometimes he hides himself, Isa. 8:17; standeth afar off, Ps. 10:1; admits them not into familiarity with him, nor fills them with the abundance of his consolations; he hears not when they call, Ps. 22:2, 3; as if he regarded them not. 2dly, Nay, he thrusts them from him with a kind of contempt, as if a father had disdainfully spit in the face of his daughter, Numbers. 12:14; and "is angry against their prayer," Psalm. 80:4. 3dly. He terrifies them with many sorrows; not only by hiding his face, without which there is no joy, Ps. 30:7, but by his fierce anger going over them, Ps. 88:16–17, Isa. 57:17. 4thly. He seems to deal with them as an adversary, and holdeth them for his enemies, and pursues them, though become like the dry stubble, writes bitter things against them, putteth their feet in the stocks, and setteth a print upon the heels of their feet, Job 13:24–27, 5thly. Gives them up sometimes to be vexed and buffeted by the devil, Job 2:6. After that the light of the divine countenance is set, immediately the beasts of the forest come forth against the soul, the young lions roaring after their prey. Ps. 104:20, 21.

XXII. The reasons of this conduct of God towards his friends are various: some respect God; others, the friends of God. God thus deals with his people: 1st. In order to show, that he is the sovereign Lord, and most free dispenser of his own grace, Matt. 20:15. Thus himself owns that he afflicted chap. Job 2:3, without cause. Not that Job had done nothing to deserve these, or even greater afflictions, but that God had found nothing in him for which to treat him with greater severity than his other friends. This was an act of mere sovereignty, that the works of God should be made manifest in him, as is said in a similar case, John 9:3. 2ndly. Likewise to show the difference between heaven and earth. For here he will have all things subject to various vicissitudes, and accustom his people to the alternate changes of a rough winter and an agreeable spring; because in heaven they are to exult in a constant uninterrupted joy in his friendship and love, Rev. 7:17. 3rdly. That he may the more endear unto them the sweetness of his grace, which, when tasted at intervals, especially after a draught of a cup of bitterness, must be most delicious to the pious soul. 4thly. That he may give a demonstration of the exceeding greatness of his power and goodness, when he preserves the soul in its spiritual life, though oppressed with so many sorrows, restores him to his former vigour, makes him triumph over Satan, and gives it the more abundant comfort, the more distant it was from all the sense of his favour. This is "to show wonders to the dead," Ps. 88:10; and to revive the wounded spirit, which Solomon, Prov. 18:14, declares exceeds any created power.

XXIII. The reasons with respect to the friends of God are two-fold; for either they regard the time past, or the time future. As to the time past, God usually restrains the beams of his favour, 1st, When his friends have been guilty of some grievous sin; for in that case his holiness is concerned, that they feel the rod of his paternal displeasure, and not be suffered then to have familiarity with him, Ps. 51:9, 11, 12. "If they be bound in fetters, and be holden in cords of affliction, then he showeth them their work," Job 36:8, 9; and really, as it were, calls out to them: "Know therefore and see, that it is an evil thing and bitter that thou hast forsaken the Lord thy God," Jer. 2:19. "But they rebelled, and vexed his holy Spirit: therefore he was turned to be their enemy," Is. 63:10. 2ndly, When, abusing the goodness of God, they worship his majesty with less reverence, and begin to flag in the exercise of devotion. 3rdly, When carnal confidence and vain glorying have seized upon them. Ps. 30:6, 7. "And in my prosperity I said, I shall never be moved—thou didst hide thy face, and I was troubled." 4thly, When the offer of divine grace is unworthily entertained through a kind of indolence and drowsiness, Cant. 5:3–5.

XXIV. The following reasons refer to the time to come, 1st, That God may try and exercise their faith, 1 Pet. 1:6, 7; which ought to be in exercise, even when nothing is to be seen; and their love, by which they are bound to love God for himself, though they are not sensible, that they themselves are loved; and the sincerity of their worship, which is not to proceed from a mere relish of the reward, but from an acknowledgment of the divine dignity or authority; and the constancy of their religion, by which they must keep close to God, even when he appears as a stranger to them. 2dly, That he may stir them up to the practice of prayer, in which Heman was fervent at such a time, Ps. 88:1, "O Lord God of my salvation, I have cried day and night, before thee;" see also ver. 9 and 13. 3dly, That he may instruct and bring his people to true wisdom; for this distress gives excellent understanding: "tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience," Rom. 5:3, 4. Heman was early introduced into this school, and such hard exercises were put upon him, that he was almost distracted; yet at length he made so great a proficiency, as to be reckoned among the wisest in his day, 1 Kings 4:31. 4thly, That they may, for the future, more carefully preserve the divine favour, when they have once recovered it. When the spouse at last found her beloved, who had withdrawn himself, "she held him," kept him fast, "and would not let him go, until she had brought him into her mother's house, into the chamber of her that conceived her," Cant. 3:4.

XXV. But what course is the soul now to take, in order to renew the interrupted friendship of God? For we are not to think that God will be angry with his people for ever, "For I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made," says the Lord, Isa. 57:16; see Isa. 54:8. And, 1st, We are, in order to this, carefully to inquire into the cause of this estrangement, that it may be removed; for generally we have provoked God to deal thus with us, either by some sin, or by our carelessness. Lament. 3:40: "Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord." And should it be, that a person cannot find out the cause of that estrangement (which is rarely the case with the serious and careful inquirer), he is then to consult the word of God: and by repeated prayer say, "Do not condemn me; show me wherefore thou contendest with me," Job 10:2. 2dly, He is to renew his faith and repentance; promise God, as by a solemn oath, that he will, for the future, improve his grace to better purpose, and keep it with greater care, if he may again enjoy it. Nay, he is to protest, and that sincerely, that he will serve God, because God is worthy to be served, and because it is his glory to serve him, though he should never again, which God forbid, taste the



sweetness of divine favour. Nothing can be done by man more acceptable to God. 3dly, He is to be instant in continual prayer, pleading, with the greatest earnestness possible, that he may not be cast away from his presence, but that God would have mercy upon him, according to his loving-kindness, and restore again the joy of his salvation, Ps. 51:1, 11, 12. The Holy Spirit himself has dictated forms of prayer, Ps. 88, 102. 4thly, He is patiently to wait for the hour in which God may be pleased to receive him into favour, not omitting his duty to God in the meantime. Lam. 3:26: "It is good that a man should both hope and quietly wait for the salvation of the Lord."

XXVI. To him who acts in this manner will come, at length will come, the blessed day, when God will change the bitter water of tears into the most delightful wine of consolation; receive and entertain his friend with the greater familiarity, the longer and the more mournfully he had been deprived of the delightful sense of his love, and abundantly repay all with interest. Believers have generally experienced this; whose triumphant songs we remember to have read and heard, no less than their mournful complaints. And it scarce ever happens otherwise: but should there be no appearance of being restored on earth to the sweet sense of divine love, all however is reserved to be fully bestowed upon them in heaven. The abundance of which will render the former dry and parched state extremely sweet and delightful, beyond what can be either expressed or conceived.

XXVII. From what has been said, it is evident, this spiritual peace differs very much from carnal security. For, 1st, The latter arises from a man's mere ignorance of his state, into which he never made any serious inquiry, or, in forming a judgment about it, he deceived himself by false reasoning. But the former rests upon a sure foundation, and is preceded by sorrow for sin, a sense of misery, a hunger and thirst after grace, diligent self-examination, and a sense of his union with Christ. 2dly, The latter makes a man well pleased with, and to have an inward joy on account of, that imaginary good, though in other respects he neglects God; whereas the former ravishes the soul with admiration of the divine goodness, and makes him confess himself unworthy of so great an honour and favour. 3dly, By the latter men are swallowed up in pleasure, are dull and heavy in that which is good, and unhappily give themselves up to an irregular life, thinking "they shall have peace, though they walk in the imagination of their heart," Deut. 29:19. But the former keeps the heart in safety, Phil. 4:7, that they may be in the fear of God continually; and this is what neither can be obtained, nor preserved, without a strict exercise of godliness. 4thly, Though the latter falsely imagines that it is the object of God's love, yet it is destitute of all true love to God. But the former consists in mutual friendship. The same Abraham who, James. 2:23, is called the friend, is, Isa. 41:8, called אהבֵי, the lover, of God.

XXVIII. As spiritual peace is the consequence of justification, in was a blessing of the Old, as well as it is of the New Testament, as we shall show in its proper place; and consequently the ancient fathers were also partakers of it, who, by an unfeigned faith, believed that they were reconciled to God, on account of the surety, the Messiah; that the enmity caused by sin was removed: they had a most delightful and experimental sense of this, and often gloried in the Lord. We, indeed, cannot deny that peace was eminently promised to the New Testament church, Ps. 72:3; Isa. 9:5, 6; Hag. 2:10; Zech. 9:10. But we are not to understand this of peace and friendship with God absolutely, which is a benefit of the covenant of grace, and not of the New Testament alone: but, 1st, Of the more abundant sense of the divine favour, with respect to believers in general. 2dly, Of the agreement between the believing Israelites with the Gentiles,

"having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances," Eph. 2:15. 3rdly, Of the peace of God granted likewise to the Gentiles. This is expressly mentioned, Zech. 9:10.

## Chapter X: Of Adoption

I. WHOM God has admitted into a state of peace and friendship with himself, he has also adopted for his sons; that they may enjoy the benefits both of grace and glory, not only by the favour of friendship, but also by a right of inheritance. There is no friendship more familiar than that between a father and his children; or rather, that natural affection between these exceeds, in familiarity and sweetness, every thing that can be signified by the name of friendship. There is not any one word, any one similitude borrowed from human affairs, that can sufficiently express or represent this most happy band of love; which can hardly be explained by a great number of metaphors heaped together. To express tranquillity of conscience, the Scripture calls it peace; to show us the pleasantness of familiarity, it calls it friendship; and, when it illustrates a right to the inheritance, it speaks of adoption; which is to be the subject of this Chapter.

II. We assert, that believers are the sons of God. The apostle John proclaims it, saying: "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God! Beloved, now are we the sons of God," 1 Epist. 3:1, 2. This is God's covenant with them: "And I will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty," 2 Cor. 6:18.

III. But they are not so only on this account, that God, as Creator, gave them being and life, Mal. 2:10; and, as Preserver, supports and provides them with all necessaries, Acts 17:25, 28.

IV. Neither are they called the sons of God on account of any external prerogative only; whether political, as magistrates are called "the children of the Most High," Ps. 82:6; or ecclesiastical, in respect of an external fœderal communion; according to which some are called "the sons of God," Gen. 6:2, and "the children of the kingdom," Matt. 8:12; in this sense also the Lord commanded Pharaoh to be told concerning Israel, "Israel is my son, even my first-born," Exod. 4:22. For this regarded that national covenant which God entered into with the children of Israel, according to which he preserved them above all other nations, and heaped many blessings upon them, both of a corporeal and spiritual kind, which he did not vouchsafe to other people, Deut. 7:6. He called them his sons, because he managed their concerns with as much solicitous care as any father could possibly do those of his own children. Deut. 32:10, 11. Nay, he called them his first-born, not only because he loved them far better than other people, beyond the measure of common providence, "showing his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel," Ps. 147:19, as the first-born had a double portion in the paternal inheritance, Deut. 21:17; but also because he had appointed them to have a kind of dominion over other people: "Let people serve thee, and nations bow down to thee: be lord over thy brethren," &c. Gen. 27:29. Though these words were, indeed, spoken to Jacob, yet they were to be chiefly verified in his posterity: of which we have illustrious evidences in David's time, 2 Sam. 8.

V. But however excellent these things were, yet they are very far below that dignity for which believers are called the sons of God; for most of those who were called by the name of Israel and the first-born, were such, with whom "God was not well pleased," and never were promoted to the inheritance of the land of Canaan, much less the heavenly inheritance, but "were overthrown in the wilderness," 1 Cor. 10:5. That very people, to whom Moses said, "Is not Jehovah thy father? hath he not magnified [established] thee?" are in the same breath called "a foolish people

and unwise," Deut. 32:6. Nay, there are of "the children of the kingdom," who "shall be cast out into utter darkness," Matt. 8:12: for that national covenant, without any thing else, did not bestow saving grace, nor a right to possess the heavenly inheritance.

VI. The elect and believers are therefore in a far more eminent sense the sons of God: wherein John observed a love, never enough to be commended, 1 John 3:1. Angels, indeed, have the glorious appellation of sons of God, Job 38:7; with which the Lord honours them, not only because he formed them, but also because he imprinted upon them the image and resemblance of his own holiness, Job 4:18, and because, as children of the family, they familiarly converse with God in his house, which is heaven, Job 1:6: in fine, because something of the dignity and authority of God is vouchsafed unto them, as we have just said, that magistrates are also called "the children of the Most High." These are "thrones, dominions, principalities, powers," Col. 1:16: nay, they are also called אֱלֹהִים, Gods, Ps. 97:7, compared with Heb. 1:6.

VII. In almost the same sense, Adam seems also to be called "the son of God," Luke 3:38: for seeing that name, which has the article του set before it, denotes father in all the foregoing verses, as the Syriac, in place of του, always puts בר; no reason can be assigned, why here, altering the phrase, we should translate, with Beza, "who was of God," in which he has followed the Syriac, who translated אֱלֹהֵא דְמֵן, "who is of God." For no doubt can be made, that Adam may be fitly called the son of God, the reasons of which Philo elegantly explains in the passage adduced by the illustrious Grotius on Luke 3:38; in the manner Josephus has also written, that men "were born of God himself:" namely, 1. God created Adam. 2. In his own image. 3. Eminently loved him. 4. Gave him dominion over the creatures. For these reasons he is deservedly called the son of God, though God had not yet declared him heir of his peculiar blessings. Nor does he seem without reason to mention Adam as the son of God. For this tends, as Grotius has learnedly observed, to raise our mind, by this scale, to the belief of the birth of Christ. For he who from the earth, without a father, could produce man, was able in like manner to make Christ to be born of a virgin without a father.

VIII. But Adam did not long maintain that dignity, on account of which he was called the son of God; for neglecting holiness, and, losing that excellency in which he was created, and suffering himself to be overcome by the devil, he became the servant of Satan, by whom he was foiled, 2 Pet. 2:19; and, at the same time, "a child of wrath," Eph. 2:3, together with all his posterity. But what the elect have lost in Adam, they recover in Christ; namely, the same, nay, a far more excellent degree of rank among the children. For let the disparity between Christ and believers be ever so great, yet "he is not ashamed to call them brethren," Heb. 2:11.

IX. But the elect obtain this degree of children of God several ways. First, they become the sons of God by a new and spiritual generation, descending from above. John speaks of this, chap. 1:12, 13: "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." This illustrious passage, which is variously explained by interpreters, requires some particular consideration.

X. The apostle describes this generation, or birth, whereby the elect become the sons of God, both negatively and positively. He denies it to be "of blood," that is, natural or ordinary, like that

whereby the children come to be partakers of flesh and blood, Heb. 2:14, and which is judged to be of blood. Neither is it "of the will of the flesh," that is, from any carnal desire of having children by any means; hence it is, that one, by giving too much indulgence to the corrupt reasoning of the flesh, makes use of means for that end which God never prescribed: something like this we may observe in Sarah, when, from a desire of having children, she gave Hagar to Abraham. Nor in fine, is it "of the will of man," who, for certain reasons of his own, loves one above others, and so appoints him to the principal part of the inheritance: just as this was the will of Isaac with respect to Esau. Nothing human can give being to this spiritual generation, which is only "of God," who decreed it from eternity, and actually regenerates at the appointed time.

XI. To those who are thus born of God, he "gave power to become the sons of God." Εξουσία here denotes right and power. Rev. 22:14, "That they may have εξουσια, right, to the tree of life." But it may seem strange, how they who are born of God may have a right to become the sons of God, seeing, by their very nativity from God, they are already become his children. To remove this difficulty, three things chiefly have been observed by very learned men. 1st, As γενεσθαι, to become, is the second aorist, it may fitly be taken for the preterperfect; to this effect: He gave them that power, that right, that dignity, that they might become the sons of God, and enjoy the privileges which are suitable to that condition. 2dly, Γενεσθαι τοιοῦτον denotes, in Scripture phrase, "to be such a one," or "to behave as becomes such a one." Thus it is used, Matt. 5:45: "Ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν, that ye may be the children of your father," that you may behave yourselves as becomes the children of God. See 1 Thess. 2:7, 10. 3dly, It might also be referred to that perfect filial state, which shall be conjoined with "the redemption of our body," and which the apostle, Rom. 8:23, enjoins us to "wait for:" and so the meaning may be, that God has granted those who are born of him a right to the heavenly inheritance, and that unparalleled honour by which, both in soul and body, they shall rejoice, as children of the family, in the palace of their Father; in such a manner, that it shall not be in the power of any creature to strip, diminish, or cut them off from that dignity. The reader may adopt which exposition he prefers. We are not a little pleased with the last; but wherein this new birth consists, we have explained at large, Chap. VI., of this Book.

XII. And this is the first foundation of that glorious state. Secondly, We become the children of God by marriage with the Lord Jesus; for when we become his spouse, then we pass with him into his father's family, and the Father calls us by the endearing name of "daughter," Ps. 45:10: and the Lord Jesus calls her also his sister, whom he names his "spouse," Cant. 5:1, 2. God had provided by his law, that if "a man betroth his maid-servant unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters," Exod. 21:9: in the same manner he is pleased to deal with elect souls. By nature, they were as maid-servants to sin and Satan; lay exposed in the open field, and were a loathing to all. However, he graciously offers them a marriage with his only-begotten Son; they, by faith, accept the proposal, almost in the same manner that Abigail did, when she was invited to marry David, 1 Sam. 25:41: and thus, by the same act by which they become the spouse of Christ, they also become "the daughters of the living God," 2 Cor. 6:18.

XIII. Thirdly, by adoption, which is an economical act of God, whereby they, who are regenerated after his image, and betrothed by faith to his only-begotten Son, are received into his family, and obtain the right and privileges of children, and the inheritance itself, by an immutable testament. They are "of the household of God," Eph. 2:19; and "if children, then heirs," Rom.

8:17; for the communication of the image of God alone does not give a right to the heavenly inheritance. This appears with respect to Adam in this state of innocence, who, indeed, was in the way of acquiring a right, but had not yet obtained it. The alone foundation of that right is the perfect and constant obedience, either of man himself, or of his surety. Christ, therefore, having appeared for us, fulfilled all righteousness, and "was appointed heir of all things," Heb. 1:2. The elect, being regenerated, receive and claim to themselves, by faith, Christ and all his benefits, even his perfect righteousness; and, being thus adopted by the Father, and become the brethren of Christ, they are "heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ," Rom. 8:17. And in this sense principally we think John speaks: "To them which are born of God, he gave power to become the sons of God," as explained above, sect. xi.

XIV. For the better understanding of what has been said, we are now to observe, that the Spirit of God, in order to explain these mysteries, uses metaphors borrowed from human things. But these metaphors are to be so adjusted, as one may not destroy, but rather supply the defects of, the other. It would seem in other respects absurd, that the soul which is born of God, should be adopted for a daughter, and joined in marriage to the only-begotten Son of God. Yet the Scripture has wisely ordered matters, when it declares all these things concerning believers. In order to express the original of spiritual life, and of the image of God in man, it says that he was born of God; to set forth our most delightful union with Christ, which is full of mutual affection, it calls it marriage; and to show the ground and firmness of our inheritance, it declares that we are adopted in Christ. And it is on account of each of these things, that we may be called the children of God.

XV. And this adoption is a most precious blessing of the covenant of grace. But it was very different, according to the different economies or dispensations of that covenant. It is, however, not to be doubted, that believers, at all times, were the children of God. Elihu, who was not of the people of Israel, called God "his father," Job 34:36\*. To understand this in that diminutive sense in which the heathen called Jupiter the Father of gods and men, is not suitable to the illustrious faith and piety of a man who was commended by God himself. A celebrated expositor has said well on this place: "God is called Father, as Mal. 1:6, 'A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master: if then I be a father, where is mine honour?'" And Isa. 64:8. 'But now, O Lord, thou art our Father.' By this appellation he sets forth the affection of God in this respect, namely, his paternal care; his own affection in requesting his brotherly love; the end of the trial, and a filial reverence and confidence."

XVI. All we have thus far said of the grounds of this glorious state, is even applicable to the Old Testament believers. They had likewise a new life by regeneration, and were created again after the image of God. They were, in like manner, betrothed to Christ, Hos. 2:19, 20: "Their Maker was their husband," Isa. 54:5. And ver. 1, the church of the Old Testament is expressly said to be married: nor were they without their adoption; "who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption," Rom. 9:4. And to conclude, "were heirs of all," Gal. 4:1: heirs of the grace of God in this life, Ps. 16:5; and of the glory of God in the life eternal, Ps. 17:15.

XVII. Though the condition of believers under the Old Testament was very illustrious, if compared with that of unbelievers, who continue children of wrath, and heirs of the treasures of divine indignation; yet all that splendour comparatively speaking was eclipsed to an almost

incredible degree, before the august majesty of believers under the New Testament, as the light of the stars before that of the sun: as will appear by comparing them together.

XVIII. Believers under the Old Testament were, indeed, sons; but sons who were subject to their father, and to the severity and discipline of tutors, "who bound heavy burdens, and grievous to be borne, and laid them on their shoulders;" nevertheless, their father said with respect to these tutors: "All whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do," Matt. 23:3, 4; namely, as long as they commanded nothing that was contrary to, or inconsistent with, the will of the father. They were obliged to be subject to the weak and beggarly elements of the world, and, like children, to be engaged all the day in the trifling ceremonies of the Mosaic institution, which were, in a manner, the playthings of the church. They were taught like infants, without being left to their own choice, not knowing how to conduct themselves, or what was fit for them; "touch not, taste not," Col. 2:21.

XIX. Besides, they were not admitted to that familiarity with their father, as to penetrate into the mysteries of his will. "The mighty God did then hide himself," Isa. 45:15. Their tutors, indeed, at times, acquainted them with some things relating to God's purpose of grace, but that only rarely, and in mysterious expressions, and under enigmatical or parabolical representations. And though many prophets and righteous men desired to see and hear many things, yet they were not gratified, Matt. 13:17.

XX. None of them was allowed to approach the holy of holies, which was, as it were, the secret place of their father: nay, they had not access to the temple itself, which was the father's house, but by means of the altar, sacrifices, and priests, without which, if they took upon them to approach to God, instead of a blessing, which they sought after, they incurred their father's displeasure. Neither was it lawful for them to omit the constant morning and evening sacrifice, Exod. 26:28, 42.

XXI. Their inheritance was the land of Canaan, a pledge, indeed, of the heavenly inheritance, but somewhat obscure, and such as they were commanded to be in some measure subjected to, and which the godly themselves were sometimes obliged to be destitute of, when forced into banishment. However they were to have such a tender regard to this land, that, when banished from their dear country, they were, in their prayers, to turn their faces thitherward, nor were they to pay their vows to heaven, without directing their eyes to that country, 1 Kings 8:48. Dan. 6:11, In all this, there was a notable subjection to this pledge.

XXII. The case of believers under the New Testament, is quite different. For after our elder brother, having taken upon him human nature, had visited this lower world, and freely undergone a state of various servitude for us, he brought us into true liberty, John 8:36, removed the tutors, blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances, which was contrary to us, declared us to be dead with himself, set free from the elements of the world, so as they never after should have any dominion over us, Col. 2:16, 20. He would no longer have us subject to these minute observances, but called us to a reasonable service, Rom. 12:1, and, having broken and removed that troublesome yoke which was laid on the jaws of the ancients, Hos. 11:4, laid his own upon us, which is easy and light, Matt. 11:30.

XXIII. He introduced us into the father's secret counsels, and, sucking the breasts of our mother, taught us the things he so much desired the spouse should be taught, Cant. 8:2: declared to us what he had seen in the bosom of the Father, nay, and even the Father himself, John 1:18, and in himself presented the Father to our view, so that we have no longer any occasion to say, "Show us the Father," John 16:9. He brought along with him those times, of which Jeremiah prophesied, chap. 31:34. He abundantly poured out upon us "the unction from the holy one, which teacheth all things," 1 John 2:20, 27. In a word, he does not now account us as servants; "for the servant knoweth not what his Lord doeth; but he hath called us friends: for all things that he hath heard of his Father, he hath made known unto us," John 15:15.

XXIV. He has also obtained for us a free access to the Father, having "consecrated for us a new and living way," in which we may walk "in full assurance of faith," Heb. 10:20, 22. By his death, the veil of the inmost sanctuary was rent, and all believers are made a royal priesthood, 1 Peter. 2:9; none is excluded the holy of holies; and though the Father still sits on a throne of majesty, yet it is at the same time a throne of grace, to which we are invited to approach with boldness, Heb. 4:6, without sacrifice, without priests, trusting only in the alone offering of Jesus our High Priest, "whereby he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified," Heb. 10:14: and this is "that better hope, by the which we draw nigh unto God," Heb. 7:19.

XXV. Nor hath he burdened us with any subjection to a typical inheritance; but hath called us directly to an inheritance of spiritual and heavenly good things, and "appointed unto us a kingdom, as his Father hath appointed unto him," Luke 22:29. There is now no corner of the earth which we should desire, as more holy and more acceptable to God than another; for, "the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof," Ps. 24:1. Nor does he disdain an altar in the midst of Egypt, Isa. 19:19. And thus "he hath made us partakers of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises," Heb. 8:6.

XXVI. On account of those excellent prerogatives, believers under the New Testament are eminently and emphatically called "the sons of God," 1 John 3:2: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God," namely, by a much better right and title than before. To this the apostle has undoubtedly an eye, Gal. 4:4-7: "But when the fulness of the time was come;" namely, that appointed time, till which the children were to be under tutors, ver. 2, "God sent forth his Son, to redeem them that were under the law," setting them free from the infantile use of ceremonies; "and that we might receive the adoption," not only that adoption whereby we are distinguished from the children of the devil and of wrath, but also that whereby we excel infants, not much differing from servants: "wherefore thou art no more a servant," as formerly, "but a son." That this is Paul's meaning, the whole connexion of the discourse and the scope of the writer evince. For the whole tends to show, that believers under the New Testament are set free from, nor ought they any longer to be oppressed with, the yoke of the old servitude, which the false judaizing teachers, with the utmost endeavours, struggled to lay on their necks.

XXVII. Certainly the condition of the sons of God is most excellent. If David put such a value on being called the son-in-law of such a king as Saul, 1 Sam. 18:23, how highly should we esteem it, to be called the sons of the living God! 1st, How unparalleled is that royalty, by which we derive the origin of our pedigree, not from any earthly prince or monarch, but from the King of heaven! 2. What can be more glorious than that divine nature we obtain by a new generation? 2



Pet. 1:4. God himself glories in his sons, as his peculiar property; nay, calls them "the first-fruits of his increase," Jer. 2:3, who may be to him "in praise, and in name, and in honour," Deut. 26:19. Almost as parents who glory before others in those of their children who are remarkable for their beauty. 3. What can be more desirable than that marriage-relation to the only-begotten Son of God, than which thought itself can conceive nothing more honourable, more advantageous, and, in a word, more glorious? "He is white and ruddy, the chiefest (standard-bearer) among ten thousand," Cant. 5:10. When David, though not yet come to the crown, sent his men to Abigail, to procure her in marriage, that prudent widow "bowed herself on her face to the earth, and said, Behold let thine handmaid be a servant to wash the feet of the servants of my lord," 1 Sam. 25:41. And what may our soul say, whenever it reflects that, having broke off the former marriage with Nabal, which was not a state of marriage, but of adultery, it is joined to the heavenly David in a marriage-covenant that cannot be broken? 4, and lastly, Nothing can be more excellent, than that inheritance, which, in right of adoption, the sons of God obtain, and which is bequeathed to them by an irrevocable testament.

XXVIII. It will not be unprofitable to insist a little on this point, and, having opened the testament of our Father, to inquire what, and how considerable the goods, and under what stipulations he has bequeathed them to us. By the testament we mean, the last and immutable will of God, recorded in the writings of the Holy Scripture, and ratified by the death and blood of Jesus, whereby he hath declared his chosen and believing people to be his heirs of the whole inheritance. I say the testament is the will of God, or that "counsel of his will," Eph. 1:11, by which he has appointed both the heirs and the inheritance, and of which our Saviour was speaking, Luke 12:32, εὐδοκῆσεν ὁ Πατήρ, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom:" I add, it is the last and irrevocable will of the Father; for as this is required to a valid testament, Gal. 3:15, so it is not deficient in this respect: "wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation," Heb. 6:17, 18. By this his will, he appointed or settled both the inheritance as well of grace as of glory, of which we shall speak just now; and also the heirs, not indefinitely, whosoever believes; but by name, this and the other persons, "whose names are written in heaven," Luke 10:20, and "graven upon the palms of God's hands," Isa. 49:16. This his will he has expressed in the sacred writings of both instruments, which for that reason are also called "testament," 2 Cor. 3:14. In fine, that nothing might be wanting, the whole is confirmed and sealed by the blood and death of the Lord Jesus, Heb. 9:16, 17. In order to understand this, we must observe, that God the Father did, by testament, give and bequeath that honour to his Son Jesus Christ, to be the head of the elect in glory, and have a right to bestow upon them all his goods; Ps. 2:8. Jesus again does, by the power made over to him by the Father, dispose by testament of his goods to be communicated to the elect: "and I διατιοεμαι, appoint by testament, unto you a kingdom, as may Father hath, διέθετό, appointed by testament, unto me," Luke 22:29. So that this making of the testament is, indeed, originally from the Father, yet immediately from Christ the mediator; who died, not to vacate or annul, by his death, the inheritance; for, "he is alive for ever more," Rev. 1:18; but to seal the promises, and acquire for his people a right to the inheritance. Hence the blood which he shed is called "the blood of the testament," Zach. 9:11, Matt. 26:28.

XXIX. The goods or blessings bequeathed by this testament, are of all others the most excellent: as became, 1st, The riches and liberal bounty of our heavenly Father, from whom we may expect so extraordinary goods or blessings, which neither eye hath seen, nor ear heard, nor hath entered into the heart of man to conceive any like them, 1 Cor. 2:9. Concerning this the Psalmist deservedly sings, "O how great is thy goodness, which thou hast laid up for them that fear thee; which thou hast wrought for them that trust in thee before the sons of men! Ps. 31:19. 2dly, The glory of our elder brother, whose joint heirs we are, Rom. 8:17, and who glories in his heritage, Ps. 16:6. 3dly, As became that dignity to which God hath raised us, having adopted us for his sons! for to them he gives "great and precious promises," 2 Pet. 1:4. Did we minutely prosecute these points, we should write a large volume: at present we will reduce the whole to three principal heads.

XXX. The first is the possession of the whole world: for, it was promised to Abraham, and his seed, that they should be "heirs of the world," Rom. 4:13. On which place let us hear the commentary of Ludovicus de Dieu: "As sin, by separating us from God, and subjecting us to his curse, banished and disinherited us, so that we have no spiritual right or dominion, as became sons of God, over the meanest creature; so, on the other hand, when God becomes our God, and we his blessed people, we are restored as sons, to the right and dominion of all our paternal inheritance: and seeing there is nothing besides God and the world, we are made heirs of the world, both the earthly, the heavenly; the present, and the world to come." When God introduced Adam into the habitable earth, he constituted him lord of the world, and gave him a right and claim to use the rest of the creatures for his own advantage, Gen. 1:28. But Adam, by his sin, lost that right; so that neither himself nor any of his posterity, while in a state of sin, have any true and spiritual right, which can stand in the court of heaven, to touch any creature. But Christ has made a new purchase of it, for himself and his brethren. Ps. 8:6. Whence, 1 Cor. 3:21, "all things are yours;" and among these all things, the world is mentioned, ver. 22, and whatever is in it, "things present and things to come. For," adds the apostle, ver. 23, "ye are Christ's."

XXXI. Now this possession of the world consists in these following things: 1st, That every son of God does possess so much of the good things of this world, as the wisdom of his heavenly Father has ordained, to be so sufficient for the support of his animal life, that his spiritual may suffer no detriment, and that he truly possess it in such a manner, as, in the use and enjoyment thereof, he may taste the love of his Father bestowing that upon him as an earnest of a far better good, and of his elder brother who became poor that his people might be rich, 2 Cor. 8:9. This love of God the Father and of Christ, when added to the least crumb of bread or drop of cold water, makes these preferable in the highest degree to all the most exquisite dainties of the rich of this world: "a little that a righteous man hath, is better than the riches of many wicked," Ps. 37:16. 2dly, That all the creatures ought to serve them as steps, by which to ascend to the Creator. For in all of them they view, as in a bright mirror, his adorable perfections, Ps. 104:24, and in that meditation they exult, Ps. 92:4, 5. Above all, they perceive in them the love of God towards them. When they view the sun, the moon, the stars, they rejoice, that their Father has lighted up so many tapers for them, by the light of which they may perform what becomes the sons of God: nor do they less admire this, than if every one had his own sun, or his own moon, shining upon him. Neither do they exceed the bounds of decency, Ps. 8:3, 4, when they think, that the world remains in its present state on their account, and that the wicked are indebted to them for this: for the holy seed is the substance (support) of the world, Isa. 6:13. 3dly, That all

the creatures, and the whole government of God about them, "may work together for their good," Rom. 8:28. This is so extensive, that both angels and devils are obliged to this service: as to angels, are they not ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation? Heb. 1:14. Ps. 34:7. and Ps. 91:11. And with respect to that infernal spirit, the teacher of arrogance, was he not constrained, by his buffetings, in spite of himself, and acting from a different view, to teach Paul humility? 2 Cor. 12:7. 4thly, If this world, which is subjected to vanity because of sin, shall not suffice them; from its ashes, when perished, God is to form another; to make "a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness," 2 Pet. 3:13. There is none of these things, which may not be included in that general promise of the inheritance of the world.

XXXII. The second good thing in this testament is a spiritual kingdom: "I appoint unto you a kingdom," Luke 22:29. To which, even the most despicable of the children of God in other respects, even man-servants and maid-servants, are called; "Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom, which he hath promised to them that love him?" James. 2:5. To this belong, 1. The excellency of the sons of God, whereby they surpass all other men, Prov. 12:26. 2. Victory over sin, and the unruly lusts of the flesh, to which kings themselves and the most dreaded tyrants are subjects and enslaved, Rom. 6:14, 18. 3. The bruising of Satan under their feet, Rom. 16:20. 4. Triumph over a whole conquered world, for, notwithstanding its rage, they shall be for ever saved, 1 John 5:4, 5. 5. Inestimable riches of spiritual gifts, Ps. 45:9, even in the midst of poverty, Rev. 2:9. 6. Holy peace of soul and joy in the Holy Ghost, Rom. 14:17. All these begin here in grace, and shall be consummated hereafter in glory.

XXXIII. The third benefit is God himself, Rom. 8:17. "Heirs of God." Here is a mutual inheritance; believers are God's portion, and God is their portion, for these are made reciprocal, Jer. 10:16: "The portion of Jacob is the former of all things, and Israel is the rod (tribe) of his inheritance." In this possession of God, his children find, 1. Protection against every evil, Ps. 91:2: "I will say of the Lord, he is my refuge and my fortress." Why? "He is my God, in whom I will trust." See Ps. 27:1, 2. Isa. 43:2, 3. 2. Communication of every good, Ps. 36:7. for, first, all that infinity of perfections which are in God himself, will appear glorious and admirable in the children of God, and be enjoyed by them to complete their consummate happiness. And what can the soul desire beyond that infinity? Ps. 73:25. Secondly, What will not God give those, to whom he gives himself? 1 Cor. 3:22, 23.

XXXIV. There are no proper stipulations in this testament, if considered in its whole extent, together with all its promises; for it consists of absolute and mere promises, which depend on no condition, to be performed in our own strength. Yet Divine Providence hath so disposed every particular in it, as to have a certain and wise order among themselves, and the practice\* of the former benefits, which are promised, is to pave the way for the possession of further blessings. We have at large treated of this, chap. i., sect. x., seq. of this book. To which I now add the words of Ames, in his *Coronis ad Collectionem Hagicensem*, Art. v. c. 2: "The whole of the disposition hath the nature of a testament, as considered simply, either in the whole or its parts; but if the benefits bequeathed are compared together, then one bears to the other the relation, as it were, of a condition."

XXXV. In the same books, therefore, in which the testament is contained, God commanded, that whoever would take comfort from the promised inheritance, should, 1st, Love, search into, meditate upon, and keep in his heart the writings exhibiting the testament, as no contemptible part of his inheritance, Deut. 32:4; nay, esteem them beyond his necessary food, Job 23:12, Deut. 6:6. 2dly, Highly value, as it deserves, the promised inheritance, 1. That he hunger and thirst after it, and be satisfied with nothing short of it, Matt. 5:6. 2. Reckon all other things, in comparison thereof, as dross and dung, Phil. 3:8. Most readily part with every thing, in order to procure this pearl of inestimable value, Matt. 13:46. 3. Glorify God for the greatness of his love, Ps. 31:19. 4. Diligently keep what he has received, Rev. 2:25, 3:11. 3dly, So walk, as becometh his condition, and the expectation of so great an inheritance, 1 Thess. 2:12, 1 John 3:3. 4thly, Be ready to impart to his brethren what he has received from his Father, both in temporals and spirituals, Rom. 12:13 1 Thess. 2:8. And endeavour that others also may be brought to enter on the same inheritance with himself, Acts 26:29. For none suffers any loss for the numbers that partake with him: he has rather an additional pleasure, his joy being greatly heightened from the abundance of love.

## CHAPTER XI: Of the Spirit of Adoption

I. HAVING thus explained the nature of adoption, as far as our design required, we are now carefully to inquire what the Spirit of adoption is: and this is the Holy Spirit, operating those things in the elect which are suitable to and becoming the sons of God, who love God, and are beloved by him.

II. This spirit differs from the spirit of bondage in this, that the spirit of bondage represents God as an austere master and a tremendous judge; hence it is that they, who are actuated by this spirit, in so far as they act thereby, perform the commands of their master from dread and terror. But the Spirit of adoption discovers God to the believing soul, as a kind and indulgent Father, and, by giving him assurance of the love of God, and sweetly cherishing the hope of the future inheritance, makes him, with alacrity and generous emotions of a filial reverence, willingly obey God, as an affectionate parent.

III. Moreover, seeing all believers were sons of God in every period of time; we may with propriety assert, that the Spirit of adoption was granted to them all in their measure and degree. For certainly what Paul says, Gal. 4:6. "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts," and Rom. 8:9, "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his," is true of all periods. All who are regenerated, are born of the Spirit, John 3:5, 6, 8. From the Spirit proceedeth faith, Gal. 5:22, by which they obtained *ἐξουσία*, a right, to become the sons of God. And if they had any degree of love, righteousness, peace, holiness, and the like, without which true faith cannot subsist, they could have them from no other but the Spirit. And as the Spirit they had was, doubtless, such as became their state; and they themselves were the adopted sons of God; why then should we not call it the Spirit of adoption?

IV. We more than once read in the Old Testament of that Spirit, as bestowed on believers at that time: such was that generous spirit in Caleb, which made him follow God fully, Numbers 14:24. Such that, concerning whom Nehemiah said, chap. 9:20, "Thou gavest also thy good Spirit to instruct them;" which we are to understand of the elect among the Israelites, in that perverse generation. Such was that, which David prayed might be given him, Ps. 143:10, "Thy Spirit is good, lead me into the land of uprightness;" and Ps. 51:10–12, "Renew a right spirit within me; take not thy Holy Spirit from me; uphold me with thy free spirit." In short, as God said to Israel of old, "surely they are my people, children that will not lie:" so also, "he put his holy Spirit within them," Isa. 63:8, 11.

V. Moreover, the operations of this Spirit may be considered either absolutely in themselves, or in relation to the distinct economies of the several periods. What the Spirit of adoption operates indiscriminately in the sons of God, are principally these things. As God has, ever since the very first sin of our first parents, proposed his gracious covenant, the summary whereof was, in all ages, handed down by the instruction of the patriarchs; it was a part of the office of the Spirit of adoption to stir up, and lead by the hand, the minds of believers to the knowledge, meditation, and apprehending of that saving grace; to intimate to the soul the things externally handed down by the tradition of the oracles, vouchsafed to the patriarchs and prophets, and thus impart some relish of divine love, first more sparingly, afterwards more abundantly. By this means, that

horror or dread is banished, which the thunders of the law, a consciousness of guilt, and the just apprehension of divine vengeance had begot in the soul.

VI. While the Spirit does this, he by the same work inflames the hearts of the children of God, with returns of love; whereby they yield obedience to God, not any longer from a fear of punishment, but from a pure and sincere affection, and a generous reverence for their most beloved Father, and that with willingness, and alacrity, as becomes children of such an extraction; with a denial of their own will, and a diligent care to do nothing unworthy of that glorious condition.

VII. Besides this, the Spirit likewise presents to their view the promised inheritance, and confirms them in the expectation of it, by the word and sacraments, whose moral efficacy, as it is called, he accompanies with a supernatural, internal, and operative virtue; and gives them the enjoyment of it in hope: nay, sometimes he raises them on high, so that, by removing the veil, and drawing up the curtain, he in some measure, gives them a view of those good things, which are laid up for them in the heavenly country, whereby, with gladness and exultation, they "rejoice in hope of the glory of God," Rom. 5:2.

VIII. These three things are the natural consequences of adoption. 1st, a persuasion of the greatest love of the adopter. 2dly, An obedience of love, agreeably to the laws of the family, into which the adopted is received, and to the nature and will of the new parent. 3dly, An expectation of the inheritance. The Spirit, therefore, who produces these things in the elect, is justly called the Spirit of adoption.

IX. The ancient believers had all these things; though God, in his wisdom, appointed degrees and limits, as the times required. Their soul exulted in the Lord, Ps. 4:7: they delighted themselves in the faith, hope, sense, and relish of divine love, Ps. 31:7, Ps. 51:14, Ps. 36:7–9, Ps. 63:5, [אלוה סוד] the familiar converse] the secret of God was in (or upon) their tabernacles." Job 29:4. They also loved God as their Father, Ps. 18:1, Ps. 116:1, and from love yielded obedience to him, Ps. 119:10, with readiness and delight in his commandments, Ps. 119:9, 11, 14, 16. They comforted themselves in adversity with the unfailing expectation of a blessed inheritance, Ps. 17:15. Which, though at a distance, yet God presented to their view, and gave them initial prelibations of, Ps. 31:19. As all these things follow upon adoption, and ought to be ascribed to the Spirit, they make it evident that the Spirit of adoption is, by no means, to be reckoned a peculiar benefit of the New Testament, as if the Old Testament believers were destitute of it; Paul himself expressly asserts, that "the same Spirit of faith," by which we speak (which, certainly, is the Spirit of adoption) "was also in the fathers," 2 Cor. 4:13.

X. However, it is not to be denied, that those operations of this free and noble Spirit, were of old, more rare and sparing than afterwards, and mixed with much terror. The legal economy was then in its vigour: as the covenant of grace was revealed more obscurely, and in much enigmatical darkness, so likewise it was not intimated to the conscience with such evidence of demonstration: a hand-writing, in the meantime, was also required to be renewed by the blood of daily sacrifices, as by so many subscriptions; a thirst after better promises was raised, though not yet to be quenched: by these means, those noble operations of the Spirit were so clouded in most, that, in comparison of the joyful abundance under the New Testament, the Spirit is said, John

7:39, not to have been under the Old. This is not to be understood in such a restricted sense, as to make us imagine, that the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, poured out on the day of Pentecost, are here only intended. For something is promised which is common to all believers in Christ, and which is said not to have been, before Christ was glorified. But what is that? It is the full and illustrious exhibition of the Spirit, which Christ deferred, till he took solemn possession of his kingdom, and which appeared in those visible gifts, as in so many mirrors, which is also to be extended to the gracious fruits of adoption: as Calvin has well observed on this place.

XI. And indeed, we often find in Scripture, that the Holy Spirit is so promised to the New Testament, as if there was no such thing under the Old, Isa. 35:6, 7, and 44:3, Ezek. 34:26, 27, Joel 2:28, Zech. 14:8, compared with Ezek. 47:1. All which things belong to the times of the Messiah's kingdom, now manifested in the world. To this also we are to refer what John the Baptist said of Christ, Matt. 3:11, that he would baptize the children of Abraham with the Holy Ghost and with fire. For seeing the Baptist speaks this not to the apostles, but to the Jews that flocked to hear him; that miraculous effusion of the gifts of the Holy Spirit on the apostles, which our Lord himself calls "a baptism," seems not to be exclusively denoted, but also that sanctifying grace of the Spirit, which had, and exerted a fiery efficacy on the hearts of believers, by penetrating, illuminating, setting on fire, purging, separating the dross from the pure gold, or the precious from the vile, and by elevating and transforming the object inflamed into its own nature: and with this passage it seems we should by all means compare what is said, Isa. 4:4, "When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof, by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of burning." Moreover, that extraordinary work which was wrought in the apostles contained the first-fruits and earnest of the fulfilment of the general promises concerning the Spirit, as appears from the application of the prophecy of Joel, and Peter's explication of it, Acts 2:28, 39. Chrysostom therefore observes well, Homil. 11, that John, by this expression, signified the abundance, the vehemence, and the irresistibleness of grace.

XII. As these things were promised, so they were also fulfilled under the New Testament. For the Spirit of God then produced a clearer manifestation of the covenant of grace, a higher sense of divine love, a more delightful freedom of the kingdom of God, a more confident boldness, more abundant consolations, a stronger assurance, more spiritual holiness, and who can pretend to recite all? This will appear, if we make a just comparison of heroes with heroes, and of more ordinary believers with others of the same kind; according to the prophecy of Zech. 12:8. See Tit. 3:5, 6.

XIII. Meanwhile, we are to observe, that, in the beginning of the New Testament, God distributed much more plentifully to believers, than afterwards. Certainly, nothing can be spoken with greater pomp of language, than what Paul often declared concerning himself and other believers in his day. For, as to consolation, and tranquillity of soul, what can be more excellent, than what he assured the Philippians, even peace which passeth all understanding, Phil. 4:7. Agreeable to this is what Peter writes: that they who love Christ and believe in him, rejoice with joy unspeakable and glorious, full of glory. 1 Pet. 1:8. And what John also says, that perfect love, such as is produced by the gospel, casteth out all fear, 1 John 4:18. And really it seems evident, that in a peace so noble and serene, in a joy almost so incredible, there can be no room for any unruly passion, fear, or trembling.

XIV. And then, the apostle gives such excellent encomiums of their holiness, as may be judged very far to transcend the measure of our days: when he thus declares concerning himself, that he was crucified with Christ, that he did no longer live, but Christ lived in him; as if his spirit and life, like that of an inferior order, were swallowed up in the more illustrious spirit and life of Christ, as the sun in the heavens extinguishes the light of the stars; and all the life he lived flowed from no other principle, but the faith and love of the Son of God. Gal. 2:20. Nay, he openly declares his contempt of all the things which other men so highly value, and that he prizes Christ alone; and that, forgetting the things which are behind, he presses forwards with a large pace and a most speedy course to perfection, Phil. 3:7, 8, 14. Who of us will deny that he does not come far short of these high attainments?

XV. The apostle every where openly professed an incredible hope and assurance of the future inheritance: and he undoubtedly describes his assurance, towards the close of the eighth chapter to the Romans, in such magnificent language, that nothing more emphatically strong can be conceived. Let that animated exultation in the Lord be attentively read, and we shall see, that it sets forth, in an extraordinary pomp of words, the immense abundance of the Spirit inhabiting his noble breast, and the sparkling flames of the love of God kindling in his heart. He also clearly displays his hope, 2 Cor. 5:1, 2. 2 Tim. 4:8. Phil. 1:23, whereby he was so far from fearing death, at the mention of which most people are ready to tremble for fear, that, on the contrary, he embraced it with open arms, and longed to be dissolved, that he might have the more full enjoyment of Christ.

XVI. Indeed, if any one shall compare these magnificent expressions, with what is observed among believers at this day, he will be obliged to own, that they come far short of that eminence and excellence; they are so mean, poor, and fading in comparison of these unparalleled expressions, which with astonishment we admire in the apostle. But doubtless the Spirit bloweth when, how, and where he listeth: it does not become us to set bounds to him. In the beginning of the gospel God showed what he can do, and what on the other hand he will do when he shall restore life, as it were, from the dead, Rom. 11:15. Ἐξέεχ' ἔξεεχ Σὸ φίλ ἥλιε· "arise, arise, thou charming friendly sun."

XVII. To this Spirit the apostle principally ascribes two effects, Rom. 8:15, 16; the former of which is, the making us cry, "Abba, Father;" the latter, that, "together with our Spirit, itself beareth witness, that we are the children of God:" and as these two things contain the highest consolation, it will not be improper to explain them with all the accuracy we are able.

XVIII. The Holy Spirit is never idle, where he is; there the heart "טוב דבר רדש" brings forth a good speech," Ps. 45:1. The Spirit is that mystical new wine, which "makes the virgins cheerful (eloquent)," Zech. 9:17; "and causeth the lips of those that are asleep to speak," Cant. 7:9. They who have the Spirit of faith, "as they believe, so they speak," 2 Cor. 4:13.

XIX. Nor do they only speak, muttering like the ventriloquists, who speak from the belly, or like those who scarce speak out what they have conceived in their mind, fear having restrained their faltering tongue; but they confidently cry out with a loud voice. Nor is it in vain that the apostle, both here and Gal. 4:6, uses the term crying. It denotes that boldness, freedom, and courage with



which we are commanded to approach the throne of grace, Heb. 4:16, and present our requests there.

XX. But what does he principally teach us to cry? "Abba, Father!" Servants and hand-maids of old were not suffered to call their masters by the name of Father, as the very learned Selden, de Successionibus, c. 4 has shown from the law of the Hebrews. But the servants and hand-maids of God, both under the Old and New Testament, are allowed this privilege; as was shown above from Isa. 63:16, Job 34:36. To which I now add Isa. 64:1, and Jer. 3:4. When Christ commanded his disciples to pray, "Our Father, which art in heaven," he used an expression well known to, and very common among, the Jews. Thus Maimonides in Tephilloth: "שבשמים אבינו", our Father, who art in heaven, so deal with us as thou hast promised by the prophets."

XXI. And the doubling of words, "Abba, Father!" both here and in the Epistle to the Galatians, is very emphatical. The former being of Hebrew, and the latter of a Greek original. Did not the apostle, by this, intend to teach us, that, under the influence of the Spirit, God was now to be called Father by believers of whatever nation, or in whatever language? For the reason of this repetition seems here to be different from that in Mark 14:36; where we have a summary of Christ's prayers, and the latter may be imagined to be added by Mark, as an explanation of the former. For Christ spoke not in Greek, as Paul wrote in that language. The observation of the celebrated Lightfoot, on Mark 14:36, is worth mentioning: that though אבי Abbi may, indeed, denote, not only a natural, but also a civil father, as an elder, a lord, or master, a teacher, a magistrate; yet אבא Abba, only a natural or adopting father. For the proof of this he gives us a great number of examples. Thus, therefore, Christ calls God Abba in the strongest sense; and believers also, according to their condition.

XXII. Unless we rather say, that this repetition of the word is an evidence that the appellation was pleasant and familiar. For ἄππα Appa, which differs not much from Abba, was not in that sense unknown even to the Greeks. Thus Callimachus, in his hymn to Diana, brings her in as a little girl playing in the bosom and arms of her father Jupiter, and calling him in a familiar and enticing manner Appa. Hence also Abare, which in Ausonius stands for ἀδελφίζειν, and signifies to address one in a kind manner, as one brother does another. See what Ludov. Capellus has learnedly collected to this purpose, in his Spicilegium on Mark 14:36.

XXIII. Nor does this appellation consist in bare words, as if we flattered God only with our lips: but if we are really partakers of adoption, it shows that there is faith, and the full assurance of it, in the heart. And, by making a profession of it, we honour God, and celebrate the glory of his grace, whereby he hath raised us, the most unworthy of mortals, to such a high degree of honour. We also profess, that we pray in faith, and expect from him, what children ought to expect from a most indulgent father. And at the same time, by calling him father we bind ourselves to an obedience, a reverence, and a love becoming such a father. And therefore, when the apostle says, that by the Spirit, we cry Abba, Father! he thereby teacheth us, that this Spirit is the author of faith, boldness, confession, piety, and sincere obedience.

XXIV. But let us now consider the other effect of the Spirit, which, according to the apostle, consists in this that he "beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Here we have two witnesses, agreeing in one testimony: the one of a lower rank, our spirit; the other of

the highest, the Spirit of adoption, who is the Spirit of the Son of God, Gal. 4:6. Both may be well qualified for this, but each in his own measure, degree, and order.

XXV. By our spirit is understood, the mind and conscience of every believer, whereby he may be conscious of what passes in his own heart. In this sense the apostle said, "what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?" 1 Cor. 2:11. It is otherwise called "the heart of man, condemning or acquitting him." 1 John 3:20, 21; or "συνειδησις συμμαρτυροῦσα, conscience joining to bear witness, and thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing one another," Rom. 2:15.

XXVI. The testimony of our spirit consists in an exact representation of our state by certain marks, and a full assurance of faith, which is followed by a most quiet tranquillity of soul, and a joy unspeakable. For as the spirit which beareth witness, and the man to whom he does so, are in effect all one, no other testimony needs here be thought of, than the composure of the soul which, by infallible marks, is conscious of its own happiness. Accordingly our apostle, when he would tell us he was fully persuaded that he spoke in sincerity, affirms that his "conscience bears him witness," Rom. 9:1: whose witness can be no other than a representation of the truth plainly perceived by it.

XXVII. It is, indeed, very requisite, that this testimony, which is given of an affair of the greatest moment, be solid and well-grounded. We are therefore above all to attend to two things. First, it is necessary, that our spirit be very exactly instructed from the word of God, about the marks, by which a child of God may be known and distinguished. The word of God alone is the silver, seven times purified and refined. By this rule we are both to think and speak of the things that relate to salvation: all the dictates of our spirit are to be tried by it, neither must we admit any thing as worthy of credit in the matters of salvation, which does not, in the exactest manner, agree therewith. Then, a most careful self-examination should be added, whether we have the marks which God has given of his children in the Scripture.

XXVIII. The marks of the children of God are of two kinds. First, a certain good habit or disposition of soul, with the consistent tenour of a pious life: then, peculiar acts of God towards his beloved people, which he vouchsafes only to those whom he loves as a father.

XXIX. The marks of the former kind are such as these: 1st. The impression and expression of the divine image, with a holy conformity to our father and elder brother. For what is more natural, than for a son to resemble his father, and one brother be like another? As, therefore, the natural Son of God is "the brightness of the Father's glory," Heb. 1:3; it is fit that we, in our order and measure, be so too. As corrupt Adam "begat a son in his own likeness, after his image," Gen. 5:3; so likewise when God begets children, he forms them in his own likeness, "in righteousness and true holiness," Eph. 4:24. And, indeed, this likeness of God is gradually perfected by familiar intercourse with him; till, having obtained that adoption, of which the apostle speaks Rom. 8:23, we are become perfectly like him, 1 John 3:2.

XXX. 2dly, A new life, that is worthy of God, and the effect of the Spirit of adoption, who is "the Spirit of life," Rom. 8:2. As is the spirit of the creatures, so is their life. The natural man has not a more noble spirit, nor a more excellent principle of life than his soul: consequently he only

lives an animal or soul-like life. But as the children of God are endowed with that free spirit, Ps. 51:12, who is the Spirit of Christ, Gal. 4:6, so in their measure they live, as Christ formerly lived, imitating his example and pattern to the utmost of their power; that what Christ declared in the highest degree of himself, may in some measure be applied to them, "the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doth the Son likewise," John 5:19. Paul's exhortation is excellent, Eph. 5:1, "Be ye followers of God as dear children."

XXXI. 3dly, A true and sincere love of God. Even nature teacheth this. For what genuine son doth not love his father? This law is not only written, but born with us. And this love arises, partly from the consideration of the most amiable perfections of God, which his children are admitted to contemplate in a familiar way, seeing the king in his beauty, Isa. 33:17, Ps. 63:2. Partly, from the rays of the divine love reflected upon them, whereby they cannot but be inflamed, 1 John 4:19. They never attentively reflect on this love, but they look upon the whole capacity of their soul, as insufficient to make due returns of love.

XXXII. 4thly. A filial fear and obedience, Mal. 1:6, 1 Peter 1:17, flowing from the before-mentioned love, which forbids them to do any thing that may displease God, and cannot bear to see his honour impaired by any other, Ps. 42:3, 10. On the contrary, it makes the person cheerful and ready in all the duties of religion, John 14:21, does not suffer him to be at rest, if haply by any ill-advised conduct he should provoke God, and be deprived of the sight of his blessed and gracious face as formerly. In fine, this constrains him to fall down in profound reverence at the feet of his father, and, with sorrow and tears plead for the pardon of his offences, and promise a more careful observance for the future, Luke 7:38.

XXXIII. 5thly, Unfeigned brotherly love, which he entertains for all those in whom he observes the image of God, and a participation of the same grace with himself. As that natural affection of Joseph for his brother Benjamin discovered itself by the most evident tokens, Gen. 45:14, 15, so likewise, while other marks are often indiscernable, this brotherly love gives to the doubting soul an evidence of its state, 1 John 3:14: for the love of the brethren cannot be separated from the love of God. Whoever loves the original will also love the copy: whoever loves God, will also love him who belongs to God, and in whom he observes the virtues of God, and whom he believes to be loved by God, 1 John 4:20. Our spirit ought to be well assured of these things before it can testify any thing about our state; and likewise to know, that all these things are to be found with the sons of God, and with them only, as the effects of the regenerating Spirit.

XXXIV. But besides, there are some special acts of divine love, which God vouchsafes only to his own children. "The Lord, indeed, is good to all; and his tender mercies are over all his works," Ps. 145:9. But he reserves a certain peculiar and unparalleled goodness for his elect, of which the Psalmist says, Ps. 73:1, "Truly God is good to Israel, even to such as are of a clean heart". Hence it is, that while they are sometimes ravished on high by his Spirit, he surrounds them with the beams of his super-celestial light, gives them a view of his face, shining with the brightest love, kisses them with the kisses of his mouth, admits them to the most endearing, mutual intercourse of mystical love with himself, and, while he plentifully sheds abroad his love in their hearts, he gives them to drink of rivers of honey and butter, and that often in the greatest drought of the parched soul, when expecting no such thing. There are many more mysteries in

this secret intercourse with our heavenly Father, which believers sometimes see, taste, and feel, and which no pen of the learned can represent as they deserve. And it is not fit that the spirit of man should be unacquainted with these things, since it is admitted as a witness of his state: for though this is not the lot of all the children of God, nor the case at all times, nor indeed frequently, yet they, whose lot it has at any time been, are certainly the children of God.

XXXV. After our spirit is well instructed about all these things, it is further necessary it make a strict scrutiny concerning itself, and, as under the eye of an omniscient God, diligently search every particular without dissimulation or disguise, to see whether these things which we said were the marks or characteristics of the children of God, are to be found in us: as also whether, at any time, we have experienced, in prayer or other exercises of devotion, the peculiar favour of the most gracious God, exciting, inflaming, comforting, and carrying heavenwards our otherwise dull and drowsy hearts. For when our spirit discovers these things by evident indications, then it confidently testifies that we are the children of God, represents that truth to our minds, and gives us to know it, and enable us to say, "this I know, for God is for me," Ps. 56:9.

XXXVI. These things, indeed, tend greatly to the consolation of God's children; but when, both by Scripture and experience, they know that our heart is deceitful, and that they are assured by the wisest of kings, that "he that trusteth in his own heart is a fool," Prov. 28:26; and as there is nothing in which they would less wish to be deceived than in this, which of all others is of the greatest moment: then at length they entirely acquiesce, when to the testimony of their own spirit is superadded that of the Spirit of God. This is what David wrestled for by earnest prayer with God. Ps. 35:3, "Say unto my soul thou art my salvation".

XXXVII. That testimony is given principally in this manner: First, the Spirit of God makes those holy habits, which, we said, were the distinguishing marks of the children of God, and which at times are often involved in much darkness, and covered with much rubbish and filth, to shine with clearness in their soul, and, as it were, readily present themselves to the contemplation of the mind, when examining itself; and then excites our spirit, otherwise ready to faint, to the diligent observation of the things in our mind, both transacted in and by it; enlightens the eyes of the understanding with supernatural light, to prevent our being deceived by what is specious rather than solid, or our overlooking those things, on the observation of which our consolation depends. There is, moreover, a certain internal impulse, which no human language can explain, immediately assuring God's beloved people of their adoption, no less than if they were carried up to the third heavens, and had heard it audibly from God's own mouth, as the apostles formerly heard in the holy mount, "a voice from the excellent glory," 2 Pet. 1:17. Lastly, Seeing no testimony is stronger than that which is proved by facts, the Spirit of God does not leave himself without witness in that respect; for he excites generous motions and the sweetest raptures in believers, and delights them with consolations so ravishing and ecstatical, and even exceeding all thought, that they cannot consider them in any other light than as so many testimonies of their adoption.

XXXVIII. Nor is there any reason to apprehend the children of God will, in this case, suffer themselves to be imposed upon, or admit, for a testimony of the Holy Spirit, what is a lie and mere illusion of the deceiving spirit. For in this voice of the Spirit of God, there is so much clearness, majesty, and efficacy, whereby it penetrates, with an irresistible power, into the

bottom and inmost recess of the heart, that they who have been accustomed to that voice, can easily distinguish it from all others. The world, certainly, cannot receive this Spirit, "seeth him not, neither knoweth him," John 14:17: but Christ's sheep know the voice of their shepherd, John 10:4. And when it sounds, not so much in their ears as in their hearts, they joyfully exclaim, "This is the voice of my beloved, behold! he cometh," Cant. 2:8. As formerly, in extraordinary appearances, God gave such clear indications of his majesty to the prophets, as to leave no room for doubt; so, in like manner, the Spirit, the comforter, irradiates the minds of the elect with such beams of light, that they can easily distinguish him from the spirit of darkness. But, as the proper sound of any voice cannot be distinguished but by the hearing of it, so these things are only to be learned by experience.

XXXIX. But the spirit of God does not usually comfort the elect with such glad tidings, unless their hearts are first broken by a long-continued acknowledgment of their sins, and a deep sense of their misery, Isa. 61:1, 3, and 57:15, 18. Generally a boisterous wind goes before the rending of mountains, and breaking in pieces the rocks before the Lord, and an earthquake and a fire before the still small voice is heard, 1 Kings 19:12. This balm is poured only into the broken heart, Ps. 51:8.

XL. And the souls of the elect are never refreshed with the sweet consolation of the Spirit, but they are, at the same time, inflamed with the love of God, and excited to the vigorous exercise of strict religion. The same Spirit, who is the comforter, is also, by the same act, the sanctifier, Ps. 51:12, 13. Nor can it be otherwise. When the soul is assured, by the Spirit himself, of the infinite love of God towards him, he bursts out into a flame of mutual love, breaking out into the warmest thanksgivings, saying, "Lord, hast thou honoured me in a manner so extraordinary and undeserved, that thou takest me for thy son? Hast thou thyself declared this so familiarly unto me, by shedding abroad thy love in my heart by the Holy Spirit, which thou hast given me? and shall I not love, worship, honour, and obey thee to the utmost of my power? O! that I was emptied of every thing else, that I might be filled only with thy love!" And this is an undoubted token of the Holy Spirit, when the man, who rejoices in soul, is, at the same time, become more ardent in love to God, and more cheerful in his worship. The spirit of the flesh and of hell, with its deceitful allurements, has ends exceedingly different from this.

XLI. We have, indeed, in a very imperfect manner, delivered these things on this mystical subject, which is the marrow of internal Christianity; which that the Holy Spirit himself may inwardly teach those who are consecrated to God, and exhibit to their eyes, ears, and taste, we ardently pray. So be it Lord Jesus! AMEN.

## CHAPTER XII: Of Sanctification

I. THE apostle Peter, 1 Epist. 2:9, has, in very high terms, declared, that the chosen, the regenerate, and the adopted sons of God, are A HOLY NATION. And this holiness, being really the most excellent ornament of the house of God, Ps. 113:5, is a subject which ought not to be passed over in silence, especially as it is none of the least of the promises in the covenant of grace, that God will be the sanctifier of his people Israel.

II. In order profitably to explain the nature of sanctification, we must consider, not so much the etymology and import of the Latin word, as of the Hebrew  $\text{קדש}$ ,  $\text{ἀγιότης}$ ,  $\text{ἀγισύνη}$ ,  $\text{ἀγιάσμος}$ , and  $\text{ὁσιότης}$ , with words of the like original, as most frequently made use of by the sacred penmen. It will be proper, therefore, to enquire more distinctly, first, what is meant by holiness, and then, what by sanctification.

III. The word holy, in Scripture, is asserted, first, of whatever is separated from a promiscuous and civil, but especially from a profane use: in this sense even the elect are called holy, as being separated from the profane world. Lev. 20:26, "And ye shall be holy unto me, because I have severed you from other people, that ye should be mine. 2 Cor. 6:17, "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you." It is no less true of the mystical, than of the literal Israel, that they are a peculiar people, "whose laws are diverse from all people," Eph. 3:8.

IV. Balaam has beautifully prophesied of them. Numb. 23:9, "Lo! the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." Israel is called the people: 1st, On account of their prodigious numbers; ver. 10, "Who can count the dust of Jacob, and the number of the fourth part of Israel?" 2. On account of those sacred ties, by which this vast congregation was united together. They were not a promiscuous assembly, but a multitude, under a proper polity or form of government, united together by covenant, governed by salutary laws, with rights and an inheritance, and having God himself for their head. Thus the apostle, 1 Pet. 2:10: " $\text{Οἱ ποτὲ οὐ λαὸς, νῦν δὲ λαὸς Θεοῦ}$ ," which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God." This is the meaning of  $\text{עם}$ ,  $\text{λαος}$ , the people, when used in the emphatical sense, and distinguished from  $\text{גוים}$ , Gentiles. And " $\text{עם לא}$ ," not a people," is a multitude that has no such privileges. Balaam testifies of the former, that they dwell alone, or are separate, "not reckoned among the nations:" they are severed and distinguished from the rest of the world by peculiar laws, customs, and institutions. Tacitus, in his history, book 5, says, "Moses, the better to attach the people afterwards to himself, appointed them new rites, contrary to those of the rest of the world. There all things are accounted profane, which we look upon as sacred; and those things are allowed by them which we hold to be incestuous."

V. This separation of the Jewish people, in as far as it was the effect of ceremonial institutions, constituted a ceremonial holiness; but if we consider it as the effect of the excellency of those laws, which prescribed moral duties; in that respect they much surpassed other nations, yet that constituted a holiness common to the godly in all ages. Hence the church of the New Testament is called, "The flock of thine heritage, which dwell solitarily." Mic. 7:14. And Christ says of his people, "They are in the world, but not of the world, for he has chosen them out of the world," John 15:19. "Delivering them from this present evil world, according to the will of God, and our

father," Gal. 1:4. To this purpose is the admonition of Paul, Rom. 12:2: "Μὴ συσχηναδίσεσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, be not conformed to this world."

VI. And this is that singularity of piety so recommended by some: which does not consist in external niceties of an over-strained will-worship, and an austerity of discipline, as was generally the practice of the Pharisees among the Jews, and of the ascetics formerly among the ancient Christians; concerning whom Casaubon may be seen in his Exerc. ad Baron. Exerc. I. No. 9. A manner of life significantly called by Epiphanius, εθελόακροτητα δικαιοσύνης, "the utmost pitch of self-righteousness:" but in shunning the vices of the age, pride, drunkenness, lust, and vanities of every kind. 1 Pet. 4:3, "For the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries." Eph. 5:7, "Be not ye, therefore, partakers with them:" and ver. 11, "and have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness." Tertullian, in his Apologia, advises us, that "in what we say, see, and hear, we correspond in nothing with the madness of the Circus, the lewdness of the theatre, the shocking cruelty of the amphitheatre, and the vanity of the Xystus; we are not to attend on such shows and representations as these." 2. That in opinions and sentiments we keep at a distance from those of the vulgar: that is what Paul hints in what follows: "But be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the will of God." By the vulgar, I mean not only the lowest class of people, of whom Tacitus says, "they have neither judgment nor truth:" but even such as seem to themselves and others extremely wise in this world; from whom God generally conceals those mysteries of his, which he reveals to babes, Matt. 11:25. 3. In will and affections. 1 Pet. 1:14. "Not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance." 4. In the exercise of such a generous and noble virtue or holiness, as is infinitely beyond the reach of other people. Phil. 2:15, "That ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world."

VII. Secondly, the word holy, denotes whatever is dedicated to, or set apart for God and his service. Thus the altar, and what belonged to it, are called "most holy," Exod. 30:29: also Aaron with his sons, 1 Chron. 23:13. So, in like manner, the truly godly are "a peculiar treasure to God above all people," Exod. 19:5. In the Hebrew it runs: סגולה ליהוה. To segullah, the last of these, the Latin word sigillum has an affinity: so that סגולה, segullah, denotes a thing which a person declares to be his own property, by impressing it with his seal; nay, indeed, it denotes such a thing, on account of which persons and kings themselves are accounted rich, and by which they display their grandeur. Eccles. 2:8: "I gathered me also silver and gold, מלכים וסגולה, and segulloth (peculiar treasures), of Kings." Thus "God hath chosen Israel לסגולה, for his segullah or peculiar treasure," Ps. 135:4. Concerning this word, see Waserus de Nummis, lib. I. c. 1. The Septuagint express it by περιουσία, Deut. 7:6, סגולה, a special people, which Paul, in imitation of the LXX. calls Λαὸς περιούσιος, a peculiar people, Tit. 2:14. And Jerome affirms, he could not learn the meaning of that Greek word from any one that was conversant in profane literature, but gathered it from the above place in Deuteronomy, and the like. Yet I think Grotius has not improperly observed, that περιούσιος is derived from περιεῖναι, which signifies, to excel; and hence περιούσιος denotes the same as ἐξάρετος, excellent; and περιύσια, superabundance; in which sense Clemens Alexandrius uses it in Admon. ad Gentes, p. 5. "Μιστον ἡμῖν της μαθήσεως, ἐκ περιούσιας, βασιλεαν οὐρανων ἐπαγγελλεται, promises to us, superabundantly, or over and above the kingdom of heaven, as the reward of our doctrine." And again, p. 69. "Φερε

ὕμῃν, ἐκ περιουσίας, τὴν περὶ τοῦ λόγου παραθησομαι πειθῶ· I shall abundantly bring a convincing proof concerning the word." In the same manner, as Demosthenes says, "Οὗτος, ἐκ περιουσίας, μου κατηγορεῖ, he superabundantly accuses me." Polybius, book iv. c. 38, opposes περιουσία to the αἱ ἀναγκαῖαι τοῦ βίου χρεῖαι, the necessaries of life. The godly, therefore, are God's excellent possession, which he claims and preserves, and in which he boasts as his "crown of glory and royal diadem," Isa. 62:3. Which he esteems as his riches, and suffers not to become the property of another; and in this sense also may holiness be ascribed to them: "Ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησίν, a holy nation, a peculiar people," are joined together, 1 Pet. 2:9.

VIII. God also truly seals his servants as his property, which he would keep from being lost; and in this sense he likewise accounts them sacred or inviolable. Rev. 7:2, 3: John saw an angel "ascending from the east," distinct from the four ministering angels, and giving orders unto them: now Christ himself is ἀνατολή ἐξ ὕψους, "the day-spring from on high," Luke 1:78; and the Gospel was published chiefly from Jerusalem to the west; namely, to the isles of the sea, or to Europe. This angel had the seal of the living God, viz. the Spirit of God, who is also "the Spirit of the Son," Gal. 4:6, and by whom the elect are sealed, Eph. 1:13; because he imprints upon them the character of holiness declared in the Gospel, whereby they are known to be the property of God. This angel gave his orders to the others, not to hurt any one, "till," says he, "we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads;" from which words we are not to imagine that God has any fellow-labourers in this sealing-work; but Christ says this concerning himself and his Spirit: who may well call God the Father their God, as both are sent from him. Isa. 48:16: "The Lord God hath sent me and his Spirit;" as thus the Hebrew may very properly be rendered. Moreover, this seal was in the foreheads of God's servants; because, as the forehead is the most conspicuous part of man, so the truth of the Gospel, and the efficacy of true piety, which is impressed upon their hearts by the Holy Spirit, discover themselves in the public profession and open practice of holiness, which strike the eyes and ears of all. Nor is it improbable there is here an allusion to a received custom in the East, by which the names of masters were stamped on the foreheads of their servants, as Grotius has observed from Hesychius and Aristophanes. The godly, then, are God's peculiar property; for they bear his name on their foreheads, Rev. 14:1. They also profess themselves to be set apart for his service.

IX. And as God sets his seal upon them, so in like manner, they "subscribe with their hand," to be only the Lord's, Isa. 44:5. The Roman soldiers of old, according to Vegetius de re Milit., lib. ii. c. 5, being marked with indelible characters in the skin, were wont to be sworn when they were enlisted; and hence in the law of Mauritius, "Signati in manu," they who are marked in the hand, is a circumlocution for soldiers: for στιγματά ἐστι τῶν στρατευομένων ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν, "the marks of soldiers are in their hands," says Æliah. This is what Chrysostom, on Rom. 4:11, calls σφραγίδα τοῦ στρατιώτου, "the seal of the soldier:" see Grotius on Rev. 13:16. In much the same manner, believers, being sealed by God with the efficacy of the flaming Spirit,\* and a truly indelible and never fading character, do, at the same time, bind themselves by an oath, to be faithful to God, as soldiers to their general. For while they profess themselves to be God's, they also give themselves up to his service alone. Acts 27:23: "Whose I am, and whom I serve." In a word, the chosen and called are all saints, because, separated from the rest of the world, they are declared to be God's on several accounts. But we have not yet mentioned the principal thing.



X. Thirdly, Holiness denotes that purity of a man, in his nature, inclinations, and actions, which consists in an imitation and expression of the divine purity or holiness. God is the great pattern of his rational creatures. His will is expressed in the law, which was the pattern shown to Moses in the mount, according to which the sanctuary of our soul ought to be framed. But his divine virtues or perfections are a pattern, which we are to contemplate with so much diligence, attention, and devotion, as to be ourselves transformed according to that, 1 Pet. 1:15, 16: "But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; because it is written, Be ye holy, for I am holy." Virtue or holiness may be considered in different respects. As it agrees with the prescription of the law, it is called righteousness; but as it is a conformity to God, and an expression of his purity, it is termed holiness. And it is chiefly in this sense that we shall now speak concerning holiness.

XI. Having thus previously explained these things, it will not be hard to infer what we mean by sanctification; namely, that real work of God, by which they, who are chosen, regenerated and justified, are continually more and more transformed from the turpitude of sin to the purity of the divine image.

XII. We distinguish this work of God from the first regeneration and first effectual calling to Christ. For the immediate term or effect of regeneration is a principle of spiritual life, which, in a moment, is put into the soul, by the immediate energy of the Holy Spirit. The term or effect of effectual calling is the mystical union and communion with Christ. But the term or effect of sanctification are the habits of spiritual virtues or graces, and their lively exercise; and thus sanctification follows upon regeneration and effectual calling, at least in the order of nature, and supposes those actions of God as going before it.

XIII. There is still a further difference between sanctification and justification: for justification is a judiciary act, terminating in a relative change of state; namely, a freedom from punishment and a right to life: sanctification a real work, which is performed by a supernatural influence, and which terminates in a change of state as to the quality both of habits and actions.

XIV. Yet we are to take notice, that the term sanctification is not always taken, by divines, in this strict sense; sometimes they comprehend under it regeneration and the first infusion of a new life, and take sanctification, renovation of the Spirit, regeneration, the new creature, the first resurrection for synonymous terms, as the Leyden professors, Synops. Disput. 33, §. 2. Sometimes also they include justification under the same term. "It is well known," says the abridger of Chamierus, p. 860, "that the terms justification and sanctification are put one for the other." Gomarus, in like manner, on 1 Pet. 1:2. Sanctification, taken in a general sense, comprises regeneration and justification. Nay sometimes the word sanctification is taken so largely, as to include the whole of man's salvation. Polanus in Syntagm., lib. vi. c. 37: "Sometimes both appellations, viz. regeneration and sanctification are taken in a larger sense, for the whole of our salvation or beatification, if I may so speak," as Heb. 10:10. But yet the accuracy of those is more commendable, who distinguish those terms in the manner I have explained: especially as the Scripture often distinctly mentions those benefits, and describes sanctification as a continued work of God, leading the elect gradually on to perfection, and as I do not remember to have observed it speak so of regeneration.

XV. Nor are we to omit, that sanctification is sometimes held forth as a blessing from God to man, 1 Thess. 5:23, "and the very God of peace sanctify you wholly." Sometimes as man's duty towards God, 1 Thess. 4:3, "For this is the will of God, even your sanctification." The former God powerfully works in us, according to the purpose of his gracious decree. The latter he justly requires of us by the will of his holy command. When sanctification denotes the first implantation of spiritual habits, it is a mere blessing from God, in procuring which we do not co-operate with him, but receive it from him. As it signifies the activity, or lively exercise of infused habits, and their corroboration and progress, so far we are active; but then it is as we are acted upon under God, and dependently on him; for these things can never be separated.

XVI. The term from which, in sanctification, is the pollution of sin. Adam, in departing from the prescribed rule, forfeited the ornament of the image of God, in which he was formed, for himself and all his posterity; and whilst he wickedly affected a forbidden equality with God, came most to resemble the devil, and like that evil spirit, deformed himself by his own crime, than which we can imagine nothing more hideous or base. The soul of the sinner is a horrid monster, misshapen, huge, and devoid of light: mere darkness, mere confusion, every thing being disjointed and out of order there; nothing properly placed; the things we should despise are esteemed, and what we should value most are neglected. Were a man to take a clear view of his inward disposition in a faithful mirror, he would certainly, with the utmost horror, fly from himself as from a most terrible spectacle. And indeed, if holiness is the most beautiful ornament of the divine perfections, that thing must needs be the most deformed which is not only the most unlike, but diametrically opposite to, that ornamental beauty. This is that *ρύπαρία και περισσεία κακίας* mentioned, James 1:21, "Filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness." To this it is owing, that man is become abominable in the sight of God, who cannot but turn away the radiant eyes of his unspotted holiness, Hab. 1:13.

XVII. Moreover, Adam propagated this vile resemblance of the devil to his posterity, not excepting those whom grace has sanctified. For he also "begat Seth in his own likeness, after his image," Gen. 5:3. I do not chiefly apply this to the likeness of the human nature, much less to the likeness of that holiness, which God graciously restored to Adam, as Chrysostom, Lyranus, and Clarius contend for. For, 1st, Holiness and righteousness are not the image of any man, but of God. 2dly, Adam is never proposed in Scripture as the pattern or author of holiness, but as the person by whom sin entered into the world, Rom. 5:12. 3dly, The image of holiness, restored in the parent by grace, is never propagated to the son by natural generation. Things natural are propagated, but things supernatural are "alone of God that showeth mercy," Rom. 9:16. But by this likeness of Adam, I understand the vicious corruption of his nature. 1st, Because the image of Adam, after Seth was begotten, is set in opposition to the image of God, after which Adam was created. 2dly, Because the apostle, in like manner, opposes 1 Cor. 15:49, the image of the earthly Adam, as consisting of sin and pollution, to the image of the heavenly Adam, which consists in holiness and glory. 3dly, Because the whole analogy of Scripture evinces, that "a clean thing cannot be brought out of an unclean," and that "what is born of the flesh is flesh," Job 14:4, John 3:6.

XVIII. This turpitude of sin is, by Paul, called the old man, Eph. 4:22, Col. 3:9. Man, because it overspreads the whole man, and defiles both soul and body; in the soul, it has possession of the understanding, will, and affections.

XIX. It has involved the understanding in horrid darkness, whereby it is grossly ignorant of divine things, Eph. 4:18. So that the ἄνθρωπος ψυχικός, the natural or animal man, or he that has no other spirit but his soul, and destitute of the Spirit of God, Jude 20, "receiveth not the things of God, neither can he know them," 1 Cor. 2:14. And as he discerns no wisdom in divine things, worthy of God, so, with intolerable presumption, he represents them under those disagreeable notions, which his own foolish and self-conceited wisdom hath devised; and while he attempts to correct the wisdom of God which he cannot understand, he transfigures it, as much as he can, to downright folly. And this is that which is said, Rom. 1:22, 23: "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools: and changed the glory of the incorruptible God," &c.

XX. But the sinner is not only under blindness, but is in love with his blindness. He glories, that he really sees, even when he is most blind, John 9:40, 41. And when, to the utmost of his power, he resists the true light, though discovering itself in a most pleasing manner by the works of divine providence, by the word of God, and by some sparkling rays of the Spirit; "he loves darkness rather than light; hateth the light, neither cometh to the light," John 3:19, 20. Of such Job witnesseth, "that they are of those that rebel against the light," Job 24:13. They have an aversion to all light, both that which is natural, which hinders them from perpetrating their crimes in the sight of the world; and that which is moral, which convinces them of the duty they ought certainly to perform, but which they wickedly neglect. They endeavour to stifle it, by disputing both against the word of God and their own conscience. Hence those impious expressions of some, who wish that this or the other truth, that opposes their lusts, was not to be found in the word of God.

XXI. And yet, those very persons that are so foolish in that which is good, are most subtle and crafty in that which is evil, Jer. 4:22. They commit evil by that art, which is exactly conformable to the pattern of the infernal spirits. Emphatical is that of Micah, on this head, chap. 7:3: "הרע על להיטיב כפים", both hands are upon evil, that they may do it well."\* They are not slothful in evil, but apply both hands, exert all their strength. And they take care to do it well, according to the rules of that satanical art, carefully observing all the contrivances of wickedness: nay, they have learned to frame and contrive it with so much art as to impose it on the incautious, under the appearance of good.

XXII. Nor is the will less corrupt; for, 1st, it is averse to all that is truly good. Job 21:14: "Therefore they say unto God, Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways. And when the great things of the law are written to them, they are counted as a strange thing;" as of no very great moment, and what they have no concern with, Hos. 8:12. And how can it be otherwise? For since, by reason of their blindness, they do not discern the excellency of true virtue, but on the contrary find many things in the practice of it which are opposite to their unruly lusts, their mind is averse to it; "they hate the good," Micah. 3:2.

XXIII. Secondly, it is driven on to evil, with great impetuosity: "they love the evil," Micah 3:2, to a degree indeed, that not some, but "every imagination of the heart of man;" not at some, but "at all times;" not in some, but in every measure, "is only evil," Gen. 6:5. Now this is to be understood, not only of the giants in the first ages, as appears by comparing this place with chap. 8:21, where almost the same words are used concerning men in future periods of time. "I will not again," says God, "curse the ground any more, because (or though) the imagination of man's

heart is evil from his youth." Whereby it is intimated that evil imagination is the common blemish of all mankind. To this also may be referred what Paul writes, Rom. 8:7: "το φρόνημα της σαρκος, the carnal mind (the wisdom of the flesh)" that which it willingly imagines, lusts after as wisdom, or that action which the carnal mind contrives, "is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

XXIV. Nay, 3dly, the desire of evil is so great, that it is irritated by that very law of God which forbids it; and is more impetuously hurried on to things forbidden, only because they are prohibited. Without the driving or impelling force of the law, sin lies dormant and lifeless; but when the commandment comes, it revives, and is put in motion, and taking occasion by the commandment, works all manner of concupiscence; to a pitch, that, every check being hurtful, "by the commandment sin might become exceeding sinful," Rom. 7:8, 9, 11, 13. Chrysostom beautifully says, "Όταν τινός ἐπιθυμῶμεν, εἰ τα κωλῳόμεθα, αἰρετα· μᾶλλον της ἐπιθυμίας ἢ φλόξ. When we lust after any thing, and are afterwards restrained; this only blows up the flame of lust to a higher degree."

XXV. Surprising and lamentable is the depravity in the affections. For, 1st, When the understanding does not lead them on to things holy, spiritual, heavenly, and eternal, they are basely and madly bent upon things corporeal, carnal, fading, and sinful; and mis-spend all their vigour on things beneath and unworthy a man. 2dly, In all their emotions they are furiously tossed, and not waiting for the direction of the understanding, but throwing off the reins of reason, and having no restraint, they rush headlong with a blind and wicked violence, and basely rack and wound the soul; never allowing her any rest, nor that calmness which would otherwise be her peculiar happiness, but continually crying, "like the daughters of the horse-leach, Give, Give," Prov. 30:16. Hence God elegantly compares the wicked to "the troubled sea, which cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt," Isa. 57:20. 3dly, They are obstinately bold and lustful, both against the will of God's decree and of his command; ever lusting after what is contrary to it, with that eagerness, that they can scarcely bear that God and nature should not be subservient to their desire, and all rules of religion not be framed and modelled to their liking. These are those "πάθη ἀτιμίας, vile affections," mentioned Rom. 1:26. Which, though they do not rage with equal fury in all, yet they reside in the soul as in a stable, and being restrained to no purpose, burst out at times with the greater fierceness.

XXVI. Nor indeed, is the body itself free from the tyrannical dominion of sin: the members are agitated by such an inordinate flow of blood and spirits, that they easily carry away the mind, while it is forgetful of her own dignity. And indeed, that pleasure which the members have in sin, or which they seek for by sinning, is the cause of most sins, even spiritual sins not excepted, and of their reasoning against the law of God. This perverseness and corruption is by the apostle called "the law in the members," that is, that power and efficacy of sin dwelling in the body, which had frequently forced it to a criminal compliance, and had "warred against the law of his mind;" that is, against the law of God, inscribed on the mind by nature and grace, and in which the mind delights, "and had brought him into captivity;" and having once taken hold of him, does not let him go, Rom. 7:23. Certainly, the members seduce and prove offensive, which Job, being afraid of, "made a covenant with his eyes, that they should not look upon a maid," Job 31:1. And David prayed, "Turn away mine eyes from beholding vanity," Ps. 119:37. And Wisdom advises,

to "put a knife to thy throat, if thou be a man given to appetite," Prov. 23:2. All these plainly declare the danger arising to religion from the members.

XXVII. As therefore this corruption wholly overspreads all the parts and faculties of man, it is therefore called man. But it goes by the name of the old man: 1st, Because it sprung up in paradise itself, at the beginning, by the infection of the tempting serpent, and owes its original to that old dragon, mentioned Rev. 12:9. 2dly, Because it is cotemporary with every man in particular, Ps. 51:7, and, if not always in order of time, yet of nature, precedes man's gracious regeneration. 3dly, Because we ought to abolish, reject, and abhor it, as a worthless and antiquated thing, which is worn out and disfigured by long use, just as old things pass away, that all things may become new, 2 Cor. 5:17.

XXVIII. This corruption is sometimes held forth under the emblem of an unseemly, filthy, and loathsome garment; and then it is said "to be put off" and laid aside by sanctification, Col. 3:9, and Eph. 4:22. Sometimes under the emblem of a monster, destroying by horrid violence every thing in man; and then it is said to be "mortified," Col. 3:5, and "crucified," Gal. 5:24. Now, this putting off and mortification of the old man, is nothing else but the destruction of the dominion of sin, and the purging of corruptions: so that, 1st, We be vexed at the heart and grieved because of them, for nothing dies without pain and anguish. 2dly, That we abhor them as we would a rotten carcass. 3dly, That we have them in execration as things which have put God and man to torment.\* 4thly, That we suppress all their motions, as far as possible, both in the soul and the body, and never suffer them to revive again, Rom. 6:6: "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed;" not only some actions and parts of it, but that entire compound, made up of depraved habits, thoughts, lusts, words, and actions, as a body is made up of its members, "that henceforth we should not serve sin."

XXIX. By another phrase, the godly are said to be "dead to sin," Rom. 6:2. The meaning of which is, that as a dead body is not a fit habitation for the soul, seeing it has not those organs and that disposition of parts by which the soul operates; so believers, with respect to sin and its motions, are dead bodies, useless and motionless organs, in which it can no longer lodge, live, and exert its efficacy.

XXX. Not much different is that expression of Paul, Gal. 6:14, in which he says the world was crucified to him and he to the world; intimating, that he was no more delighted with the vanities of the world, than a good man would be with the rotten carcass of a malefactor who was justly condemned to a shameful death; and, on the other hand, that the world was unable to act upon, or affect him, with any greater efficacy, than objects of sense affect a dead person.

XXXI. This putting off, and this mortification of the old man, is always accompanied with the putting on, or vivification of the new man, by which are denoted all those qualities wherein the excellency of the divine image is placed. These come under the appellation man, for the same reason we just gave of the depraved qualities, because they overspread the whole man; so that there is nothing in the sanctified person, no part, no faculty, that remains untouched or neglected by the sanctifying Spirit, and unadorned with new habits. And as the citadel and throne of virtue stands in the mind and inward parts, therefore Paul speaks of the "inward man," Rom. 7:22, and Peter, 1 Epist. 3:4, of the "hidden man of the heart."

XXXII. A new and gracious light shines upon the understanding: the eyes of the mind are enlightened, Eph. 1:18, by which it sees divine truths, not under false and confused ideas, but in their native form and beauty, "the truth as it is in Jesus," Eph. 4:21; so that the sanctified person really beholds in those truths, the manifold wisdom of God, the depths of his perfections, and the unsearchable riches of Christ; nor does he see them only, but in a manner not to be expressed, feels them, penetrating themselves into his inmost heart, embraces them with a glowing affection of piety, exults in them, and desires that what is truth in Christ, may be also truth in him, and that he may be modelled to the likeness of those truths, and cast as it were into the very shape of them. In fine, that knowledge of God which flutters not in the brain only, but brings forth the fruit of every good work, from the day that he hath truly heard and known the grace of God, is a part of the new man, Col. 1:6, 9, 10. Whereas that other knowledge which puffs up and boasts itself, and charges the wisdom of God with folly, is vain; and the more boldly it counterfeits the new man, the more it appears to be "earthly, sensual, and devilish," James 3:15.

XXXIII. Among other things, the understanding of a sanctified person beholds so much purity in God, who is the pattern of the rational creature; so much equity in the law of God, which is the rule of every virtue; so much holiness in Christ Jesus, who exhibited himself to us as a living law; so much beauty in virtue, or holiness itself, which is as it were the native image of the Deity; that he reckons nothing more excellent than exactly to resemble that pattern, that rule, and that image. He sees nothing in any of these that he would correct, nothing he would have otherwise appointed, neither does he imagine that any thing can be better framed, and thus "he consenteth to the law, that it is good," Rom. 7:16. This is what Paul calls a "being filled with the knowledge of his will, in all wisdom and spiritual understanding," Col. 1:9.

XXXIV. And as the eyes are with difficulty diverted from a pleasing object, so to him whose mind is enlightened by the Holy Spirit, nothing can be more desirable, nothing more pleasant, nothing more charming, than to dwell on the contemplation of God and the meditation of divine things. He loves to join the night to the day, Ps. 1:2, and then he entertains himself, then he is delighted, then he exults, and seems by his earnestness to enjoy heaven itself; while he is deeply engaged in this sacred meditation, and, at the same time forgetting himself, he is plunged as it were in the immense gulf of the divine perfections and mysteries.

XXXV. Nor is the enlightened mind satisfied to taste things alone by itself, nor enviously to conceal its treasure; but it discovers those sacred truths to the will, to which it frequently presents them as things most precious, which are far more valuable than gold and silver, or even than pearls, which are still more highly esteemed, that the will also may be united to them by the indissoluble band of love, and with the utmost readiness be in holy subjection to them. This is the activity of the sanctified understanding.

XXXVI. Now the will cannot possibly reject so great a good, which is constantly pointed out to it by the understanding as such. It is therefore ravished with the love of it, Ps. 119:97: "O! how love I thy law!" Rom. 7:22. It delights in the law of God, Ps. 40:8: "I delight to do thy will, O my God!" For what is truth in Christ, becomes also truth in its order and degree in those who are Christ's. The will is never easy, never satisfied, when it finds it has displeased God, and departed from his will.

XXXVII. Hence ariseth a steady and fixed purpose of heart, to be conformable in all things to God, Ps. 119:106. To whom the will wholly resigns itself up, to be swallowed as it were in his will; establishing this into an inviolable and sacred law for itself, to have the same inclinations, the same aversions with God. And God himself declares, that the true reverence or fear of the Deity lies in this, Prov. 8:13: "The fear of the Lord is to hate evil; pride and arrogancy and the evil way, and the froward mouth do I hate." He that truly fears God, will hate what he knows to be hateful to God; and, on the contrary, love what God loves, Ps. 139:21, 22.

XXXVIII. And seeing the will commands the inferior faculties, as they are called, and, in its measure, even the understanding itself; hence, with the greatest alacrity, it makes all things to be ready at the will and pleasure of God and of Christ. So that the soul of one who is sanctified, is like a well marshalled army, in which every individual will, in his place and order, directly move upon the first word or sign of command. This is that "willing mind," by which we are acceptable to God, 2 Cor. 8:12.

XXXIX. The understanding and will being thus set in order, the tumult of the wild affections gradually comes to subside, which being forced into order, learn to wait the commands of reason before they take a single step, and in proportion to the object, act either more intensely, or more remissly; moreover, they exert themselves in a right and proper manner, with respect to spiritual and heavenly things, with which before they were wont to be scarcely, if at all affected: in short, they calmly resign themselves to be governed by the Holy Spirit, receiving from him, with full submission, the law of motion and of rest. When formerly furious lust held the reins, they were accustomed to run mad after wordly, carnal, and vitious objects, now they suffer themselves to be led, as circumstances require, and being sublimated to a higher pitch, and having obtained a more generous and noble guide, they strongly, by their native vehemence, excite or push forward the mind, otherwise slow in its motion, to objects that are holy, heavenly, and becoming a Christian.

XL. In the mean time, this admonition is continually inculcated upon them, that they must not consult with their affections, whenever they are called to comply with, or submit to, the will of God, whether that of his decree or that of his precept. In that case, they are enjoined to a perfect silent submission. He who is sanctified does not presume so much as to wish, that God would regulate either his precepts or purposes from any regard to his desire, hope, or fear. That self-denial which is the first lesson in Christ's school, commands all the affections to be silent, and unlimited obedience obliges them to be resigned to God. It is not lawful for a Christian to wish, that any thing that God has done or spoken should be otherwise than it is; and whenever that foolish self-love which is not yet quite rooted out, begins, through its unmortified lusts and vain anxiety, to go away from God to other things, then the superior faculty of the soul, under the conduct and direction of the Spirit, repeats that pious ejaculation, "and thou, my soul, wait thou only upon [be silent unto] God," Psa. 62:5. This is to "compose the soul, and keep it in quiet;" Ps. 131:2, that it may look upon it as unlawful, either to wish or mutter any thing against the will of God.

XLI. Moreover, that holy disposition of soul communicates itself to the members of the body, which, being before "instruments of unrighteousness unto sin," are now "instruments of righteousness unto God," Rom. 6:13. In a sanctified person, the eyes, the tongue, the ears, the

hands, and the feet, are not only restrained from giving the least occasion, to entice and disturb the mind, as Paul said of himself, that he "kept under his body, and brought it into subjection," 1 Cor. 9:27; but all of them are ready, and inclined to obey God, to whom they yield themselves, in order to the practice of righteousness, and even as weapons, by which the kingdom of sin and Satan may be strongly opposed. For, so long as the most eminent virtues lie concealed in the inward recess of the mind, they cannot edify our neighbour, and gain him over from sin to holiness; but when they are exercised by the members of the body, when the tongue lays itself out in the praises of God, and the commendation of virtue or holiness; the hands and feet, in assisting his neighbour, and the other parts of the body, according to their several capacities, in the practice of religion: it is then he fights manfully, for extirpating vice, and promoting virtue. Nor can it be doubted, but the apostle's expression imports all this.

XLII. From all this it is now evident, that even the new man, no less than the old, possesses the whole man, both soul and body; according to the command of Paul, 1 Cor. 6:20: "Glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's;" and his prayer, 1 Thess. 5:23. "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly, and your whole spirit, and soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Interpreters differ with respect to the distinction between spirit and soul, and the signification of each term. We agree with those who, by spirit, understand the mind, the ἡγεμονικον, or leading faculty of man, called, by Philo, de Mundo, "ἐξάριετον ἄνθρωπον γέρας, the select ornament of man," in which his principal excellence above the other creatures consists; and elsewhere called by the apostle "νοῦς, mind," Eph. 4:17: but by soul, the inferior faculties; not as if there were two souls, but that, in the manner commonly received among philosophers, Paul distinguishes the faculties of one and the same soul. And by body, it is plain, is denoted the receptacle of the soul. And the whole man will, at last, be sanctified, when the spirit shall think nothing, the soul desire nothing, the body execute nothing, but what is agreeable to the will of God.

XLIII. Now, these spiritual qualities of a man, are called, the new man. 1st. Because they succeed upon the departure of the old man, 2 Cor. 5:17: "Old things are passed away, behold, all things are become new." 2dly. Because they are quite other than, and very different from, the former. In which sense Christ said of the apostles, Mark 16:17, "They shall speak with new tongues;" that is, other tongues, Acts 2:4, different from their mother-tongue, and from those they had learned before. And certainly these good qualities are not only different from the former, but also quite contrary to them. "For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness?" 2 Cor. 6:14. 3dly. Because rare, excellent, and unparalleled. For as new things usually attract, and are esteemed valuable, as being preferable to old things, which are worn out by long use; so that which is excellent and surpassing in its kind, is also called new. In this sense God promises a new name to the godly, Isa. 62:2, Rev. 2:17, and 3:12, that is, a condition far more excellent than what they ever yet had. And, indeed, nothing excels this new man, which Peter declares, 1 Pet. 3:4, "to be in the sight of God of great price."

XLIV. Sometimes sanctification is called the putting on of the new man, as Eph. 4:24, Col. 3:10. Sometimes vivification, or the quickening of the same. Thus these landable qualities may be considered, either as a precious ornament of the soul, 1 Peter 3:3, 4, Ps. 45:14, 15, and Ps. 93:5, and Ps. 110:3, Prov. 1:9, and then they are said to be put on; or, as a new creature made



conformable to the example of Christ, which is all activity and life, and then he is said to live in us. These expressions denote the productions of those new qualities in us, and their continual increase and growth, and their being incentives to action: all which have here the nature of a term, to which they tend.

XLV. We may view the parts of our sanctification in this order: 1st. If we consider them in their whole compass or extent, they are cotemporary. For sin is expelled, virtue or holiness is introduced by the same work, just as he, who at the same time, by his motion and progress, leaves the term from which he set out, and draws near to the term whither he at first intended. 2dly. If we consider its commencement, the vivification or quickening of the new man, is first in the order of nature. For all the virtue and efficacy against sin, proceeds from a principle of a new and spiritual life. Death is removed only by life, darkness by light, poverty by riches, nakedness by clothing, deformity by beauty, hatred of God by love. 3dly. If we consider each act a part, we find a manifold variety in the order. The illumination of the understanding, which is a part of the vivification of the new man, does undoubtedly go before our being displeased with ourselves, and our sorrow for sin, which properly belong to the mortification of the old man. And this sorrow again precedes that holy alacrity of the soul, whereby it rejoices in God: and so of the rest. 4thly. If we view its consummation, the final destruction of the old man, which is effected at the dissolution of the body of sin, that is, of the body by whose lusts we are polluted, and in which we sin, Rom. 6:6, is prior to the complete sanctification of the whole man.

XLVI. Hence it appears, that sanctification does not consist only in the amendment of the actions, according to the Socinians and the favourers of Pelagianism, who do not sincerely acknowledge the corruption of our nature; but in the conferring of new habits, which succeed to the old ones, which gradually give way. Thus Peter, among these precious promises which we obtain, mentions the communication of a divine nature, a large measure of those virtues, which if they be in us, they make us that we shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." 2 Pet. 1:8. And Paul, Gal. 5:22, speaking of the fruits of the Spirit, says, that they are "love, joy, peace, long-suffering," &c. All which virtues or graces are habitual, inherent, and permanent in the soul, 1 Cor. 13:13: "And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three." Nay, sometimes the apostle uses the very term, habit, Heb. 5:14, "Who διὰ τὴν ἔξιν, by reason of use (habit), have their senses exercised." The increase indeed of this habit is acquired by repeated acts of a vigorous endeavour; though its beginning is infused by the Holy Spirit, who fills the elect with the knowledge of the will of God, in all wisdom and spiritual understanding," Col. 1:9.

XLVII. The author and efficient cause of sanctification is GOD. Uncreated, infinite holiness is the source of that which is created and finite, Ezek. 20:12, "that they might know that I am the Lord, that sanctify them." 1 Thess. 5:23. "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly." Isa. 63:11. "Who put his Holy Spirit [the spirit of his holiness] within him." He is the author of sanctification.

XLVIII. For, by a special appropriation, according to the economy of the divine operations, this work is immediately ascribed to the Holy Spirit, 2 Thess. 2:13, "through sanctification of the Spirit." Tit. 3:5, "renewing of the Holy Ghost:" and so in many other places. This is not, however, done, as if the Holy Spirit alone was immediately concerned in the production of sanctification, and the Father and Son sanctified only mediately by the Spirit. For that power by

which holiness is produced in the elect, is common to the undivided Trinity. Nor do the Father and Son operate less immediately therein than the Holy Spirit; and as the power of each divine person is the same, so also the action of all is one. That saying, "δι' οὗ τα πάντα, by whom are all things," equally belongs to the Father and the Son, as it does to the Holy Spirit. Nor does one person act by the other, as by a mean or instrument. But the reason of this appropriation seems to be thus: because the sanctification of a sinner follows upon the grace and merit of Christ; and seeing the Holy Spirit follows the Son, in the hypostatical order of subsisting and operating, and is therefore also called the Spirit of the Son, Gal. 4:6. To whom then can the application of the grace and merits of the Son be more properly ascribed, than to him who is next to the Son in order? Sanctification is such a divine operation, as supposes the will of the Father, making a testament concerning the seed which was to be given to the Son; and the will of the Son, claiming, by right, that holy seed: who then can better claim that operation, than the Holy Spirit, who is of the Father and of the Son, and who takes of the things of the Son, all that he gives unto them? John 17:14.

XLIX. However, Christ, the mediator, acts here a special part both as to impetration and application. Christ impetrated, or purchased by his merit, the sanctification of the elect. For this cause he himself came "in the likeness of sinful flesh," Rom. 8:3. "appeared under the load of sin," Heb. 9:28; for this end also himself "was made sin," 2 Corinthians. 5:21, "that he might sanctify his church," Eph. 5:26. The image of God being defaced and lost, could not possibly be restored to sinful man, unless he, who is the personal image of God the Father, should first assume the image of man, and that of a sinner and a slave, and so expose himself to the unjust hatred of men, and the most righteous vengeance of God, as if he had been the greatest of all criminals: and thus he is made unto us, by his merit, "sanctification," 1 Cor. 1:30.

L. But that which he impetrated, he applies. He unites the elect to himself by his Spirit; and then the virtue of his death and resurrection flows from him to them: "so that being planted together in the likeness of his death, they shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection; and their old man crucified with him, and they being dead with Christ, shall also live with him," Rom. 6:5, 8, and, "by the cross of Christ, the world is crucified to them, and they to the world," Gal. 6:14. This is the effect of meditating on the cross of Christ. And the power of his resurrection, Phil. 3:10, produces a new life in them. For, he himself being raised from the dead, has received not only for himself a new and a glorious life, but a fountain of a new and holy life for all his people; from which by a continued influence, the most refreshing streams flow to all his members: hence, from his own life, by a most conclusive argument, he inferred the life of his people, John 14:19, "Because I live, ye shall live also."

LI. Moreover, that work of God which produces our sanctification, is performed by a real, supernatural and most powerful efficacy, reaching to the full effect, as we have already intimated, when treating on effectual calling and regeneration. "For, we are his ποίημα, workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works," Eph. 2:10. By the very same power, which was displayed and exerted in the work of the old creation, he forms his own people to good works, or, which is the same thing, he sanctifies them. "He gives an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear," Deut. 29:4. "He puts his Spirit within them, and causes them to walk in his statutes, and to keep his judgments," Ezek. 36:27. "He gives them one heart, and one way, that they may fear him for ever," Jer. 32:39. And certainly none is fit to form again the

image of God in man, but he who at first made man after his own image; the one being a work of no less power and excellence than the other.

LII. And hence, the gangrene of the Socinian divinity discovers itself, according to which if a man has got such a full discovery of the will of God, as is made in the Gospel, with a promise of eternal life, he will then have that, whence he may receive strength to perform that very will. They sometimes mention internal assistance for form' sake, but place it only in this, that the promises of God are inscribed and sealed on the mind: and they will have this to be the case of none, unless he has first made a right use of that external aid. They are truly ignorant of any supernatural influence and real efficiency of God. So much have a fond self-admiration, and their arrogant boasting of the powers of nature infatuated them.

LIII. But some among the heathen have really spoken far better concerning the divine assistance, though unacquainted with the excellency of Christian holiness. Plutarch, de stoic. contradict. "If God give not virtue to men, but men obtain it by their own power; and give them riches and health without virtue, he certainly gives to them what they will not use well, but ill." Plutarch adds: "If the gods can bestow virtue, but do it not, they are not good and gracious; for, if they cannot render men good, neither can they profit them, since without virtue nothing can be good or profitable." To the same purpose is the twenty-second dissertation of Maximus Tyrius, entitled, "Whether any one can be made good by God;" in which there are very many things worthy of attention, but too long to be transcribed. These things he borrowed from his master Plato, in whose Menon is extant this notable dissertation: "If in the whole of this present discourse, we we have inquired and disputed correctly, then virtue is neither obtained by nature, nor by teaching, but by divine appointment." See Clemens Alexandrinus, stromat lib. v. p. 588.

LIV. Nature itself and man's conscience teach him these two things: 1st, Our inability for virtue. 2dly, The all-sufficiency of God, whereby he is the fountain and author of all true good. Of the former, Epictetus, apud Arrianum, lib. ii. c. 11, says: "the beginning of philosophy to those who enter into it by the gate, as they ought, is a sense of their own impotence and inability." Of the latter, Maximus Tyrius Dissert. 22. "We are not to imagine, that any good can befall men, but what comes from God: as there is no good to men, which derives not its original from God.

LV. From those generals, the heathen themselves have proved these more particular propositions: 1st. That, to the acquisition and practice of virtue, men stand in need of divine assistance and grace. Hierocles, a Pythagorean philosopher, has excellently taught this in these words: "We are not so much as to preconceive, that virtuous actions are so in our power, as to be performed without divine aid: we stand in need of the assistance of God, both for escaping evil and acquiring good." 2dly, That, from a sense of our own impotence, we are to ask it of God, Epictet. apud Arrianum, lib. ii. c. 18. "Noble is the struggle, and divine the enterprise, the subject a kingdom; liberty, happiness, calm of mind unruffled by passions, are all concerned; therefore remember God, call him in for thy assistant, thy associate." See also Seneca, Epist. 10, and 41, and Marc. Antonin. lib. ii. § 40. 3dly, That we are to thank God for it, Epictet. apud Arrian., lib. iv. c. 4. "Then I sinned, now I do not, thanks be to God."

LVI. But they did not imagine, that this divine assistance consisted only in moral suasion, or in presenting such objects, whereby a man may be excited to virtuous actions; but "in divine

suggestions, aids, and inspirations," as the emperor Antonine speaks, lib. i. §. 17; who in the same place declares, that he had a good disposition of mind "from the gods," which he ascribes to their beneficence: lib. ix. §. 40, he mentions their co-operation; "for, if they can at all co-operate with men, they also can in this," namely, in the practice of virtue. But if any should except, that these relate to things in our own power, he answers: "Who has told thee, that the gods do not assist even in these? Set about asking these things of the gods by prayer, and you will see the consequence."

LVII. And they maintained, that the same divine aid was so necessary to virtue, that even the best disposed souls could not be without it. Maxim. Tyr. Dissert. 22, p. 228, says: "But they, who have acquired the very best natural dispositions of soul, halting between the highest virtue and the lowest vice, stand in need of the divine aid, to give the proper bias and direction to the better side. For their natural weakness makes them easily take the worst path. This, by means of pleasures and lusts, flatters even well-disposed souls, and hurries them into the same paths of vice."

LVIII. It is, therefore, really a shame that heathen writers have entertained more humble sentiments of the infirmity and inability of our nature for good, and clearer conceptions of the divine assisting grace, and have said finer things about imploring it by prayer, than those professors of the excellency of the Christian religion, who ought to have put a due value on the holiness of true virtue. Thus they who are pagans will, in the day of judgment, rise up against those false Christians, the ungrateful enemies of the grace of God, no less to their condemnation, than the queen of the South, to that of the unbelieving Jews.

LIX. Moreover, seeing the Spirit of God, the author of holiness, is highly generous and noble, and therefore by David, Psa. 51:12, called "free (ingenuous) Spirit:" hence that holiness, with which he adorns the elect is also such as highly surpasses all the painted virtue of the Gentiles, in whatever manner it displays itself, and all the scrupulous diligence of the Scribes and Pharisees. And indeed, if it does not exceed these, it is not acknowledged to be genuine holiness by Christ our Lord, Mat. 5:20.

LX. When the children of God recollect their glorious and heavenly pedigree, they endeavour to excel others, both in a beautiful disposition of soul and manner of life, Psalm 45:13, "the king's daughter," that is, the daughter of the heavenly Father, who is also the bride of the king's son, every believing soul "is all glorious," adorned with a holiness, not only glorious to herself, but also to the Father and the bridegroom, and is the beginning of a heavenly glory: and that chiefly, "within," not only when she appears abroad, and presents herself to the view of men; but also when she sits in the inner bed-chamber, in the secret exercises of religion, in which she in private pleases the Father and the bridegroom: who having a regard to the inward man, she above all endeavours to keep that pure and chaste. "Her clothing is of gold," in comparison of which, whatever excellency natural men were ever possessed of, is but a shining vanity: nay it was "wrought" gold, curiously beautified with various resemblances, which represents the perfections of God himself; and of different colours, on account of the different, yet harmoniously corresponding graces of the Holy Spirit: or, "of needlework" of the Phrygian embroiderers, or rather the work of "the cunning workman," mentioned Cant. 7:1. Nor is the spouse only beautiful within, but also without; "holding forth the word of life," Phil. 2:16, she practises charity,

glorifies Christ, edifies her neighbour: and in this manner "she is brought unto the king, worthy to be presented to him." This is the only way by which we are to endeavour to obtain familiarity with him, and the sweetest intercourse of the chastest love, both on earth and in heaven.

LXI. That which we have in Ps. 110:3, is not very different from this encomium: "Thy people, O Jesus Christ, which were given thee by the Father, purchased and redeemed by thee, who acknowledge thee for their Lord, and are bound to thee by a military oath, extremely willing, being devoted to thy service with the greatest readiness of soul, alacrity, inclination, and voluntary obedience. Nor are they willing only, but willingness itself, in the abstract; nay, willingnesses in the plural number, the highest and most excellent willingness: all which add an emphasis. And such it is **ביום הילך ביום** in the day of thy power" [valour], in which thy generous Spirit, laying hold on them, animates them to some grand and bold enterprise. Then they go forth 'in the beauties of holiness,' by which they are a terror to the devil, a delight to God and angels, and a mutual edification to one another."

LXII. These brave soldiers of Christ are not without their ambition, which Paul describes, 2 Cor. 5:9, **Διὸ καὶ φιλοτιμούμεθα εὐάρεστοι αὐτῷ εἶναι**, wherefore we labour [make it our ambition], to be accepted of him." God never beholds himself without the highest complacency; above all, he is delighted with his own perfections, and with holiness, which is the glory of them. When he sees any delineations of this in his creatures, there he in a manner stands still, and delights his eyes with so pleasing an object, and declares by words and actions, that nothing can be more acceptable to him. And this is the holy ambition of believers, so to behave in the whole course of their life, and to have their mind so disposed, as in both to please God. Of old, Satan inspired a wicked ambition into our first parents, to labour after the image of God in a false way, by attempting what was forbidden them. But the heavenly Spirit is the author of a more generous ambition, which stirs the man up to imitate God in the habits of his soul, and the actions of his life, that he may, upon earth, present something before God, in which he may take pleasure, as in a lively image of himself, Nothing can be more noble than this holy ambition.

LXIII. What is said, Cant. 1:9, is very remarkable. "I have compared thee, O my love, to a company of horses in Pharaoh's chariot." For the understanding this passage, we are to explain. 1st, Why the church is compared to a horse. 2dly, Why to an Egyptian horse. 3dly, Why to a horse in the king's chariots. As to the first. 1. A horse suffers itself to be easily managed and led, not only with spur and bridle, but also with the whip. Thus Strabo writes, lib. 17, that the Massylians and Lybians made use of horses so swift and manageable that they could be governed by the whip only: hence Martial says, lib. 9, Epigr. 23, "Et Massylæum virgo gubernet equum. And manage a Massylean horse with a rod." Wherefore the very learned Bochart, Hierozoic., lib. 2, c. 6, refers the Hebrew word **סוּב** to a word used by the Arabs, which signifies to manage and govern. See what Lipsius has collected, Centur. 3, ad Belgas, Epist. 56, concerning the nature, fidelity, and natural affection of horses. Such also are the godly; for, as they have renounced their own will, so they are docile and manageable at the least command of God, saying, "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth." 2. A horse is a very strong creature, and hence it is, Jer. 8:16, and 47:3, called, **אֲבִיר** strong. Whence the very learned person ingeniously conjectures, that Epirus, a country famous for horses, had its name. In like manner, the godly "go in the strength of the Lord God," Ps. 76:6; "they can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth them," Phil. 4:13. And perform such things in overcoming the world and

conquering sin, as far exceed the strength of other men. 3dly, A horse is a generous animal, to which God himself gives an illustrious encomium as an emblem of warlike prowess, Job 39:22, &c. Bochart, 1. c. chap. 8 has given us a very distinct explication of that passage. And certainly there is something heroical in the godly, which, whenever Christ, salvation, and piety, are concerned, discovers itself in a manner that may astonish those who behold it. For, the aged, the young, the helpless of both sexes, have been often seen to behave with such courage and bravery for Christ, and undergo with so much resolution the most cruel deaths in the cause of religion, that it was evident they were actuated by a spirit above that which is human. And they were "as mighty men, which tread down their enemies in the mire of the streets in the battle; and they did fight because the Lord was with them, and the riders on horse were confounded." Zech. 10:5.

LXIV. Moreover, Egypt was formerly famous for its horses, of which we frequently read in Scripture, 2 Kings 18:24, Isa. 31:1. Nay, the law itself prohibited the kings of Judah too much to multiply their horses, least by that means they should bring the people back to Egypt, Deut. 17:16. However, Solomon had his horses from thence in very great numbers, 1 Kings 10:28, 29; 2 Chron. 9:28. We may then infer from this, that they were extraordinary beyond others. But to such Egyptian horses the church is compared, to show her excellent courage and boldness: for the Egyptian horse was the symbol of this, and in their ensigns they preferred it to the lion, as Clemens Alexandrinus Stromat. lib. 5, p. 567, informs us: "for, of strength and force, the lion is their symbol; but of courage and boldness, the horse."

LXV. Nor are they compared to this alone, but also to the horses in king Pharaoh's chariot, which doubtless were the most excellent, and selected from his whole kingdom. For, as the royal chariot excelled, so, who can doubt, that the king's horses excelled all others? All these comparisons are adapted to set off the nobleness of Christian piety.

LXVI. Nay, God does not stop here; but as if it was too mean, to compare his elect to a company of horses in Pharaoh's chariot, he promises to prepare them, הוֹדֵן כְּסוּם, "as the horse of his majesty, his goodly horse in the battle," Zech. 10:3. Than which nothing could be spoken with greater magnificence. The holy person is really as a horse prepared for the battle of the Lord, and the horse of the Supreme Commander, of the Divine Majesty, which, on account of its strength and valour is worthy to be mounted by the king of heaven himself. Wherefore, even he who had his name written on his vesture and on his thigh, "the King of kings, and Lord of lords," was seen by John fitting on "a white horse," Rev. 19:11; by which is denoted the genuine professors of truth, and sincere followers of holiness, with whom Jesus fights, and in whom he rests and is glorified.

LXVII. But that this pre-eminence of Christian virtues may appear more evidently, three things are distinctly to be considered. 1st, Their original. 2dly, Their rule. 3dly, Their end; for in these things their super-excellence consists above all the virtues or graces of the unsanctified.

LXVIII. As to their original, the virtues of the heathen, and the actions proceeding from thence, have their rise from some remains of the divine image, still left in man since the fall; such as innate notions, some love of honesty, the incentives of a natural conscience; besides those, some have had a liberal education, applied themselves to the study of philosophy; and enjoyed some special benefits of the common providence of God, repressing, restraining, and curbing innate

corruption, and, on the other hand, exciting them to the practice of a much more regular life than the common herd of mankind, so that these virtues had no higher nor better original than nature, excited by the assistance of common providence, Rom. 2:14, 15: "the Gentiles do, by nature, the things contained in the law, and show the work of the law written in their hearts."

LXIX. But the practice of Christian holiness has its rise, 1st, From the spirit of grace, which Christ has merited for, and bestows on his elect, "whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him," John 14:17, who, seeing he is the Spirit of Christ, excites, in the elect, even the very same motions and inclinations of soul which are in Christ, and moulds and forms the whole life of Christ in them: so that they act, not by their own virtue or strength, nor by any innate principle of natural life, but by supernatural grace, and the virtue of Christ. 1 Cor. 15:10: "Not I, but the grace of God, which is with me;" and Heb. 12:28: "Let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably."

LXX. 2dly, From faith, "without which it is impossible to please God," Heb. 11:6. For, εὐαρεστῆσαι, to please, signifies here to walk before God, as is evident from the foregoing verse, where the apostle says, that Enoch, before his translation, had this testimony, that he pleased God. By which words he undoubtedly has an eye to what we have, Gen. 5:24: "and Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him." For to walk with God the Septuagint every where translate, εὐαρεστεῖν τῷ Θεῷ, to please God; they also, in some places, render ἡρῶ, to serve, by the same word. The apostle here imitates their way of speaking, in like manner as Tit. 2:9, where he enjoins servants, "ἐν παντί εὐαρεστοὺς εἶναι, in all things to please them," that is, so to behave as in every thing to do what is wellpleasing to their masters.

LXXI. But faith, without which nothing can be done that is acceptable to God, is that virtue or grace which is the beginning of the spiritual life, or the first work of the Holy Spirit uniting us to Christ. And there are various ways to prove that without this a man can do nothing that is good. 1st, Seeing faith apprehends and applies to itself all the efficacy of Christ's merits, it has a power "of purifying the heart," Acts 15:9. But so long as that fountain of the heart is impure, nothing pure can flow from it: for "unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure," not even their food; "but their mind and conscience is defiled," Tit. 1:15. On the contrary, "the end of the commandment is charity, out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned," 1 Tim. 1:5. 2dly, By faith we are justified and are restored to the favour of God. But it is necessary that the persons of sinners be acceptable to God in Christ before their works can be so. For how can the work of that man please God who is an abomination and execration to him? First, God had respect to Abel, then to his offering, Gen. 4:4. "Be it far," says Augustine, lib. 4, contra Julianum, c. 3, "that any one should be really virtuous who is not righteous. But be it far that he should be truly righteous who does not live by faith; for the just shall live by faith. 3dly, It is not possible that any can truly love God, and endeavour, from a principle of love, to do what is acceptable to him, unless he know him to be such, as he manifests himself in Christ the Mediator? But it is the proper work of faith to behold God in Christ; and thus faith worketh by love, Gal. 5:6. 4thly, As faith first unites us to Christ, so it continually draws virtue, efficacy, and life from him, by a spiritual suction and attraction, whereby we may be enabled to act in a holy manner. "The life which I live, I live by the faith of the Son of God," Gal. 2:20."

LXXII. But besides that common faith, which is the fountain of all spiritual life, another more special faith is requisite to the goodness of our actions, consisting in a certain persuasion of mind, that the work we undertake is good and holy, or at least lawful, and nowhere prohibited. For, whoever does any thing, about which he is not certain, that it is acceptable to God, does by that very action show that he is not affected with a due reverence for the Deity, nor endeavours, as is fit, to avoid the displeasure and indignation of God. And to this, I imagine, the apostle has an eye, Rom. 14:23: "He that doubteth;" that is, who is not persuaded in his conscience, that he may lawfully eat of any food; "is condemned, if he eat;" that is, is judged to have acted amiss: "because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith, is sin." For here the apostle presses what he had enjoined, ver. 5, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

LXXIII. 3dly, The practice of Christian holiness flows from the love of God, and consists in that very ambition which we have recommended from 2 Cor. 5:9, of doing what is acceptable to God. And in this Christian holiness surpasses all the virtuous actions of the heathen, who were very justly commended, if what they did proceeded from the love of that virtue they were acquainted with; but as that love did not ascend to God himself, but centred in a created, nay, and in a very defective thing, such as their virtue was, it was not a holy love, but a vicious affection, which indirectly and sinfully terminates in man himself.

LXXIV. Jansenius, lib. 4, de statu naturæ lapsæ. chap. 11, seq., has treated distinctly and at large on this subject, where he speaks to this purpose: "This therefore was the proper defect of philosophical virtue, even when purest, that being delighted with a certain ruinous height of virtue, they earnestly desired it for this end, that they might be great in their own esteem, delight and please themselves; whereas it became them to please God, or the truth, as Augustine speaks. This vice of self pleasing so closely adheres to those who seek not to please either God or men, that it is not possible such persons should not fall into it." To which he immediately subjoins: "Whoever lifts not up his eyes to God, in order to please him from the beauty of virtue, but admires it alone, as the end of good, the fairest and the most exalted; it is impossible that either desiring it he should not thence please himself, or not willing thence to please himself, he should desire it. Seeing it is altogether necessary, the soul of man should delight in something. With what other object, pray, can a soul alienated from God be delighted, and looking down, as we suppose, with contempt on the other meaner creatures, than with what he imagines to be most excellent among created things? but this is the mind itself, now adorned with virtue, which ornament it judges the most becoming of all. He therefore necessarily pleases himself from his virtue, who desires not by it to please either God or other men." All which is sound and solid.

LXXV. Christian virtue, therefore, has a deeper and better original, than any love of virtue whatsoever, or than any complacency in one's own actions. But faith, which represents God to the soul as infinitely good and perfectly holy, and the most bountiful rewarder of good actions; as also his laws, as full of equity and justice; inflames the soul with the love of a gracious God, and of his most equitable laws; and to deem nothing preferable to, nothing more valuable than, by a conformity to those laws, to resemble him, in his measure, in holiness, and, in that resemblance, to please him. That God, looking down as it were, out of himself and from heaven, may also find upon earth what to delight himself in, as his copy; which is the highest pleasure of a holy soul. So that it loves not virtue for itself alone, but for God, whose image it is, and whom, in the practice of virtue, it pleases. From this love to God springs the practice of true holiness.



LXXVI. I cannot but transcribe an excellent passage of Clemens Alexandrinus to this purpose, who *Stromat.*, lib. v. p. 532, thus gives us the picture of a holy person: "He who obeys the bare call, so far as he is called, labours after knowledge, neither from fear nor from pleasure. For he does not consider whether any profitable gain, or external pleasure, will ensue; but being constrained by the love of what is truly amiable, and thereby excited to his duty, he is a pious worshipper of God. Were we, therefore, to suppose him to have received from God a liberty to what was forbidden, without any apprehension of punishment; nay, moreover, had he a promise of receiving the reward of the blessed; and besides, was he persuaded that his actions should escape the notice of God (which by the way is impossible);—he could never be prevailed with to act contrary to right reason, after he had once chosen what is really lovely and eligible of itself, and on that account to be loved and desired." Than which nothing more sublime can be said.

LXXVII. He would have a holy or sanctified person do every thing from a principle of love. "It becomes him who is perfect to be in the exercise of love, and so endeavour after the divine favour and friendship, while he performs the commandments by love." But this love has not renown, nor any other advantage, but virtue itself, pure virtue for its object; so he frames his life after the image and resemblance of God, no longer for the sake of renown, or, as the philosophers speak, *Εὐκλειαν*, of a splendid name; nor from the view of reward, either from God or men. Moreover, what renders virtue amiable to him, is not that philosophical agreement it has to right reason, but because he beholds in it a resemblance to God, than which nothing can be imagined more amiable; for thus he describes it, what is truly good, he calls truly desirable, saying, "it is good by an assimilation to God to become impassive and virtuous."

LXXVIII. Yet we are not so to understand these things, as if, in the practice of holiness, we were not allowed to pay any regard to our own advantage, and that all love of ourselves ought in this case quite to disappear. We are not only allowed, but commanded to love ourselves; nor are we bound to love our neighbour without a love for ourselves. And this is not written, but a natural law, which we have learned from no other quarter, but have received from nature herself. "No man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it," Eph. 5:29. We may also be lawfully stirred up to the diligent practice of holiness, by this love of ourselves. God himself, by this enticing motive, invites his people, promising that "their labour shall not be in vain in the Lord," 1 Cor. 15:58. And to what, pray, tend all those promises, by which he has recommended his commandments to us, but that, being excited by a desire of them, we should more cheerfully obey him? Not to love the promised good, is to throw contempt on the goodness of a promising God. By the love of them not to be stirred up to piety, is to abuse them to some other purpose than God ever intended. David himself confessed, that the commandments of God were even on that account, "more to be desired than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey, and the honey-comb; because in keeping of them there is a great reward," Ps. 19:10, 12. And the faith of Moses is, for the same reason, commended, because "he had a respect unto the recompense of the reward," Heb. 11:26. Nay, that faith is required as necessary for all who come to God, whereby they may believe that "he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him," ver. 6.

LXXIX. But then, here also the love of ourselves ought to spring from the love of God, be subordinate thereto, and rendered back to him. We must not love God on our own account, so as to consider ourselves as the end, and God as the means, by which we are made happy in the enjoyment of him; but because we are God's property, whom we ought to love above all, and

therefore, for his sake, we are bound to love ourselves. We are further to seek our own good, that therein we may taste the sweetness of the Lord, and that thereby we may be so much the more improved and enriched as God's peculiar treasure. Thus the love of ourselves is at last swallowed up in that ocean of divine love. Of this we shall speak a little presently.

LXXX. Let us now consider the rule or standard of holiness. Philosophers made the nature of man, right reason and the examples of excellent men, the rule. A few of them spoke of the precepts of God, and of the example which he gives us; but that, indeed, in a very slender manner. Of the nature of man, the emperor Marcus Antoninus speaks thus, lib. viii. §. 11: "Wherein consists a happy life? In doing those things which human nature requires." They are for ever talking of right reason, and of the examples of illustrious men; see Seneca, Epist. vi. 11, 25.

LXXXI. Epictetus speaks things more sublime concerning the precepts of God than could well have been expected from a heathen. He protests in Arrian., lib. iii. c. 24, towards the end, that he would live and die before God; "As thou hast required," says he, "as free as thy servant, as knowing what thou commandest and what thou forbiddest." And a little after, "do not I wholly tend towards God, and his precepts and commands?" And lib. iv. c. 7, "I am set at liberty by God, I know his commandments." And in the same book, c. 3, "I am set free, and am the friend of God, that I may willingly obey him." And a little after: "Wherefore I cannot transgress any of his commands." And to conclude: "These are edicts I must be the interpreter of, I must obey them, before the precepts of Massurius and Cassius."

LXXXII. Sometimes also they have spoken of the imitation of God, and of conformity to him. Seneca de Benefic., lib. vii. c. 31, "let us imitate the gods." Marc Antonin., lib. v. §. 27, "we must live with the gods:" and lib. ii. § 5, "live a divine life." Clemens Storm., lib. ii. p. 403. Plato, the philosopher, defining happiness, says, "it is an assimilation to God, as far as may be." See above, chap. v. sect. 2.

LXXXIII. These things are spoken in a lofty strain: nevertheless, as they had not the knowledge of any other laws of God but what nature suggests and are inscribed on the conscience; which prescribe the duties of holiness only in general, and in a very confused and imperfect manner; and as they knew not the true God in his perfections, nor ever beheld him in his sanctuary, what they had for the rule of their virtues was very defective.

LXXXIV. But Christian holiness has a far more excellent rule to go by: whether we consider its precepts or examples. Its precepts are taken from the most perfect law of God; not only that of which the rubbish, and as it were, the faint resemblance or shadows like a passing image, still remain in the conscience of a natural man; but also that which, with so much magnificence of heavenly glory, God formerly published before the full assembly of his people, wrote with his own finger on tables of stone, enlarged with the plainest expositions of the prophets and inspired penmen, and which, by the secret efficacy of his Spirit, he writes on the hearts of the elect; which is the most exact expression not only of his most holy will, but also of his nature and perfections, so far as they are imitable by man; nor does it only regulate and order the external actions and conversation; but also reaches to man's most inward parts, directs the inmost recesses of the

heart, and roots out the deepest fibres of vice, even to the very first motions of rising concupiscence; which, in fine, raises man to a perfection worthy of God.

LXXXV. This is that law, which God gave in charge to Israel, Ps. 147:19: "By which ויאדיר יגדיל, he made them great and glorious," Isa. 42:21; so that, in an astonishing manner, they excelled other nations, Deut. 4:6, 7; in which are דברים, μεγαλεῖα, "the most ample instructions (great things written)," Hos. 8:12: the excellency of which, and not their excellency alone, but also their most exact perfection, the psalmist has nobly set forth, Ps. 19:8, &c.; and indeed, so great was the perfection, that he could find no end to it, as he found in other perfections, Ps. 119:96. And certainly, the more a man is engaged with an attentive mind in the profound meditation of this law, the more distinctly he will understand that he is far from forming in his mind a perfect notion of that holiness prescribed by it. The Lord Jesus has said all in a few words, and comprised the whole summary of the law, calling out to his disciples (but who can understand the full force of those words?) "Be ye perfect, even as your Father, which is in heaven, is perfect," Matt. 5:48.

LXXXVI. Besides those most holy laws, the believer has illustrious examples of virtues for his imitation; and those not of one kind or order. And the first that here occur are the "Saints that are in the earth, and the excellent, in whom is all his delight," Ps. 16:3. We have no occasion to present you with a Socrates, a Zeno, a Cato, or a Lælius, whom Seneca recommends for this purpose. We have men actuated by the most noble and generous Spirit of God, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and the like heroes of both sexes, whom God himself honoured with familiarity, with encomiums and commendations; whose manner of life he took care to have exactly described in the most sacred volumes of our religion, and whose number is so great, that Paul calls them "a cloud of witnesses," by whose example we may be animated to run, with constancy, the race of piety, Heb. 12:1. These are proposed to us for our imitation, 1 Cor. 4:16; and 11:2; Phil. 3:17; Jas. 4:10; Heb. 13:7.

LXXXVII. However, as the most excellent saints on earth have had their blemishes, prudence is necessary in this case, that we may propose, for our imitation, only those actions of theirs, which are the most consonant to the standard of the divine law; where they have departed from the rule, let us be admonished by their mistake, and learn to walk uprightly. For this end Nehemiah wisely proposes the example of Solomon\*, Neh. 13:26. And it is of singular use to us, that the backslidings of the holy men of God are recorded in Holy Writ. Spots appear nowhere more disagreeable than when seen in a most beautiful face, or on the cleanest garment. And it is expedient to have a perfect knowledge of the filthiness of sin. We also learn from them to think humbly of ourselves, to depend on the grace of God, to keep a stricter eye upon ourselves, lest perhaps we fall into the same or more grievous sins, Gal. 6:1.

LXXXVIII. But our Lord would not have us without perfect examples, and therefore he raises the meditations of his people to the inhabitants of heaven, the choirs of angels, and spirits of just men made perfect, whose conversation he recommends even in our daily prayer, "as it is in heaven." These being filled with the clearest light, and flaming with the purest love, and continually beholding the face of God, and being altogether conformed to him, incessantly show forth the praises of their Creator, and execute his commands with incredible alacrity. Is. 6:2, 3. Ps. 103:20. Rev. 4:8–11. The sacred writings testify all this concerning them. And faith not only

believes, but sees all this; for being endowed with the quickest sight, it penetrates within the veil of the heavenly sanctuary, and, as if mixed with the consort of the heavenly inhabitants, views those exercises of the most consummate holiness, with the love of which the believing soul cannot fail to be inflamed.

LXXXIX. But yet, as it is very desirable to have likewise an example of perfect holiness upon earth; so God has not suffered us to be without one; for he sent his own Son from heaven, who hath left us the brightest pattern of every virtue, without exception, "that we should follow his steps," 1 Pet. 2:21. It was a part of Christ's prophetic office, to teach not only by words, but by the example of his life, that both in his words and actions, he might say, "learn of me," Matt. 11:29. The imitation of him is often recommended by the apostles, 1 Cor. 11:1. 1 Thess. 1:6. 1 John 2:6.

XC. It has been very well observed by a learned person, that we are to distinguish between imitation, whereby we are said to be μιμηται, imitators of Christ, 1 Cor. 11:1; and between following, by which we are commanded to follow Christ; between "follow me," Matt. 16:24, and "follow after me," Matt. 10:38. For the former denotes a conformity to an example: the latter, the attendance of servants going after their masters; which words are generally confounded by writers in their own language, though they ought by no means to be so.

XCI. As we have already often inculcated, that Christ is not to be considered in a threefold respect, as man, as Mediator, and as God; so we are to inquire, in what relation or respect he is given us as an example. And first, we are not to doubt that as he represented, in his human nature, the image of God, in which the first man was created, and possessed and practised all the virtues, due by a rational creature, without any defect; in so far he is, in the most perfect manner, proposed to our imitation. Certainly, this world was hitherto destitute of such a pattern, ever since the fatal apostasy of our first parents, viz. to have a man, who, being untainted with vice, "holy, harmless, undefiled," might as a living and breathing law, converse among his brethren: such a one, God hath exhibited to us in Christ. It is a pleasure to him who loves holiness, to behold a most exact delineation of it in the written law of God. But what is that delineation but only a picture? It is indeed exact, and painted in natural colours; but then it is a picture only, without flesh and blood, without life and motion. How much greater therefore the pleasure, to behold the same holiness which is portrayed in the law, living, as it were, and animated in Christ?

XCII. What was peculiar and proper to his mediatorial office, as the honour of his mediation, whereby we are reconciled to God, and that eminent dignity by which he has the peculiar honour of being prophet, priest, and king; in sum, whatever belongs to that more excellent name, which was bestowed on Christ above his fellows: all this we are neither to imitate, nor follow the example of those who pretend to be imitators; "there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. 2:5.

XCIII. Nevertheless, believers, after the example of Christ, and from a participation of his unction, have the honour of being prophets, priests, and kings, Joel 2:28; 1 Pet. 2:5; Rev. 1:6. And consequently, it is incumbent upon them to conform to the example of Christ, in the spiritual discharge of those offices; in which, however, there is so great a difference, that besides

partaking of the name, and some small analogy, scarce any coincidence can be observed. The prophetic, sacerdotal, and regal offices of Christ are of a far different nature from ours.

XCIV. But those virtues which Christ discovered in the discharge of his offices are, by all means, proposed for our imitation; as the demonstration he gave of his humility, faithfulness, love, patience, zeal, and constancy, in the whole discharge of his offices; as also his not intruding into them without a call, Heb. 5:4, 5; his faithfulness to him who had appointed him, Heb. 3:2; his not seeking his own advantage or profit, Phil. 2:4, 5; his not sinking under the reproaches and contradiction of sinners, Heb. 12:2, 3; his zeal for God's house that had eaten him up, John 2:17; his not seeking his own, but the glory of his Father in all things, John 8:49, 50, and a great deal more to the same purpose.

XCV. In fine, even as God, he, together with the Father and Holy Spirit, is a pattern to us of the purest holiness, Levit. 11:44, and 19:2; Matt. 5:48; Eph. 5:1; 1 Pet. 1:15, 16. The holiness of God is so great an ornament of his other perfections, that, without it, all the rest would be unworthy of God. Hence he is said to be "glorious in holiness," Exod 15:11: and we are particularly commanded to celebrate the memorial, "or give thanks at the remembrance of his holiness," Ps. 30:4, and 79:12, after the example of the seraphim, who, having repeated the threefold praise of the divine holiness, added, "the whole earth is full of his glory," Is. 6:3. God invites his people to imitate this holiness, has set it before them in his word for their contemplation; that while they admire its beauty, they may be inflamed with the love of it, and gradually transformed to that image.

XCVI. In the third place, we proposed to speak of the end of Christian virtues, or graces; which must needs be of all others the most excellent. The true believer does not therefore apply himself to the practice of holiness, to gain praise and reputation with men, which was the crime of the heathen and the Pharisees, of whom our Lord testifies, Matt. 6:5, that "they have their reward." He does not aim only at his own advantage, either in this or in the life to come, from a mercenary self-love, which all those do, who, endeavouring to establish their own righteousness, profess that all motives to piety are destroyed, if the merits of good works are exploded. He does not only pursue after that tranquillity of soul, which is pleased with what it has done, and which virtue or holiness, when properly esteemed, usually bestows on those who love it. The intention of the godly is far more pure and sublime, whereby they are carried out both towards God, themselves, and their neighbour.

XCVII. Above all, they seek the glory of God. This they love, desire its enlargement, and promote it with all their might. "Let such as love thy salvation, say continually, the Lord be magnified." Ps. 40:16. Hither all their exercises tend, going on "without offence, until the day of Christ; being filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ unto the glory and praise of God." Phil. 1:10, 11. They who have the love of God for the source and principle, cannot but have the glory of the same God for their end. For whoever has an ardent love to God, will likewise, above all things, love what is most beloved by him. But such is the love that God has to his own glory, that whatever he does, is with a view to, and for the sake of that; wherefore all things are of him, in order to be again to him, and "to him be the glory for ever!" Rom. 11:36. In this respect the saints are truly like to God, for in all their actions they have the glory of God

before their eyes. "Whether, therefore, ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." 1 Cor. 10:31.

XCVIII. Yet these things are not so to be understood, as if in all and every particular, even the most minute actions of life, it was necessary to have that explicit intention of glorifying God before them. For this is not practicable in the present state of things: however, it ought universally to be the firm and fixed disposition of the children of God, that they be so consecrated and dedicated to God, as, for the future, neither to think, speak, meditate, nor do any thing, in which some expression of the perfections of God and manifestations of his glory may not appear. For what is sacred or devoted, cannot, without a considerable injury to him, be applied to profane uses. They are not their own: therefore it is unlawful for them to propose to themselves this end; only to seek what they imagine will be profitable to the flesh. They are not their own: let them therefore, as far as may be, forget themselves and theirs. They are God's: let them therefore live and die to him. They are God's: let his wisdom therefore over-rule all their actions. They are God's: let therefore all the parts of their life tend to him, as their only lawful end. And in this sincere self-denial, and surrender of ourselves to God, that we may firmly propose to do all our works with a holy respect to him, consists this glorifying of God we now speak of.

XCIX. For instance, a person then eats and drinks to the glory of God, when, confessing himself unworthy to enjoy this life and the conveniencies of it, he praises that bountiful favour of God, which abundantly bestows all things upon him, and above all admires that immense love of the Lord Jesus, who willingly was destitute of all the dainties of life, and submitted to drink vinegar and gall, that his people, through the favour of God, might eat the fat and drink the sweet: when also he does not delight so much in the creatures and the gifts of providence, as in the Creator himself and the giver; tasting to his unspeakable pleasure, how sweet the Lord is: when he sincerely proposes faithfully to employ his life, which is lengthened out by these means, and all his faculties, which are thus continually refreshed, to the service of God, who gave and preserves them: when, in fine, he rises in meditation, from the delights of this natural life, to the almost unspeakable pleasures of a future and heavenly life; and having a prelibation of them in thought and faith, with a grateful heart tunes up a song of love to God: "Lord, if thou doest such things in this dark dungeon, what wilt thou not do for us, when admitted into thy palace of light!"

C. Here I choose to transcribe some things from the Jewish catechism of Rabbi Abraham Ben Chanania Jagel, published first at Venice in 1595, under the title טוב לקה, afterwards reprinted at Amsterdam 1658, and at last exhibited to the Christian reader, with a Latin version by John Benedict Carpzovius, entitled, *Introductio in Theologiam Judiacam*, c. ix. p. 74. Where the Hebrew Catechist instructs his disciple in this manner: "Let all thy works be done to the glory of the divine name, and to the honour of the blessed Creator. In all thy ways think of him; when thou walkest in the way, when thou risest up or liest down. For instance, when thou eatest, know that the blessed God has, by the power of his wisdom, created thy food, and given it virtue to be converted into the substance of him, who is to be nourished by it: when thou goest to sleep in thy bed, consider with thyself, that God ordained sleep for the benefit of man, that his body might rest and his strength be recruited, and himself rendered fit and sound for serving his Creator. And thus, in all thy other bodily actions, take care to give glory and praise to God: for, by this means,

all thy works shall be to the glory of the divine name, whose providence will keep close to thee and direct all thy actions."

CI. Next to this glory of the divine name, a holy person may also, in the exercise of his virtues or graces, have a regard to himself, and endeavour, 1st, To have the assurance of his own eternal election by God, his internal vocation, his faith and communion with Christ, 2 Pet. 1:10. 2dly. To rejoice in the testimony of a conscience void of offence, and in that composure of mind, which is the consequent thereof, 2 Cor. 1:12. 3dly. That, by proving the sincerity of his love towards God by holy actions, he may enjoy for himself that love and familiarity of God, which Jesus, John 14:21, 23, has graciously promised to those that love him. 4thly. That he may gradually become, in the habits and dispositions of his soul, and the actions flowing therefrom, more like the Supreme Being, and so more glorious and happy. 2 Cor. 3:18. 5thly. And that, by proceeding in this way of holiness to eternal glory, he may live at ease, and in assurance of his salvation, 1 Cor. 9:24–27.

CII. Nevertheless, Christian holiness teacheth us to desire all these things, but not to rest in them, as our ultimate end, but even to direct them to the glory of God. For, the more abundantly any one has attained to what we have just now only mentioned, the brighter will the splendour of the divine perfections shine forth in him: the goodness and bounty of God magnificently discover themselves in this reward of virtue: the beloved spouse of Christ, whom he will one day present without spot, and glorious to God the Father, shall be the more adorned: the high value of his satisfaction and merits will be duly esteemed, from the happiness bestowed on the saints. The saints themselves shall be enriched with those rewards of their virtues, and be better fitted for celebrating the praises of their God. And thus it is, that while they piously aim at the happiness promised to them, and seek their own glory in the proper order and measure, they, at the same time, "rejoice in hope of the glory of God," Rom. 5:2. For then they are made happy, when God is glorified and admired in them, 2 Thess. 1:10.

CIII. In fine, the works of piety are also adapted to gain over our neighbour to God. The holy soul never satisfies itself in glorifying God; but designs to have many companions employed in the same work: to obtain which, he causeth his light to shine before men, that they may see his good works, and glorify his Father, which is in heaven, Matt. 5:16. And having a hearty desire for the salvation of his neighbour, he very willingly employs every means to bring him to the good old way. For this purpose, as nothing is more effectual than a holy life; so Peter calls upon Christian wives to apply thereto, "that if any obey not the word, they also may, without the word, be won by the conversation of the wives," 1 Pet. 3:1. And certainly, whoever are made partakers of that extraordinary grace of God, and translated out of darkness into his marvellous light, will labour, by the reflected rays of divine love, also to enlighten, inflame, and make others partake of the same happiness with themselves. And who can conceive any thing more holy, more praiseworthy than this?

CIV. This is that generous holiness which the Spirit of grace powerfully operates in the elect, and which he promotes by the use of various means. Though the use of these means is required of man, yet their efficacy depends on the blessing of God alone. Nor indeed, is it without the interposition of God, that man can and will savingly use those means. For daily experience teacheth us how dull and languid we usually are in those things, when the influence of the Spirit

either ceases or is but small. Among those means of sanctification, the following deserve to be most recommended.

CV. We justly give the first place to the word of God, and the devout meditation of it. God sanctifieth us through his truth, his word is truth, John 17:17: for as it proceeds from the Holy Spirit, the characters of the divine holiness are imprinted upon it, and as, in every part, it sends forth the most fragrant odour of holiness, so it inspires the pious reader with it, though perhaps he may not understand all that he readeth: which Chrysostom has likewise observed in Orat. 3. in Lazar. "Even though thou dost not thoroughly understand the contents, yet even the reading begets a very great degree of sanctification."

CVI. And whatever is contained in the word of God is directed to this end. The precepts of the law, which exhibit the exactest delineation of holiness, are adapted to inflame the soul with love to it, Ps. 119:8–10. The threatenings annexed to the law, and the recorded instances of those judgments, by which God has punished sin, are so many powerful dehortations from it, 1 Cor. 10:6, 11. The very ample promises made to godliness and the blessings wherewith the liberal goodness of the Deity has enriched the godly, who love and worship him, are so many incentives to holiness, Isa. 52:2, 3. The examples of the saints both teach and allure at the same time. Heb. 12:1. Their very stumblings and falls remind us of our weakness, inculcate humility, teach us to take heed to ourselves, and point out what things we ought to avoid, Neh. 13:26. But nothing more effectually persuades to piety than the doctrine of grace revealed in the Gospel, Tit. 2:12; and whoever abuse it to lasciviousness, never knew the truth, as it is in Jesus: "for the word of the truth of the Gospel, in all the world bringeth forth fruit, since the day they heard of it, and knew the grace of God in truth," Col. 1:5, 6.

CVII. But in order to obtain this fruit of holiness from the word of God, it is, 1st. To be diligently, daily, and carefully attended to, and as Chrysostom speaks, it is to be read with a mystic silence, or profound attention, John 5:39. 2dly. Diligently heard: for the public preaching of the word has very excellent promises, Rom. 10:14, 15, 17. 3dly. When read and heard it is to be laid up in the inward treasure of the soul, there to be kept as the most valuable treasure, Job 23:12, Ps. 119:11, Luke 2:19. 4thly. But it is not to be kept in some remote corner of the memory, there to rot in mouldiness and dust, but at times it is to be brought forth, and made the object of holy meditation; whereby the soul, by ruminating and sucking as it were, attracts and turns into its own substance, that quickening and nourishing juice, that is to be found in the word of God, Ps. 1:2, Jos. 1:8. 5thly. It is expedient to have always at hand some powerful striking passages of Scripture, wherewith we may be armed against the attacks of sin, and excited to duty. This was what the Lord meant when he ordered Israel to bind his word as a sign upon their hand, and to be as frontlets between their eyes, Deut. 6:8. Why between their eyes? To be a rule of life continually before their mind. Why bound upon their hand? To put them in mind that knowledge was to be reduced to practice.

CVIII. Very wisely indeed, did the emperor Antonine address himself thus, Lib. iii. §. 13, "As surgeons have always their instruments ready for some unexpected operation, so have thou at hand thy philosophical principles, in order to distinguish between things divine and human." Similar to this is what Seneca has, de Benefic. Lib. vii. c. 1: "Demetrius, the Cynic, was wont to say very well: that it is more beneficial to have a few precepts of wisdom in readiness for



practice, than to learn a great deal, and not have it at hand for use." And c. ii: "Our Demetrius orders the proficient to hold these things fast, and never let them go; nay, to imprint them on his mind, and make them a part of himself; and, by daily meditation, to bring himself to that pitch, that what is useful shall spontaneously occur, and what is wanted shall, upon all occasions, directly present itself." What they spoke concerning the precepts of wisdom, which Epictetus called *πρόχειρα βοηθηματα*, ready aids, we may affirm concerning some striking passages of Scripture, which it is expedient to have in such readiness, that, on any occasion, they may spontaneously cast up to the mind.

CIX. Secondly, The attentive consideration of the Lord Jesus is a most powerful means of sanctification. The vileness and hideous nature of sin nowhere more clearly appears, than in the meanness, humiliation, and sufferings of Christ. For what was it that clothed the Lord of glory with the contemptible form of a servant? What overwhelmed the mighty lion of the tribe of Judah with horror and anguish, that he was almost ready to sink under them? What roused the cruel bands of hell to arms against him? What turned the flowing rivers of heavenly consolations into the most melancholy dryness? What mixed those bitterest of bitters in the cup of the divine fury, with which the Son of God's love was almost struck with astonishment and amaze? Sin, certainly was the cause of all, Isa. 53:5. Who can reflect on this, and not be inflamed with the most irreconcilable hatred to it? Will he not endeavour to avenge himself of that hideous monster, which so cruelly afflicted his most beloved Lord, and which, unless it be first slain, will, with the same fierceness, rage against all those who give it a favourable entertainment? Who can prevail on himself to be again enslaved by that tyrant, from whose chains, burning with hell-fire, he seriously believes and considers, he could not have been delivered but by the accursed death of the Son of God? And thus the meditation of the sufferings of Christ makes us, that "being dead to sin, we should live unto righteousness," 1 Peter. 2:24.

CX. Nor did the incredible love of God towards wretched mortals ever, on any occasion, more evidently present itself to view, than in Christ Jesus; which may melt down the most frozen hearts, and kindle them into the brightest flames of mutual returns of love; "for the love of Christ constraineth us," &c. 2 Cor. 5:14, 15. Whoever is deeply engaged in the meditation of this, will he not cry out with admiration, "Wast thou, most loving Jesus, scorched no less in the flames of thy love for me, than in those of the divine wrath against my sins, and shall I be lukewarm in returns of love to thee? Didst thou die for my salvation, and shall I not live to thy glory? Didst thou descend to hell on my account, and shall not I at thy command, cheerfully walk in the way to heaven? Didst thou give thyself up for me to be tormented with hell-pains, and I not render myself to thee, to bear thy yoke, which is easy, and thy burden, which is light?" It cannot be expressed how much the pious soul, while intent on such meditations as these, will be displeased with his own lukewarmness; and wish he had a soul a hundred-fold more capacious, to be all filled with the love of Christ.

CXI. And never does virtue or holiness itself charm us with a more beautiful aspect than in Christ; it is indeed as we have also formerly intimated, seen painted in the law, but here alive and breathing: in such a manner, that the more frequently it is viewed by the eyes of the mind, it transforms the beholder into the same image, 2 Cor. 3:18. When Moses had been admitted into familiar converse with God in the holy mount, where he spent forty days, the skin of his face shone with such effulgence that the eyes of the Israelites could not bear it, Exod. 34:29, 30. Thus

it is with those who view Jesus the King of glory in his beauty with open face. The rays of the heavenly spirit, plentifully issuing from him, pervade the inmost parts of the soul, and conciliate to them a new vigour of spiritual life. To which the fixed contemplation of the Lord Jesus greatly contributes. The oftener a believer beholds him in spirit, the more clearly he knows his perfections, of which his holiness is the ornament. The more clearly he knows them the more ardently he loves them. The more ardently he loves them, the more like to them he desires to become. For love aspires after a likeness to the beloved; nay, in love itself there is already a great similitude: for, "God is love," 1 John 4:8. Moreover, the more ardently he loves God, he will both the more frequently, the more willingly and attentively behold him; and thus often running round that circle of beholding and loving, for ever returning into itself, he gains by every act a new feature of this most glorious image.

CXII. Thirdly. To this contemplation of the Lord Jesus, add the practice of devout prayer, by which we may draw from the most exuberant fulness of Christ, and which he is ever most ready to impart, and grace for grace. God has promised to give all things to those who ask according to his will, 1 John. 5:14. But we can ask nothing more agreeable to the will of God, and which he more willingly gives, than his Spirit, Luke 11:13. Who, as he is the principal cause of our sanctification, so is the author and finisher of it. Let this therefore be our daily prayer to God: "Teach me to do thy will; let thy good Spirit lead me into the land of uprightness," Ps. 143:10. "Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins, let them not have dominion over me: then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression. Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer," Ps. 19:13, 14.

CXIII. Fourthly. Whoever seriously endeavours to be a proficient, must in all things give himself up to the government and guidance of the Holy Spirit. Whenever he begins to work internally by his suggestions, impulses, and emotions, we are with care and solicitude, to observe them; and above all, beware that we do not despise and grieve the Spirit, or stifle his operations, Eph. 4:30, 1 Thess. 5:19. For the Spirit of God is a delicate thing; he deals by us, as we deal by him. If with care and alacrity we follow his conduct, he will manifest himself to us with a more cheerful and serene countenance, will carry us forward to higher attainments, bring us nearer to God and to heaven, and abundantly favouring us with his joys, make us cheerfully, and without weariness, run the race that is set before us. But if we indolently neglect his influences, he will not bear that affront, but will withdraw with those his sweetest suggestions, leave us to ourselves, justly expose us to be harassed by the devil and the flesh, and himself disquiet us with his terrors; till being brought to observe how ill we have regarded our own interest, by this indolent carelessness, and how we are nothing without him, we have again reconciled him to us by means of humble prayer and supplication. Let us therefore readily spread all our sails, while this heavenly breeze continues to blow, lest this prosperous gale should shortly die away, or the storm come on, and so our sailing to the fair haven of salvation be prevented.

CXIV. Fifthly. It is also expedient that we renew our covenant with God, and those promises by which we formerly bound ourselves to the sincere observance of his commandments; frequently saying, "I have sworn, and I will perform it, that I will keep thy righteous judgments," Ps. 119:106. It was an excellent advice of Epictetus, apud Arrianum, Lib. i. c. 14: "You ought to swear to God as soldiers to their general. And to what are you to swear? That you will always

obey him, never accuse him, nor find fault with whatever he is pleased to bestow," &c. And certainly that oath being thus renewed, if no other advantage attend it, will be of use, 1st. To restrain the soul from sin, by being put in mind of its late promise. 2dly. To quicken its indolence into zeal. 3dly. To raise it when fallen, and teach it to mourn for its sins with more than ordinary bitterness, especially as the guilt of treachery and perjury is added to all the rest.

CXV. Sixthly. Holiness is greatly promoted, if, by a careful and frequent examination of conscience, you recollect your deeds and words, nay, and your very thoughts, that with shame and sorrow, you may confess to God what you have done, either altogether wrong, or not sufficiently right, and endeavour to reform for the time to come; or if, by glorifying God for what you have done well, and rejoicing in the testimony of a quiet conscience, you are animated with cheerfulness to pursue that course of religion you have entered upon. David declares that he acted in this manner, to the great improvement of holiness. Ps. 119:59, "I thought on my ways, and turned my feet unto thy testimonies."

CXVI. The heathens themselves have recommended this examination of conscience, and, if they made not a false profession, were not negligent in the practice of it. Antoninus, lib. v. §. 31: "Recollect with thyself, how thou hast hitherto behaved towards the gods, thy parents, brethren, wife, &c. Whether thou hast committed any thing towards any of them, either in deed or even word, which did not become you." Lib. viii. §. 2: "In every action ask thyself, how far is this proper for me, may I not have cause to repent of it?" Seneca, lib. iii., de Ira, c. 36: "The soul is to be called to a daily account. This Sextius did at the close of the day, when, before he went to sleep, he would ask his soul, What evil of thine hast thou cured to day? What vice hast thou resisted? In what respect art thou become better? What therefore can be more excellent than this practice of canvassing the whole day? What sleep is that which ensues on the review of oneself? How calm, how excellent and free, when the soul is either commended or admonished, and a secret spy and censor of herself takes cognizance of her manners?" As to what Seneca adds concerning himself, the reader may see in the author. It is all excellent and divine. But the chosen people of God are to endeavour not to be put to the blush in this respect by the heathen.

CXVII. To conclude, (for should I expatiate on every particular, this chapter would swell to a large volume,) whoever would make progress in holiness, must willingly and thankfully suffer admonition and reproof. "It is peculiar to God, and above human nature, never to commit sin," said Gregory Nazianzen formerly, Orat. xv., in plagam grandinis. But to cure this evil no remedy is more salutary than prudent and friendly admonition. "As an earring of gold, and an ornament of fine gold, so is a wise reprove upon an obedient ear," Prov. 25:12. Hence faithful reproof is acceptable to the godly. "Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness; and let him reprove me, it shall be an excellent oil, which shall not break my head: for yet my prayer also shall be in their calamities," Ps. 141:5. It was finely spoken by whoever he was, whether Gregory Nazianzen or Methodius (for the author is not agreed on, as Gataker has observed on M. Antoninus, lib. vi. §. 21): "I think it a greater happiness to be reproved, than to reprove; as it is much greater for oneself to be delivered from evil, than to deliver another."

CXVIII. There can be no doubt, but whoever carefully walks in this way, shall make very great progress in sanctification, and daily arrive more and more at a nearer conformity to the pattern set before him. However we are not to imagine, that ever any one in this life can attain to that

perfection which the law of God requires, that, being without all sin, he should wholly employ himself in the service of God, with that purity, that intensesness of all his powers, that the divine holiness itself could find nothing in him but what was agreeable to it. The contrary is evident: 1st. From express testimonies of Scripture, in which it is asserted, that none liveth who sinneth not, stumbleth and falls not, 1 Kings 8:46, Eccl. 7:20, Prov. 20:9, James 3:2, 1 John 1:8. 2dly. From the humble and sincere confession of the saints, who every where own their blemishes and failings, Ps. 19:12, Rom. 7:18, 19, Phil. 3:13, 14, Isa. 64:6. 3dly. From an induction of particular examples. For there are none, even of the most excellent among the saints, whose actions are more largely described, but who have also some blemishes recorded, which, in some measure throw a shade on the light of the most shining virtues. These things are more notorious than need to be repeated here; nor do we with pleasure mention them. So far are we from taking any delight in the infirmities of the most excellent men of God, or wishing to detract from their heroic virtues, when we sometimes speak of their faults; that, on the contrary, we have an inward horror at the remembrance of them, and deservedly tremble at the consideration of our own weakness, because the latchets of their shoes we are not worthy to loose.

CXIX. The principal and proper cause of this imperfection is to be found in ourselves. It is the still indwelling flesh; or corruption which, though really subdued by the efficacy of the Spirit, with respect to its reign, Rom. 6:14, yet vexes the godly: and, as that unhappy incumbrance retarded Atalanta,\* so also believers are retarded by this corruption in their Christian race; while the flesh continually lusts against the spirit, it hinders the elect from cheerfully performing what otherwise they would most earnestly desire to do, Gal. 5:17, Rom. 7:15, 16. By the Spirit the renewed man certainly tends upwards; but the flesh soon with great struggling pulls him down again, like a heavy stone tied to the feet of one of the fowls of heaven. With a courageous boldness believers enter upon all the exercises of every virtue or grace, Ps. 119:128, Acts 24:16, and while they go on in all the strength of the Lord their God, Ps. 71:16, they undertake what far surpasses the capacity and power of natural men, and thus, at a great pace, they press forward to perfection, like those who hunt down some wild beast in hopes to possess it, Phil. 3:14. But inherent corruption, innate perverseness, heightened by so many vicious acts, the sin that easily besets us, Heb. 12:1, again spoils and taints all. And this abides in man till his death: "it dwells, but reigns not; abides, but neither rules nor prevails: in some measure it is rooted out, but not quite expelled; cast down, but not entirely cast out," as Bernard elegantly speaks, in Ps. 90, Sermon 10. According to the law of Moses, when an earthen vessel was once ceremoniously unclean, it remained impure till it was broken. Lev. 11:33. Such earthen vessels are we, 2 Cor. 4:7; for after we are defiled with sin we do not attain to perfect purity, till the earthen vessel of our body is broken by the stroke of death.

CXX. When the apostle speaks of the conflict between the spirit and the flesh, in a sanctified person, we are not to think that the conflict arises only from this, that the glandula pinealis can be impelled on one side by the soul, on the other by the animal spirits, and that these two impulsions are often contrary; so that the flesh may be then judged to prevail when the animal spirits prove the stronger; but the spirit to predominate when the soul, by a determinate judgment, proves more powerful in the impulsions of that pineal gland. For though it is a very great truth that the inordinate motions of the animal spirits excite very many vicious thoughts and appetites in the soul, yet the conflict of the spirit with the flesh does not consist in that of the soul with the body. As new habits are put into the soul by the sanctifying spirit, so there are likewise in the soul itself

the remains of the old man; these are two distinct principles of action. But sometimes when the man is left to himself he may think, reason, desire, from that vicious principle; at other times he is excited by the Spirit of God, he acts from a new principle of grace, which has not yet expelled all the power of sin; from these opposite principles, and their reciprocal actings, arises that warfare we are speaking of, which is principally carried on in the soul itself, according as it is either depressed to earth by inherent corruption, or raised to heaven by a principle of a more noble life, produced by the Spirit. And when the Scripture speaks of flesh, it does not mean the body of man, but all the remaining corruption, which in its measure doth really abide in part in the body and its members, while it still has its principal seat in the soul itself, which is the proper immediate subject both of virtue and vice. The enemies therefore in this combat are not soul and body, but the grace of the sanctifying Spirit, and the remains of natural corruption.

CXXI. But known to God are the reasons of his conduct, in dispensing the operations of the Spirit of grace in believers, so that the remains of the flesh are not entirely expelled in this life, for, 1st, He would by this show the difference between earth and heaven, the time of warfare and of triumph, the place of toil and of rest, that we may the more earnestly long for our translation out of this valley of sin and misery into the heavenly country, where every thing shall be made perfect; and may, with open arms, embrace death, which will bring us to that perfection, crying out with the apostle: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Rom 7:24.

CXXII. 2dly, He is willing to exercise and accustom his people to patience, humility, and sympathy or fellow-feeling. As in old time he suffered the Amorites and Philistines to remain in the land of Canaan for the exercise of the Israelites, to prevent their growing indolent through a slothful ease, and dissolved in too much prosperity and quiet; so, in like manner, he exercises his saints by the remains of the flesh. For nothing teaches them to think more lowly of themselves than a daily sense of so many infirmities; nothing is more effectual to bring them to patience than the constant assaults of those most wicked enemies, from whom, to their considerable grief, they have often experienced blows and wounds. Nothing, in fine, is more adapted to render them more sympathizing, with respect to the failings of others, both in judging concerning their state, and their general conversation, than the consciousness of their own defects, Gal. 6:1.

CXXIII. 3dly, By this means he strongly convinces all that the salvation of his people is owing only to his most free grace. For who that is conscious of his own infirmities and daily failings but must be obliged to acknowledge that he obtains life from God, not as the judge of merit, but as the bestower of pardon? The rigour of the law excluded from the priesthood the blind, the lame, the disjointed in any member, or those who had any such blemish, Lev. 21:18. What then can we infer but that the grace of the gospel is unmerited, which admits to the heavenly priesthood and refuses not to admit to the holy of holies made without hands those who have far worse disorders of mind? If, notwithstanding such imperfection, it be scarce if at all possible to banish the arrogance of merits out of the church, what would it be should we teach the possibility of perfection?

CXXIV. 4thly and lastly, It becomes the wisdom of God to raise his people by degrees to the highest pitch of holiness. As in the creation of the first world he began with a rude chaos and indigested mass which, in six successive days, he fashioned into this beautiful frame, till, having

given the finishing hand, he rested on the sabbath, Gen. 2:2; so, in the creation of the new world of grace, beginning with nothing, he gradually leads his people higher and higher, till, on the expiration of this earthly week, on the dawn of the heavenly sabbath, he crowns them at once with holiness and glory.

CXXV. It cannot, indeed, be denied that sometimes the scripture makes mention of some who are said to be perfect even in this life. But it is to be observed that the term perfection is not always used in the same sense. For, 1st, There is a perfection of sincerity consisting in this, that a man serves God with an unfeigned heart, without any reigning hypocrisy. In this sense it is said of Job that he was "וְיִשָּׁר תָּם", perfect and upright, and one that feared God and eschewed evil," Job 1:1. In the same sense Hezekiah protests that he had walked before God "in truth and with a perfect heart, and done what was good in his eyes," Isa. 38:3. 2dly, There is a perfection of parts, and that both subjective with respect to the whole man, in so far as he is "sanctified wholly, in spirit, soul, and body," 1 Thess. 5:23. And objective, with respect to the whole law, when all and every one of the duties prescribed by God are observed without exception. Of this David was speaking, Psa. 119:128. "I esteem all thy precepts concerning all things to be right; and I hate every false way." And it is said of Zacharias and Elizabeth, Luke 1:6, that they "walked in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless." 3dly, There is a comparative perfection ascribed to those who are advanced in knowledge, faith, and sanctification, in comparison of those who are still infants and untaught; in this manner John distinguishes little children, young men, and fathers, 1 John 2:12, 13. In that sense Paul speaks of the perfect, 1 Cor. 2:6, and Phil. 3:15. 4thly, There is also an evangelical perfection, or with a veil or covering of grace, according to which these persons are looked upon as perfect, who sincerely endeavour after perfection, God, for the sake of Christ, graciously accepting the attempts of a ready mind, and accounting every thing to be done, because what is not done is forgiven. The Apostle speaks of this, 2 Cor. 8:12 "For if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." Thus "we are complete in Christ," Col. 2:10, his most perfect righteousness covering all our defects. However this is to be understood in a proper manner; for the judgment of God is always according to truth: he so judges of us and our actions, as they are; and, seeing we ourselves and our actions are imperfect, he cannot but judge us to be so. This is what we should say agreeable to Scripture, that God, on account of the most perfect obedience of Christ, graciously accepts the sincerity of his people, nor less bountifully rewards them, than if their holiness was in every respect complete. 5thly, and lastly, There is also a perfection of degrees, by which a person performs all the commands of God, with the full exertion of all his powers, without the least defect, having rooted up every depraved lust. This is what the law of God requires. And this is that perfection which we deny the saints to have in this life, though we willingly allow them all the other kinds above mentioned.

CXXVI. It is certainly true that, when God enjoins us by his law to love him with our whole heart, soul, and strength, these expressions denote an absolute perfection, both of degrees and parts. Nor can he require any thing less than the most perfect obedience of man, even of sinful man, as we showed, book. i., chap. ix., sect. xii., &c. But when it is said of Josiah, 2 Kings 23:25, "And like unto him there was no king before him, that turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might, according to all the law of Moses," this is to be understood in a certain diminutive sense, so as to denote his sincerity, and the beginnings of, and endeavours after, a due perfection, and to signify God's gracious esteem of him in the Messiah.

In the same sense the Jews, in the time of Asa, bound themselves by an oath to seek the God of their fathers "with all their heart, and with all their soul," 2 Chron. 15:12. All which are said to have been done, ver. 15. But yet none will say that the Jewish people completely fulfilled all the holiness that the law required, seeing the high places were not taken away out of Israel, ver. 17. And then who will imagine that the condition of an entirely perfect obedience was exacted of the descendants of David before they could come to be partakers of the promises that were given them, yet this the words of God seem naturally to import, 1 Kings 2:4: "If thy children take heed to their way, to walk before me in truth, with all their heart and with all their soul." And that the commendation given Josiah cannot be taken in its full import appears from comparing it with 2 Kings 18:5, where it is said of Hezekiah, "after him was none like him, among all the kings of Judah, nor any that were before him." If these words be taken in both places, in their full import, and are not reconciled by a favourable interpretation, they involve a manifest contradiction. Wherefore it is evident that in both places there is a kind of hyperbole, or the commendation of both kings is not to be understood absolutely, but conditionally, in the order taken for the reformation of the public worship, in which the one may be said, in a different respect, to have done something more than the other.

CXXVII. We beg, indeed, in the Lord's prayer that God's will may be done on earth as it is in heaven, in which consists the utmost perfection of piety; nor did the Lord Jesus prescribe to us that part of the prayer in vain: and John says, 1 John 5:14, "Whatever we ask according to his will, he heareth us;" but yet we cannot infer from hence the absolute perfection of holiness in this life. For the particle, as, does not, in this petition, denote an absolute equality in degrees, but a similitude in the thing, and the manner of it, in the sincerity, readiness, and alacrity of submission to the will of God, as well his commanding as his decreeing will; for it is used, both in the fourth petition and Matt. 5:48, in the same signification. The godly are indeed allowed, nay are commanded, to aspire to perfection, and to endeavour to come the nearest to it possible: it is also acceptable to God to express that love of perfection in their prayers; however, seeing God has expressly declared that he does not give his people absolute perfection in this life, it is the duty of all to acquiesce in this disposition of the divine will, nor are they allowed to beg of God to grant them that perfection here, which they know he has not appointed for this, but for the other life.

CXXVIII. We very well know, that our Lord, Luke 15:7, speaks of one sinner that repenteth, and of ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance. But neither does this favour the pretended perfection of this life; for there is a two-fold repentance. The first universal, whereby the human sinner, who is estranged from the knowledge and worship of God, and all true religion, betakes himself or turns to God and to the practice of virtue; the second renewed and particular, to which, as to a sacred anchor, the regenerate themselves are often obliged to have recourse. And of this again there is a three-fold difference. For, 1st, It is possible that they who are sanctified may fall into some grievous sin, which lays them under the necessity of the greatest sorrow, and a very extraordinary degree of repentance. 2dly, It is also possible, that such may, for a time, fall into a kind of spiritual faintness and listlessness, and, for some space, continue in that state, which may expose them to very many sins; from which they are to rise by a renewal of repentance. 3dly, Should not this be the case, yet, in the very best, there are sins of daily infirmity, cleaving to their actions, words, and thoughts, from which no one, who accurately examines himself, will dare to declare he is free. Now let us apply these distinctions to

our present purpose. When our Lord speaks of a sinner causing joy in heaven by his repentance, it is evident, he treats either of that first and universal, or of the renewed repentance from some more grievous fall, and a state not so commendable. This, he says, the just need not, because they have already performed the first, and are solicitously careful that they be under no necessity of the latter; yet he does not say that they are free from all necessity of repentance; for though perhaps there may be some just persons, who, for a considerable time, are careful to be kept from more gross sins, or from falling into that sluggish state we have just described, and so not to stand in need of those ways of repentance; yet there is none upon earth who, on account of his daily failings, is not bound daily to renew his repentance. In a word, what our Lord says comes to this: that there is greater joy in heaven, on account of great sinners, when they are first converted; or for the regenerate, when returning after a shameful backsliding, than for those in whom, on account of their constant practice of a more strict piety, there is no such remarkable and conspicuous change to be observed.

CXXIX. It might here not improperly be asked, why a greater joy is said to be in heaven for the conversion of one repenting sinner, than for the constancy of ninety and nine persons in holiness; seeing a greater good may justly cause a greater joy, as it is certainly better to have kept a steady course of piety, than to return to the right way, after great backsliding. I answer, 1st, That when our Lord made use of parables, and, according to his custom, suited himself to the capacity of his hearers, he spoke of divine things after the manner of men. But it is evident, that when any good comes of a sudden, it causes greater joy than any other greater good one has for some time been in quiet possession of; and that the recovery of things lost more strongly affects the mind than in the uninterrupted keeping of others. The same also in its measure is the case here. The angels doubtless rejoice that the just labour after and press on to happiness; but they have, for a long time, been rescued from the snares of the devil. But when a wicked person is newly delivered from the snares he was in, that conversion, and the salvation of the converted, which was the consequence of it, by how much the more it was unexpected, must also yield so much the greater pleasure. 2dly, Here our Lord speaks according to the old Jewish divinity. The Jews affirmed, "that when a Hebrew sins, the angels weep." Our Lord says, that, on the conversion of any person, the angels rejoice. The Jews said, "the dignity of the penitent is greater than that of the perfectly just." And, "in the place where the penitent stand, there the perfectly just stand not." Which testimonies Drusius, Ludovicus Capellus, and Grotius, have long ago produced. The reason of which is this: because it is more difficult to break off a custom or habit of vice, than, after being brought to a commendable course of life, to go on without stumbling. It yields a greater pleasure when virtue is so very conspicuous. 3dly, The glory of the wisdom, power, and mercy of God, and the efficacy of the merits of Christ shine with greater glory in the conversion of a desperate sinner, than in the preservation of those who walk in the way of righteousness. As therefore the devil is more enraged when that prey is snatched from him, which he imagined he would have held fast for ever, so, in like manner, the angels justly rejoice more, when their and the enemy of their Lord is mortified to such a high degree. 4thly, And generally these are warmer in the practice of righteousness, who are instigated by the sorrow of a past life. An equable tenour of virtue is mostly more remiss: but they who are suddenly brought over from a very bad to a very good course, by the powerful arm of God, usually outstrip others by a quicker pace. They dread sin more, who were deeper plunged therein; have a more ardent love for religion, to whom its beauty has more unexpectedly appeared. And none prize the grace of God towards them more than those who know themselves to be most unworthy of it. And it is not possible but



this sense of so great a love must kindle the most ardent flames of a reciprocal love. As is evident from the example of Paul, and the woman who was a sinner, Luke 7:40–48. All which yield matter of greater joy to the angels.

CXXX. Seeing we have now made a frequent mention of repentance *μετανοια*, we will subjoin something concerning the proper signification of this word. The very learned Beza, either was the first, or among the first, who observed on Matt. 3:2, that the term *μετανοιᾶν* is properly never put but to denote a good; and that *σωφρονισμος* is always joined with *μετανοια*: but that *μεταμελεῖσθαι* is expressive of a solicitude and anxiety after the doing of a thing: for which the Latins say *pænitere*: and that it is also used to denote an evil, though simply signifying a kind of solicitude, and *δυσαρπησης*, a displicency, which makes us wish the thing that is done, whether good or bad, to be undone, even though it be out of our power to correct it. Hence he thinks, that *μεταμελεῖσθαι* is denoted by the Hebrew word *נחם*, as *μετανοιᾶν* is rather denoted by the word *שוב*, whence comes *תשובה*, conversion. Peter, therefore, having said, Acts 3:19, *μετανοήσατε*, repent, immediately subjoins, *καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε*, and be converted, in order to explain the former. The same thing Paul does, Acts 26:20. In this the venerable Beza has been followed by very many commentators, especially when they treat of the *μεταμελεία*, repentance, of the traitor Judas.

CXXXI. But it may be doubted, whether there is any solid ground for this distinction. For it can neither be deduced from the etymology of either of these terms, nor confirmed by the authority of approved authors, nor proved from the constant style of Scripture, nor, in fine, concluded from the corresponding Hebrew terms: which we are now to show in order.

CXXXII. As to their etymology, *μετανοέω* is a word compounded of *μετά*, after and *νοέω*, I understand, and as Hen. Stephanus in his Thesaurus translates it, *post intelligo*, and thus it is opposed to the term *προνοέω*, *ante intelligo*. Very elegantly says Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromat. lib. 2*: "Εἰ ἐφ' οἷς ἤμαρτεν μετενόησεν, εἰ σύνεσιν ἔλαβεν, ἐφ' οἷς ἐπταίσε, καὶ μετέγνω, ὅπερ ἐστὶ, μετα ταῦτα ἐγνω. Βραδεῖα γὰρ γνῶσις μετάνοια. If he has repented of his sins, recollected in what he has offended, and acknowledged it, that is, afterwards known it; for *μετάνοια* is a slow kind of knowledge, that comes after something is done." But *μεταμελεία*, according to its etymology, signifies solicitude, after having committed or omitted any thing. And thus *μετάνοια*, which is properly an act of the understanding, reflecting on itself and its actions, in order of nature goes before *μεταμελεία*, which rather belongs to the will and affections.

CXXXIII. Both words are so used in the best authors, as indifferently to denote an after-sorrow of mind, whether in good or in evil. Hesychius explains *μεταμελεία* by *μετάνοια*. Suidas in like manner, *μεταμελεῖ, μετανοεῖ*. And in the *Etymologicum Magnum*, *μεταμέλομαι, μετανοῶ, μεταγινῶσκω* are used promiscuously. Gomarus, on Matt. 11:20, adduces a remarkable passage from Plutarch, *περὶ εὐθυμίας*, where he varies the terms, *μεταμελεία* and *μετανοία*, as words of the same signification, and describes *μετανοια*, as *δακνομένη συν αἰσχύνῃ τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ κολαζομένη ὑφ' αὐτῆς*• remorse and torture to itself with shame of soul: which the venerable Beza will have to be appropriated to *μεταμελεία*. Nay, I have observed instances where *μετάνοια* denotes a simple displicency: as in Marc Antonin., lib. viii. §. 2: "καθ' ἐκάστην πράξιν ἐρωτα σεαυτὸν, πῶς μοι αὐτῇ ἔλει; μὴ μετανοήσω ἐπι αὐτῇ; In every action, ask thyself, How does it

affects me? shall I have reason to repent it?" Ibid. §. 10: "ἡ μετάνοια ἐστὶν ἐπέληψις τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, ὡς χρήσιμόν τι παρεικόνος: repentance is a kind of reprehension of ourselves, as having omitted something useful." On the contrary, μεταμέλεια is sometimes of the same signification with σωφρονισμός, amendment. In which sense Plutarch said, "πάνυ γὰρ ἡ μεταμέλεια σωτηρωδαίμων, amendment is altogether a salutary genius."

CXXXIV. Nor does the Scripture use of these words differ. For even there μεταμέλεια, sometimes denotes a sincere repentance: as Matt. 21:29, "Ὑστερον δὲ μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπῆλθε, but afterwards he repented and went:" and ver. 32, where our Lord upbraided the Jews for not having true repentance, says: "ὕμεῖς δὲ ἰδόντες οὐ μετεμέληθετε ὕστερνια τοῦ πιστεύσαι αὐτῷ• and ye when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him." Where μεταμελεσθαι answers to John's invitations, expressed by μετανοεῖτε. And on the contrary, μετάνοια sometimes signifies mere sorrow. Thus Christ, Luke 17:3, treating of some degree of sorrow for offending a brother, says, "ἐὰν μετανοήσῃ, if he repent," and ver. 4, if he shall say, "μετανοῶ, I repent," I could wish it undone. And Matt. 13:41, μετανοεῖν is affirmed of the Ninevites, and their repentance was external only, not internal; civil, not spiritual; temporary, not persevering.

CXXXV. Besides, it is not universally true, that μεταμέλεια answers to the Hebrew נחם; and μετανοια to שׁוּב. For though perhaps the Syriac interpreter of the New Testament renders μετανοεῖν constantly by ܠܘܬ: yet the Septuagint promiscuously translate נחם by μεταμέλεσθαι or μετανοεῖν. I shall single a few examples of each out of many; as 1 Sam. 15:35: "And the Lord repented (נחם) that he made Saul king." The LXX., καὶ Κύριος μετεμεληθη. In verse 29. of the same chapter, וְלֹא נִחַם: the LXX., "οὐδὲ μετανοήσει, nor will he repent." Again, Ps. 110:4, וְלֹא יִנַּחֵם, the LXX., "καὶ οὐ μεταμελεθησεται, and will not repent." On the contrary, Joel 2:14, וְשׁוּב יִגָּד: the LXX., "ἐκιστρέψει καὶ μετανοήσῃ, he will return and repent." In like manner, John 3:9, Jer. 4:28, and 8:6, and 31:19, and in very many other places, they have translated נחם by μετανοεῖν. Whence it is evident, they thought these Greek words were synonymous.

CXXXVI. To conclude, it cannot be proved from Acts 3:19, or Acts 26:20, that μετάνοια constantly answers to תשובה, as the contrary may be deduced from these passages. For επιστρέψατε expresses the Hebrew שׁוּב, as we just shewed from Joel 2:14. As μετάνοια properly denotes the act of the soul recollecting its own actings, so, in order of nature, it goes before conversion, and is justly pre-supposed by Peter and Paul. Let these hints, therefore, suffice concerning these words. If any desire more, they may consult Grotius on Matt. 27:3, Schultetus, Exercitat. Evangelic. c. 19. Gataker advers. Miscel. c. 29, and Suiceri Thesaurus.

## CHAPTER XIII: Of Conservation\*

I. THOSE to whom God has freely given faith and holiness, he likewise keeps with such solicitous care, that it is impossible for any true believer totally and finally to fall away from that holiness, when once it is begun, and thereby forfeit the salvation appointed for him. "The Lord is faithful, who shall stablish you, and keep you from evil," 2 Thess. 3:3.

II. Conservation is a gracious work of God, whereby he so keeps the elect, the redeemed, the regenerated, the faithful, and the sanctified, though in themselves weak and apt to fall away, internally by the most powerful efficacy of his Spirit, externally by the means which he has wisely appointed for that purpose, that they shall never quite lose the habits of those graces once infused into them, but be certainly brought by a stedfast perseverance to eternal salvation.

III. They whom God preserves and enables to persevere, are elected persons, or persons appointed by the immutable counsel of God, not only to some external communion of a national covenant, Deut. 8:6, but to an internal glory, Eph. 1:4, 5. They are redeemed by Christ, not only bought by that master of a family, who obtains very great though only common benefits for some, and takes them into his family in the capacity of servants, who, in that great house are at length found to be "vessels to dishonour," 2 Tim. 2:20, of whom Peter speaks, 2 Peter. 2:1, but also redeemed from the bondage of sin by the precious blood of Christ the Lord, 1 Peter 1:18, 19. They are regenerated, who have not only acquired a name to live, whereby they impose on themselves and others by some external actions which resemble the spiritual life, Rev. 3:1, but who have a principle of spiritual life implanted in them by the spirit of life, which is in Christ, Rom. 8:2. They are faithful, or believers, having not only that faith, which consists in a bare assent, nor that called temporary by our Lord and having no root, but that which is unfeigned, 1 Tim. 1:5, which influences the whole soul, and, being rooted in Christ, brings forth the fruits of holiness. They are sanctified, not only by a fœderal holiness, which gives a right to the sacraments in the visible church, 1 Cor. 7:14; nor by that external holiness, whereby one has "escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," 2 Peter 2:20, while yet they still retain their canine and swinish nature, ver. 22; but by a true and thorough holiness, whereby righteousness and true holiness are brought into the soul, Eph. 4:24.

IV. All these things are to be well observed lest any one should object to us, either the covenant-breaking Israelites, who were really chosen to the communion of an external covenant, but distinguished from those who were "elected to glory," Rom. 11:7, or the false prophets, who deny the Master who bought them, and who are different from those, whom not the Master, but the Lord not only bought for any kind of benefits, but redeemed by his precious blood, 1 Peter 1:18; or those branches of Christ, who abide not in him, but are "cast forth and withered," John 15:6; for, though they may be said to have been in Christ, as to the knowledge and profession of him, and the external communion with the church, the mystical body of Christ, and in so far with Christ himself; yet they were always without the quickening communion of Christ and the nourishment of his vivifying Spirit, or those temporary believers, mentioned Matt. 12:21, whose faith, though it may be said in a sense to be true, because by a mask of a feigned profession, they do not counterfeit what they have not in their heart, but sincerely profess what they believe concerning Christ, yet this is not that true faith eminently so called, which "knoweth the grace of

God in truth," Col. 1:6, and which alone constitutes the true disciples of Christ, John 8:31; or in fine, those who "trample under foot the blood of the covenant by which they were sanctified," Heb. 10:29. For if that sanctification is to be referred to those profane men (which yet is not necessary, as we have elsewhere shown), it is altogether to be understood of a fœderal, a sacramental, and an external sanctification, such as is also found in the dogs and swine mentioned by Peter. It was proper to premise these things concerning the genuine object of a gracious conservation, because by this very means we obviate many objections of adversaries, arising from the improper manner of handling this subject.

V. It is true, elect believers considered in themselves and in their internal principles, are weak and may fall away; nor are they alone sufficient to surmount the assaults of the world and the devil. Indwelling sin, "which easily besets them," Heb. 12:1, still resides in their members. They are often tempted by the flattering lusts of the flesh, Gal. 5:17. The very habits of engrafted graces are exceedingly imperfect in this life; and frequently, some degrees of sloth and drowsiness steal even upon the wise virgins and the chaste spouse of Christ, Matt. 25:5, Cant. 5:2, while the devil, that cunning and powerful enemy, watches these opportunities of acting, that he might easily bring them under his power, were they left to themselves alone. The perseverance therefore of those who are so weak in themselves, is owing partly to the internal principle of immortal life, which God has graciously bestowed upon them, and partly to the external superadded divine protection, guardianship, and support, which the immutability of the divine covenant causes to be perpetually, though not equally present with them.

VI. That which God preserves in his people is the essence of the spiritual life and the habits of the Christian graces. For as to the acts, we really own it to be possible, that a true believer may gradually sink to so torpid a state, as that the activity of that excellent life may seem almost to cease, and himself be like trees almost killed by a long and severe winter. For the church of God has also its alternate changes of winter and of summer, Cant. 2:11. Nor is that remarkable prophecy, Jer. 17:8, any objection to this assertion, which experience has so often proved, "He shall be as a tree planted by the waters, and that spreadeth out her roots by the river, and shall not see when heat cometh, but her leaf shall be green, and shall not be careful in the year of drought, neither shall cease from yielding fruit." For that promise is not universal, nor the lot of all believers, in whatever spiritual state they may be, seeing it is certain they are sometimes like a "bruised reed," Isa. 42:3, which certainly differs very much from such a fruitful tree. Neither by heat and withholding of rain, is here understood spiritual dryness, arising from restraining that mystical influence which is the cause of vigour in believers; for, on the contrary, the abundance of that influence is supposed, when this tree is said to be planted "by the waters" and "to spread out her roots by the river;" whereby he intimated, that it is not without the watering of the stream that washes it from which the root may draw its juice and sap. The words therefore of God in Jeremiah, contain a description of a believer, who being filled with the grace of the Spirit of God, brings forth the fruits of righteousness most abundantly, in the midst of adversities and in the want of external things.

VII. We add, that it is possible a sanctified person may be guilty of some acts, which are directly opposite to spiritual life, and to the habits of Christian graces. And experience, as well as Scripture, has proved, that the most eminent men of God have frequently fallen into grievous and atrocious sins, by which they not only deserve the entire desertion on the part of God,

disinheritance, and spiritual death; but also actually very much grieve the Spirit of grace, wound the spiritual life, and very greatly diminish the assurance of faith; nay, would entirely stifle the principle of life, unless their guilt being taken away by the blood of Christ, his quickening Spirit graciously prevented this mortal efficacy of such sins.

VIII. Nor do we disown that habits themselves, as to the facility and readiness of acting, are sometimes impaired, and spiritual life itself sometimes undergoes so violent a fainting fit, as to seem to be just at the point of death. This is thought by some practical writers to have been the case of Heman, when he complained, Ps. 88:15: "I am afflicted and ready to die from my youth up: while I suffer thy terrors, I am distracted."

IX. When we therefore speak of conservation, we mean, that God so continues to cherish by his gracious influence the principle of spiritual life once ingrafted, and the habits of Christian graces once bestowed, that though they may be many ways shaken by various temptations, and sometimes by very grievous sins, yet they will never entirely fall away; but afterwards resuming strength, and renewing faith and repentance, they will at last triumph over all their enemies, and continue stedfast unto death.

X. Neither do we assent to those who teach, that the salvation of the elect is so secured that death shall not come upon them while they are destitute of faith, yet who think that the spiritual life is sometimes quite destroyed, but may afterwards be restored by some new and singular act of the grace of God, so that they admit a total defect of spiritual life sometimes in the regenerate, but deny equally with us a final. They are, indeed, to be commended in that they deny not the certainty of the salvation of the elect, but are to be blamed in that they would overthrow the stability of faith.

XI. The absurdity of this opinion, not to mention other things, appears from this, that should the believer wholly apostatize from his faith, he would then no longer have any interest in Christ, to whom we are united by faith alone, would be brought under the power of the devil, become his child, and be entirely excluded the communion of God for that time, which would be effects and indications of the grievous wrath of God towards the believer under the guilt of great wickedness. But now if the wrath of God could be so great towards his children, while as yet believers, as to deprive them of the faith and right of children, I would ask, after they shall be altogether wicked and enslaved to the devil, what shall bring them again into favour, that being anew adopted and restored, they may obtain the gift of faith? For if he shall be so offended with his own children, as for their condign punishment to deprive them of life, and seclude them wholly from the communion of the Lord Jesus, in whom alone he can be reconciled (which yet is not at all suitable to the goodness and clemency of our heavenly Father), there can be no reason given why he should again receive them into his favour, when they are neither reformed nor yet lament their past sins, which they cannot do without the preventing grace of God. For on what account could they, who are thus disinherited, be received into favour? No probable cause can be assigned, but the satisfaction and intercession of Christ. But if that can procure the restoration of those who are already cast out of their Father's house, disinherited, and enslaved to the devil; shall it not rather procure, that they whose sin is pardoned shall never be ejected, disinherited, or brought under the power of the devil, but rather be corrected in measure, by their most gracious Father according to their fault? This is much more probable, and far more becoming God.

XII. The whole adorable Trinity concurs to that conservation of believers above described. The Father has, by a sure and immutable decree, predestinated them to eternal salvation, which we proved at large chap. iv. sect. xiv. seq. But they cannot obtain salvation unless they persevere in faith and holiness. Neither can they persevere unless they are supported by the power of God. Hence Christ himself infers the impossibility of the seduction of the elect from their election. Matt. 24:24: "They shall show great signs and wonders, insomuch that (if it were possible) they shall deceive the very elect." It is plain that the Lord Jesus there treats of the elect after their calling, and being brought to the knowledge of the truth; and speaks, not of any seduction whatever, but of that which is total and final; whereby, having forsaken Christ, they give credit to the most false and lying deceivers. He, moreover, foretells, that such would be the efficacy of those false prophets to deceive, that they would not only seduce those, who at least make some slight attempts after faith, but impose on the very elect, if (as it is not) the power of any seduction was so great, as to overthrow the faith of such. But that those words, "if it were possible," intimate a real impossibility, from the supposition of the divine decree, is evident from this; because if it was possible for any of the elect to be seduced, which our adversaries suppose; it would also happen, according to our Lord's expression, that some of the elect might be actually deceived by the false prophets; which is contrary both to the intention of Christ, to experience, and all sound reasoning.

XIII. Yet our adversaries insist and pretend that the phrase, "if it were possible," does not always denote an absolute impossibility, but often the difficulty of doing a thing; and bring, for that purpose, various places of Scripture; as Acts 20:16, where Paul is said "to have hastened, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of pentecost." Rom. 12:18, "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men." Gal. 4:15, "I bear you record, that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me." Matt. 26:39, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me."

XIV. But the answer is at hand. 1st. If the thing spoken of should really happen, then the expression "if it be possible," would denote the great difficulty of executing the same; if it should not, its real impossibility is then intended. Paul was in doubt whether it were possible for him, at so great a distance, to be at Jerusalem on the feast day; which was very difficult, nay, impossible, unless he made more than ordinary expedition. It is impossible, considering the great perverseness of mankind, to live always in peace with all men. It was impossible for the Galatians to pluck out their own eyes and give them to Paul, that they might become his and be of service to him. The thing could not be, except we suppose them out of their senses, thus without advantage to any, they should exercise such an act of cruelty on their own body; and without suppose Paul to be out of his mind, who, for his own honour, would permit and commend it. In fine, it was impossible for that cup to pass from Christ without his drinking it. Impossible, I say, not absolutely, in which sense Christ says, "O my Father, all things are possible to thee;" but from the supposition of the divine decree, the suretiship he had undertaken, the prophecies and types by which he was foretold and perfigured. For Christ was to make satisfaction to the utmost farthing. Which satisfaction is represented by his drinking the cup. 2dly. Should we grant our adversaries what they strenuously content for, that impossible, sometimes denotes what is difficult; and possible, what is easy; yet that sense would not suit this passage. For, should any transform our Saviour's words, thus: "They will show signs and

wonders, so as to deceive (if it might be easily done) the elect themselves;" he would render that most wise sentence impertinent and foolish.

XV. Secondly. The Father gave believers to Christ, John 17:6, for his inheritance, and as the reward and price of his labour, Ps. 2:8. But the Father will neither suffer the inheritance of his only begotten Son to be alienated, nor him to lose his purchase. Christ was secure as to this when he said, Isa. 49:4: "Surely my judgment is with the Lord, and my work with my God;" and John 10:29, "My Father which gave them me is greater than all, and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hands:" that is, neither Satan, nor the world, nor the flesh, which three are the enemies of Christ's sheep, shall ever have so much power as to make them unwilling to abide under the saving protection of the Father; for they cannot be pulled away against their will. This violent taking them away consists in the alone change of the will. Whence it appears, that these persons trifle in a matter of serious importance, who would have this condition understood, viz. unless they willingly depart from God. For the tendency of Christ's discourse is to assure believers that their enemies shall never be able to make them foolishly steal away from God. We are to attend to Christ's manner of arguing, which runs thus: "I give life to my sheep, nor shall they ever perish, because none can pluck them out of mine or my Father's hands." But if our adversaries' answer be true, that they may cease to be sheep, and of their own accord, by their sins fly out of his hands, though not plucked out of them; then Christ's reasoning would be weak and inconclusive. It is the greatest absurdity to restrict these words of Christ to those who have died in the faith; and that the plucking them out of Christ's hand, denotes the detaining them under death and condemnation, and preventing their being raised by Christ from death to eternal life. For, 1st. Christ here speaks of the sheep which hear his voice and follow him; the voice of a stranger they hear not, but fly from him: all which belong to the state of this life. 2dly. It is evident that Christ here comforts believers against those temptations by which they are most of all annoyed. But what believer is much disquieted by the thought, that, when he is dead in the faith of Christ, and his soul is received into the heavenly mansions, he shall be detained under death and condemnation? Who once doubts, but his happiness is then firmly secured? 3dly. Nothing can be spoken more unsoundly than that "they who have died in the faith of Christ, are detained under death and condemnation;" as the babbling apologist for the Remonstrants is pleased to say. What! are those who have died in the faith of Christ under a condemnation, under which they can apprehend they may be detained?

XVI. 3dly. The Father has, by an immutable covenant and testament, promised to take care that the elect should not fall away from him to their eternal destruction. But to doubt of the faithfulness of God promising and bequeathing by testament is blasphemous. To this purpose is Isa. 54:10, "The mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord, that hath mercy on thee." By which words, God not only in general declares that he will faithfully adhere to what he has promised in behalf of his children; but intimates the stability of the covenant of grace, which he calls the covenant of peace, beyond the covenant of works. Certainly God would have performed what he had promised in the covenant of works, provided man had persevered in his obedience; but in the covenant of peace he absolutely promises, that his goodness shall not depart from his covenant-people, because it was that which was to preserve them in holiness, and so to bring them to happiness. And in this sense also, it may be said of the new covenant, that "it

is better, and established upon better promises," Heb. 8:6, namely such as are absolute, without depending on any uncertain condition.

XVII. The same thing is more fully inculcated, Jer. 32:38–40, "and they shall be my people, and I will be their God: and I will give [put within] them one heart and one way, that they may fear me for ever. And I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me." The very same thing we have Jer. 31:31, 32, 33. On these testimonies we are to observe, 1st. That God here, in explaining his gracious covenant, proposes it by way of testament, while he absolutely promises what he is to do, requiring no conditions to be performed by man. 2dly. That this covenant or testament, is said to be perpetual, or everlasting, with an express opposition to another Covenant, which depended on a mutual condition, broken by man, and abrogated by God, Jer. 31:32. 3dly. That there is not only a promise of the constant affection of God towards them, whereby he will never turn away from doing them good, to which promise some condition might be understood; but also of that fear of God whereby they shall not depart from him. Which being supposed, nothing further can be required. 4thly. That God says not he will invite them by his word, by the greatest promises, and by very many benefits to a constant fear of himself, and thus, by moral suasion, incline their minds as much as in him lay, which the Remonstrants repeat after the Socinians, but that he would actually, and by the invincible efficacy of his Spirit, put his fear in their hearts; the consequence of which would be, that "they should not depart from him." Could this almighty conservation of believers be possibly promised in clearer terms?

XVIII. Almighty, I say: for what we are fourthly to observe is, that God exerts his super-eminent power in the performance of those promises, for their conservation: that power by which he is "greater than all," as we have just heard our Saviour declaring. Of this Peter speaks 1 Pet. 1:5, "Who are kept by the power of God (as a garrison) through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time." There Peter testifies, 1st. That the elect are kept unto salvation by the power of God. It is not therefore possible they should perish. 2dly. He compares that power to a strong garrison, which may not only bravely repulse all external violence, but also easily quell all commotions of intestine rebellion; for both these are incumbent on soldiers in garrison. 3dly. He shows the means of their conservation, namely faith, whereby we cannot be preserved unless it also be preserved in us. Thus far of the Father.

XIX. Now let us take a view of the SON. And first consider at what rate he purchased the elect; not with gold or silver, but with his precious blood, with dreadful horrors of soul and tortures of body, with an accursed death, accompanied by the pains of spiritual and eternal death. Can any one think it probable, that Christ would suffer those, whom he purchased at so dear a rate, to be taken away from him, and to fall into the power of another, and even of him who is our most enraged enemy? What! Will not Jesus protect them who are now become his peculiar property? Why was he willing to be at such expense for their purchase? Why are they called "λαος εις περιούησιν, a people purchased," 1 Pet. 2:9; and "λαος περίουσιος, a peculiar people," Tit. 2:14? For περιποίησις and περιούσία are interpretations of the Hebrew word סגולה Segullah, which signifies a peculiar treasure, a thing of value, that is, a thing acquired by one's labour and expence, and therefore exempted from all foreign right and power, to be carefully kept by the purchaser, and its loss to be deemed a great detriment and damage. Elegantly says Moses Gerundensis on Exod. 19:5, "Ye shall be in my hands a purchase, a beloved thing, which one



puts not into the hands of another." See what we have more fully said on these words in the preceding chapter, sect. 7. Or can he not keep them, unless they also themselves are willing? But he who could act so powerfully by his inclining efficacy on their will, when beset on every hand by the devil, as with full bent of soul towards him to rest, by faith and love, upon him; why can he not, by the same inclining efficacy, cause them, after having fully tasted his incredible sweetness, to abide with him with a fixed purpose of soul? Nay, he is both willing and able to keep them, and actually does so: "Those that thou gavest me, I have kept, and none of them is lost." John 17:12. From what our Lord adds, "but the son of perdition," we are not to conclude that Judas was, in the same manner given to Christ as the other apostles were; namely to be redeemed and saved. For "Christ knew who were his;" had long before known that Judas was a devil. John 13:18, and John 6:70. It is therefore plain that we cannot conclude, from the ruin of Judas, the perdition of those who are given to Christ to be redeemed, and whom he actually has redeemed with his own blood.

XX. Secondly, It is evident that the Lord Jesus is heard by his Father in all things, especially in those things which he asks as our intercessor. John. 11:42. But he prays the Father for all believers, that "he would keep them from the evil," or the evil one. John 17:15, 20. Our adversaries, by a ridiculous sophistry, endeavour to subvert this invincible argument, by affirming that Christ has nowhere prayed for the absolute perseverance of believers in the faith; nay, would not have prayed so earnestly for their preservice, had God absolutely determined it should be so. This assertion, together with the reason annexed, is very rash and extremely false. It is a rash assertion: for, 1st. Where, in this petition of our Lord, is there the least sign of a conditional prayer? It is not for us to frame conditions at our pleasure. And then, 2dly, What condition is understood, when Christ says, keep them from the evil, or the evil one? Is it this? unless they become willing to join themselves to that evil one? But their conservation consists in this very thing, that they shall be constantly unwilling to do that. 3dly. The Remonstrants themselves deny not that Christ prayed for the absolute perseverance of Peter. Luke 22:32. But that immunity from defection, which he prayed for in behalf of his disciples, he also prayed for in behalf of all who were to believe by their ministry. John 17:20. The reason they gave is most false, because it supposes that none earnestly prays for what he knows to be certainly decreed by God. The contrary appears in David, 2 Sam. 7:27–29, "For thou, O Lord, hast revealed to thy servant, saying, I will build thee an house; therefore hath thy servant found in his heart to pray this prayer unto thee." And in Daniel; who, when he had found from the prophecies of Jeremiah, that the determined period for the Babylonish captivity was seventy years, immediately "set his face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications," that he would do, what David knew from Jeremiah was certainly decreed by God. Dan. 9:3. And lastly, in Christ himself, who certainly knew that it was a thing fixed and decreed, that he was to be glorified with the glory which he had with the Father before the world was; and yet with no less earnestness does he ask for that, in this very prayer, than he did for the conservation of his own people. John 17:5.

XXI. Thirdly, We have Paul's authority to assert, that Jesus Christ built the church for his own house, Heb. 3:3. But Christ speaks of that building in order to show, by the strongest reasons, its impregnable stability; Matt. 16:18, "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." From which place we argue these three ways. 1st. The building or house of Christ consists of "lively stones," 1 Pet. 2:5, "fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth." Eph. 4:16. But should it happen (which our adversaries pretend

it sometimes does) that some lively stones die away, and that the dead are removed from their place; the work would be interrupted, the towering walls totter, and the edifice of the greatest artist be disgraced with many flaws. 2dly. A house built upon a rock stands secure against all the shocks of storms, streams and tempests. Matt. 7:25. But what rock is that? Here let that of the apostle directly strike our mind, 1 Cor. 10:4, "that rock was Christ." "Who is a rock save our God?" Ps. 18:31. "Yea, there is no (rock) God, I know not any." Isa. 44:8. Christ, therefore, is at the same time, under a different metaphor, both the architect and the foundation of this house. 1 Cor. 3:11. And seeing he his "the rock of ages," Isa. 12:4, not only because he is from everlasting to everlasting, but also because he gives a blessed eternity and an eternal security to all those who are spiritually united to him: it is not possible that they should be torn, by any violence, or by any stratagem, from that rock on which they are built.

XXII. 3dly. What our Lord adds is most emphatical: "And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Hell, in Greek ἄδης, Hades, in Hebrew שאול Sheol, in Scripture style signifies, the place and state of the dead: ἄδης property signifies, τὸν ἀύδῃ τοπον, the unseen place, in which they who are, do not appear: שאול denotes that place, in which he who is, is to seek; whom you may seek, but not find. This place the Scriptures set in the lowermost parts, and oppose it to the high heavens. Matt. 11:23. Sometimes it signifies not so much a place as a state, as Gen. 37:35, where Jacob says, "I will go down שאול, εἰς ἄδην, into the grave (Hades) unto my son, mourning;" though he imagined his son was devoured by beasts. In like manner, Ps. 49:14, "like sheep they are laid לשאול, ἐν ἄדῃ, in the grave (Hades)." Who yet are neither laid in a burying-place, nor carried away to a place of eternal torments. It therefore denotes the state of the dead: thus also Theophylact, on Luke 21. defines it, according to the opinion of many, "the translation of the soul from the state in which it appears (namely by its operations), into that in which neither appears nor is seen." Moreover, both the place and the state of the dead may be considered, either with respect to the body or the soul; and both are called Hell or Hades. Hezekiah spoke of the former, Isa. 38:10, I shall go to the gates of (Sheol or Hades) the grave;" and the sacred writers very frequently. The profane writers place all the souls both of the just and unjust in Hades. Diodorus Siculus explains the fabulous figment of Hades, by "the torments of the wicked; and the Elysium, or flowery meadows of the pious." And Iamblichus says, "We shall obtain in Hades, as the wise poets assert, the rewards of virtue:" Grotius, on Luke 16. has collected very much to this purpose. Yet I do not recollect that the Scriptures ever place the souls of the righteous in Hades. It therefore remains, that Sheol and Hades, when applied to the soul, denote a place of torments: and I see no reason why some learned men should deny this. For both Luke 16:23, and Prov. 5:5, persuade us of this; where Solomon says of the adulteress, "Her steps take hold on hell." Her steps are not directed to that which is truly life, but to [Sheol] the place of eternal misery; and Prov. 7:27, "Her house is the way to hell (Sheol):" compare 1 Cor. 4:10, and Rev. 21:8, where whoremongers are excluded the kingdom of heaven, and thrust into the place which burns with fire and brimstone. To this purpose also is Prov. 15:24; "The way of life is above to the wise, that he may depart from hell (Sheol) beneath:" which the Septuagint translate, "ἵνα ἐκκλίνας ἐκ τοῦ ἄδοῦ σωθῆ, that declining from hell (Hades), he may be saved." The wise man's meaning is, that he may ascend to the heavenly mansions, where true life is enjoyed; and never sink down to hell, the place of eternal death. We see then, what hell signifies in Scripture; namely, in general, the state and place of the dead; and more especially the state and place of souls spiritually dead, who are associated with devils.

XXIII. But what mean the gates of hell? I think it may be far better learnt from Scripture than from the expressions used by the profane poets. 1st. Gates are the defence of a town, where bands of soldiers, and arms, and whatever may be necessary in sallies for repelling force, are usually kept in readiness. Hence we read of "the gates of the foundation," 2 Chron. 23:5, which 2 Kings 11:6, is called, "the gate of retreat," whither one may safely retire. 2dly. In the gates they formerly held courts of justice; Amos 5:15, "Establish judgment in the gate." 3dly. In the gates was held the solemn assembly of the citizens, where they deliberated on difficult matters, and the elders gave prudent counsel: hence Ruth 3:11, "All the city (gate) of my people doth know," that is, the whole assembly which usually meets in the gate; and Lament. 5:14, "the elders have ceased from the gate." The gates of hell therefore signify: 1st. All the power of death, and of him who hath the dominion of it, that is the devil. 2dly. The bloody edicts passed, and cruel sentences of death pronounced, at the instigation of the devil, by the princes and dreaded tyrants of the world, on the confessors of the Christian truth. 3dly. All the craft and cunning of evil spirits, exciting each other mutually to deceive the godly.

XXIV. It is not to be doubted but these gates of hell have great strength and power; and yet they shall not prevail against the church. No force of the devil, though ever so strong, though he sallies out with his powers from the gates of hell against believers: no edicts of emperors, kings, and princes, though never so cruel, that are passed against them; no arts and deceits framed in the very council of hell, shall be able to subdue and force the saints from their faith in, and union with, Christ. And hence it is, that neither death, nor he that hath the power of death, can either bring or detain them under his dominion. This to us seems to be the fullest meaning of that saying.

XXV. Fourthly, Christ unites believers to himself, so that he is the head, and they, collectively taken, are the body; and every one in particular is a member of his body. Eph. 5:23. From this likewise we have a twofold argument. 1st. As it is impossible any member should be torn from the natural body of Christ, who is now in a state of glory; so it is no less impossible that any such thing should befall his mystical body. Because, as Christ, by the merit of his humiliation, obtained for himself a constant immunity in glory from all harm; so by the same merit he also obtained, "that he might present to himself" his whole mystical body "glorious," Eph. 5:27, that is, the true church, and each spiritual member thereof. But this he could not do, were any of his members to be wholly cut of. 2dly. As the animal spirits, which produce motion in the members by means of the nerves, incessantly flow from the head to the lower parts, so that power and efficacy, wherein spiritual life both consists and is exercised, flows continually from Christ to believers; and though it unequally moves them to produce spiritual actions, he at least preserves that life, and will not suffer it altogether to be stifled.

XXVI. There is no ground to object the instance of David, as if, when he defiled himself by his adultery with Bathsheba, and was joined to her, "he had taken a member of Christ, and made it a member of an harlot," according to 1 Cor. 6:15. For, 1st, It is certain that David was neither finally nor totally cut off from Christ. For the spiritual life, which incessantly flowed from Christ, being exceedingly oppressed, and almost stifled with the poison of sin, did, in its appointed time, powerfully exert itself by the evidence of a sincere repentance. Hence he begged of God "not to take his Holy Spirit away from him," Ps. 51:11; intimating, that though he was indeed very much grieved and oppressed, yet not quite taken away. 2dly, Paul's words run thus:

"Α ρας οὖν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ποιήσω πόρνης μέλη; shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of on harlot?" But the verb ἄρω does not always signify to take away, but to take upon oneself, to attempt or enterprise something therewith. And so the meaning is, shall I take upon me to put the members of Christ to so vile a use? 3dly, The apostle does not say, that a person is so estranged from Christ by one act of incontinence, as to become one with the harlot; but speaks of him who is "joined to an harlot;" being as much inclined towards her, as a husband, by the command of God, towards his lawful spouse. In sum, "he declares the natural consequence of whoredom, and the usual case of those who do not desist from it: but he does not limit the grace and mercy of God; as if he who has joined himself to a harlot, could not for some time be continued in union with Christ." These are the words of Ames in his Antisynodalia, de persever. sanct. c. 5.

XXVII. The HOLY SPIRIT, by an insurmountable efficacy, takes possession of the hearts of the elect, which was the place Christ had designed for him, and having vanquished and expelled the evil spirit, keeps his throne constantly there alone, and never quite forsakes his habitation: according to what Christ says, John 14:16, 17: "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you." This promise was not made to the apostles alone, nor does it treat of that effect of the Spirit only, by which they were rendered infallible, in preaching the gospel; but regards all believers. For, 1st, It is proposed as the fruit of our Lord's ascension to heaven, and of his sacerdotal intercession; the benefit of all which redounds to all the elect. 2dly, He is not speaking concerning the Spirit, as the author of infallibility in teaching, which the apostles and some other evangelists had; but as an advocate and comforter, which belongs to all the faithful. 3dly, They to whom the Spirit is promised, are not distinguished from other believers, as teachers are from the common people; but from the world of reprobates, who neither see nor know the Spirit, and consequently cannot receive him. Nor are we to think that this continual indwelling of the Spirit is so promised to the whole church, that every member of it cannot claim it to himself: for, by these words, our Lord comforts every one of his disciples in particular; for being grieved for his approaching departure, he gives them the promises of such a presence of the Spirit, that shall never at any time be entirely taken from them. But so long as the Spirit of Christ dwells in any person, so long, it is self-evident, he is Christ's, nor can he belong to the devil. We, indeed, allow, that the Holy Spirit, when he is ill treated and grieved by believers, will sometimes depart, as to the influences of his consolations, and their having cheerfulness in the spiritual life: yet abides with them as the source of their life, and the band of their union with Christ.

XXVIII. Nor is there any reason to object David's prayer, Ps. 51:11, where he so earnestly entreats that God would not take away his Holy Spirit from him; which he would not have done, had he been assured he was never taken from the elect. For, 1st, We have proved already, sect. xx., the falsehood of that hypothesis; namely, that none prays fervently for what he is well assured will be granted him. 2dly, After a believer has fallen into so horrid a sin, his faith and his full assurance are usually so much shaken, that he dare not always securely promise himself the continuance of divine grace in that state: hence those sighs and anxious ejaculations of soul to his God. 3dly, When David prays that the Spirit of God may not be taken from him, it may be understood,—1. Of the Spirit of royal wisdom and military prowess, of which he had seen a

melancholy instance in Saul. 2. Of the prophetic Spirit, which had before spoken by his mouth, 2 Sam. 23:2. 3. Of that operation of the Spirit, which should prevent his commission of other sins in the administration of government, whereby the wrath of God would be kindled against Israel. 4. Of those motions of the Spirit, whereby he now found his heart pricked, and which he sincerely wished, that they might not be stifled again, but heightened by new accessions, so as to end in a true and solid repentance.

XXIX. The case is different as to what we read, Isa. 63:10, "But they rebelled, and vexed his Holy Spirit; therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and he fought against them." For he is not there speaking of elect believers, but of the rebellious Israelites. God had placed among that people his Holy Spirit, who spoke by the prophets and sanctified the elect. The rebellious resisted that Spirit, rushed upon him like wild beasts, Acts 7:51, by persecuting the faithful servants of God and his dear children,\* Isa. 66:5. In this manner then, "they vexed his Holy Spirit," who dwelt not in them, but in the prophets and other holy persons; that is, they gave him occasion to do those things which are the effects of wrath, and which are usually done by him who avengeth the injuries he has received; or, if we may explain it of the Spirit working in those rebels, then it is to be understood of the convictions of natural conscience, excited by the Spirit, which they impiously opposed. Therefore it was, "that he turned to be their enemy," and rejected that people, and took their kingdom from them, and gave them up to hardness of heart: "and fought against them," as well externally by his armies, which slew them, and destroyed their city and polity; as internally by terrors and anguish of conscience, Deut. 28:65. All which is no proof of the total departure of the Holy Spirit from believers.

XXX. As that Spirit continually abides in believers, so he is also in them as the spring of eternal life. For he is "the Spirit of life," Rom. 8:3. His holy and comfortable energy is the life of the soul: for death reigns in a blind and depraved mind. John 17:3: "This is life eternal, to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Spiritual life consists in knowing, loving, revering the grace and truth of God the Father and of Christ, and in the joy which arises from these; which is called eternal, because, when it is begun in this world, it is carried on by the continual influence of the Spirit, and brought to perfection in the world to come. In another place it is called "a root within," Matt. 13:21. "The anointing which abideth," 1 John 2:27. "The seed that remaineth," 1 John 3:9. "A well of water springing up into everlasting life." John 4:14.

XXXI. The nature of that life, which is infused into the elect in regeneration, is far different from that which was in Adam in innocence, though even that was holy, and from the Holy Spirit. For, 1st, In that state, man was left to himself, without any promise of the constant inhabitation of the Spirit; such as, we have just proved, the elect have now. 2dly, That cause which first produced this life, seems also to be the same which makes them persevere therein; but this life is implanted in man, who resists it, and takes pleasure in spiritual death, and sets himself with all his might against God: it is infused, I say, by the invincible efficacy of the Spirit, which Paul has so highly commended, Eph. 1:19. As, therefore, that efficacy of the Spirit has, notwithstanding, overcome and subdued those that resisted and opposed his operations, so, in like manner, after he has once settled himself in souls thus vanquished and subdued, he constantly keeps the place he has once occupied; and should any thing arise, either from within or from without, that should attempt to weaken it; the more violent the attack, the more carefully it will collect its whole force and prepare for a resistance. And what should retard its progress, when its enemies are now

vanquished; seeing nothing could withstand its power in the beginning, when every thing was against it.

XXXII. Moreover, 3dly, This life flows from the life of Christ, Gal. 2:20, "Nevertheless, I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Moreover Christ, by his death, has obtained, that he should live for ever. Rev 1:18: "I am he that liveth, and was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore." But Christ lives not only in glory with the Father as to his person, but also by his Spirit in the elect. The Spirit of life, which, residing in him as the fountain, flows from thence to his people, and he is the author of the same glorious life in them, which shall be perfected in their several degrees. And hence he argues from his own to our life, John 14:19, "because I live, ye shall live also." This life therefore of Christ in us is different from the life implanted in Adam by creation. For that was given him for the trial of his constancy, and might therefore be lost. But after his constancy was at length tried, he might expect a confirmation in a holy and blessed life, as was the case with the blessed angels. Whereas the life of Christ in believers is the fruit of his satisfaction and merits, and therefore must be everlasting and eternal, that he might not lose the pains he had been at: and is to be compared, as, to its duration, not with the life of Adam, when in a state of probation, but with that life which he was to obtain, had he happily finished the course of his trial.

XXXIII. That expression of Paul is very memorable, which we have, Col. 3:3, "ye are dead," namely, to the devil, the world, sin, and yourselves, "and your life is hid with Christ in God;" every word of this sentence is sufficient to prove the perpetuity of this life. Life here denotes that holy and blessed energy, or activity of believers, which result from the communication of the Spirit of Christ, which begins in this life, and is perfected in that which is to come. That life is hid, 1st, From believers themselves, who do not fully conceive the manner in which the Spirit now worketh in them; and still less that inexplicable knowledge, that perfect holiness, that unshaken love, that unspeakable joy, which is ready to be revealed in the last time, 1 Pet. 1:5; 1 John 3:2. 2ndly, From the world. For as Christ, who is our life, is not seen by the world; so neither does the world know, how we live in Christ, and Christ in us; but reckons these mysteries of our Christianity as a kind of melancholy madness. 3rdly, From the devil;\* whose mortal blows and triumphs can have no access to it. The life of God's children, like a most precious treasure, is laid up in a secret place, from which the evil Spirit cannot take it away, neither by open violence, or secret stratagem. In this sense it is said, Ps. 83:3: "They have consulted against thy hidden ones," whom thou protectest in thy bosom. This life is hid "with Christ," to whose care and custody it is intrusted, "who is able to keep that which is committed unto him against that day." 2 Tim. 1:12. As Christ therefore, though invisible to the world, actually sits at God's right hand, and will be really revealed; so in like manner, our life is with Christ, and is really kept for us. In fine, the same life is hid in God: that is, is contained in the decree and love of God, who, in his own time, will make it manifest for what end he loved us in Christ. The bosom of God is that most sacred repository, in which that treasure is kept safe.

XXXIV. The same Spirit, who is the author of this everlasting life, is the seal wherewith believers are sealed, Eph. 1:13. The apostle compares believers to "an epistle, written, not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God," 2 Cor. 3:3. Now, that epistle contains God's testament. And whenever the elect have received the promises of that testament by a lively faith, then, in some measure, they have the Spirit to write them on their minds. Moreover, God ratifies that

inscription with the stamp of his seal. That seal is the Spirit of promise, not only with respect to the extraordinary gifts, which formerly abounded in the church (for these were neither conferred on all, nor on true believers only, neither were they an earnest of the heavenly inheritance), but chiefly with respect to saving gifts or graces. It is called "the Spirit of promise," either because he was promised, or because it is his office to intimate to, write and seal the promises of the Gospel upon the hearts of believers. A sealing is the impression of the image, which is on the seal upon the thing sealed, whereby we both assure the person to whom we write, of the author thereof, and more strongly confirm the contents of the epistle or testament, so as he may have no doubt about the truth of the thing. This mystical sealing, therefore, by the seal of the Spirit, consists in the effectual communication of that divine light, purity, holiness, righteousness, goodness, blessedness, and joy which are found in the Holy Spirit; of which the first lines are drawn at the beginning of regeneration, and this is the writing on the heart by the Spirit. But after faith in Christ comes to be strong and operative, all these things are confirmed, strengthened, increased, and more deeply imprinted by the same Spirit; and in this deeper impression consists the sealing, by the view and sense of which believers have assurance that they are the children of God.

XXXV. Moreover, this sealing of the Spirit is a proof of the unshaken steadiness of believers, for the apostle himself with good reason, joins their establishment with this sealing, 2 Cor. 1:21, 22. "He which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us." For, 1st, The promises of the eternal testament are confirmed and ratified to us by that seal. The wonderful and almost incredible goodness of God shines forth in this matter. He not only promises the elect, that he will never depart from them, but will so order it, that they shall never depart from him. And he likewise ratifies the same in the sacred and inviolable writings of both testaments: but this is not all, for he also engraves the same promises, by the finger of his Spirit, on the hearts of the elect. Nor does he stop here: but he adds the seal of the same Spirit whereby they are assured, in the highest degree, of the donation of these excellent promises. 2dly, This sealing denotes a firm and indelible impression of the graces of the Holy Spirit. For who can efface God's own seal, which he has appended to his eternal testament, and deeply impressed on the hearts of his people? 3dly, By this sealing, the sealed are rendered inviolable or sacred: thereby God declares that they are his peculiar property, which he will never suffer to be alienated, Rev. 7:3.

XXXVI. We cannot here omit that remarkable passage, 2 Tim. 2:19: "Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his; and let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity." Chrysostom, by the "sure foundation of God," understands, "These stedfast souls, who stand firm and immoveable." Which exposition is suitable both to this context and to the language of Scripture. It is agreeable to this context: for the sure foundation of God is distinguished from those men, who suffered themselves to be drawn aside from the doctrine of the true faith, by the new doctrines and deliriums of deceivers, such as were Hymenæus and Philetus. And it is agreeable to the language of Scripture, where the believer is called "an עולם יסוד," a foundation of ages, or "an everlasting foundation," Prov. 10:15; and "a pillar in the temple of God, which shall go no more out," Rev. 3:12. To this also might be referred, Isa. 28:16, where Christ is called מוסד מוסד יקרת פנת which may be translated "a precious corner (corner stone) of the surest foundation." For, Christ is the corner-stone of his church, which, being built upon a rock, has the surest foundation; therefore

the church of the faithful is the foundation. And as none but God can lay such a firm foundation, it is therefore called "the foundation of God." "Ye are God's building," 1 Cor. 3:9. That foundation of God stands sure, and unshaken against all temptations. But what is the reason and cause of that stability? Believers have it not of themselves, but from the seal of God: of which seal a two-fold use is here proposed, 1st, To set a mark on the elect, as those who are known to and beloved by God, and on whom he imprints characters, as his peculiar treasure which he highly esteems and choicely keeps, and as testimonies of his dominion and property: of this it is said, "The Lord knoweth them that are his." 2dly. To impress upon them the likeness of that holiness, which is in the seal, that is, in the Holy Spirit, whereby they are made to be diligently on their guard against iniquity and defection. To this purpose is the caution, "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ, depart from iniquity." For, whoever has this law inscribed within, so that it becomes the proper law of his heart, which he frequently repeats to himself, as from this he may know that he is chosen and beloved of God, so he carefully reserves himself for God, to whom he belongs.

XXXVII. In the last place, this Spirit is "ἀρράβων τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν, the earnest of our inheritance," Eph. 1:14. Grotius has learnedly observed on this place, that the word ἀρράβων (earnest) is not of Greek, but Syriac origin; but we say, it is of Hebrew derivation, as appears from Gen. 38:17, where Tamar asks ערבוני Arabon, a pledge, of Judah. It is probable, the Greeks had this word from the Phenicians, with whom they carried on much commerce. But arrabo, an earnest, or, as the Latins express it shorter, arra, is a part of the price given beforehand, as an assurance that the whole should afterwards follow. And Chrysostom says, "ὁ ἀρράβων μέρος ἐστὶ τοῦ παντός, an earnest is part of the whole." In like manner, those gifts of the Spirit of which we have just spoken, are a part of the future happiness, and of the principal thing that is to come after: and they clearly resemble that earnest, which the bridegroom gives to the bride in testimony of her communion with him in all his possessions. For who will not readily believe, that there is a reference here to the ceremony of betrothing? to which there is certainly an allusion, Hos. 1:21, 22. Moreover, that possession of which the Spirit is an earnest, is called "the inheritance of the children of God," because it is perpetual, and never to be alienated from the possessors: whoever has it, has it continually, from the first moment of possession, through all the ages of eternity. Therefore we conclude, that it is not possible that they, who have once received the Holy Spirit, can forfeit the heavenly inheritance: because, otherwise, which God forbid, the Spirit of truth would be a false and fallacious earnest.

XXXVIII. Thus far we have shown, that the whole adorable Trinity contribute their part to the conservation of believers, whence it appears that their salvation is secure under such guardians. Let us now further enquire into the method which God takes for their conservation. First, then, he employs that infinite and supernatural power, by which he, at first, infused the beginning of the spiritual life into elect souls, so that it may be cherished and maintained for ever by no less efficacy than it was at first produced. To this purpose is what we have advanced, Sect. xviii. concerning the power of God displayed in this affair.

XXXIX. But, as it becomes God, to deal with a rational creature in a way suitable to its nature; so he superadds to that supernatural power some means, acting morally, as they commonly speak, by which the elect themselves are excited carefully to keep themselves under God's protection. Here he uses the ministry of his Word, which is "the incorruptible seed," and "the



Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever," 1 Pet. 1:23. He sets before them the excellence of faith and godliness, thereby "confirming the souls" of his people, and "exhorting them to continue in the faith," Acts 14:22. He gives the promises of a great reward to those and only those who persevere, Matt. 24:13. Rev. 2:10, 11. He subjoins the threatenings of a dreadful vengeance against backsliders and apostates, Ezek. 33:13–15: and at times awakens dull and drowsy souls with his chastening rod, and reminds them of their duty, Ps. 119:67, "Before I was afflicted, I went astray; but now have I kept thy word." These admonitions, promises, threatenings, and the like actions of God, towards the elect, are so far from giving the least ground to conclude any thing against their perseverance; that, on the contrary, they are powerful means for their conservation.

XL. For when God, by the power of his Spirit, excites the mind attentively to consider these things, a certain holy fear and trembling are produced on man, Phil. 2:12, which stir him up to be diligently upon his guard against the flesh, the world, and the devil, and all their snares, least, by being imposed upon by their deceits, he should do any thing prejudicial to his own salvation. And should it happen, that he has departed from God by some abominable iniquity, the sense of the wound he has given his conscience, and which, unless timely cured, must at last issue in eternal death, does not suffer him to be easy till, by renewed repentance, he has returned to God and obtained, with many tears, the pardon of his sin from his infinite mercy. And as every believer is conscious of his own weakness, therefore, with humble dependence on the assistance of divine grace, he is earnest in devout prayers for the continual influences of it, in order to his conservation and corroboration; praying, according to our Lord's direction, "lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." And in this manner all true believers, being excited and assisted by God, also persevere and preserve themselves: "We know, that whosoever is born of God, sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not," 1 John 5:18. And indeed, whoever forms a right judgment of the vileness of sin, the torments of hell, and the greatness of divine wrath; whoever has had but the slightest taste of the beauty of religion, the pleasantness of grace, the honour of eternal glory, and the incredible sweetness of the love of God; it is not possible he should not exclaim: "Lo! they that are far from thee shall perish; thou hast destroyed all them that go a whoring from thee: but it is good for me to draw near to God," Ps. 73:2, 28. This is "with purpose of heart to cleave to the Lord," Acts 11:23.

XLI. Hence appears the falsehood of the calumny of our adversaries, that, by this doctrine concerning the almighty conservation of God, a wide door is opened to profaneness and carnal security. That it is highly useful and effectual for the consolation of believers, provided it is true, will not be contradicted even by those who deny it. But nothing can be effectual for the consolation of the saints, which, at the same time, is not effectual for the promoting of holiness. For in every consolation, there is a demonstration of the beneficent love of God towards the wretched sinner who is solicitous about his salvation; and the clearer that demonstration of divine love is, and the more particular the application, the stronger also is the consolation. Besides, nothing is more powerful for inflaming our hearts with love to God, than the knowledge, sense, and taste of the divine love shed abroad in them. Whoever, therefore, most amplifies the powerful grace of God in his consolation, which impudence itself will not deny we do, presents to the saints the most powerful motives to divine love and the consequences thereof.

XLII. But let us more particularly show, that our doctrine is far more adapted to promote piety, than what our adversaries maintain concerning the unstable happiness of believers. And first, our doctrine doth certainly most of all illustrate the glory of God, which the opposite tends to obscure. We celebrate the infinite power of the Deity, whereby he can not only restrain our outward enemies from overthrowing our salvation, but also so fix the wavering disposition of our will, that it may not depart from the constant love of holiness; also his truth in the promises of the covenant of grace, on which we safely and securely rely; being assured, that he who hath promised will also perform; and his goodness, whereby he does not altogether reject or disinherit his children, or cut them off from the communion of Christ, even when they have fallen into some grievous sin, but by his fatherly chastisements, graciously recovers them from their fall and stirs them up to repentance; and his holiness, to which it is owing that he hides his face from his children, when, for some time, they seem to give too much way to sin, so that he does not grant them familiar access to himself, nor the influences of his consolations, but sharply stings and thoroughly terrifies their conscience with the sense of his indignation, lest he should appear to be like the sinner, or could bear with sin in his own people without resentment; and the efficacy of the merits and intercession of Christ, whereby he has acquired and preserves for himself an inheritance never to be alienated. In fine, we celebrate the invincible power of the Holy Spirit, who so preserves his mystical temple, that it neither can be destroyed, nor be made an habitation of impure spirits. But as the sum of our religion consists in glorifying God; so that which illustrates the glory of God in this manner, does most of all promote godliness.

XLIII. But as the opposite doctrine separates the immutable bent of the free will to good from the efficacy of divine grace; as it maintains that God does not always perform what he has promised; as it will not grant that God's children, when they fall into some grievous sins, are chastised with rods, but disinherited and punished by spiritual death; as it asserts that the impetration of salvation by Christ may be perfect, and in every respect complete, though none should happen actually to be saved thereby, and that Christ was not always heard in his prayers; and that the Holy Spirit is sometimes constrained, by the mutability of the human will, to give up his habitation to the evil spirit; the opposite doctrine, I say, must in many respects, be injurious to the power, truth, and goodness of God the Father, to the merits and intercession of God the Son, and to the invincible efficacy of the Holy Spirit.

XLIV. 2dly, Our doctrine is excellently adapted to allure the unconverted seriously to endeavour after conversion and repentance; for the more sure and stable that happens it, which is promised to the penitent, the more effectual is the motive taken from the consideration of it. The Scripture every where dissuades men from searching after the good things of this world, and encourages them to seek those good things which are spiritual, from this argument, that the former will perish, but the latter endure for ever. John 6:27: "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life." 1 John 2:15, 17: "Love not the world: the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." And indeed, what can be more powerful to excite to repentance than this reflection? "As long as I am distracted with the anxious cares of this life, let my success be ever so great, I can only amass perishing treasures, of which I may perhaps be deprived in this very life, and the remembrance of which shall certainly torment me in the next. But if I diligently pursue the work of my conversion, I shall, from the very first moment of that, obtain that love of God in Christ, from which nothing shall ever be able to separate me again; and the sooner I enjoy that, the sooner I

acquire that supreme good which is possessed without any danger of having my misery renewed."

XLV. But the opposite doctrine is adapted to procrastinate endeavours after repentance. For, when it is inculcated on a man, that a child of God by regeneration, after having for some time been engaged in the practice of holiness, not only may, but actually has often fallen away, and become a child of the devil, been disinherited by his heavenly Father, and is with greater difficulty renewed to repentance, the further progress he had made in holiness: the thought will easily be entertained by those who hear of exhortations to repentance, that there is no occasion to press the matter of their conversion so strenuously in their tender years, lest perhaps, considering the great inconstancy of unstable youth, they be overtaken by some great sin and their condition be far worse than it was before: that it is more advisable to wait for those years (for we generally promise ourselves long life), in which both our judgment is riper, and the mind usually pursues with more constancy what it has once applied to, enjoying in the mean time the delights of this world. Now, nothing can be more pestilential than this thought, which yet this doctrine suggests.

XLVI. 3dly, Our doctrine is also very powerful to confirm the elect, already converted in the spiritual life, and to quicken them to the constant practice of religion, which may be proved various ways: 1st, All the arguments which are raised from the possible apostasy of the saints, are taken from the fear of punishment and the terror of dreadful threatenings; but those taken from God's most powerful conservation, breathe nothing but his love and the incredible sweetness of divine grace. Moreover it is certain, that the children of God, "who have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but the spirit of adoption, whereby they cry, Abba, Father," Rom. 8:15, are more powerfully drawn by the cords of love, than driven by the scourge of terror; for, "that love of Christ constraineth us," 2 Cor. 5:14. 2dly, All our religion is nothing but gratitude; but it is clear, that that person more effectually promotes gratitude, who proves by cogent arguments, that the happiness bestowed from grace, shall be perpetual by the help of the same grace, than he who maintains, that though it be truly great, yet it may be lost. 3dly, It is equitable, that the better secured the reward of our duty is, the more diligent we should be in the practice of religion. For the consideration of the reward is among those things which render the commands of God sweet, Ps. 19:10. But we assure the faithful worshippers of God from his own word, that, from their very first entrance on the course of sincere godliness their reward is sure; calling upon them with the apostle, 1 Cor. 15:58: "Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord." But our adversaries unhappily discourage all diligence, while they teach that we know not whether our labour shall be in vain or not, since it is possible we may fall away, and so have all along laboured for nothing.

## CHAPTER XIV: Of Glorification

I. As all God's works tend to his glory, so also to the glorification of his chosen people. This doubtless is the glory of God, to manifest himself in his elect, to be what he is to himself, the fountain of consummate happiness. When he does this, "he is glorified in his saints, and admired in all them that believe," 2 Thess. 1:10. Believers exult in this hope of their salvation, which is so connected with the glory of God, that it is called by that very name in the holy Scripture: "We rejoice in hope of the glory of God," Rom. 5:2. Our glorification is called the glory of God, not only because it comes from, and is freely bestowed on us by God; but also, because the magnificence of the Divine Majesty displays itself no where more illustriously, than in that glorious happiness which he makes to shine in his beloved people.

II. Some would prove that we are called to this by God, from 2 Peter. 1:3, who hath called us to glory and virtue; but the Greek runs, "διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς, by glory and virtue," which may be understood either of our glory and virtue, or of the glory and virtue of God and of Christ. If we understand it of ours, the meaning will be, that God had called us to communion with himself, by such a clear display of the glory to be revealed in the saints, and by the proposal of true virtue, which is made in the Gospel, that none can be acquainted with it, but must be inflamed with a desire after it. But it will be better to apply them to God, as Peter elsewhere calls them "τὰς ἀρετὰς τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς, the virtues (praises) of him who hath called us," 1 Peter. 2:9. And some manuscripts have "ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ, his own glory and virtue;" and then the meaning will be, he hath called us by his own glorious virtue; or, what I take to be fullest, the Lord Jesus hath called us by glory, while he presents unto us a glory in himself, as of the only begotten of the Father, and by virtue, while he discovered a life full of every instance of virtue, which, as they are set forth in a preached Gospel, clearly show, that he was the Son of God and Saviour in the world. And thus we keep to the proper signification of the particle διὰ, which I have not yet seen proved by any example to signify the same as εἰς, to. Indeed, the venerable Beza adduces Rom. 6:4, where Christ is said to be raised from the dead, διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ Πατρὸς, that is, says he, "to the glory of the Father." But such an explication is unnecessary; let us say, as the words bear, "by the glory of the Father," which admits a twofold sense, and both of them very agreeable. As first, by glory to mean the strength and glorious power of God, for sometimes the Greek word δόξα answers to the Hebrew כֶּבֶד, Isa. 45:24. Thus God is said to "have raised Christ, διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, by his own power," 1 Cor. 6:14, in the same sense. Again, if by glory we understand the display of the divine supereminent excellency, we will say, that Christ was raised by the glory of the Father, because it was for the Father's glory that the only begotten and righteous Son of God should live a glorious life in himself, and a holy life in his members.

III. But whatever be Peter's meaning, it is evident we are both called and justified, in order to glory; and for that end powerfully preserved by God. Paul speaks of our calling, 1 Thess. 2:12: "Who hath called you unto his kingdom and glory:" of justification he says, Rom. 8:30, "Whom he justified, them he also glorified:" of conservation Peter speaks, 1 Epist. 1:5: "Who are kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time.

IV. GLORIFICATION is the gracious act of God, whereby he actually translates his chosen and redeemed people from an unhappy and base, to a happy and glorious state. And it may be considered, either as begun in this life; or as consummated in the next. "The first-fruits of the

Spirit," Rom. 8:23, who is "the Spirit of glory," 1 Pet. 4:14, are even in this life granted to the children of God; not only that by these they might comfort themselves in adversity, but also that, from these, they might in some measure infer, what and how great that future happiness is, which is reserved for them in heaven; and that, having had a foretaste of that great reward they expect, they may be the more cheerful in the course of faith and holiness: now these first fruits consist in the following things.

V. First, In that most excellent holiness, which is freely bestowed on the elect, and was described, chap. xii. For, as there is the greatest filthiness in sin, it being contrary to the most just and righteous law of God; so also the greatest vileness and misery, as it makes man most unlike the infinitely glorious and blessed God. Accordingly these two things are conjoined; "they have sinned, and come short of the glory of God," Rom. 3:23; and sin is called "that shameful thing," Jer. 3:24. On the contrary, in righteousness and holiness, there is not only some moral goodness, in so far as they agree with the law and with God, the pattern of them; but also an excellent glory, in so far as there is in them a resemblance of the most blessed God; whom Moses represents as *נאדר בקדא נאדר* magnificent, "glorious in holiness," Exod. 15:11. Accordingly, "the image and glory of God," 1 Cor. 11:7, are connected. See what we have said, chap. viii. sect. ix. To say nothing now about that incredible sweetness and boldness with God, which the consciousness of sanctification gives those who endeavour after it. On which account David described "the statutes of the Lord to be the rejoicing of the heart, sweeter than honey and the honey-comb," Ps. 19:8, 10.

VI. Secondly, in that vision of God, with which He honours the saints even in this life. We shall presently hear, that the complete happiness of the life to come consists in the perfect vision of God. That vision, therefore, which is the privilege of believers here, is certainly the beginning of that other. Now God presents himself here to be seen; 1st, By faith, which, indeed, is mere darkness, when compared with the light of glory, and, in that respect, is distinguished from sight, 2 Cor. 5:7, and said to be the evidence of "things not seen," Heb. 11:1; yet it is a clear and shining light, in comparison of the ignorance of unbelievers, "in whom the god of this world hath blinded their minds," 2 Cor. 4:4. Hence Moses is said by faith "to have seen him who is invisible," Heb. 11:27. By faith also "we all with open face behold as in a glass the glory of the Lord," 2 Cor. 3:18. Nor does the faith of believers behold the perfections of God only in general, as they are in him, but it likewise beholds them as belonging to them, and become theirs for the sake of Christ. Which certainly has no small influence on our salvation. He that believes, and by faith views God, and that as his own, not only expects, but already has eternal life, and through that very "faith he is saved," Eph. 2:8; according to that of our Lord, John 5:24: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life." 2dly, God is also seen by an experimental sense of his goodness, which intimately insinuates itself into the soul, in the holy use of the creatures. So that he not only knows by reasoning that God is good, not only believes it on the authority of infallible testimony, but has the experience of it both by sight, sense, and taste, while God himself, by means of his creatures, wonderfully delights the soul. To this purpose is the invitation of the psalmist, Ps. 34:8: "O! taste and see, that the Lord is good." 3dly, He is seen still more immediately, when he reveals himself to the soul, while deeply engaged in holy meditation, prayer, and other exercises of devotion, as the fountain of life and the source of light; so as wonderfully to affect it with the immediate darting of his rays into it. This, I imagine, was what David desired, when he sought "to behold the beauty of

the Lord, and to inquire in his temple," Ps. 27:4. And this, I am apt to think, he obtained, when he sung, *הזיתך בקדש כן*, "to see thy power and thy glory, so as I have seen thee in the sanctuary," Ps. 63:3. 4thly, Something peculiar is at times imparted to sick and dying Christians, in whose imagination God sometimes draws so distinctly the brightest images of heavenly things, that they seem to see them before their eyes; nor are they otherwise affected than if the things themselves were present before them. The nearer the soul is to heaven, it is also enlightened with the brighter rays of supercelestial light, flowing from him who, being light itself, dwells in light inaccessible. Of which there are not a few instances in the history of the life and death of godly persons, and very many experiences offer in our daily visitation of the sick. This is a kind of descent of heaven into the soul, before the soul is taken up to heaven.

VII. Maimonides, the wisest among the Jews, seems to have had something to his purpose in his mind, when, in *More Nevochim*, p. 3, c. 51, towards the end, he speaks thus: "The more the faculties of the body are impaired, and the fire of lust is extinguished, the more is the understanding strengthened, its light increased, the apprehension purified, and the more it rejoices at what it apprehends; so that when the perfect man is arrived at mature age, and just approaching to death, the apprehension, the joy arising from that apprehension, and the love of the thing apprehended, are, in an extraordinary manner, heightened, so that the soul, as it were, is in a state of separation from the body, during the time of that high pleasure. To this our wise men had an eye, while they say that, at the death of Moses, Aaron, and Miriam, these three died *בנשיקה*, in the kiss, or by the kiss. For, say they, what is said, 'So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab *יהוה פי על*, at the mouth of the Lord,' Deut. 34:5, which shows, that he died in the act of kissing, *בנשיקה*. And so it is said of Aaron, 'At the mouth of the Lord, and he died there,' Numb. 33:38. They also affirm of Miriam, that she died *בנשיקה*, in the act of kissing: but yet the Scripture does not say of her, at the mouth of the Lord, because, being a woman, that parabolical mode of speech was not suitable. But the meaning is, that they died from excessive love, in the pleasure of the apprehension thereof. As to the phrase itself, our wise men borrowed it from the song of songs, where the apprehension of the Creator, conjoined with the supreme love of God, is called *נשיקה*, 'kissing, let him kiss me with the love of his mouth,' Cant. 1:2." Thus far that learned Jew.

VIII. Thirdly, In the gracious possession and enjoyment of God; when God himself, according to the promise of his covenant, holds communion with them, and gives them not only to see him, but also to possess and enjoy him in the manner we explained, Chap. x. sect. 33; and in this consists salvation. "Happy is that people, that is in such a case; yea, happy is that people whose God is the Lord," Ps. 145:15. He may justly glory of riches, who is admitted into the possession of such great happiness. "The Lord is the portion of mine inheritance and of my cup, thou maintainest my lot. The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage," Ps. 16:5, 6. But that fruition of God consists in that sweet and frequent delight the soul takes in him as its treasure, Ps. 73:28, in its being enriched with his riches, fed with his plenty, preserved by his power, directed by his wisdom, refreshed by his goodness, and, in fine, filled with his sufficiency; so that he knows of nothing he can desire, besides the perfect fruition of him, of which he has now only the first fruits. "Blessed is the man whom thou chooseth, and causet to approach unto thee, that he may dwell in thy courts: he shall be filled with the goodness of thine house, even of thy holy temple." Ps. 65:4.

IX. Fourthly, Such magnificent beginnings of glory beget "all riches of the full assurance of understanding," Col. 2:2, and the firmest certainty of consummate happiness to be enjoyed in its appointed time. For when one has obtained the first fruits of the Spirit, and has so many and such evident signs of his communion with God and Christ, why may he not say with Paul, "I know whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day," 2 Tim. 1:12: and again, "I am persuaded that neither death nor life shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord," Rom. 8:38, 39. And indeed, I know not, whether any thing more delightful and pleasant can be desired in this life, than that full assurance of our faith, which entirely calms the conscience, and delights it with the ineffable sweetness of consolations.

X. Fifthly, These so many and so great benefits joined together, beget a joy unspeakable and full of glory, whereby Peter testifies, "though now not seeing, yet believing they rejoice," 1 Pet. 1:8. For that God, with whom they have fellowship as their God, is their exceeding joy *נילם שמחה אל* "the God of the joy of their exultation," Ps. 43:4. Nothing exceeds this joy in efficacy, for it penetrates into the inmost soul, and is alone sufficient to sweeten the most grievous of all afflictions, let them be ever so bitter, and easily dispel the greatest anguish of soul: so that the faithful martyrs of Christ, who had tasted the sweetness of it, have gone with joy and songs of praise to the most cruel torments, as to the most sumptuous feasts. Nothing is more pure. It does not discompose the mind, unless in a salutary, wise, and holy manner; that, having no command of itself, but being full of God, and on the very confines of heaven, it both favours and speaks above the capacity of a man. The more plentifully one has drank of this spiritual nectar, though he may appear delirious to others who are unacquainted with those delights, he is the more pure, and wise, and happy. Nothing, in fine, is more constant; "Everlasting joy upon their heads," Isa. 35:10; "Your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you," John 16:22. If it is not constant as to the second effects, or after acts, as they are called, yet it is so at least, as to the foundation and first act. For though God in this life, according to his infinite wisdom, mixes the communication of his sweetness with much bitterness, yet believers have that in them, which proves the inexhausted fountain of a joy springing forth at times, and of a delight that is afterwards to continue flowing for ever. Nor does God at all times deal out this joy with a sparing hand: he sometimes bestows it in such plenty on his people, that they are almost made to own themselves unable to bear such heavenly delight on earth, and to say with Ephrem Syrus; "Lord, withdraw a little, lest the brittle vial of my heart should burst by the rays of thy favour darting too strongly." If God does so great things for his people in the prison, what will he not do in the palace? If the first fruits are so plentiful, how abundant will the harvest be?

XI. The glorification of the future life has again its several degrees and periods; and is either of the soul separated from its body, before the last judgment, or of the whole man after the resurrection. We are here to take notice of the gangrene of the Socinian divinity, whose meaning it is hard to come at, these worst of hypocrites are so involved and dark. I shall give their own words, from the compendiolum they themselves drew up, and which the venerable Cloppenburg undertook to refute.

XII. Their sentiments about the state of souls after death are these: That man by death undergoes such a total dissolution, as to be altogether nothing, unless that his spirit (even as the spirit of the beasts) like a kind of wind or breath, returns to God, who gave it, Eccl. 12.—because that

breath or spirit is a kind of virtue or efficacy of him, to whom it returns—moreover, they infer from this, that souls after death have no sensation; nay, do not, indeed actually subsist in themselves, as persons do. The whole comes to this: 1st, Since they contend that the soul is not a substance, but a kind of virtue and efficacy, as strength, health, wit, skill, and the like; they deny that it any ways subsists of itself. 2dly, As they say, it returns to God, they ascribe nothing to it, but what it has in common with the spirit of beasts; dreaming, namely, of a kind of divine air or breath, a particle of which every man, and every beast enjoys; by which God inspires, vegetates and moves their bodies, and which, when it is breathed out at death, he receives as a kind of virtue or efficacy of his own. 3dly, However that return to God hinders not man, "after death, from becoming altogether nothing," as beasts are nothing after death; only with this difference, that the soul of man is rational, and has the hope of eternal life; such as the souls of the righteous who will actually live for ever. But then they mean that eternal life, which begins at the resurrection, by which the soul as well as the body will be again brought into being; while the souls of the wicked will remain in the same condition with those of the beasts, which are not to be reproduced by any resurrection. 4thly. Since they deny the souls, surviving death, to be substances; it is much more evident, that they deny them to be capable of rewards or punishments, which is downright epicurism.

XIII. We are therefore to prove these three things in their order: 1st, That human souls truly survive after death. 2dly. That they live and think; for that life, which is essential to the soul, consists in these; and consequently they either enjoy the beatific communion of God with the highest delight, or are tormented with the gnawing worm of conscience, and the horrible expectation of a future judgment with the utmost pain. 3dly. That the souls of the righteous (for we now treat of their glory) are immediately, upon their quitting the body, received, not only into heavenly joys, but also into heavenly mansions.

XIV. As to the first: that the soul, on being set free from the body, subsists; and that man after death is not reduced into nothing, the Sacred Writings so evidently declare, that scarce any thing can be clearer. The Lord Jesus invincibly proves that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob existed, when, long after their death, God declared that he was their God, Matt. 22:32, compared with Luke 20:38. For, how could he be their God, when themselves had no existence? And if the soul, when separated from the body, could not at all subsist, Paul would have ridiculously doubted, whether he was caught up into the third heaven, in the body or out of the body, 2 Cor. 12:2, 3. His words also had been vain, Phil. 1:23, "I have a desire to be dissolved, or depart, and to be with Christ." Indeed, he says, to be dissolved, or depart, and not to be extinguished: nor can we refuse that he has a being, who is said to be with Christ. And how, pray, are we come not only to myriads of angels, but also to the spirits of just men made perfect, who are in the heavenly Jerusalem, if none such existed? Heb. 12:23. To what purpose also is that well known parable of the rich man and Lazarus, but to acquaint us with the existence of separate souls, and their different conditions? Luke 16. To what end those prayers of believers, and of Christ himself, by which they commended their departing spirits to God? Ps. 31:5; Acts 7:59. In a word, seeing Christ, whom these men reproach as a mere man, was a true man, and in all things like unto his brethren, I ask, what they think was become of his soul during the three days of his death? Did it also vanish into thin air, and was Christ really annihilated after his death, till his soul was raised together with his body? One or other of these they must say! either that the soul of Christ was of a quite different nature from ours, which, they assert, can no ways subsist, viz. in a state of



separation, and so they contradict Paul, who declares that "He was in all things like unto his brethren, yet without sin," Heb. 2:17, and 4:15: or that Christ was annihilated during the three days of his death; and so they contradict Christ himself, who promised the thief that he should be with him in paradise, immediately upon the death of both, Luke 23:43.

XV. The heretics, in like manner, pervert the meaning of the Preacher, who says, Eccl. 12:7, "then shall the dust return to the earth, as it was; and the spirit shall return God, who gave it:" as if that return was nothing but a resolution into God, of I know not what virtue, which they call a particle of divine breath, proceeding from God; almost in such a manner with God as now received from the body, as it was with him before it removed into the body, which are monstrous opinions! It is contrary as well to the nature of God, as to ours, that either our soul should be any part of God, or God any part of our soul. The meaning of the preacher is no ways obscure. After the death of the man, he says, that the condition of the body is quite different from that of the spirit. The body, when deprived of the soul, he calls dust; because the union of soul with body is the band, and as it were, the cement whereby the parts of the body remain conjoined. After the departure of the soul, the lifeless body, which at first was formed out of the earth, is nothing but a heap of earthy particles, into which also it resolves in process of time. But the condition of the soul is quite different. It dies not, nor is dissolved, as the body; but "goes to God," as to the judge, who is to assign it its place, either of reward or punishment. Nay, "it returns to God," not as if it had actually been with God, before it was infused into the body; (for God "formeth the spirit of man within him," Zech. 12:1,) but because, in order of nature and of efficiency, it was God's before it was man's; for God gave it to and made it for man. What Euripides has elegantly said, as quoted by Philo in his book, De Mundi Immortalitate, wonderfully agrees with this saying of the preacher,

Χωρεῖ δ' ὀπίσω, τὰ μὲν ἐκ γαίας

Φύντ' εἰς γαῖαν· τὰ δ' ἀπ' αἰθερίου

Βλαστόντα γονῆς, εἰς οὐράνιον

Πύλον ἤλθε πάλιν.

That is, as Grotius explains it.

Retroque meant, quæ terra dedit,

Iterum in terram. Quod ab ætherio

Venerat ortu, cæleste poli

Repetit templum.

In English thus:

"What springs from earth, goes back to earth again: but what from heaven derives its high pedigree, thither again returns?" Similar to this is that of Epicharmus, apud Plutarch ad Appollon: "Συνεκρίθη καὶ διεκρίθη καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ὅθεν ἦλθε ἦλθε πάλιν• γὰ μὲν εἰς γᾶν, πνεῦμα δ' ἄνω. They are joined together, and afterwards separated, and return again from whence they came; earth to earth, the spirit to heaven."

XVI. None should oppose to this testimony, the 19th verse of the 3d chapter; "I said in my heart—that which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts, even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have one breath, so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for all is vanity." For, it is evident, that the comparison between man and beast is only made with respect to what is external and strikes the eye; inasmuch as man equally with the beasts is deprived of that life, whereby he can enjoy the pleasures of this world. He does not here consider the condition of the next world, which is apprehended by faith. And it is plain that these words cannot be understood absolutely, but only relatively, as to the privation of animal life, because, otherwise man and beast would have the same kind of spirit; and that man has no pre-eminence above the beasts, none who is not out of his senses will affirm, and who, by giving up all pretence to solid reason, has willingly turned himself to a beast.

XVII. When the Scripture affirms, that the dead "are no more," Ps. 39:13, Jer. 31:15, it does by no means say, that nothing of them survives more, including even the soul in the same condition; which the adversaries themselves will scarce venture to affirm: but that they are not to be what they were before, namely, living men, consisting of soul and body united; nor, where they were before, "הַחַיִּים בְּאֶרֶץ" in the land of the living;" and because all their converse with the living is cut off, so that with respect to that intercourse it is much the same as if they had no existence: see Gen. 5:24.

XVIII. Now let us proceed to what we undertook to prove in the second place. That the soul not only survives after death, but also lives, understands, and feels either the favour or vengeance of God. Not only Scripture, but even reason should persuade us of this: for the faculty of thinking, in which the life of the soul consists, is so essential thereto, that the soul cannot exist without it. Though we really approve not their way of speaking who affirm that the soul is thought; yet it is evident that thought is so essential to a rational soul, that a soul which cannot think, is not, indeed, to be deemed a soul. And if the soul has lived in the body, without deriving its life from the body; why should it not live, when it is freed from the prison of the body? Will it, when it comes to God, the fountain of life, lose its own life? Nay, on the contrary, it is agreeable to think, that the nearer it comes to God, it will live in a more excellent manner. Some of the heathen philosophers have spoken much more justly of the soul, than those who are the reproach and disgrace of the Christian name. Plato said the soul was "αὐτοκίνητος," self-moving, or endowed with spontaneity: Alcinous, de doctrina Platonis, has best explained the meaning of that word, c. 25: "Αὐτοκίνητον δὲ φησὶ τὴν ψυχὴν· ὅτι σύμφυτον ἔχει τὴν ζωὴν, ἀεὶ ἐνεργουσαν καθ' αὐτήν. He affirms the soul to be "self-moving, because it has a connate life, ever active in itself." Aristotle, in like manner, lib. iii. de anima textu septimo: "Τὸ μὲν αἰθητικὸν οὐκ ἄνευ σώματος, ὁ δὲ νοῦς χωριστός. The act of sense is not performed without a body; but the mind is separable therefrom. Also, textu decimo novo et vicessimo; "Χωρίσθεις δὲ ἐστὶ μόνον τοῦθ' ὅπερ ἐστὶ, καὶ τοῦτο μόνον ἀθάνατον καὶ αἰδίου· the soul alone, whatever that be, is separated, and that alone is immortal and eternal." See Vossius de Idololat. lib. 1. c. 10. Thus the philosophers ascribe life to

the soul, even in the state of separation, and a faculty of acting independent of the body. But nothing, from a mere heathen, can exceed in grandeur those words of Maximus Tyrius: "How then shalt thou be able to emerge out of this sea, and obtain a view of God? Then only, and that perfectly, when thou shalt be called by him, which will soon be the case, only tarry thou, and wait till he call. Old age will presently come, which shall conduct thee thither: death, which cowards, or the faint-hearted deplore, and tremble at its approach, will soon be here. Whoever, on the contrary, longs to be joined to God, expects it with joy, receives it with undaunted resolution." And again, Dissert. ii. 25: "Ὁν γάρ καλοῦσιν οἱ πολλοὶ θάνατον, αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἦν ἀθανασίας ἀρχή, καὶ γένεσις μελλοντοῦ βίου· what the generality call death, is the very beginning of immortality, and a birth to a future life; while the body, indeed, perishes by the very law of its nature, and drops in its appointed time; τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτῆς τόπον καὶ βίον ανακαλουμένης, but souls are recalled to their proper element and life." See also Dissert. 28. For it would be too tedious to transcribe all.

XIX. But let us take a view of the Scripture testimonies: the Lord Jesus expressly declares, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, after death, do all live unto God, Luke 20:38. Which is not only to be understood of that happy life of the entire compound, which they are to obtain by the resurrection from the dead; but of the blessed life of the soul in a state of separation, which our Lord ascribes to them in the present time. In order to prove the resurrection he proceeds in this manner; as first, he concludes, that the soul survives and lives, and then from that infers the resurrection of the body, because God's covenant was not made with souls, but with entire persons. And what is clearer than that testimony of Paul? Rom. 8:10: "And if Christ be in you, the body is dead, because of sin; but the spirit is life, because of righteousness." He opposes the spirit to the body; to this last, he attributes death, as the effect of sin; to the former, life, flowing from the life of Christ, even while the body is dead. Add, that not only Elias, who, without death was taken up to heaven; but also Moses, who it is evident died, appeared to the disciples in discourse with Christ, Matt. 17:3, which could not possibly be without the life of the soul. But what kind of body Moses appeared in, is not for us to determine, as the Holy Ghost is silent about it.

XX. And why had Paul a desire "to depart and to be with Christ," and thought it "far better" for him? Phil. 1:23: why did he judge it "gain to die?" ver. 21; and why are believers actuated by the same spirit, "willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord," 2 Cor. 5:8; if, after death, they are to be altogether deprived of that most holy and sweet communion with God in Christ, which they enjoy in this life? Can it be imagined, that believers expected no happiness but what they were only to obtain at the last day? as Smalcus impertinently talks. But what should oblige them to wish therefore for death, which was to bring them no nearer to that day? Paul longed for death, and reckoned it gain; believers were willing rather to be absent from the body. Say, Smalcus, tell us, why Paul desired it, why believers rather chose it, if they had nothing to expect before the last day? Certainly, death in that case is not any gain, but an inestimable loss, as it deprives them of so many and great blessings we so lately described, and brings them no manner of advantage.

XXI. But by what cavil will they elude what is asserted, Rev. 14:15: "Blessed are the dead, who die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them." This testimony contains many things. 1st, That the dead in the Lord

are blessed; but, to suppose any blessedness without knowledge or feeling, is only for those to affirm who are destitute of all spiritual knowledge and feeling. 2dly, That the dead are happy ἀπάρτι, from henceforth, which is to be understood either of that time, when John heard that voice from heaven, and was ordered to write these things; or, of that time when believers die in the Lord. But pray, what new change was introduced in the dead from that time in which the revelation was made to John, that the dying should then be happier than those, who, a little before, had died in the Lord? Unless, perhaps, it be intended to show, that at what time the everlasting Gospel shall be again preached, ver. 6, after convicting Antichrist and purging the church, there will from that time, be preached and written in the church, what we contend for concerning the happiness of believers after death, the fiction of a purgatory being quite exploded. But it seems more natural to think, that ἀπάρτι, from thenceforth, denotes the moment of their death; because, from that time the more perfect happiness of their souls shall commence. 3dly, That they then "rest from their labours," which rest consists not in a sleep that deprives them of all sense; but in a freedom from all vexations, and in the most calm and never to be interrupted participation of the divine glory; and, in a word, in a continued serenity of conscience. 4thly, That "their works follow them:" that is, that they enjoy the free reward of their good actions, which can then, as little as afterwards, be unattended with any sensible feeling of the intelligent soul.

XXII. Nothing more plausible is advanced by our adversaries against this truth, than that reasoning of Paul, by which he proves the resurrection of the dead from this consideration; because otherwise, they who believe in Christ, would to no purpose stand in jeopardy every hour, in vain undergo so many calamities for Christ, and because Christians would of all men be the most miserable, 1 Cor. 15:19, 30, 31, 32. Certainly, they say, this would be false, should the souls of the righteous, immediately upon death, enjoy the happiness of heaven, and of the wicked feel the torments of hell; for the former would not bear their calamity in vain, nor the latter pursue the pleasures of the flesh with impunity; and the pious would be much more happy than the wicked, though their bodies should never rise. But it is to be observed; 1st, That they whom Paul refutes, did not only deny the resurrection of the body, but also the immortality of the soul, just as the Sadducees did, against whom Christ disputed concerning the resurrection. And this is the reason why both our Lord, and his faithful servant, reason in such a manner as to draw both conclusions at once. This appears from the points which the apostle undertook to refute, ver. 18, 19: "They which are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ;" and ver. 32, "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." All which tended to persuade men, that there was nothing after death either to be feared or hoped for. If that be true, says the apostle, that all who die perish, if our hope be confined to this life, if the soul neither survives, nor the body is to be raised, in vain are so many calamities undergone for Christ, and Christians of all men are the most miserable, which is not a false or deceitful, but a solid way of reasoning, and worthy of an apostle. 2dly, As the dangers and calamities the apostle here speaks of, principally concern the body, he justly argues, that the body seems to have been in vain employed for the Lord, if it also was not to be raised, in its appointed time, to a participation of the reward; so that no inference can be deduced from this against the immortality of the soul.

XXIII. Let us now in the last place show, that when the souls of the godly are separated from the body, they are received not only into heavenly joys, but also into heavenly mansions. The apostles assures us of this, 2 Cor. 5:1: "for we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle

were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." He assigns a twofold receptacle for the soul; one earthly, that is, the body, in which it resides during this animal life, and from which it departs at death; the other heavenly, which it possesses immediately on quitting the former. For here he speaks of that eternal receptacle for man, which death makes way for, and which is said to be eternal in the heavens. In the same "heavenly Jerusalem," he places the "spirits of just men made perfect;" where are "myriads of angels," and "Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant," Heb. 12:22, 24. In like manner also, John saw "a throne set in heaven, and round about the throne four and twenty elders," who are the patriarchs [or representatives] both of the Old and New Testament church, sitting on so many thrones, Rev. 4:2, 4.

XXIV. Nor are we to doubt, but this was Christ's meaning, when he said to the penitent thief: "Verily I say unto thee, To-day thou shalt be with me in paradise," Luke 22:43. These words are an exact answer to the petition of the thief, who prayed that Christ would "remember him:" Christ answers, I will not only remember thee as absent, but promise that thou shalt be in my presence in everlasting glory: "thou shalt be with me." The thief fixed the time in which he desired his petition might be granted, viz., "when thou comest unto thy kingdom." Christ informed him not only of the place where he was to reign, which he calls "Paradise," that is, the third heavens, compare 2 Cor. 12:2, 4. A very common way of speaking among the Jews, who place the souls of the godly deceased עֲדָן כֶּנֶן, in the garden of Eden, but also of the time, in which he was to enter on his kingdom, TO-DAY: "and it was about the sixth hour," the noon of the day, before the expirations of which, the death of both intervening, that our Lord promised him these joys. But because such a sudden change of condition seemed to be strange and almost incredible, Christ confirms his promise by an asseveration, AMEN, verily.\* These things are plain. Whereas, on the other hand, the interpretations of our adversaries are strained and foolish. They imagine the words may be thus pointed or distinguished, "I say unto thee to-day, thou shalt be with me in paradise," as if Christ did not fix the time when the thief was to be with him in paradise, but only declared the truth of what he promised. And they refer to Deut. 30:11, 15, 17, 18, where Moses says, "I command thee this day," &c. But how weak is this! For, 1st, The thief could not be ignorant of the time, when Christ said this to him; he did not want that inculcated. 2dly, It is not our Lord's saying "to-day," but his saying "Amen, verily," that declares the truth of the promise. 3dly, To-day denotes a time, and answers to the when,\* which was in the petition of the thief. 4thly, Maldonat himself looks upon this exposition as insipid and weak: Bellarmine accounts it ridiculous, from the same arguments almost with ours. See Riveti, Catholicus Orthodoxus, quæst. 60. 5thly, The phraseology of Moses is of a different nature: "I command thee this day;" "I denounce unto you this day;" for, besides, that the words there cannot be otherwise construed, here they both may and ought. Moses there prophesies of things that were to come to pass afterwards, and would have the Israelites mindful of that time, in which he had foretold them in such a pathetic protestation; and therefore, this day or to-day, has a remarkable emphasis in the discourse of Moses, but renders the discourse of Christ, if construed as our adversaries would have it, weak and insipid. Moreover, what they contend for, that the thief understood by Christ's coming into his kingdom, his coming to judge the quick and the dead, is asserted without any proof, nor will they ever be able to prove it. He had certainly been mistaken, if he imagined that Christ's kingdom was to be deferred to the last day. Christ had reigned long before, notwithstanding the vain rage of all his enemies. And Christ's kingdom so far from beginning at the last day, that Paul declares, he will then "deliver up the kingdom to his

Father," 1 Cor. 15:24. But a grosser impiety, than any Christian could well be imagined guilty of, is what the heretic subjoins; that, "from all these things, there is not the least pretence to conclude, that Christ, in any respect, lived after death, or that any other men live after death." These things are blasphemous, and cannot be either read or heard without horror.

XXV. Let us add Luke 16:22, and Lazarus was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. It is the general opinion of the Jews that God uses the ministry of angels in carrying home the souls of the pious. Thus they relate concerning Moses, that when the moment of his death was come, God said to Gabriel "משח של נשמתו והנא צא", go and bring me the soul of Moses." And Christ confirms the opinion about the ministry of angels by his own authority. But whither was the soul of Lazarus conveyed? Into Abraham's bosom. From which expression it is certainly manifest, that the place and state of the blessed are understood, from the opposition to the place and state of the miserable, in which the rich man was. But the learned are not agreed about the derivation of that metaphor. Some think, that this present life is compared to a tempestuous sea, the condition of the pious soul after death to a calm haven, signified by the term, bosom. Thus in Virgil:

Nunc tantum sinus, et statio malefida carinis.

It is now only a bosom, or bay, and an unsafe harbour.

And James Capellus has observed, that what the Latins called "navem appellere, to bring a ship to land," the Greeks express by *κελλειν*· from which Eustathius remarks, is derived *κολπος*, a bosom, or bay, which is the word that Luke uses here. But Ludov. Capellus thinks, that the bosom of Abraham is an expression borrowed from the custom of parents, who cherish their dear infants in their bosom, in which they also sometimes sweetly rest and sleep: just as the godly are said to sleep, when they die, and to rest from their labours: but where can they be said more properly to rest and sleep, than in the bosom of Abraham, their spiritual father? For confirming this interpretation, we may add, that little ones thus tenderly treated, are called by the Greeks *εγκολπίδια βρέφη*, children in the bosom; see also John 1:18, "the only begotten son, which is in the bosom of the Father," that is, who is most intimate and familiar with, and extraordinarily beloved by the Father. But, if I mistake not, they explain that expression best, who think that here, as also Matt. 8:11, and often elsewhere, eternal happiness is represented under the similitude of some splendid and sumptuous feast. For it was customary, that whoever of the guests was allowed to lean on the bosom of the master of the entertainment, was accounted the most honourable person. Thus John 13:23, "there was leaning on his bosom one whom Jesus loved." Moreover, there is no doubt but the Jews ascribed to Abraham, the father of the Gentiles, the principal place among the righteous. Here then is denoted the very great honour conferred on Lazarus, who, in that blessed abode, was placed next to Abraham. See Cameron and Grotius on the place. I conclude in the words of Augustine, lib. ii. de Origine Animæ, c. 4: "Were you then so very ignorant of this sound and very wholesome article of faith, that souls are judged upon their departure out of the body, before they come to that other judgment, in which they must be judged, at the restitution of their bodies, and that they are either tormented or glorified in that very flesh, in which they lived? Who has with such obstinacy of mind been so deaf to the Gospel, as not to hear, and, upon hearing, not to believe these things, in the instance of that poor man who, after death, was carried into Abraham's bosom, and in that of the rich man, who was

consigned to eternal torment?" What the opinion of the ancients was concerning the bosom of Abraham, Martyr has with great learning, explained at large, *Classis Tertia Loc. xvi. §. 7, seq.*

XXVI. When we ascribe to separate souls, not only a change of state, but also of place, and new habitations or mansions, we speak agreeable to the Scriptures, which assign mansions and a place to heaven, John 14:2, 3, and everlasting habitations, Luke 16:9, and a house, 2 Cor. 5:1, 2. Yet we do not think that souls are in a place in the same manner that bodies are: nor do we conceive that they consist of some very subtle corpuscles, whose particles are commensurate to the parts of the space, in which they are included. The very learned Parker, *de descensu ad inferos*, p. 106, 107, has given undoubted testimonies, that a great many of the ancients were of this opinion. But we think that, not only with respect to their external operations, but even as to their substance, they are in that part of the created world, where Christ is bodily present, so as not to be on the earth. We distinguish the essence of the soul, which is a spiritual and immaterial substance, from all its operations whatever, whether internal or external, as an agent is distinguished from its action. Nor do we only inquire about the actions of the soul, in what place they may be exerted, but also about its substance, in what place it may exist. Seeing it ceases not altogether to be, it ought to be somewhere: and as it is not infinite, it cannot be everywhere. It is therefore in some place; for instance, in some part of heaven, or of hell, not indeed locally, as if it had parts commensurate to the parts of space; but in a way suitable to a spiritual nature: so that while it is in this place, it cannot be in another. Nor is it in this place, because it operates therein; but on the contrary, operates in this and in no other place, because it exists in this place. Hence the presence of the soul, as to its substance, is, in order of nature, prior to its presence as to its operation. And when the Scripture asserts that souls are in heaven, we are to understand that of their substance, even secluding every consideration of their external operations. We would rather be content with this plain way of speaking, than to say with some, that "the soul, considered in itself, without any operation *ad extra*, cannot be conceived to be in any *ubi* or place," from which it would follow, that if the soul does not operate without itself, it has no *ubi*, and is incapable of every change of place after death. But we do not remember that any has explained whether and what it then operates without itself. Of a kin to this, is that inference from the subject relating to the condition of the separated soul, "that by heaven and hell, we are only to understand the states of happiness and misery," which is crude and indigested.

XXVII. We need not be very solicitous about the place of those separate souls, which were soon to be reunited to their bodies, by a miraculous resurrection: nor here give too great a loose to our curiosity: nor venture to "intrude into those things which we have not seen," Col. 2:18. The Sacred Writings say nothing distinctly on that subject. The safest course is to commit those souls to the hands of God, who has wisdom abundant to assign them a proper place of rest for that time, and of whose goodness and justice, we need entertain no apprehension that he will do them any injustice. This is their glory, this their salvation, that, in whatever place they are, they are still for the glory of God, and in his favour and grace. This is the language of modesty; to determine any thing peremptorily would be only presumption.

XXVIII. Let us now see what happiness the souls of the righteous enjoy, when they are set free from the body in heaven. And first, It is their happiness that they are "with God and Christ in glory," John 12:26, "where I am, there shall also my servant be." John 17:24, "Father, I will, that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am." Believers even here are with Christ

by faith and love: Christ with the Father cometh to them, and manifests himself to them, John 14:21. And they find an incredible rest to their souls, in that gracious presence of God and of Christ. "It is good for me to draw near to God," Ps. 73:28. But the greatest nearness they are favoured with in this life, is mere distance from God, if compared with the future state of the soul: "whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord," 2 Cor. 5:6. And hence it was, that Paul "had a desire to depart, and to be with Christ," Phil 1:23.

XXIX. Secondly, Being in the presence of God, they shall also see him in the light of glory. That is, they shall attain to that knowledge of the most blessed God, which shall be sufficient both to perfect and content the understanding, and with respect to this, that vision of God which is allowed them in this world is mere darkness and blindness, as we have formerly hinted. Of this vision our Lord speaks, Matt. 5:8, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." And they shall see God:—1st, In the works of glory, which are now made known in heaven, wherein his most illustrious perfections will shine forth with far greater clearness, than in the works both of nature and grace. 2dly, In the face of Jesus Christ, whom they will continually contemplate face to face, and very familiarly and intimately know, John 17:24, "That they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me." 3dly, More immediately, in himself; so far as man is capable to approach to God, in a degree and measure incomprehensible to us.

And love him with the greatest delight.

XXX. Thirdly, This vision of God, who is essential truth, shall be accompanied with the most holy and, at the same time, the most delightful love of the same God, who is also perfect goodness: nor can it otherwise be. For when the understanding beholds, and without interruption, contemplates God himself and his most desirable perfections, not in a fallacious appearance, nor with obscure and confused ideas, as here, but in their native light, the holy will cannot but be inflamed with most ardent love to them. That happy soul, not only in the light of God, beholds God as the fountain of light, but is, on every hand, surrounded with the flames of divine love, by which it continually gives love for love. And that love makes it feel neither weariness nor uneasiness in the presence, contemplation and fruition of God; while new pleasures, one after another, arising from the intimate possession of the chief good, supremely beloved, and its unvaried complacency, charm the soul. For that love is not a love of longing, but of long desired fruition. And this is that love which the apostle, 1 Cor. 13:8, declares abides for ever, when even faith and hope are no more.

XXXI. Fourthly, To perfect love is conjoined the most perfect conformity of the soul to God, in holiness and glory. If Moses were so favoured, that rays of unusual light shone from his face, after his familiar converse with God in the mount, which yet can scarce be compared with that familiarity of intimate access, which the blessed enjoy in heaven; how great, do we think, must that effulgence of divine glory be, which the infinite goodness of God communicates to the souls who are the objects of his love, and who perfectly love him! What the first-born Son of God is, in a most eminent degree, and in a way altogether peculiar to himself, viz. "the brightness of the Father's glory," Heb. 1:3, that also they shall be in their measure, even perfectly, according to that state, though only so far as mere creatures can be, that Jesus "may be the first-born among many brethren," Rom. 8:29.



XXXII. Fifthly, From all these things taken together, a joy arises more than inexpressible, more than glorious, of which that joy we have already described, sect. v., is but a faint and transient image. For as the blessings of grace are infinitely exceeded by those of glory, so the soul also, in a state of glory, is capable of those that are more excellent, is a far better judge of them, and enjoys them much more perfectly: hence also the joy flowing from them must be much more excellent. In Matt. 25:21, it is called "the joy of the Lord." Because, 1st, It proceeds from, and is freely bestowed by the Lord. 2dly, It has the Lord for its object. Ps. 16:11: "In thy presence is fulness of joy, at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore." 3dly, and lastly, It is the most excellent and worthy of the Lord.

XXXIII. There can be no doubt, but the things we have thus far mentioned, are most excellent: yet they are not the complete fulness of that state; nor do they fully contain that abundance of happiness and glory, which the gospel commands us to hope for. And for this reason, the Sacred Writings frequently put off the consummation of our happiness, till the glorious coming of our Lord; as 2 Tim. 1:12. "I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day;" and ver. 18, "The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day." 2 Tim. 4:8: "There is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord shall give me at that day." 1 Pet. 1:2: "The salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." And 1 Pet. 5:4: "When the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory, that fadeth not away; add Col. 3:4, and 1 John 3:2. From these testimonies we are by no means to conclude, that the souls of the righteous shall be, till then, without all sense of happiness; but only, that what they have till then been favoured with, is but a kind of prelibation, till the work of salvation shall be in every respect completed. For certainly, it cannot be denied, that there is a great difference between that measure of happiness, which the souls of believers enjoy while they are separated from the body, and that consummation of glory which is to be revealed at the last day; and that because the happiness of a part is not to be compared with the whole; since even that part, which is already received into heaven, has not attained to that perfection which the gospel has promised, as we shall presently more fully show. Hence, also, the ancients said, that the souls of believers have indeed a joy, but it is only enjoyed in part; as sinners have a sorrow and a punishment in part, while they are shut up in prison they are reserved for the coming of the judge, Auctor quæst. et respos. quæst. 20 (who is said to be Athanasius). And Chrysostom, places these souls as in a kind of porch. Bernard called it a hall, Sermon. 3, de Sanctis, distinguishing three states of men, or of souls; "the first in the tabernacle, the second in the hall, the third in the house of God." Which, however, is to be understood with caution, not that the souls of believers are out of heaven, and have not the vision of God, but we are to think that then they will obtain their most perfect happiness, when they shall be reunited to their bodies.

XXXIV. The things, which the last day will contribute to the consummation of happiness, we comprise chiefly under three heads. First, the bodies of believers, when raised in glory, shall be restored to their souls. The apostle has fully treated on this subject, 1 Cor. 15. The bodies, indeed, shall be the same which believers, as was their duty, tenderly cherished in this life, in which, as in temples dedicated to the most holy God, they glorified God, and often underwent so many afflictions for the cause of Christ and religion. For both the justice of God, the comfort of the godly, and the very term, resurrection, which can only be applied to what fell by death, do require them to be the same. But though they are to be the same as to substance, yet they shall be so changed as to qualities, that they will seem to be altogether different: "For this corruptible

must put on incorruption, and this mortal put on immortality: then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory," 1 Cor. 15:53, 54. Great, therefore, shall be the change of the body, but the same subject shall remain. Which the apostle intimates by the term, this, as if he had pointed to his own body. And to what purpose is the repetition of the same particle, four several times, but to remove all ambiguity, and every cause of hesitation? And in fine, how otherwise can death be said to be "swallowed up in victory?" Ought it not rather to be said, that death swallowed up our bodies ἐς νίκης, or as it is in the Prophet לַבַּיִת, which may also be translated for ever, if the same numerical bodies do not rise?

XXXV. Moreover, we cannot here but admire the almost incredible goodness of God. The divine mercy was willing to bless our bodies also with a participation of heavenly felicity. But their present constitution renders them incapable of so great a glory. As herbs and flowers wither and fade by the excessive heat of the radiant sun, so also our bodies, such as we now carry about with us, are unequal to bear the heavenly glory. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," 1 Cor. 15:50. Where flesh and blood do not denote our nature, corrupted by sin, but the very substance of the human body, with those infirmities of animal life which naturally follow it. Our flesh is from blood; blood from meat and drink; and in blood consists that animal life from which the body is called animal, ver. 44. By flesh and blood, therefore, is signified the nature of the human body, as it is nourished and preserved in this life, by taking in meat and drink, and by the circulation of the blood. But such flesh and blood is incapable of the heavenly glory. What then? Is God to diminish the heavenly glory, that our body may also be admitted to have some participation of it? By no means. He will rather change the qualities of our body, and of terrestrial make it heavenly, and of animal spiritual, so as thus to bear a suitable proportion to the glory wherewith it shall be endowed, ver. 40, 43. But who, while he still remains on this earth, can comprehend this heavenly language? Who can form an idea of such a spiritual body? And yet it is evident from undoubted testimonies of holy writ, that the righteous shall have this granted to them, and we are to look for it from our Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, "who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working, whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself," Phil. 3:21. that we may shine forth, not as to our soul only, but also as to our body, "as the sun in the kingdom of our Father," Matt. 13:43.

XXXVI. The second thing, in which the last day shall contribute to the consummation of our happiness, is such a great effulgence of the divine perfections in the works of glory, that a more illustrious neither the understanding can conceive, nor the heart wish for. Undoubtedly the soul of man, immediately upon its reception into heaven, most distinctly sees very many things in and concerning God, which on earth it understood only by the faint glimmering light of faith; but yet God has postponed the full display of his glory to that day. And therefore that vision of God, which we maintain to belong to the separate soul, though more evident than we can now well conceive, is not yet so perfect but a greater measure of new light. For as knowledge depends most of all on the revelation or discovery of the objects, so that knowledge cannot be brought to its perfection, while a great part of the objects lie concealed. But a great part of the objects, in the contemplation of which our mind shall be employed, lie concealed, till a new heaven and a new earth are made, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Indeed, the more illustrious the works of God are with which the blessed find themselves surrounded, the greater is the pleasure with which they contemplate the glory of God therein. But what more illustrious, than to see this vast

universe, delivered from the bondage of corruption, and brought into the glorious liberty of the sons of God, which this created world, with earnest expectation, waited for? Rom. 8:19, 21. What more noble and divine than that general judgment, in which they shall hear themselves not only acquitted, their enemies not only condemned, but themselves also appointed to judge angels in Christ their head? 1 Cor. 6:3. What more illustrious than that general assembly of all the elect, from the beginning of the world to the last day, who, being clothed with heavenly bodies, shall each of them shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father? And with what pleasing astonishment may we imagine the soul will look upon its body, which it formerly knew to be subject only to very many and great infirmities, but shall then behold it glittering with such a blaze of light, as that it may seem not indeed equal to, but yet greatly resembling the glorious body of Christ? And as, in all these things, it can admire nothing but the effulgence of the divine glory, may it not be said, while it beholds them, to see God himself in a most eminent manner? Hence John says, 1 Epis. 3:2, "But we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." And David, in like manner, promises himself only after the resurrection, that contemplation of God which gives the most full satisfaction. Ps. 17:15; "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." To this also we are to refer that of Paul: "For now we see through a glass, darkly, but then face to face: now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known," 1 Cor. 13:12. That is, in a manner most perfect and altogether divine, a more excellent than which cannot, it seems, be the portion of any creature. For both the object shall be most clearly represented, as well in its most glorious operations, as in its immediate illapse or entrance into the mind, in a manner which at present we cannot explain; and the subject will be disposed in the best manner, in order to behold and observe in God whatever can complete its happiness.

XXXVII. Thirdly, That day shall bring the blessed to that fruition of God, which shall be much more perfect and immediate, than whatever they had enjoyed before. As long as there are some believers who are still in this miserable life; as long as the bodies of the elect, who are departed out of it, are detained in the prison of death, and lie hid in the dust, the saints in heaven cannot be ignorant, that very many remains of that power which sin had gained over man, must still subsist. And consequently something must be wanting to the full perfection of their joy. And seeing the effects and remains of sin are not yet abolished in their own bodies, and in believers not yet made perfect, who, together with them, are members of the same mystical body, hence God does not communicate himself to them, but by the intervention of a mediator. But by the resurrection, "death itself, which is the last enemy, shall be abolished, 1 Cor. 15:26. and "cast into the lake of fire and brimstone," Rev. 20:14, never more to have any power but over the enemies of God and of believers. Nor shall there be any member of the whole mystical body of Christ, which shall not be perfectly holy, and absolutely subject to him. And after all the remains and effects of sin shall be entirely destroyed, nothing shall hinder God from communicating himself immediately to men without the intervention of a mediator, as he does to the holy angels. We are of the opinion, with the best interpreters, that this is the meaning of Paul in 1 Cor. 15:28, "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

XXXVIII. To this happiness belongs a boundless and immutable eternity: without which it would in reality be no happiness. For no good, how great soever, that one is possessed of with a fear of losing it, can, by its fruition, yield that perfect and solid joy which is requisite to

happiness. Wherefore happiness is called "eternal life," Matt. 25:46. Rom. 2:7, and "a crown of glory, that fadeth not away," 1 Pet. 5:4, and "an incorruptible crown," 1 Cor. 9:25, and the apostle declares concerning the righteous, 1 Thess. 4:17, that they "shall ever be with the Lord".

XXXIX. Here it is usual to inquire, whether there will be any difference of degrees among the blessed. In this question, indeed, (though we utterly disclaim the proud doctrine of the Romanists concerning the disparity of glory, founded on the inequality of merits) the arguments of those who think, that God will crown the unequal measure of the gifts of grace with a disparity of gifts of glory, seem more probable to us. To this purpose are those Scriptures, Rom. 2:6, "who will render to every one according to his deeds," and 2 Cor. 5:10, "That every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done." By which words is not barely signified the quality of the free reward which shall be granted the righteous, according to their works; but also the quantity of that reward, answering in a certain proportion to their works. Which is expressly explained by the apostle, 2 Cor. 9:6, "He which soweth sparingly, shall reap also sparingly: and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully." Moreover, that this harvest, and its diversity or different product, is erroneously confined to this life, appears from comparing this place with Gal. 6:8, "He that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting." To the same effect is 1 Cor. 3:8, "He that planteth and he that watereth are one: and every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labour." Where it is clearly enough declared, that the proportion of the reward will be adjusted to that of the labour. Nor unlike to this is the discourse concerning the resurrection of the dead, 1 Cor. 15:40, 41, "There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial; but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another. There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory." Where first, the bodies laid aside at death are compared with those assumed at the resurrection: and then, the celestial bodies are said to differ very much in glory from each other. As the sun, moon, and stars are all truly celestial bodies, but greatly unlike in glory. And to what purpose is that distinct mention of sun, moon, and stars, and of the unequal glory of each, if the apostle only intended to teach us the difference of the terrestrial from the celestial bodies, while all the celestial were notwithstanding to have the same degree of glory?

XL. It cannot, it seems, on any pretence be denied, that at least the principal leaders, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, and diligent teachers of the Old and New Testament church, shall have some greater degree of glory assigned them. What was said to the apostles was not said to all, Matt. 19:28, "When the son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." The meaning of these words, if I can form any judgment, the illustrious Grotius has best of all explained. It is as if our Lord had said, you shall occupy the next place of honour to me your king. To judge here denotes, to be set over or to preside, by a metalepsis, because general presidents are employed in passing sentence. Whence a presidentship or province is called by the Hebrews *סדיכה*, Gen. 49:16. Zech. 3:7. The metaphor is taken from the ancient state of the kingdom of Israel, in which the Phylarchæ, or heads of the tribes, stood in the next degree to the royal majesty, and are supposed to have sat by the king's throne, in chairs of state, in the public assemblies. But to confine this glory of the apostles within the limits of the church militant in such a manner, that in the triumphant, where they have the full reward of their labours, they shall quit their thrones, seems repugnant to reason: nor does it agree

with John's vision, who saw in heaven four and twenty thrones, and twenty-four elders sitting on them, that is, the patriarchs of the Old and New Testament church, "clothed in white raiment, and having on their heads crowns of gold." Rev. 4:4. And these things are so evident, that those very persons, who in other respects contradict the disparity of celestial glory, own that we are to distinguish between that happiness which shall be the portion of believers, as believers, and the commendation which, in the last day, shall be given to every one, in proportion to the diligence and success he shall have laboured in promoting the kingdom of Christ, and which, it seems, is to be unequally distributed. But because it is a glorious thing to obtain such a commendation from the mouth of Christ, and the memory of that testimony shall for ever abide in the minds of believers; they cannot deny, but in the kingdom of heaven a disparity of degrees in that kind of glory may be admitted to take place among the blessed. For certainly, it is not to be thought, that then there will be many servants of Christ, who may in that respect be compared with the apostle Paul. See Theses Amyraldi de vita æterna, § 34.

XLI. The apostle John seems to have given a check to other things, which are too curiously made the matter of inquiry, concerning the condition or state of the future world, when he said. 1 John 3:2, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be." It is then more prudent and pious to endeavour to become hereafter partakers of that glorious life, than to gratify an itch of curiosity with insipid and vain speculations. This, however, we may look upon as a certain truth, that "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man to conceive, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." 1 Cor. 2:9.

## **THE ECONOMY OF THE DIVINE COVENANTS - BOOK IV**

## CHAPTER I: Of the Doctrine of Salvation in the first age of the World

I. WE have thus far considered those benefits, that are essential to the covenant of grace: let us now more particularly take a view of the two ECONOMIES, or the different dispensations, under which that covenant was administered. And here, according to the plan laid down chap. III. of the preceding book, we are more accurately to explain, first, the nature of the Old Testament, and then that of the new. In the old, we will distinctly confider four principal points. I. The doctrine concerning the common salvation, as there laid down. II. The benefits or privileges of that testament. III. Its defects, or according to Paul, Heb. 7:18, "the weakness and unprofitableness thereof," on account of which that covenant was not faultless, Heb. 8:7. IV. Its abrogation. The doctrine again may be considered, as expressed by words, figured by types, and ratified by sacraments.

II. Divine compassion published to wretched man, immediately upon his fall, the first doctrine of grace; in such a manner, indeed, as in few words, and those almost enigmatical, summarily to contain the whole Gospel; we have that first promise, Gen. 3:14, 15: "And the Lord said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field: upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Luther long ago complained that none of the ancient fathers and bishops, who were men eminent for knowledge and piety, had explained this passage as it deserved: their successors ought to use the greater diligence to do it with the more care, which several learned interpreters have indeed happily effected. Treading in their footsteps, we shall make it appear that the principal articles of the Gospel doctrine are summarily contained in this text.

III. We suppose that the devil is condemned by this sentence, to whom the Lord addresses himself under the appellation of the serpent, because he had abused that animal, in order to deceive man. For, it is dull and trifling to restrict that magnificent speech of the Deity, as if it had its full accomplishment in that animal alone; for besides, that it might seem unbecoming the Supreme Being to address a brute beast, void of all reason, in such pomp of language, many things said here to the serpent, if interpreted literally, are natural to that beast: as "to go upon his belly" and "eat dust." For we are not to affirm, without Scripture, that the serpent, as the Jews vainly dream, went on feet, or walked erect, or had other food formerly, different from what it has now; nor to imagine, that serpents now feed only on dust, seeing Aristotle reckons them among the *παμφαγοι* or omnivorous, that eat all kinds of things, and testifies that they eat both flesh and herbs, and "that of all animals, they are fond of the nicest delicacies." Dust is said to be the serpent's food, because, since it creeps upon the ground, it cannot but take dust into its mouth along with its other food. Just as David complains in his mourning, that "he ate ashes like bread," Ps. 102:9, for while he lay on his face in the ashes, he eat the bread that was thrown to him on the ground. Moreover, what is here said of the serpent going on the belly and eating dust, is common to many kinds of worms, as the very learned Bochart has shown, Hierozoic. lib. i. c. 4. But how could that be a curse to the serpent, which is natural to other animals, whom Satan never abused in this manner? And then, its being detestable to man is owing to its dangerous poison, which it also has in common with other beasts, who, after sin, became a horror and dread to man. But some serpents are commended for their philanthropy, or love to men. See Vossius de

Origin. Idololat. lib. vi. c. 58: some also are fit to be eaten, and accounted a royal dainty, *ibid.* c. 62. In a word, it is of no great consequence to man, whether any animal goes on its feet, or on its belly; whether it feeds on herbs, or flesh, or dust. But certain it is that, by this condemnation of the serpent, God intended to comfort our first parents in their wretched estate. To what purpose then is it to interpret the words in such a manner, as to yield very little or no comfort at all to man, who now seriously deplored his own unhappiness?

IV. But the principal consideration is, that the Scripture expressly calls the devil, "ὄφις, the serpent," 2 Cor. 11:3, and "τον ὄφιν τον αρχαιον the old serpent," Rev. 12:9: and his defeat is called "the bruising him under our feet," Rom. 16:10. And though we grant that both these things were primarily and literally said to the animal, the instrument which Satan spoke by; yet it is evident from the nature of the thing, that both might and ought rather to be said to the principal seducer. For, as Chrysostom argues well; if the instrument experienced such a degree of indignation, what punishment can we probably imagine the devil incurred?

V. Nor can it be objected, that what is said to the serpent, all the days of thy life, cannot be applied to Satan, who, it is evident, is an immortal and never-ceasing spirit. For even Satan has a peculiar death reserved for him, namely, the judgment of the last day, in which he, together with death, will be thrown into the lake of fire and brimstone, Rev. 20:10. The devil lives when he works effectually in the children of disobedience, and thereby shows himself to be τον κοσμοκρατορα the prince of this world. He shall die, when he will no longer be able to use any of his instruments in or against the kingdom of God. Thus the Lord Jesus "stills the enemy and the avenger," Ps. 8:2, and "destroys him that had the power of death," Heb. 2:14. The days, therefore, of the devil's life are those antecedent to the last judgment: which yields us an useful doctrine, as we shall presently see.

VI. But God was pleased to pronounce those words (the source of all consolation to wretched man), against the devil in the presence and hearing of man. 1st, To mortify that wicked and arrogant spirit, who was constrained to hear his own condemnation, in the presence of such weak feeble creatures, whom he had so easily brought under his power, and over whom he thought to domineer for ever. 2dly, That he might revive and charm our first parents with the sweetest consolations, to whom not only that just vengeance ought to be most acceptable, which God promised to take of their enemy; but who, also in the condemnation of the devil, heard their own absolution. 3dly, To show that this sentence had the nature of a last or unchangeable will. For as God, by a peremptory and irrevocable sentence, condemns, without farther inquiry, the devil, when he was taken in the very fact, which he could neither deny nor transfer to another; so those blessings or privileges, which are made over to the elect in this condemnation of the devil, are made over to them by the last and immutable will of God, which does not depend on any uncertain condition.

VII. Now let us take a more distinct view of the things contained in this sentence. And they are the following: I. The blessings or benefits promised to man. II. The author of those good things. III. Their meritorious cause. IV. The manner of acquisition. V. The heirs. VI. The mean of acquisition.

VIII. The evils which God pronounces against the serpent, are so many benefits or blessings to man; and they are four. The first is, the curse of the serpent, "because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field." All beasts are subject to destruction: natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, 2 Pet. 2:12. And it is for man's sin that beasts, as the property of man, are made more miserable: for they cannot be excluded from being a part of this world, which is not willingly subject to vanity, Rom. 8:20, and among them there are those called evil beasts. But the curse threatened against the serpent is such, as renders him inferior to, viler and more miserable than all beasts: importing, 1st. An invincible folly and malice; so that he can neither be wise nor good; worse than a horse or mule, which have no understanding, Ps. 32:9. 2dly, The very worst degree of vileness, whereby he who impiously attempted to be equal to God, and seemed to have acquired a dominion over man, the noblest of God's creatures, is depressed below the beasts of burden. 3dly, A state of never ending misery. The beast die and perish, and never come into judgment. But the serpent, accursed above the beasts, cannot escape judgment; "everlasting fire is prepared for the devil and his angels," Matt. 25:41. It could not but be acceptable to man to hear that sentence pronounced, by which that enemy who had made him obnoxious, is himself doomed to be accursed.

IX. The second benefit is the destruction of his power, expressed by three several phrases. The first, "upon the belly shalt thou go;" that is, thou shalt be constrained to creep on the ground, nor suffered any longer to fly at man, twist thyself round him, and kill him with thy envenomed embraces. Pareus says judiciously, "he himself is also forced to creep on his breast; because being once thrown headlong down from heaven, he is now condemned to creep for ever on the ground, amidst earthly filth, nor able any more to raise his head to heaven." Thus Rev. 12:9, "The judgment of the old serpent, the devil, by which he is now bound fast, is called his casting out into the earth, where, in a hostile manner, he persecutes, but cannot overpower the woman.

X. The other expression, dust shalt thou eat, doubtless denotes a state of the greatest degradation. For, the Scripture phrase, to lick the dust, is applied to conquered enemies, who lie prostrate at the conqueror's feet: Ps. 72:6, "His enemies shall lick the dust;" Micah 7:15, "They shall lick the dust like a serpent;" Isa. 49:23, "They shall bow down to thee with their face towards the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet." But there seems a much greater emphasis in these words, when the serpent is commanded to eat dust; as also when it is said, Isa. 65:25, "and dust shall be the serpent's meat." Which, if I mistake not, signifies in general three things. 1st, The restraining the devil's power to earthly minded men, who are glued to the earth, and seek their good and happiness in earthly things. Those alone he shall be able to devour, without having any right over others. And this tends much to the great benefit of the church. For, when the wicked are devoured by the devil, offences are removed out of the way of righteousness, the church is delivered from their vexations, and Satan's kingdom diminished in this world. 2dly. As to the elect, it signifies the restricting the power of the devil to their bodies, which on account of sin, is said to be dust, and to return to dust. That body the devil will devour, that is, bring down to death, and keep under the power thereof, till the resurrection: he shall have no power over the souls of the elect. And even that destruction of the dusty body is of benefit to believers: for, at the same time the old man is destroyed, who had hitherto harboured in their members. 3dly. It denotes that wicked pleasure, which the devil takes in drawing the reprobate to sin, and consequently to eternal destruction, and in vexing the godly as much as he can. It was the meat, that is the delight, of the Lord Jesus, to do the will of him that sent him," and to turn men to God,



John 4:34. On the contrary, it is the delight of Satan to push on the wicked to evil, and to vex the beloved children of God; which as it is the greatest wickedness, so also the highest degree of misery.

XI. Least any one should hiss this exposition off the stage, as if it were new and never heard of before, I shall subjoin the comments of Fagius and Pareus. Fagius writes thus: "If we now, as we certainly ought, refer these things to that spiritual serpent, I mean Satan, whom the Hebrews call קדמוני נחש, the old serpent, who acted in the serpent, a brute animal, as in an instrument, they signify that this, our old crafty enemy, who before walked, as it were, in state, is now thrown down and confounded; to eat dust, signifies to consume earthly minded men, who are enslaved to their affections. Satan is a spirit, such therefore must be his food; here are sins to stay his hunger. For, as the serpent creeps on the earth, lives on the earth, broods on the earth; so the disposition of Satan is to entice men to the earth, to hurry them to earthly things, and draw them aside from those that are heavenly." Thus far, Fagius: from whom Pareus does not greatly differ. His words are these: "He is also condemned to eat earth, that is to feed on the earthly nastiness of vice and wickedness, as the filthy swine feed on excrements. Which that impure spirit does, when he not only pollutes and delights himself with the defilements of the world, as swine with wallowing in the mire; but also plunges the reprobate into the same, and destroys them with himself: this is Satan's sweetest food. For, wherewith any one is delighted, that he accounts his meat and his pleasure, according to that saying, 'envy is the best food: again envy feeds on the livings', &c. Augustine advances no inelegant doctrine, where he says, 'The sinner is earth; the sinner, therefore, is given up to the devil for food. Let us not be earth, if we would not be devoured by the serpent.' " Thus far Pareus. Ambrose, lib. i. de pœnitentia, c. 13, quoted by Rivet, Exerc. xxxv. in Gen. explains dust by the flesh of men, and maintains that the devil is permitted by God to feed on this flesh, that is, to torment and tear the bodies of believers, but not to have any power over the soul.

XII. The third expression by which the destruction of the devil is set forth, is "the bruising his head." In the head of the serpent are his poison, craft, strength, and life. The head or the serpent, therefore, signifies the crafty subtlety of the devil, his venomous power, and all that tyrannical dominion, which by sin he has acquired over man. The bruising his head is the abolishing of all his power, according to the apostle's explication, Rom. 16:20: "and the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly." The symbol of this bruising was that extraordinary power granted to the disciples of Christ, mentioned Luke 10:19. "Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall by any means hurt you." And Mark 16:18: "they shall take up serpents;" namely, without being hurt, as appears from the history of Paul, Acts 28:5. Which power of depriving serpents of their venom and of bruising their heads without harm, Tertullian, as quoted by Grotius on Luke 10:19, testifies was not quite extinct in his time among Christians. Though the devil imitated this miracle in the temple of Isis in Egypt, as Bochart has remarked from Allian, Hierozoic, lib. i. c. 4, at the close; yet our Lord expressly declares, that the destruction of his kingdom was thereby signified, when, to serpents and scorpions, he adds, "all the power of the enemy." Thus the devil was constrained, by his juggling tricks and delusions, to give a prelude of his own destruction.

XIII. The third benefit God promises here, is "the putting enmity between the serpent and the woman and her seed:" these words include man's sanctification. For, when man becomes an

enemy to the devil, then he abhors and avoids all intercourse with him, hates and detests his works, endeavours to destroy him and his kingdom in himself and others, and most willingly does what he knows shall mortify the devil. And though the devil on that account wages war against him, because he endeavours after godliness, yet he is so far from suffering himself to be thereby diverted from that which is good, that, on the contrary, he goes on with the greater alacrity to oppose him. While a man continues unsanctified, he cultivates peace with the devil, and calmly submits to his dominion: enmity and hostility against the devil can only proceed from an infused principle of holiness. And this is what God promises to man, when he says, "I will put enmity," &c.; he not only commands the woman to have no intimacy or friendship with the devil, or to have any commerce with a sworn enemy; nor, by this sanction, did he only again open a door of repentance for our first parents, as Pareus observes on this place; but he also promises, that, by the unsurmountable efficacy of his power, he would perform and bring it about; namely, that he would put that enmity against the devil, which cannot subsist where there is not the love of God. Rivet says well, Exerc. 36. in Gen.: "When a state of enmity is foretold, in the same breath it is also foretold, that men shall return to such soundness of mind, as, displeased with that grievous yoke of Satan's tyranny to seek the shaking it off, and having once happily succeeded, afterwards to watch by a continual struggle against being entangled therein again." But fullest of all, Cloppenburgius, Schol. Sacrific. p. 75: "There could have been no enmity between the woman and the devil, without removing, by justification, the enmity with God, which the devil, by his seduction, had brought the woman and her posterity to; and without conquering and subduing, by sanctification, the dominion of sin in the woman. Putting therefore that enmity against the devil, he appoints a covenant of peace and friendship, whereby he promises to the woman the grace of justification and sanctification."

XIV. The fourth benefit is the resurrection of the body, which was brought to dust by his means who hath the power of death; this is more obscurely intimated, when it is said, "the serpent shall eat dust all the days of his life," which we have shown, sect. v., to be the days preceding the last judgment. From which we concluded, that the time of the devil's power, and of his going about to devour, is limited and to have a final period. And when that is elapsed, the bodies of the righteous shall be raised from the dust, and all the effects and remains of the power of the devil and of sin, by which he acquired his power, be entirely abolished, that he may not detain under his power the dust of our bodies, which ought to be temples of God, and of his Holy Spirit in a state of glorious holiness. Nor was this, indeed, altogether unobserved by Fagius, who thus speaks: "The days of Satan's life are the whole time to the consummation of the world and the coming of Christ. For then he and all his servants shall be thrown headlong into everlasting fire," Matt. 25:41.

XV. Jehovah God, who speaks to the serpent and declares, that he would put that enmity, of which we have been speaking, takes the honour to himself of being the Author of all those benefits. Though we are not to deny, that the conferring so great a benefit is to be ascribed to the whole undivided Trinity; yet, in the economy of our salvation, the Father, who is first in order, holds the principal place. And whereas, the eternal suretiship of the Son, according to the tenour of the covenant between the Father and the Son, on the supposition of sin, began immediately to exert its efficacy; these words are not improperly referred primarily and immediately to the Father, who, on account of the suretiship of the Son, appoints his grace to the sinner; and who expressly enough distinguishes himself from the Mediator, or the seed of the woman. And

indeed, "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," 2 Cor. 5:19. that is, the Father in the Son, the Mediator.

XVI. The meritorious cause of those benefits is the seed of the woman, eminently so called. I own, indeed, when the seed of the woman is opposed to the seed of the serpent, and between both an enmity established, both seeds are to be understood collectively; that by the seed of the serpent all the wicked are intended, who, Matt. 3:7, are called the "generation of vipers;" by the seed of the woman, elect believers, together with Christ their head; yet it is without all doubt, that, in this seed, there is some eminent one, to whom that name does chiefly belong, and by whose power the rest of the seed may perform the things that are here foretold. Just as the seed of Abraham is sometimes to be understood more largely, at others more strictly; sometimes denoting his posterity by Isaac and Jacob, as Gen. 17:8: "I will give unto thy seed the land wherein thou art a stranger;" sometimes more especially believers of his posterity, who walk in the steps of the faith of their father Abraham, and to whom the promise of the inheritance of the world, by the righteousness of faith, is made, Rom. 4:12, 13; sometimes, most especially, that eminent one in the seed of Abraham, who is to be the spring of every blessing, as Gen. 21:18: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, which is Christ," Gal. 3:16. Thus also the things here said are in their measure common to all believers; but then some effects are primarily and principally to be ascribed to him, who, in this seed is the eminent one, namely, Christ; as the apostle also distinguishes the seed that sanctifieth, and that which is sanctified; both which are of one, Heb. 2:11.

XVII. But the reasons for which Christ is called the seed of the woman, seem to be chiefly these two; one peculiar to Christ, the other common to him with other men. That which is common, is his being of the same blood with us, that we might know him to be our brother and next kinsman; for men, in Scripture language, are called "born of a woman," Job 14:1, and Job 15:4, and 25:4; "born of women," Matt. 11:11. But then, we must add that which is peculiar to himself, that though Christ indeed had a woman for his mother, being "made of a woman," Gal. 4:4, yet he had no man for his father, being "without father," Heb. 7:3. See Jer. 31:22: "a Woman shall compass a man." For, though this last reason holds not in believers, who are likewise called the seed of the woman, for another reason to be explained directly; yet, seeing Christ holds the principal place in this seed, as he bruises the head of the devil in one sense, and believers in another; so therefore, he is called the seed of the woman in a different sense from them. The same words are indeed used of both; but because Christ is far more excellent than they, therefore when they are applied to Christ, they have a much more illustrious meaning.

XVIII. It is indeed true, that Christ is the seed of Adam, whose son he is called, Luke 3:38; also, the seed of Abraham, and the son of David, because he was born of a virgin who descended from them. Yet there was great reason why he should be here called the seed of the woman, rather than of Adam. For Adam, in Scripture, is represented as the origin of sin and death. Eve, indeed, was first in the transgression; but as it was not Eve, but Adam, who was expressly constituted the federal head of all mankind; so sin and death are said to have entered into the world by Adam, Rom. 5:12, 14. Wherefore he, who delivers us from sin and death, ought not to be considered as subordinate to Adam, and as his son; but as the second Adam, and the head of another family opposed to Adam. However, as he was to be our kinsman and brother, it was necessary that he should be born of a woman; and that Adam, as his son by the Spirit and by faith, should be

subordinate to him. For since God says here, that he would put enmity between the woman and her seed, and between the serpent and his seed, without any mention of Adam, it must be, that either Adam is excluded this promise, or comprised under the seed of the woman. The respect and regard we ought to have for our parent, who was the author and teacher of the true religion to his posterity, forbids our saying the first. Nor do I think we should say the second; because it is agreeable to reason, that the woman should be comprised under, and accounted in the man; not, on the contrary, the man under the woman. It therefore remains, we say the third; namely, that Adam, as he was the origin of sin and death, is opposed to Christ; as himself was saved, is to be accounted to the seed of the woman, whose head is Christ, and so to be subordinate to Christ. Christ therefore is called the seed of the woman, because being the origin of a better stock, he is opposed to Adam as the root of a corrupt race. And it is hinted, that Adam himself owes his salvation to the woman on account of her seed.

XIX. Paul, if I mistake not, leads us to this, 1 Cor. 11:11, 12, "Neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman; but all things of God." I do not remember to have seen a fuller explication of this place than what I shall give from the Theses of a certain very learned person. That the man and the woman may be in the Lord, partakers of the grace and redemption purchased by Christ, they are mutually indebted to one another for something common to both, which the one neither had nor could have obtained without the other. For as the woman is ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρός, of the man, from whose rib she was formed, and who could not have been in the Lord, had it not been for the man, without whom she could not have so much as existed: so the man is in the Lord διὰ τῆς γυναικὸς, by the woman, for the woman was appointed to be the first enemy of the serpent, and the Messiah is called the seed of the woman; but the man obtains the same happiness by the woman, as by faith he lays hold on the Messiah, who was to descend from her in virtue of the promise. The woman is of the man, materially and naturally: not so the man of the woman (which yet might be said; if we only mean ordinary generation, according to the manner that children are of a woman, Matt. 1:3, 5, 6, and Christ himself, Gal. 1:4.) But by the woman, because not materially, but spiritually and supernaturally, by grace and faith. Thus, therefore, the man is the origin of being to the woman, the woman of well-being to the man. But to prevent pride on either hand on this account, and their arrogating any thing to themselves, it is added, "but all things are of God:" by whose wisdom and most free disposal it was ordained that the woman should derive her natural origin from the man; the man, his supernatural from the woman, and become mutually debtors to one another: but the glory of both these privileges to remain entirely to God alone, the supreme cause.

XX. Hence it is evident, such a Saviour is promised, who was to be man, and the son of man. But seeing he is described as stronger than the devil, who, by sin, had acquired a right over man, it follows that he is also true God. For the bruising of the serpent's head is ascribed to him; and this he does, 1st, By the merit of his satisfaction, and therefore he must have been of such dignity as to be able to pay a suitable ransom for all the elect. 2dly, By the efficacy of his Spirit, which gradually abolishes every power of the devil, and so shows himself to be "stronger than the strong man."

XXI. God declares the manner in which this Saviour was to purchase salvation, by saying to the serpent, "thou shalt bruise his heel." In which words there is, 1st, A denunciation of sufferings, to

be inflicted on Christ by the devil and his instruments, whereby he would be thrown down for a time. While he himself bruises with his foot the serpent's head, and strips him of all his power; the serpent, by his envenomed sting, will grievously wound his heel,\* and constrain him to stagger and fall. For a man, in an upright posture, stands on his heels, which being grievously wounded, he is thrown down. 2dly, A prophecy of his resurrection: for his head will not be bruised, nor his heart wounded, nor any vital part grievously affected, but only his heel hurt; nay, not both, but only one. Though he was, therefore, thus to be thrown down, yet he was soon to rise again, on resuming strength, and show himself a conqueror to the whole world.

XXII. The sufferings here denounced are not only warlike, as a certain author calls them, with which the serpent, together with his seed, from a hatred to holiness and righteousness, assaulted Christ; but even judiciary, being inflicted, by the most righteous sentence of God, on the Son the surety, to show his righteousness, by which he could not pardon sin without a due satisfaction. For God here personates a judge; pronounces sentence against the devil, declaring his destruction at the appointed time. But the same sentence also condemns the surety of men to undergo those vexations of the devil, which, as a conqueror, he could have inflicted on sinful men. He had indeed acquired his dominion over man by evil practices. Yet after man, by forsaking God, his lawful Lord, had enslaved himself to the devil, the justice of God, in every respect, required his being subject to the devil, as God's jailor and executioner, for his torment, punishment, and condemnation. In which sense the devil is said to "have the power of death," Heb. 2:14: and that even by virtue of the law and sentence of God; for "the sting of death is sin;" that is, sin introduced death, and the instruments of it, and made them sharp, mortally to wound man: "but the (strength) power of sin is the law." That is, the power that sin has of putting man to death, is in virtue of the divine law, which threatened the sinner with death, 1 Cor. 15:56. Whence it follows, that the power of the devil over sinners of mankind is so far lawful, because the devil obtains the power of death over man, but death its power from sin, and sin from the law. But as that law is most righteous, life cannot be granted to the sinner in prejudice thereto. It is therefore necessary, that satisfaction be made to it from some other quarter, and that the devil should exercise that power of death which he had acquired by sin, either on the sinner himself, or on his surety. Yet in such a manner that, while he puts the surety to death, he lays violent hands upon himself, and loses all his dominion over the elect; for full satisfaction is made by the death of the surety, to that divine justice by which the devil had obtained power over the sinner. These words, therefore, show how the devil, in a way agreeable to divine justice, may be deprived of all that power over the elect, which justice had granted him over sinners; namely, because the devil was to exercise that power over the surety of men, by biting his heel, or putting him to death. So that those sufferings, which was here foretold to endure, are, in the highest degree, judiciary or satisfactory. Compare these things with what we have said, book II. Chap. vi. sect. 23, 24.

XXIII. The heirs of those benefits or blessings are, 1st, The woman herself, הַאִשָּׁה, with the demonstrative particle, he,\* namely, that woman whom the serpent had first attacked and conquered. She is here mentioned, but not in exclusion of her husband, but because she, having been enticed by the flatteries of Satan, seemed to have contracted a greater familiarity with him; and therefore her enmity to the devil was to be a most admirable effect of divine power and goodness. And then it was also a remarkable contempt put upon the proudest of spirits, that he should be vanquished, not by the man, but the woman, that very woman whom he had so easily subdued by his delusions. In fine, from this it most clearly appears, that the whole work of our

salvation is owing to divine grace. For if Adam had here been expressly set in opposition to the serpent, because he was stronger and more prudent by nature, and was last overcome by the devil; this thought might, by degrees, have easily gained upon mankind, that, by the remains of virtue and wisdom, which were in Adam, he had undertaken a new combat with the serpent, and with better success. But seeing the commencement of the enmity is ascribed to Eve, the woman, who was both weaker by nature and first overcome, it is clearer than noon-day, that the grace of God alone is here all in all.

XXIV. 2dly, The seed of the woman. By which is signified, not all mankind, but elect believers; as appears from that distinction, by which that seed is opposed to the seed of the serpent. For it is evident that wicked men, who "are of their father, the devil," John 8:44, 1 John 3:8; and "the children of the wicked one," Matt. 13:38, are the seed of the serpent. The seed of the woman, therefore, is the godly posterity of Eve; namely, the children of the promise, who "are counted for the seed," Rom. 9:8. And perhaps this is the reason why the godly are called the seed of the woman, and not the seed of the man; because, as the woman was wholly indebted to a gracious promise, that she was appointed to oppose and fight against the serpent, not without the desired success; so also it was not those children in general who were to be born of her, according to the law of nature, by matrimonial commerce; but those only whose mother she was to be by the same gracious promise, who are here accounted for her seed. For though Eve, as she was joined to Adam in marriage, is the natural mother of all mankind, even of those who are called the seed of the serpent, yet the same Eve being, by virtue of this divine promise, set in opposition to the serpent, by whom she was overcome, is the mother only of the blessed seed which was to proceed from her, not according to the law of nature, but in virtue of the promise of grace; the seed is, therefore, called the seed of the woman, even of that woman who is, and in so far as she is, placed in opposition to the serpent.

XXV. The means by which the appointed heirs become actually partakers of the promised benefits, is faith in the surety, as is intimated by a twofold enigma or dark saying. 1st, As all the heirs are called by the common name, seed; this denotes the mystical union and communion of the seed which is sanctified with that which sanctifies; so that what the latter has done or suffered, the former is accounted to have done or suffered in him. But the band of that union is faith, by which we receive Christ, adhere to him, and become one spirit with him, 1 Cor. 6:17. 2dly, As the bruising the serpent's head is ascribed to the seed, which, indeed, Christ alone does, by the merit of his obedience, and the infinite efficacy of his Spirit; yet the elect also in Christ, and by the power of Christ, conquer him through faith. Christ is the general in this combat, the seed of the woman by way of eminence, who overthrows and triumphs over the enemy; but next to Christ, and under him, believers also fight and overcome by his power; "and they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb," Rev. 12:11; that is, because on that very account the blood of the Lamb was shed for them. The victory which the rest of the seed gains over the serpent, cannot but follow upon the shedding of the blood of the lamb, who is the seed of Eve. Moreover, that victory is obtained only by faith: "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world" (consequently the devil, who is called the prince and god of this world, Eph. 6:12, 2 Cor. 4:4.). "And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."

XXVI. It is not to be thought improbable, that so many and so great mysteries of faith are expressed in few words. For the words are both very proper to signify, and elsewhere in

Scripture do signify what we have said; and it became the wisdom of God to lay before the primitive church some short abridgement, which, by its well contrived brevity, might comprehend the sum of the things to be believed; and then it is our duty to form high and honourable thoughts of what God speaks. Neither is it unreasonable that the whole should be wrapped up in some enigmatical or obscure expressions. For the bright shining light reserved for noon-day was not suitable to the first dawn of the day of grace. Moreover, God had not then desisted from appearing to our first parents; but explained to them, by frequent instruction and the gracious illumination of their mind, those things which belonged to faith and godliness. And indeed it was wholly reasonable, that above all they should carefully keep this promise of salvation, as a most valuable treasure, diligently meditate thereon, and explain it by mutual conversation to each other and to their children. Some other things seem to belong to this subject, which being briefly related by Moses, we shall explain a little more particularly.

XXVII. Moses having distinctly related what God had said to the serpent, to the woman, and to Adam, subjoins, Gen. 3:20, "and Adam called his wife's name EVE, because she was [or was constituted] the mother of all living." It is not necessary that we should here suppose with some a proteron-hysteron,\* as if this name had been given before the fall; at the same time, when Adam called that help, which had just been given him, אשה, woman; for there is no reason why we should contend, that things were done at the same time, which Moses relates on different occasions, and after other intermediate narratives. We own, indeed, that sometimes a thing is related after, which had been done before: but this is not usual, unless the affinity of the subject with what goes before or follows makes it necessary. But there is no such affinity here; unless we would say, that this denomination bears some respect to the words of God, before narrated by Moses, in the sense we are presently to show. Nor can we prove that the word וקרא, "and he called," is to be rendered in the preterplu-perfect tense, "and he had called;" that Moses's meaning should be, Adam was greatly deceived, who had promised life to himself and his posterity from his wife; whom he afterwards found to prove the cause of death. For, 1st. The following words, which explain the reason of this denomination, are not the words of Adam, deceived in his expectation, but of Moses, showing the truth of the matter. 2dly. If we will have them to be the words of Adam, we ought to change היתה, "she was," into תהיה, "she will be," and to have something understood as, he imagined, or the like; to this effect Adam had called her name Eve, because he imagined she would be the mother of all living, but, from the event he learned the reverse. But we do not take upon us so boldly to make free with the sacred text; let us therefore dismiss this ungrounded πρωθυστερον.

XXVIII. But why was she called חוה Chavah, Eve? Some of the Rabbins ridiculously derive that name from חוה, which in Piel denotes to signify, or disclose, "because she was a great talker," according to Baal Hatturim. Fagius writes, the Jews thus express it, "because she was a great talker, and uttered many empty words to the serpent, till, being ensnared in her talk, she sinned; and as soon as she made her husband to sin, he called her חוה," Chavah, of Eve, as we render it. But these things are repugnant to the express declaration of the Holy Spirit, who gives a quite different reason for the name; for he shows that this name is derived from חייה, to live, not from חוה; and the yod is changed into vau, to put some difference between the name of the woman and of a beast, which in Hebrew is called חייה, as Aben Ezra has not improperly observed.

XXIX. No less ridiculous is Lyranus, who says, that "Eve in Hebrew denotes life, but subject to penalties:" most of all Peter Comestor, author of the Scholastic history; "that Adam, then deploring the misery of his posterity, called his wife Eve, alluding to the cries of infants; the male newly born crying A, but the female E; as if we should say, all born of Eve will say A or E." This perhaps might be pardonable in poor Comestor, and in the age in which he lived; but it is highly ridiculous, that amidst so great a light of knowledge, Cornelius a Lapide, in his commentaries, should not blush to call such trifling by the name of pious contemplations. There is nothing in the word חַוָּה, that can denote anguish or penalty. But let us proceed to what is serious.

XXX. Moses explains the reason of the denomination in these words; "because she was, or was constituted the mother of all living." By "all living," sometimes is understood all men in general, as Ps. 143:2. And it is certain, that, except Adam, all that ever did, do now, or shall hereafter live, derive their origin from our mother Eve. But if this alone was intended here, it might be asked, 1st, Why Adam chose to call his wife the mother, rather than himself the father of all living, as the natural origin of all is equally due to both? 2dly. Why, as we have shown from the series of the Mosaic history, he gave this name to his wife, not till after the fall; seeing, if we attend to natural generation only, she became the parent, not so much of the living as of the dead? 3dly. Was this a thing so very worthy of notice, since it was self-evident, that all who were to exist, were to descend from her, who was the only woman in the world.

XXXI. It seems therefore more advisable, and more becoming both the faith and piety of Adam, and the wisdom of the Holy Spirit, who accurately relates those things, to understand by all living, both the Lord Christ, who is the fountain of life, and the elect, who, being united to him, are quickened by his Spirit. The woman was constituted the mother of these living, by the word of promise, by which she was expressly appointed to have that seed, who was to bruise the serpent's head. Wherefore Adam, who by sin became the father of all who die, 1 Cor. 15:22, called his wife Eve, from his faith in God's promise, believing, according to the word of God, that no man should have true life, but what would be derived from her. However, the original of this was not in the woman herself, but in the principal seed that was to descend from her. This name therefore contains a confession of Adam's faith, and shows what Adam taught his children, and to what hope he formed them by the word of God: who, in the very name of his wife, as often as he repeated it, would have a lasting monument both of the promise of God and of his own hope.

XXXII. Peter Martyr, that most excellent interpreter of Scripture, saw and taught these things long ago: who thus comments on the place. "Adam, knowing that her seed would bruise the devil and death, justly and with propriety chose to call her by that name, by which this salutary promise of God might at all times occur to his mind. Now Adam had entertained hopes of life by Christ, and when he perceived that his wife was to be the mother of him, and of all those who were to be quickened by him, called her name Eve, because she was the mother of the living." Fagius, in like manner: "We doubt not but Adam, by giving that name to his wife, had a view to the promise concerning the seed, that was to bruise the serpent's head; by which he hoped that his wife was to be that person. Wherefore he named her חַוָּה Chavah, which we call Eve, as if you would say an enlivener; because dead mankind was to be made alive by her offspring." See also Pareus and others, all agreeing in the same thing.



XXXIII. Eve discovered the same hope, when, upon bringing forth her first-born, she cried out, יהוה את איש קניתי, Gen. 4:1. Which words are variously rendered by interpreters. That which we think most agreeable, is, with Reuchlin, Pelicanus, Fagius, Forsterius, Luther, Clarius, Scindlerus, and many others, to take את, as usual, for the sign of the accusative case, and the meaning be, I have gotten a man Jehovah. Remarkable is the Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan. "And Adam knew Eve his wife, who was taken with a longing for that angel, and conceived and bore Cain, and said, I have gotten the man, that angel of the Lord." Certainly our pious mother continually revolving in her mind that promise of God, which was the ground of all her consolation, as soon as she bore that male child, observed in his birth a sign or token, that the promise would be performed. She therefore joyfully exclaims, she had now obtained that promised seed: not that she imagined Cain was that seed, but that, in his birth, she could see the first multiplication of mankind, and, in that multiplication, an argument for her hope concerning the seed, eminently so called, who was to arise in his appointed time. Seeing she laid hold of this with a great assurance of faith, and made it as it were present to her mind, she now so speaks, as if in the birth of Cain, she was actually possessed of that seed, which, by an argument taken from that birth, she expected with an assured faith. For had she thought that Cain was the promised Messiah, and Jehovah himself, she would have paid him, though her own son, religious worship, and by this means incurred the guilt of a horrid idolatry; till being apprised, either by the vicious disposition of the child, or by some other means, she had owned her mistake. Which our pious respect to our common parent forbids us to believe. She moreover publishes an eminent confession concerning the person of the Messiah, whom she acknowledges to be God-man. She declares him to be man, by calling him man; at the same time pointing out his excellence above other men for ראם Adam, and איש Ish, are usually distinguished, so that the last, viz. Ish, implies excellency; and the first, viz. Adam, meanness. Christ, indeed, in his humiliation, was ולא תולעת and איש, "a worm and not man," Ps. 22:6: but considered in himself he is יהוה ימין איש, "the man of the right hand of the Lord," Ps. 80:17, and עמיתו נכר, "the men his fellow." Zech. 13:7. She also makes profession of the divinity of the Messiah, when she calls him Jehovah; and signifies, that both natures should be united in one person, by joining these two, יהוה את איש. Paul calls him, "God manifest in the flesh." 1 Tim. 3:16.

XXXIV. To this explication three things are principally objected. 1st. If Eve intended this, she would have said יהוה את איש את, doubling the sign of the accusative case: as in the following verse, הבל את אחיו את, τον ἀδελφον αὐτοῦ τον Ἄβελ. 2dly. את often signifies the same as עם, with; יהרה את, therefore, signifies with Jehovah, as עם Θεῶ, with God. In this sense, Jonathan is said to have wrought עם אלהים, with God, 1 Sam. 14:45, that is, under the conduct and direction, or by the assistance and help, of God. 3dly. Filial respect prompts us to entertain right sentiments concerning the faith of our mother Eve; namely, that she knew and believed the Messiah was not only to be God-man, but also the seed of the woman, that is, the son of a virgin: for without this her faith had been a mistaken, not a true faith, nor yielded her any comfort. She could not therefore think, she got in Cain the Messiah; as she was perfectly well assured, that Cain was not the son of a virgin.

XXXV. We answer, to the first: that the repetition of that particle, is indeed frequent, but yet not universal: for we have instances of the contrary, 1 Kings 11:23, רזון את שטן לי אלהים ויקם, Is. 8:2, אוריה את נאמנים ערים. Ezek. 4:1, ירושלם את עיר, 1 Sam. 15:4, יהורה איש את אלבים עשרת, Where the sign of the accusative case is placed between two nouns, without a repetition. To the second: we

deny not, that אַת is often equivalent to עַם: but there is no instance to prove, that what the Greeks say, σὺν Θεῷ, the Hebrews express in their language by יְהוָה אֵת, or אֱלֹהִים אֵת: as it is well known, they usually express it by בִּיהוָה or בְּאֱלֹהִים. What is adduced from 1 Sam. 14:45, is not to the purpose. For there we have עַם but not אֵת. For though these particles are sometimes equivalent, yet they ought not to be confounded. And then, with God, does not so much signify with God's assistance, as God disapproving. Compare Isa. 36:10. With greater show of reason might be urged Mic. 3:8. יְהוָה דוּחַ אֵת כַּח מְלֵאכֵי וְאֹנְבֵי, "I am full of power by the Spirit of the Lord," that is, by the help of that Spirit; and Hab. 3:13, מִשִּׁיחַךְ אֵת לִישַׁע עַמְךָ לִישַׁע יִצְחָק, "thou wentest forth for the salvation of thy people, even for salvation with thy Messiah," that is, salvation to be procured by his means. But the former passage is very properly rendered, "I am full of power with the spirit of Jehovah;" full of power no less than full of the Spirit. And the latter should seem to be thus pointed, that God may be said to go forth with Christ for salvation. To the third, it might be answered, that there would be no absurdity to suppose, that Eve was not so well acquainted with every thing, regarding the condition of the Messiah. Who can assert, she knew the Messiah was to be born of a virgin, when the blessed virgin herself did not know it, when she heard it from the mouth of an angel, as appears from her words? "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" Luke 1:34. We deny not that the Messiah is eminently called the seed of the woman, because he was to be born of a woman; which the Holy Ghost afterwards more clearly foretold. But it is no crime to doubt, whether our mother Eve could have gathered this from those words; since, in the sacred language, even they are said to be born of a woman, who are conceived in matrimony, as we showed section xvii. One may assert this, and not transgress against that respect due to our common mother; as it is certain God gradually brought his people to the knowledge of the Messiah: nor does it overturn the faith of Eve, which might have been genuine and saving, though it was under this imperfection, ignorance, and mistake; as Peter had a true faith concerning Christ, that is, a saving, and not a hypocritical, though he imagined through mistake, that Christ could be the Saviour of his people, without sufferings, Matt. 16:22. But we are under no necessity to be obliged to say any of these things, for we do not assert, our mother Eve received Cain, for the very Messiah: but only we are of opinion, that, in the birth of Cain, she observed a sign or token of God's performing the promise, and something to support her faith, which she was willing to declare and preserve the memory of, by giving him that name: and consequently that argument does not affect us.

XXXVI. And we are not to pass over in silence, that when she afterwards brought forth another son, she called his name Seth, שֵׁת, because God (שָׂרַת) "hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew," Gen. 4:25. A sentence full of spiritual assurance and of prophecy. She calls him seed, having a view to the promise, and foretelling that he would not only carry on the enmity with the serpent, but also that from him, that eminent seed would come forth, by whose power the serpent's head was to be bruised. This seed she proclaims was given by God, as a son not of nature only, but also of grace and promise, and accounted by God himself for a seed: nor only given, but also appointed of God, that is, established and secured by the counsel of God, that he should not be slain, but be the foundation of the future church, to be propagated in an uninterrupted succession in his posterity, and preserved down to Christ. For the word, to appoint, denotes a determination and steadiness, as John 15:16: "I have chosen you, and ordained (appointed) you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit." She therefore acknowledges Seth for the chosen seed, and the parent of him, in whom all the elect are chosen.

XXXVII. This doctrine of salvation flourished both in the mouths and in the hearts of believers, who began יהוה בשם לקרא, that is, as Aquila translates it, Καλεῖσθαι ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, to be called by the name of the Lord, Gen. 4:26; and they were called the sons of God, as distinguished from the sons of man. Above all, the prophecy of Enoch is very remarkable, which the apostle Jude relates in his epistle, not from any apocryphal book, nor from the mere authority of any unwritten tradition, nor by a sagacious conjecture from the history of Moses, but by the inspiration of that same Spirit, who prompted Enoch to prophecy, ver. 14, 15. in these words: "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh, with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them," &c. That Lord, of whom Enoch speaks, is the Messiah, in unity of essence the same Jehovah with the Father and the Holy Spirit; to whom also, all power is given in heaven and in earth, and whose peculiar property the elect are on a special account. He foretells his coming by a verb of the preterperfect tense, to express the undoubted certainty of the thing, and the full assurance of his own faith, he prophesies that the Messiah, at that coming, will be attended with myriads of angels. Which happened, when he came down upon mount Sinai, to give the law, Deut. 33:2: and when he came in the flesh, to visit his people: for, then a multitude of the heavenly host, declaring his nativity, was seen and heard in the country of Bethlehem, Luke 3:13: but this will be the case, in a most illustrious manner, when "he shall come in the clouds of heaven, and all the holy angels with him," Matt. 25:31. The end of this coming will be "to execute judgment upon all; for the Father hath committed all judgment to the Son," John 5:22, and to convince all that are ungodly, by inflicting the punishments due to their impiety. These things Enoch preached to the people in his days, who, giving a loose to their lusts, impiously denied the future coming of the Lord. And seeing that prophecy contains an universal truth, it is applicable to all who walk according to their lusts. And these are the things which the Scripture testifies were delivered concerning the doctrine of salvation, in the first age of the world.

## CHAPTER II: Of the Doctrine of Grace under Noah

I. As Noah was the patriarch of the new world, we are now to explain what was handed down to us in his time, concerning the doctrine of salvation; as soon as he was born, his father Lamech called him כַּנֹּחַ Noach, saying, יִנְחַמְנוּ זֶה, this same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed," Gen. 5:29.

II. And here, in the first place, we are to take notice of the name given to the child, both with respect to its etymology, and the reason assigned by the pious parent for that name. The name is נֹחַ Noah, which, if we follow the rules of grammar, is derived from the root נָח, to rest or be quiet; to which word, both as to letters and signification, נָחַם, he comforted, is near of kin, which Lamech used in assigning the reason of the etymology. They who keep close to grammatical niceties, endeavour to correct the words of the text, and, instead of יִנְחַמְנוּ would have us read יִנְיַחְנוּ, as the Septuagint, in order to come nearer to the etymology of the word, and to the name נֹחַ, have also rendered it, οὗτος ἀναπαύσει ἡμᾶς, this same shall refresh us. But seeing the Hebrew copies, the Chaldee paraphrast, Jerome, &c. constantly read יִנְחַמְנוּ, we dare not rely only on our own judgment, or be willing to have any thing altered. In proper names, derived from a verb, commonly some letter or other is either added, taken away, or transposed, and the accuracy of grammatical etymology not constantly observed; which the celebrated Buxtorf has shown by several examples; in his *Vindiciæ Veritatis Hebraicæ*, p. 267. Whence the Hebrew doctors generally incline to derive נֹחַ from נָחַם, by cutting away the last letter. But Mercer's opinion appears more probable, who affirms, here only is a resemblance of words, but not a reason taken from etymology; because the verb נָחַם, both in sound and signification, comes near to the noun נֹחַ, which signifies rest and comfort; and as Aben Ezra learnedly says, comfort also is rest from grief of heart. And then the Hebrews usually have a greater regard to the sense than to the sounds of words. As therefore the reason of the name is thus expressed, יִנְחַמְנוּ זֶה, he shall comfort us, it is altogether the same, as if he had said יִנְיַחְנוּ זֶה, he shall make us to rest, because to the same purpose; whoever comforts, causes rest, from trouble. But these are rather niceties, though not to be overlooked, in order to preserve the integrity of the Hebrew copies inviolable. This one thing is evident, that Lamech, in the name of his son, intended a standing monument of his own wishes and hopes.

III. Let us therefore see what he intended by this name. This same, says he, shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed. Three things are contained in this sentence. 1st, The evil under which, with other pious people, he groaned. 2dly, The good opposed to that evil, which he had the hopeful prospect of. 3dly, The author of that good.

IV. He makes the evil he complains of, to consist in our work, in the toil of our hands, and in the ground which God hath cursed. The carnal Jews generally restrict this to that fatigue of body which men are forced to bear, in the culture of the earth, occasioned by the curse of God, and that these words only contain a prophecy concerning an easier method of agriculture which Noah would discover. But his pious parents were not so delicate, and so much taken up with the conveniences of this life, as to place the greatest part of their misery in those fatigues of the body. These things have a higher view. By מַעֲשֵׂנוּ, our work, are principally to be understood those evil works, which bring grief and sorrow to the soul. For these are our works, opposed to

the work of God in us. These produce an unspeakable trouble and fatigue to the godly, as an heavy burden, they are too heavy for them, Ps. 38:4. These were at that time visible everywhere, men being arrived at the utmost pitch of wickedness. Whence Peter, 2 Pet. 2:5, calls the men of that generation, the world of the ungodly. But to those evil works was added the toil of their hands. To this I refer all the labour, misery and calamity of this life, which were to be undergone in the sweat of our brow. This is accompanied with dwelling on the earth which is cursed; so that while man lives there, he cannot possibly enjoy a full state of holiness and tranquillity of soul, and see the light of God's face in glory. For, "whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord," 2 Cor. 5:6.

V. The good opposed to this evil, which he desired, and was in expectation of, he calls consolation or comfort. This consists in the applying some effectual remedy against, and in the very removal of, those evils. The comfort against our vicious works consists in the expiation and remission of them, in the intimation of that gracious sentence, by which they are pardoned on the account of the Messiah, and finally, in the purging them away by the spirit of sanctification. Comfort from the miseries of this life, or from the toil of our hands, is partly a lessening of that affliction, by granting a more prosperous and happy state of things, partly the delighting the soul with an inward relish of divine goodness, whereby it is enabled to bear all those toils, with which God is pleased to exercise his people, willingly and with cheerfulness, from a sense of the love of God. Comfort, as to the ground, which God hath cursed, consists in the beginnings and preludes of the heavenly glory, which the elect are even here favoured with; but chiefly, in a freedom from the body of death, and the translation of the soul into a better state and mansion. Lamech breathed after these blessings, desired them, and hoped for them; and was willing to have a monument of this desire and hope in the name of his son.

VI. But whom did he point to as the author of this great blessing, when he said to his son, when he was born, "this same shall comfort us?" Some think, that being mistaken in the person, he flattered himself that Noah was the Messiah. And indeed, as the believers of that age, with the greatest and most assured hope, pressed earnestly, after the accomplishment of the promise made in paradise and prepossessed it in their longings, but not having any certainty about the time when it was to be fulfilled, it is not so very improbable, that in the warmth of desire they promised to themselves the expected seed in the persons of the sons, which were born to them. But what we lately observed concerning the expectation of our mother Eve, are objections to this. It seems therefore safer to believe, that, on occasion of this son, he comforted himself with the hope of the speedy coming of the Messiah, and considered him as a forerunner and type, and an extraordinary herald of the Messiah. Martyr speaks well to this purpose: "I would rather imagine, they acknowledged their sons to be shadows or types of Christ, and therefore distinguished them by such names. But Noah was not only a shadow of Christ," &c. Though a genuine and real consolation proceeds alone from the Messiah and his Spirit, yet Lamech truly prophesied of Noah, that he also would be a comfort to wretched mortals. And he was so: 1st, By preaching, with an extraordinary zeal, the righteousness of faith; of which presently. 2dly, By obtaining a respite of the imminent destruction by means of his prayers, and exemplary holiness of life, till the ark should be completed: for, Ezekiel classes him with Daniel and Job, as one who was very prevalent by his deprecations, Ezek. 14:14, 20. 3dly, By preserving the remains of the perishing world in the ark, which he had built at God's command, and performing very many

things, in which we might see him, as a type of the Messiah, and of the spiritual and heavenly benefits to be obtained by him. Of which we are to speak more fully hereafter.

VII. We have just now said, that Noah was a preacher of righteousness. This we learn from Peter, who calls him "κηρυκα της δικαιοσύνης, a preacher of righteousness, 2 Pet. 2:5. But righteousness signifies not only that virtue of man, which consists in rectitude and a conformity to the rule, but also that obedience of the Messiah, whereby the ungodly is justified; "the righteousness which is of God, and opposed to our own righteousness," Rom. 10:3. Noah was a preacher of both these. He not only pathetically exhorted the men of his time to a holy life, and to the practice of religion, in order to escape the wrath of God that was hanging over them, but also preached that righteousness of the Messiah, which, as it is the same with respect to its efficacy, yesterday, to-day, and for ever, so it is also "witnessed by the law and the prophets," Rom. 3:21, and of which himself was heir, as Paul affirms, Heb. 11:7. For, seeing he was not ignorant of so great a benefit, nay, and even enjoyed it, it is quite inconsistent with the piety of the man, and the zeal with which he was animated for the glory of God, and for the salvation of his brethren, to suppose he would conceal it from them.

VIII. Here we are to explain another passage of Peter, 1 Pet. 3:19, 20; where he thus speaks of Christ, who was quickened by the Spirit: "Ἐν ᾧ (πνεύματι) και τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι πορευθεῖς εκήρυξεν, ἀπειθήσασι ποτέ, by which (spirit) also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the ark was a preparing." It is to no purpose to say, how variously this passage has been treated by interpreters, though if it be well considered the meaning will appear easy and plain. The Lord Christ, says he, who was raised from the dead by the infinite power of his Spirit, formerly went, came out of heaven, not indeed in the flesh assumed, and personally united to himself, but in the demonstration of his Spirit, by which he formed the prophets and among them also Noah. By the ministry of these prophets, who were stirred up by his Spirit, he himself preached. For not so much the prophets, as the "Spirit of Christ, which was in them, spake," 1 Pet. 1:11. By that preaching, he invited the spirits to faith and repentance, that is, those souls of men which are now separated from the body, and such are usually called spirits, Heb. 12:25, and now are in prison, in *שׁוּלַיִם*, according to the Syriac interpreter, in hell; compare Rev. 20:7; because they were disobedient and rejected the preaching of Christ by Noah, when the divine goodness and long-suffering called them to repentance. Peter therefore declares, that Christ formerly, and especially in the days of Noah, preached by his Spirit by the prophets; and what else did he preach, but himself, and faith and repentance, whereby they might come to him? In this sense also Peter writes, chap. 4:6, that the "Gospel was preached to them that are dead;" namely, when they were formerly alive. Thus to the same purpose, Naomi said to her daughters in law, Ruth 1:8, "as ye have dealt with the dead and with me."

IX. Neither improperly, nor without authority does Peter refer the preaching of the prophets, and especially of Noah, to Christ. For Christ, who calls himself Jehovah the Redeemer, expressly proclaims, "I have not spoken in secret from the beginning," Isa. 48:16, 17. And what else can the meaning be, but that I have publicly preached, from the very beginning? Nor is it altogether improbable, that Peter had a view to Gen. 6:3: "and the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man," that is, "I will not always contend against their wickedness by fruitless exhortations and rebukes, made by my prophets, actuated by my Spirit; but for the determined

space of a hundred and twenty years, will invite them to repentance by my long-suffering and forbearance of wrath; but when that term is once expired, I will destroy them all by a deluge." From this it appears, that, in the time of Noah, Jehovah contended with men by the preaching of his Spirit. That Spirit, by whose inspiration, the word of life was declared, is by Peter justly called the Spirit of Christ; not only because he is the Spirit of the Son no less than of the Father; but also because it is owing to the suretiship of Christ, that the word of grace is proposed to sinful man. The Spirit therefore preaching that word, may, by a peculiar appropriation, be pointed out as the Spirit of Christ the surety. All this is to inform us, that the same doctrine of salvation concerning the same Christ, and through him, was, by means of the prophets, preached from the remotest antiquity.

X. I cannot here but take notice, how strangely Grotius perverts and corrupts the eminent testimony of Peter. He seems to envy us, and refuse that we can find Christ and his works in the ancient ages of the world; and therefore, he applies what Christ is said to have performed in the time of Noah, to what was done by the apostles, and to the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles. By the spirits in prison, he understands "the souls of men in the body as in a sheath". But how does he prove it to you? Peter, says he, borrows a similitude from the times of Noah. Then God said, באדם דון ידון לא, that is, if we regard the propriety of the words, "my Spirit shall not be so detained in man as in a sheath," that is, the soul, which I gave him (Wisd. 12:1) shall not be useless as a sword in its sheath, which by no means answers the end it was made for. Let us proceed. A prison is usually called φυλακή, but the sheath is, as it were, the prison of the sword, the Chaldees calling a sheath נדנה. The same name they give to the body of a man, as Dan. 7:15, and the Talmudists often. But on the words "who were disobedient, &c., he observes: they were such as the "souls, who did not obey formerly in the times of Noah; he speaks as if they had been the same: and they were the same spirits or souls, not numerically, as Aristotle speaks, but generically, that is, souls equally useless to God; namely, as those who did not obey the preaching of Noah. Men altogether alienated from God did not believe Noah, did not believe Christ." If I rightly take the meaning of the intricate discourse of this otherwise illustrious person, the sum of his opinion comes to this, Christ, by the Spirit put into the apostles, preached the Gospel to the Gentiles, whose souls were shut up in the body as in a prison and sheath, and who are justly accounted the same with the disobedient men who lived in the days of Noah, the same, I say, not numerically, but by imitation of their wickedness. I tremble at the reading such things, and imagine I see in them a spirit, which will not have the Holy Ghost to have said, what he actually has, and which shamefully misapplies its learning: let us now make this appear.

XI. 1st, The explication of the words of God, Gen. 6:3, though countenanced by some Jewish and Christian doctors, is absurd. Among others, see Buxtorf in Vindic. Verit. Hebræe. p. 639. For the soul of man is no where in Scripture called the Spirit of God. It is indeed formed in man by God, Zech. 12:1, yet not called the Spirit of God, but "the spirit of man," Eccles. 3:21, and "the spirit of man which is in him," 1 Cor. 2:11. In vain are alleged to the contrary, Ezek. 37:14, and Ps. 104:30; for there the Spirit of God does not denote the soul, or life of the creatures, but the author of that life. Nor does the grammatical analogy admit the deriving ידון yadon from נדנה, for, in that case, the points ought to be altered: the letter dalet ought to have a dagesch forte, because nun is excluded, and under yod, a Chirek. Not to mention, that neither in the Talmudists nor Chaldee, nor books of the Old Testament, is there any word derived from נדנה, which signifies to be detained in a sheath; so that this explication is rashly urged, without either reason

or authority. 2dly, The application of those words to the words of Peter is still more absurd, as if hence we could understand what is meant by the "spirits in prison". For certainly, the Spirit of God is one thing, the "spirits of disobedient men" another. And should we grant, which yet we do not, that there is in Hebrew a verb derived from נדנה, a sheath, this נדנה, a sheath, is certainly on thing, which the Septuagint render κολεδόν, 1 Chron. 21:27, and φυλακή another, which, according to the venerable Beza's observation, when it does not signify the fourth part of the night, always denotes a prison. To conclude, what method of commenting is this? That the words of Peter, namely, "the spirits in prison," shall be explained from Gen. 6:3, ידון ידון; and ידון moreover explained from נדנה; and again נדנה denotes a prison, because a sheath is the prison of the sword; and then the body be the prison of the soul; and therefore, the "spirits in prison" in Peter, shall denote the souls contained in the body, as in a sheath. How far fetched, uncertain, and trifling is all this! 3dly, It is most absurd of all, to make the Gentiles, to whom the apostles preached, the same with the disobedient who lived in Noah's days, who were not only men of another age, but, by an interval of many ages, men of another world. Indeed, Grotius refers us to his book de jure B. and P. lib. iii. c. ix. §. 3, where he proves, that a people is accounted to be the same at this day which they were a hundred years back, as long as that community subsists which constitutes a people and binds them together by mutual ties. Though this be true, it is nothing to the purpose; for the Gentiles, to whom the apostles preached, were knit by no tie of mutual union to the same society with the cotemporaries of Noah. They who were disobedient when the ark was a preparing, were all of them entirely destroyed by the deluge, nor from any of them did any of the Gentiles derive their origin; so that it is inconceivable how they could coalesce into one people with the Gentiles. And Peter is so far from making the unbelievers of his time to be one body with those who lived in the time of Noah, that, on the contrary, he calls the old world "the world of the ungodly," 2 Peter 2:5, and chap. 3:6, 7, opposes "the world that then was, to the world which is now." A similitude of manners is not enough to make them the same people. Who that trembles at the word of God, can ascribe such a weak and foolish speech to the divine apostle as to think he could say, that when the apostles preached to the men of their time, they preached to those who were disobedient in the time of Noah? Be it far from us to trifle with sacred writ. The reader may be pleased to see a very solid defence of this passage in Disputat. Placæi, Disput. 15.

XII. Memorable also is that blessing with which Noah blessed his pious sons, containing many doctrines of the true religion. Gen. 9:26, 27: "Blessed be Jehovah the God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant: God shall enlarge (or allure) Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem." When he calls Jehovah, "the God of Shem," he gives an imitation of that covenant, which was to subsist between the Supreme Being and the posterity of Shem above other men. For Abraham and all Israel were descended from Shem. These God had chosen to himself for a peculiar people. Whence, with a remarkable compellation, Shem is called the "father of all the children of Heber," Gen. 10:21, that is, of the Hebrews. He also publishes the piety of Shem, who was constantly to adhere to the worship of the true God, and to oppose to the utmost, the spreading of idolatry: teaching, both by his doctrine and example, that he acknowledged none to be God but Jehovah. Generally interpreters also observe, that these words set forth that the Messiah should descend from the posterity of Shem, since he does not celebrate so much Shem himself, on the account of his piety, as he transfers the whole praise to God, saying, "blessed be Jehovah," he shows that God is the author of every good inclination of the soul, and pious action of the life, to whom, therefore, all the glory of them is due. He had denounced a curse on the



guilty in his own person, on account of the crime he had committed; because the fuel and source of evil is in man himself. But being pleased with the piety of Shem, he was willing rather to bless God, that he might not seem to ascribe too much to his son, or to sacrifice to his own net, and attribute any thing to his good education. He gives thanks to God, who had heard his vows, and had abundantly blessed the pains he had taken in forming the morals of his son. Nor is it without a mystery, that though Japheth was the first born of his three sons, yet Noah should, by the Spirit of prophecy, prefer Shem before him, to teach us that, in election, God has no respect to age, and that the order of grace is not the same with the order of nature. He was, therefore, justly called שם, that is, famous and of a great name, because he was eminent for so many and so great privileges above his brethren; and especially because with him and his posterity שם את יהוה שם, Jehovah puts his name, as it is, Deut. 12:5. Noah adds, "and Canaan shall see his servant:" providing him with a servant after he had provided him with a Lord. This prophecy was not fulfilled till eight hundred years after, when the Israelites who descended from Shem, invading the land of Canaan, vanquished above thirty kings of the Canaanites, and having utterly destroyed the greatest part of the inhabitants, made slaves of the rest, laying a heavy tribute upon them. And they employed the Canaanites in cutting wood, and drawing water for the service of the tabernacle, down to the days of David, who changing their name called them נתינים, Nethinim, that is, dedititious, or persons given or offered, Ezr. 8:20, because they willingly surrendered themselves. See Bochart. Phaleg. lib. ii. c. 1.

XIII. What is said to Japheth is variously explained. The verb פתה, from whence Japheth is derived, as also the term Japht, which Noah here uses by an elegant paronomasia, or illusion, signifies in Chaldee to enlarge. Hence, in the Chaldee paraphrase, Ps. 104:25, פתיא ימא, is the wide sea; and 1 Kings 4:29, לבא פתיית, largeness of heart. But in Hebrew, the same verb signifies in kal to be allured, in piel to allure, and is generally taken in a bad sense, to denote an alluring or seducing into error; though sometimes in a good sense, as Jer. 20:7: "ואפת פתיתוי", thou hast persuaded me, and I was persuaded;" and Hos. 2:14, or according to another division, ver. 16: מפתיא אנכי הנח, behold, I will allure her, or persuade her." Both significations are applied by great men to this passage.

XIV. They who contend that the signification is to enlarge, insist on the following arguments. First, that Noah makes use of the conjugation hiphil, which is never used to signify alluring; nor does it elsewhere occur in hiphil but in the Chaldee, where אפתי signifies to enlarge. Secondly, that מתה is a verb of a common signification, nevertheless it is almost always taken in a bad sense, excepting in one or two places. The Greeks generally render it ἀπατᾶν by a manifest allusion, but which rightly expresses the force of the word. Thirdly, that פתה when it signifies to allure, always governs an accusative: but here it is joined to the dative for lamed. Seeing, therefore, it cannot be said, "God shall allure to Japheth," we must render it, "God shall enlarge to Japheth," place or habitation being to be understood. For thus the Hebrews speak, as Gen. 24:22: "לנו יהוה הרחיב", the Lord hath made room for us;" and to the same purpose generally elsewhere. Moreover this explication is very consonant to the event. For in the division of the earth, the largest portion fell to be inhabited by Japheth. For besides Europe in all its extent, Asia the less belongs to the portion of Japheth; and Media, and a part of Armenia, and Iberia, and Albania, and those vast regions towards the north, which the Scythians formerly occupied, and the Tartars possess at this day; to say nothing about the new world, to which it is not improbable

that the Scythians formerly passed over by the straits of Anian, as Fuller in his Miscellan. Scar. lib. ii. c. 4, has shown at large.

XV. But others, who contend for the signification to allure, can make use of these reasons: 1st, That Noah did not speak in Chaldee, but in Hebrew, in which language פתה has scarce, if at all, any other signification but to allure. 2dly, That not without reason he used the conjugating hiphil, though occurring nowhere else in Scripture; namely, to render the paronomasia or allusion more elegant, which in piel cannot come so near to the name Japheth. And that a change of conjugation does not necessarily infer a change of signification. 3dly, That from the instances above alleged, it appears, פתה is also taken in a good sense; and that it is not to the purpose, whether more rarely or more frequently so. And indeed, the word πείθω, used by the apostle, 2 Cor. 5:11, when he speaks of the doctrine of the Gospel, has a greater affinity with פתה, than the verb ἀπατάω. 4thly, Buxtorf shows, by many examples, that the change of the dative for the accusative with active verbs is frequent, Thesaur. Grammat. lib. ii. c. 12. And more especially, that though verbs of commanding are indeed oftener construed with the accusative, yet also sometimes with the dative, as Numb. 9:8, לִבְרָם יִצְוֶה, Isa. 38:1, לְכִיתִיךָ צוֹ. As is also השא, to seduce, construed sometimes with the accusative, Jer. 49:16; at other times with the dative, Jer. 4:10. And why not the same thing hold in פחה? 5thly, That neither did the event disagree with this explication: seeing upon rejecting the Jews, the Gospel by which they are allured to the communion of God in Christ, was more than to all others revealed to the posterity of Japheth, and that in their own language. And as this was a far greater blessing than the possession of the whole earth, why not rather think that by those words was predicted what they may most conveniently signify?

XVI. Now what follows, and let him dwell, or he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, may be applied either to God or to Japheth. They who apply it to God, as, among the ancients, Theodoret. in Gen. quæst. 58; among the moderns, Fuller in Miscellan. Sacr. lib. ii. c. 4: Musculus in commentar. and others, have a regard to the word ישכן, whence שכנה Shekinah σκηνώσις; by which words, the inhabitation of the divine majesty is generally signified. The Shechinah was in the tabernacle of the Israelites in Mount Sion, and in the temple built there, of which God said, "that he would dwell in the thick darkness, that is, in an amazing cloud, the sign of the divine glory, which filled the house," 1 Kings 8:11, 12. And the city, where either the tabernacle or temple stood, was called the "place which the Lord chose to place his name there," Deut. 14:23. But above all the Shechinah is in Christ, in whom "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," Col. 2:9, and by whom manifesting himself to the Israelites, and travelling over their country, God dwelled in the tents of Shem. To which John seems to allude. John 1:14: "The word was made flesh, and εσκήνωσε, tabernacled, dwelt among us;" and Rev. 21:3, behold, "ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ, the tabernacle of God is with men, and σκηνώσεται, he will dwell with them." Onkelos, the Chaldee paraphrast, led the way to our writers in this explication: who speaks thus: "May God enlarge to Japheth, and may his Shechinah, majesty, dwell in the tents of Shem." Hence Erpenius's Arab interpreter, "and may his light," that is, the glory of God, "dwell in the tents of Shem." Which is certainly a beautiful explication, and contains a prophecy of Christ's walking and dwelling in the land, given to the posterity of Shem.

XVII. They who explain this prophecy, not of God, but of Japheth, who was to dwell in the tents of Shem, affirm, that it was fulfilled partly literally, partly mystically. Literally, because it is

apparent, that the Greeks and Romans who descended from Japheth, invaded a great part of Asia, the lot of Shem; as also Balaam prophesied, that Chittim, the posterity of Japheth, shall afflict Ashur, and afflict Eber, that is, the Assyrians and Hebrews, the posterity of Shem, Numb. 24:24. Mystically, because the posterity of Japheth were, by the preaching of the Gospel, brought to dwell in the same church with the Jews who believed; or to succeed the unbelieving Jews who were cast off. And the church is compared to tabernacles; not only because the patriarchs lived in tabernacles or tents as strangers, Heb. 11:9, but also because this is the condition of all believers in this life, 2 Pet. 1:13; 2 Cor. 5:1. Moreover, these tabernacles are said to be Shem's, because the church, even to the coming of Christ, was confined to the family of Shem. And to them the believers of the Gentiles are united by him, who made both one, Eph. 2:14. In fine, the posterity of Japheth is the principal part of the church of the Gentiles. For though God excludes neither the posterity of Shem nor of Ham from the church, in which there is neither Greek nor Jew, Barbarian, Scythian, but Christ is all and in all," Col. 3:11; yet it is certain, that the faith of Christ, from the days of the apostles, has chiefly flourished in Europe, and in those parts of Asia which fell to Japheth's lot.

XVIII. But, indeed, seeing both these things, the habitation of God by Christ in the tents of Shem, and the habitation of Japheth in the same tents, have been joined not only in time, but also that the latter is a consequent and effect of the former, that is no reason why we may not affirm that both are included in the latitude of the words: and the meaning to be, that the time should come when God would visibly dwell by Christ in the church, descended of Shem; and this extraordinary grace be preached through the whole habitable world with such powerful persuasion that many nations, and among these chiefly the descendants of Japheth, should, by a true faith, be united with the church of the Israelites.

XIX. Lastly, it is added, that Canaan should also be the servant of Japheth. And history testifies, that those parts of Asia, which had been long possessed by the Canaanites, were conquered by the Greeks and Romans; and that if any remains of the Canaanites continued, supposing Tyre built by the Sidonians, Thebes by Cadmus, and Carthage by Dido, they were all of them destroyed either by the Greeks or by the Romans. Here I again recommend to the reader Bochart's Phaleg. lib. iii. c. 1.

XX. Let us now take a summary view of the doctrines pointed out by this prophecy of Noah. 1st, We find that the praise of every virtue, and of every good action is to be ascribed to God, as the supreme author thereof; whom therefore Noah blesses on account of the piety of his son. 2dly, God, by a special covenant, laid claim to Shem and his posterity, as his peculiar people, so as to be called their God. 3dly, In the election to grace and glory, and in the bestowing of spiritual benefits, external prerogatives are of no manner of avail. For Shem, who was younger than Japheth, is preferred to the elder. 4thly, The heinous crimes of parents are sometimes visited on their descendants unto several generations. For Canaan, with his posterity, is, on account of the sin of Ham, condemned to be slaves to the descendants of Shem and of Japheth. 5thly, Godliness has the promises even of this life, as well as of that which is to come, and obtains for its reward not only blessings for the soul, but also for the body: for a large part of the earth is promised to Japheth, if we derive his name from enlarging, and a large dominion over the Canaanites to Shem and to Japheth 6thly, The word of grace, published in the Gospel, has a great power of alluring and persuading. 7thly, Such is the condition of the church on earth, as to resemble

tabernacles, expecting a fixed habitation in heaven made without hands. 8thly, The divine majesty, shining forth in the Messiah, who was to arise from the posterity of Shem, was afterwards to dwell in his tents. And then, 9thly, the Gentiles, especially the descendants of Japheth, who were before aliens from the covenants of promise, were to be allured, by the preaching of the Gospel, to the communion of the church of Israel.

XXI. We are, also, here to take notice of the longevity of the patriarchs in this period; by which means, the doctrine of grace could be very conveniently and safely propagated by them. For our father Noah, not to mention now the others, lived to see all the Antediluvians, excepting the first three; and his son Shem, who also had seen the first world, lived to the fifty-first year of Jacob. But as these testimonies concerning the doctrine of the ancient church, were, in that period, both more obscure and sparing, we have been the fuller in treating of them; we shall therefore study more conciseness in the others, where the lustre of divine grace was made known in greater plenty and perspicuity.

## CHAPTER III: Of the Doctrine of Grace from Abraham to Moses

I. WE are now got to the days of Abraham, to whom, as God revealed himself at sundry times and in divers manners, so, lest our present work should exceed all proper bounds, we shall only briefly confider the principal heads: and, first, treat of the appearances made to Abraham, and then of the covenant solemnly entered into, and frequently renewed, between God and him. For both these contribute to set the doctrine of the church, during that period, in a clearer light.

II. The Scriptures testify that God appeared eight times to Abraham. 1. At Ur of the Chaldees, when he commanded him to leave his country and kindred, and go elsewhere. Gen. 12:1, compared with Acts 7:2. 2. Near Sichem, at the oak of Mamre, Gen. 12:6, 7. 3. In Bethel, Gen. 13:3, 4. 4. When he promised him a son and heir, Gen. 15:1. 5. When he gave him circumcision, Gen. 17:1. 6. When he entertained him as his guest, Gen. 18:1. 7. When he approved Sarah's proposal to cast out Hagar and Ishmael, Gen. 21:12. 8. When he commanded him to offer up Isaac in sacrifice, Gen. 22:1.

III. There was, in these appearances, such an evident manifestation of the divine majesty made to the conviction of conscience, that the godly could as easily distinguish them from the delusions of evil spirits, as a sober man can distinguish sleeping and waking. But the Scripture does not always determine in what form God appeared to Abraham. It is however clear, that sometimes it was in a human form, by way of prelude, it seems, and symbol of the future incarnation. Nor are they mistaken who imagine that, generally, it was the Son of God who appeared to Abraham, as he did afterwards to the other patriarchs, and to Moses. To which may be referred, John 8:56, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad." He saw that day in the promise of the seed—in illustrious appearances—in Isaac, the type and pledge of the Messiah, who was to come—and, in fine, by faith, the property of which is to exhibit things future, as if they were present; in all these things he had a prospect of the incarnation of the Son of God.

IV. Among the other appearances, that mentioned, Gen. 18:1, is very eminent. Where it is said, that Jehovah appeared unto Abraham, and ver. 2. and immediately subjoined, that he saw three men; whence the pious ancients concluded, that the adorable Trinity appeared to Abraham in a visible form. Ambrose, in *Procœmio* in lib. ii. de *Spiritu Sancto*, speaks thus: "But Abraham was not ignorant of the Holy Spirit. He really saw three, and adored one; because one Lord, one God, and one Spirit. And, therefore, there was an unity of honour, because an unity of power." Augustine, lib. ii. de *Trinit.* c. 11, 12, also lib. iii. *contra Maximinum*, c. 26, is more full on this head. With whom agrees Paschasius the Roman deacon, lib. i. de *Spir. Sancto*, c. 5; and others cited by Forbes, *Instruct. Hist. Theol.* lib. i. c. 14. See *Christiani Schotani Bibliotheca*, in *Hist. Abrahami*, p. 155. Seq. Musculus, though of a different opinion, yet, in his commentaries writes: "This passage was usually quoted in the church, when the mystery of the sacred Trinity and Unity was treated of. Munster, after reciting the words of Aben Ezra, who in vain attacks the doctrine of the Christians, adds, "This is certain, that Abraham saw three, and addressed himself to one, 'O my Lord, if I have found favour in thine eyes,' whatever the Jews may idly talk to the contrary. Had not Abraham acknowledged that mystery, he would have said, My Lords, if I have found favour in your eyes, &c. The prophets represent a plurality of persons in God, &c. Fagius insinuates, that it is a common argument of our divines, when he says, our authors infer the

mystery of the Trinity from the appearance of angels. Though Martyr is of the same opinion with Musculus, yet he thinks he should not conceal, that both the ancient Latin and Greek Fathers usually produced this passage in proof of the Trinity, and adds, that the inculcating these things is not altogether unpleasant to godly persons.

V. We indeed acknowledge, that the church has stronger arguments, whereby to establish this fundamental article of our faith; yet, we imagine, the pious zeal of the fathers in this subject, is on no account to be exploded. The text affords them wherewith to defend themselves. And why shall we so far gratify our adversaries, as to go about to overturn no contemptible reasons for the truth? First, we are to observe, that after Moses had said, ver. 1, and Jehovah appeared to him, he immediately adds, ver. 2, and he lift up his eyes, and looked, and lo, three men stood by him. Which words really seem to contain the explication of the manner in which God appeared to Abraham. Nor should it be thought unsuitable, that even the Father and the Holy Spirit appeared in human form; for Isaiah saw the whole Trinity, like a king sitting on a throne. This vision is actually explained of the Son, John 12:41, and also of the Holy Ghost, Acts 28:25; and, I imagine, none should exclude the Father. Daniel also saw the Ancient of Days sitting on a throne, and another, like the Son of man, who came to him, Dan. 7:9, 13; which interpreters commonly explain of the Father and Son, and, as I think, not improperly.

VI. Moreover, we find that Abraham addresses these three, as if they were one; saying in the singular number: "O my Lord, if I have found favour in thy sight, pass not away from thy servant." He was accustomed, perhaps, to see God in a like form, or was instructed in that matter by the Holy Spirit; and therefore in the Trinity he immediately observed an Unity: for what some object, that Abraham addressed himself to one of the three, because, by his more august appearance, he discovered himself to be the Lord of the others, is saying a thing without proof, and beside the text. Nay, the words of the patriarch are so put together, that they not only express a civil and common respect, but a religious homage. For, he uses the appellation Adonai with kametz under the letter nun, which being thus pointed, (unless, perhaps, on account of the accent, patach may be changed into kametz), is among the epithets of the Supreme Being, as the orthodox agree. Nor is it any objection, that he entertained them as men; for, seeing they behaved themselves as such, he was unwilling to deny the duties of humanity, due to the person they sustained. But it was something above common civility, that while they were eating, he himself should stand by them as a servant under the tree, ver. 8.

VII. It is added, that when three men appeared to Abraham, one of them is constantly called Jehovah, ver. 13, 17, 20, &c. and the others, angels, Gen. 19:1, sent by Jehovah to destroy Sodom, ver. 13. Because the name, angel, cannot agree to the Father, who is never sent; but may to the Son and Holy Spirit, who are sent by the Father. Augustine says well, lib. ii. de Trinit. c. 13: "Though I do not recollect that the Holy Spirit is any where called an angel, yet it may be gathered from his office. For, of him it is said, 'he will annunciate or declare unto you things to come:' and certainly angel is interpreted messenger: but we very evidently read concerning our Lord Jesus Christ in the prophet, that he is called the Angel of the Covenant, though both the Holy Spirit and the Son of God is God and Lord of angels." Nor does Epiphanius differ in his sentiments, in Ancorato, §, 70. "for, as the Son is the angel of the covenant, so also the Holy Spirit." But that those angels, which Lot saw, were not ministering spirits, may be gathered from the religious honour which he paid them, Gen. 19:18, 19, &c. And the answer, full of authority

and divine majesty, they gave, ver. 21. What some pretend that, in the mean time, a third person intervened, who had remained with Abraham, and to whom these words are to be applied, is what is not in the text; nor do I see how it can be proved.

VIII. It does not militate against this interpretation, that these angels are expressly distinguished from Jehovah, ver. 13. They are, indeed, distinguished from Jehovah the Father, not essentially, as we have shown, but hypostatically or personally. Nor is it below the dignity of an increated angel to say, לֹא דָבַר לַעֲשׂוֹת אוֹכֵל, "I shall not be able to do any thing, till thou be come thither," ver. 22; because that was said on the supposition of a gracious decree and a promise already made to Lot. And this expression should be compared with John 5:13, 29. And lastly Heb. 13:2, is but foolishly objected, for the apostle there recommends hospitality on this account, namely, that "some have entertained angels unawares;" whereas, if God himself had been entertained, that consideration should rather have been urged. But it is not for us to prescribe to the Holy Spirit, what arguments or expressions he is to make use of. If the apostle had thought fit to say, that Jehovah himself was entertained, he might certainly have done it, seeing Moses expressly asserts it. And now when he speaks of angels, he in like manner imitates Moses, who declares that angels turned in to Lot. But seeing the term angel signifies diverse things, and may be applied both to an increated and to a created angel; therefore, from the bare appellation angel, it cannot be proved that the discourse only regards created angels. Moreover, when he says that some entertained angels unawares, he again has an eye to Lot, who, inviting them to come under his roof, imagined they were some honourable guests, till, from their talk, or by the inspiration of the Spirit, he understood who they really were. Nor is it any objection, that the apostle says in the plural number, that some entertained angels. For an enallage or change of number is frequent in such ways of speaking; and it is probable, that what happened to Lot happened also to many others. And now let it be sufficient to have said these things, in favour of the explication of the ancients, and of other very excellent divines of the reformed church. Nor do I imagine that equitable judges will blame me, for having attempted to show that those pious and learned men neither spoke inconsiderately, nor, by their arguments, did any prejudice to the good cause they undertook to maintain. But should any one think otherwise, it is not our province to contend with him; we shall use much stronger arguments than these with such a person.

IX. Let us now consider that covenant which God entered into with Abraham. Paul says, that its commencement was four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law. Gal. 3:17. As chronologers vary in their calculations, so it is a matter of dispute among them, from what period to begin these years; the difficulty of finding the truth being such, that Scaliger declared it to be unsurmountable. What seems to come nearest, Fridericus Spanhemius in *Introduct. Chronologica ad Hist. V. T.* has ingeniously, as is his manner, explained. Whole calculation is thus; from the 75th\* year of Abraham, in which he came out of Charan, Gen. 12:4, to the birth of Isaac in the hundredth year of his father, are 25 years. From the birth of Isaac to that of Jacob, who was born in Isaac's 60th year, Gen. 25:26, and 15 years before the death of Abraham, Gen. 25:7, 8, are 60 years. From that period to the going down of Jacob into Egypt, in the 39th year of Joseph, or about nine years after his exaltation in Egypt, Gen. 41:46, are 130 years. Gen. 47:9. The years from Abraham's entering Canaan, to the going down of Jacob to Egypt, come to be 215. And then the years of the dwelling or bondage of the Israelites in Egypt, were as many, or 215 years; and are thus calculated. Joseph died in the 110th year of his age, Gen. 50:26; from which if you subtract 39, which was his age at the time of Jacob's descent, there will remain 70 years. From

the death of Joseph are to be reckoned about 65 years down to the birth of Moses, the grandson of Kohath, who went down very young with his father Levi into Egypt, Gen. 46:11, and begat Amram the father of Moses, when upwards of 60 years old; but Amram, when he was 70, begat Moses, who was younger than Aaron. Exod. 6:17, 19. From the birth of Moses to the bringing the people out of Egypt, are 80 years: and thus the years of their continuing in Egypt, amount to 215. Which, if added to as many years from Abraham's going out of Charan to his going down into Egypt, we have a period of 430 years. And by so many years did the federal promise, made to Abraham, go before the giving of the law.

X. But in this covenant we will consider. 1st. The Stipulations. 2dly. The Promises. Which were, indeed, repeated at various times, and expressed under different heads or articles; but which we shall recite briefly and in order, for the help of the memory.

XI. The Stipulation contains chiefly three precepts. 1st. That of leaving his country, his kindred and father's house; though he knew not whither God was to bring him. Gen. 12:1. This imports a denial of himself, and of those things which are usually most dear and desirable; and in fine, an universal surrender of himself to God. Compare Psalm 45:11, and Luke. 9:59–62, and Matt. 10:37. 2dly. Of not fearing. Gen. 15:1. By this faith, securely acquiescing in God was enjoined upon him. For fear is opposite to faith. Mark 5:36, and Mark 4:40. 3dly. Of walking before God, and being upright. Gen. 17:1. This is the precept of holiness; which extends not only to the external actions, but also to the inward motions of the soul, believing that all must be done, as in the presence and under the all-seeing eye of God. In those few words, the infinitely wise God has comprehended all the duties incumbent on a religious person towards the Deity.

XII. The Promises, annexed to the stipulation, are of various kinds: some are spiritual, others corporeal. The spiritual are either general and common to all believers, or special and peculiar to Abraham.

XIII. The general promises are these, Gen. 15:1, "I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward," and Gen. 17:1, 7, "I, who am El Shaddai, God all-sufficient, will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." In these words God promises, 1st. Protection against every evil, while he calls himself a shield. 2dly. A most eminent reward, and of infinite value, seeing he makes over to him, not only his benefits, in which he is most affluent, but also himself, the fountain of every blessing. In like manner, as Eliphaz says to Job, "the Almighty will be thy most choice gold, לך תועפות וכסף, and silver of strength will be to thee:" תועפות is from עָף "he was weary;" it therefore signifies eminently "an exceeding and eternal weight of glory," 2 Cor. 4:17; which we could not bear, unless we were endowed with new powers. 3dly. The communion and fruition of this all-sufficient God, in grace and glory, in soul and in body. See what we said of the word Shaddai, book iii. chap. i. sect. 2, and of the expression, "to be the God of any one," *ibid.* chap. ii. sect. 5. 4thly. The continuance of that favour in the elect seed.

XIV. More especially God promised, first, that Abraham should be the head and honorary father of all believers, who in him as the type of the blessing, were to obtain the blessing. For so the words run, Gen. 12:2, 3, "I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing—and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." He not only makes the most ample promises of every kind, as well earthly as heavenly,



but he likewise promises a new and a great name, that he should be the "father of all believers," Rom. 4:11, than which scarce a greater can be granted to any mere man. Nay, he declares that he should not only be blessed, but blessing itself; so that all the blessing of God might be seen accumulated on him, and to reside in him, as the fountain and source, but a secondary and less principle; and be the type and exemplar of every blessing. For it is added, "and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." In thee may be simply explained with thee; as it is said, Gal. 3:9. "they which be of faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham." For ב of the Hebrews is sometimes the same thing as with: as Exod. 8:5, "stretch forth thine hand במטך with thy rod," and Exod. 15:19, "the horse of Pharaoh went in ופרשיו ברכבו with his chariots and his horsemen into the sea." But ב, in thee, seems to denote something more: for in Abraham all the nations of the earth are blessed. 1st. Because the Messiah was in his loins, in whom every blessing is contained. 2dly. Because he was the head and prince of God's covenant, and the pattern of faith and blessing to those who were to come after him.

XV. Paul has given a notable commentary on this place, Gal. 3:6–11, "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye, therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." The Apostle there supposes, as a thing well known among Christians, that Abraham was the honorary father of all the blessed seed, and consequently that there was no other mean, of obtaining the blessing, that is justification and the favour of God, than that by which Abraham obtained it: but he obtained it by faith. Moreover, seeing it is foretold, that in him all the families of the earth are to be blessed, they must needs be united to him, and be accounted to him, as their spiritual parent. But in order to that union, it is not sufficient that there be even an association with his natural descendents by a communion of ceremonies, or of political laws; but a communion in the same faith is requisite. And seeing this promise extended to all the families of the earth, and consequently even to the Gentiles; the apostle has justly concluded, that the Gentiles also are to be joined to Abraham, by the imitation of his faith, and, by the same faith, become partakers of the same blessing with him.

XVI. Secondly, God especially promised him a seed: which does not signify promiscuously, any one who was to descend from Abraham according to the flesh. For even Ishmael was his seed. Gen. 21:13. And therefore great but carnal promises were also made to him. Gen. 16:10, and Gen. 17:20. But by seed we are to understand, 1st. Isaac, who sprung from a father almost dead, and of a mother barren and past bearing. For "in Isaac shall thy seed be called." Gen. 21:12. Moreover Isaac was not only the stock, but also the type of the Messiah, who was afterwards to be born, and that of a virgin, who was certainly not more, if not less, capable than Sarah to bring forth a seed. And therefore, 2dly, the seed denotes also Christ,\* that seed which was formerly promised in paradise, "He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but to thy seed, which is Christ." Gal. 3:16. Besides, as Isaac was born, not by the virtue or power of the flesh, but of the promise, he is also a type of all believers, who are indebted to the word of the promise of the gospel for their spiritual birth. And 3dly. Believers are also denoted by the seed: "They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are accounted for the seed." Rom 9:8.

XVII. Here we have a difficulty to be resolved, which, it seems, cannot well be omitted. Seeing the word seed sometimes denotes, not only but also chiefly, a multitude of men; and especially as it was promised to Abraham, that his seed should be as the dust of the earth, and since it has just been shown that, by the promised seed of Abraham, both Isaac and all believers are to be understood; how then could the apostle insist on the singular number, in order from thence to make out, that by the seed we are to understand Christ? and which seems to be the less cogent, because the sacred writers of the Old Testament, when treating of men, never use the word זרע, in the plural number. This difficulty appeared so great to Jerome, that not knowing how to untie the knot, he ventured, though not with sufficient piety, to cut it asunder. He observes that Paul only made use of this argument with the dull and stupid Galatians, which he knew would not, in other respects, be approved by the prudent and the learned, and therefore forewarned the prudent reader of this, when he said, Brethren, I speak after the manner of men. Jerome's words are as follows: whence it is evident that the apostle performed what he had promised, and did not make use of abstruse meanings, but such as daily occur and are common, and which (had he not premised after the manner of men) might displease the prudent. But this is giving up the cause to those who despise and ridicule the Scripture. The apostle certainly, by the expression mentioned by Jerome, was far from intimating that, by abusing the stupidity of the Galatians, he would argue less accurately and solidly. This is highly unworthy the gravity of an apostle, and the unsearchable wisdom of the Spirit of God, by whose inspiration he wrote these things. Nor was this epistle written only for the dull and stupid Galatians if we may call them so, but also for the whole church, to be a directory of faith. He intimated only this, that he was to draw a similitude from human things, in order to explain things divine, and thus compare great things with small.

XVIII. And, indeed, as all other things, so these also appear to me to have been most wisely observed by the apostle. It is certain that the term seed, often signifies a multitude, but it is a multitude collectively taken and united in one; at least with regard to the first stock or origin. When he speaks of the seed of Abraham, as the seed of the promise ὃ ἐπηγγελεται, which he had promised, to which the same blessings are to flow from the same fountain, it must be considered as one body. If I mistake not, when the apostle says, the promises were made to Abraham and to his seed, he points to the formula of the covenant, which we have, Gen. 17:7, "I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." On this occasion the apostle declares, that seeing all the families of the earth were, in their proper time, to become partakers of this blessing, it was necessary they should be accounted to the seed of Abraham, and united to him in one body; and as he speaks, Eph. 1:10, "gathered together in one in Christ." But this is not done by circumcision, or the other Jewish ceremonies. For besides that the promise was made to Abraham, while he was yet uncircumcised, and 430 years before the giving of the law; these ceremonies are the middle wall of partition, which separate the Israelites from the Gentiles, and therefore cannot be the band of union. But this incorporation or coalition is effected by the Spirit of faith, which indissolubly unites believers to Christ the head, who is the principal seed, and with one another mutually: and thus they all form together one spiritual seed of Abraham, a whole Christ, with his mystical body. For here, we take the word Christ in the same sense, as 1 Cor. 12:12. Seeing therefore, as is evident, the promises were made to the spiritual seed of Abraham alone, exclusive of all others; but that spiritual seed ought to have also the same spiritual stock and origin, it must needs form one mystical body, whose head undoubtedly is Christ, from whom all the other members have the honour to be called. Well therefore did the apostle urge, that by the appellation seed, an union was intended, not precisely of person, but of

some mystical body, united by faith under the head Christ. See on this place, Drusius, Cameron, Gomarus, Diodati, and others, who explain it of Christ and his mystical body.

XIX. But we are not to overlook a notable diversity of expression, that occurs here. God several times repeats to Abraham, "in thee והתברכו shall be blessed all families of the earth," Gen. 12:3 and Gen. 18:18. But of the seed of Abraham it is said, "and in him shall all nations of the earth והתברכו bless themselves," Gen. 22:18, which is repeated, Gen. 26:4, of the seed of Isaac. But surely, we are one way blessed in Abraham, and another in his seed, Christ. In Abraham, as the type and exemplar; in Christ, as the meritorious cause and real bestower of the blessing, Eph. 1:3. We are not only blessed, but also bless ourselves in Christ, acknowledging and praising him, as the fountain and source of the blessing flowing down to us: "אמן באלהי יתברך בארץ המתברך אשד" that he who blesseth himself in the earth, shall bless himself in the God of truth,"\* Isa. 65:16.

XX. The corporeal or external promises made to Abraham, are chiefly three. 1. The multiplication of his seed by Isaac, Gen. 13:16; 15:5; 17:2; and 22:16. 2. The inheritance of the land of Canaan, Gen. 12:7; 13:15; 15:17; and 17:7; which was fulfilled in the twelve tribes of Israel, especially under David and Solomon; and afterwards, during the second temple, when all Palestine and Idumea were conquered and subdued by the Jews. 3. The deliverance from the Egyptian bondage, Gen 15:13, 14. But we are to observe, that these external promises were types of spiritual and heavenly things. For, the multiplication of the carnal seed denoted the great number of spiritual children, both from among the Jews and the Gentiles, that was to be brought to the faith, Rev. 7:9. And Canaan was a pledge of heaven; and the deliverance from Egypt, signified the deliverance of the church from sin, from the world, the devil and Babylon.

XXI. But we ought not to omit the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith alone, which, at that time, was very much illustrated by the example of Abraham, and the divine declaration concerning him. For, thus it is said, "Abraham believed in Jehovah, and he counted it to him for righteousness," Gen. 15:6. This testimony is the more to be observed, because the apostle frequently uses it, in order to assert his righteousness of faith, Rom. 4:3, Gal. 3:6.

XXII. The faith of Abraham had, for its general object, all the promises made to him. "He gave glory to God, and was fully persuaded, that what he had promised he was able also to perform," Rom. 4:20, 21. He therefore believed, and, by faith, embraced the promises of the heavenly and eternal blessing, of the birth of a son from his barren wife, of the multiplication of his seed, both the spiritual and carnal, of the calling of the Gentiles, &c. But more especially, he believed that promise, whereby God engaged to be "his shield and exceeding great reward," Gen. 15:1. That is, he relied on God, as the averter of every evil, and the bestower of every good. But in a most especial manner, he believed the promise concerning that seed, who was to be the repository and the cause of the blessing; and he expected that the Son of God would manifest himself in the flesh, which he would assume from his posterity, and thus his faith was in Christ, for "he rejoiced to see Christ's day, and he saw it and was glad," John 8:56.

XXIII. But this faith, this believing, was imputed unto him for righteousness. Not that the faith of Abraham was, by a gracious estimation, accounted by God in the room of perfect obedience, which the covenant of works required: but that by his faith, he laid hold on, and spiritually united or appropriated to himself, the promised seed, by virtue of which union, all the righteousness of

that seed was reputed to be his righteousness. Thus in the book of God's accounts, the great blessings of God are written on one page, as so many talents bestowed on men; and the sins of men, not rendering to God the thanks due for so great benefits, as so many debts: and, lastly, the condemnatory sentence, by which they are declared guilty of eternal death. But as man's own righteousness could not stand on the other page, the satisfaction and merits of Christ for the elect are inscribed, and likewise their faith, as the gratuitous gift of God, and that by which the elect are united to Christ, and become partakers of all his righteousness. And thus upon balancing the account from their faith, it appears that all their debts are cancelled, and that they have sufficient to give them a right to eternal life. Thus faith is imputed for righteousness. See what we have considered at large, book iii. chap. 8, sect. 42.

XXIV. The promises made to the father, and especially that concerning the seed, in which all nations of the earth were to bless themselves, were not only confirmed to Isaac the son of Abraham, Gen. 26:4. but also the doctrine of gratuitous reprobation and most free election, was evidently published in the oracle concerning his sons, Jacob and Esau. For Jehovah said to Rebecca, when with twins, "Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people, and the elder shall serve the younger, Gen. 25:23.

XXV. We find in Scripture, that this prophecy was two ways fulfilled, the one historically, the other mystically; both regarding as well the stocks themselves, as the nations, which were to arise from them. As to the stock and heads of the nations, the elder served the younger, that is, Jacob appeared more worthy than Esau. 1. In respect of the birthright, which Esau sold. 2. Of the inheritance of the land of Canaan, from which Esau was excluded, as Ishmael, and the other children of Abraham, had been formerly. 3. Of communion in the covenant of God, which Esau, by his profaneness, had forfeited. If we consider the nations, they were often at war, and there was a time, when the Edomites seemed to prevail over the Israelites, "Edom pursued his brother with the sword, and cast off all pity," Amos 1:11. see Numb. 20:18, 19. But at last the Israelites proved conquerors, when David put garrisons throughout all Edom, and the Edomites became David's servants, 2 Sam. 8:14. And they continued so, until the reign of Joram, under which they again shook off the yoke, 2 Kings 8:20, according to the prophecy of Isaac, Gen. 27:40. But afterwards, under the second temple, they were again conquered, and entirely subjected to the Israelites. See Joseph. Antiq. Lib. xiii. c. 17.

XXVI. But these things had likewise a further prospect; for, as the inheritance of the land of Canaan was a type of the heavenly inheritance, and the national covenant included the spiritual covenant of grace; so also the exclusion from the national covenant and typical inheritance, was a sign of the exclusion from the covenant of grace and the heavenly inheritance. So that Esau and Jacob are here instances of the most free reprobation, and gratuitous election of God. And that this was the mystical sense of this prophecy, the apostle shows Rom. 9:10, and following verses.

XXVII. God renewed the same promises made to the father and grandfather to Jacob. Gen. 28:13–15. Though Jacob declared his twelve sons, the patriarchs, to be the heirs of these promises; yet, by the inspiration of the Spirit of God, he gave the tribe of Judah such prerogative above the rest, that not only kings, but also the prince of kings, even the Messiah, was to descend from it, Gen. 49:10, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his

feet, until Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." On which place we have illustrious commentaries by the most excellent persons, which we judge foreign to our purpose here to rehearse. The plain meaning seems to us to be this. It is foretold concerning Judah, that his tribe should very much excel all the rest, both with respect to the ornament of the sceptre and the supreme government, and the seat of religion, the temple and schools, where מהרקימ, the most famous doctors of the law, were to reside. It is also foretold, that שילה, Shiloh, shall come from this tribe. This word I translate, the quieter or peace-maker, saviour, from the root שלה, to be quiet and safe. As the Hebrew שלו, and Latin salvus, agree to it both in sound and sense. This is doubtless the Messiah, to whom is promised the gathering, or obedience of the people who were to believe in him, and submit to his precepts. The event ratified this explication. For in very many things the tribe of Judah had the pre-eminence above the others: from that the royal family arose; there, for a long time, was the seat both of empire and religion, and lastly, from the term Judah, the whole nation of Israel had its name. It is also evident and well known that "our Lord sprang out of Judah," Heb. 7:14, about the time of whose birth, according to the intention of the oracle, the sceptre gradually departed, 1. When Judea was subdued by the victorious arms of Pompey, and Jerusalem taken. 2. When Herod the Idumean was raised to the throne. 3. When Judea was reduced to a Roman province, and annexed to Syria. 4, and lastly. When the city and temple, and the whole Jewish polity were destroyed and overturned by Vespasian. While in the mean time many nations flocked with emulation, from all parts of the world, to the standard of salvation, which was then erected, and gave up their names to Christ.

XXVIII. It will not be improper to inquire into the blessing of the tribe of Naphtali; to see whether we may not possibly find something even there concerning Christ, Gen. 49:21. נפתלי. שפר אמרי הנותן שלוחה אילה, "Naphtali is a hind let loose, he giveth gooly words:" for so the passage is commonly rendered. What the Jewish as well as Christian interpreters intended thereby we leave others to find out. In words so very obscure, we apprehend that he who conjectures best is the best interpreter. Jerome, after premising some things, says, it is better, that "we refer the whole to the doctrine which our Saviour taught, for the most part, in the lot of Naphtali;" but he does not properly show how the words can be applied to that. Let us attempt it. We suppose that a part of Galilee fell to the lot of Naphtali; to which belonged the lake of Gennesaret, and in the neighbouring territory Capernaum stood; as Lightfoot proves, Centuria chorographica, Matthæo præmissa, c. 71 and 80; and as appears from Matt. 4:13. where it is said to be "a town on the sea-coast, in the borders of Zabulon and Naphtali; that is, in that part of Naphtali bordering on Zabulon. In that town Christ dwelt, and first preached the gospel, as he likewise did in the adjacent country, according to Isaiah's prophecy, there quoted by Matthew. And thither a great multitude came from their habitations, quitted their occupations, and flocked with the greatest ardour to hear Christ preach. Let us now see whether that truth be not justly signified by this prophecy of Jacob. "A hind let loose," of what can this be a more proper emblem, than of some multitude running with the greatest eagerness of mind, to some place or other; especially, where they find fountains of living water to quench their parching thirst: as it is not unusual with the Holy Spirit to compare believers to hinds. See Cant. 2:7, Heb. 3:19, Isa. 35:6. And the Naphtalites may be called a hind let loose, because they were formerly engaged in other pursuits, which could not quench their thirst; but now being stirred up by the gospel, which is the publication of liberty, and breaking through the entanglements of worldly pursuits, they flocked to the Lord Jesus. But by him, "who giveth goodly words," who can more properly be

understood than Christ, into whose "lips grace is poured," Ps. 45:2, whose "mouth is most sweet," Cant. 5:16; whose "gracious words," that is almost literally שֵׁפֶר אִמְרֵי, astonished the hearers, Luke 4:22. Moreover it often happens, that in Hebrew the absolute state is put for the constructed; as Buxtorf proves by several examples Grammat. lib. ii. c. 4. So that nothing hinders our construing the words thus: "Naphtali is הַנּוֹתֵן אֵילָה, a hind of him that giveth goodly words," that is, devoted to the most lovely Jesus, and hanging on his gracious lips. What favours this interpretation is, that the two hemisticks do not otherwise appear to be well connected; it not being the property of a hind to give goodly words. But if we construe them as I have said, nothing is forced into the text, nothing mean and low is expressed by the prophecy, nothing devised inconsistent with the genius of the Hebrew language; but every word has a signification, both proper and highly emphatical: and seeing they undoubtedly set forth the blessing of Naphtalites, why should we not rather think of some spiritual privilege they had by the Messiah, than of some external and momentary blessing under Barak and Deborah, in which Naphtali had nothing distinguishing above Zabulon? Nor is it so certain that the Naphtalites, as some would gather from this place, were more eloquent than the other Israelites. On the contrary, the people of Galilee, a part of which that tribe occupied, were so impure in their language, and rude in their manners, that they were the derision of the inhabitants of Jerusalem: as Buxtorf largely proves, especially of that part of Galilee in which the Naphtalites dwelt, Lex. Talm. voce גליל. But Barak, say they, was a Naphtalite, who, upon the defeat of Sisera, sung together with Deborah that excellent song of triumph, which we still have in the fifth chapter of Judges. As if it could follow, that the Naphtalites studied eloquence of language, from this single instance of a poem, written not by Barak, but by Deborah the prophetess, who was descended not from the tribe of Naphtali, but of Ephraim: as Bochart. Hierozoic. lib. iii. c. 18, has learnedly observed. Masius also, in his commentaries on the book of Judges, chap. 19 No. 35, proves by several arguments, that these things cannot be applied to Barak and Deborah; with whom Rivet on this place agrees. Nor should any scornfully reject this application made to the doctrine of Christ, as if it was a modern invention, because, besides Jerome, the same application is made by Ambrose and Procopius, as quoted by Cornelius a Lapide. To whom may be added Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, and Peter Martyr. And if Isaiah prophesied concerning Christ's preaching in the country of Naphtali, why may we not allow that Jacob prophesied concerning the same thing, when he foretold the fate of his children?

XXIX. It is not to be doubted, that these articles of the saving doctrine, which were so carefully handed down by the fathers, were not only preserved in Egypt, and inculcated upon their children, by these pious patriarchs; but also that, among the posterity of Lot, of Ishmael, of Esau, and others, as long as the Gentiles were not entirely rejected, the remains of the same truth eminently shone forth, as appears from Job, from his friends, and from Balaam.

XXX. When Job declared his confidence in God, he called him הַאֲדָם נוֹצֵר, the notzer of Adam, the keeper or preserver of men, Job 7:20. Christ uses the same word, when he expresses his solicitous care for his church, Isa. 27:3, נוֹצֵרָה יְהוָה אֲנִי, "I Jehovah do keep it." And the elect, whom Christ bears as it were in his eyes and hands, are called יִשְׂרָאֵל נוֹצְרֵי "the preserved and the saved of Israel." Isa. 49:6. The denomination Nazarene comes nearest to this term in Hebrew, נוֹצְרֵי, though it was given to Christ because he dwelt at Nazareth, yet we learn from Matthew that it was mystical, and belonged to the fulfillment of some prophecy. Matt. 2:23. Interpreters endeavour to find this prophecy in more places than one. Some have recourse to the Nazarites of

the Old Testament. But these are not called נוצרים, with a tzaddi, as the Jews constantly write the name, Nazarene; but נזירים, with a zain. Others observe, that the Messiah is called Isa. 11:1, and Isa. 60:21, נצד, the branch, from which the name of the town Nazareth is likewise derived. But amidst such diversity of opinions, it is astonishing that but very few have recollected this passage of Job, where there is express mention of the Messiah, under the appellation נוצר, Notzer. At least this passage of Job, and that of Isaiah, with which we compared it, are with no less probability applied to this purpose, than any thing else I have met with among interpreters. Job also professes excellent things concerning the person, offices, and benefits of Christ. Job 16:25, seq. but that passage we have already discussed, book iii. chap. ii. sect. 19.

XXXI. Let us add Elihu's commendation of the Messiah. Job 33:23, 24: "If there be מלאך, [an angel] a messenger with him, מליץ, an interpreter, one among a thousand, to show unto man his uprightness: then he is gracious unto him, and saith, Deliver [redeem] him from going down to the pit, I have found a ransom." Elihu here speaks of a man, who was brought by afflictions and disease almost to the gates of death; and shows how he may be saved from death both of soul and body. If Elihu had any knowledge of the Messiah, certainly this was the place to speak concerning him. And since every word is so framed, as to suit none more properly than the Messiah, to whom can they be better applied than to him? Elihu sets forth in a concise manner. I. The excellence of the Messiah. II. His offices. III. His benefits.

XXXII. He proclaims the excellence of the Messiah, calling him אלהי מני אחד, one of a thousand. Where thousand is a definite number, put for an indefinite; as if he had said, one above others, let them be ever so many. There are indeed very many who may be called angels and interpreters; and though these names may be given to thousands, yet this person is not to be among the number of a thousand others, because he excels them all in respect of nature, dignity, and efficacy, being אחד, only one, among so many others.

XXXIII. He first set before us, under a general appellation, the offices of the Messiah, and then more particularly explains them. In general he calls him מלאך, an angel, because Christ was sent by the Father, and spoke and acted with men in the Father's name. In Mal. 3:3, he is called the Angel of the Covenant. Nevertheless, he is so the Angel of Jehovah, that, at the same time, he is himself Jehovah, Zech. 3:1, 2.; in "whom is the name of Jehovah," Exod. 23:21; and who "is by so much more excellent than all other angels, as he obtained a more excellent name than they," Heb. 1:4. Christ was called an angel before his incarnation, because he often appeared as angels usually did; and because he then performed those things which depended on his future mission in the flesh.

XXXIV. But then more particularly, his prophetic office is signified when he is called מליץ, interpreter, a teacher, compare Isa. 43:27. namely, because he is המדבר, "he that doth speak," Isa. 52:6; ὁ λογος του Θεου, the word of God, whose office is to "declare the Father," John 1:18. Nay, he who speaks plainly, and interprets dark sayings. For this is the meaning of מליצה a clear saying; to which is opposed חידה, a dark saying, Prov. 1:6. Moreover, it belongs to Christ as a prophet, to declare unto man his righteousness, externally by his word, internally by his Spirit, by which we may understand, either the righteousness of God demanding satisfaction for sin, and even chastising his elect on that account, or the righteousness, of Christ himself, or his satisfactory righteousness, which is the only meritorious cause of our salvation; or in a word, the

righteousness of man, that is, the practice of faith and repentance. There is none of all these things which Christ does not teach his people.

XXXV. 2dly, The office of redeemer, because to him is ascribed פדעה or פדות, both signifying the same thing, כופר. The former word denotes redemption from guilt, from his obligation to, and from the power of, another; properly, indeed, that which is effected by a price, as Ps. 49:7, where פדיון and כופר, price of redemption, are joined; improperly, that which is brought about by a greater power, opposed to the power of an unjust detainer, as Deut. 9:26. "בנדלך פרייתה," thou hast redeemed through thy greatness;" that is, as it is explained, Neh. 1:10. "ההזקה ובידך הגדיל בכחך," by thy great power and by thy strong hand." Both these ways of redemption are applicable to the Messiah, who, on paying the price, purchases the freedom of his people, and by a strong hand applies it to them. The term כופר generally signifies a price by which any one may be appeased, and the punishment bought off. Christ paid that price, when he gave his "life a ransom for many," Matt. 20:28.

XXXVI. But interpreters are not agreed, whether those words, deliver or redeem him, are the words of Christ, interceding with the Father; or the words of the Father addressed to Christ. Those who maintain the former, explain them thus: Redeem him, that is, by "thine infinite power deliver him from the evil with which he is pressed down, and which otherwise hangs over him; for I myself have undertaken to satisfy thy justice, and in that satisfaction there is λύτρον, the ransom, which I have found, that is, which I know to be full and complete; or which I have found, that is, have discovered to him for whom I intercede, that he may apprehend it by faith." Compare Heb. 9:12, "having obtained eternal redemption." They who choose the latter, think that the meaning of the words is this: "Do thou, O Christ, redeem this wretched man, apply to him the efficacy of thy merits, I have no longer any objection to his happiness; for I have found a ransom, I have considered and weighed the satisfaction thou hast made for man, and have found it to be such as my justice required, that is, highly sufficient." Whatever way we take the words, they yield a very suitable meaning.

XXXVII. There are two benefits mentioned. 1st, The mercy of God, if there be a messenger (an angel) with him, an interpreter; this is the protasis, or first proposition; and, or then, he is gracious unto him; this is the apodosis, or latter proposition. He shows that it is not otherwise possible for man to obtain mercy of God, unless there be some angel intercessor, who, by his atonement and intercession, may restore him to the favour of God; nay, unless that angel be with him, עליו, by his gracious presence, and by his aid and assistance. For על is often the same as with: as Gen. 18:8, Judges. 3:16, and other places; and here it seems most properly applicable to the man spoken of. If, among the numbers who surround the sick person's bed, and who can only comfort him in his sickness with medicines, that shall avail him nothing, or entertain him with frivolous, idle discourse, this one of a thousand be present, by his counsel, help, and intercession, the man will then be exceedingly refreshed with the fruits of divine mercy; even deliverance from the pit or corruption, that is, from death, both temporal and eternal.

XXXVIII. None have occasion to despise these things as if they were modern inventions, for certainly Gregory applies them at large to Christ. "For who," says he, "is that angel, but he who by the prophet is called the angel of the covenant? For, seeing to evangelize in the Greek signifies to declare as a messenger, our Lord, who delivers his message to us, is called the



angel." He also more clearly observes, "there are who, by angel, understand Christ, the angel of the great council, by whom we are justified;" see, above all, the commentary of Sebastian Schmidius, a divine of Strasburg.

XXXIX. Let us add to these Balaam's prophecy concerning the Messiah, which he delivered in magnificent language, Numb. 24:15–19: "Balaam, the son of Beor hath said, and the man whose eyes are open, hath said: he hath said, which heard the words of God, and knew the knowledge of the Most High, which saw the vision of the Almighty, falling into a trance, but having his eyes open: I shall see him (it) but not now: I shall behold him (it) but not nigh: there shall come a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth. And Edom shall be a possession, Seir also shall be a possession for his enemies, and Israel shall do valiantly. Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city."

XL. The author of this prophecy is Balaam, whom, from an ancient tradition of the Jews, Jerome and Eucherius will have to be the same with Elihu, whose testimony concerning Christ we have just explained. But Frederic Spanheim, the son, in his history of Job, c. 15 § 18, 19, has learnedly shown the silliness of that tradition, and that there is no resemblance between Elihu and Balaam. Here Balaam mightily extols himself, in order to gain the greater credit and authority to his prophecy; and though it is not without affectation and vain glory that he uttered these haughty encomiums of himself, yet by them God was pleased to ratify what he resolved to teach us by the mouth of the prophet. He calls himself the man whose eyes were open, that is, endowed with prophetic light to discern things which were concealed from others: hearing the words of God, to whom God familiarly imparted his secrets. Knowing the knowledge of the Most High, knowing, from divine revelation, those things which, in other respects, God alone knows. Seeing the vision of the Almighty, like a prophet of the true God, according to Numb. 12:6: "I make myself known unto him in a vision." Falling into a trance, but having his eyes open, who falls into a sleep, or an ecstasy, and yet has the eyes of his mind open. Whatever be the case as to his other prophecies, it is certainly not to be doubted, but he delivered this prophecy by a divine impulse.

XLI. He premises, that what he had a prospect of in spirit was not nigh: "I see it but not now, I behold it but not nigh." He gives warning of this beforehand, in order partly to embellish his prophecy, which reached forwards to things so distant; partly to shun envy, and to comfort Balak, whom he endeavoured to gratify as much as he could. However, he also comes up to the style of the holy prophets; who usually refer what they prophesy concerning the Messiah to the latter days.

XLII. But what is the subject of his prophecy? "A star," says he, "shall come out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel." This might be understood literally, and in a diminutive sense, concerning David, who was, as it were, a kind of light shining in darkness, and who obtained the sceptre of Israel by a series of astonishing providences; who also smote the Moabites, and made them tributary, 2 Sam. 8:2. Hence he says, "Moab is my wash-pot," Ps. 140:10, that is, does me the offices of the meanest drudgery, is placed at my feet, as a vessel, in which I usually wash them. But these things have a higher view. And David, in this respect, can only be considered as the type of a more excellent person. The star, therefore, and sceptre, signify Christ the Lord, who is both the light of his people, by the demonstration of the truth, and their manifold consolation

by his word and Spirit, "the bright and morning star," Rev. 22:16. and the Sceptred King; King of kings and Lord of Lords, Rev. 19:16. He came out of Jacob and rose out of Israel. For the Lord raised up that prophet. "from the midst of his brethren," Deut. 18:15; "and the glorious one of Israel shall be of him, and the governor shall proceed from the midst of him," Jer. 30:21; "who is over all, God blessed for ever; but from the fathers as concerning the flesh," Rom. 9:5.

XLIII. The works ascribed to him are these two: 1st, The smiting (breaking) of the sides or corners of Moab. That is, the subduing of those who were before sworn enemies to himself and his church. And that two ways, either by grace, when, by his word and Spirit, he subdues them to the obedience of faith, so that they willingly submit to his sceptre, "casting down every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ," 2 Cor. 10:5. Or, in a way of justice and vengeance, when he subdues the obstinate, and forces them, however unwillingly, to acknowledge his power and supereminence, "breaking them with a rod of iron, dashing them in pieces like a potter's vessel," Ps. 2:9. But the Moabites are here mentioned as an instance, because Balaam was at that time principally concerned with them. 2dly, "The destruction of all the children of Seth." This signifies his triumph over all men, whom he shall subdue to himself, either by his grace or by his righteous vengeance. Because all men in the world are propagated from Seth; while the progeny of Cain, and of the other sons of Adam, perished in the deluge. From Seth, Noah descended, and all mankind from Noah, so that we are all the children of Seth. But we shall all be made subject to Christ, "who shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father: when he shall have put down all rule, and authority, and power," 1 Cor. 15:24.

XLIV. In the last place, he shows the time and nature of Christ's kingdom; when Israel shall do valiantly against his enemies, by shaking off the tyrannical yoke of Antiochus and others: when Edom and Seir, a noted mountain of Idumea, shall become the possession of Israel; which happened under the second temple, when the Idumeans were subdued, and submitting to circumcision and the other Jewish rites, were added to the republic of Israel; as not only Josephus, but also Strabo relates, Geogr. lib. xvi. "They joined themselves to the Jews, and had laws in common with them." When, I say, all these things shall happen, "out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion:" namely, that great ruler, that "mighty one of Jacob," Isa. 60:16; "whose right it is, and I will give it him," Ezek. 21:27. "He shall destroy him that remaineth of the city." He will overthrow the city, and all human power which shall made head against him to the utmost: "For he bringeth down them that dwell on high, the lofty city he layeth it low, he layeth it low, even to the ground, he bringeth it even to the dust. The foot shall tread it down, even the feet of the poor, and the steps of the needy," Isa. 26:5, 6. And thus we have carried down the doctrine of salvation in one continued series to the times of Moses.

## CHAPTER IV: Of the Decalogue

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

II. It was the prerogative of the people of Israel above other nations, that to them pertained the "covenants and the giving of the law." Rom. 9:4. And there were several kinds of laws given them, of which there are principally three mentioned by divines. The moral, or the decalogue, the ceremonial, and the political, or forensic. The people of Israel may doubtless be considered three ways. 1st, As rational creatures, depending upon God, as the supreme reason or cause both in a moral and natural sense. And thus the law of the decalogue was given them; which, as to its substance, is one and the same with the law of nature, and binds men as such. 2dly, As the church of the Old Testament, who expected the promised Messiah and happier times, when he should make every thing perfect. And therefore they received the ceremonial law, which really showed that the Messiah was not yet come, and had not yet perfected all things; but that he would come, and make all things new. 3dly, As a peculiar people, who had a polity or government suited to their genius and disposition, in the land of Canaan. A republic constituted not so much according to those forms which philosophers have delineated, but which was, in a peculiar manner, a theocracy, as Josephus significantly calls it, God himself holding the reins of government therein, Judges 8:23. Under that view God prescribed them political laws.

III. We are first to speak of the decalogue and its promulgation. Moses has accurately described it, Exod. 19 and 20 The law-giver, or, if you will, the legislator, is God himself. "The one law-giver, who is able to save and to destroy." James 4:12. Who has a right of dominion over the consciences of men. As the supreme reason or cause, he is the rule of all reasonable creatures; and as the supreme Lord, is the ruler of all, and by taking Israel to himself for a people, in an especial manner showed himself to be their God. In the first words of the law he asserts his own divinity, proclaiming "I am Jehovah thy God."

IV. But we judge it criminal for any to doubt that this is to be understood of the whole undivided Trinity, whose equal majesty, in one Deity, we are all bound to acknowledge and worship. Nevertheless, as the Son of God was then, in a certain peculiar respect, the king of the people of Israel and of the church at that time; the giving of the law is also, in a singular manner, ascribed to him. For Stephen in express words declares, Acts 7:38, compared with ver. 35. that it was an angel who spoke with Moses and the fathers on Mount Sinai, even that very angel who appeared to Moses in the bush, and said that he was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But no Christian will deny that this was Christ. And Christ certainly is he "who ascended on high," &c. Ps. 68:18, compared with Eph. 4:8. But he himself "went forth before his people in the wilderness, when the earth shook, the heavens also dropped at the presence of God; even Sinai itself was moved at the presence of God, the God of Israel," that is, at the giving of the law. Ps. 68:7, 8. Certainly the apostle, Heb. 12:26, says, that he "who spoke from heaven, and whose

voice then (namely at the giving of the law) shook the earth," was our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom we are now also to hearken; as Zanchius has learnedly observed, T. iv. lib. i. c. 12. Who professedly and at large proves, that he who promulgated the law was the Son of God de Tribus Elohim, lib. ii. c. 3.

V. What the celebrated Iac. Altingius has observed on Deut. 5:6, from a catechism of the ancient Jews, very much deserves our notice. The Jews say, "three spirits are united in one; the lowest spirit, which is called the Holy Spirit; the middle spirit, which is the intermediate; and called wisdom and intelligence; and this is the spirit which proceeds from the midst of the most consummate beauty, with fire and water: the supreme Spirit, which is absolutely in silence, in whom all the holy spirits, and all the bright persons, consist. Rahanat. fol. 132. col. 3. They also say, that אכי and הוּא and הוּא, I and thou and he, are names of God, denoting three persons, and, at the feast of tabernacles they all profess it in their prayers: נא הושיעא והוּא אָנִי, "I and, he, save I pray". Moreover, they say, that when the law was promulgated, there were two persons. for, quite to the end of the second commandment, the discourse runs in the first person. "I the Lord thy God, &c. For I the Lord God, &c. of those that hate me, &c. of those that love me, &c." In the third and following commandments, God is mentioned in the third person. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God, &c. The sabbath of the Lord thy God." Which having observed, they proceed thus: "That the first two words or commandments were spoke by the supreme Spirit; but the other words, by his glory, called El Shaddai, known to the fathers, by whom the prophets prophesied, who is called Jah, in whom is the name of God, the beloved of God, who dwelt in the temple, and the mouth of God, and face of God, and the rock, and that goodness which Moses saw, when he could not see God," Bechai, fol. 88. col. 3, 4. Elsewhere they call him שכינה, the Shechinah, "by whom there is access to God, by whom prayers are poured out to God: who is that angel, who has the name of God in him, who also himself is called God and Jehovah." I inquire not now how solid these reasonings of the Jews are. It is sufficient to have mentioned these remarkable records of an ancient catechism concerning the plurality of the divine persons; of which there are also indications in the Decalogue itself.

VI. Angels were present as ministers, at the giving of the law by the Lord Christ. Whence Stephen says, Acts 7:53. that the "Israelites received the law by the disposition of angels," εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων. Grotius observes, that εἰς here signifies amidst, and that διαταγὰς denotes troops, ranged in military order: that the meaning is, the law was given in a magnificent manner, amidst many troops of angels, and that there was a reference to Deut. 33:2. these things are not improper. But others would rather take διαταγή for a command, ordinance, and sanction: as Rom. 13:2.\* And they render εἰς at; in which sense the Son is said to act at the pleasure of the Father. Ludovicus de Dieu has learnedly expressed that meaning; and as his words tend to explain several passages, we shall not scruple to insert them as follows. "Stephen had said, ver. 38. that the angel spoke with Moses in Mount Sinai, even the same who had appeared to him in the bush, v. 35. who, though he was in himself God, yet is here economically considered as the angel of God, and the captain of the other angels. He gave the law to Moses, from the midst of the angels, who surrounded him on all hands. Of which there was a figurative representation in the sanctuary, where God, sitting between the cherubim, delivered his oracles. Hence Ps. 68:17, when he had said, the chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels, the Lord is among them; he adds, בקדש סיני, 'Sinai is in the sanctuary:' to teach us, that as God, when formerly surrounded on Sinai by myriads of angels, and riding on them, as on chariots, gave

forth the law, so the sanctuary resembles Mount Sinai, where God rides on a chariot of cherubims. Seeing therefore the law came forth from an assembly of angels, whose president was the supreme Angel Jehovah, the apostle justly said, that it was pronounced and ordained by angels, Stephen, that it was received by the people by the disposition of angels. Διαταγή ἀγγέλων is here the same thing, as עֵידִין נֹזֶרֶת, 'the decree of the watchers,' קִדְיִשִׁין וּמְאַמֵּר, and 'the word of the holy ones.' Dan. 4:17. The decree and mandate of the angelic senate is understood, over whom the Son of God presided as supreme: in regard of whom the same decree is called, ver. 24, נֹזֶרֶת עֲלֵיָא, 'the decree of the Most High.' " Thus far de Dieu.

VII. But what kind of ministry did the angels perform to God at giving the law? First, It is certain that with their heavenly choirs they surrounded the mount, and added to the majestic pomp of the Lawgiver, and were witnesses of all that was transacted. The consideration of this was capable of striking not only terror into the Israelites, but should also have inspired their minds with reverence, that the angels, in whose assembly the law was given, might not be witnesses of their perfidy. To this purpose is Deut. 33:2, "Jehovah came from Sinai, he came with ten thousands of saints; from his right hand went a fiery law for them." Secondly. It is not improbable, that the sound of those words, in which the law was conceived, was formed in the air by the means of angels. For God properly uses not a voice: this is a degree of imperfection: but yet it is called the voice of God, formed in the air in some extraordinary manner, to express the mind of God, for which purpose he uses the ministry of angels: namely, the law was given in thunder and lightning; the thunder indeed, which formed the matter of the voice, which proclaimed the words of the law, must certainly have had an articulation superadded, which was framed by the means of angels. Philo, in Ennaratio Decalogi, says, God spoke not by himself, but "filling a reasonable mind with a distinct knowledge, which moulding and attenuating the air, and changing it to a flaming fire, he gave forth an articulate sound; as breath does through a trumpet." I know not whether he intended the same thing that we do. We mean nothing but what the apostle said, when he calls the law, "the word spoken by angels." Heb. 2:2. Not that it was any created angel who said, "I am Jehovah thy God." These are the words of God; but that the thunder in which God spoke, was produced by the means of angels, and articulated into words intelligible to man. They who understand by angels, only their presence and attendance, as 2 Tim. 2:2. "among many witnesses," too much lessen the force of the apostle's comparison, by which he prefers the gospel to the law on this account, that this last was promulgated by the ministry of angels, the former published by the ministry of the Son of God manifested in the flesh. See Cameron and Mestrezat on the place. Thirdly, It is probable that the tables of testimony, on which the law was written by the finger of God, were delivered to Moses by the intervention of angels: and to this I refer Gal. 3:19, "the law was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator."

VIII. Moses was the other minister of God at the giving of the law. "Moses commanded us a law, even the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob," Deut. 33:4. "The law was given by Moses," John 1:17. And Moses is that mediator, in whose hands, as we have just learned from Paul, the law was ordained by angels. We can by no means agree with a certain learned author, who denies that Moses was the mediator of the moral law, and maintains that by the law we are to understand the ceremonial only; and he thinks, the history of the promulgation of the ten words or commandments removes Moses to such a distance from the office of a mediator, that it places him in the same rank and order with the people, Exod. 19:25: "So Moses went down unto the people," &c. and Exod. 20:1. "And God spake," &c. But if I err not, the very learned person

mistakes the case. Moses indeed went down from the mount, to put the people on their guard not to break through the boundary by coming up to Jehovah, and having executed that commission, he, together with Aaron his brother, went up again, at the command of God, some little way at least, Exod. 19:24, and stood nearer when God promulgated the laws. Which done, he again spoke with the Israelites. Very many considerations sway with us thus to range these matters. Let us, first, consider verse: 9. "And Jehovah said unto Moses, Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, and believe thee for ever." From this it appears, that from among the whole assembly, God called Moses by name, and recommended him to the people as the messenger of God, when he promulgated this law. And Moses himself declares this, Deut. 5:4, 5, 6, "Jehovah talked with you face to face in the mount, out of the midst of the fire. (I stood between Jehovah and you at that time, to show you the word of Jehovah. For ye were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up into the mount,) saying, I am Jehovah thy God," &c. And what is plainer than that of Stephen: "That Moses was in the wilderness with the angel, which spake to him in the Mount Sinai, and with our fathers, who received λόγια ζῶντα, the lively oracles, to give unto us," Acts 7:38. Where Beza says; "It is not to be doubted, but Luke calls λόγια, oracles, what the Hebrew calle הדברים, the words, and has an eye to God himself, who is said to have pronounced and delivered them to Moses, written with his own finger." And what appearance of truth is there, that by λόγια ζῶντα, lively oracles, we are only to understand the ceremonial laws, and not those precepts of the moral law, which whoever does shall live in them? And this very learned author himself has elsewhere observed, that the words ומשפטים תורה חקים, law, statutes, and judgments, are often synonymous; but whenever they are thus joined together, they are distinguished from each other by a peculiar signification, and that by חקים, is understood the moral law, by תקים, the ceremonial, and by משפטים, the forensic law. But now these three are so joined, as that each of them is ascribed to Moses, Mal. 4:4. "Remember ye עבדי משה תורת, the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments." You see, that the law equally with the statutes and judgments are ascribed to Moses. In like manner, Lev. 26:46: "These are the statutes, and judgments, and laws, which Jehovah made between him and the children of Israel, in Mount Sinai, by the hand of Moses." Moses therefore was the mediator even of the moral law, and his institutions are erroneously restricted to the ceremonies.

IX. The time of the publication of the law is supposed to be the fiftieth day from the departure of the people out of Egypt, and from the celebration of the passover. How to find out this number of days, see Rivet on Exod. 19:1. And thus the Israelites were taught, when they were delivered from Egyptian bondage by a merciful hand, that they were not then to be at their own disposal, so as for the future to live at their own discretion; but to enter into the service of God, and to apply themselves to it with the greater earnestness, the more they were set at liberty from extraneous bondage, as Zachariah also prophesies, Luke 1:74, 75, "That being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, we might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of our life." God likewise ordered three days to be set apart for preparation, because none has access to familiar converse with God, but he who has duly consecrated himself to him.

X. The place was Mount Sinai, sometimes also called Horeb, Deut. 5:2. Exod. 3:1, and sometimes "the Mount of God," 1 Kings 19:8. "The law was given in the Mount;" Beda on Exod. 24., says, "that from the height of the place we may gather, how sublime or how different from

human institutions, the law was which Moses received." That mountain was situated in the deserts of Arabia, an uncultivated and barren spot, far from Canaan, opposed to Mount Sion, which was greatly cultivated and very pleasant, Ps. 48:3, and situated in the heart of the promised land, from whence came forth the law of faith, Isa. 2:2, 3. For, the law cannot give life to sinful man, render him fruitful in the practice of true holiness, and introduce him into the heavenly country. That is the province of the Gospel, "which is the power of God unto salvation," Rom. 1:16. We are not to despise the observation of Lud. Cappellus on Gal. 4:25. That Mount Sinai was so called from the word סִנַּי, which, both in Hebrew and Arabic, signifies a thorn, bush, briars. For, God spoke here to Moses from the bush. Mount Horeb, חֹרֵב, also denotes dryness and desolation, for God made choice of such places and names in giving the law, with a particular purpose, that the names might answer to the things, and the things typified to their types. The law, considered in itself alone, is more dry and barren to sinful man than any rock or sandy desert, from which not even a drop of true piety can penetrate into the heart of man; it also forms a horrid waste and desolation by its threats and curses, with which, as with so many thorns, it pricks and wounds the conscience of the sinner. And what the most excellent Lightfoot has remarked, deserves also to be added, Miscellan. c. lix. "The ceremonial law, which only regarded the Jews, was given (at least, as to a great part of it), privately to Moses in the tabernacle, Lev. 1:1, and was demolished along with the tabernacle when the veil was rent. The moral law concerns the whole world, and was published in the sight of all; namely, from the top of a mountain, and ought to last, as long as any mountain shall stand. The judicial law, which is more indifferent and may stand or fall, as shall seem most expedient for the common-weal, was not published so openly as the one, nor so privately as the other."

XI. Besides, though the people were in their manner externally sanctified, yet they had not free access to the mountain. God commanded that the mountain and the people should be kept within bounds, and threatened those with death, who should dare to go up to the mountain, or to touch any part of it, Exod. 19:13. This command appeared so severe, that Paul declares, "they could not endure it," Heb. 12:20. And as it is truly delightful and "good to draw near to God," Ps. 73:28, so it is unpleasant and melancholy to be debarred from access to him. That command was a proof, that the Israelites were impure, and unworthy of the presence of God. The very animals appointed for their service were reputed impure. And therefore proclamation was made, "If even a beast touched the mountain, it should be stoned or thrust through with a dart." To such a degree were all things brought into the bondage of corruption by and on account of sinful man, Rom. 8:21.

XII. There were likewise awful signs, such as loud peals of thunder, quivering, flashes of lightning shining along the cloud of thick darkness which covered the top of the mountain, black vapours of smoke ascending up to heaven, the earthquake, the quaking of the very mountain, as if sensible of the approach of God, and many other circumstances recorded, Exod. 19:16, 18; Deut. 4:11; Heb. 12:18. Now to what purpose was all this apparatus? It was first to proclaim the tremendous majesty of the lawgiver, and to beget in the souls of men a reverence for his law; "God himself is come, that his fear may be before your faces, that ye sin not," Exod. 20:20. 2dly, To display the nature of the law, which by demanding perfect obedience, and by the addition of dreadful threatenings, wonderfully strikes sinners to the heart, and without any mixture of Gospel grace, leads to despair, and is to them "the ministry of death and condemnation," 2 Cor. 3:7, 9. But it is otherwise with the Gospel, which, in this respect, is opposed to the law, Heb.

12:18, 22. 3dly, To put the faith and constancy of the Israelites to the trial; whether this terror of God would bring them to humility and obedience, or whether through forwardness they would pour contempt upon him, or out of despair rebel against him, Exod. 20:20: "that he might prove you."

XIII. But notwithstanding this display of majesty, the Israelites saw no form or similitude of God, Deut. 4:12, 15. This was on purpose to prevent them from entertaining gross conceptions of the God of heaven, or "corrupting themselves and making to themselves a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female," ver. 16. For to what could they liken him, of whom they saw no similitude? Isa. 40:25: "to whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One."

XIV. The law, which God in this manner published, consists of ten words or commandments, Exod. 34:28, Deut. 4:13. Wherefore the Greeks also called it δεκάλογος, the decalogue. Moreover the contents of those ten words are various. 1st, There is the prescription of certain duties; and in this, the nature of a law, as such, properly consists. 2dly, The threatening of divine vengeance against the transgressors thereof, as in the second and third commandments; and this is the sanction of the covenant of works, from which all threatenings are derived, as we explained at large, book iii. chap. i sect. 22. 3dly, The proposal of divine grace and favour; and as this is made to sinners, and that under a condition, not of perfect, but of sincere obedience, so far it flows from the covenant of grace.

XV. All the duties required by the law, are comprehended under this one, viz. love, which is therefore called the "fulfilling of the law," Rom. 13:10. and "the bond of perfectness," Col. 3:14. Moreover, seeing love either ascends to God, who, as the chief good, is to be loved above all, and with all our strength; or extends itself to our neighbor, whom we are bound to love as ourselves, since he belongs to God equally with ourselves; therefore Christ divides the whole law into these two capital precepts, Mat. 22:37, 22:38, 22:39.

XVI. The most high God was not only pleased to publish his laws to Israel with a loud voice, in the presence of the most august assembly of the whole people, but he likewise engraved them with his own finger, on tables of stone, polished by himself for that purpose, Exod. 24:12, 31:16, Deut. 10:1. He chose to write his law, in order to prevent the oblivion of it, and to perpetuate the memory of the giving and receiving it in Israel. And hence these tables are called *תעודות לוחות*, "the tables of testimony," Exod. 31:18, 34:29. Both because they contained the declaration or testimony of the divine will, and because the preservation of them by the Israelites, was a testimony of the law given to and received by them at Sinai. This writing also signified the purpose of God to write the law on the hearts of his elect, according to the promise of the covenant of grace, Jer. 31:33.

XVII. Nor is it for nothing that God himself would be the author of this writing, without making use of any man or angel. For this is the meaning of the Holy Spirit, when he says that the tables were written *באצבע אלהים*, "with the finger of God," Exod. 31:18; and that the writing was "the writing of God," Exod. 32:16. The reasons were, 1st, To set forth the pre-eminence of this law, not only above all human, but also above the other divine laws which he permitted to be written by Moses. 2dly, To intimate that it is the work of God alone, to write the law on the heart, which



is what neither man himself, nor the ministers of God can do, but the Spirit of God alone. And thus believers are "the epistle of Christ, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God," 2 Cor. 3:3.

XVIII. It likewise merits our attention, that this writing of God was not a drawing of certain letters on a plane, but *חרות מכתב*, an engraven writing, by incision and engraving, Exod. 32:16. The term *חרות*, which occurs nowhere else, seems, by a commutation of the letters of the same organ *ת* and *ט*, to be from *חדט*, which signifies a graver, graving instrument or tool: so that *חרת* signifies "he cuts with a graver or style," as R. Soloman has observed. This signified not only the perpetuity of the law in respect of its obligation (for characters so engraved are with much greater difficulty effaced than letters drawn upon a plane), but also its deep engraving in the inward parts of the elect, which Satan himself, with all his power and stratagems, cannot erase. If we consider ourselves as corrupted by nature, "our sin is written with a pen of iron, and with the point of a diamond it is graven upon the table of our heart," Jer. 17:1. But the grace of God will cancel that writing of sin, and in the room of it with the graver of his most holy spirit, will engrave on the same table of our heart the characters of his law.

XIX. Nor must we omit, that God would not write his law in paper or parchment, nay, nor even on wood, but would engrave it on tables of stone. That was done, as A barbanell well remarks, "that the foundations of the law might always remain incorrupted, and thus be a monument of the perpetuity of the law." The other laws, which were to continue at least till the time of the restitution, and whose abrogation was at hand, "for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof," Heb. 7:18, were written by Moses on a less durable material. But this law, which is of eternal obligation, was engraved by God himself on stone. And why may we not, on this occasion, reflect on the stony hardness of our own hearts, on which, however, the characters of the divine law are imprinted by the Spirit of sanctification? Musculus, in *Locis communibus de Decalogo*, says, "It was not enough to have heard the voice of God, unless there was also a literary monument, written by the finger of God, for the benefit of posterity, and for the conviction of the rocky conscience of a hardened people, and therefore tables of stone, and not paper, were used." See also Jo. Gehardi; *Loc. Commun. de Lege*, sect. v. §. 32.

XX. These tables were two in number, enjoining the sanctification both of soul and body, the love both of God and our neighbour. They were also "written on both their sides; on the one side and on the other were they written," Exod. 32:15. Which is either to be understood thus, that the tables shut or closed on each other like writing tables, and were written on their two sides that faced each other; or, what appears to be more simple, that each table was filled up with writing on each side thereof, in the manner of that which the Greeks call *ὀπισθόγραφα*, *opisthography*. And thus provision was actually made against a possibility of either taking from or adding to this law; which also God expressly charged upon his people, Deut. 4:2, 12:13. Nor is it preposterous to think, that, by this means, the sanctification of the whole man was shadowed forth. As there was no part of these tables left unwritten by God, so there is no part of the believer which the Spirit, by his sanctifying influences, does not pervade, 1 Thess. 5:23.

XXI. But we cannot well determine what number of precepts God inscribed on each table. For when we refer the former precepts, treating of love to God, to the first table, and the six following, which treat of love to our neighbour, to the second table, we do not so much consider

the manner of God's writing as the nature of the things, as Christ also did, Matt. 22. We have just heard, that the tables were written both sides, and that they were of equal size is very probable. But the four former precepts greatly exceeding the other six in length, it is scarcely credible they were contained in one table.

XXII. When Moses came down from the mount, with the tables written by God in his hand, and, on his approach to the camp of the Israelites, observed the calf which Aaron had cast or founded at their command; he was moved with a holy indignation, and threw the tables out of his hand and broke them, Exod. 32:19, Deut. 9:16, 17. We are by all means to conclude, that Moses, fired with a zeal for God, broke these tables consistently with his duty. For this conduct tended, 1st, To strike the Israelites with shame and terror, since, by this alarming action, he much more effectually convinced them of their breach of covenant, than he could possibly have done by any vehemence or warmth of words; by depriving them of that inestimable treasure whereby they had otherwise excelled all other nations of the world. 2dly, To demonstrate. that, by their breach of the most solemn covenant, they made themselves unworthy of the symbol of the divine presence. For the words of the covenant were written on the tables, in order to their being placed in the ark, and that God might dwell upon the ark in the tabernacle. Therefore, by this indignation of Moses, God so ordering it, it came to pass that there was nothing which could be deposited in the ark, and so the tabernacle could neither be erected, nor the propitiatory or mercy-seat be in the midst of Israel.

XXIII. Nevertheless God, being entreated by Moses, renewed the broken covenant, commanded Moses to hew two other tables like the former, on which God himself might write the same words, Exod. 34:1. However, he was pleased to manifest his grace in such a manner, that some token of his displeasure should remain, lest the facility of pardon should produce indolence and sloth. There was no art of man used in the former tables; both the tables and the writing were God's. But now, some part of that so great dignity was impaired; since Moses was commanded to bring the stones, when polished by the hand of man, that God might write the ten words upon them. We are, moreover, taught, that the most holy persons can, indeed, offer nothing to God (if even they can do that) but smooth tables without any characters. The whole writing is to be entirely ascribed to God, the author of holiness.

XXIV. While these things were doing, God again prohibited the Israelites from coming near the mount, because, by their idolatry, they had made themselves abominable in the sight of God: nor, indeed, did he suffer either sheep or oxen to feed in sight of it, Exod. 34:3. We men, perhaps, might have thought that the miracle would have been more illustrious, if the writing had been made to appear in an instant on the bare tables in the sight of all; but now the writing was performed in secret, before Moses alone, in order to leave some room for faith, to embrace even what it sees not. However, God sufficiently obviated the cavilling of carnal reason; it being evident, that Moses neither took any graving tool with him, nor could find any in the mount. For God so orders the dispensation of his heavenly doctrine, as to prove the obedience and docility of believers, and yet to leave no room for doubting, as Calvin has ingeniously observed.

XXV. But there was another way by which God asserted the authority of his law; namely, by that extraordinary splendour which glistened in the face of Moses, when he came down from the mount, with the tables of the testimony in his hands, so that the Israelites were not able to look

upon him, but he was obliged to put a veil on his face when he spoke with them, Exod. 34:30. This also was a part of the ornament and glory of the law, as the apostle intimates, 2 Cor. 3:7. For if Moses himself, who was a minister, appeared in such eminent glory, the ministration itself could not be less glorious. But since the Israelites could not bear that splendour that was to them an indication how far they had departed from God by their ingratitude, who were so much afraid at the sight of the servant, this distinction, therefore, might really humble them; since Moses was favoured with a nearer view of the glory of God himself, and with having the effulgence of that glory in the skin of his face; while they, being struck with terror, started back at the sight of a mortal man. Moreover, it being said, that Moses, when he spoke to Israel, put a veil on his face; this was a proof, that the great mysteries and the true end of the law, which is "Christ for righteousness to every one that believeth," Rom. 10:4, were concealed from them, 2 Cor. 3:13. And finally, the apostle observes, that the glory of the face of Moses was to be done away as useless, 2 Cor. 3:7. It might be, that this shining splendour of his skin lasted not long; at least it vanished at death; which was a visible proof that the glory of the Mosaic ministration was afterwards to have a period to make way for the more eminent glory of the ministry of Christ.

XXVI. These tables were deposited in the ark of the covenant under the mercy-seat, Exod. 25:16, Deut. 10:5, 1 Kings 8:9. Not only to be kept there as a most precious piece of furniture, and a symbol of the divine covenant, but especially to signify that Christ, who was typified by the ark, was to have the law of God in the midst of his bowels, or "within his heart," Ps. 40:8, and to fulfil it perfectly for his people: likewise that Christ had not only the propitiatory or mercy-seat, whereby our sins are covered, but also the law, which was to be the rule of life and directory of gratitude to those who are reconciled with God.

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

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

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

XXX. 3. The Gentiles, who had heard nothing of the giving of the law in the wilderness, were not bound to the observance of that law, as it was published to the Israelites, but only as inscribed on their own consciences. Hence the apostle says, "that as many as have sinned without law (namely the written law) shall also perish without law," Rom. 2:12. That is, shall not be condemned in consequence of the law, as delivered to Israel in writing, but of the violation of the natural law. However, if any of the Gentiles came to have any knowledge of the giving of this law, they were to believe, that the precepts of it were spoken to them no less than they were to Israel; nor could they neglect them, without throwing contempt on God, and incurring the forfeiture of salvation.

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

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

XXXIII. 6. As the people of Israel constituted the church at that time, and as Jesus Christ the Son of God, and King of the church, prescribed the decalogue to them, it follows that the same law retains its force in the church, till it be abrogated again by the King of the church. We are not to

think that the church of the Old Testament, which consisted of Israelites, and that of the New, though for the greatest part made up of Gentiles, were a quite different people. They ought to be looked upon as one kingdom of Christ, who made both one, Eph. 2:14, and who grafted us, when wild olives. into that fat olive, Rom. 11:17. And consequently, the laws which were once given to the church by Christ the king, are always binding on the whole church, unless Christ shall declare that he has abrogated them by some other institution. But it is absurd to imagine that Christ abrogated the moral law, in so far as he gave it by the mediation of Moses to the church of Israel, and directly confirmed the same law to the Christian church. For seeing it is the same law, of the same king, in one and the same kingdom, though that kingdom is enriched with new accessions and new privileges; why should we suppose it abrogated and ratified again almost in the same breath? Nay, many considerations persuade us to believe, that the law of the decalogue was given to the church in order to be a perpetual rule, from the manner in which it was given.

XXXIV. For as these commands were published before the assembly of the whole church, in the hearing of all, while the other precepts were given to Moses alone in his sacred retirement: as they were engraved on tables of stone by the finger of God, to the end that, as Calvin remarks, this doctrine might remain in perpetual force: and seeing they, and they alone, were put into the ark of the covenant, under the wings and guardianship of God himself; God plainly showed by so many prerogatives, that the reason of those precepts was far different from that of the others, which were only imposed on the church for a time.

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

XXXVI. We may add, that Christ has declared, "he was not come to destroy, but to fulfil the law," Matt. 5:17. To destroy signifies there to abrogate, and to free men from the obligation of it, as appears from ver. 19. But that Christ speaks of the law of the decalogue, we gather from what follows, where he explains the precepts of that law, and recommends them to his disciples. And when Paul, Rom. 13:9, and James chap. 2:8, 11, inculcate the precepts of the law on Christians, in the same terms in which they were delivered by Moses to Israel, they do not insist upon this consideration, that they were agreeable to the dictates of right reason, or were ratified again by Christ, but that they were thus formerly published and written by God. Nay, Eph. 6:2, the apostle not only insists on the promise that was annexed to the fifth commandment, but also on the order of the precepts, recommending honour or regard to parents from this argument, that this is "the first commandment with promise." But if the decalogue, as it was formerly delivered to the

church of Israel, did not concern Christians, that argument of the apostle (which be it far from us to say) would have no force with Christians.

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

XXXVIII. However we do not deny that the law of the covenant of works was abolished by Christ in its federal consideration. 1st. As to its rigour, which required of man himself an obedience in every part and degree perfect, as the condition of justification, and that without any promise of the Spirit and of sanctifying grace. 2dly. As to the curse which it threatens against all who deviate from it in the least. And in this sense Paul says, "that we are not under the law, but under grace," Rom. 6:14, though as to its normal relation, or as it is the rule of life and manners, it was not even for a moment abrogated or abolished by Christ. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid, yea, we establish the law," Rom. 3:31. In that respect Christians are no less under the decalogue, than the Jews were formerly: and that not only because the precepts of it are just and holy, but also because they are commandments, which were formerly promulgated with so much majesty and pomp: or, which is almost the very same thing, not only on account of the doctrine they contain, but also of the authority of the supreme Governor.

XXXIX. Let us now consider the use of this law in all ages of the world: and this may be considered either absolutely and in itself, or relatively, with respect to a certain condition or state of man. In itself, the law is, 1st, A representation of true virtue, a delineation of internal and external goodness, and a copy of that holiness, which is worthy of God. 2dly, A demonstration of the way, in which a rational creature can come to have glorious communion with God: "Which if a man do, he shall live in them," Lev. 18:5. "The commandment which was ordained to life," Rom. 7:10. None attains to life but by this law, which must be fulfilled either by man himself, or a surety for him. 3dly, A command of the Supreme Ruler, binding every one to obedience, under the threatening of eternal death, Lev. 18:2, 3, 4; Deut. 27:26.

XL. The state of man, to which the law has its peculiar relations, is threefold; viz. his first, his fallen, and his restored state. In his first state it was to man, 1st, the rule of his nature and of all his actions, to which he willingly, and with the greatest complacency of soul, conformed himself. 2dly, The most excellent beautiful ornament of man, as stamped and impressed by the creating hand of God on his mind. 3dly, The condition of the covenant of works, which man himself was to perform in order to obtain consummate bliss and happiness.

XLI. In his fallen state it serves, 1st, To discover and convince man of his sin, Rom. 3:20. "By the law is the knowledge of sin." And the precepts of the law do this two ways. First, as in a

mirror, they discover to man the vileness both of his life and actions, Jam. 1:23. Then by its irritating virtue, whereby, on account of human depravity, it stirs up sin, which otherwise lay dormant; so that, like one galled by a bridle, the more strictly sin is prohibited and restrained, the more vehemently it resists and makes opposition, every thing that would keep it under being offensive to it. The apostle excellently illustrates this, Rom. 7:7, 13. 2dly, To denounce the curse against man; which it does by its comminations: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God," Rom. 3:19. 3dly, To be a restraint upon men, and bring them to some external honest deportment, in order to preserve civil government, and prevent the destruction of mankind by adulteries, rapines, oppressions and the like heinous crimes. The apostle seems particularly to intimate this office of the law, 1 Tim. 1:9, when he says, "That the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners," &c. For he shows that it is a curb to those prevailing lusts of the flesh, which otherwise would be immoderately extravagant. 4thly, To bring sinners to Christ: "For, Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth," Rom. 10:4. "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ," Gal. 3:24. This is not only true of the ceremonial, but also of the law of the decalogue, which brings to Christ these two ways: first, as it really keeps an elect person, while in an unconverted state, in some measure, in the way of his duty, that he may not obstinately neglect all concern for righteousness and his soul. For, where the Spirit of God does not yet bear rule, sinful lusts break forth there in such a manner that the soul, which is obnoxious to them, is in danger of sinking into forgetfulness and contempt of God: and they would actually do this, did not the Lord put a bar thereto by this remedy of his law. But principally the law brings to Christ, as it strips man of all confidence in his own goodness and righteousness, and, by an acknowledgment of his misery, deeply humbles him, that so he may be thus prepared to endeavour after what before he thought he did not stand in need of.

XLII. In the state of restoration it teacheth believers, 1st, How perfect the obedience was which Christ performed for them, and how much they are under obligations to him, since he, who was Lord of the law, subjected himself to it for them, not only to obey its precepts, but to endure the curse, that he might redeem them from the law, Gal. 4:4, 5. 2dly, At what distance they still are from that perfection of holiness which the law requires, in order the better to bring them to humility, and to a denial of all self-righteousness, Phil. 3:8, 9; and a longing after a blessed perfection, Rom. 7:24. 3dly, What is the rule of their gratitude, and the mark at which they ought to aim, Phil. 3:12; 1 Tim. 1:5. 4thly, and lastly, It bears witness to, approves, and commends the beginnings of sanctification, and comforts those as being true Israelites, who "delight in the law of God after the inward man." The law does this not from its own authority, which can admit of nothing but what is perfectly holy, and condemns every thing that is stained but with the least spot; but from the authority of the grace of Christ, to whom it is now subservient, and at whose command it commends even the imperfect works of believers, declares them to be sincere, and so far approves of them as conformable to itself; and in that sense the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in those, "who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit," Rom. 8:4.

XLIII. Upon these ten words or commandments God entered into a covenant with Israel. "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb," Deut. 5:2. So that the ten words are called the "words of the covenant," Exod. 34:28; and the "covenant itself," Deut. 4:13; nay the tables on which they were written are called the "tables of the covenant," Deut. 9:9. The plan of this

covenant is that contract which God entered into with Israel a little before the law was given, Exod. 19:5, 6, 8. Its solemn ratification was made by those signs which are recorded, Exod. 24:3, seq.

XLIV. The stipulation on the part of God was published in these words, Exod. 19:5, 6. "Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation." We are not to think that God, by these words, required Israel to perform perfect obedience in all parts and degrees, as the condition of the covenant. For in that case the whole of this proposal would be nothing but an intimation of an inevitable curse; seeing it is absolutely impossible for sinful man to give such a perfect observance, even though he is regenerated and sanctified. But a conditional proposal upon an impossible condition is equivalent to an absolute denial. It is indeed true, that the law, considered as a rule, cannot but enjoin a holiness absolutely perfect in every respect: which we have elsewhere professedly proved: but the case is different, when something is required as the condition of a covenant. The man indeed is still bound to perfect holiness, so far that the least deviation is a sin: but yet supposing a covenant of grace, among the benefits of which is remission of sins, God stipulates with his people in this manner; if, with sincerity of heart, you keep my precepts, and recover from your falls by renewed repentance, I will upon that give you an evidence that I am your God. Here therefore he requires a sincere, though not, in every respect, a perfect observance of his commands.

XLV. Upon that condition he promises to them not only temporal blessings, such as the possession of the land of Canaan, and a peaceable life there, abounding with all plenty of every thing desirable, Exod. 20:12; but also spiritual and eternal, when he says that he will be their God and they his people, in that sense which he promised the land to the pious fathers: "That he may establish thee to-day for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob," Deut. 29:13. Compare Jer. 7:22, 23. But that these words comprise life eternal, and the resurrection of the body, we learn from our Lord, Matt. 23:32.

XLVI. To this stipulation of God the Israelites agreed, Exod. 19:8: "And all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." Which they repeated upon the publication of the law, Exod. 24:3: "And all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the Lord hath said will we do." The pious among the Israelites, conscious of their own inability and manifold infirmities, humbly promised, depending by faith on the gracious influences of divine strength, and obedience, not indeed perfect (for that would be to incur the guilt of a lie), but yet sincere, and by no means feigned. The others, as they did not duly attend either to the spiritual perfection of the law, or to their own natural inability, rashly and confusedly bound themselves to the observance of all the precepts. Yet so far these words were good and acceptable to God, as by them they testified some degree of readiness of soul, Deut. 5:33, 34, 35.

XLVII. Now concerning this covenant, made upon the ten commandments, it is queried whether it was a covenant of works, or a covenant of grace? We judge proper to premise some things, previous to the determination of this question. And first, we observe that, in the ministry of



Moses there was a repetition of the doctrine concerning the law of the covenant of works. For both the very same precepts are inculcated, on which the covenant of works was founded, and which constituted the condition of that covenant; and that sentence is repeated, "which if a man do he shall live in them," Lev. 18:5; Ezek. 20:11, 13; by which formula, the righteousness which is of the law is described, Rom. 10:5. And the terror of the covenant of works is increased by repeated comminations; and that voice heard, "Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them," Deut. 27:26. Now the apostle declares that this is the curse of the law, as the law is opposed to faith, or the covenant of grace. Gal. 3:10, 12. Nay, as the requirement of obedience was rigid under the ministry of Moses, the promises of spiritual and saving grace were more rare and obscure, the measure of the Spirit granted to the Israelites scanty and short, Deut. 29:4; and, on the contrary, the denunciation of the curse frequent and express; hence the ministry of Moses is called, "the ministration of death and condemnation," 2 Cor. 3:7, 9: doubtless because it mentioned the condemnation of the sinner, and obliged the Israelites to subscribe to it.

XLVIII. Secondly, we more especially remark, that when the law was given from Mount Sinai or Horeb there was a repetition of the covenant of works. For those tremendous signs of thunders and lightnings, of an earthquake, a thick smoke and black darkness, were adapted to strike Israel with great terror. And the setting bounds and limits round about the mount, whereby the Israelites were kept at a distance from the presence of God, upbraided them with that separation which sin had made between God and them. "In a word, whatever we read, Exod. 19 (says Calvin, on Heb. 12:19) is intended to inform the people, that God then ascended his tribunal, and manifested himself as an impartial Judge. If an innocent animal happened to approach, he commanded it to be thrust through with a dart; how much sorer punishment were sinners liable to, who were conscious of their sins, nay, and knew themselves indicted by the law, as guilty of eternal death." See the same author on Exod. 19:1, 16. And the apostle in this matter, Heb. 12:18–22, sets Mount Sinai in opposition to Mount Sion, the terrors of the law to the sweetness of the gospel.

XLIX. Thirdly, We are not, however, to imagine, that the doctrine of the covenant of works was repeated, in order to set up again such a covenant with the Israelites, in which they were to seek for righteousness and salvation. For we have already proved, book i. chap. ix. sect. 20. that this could not possibly be renewed in that manner with a sinner, on account of the justice and truth of God, and the nature of the covenant of works, which admits of no pardon of sin. See also Hornbeck, Theol. Pract., tom. ii. p. 10. Besides, if the Israelites were taught to seek salvation by the works of the law, then the law had been contrary to the promise made to the fathers many ages before. But now says the apostle, Gal. 3:17: "The covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." The Israelites were, therefore, thus put in mind of the covenant of works, in order to convince them of their sin and misery, to drive them out of themselves, to show them the necessity of a satisfaction, and to compel them to Christ. And so their being thus brought to a remembrance of the covenant of works tended to promote the covenant of grace.

L. Fourthly, There likewise accompanied this giving of the law the repetition of some things belonging to the covenant of grace. For, that God should propose a covenant of friendship to sinful man, call himself his God, (at least in the sense it was said to the elect in Israel), take to

himself any people, separated from others, for his peculiar treasure, assign to them the land of Canaan as a pledge of heaven, promise his grace to those that love him and keep his commandments, and circumscribe the vengeance denounced against disciples within certain bounds, and the like; these things manifestly discover a covenant of grace: and without supposing the suretiship of the Messiah, it could not, consistently with the divine justice and truth, be proposed to man a sinner. Judiciously says Calvin on Exod. 19:17: "By these words we are taught, that these prodigies or signs were not given to drive the people from the presence of God; nor were they struck with any terror, to exasperate their minds with a hatred of instruction; but that the covenant of God was no less lovely than awful. For they are commanded to go and meet God, to present themselves with a ready affection of soul to obey him. Which could not be, unless they had heard something in the law besides precepts and threatenings." See also Tilenus Syntagma, pt. i. disp. xxxiii. § 18, 19, 20, 28, 29.

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

LII. However, the carnal Israelites, not advertng to God's purpose or intention, as they ought, mistook the true meaning of that covenant, embraced it as a covenant of works, and by it sought for righteousness. Paul declares this, Rom. 9:31, 32: "But Israel which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness; wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law; for they stumbled at that stumbling stone." To the same purpose it is, that, Gal. 4:24, 25, he compares to the Ishmaelites the Israelites, while they tarried in the deserts of Arabia, which was the country of the former, who are born to bondage of their mother Hagar, or the covenant of Mount Sinai, and being destitute of true righteousness, shall, with Ishmael, be at length turned out of the house of their heavenly father. For, in that place Paul does not consider the covenant of Mount Sinai as in itself, and in the intention of God, offered to the elect, but as abused by carnal and hypocritical men. Let Calvin again speak: "The apostle declares, that, by the children of Sinai, he meant hypocrites, persons who are at length cast out of the church of God, and disinherited. What, therefore, is that generation unto bondage, which he there speaks of? It is doubtless those who basely abuse the law, and conceive nothing concerning it but what is servile. The pious fathers who lived under the Old Testament did not so. For the servile generation of the law did not hinder them from having the spiritual Jerusalem for their mother. But they who stick to the bare law, and acknowledge not its pedagogy, by which they are brought to Christ, but rather make it an obstacle to their coming to him; these are Ishmaelites (for thus, and I think rightly, Morlorat reads) born unto bondage." The design of the apostle therefore, in that place, is not to teach us, that the covenant of Mount Sinai was nothing but a covenant of works, altogether opposite to the gospel-covenant; but only that the gross Israelites misunderstood the mind of God, and basely

abused his covenant; as all such do who seek for righteousness by the law. See again Calvin on Rom. 10:4.

LIII. Nor was it formally a covenant of grace; because that requires not only obedience, but also promises and bestows strength to obey. For, thus the covenant of grace is made known, Jer. 32:39: "And I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me for ever." But such a promise appears not in the covenant made at Mount Sinai. Nay, God, on this very account, distinguishes the new covenant of grace from the Sinaitic, Jer. 31:31–33. And Moses loudly proclaims, Deut. 29:4, "Yet the Lord hath not given you a heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear, unto this day." Certainly the chosen from among Israel had obtained this. Yet not in virtue of this covenant, which stipulated obedience, but gave not power for it; but in virtue of the covenant of grace, which also belonged to them.

LIV. What was it then? It was a national covenant between God and Israel, whereby Israel promised to God a sincere obedience to all his precepts; especially to the ten words. God, on the other hand, promised to Israel, that such an observance would be acceptable to him, nor want its reward, both in this life and in that which is to come, both as to soul and body. This reciprocal promise supposed a covenant of grace. For, without the assistance of the covenant of grace, man cannot sincerely promise that observance; and yet that an imperfect observance should be acceptable to God is wholly owing to the covenant of grace. It also supposed the doctrine of the covenant of works, the terror of which being increased by those tremendous signs that attended it, they ought to have been excited to embrace that covenant of God. This agreement therefore is a consequent both of the covenant of grace and of works; but was formally neither the one nor the other. A like agreement and renewal of the covenant between God and the pious is frequent; both national and individual. Of the former see Josh. 24:22, 2 Chron. 15:12, 2 Kings 23:3, Neh. 10:29. Of the latter, Ps. 119:106. It is certain that in the passages we have named, mention is made of some covenant between God and his people. If any should ask me of what kind, whether of works or of grace? I shall answer, it is formally neither; but a covenant of sincere piety, which supposes both.

LV. Hence the question, which is very much agitated at this day, may be decided; namely, whether the ten words are nothing but the form of the covenant of grace? This, I apprehend, is by no means an accurate way of speaking. For, since a covenant strictly so called, consists in a mutual agreement; what is properly the form of the covenant should contain the said mutual agreement. But the ten words contain only a prescription of duty fenced on the one hand by threatenings, taken from the covenant of works; on the other, by promises, which belong to the covenant of grace. Hence the Scripture, when it speaks properly, says that a covenant was made upon these ten words, or *פי צל*, after the tenor of those words, Exod. 34:27; distinguishing the covenant itself, which consists in a mutual agreement from the ten words, which contain the conditions of it. The form of the covenant is exhibited by those words, which we have already quoted from Exod. 19:5, 6, 8. I deny not that the ten commandments are frequently in Scripture called the covenant of God. But at the same time, no person can be ignorant, that the term covenant, *ברית*, has various significations in the Hebrew, and often signifies nothing but a precept, as Jer. 34:13, 14. Thus Moses explains himself on this head, Deut. 4:13. "And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments." They are therefore called a covenant by a Synecdoche, because they contain

those precepts, which God, when he set his covenant before them, required the Israelites to observe, and to which the said Israelites bound themselves by covenant.

LVI. The ten words, or commandments therefore, are not the form of a covenant properly so called, but the rule of duty; much less are they the form of the covenant of grace; because that covenant, in its strict signification, consists of mere promises, and, as it relates to elect persons, has the nature of a testament, or last will, rather than of a covenant strictly speaking, and depends on no condition; as we have at large explained and proved, book iii. chap. i. sect. 8. &c. And Jeremiah has shown us, that the form of the covenant of grace, consists in absolute promises, chap. 31:33, and 32:38–40. In like manner Isaiah, chap. 54:10.

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

## CHAPTER V: Of the Doctrine of the Prophets

I. THE plan we formerly laid down should now require us to speak a little of those things from Moses himself and the succeeding prophets, which they have published concerning the person, natures, states, offices, and blessings of the Messiah. And it would be easy to show, that nothing remarkable did befall our Jesus, nothing great was either said or done by him, which the prophets did not foretell was to come to pass. The prophets, I say, who "prophesied of the grace that should come unto us; searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow," 1 Peter. 1:10, 11; and who all, with one consent, "give witness to Jesus, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts 10:43. The apostle Paul, who protested "he had not shunned to declare all the counsel of God," Acts 20:27; at the same time protests, "he says none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come," Acts 26:22. And certainly, the body itself should exactly agree with the picture, that was long before presented to the view of the ancient church, since it became the wisdom and goodness of God, to give such an exact description of the Messiah, with all his marks or characters, that he might be known by any thoughtful and attentive mind, and distinguished from all manner of impostors, who should impiously pretend to or counterfeit his name. But this subject has been, both formerly and lately, considered by the learned, and treated with such accuracy, that I have nothing to add. If any would have a compendious view of these things, he may consult the preface to the New Testament, drawn up with great judgment by our divines.

## CHAPTER VI: Of the Types

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

II. Their mystical signification points to Christ, in his person, states, offices, and works, and in his spiritual body, the church; for "Christ is the end of the law," Rom. 10:4. the body, or substance of the ceremonial shadows, Col. 2:17; and the centre of the prophecies, Acts 10:43. The doctrine of Christ is "the key of knowledge," Luke 11:42. without which nothing can be savingly understood in Moses and the prophets. As is apparent in the Pharisees of old, and the Socinians in our day; who being tainted with false notions concerning the Messiah, pollute, for the most part, all the testimonies concerning the common salvation, by their impure interpretations. It was very well said by the ingenious Bisterfeld, that "The Lord Jesus Christ was the spirit and soul of the whole, both of the Old and New Testament," *de Scripturæ eminentia*, § 40.

III. It is an unquestionable truth, that the Old Testament believers, especially those who were favoured with a fuller measure of the Spirit, applied themselves with peculiar diligence to find out the mystical meaning of the types; in which study they were very much assisted by the prophets and divinely inspired priests. Thus David declared, that "he had seen God in the sanctuary," Ps. 63:2 that is, that he had, by the figures of the Levitical service, searched by holy meditation into the very truth of the things. This made believers so cheerful in the acts of external worship, not that they were very much taken with those minute corporeal performances, but that "they beheld in them the beauty of Jehovah, and inquired in his temple," Ps. 27:4. They were not put off with mere shadows, but were "satisfied with the goodness of God's house, even of his holy temple;" and though it was but darkly, yet they heard him "speaking terrible things in righteousness," Ps. 65:4, 5.

IV. Though Christ and the apostles, in order to illustrate and prove the truth of the gospel, argued from the types by divine inspiration and the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit; yet they did not lay the stress of those arguments on their own bare authority, because they were inspired (for that authority was at times called in question, and upon supposing it, all reasoning would almost seem superfluous), but on the evident demonstration of the truth to the conscience, which plainly discovered to an attentive person that it was worthy of God to represent such a truth by such types.

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

VI. It is not only lawful, but the incumbent duty of teachers, even though not inspired, to tread in this very path, and to explain in the same method the types of the Old Testament. For we must not think, either that an infallible authority is necessary to explain the types, or that all the types of the Old Testament are explained in the New. Not the former, for why should an infallible authority be required in interpreting the types, rather than in interpreting the prophecies and other dark expressions in Scripture? Since it is manifest, that it was the will of God to instruct the church by types; and the explication of the types is now oftentimes far more easy, on account of the distinct knowledge of the antitype, than of many prophecies, which it is far more difficult to determine to what they refer. Not the latter, for why should we believe, that all the types of Christ were explained rather than all the prophecies concerning him? Especially as the apostle affirms, that he has not spoken particularly of them all, Heb. 9:5. We are therefore to maintain, that the inspired teachers have pointed out to us the way and method in which we ought to proceed in explaining the types, and given us a key to open those mysteries which are contained in them.

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

VIII. In every thing we are to proceed with caution, "fear and trembling," lest we devise mysteries out of our own imagination, and obstinately pervert to one purpose what belongs to another. We do injury to God and his Word, when we would have it owing to our fanciful inventions, that God seems to have spoke or done any thing wisely. However, though there is a measure in all things, I should think the mistake of him more tolerable who imagines he sees Christ, where perhaps he does not reveal himself, than of another who refuses to see him, where he presents himself with sufficient evidence. For the one is an indication of a soul that loves Christ, and is very much taken up with the thoughts of him, when the very least, or perhaps no occasion is given him; the other argues an indolent soul, and slow to believe—such as discovers

itself in the Socinians and in Grotius, in other respects a great man, who generally so pervert very many passages, that they make them appear to have no manner of regard to Christ.

IX. Whenever it is evident that any person or thing is a type of Christ, we are not to imagine that every circumstance in that person or thing is typical. For it may be that, in the same context, some things are peculiar only to the type, others only to the antitype, and others common to both; for instance, 2 Sam. 7. Solomon is proposed as a type of Christ. But it agrees to Solomon and not to Christ, "if he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men," ver. 14. To Christ, and not to Solomon in its full signification, "I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever," ver. 13. For the kingdom of Israel became extinct in the posterity of Solomon by the Babylonish captivity. And it is applicable to both, "he shall build an house for my name," ib. We may consider other instances in the same manner.

X. Sometimes it is sufficient that there be a very faint resemblance in the type of something most excellent, in a most eminent manner, in the antitype. Nay, the more noble and divine the thing signified is, the resemblance of it must of necessity be the more slender; because of the immense distance there is between Christ and the poor creature. For example: there being no mention in Scripture either of the beginning of the days or the end of Melchizedec's life, that was sufficient to prefigure the eternity of Christ. Heb. 7:3. And this, once for all, should be a fixed principle in our minds, that, when the same things are asserted both of the type and the antitype, they are, in more excellent manner, true in the latter than in the former, so that the truth of the thing, in its full import, is only to be found in the antitype. Thus we are to explain that of the apostle, Heb. 1:5. "To which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son—I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son;" when it is evident the same was said concerning Solomon, but in such a diminutive sense with respect to Solomon, that when his whole dignity, honour, and grandeur are compared with Christ, it is plainly of no avail; but it is true in Christ in such a large and extensive sense, that his dignity and honour exceeds that of all the angels, and cannot be communicated to any creature.

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

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



XIII. By a natural type, I understand the creation of this visible world, as Moses has given us the history of it, which was a type of the new creation of believers and of the constitution of the church. Hence the new man is said to be after God created, Eph. 4:24, and believers are said to be Θεου ποίημα, κτισθέντες εν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, God's workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works, Eph. 2:10. And the whole mystical body of Christ is called a new creature or creation, 2 Cor. 5:17. Nay the whole method of our restoration is expressed in phrases and similitudes, for the most part, taken from the first creation. Though Adam in his innocent state could have no thoughts of that, nothing having been made known to him, either concerning his fall or his recovery; yet God so wisely ordered his works in the first creation, that they might be, as it were, an exemplar of the second; and it is manifest to any attentive person, that they are so, which will evidently appear, by particularly comparing the one with the other.

XIV. The first creation of the world was out of nothing; so nothing was prepared for the second, no good, no virtue, no previous dispositions in the subject: yea, something indeed was in being, which had no place in the old, but that was only rebellion and enmity making vehement opposition to the almighty grace of God.—The first was performed at the command and will of God, the second in like manner. "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures," James. 1:18.—The rudiments of the first was an undigested mass. "The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep," Gen. 1:2. In like manner, all things lie in base confusion in the soul, when it is to be adorned by the new creation; and depraved lusts are violently agitated everywhere, without any order. Those things, which should possess the upper place, are depressed to the lowest. There is also a surprising emptiness of every thing that is good, Rom. 7:18. Neither are all things only surrounded with the gross darkness of ignorance, but the whole soul is nothing but darkness itself, Eph. 5:8. When God was pleased to adorn the world he had created, he began with the production of light, and he takes the same method in this other creation. "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," 2 Cor. 4:6.—After the light, God made the expanse or firmament, to divide the waters from the waters, or the waters under the firmament from those above it. He divided also the waters from the dry land. So also he brings every thing, by degrees, into order in our souls. He places reason, which was formerly depressed by the affections, on the chief throne, and commands the affections to stand at the footstool of reason; but then in such a manner, that the same Spirit which of old moved on the face of the waters, has the management of all here likewise.—When the dry land discovered itself from the waters, immediately flowers, herbs, and trees with their fruit, were produced: so after every thing is properly arranged in the new man, fruits meet for faith and repentance appear, and the church of God is "a paradise of pomegranates,"\* Cant. 4:13. When the "rain is over and gone, the flowers appear on the earth, the fig tree putteth forth her green figs, and the vines with the tender grape give a good smell," Cant. 2:11–13.—But as God was pleased to divide the huge mass of light into unequal parcels, in order to distinguish years and days in their seasons, and the more commodiously to cherish all things, by a certain proportion of light and heat: so he likewise dispenses his light in the church in different degrees. She has the stars of the prophecies twinkling in the midst of darkness; also the brighter day-star of the Gospel, the joyful harbinger of the perfect day, 2 Pet. 1:19: she is as the moon in the heavens of this universe, and the more abundant rays she receives from Jesus, who is her sun, the brighter she is, Cant. 6:10. Lastly, in proportion to the approach or removal of her sun, she enjoys the mystical revolutions of day and night, of summer and winter, Cant. 4:6.

and 2:11. While the heavens are spangled with so many stars, the inferior parts of the creation are replete with various creatures, the air with birds, the waters with fish, the earth with animals, as well reptiles; as with feet. In the same manner, the grace of the Spirit of God quickens the soul by his holy emotions; some souls seem to live, as it were, in the waters of pious tears; others again, suiting themselves to meaner attainments, creep on the ground others, like lions, hold on a steady pace; while others, in fine, like eagles, soar aloft, and waft themselves on nimble pinions above all heavens.

XV. But the creation of man, which succeeded the former, displays again new mysteries. The whole Trinity addressed themselves to this by mutual consultation, and manifest themselves in a singular manner in the work of the new creation. The Father from eternity laid the plan of that work in his Son. The Son, in our nature, purchased our transformation into the likeness of God. The Holy Spirit executes the counsel of the Father, and applies the merits of the Son to his chosen people, in that new creation. We are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus, Eph. 2:10, and born of the Spirit, Job 3:5.—In the first creation, man was adorned with the beautiful image of God, the same is restored to him in the second; at first, indeed, this image is soiled with some stains, however it cannot be lost, but shall gradually be perfected to the full likeness of God. While Adam was asleep, out of one of his ribs Eve was formed, whom he acknowledged to be flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone. The death-sleep of Christ gives life to his beloved spouse. This mystery of Adam and Eve is great, regarding Christ and the church, Eph. 5:32.—The first man had dominion given him over all things, which is restored to him far more gloriously by grace, 1 Cor. 3:22. And if perhaps this world, as being subject to vanity, might seem unworthy of his dominion, God has framed another for his sake, in which dwelleth righteousness, 2 Pet. 3:13.

XVI. When God had thus created all things for man, man for himself, and formed Eve for Adam while he was asleep, he then rested from all his work, and took pleasure in it as good, and adapted to display the glory of his perfections. In this manner God still proceeds in the work of grace, till his Eve, his church, shall be perfectly adorned for our heavenly Adam, and the whole body of the elect, gathered together into one: and then, having finished all his work, he will enter upon his most blessed rest, and most sweetly delight himself in the new world of glory. And as on that day, on which God rested, man, at the same time, entered into the rest of God; so, in this other rest of God, the church having happily gone through all her toils, shall for ever enjoy, in like manner, a most holy and delightful rest. This is that [Sabbatism] rest which remaineth for the people of God, that they may enter into God's rest, and cease from their works, as God did from his, Heb. 4:9, 10. And this shall suffice concerning the natural types.

XVII. Let us now illustrate two historical types, in the first age of the world. And we have Abel among the first, who was slain by his envious brother Cain, Gen. 4 1. Abel in Hebrew signifies vanity and emptiness; and he was called by that name, though he was a son dear to his parents, a servant dear to God, and indeed the first of all mankind, whom we read of that was honoured with the glory of heaven. Thus also Jesus, though he thought it not robbery to be equal with God, was to empty himself, upon assuming the nature of man, who is "like unto vanity," Ps. 62:9. Nay suffering himself to be treated like a worm, which is inferior to a man.\* 2. Abel was a shepherd: so the Messiah is that good shepherd by way of eminence, John 10:14. 3. The religious service of Abel was acceptable to God; and Christ does always those things that please him, John 8:29. 4.

Abel offered the choice of what he had to God, of the firstlings of his flock and of their fat. Christ, having nothing better, "through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God," Heb. 9:10. 5. God graciously looked upon Abel's offering: the offering of Christ was for a sweet-smelling savour to God, Eph. 5:2. 6. Cain, though a full brother, burnt with ungovernable envy against Abel. With the same fury the Jews were instigated against Christ, though they were his brethren on many accounts. 7. Cain conversed with Abel, with a design to entangle him in his words. How often did the Pharisees lay snares and traps for Christ, by their deceitful conferences? 8. Abel at last was slain by his brother, and, by a bloody death, cut off in the very flower of his age. Nor did the Jews cease, till they had cut off Christ by an accursed death, nailing him to the cross. 9. The parricide Cain was accursed and banished from the presence of the Lord. The deicide Jews are still under the same curse, being banished both from heaven and their native soil: and the blood of Christ which they shed, calls aloud for the vengeance which they, with mad fury, imprecated on themselves and their posterity; though, in other respects, the blood of Christ speaks better things than that of Abel, Heb. 12:24.

XVIII. As Abel typically represented Christ in his state of humiliation, so Enoch was a type of his glorification. 1. Enoch, חנוך signifies instructed,\* devoted, being one who was consecrated to God, and from his early years, instructed in the doctrine of godliness. Compare Prov. 22:6: "חנוך חנוך לנער train up, initiate, [instruct] a child in the way he should go," instil into him the first principles of heavenly wisdom. If ever any one, surely Christ was consecrated and devoted to God, and when he was scarce twelve years of age, he appeared as a doctor amidst the greatest doctors in Israel. 2. Enoch walked with God, that is, according to the apostle, Heb. 11:5, pleased God. This also Christ perfectly did, in whom the Father was well pleased. 3. Enoch prophesied of the glorious coming of the Lord with ten thousands of his saints, Jude ver. 14. Christ often and very expressly foretold this, and that even when he was charged with blasphemy, and stood before the tribunal, Matt. 26:64. 4. Enoch, after he had walked with God, and declared the counsel of God to the men of his generation, was taken up alive to heaven, in soul and body, without seeing death, Heb. 2:5 for he was not to conquer it for the salvation of others. But Christ having suffered death for the elect, and purged away our sins by himself, was made higher than the heavens, and sat down at the right hand of the majesty in the highest. 5. Enoch was the seventh from Adam; Christ the seventieth from Enoch, as appears from his genealogy in Luke. 6. Enoch was the third person that we read of, who departed this world: Christ the third of those† who ascended to heaven. 7. As in Abel we have an instance of a violent death, in Adam of a natural; so in Enoch, an example of that supernatural change, which those of the elect shall undergo, who shall be alive at the last day. 8. And lastly, God was pleased, before the law, to give the world in Enoch an instance of an ascension to heaven; under the law, in the person of Elias; under the Gospel, in Christ; to show that believers, in every period, become partakers of the same salvation.

XIX. Let us next, under the second period, explain two types of the same kind. The first is Noah, the second Isaac. Peter declares, 1 Peter 3:20, 21, that Noah, the Patriarch of the new world, the ark which he built, and the waters of the deluge, had all their mystical signification; where he teaches us, that baptism is the antitype of those things which happened under and by the direction of Noah. Antitype there denotes a type corresponding in the same signification to some other type. For order's sake, we will distinctly consider three things. 1. Noah himself. 2. The Ark. 3. The Deluge.

XX. As to Noah. 1st, His name signifies rest. And as that was not altogether expected in vain, so he could not bestow it fully and in a manner that was proper to answer the import of that name. But Christ freely bestows this on all those, who, being burdened with the load of sin, betake themselves to him; having calmed the storm of divine wrath that was hanging over our guilty heads, he brings his church amidst the storms and tempests of adversities to the wished-for haven of rest. 2dly, Noah was "a just man in his generation;" Christ was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners," knew no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; nay, he is Jehovah our righteousness. 3dly, Noah was a "preacher of righteousness;" Christ preached this much more distinctly, both that righteousness by which we must be justified before God, and that which we should endeavour after as a testimony of our gratitude. 4thly, Noah, in building the ark, prepared a safe retreat for his family against the impending waters of the deluge. Concerning Christ it is said, Isa. 32:2, "and a man shall be as an hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest." 5thly, Noah preserved his family, which consisted only of eight souls; Christ preserves the children whom God has given him; who, in comparison of the great number of those that perish, are but a little flock. 6thly, As Noah was the prince of the second world; so Christ is the head of that new world, which was formed by means of the ruin and destruction of the former. For, as whatever belonged to the former world was destroyed in the time of Noah; so whatever takes its rise from the first Adam ought to be abolished, in order to give place to the new creature, which is from Christ. 7thly, Noah offered to God a sacrifice of a sweet savour; Christ offers that sacrifice of a sweet smelling savour, by the virtue of which God is reconciled to the world. 8thly, After God had smelled a sweet savour from the sacrifice which Noah offered, he promised that he would no more destroy the world by a new deluge; but only collect that quantity of vapours in the air, which being beautifully painted with the solar rays, might form in the heavens the variegated rainbow. By the efficacy of the sacrifice which Christ offered, God was reconciled to his elect, and promised that he would never punish them in his anger, but only chastise them with slighter paternal stripes, amidst which the rays of his grace would shine.

XXI. The ark which Noah built, signified both Christ and the church of Christ. It was a type of Christ: for, 1st, As the ark secured all who entered into it from the descending rains, and from the waters of the great abyss, as they broke out from beneath; so Christ gives a secure refuge to all who fly to him, both against the wrath of God, which is revealed from heaven, and against the rage of their infernal enemies. 2dly, As it appeared ridiculous to the ungodly world, who were hardened to their own destruction, that the seeds of a new universe should be preserved in such an ark; so the glad tidings of salvation which we are to seek for only in Christ, are to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness. 3dly, As the ark had its just dimensions of length, breadth, and depth, and in a word, was so large as to be able to contain so many animals together with their food: so in like manner, there is in Jesus Christ that length, breadth, depth, and height of delightful love, which is abundantly sufficient for saving all the elect for ever. 4thly, That pitch, with which, according to God's appointment, the joints of the ark were pitched over, within and without, to prevent all ingress of the water, is called in Hebrew **בופר** cophir, which likewise signifies expiation, and a price of redemption. Was not this an elegant and correct representation of the expiation and redemption of Christ, to which alone we are indebted for our being secured from the deluge of divine vengeance?

XXII. But this same ark was also a figure of the church. 1st, As the ark contained all the hope of the second world; so in like manner, the church contains that assembly of the first-born, who are

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

XXIII. Again, the waters of the deluge have a reference both to Christ and the church. 1st, As the waters which descended from heaven and violently issued out from beneath, covered the ark and encompassed it on every side; so Christ was also to grapple with the wrath of his heavenly Father, with the bands of hell let loose upon him, and with the unrelenting cruelty of malicious men. In short, "the sorrows of death compassed him, and the floods of [Belial] ungodly men made him afraid," Ps. 18:4. 2dly, As those waters did indeed cover, but did not sink the ark; nay, the deeper they were, the more they lifted it up on high and brought it nearer to heaven; so Christ, in like manner, "was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit," 1 Peter. 3:18. And the more grievous his sufferings were, to the higher pitch of glory did God exalt him, Peter. 2:9. 3dly, As the waters of the deluge destroyed the world of the ungodly, but preserved the ark, 1 Pet. 3:20, which being lifted up on high, was placed above the tops of houses and turrets, against which it might be dashed, while in the mean time, all the devices and instruments of art were overthrown; so the afflictions, which are sent by God are indeed to consume the ungodly, and drive them headlong into hell; but appointed to purge and prepare the godly for salvation, that they may not perish with the world, 1 Cor. 11:32. 4thly, As the waters of the deluge, by drowning sinners, washed out the crimes of the old world, that the church being delivered from these notorious crimes, might with the greater purity serve God, (by which the same thing is set forth as by the water of baptism, 1 Peter 3:21); so by the blood and Spirit of Christ, our sins are washed away, the old man mortified, that the new man may with the greater alacrity be employed for God.

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

XXV. Omitting for the present the illustrious type of Melchizedek, which Paul has accurately explained, Heb. 7, we shall take a short view of the history of ISAAC, who was a type of Christ, 1st, In his person; 2dly, In his offering; 3dly, In his deliverance and the glorious consequence thereof.

XXVI. As to his person. 1st, He is called Isaac from laughing, because he was a son of joy and exultation to his parents, Gen. 21:6. But Christ is the joy of the whole world, and at his birth the angels proclaimed to the shepherds good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people, Luke 2:16. 2dly, Isaac was the "Son of the promise," being descended in a miraculous manner from Abraham, who was old, and from Sarah, who was barren and past bearing, by the alone efficacy of the word of God, whereby "he calls things that are not, as if they were," Rom. 4:17; so Christ, not according to the order of nature, nor by virtue of the general blessing, "Increase and multiply," but by the efficacy of a gracious promise, was born of a virgin mother by a strange and surprising miracle. 3dly, Isaac was the only son of Abraham, Gen. 22:2, by a lawful and free wife, and in whom "his seed was to be called," Gen. 21:12, though he likewise had Ishmael, and afterwards begat sons of Keturah; so Christ is the only-begotten Son of the Father, John 3:16, though he also has brethren, but of a far more inferior order and condition, Rom. 8:29. 4thly, Isaac was the head of Abraham's family, and, in his measure, that is, typically, the origin of the blessing. Christ is the head of God's family, "of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named," Eph. 3:15; and "in him we are blessed with all spiritual blessings," Eph. 1:3.

XXVII. In the offering of Isaac the analogy is in the following particulars:—1st, Abraham could not possibly have given a more illustrious instance of his love to God, than by offering to the death his son, his only son Isaac, whom he loved, in whom all his hopes were placed. Nor was it possible for God to give a more illustrious display of his love to men than by delivering up for them his beloved and only-begotten Son to the most dreadful tortures of many deaths in one, John 3:16. 2. It was an extraordinary instance of Isaac's obedience, to submit to his Father in such a dreadful case without a repining murmur. And who can, as it justly deserves, relate with what cheerfulness Christ obeyed his Father unto the death, even the death of the cross? Phil. 2:8. 3. As Isaac went out of his Father's house to the place which God had appointed; so Christ went out of Jerusalem in order to suffer without the gate, Heb. 13:11. 4. Isaac carried the wood; and Christ carried his cross. 5. Isaac's hands were tied; in like manner were Christ's. 6. Isaac was laid on the wood; and Christ was nailed to the cross. 7. Isaac was offered on Mount Moriah, which was either the same with or at least near to Calvary, where our Lord was crucified.

XXVIII. We are further to observe these coincidences in his deliverance. 1st, Isaac was already dead in his father's opinion, and Abraham received him from the dead in a figure, Heb. 11:19. So Christ, being truly dead, was restored to life. 2dly, Isaac was dead in his father's intention, from the moment he received the command to offer him up, until the third day, on which he was forbid to lay hands on the lad. On the third day also Christ arose. 3dly, When Isaac was restored to Abraham, he dwelt with his father, and became the parent of a numerous seed. So when Christ rose from the dead, he entered into his Father's house, and saw his seed, Isa. 53:10.

XXIX. When a ram was substituted for Isaac, who was otherwise to have been offered; by inverting the figure, Isaac represents the church, and the ram is a figure of Christ. 1. Isaac was, by the command of God, brought to be offered, which was near put in execution by Abraham.

Thus the severity of the divine judgment against sin was shadowed forth; whereby, unless the satisfaction of Christ had interposed, all mankind must have perished. 2. That ram was not of Abraham's fold, but was suddenly at hand, and got ready for that purpose, by a remarkable dispensation of divine providence. Thus also Christ was given by a peculiar gift of God to us, who could never have found, among any thing belonging to us, a sacrifice fit for an expiation. 3. That ram's being caught by the horns in the thicket, seems to be a representation of all those calamities in which Christ was involved through the whole course of his life; and why may we not here call to mind that crown of thorns which was put round his head? 4. Abraham did not see the ram before he was called upon by God. None sees Christ by faith but by the efficacy of the Gospel call. 5. After the ram was offered Isaac was set at liberty. Christ having died for the elect, they also shall live for ever.

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

XXXI. To the former relation belong the following particulars:—1st, His slow speech and stammering tongue, Exod. 4:10, signified, that the doctrine of the law is disagreeable and harsh to the sinful man (quite the reverse of the doctrine of grace, which Christ declares, whose mouth is therefore said to be "most sweet," Cant. 5:16), and can by no means justify him, but rather condemns him, that "every mouth may be stopped," Rom. 3:19. 2dly, That the people being forbidden to draw near to the holy mount, on pain of death, and their being secluded from familiar converse with God, while he himself alone was allowed a nearer approach to the Deity, represented, that his legal ministry could by no means unite sinners to God, but was rather an evidence of that separation which is between God and man. 3. When, being actuated by a holy zeal, he broke the tables of the covenant, and stirred up the treacherous Israelites to mutual slaughter, he actually showed that his ministry was the "ministration of death and condemnation," 2 Cor. 3:7, 9. 4. That his covering his face with a veil, when he was to speak to the children of Israel, was a figure that the glorious doctrine of grace was not a little obscured among a carnal people by the covering of his ceremonies; for being wholly intent on the veil, they did not penetrate into the glory that was concealed behind it. 5. Though among the many miracles he performed, a variety of judgments were indeed inflicted upon his enemies, by which they were destroyed, but not so much as one raised from the dead. Is not this a confirmation of what we just said, that the law is a "killing letter," 2 Cor. 3:6, in contradistinction to the "law of the Spirit of life, which is in Jesus Christ," Rom. 8:2. 6. and lastly, That he himself died in the wilderness, without being able to bring the people into the promised land, but was obliged to leave that work to Jesus (Joshua), the son of Nun. Is not this a plain proof that salvation is not of the law? It is only to be looked for from our Jesus, who is also the end of the law, which was published by Moses, and whom Moses recommended to the people to hear, preferably to Joshua.

XXXII. But as in that respect Moses was opposed to Christ, so in another he clearly prefigured him, both in his person and offices. As to his person: 1. The birth both of Moses and of Christ was rendered famous by the tyrannical slaughter of infants. 2. Both of them having undergone, immediately on their birth, a cruel persecution from their enemies, did not escape but by a

miracle of the singular providence of God. 3. Moses, when he might have enjoyed the pleasures of the Egyptian court, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to partake in the reproach of his brethren. In like manner, though Christ thought it no robbery to be equal with God, yet, veiling his majesty, he chose contempt and poverty, in order to honour and enrich his people, 4thly, Moses had not his equal among men for meekness, Numb. 12:3. So Christ left an example of the most perfect meekness to his people, Matt. 11:29. 5thly, When Moses came from conversing with God in the holy mount, he dazzled the eyes of the spectators with a kind of radiancy issuing from his face. Christ is the "brightness of the Father's glory," Heb. 1:3, "and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father," John 1:14. And when he was transfigured before his disciples, "his face did shine as the sun," Matt. 17:4.

XXXIII. Moses sustained a three-fold office. I. That of a Deliverer. II. Of a Mediator. III. Of a Prophet. In each he was a type of Christ. He is called λυτρώτης, a deliverer (redeemer), Acts 7:35. For, by the power of God, he delivered the people from Egyptian bondage, by destroying the first-born of Egypt, by preserving the Israelites by the blood of the paschal lamb, by enriching them with the spoils of their enemies, and, in fine, by drowning Pharaoh and all his host. In like manner, Christ redeems (delivers) his elect from the tyranny of the devil, overthrows all the power which opposes the liberty of his brethren, taking such a vengeance on his enemies as contains an express charge of guilt: with his own blood he sprinkles the hearts of the elect, and screens them from the destroying angel, brings into the church the glory and honour of the nations, Rev. 21:26; and in a word, having spoiled principalities and powers, he makes a show of them openly, triumphing over them, Col. 2:15.

XXXIV. Moses himself declares, that he was a mediator. Deut. 5:5: "I stood between Jehovah and you at that time;" and he acted as a mediator in a two-fold respect. 1. As the messenger of the covenant, proposing the commandments and promises of God to the people, and bringing the words of the people back to God, Exod. 19:7, 8, and in a solemn manner ratifying the covenant in the name of both parties, Exod. 24:8. 2. As interceding for the people with God, praying, that if divine justice could not otherwise be satisfied, himself might rather be blotted out of the book of God, and the people spared, Exod. 32:32. In all these things, he represents Christ, who in a far more excellent manner is the mediator between God and man: not only the angel of the covenant, and the messenger of the everlasting testament, but also the sponsor and surety of a better covenant than that of Moses, Heb. 7:22; not only in the name of God undertaking with men for their salvation, and all things appertaining thereto, but also in our name undertaking with God to cancel, by his death, all our debts, to the utmost farthing; and being admitted by God to the discharge of that office, he, by his death and intercession, became the procurer of an everlasting peace.

XXXV. Lastly, As Moses was the greatest Prophet of God's people, whose equal no age produced, Deut. 34:10; so Christ in this also was like to Moses, Deut. 18:28; nay, so much greater than Moses, as a Son is greater than a servant, and "he who hath builded the house than the house," Heb. 3:5, 3:6. More especially, First, Whereas God made himself known unto the other prophets in a vision or a dream, with Moses "he spoke mouth to mouth," and gave him to behold "the similitude of the Lord," Numb. 12:6, 7, 8. But who did ever more clearly see God than his only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, and was therefore only qualified to declare the Father unto us? John 1:18. Secondly, None of the prophets was so famous for



miracles and wonders as Moses. And yet Christ, by his miracles, struck every one with astonishment, and obliged even the most refractory Jews to confess, that nothing like or even equal to them was ever seen in Israel, Matt. 9:33. Thirdly, Moses made great alterations in the external polity or form of worship, and, at God's command, made many additions to it. Christ again, by the same will of God, having abrogated the former institutions, made the church appear in a more excellent form, and delivered those words which God had reserved to be spoken in the last days. Fourthly, "Moses was faithful in all the house of God, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after," Heb. 3:5, proposing all these things briefly and obscurely, which were to be spoken and taught though the whole house of God in every period of time. But Christ, with his apostles, spoke those things clearly, to which Moses bore witness as to things afterwards to be spoken, John 5:46, Acts 26:22.

XXXVI. To Moses let us join Aaron, whose typical relation we cannot here however explain without intermixing some things from the legal types. First, He being born before Moses, was sanctified, at God's command, to be the high priest of the people in things pertaining to God, Exod. 28:1, and 29:1; Heb. 5:1. In like manner Christ, the first-born among many brethren, and the only begotten Son of God, is the "high priest of our profession (Heb. 3:1, who glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him, thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee," Heb. 5:5. Secondly, When Aaron was to be installed in his office, he was anointed with the most fragrant oil, even with that which was appointed for the most sacred uses, Exod. 29:7. and 30:31, 32. This was so plentifully poured on his head, that it run down upon his beard, and to the skirts of his garments, Ps. 133:2. In like manner God anointed Christ "with the Holy Ghost and with power," Acts 10:38; "not by measure," John 3:34. and his gifts descend plentifully upon all his chosen people, 1 John 2:20. Whence "his name is as ointment poured forth," Cant. 1:3; but the elect only partake of it; for the profane world "receiveth not this Spirit," John 14:17.

XXXVII. Thirdly, Aaron was likewise clothed with holy garments. 1. He had a mitre of the finest linen upon his head, to which was fastened on a blue lace a plate of pure gold, having engraven upon it "Holiness to Jehovah," Exod. 28:36, 37: and by this was signified the most unspotted holiness of Christ, both as to his divine and human nature, Heb. 7:28, and likewise that Christ was the person who "bears the iniquity of the holy things," ver. 38, that is, expiates the sins with which our most holy actions are otherwise polluted. 2. He was also clothed with a blue robe, upon the hem of which were pomegranates and golden bells interchangeably, quite round, Exod. 28:31, 33. That represented the robe of righteousness with which Christ was himself clothed, and with which he clothes his people, Isa. 61:10, as also the most acceptable sound of the gospel, to be preached by him, whithersoever he should come, together with the most sweet and fragrant fruits thereof. 3. He also had on the ephod,\* or short cloak of most curious workmanship, on the shoulders of which were joined two onyx stones with the names of the children of Israel, Exod. 28:6, 9. By which was signified that his chosen people would be very dear to Christ our high priest; he was to carry them, as it were, on his shoulders into the heavenly sanctuary, Isa. 40:11; nay, and to carry them with care, as a precious stone, סגולה segullah, a peculiar treasure, and as his own inheritance. 4. There was likewise the holy breastplate of judgment, with twelve precious stones set therein, on each of which was a name of a tribe of Israel, Exod. 28:15, 17. Many are pleased to call this the "Urim and Thummim," Lev. 8:8. This signified that Christ is he, המשפט לו אשר "whose is the judgment," Ezek. 21:27, to whom "the

father hath given authority to execute judgment," John 5:27, with whom is the light of the most perfect wisdom, and the perfections of the most consummate holiness, and who bears his chosen people on his heart, and presents them by name, by his intercession with his Father. Nor has it without reason been observed by the learned, that, when under the New Testament we likewise read of twelve precious stones; the jasper, which had the last place in the Old, has the first in the New, Rev. 21:19, as if it was the band or connexion of both Testaments, intimating to us, that both have the same scope; namely, Christ, whose cherishing never-failing grace is elegantly represented by the greenness of the jasper. 5. and lastly, To omit other particulars, Aaron's ephod, which otherwise hung loose, was bound close with a girdle of gold, blue, &c., interwove with fine linen, in a most curious manner, ver. 8. Which signified with what alacrity and readiness, together with the most considerable prudence, Jesus undertook his office.

XXXVIII. 4thly. The authority of Aaron's priesthood was ratified by the miraculous buds, blossoms, and fruits of the rod which was cut from the almond-tree, which was the only one of all the other rods that suddenly budded, Numb. 17. That rod signifies Christ, who not only came forth out of the cut stem of Jesse, Isa. 11:1, but was also "cut off out of the land of the living," Isa. 53:8, yet budded again immediately after his death, and became a tree of life, having at the same time buds, blossoms, and fruit, yielding new fruit every month, Rev. 22:2. It also represents the perpetual fresh and flourishing efficacy of Christ's priesthood, who is a priest "after the power of an endless life," Heb. 7:16.

XXXIX. 5thly, Aaron, by the legal sacrifices, expiated the sins of the people, and by his prayers interceded for them, Numb. 16:43, especially on the solemn day of expiation, when, with the blood of the slain sacrifice, he entered into the holy of holies. So Christ in like manner "through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, entered not into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; nor with the blood of others, but with his own, he obtained eternal redemption," Heb. 9:14, 24, 25.

XL. These are a few instances, from among many, of the historical types, to which we shall subjoin two of the legal types from a great number of others. And in the first place, let us consider the mystery of the ark of the covenant, which is, as it were, the centre and compendium of all the ceremonies. The construction of this ark is described, Exod. 25:10. It was made of Shittim wood, or, as is generally thought, of the most excellent cedar. That wood, when made into the form of an ark, was overlaid within and without, with the purest gold. The ark had a crown or cornice of gold around it. Four rings of gold were put in the sides; and into these two staves made of cedar wood, but overlaid with gold, to carry the ark by, which were never to be taken out of the rings, even while it remained in its place. In the ark the tables of the testimony were put; but the covering mercy-seat of pure gold was placed above on the ark. And two cherubim of gold, made of one piece with the mercy-seat, covered it with their wings, having their faces so turned towards each other, as at the same time to look downwards to the mercy-seat. The figure of these cherubim is a matter of much dispute among writers. The description which Josephus gives of them is not amiss, Antiq. lib. iii. c. 6, when he says that they were "winged animals, resembling nothing that was ever seen by men." That they came the nearest to the shape of an ox, may be gathered from Ezek. 1:10, compared with Ezek. 10:14. For, in the latter place, what is called the face of a cherub, is in the former called the face of an ox. Further

כַּרְבּוּב, whence the name cherubim is derived, signifies in the Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic, to plough, for which oxen were formerly much employed. On the mercy-seat, between the two cherubim, was the throne of the divine majesty, from whence answers were given to the inquirers. The ordinary place of the ark was within the veil, in the holy of holies, Exod. 26:33; but in such a manner, that the ends of the staves were seen from the holy place, towards the front of the holy of holies, 1 Kings 8:8. While the tabernacle stood, the ark was taken out of it when the Israelites were to march, that it might search out a resting-place for them, Numb. 10:33, and be to them as the symbol of the divine presence, for their comfort, but a terror to their enemies, ver. 34, 35. But after it was once brought into the temple it was not taken from thence till that was destroyed, Ps. 132:13, 14; 2 Chron. 5:9. Now let us inquire into the meaning of all this.

XLI. This ark principally signified, or was a type of Christ. 1st, Its matter, being partly of wood and partly of gold, was proper to represent the two natures of Christ: the wood might denote his human nature, according to which he is "the fruit of the earth," Isa. 4:2. And it was incorrupted, free from all putrefaction, even when it was dead and laid in the grave, Ps. 16:10, agreeably to which Pliny ascribes "eternity to cedar," lib. xiii. c. 5. Gold was accounted a symbol of divinity, in respect of solidity, purity, brightness, and value; and so that represented the eternity, holiness, and glory of Christ; and, at the same time, showed us how valuable he ought to be in our eyes; even of such value, as that we should count all things else but loss and dung, in comparison of him, Phil. 3:8. But as the gold only was conspicuous, and not the wood which was within and without overlaid with gold, did not this signify that Christ was not then manifested in the flesh, but his manifestation, which had hitherto been wrapped up in the most precious promises of God, was reserved for a happier period? 2dly. The form of the ark, by which it was capable to contain a great treasure, denoted that Christ was the person, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, and of all manner of happiness; from whose fulness the elect may receive grace for grace. 3dly. The cornice or crown of gold which encompassed the ark seems to be a type of the crown and kingdom of Christ. 4thly. The tables of the covenant, which were put into the ark, signified, that Christ was to have the law of God in the midst of his bowels, or within his heart, and to fulfil all the righteousness of it for his chosen people.

XLII. 5thly. But the propitiatory covering, or the mercy-seat, in an especial manner, signified Christ, as taking away the guilt of our sins. For "God is in Christ reconciling the world to himself," 2 Cor. 5:19. Formerly that propitiatory or mercy-seat, being placed in the holy of holies of the tabernacle, or temple, behind the veil, was concealed from the eyes of all, because the expiation was not yet made: but God has now set forth Christ, exposed him before the eyes of all believers, and openly exhibited him to their view, as "a propitiation in his blood," Rom. 3:25. The mercy-seat being of pure gold, but laid upon the ark of wood, teacheth us what it was that added worth and value to the obedience and sufferings of the man Christ; namely, the infinite dignity of his God-head. The tables of the law were covered by the mercy-seat; which the men of Bethshemeth venturing to look into, when the cover was but a very little removed, brought a fearful destruction upon themselves, 1 Sam. 6:19. By Christ's propitiation all our sins are covered, Ps. 32:1; but should we venture to view the law without this, we should find nothing there but the sentence of eternal condemnation. On the mercy-seat God displayed the presence of his majesty, and from thence gave gracious answers to his people. In Christ a throne of grace is erected, to which every believer may approach with boldness. And be assured that, if he pray according to the will of God, he shall not pray in vain, but there "find grace to help in time of

need," Heb. 4:16. There God dwelt in the cloud, Lev. 16:2; amidst the darkness of which the rays of divine effulgence shone forth; which indwelling the Hebrew doctors have expressed by the famous term, שכינה, shechinah, and what else does this signify, but the fulness of the Godhead, that was to dwell bodily in the man Christ, and through Christ graciously in us? Col. 2:9. The Word was made flesh, and ἐσκήνωσεν, tabernacled, or dwelt, as in a tabernacle (observe the elegant allusion to the Hebrew word, shechinah), ἐν ἡμῖν in, among us, John 1:14.

XLIII. Sixthly, The cherubim over the propitiatory or mercy-seat, represented the holy angels, who descended upon Christ to minister unto him while in this world, John 1:51, and with myriads of whom he is now surrounded, while sitting on a throne of glory, Dan. 7:10. Isa. 6:2. Ps. 68:17. They were of the same piece with the mercy seat, because Christ, by his propitiation, has brought about a coalition of the elect, from among men, into one heavenly society with the angels. For by his means, "we are come unto the heavenly Jerusalem, and to myriads, an innumerable company of angels," Heb. 12:22. The cherubim viewed the ark with their faces downward, desiring to look into the mysteries of our redemption, 1 Pet. 1:12. They were two in number, with their faces towards each other, nevertheless each might also view the ark: this their position represented the duty of believers, both of the Old and New Testament, who, with eyes of a like precious faith and mutual love, view one another, but they jointly fix their eyes upon Christ, for the angels are often proposed to us as examples.

XLIV. I dare not affirm with some, that the cherubim were directly an emblem of believers, it being certain that by them in Scripture, angels are represented. God committed the guarding of paradise to the cherubim, Gen. 3:24. Riding upon a cherub he flies, Ps. 18:10; but I have not yet seen any Scripture-testimony, to prove that believers are called cherubim. The only one produced, with any show of probability, is that from, Rev. 5:8–10, where it is thought that the same song is ascribed to the four living creatures, which are the cherubim, together with the four and twenty elders, in which they proclaim their being redeemed by the blood of the lamb, out of every kindred; which is not true of angels but of believers. But I answer: 1st, If, by the four living creatures, believers are here to be understood, I could wish it were shown, why these living creatures are generally placed before the four and twenty elders, who are the patriarchs and predecessors of the universal church; nay, and who lead and go before them in their sacred songs, as may be seen, Rev. 4:9, 10. As every reason would persuade, that the patriarchs of the universal church should have the precedency before the promiscuous assembly in celebrating the divine praises. Also, how the church of believers should introduce John, to the vision and knowledge of things to come, which certainly knew nothing about them but by means of John; and yet they are said to have done this, Rev. 6:1, 3, 5, 7. Certainly, angels, and not men, usually perform that office to the prophets. 2dly. The former clause of ver. 8, namely, the four living creatures, and the four and twenty elders fell down before the lamb, is affirmed of both conjointly. But we need not understand what follows, "having every one of them harps," &c. ver. 9. "and they sung a new song," &c. of any other but the four and twenty elders. I will not now say, with a very learned person, that this appears from the Greek construction; because, as ἔχοντες ἕκαστος, having every one, is of the masculine gender, it cannot be referred to ζῶα, living creatures, which is neuter; for I know that is of little weight: but I shall confirm this exposition by some passages altogether similar, Neh. 13:1, 2, it is said: "Therein was found written, that the Ammonite and the Moabite should not come into the congregation of God for ever: because they met not the children of Israel with bread and with water, but hired Balaam

against them," &c. The first thing asserted, viz. that they met not Israel, is common both to the Moabites and Ammonites; but the latter, about hiring Balaam, is applicable only to the Moabites, as appears from, Numb. 22:3. In like manner, Jer. 21:7. "I will deliver Zedekiah king of Judah, and his servants, and the people, &c. into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, &c. who shall smite them with the edge of the sword." What is said in the former clause, about delivering Zedekiah, and his servants, and the people, into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, is true of all: but what is afterwards added, who will smite them with the edge of the sword, must be understood of the servants and people of Zedekiah, not of himself, who died a natural death, Jer. 52:11. So in like manner, here it is true, that both the living creatures and the elders fell down before Christ, whom angels, as well as men, adore. But the harps, and vials full of odours, and the song, belong to the elders, not to the living creatures.\* At least it cannot be proved from this place. But let us return to the ark.

XLV. The staves, which were put into four rings of gold for carrying the ark, signified, that Christ with all his grace and glory should be, as it were, carried by the preaching of the Gospel to the four quarters of the world. The faithful preachers of the Gospel may justly be called *χριστοφόροι*, bearers† of Christ. These staves were never to be taken out of the rings, even while the ark rested, after it was set up in its place. The sound of the gospel has never been altogether suppressed; and no country can be assured, that Christ with his Gospel may not depart from it. The place in which the ark rested, was the holy of holies within the veil. The place of Christ's rest is in the sanctuary not made with hands, Heb. 9:24, after he entered into that within the veil, Heb. 6:19, 20. But the ends of the staves being seen in the holy place, signified that though Christ indeed is in heaven out of the reach of our bodily eyes; yet he reveals himself to the eyes of our faith, by a manifestation of his manifold grace. That, during the standing of the tabernacle, the ark was carried sometimes to one place, and sometimes to another, but was not removed from the temple, till the destruction of it, might signify to believers that Christ should afterwards come forth, from the sanctuary of the divine decrees and promises, and so from heaven itself, and while he passed through the country of Israel, was seen sometimes in one place, and sometimes in another, but after he was again received into heaven, he should continue there until the time, "in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat," 2 Pet. 3:10. "Whom the heaven must receive, until the times of the restitution of all things," Acts 3:21.

XLVI. It was not without a display of divine wisdom, that there was to be a time when the ark was not in the house of God; namely, under the second temple, as Jeremiah foretold should happen: "They shall say no more, the ark of the covenant of Jehovah: neither shall it come to mind," Jer. 3:16. For by this they might be admonished to expect another, and indeed, a far more noble habitation for God; another mercy-seat, far more excellent, to which the former was commanded to give place, as the shadow to the body. However, it is not without a mystery, that John saw again the temple of God opened in heaven, and that there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament, Rev. 11:19. And that, at the time, in which the kingdoms of the world were become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ, ver. 15. John saw these things in heaven, because heaven was the place where he was favoured with these visions, Rev. 4:1. Not that every thing he saw was to be in heaven. For surely that war, which he describes, Rev. 12:7, 8, was not to be there, but in the church on earth. But what did he now see? The temple opened. This, if I mistake not, signifies a free, open, and unobstructed entrance for all into the church of Christ,

into which the nations of the world, or as Paul speaks, Rom. 11:25, the fulness of the Gentiles had come in; and whose doors now stood open even for the Jews, against whom they had been shut for a great while. In that temple, he sees again the ark, which was a symbol of the covenant formerly entered into with the Jews: by which is signified a new habitation for Christ among the Jewish nation, not by an external symbol, but by internal and spiritual grace; and as they shall enjoy this, they will readily and with gladness be without an external symbol. See what Jonas le Buy, whom Bochart, Hieroz, lib. iii. c. 9, calls an excellent person, and highly skilled in those matters, has wrote on this place.

XLVII. Near the ark was laid up the pot of manna, and Aaron's rod, which budded, Numb. 17:3, 5. to represent the incredible and permanent sweetness of that spiritual food, which Christ bestows on his people, and which himself prefers, on so many accounts, to the manna, given by Moses, John 6:48, &c. and which, by an evident allusion to what was contained in this pot, is called the hidden manna, Rev. 2:17. And, at the same time, to show the perpetual verdure and eternal efficacy of Christ's priesthood, by virtue of which our buds also may come to blow, and humble shrubs may emit balsam. So much shall suffice concerning the ark of the covenant.

XLVIII. Let us now consider the things which the high priest was to perform on the solemn day of expiation, in order to give another instance of a legal type, the ceremonies of which are described, Lev. 16. Aaron was to put on the linen garments appropriated for that day, and only during those ministrations which were to be performed within the second veil, ver. 4. And after he was ordered to make an atonement for himself and his house by offering a young bullock, he was commanded to take from the congregation of the children of Israel, two kids of the goats for a sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering, ver. 5. These kids were to be procured at the common expense of all, out of the treasury appointed for defraying the charges of the sacrifices, and other things necessary for the worship of God. Both, as one offering, belonged to one sacrifice for sin. Both were an expiatory sacrifice, bearing their sin, in the room of sinful Israel. These goats were to be presented to God before Jehovah, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; they were sacred to God and devoted to his worship, ver. 7. Lots were to be cast upon both; one lot for Jehovah, and the other for Azazel,\* ver. 8: this, according to the Jews, was done in this manner. The High Priest stood before the goats between the Sagan, or the Priest next the High Priest, and the head or chief person of the principal family; then out of a box he drew the lots, which were at first of wood; and under the second temple, of gold: on one these was inscribed, for Jehovah, on the other, for Azazel: the lot drawn out with the right hand, was put on the head of the goat, opposite to that hand; and that drawn with the left, placed on the head of that opposite to the left. See Ainsworth and Altingius. That which fell to Jehovah, was to be prepared for a sin-offering; which was directly done, not by killing immediately, but by declaration. For, the lot being laid upon it, the High Priest called it the sin for the Lord, that is, appointed to be a sacrifice for sin; and he offered it, that is, put it in the place of slaughter at the north side of the altar. But that which fell to Azazel, was again presented alive before Jehovah, to make an atonement over it, by confession and imposition of sins, ver. 9, 10. Then that which was Jehovah's was to be killed for the sins of the people, and its blood carried within the veil, with which blood the High Priest was to sprinkle both the mercy-seat, and the place before the mercy-seat. Thus an atonement was to be made for the holy place, and for the tabernacle of the congregation, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, ver. 15, 16. Then again the live goat, which by lot fell to Azazel, was to be brought forth: and the High Priest laid both his

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

XLIX. And first, it is indeed very obscure, what we are to understand by עזאזל Azazel: I have chiefly met with four opinions of the learned concerning this word. The first is, that by Azazel we are to understand the very goat which was sent forth into the wilderness. And they suppose this may be gathered from the etymology of the word, which is said to be compounded of עז, a goat, and אזל, went away. And according to them, the words of Moses are thus to be understood. One lot for Jehovah, that is, for the goat to be offered to Jehovah; the other for Azazel, that is for the goat that was to go into the wilderness. But though the Hebrew word may signify a goat going away, yet it cannot thence be concluded that by that name the goat itself was signified: as it is possible, that, on occasion of the goat's going away, the place to which it was led might be so called, which Kimchi in Radicibus contends for: "that place was so called," says he, "because the goat went thither." But the main thing is, that this explication of the lots is very perplexed: whereas the words of Moses are clear, that the lots were cast for the goats, to know which of them should fall to Jehovah, and which to Azazel. Nor does it appear that one of the goats could be called Azazel, unless we suppose the other goat was called Jehovah, which is absurd.

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

LI. The third opinion is of those, who contend that Azazel is the devil: and they will have one of the goats to have fallen to the devil, not as if it were offered to the devil, (for it was devoted to God, and brought before him to the tabernacle) but that, at the will of God, it was exposed to be tormented by the devil. This sentiment is supported by such arguments as these. 1st. It is the

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

Α σοι χόρηγεῖ σὸς πατήρ Σατάν αἰὶ,

Δι' ἀγγελικῆς δυνάμεως Αζαζήλ ποιεῖν.

Hæc tu ille Satanæ fretus auxilio Patrio

Azazelique mira designas ope.

"Which thy Father Satan ever enables thee to perform by the angelic power of Azazel." These verses are cited by Epiphanius, Hæres. 34:11. The etymology favours this. For אֲשֶׁר עָזַע עֲוָזָל is אֲשֶׁר עָזַע, the goat which went away; that is, the creature which kept not its first estate, but revolted from God. Elsewhere in scripture the devils are called שְׁעִירִים, goats, as Lev. 17:7, 2 Chron. 11:15. Kimchi, in his Lexicon, gives the reason of it: "They are called goats," says he, "because they appear in the shape of goats to their votaries." Maimonides in more Nebochim, lib. iii. cap. 46, speaks much to the same purpose. To this may be referred the ancient mythology concerning Pan, Faunus and the Satyrs, who were likewise called goats. Since then devils have indisputably been called goats elsewhere, why may not the devil here likewise be emblematically signified by Azazel, that is, "the goat, which went away?" Or as Ben Nachman speaks, "the prince who rules in desert places?"

LII. The fourth opinion is that of Bochart, who, though he owns he can advance nothing certain on the head, yet offers his conjecture, which is thus: the Arabic verb azala signifies to remove and separate. Which he proves by many instances. And he thinks that Azazel is derived from that, and signifies separation and secession. The goat, therefore, whose lot is to Azazel, to secession, was that which by lot was appointed for retreat, in order to be led into a separate place of the wilderness, which, ver. 22, is called נִזְרָה אֶרֶץ "a land cut off or separated."

LIII. But leaving every one to judge for himself, the third opinion pleases me not a little, because it seems to rest on the firmest grounds, and gives us a discovery of a great mystery: and I scarce see what can be objected to it, unless this one thing, which Bochart advances: namely, that עָזַע and אֲזָל agree not in gender, the former being feminine, the latter masculine; and therefore, says he, the word could not be made up of both. But that reason is of no great weight: for, 1st. In compound names, grammatical analogy is not always regarded: for instance, in the word שְׁמוּאֵל, which at full should be שְׁאוּלמֵאֵל, asked of God, the letters א and ו and ל are struck out, and מ is joined with אֵל by a Shurec, whereas analogically it ought to be joined by a tzere. Instances to this purpose are numerous. 2dly. A change of genders is common among the Hebrews. We have a similar instance in Gen. 30:38, הַצֶּבֶן זִיחַמְנָה in the feminine; and ver. 39, הַצֶּבֶן וִיחַמוֹ, in the masculine. Buxtorf has collected a great many examples to this purpose in his syntax. 3dly. Though עָזַע be feminine in signification, yet it is masculine in termination, as also the plural עֲזָיִם; and therefore it is no wonder it be joined with a word of a masculine termination; which is also done, Lev. 22:27, יְהוּהָ יוֹלֵד נִי עָז, where a double masculine is joined to the word עָז. But neither is Spenser's observation to be overlooked, that עֲוָזָל may be explained by the strong one going



away. For עז, signifies strong. And as the true God is said, Ps. 24:8, to be ונבור עזו, "strong and mighty;" so also the devil was called Azizos by the Phenicians; and in the Gospel, Luke 11:21, "the strong man."

LIV. Secondly, it is worth inquiring, what might be signified by Aaron's laying his hands on the head of the goat: which was not done here only, but also upon other occasions, Lev. 1:4, Lev. 3:2, and Lev. 4:4; and Herodotus says this was likewise in use among the Egyptians, lib. ii. chap. 39. See Outram de Sacrif. lib. i. cap. 15, § 18; and chap. 22, §. 5, seq. Bochart, if I mistake not, has given us the best explication of the reasons of this. 1st. The offerer, by this rite, delivered up the victim to God, and as it were manumitted or released it, professing he gave up all the right he had in that animal, exempted it from his own dominion, and devoted it to the service of God. Just as the Romans formerly held in their hand the slave they were to set at liberty, uttering these words, "I will that this man be free". 2dly. By this very ceremony, the sinner deprecated the wrath of God, and prayed that it might fall on the head of that victim which he put in his own stead. By this ceremony, therefore, the sins of all Israel were laid on this goat, in order typically to bear them, and carry them away far from Israel.

LV. Thirdly, let us inquire, what is גזרה ארץ, the land of excision, or separation, into which that goat was to be carried. I do not think that any particular place was precisely signified: for it is not credible, when the sacred services were performed at Jerusalem, that the goat was carried to the same place, to which it was carried, when Aaron performed that ceremony for the first time in the wilderness. In general, therefore, it signifies a place remote from the resort of men; צריא אחר, a desolate place, says Jonathan; יתבא לא ארץ, an uninhabited land, according to Onkelos. The Greeks call it γῆν ἀβατον, wayless or inaccessible. Abarbanel explains it a land of the decree, meaning that country concerning which a decree was made, that the captive Israelites should be sent away thither.

LVI. Fourthly, we may inquire who is that עתי איש fit man, who was to carry away the goat? We meet with the Hebrew word עתי nowhere else. The Greeks render it ἐτοίμος, ready. עת certainly signifies time, the same that the Chaldee זמן. Hence they inferred, that עתי with the Hebrews, is the same with the זמין of the Chaldees, ready, furnished. It would not be improperly rendered Καίριος or ἔσκαιρος, seasonable, opportune. Abarbanel will have it to be עתו ברמנו גדול איש, "a man of great dignity in his age and time," at least in the application of the type. Whatever there may be in this it is very plain that God appointed no particular order of men for this office. The Rabbins tell us that any one was fit for it, if he were appointed by the High Priest; and that formerly scarce any but a stranger was employed in this service.

LVII. Lastly, we are to inquire what became of that goat at last. The Jewish doctors have a constant tradition, that the priest fastened a piece of scarlet cloth in the shape of a tongue, weighing two shekels, to the head of the scape-goat, which the conductor of the goat, when he was come to the place appointed, divided in two, and fastening one part to the rock, to which he had driven the goat, and the other to the horns of the goat, he pushed the goat down from behind, which falling head-long, was crushed to pieces before it reached half way down the precipice, But Jonathan insists, it was pushed down by some divine power. Moreover, if this scarlet tongue turned white, which they say was generally the case, they looked upon that as a happy omen; and thence conjectured their sins were forgiven; according to that, Isa. 1:18: "Though your sins be as

scarlet, they shall be as white as snow." But these things are either false, or doubtless uncertain, which borders upon falsehood. Others, therefore, are of opinion that it was let loose in the wilderness, to feed where it listed: and Bochart proves, that both the ancient Greeks and Romans had animals consecrated to God, which were called ἄφρατα ζῶα, animals let loose; and the words of the text favour this, ver. 22: "and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness."

LVIII. Let us now search into the mystical meaning of all this. That solemn day represents to us Christ's death, resurrection, and ascension into heaven; and principally, our reconciliation with God, in virtue of his satisfaction and intercession. Aaron, we see, performed those sacred rites in linen garments, of less value indeed, yet white and very pure. This was to represent Christ's humiliation, which was never lower than when he was most engaged in making atonement for our sins; and likewise showed his most holy purity, unstained with the spot of the least sin. In this respect our Lord is certainly greater than Aaron, and all the other High-Priests; because he stood in no need of offering for his own sins, for he had no sins on account of which an offering was necessary, Heb. 7:26, 27. When the Israelites saw Aaron first offering for his own sins, they might thence easily conclude the weakness and unprofitableness of that earthly priesthood. For what real good could that priest do the people, who, by a solemn expiation, publicly declared, that he himself, together with the people, was in the number of the guilty? But our Lord Jesus, having no occasion to offer for himself, gave himself, as it is evident, out of pure love for his people.

LIX. Christ, who is frequently in other places called the lamb, is represented here by the emblem of a goat. For as on account of his meekness, patience, and holiness, he merits to be called the lamb; so on account of our sins, for which, as surety, he undertook, and of his coming in the likeness of sinful flesh, Rom. 8:3, he is typified by the symbol of a vile and wanton goat. That goat was given to Aaron by the people; Christ was given to men by God: yet what he offered, namely, his human nature, he took from men, being raised up by God "from the midst of his brethren," Deut. 18:15. Christ was bought with thirty pieces of silver, which were taken from the treasury, in order, it seems, to be an expiation for the whole people. Both the goats were presented to the Lord at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation. Christ willingly presented himself to God, saying, "Lo! I come; I delight to do thy will, O my God," Ps. 40:7, 8; and his offering was made in the view of the whole church, and at the instigation of those who were the principal men of the tabernacle. The goat, which by lot fell to Jehovah, was slain. But as divine providence alone undoubtedly orders the disposal of the lot, Prov. 16:33, so Christ also was delivered to death by the "determinate counsel of God," Acts 2:23, Acts 4:28. The slain goat was burnt in the sacred fire: Christ, in like manner, was scorched and burnt, both by the fire of the divine wrath, kindled against our sins, for which he undertook to suffer, and by the flames of his own love for us, and of his zeal for the glory of God. The burning of the flesh and skin of this goat was performed without the camp: Christ also suffered without the gate; and we are likewise to go out to him without the camp, bearing his reproach, Heb. 13:11, 12, 13; namely, we are courageously to bear it, if, for the sake of Christ, we are exposed to lose the advantages of this world. Thus Christ's humiliation was typified by this goat.

LX. But let us also take a view of a type of his exaltation. Aaron entered into the sanctuary with the blood of the goat, which was given by and for the people. Christ having made an offering for our sins, entered into heaven, and "sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High," Heb. 1:3.

Aaron entered within the veil with the censer and incense. Christ ascended into heaven, "to appear and intercede there in the presence of God for us," Heb. 9:24. And there was no entrance possible for Aaron without the blood of the expiatory sacrifice; neither did Christ enter into the holy place without blood; blood, I say, not of goats or bulls, but his own, whereby he obtained eternal redemption for us, Heb. 9:12. Nor is there any other way by which we can enter into the sanctuary, but by the blood of Christ, whereby he hath consecrated for us a new and living way thereto, Heb. 10:19, 20. The veil, which gave way to the priest, who was to represent the atonement made, returned to its former place and use, when he went out again; because an expiation was made for sin, not in reality, but in figure only, Heb. 10:4. But when Christ was to enter into the heavenly sanctuary, the veil not only yielded to him for a time, but was rent by the hand of God, Matt. 27:50, 51, he having obtained a redemption of eternal efficacy and value. The blood of the goat was to be sprinkled on and before the mercy-seat; and so that blood remained in the holy of holies. Christ appears always in heaven with his blood, which is the "blood of sprinkling speaking better things than that of Abel," Heb. 12:24. Hence it is that John saw before the throne "a lamb standing, as if it had been slain, Rev. 5:6. For though Christ was once dead and liveth for evermore, Rev. 1:18, yet he is represented in heaven as slain, on account of the virtue and efficacy of his death, which is ever fresh. Nor is the intercession of Christ any thing else but a continual representation of his merits and death before his Father. But that an expiation was to be made by blood for the holy place itself, and for the tabernacle of the congregation, signifies, that God's indwelling in the sinner man cannot be in a holy manner, without the sacrifice and blood of Christ; and that heaven itself would be polluted, if, which is impossible, sinners were to be admitted there without an expiation. Thus Paul affirms, Heb. 9:23, "The heavenly things are purified with better sacrifices." Not that there is any impurity in heaven, but that it is not consistent with the divine holiness to admit sinners unexpiated by the blood of Christ into the communion or participation of his glory, nor for him to dwell in them. These things concerning the first goat are sufficiently evident.

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

LXII. The former speak to this purpose: Whereas the sending the goat away into the wilderness was done after the purification of the tabernacle, and it did not fall into the Lord by lot; so the disobedient people, and not the mediator of the testament, seems to be set forth by the banished goat. For the wicked are called goats, Matt. 25:33. They controverted Christ's right of access to God. The determination between both was made by a divine lot. Christ, by his blood, was introduced into the heavenly sanctuary; over the others hung that curse in Deut. 29:21: "And Jehovah shall separate him unto evil out of all the tribes of Israel." Are not also the Jews sent away and dispersed among the nations? They are given up to Azazel, or, according to the ancient rabbins, they are fallen as a portion to Sammael (for the serpent may eat the dust, Gen. 3:14.) In a word, they are given up to the power of the devil. "And how justly the vessels of wrath are said

to bear the sins of the faithful people is evident. For though there is no procuring cause of justification in them, yet in them the severity of God is seen; thus all the blood shed from the beginning of the world, and so every sin, at any time committed, is avenged. For they who refuse to confess their own sins, in order to submit to the justice of God, make the sins of all others their own." What is said of the goat to be sent away, namely, its being "to be presented before the Lord to make an atonement," signifies, that they also, as sanctified in the root, "are presented to God by Christ the Priest," that even from them may arise a "holy seed." Isa. 6:13, and children of the promise. In a word, that the time shall come when all Israel shall be saved, and at last be expiated by Christ the Priest, Rom. 11:26, 27.

LXIII. It always did and still does appear strange to me, after the closest and most solicitous meditation, that learned men could seriously give in to such idle imaginations; than which I apprehend nothing could be spoken more foreign to the mystery of this ceremony; because it is altogether inconsistent with the end and sacred intention of this day. For who can think it probable, that, on the solemn day of propitiation, which was set apart for making an atonement for all the sins of the whole people, the rejection of the same people should be so solemnly inculcated by an anniversary symbol? The whole people fast, afflict their souls, confess their sins, pray for the forgiveness of them: the High-Priest is wholly taken up in procuring an expiation: God promises to "the whole congregation of Israel, Ye shall be cleansed from all your sins before Jehovah." Can we believe, that, at the same time, and by the very same sacred rites, the High-Priest and the believers among the people, should be commanded to lay their sins by direful ceremonies on the goat, representing the far greatest part of their brethren according to the flesh, in order to be punished in them, by a most severe instance of a divine curse; the like to which was never afterwards seen among men. I allow, that the punishment of the rebellious Israelites was foretold in awful prophecies; nor would I deny that there were some Mosaic institutions which prefigured that punishment. But at that time when the typical expiation of all Israel from all their sins was to be procured by those rites, it appears to me of all things the most improbable, that, at the same time, and by the very same ceremonies, the dreadful curse of God for the sins of all, which could not be separated from the imposition of sin, was represented as resting on the greatest part of Israel, and that according to the imprecation of the expiating Priest, and of believers who prayed for expiation. I know, it is said, that "the godly, who were mixed with the ungodly among this people, might have the consolation of beholding, on this day, a sign or token of their happier lot beyond the disobedient." But none, I imagine, will deny, that even this consideration must have yielded the greatest grief, which would have been an exceeding damp to the joy they had conceived for the pardon of their sins; and that the pious would rather intercede in behalf of the perishing, than lay their own sins upon them with an imprecation. Certainly, Jesus himself deplored, with bitter tears, the impending destruction of the abandoned city. And Paul calls not only his conscience, but also Christ and the Holy Spirit to witness, that he had great grief and continual anguish of heart, whenever he reflected on the deplorable state of his brethren, according to the flesh; and was so far from wishing to make them a curse for himself, by the imposition of his sins, that he rather wished himself separated from Christ to become a curse for them, Rom. 9:1, 2, 3.

LXIV. Moreover, as the interpretation we are now examining, is foreign to the end and intention of that day, so almost all the ceremonies that were then used, strongly dissuade us from it. 1st, Aaron was commanded to receive both goats from the congregation of the children of Israel, and

that for sin, that is, to expiate and take away sin, ver. 5. "But the goat, which was given by the people, shows that what was from them is offered for them;" as these learned men themselves speak very justly. If that be true of the one goat, why may it not be said of the other, even that it represented its being from the people, in order to take away sin? For so far both are on a level. Both being from the people, both bought at the common expence, both of them for sin; thus far there was no distinction in the types. What can then constrain us to imagine, there was so great difference in the signification? Is it consonant to reason, that what was appointed to represent their eternal curse, was bought at their expense, that is, with their consent and approbation? And was the rebellious nation of the Jews given to the rest for sin, that in this respect, they might be joined together with the Lord Christ? Be it far, says the learned person, they should thus be joined along with Christ, "for whose honour we are too much concerned, to speak so impertinently." We are thankful to God, that he speaks so far piously. But he denies, that one of the goats was taken for sin. He says, "that is asserted of both which is true only of one. Before the lot distinguished them, that could be affirmed collectively of both, which after the lot was to be the case only of one." But I think, we are by no means to depart from the plain meaning of the words; nor to understand only of one, what is affirmed of both. Though we are to understand with some difference, what the following words of the law intimate, namely, both goats were for sin, which the law expressly affirms; yet with this difference, the one was sin, because it was slain for sin; the other, because by bearing the sins of the people it took them away. To sum up all in a word, the whole of this sacred expiation consisted of two parts; first, the slaying the one goat, whose blood was shed to expiate the sins of the people; and then the sending away the other goat, which took away the sins which were laid upon it, by virtue of the sacrifice just offered. Both therefore concurred in their place and order to the solemn atonement.

LXV. 2dly, Aaron was commanded to present both before Jehovah, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, ver. 7. By which both were declared to be equally devoted to God. Without all controversy Aaron is here a figure of Christ as priest; the goat to be slain signified Christ as the sacrifice. For he presented himself to God, when "he went up to Jerusalem, that all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man might be accomplished," Luke 18:31. But how did our High Priest, when he was about to make an atonement, at the same time present before God the rebellious Jews, who were to be given up to the devil? To say that they were presented before God, so far as they were sanctified in the root, and were to be the fathers of the sons of the promise, is quite from the purpose. For, the rebellious Jews consigned to the devil, are to be wholly distinguished from the holy root, from which those degenerate branches took their rise, and from the children of the promise who were to descend from them, in their appointed time. These certainly the priest daily presented to God in the names of the twelve tribes, which he wore on his breast; the very same he also now presented to God, though without that symbol. But it cannot be explained, how the high priest when making atonement, could present those to God, if by this goat they were represented as the portion of the serpent.

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

figure, or to the thing represented. That it cannot to the thing represented is plain; for the Israelites neither ought, nor could have any doubt, which should fall to the devil, Christ, or the rebellious Jews, so there was no need to make a trial of it by lot. What pious ears would not be offended to hear any person assert, that the high-priest, at the command of God, cast lots between Christ and the rebellious Jews, whether he or they should be offered to the Lord? I imagine none will contend with me on this point. Though the wicked Jews had a controversy with Christ concerning the priesthood, yet it was not proper for that to be decided by lot, but, as was really done, by a demonstration from the Sacred Writings. It therefore follows, that the casting of lots here regarded the goats themselves, since it was unknown what each of them was to prefigure. Moreover, as both were purchased at the common expense for the benefit of the whole people of Israel, and consecrated to the service of God, neither the one nor the other seems adapted symbolically to represent those who were to be given up to the devil. For, though the goat fell by lot to Azazel, yet it ceased not to be the Lord's. The very learned Frismuthus speaks to the purpose, *de hirco Emissar. Dissert. ii. § 14*: "We must not think that the former goat alone was consecrated to God; for as both were usually presented before him, it is evident that the goat on which the lot fell for Azazel was also the Lord's, as even R. Nachman has granted. But that the one on which the lot fell for the Lord, did peculiarly and by special right become the Lord's, was because it was slain upon the altar. Such a sacrifice offered in honour of God is called, in the Hebrew phraseology, the bread of God, (Lev. 21:6.) Which appellation could not be given to the other that was to be sent to Azazel, it being appointed to be separated from the flock, and carried to remote places to be exposed, perhaps, to the teeth of wild beasts." The goat therefore, which is, and in the whole ceremony remains, consecrated to God, seems not adapted to be allotted for a symbol of those, who, on all accounts, were to be the slaves of the devil.

LXVII. 4thly, A strong argument may be taken likewise from the imposition of the hands of the priest, and of the sins of Israel, with those prayers of the high-priest and applause of the people, we mentioned sect. *xlvi. which are very easily applied to Christ, when he bore, according to his own and his Father's will, and the wishes of all the godly, the sins of the whole mystical Israel. And if any thing was to be represented to the Jews on the day of expiation, certainly this was the thing which is the alone foundation of a true expiation. But with great difficulty, nay, indeed in my judgment, on no account can that which is signified in the sacred ceremonies, by the imposition of hands and of sins, be referred to the rebellious Jews, whom the faithful Israelites never constituted to stand in their room and stead. Do they, the most abandoned of mankind, "who please not God, and are contrary to all men," 1 Thess. 2:15, bear the iniquities of all Israel, laid upon them by the priest, into an uninhabited land, carrying them far away from Israel? Why do we yield so much to that most pestilent sect the Socinians, as to try to overturn an argument for the satisfaction of Christ, hitherto happily defended from this rite, by this extravagant fiction.*

LXVIII. In fine, who can digest so hard a saying? "It appears, how justly the vessels of wrath may be said to bear the sins of the faithful." Which of the prophets or apostles ever said so? Is this to speak with the Scriptures? Who has to this day ever heard, that "those make all the sins of all men their own, who refuse to confess their own? or, that "all the sins ever committed are avenged on the rebellious Jews?" This is an imputation of sin, altogether new and unknown in the schools of divines. Certainly, our modesty forbids us to dispute against that right of God, whereby he punishes the sins of parents in their children and posterity, which he himself, such is his clemency, usually confines to the third and fourth generation of those that hate him. Nor is it

lawful for us to deny, that the severity of God's anger may at times burn to a farther degree, if the sins are above measure atrocious; and posterity shall, for a long series, not only equal, but even exceed their ancestors in wickedness. God was pleased to give us an example of this in the wicked Jews, according to that threatening prophecy of Christ, Matt. 23:35, Luke 11:50: "So that from this instance his wrath might be seen, burning from the beginning of the world against hypocrites, enemies of righteousness, and murderers;" as the learned person very well speaks elsewhere. But, that "all the sins of all men are punished in some one person or people," I do not remember that I ever read or heard till now; neither that "the wicked bear the sins of the faithful." I know that when God, in his pathetic language, Isa. 43:3, 4, commends his love towards Israel, he declares, that he gave the Egyptians, Ethiopians, and Sabeans for their ransom, and other men and people for their life. But, as our Calvin judiciously observes, the prophet borrowed that way of speaking from the common method of men, as if he had said, "the Egyptians, Ethiopians, and Sabeans, have been substituted for thee, and, as it were, by way of exchange, forced to undergo that destruction which was hanging over thee; for that I might save thee, I have destroyed them; and turned against them the power of the enemy, that was ready to fall upon thee." Or, to return to the learned person's own words: "the meaning of that passage is; such is my esteem for thee, that I am to bring to nought the greatest and most flourishing empires of the world in order to relieve and comfort thee." This certainly is quite different from bearing the sins of the faithful, as was typically done by the goat.

LXIX. It is with joy we learn from Paul, that the time will come when all Israel shall be saved, after the fulness of the Gentiles is come in. But we think, this cannot be inferred from these words, "the scape-goat shall be presented alive before Jehovah עליו לכפר, to make an atonement with it." The learned persons themselves teach us that על sometimes signifies an instrument, as Gen. 27:40, Deut. 13:3. And why not here? That the meaning should be, to make an atonement with or by it. We shall presently show how this was done by the live goat.

LXX. Others therefore, and, if I can form any judgment, to better purpose affirm, that this scape-goat, no less than that which was killed, was a type of Christ. But these again run into different sentiments. Some maintain, that here are represented the two natures of Christ; the human to be exposed to misery and torment; the other the divine, as being impassible, to remain free and to live for ever; which Cornelius a Lapide relates, was the opinion of Theodoret, Hesychius, and Cyril. Others say, that the twofold state of Christ, before and after his resurrection, was here set forth. Thus the slain goat was the type of Christ, lifted upon the cross; but that sent away alive, of the same Christ raised from the dead, and living for evermore. Of this opinion, after Augustine and Procopius, were Bochart and other celebrated divines. Yet two things seem very much to oppose this sentiment: 1st, That the sins of Israel were laid upon the live goat; but Christ rose from the dead, and entered into glory "without sin," Heb. 9:28. 2dly, That the same goat, as loaded with sin, was accounted unclean, so that the person who conveyed it into the wilderness stood in need of cleansing, ver. 26. But no uncleanness can so much as be conceived to be in Christ after his resurrection.

LXXI. Others, therefore, to whom I readily yield, imagine that a twofold relation of Christ the mediator is signified; the one to God the judge, to whom satisfaction was to be made by the merit of his death; the other to the devil his enemy, with whom he was to encounter by the efficacy of his life. With respect to the former, the goat to be slain, fell to God: in the latter respect, the live

goat, fell to Azazel. Let us add, that, in the slain goat, a true expiation of sin was represented, which is performed by shedding of blood and undergoing punishment; but in the other, the effect of this expiation, namely, the removing and taking away of sin by the bearing it away so far as never to come into the sight of God against us. And this seems to be the reason of the order, why, after slaying the former goat, sins were laid on the other to be carried a great way off. Because there could be no taking away of sin without shedding of blood. Both, indeed, were done in the ordinary sacrifices: but because the latter was not so evident in the other sacrifices, God was pleased to set it forth by a peculiar symbol in this solemn festival, for the greater consolation of his people. And thus the riches of the divine goodness and wisdom manifestly appear, when he laid before the eyes of his people, by different types, all the relations of Christ the redeemer, which could not be distinctly exhibited in one single piece or picture.

LXXII. But let us more distinctly illustrate the analogy. 1st, The sins of Israel were laid on this goat that he might bear them. Christ truly bears, and by bearing takes away the sins of the whole world. And as Aaron laid both his hands on the head of the goat, so the hand of God lay very heavy and grievous on our surety. 2dly, This goat was appointed by lot for Azazel: not that this brute creature, which was consecrated to God, might be offered to the evil spirit, but exposed to be tormented by the devil, who very much resides in solitary places, Matt. 12:43. Now the first promise shows, that Christ also, by the divine will, was to be given up to the serpent, who deceived Eve; Gen. 3:15, "thou shalt bruise his heel." And Christ himself says, John 14:30, 31, "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me, but that the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do." That is, "the devil, indeed, has no right in me, who am perfectly holy, nor, as I am holy, can he ever prevail against me; yet he is come out to combat with me, to vex and even to slay me, because I have interposed in the room of those who deserve death. But I go out cheerfully to meet him; to the end my obedience and love to my Father may appear to all the world." 3dly, The goat was to be sent to a wilderness, and a land not inhabited; and such was the whole world, such, above all, was Judea, when Christ came to suffer there. Scarce any harvest of faith, truth, and piety was to be found there; nothing but unfruitfulness; every where the thistle and prickly thorn arose. And why may we not apply to this what Matthew relates concerning Christ, when he was carried by the Spirit into the wilderness, there to be tempted by the devil? Matt. 4:1. For the wilderness, into which the goat was driven, could not less typify the wilderness in which Christ was tempted, than the wood on which the serpent was raised typified the wood on which Christ was lifted up. 4thly, The hand of a fit man, by which the goat was sent away (which, by a constant tradition of the Jews, might be done as well by a stranger as by an Israelite), seems to denote the power of those who rose up against Christ, namely, "the Gentiles and people of Israel," Acts. 4:27; and above all, Pilate, who had caused Christ to be carried without the gate, loaded with the cross, the symbol of a curse, when he was to encounter with the devil for the last time.

LXXIII. I acknowledge I have learned these things partly from Turretin,\* partly from Cocceius himself; the former explains this opinion in a large discourse, and with cogency and success defends the argument deduced from it, for the satisfaction of Christ against the Socinians, de Verit. Satisfact. Christi, p. 3. §. 22, 23. But the words of the latter, in Comment. ad Heb. c. ix. §. 25, seq., as far at least as they are to our purpose, very well deserve to be inserted here. He says, "It is evident, from Ezek. 20:35, that Christ was to come to Israel, when Israel was, as it were, in the wilderness, but that was, when Judea was a Roman province, and had a Roman governor; for



then it was a part of the wilderness of the people. And it is plain enough that, by the dragon, Rev. 12, is represented the Roman people. He made himself ready to devour Christ as soon as he was born. Moreover, the first promise declares, Gen. 3:17, 'That Christ was to be given up into the hands of the devil, who deceived Eve, under the appearance of a serpent. The Jews ascribe this to Sammael.' As, therefore, the slaying of the one goat represents the death of Christ, and the shedding of his blood: 'So the sending away of the other goat into a place uncultivated and desert, denotes the delivering of Christ into the hands of the devil, who has the power of death, in order to vex and disquiet him; and that by the hands of sinners, and of such men to whom the land was subject, like the rest of the wilderness of the people, and a part thereof. That this was done by the appointment and will of God, Christ himself declares,' John 14:30, 31. As if he should say, the prince of this world, who has nothing in me, is come to exercise his cruelty upon me; which will happen to the end, that my obedience may appear to the world. We have, therefore, a figure of a twofold delivering up of Christ. First, of that by which he delivered up himself, as Priest. Secondly, of that by which he was given up into the hands of sinners, or the Gentiles." Thus far Cocceius. To the like purpose, the very learned Momma, *Æconom. Temp. t. i. lib. 2. c. 11. §. 36, seq.* Where after explaining the same opinion with neatness and elegance, and proving it from Scripture, he then subjoins: "We might rest contented with these things, and proceed to others." Let, therefore, none be offended, that being satisfied with these things, which exhibit a doctrine sound and certain, I pass over other things, in which I find neither that soundness nor that certainty.

LXXIV. Very lately were published the *Varia Sacra* of the very famous John Van der Waeyen, in which are two dissertations concerning the goat Azazel; the former of which is principally levelled at me. But I would neither have my reader, nor the illustrious author ignorant, how much I have profited by the perusal of that dissertation. By it I was really brought under a kind of necessity, to consider more accurately the whole of this subject; which I have also endeavoured to do with a mind so free from, and divested of all prejudices, as if I had never written any thing on the point before. Nor do I conceal, that from thence I had an opportunity to explain some things more clearly, others also more distinctly, and to set a keener edge on my arguments than I had done in the former editions of this book. On that account, therefore, if he will accept of it, I return him my thanks. But then he must suffer me to say, that I have not found reasons cogent enough in his dissertation to render his opinion more probable, or mine less so. While he opposes my sentiment, and seems to charge it with many inconveniencies, he opposes what Dr. Cocceius himself has dexterously explained, and confirmed by Scripture testimonies, and, as far as I know, never condemned or disapproved, though he superadded another opinion. But I could never yet think it probable, that one and the same ceremony should signify things so very remote from one another. As for my particular, I leave the entire decision of this controversy with the equitable reader; who, if he is not wiser than us both, may profit by our writings. But as to the manner in which the illustrious person manages the dispute, I imagine I have very weighty grounds of complaint. Whoever happens to enter the lists with him, contends, indeed, on unequal terms. While he thinks he may say what he will against others, he gives no quarter to any expression of his opponent, if it has but the least appearance of harshness in it; and assuming to himself what is the prerogative of God alone, canvasses not only the heart and inmost principles of the thoughts, but also boldly pronounces what sentence upon them he thinks proper. Indeed, I should appear ridiculous, was I seriously to ward off from myself the grudge conceived against Cocceius, as the origin and the cause of this dissention. Every page in my book shows my esteem for that

celebrated person. And though I cannot assent to him in every particular with an implicit faith, yet I never once dreamed of charging him with heresy: much less in this controversy, where the dispute is not so much about a doctrinal point, as about the mystical signification of some Mosaic institutions, without any detriment to our common faith. In which kind of subjects, if I may not be allowed by John Van der Waeyen the liberty to dissent, in what, pray, shall I be allowed it? But I will suffer no mortal ever to deprive me of this liberty. But, good sir, whenever I am to dispute, I desire my method of writing may be as different from yours as possible. While your language breathes nothing but harshness, mine shall be all mildness. As in this dispute I have struck out every word that had but the least tendency to harshness, and substituted softer. And let this suffice, by way of specimen, concerning the types.

## CHAPTER VII: Of the Sacraments of Grace down to Abraham

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

II. And these again were, indeed, very different; consisting either in things natural, on which God inscribed that character in order to be vouchers and seals of his testaments. To which Calvin refers Noah's ark, Instit. lib. iv. c. 14. §. 18. Or in things miraculous, such as the manna which was rained down from heaven, and the water issuing out of the rock, which constituted the miraculous meat and drink of the Israelites in the wilderness; or in certain ceremonies and sacred rites instituted by God to represent spiritual things. Some were also extraordinary, in favour of some certain persons, and but of a short continuance. Others, ordinary, given for the use of the whole church, and not to cease but with that particular economy of the covenant. And hence it is, that in reckoning up the sacraments of the Old Testament, divines are not agreed; for some take the term in a larger extent, and others in a more restricted sense. We are not inclined to confine ourselves within too narrow bounds, but shall freely and calmly consider, according to our capacity, what has any relation to a sacrament, in every period of time.

III. Some would have the first sacrament of the covenant of grace to be the ejection of man out of paradise, and blocking up his access to the tree of life, lest he should put forth his hand and eat of it, thinking that he should thereby obtain eternal life. For man, being deprived of this sacrament of works, was, at the same time, given to know, that righteousness was to be sought for from another covenant; and thus he was led by the hand from the covenant of works to the covenant of grace. But we cannot be satisfied with these things. 1st, Because man's ejection out of paradise, and exclusion from the tree of life, were the effects of the divine wrath and vengeance against his sin, as appears from that truly holy, but stinging irony: "Behold the man is become as one of us." But the institution of a sacrament is an act of the highest goodness and mercy. We deny not, that man was already received into favour, and had the hope of eternal life: nevertheless, some things were inflicted upon him because of his transgression, that he might, by his loss, experience the direful nature of sin, and God's hatred of it. Among these was this ignominious ejection out of paradise. It was an instance of grace and favour, that God placed him in paradise immediately upon his creation, but of wrath that he turned him out when he had sinned. 2dly, This ejection doubtless declared, that man could not now obtain salvation by the covenant of works, and that he who was deprived of the thing signified was unworthy to use and enjoy the sign; and that it was in vain, and to no purpose for him to please himself with the thoughts of it. But it by no means showed that there was another covenant by which righteousness could either be sought for or obtained. Adam was to know, and he did know this elsewhere. 3dly, Every thing, upon the supposition of the promise of the covenant of grace, that,

by convincing man of his own impotency, leads him to that covenant, is not to be esteemed a sacrament of it. For then every demonstration of God's wrath from heaven against sinners, and every sign which is proper to give us an intimation of the curse of the covenant of works; in a word, every chastisement, as all these are appointed to bring the elect to Christ, should be called sacraments of the covenant of grace.

IV. According to my judgment, the learned have much more probably ranged them in this manner: that God first of all dealt with fallen Adam about sacraments, that is, when the aprons of fig-leaves, which man sewed together, were not at all sufficient to cover the shame of his nakedness, he himself clothed Adam and his wife with coats of skins, Gen. 3:21. And it is very probable, these were the skins of those beasts which were slain for sacrifices. But it is a vain controversy, which some make about the matter of those garments; since the Hebrew word עור, is never used in Scripture to signify any thing but the outward skin of animals. And as this is the most simple and plain, so it is the most ancient kind of clothing. See Job 31:20, Prov. 27:26. Hence the ancient heroes among the Greeks were clothed with the skins of a wild boar, or a tiger, or a lion, or the skin of the Lybean bear, or the skin worn by the Bacchæ, or female priests of Bacchus, which was that of a fox. And who now is ignorant, that the progenitors of the Romans were clothed with skins, and were of a rude disposition of mind. See Vossius de Idololatria, lib. iii. cap. 70. It is a curious observation of Mr. Cloppenburg Schola Sacrificiorum, p. 12. Here we may see the original of that law in Lev. 7:8, by which the skin of any man's burnt offering is appropriated to the priest who offers it. And who will deny, that God's clothing our first parents was a symbolical act? Do not Christ's own words very clearly allude to this, Rev. 3:18, "I counsel thee, to buy of me white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear." Compare Joh. Henrici Ursini Analecta. lib. vi. chap. 15.

V. The mystical similitude of these things is this: 1st, As that clothing, which man contrived for himself, could not cover him, so as to appear before the eyes of God, in like manner, nothing that a sinner can work or toil by his own industry, or wisdom falsely so called, can produce any thing that can procure him a just and well grounded confidence, by which he may appear before the tribunal of God. "Their webs, which are spiders' webs, shall not become garments, neither shall they cover themselves with their works," Isa. 59:5, 6. 2dly, Proper garments for men were the gift of God's mercy, and so that righteousness, by which our sins are covered, is of God, Phil. 3:9, contrived by God, perfected by Christ, who is God, and applied to us by the Spirit of God through faith. 3dly, The bodies of our first parents were covered with the spoils of mortality and the skins of slain animals. The garment of grace, whereby the body of sin is covered, is owing to the very death of Christ, without which that righteousness, which makes us acceptable to God, could not have been performed. 4thly, That simple clothing of the first man was, in its appointed time, to be changed for one more convenient and fine. And this garment, which we have from God, while we are under the cross and partakers of the death of Christ, and which in external appearance is mean and despicable, shall afterwards be changed, For since we shall be partakers of Christ's resurrection, no longer in hope but in reality so the garment, which now appears to be mean and contemptible, shall be then most neat and beautiful, and worthy to be accounted the nuptial robe. See Peter Martyr and Musculus.

VI. The other sacrament of that first period were the sacrifices, which were slain at God's command, after the very first promulgation of the covenant of grace, as appears, 1st, Because

"Abel offered by faith," Heb. 11:4. That is, he knew that himself and his sacrifice were acceptable to God, and in his offering he looked by faith to the future offering of the Messiah. But such a faith plainly presupposes the divine institution of sacrifices, and a revelation about their signification. 2dly, Because God gave that testimony to the sacrifices of the ancient Patriarchs, whereby he declared that they were acceptable to him, *ibid.* But in the matters of religion, nothing pleases him but what himself has commanded. All will worship is condemned, Col. 2:23. 3dly, Because there was a distinction between clean and unclean animals before the deluge, which was not from nature, but from the mere good pleasure of God, and has a particular respect to sacrifices. And it is probable that this was the case with every kind of sacrifices, even with those that were of a propitiatory nature, by which the promises of the covenant of grace were more clearly and distinctly ratified, than by all the others. For while Moses shows, that the Patriarchs offered such sacrifices, as he himself offered, and that they were adapted to signify the same things, it is not for us to restrict what is said in general, to certain particular kinds, in exclusion of others. Certainly, Job offered עֹלוֹת, burnt offerings, for the sins of his children and friends, Job 1:6, and Job 42:8, which doubtless were propitiatory.

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

VIII. The Priests were, in a manner, typical sureties, in so far as they approached to God in the name of the people; being "ordained for men in things pertaining to God," Heb. 5:1. And they became sureties, whenever they took upon them to offer sacrifices for sin. For, by that offering, they performed what God, at that time, required for the expiation of sins, Lev. 1:4, and 4:26, &c., and 16:34. And thus believers were assured, that Christ is the surety of an eternal testament; who, immediately on man's first sin, undertook to fulfil the whole will of God at the appointed time, and to offer a sacrifice, which should be the cause not of a typical, as formerly, but of a true and saving expiation. By which will of God and of Christ "we are sanctified," Heb. 10:10.

IX. In the animal which is offered, we should consider, 1st, That it was to be clean, without spot or blemish; that it might signify that most unspotted purity of Christ, "as of a lamb without blemish and without spot," 1 Pet. 1:19. 2dly, That it was to be such as was given to man for food, by the use of which food man continues to be what he is. And therefore such an animal might be substituted for man himself, and, in the typical signification, be a sponsor, partaking of the same flesh and blood with us. 3dly, That it was to be such as men set a great value upon: "The goats are the price of the field," Prov. 27:26. Of old, flocks and herds were the only or principal riches. Accordingly, Columella, in *Prefat. lib. vii.*, conjectures that the names pecunia, money, and

peculium, private property, seem to be derived from pecus, a beast, which not only the ancients possessed, but are, at this day among some nations, reputed the only kind of riches. By this was represented that Christ was to be offered for men; and as he is the choice and beloved of his Father, and his blood infinitely more precious than gold and silver, so he should also be most precious to us, who believe, 1 Pet. 2:4, 6, 7. 4thly, That it be an animal, dumb before its shearer and slayer, in order to be an hieroglyphic of that unspeakable patience which was illustrious in Christ. 5thly, That the firstlings were most acceptable to God, which therefore Abel offered, and God afterwards required under the law, Exod. 13:12. By this emblem we may discern that preeminence of Christ, whereby he is the first-born among many brethren, both as to inheritance and dignity. For none comes to the inheritance but by Christ, nor to any other inheritance but what was his before.

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

XI. The accension, or miraculous consuming the sacrifices by fire, seems to be cotemporary with sacrifices themselves; and the opinion of some excellent divines is very probable, that God had such a regard to Abel's gift, as in this manner to set it on fire; while Cain's was neglected. For at the time when sacrifices were in use, God generally testified, by fire from heaven, that they were acceptable to him, when offered in faith. "A burning lamp passed between the pieces," Gen. 1:5, 17. See also Lev. 9:24; Judg. 6:21; 2 Chron. 7:1. And this burning of the sacrifices by fire from heaven, being the most certain token of the divine acceptance, was prayed for, Ps. 20:3. "remember all thy offerings," ידשנה ועולתך "and accept (reduce to ashes) thy burnt-sacrifice." This fire from heaven signified the Holy Spirit, by whose flames whatever is not set on fire cannot be an acceptable sacrifice to God; and by which Christ also offered himself to God without spot; by which, in fine, he baptizes his people, that both they and their actions may be pleasing to God. We may see what John the Baptist says: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," Matt. 3:11. For this burning of the sacrifices we are now speaking of, was, in all respects, a typical baptism of fire, that came suddenly from heaven, after the other typical baptism of water, wherein the hands and feet of those who approached the altar were washed, Exod. 40:30, 31, 32, as Cloppenburg has ingeniously observed, Schol. Sacrific. p. 65.

XII. When the sacrifice was duly performed, the expiation followed, which consisted in this, that God was satisfied with the sacrifice, which he graciously accepted, and that, when the guilt of the sin laid on the sacrifice, was, together with the sacrifice, typically abolished, the wrath of God was appeased, the raging plague stayed, and God gave tokens of his favour to the sinner. For this reason the atonement for the soul is ascribed to the sacrifices, Lev. 17:11; namely, a typically and sacramentally. See what we advanced, sec. 8. Sacramentally, I say, because that typical expiation was a sacrament or sign of the true expiation, which all believers obtain in Christ. And those types prefigured that God, from the very first notification of the gospel, acquiesced in Christ's undertaking to make satisfaction for sins, in the fulness of time, by which they might be truly expiated. And in this sense Paul declares that the blood of Christ purges the conscience from dead works; as the blood of bulls and of goats sanctified formerly to the purifying of the flesh, Heb. 9:12, 13. For this last prefigured and sealed the former on supposition of the faith of the offerers.

XIII. There was, last of all, a sacred feast kept before Jehovah, upon the offered gifts and sacrifices, which were not entirely consumed by fire; this, under the Mosaic law, was the case especially with those sacrifices, which were called שלמים, peace-offerings, Lev. 7:15. Which word the Greeks have rendered εἰρηνικὰ: the Latins, pacifica; others prefer Ευχαριστικά. But confession, תודה, or thanksgiving, is one of the kinds of this sort of sacrifices, Lev. 7:12, and these were also propitiatory; as appears from the imposition of hands, which denotes the imposition of sins, Lev. 3:2, 8, 13. And therefore it has not been improperly observed by a learned person, that the reason and notation of the name seems to be, that in this sacrifice there was in some measure a perfection, a consummation. For burnt-offerings were entirely consumed, and no body eat of them: of the others the priest eat; of the last, even any private person, whose sacrifice it was, Deut. 12:6, 7. To which the apostle has an eye, 1 Cor. 10:18: "Are not they, which eat of the sacrifices, partakers of the altar?" This was a sacrament of the communion, which they who approach to God have with the altar and the true priest; and a symbol of that communion which all believers have among themselves in Christ, whereby Christ and all his benefits, and all the gifts of every believer in particular, are the gifts of all, as belonging to the same body. Paul intimates that to this feast the Holy Supper answers, as an antitype, 1 Cor. 10:16, 17, 18. In this manner the grace of God and the benefits of Christ were signified and sealed to believers in the sacrifices.

XIV. But there was in them no less a reminding of the duty, which believers owe to God, and to which they bound themselves by the use of the sacrifices. First, There was in sacrifices a confession of sin and guilt. For there were no sacrifices before the fall. And the animals, which the offerers substituted for themselves, as oxen, sheep, goats, &c., signified some fault. For the ox is an emblem of ignorance, Isa. 1:3. the sheep, of wandering, Isa. 53:6; the goat, of petulance and mischievousness, Mat. 25:33. And the slaying and burning the sacrifices extorted from man a confession that he deserved eternal death, and to be scorched in the flames of divine justice.

XV. Secondly, There was likewise in sacrifices an excitement to the practice of holiness and real goodness. 1st, It was not lawful to offer any thing to God but from among clean animals, which were given to man for food. Thus, "pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to keep himself unspotted from the world," Jam. 1:27. 2dly, Nothing was to offered but what was sound, without blemish or defect in any part, not the blind, the deaf, the maimed, the lame, the

languid, and the sick, Mal. 1:13. Thus, which will also be a thing acceptable to God, we ought to serve him with all our faculties, with all attention and intention, with a right judgment, a sound heart, a cheerful will, and to, consecrate all our members to him: because God requires perfection, Mat. 5:48. 3dly, The animals, appointed for sacrifice, had something peculiarly adapted to represent those virtues, which ought to be in those, that approach to God. Oxen are both patient in labour and obstinately resist what is hurtful to them: sheep and goats know their shepherd, and hear his voice, without listening to that of a stranger, John 10:4, 6. Polybius, lib. 12, not far from the beginning, relates a remarkable story concerning goats, with respect to this particular. And then they are Led to the slaughter, without a murmur or noise, Isa. 53:7. All these things should in a spiritual sense be in those, who are devoted to God.

XVI. Thirdly, By the offering of the sacrifice is signified, 1st, That our old man with all his lusts should be slain to the honour of God. 2dly, That it is equal and just that the man, who endeavours to please God, should present himself before him in the exercise of faith and love, and with his heart inflamed, or a desire to have it inflamed with zeal, as "a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God," Rom. 12:1. 3dly, As sacrifices consumed with strange fire were displeasing to God, so is every act of worship, that has not the Spirit of God for its author, or does not proceed from heavenly love. They who kindle a fire, and compass themselves about with sparks, shall go into the fire, and the sparks they have kindled, Isa. 50:11. "Though one should give his body to be burned, and has not charity, it profiteth nothing," 1 Cor. 13:3. 4thly, That we ought to consecrate to God not only ourselves, but also our all: for, as we hinted above, riches formerly consisted chiefly in herds and flocks, and Paul tells us, that the "doing good and communicating are sacrifices, with which God is well pleased," Heb. 13:10. 5thly, That our very lives ought not to be dear to us; but when God calls us to it, we are willingly to lay them down for his glory, Phil. 2:17. "Yea, and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all."

XVII. We are next to speak of the rainbow, which was given for a sign of the covenant made with Noah, Gen. 9:12–16. And here we are, 1st, to consider what covenant it was; and then, how the rainbow was a sign of the covenant.

XVIII. Concerning the covenant, we observe the following things: 1st, That it was not formally and precisely the covenant of grace. For here there is no mention of a spiritual and saving benefit; and then the promises of this covenant are not only made to Noah and his elect seed, but to all men, to every living creature without exception, fowl, cattle, and every beast of the earth; an universality this not to be found in the covenant of grace. God indeed says, when he speaks of the covenant of grace made with the church, Isa. 54:9: "For this is as the waters of Noah unto me," &c.: nevertheless by these words God does not declare that the covenant made with the church was, in every respect, of the same nature with that universal covenant which secured the world from being destroyed by a deluge. He only runs the parallel between both, with respect to permanency and stability: just in the same manner that he compares his covenant made with Israel with the covenant concerning day and night, Jer. 33:25.

XIX. 2dly. However, it would not be consistent with the divine perfections, to make such a covenant with every living creature, but on supposition of a covenant of grace, and with a respect to it. For, all the patience of God, in the preservation of the world which was stained with so



many crimes, and of men who more than deserved an avenging deluge, was ordained for the elect, whose salvation God intended, and for whose sake all other things are preserved, to be subservient to the promoting their salvation, 2 Pet. 3:9. It is a question, says Pareus, whether it is a different covenant from the former in Gen. 6:18, and from the covenant of grace? Answer: "Certainly it is another with respect to the earthly promise which is common to men, beasts, and the earth, and as to its peculiar sign. Yet the same as to origin and grace; for God would not have adopted the sons of Noah into that covenant, unless he had first received them into the covenant of grace. It is therefore an appendage of the covenant of grace with regard to an earthly promise."

XX. 3dly. Nay, in this covenant there is a confirmation and a typical representation of the covenant of grace. I shall here use the words of Peter Martyr. "This we are carefully to remark, though in this covenant God promised to deliver men, as to their bodily life, that they should not perish in the waters; yet in this there was a shadow or type of the deliverance from eternal death; namely, they should not be overwhelmed with eternal damnation. And besides, as this is held forth by a shadow, believers may also form an argument to this purpose: if God thus provides for those that trust in him, as to give them assurance, without doubting of their deliverance from the waters; how much more will he deliver their souls, their better part, not from a momentary, but from an eternal death? If he is so careful in these things of less moment, how much more about what concerns the sum of our happiness?" See Owen's Theologoumena, lib. iii. c. i. And since we should observe, that previous to this, there was a symbol of the covenant of grace, whose antitype was baptism, 1 Pet. 3:21, in the deluge and the ark of Noah, which contained, as it were, the universal seeds of the whole world; why should we not take notice of a confirmation of the covenant of grace in the promise, that no deluge should any more come upon the earth?

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

XXII. 2dly. But then, as this covenant presupposed, and in its universality implied, the covenant of grace, we are not to deny, but the promises of it were also sealed to believers by the rainbow. Hence John mentions a rainbow, Rev. 4:3, and Rev. 10:1, which he saw "round about the throne and the head of Christ:" that we may acknowledge, says Rivet, Exercit. 60, in Genesin, "that Christ's throne is encompassed with mercy, and that he shows it on his countenance, whenever he manifests himself. But especially, that in his face we have that rainbow, by which we are assured, not only that the waters shall no more overflow the whole earth; but especially that we are not to be afraid of the deluge of divine wrath, seeing Christ has reconciled the Father, so that while God beholds him, he remembers his mercy and his promises, which in him are yea and amen. Christ therefore appears crowned with a rainbow, as the messenger of grace and peace." For he is the prince of peace, and our peace, Isa. 9:6, Eph. 2:14.

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

XXIV. Musculus has judiciously taken notice of the general analogies. 1st. God would have this to be ברית צולם an everlasting covenant, to continue to the end of the world; and therefore appointed a sign, which not only Noah and his family might view at that time, but also his posterity have before their eyes, while the covenant itself endured. 2dly. That covenant has the nature of a testament and last will, is absolute, without depending on any condition of our righteousness and piety. And therefore he hath also added such a sign to it, which we can neither make nor repeat, but can only be produced in the course of the seasons; and, being formed by himself, be proposed to the view of our eyes only, and the meditation of our minds. 3dly. We are also to consider where he placed the bow, the sign of his covenant; and when he produces it. For he placed it where it may be seen by all—in the heavens; not in any place of the heavens whatever, but in the clouds: he does not produce it but only in time of rain, when thick clouds hang over the earth, and either threaten or actually pour down their showers. Here we must be obliged to acknowledge the singular providence of God; whose goodness calls aloud to every one from those very watery clouds: "be from henceforth not afraid of them; behold in those very clouds, the rainbow, the symbol of my favour, and the sign of the covenant between me and all flesh; what was formally the instrument of my vengeance, shall now present you with a token of my perpetual grace."

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

XXVI. Concerning the colours he goes on as follows: from the matter, which is water, and from the nature of the colours, which represent both the light and darkness of water, it appears to be a suitable symbol. For, by this, God has promised, that for the future, he would so order the waters, that they should not destroy all things; but what represses or restrains waters more than heat, both contained in and signified by light? This sign, which is mixed with water, has something to give it a check, I mean the light of heaven, whereby God restrains its violence. Grotius observes, that the three colours of the rainbow represent the severity, mercy, and goodness of God. Another learned person thinks that the colours of the rainbow, red, fiery, and green, signify, a mixture of holiness, and mercy by means of blood: that both these being manifested by the shedding of blood, may render God venerable and lovely in our eyes on account of these

perfections of his nature. The same person elsewhere would have us behold in the rainbow the colour of fire, blood, and green grass, and in them to reflect on the zeal of God, the blood of Christ, and on mercy and life; for the zeal of God is unto life, by the blood of Christ. Another likewise has observed, that the rainbow, with which John saw the throne of God encompassed, was only of one colour, "in sight like unto an emerald," Rev. 4:3. To set forth, that God's gracious covenant with the church is different from the general covenant made with all mankind after the flood. For in this covenant God, indeed, promised he would no more cover the whole earth with water; yet, at times, he hath reduced whole countries to ashes by avenging flames: and therefore the symbol of this covenant was painted out in various colours, the red or fiery colour flashing out between the bright and green. But the sign of the covenant of grace made with the church is of one colour only; namely, green or emerald; to represent, that this covenant was always one, and always yielding joy to those who are truly in covenant. For, in the kingdom of God there is nothing but "peace and joy in the Holy Ghost," Rom. 14:17. These observations of learned men are curious and judicious, and may be matter of pious meditation; but I doubt whether they will meet with the assent of those of a difficult and nice taste. It is enough that we have related them. Let the prudent and pious reader judge for himself.

## CHAPTER VIII: Of Circumcision

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

II. The rite of circumcision was, according to God's appointment, as follows: the extreme cuticle or thin skin of the glans was cut off with a sharp knife. This, from its natural use, was called ערלה by the Hebrews, Gen. 34:14, from the verb ערל to close or stop up. The Greek interpreters of the Old Testament, and the writers of the New, express it by an elegant term ακροβυστία, because πὸ ἄκρον τῆς βάλανου βυει, it covers the extremity of the glans. Gomarus ad Luc. 2:21, has made many learned remarks on this word. The Latins call it præputium, a word of uncertain derivation. On account of circumcision, the Jews were, by way of contempt, and in derision, called Apellæ and Recutiti, because they had not that pellicle or skin. But it pleased God, in order to confound all the wisdom of the flesh, and to try the faith and obedience of his people, to give them for a sign of his covenant a rite, so much to be blushed at, and almost ashamed of; just as he also laid the ground-work of all our salvation in what appears no less shameful to flesh, namely, the cross of Christ.

III. The instrument of circumcision was any knife they could procure, made of any matter that was fit to take an edge; namely, of stone, glass, or wood. Yet Buxtorf, in Synagoga Judaica, says that it was generally one of iron, and that very sharp, as surgeon's instruments usually are; some think that knives of stone were formerly used, because the instrument of circumcision, mentioned Exod. 4:25, is called רוע, which in Ezek. 3:9, denotes a stone; and in Josh. 5:2, the knives of circumcision are called צורים חדבות, swords of stone. But that inference is not so certain. For צור signifies not only a stone, but also an edge; as is manifest from Ps. 89:43, חשיב צור, "thou hast turned the edge of his sword:" nor formerly did they fight with swords of stone, Hence the Chaldee paraphrast translates Josh. 5:2, sharp knives.

IV. The first institution of circumcision, Gen. 17:11, was in the house and family of Abraham, about the year of the world, two thousand.\* Circumcision was not immediately given, to be a public and universal sacrament to the whole church, in those times, but was confined to Abraham's family. The remnant of the ancient fathers, satisfied with their sacrificial sacraments, could exercise their faith and please God, in uncircumcision, without being obliged to submit to this rite. But, after the expiration of about four centuries, when the visible churches, not of Abraham's family, gradually apostatised to heathenism, the godly remnant being removed to the heavenly assembly; and when the republic of Israel, in the mean time, wonderfully increased, and the measure of iniquity among the nations being now full, the church was confined to Israel, and the rest of the world was rejected; and all that feared God were bound to join themselves in communion with them, by a participation of the same rites. Well says Maimonides, in Issure Bia, c. 13: "Whenever any Gentile would betake himself to the Israelitish covenant, and put himself under the wings of the divine majesty, and take upon him the yoke of the law, there were required circumcision, baptism, and a voluntary offering." From that time, circumcision became an universal sacrament of the church. Thus the Lord Jesus distinguishes it, as it was of the fathers, to them it was a family institution, and, as given by Moses, an universal sacrament of the church, that was to be constituted or set up, John 7:22.

V. Moreover, circumcision was not only enjoined upon Abraham and Isaac, but also on all the descendants of Abraham, whether by Sarah, Hagar or Keturah, and even on all his domestics, bought with his money, and strangers, Gen. 17:25–27. For though, even at that time, God had determined to form a peculiar people to himself from the posterity of Isaac alone, not indeed from all of them; nevertheless the time was not yet come, when he would have his church confined to one particular people. Nor are we to doubt but he had his chosen people among the other sons and descendants of Abraham. And nothing is more certain than that, within the compass of these four centuries, circumcision, and with it the visible church, was propagated among all those eastern people who derived their origin from Ishmael, from the sons of Keturah, from Esau, and the proselytes who were circumcised in Abraham's family. But I would observe by the way, that most of the Jewish rabbins will have it, that Keturah was Hagar herself, while others of them sometimes deny it, and at other times call it in question, as may be seen in Selden, *de Synedr.* lib. ii. c. 3. Those churches therefore, which, from among Abraham's posterity, had the sign of circumcision, as well as the uncircumcised churches, from the pious remnant of the other fathers, together with the Israelites, whom God began to claim to himself by a nearer relation, made up the universal church of those times. Nor should they, in the mean time, be accounted strangers from the covenant of God, confirmed with Abraham in Christ, but rather brethren, and fellow-professors of the same religion. To this purpose we may apply Deut. 23:7: "Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite, for he is thy brother." And as circumcision was at first enjoined even on strangers, in Abraham's family, this ought afterwards to have put the Israelites in mind of the future calling of the Gentiles.

VI. Meanwhile among the nations that descended from Abraham, the use of circumcision continued much longer than the true religion. For while they revolted by degrees from the God of their fathers, so they polluted themselves with horrible idolatries, and were rejected by God, and banished from his covenant; but still they retained circumcision. Accordingly authors of every kind speak of many circumcised nations besides the Israelites. Grotius has drawn up a catalogue of them, in *Notis ad lib. i. de Veritate Relig. Christianæ*; and Selden, in a place already quoted, has much to this purpose.

VII. It is, then, certain that other nations, besides the descendants of Abraham, were circumcised; as Herodotus in *Euterpe* testifies of the Egyptians, the Ethiopians, and the inhabitants of Colchis. Grotius indeed says, that the Ethiopians were descended from the posterity of Keturah; and that the Colchians, and neighbouring people, are the descendants of the ten tribes, which were carried away by Salmanassar. But Bochart, *Geograph. Sacr.* lib. iv. c. 26 and 31, has made it appear, by cogent arguments, that both the Ethiopians and Colchians owe their origin to the Egyptians. And Diodorous Siculus, whose fidelity on this point Grotius vainly attempts to weaken, relates that the rite of circumcision passed from the Egyptians to their colonies and ancient offspring, as Ammianus, lib. ii. calls the Colchians. The same thing we are to believe concerning the Colchians. What Ambrose, *de Patriarcha Abrahamo*, lib. 2. c. 11, relates of the Egyptians, is both remarkable and surprising: "The Egyptians," says he, "circumcise their males at fourteen years, and at the same years, their females; namely, because at those years, the passions of the male begin to rage, and the monthly courses of the females to take their rise." But Gomarus, *ad Luc.* 2:21, has justly observed, that we may very well doubt of the truth of that narration (unless he probably speaks of his own time), on account of its disagreement with ancient history. Besides,

we can scarcely allow the least doubt, that the Egyptians had learned circumcision from the Israelites, when they dwelt among them, and were, at first, acceptable guests.

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

IX. But who does not see that these are foolish and trifling stories? Not to mention other things, the absurdity and gross falsehood of which lie open to the view of every one. They arrogantly brag that it was their queen who went to Solomon, when it can be easily proved, that it was the queen of Arabia Felix. 1st. She is called in Scripture, the queen of Sheba, 1 Kings 10:1. But Philostorgius says, that this was the name which the Greeks gave to Arabia, the Great and Happy. It is otherwise called Homeritis, from an Arabic word. The Nubian Geographer relates that this queen reigned there, whom he calls Belkis, and the wife of Solomon. 2dly. Christ calls her the queen of the south. But Sheba, or Arabia Felix, is not only south of the land of Israel, but is also in Arabic called אלימן Aljeman, that is the southward, as Drusius, ad Matt. 12:42, has observed from Judæus Salmanticensis and Aben Ezra. And Benjamin, in his Itinerary, p. 73, says אלימן היא שבה Sheba is Aljeman. When Christ therefore called her queen of the south, which, in Syriac, is דהמנא מלבתא queen of Timena, he spoke after the vulgar, so that he might easily be understood by any one. 3dly. Christ adds, that this queen came from the uttermost parts of the earth, which much better agrees to the Sabeans than to the Ethiopians; for the most extensive countries lie beyond Meroe, the metropolis of Ethiopia; whereas the Sabeans occupy, on the ocean, the utmost parts of Arabia towards the sea, consequently the ends of the earth. 4thly. There is much greater plenty of gold and spices, with which this queen is said to have loaded her camels (1 Kings 10:2), in Arabia, than in the country of the Ethiopians, and therefore called by the Greeks, Αροματοφορος, spice-yielding. 5thly. What Josephus says, Antiq. lib. 8. c. 2, concerning the queen of the Ethiopians, and her royal city, formerly called Saba, afterwards Meroe, is not only uncertain, but also bewrays very great ignorance in history, as Bochart, who may be consulted on this head, has invincibly shown, Geograph. Sac. lib. ii. c. 24. As therefore the queen of the south is not the queen of the Ethiopians, the modern Ethiopians vainly boast, that they received circumcision, and therewith Judaism, on occasion of that queen. It is much more probable, they received it long before that time, from the Egyptians, whose descendants

they are: but it is more likely, the Sabeans, who according to Philostorigus, were circumcised the eighth day, were taught it by their queen, who visited Solomon.

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

XI. But in all other nations, who were strangers to the true worship of God, circumcision was nothing but a mere superstitious practice, and a wretched imitation of a sacrament given by God to his covenant people. But he would have those in covenant with himself, strictly to be bound by this tie, Gen. 17:14: "And the uncircumcised man child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people, he hath broken my covenant." I am not now inclined to transcribe what the learned have long ago observed on כרת, or "the cutting off a soul from his people". Among many others may be seen Fagius ad Exod. 12:15; Amama in *Antibarbaro*, lib. iii. towards the end; Seldenus de *Synedriis*, lib. i. c. vi; and de *jure Nat.* lib. vii. c. ix. L'Empereur in *notis ad Bertramum de Republ. Hebr.* lib. i. c. ii. and Hen. Ainsworth ad Num. 15:30, 31; Hottingerus ad *juris Hebr. præceptum*, 227; Owen in *proleg. ad Hebr.* p. 289; and very lately, John a Mark, *Exer. Juv. Disp.* 1 and 2. I do not think it improbable, that the cutting off a soul from the people signified a seclusion or separation, from the church, and from the solemnities and prerogatives of the people of God, to which is opposed "יהוה כקהל בא", to enter into the congregation, (or church) of Jehovah," Deut. 23:2. To this purpose is Exod. 12:19: "Even that soul shall be cut off מערת ישראל, from the congregation of Israel," that is, shall be removed from the fellowship of the saints. Ezek. 13:9: "they not be עמי בסוד, in the council", or mystical assembly, "of my people, neither shall they be written in the writing of the house of Israel:" namely, he who "הפיד", has broken" my covenant, which "כדתי", I made" with him, "יברת", shall be cut off" from among this covenant-people, and shall not partake of their privileges. Besides this ecclesiastical death, there sometimes was added to it death by the sentence of the judge, Lev. 20:6, compared with ver. 27, sometimes by the immediate hand of God, and other grievous calamities inflicted by him: see Exod. 4:24, 25; sometimes a being childless, Lev. 18:29, compared with Lev. 20:20, 21; and at last, unless the sinner repented, the eternal destruction of his soul. Abarbanel does not speak amiss, as his words are quoted by L'Empereur: "The soul shall be cut off from that supreme bundle of life, and shall not obtain the splendour of the divinity, that is, the pleasure and reward of a soul." And why may we not include all these in this general expression? But by this threatening, God would guard the command of circumcision, lest a sacrament, in other respects full of shame and pain, should be either slighted or neglected. It was his will, that his covenant should be in such esteem, that its yoke, though hard, might be cheerfully submitted to. Aben Ezra has observed, that, in the whole sacred Scripture, he finds twenty-three places, where God threatens כרת extermination, to those who transgress the negative precepts; but with respect to the positive he only found כרת with regard to the precepts of

circumcision, and the due solemnizing the passover. From which it is evident, it was the will of God to bind his people to these sacraments by the strictest tie.

XII. But yet we are, on no account, so to understand these things, as if all infants, dying uncircumcised after the eighth day, were consigned to condemnation; which, after some popish writers, I wonder that Chamierus should have adopted, lib. iii. de Sacram. c. ii: "But the meaning is, (as Perkins has well observed, Tract. de Sacram. Baptismi,) whoever has not been circumcised in his infancy, and being come to years of discretion and knowledge, shall then refuse circumcision, his soul shall be cut off from his people." And therefore this is said of adults, not of infants, who cannot break the covenant. There are the following reasons for this explication: 1st, Because the words of the original text are active, "בשד ימל לא אשר", he who shall not have circumcised the flesh of his foreskin." Where את, the sign of the accusative, shows, that the word ימל is not here of the form niph'al, from מול, but of the form kal, from נמל. Whence I conclude, these words are not addressed to him, who, in the act of his circumcision, unknowingly suffers any thing; but to him who can procure his own circumcision, and yet deliberately neglects it. 2dly, Because it is added, "he hath broken my covenant, הפר בריתי אה." In which words he is charged with a culpable action, who only before could be charged with a culpable deficiency. But an infant, who is without circumcision, not through his own default, does not thereby render the covenant of God of no effect. 3dly, The occasion and end of this sanction lead to this; namely, circumcision was enjoined to Abraham, when 99 years old, to his servants and domestics, when grown up, to Ismael, a lad 13 years old. But as it would have been difficult to persuade grown persons to that act of cutting away, or of mutilation, conjoined with so much shame and pain; for this reason that threatening was added, that, for fear of a greater evil, they might obsequiously submit to the command. As this could only be seriously considered by grown up persons, so it regards them only. 4thly, We may add this inconvenience; if infants dying uncircumcised after the eighth day, are, on that account, consigned to condemnation, as covenant breakers, there can be no reason, why the same thing may not be said concerning the infants of Christians, who die before baptism; because baptism, no less than circumcision, is a sign of the covenant. And that this was also the constant opinion of the Jews, see in Selden de Synedriis, lib. i. c. vi.

XIII. The minister of circumcision was every master of a family, Gen. 17:23, or any other person, qualified for that office, and substituted in the master's place. Nor does it appear that Zacharias, though a priest, circumcised his son John with his own hands, Luke 1:59. At least, it appears not, that God confined the administration of this ordinance to any particular order of men. But yet, that women were not called to do it, may be gathered from the example of Zippora, Exod. 4:24, 25. Because amidst the confusion, arising from a present danger, neither she nor Moses seem sufficiently to have attended, by whom circumcision was to be administered, if it was only done. And it is plain, that God really approved that circumcision; but it does not appear, that he approved the manner of it.

XIV. The day appointed for circumcision was the eighth from the birth. Though the principal reason of this is, the will of him who commands; yet other reasons are likewise probably added. 1st, That thus a regard might be had to the tender state of infants, who, before the eighth day, are scarce able to bear the pains of circumcision, under which grown persons themselves almost sink, Gen. 34:25. 2dly, Because infants just born, are with their mother, accounted unclean till



the eighth day. This reason R. Simeon, the son of Jachi, gives in Pesikta, fol. 16. col. 3.: "Why has the law appointed circumcision on the eighth day? Circumcision is put off, till the woman in child-bed be cleansed from her uncleanness," Light-foot ad Luc. 2:21. And this reason seems to be grounded on Lev. 12:2, 3. Certainly the infant was initiated by circumcision, and offered up as it were to God by the shedding of his blood. And it was after the seventh day, before God admitted of any sacrifices from among brute animals, Exod. 21:30, Lev. 23:27. 3dly, This was so appointed, that we might not imagine salvation depended on an external sign; for otherwise, a good and gracious God would not have deferred it till the eighth day, before which time many must needs have died. Upon this account also Abraham himself was justified in uncircumcision, Rom. 4:10.

XV. I will not say with some (who yet, I own, can defend themselves by the authority of Cyprian and sixty-six bishops assembled by him in council. See Cyprian's Epistles, lib. iii. epist. viii., which in Pamel's edition is the 59th), that this mystery prefigured the day of Christ's resurrection, which in the order of the days is the eighth, and on which the true circumcision and our salvation, were entirely completed and perfected. 1st, Because Christ is nowhere said to have risen on the eighth day, but either on the third from his death, or on the first day of the week. But this day, with respect to circumcision, is no more the eighth than any other day. Nor is it usually called the eighth from the first day of the preceding week, as the week is closed with the seventh day; from which the first of the new week is reckoned. 2dly, Because circumcision was not a type so much of the resurrection, as of the sufferings and death of Christ, as we shall directly show. 3dly, Neither does it seem an accurate way of speaking, to say that the true circumcision and our salvation, were entirely completed and perfected on the day of Christ's resurrection. For, as to the impetration or purchase of our salvation, that indeed was perfected by the death of Christ. The complete application of the purchased salvation, not only requires the resurrection of Christ from the dead, but his ascension into heaven, and waits for his return to the general judgment. There is therefore no reason why these days ought not, as much as the day of his resurrection, to be prefigured. We are carefully to be on our guard, not to run into extremes in allegorizing.

XVI. The spiritual signification of circumcision is as excellent, as the sign itself seems mean and almost shameful. In general it was a "sign of the covenant of God with Abraham," Gen. 17:11. And therefore, by a sacramental phrase, it is called the covenant itself, ver. 10, 13. Nay it was not only a sign, but also a seal; for not only Paul has declared this, Rom. 4:11, but also the Jewish masters, Light-foot ad Matt. 28:19. Whose words, from the Jerusalem Talmud, Tract. Berachot, are as follows: "Blessed be he, who sanctified the beloved from the womb, and put a sign in his flesh, and sealed his sons with the sign of the holy covenant." God promised to give the Messiah, and with him all manner of blessings, earthly, spiritual, heavenly, to Abraham and his seed, and that all these should come from his seed. God required of Abraham by covenant, that he should walk before him. Circumcision was the sign and seal of this covenant; so that all, who duly submit to this, according to God's prescription, were solemnly declared by God himself to be partakers of the promises made to Abraham; and, at the same time openly avowed, that, by a lively faith, they received the promised Messiah, and expected from him blessings of every kind. And thus circumcision became to them a seal of the righteousness of faith, Rom. 4:11. And the circumcised person was said "to enter, and to have a safe station, under the wings of the divine majesty". And by the same act, they also bound themselves to the sincere observance of the

whose of religion, and consequently of all the precepts of God, as became those in covenant with the Supreme Being. It is not to be doubted, but the prayer, which the Jews, at this day, still use in the circumcision of their young infants, is from the remains of ancient piety, Buxtorf. Synag. Jud. c. ii.: "As thou hast made this young child to enter, or hast received him into the covenant of Abraham our father; so make him enter into the law of Moses, into the state of matrimony, הוּפָה, (which Selden de Jure Nat. lib. i. c. ii., renders, into protection or safe-guard), and into good works."

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

XVIII. Man's misery consists partly in sin, partly in the punishment of sin. Both these are signified by circumcision. For the foreskin, that is, the extreme pellicle of the generative member, which was to be cut off by circumcision, denotes that viciousness or corruption of the whole man, inherent in him from his very first origin, and frequently in scripture is called the foreskin of the heart, or an uncircumcised heart, Deut. 10:16. Jer. 4:4; Lev. 26:41; Jer. 9:26. And the painful cutting away of that fleshly part signified, that the whole man deserved to be separated for ever from the communion of God and all his saints, with exquisite and intolerable torments both of soul and body.

XIX. Here the Redeemer and the redemption of men are no less clearly discovered. For, this sacrament signified and sealed, 1st, That from Abraham, now circumcised, was to arise Isaac, Gen. 17:16, the Father of that blessed seed or of the Messiah, who was to take upon himself, and to expiate, all our sin and all our guilt. 2dly, That this Messiah was to shed his blood for men, without which the covenant of grace could never be sealed, and to commence his sufferings from the very beginning of his life. 3dly, That he was to partake of the same flesh and blood with us, Heb. 2:14; to be cut off from the land of the living, Isa. 53:8, in order to the preservation of his body, the church, Eph. 5:23; as in the carnal circumcision a part of the body was to be cut away, that the whole man might not be cut off from his people. 4thly, That he would freely enable us to cut away and to put off the sins of the flesh, by regeneration and sanctification, which are perfected in glory, Col. 2:11. This, I imagine, was the meaning of the ancient Jewish doctors, when they said, that, whenever one becomes a proselyte, he is like a new-born child. This being so very common in the mouths of their masters, Christ justly replied to Nicodemus, when he so impertinently inquired about being born again, "Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?" John 3:10. They taught that a new soul, which came under the wings of the Divine majesty, and was received into the embraces of the supreme Being, dropped down from some heavenly palace on him who was circumcised. By such dark and mysterious expressions it is probable the ancient Jewish doctors described spiritual regeneration, which, not being understood by the more modern, was by them changed into mere empty sound. see Selden, de jure nat., lib. ii. c. 11.

XX. Lastly, By the use of this sacrament, they were put in mind of the duties of a becoming gratitude. 1st, That they were to apply themselves to internal, secret, and spiritual piety, just as circumcision was performed on a secret member of the body, which is to be veiled, Rom. 2:28, 29. 2dly, To mortify their members, which are upon the earth, Col. 3:5, that is, to renounce their lusts, even those that formerly were most dear to them, and beloved by them. 3dly, To have no

longer any intimate friendship with the world which lieth in wickedness, as the descendants of Abraham were separated by circumcision from other nations, and renounced their friendship, as appears from the open declaration of the sons of Jacob, Gen. 34:14, 15. Though indeed they spoke this from an evil intention, yet what they said was right: compare Acts 10:28. A circumcised person, say the Jews, has withdrawn himself from the whole body of the nations. And indeed, circumcision was a great part, and as it were, the foundation of the middle wall of partition. 4thly, They were cheerfully and willingly, at the command of God, and for his glory, to submit to every thing however difficult, grievous, and painful, and however improper, foolish, and ridiculous, in the eyes of the world; not to account their reputation, nor even their life dear in comparison thereof.

XXI. God has determined the duration of circumcision in these words, Gen. 17:13: "And my covenant shall be in your flesh לברית עולם for an everlasting covenant." This is not to be understood of a perpetual duration even to the end of the world. The distinction is well known of עולם הזה, of this age, as they spoke formerly, which comprised the whole economy of the Old Testament, and of עולם הבא, of the age to come; which by the apostle, Heb. 2:5, is called ὁ μέλλων αἰὼν the age to come, or ἡ οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα, the world to come, to which age belong the days of the Messiah. But the prophecies constantly say that what was instituted for the covenant of the former age must not be extended to the latter age, whose face or state and economy were to be quite different.

XXII. Moreover, that circumcision was to be abrogated in the days of the more joyful dispensation of the covenant may thus appear. 1st, Because it is a part of those shadows, which, because they prefigured the body that was to come, ought now to give place to it, since it is come, Col. 2:17. 2dly, Because it was a great part of that middle wall of partition which separated the Jews from the Gentiles, and whose inclosure was to be broken down by the death of Christ, "having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments, contained in ordinances; for to make in himself, of twain, one new man, so making peace," Eph. 2:15. It was certainly foretold of old time, that the Gentiles were to be fellow-heirs, and of the same body with Israel, and partakers of the same promise, Eph. 3:6: see Deut. 32:43. Isa. 19:24, 25. and Isa. 60:3, &c. But this concorporation, or being of the same body, was not to be brought about by enclosing the Gentiles with Israel, within the same inclosure of rites and ceremonies (for that inclosure was appointed to establish a separation and enmity) but by destroying the same: "For in Jesus Christ, neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith, which worketh by love," Gal. 5:6. "They which are of faith", whether circumcised or not, the same are the children of Abraham", Gal. 3:7. 3dly, Because circumcision plainly showed, that the blood of the New Testament was not yet shed, that the Messiah was not yet born of the seed of Abraham, or at least not yet cut off for the salvation of his mystical body. But when the world was made to know, by the preaching of the Gospel, that these things were done, it was necessary, that what testified they were not yet done should be abrogated; least any institution of God should be found to bear witness against the truth. To this purpose is that of Paul, Gal. 5:2, 3, 4, "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing; for I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law." The meaning is, whoever submits to circumcision, as a necessary part of God's instituted worship, or as a mean of justification thereby renounces Christ. 1st, Because he would have that sign to be still necessary, which testifieth, that every thing is not yet accomplished by Christ. 2dly, Because, as

circumcision cannot be separated from the rest of the ceremonial law, to which it was as the porch, so he who submits to circumcision, thereby binds himself to the observance of the whole ceremonial law. But that is in effect to deny the coming of Christ, and the time of reformation and liberty. 3dly, Because, as the righteousness of man before God, must either depend wholly on his own works, or wholly upon Christ, and these two cannot be conjoined, Gal. 2:21, and Gal. 3:12, 18; whoever seeks for righteousness in circumcision, as his own work, is fallen from the righteousness of Christ; and so, if he would obtain salvation, it is necessary, that he keep the whole law: which being impossible for him to do, he knows, he is cut off from all hopes of salvation.

XXIII. But the abrogation of this rite of circumcision had its several degrees. It was first in a languishing state, then it was dead, and at last became pernicious. 1st, It began to languish at the circumcision of Christ, who by submitting himself to the law for the elect, and solemnly testifying that subjection by taking upon him the symbol of circumcision, made it appear, that he was that singular seed of Abraham, whose future nativity circumcision was originally appointed to prefigure. From the time therefore, that he appeared, circumcision, which signified that he was to come, lost a great part of its signification. 2dly, It was further weakened, after Christ had, in the thirtieth year of his age, manifested himself to Israel, and was pointed out by John, as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world, and was publicly owned by the Father as his beloved Son, to whom all were to hear and obey. For then the Gospel of liberty and of the kingdom began to be preached, and baptism, a sign opposed to circumcision, was used, as a sacrament of initiation into a better covenant, whereby circumcision came to lose much of its dignity. 3dly, It began to die at the death of Christ. For when he was cut off from among his people, for the salvation of the whole mystical body, and had sealed the New Testament by his blood, every thing relating to the future Messiah, which circumcision prefigured, and to which Christ by his own circumcision bound himself, was fulfilled. And thus the hand-writing, which was against Christ the surety, and against believers, was torn asunder in his cross, Col. 2:14. 4thly, It came to be quite dead, after Christ, by his resurrection from the dead, had received from the Father a discharge, in witness that the fullest payment was made, and exhibited it to the view, as it were, of the whole world. Yet believers had so little knowledge of the liberty purchased for, and offered to them, that Peter himself wanted to be taught it by a heavenly vision, Acts 10:28, 34, 35, 47. 5thly, It was not yet destructive, but so long as the church was not sufficiently instructed in her liberty, it might at times, to avoid giving offence to the weak, be prudently, yet lawfully used, not from a principle of conscience, but from the dictates of charity and prudence, lest the Jews, who were too tenacious of their peculiar and paternal rites, should be alienated from the Christian religion: just as Timothy was circumcised, being the son of a Jewess, Acts 16:1, 3. 6thly, But after the nation of the Jews, on rejecting the Gospel, were cast off by God, and continued obstinately to insist on circumcision, as a necessary part of religion, nay, of righteousness, and the church was sufficiently instructed in her own liberty, circumcision came to be destructive, as being a character of superstition and a badge of Jewish infidelity, and a renunciation of Christian liberty, as we have shown from Gal. 5:2, 3.

XXIV. It is not now difficult to determine that question; namely, whether the nation of the Jews, when they shall in the last times be fully converted to Christ, will religiously retain the circumcision of infants? Without any hesitation, I think, we are to answer this question in the negative, for the reasons just given. As they are such, as evince that not only the Gentiles but

also the Jews were made free, under the liberty of the New Testament, from circumcision, which is the band of the whole yoke. And in every respect the reason of both ought to be altogether the same. Though the pre-eminence of the Jew was formerly great, yet now he has none at all. None under Christ has wherein to glory: Paul accounted it as loss and dung, Phil. 3:7, 8. In Christ there is no difference of Jew and Greek, of circumcision and uncircumcision: but Christ himself is all in all, Col. 3:11; all pre-eminence, of whatever nation, being totally removed. "Henceforth", saith the apostle, 2 Cor. 5:16. "know we no man after the flesh," that is, we have no greater esteem for him on account of his pedigree from the Holy Fathers; "yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh," that is, though we have looked upon our carnal relation to Christ as any prerogative: "Yet now henceforth know we him no more;" we now place all our happiness [not in that, but] in our spiritual union with him by faith. And since God is now in no sense "a respecter of persons," Acts 10:34, we can never be allowed "to have the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ the Lord of glory, with respect of persons," Jam. 2:1; or, in the kingdom of Christ, to put a greater value on the descendants of Abraham, as such, than on Barbarians or Scythians, "who have obtained like precious faith with us," 2 Pet. 1:1. In a word, the circumcision of the believing Israelites, in the last times, would be either a future privilege, or a burden and yoke. But can be neither: not the latter, because that would be repugnant to the liberty purchased by Christ, which, as is meet, should be exceeding glorious in that happy period: not the former, because the Gospel of the kingdom hath removed all pre-eminence of one above another, "hath made both one", Eph. 2:14.

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

XXVI. But we are here to consider distinctly three things. 1st, The true doctrine of Paul. 2dly, The calumny invidiously fixed upon him. 3dly, The prudential advice suggested to him by James and the elders. Indeed Paul, who was an excellent preacher of Christian liberty, set both Jews and Gentiles, who had submitted to the Gospel, at liberty from the necessity of submitting to circumcision and the other ceremonies: for he proclaimed to all, that "circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God," 1 Cor. 7:19. And he compares the law to a tutor, under whose tuition the Old Testament church was placed, being then in a state of bondage; but now the kingdom of heaven being set up in the world; he declares that the same church was come to age, which no longer standing in need of a tutor, was not again to be given up to bondage under those first elements of the world, Gal. 4:1. Which certainly comprised both Jews and Gentiles. He every where published this privilege of the New

Testament freely and openly. Nevertheless he was not against making some allowances for the Jewish brethren, in the exercise of that liberty; in case there were not a spirit of contention, nor an opinion of necessity and righteousness in standing up for the practice of the ceremonies. Calumny put a quite different construction on this conduct: as if he acted thus to the reproach of the law, and taught apostasy from Moses, and did not agree, in this doctrinal point who with others, who maintained the Christian faith. But the case was certainly the reverse; for it is no reproach put upon the law, to teach that Christ made satisfaction to it; any more than it is a reproach put upon a hand-writing, that, on payment being made, it is cancelled. Nor is it any apostasy from Moses, to preach that Christ is the bestower of liberty, since Moses himself commanded him to be heard; nor did Paul disagree from the other apostles; because they also taught, according to the decree of the Synod of Jerusalem, an immunity from that yoke; and Paul, in the exercise of that liberty, by no means disowned, that charity and prudence were to be regarded. Nevertheless the calumny gained ground, and many of the brethren, who were not truly informed of the apostle's doctrine, entertained groundless suspicions of him. Hence arose the advice, that he himself should openly perform some certain ceremonies, not in order to create any prejudice to that Christian right and liberty which he had preached, but to show publicly that he had done nothing inconsiderately which could give rise to any just indignation: that it was a vile calumny, by which he was defamed, as entertaining less reverend thoughts of Moses, and teaching the Jews a contempt of the law. With this advice the apostle complies, not that he approved the violence of those zealots, but to wipe off a calumny, and to suit himself prudently and friendly to the weak. Thus, "Unto the Jews he became as a Jew, that he might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that he might gain them that are under the law," 1 Cor. 9:20. These things being duly considered, it is evident nothing can be concluded from this passage for the continuance of circumcision among the converted Israelites.

XXVII. From the Old Testament is objected, Ezek. 44:9, where the Lord, describing the state of the church after the conversion of Israel, thus goes on: "No stranger, uncircumcised in heart, nor uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into my sanctuary." By which words, all who have a right to enter into the sanctuary, are required to have the circumcision both of flesh and heart. If the question was about uncircumcision in general, we might very plainly explain it of the depraved disposition of the unregenerate heart. Nay, if the uncircumcision of the flesh were expressly mentioned, nothing could hinder us from taking a prophetic expression, borrowed from the rites of the Old Testament, in a spiritual sense. But when the uncircumcision both of flesh and heart is distinctly mentioned, it seems altogether necessary we should certainly understand the one spiritually, but the other literally.

XXVIII. In answer to this reasoning, I offer the following considerations. 1st. That the whole context of Ezekiel concerning the building of a new temple is mystical and allegorical, and is expressed by similitudes borrowed from the Old Testament, all which, as is suitable to the state of the New Testament, are to be explained spiritually. 2dly. That though the uncircumcision of flesh and heart are distinct, yet they are both mystical. Surely uncircumcision mystically signifies any depraved disposition of man. Hence we read of uncircumcised lips, Exod. 6:12; and ears, Jer. 6:10, Acts 7:51. Nay, any impurity even of those fruits, which God had forbid to be eaten, is called uncircumcision, Lev. 19:23\*. The uncircumcision therefore of the heart, in the mystical language of Ezekiel, signifies the impurity of the heart and inward affections; the uncircumcision of the flesh, the impurity of the outward actions, performed by the body, according to the

distinction of Paul, 2 Cor. 7:1. Both kinds of impurity are to be laid aside by him, who would be reckoned to belong to the communion of the people of God. "Who shall ascend into the hill of the Jehovah? And who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart," Ps. 24:3, 4. But we are especially to take notice, that the discourse here is not concerning the Israelites, but concerning the strangers, who were to be admitted into the sanctuary. They certainly, shall have their proper place in this new temple, Isa. 56:6, 7, and not have reason to complain; "Jehovah hath utterly separated me from his people," ver. 3. But to impose upon them, in the latter days, the necessity of circumcision, from which they were free all the intermediate time, is, as has been shown, diametrically opposite to the doctrine of the apostles.

## CHAPTER IX: Of the Passover

I. THE whole doctrine of the passover has been learnedly and copiously, beyond what can well be expressed, unfolded by the very laborious Samuel Bochart, Hierozoic. lib. ii. c. 50. But because that most excellent and invaluable book is rarely to be found in the hands of the youth under our tuition, we have thought proper in this chapter to exhibit, in a compendious way, what he has handled at large; yet, in such a manner, as to follow at times our own judgment, and now and then intersperse what observations we have made from other authors. We will therefore briefly run over these seven particulars. 1. The appellation of the passover. 2. Its time. 3. Its place. 4. Its ministers. 5. Its guests. 6. Its rights. 7. Its mystery.

II. The name pascha is Chaldee, as Philo justly observes. In Hebrew it is called פסח, Pesach, by the ancients Phase and Phasac. The root פסח, signifies to pass over. Josephus renders it ὑπερβάσια: Philo, διαβατήρια. Just as there were also sacrifices called for passage a Lacedemon, that is, for the happy progress of an expedition. But it is thus called Pascha, because God, while he slew the first born of the Egyptians, passed over the doors of the Israelites, on seeing the posts thereof sprinkled with the blood of the lamb, Exod. 12:13. Thus Isa. 31:5, God delivers Jerusalem by passing over it, while he takes due vengeance on other people. But the term Pascha is of various acceptations, denoting: 1st. The passing over of the angel, who while he smote the first born of the Egyptians, passed over the houses of the Israelites, 2dly. The lamb which was slain in memory of this deliverance, Exod. 12:21, "kill the passover;" Luke 22:7, then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed. 3dly. The sacrifices then usually offered to God along with the lamb, Deut. 16:2: "Thou shalt sacrifice the passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and the herd." 4thly. The festival days on which these things were solemnized, Luke 22:1, "Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the passover." Seeing Christ our Lord suffered at that time, hence some of the ancients who were not acquainted with Hebrew literature, derived the name Pascha from the Greek πασχω, I suffer.

III. The time is expressly specified, Lev. 23:5, in the fourteenth day of the first month, at even (between the two evenings) is the Lord's passover. Where observe: 1. The month. 2. The day. 3. The hour or time of the day. The month, Abib, is mentioned Exod. 13:4: elsewhere called Nisan, Neh. 2:1, Est. 3:7. אביב signifies in Hebrew, an ear of corn, as yet fresh or green. Hence was the name of the month; because in those warmer countries, and especially in Judea, in that month which answers partly to our March, partly to our April, the standing corn necessary for the support of life, according to Philo, begins to ripen; and at that time the Israelites began to put the sickle to the standing corn, Deut. 16:9, and on the second day of the Paschal solemnity, they offered to God a handful of the first fruits; but why the same month is, in Chaldee, called ניסן Nisan, is not so evident. A great man conjectures it ought to be written Nissan, as is done by Josephus, or the dagesch struck out of the latter ס to be made by a long vowel; as ניסן Nisin, is often put for נסין, Nisin, that is, standards. And thus the appellation Nisan is very properly taken from the warlike ensigns or standards, with which, in that month, they first took the field. And this very time the Jews understand to be intended, 2 Sam. 11:1, "And it came to pass, that after the year was expired, at the time when kings go forth to battle." For a like reason, the two former spring months were called by the Bithynians Στρατειος and Ἄρειος, as by the Romans, Martius, from Mars. But this month is called the first, namely, of the sacred or ecclesiastical year, from the exodus out of Egypt, being otherwise the seventh of the civil year, whose beginning was



about autumn, and whose first month was called Tisri. And there was the express command of God for this, Exod. 12:2, "this month," namely Abib, compare Exod. 13:4, "shall be unto you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month of the year to you."

IV. The day of this first month, set apart for the passover, was the fourteenth. The hours, or time of the day, was between the two evenings; the one of which was a little past noon, when the sun began to descend, the other a little before the setting of the sun. Not only the Hebrews distinguished their evenings in this manner, as may be seen in Buxtorf's lexicon under the word ערב; but also some of the Greeks, according to the testimony of Eustathius, ad lib. xvii. Odys. "According to the ancients, the evening is two-fold; for the late evening, according to them, is the latter part of the evening towards sun-set: the other the early evening, the first of the evening following just upon noon." See also Hesychius, under the word Δείλη. Within the compass, therefore, of that time, in which the sun begins to decline, and in which he sets, the passover was to be slain and roasted, that it might be eaten on the beginning of the fifteenth day, which was at sun-set. Josephus says that the Paschal lambs were killed, from the ninth hour till the eleventh, that is, from three in the afternoon till five, Bell. Jud. lib. vii. c. 17.

V. As to the place, the passover was celebrated the first time in Egypt, Exod. 12:21; then in the wilderness of Sinai, Numb. 9:5; and in Egypt, indeed, every one slew it in his own house, as there was no altar, no place set apart for God there. But after the Exodus, none were allowed to kill the passover any where, but in the place which God had chosen, as is expressly enjoined, Deut. 16:5, 6. But that place was not Jerusalem only, after Solomon built the temple there, but also the very court of the temple, where they usually killed the other sacrifices. For God placed his name, and caused it to dwell, not so much in the whole city, as in the temple. The Jews all agree in this: "they kill the passover as they do other sacrifices, only in the court of the temple," says Maimonides, lib. de Pasch. c. i. sect. 3. And a very learned English author has shown, that this is confessedly the opinion of the Karaites or scripturarian doctors of the Jews.

VI. And the reason is obvious: for every one knows it was not allowed to kill the sacrifices, but in the court of the temple. But that the passover was a real sacrifice, is evident from the following arguments. 1st. Because the Scripture in express words calls its זבח, sacrifice, Exod. 12:27, "it is the sacrifice of Jehovah's passover." Though this word, in other places, denotes any feast whatever, made up of slain animals, as Prov. 17:1, yet that it is here to be taken in its most common and sacred sense, we gather from this: because זבח, the paschal sacrifice, was a type of that most real sacrifice of Christ, concerning which, Paul says, 1 Cor. 5:7, "Christ our passover ἐθύθη is sacrificed for us." Josephus and Philo likewise everywhere call the paschal lambs, θυσίαι or θύματά, that is, according to the interpretation of Rufinus hostiæ, sacrifices. 2dly. Because the persons celebrating the passover, are said to offer the offering to Jehovah, Numb. 9:7, 13. 3dly. Because the blood of the paschal lamb, as of a true sacrifice, was offered to the Lord; which may be gathered from the words of Moses, Exod. 23:18, "Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread, neither shall the fat of my sacrifice remain until the morning" of my sacrifice, that is, of my passover, as even Onkelos has it, the blood of my sacrifice; and Jonathan, the blood of the libation of my passover. Add a parallel passage, Exod. 34:25, "Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven, neither shall the sacrifice of the feast of passover, be left unto the morning." 4thly. Because the blood of the paschal lamb was sprinkled as well as the blood of the other sacrifices. In 2 Chron. 30:16, speaking of the

passover it is said, that the priests sprinkled the blood, which they received from the hands of the Levites: also chap. 35:11, "and they killed the passover, and the priests sprinkled the blood from their hands." And none is ignorant that this belongs to a sacrifice. Maimonides observes well, on this occasion, that the sprinkling is of great importance, as being the foundation of the offering. And Peter, alluding to this, says, that we are elected unto sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, 1 Pet. 1:2. As therefore we have a more clear representation of the sacrifice of Christ in the passover, besides so many arguments, it is plain we are by all means to assert that the passover was a true sacrifice. And if so, it could not be properly killed anywhere but in the court of the temple.

VII. The straitness of time and place is in vain objected; as if it were not possible within the compass of the two evenings, to present and offer at one altar, so many thousand lambs. Concerning the prodigious number of these; see an extraordinary history or fable in Lightfoot on John 12:12. For, that the court of the Temple was very extensive appears from the twenty-two thousand oxen, and a hundred and twenty thousand sheep, which Solomon offered there at the dedication of the Temple, 1 Kings 8:63, and the sacrifices without number offered by the rest of the people, 2 Chron. 5:6: moreover, there were very many disengaged priests at leisure for four hours, if circumstances so required, to be employed in offering these lambs. And those very persons who tell us, there was such a prodigious number of paschal lambs, at the same time tell us, that the number could not be ascertained, but by the priests who offered in the court.

VIII. The ministers here, were 1st, The common people. 2dly, The Levites. 3dly, The priests. It belonged to the common people, not only to bring the paschal sacrifices to the priests, but also, if they pleased, to kill them. Which Philo, after the manner of orators exaggerates, when he writes, lib. de decalogo: "That at the feast of the passover every one indiscriminately sacrificed, the law granting on one extraordinary day once a year, the office of priest to the whole people, to offer sacrifice for themselves." God himself seems to have granted that privilege to all the people, Exod. 12:6: "And the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it." Nor was this peculiar to the passover, as Philo speaks, but allowed to the common people in the case of any other sacrifice, namely, to kill the sacrifices, even the most holy, whether for themselves, for private persons, or for the whole congregation; as Maimonides has more accurately observed than Philo, de Ingress. Sacerd. in Sanct. c. ix. §. 14: and the thing is clear from Scripture. See concerning the burnt-offering, Lev. 1:3, 4, 5; concerning the peace-offering, Lev. 3:2; and concerning the sin-offering, Lev. 4:24.

IX. But when private persons did not choose to kill the passover, or were not allowed on account of uncleanness, the Levites were substituted for this work in their room, because they were more skilful and expeditious. We have an example, 2 Chron. 30:17: "For there were many in the congregation that were not sanctified; therefore the Levites had the charge of the killing of the passovers for every one that was not clean, to sanctify them unto the Lord." Similar to this is the passage, Ezra 6:20.

X. The business of the priests was to sprinkle at the altar the blood received from the common people or the Levites, as we have already shown from 2 Chron. 30:16, and 35:11. They also alone burnt the fat on the altar, as the Jews constantly assert. Instead of all others let us only hear Maimonides, de pasch. c. i. §. 14. Who, after he had described a large circle of priests around the

altar, with basins of gold and silver, adds, when any of them had killed the passover, the blood was received in a basin by the next priest, who was to deliver it the a second, and so on, till it came to the priest next the altar, who poured it out at once at the bottom of the altar, and returned the basin empty which he had received full. After the blood was poured out, as he says elsewhere, ver. 6, they strip the paschal lamb of his skin, and opening his belly take out the fat on the inwards and burn it leisurely as in every sacrifice. Which they might do during the whole night till the morning dawn. Which is a further confirmation that the passover was a true sacrifice.

XI. As to the guests, they were in the first place all true born Israelites, if they were not excluded by legal uncleanness. For, Exod. 12:6, 47, "all the congregation of Israel" is commanded to solemnize the passover; and then the proselytes, who "were circumcised and became Jews," Est. 8:17; whether they were bondmen born in the house, or bought with money, or mercenary, or inmates of the land of Canaan, subject to no bondage, or in fine, those whom they called proselytes of righteousness, who, upon being circumcised, had a right also to eat the passover, Exod. 12:48: "And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to Jehovah, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that is born in the land; for, no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof."

XII. It is a question, whether women were likewise excluded by the same law that the uncircumcised were, especially as the law commanded the males only to repair to the three festivals, Exod. 23:17, and 34:23; Deut. 16:16. It would seem they were not. 1st, Because women cannot be numbered among the uncircumcised, nor accounted as such, for circumcision did not belong to them, but they were reckoned along with their circumcised parents or husbands. 2dly, Because all the congregation of Israel, as we have just shown, is commanded to celebrate the passover. But the women make a part of this congregation, Deut. 29:11. 3dly, That the women together with the men celebrated these solemn festivals, appears from the example of Elkanah, who yearly carried with him his two wives, with his sons and daughters, to Shiloh to the solemn festivals, 1 Sam. 1:3, 4. Joseph also and the holy virgin, repaired yearly to Jerusalem to the feast of the passover, Luke 2:41. From which it appears, that the same thing may be concluded concerning all the pious women in those times. 4thly, From a parity of reason; because in other eucharistical sacrifices, or שלמים, peace-offerings, women also had their portion: thus Elkanah gave to his wife Peninnah, and to all her sons and daughters, parts of the sacrifice; but to Hannah, whom he loved, a worthy, a double portion, 1 Sam. 1:4, 5. When David likewise offered eucharistical sacrifices, he dealt out a part of them to all Israel, as well to the women as men, 2 Sam. 6:18. And the daughters of the priests ate of the sacred food, Numb. 18:11, 19. And why may we not suppose that women also partook of the passover, which was a kind of eucharistical sacrifice or peace-offering? 5thly, We add the testimony of Maimonides, who says, that women were not only admitted to the paschal feasts, but also at times there was a company which consisted only of women, de Pasch. c. ii. §. 5.

XIII. We must not, however, omit here the observation of the rabbins, who distinguish between the command concerning the passover, and concerning the not eating leavened bread. They say, that all were absolutely bound to this last, females as well as males. This law not to eat leavened bread, Exod. 13:3, is, say they, "at every time and in every place, equally binding on males and females." see Hottinger. jus. Hebr. sect. iv. §. xxii. But the command concerning women's

appearing at Jerusalem to keep the passover is nowhere to be found in express terms. Hence it is said in Talm. Hierosol. Tract. Kidduschin, fol. 61, col. 3, "the passover of women is a discretionary thing." But those women who were led by a zeal for religion, were accustomed to present themselves before God, in order to partake of this sacrifice, Lightfoot, ad. Luc. 2:43.

XIV. The guests who partook of the paschal lamb, are commanded to meet by houses or families, Exod. 12:3: "They shall take to them every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for an house." But if a house had not a number sufficient to consume a lamb, the neighbours were to be called in, till a just number was made up, ver. 4. The Jewish masters took care that the number of guests should not be under ten, nor above twenty. Which Jonathan's paraphrase on Exod. 13:4, and Josephus, de Bell. Jud. lib. xvii. c. vii. observe. In those companies or societies, called φρατρίας by Josephus, by the Hebrews, הזבורה, men and women sat down together, old men and young, whole and sick, masters and servants, and in fine, every Jew that could eat a morsel of flesh, not excluding even young children.

XV. They who were legally unclean, whether by touching a dead body, or by a leprosy, or whose seed went from them, or by any other accident, and women in their monthly courses, were debarred from the passover, Num. 9:6. Persons thus polluted, till the time for their purification was elapsed, were not permitted to taste the flesh, either of the paschal lamb, or of any peace-offering, under pain of being cut off, Lev. 22:3, &c. And therefore, the Jews being to eat the passover, would not enter the judgment hall lest they should be polluted, John 18:28. But, under king Hezekiah, many tribes of Israel broke this law, for a great part of them had not sanctified themselves as they ought. Yet God, being appeased upon the prayer of the pious king, forgave those who were truly converted, 2 Chron. 30:17, &c.

XVI. But lest they who were unclean at the time of that passover, should be deprived of such an excellent sacrament for a whole year, a second passover was, at God's command, appointed for them in the second month; on which a person on a journey afar off was bound to attend, if he was not able to come to Jerusalem at the stated time of the passover, Numb. 9:10, 11. The Jewish masters fix a journey afar off\*, at fifteen miles without the walls of Jerusalem; so that a person, at that distance from the city on the fourteenth day of the month, might lawfully keep the second passover. But why should he not rather set out on the preceding day, in order to be at the feast, and not suffer himself to be straitened in time? For if any one who set out on a journey was retarded by the invincible slowness of his beasts, or by a disorder in his feet, or any accident of the like nature, such a person was not accounted to be on a journey afar off, but to be אנוט, detained by force. Philo therefore, de vita. Mosis, lib. iii. seems to have better understood the meaning of this law, when he applies the following things to those, "who on account of a journey afar off, are hindered from sacrificing with the rest of the nation. For, (says he,) they who travel and live in other parts of the world, are not guilty of any sin, for which they are deprived of the common honour with the rest. Especially, as one country cannot contain so populous a nation, but is obliged to send out colonies into many places." Concerning this second passover of the unclean, there are excellent observations in Selden, de Synedriis, lib. ii. c. i.

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

XVIII. The paschal beast was to be  $\text{שֶׁבִי}$ , "a small cattle or beast, a lamb or kid," Exod. 12:3; for that name is common to both: Deut. 14:4, ye shall eat "a small beast, of sheep, and of goats:" thus also, Exod. 12:5, it is emphatically added, "ye shall take it out from the sheep, or from the goats." However, it is probable that the pious used this liberty in such a manner, that they more frequently offered a lamb, as a more acceptable sacrifice to God, because, in sheep there is a greater degree of meekness, docility, and innocence. And therefore it is, that though Christ is in so many different places, proposed to us, under the type of a lamb, yet we never once observe that he is pointed out under the denomination of a kid. And therefore, Theodoret, quæst. 24, in Exod., seems not to have given a bad explication of the meaning of the Law-giver: "That he who has a sheep should offer it, but he who has none should offer a kid."

XIX. We are not to think that oxen were made use of in the paschal sacrifice, strictly so called; though in Scripture, even they are called by the name of the Passover; as Deut. 16:2: "Thou shalt therefore sacrifice the passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock, and the herd;" and 2 Chron. 35:8. "They gave unto the priests for the passover-offerings two thousand and six hundred small cattle, and three hundred oxen:" and again, ver. 9. "They gave unto the Levites, for passover-offerings, five thousand small cattle, and five hundred oxen." The appellation, passover, when it comprehends oxen, is taken in a larger sense, and then denotes those peace-offerings, which were killed at the passover festival, in order to feast on them with joy, before Jehovah. Thus, in the solemn passover under king Hezekiah, "They did eat throughout the feast seven days, offering peace-offerings," 2 Chron. 30:22. To this also, it seems, we should apply what John relates, 18:28, that the Jews would not enter the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; "but that they might eat the passover;" not certainly the paschal lamb, which they had eaten at the same time that Christ did, the day before, but the sacrifices that were usually offered for the seven days of the feast, which were hence also called Passovers. We therefore infer, that the sacrifice appropriated to the passover consisted of a lamb or a kid only.

XX. The Law-giver requires three things, in the lamb or kid to be offered; that it be sound, "a male, and of the first year," Exod. 12:5. To be sound, signifies to be without defect and blemish, Lev. 22:19, 20, 21. The blemishes in a sacrifice are described at large, ver. 22. God would have a male, because the more excellent things are to be offered to him; but a male is more excellent than a female, Mal. 1:14. In fine, it was to be  $\text{שְׁנֵה בֶן}$ , the Son of a year, or of the first year. By which expression is not meant a lamb, come to, but short of his first year. For every beast was, from its eighth day, pure, or fit for sacrifice, Exod. 22:30, Lev. 22:27. From the eighth day, therefore, if we regard this general law, a lamb might be offered, till it completed its first year. After which the Jewish masters exclude it from sacrifice. Yet to me it seems more natural, by a lamb of the first year, to understand that which is almost a year old, at which time it is come to its proper size, and its most grateful relish. Nor can I imagine that the ancient believers were so minutely nice, in calculating the time that they accounted their lambs profane, directly on the commencement of the second year; or that they set down the nativity of their cattle in journals, lest they should mistake in a minute.

XXI. The preparation of the paschal lamb consisted in the keeping it up, or setting it apart, which was done on the tenth day, and continued until the fourteenth, on which it was to be killed, Exod. 12:3. The Jews give the following reasons for this command: 1st, Lest they should forget it, if they delayed it, and took no care about it, till the very moment of their departure, since they

would then be hurried with a variety of business. 2dly, That they might more exactly observe whether the lamb had any blemish. 3dly, That they might have an opportunity, from the sight of the lamb, to converse together concerning their redemption out of Egypt. 4thly, That they might have time to prepare themselves for keeping the approaching solemnity.

XXII. The killing of the lamb followed upon its separation. Exod. 12:6: "And the whole congregation of the children of Israel shall kill it." The blood was to be received in a bason, and a bunch of hyssop to be dipt therein, with which they are to strike or sprinkle the lintel, and the two side-posts of the house, ver. 22. The lintel, I say, not the threshold, lest those that passed should trample under foot the sacred blood, which was instead both of a sacrifice and a sacrament. For why should not true religion have the same effect on them that superstition had on the people of Ashdod, who, for a long time, would not tread on the threshold of their temple after Dagon had fallen on his face upon it? 1 Sam. 5:5: God himself shows the reason of this sprinkling, Exod. 12:13. "And the blood shall be to you, for a token upon the houses where you are; and when I see the blood I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you, to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt." Not that there was any natural efficacy in the blood of the lamb, or that God stood in need of a sign to distinguish his own people, 2 Tim. 2:19. But this sign was given to the Hebrews, that thereby they might be confirmed and assured of their deliverance. Heb. 11:28, "Through faith Moses kept the passover, and the sprinkling of blood, lest he, that destroyed the first-born, should touch them.

XXIII. God gave a command about roasting it, Exod. 12:9. "Eat not of it raw, nor sodden at all with water, but roast with fire." First, God forbids the eating it raw. Not that this is to be understood of what is quite raw; for the Israelites knew this of themselves. They were not so voracious as usually to feed on flesh altogether undressed. It is therefore meant of that, which is not sodden or roasted enough, as the Jewish masters well explain it. For in that great hurry, with which the first passover was enforced, and so great a number of paschal lambs, it might easily happen that some of them might be only half done or scorched, unless the law-giver had provided against it, by an express command. A thing not without its mystery, as we shall presently see. But it was not sufficient to have the lamb perfectly done, unless also done in that manner which God prescribed, namely, roasted, not boiled. This was quite otherwise, than in the other peace-offerings, whose flesh was customarily boiled, in order to be eaten, both by the people and the priests, even at the paschal solemnity. Wherefore, 2 Chron. 35:13, these things are accurately distinguished: "And they roasted the passover with fire, according to the ordinance, but the other holy offerings sod they in pots, and in caldrons, and in pans." Where observe, that in both cases the word *בשל* is used, to show that it is applied both to boiling and roasting, according to the nature of the subject.

XXIV. The roasting is followed by the eating it. Where first, we are to observe the dress or attire of those who were to eat it, which they were to do with their loins girded, their shoes on their feet, and their staff in their hand, Exod. 12:11; which is the dress of travellers, and of those who undertake something laborious. For the garments of the Orientals being long and flowing, and generally ungirded, were to be tucked up, when either they addressed themselves to a journey or some laborious work, that they might be no impediment to them, 2 Kings 4:29. And a person girded, does not seldom denote an industrious person, whom the Greeks call *ἐὺζῶνος ἀνήρ*, a man well girded, and the Hebrews *הלויין* And none is ignorant, that a staff is proper for a journey,

as travellers are thereby supported in dangerous places, and defend themselves with it against aggressors and wild beasts; see Gen. 32:10. Mark 5:8. Nor was the rod of Moses, which is so celebrated, any thing but a traveller's staff, Exod. 4:2.

XXV. Their being commanded to eat the passover with shoes on their feet, seems to be to the same purpose. For it is probable, while the Israelites were in Egypt, they were generally without shoes; at least they did not use them daily during their severe bondage. As in the flourishing state of the Jews, we have examples of persons being unshod, even in Judea. As this want of shoes was less hazardous to the Israelites in Egypt, God was pleased to provide them with shoes, when they were now to undertake a tedious, hard, and rough journey. In other cases, one's being bare-footed was a sign of submission and devotion, Exod. 3:5. Hence that saying of the Pythagoric school, "do thy religious worship and adoration bare-footed." And Berenice, the sister of king Agrippa, "came bare-footed before the tribunal," to prefer her suit to Florus, who exercised great cruelties against the Jews, Joseph. de Bell. Jud. lib. ii. c. 15. This putting on of shoes, was not therefore a part of religious worship, but a symbol of their approaching journey.

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

XXVII. But to return from this digression. Moreover, God was, Exod. 12, pleased to command them to eat the passover with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. Plutarch relates, that among the Romans, the Flamen Dialis, or priest of Jupiter, was forbidden the use of leaven, in Quæst. Roman. Because, as leaven arises from a state of corruption, so also when it is mixed it corrupts the lump. Nor was only the paschal lamb to be eaten with unleavened bread, but God commanded the Israelites to abstain from leaven for seven whole days, Exod. 12:15. Since the five intermediate days of these seven were working days, God ordered the first and last to be accounted festival; for as on the first they were set at liberty from such a hard and grievous bondage, so on the seventh the Red Sea swallowed up Pharaoh and all his host. And this divine institution served to perpetuate the memory of both these among his people. But of what sort these bitter herbs were, we are neither much inclined to inquire, nor is it of great importance. Whoever would know the opinions of the Jewish masters on this head, may consult our great author, Bochart. We hasten to other matters.

XXVIII. God also forbade them to break so much as a bone of the paschal lamb, Exod. 12:46; Numb. 9:12. This law seems likewise to have a reference to their being commanded to eat it in haste; for they who are in hurry do not spend time in breaking and taking the marrow out of the bones. But a mystery also lay concealed in this law, of which presently.

XXIX. There was another law, not to leave any of the flesh of the lamb until the morning, but to burn what remained thereof, Exod. 12:10. Of this kind were the laws in all sacred feasts, see Exod. 16:19; Lev. 7:15, and Lev. 22:30, excepting only the flesh of the offering of a vow, or a voluntary offering, Lev. 7:16, 17. The design of these laws was to preserve the sacred food from corruption, and from being put to profane uses. In the lamb they were to take special care, that its remains should neither hinder nor clog the Israelites, who were now to depart; nor yield matter of derision to the Egyptians, nor become a prey to dogs; and, perhaps, also to prevent their becoming an object of idolatry as the brazen serpent was.

XXX. Moreover, God commanded that none should go out at the door of his house, until the morning, Exod. 12:22. lest they should meet with the destroying angel, who, indeed, could have distinguished the Israelites even out of their houses; but, they were to be taught, that their safety consisted in keeping themselves, as it were, under the protection of the blood of the lamb, with which they had sprinkled the posts of their doors. If they had rejected this sacrament of their security, they would thereby have also rendered themselves unworthy of the grace that was represented by that sign.

XXXI. In fine, it was ordained to be eaten in one house, and none of the flesh to be carried out, Exod. 12:46. This law seems to be joined with ver. 4, in which those families, which were so small as not to be able to eat a whole lamb, are commanded to join with their neighbouring families. But here, lest any should think that the lamb could be halved, and one half carried out to the absent family, the law directs two families joining together to eat the lamb in one house, and carry none of its flesh abroad; because so salutary a victim could not be divided, and nothing but an entire lamb, in every house, could rescue that house from the imminent destruction.

XXXII. But we are to observe, that some of those ceremonies were perpetual; as the killing, roasting, and eating the lamb, with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, without breaking a bone, &c. Others, again, were used only once, and nowhere else but in Egypt. To this may we reckon: 1st. The law concerning the keeping up the lamb, for the space of four days, before it was to be killed. God would have this done in Egypt, lest the Israelites, when among their enraged enemies, should not have lambs, if they were obliged to look out for them at the very last: but in Judea, they had nothing to fear of this kind, and it would have been no easy matter for those who came a great way to the city, to provide themselves precisely at that time, as the greatest part did not come till the preparation for the feast, or at most, the day before, and then purchased from these who usually exposed lambs to sale in the temple, John 2:13, 14. It also appears, from the history of Christ's last passover, that the disciples asked their master, only on the first day of unleavened bread, "Where wilt thou that we go and prepare, that thou mayest eat the passover?" Mark 14:12: consequently, they had not kept up a lamb four days before. 2dly. The law concerning striking the lintel and side-posts with the blood of the lamb, because the reason which God gave for this command could only respect Egypt, Exod. 12:12, 13: and from 2 Chron. 30:15, 16, and chap. 35:5, 6–10, 11, we learn, that in Judea, the paschal lambs were killed in the court of the temple, and there their blood was poured out. Nor does it appear that any part of this blood was carried into private houses, to be sprinkled on their door-posts. 3dly. The law concerning the eating the passover, with their loins girded, with shoes on their feet, a staff in their hands, and with haste. Because these things had a respect to that long and tedious journey, they were in a few hours to take; but after they had performed that journey, they ate it quietly and ungirded, not



standing, but sitting, not in haste, but at leisure; as is plain from the example of Christ, who sat down on a couch, in an upper room, with his disciples. 4thly. The law not to stir abroad out of their houses, lest they should meet the destroying angel, as in like manner appears from the example of Christ and his disciples, who, in that very night, in which they kept the passover, repaired to the mount of Olives, Matt. 26:30.

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

XXXIV. And, 1st, The very name Pascha, which, as we have said, signifies a passing over, reminded the Israelites of the angel who passed over their houses without touching them, in that night in which he fell on the Egyptians in such a manner, that not a house was free from the slaughter, Exod. 12:30. 2ndly, The bitter herbs, with which they were to eat the lamb, signified the bitter life they had led in Egypt, under hard bondage, in mortar, and in brick, Exod. 1:14, so that they justly might cry out, as they afterwards did in the Babylonish captivity, Lam. 3:15, that they were filled with bitterness, and made drunken with wormwood. This they testified in the passover, saying to each other, as Maimonides de Pasch. c. ii. §. 40, relates, "We have eaten that bitter thing, because the Egyptians embittered the life of our fathers in Egypt, as it is written," Exod. 1:14. 3rdly. The unleavened bread, also, which was but little grateful to the palate, was eaten for the same end. Wherefore the master of the family, when he distributed the pieces of it to his domestics, addressed them thus: "This is the bread of affliction, which our fathers did eat in the land of Egypt," in the very words of Moses, Deut. 16:3. They therefore set down the unleavened bread only in pieces, because not whole but pieces of bread are given to the poor. 4thly. Most of the other rites signified to the Israelites, that, being now called to liberty by God, they were, as soon as possible, to betake themselves out of that state of bondage. And therefore they are commanded to eat in a standing posture, with their loins girded, with shoes on their feet, and leaning on their staves, and in haste, because that very moment they were to depart. They were not to eat it boiled, but roasted, that being sooner done; and with unleavened bread, that they might not slip the opportunity of departing, should they stay till the lump was leavened. 5thly. However, as it is necessary to explain dumb signs by words; so, when their children asked what this ceremony meant, they were commanded to answer: "This is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses," Exod. 12:27.

XXXV. But a deeper mystery was veiled under these things, of which we are now to speak. And that we may do it with greater exactness, we will show that four things are represented by this sacrament. 1. The very person of Christ. 2. The sufferings he bore for us. 3. The fruits of his sufferings. 4. The manner we are made partakers of them.

XXXVI. The Scriptures frequently represent the person of Christ under the type of a lamb, John 1:29, 36. On account of his meekness and humility, Matt. 11:29; the simplicity of his manners, 1 Pet. 1:19; his extraordinary patience, Isa. 53:7; which was the more amazing in him, that though he was able to take vengeance, and deliver himself, yet he voluntarily submitted, and, by an

astonishing transformation from the lion of the tribe of Judah, became a lamb: and thus Samson's riddle was fulfilled in Christ, "Out of the eater came forth meat, and out of the strong came forth sweetness," Judges 14:14. This same lamb feeds us with his flesh, gives us his blood to drink, and, in fine, clothes us with his wool, Rom. 13:14. Gal. 3:27. But there were peculiar circumstances in the paschal lamb.

XXXVII. For, first, as the lamb was taken out of the flock, so also was Christ from among his brethren, Deut. 18:15, being a partaker of flesh and blood, and in all things like unto his brethren, Heb. 2:14, 17. Secondly. The lamb was to be perfect; Christ, in like manner, is a lamb without blemish and without spot, 1 Pet. 1:19, who through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, Heb. 9:14. Thirdly. The same lamb was to be a male, a symbol of vigour, strength and excellency; so Christ also is that man, Jer. 31:22, the man child, Rev. 12:5. Fourthly, it was to be of the first year, that is, young and of a most grateful savour, and of the greatest vigour, in order to represent: 1. That Christ was not to continue long among men, but to be cut off in the flower of his age. 2. That he is the sweetest food of the soul, beyond all the dainties of this world, Cant. 5:16. 3. That his sacrifice is of perpetual and of the greatest efficacy. Fifthly, Nor is it in vain that the lamb was, for the space of four days, separated from the fold. Thus also was it with Christ, if we reckon prophetic days for years, see Ezek. 4:6. For at his thirtieth year, he left his mother's house, as a fold, where he was born and brought up, and was crucified the fourth after, but it likewise deserves observation, that Christ came to Jerusalem to the feast, and to his last passover, on that very day on which God had commanded the lamb to be kept up in Egypt; namely, the tenth of the month Nisan. For, six days before the passover, he came to Bethany, John 12:1; that is, on the ninth of the month Nisan, the day after he went to Jerusalem, ver. 11, to present himself to be offered to God.

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

XXXIX. As to the manner. 1st. The lamb was to be killed, and that by the whole multitude of the congregation of Israel: so the priests, scribes, and pharisees, with the whole body of the people, conspired to the slaying of Christ; for, not being satisfied with mockings, smitings, and scourgings, they ceased not, till he was given up to death, Luke 23:18, and they cried out, all at once, saying, Away with this man. 2dly. There is likewise an argument as to the kind of death. For, as the blood of the lamb, so that of Christ was also shed; both for the people. Nor was the blood of the lamb poured out on the ground, but, as something precious, received in a bason, because it represented the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without spot, 1 Pet. 1:19; for that blood is the perpetual treasure of the church, which Christ even at this day offers to the Father, and is for ever to offer, or present. 3dly. The lamb was not to be eaten raw, or not sufficiently done. Christ was also to suffer indeed, and not in a superficial manner: his cup was not to pass, till it was drunk up to the bottom. 4thly. The roasting of the lamb at the fire, expresses the burning heat of divine wrath justly kindled against sinners, with which Christ, who presented himself as surety for sinners, was to be scorched. Hence those complaints, Ps. 22:14, 15 "My heart is like wax, it is melted in the midst of my bowels: my strength is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws." See what we have observed concerning the peculiar manner of this roasting, book ii. c. x. §. 26.

XL. The place where both the passover and Christ was slain are both the same. For the paschal lamb was, from the days of David, to be killed at Jerusalem; the place which God had chosen for himself, to cause his name to dwell there. But it was there that Christ suffered, as himself foretold. "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." Luke 13:33. And Luke 18:31. "Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets, concerning the Son of man, shall be accomplished."

XLI. There is also a manifest similitude with respect to the time. The passover was killed in the middle of the month Nisan, at the full moon, between the two evenings, that is, according to Josephus, from the ninth to the eleventh hour. On that very month, day, and hour, Christ was cut off; as is remarked, not without reason, by Matthew, chp. 27:46, 50. Some observe, that in the month Nisan, after the equinox, the days come to be longer than the nights; to signify that a new light then arose upon the world, when Christ dispelled the darkness of error and ignorance. And there are others, who, by the full moon, will have the fulness of time, and, by the two evenings, the evening of the world, and the last times to be shadowed forth, in which Christ offered himself a sacrifice, according to that of the apostle, Heb. 9:26, "Once in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Which are at least ingenious, if not solid reflections.

XLII. It now follows that we consider the consequences and fruits of this sacrifice; and indeed they are most excellent and abundant. For, first, the posts and lintels of the Israelites were sprinkled with the blood of this lamb, that they might avoid the common calamity, and be preserved from the destroying angel: to teach us that the justice of God spares all whose consciences are sprinkled with the blood of Christ, Isa. 52:15, "He shall sprinkle many nations." This is that "sprinkling of the blood" of Christ, this is that "blood of sprinkling," spoken of by Peter and Paul, 1 Pet. 1:2, Heb. 12:24. We are therefore no longer to dread the sword of the avenging angel. For whether an angel of darkness, "God hath delivered us from the power of darkness, through the blood of his Son," Col. 1:13, 14: or an angel of heaven, "Having made peace through his blood, he hath reconciled all things unto himself, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven," ver. 20.

XLIII. Secondly, on the night the lamb was slain, the Israelites received full power to deliver themselves from the Egyptian bondage: to teach us, that Christ, by his blood, has redeemed us from the bondage of the devil, the world, and sin, in order to call us to the glorious liberty of the sons of God. Heb. 2:14, 15, John 8:36.

XLIV. Thirdly, in that very night, the God of Israel inflicted his judgments on the Gods of the Egyptians, Exod. 12:12, Numb. 33:4: namely, four judgments, if we may credit Jonathan, whose words in his paraphrase are these: "Their molten images were melted down, their idols of stone cut down, those made of earth, ground to powder; in fine, those of wood reduced to ashes." Though we cannot avouch this for truth, as the Scripture is silent, yet it is certain God's threatenings were not without their effect. And whatever they signified, we see an illustrious fulfilment of them in the death of Christ; whereby the middle wall of partition being broken down, by which many nations, who had been separated from the Jews, being called to the knowledge of the true God, cast their idols to the moles, and to the bats. Isa. 2:10.

XLV. Fourthly, the month Abib, before the institution of the passover, was the seventh month of the Jewish year: but when God instituted the passover, he commanded, that it should for the future be accounted the first, and from it they should begin to reckon their sacred or ecclesiastical year. This month began with the spring; at which time, when God sendeth forth his Spirit, all things are created, and the face of the earth is renewed. Ps. 104:30. And this may also be applied to Christ, who introduced a new age, and abolished old things, in order to change them for the better: "Behold," says he, "I make all things new." Rev. 21:5. So that now we justly reckon time, not from the first creation of the world, which seems to have happened on Tisri, the first month of the civil year, but from the rising of a more auspicious star, at the illustrious Epiphany or manifestation of our Saviour: for such new miracles of divine goodness cause former things, in comparison of these, "not to be remembered, nor come into mind." Isa. 65:17.

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

XLVII. By the door posts of the houses are meant our hearts, because God sprinkles these with the blood of his Son, Heb. 10:22, "our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience." And the hearts of men lie as open before God as the door posts of our houses to us, 1 Sam. 16:7: the doors of our hearts are to be set open, that by them the king of glory may come in, Ps. 24:7, Rev. 3:20. But we may be said to sprinkle our hearts with the blood of Christ, when, by a stedfast faith, we embrace the doctrine of the cross, and apply to ourselves the merits of his sufferings. We are however to take care that we do not sprinkle on the threshold, what we are commanded to sprinkle on the lintel and posts of the door, that it may not be trampled under foot, lest the apostle's threatenings should be executed on us, which he denounced against those, who "tread under foot the Son of God, and account the blood of the covenant, wherewith they were sanctified, an unholy thing," Heb. 10:29.

XLVIII. By the same faith also the flesh is to be eaten. For why hast thou teeth, and a stomach? [Is it not to eat?] Believe, and thou hast eaten. This eating is absolutely necessary to salvation, John 6:53, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, ye have no life in you."

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

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

LI. What remained that could not be consumed, because of the small number of guests, was not suffered to be reserved to the next day, but was to be burnt with fire. This may be applied partly to the type, partly to the thing signified. The type was not to be reserved to another time. From the day the light of the Gospel appeared, what regarded the shadows was to cease and be abolished. As to the thing signified, whoever feeds upon Christ by a true faith, will not be found empty or hungry on the morrow; nor does he stand in need of a new Christ, or a new offering of him. For as "by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," Heb. 10:14, so "he that cometh to him shall never hunger, and he that believeth on him shall never thirst," John 6:35. Wherefore thou art under no necessity to reserve any thing of thine own for thyself, with which to make up a deficiency in Christ, when thou hast once apprehended him by faith.

LII. In the mean time, they were so to eat the flesh of the lamb as not to break a bone of it. To break the bones of the lamb, is to pry and search into things that exceed our capacity. As if it was not sufficient for faith to be fed with things obvious, unless we attempted to search into those things, the knowledge of which is forbidden, and the discovery dangerous. To pry into such things is to come off with damage in the attempt. This brings to mind that saying of Moses, Deut. 29:29: "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed, belong unto us and our children for ever;" and that excellent saying of Jerome, Prov. 25:27, though not so agreeable to the Hebrew, "The curious pryer into his majesty, shall be overwhelmed with his glory."

LIII. The bitter herbs, with which the lamb was to be eaten, signify the necessity of communion with him in his sufferings, Phil. 3:10, if we would have communion with him in his glory; we are to wear a crown of thorns with Christ, that a crown of glory may succeed; "if we suffer, we shall also reign with him," 2 Tim. 2:12. Nor are these things to be applied only to the external afflictions of the body; but also to the internal distresses of the vexed soul, grieving for sin in a godly manner, fearing the wrath of God, without which, the sweet consolations of the Lord Jesus, which he applies only to the mourners in Zion, Isa. 61:3, are usually neither tasted nor felt.

LIV. Nor is it in vain, that leaven is so often and so expressly forbidden those who are invited to eat of the lamb. For, in Scripture leaven is the symbol of corruption and especially of hypocrisy, Luke 12:1. Paul has written very properly to this purpose, 1 Cor. 5:7, 8: "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with leaven of malice, and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." Leaven might also be applied to pride, because the leavened lump directly rises or puffs up, or to hatred and animosity, which embitter the soul. Now, whoever has communion with Christ, ought doubtless to be purged from all these vices, because he, in whose mouth was found no guile, 1 Peter 2:22, cannot endure hypocrites; nor he, who became obedient even unto the death of the cross, Phil. 2:8, the proud; nor he, who is our peace, Eph. 2:14, the contentious; and therefore he offered himself in order to reconcile us both to God and to one another.

LV. But strangers, the defiled, the uncircumcised, were excluded from the paschal lamb, because righteousness hath no fellowship with unrighteousness, nor light any communion with darkness, nor Christ any concord with Belial, 2 Cor. 6:14, 15. Nevertheless whoever he be, that from a sense of his own uncleanness, has recourse humbly to the grace of God in Christ, ought not therefore to despond; for, "the good Jehovah pardoneth every one that prepareth his heart to seek

God, Jehovah the God of his fathers, though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary," 2 Chron. 30:18, 19.

LVI. Again, the Israelites in Egypt were commanded to eat the lamb, girded, shod, and leaning on their staves. To which rites we may see frequent allusions in Scripture. Christ, Luke 12:35; Paul, Eph. 6:14; and Peter, 1 Peter 1:3. command us to have our loins girded about; to signify, that the souls of believers are to be girded about with truth and soberness; to be ready for the heavenly journey, for the work of the Lord, for the conflict with spiritual wickednesses in heavenly places; to all which undertakings, flowing and trailing garments are an impediment. Paul, Eph. 6:15, speaks of feet shod with the preparation or promptitude of the gospel of peace. For, the Gospel is to be preached with cheerfulness, and confessed and walked in without stumbling. God himself is the believer's staff, on whom he leans, and to whom he commends his soul. Faith also is instead of a staff, because by it we are said to stand, Rom. 11:20; 1 Cor. 16:13. But we are to take particular notice, that this is the attire of travellers, which is the condition of all who are partakers of Christ. For in this life they are strangers and in their way to a better country, Ps. 39:13, 1 Peter 2:11.

LVII. The Israelites were also commanded to eat it in haste, because there was danger in delay from the Egyptians, who were soon to press them to be gone. And this is also applicable to us, because many enemies have a design upon us, the journey is long, the time short, and we feeble and easily apt to flag. Wherefore, as Lot was to go out of Sodom, and the Israelites out of Egypt, so we are commanded to make haste, to stretch every nerve, in order to escape the jaws of the devil, imitating those violent men who take the kingdom of heaven by force, Matt. 11:12, and remembering Lot's wife who perished by her delay, Luke 17:32.

LVIII. Lastly, we are to observe, that the lamb was to be eaten in one house, out of which it was not lawful to go for fear of meeting the angel of death. This house is the church, out of which there is no salvation, no communion with Christ. Let the false Nicodemists take notice of this, who imagine they can skulk in safety among the Egyptians, and think it sufficient, if they believe in their heart, though with their mouth they confess not the Lord Jesus, separating what the apostle has joined together, Rom. 10:9. And therefore, if they be wise, let them not forsake the assembling themselves together with us, Heb. 10:25. And having once entered this house let them never leave it lest they be condemned for apostates, concerning whom Paul speaks, Heb. 6:4, 5, 6, and 10:38, 39; and Peter, 2 Peter 2:20, 21.

## CHAPTER X: Of the extraordinary Sacraments in the Wilderness

I. BESIDES the ordinary and universal sacraments of circumcision and the passover, some extraordinary symbols of divine grace were granted to the Israelites in the wilderness, which, in the New Testament are applied to Christ and his benefits, and said to have the same signification with our sacraments. And they are in order these: 1st, The passage in the cloud through the Red Sea. 2ndly, The manna which was rained from heaven. 3dly, The water issuing out of the rock. 4thly, The brazen serpent erected by Moses for the cure of the Israelites.

II. The sacred history, Exod. 14. very particularly relates, how Pharaoh with mad rage at the head of a vast army, pursued the Israelites who were just departed from Egypt, and as he imagined, were entangled on every hand through a mistake of the way in impassable deserts; how in the first place, a miraculous cloud, interposing between them and the Egyptians protected the Israelites, who were trembling with fear and calling out to heaven for help; next, how the channel of the weedy or Red Sea, was made passable as on dry land by the waters giving way on each hand, being divided by the rod of Moses and by a strong east wind. How, in fine, the Egyptian monarch did not delay to pursue them close as they retreated, entered the sea as it opened a way for them, and was destroyed with all his army, the waters immediately returning upon them. For the better understanding of all this, we shall briefly explain these five heads. 1st, Why that sea, which Moses, Exod. 13:18, and 14:4, called יַם סוּף, or the weedy sea, is by Paul, Heb. 11:29, and generally by writers, called ἡ ἐρυθρὰ θάλασσα, the red sea? 2dly, Whether that drying up of the waters was natural, or altogether miraculous? 3dly, Whether the Israelites passed over the whole breadth of the sea, and landed on the Arabian shore over against Egypt, or only marched as far through it as was enough to overwhelm the Egyptians, and returned again on foot, by taking a semicircular compass to the same shore? 4thly, In what sense the apostle might say, the "Israelites were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea?" 5thly, What may be the mystical signification of these things?

III. The reason is obvious why this is called the weedy sea; namely, because of the plenty of sea weeds with which it abounds, heaps of which being raised like mountains near the shore, and laid close together by the continual heat of the sun, afford the convenience of houses to the inhabitants there, who, from their eating of fish, are called Ichthyophagi. And Agatharcides says, that some of them live "under the ribs of fish, covered over with sea-weed". Bochart in Phaleg. Lib. 4. c. 22. may be consulted on this subject.

IV. Why it is called the red or Erythrean Sea was formerly not so well known. The ancients generally referred it to the colour of the water, which some think was derived from the reflection of the solar rays; others from the circumjacent mountains being made red by the scorching heat, from which waters impetuously descended into the sea and tinged it of a like colour; others, in fine, from the red sand that lay on its shore, or channel; not to mention any thing now about the fable of Perseus, who, after having killed the sea-monster, to which the daughter of Cepheus had been exposed, is said there to have washed away the blood with which he was all over stained. But the undoubted experience of mariners shows the falsehood of all this. Ludovicus Vartomannus, who sailed over the whole of it almost from its extremity to the mouth of the straits, says, "It is a thing sufficiently confessed by all, that the said sea is not red, but like other seas," Navig. lib. 1. c. 21. The same thing, Pietro della Valle, a noble Roman, an eye witness,

testifies, who says the waters are clear, transparent, and blue, and the sand of the usual colour, nay, whiter than ours, Itiner. p. 1. c. 30. Diodorus Siculus writes, that "in colour it is altogether green". Not that such is the nature of the water, but on account of the quantity of moss and seaweed floating thereon. What is therefore said of the red colour is all fable, this prejudice having arisen from an erroneous interpretation of the name.

V. They come nearer the truth, who derive its name from king Erythras or Erythrus, who had this sea within the bounds of his empire. But who this Erythras was, all the profane writers are absolutely ignorant. The Scriptures alone inform us of this, from which Nic. Fuller, Miscellan. lib. iv. c. 20, boasts that he made the first discovery: namely, that this Erythras was Esau, surnamed Edom or Red, both from the hairy redness, with which he was born, Gen. 25:25; and from that red pottage, for which he sold his birth right, ver. 30. This Edom, who, according to the genius of those times having the whole authority in those parts, gave name to the country reduced under his dominion and power, so that it was also called the land of Edom, and even simply Edom, namely, of the feminine gender, Jer. 49:17. His posterity, proud of so great an original of their nation, lived on the borders of the sea we are now treating of; and hence it had its name, the Hebrew Edomi or Idumean Sea, the Greek ἐρυθραῖον, and the Latin, Mare rubrum, differ therefore only in language. See among others Vossius de Idololat. lib. i. c. 34.

VI. We are on no account to imagine that what, as we are here told, befell the waters of the Red Sea, was either altogether, or for the greatest part, natural: as if Moses, who had great skill in the knowledge of nature, taking the opportunity of an ordinary reflux, which, on the blowing of an east wind, was both more impetuous and lasting than usual, ventured in the present imminent danger, to attempt the passage, and persuaded the Israelites to follow his example: but Pharaoh, who was ignorant of these things, and delaying too long, was drowned on the return of the flood. For the whole of this history is full of miracles, which none but the enemies of the Scripture, as Scaliger, de Subtilitat. Exercit. 52, justly calls them, can doubt of. 1st. It was a miracle, that the extraordinary cloud, which went before, and pointed out the way to the Hebrews, should now place itself in the middle, between them and the Egyptians, Exod. 14:19. 2dly. It was a miracle, that when Moses lifted up his rod, and stretched out his hand, the sea should not only go back, but was also divided; and giving way on each hand, yield a safe passage to Israel amidst the waters, ver. 16, 21, which never was, nor could be done, by any natural reflux. 3dly. It is a miracle, that the waters, naturally fluid, should be collected together into very high heaps, and stand like a wall on the right and left of the Israelites, ver. 22. 4thly. It was a miracle of miracles, that when Moses again stretched out his hand and rod towards that part of the sea, where the Egyptians were pursuing them, the waters should return to their natural force, and drown all the Egyptians; while the children of Israel had now either almost finished, or were still prosecuting their journey on dry land, through the midst of the sea, ver. 26, 27, 29. Can any mortal have so much impudence, as to dare to compare these things with the daily flux and reflux of the sea? It is indeed true, that God here made use of the wind, but it is also evident, that the same God exerted an extraordinary power, both by raising the wind so seasonably, and by executing such things by it, as could not be effected by any natural cause, by its own virtue. And therefore the Israelites deservedly admired in this work, הַגְּדֹלָה הַיָּד אֵת, that great hand of their God, ver. 31.

VII. The inhabitants on the coast of the Arabian gulf, though barbarous to the highest degree, preserved the memory of this prodigy for many ages after; as Diodorus Siculus vouches, lib. iii.



where he writes as follows: "The neighbouring Ichthyophagi have an ancient tradition handed down to them by their ancestors, that upon a certain great recess of the sea, all the parts of this bay being dried up, and the sea falling back to opposite parts, the channel appeared of a green colour, and that again the sea, returning with a strong tide, was restored to its former place." In these words, who does not see that this miracle of Moses is described, the memory of which these barbarians did, though somewhat obscurely, propagate to their posterity.

VIII. But it is a more intricate point, which is even at this day made the subject of debate among the learned, whether the Hebrews passed the sea straight forward, from the shore of Egypt to the opposite coast of Arabia; or whether they fetched a semicircular compass in the midst of the sea, and returned to the same shore from which they set out? The former opinion is by far more commonly received, and rests on those arguments, collected by Rivet, in Exod. 14:21. 1st. The words of the history seem to bear this meaning, and it tends very much to show the greatness of the miracle. The Scripture says, that the Israelites passed through the Red Sea; but that which others allege, was not a transit or passage, but a circuit. 2dly. It appears from the map of the country, try that it must have been so; for, in order to come from Egypt to Mount Sinai, as the Red Sea lies between that mountain and Egypt, it must of necessity be passed over. For, though the foot passage from Rameses to Sinai is direct, leaving the Red Sea on one side, yet it so blocked up, and everywhere so rough on account of rocks, as not to be fit for the journeying of so great a people. 3dly. The same is concluded from Numb. 33:8, and they departed from before Pi-hahiroth, and passed through the midst of the sea into the wilderness; which seems to denote quite a different thing from their returning by a circuit, or compass, to the wilderness. 4thly. Add the authority of Josephus, who declares that the Israelites passed over to the opposite shore, Antiq. lib. ii. c. ult.

IX. But the contrary opinion has also great names, and no mean arguments to support it. 1st. They desire us to take notice of the intent of the passage through the sea; which was the drowning of the Egyptians, and by that means to manifest the glory of God to the people all around. And, therefore, it is probable the Egyptians were thrown out on that part of the shore which was nearest to Egypt, that the judgment of God might be manifested to that kingdom. 2dly. They observe, that the part of the Red Sea which the Israelites passed over, is distant from the opposite shore at least six, others say, fifteen leagues; which journey, it seems, could not possibly be accomplished by so great an army, together with their children, women, and luggage, in the compass of a short night, as was done here, ver. 21, 23. 3dly. It appears from Exod. 13:20, that before the Israelites entered into the sea, they encamped in the wilderness of Etham, in the border of the wilderness. And yet after their coming out of the sea, they again proceeded to the wilderness of Etham, Numb. 23:8; they consequently returned to the same shore, but at a greater distance from the place from which they set out. This argument cannot be answered but by saying, either that there were two wildernesses of the same name, on each side of the Red Sea, which Lyranus does; or, that the whole country, quite to Mount Sinai, went under the same appellation, according to Rivet: but whether this can be proved, is matter of inquiry. 4thly. They add, that the Red Sea does not lie between Egypt and mount Sinai, but that the journey by land is directly performed with camels and other cattle. Of this may be seen the Itinerarium of della Valle, p. 1. c. 27, 28. 5thly. The argument for the contrary sentiment, taken from its being said that the Israelites passed through the Red Sea, seems to be of little weight. For, the sacred history uses very general terms, ויבואו, and they went into the midst of the sea, Exod. 14:22; הלכו, they

walked upon dry land in the midst of the sea, ver. 29; it is, indeed said, Numb. 33:8, ויעברו, and they passed through. But besides that, עבר sometimes simply signifies to go on before, as Gen. 33:3, לפניהם עבר והוא and he passed over (went on) before; the Israelites may very properly be said to have passed through the waters of the sea, though by taking a semicircular compass they returned to the same shore; for, in every journey there is an intermediate passage from the term from which, to the term to which. Nor is it necessary that every passage should be in a direct line. 6thly. Nor is it more convincing, that they are said to have walked in the midst of the sea, though others oppose this very reason; for certainly they, who had the sea both on their right and left, must have walked in the midst of the sea by what way soever, or whithersoever they went. So that it appears nothing certain can be brought from Scripture for the opposite opinion. The decision of the question depends principally on an exact plan or map of the country. Whoever wants more on this head, may consult Fagius in Exod. 4.; and Christian. Schotanus, my honoured predecessor in the chair at Franeker, Biblioth. Sacr. T. ii. p. 142: add Genebrardus in Chron. p. 66. Gregor. Turon. Hist. lib. 1. c. 10; Abulensis, and Grotius on the place, and who is more full on the subject, Ludovicus de Tena ad Heb. 11; Difficult. 19; and lastly, Usher, Epist. 105.

X. The Apostle alluding, 1 Cor. 10:1, 2, to this history, says, that all the fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses, in the cloud, and in the sea. Here are three difficulties to be cleared up: first, it is inquired, how the apostle could write that they were under the cloud, since the sacred history declares, that the cloud went behind them, Exod. 14:19. But this is of little weight, for it was behind them in such a manner, that it hung a great way over them, and extending to a vast breadth and height, encompassed them under its protection, as there is an allusion to this, Isa. 4:5: "And Jehovah will create upon every dwelling place of mount Zion, and upon her assemblies a cloud by day."

XI. The other difficulty is something more considerable, namely, how the Israelites could be baptized in the cloud and in the sea, since they were not dipped in the water of the sea, nor wetted by the cloud. But we are to know: 1st. That the apostle uses the term baptism, here, in a figurative sense. For, because the Corinthians gloried of baptism, the apostle applies the name of baptism to those things, of which the Israelites might glory as much as the Corinthians would of baptism, and which were to them instead of baptism. 2dly. There is also some sort of agreement in the external sign: a cloud differs very little from water, and the sea is water indeed: the cloud hung over their heads, so also water hangs over baptized persons. Compare this with what we shall presently advance from Gregory of Nyssa, concerning the cloud. The sea surrounded them on all sides; so does water also those that are baptized. 3dly. This sign signifies the same that baptism does: and so baptism is the antitype of it, as, on a like subject, Peter said, 1 Pet. 3:21. See Cameron in 1 Cor. 10. And the ancient Jews have observed that, in the baptism of the Israelites, there was indeed a peculiar respect had to the pillar of cloud. In Pirke R. Eliez. c. 44, R. Zacharias speaks thus: "The pillar of cloud surrounded the camp of the Israelites, as a wall surrounds a town: nor could an enemy or foe approach to them." But, the cloud preserved those who wanted true baptism, even without the camp, which was holy." Gul. Vorstius has ingeniously compared this passage with this place of the apostle. But what we have said concerning the passage of the Israelites through the sea, and the baptism therein, appears much more probable to us than the judgment of Selden, in other respects a learned man, who, by the sea, understands here any receptacle of water, and will have the passing through the sea to be the

same as to be dipped in water, de Synedr. lib. i. c. 3. But this intricate way of speaking, seems not to agree with the simplicity of the apostle.

XII. Thirdly, it is proper to inquire, in what sense they may be said to be baptized unto Moses; since that seems to be too great an honour to be conferred on a servant, or any mere man? 1 Cor. 1:13. I answer, It is one thing to be baptized unto a person; another, to be baptized in the name of a person. In whose name soever we are baptized, we are baptized by his authority and command; we acknowledge him for our king, who alone can institute public seals; we devote our obedience and worship to him, so as for the future to be called by his name; from him we, by faith, expect that spiritual grace which is sealed by baptism. Paul carefully disclaimed this honour, because it was greater than became a man. To be baptized unto any person, is by far of a lower degree: for either it signifies simply to be baptized by the ministry of any one; or thus, that by receiving baptism, we acknowledge such a person to be a faithful servant of God. Both may be here with propriety joined together. They were baptized unto Moses, that is, according to the Syriac, by the hand of Moses; or, as Augustine reads, on Ps. 77, by Moses. For Moses, by his prayers, obtained for them this protection of the cloud, and this passage through the sea. Moses, by stretching out his rod, divided the water. Moses first entered the channel of the sea, and both led and encouraged the rest to venture with him; and thus they were baptized by the means of Moses. But there is more implied in this manner of speaking. As these miracles were sacraments of divine grace to the true and spiritual Israel, so they were also symbols, by which God confirmed the ministry of Moses, and proved him to be a typical deliverer and mediator. And therefore, in the place where we read of their passing through the sea, the people is said "to have believed Jehovah and his servant Moses," Exod. 14:31; and in so far the people did well, for, Exod. 19:9, when God himself set forth the authority he had bestowed on Moses, he says, "Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, and believe thee for ever." And thus they were baptized unto Moses, because by this sign God taught them to acknowledge Moses for a faithful prophet, and an eminent type of the Messiah, by whose intervention those benefits should be conferred upon them, which were both great in themselves, and earnest of the greatest blessings to be conferred by the Messiah. And in this respect, Moses had something peculiar above other ministers.

XIII. This very passage of Paul leads us to meditate on the mystery of this sign; for it teaches us that, in its signification, it answers to our baptism. Tertullian, lib. de Baptismo says, "First, when the people went out of Egypt, and, by passing through the water, escaped the tyranny of the king of Egypt, who with all his hosts was overwhelmed. Which figure is more evident in the sacrament of baptism. The nations are delivered from the world, namely by the water, and leave the devil, their old tyrant, sunk in the water." But let us descend to particulars.

XIV. This miraculous cloud was: 1st. A symbol of God's gracious presence; for, God was in the cloud, Exod. 13:21 and the angel of God, Exod. 14:19: namely, the angel of the covenant, the angel of his presence, who had appeared to Moses in the bush, and led the Israelites through the wilderness, Isa. 63:9. 2dly. It prefigured the future incarnation of the Son of God: for, as the Son of God veiled the infinite glory of his majesty in this cloud, spoke from it, wrought miracles, and protected his people, so in like manner he was, in due time, to conceal his majesty under the assumed form of a servant, Phil. 2:7, but in such a manner, that the rays of his glory might, at times, shine forth in his divine discourses and miracles, which no age ever saw either like them,

or equal to them, John 1:14. 3dly. It signified God's protection towards the elect, and his pointing out the way, through the wilderness of this world, to the heavenly Canaan. For, as Gregory of Nyssa finely says of this cloud, *de Vita Mosis*: "It was such a miracle, that, while the shining rays of the sun were hot and scorching, it defended the people like an interposing screen, and tempered, with its shade and the gentle drops of dew that were diffused, the heat of the air; but, in the night, it became a fire, and by its own light afforded the Israelites, as it were, a torch or flambeau, from evening till the rising of the sun." Such is the protection and guidance that we have in Christ, who, by his shadow screens us from the heat of divine wrath, Isa. 4:5, 6, and enlightens us by his Word and Spirit, "as the light of the world which, whoever followeth, shall not walk in darkness," John 8:12; who, in a word, is the "author and finisher of our faith," Heb. 12:2. 4thly. As this cloud placed itself in the middle between Israel and the Egyptians; so Christ takes upon himself those evils which threaten his people, and "the glory of the Lord is their reward," Isa. 58:8.

XV. We may observe in the passage through the Red Sea, the following things. Pharaoh and the Egyptians are the figure or emblem of the devil and sin, who use the utmost endeavour to keep the elect under their yoke of bondage, and whenever, with a generous mind, they aspire to liberty, to pull them back again. But they shall lose their labour, and in the end, dearly pay for their wickedness, in a way answerable to their crimes. Because Pharaoh commanded the young children of the Israelites to be drowned in the river, Exod. 1:22, himself with all his hosts is, by the law of retaliation, drowned in the sea. The angel of the waters publishes a similar procedure of divine justice, Rev. 16:6, "because they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, thou hast given them blood to drink, for they are worthy."

XVI. Moses was a type of Christ, our deliverer and Saviour. 1. Moses, by his prayers, interceded for the people, and obtained for them this great salvation. Christ is our advocate with the Father, and all the good that befalls us is owing to his intercession. 2. Moses, with his rod, as a moral instrument, divided the waters: Christ, with the wood of his cross, hath opened a new and living way to heaven. 3. Moses was the leader of the people, and went before them, through a way by which none ever went before. Christ also went before us in the road of sufferings, "leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps," 1 Pet. 2:21. 4. Moses, with the rod with which he divided the waters, that the Israelites might go through, caused the waters to return and drown the Egyptians. The same cross of Christ, which, "unto them which are called, is the power of God, is unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness," 1 Cor. 1:23, 24: "to these the savour of death unto death; but to those the savour of life unto life," 2 Cor. 2:16.

XVII. The waters of the Red Sea signify afflictions, and even death itself; so likewise do the waters of baptism, the fellowship in the sufferings, death, and burial of Christ, Rom. 6:3, 4. But as the Israelites marched to their deliverance through the midst of the waters, as through the midst of death; so, in like manner, the sufferings which we undergo for Christ, work for us a far more exceeding weight of glory, 2 Cor. 4:17, and death itself is the passage to eternal life, John. 5:24. The waters which saved Israel, destroyed the Egyptians. The death of our body, which presents our souls pure before God, as a flock of sheep newly shorn, which come up from the washing, Cant. 4:2, entirely destroys in us all the remains of the devil and of sin, insomuch that our eyes shall never more behold those enemies, to whose troublesome and malicious assaults we have been exposed even to the very last.

XVIII. That strong east wind, which by its violence drove the waters before it, for the benefit of the Israelites, was an emblem of the Spirit of Christ, John 3:8, of Christ, I say, who is "the dawning, day-spring\* from on high," Luke 1:78, and applies to us, by the efficacy of his Spirit, the virtue of his merits, by removing all hinderances, nay directing them to the salvation of his people: "not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith Jehovah of hosts," Zech. 4:6. By the same Spirit of his mouth, he will hereafter consume that wicked one, who opposes his kingdom, 2 Thess. 2:8.

XIX. The Israelites, when just come out of Egypt, are a figure of believers, who, having no sooner renounced the devil, and by the power of Christ, recovered their liberty, are immediately exposed to the persecution of Satan and the world, who endeavour to bring them back again to bondage. And though they have now happily surmounted the first danger, yet they have still a wide sea to cross, lofty tops of mountains to pass over, and in fine, an impassable wilderness to go through, before they obtain that full salvation, which is the mark they aim at and desire. When every thing seemed to be given up for lost, and no way of escape appeared, then God came to Israel's help, and opened a way through the midst of the sea. So, in an especial manner, he comes by his grace to the relief of his church, when she is destitute of all human assistance, and nothing but the most certain destruction seems to hang over her. Isa. 43:2. "When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee." This deliverance happened to Israel, when they did nothing at all towards it, Exod. 14:14, "Jehovah shall fight for you, and ye shall hold your peace;" but only believed, and behold the mighty hand of God: Heb. 11:29, "by faith they passed through the Red Sea." It is thus also, that God works out eternal salvation for us; for us, I say, not working, but believing in him, that justifieth the ungodly, Rom. 4:5. The Israelites, after their passage through the sea, and the destruction of their enemies, sung a joyful song or triumph to the praise of God their deliverer: thus also John, in the revelation, chap. 15:2, 3, saw the saints, who, having got over the sea of glass which was mixed with fire, sung the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb. And thus far of the passage through the Red Sea.

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

XXI. The surprise of the Israelites gave rise to the name. When they first saw it, they said to one another, Exod. 16:15, מן הוא, man hu, it is manna; for they wist not ma hu, what it was, and v. 31, and the house of Israel called the name thereof manna. We can on no account assent to those who render מה הוא what is this? For מן never signifies in Hebrew, what, and here it is very expressly distinguished from מה: nay, it is not very commonly taken in that sense in Chaldee, as they usually say מן of a person, not of a thing. I will not however conceal it, that they speak with greater freedom than they ought, who absolutely deny that מן in Chaldee is applied to a thing. Drusius ad Joh. 6:31, hath given some examples to the contrary. But the Israelites spoke then in Hebrew, not in Chaldee. I know not whether they are in the right who affirm that מן is an Egyptian word, and is equivalent to an interrogative pronoun; but though they are, yet it does not seem probable that the Israelites would express a thing so sacred by a term borrowed from a nation so odious, not only in that first surprise, but also ever after. And then it is altogether

trifling to say that the food, which God gave to the Israelites, was always called what, only because when at first they did not know it, they asked, what is this?

XXII. It is much more agreeable to derive the word from *בזנה*, he prepared, appointed, determined; and hence the name *מנה*, manna, portion, even of the food allotted for any person, 1 Sam. 1:4, 5: Neh. 8:10, 12, and generally elsewhere. But from manna it is easy to form man by an apocope,\* especially in the exclamation of persons under a surprise, and when he is the next letter that begins the following word. And this is the more probable, as such an apocope is often to be met with in the word manna: once in the imperative, *מו ואמה הסד* "prepare (or appoint) mercy and truth," Ps. 61:7; and again in the preterite, Jonas 1:17, *וימן*, "and Jehovah prepared a great fish;" and what comes nearest to the point in hand is, when an allotment of food is spoken of, as in Dan. 1:5, *וימן*, "and the king appointed them a daily provision." As therefore both the form of the term agrees to it, and the signification is very suitable, what remains, but that we say with the most learned of the Jews, that man signifies the food appointed, prepared for, and given to Israel as their portion? Such a name became this miraculous food. And what is added is no objection, namely, that the Israelites knew not what it was. For, in general, they knew from the prediction of Moses, that they were to be satisfied with bread, ver. 12, from which they conjectured, that what they saw, was the portion which was intended for them from heaven, and this they expressed by the name, man. But they did not distinctly know what it would be, nor had they any peculiar name by which to express it. To this the author of the Book of Wisdom seems to have alluded, when c. 16:20, he calls "manna, bread prepared from heaven." And therefore this name has so far prevailed, that it has remained unvaried in all languages, and is even given also to things which have any similitude with that food of the Israelites.

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

XXIV. Now the question is, whether the manna of the Israelites was of the same species and nature with the common? It is sufficiently agreed on, that some miraculous circumstances attended the manna of the Hebrews, but there is no solid reason to conclude from this, that the thing itself was altogether new, and was never produced by natural causes at any time or in other places, since God could so multiply the dew conveyed in great plenty from some other quarter, to be matter fit for the production of manna, as to be sufficient for the daily supply of that great multitude; and so dispose it, as to be endowed with those wonderful adjuncts we are hereafter to speak of. It is certain, Josephus thought it was a natural manna, and relates, that in his time, it still continued to be plentifully rained down about Mount Sinai,\* Antiq. lib. iii. c. i. And

Franciscus Vallesius Philosoph. Sacr. c. lvii. insists at large, that the manna of the Israelites was altogether the same with the common. Cardan also, de Subtilitate, lib. xxi. relates, that in the desert of Traga in Lybia, there is so much of it gathered in a day, especially about the town Agadez, as that a pound of 28 ounces, is sold for two pence; and adds, the inhabitants by eating it live sound and healthy though the air be pestilential. They who are of this opinion likewise observe, that they do not undervalue the favour granted to the Israelites in such an extraordinary manner, when they search into the natural causes of things, but praise the infinite wisdom of God, who disposes all things in such a way that even the most extraordinary, may, in a good measure, seem to have happened according to the ordinary course of nature, as Vallesius speaks in the place above quoted. Others again think, that the manna of the Israelites was something extraordinary, never seen before, and after it ceased was never after to be met with; and when it is called angels' food, and every where spoke of in the Holy Scripture, as prepared by the special hand of God, they think a natural cause ought piously and religiously to be excluded in this case. Thus Rivet in Exod. 16:13.

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

XXVI. To the manna of the Israelites the Polish comes nearest, which was not long ago found strewn in the fields; it was small and like sugar, and when it is boiled up with butter and a little sugar, may easily vie with the most delicate Italian jellies or dainties, as Keckerman describes it, Physic. lib. vi. c. x. A Lapid in Exod. 16:21. treats more largely on this, and declares that from the constant accounts of the Poles, it rains down in the nights of the months of June and July, and settles on the herbs like a dew; that, before the sun is up, it is gathered in sieves, sifted, pounded, mixed with water, and made into a kind of hasty-pudding. But if the sun begins to be hot, the husk of it dissolves, and the grain of the manna inclosed therein is lost. He adds, that he had seen the grains, and that they resembled millet, only longer and of a ruddy colour, and found the taste of it like that of pannick.\* But even this manna is different from that of the Israelites. 1st, In figure, for it is oblong; whereas that of the Israelites was round like coriander-seed. 2dly, In colour, being ruddy; whereas the other was white. 3dly, The Polish is included in a husk; whereas the other had none. 4thly, The manna of the Hebrews melted before the sun and vanished; the husk of the other is dissolved, but the grain is hard and falls to the ground.

XXVII. However, there are many concurring circumstances which here proclaim that a miracle must by all means be admitted. For, 1st, The manna which is commonly known, is gathered only at certain seasons of the year, but this came down daily. 2dly, During so long a time none fell on the sabbath, but in a double quantity on the day before. 3dly, It was found daily in such quantities as to suffice to feed so many thousands. 4thly, If it was kept till the next day it spoiled,

except that which was the portion of the sabbath. 5thly, And yet that part of it, which God commanded to be laid up, remained untainted for some ages after. 6th, It fell in all places wherever the Israelites encamped, but was not known among the neighbouring people, at least not used for food, much less for their daily food. 7thly, It ceased after they passed over Jordan, and they had got a full supply of ordinary bread, and perhaps there are more circumstances to the same purpose.

XXVIII. The origin of the manna was from God, as the principal cause. It is every where ascribed to him as a singular privilege which he bestowed on his people Israel, Exod. 16:4, 8, 16; Deut. 8:3, 16; Neh. 9:15, 20, 21. But God formed this bread in the air, from the vapours or exhalations properly prepared by the sun and by the other stars, if they contributed any thing towards it. Whence it is said, "That he commanded the clouds from above, and opened the doors of heaven, and gave them of the corn of heaven, Ps. 78:23, 24. But the air which is the seat of meteors, is called heaven, as "the fowls of heaven," and in Lucretius, "the air which is called heaven." And as the angels are ministering spirits, Heb. 1:14, whose ministry God very frequently used in the whole economy of the Old Testament, and who upon other occasions supplied God's servants with food, 1 Kings 19:5, 6, 7, I see not why a celebrated expositor of our day, who in other things makes the church of that age subject to angels, can deny that this food was prepared by angels. Suidas says, "Manna is a food supplied from above; and is called the bread of angels, because they supplied them with it."

XXIX. And yet I doubt whether any sufficient argument can be formed from Ps. 78:25, for the ministry of angels in this particular. We there indeed find אַבִּירִים לֶחֶם, which the Septuagint translate, "ἄρτον ἀγγέλων, the bread of angels;" just as the author of the Book of Wisdom calls it τροφήν ἀγγέλων, c. 16:20, "angels' food." And R. Solomon in like manner, מְלֹאכֶם לֶחֶם. But first, we are under no necessity to understand angels by אַבִּירִים, which signifies the strong. For that is a general name, and is applied to men of valour, or heroes among men, Jer. 46:13; Lam. 1:15. Let it therefore be called the bread of the strong, because it made the Israelites robust and strong; as supplying the place of ordinary bread, by which the heart is supported, though at first sight and taste it might seem light; or, what I would choose, the bread of Heroes, that is, such as even the greatest nobles would reckon delicious. God is also called אַבִּיר, "the [Hero] mighty one of Jacob, or of Israel," Gen. 49:24; Isa. 49:26. Nor is it unusual in Scripture, when speaking of God, to use the plural number; of which they who have but a small share of learning are not ignorant. Why may we not therefore be allowed to explain it of the bread of God, which the Hero of Jacob gave them, and which also spiritually was a representation of himself? Drusius also has observed this on John 6:31. Again, should we grant that angels are meant, yet I do not recollect that they are called אַבִּירִים in Scripture, though I well remember, that they are represented as כֹּוֹחַ נְבוֹרִי, "excelling in strength," Ps. 103:20; yet the matter would still remain undecided, since it might be called the bread of angels, because of its excellence and spiritual signification; for, it signified that God who is the life and joy of angels, was to descend from heaven in order in like manner to become the food, that is, the joy and life of men.

XXX. Moses here also acted his part, who, it is very probable, interceded with God by prayer that he would give food to the starving people. Josephus says, his prayers were poured forth on a high rock, adding of his own fancy, that the manna first fell and thickened on the palms of his hands, as they were stretched out to heaven when he returned thanks to God; and that Moses,



suspecting what it was, tasted it, and joyfully upon the discovery, showed the people the favour God had bestowed on them. That the people, having seen their food rained down from heaven, imagined it snowed, the season of the year comports with this. But these things neither agree with reason (for it is beyond all probability, it should in that hot climate in the month of May, when these things happened) nor with Scripture, which speaks expressly of some persons who went out of the camp at break of day, and first observed the manna, *Exod. 16:15*.

XXXI. The Gemarists go too far, when they say in *Taanith*, fol. 9, col. 1: "That the Israelites had three good shepherds, Moses, Aaron, and Miriam; and three benefits given them by their hands; the fountain, the cloud, and the manna. The fountain, for the merits of Miriam; the pillar of cloud, for the merits of Aaron; and the manna, for the merits of Moses." But what Christ says, contradicts this assertion, *John 5:32*. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father gaveth you the true bread from heaven." Nor was the typical bread from Moses, but from God. Moses was only the messenger, not the meritorious cause of the divine gift; and much less did the antitype Christ, with his grace, the bread which came down from the third heavens, proceed from Moses. This however Moses did, having by his prayers obtained the favour of God, he told the people in God's name, what should happen with respect to their food, and explained the whole design of the manna. Philo has prudently observed, that God indeed gave his people comfort, but discovered it first to Moses: "The one, indeed, on account of his natural benignity and affection towards men, but the other because he would put honour on the leader whom he himself had appointed."

XXXII. The adjuncts of the manna are either internal or external. To the former belong the figure, colour, taste. Of the figure it is said, 1st, That it was "a small thing, as hoar-frost on the ground," *Exod. 16:14*: small indeed at first sight, yet precious in itself, and of the greatest efficacy; as God usually displays his wonderful power in the smallest things. 2dly, That it was *מִהַסְפֵּס*, a word which we nowhere else meet with in Scripture, and therefore diversely explained. The Vulgate has, "quasi pilo tustum, as if pounded by a pestle," that is, of such minuteness, that it seemed to be brought to that smallness by some art, and as in a mortar. Others translate it, *decorticatum*, peeled; Junius, *rotundum*, round, as also Erpenius, Arabic interpreter; and Kimchi says, it signifies the same thing as *עגול*, round. Other Jews translate it *retectum*, disclosed; and imagine, the manna was shut up in the dew, which was over and under it as in a coffer, and the upper dew ascending, by the more advanced elevation of the sun above the horizon, the manna appeared in sight. But all this, to speak in the softest manner, is uncertain. 3dly, That "it was like coriander-seed," *ver. 31*. Not in colour, since coriander-seed is black, but because it was small and round. Well say the Talmudists in *Joma*, chap. viii. fol. 73. col. a, "round as coriander and white as pearl."

XXXIII. With respect to its colour it is said, *Exod. 16:31*, that it was white, and *Numb. 11:7*, "the colour thereof as the colour of bedola;" but what that was interpreters are not agreed. The Jews insist it was a kind of precious stone, but are opposed by Junius and Marcus Marinus Brixianus, because, *Gen. 2:12*, it is said, "there is bedola and the onyx-stone;" wherefore, as the name stone is, by way of distinction, added to the word onyx, they conclude that bedola cannot be a stone. Others imagine it was crystal, and consequently the colour of the manna was bright and transparent. Most of the moderns, following Josephus, from the affinity of the word, contend that it was bdellium; concerning which, Serapion, quoted by Drusius, says, that "the Jewish bdellium

is the gum of a tree that grows in Arabia, and that the better sort is that of a good flavour, tough within, and soon dissolving, inclining to white, not having any bits of wood or other impurities in it," &c. Pliny adds, "it is transparent and like to wax," lib. xii. 9. See Salmas. Exercit. Plinian, p. 806, and de homonymis hyles Iatrecq. c. cxix. From this they conclude, that the grains of the manna were transparent and of a whitish cast, which is a sign of its great purity and perfect digestion. But I must not conceal, that Bochart in Hierozoic. p. 2, lib. v. c. 5, has by his arguments convinced me, that bedola is a pearl, for which they still very frequently fish in that place which Moses has described, Gen. 2:12; as Petrus Texeira, an eye-witness; and Benjamin in Itinerar. p. 105, testify. Besides, both the manna and the pearl are of the same colour, namely, white, and both of them are round; nor is the observation of Junius or Brixiamus to the contrary of any weight. Since it does not follow, that because the onyx is called a stone, bedola is not a stone likewise. Not to mention now, that the lawyer also excepts pearls from the class of stone and gems, lege, quum aurum, 19. §. Gemma autem, 17 and seq. ff. De auro et argento legato. And though pearls are usually called stones by the Hebrews, yet they are of a quite different kind from those stones produced in the earth, such as gems properly so called. They who contend for bdellium, have scarce any other argument but the affinity of the appellation, which is often fallacious; in other respects, bdellium and manna have no such agreement.

XXXIV. Its savour or taste is likewise highly commended, Exod. 16:31, בדבש כצפיחה, Sicut epichyti exmelle," as Junius translates, "as of a wafer made of honey," or, according to the Vulgate, "quasi similæ in melle, as of fine flour in honey." And, Numb. 11:8, "חשמן לישד כטעם," as the taste of fresh oil." As the Scripture thus determines the taste, the fictions of the Jews are very trifling, which the papists too greedily catch at the better to put a varnish on their monster of transubstantiation; as that the manna had all kinds of tastes, and that every individual Israelite tasted in it whatever he pleased; young men, bread; old men, honey; young children, oil; as the Jewish masters trifle in Schemoth Rabba, § 25, with whom the author of the Book of Wisdom, c. 16:20, seems to agree. It is astonishing with what nicety the papists dispute on this matter; namely, whether this was only the privilege of the pious, or common to them with the wicked; Tirinus, after Augustine, Abulensis, and Hugo Cardinalis, stands up for the former, but is opposed by Corn. a Lapide. This being observed, there are other questions also started, and among the rest, whether the manna changed not only its taste, but also its substance, at the desire of those who eat of it, so as to be turned into an egg, a pullet, or lamb, as often as such things were longed for, or whether a change only was made in the qualities? In either of these ways, they find something in the manna to support their doctrine of transubstantiation. For if the former, as has seemed good to doctors of great reputation, we have an evident example of a transubstantiation. If the latter, with the jesuit a Lapide, hence at least may be concluded, that accidents may remain without their substance; because, as a different taste usually accompanies a different substance, the substance of the manna remaining, the taste was changed at will and proved nourishing; whence it follows, that the accidents of bread may also remain, and prove nourishing in the transubstantiated wafer. But these are the dotages and fond sportings of men, who shamefully abuse their wit and are overturned by three arguments from Scripture. 1st, As it accurately describes the peculiar taste of the manna. 2dly, As it mentions the industry of the Israelites in the different ways by which they prepared it for their more convenient use. 3dly, As it gives an account of their loathing it, Numb. 11:6, which could not happen did the manna yield the palate any taste at pleasure.

XXXV. However, we have not yet got over all the difficulty; for, as the taste of honey differs from the taste of oil, we may inquire how manna can be compared to both in taste? But this difficulty may be obviated three ways; if we say first, that the taste of the manna was somewhat different, when it was eaten in a plain manner, from what it was when differently dressed and prepared by the Israelites; the one may therefore be understood of manna undressed, the other of that which was boiled. And again, which I would prefer, it might, in a different respect, be compared both with honey and with oil, not that in all respects the taste of it resembled either oil or honey, but partook of something of both, the sweetness of honey and the fatness of oil, in general a taste mixed of both. It might be added, as honey is the chief of sweet things,\* as the son of Syrach speaks, whatever things are sweet to the taste may be compared with honey. And so manna may be said to have the taste of honey, that is, in general to be very sweet. Wherefore the author of the Book of Wisdom, c. 19:21. calls it a "kind of ambrosial food that could easily melt, ἔυτηκτον γένος ἀμβροστας τροφῆς."†

XXXVI. The external adjuncts or circumstances are place and time. The place where God fed the Israelites with manna was the wilderness. The favour of heaven supplied them with what the barrenness of the soil denied; and when they were destitute of ordinary bread produced from the earth, they were satisfied with bread which came down from heaven. Still, says Josephus, "so divine and admirable was this wood, that it supplied the want of all others to those that partook of it;" and truly believers may go every where with safety, when God leads the way, even through the wilderness and a land not sown, Jer. 2:2. "The young lions do lack and suffer hunger, but they who seek Jehovah, shall not want any good thing," Ps. 34:10.

XXXVII. We are to observe the following things concerning the time when the manna was given. As, 1st, That the Israelites had none, before they left Egypt. Then they happily exchanged their cucumbers, pompions, garlick, and every servile food, for the bread of heaven, and the dainties of angels. 2dly, That this bread was for the first time rained down from heaven, when there was nothing in the land to stay their hunger. Thus God usually provides for his own people in due season, and where ordinary means fail, employs extraordinary. While a famine raged in all places, the rapacious ravens carry a daily portion to Elias, 1 Kings 17:6. 3dly, That the manna was rained every day, except on the sabbath, when none was to be seen on the ground; but a double portion was gathered the day before, for the supply of the following. Thus the goodness of God is new every day; neither will the observance of his commands, especially that of the sabbath, prove detrimental to any. 4thly, That the manna continued forty years, till the Israelites came into Canaan, where they could eat of the fruits of the land, Jos. 5:12; for where ordinary means are within our reach, we are not to desire or expect extraordinary.

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

XXXIX. Secondly, They were to gather it by certain measure, an homer for each: a quantity, it is probable, sufficient to satisfy even the most robust, and those of the largest appetite. For an homer was a large measure, concerning which may be seen Waserus de Antiq. Mensur. lib. ii. c.

3, where he shows that an homer contains as much as forty three shells of eggs and a half. Tirinus has computed the allowance of each to have been about fifty of our ounces. God stinted them to a certain measure, to set bounds to their excessive appetite: but indulged them in such a measure, as would show the riches of his bounty.

XL. But the account here given by Moses, deserves particular consideration, namely that some of the Israelites gathered more, others less: but that afterwards, when it was measured by the homer, he who had gathered more, had nothing over, and he who had gathered less, had no lack, Exod. 16:17. Some have conceived a twofold miracle here; one about the gathering of the manna; the other about the consuming it. They imagine, if any had gathered less than the appointed quantity, before it came to be measured, what was lacking was miraculously added by an angel; but if more, the overplus was taken away by an angel, and invisibly added to what others gathered. They also imagine, that every one consumed an entire homer of manna a day: but as this was not possible in such a diversity of ages and health without a miracle, they boldly pronounce, God very unequally attempered the nutritive efficacy of the manna in equal quantities to the strength and appetite of every person: and, besides, heaped the manna closer in the homer for the more voracious, but looser for the weaker and the young.

XLI. But all these things are framed at pleasure; nor are we to multiply miracles without necessity. As to the gathering, the manner of it seems to have been thus. Every one gathered as much as he could: and, as is usual in such cases, some gathered more, others less, as some were more diligent than others. But what was collected by all, who lived under the same tent, seems to have been thrown into one heap; from which the master of the family taking the appointed measure, so distributed to each his portion, without paying any regard to the labour or diligence employed, but to the divine appointment, so that each had an equal portion. For, so much could with ease be jointly gathered, as that every one might have an equal portion. These thoughts have, in my opinion, been judiciously suggested by the most excellent Rivet, and may be confirmed from 2 Cor. 8:14, 15, where Paul exhorts the rich to supply the wants of the poor out of their abundance, by this argument: because "It is written, he that had gathered much, had nothing over; and he that had gathered little, had no lack." As if he had said, "As formerly it was the will of God, that, among the Israelites, they who had gathered much manna, should supply the wants of those who had gathered less, that there might be an equality; so among Christians, it is but just that those who, by the bounty of God, are possessed of an affluence of good things, should supply the wants of those, for whom a more scanty provision is made."

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

XLIII. The third duty was, to reserve none of the manna for the morrow, ver. 19. Not that every person was obliged to consume their measure daily, and force it upon their loathing stomach beyond their appetite: for this, as I have just hinted, was inconsistent with the holiness, wisdom, and goodness of God. It was enough, if nothing was reserved for the use of the following day. What remained might either be burnt in the fire, or buried in the earth, or given to the cattle, or destroyed some other way. But God, by this method, was pleased to try their obedience, *Exod.* 16:4, and to exercise their diligence every day, and teach them contentment, and to inculcate faith and trust upon them; that, depending alone on his providence, they might wholly commit to him the care for the morrow, *Matt.* 6:25, 31.

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

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

XLVI. We must here, by the way, remove an apparent contradiction. Moses says, *Exod.* 16:34, that a pot with manna, agreeably to the divine command, was by Aaron laid up before the testimony to be kept. But the testimony is either the ark, so called, because the testimonial tables of the covenant were laid up in it, or the tables themselves that were in the ark: but Paul writes, *Heb.* 9:4, "in which (the ark) was the golden pot, that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant," where he places the pot with the manna in the ark as well as the

tables of the covenant. This difficulty is so much the greater, if we compare 1 Kings 8:9, and 2 Chron. 5:10, where it is expressly said, that there was nothing in the ark, but the two tables of the law. Many things have been ingeniously devised, by the learned, to take off this apparent contradiction. I own I am best pleased with the observation of Drusius, on Exod. 16:34, that the particle in with the Hebrews, and those that adopt their way of speaking, sometimes denotes at, near, by. To prove this, he quotes Josh. 10:11, and Judges 18:12. Another learned author has very properly added Josh. 5:13; 1 Kings 17:3; Jer. 13:5; Col. 3:1. And therefore, in which, here denotes, at or near the ark. Yet Drusius himself starts a difficulty, which he owns he is not able to remove: "Every thing would answer well," says he, "unless there followed the tables of the covenant; for these were within the ark. But that the preposition in should signify two different things in the same place, is not very probable: take care, therefore, how you believe this." But we are not so soon to lose heart. We have, at least, found this, that in sometimes denotes such a latitude of place, that it even comprehends those things which are near and by. Moreover the ark was so framed that some things might be placed on the sides of it without, as appears in the case of the volume of the law written by Moses, which was placed "in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord," Deut. 31:26. All the things, therefore, mentioned by Paul, were in the ark, that is, within the compass of the ark, though some of them were within it more than others. Nor could Paul speak less properly thus, than we do when, for instance, we say, in the human body there are skin, and flesh, and bones and bowels; where in is used in the same sense, and yet with some latitude.

XLVII. There are three sins of the Israelites recorded, with respect to the manna. 1st. That several of them, contrary to the express command of God, reserved some of it for the morrow, Exod. 16:20. With such insolence does the wisdom of the flesh set itself in direct opposition to God, though, by his astonishing goodness, he renders himself amiable, and at the same time, venerable. And this obstinacy of corrupt nature, is not to be subdued by any miracles. But what was reserved began to swarm with worms, and was putrified. To teach us, that whatever is unjustly and covetously reserved, contrary to the command of God, stinks before God and men; and hence worms arise, that is, various kinds of evils, especially the worm of conscience; whereas, on the contrary, what was reserved against the future sabbath proved permanent and incorruptible, Matt. 6:20; 1 Tim. 6:19. 2dly. That they went forth on the very sabbath to seek for it; however then they found nothing, ver. 27. God justly frustrates the desires of those and renders their labours abortive, who undertake any thing contrary to his command. Nor have such any reason to expect the divine blessing on their labours, who, on the day of the Lord's rest, are employed in things that regard their own subsistence, while they omit the worship of God, Isa. 58:13, 14. 3dly. That, at last, they loathed and disdained the manna, though it was the sweetest and most wholesome of all food, especially in comparison of the cucumbers, the melons, the leeks, the onions, and the garlic, Numb. 11:5, 6. Thus men usually prefer the carnal refuse of this world to the treasures of heaven; the husks of the earth to the dainties of angels: and, that nothing on this earth is so delightful, but that, one time or other, it begets a loathing: even the most excellent gifts of God, natural as well as spiritual, on account of this perverseness of our minds, lose, through custom, their value in our esteem.

XLVIII. Now let us consider the mystery of the manna. Paul teacheth us, that this food was sacramental, 1 Cor. 10:3, where he calls it spiritual meat; but it was so, not in its own nature, for it was appointed for the support of the animal life, but in signification, wherein it answers to our

mystical supper. Angustine on Ps. 77:1, says, "it was spiritual, that is, it signified something spiritual." And Christ declares, John. 6:32, himself was that true bread which came down from heaven, and was prefigured by the manna. The Jews however, blind, promise to themselves a new manna by the Messiah. For thus in Midras Cohelet, fol. lxxxvi. col. 4, "The first redeemer caused the manna to descend, so also the latter redeemer will make the manna to descend; as it is written, And there shall be an handful of corn in the earth, Ps. 72:16." Though their expectations were really carnal and corrupt, yet they are the remains of ancient and spiritual instruction. So likewise in Midras cantici, fol. xvi. c. 4: "The last redeemer shall be revealed to them. And whither will he lead them? some say, to the wilderness of Judah: others, to the wilderness of Sihon, and Og: and he will cause the manna to descend to them." But it is to be observed, that Christ frequently fed the multitude in the deserts of Judea, and in the wilderness of Og, with the food of his word, which is more excellent than any manna; and, when there was occasion for it, stayed the hunger of the body with bread, which he multiplied no less miraculously than the manna formerly was. See other testimonies of the Jews in Viega on Rev. 2:17. But, according to the method prescribed, let us come to particulars.

XLIX. Manna denotes that food which was appointed, prepared by God, and given to the Israelites, for their portion, in order to the support of life. So Christ is the gift of God, John 4:10. That excellent gift, foreordained by God, 1 Pet. 1:20, and by his unspeakable goodness bestowed on the true Israel, for their portion, Pet. 10:16, by which they should live: thus Jesus himself declares, John 6:51. "I am the living bread, which came down from heaven: If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." The manna was given to the Israelites, when they were least concerned about the blessings of God, and put a greater value on the good things of Egypt, and had again tempted God. Christ came into the world when it was most corrupted, and offered his spiritual blessings, at a time when the very best could scarce ascend above earthly and carnal things.—

Israel did not know the manna when it was first given, though promised by Moses. Though Christ was so often promised by Moses and all the holy prophets, and described to the life, yet when he came into the world, the world knew him not, John 1:10.

L. Though the origin of the manna was from heaven, yet the vapours or exhalations from which it was congealed together, were raised from the earth by the efficacy of the sun. Christ several times repeats it, that he came down from heaven, to give life to the world, John 6. He, who is the day-spring from on high, Luke 1:78, is also the fruit of the earth, Isa. 4:2.—We have already observed, that angels were employed about the descending manna. A great multitude of the heavenly host sung the birth-day song, when Christ first came into the world, Luke 2:13.—Moses, indeed, could not give the manna, yet he promised it, and explained the nature of it. So neither was he the author of true salvation, but testified of Christ, and taught that the life of the soul consists in communion with him, John 5:46.

LI. The manna was, in its form and figure, small and minute, promising nothing great at first sight: thus also Christ, when he was seen only with the eyes of flesh, had neither form nor comeliness, that we should desire him, Isa. 53:2.—Yet the white colour of the manna, and usually that of pearls too, represented the most excellent purity of the Lord Jesus, and the glory of the divine majesty shining forth in the assumed form of a servant. The taste of the manna that

was so very sweet, like honey, and the most excellent oil, signifies the unspeakable delights of that grace we obtain by Christ, whose sweetness none understand but they who taste it, Ps. 34:8. In order to be a more proper food for Israel, it was ground in mills, or pounded with pestles, or baked in pans, Numb. 11:8. Christ was also prepared by various sufferings, that he might be most sweet and wholesome food to our soul.

LII. The manna was rained down in the wilderness, and Christ came into the world, and to the people of Israel, when, like a wilderness, it was overgrown with thistles and thorns, and most barren of good fruit: and by his coming "comforted all the waste places of Zion, and made her wilderness like Eden, and her desert, like the garden of Jehovah," Isa. 51:3. It was then that the Israelites obtained the manna, when all that they had brought out of Egypt was spent, and they saw they must inevitably perish by famine, unless they were relieved by the unexpected favour of heaven. Christ bestows his grace only on those who, sensible of their want, and rejecting every worldly comfort, choose to owe their salvation to him alone, Luke 1:53, "he filled the hungry with good things, and sent the rich empty away." Nor can any one hope for the consolations of divine grace, unless he first quit the Egypt of this world, and the prison of sin, and passing through the red sea of sorrowful repentance, give himself up to be led and directed by the Holy Spirit, in the way to the heavenly Canaan, Isa. 32:16, 17.

LIII. The manna came down every day, and whenever the morning dawned, presented itself fresh to the Israelites. Thus also, the grace and tender mercies of the Lord are new every morning, Lam. 3:23. Yet this bread was in such manner given, for six days, as none of it was to be seen on the seventh. This seems to signify, that Christ would, in his appointed time, appear among the Israelites, and converse daily with them; but afterwards would neither be seen, nor sought for, anywhere on earth, nor be imagined to be either in this or in the other place. But because that day was the seventh of the week, this set forth, he should cease to be seen by men on the seventh; but on the first day of the week, when he returned from the grave, he would present himself to the view of his people, almost as early as the sun.—When the Israelites were come into Canaan, the manna ceased; every thing which regards the state of the church, wandering in the wilderness of this world, consequently every healing grace, and every thing which flows to us from Christ, as mediator, and supposes any defect shall cease after the last day, when God himself shall be all in all to his church, when introduced into the heavenly country, 1 Cor. 15:28.

LIV. The manna was not bestowed on the Israelites as the effect of their sowing or culture, or of any human industry, but by the gratuitous gift of the divine goodness and bounty alone; the only thing required of them was to receive, to gather, and make use of, that gift of God. Thus, in like manner, the life and salvation we have in Christ the Lord, "is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy," Rom. 9:16. And his grace is "as a dew from Jehovah, as the showers upon the grass, that tarrieth not for man, nor waiteth for the sons of men," Mic. 5:7. It is however our duty by faith to receive and apply to ourselves the offered grace. And this was what our Saviour meant, when he said, John 9:27, "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you."—And this, indeed, was to be done early in the morning, not letting slip the opportunity, Isa. 55:6. "seek ye the Lord, while he is near;" Ps. 63:1. "O God, thou art my God, early will I seek thee."—The Israelites were to go without the camp, in order to have the manna. Whosoever labours to find Christ, must not indulge too much the ease of the flesh. When the



spouse sought her beloved in her bed, she found him not, Cant. 3:1; but when she had gone a little further, she found him," ver. 4.

LV. Though God gave the manna in a certain stinted measure, yet in a quantity sufficient for those of the largest appetite; Christ deals out a portion of his grace to each, in such a manner, as nothing may be wanting to their salvation, 2 Cor. 12:9. His grace however, is equally set before all the elect, that each may take of it to his full satisfaction, Cant. 5:9. If they open their mouths wide, they shall be filled with the goodness of the Lord, Ps. 81:20; Ps. 36:8, 9.—Our esteem and longing for the divine grace can, indeed, never be to excess; nor are we forbidden to strive after more; let each account it said to himself, 2 Cor. 12:32. "covet earnestly the best gifts." But yet every one ought to be content with the most free and wise dispensation of our Father, humbly confessing ourselves unworthy even of the least. But if any, by the blessing of God, is found to have gathered more than others, his duty is to lay out his abundance for the common benefit, and supply the wants of others from the plenty of his gifts.

LVI. The manna that was kept to the following day, became tainted, and ceased any longer to be either the usual, much less the sacramental bread. Thus also the eucharistical bread, the antitype of the manna, after the time is over when it is distributed to be eaten, loses the virtue of a sacrament; and if it be kept, contrary to the command of God, instead of being a spiritual food, will be found tainted with the maggots of a base superstition.—A double quantity was gathered the day before the sabbath, for the use of that day of rest: on the same day of the week, the labour of Christ's soul being redoubled, such an abundance of grace was purchased for the elect, even enough to satiate, and make them happy through an eternal sabbath.—Nor are we to apprehend the spiritual gifts, laid up for that day, can be tainted by any corruption.—In a word, the keeping the manna in a golden pot, and the laying it up in the tabernacle before Jehovah, and the testimony set forth, that he who came down from heaven, to be the bread of life to sinful man, should again be taken up into heaven, and continue in the sanctuary not made with hands, and in a state of uninterrupted life before God; whence also the communion with Christ in glory is called the "hidden manna," Rev. 2:27.—Moreover, we are, above all things, to be on our guard, lest, with the ungrateful Israelites, we loathe the incomparable delights of the heavenly grace, and prefer the husks of this world before them, and so incur the justest vengeance of a despised Deity.

LVII. But for as much as "the savour of meat is nothing, if there be no drink," as Josephus introduces Moses speaking to God; and because the superbundant fulness, which is in Christ, was to be shadowed forth to the ancient people, as well as to us, the divine goodness indulged the murmuring Israelites likewise with drink, which was as miraculous as their meat. For the people being parched with thirst, and finding no water either for themselves or children, much less their cattle in the parched wilderness, Moses at God's command, striking with his rod the rock which was in Horeb, on whose summit the glorious majesty of the divine presence was seen, opened large veins of water, Exod. 17:1–6. This miracle is celebrated in many places of Scripture, Psal. 78:15, 16. "He clave the rocks in the wilderness, and gave them drink, as out of the great depths; he brought streams also out of the rock, and caused waters to run down like rivers." Some imagine the rock itself was turned to streams of water, from Ps. 114:8, where the Vulgate translates, "qui convertit petram in stagna aquarum, et rupem in fontes aquarum," which turned the rock into a standing water, the flint into a fountain of waters; the Septuagint, τοῦ τρέψαντος.

But this is a poetical hyperbole, as if we should say, heaven itself was dissolved into showers. Nothing is more ridiculous, than to bring this in support of the monster of transubstantiation. But whether God first miraculously produced the water in that place, or whether, when Moses smote the rock with his rod, he suddenly set open the veins of water, which had been there before, but had been shut up till then, is not for us to determine, since the scripture is silent. What the Jews feign, that the rod of Moses was made of adamant, and hence penetrated the rock by the stroke; and that therefore Moses is said not to have struck, "צור על" upon the rock," but, "בצור, in the rock," ver. 6, is trifling to the highest degree.

LVIII. As there is no great difficulty in this historical account, we hasten to the consideration of the mystery; set forth 1 Cor. 10:4, "And did all drink the same spiritual drink." Spiritual, not surely in its own nature, but in its signification, as we have intimated concerning the meat, "For they drank of the spiritual rock that followed them," that is, the water of the rock which followed them in a plentiful stream in the wilderness. "And that rock was Christ," that is, as Tertullian, de Patientia, says well, "signified Christ;" with whom Augustine agrees, Quæst. 57, in Leviticum, "the rock was Christ, not in substance, but signification." Let us take a survey of the similitude.

LIX. It is certain, Christ is often called a rock in Scripture; on account of his eternal duration, Isa. 26:4, and impregnable strength, Ps. 31:2, and, which is the consequence of that, a most safe habitation, Ps. 71:3. Yet I imagine these respects do not come under our present consideration. Christ is here represented by a rock only, as that gave water to quench the thirst of the Israelites.

LX. The true similitude is this. 1. This rock, hath its name from a parched dry waste (for this is the meaning of Horeb in Hebrew,) and seemed to promise nothing less than what it produced, namely streams for giving water to such a number of people with their cattle. Is not Christ also "as a root out of a dry ground," Isa. 53:2. And is it not something above a prodigy, that he, who complained of thirst on the cross, should call out to others, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living waters," John 7:37, 38. 2. The rock did not produce water till it was smitten. Thus also "it became God to make the captain of our salvation perfect through sufferings," Heb. 2:10. When his side was pierced with the spear, immediately there issued out blood and water, John 19:34. And by this means he became "a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin, and for uncleanness," Zech. 13:1. 3. Nor was it lawful to smite the rock with any other instrument than the rod of the Law-giver; to intimate, that Christ was to undergo the same suffering and the same curse, threatened by the law to the sinner man, Gal. 3:13. 4. The smiting of the rock was performed in the sight of the Elders of the murmuring people. At the loud clamour of an enraged multitude, and at the desire of the Elders, many of them also standing by, Christ was nailed to the cross, Matt. 27:41. 5. The majesty of the Supreme Being displayed itself on the top of the rock. When Christ suffered, did he not, even at that time, so veil himself as if he was void of divine glory? But they who were most unwilling to own it, were obliged to confess it. Matt. 27:54. 6. Such a quantity of water flowed from the rock, that was sufficient not only to quench the thirst of the Israelites, but also to follow them in streams, whithersoever they travelled in the wilderness, Ps. 77:15–20. Psal. 105:41. Thus also the abundance of grace that is in Christ makes "our cup to overflow, and goodness and mercy to follow us all the days of our life," Ps. 23:5, 6.

LXI. What we have recorded, Num. 20:8, is different from this history, and is likewise mystical. There Moses is commanded, indeed not to smite the rock with his rod, but only to speak unto the rock, before the eyes of the Israelites, in order to its producing water. By which it seems was signified, that Christ ought to suffer but once, and that his one offering was sufficient for perfecting believers, Heb. 9:27, 28. Heb. 10:14. The efficacy of which was to be dispensed to the elect by the preaching of the gospel. But Moses, contrary to the will of the precept, though according to the will of the divine decree, in smiting the rock twice, was a type of those who, wickedly indeed, but by the determinate counsel of God, persecute over and over again, and evil entreat Christ, after once suffering on the cross, in his mystical body, Acts 9:4. Col. 1:26. As out of the rock, which was smitten twice, there issued out much water, and the congregation drank, Num. 20:11; so in like manner, even the afflictions of believers have turned out to the advantage of the church, Phil. 1:12; the blood of the Martyrs, like a fructifying rain, has watered the paradise of God; and the sparks, flying every way from their funeral piles, have kindled far and near a new light of faith, and new flames of love: so that the church never experienced a greater abundance of divine consolations, than when she was forced to endure the heaviest strokes of persecution. Yet as Moses himself, who was so faithful, so dear to God, was for this very thing excluded the land of Canaan, Numb. 20:11, so none of these persecutors shall go unpunished for this their rash presumption, Psa. 105:24. 2 Thess. 1:6.

LXII. There now remains the sacrament of the brazen serpent, whose history recorded, Numb. 21:6. Bochart has distinctly explained, *Hicrozoic.* p. ii. lib. 3, c. 13. The sum of which is this. The Israelites, for murmuring against God, and against Moses, and speaking with contempt of the heavenly manna, incurred the heavy displeasure of the Deity. And therefore serpents were sent among them, to bite the people, and immediately cut off many by an infectious calamity. The Scripture call these serpents שרפים. Seraphim; which name they have in common with the most exalted angels, and is derived from burning; but are so called, because they send a flame out of their mouth, and burn by their venomous breath. The Greeks call some serpents, from their heat, *πρηστηρας* and *καυσανας*. But whether Seraph here denotes a water-serpent, or an amphibious serpent, which is Bochart's opinion, or any other species of serpents, is neither so very certain, nor much our concern to, know. It is more profitable to consider how the divine mercy, importuned by the complaints of the people, and the confession of their sin, and the prayers of Moses, afforded a present remedy for so great an evil. At the direction of God a brazen serpent was framed by Moses, and put upon a pole; that whosoever looked upon it, when it was thus erected, might find a most infallible cure for the mortal bites of the serpents: which also the event plainly proved. Three things are here distinctly to be observed. (1.) The misery of the people. (2.) God's favour and goodness. (3.) The duty required of man, in order to his partaking of that goodness.

LXIII. In the misery of the people, we are to consider both the sin and the punishment of it. It was a sin, to throw contempt upon the manna, and to murmur against God and against Moses. The depraved corruption of nature scarce any where more plainly shows itself than in the people of Israel; who, though loaded with so many benefits by God, so often chastised with paternal rods, yet incessantly returned to their natural disposition. Nor do they rise up against Moses alone by whose means they had escaped so many dangers, but against God himself, who was present among them, by such extraordinary signs of his majesty; and with a frantic wantonness loathe the manna, even the heavenly manna, which they had lately received with so much

eagerness. Does not this plainly argue the unconquerable depravity of our nature, and the incredible abuse of the divine beneficence in man, when left to himself? And as we are all of the same frame, we may behold a specimen of our own perverseness in the Israelites.

LXIV. The punishment, consequent on the sin, was the bites of fiery serpents; by which it is not improperly imagined, are shadowed forth the suggestions of the devil, when he tempts to despair, and which Paul calls "the fiery darts of Satan," Eph. 6:16, and which spread their poison through every part. For the devils are truly Seraphim; who, as in their first creation, they shone fair with the flames of divine love, so after their sin, became horrid and scorching serpents. As themselves are scorched with the fire of divine vengeance, so they burn with rage against God and his people. And indeed they are justly given up to the vexations of Satan, who contemptuously rejected the word of the Gospel, and the grace of God in Christ, which is sweeter than any manna; or blaspheme against God himself, as Hymeneus and Alexander, 1 Tim. 1:20.

LXV. But as those Israelites who found the bites of the serpents mortal, not being careful to obtain a cure, are an emblem of the impenitent, who, despise the grace of God, and so die in their sins; so they, who had recourse to Moses, confessing their sins, and imploring the grace of God, plainly signify those whom a sense of sin, and dread of divine judgment, excite to wiser resolutions; such as those who were pricked in the heart, and said to Peter and the other apostles, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Acts 2:37, and the Jailer, Acts 16:29, 30. But for their sake God commanded Moses to put a brazen serpent on a pole, and promised, that as many as were bitten, should, by looking to it, be cured. Indeed I make no manner of doubt, but this serpent was a representation of Christ; for he himself asserts, John 3:14. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up." This type represents the antitype several ways.

LXVI. First, as to the form. That the serpent was a type of the devil, not of Christ, is asserted by a learned author without any probable reason. Though the serpents which destroyed the Israelites by their venomous bites were a figure of the devil, yet all circumstances loudly declare the brazen serpent, which was made at God's command, and ordained to cure the bites of the other serpents, was a sacrament of Christ. Nor is it more improper to represent Christ by the figure of a serpent, than, what the learned author so often inculcates, by that of a wanton goat. The similitude consists in the following things. 1st, That Christ, though himself free from sin, came "in the likeness of sinful flesh," Rom. 8:3. 2dly, That by a voluntary covenant-engagement he substituted himself in the room of those, who by nature, like all others, are a "generation of vipers," Matt. 3:7. 3dly, That by virtue of that engagement, by bearing their sins, he was made "sin and the curse," 2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:13. And so had truly the figure of a serpent without its poison.

LXVII. Secondly, As to the matter of it, whereby in different respects, were represented both the vileness of the human nature, the excellence of the divine, and the efficacy of the Gospel, as the learned have observed. 1st, The serpent was not of gold, but of brass, which is a meaner metal, to hold forth Christ to us, as one "in whom there is no form, nor comeliness, no beauty, that we should desire him," Isa. 53:2. 2dly, To signify the divine power of Christ by the firmness and durableness of brass. Whence Job 6:12 "Is my strength the strength of stones? Or is my flesh of brass?" And in the Poet, "a monument" is said to be "more lasting than brass." 3dly, As among

metals brass is the most sounding. Whence Paul, 1 Cor. 13:1: "I am become as a sounding brass." Thus Christ crucified seems to be rightly set forth by brass, as also the preaching of the cross, "whose sound went into all the earth," Rom. 10:18.

LXVIII. Thirdly, As to the lifting up. This lifting up of the serpent on a pole, prefigured the lifting up of Christ, not his glorious exaltation in heaven, but his ignominious lifting up on the cross, John 3:14. As John himself explains that phrase, John 12:32, 33. For, according to the Syriac and the language of the Targum, to lift up, signifies to hang up on a tree. Both actions are denoted by the same term זָקַף. And as Bochart has learnedly observed, that manner of speaking seems to have taken its rise from the decree of king Darius, at least it may be confirmed by that, Ezra 6:11: "Whosoever shall alter this word, let timber be pulled down from his house, יִתְפָּחַז זָקִיף עֲלוּהִי, and being set up, let him be hanged (put to death) thereon;" set up, that is hanged up. But holocausts, or whole burnt offerings, called in Hebrew עֲלוֹת, that is, elevations, because they were carried upwards, signified that Christ, when offering himself for sin, should be lifted upon the cross. Nor is it for nothing that God would have the serpent lifted up by Moses; because it was in consequence of the curse thundered out by the law given by Moses, that Christ was nailed to the cross.

LXIX. Fourthly, With respect to the benefit. As from the serpent the Israelites obtained the cure of their mortal bites, so "in the wings of Christ there is healing," Mal. 4:2. "He healeth all our diseases," Ps. 103:3. Wherefore as the Jews, depending on such a present help, little dreaded the bites and stings of the other serpents, so the believer who relies upon Christ, and makes nothing of the assaults of devils, cries out with full assurance, "O death, where is thy sting?" 1 Cor. 15:55.

LXX. In order to partake in so great a benefit, God required nothing of the Israelites, but to look to the brazen serpent; just so a bare look to Christ lifted up on the cross, perfectly cures the wounds given by the devil; namely, a look of faith, by which Moses saw him who is invisible, Heb. 11:27. Thus Christ himself explains it, John 3:14, 15: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have eternal life." If therefore any among the Israelites were blind, or voluntarily turned away their eyes, there remained no hope of salvation for them; so neither at this day for unbelievers, or for "those that rebel against the light," Job 24:13; or for those, "whose minds the God of this world hath blinded, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ should shine unto them," 2 Cor. 4:4. Yet as even a weak sight might be saving; so a faith still in a state of weakness, if it be genuine and sincere, rescues us from death: and as whoever was once bit and cured by the sight of the serpent, if again bit, he was to have recourse to the same remedy; so if after our restoration we fall again into sin, the same faith succours as before.

## CHAPTER XI: Of the Blessings of the Old Testament

I. As the Old Testament is nothing but the covenant of grace, as it was dispensed before Christ came in the flesh, it is necessary that all the blessings or good things, which were promised by the covenant of grace, as such, have likewise a place in the Old Testament. But the benefits of the covenant of grace are eternal salvation, and whatever has a necessary connexion therewith; such as, regeneration, vocation by the word and Spirit of grace, faith, justification, spiritual peace, adoption, and, in a word, all the particulars explained in the preceding book. Though most of these are much more eminent under the New Testament, yet all of them, as to their substance, were conferred even under the Old, as is evident from the nature of the thing, and from what we have proved before. We shall only treat of the good things peculiar to the Old Testament, especially under the Mosaic dispensation.

II. And they are five. 1st, The election of the Israelites for a peculiar people. 2dly, The inheritance of the land of Canaan. 3dly, The familiar demonstration and inhabitation of the divine majesty. 4thly, The shadowing forth of divine mysteries, and daily sealing them by a religion of ceremonies. 5thly, An almost uninterrupted succession of inspired prophets.

III. It was certainly a great benefit, that God should choose the people of Israel above all other nations of the world, to have communion with himself in a most sted-fast covenant. God himself declares this in these words, Deut. 7:6: "For thou art a holy people unto Jehovah thy God. Jehovah thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth." In consequence of this election, it was: 1st, That Israel was called, "the first-born son of God," Exod. 4:22. That is, above all other people whose souls the same God had made, and to whom he gave life and breath and all things; a singular people, his only beloved, lord of all the rest, having a double portion of the blessing, an inheritance, not only earthly, but also spiritual. 2dly, That they should be the peculiar property of God, his treasure, *περιουσία* and as it were, his royal riches, which he boasts of in the world and glories in, *סגולה עם*, as his *segullah*, concerning the emphasis of which word, see what we have said Book III. c. xii. §. 7, and c. xiii. § 19. 3dly, That they might glory in God as in their portion. For when God took them for a people to himself, he at the same time gave them a right to call him their God, and to have him for their portion; as these things are joined together, Deut. 26:17, 18: "Thou hast avouched Jehovah this day to be thy God; and Jehovah hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people," Jer. 10:16: "The portion of Jacob is the former of all things; and Israel is the rod of his inheritance." 4thly, That they should have a right to expect the Messiah from the midst of them, as one of their brethren, Deut. 18:15, 18.

IV. In these things certainly great was the "advantage of the Jew, and much the profit of circumcision, much, I say, every way," Rom. 3:1, 2. Hence the apostle, Rom. 9:4, 5, in strong terms amplifies that advantage of the Jews: "Who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God and the promises: whose are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came."

Yet none of these things, nay, not all of them together, if we only consider the external confederation, was sufficient to them for salvation: "For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel; neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children," Rom. 9:6, 7. Very

many of them, notwithstanding they were the children of the kingdom, were cast out, Matt. 8:12. Yet in this election of the whole body of the people to the communion of a very close but yet external covenant, there was a certain type of those who were actually chosen to grace and glory; and the godly among the Israelites, besides these outward prerogatives, enjoyed the saving favour of God, and the privilege of the mystical covenant in and by them.

V. The Second benefit or privilege of the Old Testament was the land of Canaan. This God had promised to Abraham and his seed, Gen. 12:7, Gen. 13:15, and 15:7; nay, and assigned it to them by oath, Gen. 26:3, 4, Exod. 33:1, Ezek. 20:6. This promise, confirmed by oath, God calls ברית, a covenant, διαθήκη, a testament, that is, the last and irrevocable disposal of his will. Gen. 15:18, "In that same day Jehovah made a covenant with Abraham, saying, unto thy seed have I given this land. And because, in consequence of that Testament the seed of Abraham was to possess that land, it is therefore called their inheritance, Lam. 5:2. Heb. 11:8.

VI. But we are by no means to understand this as if that typical inheritance made up the whole inheritance of the Old Testament, or that we are to give such a continual definition of the Old Testament, as if it was only the will of giving the land of Canaan. Much less are we to say, that they who deny this, either admit no Old Testament at all, or confound it with the New. For the Old Testament, as I have several times repeated, is nothing but the very testament of grace, as proposed under the veil of types, which were afterwards to be abrogated. But heaven and salvation, and God himself are the inheritance of the children of God, by the testament or covenant of grace; and as that testament is invariable, the substance of the inheritance cannot be one thing under the old, and another under the new economy of the same testament. The difference of the economies consists in this, that the same inheritance is held forth different ways; in the New Testament clearly and without any veil; in the old, wrapt up in types and earthly pledges; among which, after the covenant was made with Abraham, the typical inheritance of the land of Canaan was the most eminent. In the Old Testament it was conjoined with bondage; in the New, with liberty; to which the inheritance of the Gentiles is likewise added.

VII. That this inheritance was typical, both reason declares, and the Scripture attests. For as the whole habitable world cannot be the happiness of the soul, and is subject to vanity by reason of sin, there is no country considered in itself of such value as to deserve to be called the inheritance of the people of God. And certainly, God's covenant people have something more to expect from him than what even the wicked may possess. Nor is there so vast a difference between Syria, Egypt, and Canaan, if we consider only the fertility and pleasantness of countries, as that the possession of the Israelites, unless something higher was implied, should be so much commended as to be the envy of all other nations. In fine, if their happiness consisted in the fields which they possessed, what became of those pious persons, who, at the risk of this life, and this earthly inheritance, willingly laid down their lives for the love of their God? And what was the reason why Moses, just on the confines of death, expressed so great a desire after that land, at least to see it with his eyes, Deut. 3:25, but because he eagerly wanted some way or other to taste that pledge of heaven which he was debarred from entering into.

VIII. But scripture also very plainly declares the same thing. When the ungrateful Israelites had, by their murmurings, provoked God, he swore in his wrath, "as truly as I live, they shall not see

the land, which I swear unto their Fathers," Numb. 14:21, 23. It is thus expressed, Ps. 95:11, "Unto whom I swear in my wrath, that they should not enter into my rest." Which Paul, Heb. 4:1-11, refers to the kingdom of the Messiah, and to the spiritual and heavenly rest purchased by Christ; intimating, that the quiet possession of the land of Canaan, into which Jesus, or Joshua the son of Nun, introduced the children of those rebels, was a type of the spiritual rest, purchased for the elect by Jesus the Son of God, and of Mary.

IX. The analogy or similitude consists in the following particulars: 1st, The land of Canaan was eminent for its situation, pleasantness, fertility, and for the excellent fruits of the earth, above very many other countries of the world, whence it is so often called "a goodly land, a land flowing with milk and honey," a phrase used even by poets, as well Greek as Latin; "the pleasant land," Ps. 106:24, Zech. 7:14; and in a word, "the glory of all lands," Ezek. 20:15; where the inhabitants "were made to suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock, and butter of kine, and the pure blood of the grape," Deut. 32:13, 14. It therefore represented the delightful pleasantness and abundant plenty of the spiritual blessings in the kingdom of Christ, both of grace and of glory; concerning which Jeremiah prophesied, chap. 31:12: "Therefore they shall come and sing in the height of Zion and shall flow together to the goodness of Jehovah, for wheat, and for wine, and for oil, and for the young of the flock, and of the herd; and their soul shall be as a watered garden, and they shall not sorrow any more at all:" compare Joel 3:18.

X. 2dly, The land of Canaan was, in a peculiar manner, Jehovah's land, Hos. 9:3, where himself intended to dwell, Ps. 83:12. Whence it is called "the place where Jehovah had made for himself to dwell in," Exod. 15:17; "and his holy habitation," ver. 13. But it is called so not only because God was a temple in that land and to display some peculiar symbols of his presence, but also because in that land he was to send his Son to them, and to anoint him in the midst of them, both king and Lord, by pouring out his Holy Spirit. The Israelites, therefore, in their land, which in a peculiar manner was the land of God, had a pledge of the revelation of the Messiah in the midst of them. That שְׁבִיכָה, σκήνωσις, inhabitation of God in Canaan was a symbol of what John describes, Rev. 21:3, "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell (tabernacle) with them." And in the last place, Jerusalem, which was the throne of glory in the land of Canaan, Jer. 3:17, was a pledge of heaven, which is "the habitation of the holiness and glory of God," Isa. 63:15.

XI. 3dly, The land of Canaan was given to Israel in virtue of the testament of grace, not for any merit or worth of theirs, but by the mere favour of God; Deut. 7:7, 8, "Not because ye were more in number than any people, but because Jehovah loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath Jehovah brought you out with a mighty hand;" compare Deut. 4:37, 38, Ezek. 16:60, and Ezek. 36:32. Thus also the inheritance of heaven comes to believers from the most free grace of God alone, and the most free testament of God the Father and of Christ, Luke 12:32, Eph. 2:8. But yet Israel was to travel through a large and great wilderness, and to conflict with the Canaanites in various and severe battles before they could enter upon the possession of the promised land. They also, to whom a full right to heaven is freely given through the grace of Christ, are to walk in that narrow way beset with briars and thorns, and to fight valiantly against the enemies of their salvation, and take the kingdom of heaven by violence.



XII. Lastly, though Moses indeed brought Israel out of Egypt, yet he could not bring them into the promised land: that office was reserved for Joshua; and certainly, when the law is subservient to the covenant of grace, it tends to drive the elect out of themselves by making them acknowledge their vileness and misery; nevertheless it is by Jesus only that we are introduced into a state of grace. Moses is to begin the work and prepare the soul, and lead the people round through the wilderness; but it is the office of Jesus to put the last hand to the work, to say, "It is finished," and procure true rest to the souls of his people, Matt. 11:28.

XIII. The third blessing of the Old Testament is the familiar and clear demonstration or display of the Divine majesty; such as was made in the appearances of angels, when they declared the will of God; nay, of God himself, when he presented himself to the view of the patriarchs and prophets under a visible appearance. But that glorious epiphany or manifestation of God before the assembly of the whole people, when he came to give his law and to establish his covenant, is of all others the most remarkable. This prerogative of Israel was indeed so great, that no people on earth ever enjoyed any thing like it. Deut. 4:32, 33: "For ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee since the day that God created man upon the earth; and ask from the one side of heaven unto the other, whether has been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it? Did ever people hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou hast heard, and live?" There were likewise the conspicuous symbols of the divine presence in the pillar of cloud and fire, in the sacred and heavenly fire, in the cloud of the sanctuary, and many other things of a similar nature; wherefore God is said "to have had his fire in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem," Isa. 31:9. Which visible symbols of the divine familiarity gradually ceased upon the manifestation of Christ in the flesh, of which they were appointed to be types and figures.

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

XV. And for this reason it is, that the scripture so often mentions this thing, as a great blessing granted to the Israelites. Psal. 147:19, 20: "He showed his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel: he hath not dealt so with any nation." Isa. 42:21: "Jehovah is well pleased for his righteousness' sake," that is, for his truth and goodness, he will ויאדיר תורה נדיל, magnify (him by) the law and make it (him) honourable. Hos. 8:12: "I have written to him תורת רבי, the great things of my law." Which is not only, nay, I may venture to say, not principally to be understood of the moral or even the forensic or judicial law; but chiefly of the doctrine of grace, which was prefigured by the ceremonial law. For the principles of the moral law, implanted in

man at his creation, still remain in the conscience of men, though no new revelation had been superadded, and for the safety of bodies politic many things have been happily devised by wise men. But as to the mysteries of the ceremonial law, these were the peculiar privilege of the people of God; and on account of them the Israelites looked on themselves as having the preeminence above all other nations.

XVI. For the same reason the godly assisted at those ceremonies with so much delight and cheerfulness of soul, and on the contrary accounted it the greatest part of their unhappiness, if at any time they were banished from their country, and forced to live at a distance from these holy things, for it was their continual prayer that they might be allowed to live in the house of God for ever: see Psal. 23:6, Ps. 27:4, 42:2, 5, 84:2, 3, 89:15. As without all doubt they learned from these ceremonies their uncleanness and guilt, which tended to the saving humiliation of their soul; so in them also they beheld the expiation of guilt and the sanctification from sin, the absolution or purging of the conscience. True that was only typical by the ceremonies, but it was true and spiritual through him who was prefigured by them.

XVII. Which things being so, those persons seem too much to depreciate those salutary institutions of God, who scarcely ever consider them but as an unsupportable burden, and a hand-writing contrary to them, and as the penalty of breach of covenant; and insist, that what God declares, Ezek. 20:25, is to be applied to them, namely, that he gave Israel statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live. But the celebrated Dr John a Marck, who was formerly my intimate colleague, has vindicated this passage in such a manner as entirely to supersede any defence of mine. We acknowledge that there was something in the ceremonies which was both grievous, and testified their imperfection, and that the expiation of sin was not yet perfected; but of these things we shall speak in their place. But at the same time we insist that they had a reference to the Gospel, and were a picture of Christ and his benefits, and seals of grace; neither are we to think that they were effects of his wrath in such a manner against Israel, as if they were not given as tokens of a singular favour to that people. The Jews themselves really were, and at this day are still sensible of this; for though they acknowledge they cannot find out the reason for these ceremonies, yet they affirm that a more secret wisdom is contained in them than they can perceive. To this purpose Abarbanel in Legen. fol. 197, col. 2, writes concerning them: "Lo! the principal intention in them is to be as a book of sublime wisdom and divine doctrine, which students in the law may contemplate till they perfect their souls by those apprehensions and notions."

XVIII. The fifth and last blessing of the Old Testament is an almost uninterrupted succession of inspired men, by whom the church in those days, instructed in all their doubts, were without any hazard of being deceived. For in the first ages the Patriarchs might be consulted, to whom God immediately revealed himself, and who, in a state of such longevity, were generally many at a time, or at least were almost contemporary with one another. After them succeeded Moses. He was followed by a long succession of prophets, even to the time of the Babylonish captivity, if we except some very few and short intervals, such as are mentioned, 1 Sam. 3:1, and 2 Chron. 15:3. Under the Babylonish captivity flourished Ezekiel and Daniel; after this last came Haggai, Zachariah, and Malachi, not to say any thing now of Nehemiah and Ezra. And after the Holy Spirit ceased to dictate things to be written for the canon of the church of Israel, yet even to the coming of Christ, he ceased not to move, in an extraordinary manner, the minds of some by his

divine inspiration, as is evident in Simeon, in Zechariah the father of John the Baptist, and in Anna the prophetess. But under the New Testament, after the canon of Scripture was completed by the apostolic writings, those prophetic illuminations or impulses gradually expired.

## CHAPTER XII: Of the Imperfections falsely ascribed to the Old Testament

I. THAT the Old Testament was not such as to contain no deficiency to be supplied, appears even from this, because otherwise a place would not have been sought for a second; as the apostle, Heb. 8:7, proves to a demonstration. Having therefore treated of the blessings and privileges of that testament, it is proper that we now consider its imperfections and defects. Not that we would detract any thing from the divine grace, as it was displayed in the times of old (because the ancient Fathers both acknowledged and actually experienced, that it was sufficient for their salvation), but that we may set a higher value on the infinite riches of the divine bounty, which were reserved for the more auspicious age of the New Testament.

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

III. We here pass over unregarded the heresy of the Socinians, who assert, with the utmost effrontery, that there was no promise of eternal life in the Old Testament; that Jesus Christ was the first and only preacher of that important truth: a blasphemy we have already confuted. At present our business is with brethren, whom we esteem in the Lord, only we must always give the preference to the sacred truth. It does not become us nor any Christian to multiply disputes without cause, and to wrest things well or tolerably said, to a worse meaning than they will bear, and when we have wrested them invidiously to expose them, a manner of procedure this not to be used with enemies, much less with brethren. It is, however, incumbent on all to endeavour to speak with the utmost caution and perspicuity they are able; nor should any one take it amiss, if things, which are spoken improperly and harshly, and less consistently with the truth, are modestly, calmly, and without any party zeal, taken notice of and corrected; especially if they have escaped from persons of character in the church, and are urged by some with a warmth not to be commended, as if they excelled the common doctrine of the reformed churches by the commendation of a purer and more sublime knowledge; so that if any person that does not assent to them in all respects, he is scarce accounted a learned and unprejudiced divine.

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

V. Who that reads or hears these words, would not be led by their very sound to imagine even this, that though the Israelites really enjoyed temporal privileges, such as possession of the land of Canaan, a peaceable government, a flourishing kingdom, prosperity as subjects, long life, and the like, yet they had no benefits that were true and permanent; by which one can scarce forbear thinking, that they had no communion with the Messiah, nor part in his peculiar blessings, as

reconciliation with God, peace of conscience, reformation after the image of the divine purity, foretastes of the joys of heaven, and a happy removal of the soul from this to an immortal life? For these, if any, are deservedly and usually called true and permanent benefits, and salvation itself. Whoever therefore affirms, that very great temporal privileges, and in the same breath denies that such as were true and permanent were bestowed on, and salvation itself, disclosed to the Israelites, speaks in such a manner as to suggest to the mind of the reader that the spiritual blessings of the soul and eternal life were neither bestowed on nor discovered to them.

VI. And it is also scarcely possible for the reader not to be confirmed in that suspicion, if in another part he reads that the only delight the Israelites had was that they could extend their meditations to the felicity of the latter times, which yet they were not to see with their own eyes. But the same author's preface to the Psalms inculcates this in a set, premeditated discourse, not far from the beginning: "This, indeed, was their only solace; for while they were singing most of the Psalms, they were, in the type of David, either singing beforehand the afflictions and exaltation of Christ, or reaching forwards to the latter times; and, deploring their present forlorn case, were endeavouring to change it into the joy of the future time, nay, assuming the disposition, the joy, the zeal, and sharing in the combats and victories, of those who were to see what themselves did not, to hear what themselves did not hear. This, I say, was their only comfort. For neither what they saw could yield them any delight, because they were shadows; nor what they heard, because it was only, partly a promise, partly an accusation of sin and guilt, with which man is born, but was not then abolished and blotted out; nor what they possessed, because they were to leave them, or because the wicked enjoyed them as well as they: in fine, because they were no real blessings capable to satisfy the soul." Who may not gather from this, that, in the Psalms of David, the present blessings of saving grace were neither foretold, commended, or celebrated, and therefore the Israelites did not possess them, though not only the hopes of these blessings, but also the actual possession of them, have been, in all ages, the subject and cause of unspeakable joy. For if David, in his Psalms, can celebrate even such spiritual blessings, which are connected with eternal salvation, as himself and other believers enjoyed even at that time; with what design can it be said, that their only solace and comfort consisted in meditating on the joy of the time to come, and that they possessed blessings which were neither real nor sufficient to satisfy the soul? Who, on reading these things, could imagine he was perusing the writings of a reformed doctor?

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

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

IX. What then? Did memory, did judgment, did soundness of mind fail this very learned author, when he advanced things so contradictory? But his acknowledged learning forbids us to suspect any such thing. Let us then declare the matter as it is. By true and permanent benefits, which, he says, were not bestowed on the fathers of the Old Testament, he means the blessings peculiar to the New, as the truth is opposed to the type, and what is permanent to the shadow that was to vanish. And salvation with him denotes complete salvation. He has found an interpreter and apologist in a divine of very great name, who with great confidence tells us, that this assertion is for the most part in Scripture terms; which might have been better understood by divines, if they had taken as much pains to read and meditate on the writings of God as of men; and he endeavours to show, that some of the things peculiar to the New Testament, as such, are sometimes held forth by the name of salvation, and of true and permanent benefits. For this purpose, he quotes, Heb. 2:3, where salvation is said, "at the first to have begun to be spoken by the Lord;" that is, the work of salvation, which Christ now began to perform; or even that clear and effectual doctrine of the Gospel, which calls us to salvation. He further observes, that those benefits are sometimes called true, which are opposed to those which were typical, as John 1:17: "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ;" and as the blotting out the hand-writing which was against us, and that glorious degree of adoption, mentioned Gal. 4:5, are said to be true benefits; he asserts, that they are justly called permanent, in contradistinction to the covenant of grace, as it was a covenant with the Israelites, which was neither faultless, nor permanent, Heb. 8:7, 9. From all which he concludes, that is to speak agreeable with the scriptures to say, that true and permanent benefits, and salvation itself, were not bestowed on and discovered to Israel.

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

XI. But let us consider the constant tenour of the sacred writings. These call the spiritual blessings of the soul, τὸ ἀληθινόν, the true, Luke 16:11, in opposition to the unrighteous mammon, or the false riches of this world; and the grace granted to the elect, as such, "τὴν ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ, the true grace of God wherein they stand," 1 Peter. 5:12. Whether we understand this of the doctrine of grace, or of that saving grace itself, which, by that doctrine is offered to and conferred on the elect which, ver. 10, was called "the eternal glory of God," it is very evident, that true grace is opposed to any false persuasion whatever concerning salvation.

They are also expressly called permanent blessings, Heb. 10:34: "Knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance," which is not opposed to types and shadows, but to the good things of this world, which are fading and subject to spoiling or rapine. "Υπαρξίς μένουσα, enduring substance, answers to the Hebrew words תושיה and יש, which signify, a true solid, and permanent substance. But this was what the supreme wisdom has, from the beginning, promised to and bestowed on those who observe her, Prov. 2:7: "תושיה לישירים יצפן", he layeth up sound wisdom (substance) for the righteous," and Prov. 8:21. "יש אהבי להוהיל", to cause those that love me to inherit substance." Our Lord calls these very benefits "treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal," Matt. 6:20. Now the believing Israelites were undoubtedly admitted to the possession of these. The learned author himself writes, Indagat. Natur. Sabbat. §. iv. that "Holy persons, who believed the promise and expected salvation, had the ornament of a meek a quiet spirit." Which no one doubts are permanent. In a word, what does salvation itself more commonly signify, than that happiness of the soul which is begun here upon earth, and will be perfected in heaven, and is the end of our faith? Of which, 1 Peter. 1:9: "receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls." The salvation of the soul is its deliverance from the condemning and domineering power of sin, and its delighting in God as the fountain of happiness. And this is the end of faith, not only under the New, but also that which obtained under the Old Testament. Which was indeed discovered to Jacob, and by him to his children, when he said, "I have waited for thy salvation, O Jehovah," Gen. 19:18. As therefore spiritual blessings are called in scripture true, permanent, and salvation itself, and the brethren dare not refuse that these were granted and discovered to the ancient Israelites; must we not acknowledge, that whoever says, that true and permanent benefits, and salvation itself, were not granted and discovered to the Israelites, does not speak according to scripture?

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

XIII. But let us take a more distinct view how well the brethren maintain their ground by scripture. 1st, We allow that the apostle, Heb. 2:3, by salvation understands that great happiness, whose cause was then present and the Gospel in its perfect state, wherein the salvation now begun to be impetrated, and soon to be fully so is declared; and it is certain, salvation in that sense was not before the manifestation of Christ, nor did the Israelites enjoy it. But he that would illustrate this, should distinguish between this salvation already impetrated or obtained, and salvation about to be impetrated; or between salvation and the promise of salvation; and not as our author does, between salvation and temporal benefits. For certainly eternal salvation was given and manifested to Israel, though the cause of salvation as it now appears, and the work of salvation as already begun, could not be preached to them. Because, what Christ had promised and engaged was at that time sufficient to procure salvation, to be manifested and bestowed.

XIV. 2dly, None will deny that true benefits are sometimes opposed to typical, but this observation is altogether foreign to the case in hand, unless the brethren mean, that the Israelites enjoyed only typical good things, but were destitute of those true or spiritual blessings which were signified by the typical. What we just quoted from the preface to the Psalms, and which I own I do not sufficiently understand, seems to tend to this. But let these things pass. Let us go on with what is perspicuous. Moses indeed who was a servant, could not bestow those true blessings; yet Christ, who was the same yesterday and to-day, bestowed on believers even under the Mosaic economy true benefits, in and with the typical. And when they deny, that true benefits were bestowed on Israel, I cannot think they will reckon remission of sins, and redemption, and a new creation, &c. among the number of those which were typical, and they own that these were bestowed on Israel. To what purpose then is the inculcating here a distinction between true and typical benefits? But, say they, the blotting out the hand-writing, and that glorious degree of adoption, are true benefits. Are they so? And is not also remission itself, the hand-writing not being yet blotted out, and adoption itself, though not in that degree, to be reckoned among the true benefits? Did the types of the Israelites only prefigure that measure of grace peculiar to the New Testament; not saving grace itself, which is common to both dispensations? Were their sacraments signs only of this grace which is freely bestowed on us, and not also of that of which they themselves were made partakers? Let the learned authors tell me I pray, whether the new creation, redemption, remission of sins, adoption, friendship with God, and the salvation of the soul, both in heaven and on earth, and the like spiritual blessings, which the Israelites enjoyed, belong to the law, and are given by Moses, or to the truth and grace, which came by Christ? If they affirm the latter, as I imagine they will, I again beg of them to explain what the passage quoted from John makes to the purpose, as from that it is clear, that true benefits as opposed to typical, were bestowed even upon Israel, which yet the words now under examination deny.

XV. 3dly. The main point is, that the economy of the Old Testament was not permanent and stable, like the economy of the New. In the former there is the removing of those things that are shaken, that, in the latter, those things which cannot be shaken may remain, Heb. 12:27. But it is wrong to infer from this, that under a mutable economy, which was, in due time, to be changed, there were no permanent blessings either bestowed or made known. Because the bestowing and manifesting permanent benefits proceed not from those circumstances, which are mutable, but from the very covenant of grace, which is God's eternal testament. Then again granting, there is some permanent benefit under the New Testament, which was not under the Old, I cannot therefore indeterminately affirm, that permanent blessings were not bestowed on Israel. I shall give a palpable instance. The apostle says even to believers under the New Testament, while they sojourned on this earth, Heb. 13:14, "Here have we no continuing city." The celebrated interpreter says well on this place: "It is peculiar to Christians, and those who join themselves to Christ, that they have not here a city. They are without a city in the world. Some may say, the apostle denies not that they have a city but they have no abiding one; nay, he denies that we have a city here because no city is abiding." Can I therefore be allowed to assert, that no permanent benefits are bestowed on believers of the New Testament? I cannot think it. I conclude, it had been much better, the brethren had frankly owned, that the learned author, while he was writing these things, betrayed human frailty, and spoke uncautiously, than by far fetched pretences to palliate things, which the reformed churches will never acknowledge as their doctrine.



XVI. Secondly. The excellence of the Old Testament is too much lessened by asserting, that the circumcision of the heart, mentioned, Deut. 30:6, was a blessing peculiar to the New Testament. It is worth while to hear, how the learned author explains himself. First, he desires us to observe, that this verse treats of the time of the Messiah, the foregoing signs of whom are explained in the preceding verses; and therefore he enumerates circumcision of the heart, mentioned here among the blessings of the New Testament, de fed. §. 352. Consequently he says, that God hence promised a kind of circumcision of the heart, which he would not give till that time. Sum. Theol. c. 53. §. 7. But what is that circumcision of the heart here promised? Let us hear the learned author himself, when professedly commenting on this place. By circumcision of the heart we are here to understand, whatever answers to circumcision, as a figure, and is contained in God's covenant, except those things that do not belong to this life, Ultim. Mos. §. 334. And more clearly still, to sum up the whole briefly, the circumcision of the heart here promised ver. 6, is regeneration by the spirit of adoption. Above all it signifies regeneration, or sanctification by the spirit of faith and the love of God. Secondly, it denotes consolation in hope of eternal life, by the expiation of Christ. Ibid. §. 336, 337, 338. From these quotations, if duly connected, arises this argument:—The circumcision of the heart promised, Deut. 30:6. is a benefit of the New Testament, which God did not bestow till then: but regeneration by the spirit of adoption, or sanctification by the spirit of faith and of the love of God, and consolation in hope of eternal life by the expiation of Christ, is the circumcision of the heart there promised: therefore such regeneration or sanctification and consolation in hope of eternal life is a benefit of the New Testament, which God did not bestow before that time. This conclusion necessarily follows from the premises, when placed in due order. But the premises are the very words of the learned author.

XVII. And yet he does not admit the conclusion; but protests against it. "And the fathers had both; for they could not without the Spirit of God, 1 Cor. 12:3, and the creation of a clean heart, Ps. 51:10, and the circumcision of the heart, call Christ Lord, as David does, Ps. 110:1. And they had the hope and joy of salvation, Gen. 49:19. Ps. 51:12. Ps. 17:15. Psal. 49:15. Ibid. §. 339. If any can reconcile these things, I own I cannot. There is only one way of getting clear: namely, by making a distinction in regeneration, sanctification, and consolation in hope of eternal life; as that there is a certain regeneration by the spirit of adoption; another from something else than from that spirit: a certain sanctification by the spirit of faith and love of God; another not: a certain consolation in the hope of eternal life by the expiation of Christ; another from some other way. The former of these are indeed peculiar to the New Testament; and the latter belong to the Old. But these very learned persons must excuse me, if I confidently affirm, I never learned from Scripture of any regeneration but what is from the spirit of adoption, any sanctification but what is from the spirit of faith and love; any hope of eternal life but what is by the expiation of Christ, either to be made, or already made.

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

sanctification, and consolation, but in some measure only. But what is there to be superadded to what they had received? That must be some third thing, even that which the circumcision of the heart denotes; namely, "the removing the veil from the eyes, and the yoke from the conscience, in order to serve God without taking away the fleshy substance doubtless signifies freedom from the yoke of such a law," *ibid.* §. 340.

XIX. But we distinctly offer the following considerations against such intricate notions. 1st. Thus the circumcision of the heart is a blessing of the covenant of grace as such, and equally belongs to believers of both Testaments. Which we make appear thus. The foreskin of the heart always signifies in scripture that impurity and depravation which is naturally inherent in the soul, and is increased by repeated evil actions; but the circumcision of the heart is nothing but the taking away that foreskin, that is, that depravation; which is done by regeneration and sanctification. This Moses declares, Deut. 10:16, "Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiff-necked." And Paul, in like manner, Col. 2:11. describes the circumcision of the heart, which is done without hands, to be the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh. But that this was the privilege of believers in all ages, appears from this, because without it none can be a Jew whose praise is of God, Rom. 2:28, 29. But none will deny, that in consequence of the covenant of grace, there were always such. And as circumcision of the heart is this very regeneration and sanctification, without which none can see God, we must of necessity say that it is the privilege of all those that were saved at any time. A greater or less degree of sanctification alters not the species. Nor do I imagine any believer at this time will, even as to the degrees of sanctification, claim to himself a superiority above David or Moses, or Abraham. Who will ascribe the circumcision of the heart to himself, and refuse it to those heroes, who were also partakers of the same grace with them, though not in an equal degree?

XX. 2dly. Besides to understand, by circumcision of the heart, the removing the veil and yoke, or, which is the same, the abrogation of the ceremonies, is contrary to all sound divinity and reason. For, 1st. Let but one single testimony of Scripture be produced, where the Holy Spirit thus explains it. 2dly. We are, on the contrary, taught that circumcision was, as it were, the entrance to the observance of that law, in which it was a yoke, Gal. 5:3. How then could it signify to the Israelites, on their receiving it, the abrogation of that yoke? 3dly. Circumcision itself was a great part of the yoke, Acts 15:5, compared with verse 10. Besides what is more absurd, than that the receiving the yoke should signify the removal of it? What sacramental analogy is there here? 4thly. As there is a relation between circumcision and uncircumcision, if circumcision be the abrogation of the ceremonies, it necessarily, follows, that the ceremonies themselves are the foreskin, or uncircumcision of the heart, than which what can be more contrary to Scripture language? 5thly. If it be objected, that the ceremonial law is called a carnal commandment, Heb. 7:16; therefore its abrogation was fitly prefigured by cutting away a small part of the flesh, I shall avert the argument, and conclude; therefore it hath its confirmation in that act, which if any thing, should be accounted among the carnal, as it was performed in the flesh; wherefore it is also called the covenant of God in the flesh of the descendants of Abraham, Gen. 17:13. For the apostle calls that commandment carnal, which, as to the external rites, is performed not in the spirit or mind, but in the members of the body. Otherwise it might, with equal reason, be said, that the killing and burning the sacrifices prefigured the abrogation of the carnal ceremonies, which is unworthy divines. There was, indeed, that in circumcision, as also in the other ceremonies, which might discover imperfection, and give hope of a more joyful time

and presignify that when that time should come, the ceremonies were to be abrogated; yet the thing signified was not the abrogation of the same.

XXI. 3dly. And though sometimes circumcision of the heart was the same thing as taking away the veil and yoke; yet it is not promised in that sense, Deut. 30:6. For, God himself explains it otherwise in the following words, which runs thus: "And Jehovah thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love Jehovah thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." That circumcision therefore, is meant, whose immediate effect is the sincere love of God, and the more remote life or salvation. Now what is this but regeneration or sanctification, without which there can neither be the love of God nor life. But both may be, where the veil and yoke of ceremonies are not yet removed. The Jewish doctors also agree, that here sanctification is meant; though they give it too great an extent, and think that a perfect sanctification is here promised. We shall not scruple to transcribe a few things out of Moses Gerundensis. "Their heart will desire nothing, but what, in every respect, is virtuous. And this is the circumcision mentioned here. For concupiscence and appetite are the foreskin of the heart; but to circumcise the heart is to set it free from that appetite and concupiscence."

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

XXIII. Thirdly, In the same unworthy manner, they make the writing the law on the heart, a blessing peculiar to the New Testament: because, Heb. 8:10. it is said from Jer. 31:34, "for this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts:" that is, says our author, in ver. 31 §. 61, "I will cause them to receive my law, delight therein, and not forget it." If these words be taken as they lie, it follows that the ancient believers, who lived before the times of the New Testament, did not receive the law of God, nor delight in it, but forgot it. But that these things are most eminently false, appears from the example of David alone: who professes that he received the law, when he says, Ps. 119:11. "Thy word have I hid in my heart:" and adds ver. 16. "I will delight myself in thy statutes, I will not forget thy word." How then is this a blessing peculiar to the New Testament, in which David claims an interest in so many words?

XXIV. But there is something else implied. Here, says the celebrated interpreter, the law of the love of God is spoken of. But that commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," Deut. 6. could not, under the Old Testament, have its full efficacy on the hearts of believers: because "where there is fear (which they who differed nothing from servants, could not be without, Gal 4:1.) there is no perfect love," 1 John 4:18. And when "the love of God is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost," Rom. 5:5, and the love of God is not bestowed with sadness, as

formerly, but with the "exceeding joy of sons," it is excellently, and as it were peculiarly said, that "the law of God is written in the heart." All this we may find in Sum. de fed. §. 352.

XXV. But I do not meet with these things in the sacred writings; for they declare that even the ancient believers loved God. Ps. 18:1, and Ps. 116:1. And that as their Father, Isa. 63:16: and with the exceeding joy of sons, Ps. 43:4: and without any fear, that did become the children of God, Ps. 46:2, and Ps. 23:4: nay, that they had a joyful sense of the love of God, shed abroad in their hearts, Ps. 4:7: and hear God, "saying to their souls, I am thy salvation," Ps. 35:3. In a word, that they delighted themselves in God's commandments, which they loved. Ps. 119:47. What can now remain as a requisite towards writing the law on the heart?

XXVI. But yet you will say, something is here promised, to be obtained by virtue of the New Covenant, which the old could not give, in the place of which the new was substituted on account of its imperfections. I answer, the apostle does not here oppose the covenant of grace, as it is dispensed after the coming of Christ, to the same covenant of grace as it was dispensed before: but opposes the covenant of grace, as in its full efficacy under the New Testament, to the national covenant made with the Israelites at Mount Sinai; and as a spiritual covenant to a typical. In which covenant the people promised obedience to God; and God promised the people that if they performed that obedience, he would accept and reward it; but did not promise to give them a heart to obey; as may be seen in their first engaging in covenant, Exod. 19:5, 6, 8, and in the solemn confirmation of it, Exod. 24:7, 8, where there is no promise made of a new heart. And therefore, in consequence of this covenant, the law was not written on the heart of the people of Israel. And hence it was that they broke that covenant by their apostasy, and made it of no effect: and that God refused to be called their God, and to acknowledge them for his people; and that in contempt he called them the people of Moses, rather than his own. Exod. 32:7. Here a better covenant is opposed to that Israelitish covenant, which is not formally the covenant of grace, but is only considered with respect to its typical or shadowy pomp, the effect of which is the writing the law on the heart, and communion with God, as the fountain of salvation. Moreover, that covenant is referred to the days of the Messiah, not that it was only then to exist in those effects of it; but that at that time it would be exceeding glorious, and produce effects very conspicuous. However, the elect among Israel, even in the ancient times, besides their engagements by the Sinaitic covenant, were joined to God by the covenant of grace, which he had solemnly renewed with Abraham. And from that covenant they had every thing that the writing the law on the heart comprises, and God himself for their God, that is, the fountain of salvation. As the covenant of grace, under which the ancients were, is not to be confounded with, so neither is it to be separated from, the Sinaitic covenant: neither are we to think, that believers were without all those things, which were not promised by the Sinaitic covenant, and which the typical covenant, because of its weakness and unprofitableness, could not bestow; as they were likewise partakers of the Abrahamic covenant, which was a pure covenant of grace: and hence were derived the spiritual and saving benefits of the Israelites.

XXVII. Fourthly. The godly, who are zealous for the truth, are not without cause offended, when they read in express terms, that "justification is promised in Scripture, as a blessing not of the ancient, but of the latter times," Sum. Theol. cap. 69. §. 3: that "remission is promised, as a gift of the New Testament." de fed. § 323. That "before Christ came, there was no remission." Indag.

nat. Sabbat. § 3. And, in a word, that "no sin was properly forgiven under the Old Testament." Sum. Theol. cap. 96. § 26.

XXVIII. But he who speaks so, understands, by remission of sins and by justification, something more than the will to remit the punishment of sin, and to bestow eternal life for the sake of the mediator, received by faith. He means by these terms, "that then the will to punish sin is excluded, by appointing a sacrifice for sin; and the declaration and testimony included; that sin is blotted out and expiated:" as he explains himself in Animad. v. ad. Quæst. 83. Quæst. 68. This he has expressed more clearly, Sum. Theol. cap. 51. § 9. As to that justification which is the discharge and perfecting of the conscience, or the consolation arising on account of the cause of righteousness being now manifested, they had not that formerly. He has accurately and briefly explained the whole of his meaning in Comment. ad Col. 2. §. 110. "In sum, the difference of remission, according to the times, is thus: (1.) There was a remission of sins, and indeed a confession of as sin not yet expiated, and of righteousness not as yet brought in, but without bondage and a yoke; even before the law: previous to which sin was not imputed. (2.) There was a remission of sins with bondage, a yoke and ordinances, which exacted a hand-writing contrary to them, both evident and plain; and that under the law. (3.) There is a remission of sins, with a declaration of righteousness being brought in, and of the death of Christ, for the doing away of sin, even on account of the blotting out the hand-writing, and that under the New Testament.

XXIX. Against all this I offer the following considerations. As the scripture asserts, in express terms that the ancient fathers had remission of sins and justification, it is neither laudable nor prudent to deny it. For in what sense soever you do it, it looks at least like an attempt to gainsay God, and correct his language. Which ought to be very far from every one that loves and reveres God. Besides, the scripture is express as concerning remission of sins, Psal. 130:4, "but there is forgiveness with thee," Exod. 34:7. "forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin;" so concerning justification, James 2:21, "Abraham our father was justified," and Rom. 4:2, 3. As God has declared that these had remission and justification, to what purpose then this is denied? You will allege you have done so in a different sense: but let us now consider whether in a right and a good one.

XXX. By remission of sins and justification you understand absolution, on account of the payment being actually made, together with an entire discharge from the hand-writing; such as certainly did not exist under the Old Testament. But I do not remember that any has proved, that the term justification is used in that sense any where in Scripture, to distinguish it from that absolution which the ancients enjoyed. For what is said Acts 13:39, "By him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses," is not to the purpose. There it is shown we have the truth in the saving grace of Christ, of which they had only the shadow in the external ceremonies of the law of Moses. There is no opposition made in that text between the Old and New Testament, only between internal communion with Christ and the external ceremonies. But it is beyond all controversy, that believers, even under the Old Testament, were partakers thereof. We have the term ἄφεσις, remission, once in that sense, Heb. 10:18, but once only, that I know of. In other respects ἄφεσις, is frequently asserted of the ancient fathers, as we shall presently show. Seeing therefore the Scripture frequently declares, that the ancient fathers enjoyed remission of sins; and either once, or but rarely ascribes remission with any annexed limitation to the New Testament, contradistinguished from the Old;

it does not appear consistent with Christian prudence, so often to deny a remission under the Old. It had been better, in order to prevent offence, to say plainly and distinctly that such a mode or manner of remission did not obtain under the Old, as does now under the New Testament. Nor can any plead in excuse such Scripture expressions, which says, that the Old Testament had not benefits in such abundance, as John 7:39; for these expressions are not so common. And whoever in his discourses attempts to render Scripture more intelligible to the less experienced, ought not to frame his expressions by what is both more rare and obscure, but by the ordinary tenor of Scripture, in order to throw a light on the more obscure passages and phrases.

XXXI. In fine, we cannot approve his saying, that the hand-writing was not exacted of the fathers before the law of Moses. For sacrifices and circumcision, which is not of Moses but of the fathers, John 7:22, belong to the ordinances, and were types of Christ to come, and implied a confession of guilt which was not then expiated, but are abolished by the cross of Christ. And if they made no part of the hand-writing, is there any reason why they may not be observed under the New Testament, at least in the manner in which they were observed before Moses? The brethren make the state of the Israelitish church too servile beyond the other periods, both the preceding and the following. But these do not properly concern this controversy.

XXXII. Many have also been offended, that Psalms 32: 51. 103, and the like, which exactly describe remission of sins and the justification of a sinner, should be thought to contain a prophecy concerning the New Testament times, as if the Psalmist, on that occasion, delighted himself in the anticipation of the joys of the New Testament times, Sum. Theol. c. 69. §. 24, and frequently elsewhere, especially in his commentaries on these psalms. These things seem very disagreeable, nor are they thought possible to proceed but from one, who denies that the fathers had remission of sin, together with that holy security of soul, which delights itself in God. Yet it is not to be denied, that the brethren elsewhere loudly protest, that they ascribe to the ancient fathers that remission of sins, which begets a full assurance of hope concerning happiness and a consolation, and a glorying even in death. And charity, which thinketh no evil, obligeth us to believe, that they speak thus from the heart. However, I look upon that method of interpretation to be very indecent, whereby things of a doctrinal nature, which have no respect to the different economy of times, are rashly transformed into prophecies concerning the New Testament. And I find nothing in those psalms, at least so far as they declare the grace of God in the remission of sins, which may not be applied to David, and to believers, his cotemporaries. Nor does any thing occur in the New Testament, which authorizes believers of the last times to appropriate these things to themselves beyond others. Let us consider each of them.

XXXIII. There is nothing in Psal. 32 that savours of prophecy. The title shows it is\* a doctrinal ode, containing the doctrine concerning the true happiness of a sinner, as common to every age; and declares that this consists in remission of sins. Moreover, by his own example, he shows to whom that happiness belongs, and after what manner it may be obtained. This he proposes, ver. 5. for the imitation of others, and presses it, ver. 8. and the following, in very strong terms. Who, but one blinded with prejudice, can find a prophesy in all this? And certainly, when David pronounces the person blessed unto whom Jehovah imputeth not iniquity, &c. I would fain know whether he includes himself in that blessedness? If he does, it is no prophecy of the New Testament times, which is what I contend for; but if he excludes himself from that happiness, he also excludes himself from the benefit of that justification, which is obtained by faith; but Paul

brings in this happiness of David, Rom. 4:6, to prove the doctrine of justification by faith, and shows that Abraham was made partaker of it: but this I imagine none of the brethren will say. I would also fain know, what person speaks, ver. 3, 4? Is there here any kind of *prosopopœia* representing to us a believer of the New Testament? But what proof is there of such a fiction? What demonstration have we for it? Or does David himself speak? Certainly, the title of the psalm leads us to this: and there is nothing in these words which are not true concerning David, and which he does not elsewhere affirm of himself; see Psal. 6:2, 3. But if the prophet affirms of himself what is there spoken, of the grief and anxiety of a soul not yet sensible of God's being reconciled, he certainly also speaks of himself, ver. 5. "and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin," for these words cannot be separated from the foregoing. I entreat the pious reader to compare this commentary, by which such a plain psalm is turned to I know not what kind of drama, where, under the mask of David, quite different persons lie concealed, with the clear and savoury commentary of Calvin, and if I am not mistaken, he will evidently see the mask fall off.

XXXIV. Of the same nature is, Psal. 51. The inscription and occasion of it there mentioned, prove that it is so evidently applicable to David, that it is superfluous to add a single word. The learned author himself, in his commentaries, applies many things to David; and on the title of the psalm, he expressly says, "it is a prayer of David to God, after his conversation with the prophet Nathan:" and on ver. 1. "all are bound to have recourse to grace, and lay hold on that, and consequently, with David, to apply to themselves the grace of God." Why then does he, elsewhere, wrest these things to the New Testament times? Is it, because ver. 7, he says, "sprinkle me with hyssop;" by which ceremony the atoning sacrifice of Christ was represented? But is not that very expression more applicable to a believer under the Old than under the New Testament? How could he more effectually express the activity of the ancient faith, which takes a distant prospect of a Saviour to come through a thick cloud of ceremonies? "The man of God knew," says Musculus, "that the expiation of sin consists not in ceremonial actions; but is rather by the grace and Spirit of God in Christ to come." Or is it because, ver. 18, he speaks of the sacrifices of righteousness, which were to be offered after the rebuilding of Jerusalem, or of the sacrifice of Christ, whereby he made the fullest satisfaction to the justice of God? But what can be inferred from this? Could not believers of the Old Testament sing praises for the benefits bestowed on them, and, at the same time, make mention of the future satisfaction of Christ, in virtue of which they obtained those blessings? And then why may we not, with Bucer and Musculus, understand by these sacrifices, those spiritual sacrifices of which Peter speaks, 1 Pet. 2:5, and which are abundantly offered to God when he does good to Zion, &c.; that is, enriches his church with his spiritual grace, as well under the Old as under the New Testament? Unless with Calvin, Mollerus, Piscator, the Dutch commentators and others, we had rather explain it of the legal sacrifices themselves, but offered in a proper manner, according to the divine prescription, and by faith, which is still farther from the sentiment of Cocceius.

XXXV. The hundred and third Psalm contains nothing which regards only the New Testament times. And the 19th and 22d verses are to no purpose produced, as if they treated concerning the kingdom of liberty and grace which was to extend through all the world. For it is not certain that these words are to be referred to the kingdom of heaven under the New Testament. There is nothing in them which may not be applied to the kingdom of God's power or providence. "It is plain," says Musculus, "these things are not spoken concerning the kingdom of grace, but of the kingdom of God's power, authority and dominion. But was it not likewise true under the Old

Testament, that "Jehovah hath prepared his throne in the heavens, and that his kingdom ruleth over all?" Was the state of the New Testament times represented to Micaiah, when he saw Jehovah sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him? 1 Kings 22:19. Did Nebuchadnezzar also prophesy of the New Testament times, when he called God, "king of heaven," and ascribed to him an "everlasting kingdom over all the inhabitants of the earth?" Dan. 4:36, 37. Can it be said under the New Testament alone, "Bless the Lord all his works." But the psalmist, Ps. 148, even under the Old Testament, invited every thing in heaven and in earth to that duty. I omit other passages, lest, in a thing so plain, I should be charged with a too superstitious exactness. However, I will not deny that those things which are spoken concerning the kingdom of God's power, which extends itself over the whole earth, and concerning his eminent majesty over all creatures, do illustriously shine forth in the kingdom of liberty and grace, as Mollerus has likewise observed. But yet there is no reason to turn all this into a mere prophecy concerning the time to come. Well says Amyraldus, in his preface to this psalm, "there is nothing here which can be properly typical, or which, by any mystical interpretation, can be referred to the fulness of time." But should we grant that the prophet, filled with the abundance of divine grace, was, from the sense thereof, moved to sing, towards the close of the psalm, concerning the kingdom of liberty and grace; does it therefore follow, that what he had before sung of the bounty of God towards himself, and of the pardon of all his sins, was not applicable to himself, but only to believers under the New Testament?

XXXVI. What has also perplexed some, is that laboured distinction, and so often inculcated, of *πάρεσις*, passing by, and *ἄφεσις*, pardon, which is usually pretended to be of extraordinary use in divinity. But they generally explain it thus: that *πάρεσις* denotes a passing over, a passing by, a concealing, whence it comes, that God does not punish sins, nor has a purpose of exacting them of the sinner; nevertheless he does not declare that satisfaction has been made, but on the contrary, reserves to himself a power to call the sinner before him, that is, to remind him that the debt is not yet cancelled, and to exact of himself the hand-writing, by which he may own, as by the subscription of his own hand, that guilt is not yet abolished and expiated. This the Scripture would call *παριέναι*, to pass by, to which answers *שׁוֹתֵת*, to be silent, Ps. 50:21, and Esth. 7:4. They distinguish this passing by two ways. 1st. Before the law of Moses, when God was altogether silent, and sin not imputed, by exacting the hand-writing. 2dly. After the law, when God called the sinner before him, and demanded the hand-writing. But by *ἄφεσις*, properly so called, they understand that pardon of sin by which God declares that Christ has made satisfaction to his justice, and pronounces the meritorious cause of the right to life to be now actually in being, affirms sin to be blotted out, tears the hand-writing, and finally gives a discharge; as if he should say, "I have received, I will not give in pledge." All this we find in de fed. §. 339. Sum. Theol. c. li. §. 11. Animadvers. ad Quæst. 83, Quæst. 68. Ad Rom. 3. §. 72. More Nebo. p. 65, &c.

XXXVII. On this I observe, that in the main there can be no controversy, if it be allowed that the guilt of sin did not lie upon believers, in such a manner, that they, on supposition of Christ's suretiship, should be forced to bear the punishment of it in their own person. So far, indeed, they were obliged to remember: 1st. That, according to the law, they are debtors. 2dly. Though on account of the covenant-engagement of the Messiah, they are absolved from the penalty, yet as that engagement was not yet actually fulfilled, so far their guilt was not yet expiated; but that it continues to lie on him who was still their surety, from whom it will demand sufferings and



death; and as they themselves, by the decree of election, are one mystical body with the surety, so far it lies upon them to give satisfaction, not in their own person, but by the surety. Just as the catechism speaks, "we are to make payment by another." If so, as I apprehend, this is what the brethren mean, none will dissent from them. But then their boasting of the extraordinary usefulness of their distinction will appear groundless, since they say nothing but what all orthodox divines either have said, or would say.

XXXVIII. Moreover that distinction cannot be proved from the terms *πάρεσις* and *ἄφεσις*. For, it is certain that *ἄφεσις* is ascribed to believers before the actual expiation of sin, Lev. 5:10, "καὶ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, and it shall be forgiven him," and so in other places. And least any should cavil, that this is meant of a typical forgiveness, which yet was the symbol of the true, and to which the august term, *ἄφεσις*, seems less applicable than to that real forgiveness the ancients enjoyed, I add from Psa. 85:2. "Ἀφῆκας τας ἀνομίας τῷ λαῷ σου, thou hast forgiven the iniquity of thy people." I deny not, that this psalm was to be sung by the Israelites, when they were to be converted to Christ the Lord; but I think it cannot be proved, that it was not sung by believers when they returned from the Babylonish captivity, with an application to their condition at that time. To omit other considerations, it is beyond all exception, that Christ, before his satisfaction, bestowed *ἄφεσις*, forgiveness, on some, Matt. 9:2. "Ἀφένονται σοί αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου, thy sins be forgiven thee." In like manner, Luke 7:47.

XXXIX. But we have not yet seen it proved, that *πάρεσις* signifies passing by, concealing, silence. Budæus, indeed, in Comment. Ling. Græce. p. 286, shows that *παριέναι* is sometimes to pass over; but that is in a quite different sense, for he quotes a passage from Xenophon, lib. 4. Hellen: "Εἰπὼν αὐτῷ μηδένα παριεναι εἰς ακροπολιν, commanding him not to pass or send over any into the citadel. Moreover, he says, that *παριέναι*, is to indulge, to promise, to forgive; and Hesychius speaks to the same purpose. Παρίημι is *συγχωρῶ*, yield, *αφημι*, remit; and he explains *πάρεσις* by *ἄφεσις*, remission, *συγχωρησις*, concession, pardon, so far are these words from being distinguished, that the one may be explained by the other. I am aware that a certain author says, that the authority of Hesychius does not move him, because he had before his eyes this passage of Paul, and explained it from the subject matter itself, on which Paul is speaking, Mor. Nebo. p. 29. But neither do I imagine, the celebrated person would have us to be moved by his own authority. Hesychius is no contemptible author. Let us hear the judgment of Dan. Heinsius, Aristarch. Sac. p. 9, Edit. 8vo. In Hesychius is contained, not only the learning of all Greece, but also of the east, p. 14. A grammarian of surprising and profound learning, p. 18. A grammarian, who is an abyss of the ancient erudition, p. xi. 6. Hesychius is no mean author, whose glosses are certainly for the most part, adapted to explain the Greek authors, and especially the Septuagint. And if Hesychius had this passage of Paul before his eyes, and explained it from the subject matter, and from his acquaintance with a language which was his mother tongue, certainly he has not explained it amiss.

XL. The learned author, indeed says, that *παριέναι* answers to שׁוֹתֵת, to be silent; but does not prove it. He quotes Esth. 7:4; but *παριέναι* is not there, in the copies I have. That of Walton and the London in 8vo, A. 1653 have *παριήκουσα*. However that I may not conceal any thing, I have been made to understand, that it is in another copy. But suppose it was in them all, what is it to the purpose? For, I had been silent, does not there signify, I had passed over that injury unpunished, but I had in silence submitted myself to that indignity, nor troubled the king with

any petition of mine. By which our *παρεσις* gains nothing. And then also when God, Psa. 50:21, says to the wicked, "These things hast thou done, and I kept silence," which the Septuagint translate *τὰυτα ἐποίησας καὶ ἐσίγησα*; there is no such thing intended by that term, like that *παρεσις*, remission, which Paul describes and the brethren insist upon. For, that is the absolution of believers from the penalty, on account of Christ's suretyship. But this silence is the deferring the punishment of the wicked, in order to compensate its slowness by its severity; things widely different. I cannot conceive, with what judgment the celebrated author quotes these things here, in which though even the word *πάρεσις*, were to be found, yet certainly, not the thing itself, which he would have signified by that term.

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

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

XLIII. But the illustration given by the excellent James Altingius, merits our regard; who Heptad. 2. Dissert. 2. §. 92. Seq., speaks almost to the following purpose. Three things are required to a full and perfect *ἄφεσις*, forgiveness; namely, the taking away, the transferring, and the expiating of sin. The taking away of sin is that act whereby the guilt is removed from the offender; that though he has sinned, yet he is not under the obligation to punishment. This is pointed out by the term, *נשא*, when it signifies to remove, and take away, Exod. 34:7; Psa. 99:8; Psal. 32:5; Psa. 85:2; Psa. 25:18. The transferring of sin in that act, whereby the guilt, which is removed from the offender, is transferred to the surety, that he may be obliged to answer for it; as was done in the case of a sacrifice, by the imposition of hands, which then bore and carried the guilt. This he thinks, was pointed out by the word *העביר*, he caused to pass, he transferred; 2 Sam. 12:13, when David said I have sinned, or I am guilty, against the Lord; Nathan answers, Jehovah also *העביר*, hath put away (caused to pass) thy sin, guilt, thou shalt not die. And the angel, the Lord, Zech. 3:4. says; behold, *העברתי*, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee. Which words ascribe this transferring to God, as the Creditor, and to Christ, as the surety. But it is also what the debtor may claim; whence David prays for it, 2 Sam. 24:10. "And now I beseech thee O Lord, *העבר* take away (cause to pass) the iniquity of thy servant." And Solomon, Eccl. 11:10, because we must give an account of all our actions to God as the last judgment, enjoins us *העבר*, to put away (cause to pass) evil from our flesh. Which cannot otherwise be done, (as the

evil done can on no account be undone,) than by transferring or transporting sin. And he imagines, that this transferring is what the apostle calls *παρεσις*, remission. The expiation of sin is that act, by which, the guilt, removed from the offender, and transferred to the surety, is expiated by him, who bears all the punishment to which the sinner was bound, so that divine justice shall have nothing more to demand, much less to inflict. This is expressed by the word *כפל*, to expiate, to cover with the blood of payment, that the writing of sin may be cancelled, and no longer appear. This last act is at length followed by a complete *ἄφεσις*, remission, which absolutely discharges from every demand, either upon the debtor, or the surety; so that after this, there is no further any occasion for a sacrifice for sin, Heb. 10:18, all remembrance of it being entirely effaced, ver. 3, compared with ver. 17. Having thus explained these things, the very learned author proceeds as follows. Under the Old Testament, believers were without this last degree of expiation, because the time appointed was not yet come, and consequently the *ἄφεσις*, forgiveness, which follows upon it. Their sins were not expiated, and the hand-writing remained in its full force uncanceled, as also the remembrance of transgression was often repeated, &c. All which were at length abolished by the death, cross, and the blood of Christ's cross. But yet these believers were not without the two former degrees of taking away and transferring; which are elegantly joined together by Job chap. 7:20, 21, "I have sinned, what shall I do unto thee, O thou preserver of men? Why hast thou set me as a mark against thee, so that I am a burden to myself?" *עונוי את ותעפיר בשעי השא לא וסה*, and why dost thou not pardon (take away) my transgression, and take away (cause to pass) mine iniquity? Take away from me the guilt, under the weight of which I shall otherwise faint and sink; and transfer it to another, who is able to bear it; namely, the surety; seeing, by all means satisfaction must be made. The very learned author prosecutes this subject at further length, at which none will repent having perused. And indeed I always looked upon the subject thus explained to be true and sound doctrine, which I likewise publicly testified. My only scruple was, whether this clear and explicit doctrine relating to the transferring of sin to the score of the Messiah, could agree with the simplicity of the Old Testament, and was generally thus known to the ancient believers; and likewise whether it could be solidly proved by the word *העביר*. Should any think me too scrupulous in hesitating about this, I am not now inclined obstinately to contradict him; but have I, on that account, deserved so unkind a treatment at the hands of the learned author, as may be seen Heptos. 3. Dissert. 4. §. 27, and Heptos 4. Dissert. 3. §. 14. I am indeed sorry, that such resentment dwells in heavenly breasts; however I think, that I must take care lest either the passions of others, or my own, should at any time cloud my mind in the discernment of truth. Sacred candour! descend and gently glide into our soul, that, with the greatest cheerfulness, we may receive what is well said, even from those who are displeased with us: and with equal readiness disclaim what we ourselves may have less accurately advanced.

XLIV. Fifthly. We dare not deny, that adoption, in a certain respect and in some degree of eminence, may be accounted a blessing of the New Testament; so far namely, as it imports that condition, not whereby believers are distinguished from the children of the devil and of wrath, and constituted heirs of divine grace and glory, (which is a dignity common to all believers in all ages) but whereby believers of the New Testament are preferred to children, who differ not much from servants. In which sense the apostle ascribes adoption eminently to the fulness of time, Gal. 4:4–7. Where Calvin comments thus on ver. 5. "For even the Fathers under the Old Testament were assured of their adoption; but did not then so fully enjoy their privilege. Here therefore adoption is taken, just as redemption, Rom. 8:23, for possession itself. For, as at the last day, we

shall enjoy the fruit of our redemption; so now we enjoy the fruit of adoption, of which the holy Fathers, before the coming of Christ were not partakers." And on verse 7, "wherefore thou art no more a servant but a son;" that is, in the Christian church there is no longer any state of servitude, but the condition of sons. He again therefore speaks of the difference between the Old and New Testament. Even the ancients were the sons of God, and heirs through Christ; but we are in a manner quite different; because we have Christ present, and therefore enjoy his benefits. Consult what we have more largely explained Book 3. chap. x. And if I mistake not, this is the very meaning of the brethren in commenting on Gal. 4. §. 58. Let it only be observed, that adoption is not said to be so peculiar to the New Testament, as if the Old was entirely destitute of it. For the apostle presupposes, that even those, who were in bondage under the elements of the world, were heirs.

XLV. But what is said elsewhere, de fed. §. 352, is very harsh: "Though the saints under the Old Testament received the sanctifying Spirit, yet he did not work in them that affection, which was either worthy of God as a Father, or of them as children; but there was in them a spirit of bondage to fear. On the contrary, they who are under the New Testament, do immediately, upon believing, receive the promise of the Holy Spirit, Gal. 3:14, that is, the Spirit of sons, which was promised, and whose it is to cry, Abba, Father, Rom. 8:15.

XLVI. On which I observe, 1st, It is supposed without proof, that the Spirit of bondage was peculiar to the Old Testament, for even under the New, those effects of the Spirit are observable, which are to be referred to fear and to bondage. Even at this day, it engenders terror in the elect, because they look upon themselves to be in very bad condition, while they live in sin, nor can possibly be otherwise, till by a true faith they are reconciled to God, Luke 15:17. Moreover, by this terror it drives them to lay hold on the fortress of salvation in Christ, 2 Cor. 5:11. By the same terror also it restrains them from sin, and extinguishes the desire of sinning in them. In fine, it very often redoubles this terror, racking their conscience with anguish and pain, and leading them in a way just by the brink of hell, in which rarely with joy and exultation, generally with a kind of anxiety of a trembling heart, yet in sincerity they can serve God. Just as at this day those whose office it is familiarly to inquire into their state, find believers very often affected. It cannot be denied, that in all these there is fear; nay, that there is something which proceeds from bondage, and is, in some measure, different from that ingenuous performance of duty which only arises from the cheerfulness of a heart actuated by love. Why then may not the Spirit who works these things even under the New Testament, be called the Spirit of bondage to fear?

XLVII. 2dly, It is also falsely asserted, that those affections which the spirit of bondage formerly wrought in the saints, were unworthy of God as a Father, and of the saints as children. For as those affections were holy, and the effects of the sanctifying Spirit whom God bestows upon none but his own children, nay, as they were most certain signs of their adoption, and of their right to the inheritance, it is to entertain unworthy thoughts of God their Father, and of his children, to account them unworthy of both. True indeed it is, that in those affections of the saints there was a kind of relation, like that of servants to a master; yet that by no means destroyed, but only in some measure modified the relation of sons to a father; as even at this day God is held forth to us under both these relations.

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

XLIX. 4thly, It is contrary to all reason to say, that the ancients had not the spirit of sons, whereby they cried Abba Father. For this spirit is not so contrary to the spirit of bondage, as if it were not possible for both to reside together. The contrary to which we have proved already, book iii. chap. 11, §. 9. As this Spirit therefore is always operative suitable to its condition, so it wrought those affections even in the believers of the Old Testament, which were worthy of God as a Father, and likewise taught them to cry, "My Father," Job 34:26, Is. 63:16.

L. Sixthly, It is not consistent with that divine grace, which was bestowed even on the ancients, to deny that they had peace of conscience. On which head we find written, on Heb. 10. §. 15, as follows: "Conscience cannot be easy before a man is expiated by a sacrifice (with and by which we ought to approach unto God), and knows, that in confidence of that sacrifice he approaches to God. For it is by this that the conscience is at last calmed and perfected. And till then a man must of necessity have a conscience both accusing him before God, and separating from all communion with him.

LI. And yet the same person who speaks thus, openly protests that he by no means deprives the ancient believers of their assurance of hope and the joy of a conscience that gloried in God. For he thus speaks elsewhere on Ps. 51. §. 15: "This is the wisdom of God, that he suffers not sinful man to perish, and for that purpose he gives the sinner a testimony of his righteousness, and the assurance of the hope concerning eternal happiness; so as with an uninterrupted joy to bear all crosses and afflictions, and glorify God, and give him thanks, in life and in death. This wisdom of God, as Nathan had notified to him (David) by the word, so God had sealed it to him in his very inmost soul.

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

LIII. 1st, The Scripture nowhere says, that the ancient believers had not peace of conscience; but on the contrary, that, from an assurance of the favour of God towards them they slept secure, Ps. 3:5; that, with full assurance of faith, they gloried in their present grace, Ps. 4:3, and with the same assurance of hope expected future glory, Ps. 17:15. 2dly, Nor does it any where say, that believers under the Old Testament had the conscience of sin accusing them before God, and separating from all communion with him. But on the contrary, that conscience bore them witness, that sin was forgiven, Ps. 32:5, and Ps. 103:3, 10, 12. And how could sin accuse them

before God, and separate from his communion, seeing it was charged to the surety, and was to be exacted of him? 3dly, The same scripture testifies, that believers under the Old Testament acted what the redeemed act, and glorified and rejoiced in God. Ps. 106:7, 8: "Return into thy rest, O my soul, for Jehovah hath dealt bountifully with thee. Thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears, and my feet from falling."

LIV. Heb. 10:1, is here misapplied; for the apostle does not there deny that the ancient believers had a conscience perfected; only denies, that there was perfection from the law, which had but the shadow of good things to come; denies that the sacrifices, which were offered year by year continually, could make the comers thereunto perfect, that is, as Pareus says well, "sanctify and save them." But what the law could not, the grace of the surety, of which they were partakers, both could and actually did effect. 5thly, The conscience of sin, of which ver. 2 speaks, is not of sin as accusing before God, and excluding from all communion with him (for the suretiship of Christ apprehended by faith, was a bar to sin's effecting that), but it is a conscience of sins, as not yet actually expiated, and which were not to be expiated by the sacrifices of beasts. These were therefore repeated, that believers might testify that they only used them as symbols, which God appointed, but did not expect to obtain remission but from the suretiship and future sacrifice of the Messiah.

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

LVI. Seventhly, It seems likewise to tend to undervalue the Old Testament church, that it is said to have been, in an especial manner, subject to the dominion of angels. Concerning this, he says on Heb. 2 §. 39: "The former world, that is, the people of the land of Canaan, was subject to angels, being subject to the word spoken by angels, and to the dispositions and appointments of angels, as well the heavenly as those that sat in Moses's seat, and who, in like manner, are called Gods. For the heavenly angels, who assisted at the promulgation of the law, were the avengers or defenders thereof, as they were the guardians of the authority of the elders." Here then they present us with two sorts of angels; the heavenly, who are Spirits; the earthly, who are men sitting in the seat of Moses. The people of Canaan is said to be subject to both: to the heavenly,—1st, As the law was published by them. 2dly, As they were constituted the avengers or defenders of the law. 3dly, As the guardians of the authority of the elders. To the earthly, as the people was obliged to apply to them, to seek the testimony and the law, and to obey them, just as if God himself in person had published his commands with an audible voice. And on account of this dominion both the earthly and the heavenly angels were called Gods.

LVII. I answer, the source of this error is a misinterpretation of what the apostle says, Heb. 2:5, where, indeed, it is denied that this habitable world is put in subjection unto angels; but this is no ways asserted of the former. And from the denial of the one, the affirmation of the other cannot be concluded. The apostle's whole discourse is with a view to gain the greatest authority to the doctrine of Christ. For this purpose he had, in the foregoing chapter, described in magnificent encomiums the excellence of his person: he then established the great pre-eminence of the gospel above the law. And now he urges that Christ was to be obeyed, because the Father had given him the government of the whole world, which is an honour not at all conferred on angels. He speaks of the world to come, not in contradistinction to the past, as if angels exercised dominion in that as Christ does in this, but because it is a part of Christ's exaltation to be appointed Lord of that world by God, a world far more excellent than the past. This then is the apostle's reasoning. We are, with the greatest reverence to attend to the word of Christ, because he is appointed Lord of the whole world; and indeed, especially at that time, wherein the state of all things, and particularly of the church is the most perfect; but no angel had ever such an honour conferred upon him. How do you torture the word when you extort the subjection of the ancient church unto angels from this text!

LVIII. 2dly, The law published by angels was the decalogue, which we are bound to own as the rule of our obedience, equally with the Israelites. Are we then also on that account subjected to angels? 3dly, The part which the angels acted in promulgating the law was purely ministerial, and therefore implies no dominion. John was not therefore subject to an angel, because the apocalypse was sent and signified to him by an angel, Rev. 1:1. 4thly, I cannot see how it can be proved that the avenging the law was enjoined upon angels under the Old Testament by any special command, which is revoked under the New. And the brethren themselves will not deny, that the words, Ps. 35:5, 6, belong even to the times of the New Testament, and to the enemies of Christ. The punishment of rebels, the chastisement of the miscarriages of the righteous, the defence of those under unjust oppression, argue, indeed, the ministry, not the empire of angels. And what has the Old Testament in this respect, to which the New cannot show something similar? For here also the apostle, 1 Cor. 11:10, 1 Tim. 5:21, urges the observance of decency in the church because of the presence of the angles. But it is worth while to hear Cocceius himself commenting to this purpose on John 1:51: "Moreover, that angels were present with the Christian church, appears from the preservation, enlargement, and purging of the Christian church, and from the astonishing protection of those that came out of Babylon." And a little after: "As he subjects our members to our will, and inspires us with a good will; so he also makes his will known to his angels, and sanctifies their will, and if there be any thing that regards the good of man he inclines them to it. Thus while he reigns in the church, he reigns in the angels; and the same Spirit is in the angels which is in the church; as in the vision of Ezekiel, the same Spirit was in the wheels, which was in the living creatures, Ezek. 1:20." Let us add what he says in Disput. ad. Matt. xxiv. Thes. 38: "The angels assist the preaching of the Gospel, no less than they were solicitous that the law should be observed for the determined time." 5thly, I know not on what ground it is so confidently asserted, that angels were formerly, in a peculiar manner, guardians of the authority of the elders, unless, perhaps, on that general one, that God usually employed them to keep up the order he had established upon earth; but they cease not to do this under the New Testament. 6thly, They are called gods, because of the excellency of their nature and office, and of the image of God in that respect; not because of any empire they had over the

people of God, of which they are now deprived; for Paul, in his time, called them "thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers," Col. 1:16.

LIX. 7thly, 'Tis scarce needful to mention any thing about men sitting in the seat of Moses, who are called earthly angels. For who will deny that in the commonwealth of Israel, which was a royal priesthood, God appointed a magistracy, that was both civil and ecclesiastical, with proper authority, in order to see to the due observance of his law? And I shall easily grant, that this magistracy received authority to deal somewhat more severely with the church, while she was an infant heir, under tutors and guardians, than can now well suit with an advanced age, and days of greater liberty. But I do not see who can prove that the apostle, in the quoted passage to the Hebrews, treats of them under the name of angels; especially as in the whole of this discourse he constantly means by angels those ministering spirits, whom God commands to be ready to serve his beloved people, Heb. 1:14. And then even the New Testament church hath its angels, of which in the Revelations. Shall we also affirm that therefore it is subject to angels? 8thly and lastly, The name god, is common to any civil magistrate, who dispenses justice in God's name, even in pecuniary causes; as appears from Exod. 21:6, and Exod. 22:28, Deut. 19:7. That notion, therefore, about the church of the Old Testament being in a peculiar manner subject to angels, falls to the ground.

LX. 8thly, It also deserves our inquiry whether we are to reckon the continual fear of temporal death, to which believers of that time were all their life subject, among the defects of the Old Testament? Concerning this fear the brethren argue to this purpose. They distinguish between a good and an evil fear of death. This last is attended with a horror and hatred of the holiness of God, proceeding from an evil conscience, in every unregenerate sinner, who knows and reflects, that God is judge: the former again is twofold; either common or peculiar to the saints under the Old Testament: common in all those that account this life and freedom from misery, to be an extraordinary gift of God, and which may be profitable both to themselves and others. This fear is not unbecoming the pious, nor renders them miserable. That which in an especial manner belonged to the Israelites, the inhabitants of the land of Canaan, arose from causes which were peculiar to them: namely, 1st, From an affection for the land of Canaan, which was given them, with a promise of long life therein, as a pledge of the heavenly inheritance. And therefore it was necessary that believers should desire to enjoy that pledge. 2dly, From a desire and hope of seeing, in due time, the Saviour in that land. 3dly, From the bondage to the elements of the world, to which they were tied down by that law, that if on set purpose they neglected it, they became, as transgressors of the law, obnoxious to temporal and eternal punishments; but if, through infirmity or thoughtlessness, they acted against the ordinances, they had reason to apprehend immediate death to be inflicted upon them by the hand of God; terrible examples of which were sometimes set before their eyes. This fear was good, proceeding from the love of a good conscience and the grace of God, and made them, with diligence and care, perform the service of the ceremonies; for the godly had this all their life long. But they were delivered from it by the death of Christ. And this Paul is thought to have declared, Heb. 2:15. This is the sum of what is almost everywhere repeated, and more summarily explained, Animadv. ad Quæst, de V. and N. T. Quæst. 31.

LXI. For my own part, I will not disown that there was something in the rigour of the Mosaic polity that had a tendency to make them afraid of some dreadful death. Heb. 10:28: "He that



despised Moses' law, died without mercy, under two or three witnesses." God himself commanded that such as these should be punished with death, Lev. 24:16, Numb. 15:34; and sometimes made examples of those who had not very carefully observed some circumstantial by a death altogether extraordinary, Lev. 10:2, 1 Sam. 6:20, 2 Sam. 6:7–9. This, especially if it was just before them, or had lately happened, could not but strike a terror, and excite the righteous to take diligent heed lest they should split on that rock. But it is not probable that they, who walked in a good conscience before God and knew they had to do with a most merciful Father, were tormented all their life with the continual dread of death; for examples of such rigour were rare; but instances of paternal indulgence common and conspicuous before their eyes.

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

LXIII. Pious persons under the Old Testament, who deprecated an untimely death, are not said to have done so from any fond love to the earthly pledge, but from a desire of glorifying God among the living, Ps. 6:4, 5, Isa. 38:18, 19. This exercise of piety made the psalmist's life agreeable and truly worthy of the name of life, Psal. 18:17. And then they were public persons, who were fond of longer lease of life, not so much out of a regard to themselves, as to the kingdom and church, whose advantages they watched over. However, it is not to be doubted but all the saints, whenever they considered themselves separately, and compared the imperfections of this life with the perfections of the future, desired to be dissolved, and be with God in glory. For this was then to them, as it is now to us, far better.

LXIV. The people of Israel in general had hopes of seeing Christ in their own land; but this was not the case of every individual. Nor was it lawful for those who lived in Canaan many ages before the coming of the Messiah, to expect such a long term of life, as to hope to see Christ's day; nor be struck with horror at the thoughts of death, that perhaps might cut off all those hopes. Those who, actuated by a higher spirit, had more exalted apprehensions than the vulgar, longed, indeed, to see those things which the disciples of Christ saw, Matt. 13:17, and searched diligently what, or what manner of time the prophetic Spirit, which foretold those things, should happen, 1 Pet. 1:11. But I know not from whence the brethren could have learned that every one in particular, whom they make subject to the fear of death, or that the generality of believers without distinction, expected, perhaps, in their time, the coming of Christ, and that hence arose their horror of death. Peter speaks the contrary, ver. 12, "that it was revealed unto them, that not unto themselves but unto us they did minister those things." Can the brethren then mention so much as a single instance of any, who on that account is said to have been afraid of death?

LXV. These hypotheses are groundlessly built on the saying of Paul, Heb. 2:15, where the fruit of Christ's death is said to be the "delivering them who through fear of death were all their life time subject to bondage." For 1st, What reason can persuade, nay admit that the fruit of that death, for undergoing which it was necessary Christ should become man, should be restrained to

the Jews alone, the inhabitants of Canaan? For the benefits of Christ's death belongs to all the elect from the beginning to the end of the world, and the apostle is here treating of all those that are sanctified by Christ, whom Christ calls his brethren, and the children given him by the Father?

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

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

LXVIII. 4thly, The term death is most unreasonably restricted to temporal death. The apostle argues in this manner: It was necessary for Christ to become man, because he was to die. He was to die, 1st, That by his death he might destroy the devil, who had the power of death. 2dly, That he might deliver his people from death itself and from the fear of it. What can be more plain than that the whole of that death is here meant, over which the devil has power, both temporal and eternal, especially the last? The fear of temporal death, as the brethren describe it, was good and holy in itself, only somewhat troublesome and uneasy; and can it be thought probable, that the apostles, when speaking of the effects of Christ's death, should explain in very magnificent terms the freedom from a thing good and holy in itself, because it produced some uneasiness, and omit the deliverance from that which comprehends all evils and miseries? And yet so form his discourse as if he seemed to have spoke rather of that which is the greatest, than of that which is the least evil, and what he alone intended?

LXIX. 5thly and lastly, I could also wish it were explained, what is that universality of saints, denoted by the term, ὅσοι, which Christ delivered from the fear of losing the pledge by death. Were the saints who died before Christ of this number? That does not appear, for they are supposed to be troubled by the fear of death all their life time. And yet, if I mistake not, they were delivered from this when once they died. What then did the death of Christ profit them in this respect? Are we then to understand those saints who lived at the time of Christ's death? The brethren seem to intend this when they say: "As many as bore bondage with that disposition, were delivered by Christ when he died," Ad. Heb. 2 § 89. But who are those? Not believers of the Gentiles, who had no country given them for a pledge. It must then be the Jews. But it could

not be all of them. For many of them lived out of the land in a voluntary exile without enjoying that pledge. How greatly then is this fruit of Christ's death limited? Let us suppose it was they who, after the death of Christ, received Christ by faith in the land of Canaan that constituted this universality. But how were these delivered from the fear of losing the pledge? Was it because after Christ's death the land ceased to be a pledge, and was shortly to be given up to the Gentiles to a total destruction? Is this the meaning of the brethren? How flat and mean! Well says the celebrated interpreter on Zech. 9 §. 23: "They voluntarily renounced the inheritance of the land of Canaan, and exchanged it in order to partake of the heavenly Jerusalem, and the inheritance of the world." But neither will this remove all the difficulty; for Paul speaks of those who all their life time were subject to the fear of death, which the brethren themselves at other times urge; but they whom we suppose to be delivered by Christ, cease not to live when delivered from the fear of death. I beg of these learned persons, again and again to consider, in what intricate perplexity they entangle themselves, while, without any just ground, they quit the trodden plain road.

LXX. Ninthly, It is most of all grievous, and tends to stir up the resentment of the meekest person, that believers under the Old Testament are often, and that at great length, said to have been under wrath and the curse. And indeed this assertion is shocking to tender ears, and unusual in the reformed churches. The brethren took occasion to speak thus from Gal. 3:10: "As many as are of the works of the law are under the curse." Which passage they think is to be explained as if it was there said, Whoever are subject to the ceremonial law, bear testimony that the curse is not yet removed by Christ, nor the blessing yet actually obtained. For, though they are free from the curse belonging to the wicked, and partakers of the blessing of the sons of God, yet, by the use of the ceremonies, they openly avow that the meritorious cause of the blessing was not yet come. But let us hear their own words. In Comm. ad Gal. 3 § 104: "The ancient interpreters have here departed a little from the meaning of the apostle, not adverting how believers and the saints of the Old Testament could be said to be under the curse, for they think it necessarily follows, that it is not possible for him who is under the curse to be saved. In this they are mistaken. For, according to the apostle, 'to be under the curse,' signifies here not to be without the covenant of grace, but to undergo something on account of the curse, which was not yet blotted out by the payment of the price, either for the sake of the hand-writing against themselves on account of sin, and of the curse annexed thereto, and so far the sake of God, who neither did nor was to punish their sins, as if he were to pardon them; and who had promised life to believers, that he might be sanctified by declaring his righteousness which he was to manifest in Christ."

LXXI. But though this explication sufficiently provides for the salvation of the fathers; yet I think it harsh, and very far from the scope of the apostle, and the language of Scripture. The scope of the apostle is to refute the opinion of the false apostles, by which they disturbed the quiet of the churches of Galatia, as if faith in Christ was not alone sufficient to justification, but that the Gentiles were bound to observe the Mosaic ceremonies as a part of that righteousness and holiness commanded by the law. For certainly, the Jews were, and still are at this day, tainted with the heresy, that the ceremonies contribute to justification. The apostle briefly sets the truth in opposition to that false notion, Gal. 2:16, which he confirms by several arguments. After many others he makes use of this. For as that sanction, by which the curse is threatened against transgressors, is annexed to all God's laws, and as there is none who ought not to confess, that they have one time or other transgressed some one law of God, so far from any being able to hope for life from any observance of any law, that, on the contrary, "as many as are of the works

of the law," that is, who take part with those who would be justified by works, "are under the curse," Gal. 3:10. This inference is solid and clear, and in Paul's usual manner. See him arguing the same way, Rom. 3:19, 20.

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

LXXIII. 2dly, Paul means here the same curse that Moses did, from whom he quotes a passage for establishing his doctrine, Deut. 27:26. But since that Mosaic formula, which undoubtedly contained the sanction of the covenant of works, speaks of that curse which all sinners naturally are under, because they continue not in all things commanded by the law, and which is opposed to the favour and saving grace of God; had the apostle meant another curse, he would have trifled and not argued, but this is far from his character.

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

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

LXXVI. In the last place, I do not imagine that either of these can be proved from any passage of Scripture; either, that those can be called the true and spiritual sons of Abraham, "who are of the works of the law;" or, that those who, in faith and a good conscience, observe the precepts of the ceremonial law, can on that very account be said to be under the curse. I find Rom. 4:16, is quoted as a proof of the former: "to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed, not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all." But the case is very different: for, 1st, That expression to be of the law, and that to be of the

works of the law, are not in all respects the same; for those may simply be said "to be of the law, to whom pertained the giving of the law," Rom. 9:4, that is, the Jewish nation, to whom the law of God was delivered, and who, in consequence of that giving of the law, and of the covenant founded thereon, became what they are, a people peculiar to God. But seeing works, in the business of justification, which was the dispute among the Galatians, are always set in direct opposition to faith, those who are of the works of the law cannot be of justifying faith. If you object that the law is in like manner opposed to faith, I answer, the law has a twofold relation; a legal, strictly so called, as it contains the condition of justification, by a personal and proper obedience; and an evangelical, as by its types and shadows it leads to Christ. Whoever, according to the former relation, are of the law, are not heirs, Rom. 4:14; but whoever were of the law, so as to discover in it the gracious promises of the gospel, belonged to that seed of Abraham to which the promise was declared. And, according to this different relation of the law, the apostle in a different sense says, that some are of the law, some who, because they want to be of the law, are not heirs; namely, those who reckon their works as a condition of righteousness with God, either for purification or satisfaction; and some again who are of the law, and yet are heirs, namely those who suffer themselves to be led by the law as a schoolmaster to Christ. But works, contradistinguished from faith, can have no other than an opposite relation in justification.

LXXVII. To this purpose I formerly wrote, with the generality of interpreters, and even Cocceius himself, who so explains the words of Paul, that he divides into two classes all that seed, to which he maintains the promise was made sure; one of which classes is said to be of the law; the other, of the faith of Abraham: the one, of the Israelites, to whom pertained the giving of the law; the other of the Gentile believers, who without circumcision, but only in imitation of his faith, become the seed of Abraham. But I afterwards met with the discourses of James Altingius, who observes that the Greek of Paul, παντὶ τῷ ἐκ σπέρματι, οὐ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ, is not necessarily to be translated, "to all the seed, not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham;" so as to apply the restrictive particle only to the seed; but is more properly translated, "to all the seed, not to that which is of the law only," &c. So that the restrictive particle should be joined to the law, not to the seed. And he thinks this verse is to be compared with ver. 12, "the father of circumcision to them, who are not of the circumcision only, but also walk in the steps," &c. That the meaning is, that those are the seed of Abraham, to whom the promise can belong, not who, by circumcision only, or any other carnal precept, in which they vainly glory, may in some measure resemble Abraham, but who resemble him in faith. Thus both members belong to the Jews, and those are excluded from partaking in the blessing, who are only of the law, ver. 14, those only being admitted who are of the faith of Abraham. But those descendants of Abraham, who received the covenant proposed to them by God as a covenant of works, and circumcision as the sacrament of such a covenant, are of the law, and indeed only of the law. These things are at large and with accuracy deduced by the very learned author. But if this interpretation holds, the brethren are so far from finding any support in this passage, that rather every thing is against them.

LXXVIII. For the proof of the latter, it is alleged, that the time of the Old Testament, is called the time of ὀργῆ, wrath and severity, Isa. 10:25, Dan. 8:19; and that Moses, the minister who gave the law, is called the minister of death and condemnation, 2 Cor 3:7, 9, and that the law worketh wrath, Rom. 4:15, that is, imposeth something, which proceeded from sin and guilt, and so from wrath. But these things are not to the purpose. For, 1st. There is nothing there concerning a curse

or execration, which constantly in Scripture denotes the deplorable condition of the wicked, especially if any one is said to be under it. 2ndly. Isaiah and Daniel speak not of the time of the Old Testament in opposition to that of the New; but represent that period of time, in which God more severely punished the sins of his people, which he likewise does sometimes under the New. 3dly. Moses is called the minister of death and condemnation, because his ministry, for the most part, tended to terrify the sinner, and convince him of his sin and curse. 4thly. In the same sense the law is said to work wrath, which is not to be understood of the ceremonial law alone, but also and indeed chiefly of the moral law, which, by its most accurate precepts, discovers sin; and, by the dreadful comminations of divine wrath against sinners, raises in the soul a sense of wrath. But these things are no proof that believers of the Old Testament were under the curse.

## CHAPTER XIII: Of the real defects of the Old Testament

I. HOWEVER the Old Testament had really some peculiar defects, on account of which it is found fault with, Heb. 8:7, 8; and, because of these, it was to make room for the New. When we say this, we do no injury to the divine wisdom, as if it were inconsistent with that, to make the first covenant with his people such as would afterwards want correction. For as God, in the first creation of the world, began with things that were more rude, and by degrees, as it were, first rough-hewed them, then polished and exactly squared them, till they attained to that beauty in which he acquiesced; so, in like manner, in the formation of his church, he would have the beginnings to be more unpolished, which, in the regular course of things, were to arise in process of time to a more beautiful symmetry and proportion, till he should put the last hand to them, at the consummation of the world. And if it was not unworthy of God, to have made something imperfect in the kingdom of grace, which shall be brought to absolute perfection in the kingdom of glory; neither is it unworthy of him to have granted something more sparingly under the Old Testament, which he most liberally vouchsafed under the New. Nay, by this very thing he displayed his manifold wisdom, in that he distinguished the diversity of times by proper and suitable marks or signs. Paul represented the Jews, as resembling children; Christians, grown men. What irregularity is there in God's thus ordering matters, that he should confine the former to the rudiments, as being more suitable to their measure of age, and train up the latter in a more hardy, and, as it were, manly discipline?

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

III. And as the cause of salvation did not then appear, namely, God manifested in the flesh, neither did righteousness, or that on account of which we are justified. Because the Captain of their salvation was not yet made perfect through sufferings, Heb. 2:10; that in which the expiation of our sins consists, did not then exist, and consequently, everlasting righteousness was not yet brought in, Dan. 9:24. For, as the ransom was not yet paid, the debts were not actually cancelled; that day had not yet shined, on which God removed the iniquity of the earth, Zech. 3:9. The fathers, indeed, had a true and a sufficient remission of sins; yet had not that, for which sins are justly, and in a manner worthy of God, remitted; namely, the satisfaction and expiation of Christ. Pareus says well, ad Heb. 10:18, "the expiatory offering was not yet made, in which the remission of sins wherewith they were favoured, was founded."

IV. In this respect, it is no absurdity to say that the sins of believers remained, and still existed till they were cancelled by Christ's satisfaction. For, they existed in the accounts of the surety, who was to answer for them: nor were they blotted out till after the payment was made. We are not to think they so lay upon believers, as that they went to heaven loaded with the guilt of them;

than which nothing can be more absurd; nor are we to maintain, that they were entirely cancelled out of the book of God's accounts; for, in that case, Christ's satisfying for them had been superfluous. But they remained as debts upon the surety, which he was to pay; and therefore God, who had already before-hand remitted very many sins, exacted them of Christ at the time appointed, Isa. 53:7, "to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past," Rom. 3:25. Pareus again, l. c., "In the mean time, therefore, sins, even remitted without true expiation, remained till they were, at length, expiated by the death of the mediator; which expiation being made, both their sins and ours were, at last, truly abolished in the judgment of God." Calvin uses the same way of speaking, Instit. lib. ii. c. 7, §. 17, "For which reason the apostle writes, that the remission of the sins which remained under the Old Testament, was at length accomplished by the intervention of Christ's death." This then was the first defect of the Old Testament, that it had not the cause of salvation completed, and, consequently, not a true expiation of sins.

V. The second defect was the obscurity of the old economy. This follows from the preceding. What can there be, at most, but twilight before the rising of the sun? The Lord therefore dispensed the light of his word to them, in such a manner, that they could only view it still at a distance, and obscurely. Peter has elegantly represented this, by comparing the prophetic language "unto a lamp that shineth in a dark place," 2 Pet. 1:19. When he calls it a lamp, he intimates the absence of the sun; and when he speaks of a dark place, he represents the condition of the ancients, which, amidst the darkness, had the glimmering small light of a burning taper, and no more than a taper, which is used only in the night time, not in the full day. To this purpose, also, is the saying of Christ, Matt. 11:13, that "the law and the prophets were until John. From that time, the kingdom of God was preached." What did the law and the prophets discover to those who lived in their days? certainly nothing but a taste of that wisdom which was afterwards to be clearly displayed, by foretelling it as shining at a distance. Whenever Christ can be pointed out with a finger, the kingdom of God is disclosed.

VI. There was certainly in the ceremonies, an institution concerning Christ's person, offices, and benefits. And therefore, it was a distinguishing favour that God should honour Israel alone, above all other people, with that kind of instruction, as we have formerly intimated. But, as the ceremonial rites were vastly increased, and the repetition of the promises of grace was, in the mean time, more sparing and uncommon; the very great number of rites was like a veil, by which the naked simplicity of the ancient promise was very much clouded. And the event showed, that the greatest part of the Israelites cleaved to the ceremonies themselves, sought for justification and expiation of sin in them, and did not penetrate into the spiritual mysteries which were hid under the veil, with the eyes of the understanding and of faith. This, indeed, was their own fault; but that method of teaching was not so well adapted and effectual for the correcting of it. This is also represented by the type of Moses, who "put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is now abolished, as useless," 2 Cor. 3:13. There the apostle, by way of allegory, proposes the person of Moses, to represent the economy of the Old Testament. It had, indeed, the light of the promises of grace, as the face of Moses had an extraordinary glory, ver. 7. But, while Moses spoke with the Israelites, he covered this glory with the veil of the ceremonies, which he had introduced, the end of which, indeed, was Christ and his grace; but Israel, being intent on the contemplation of these, satisfied themselves in them, and forgot to look to that to which, had they turned their mind as became them, they would have been



led by the ceremonies themselves. And this is "that veil which, in the reading of the Old Testament, not being taken away, still remaineth on Israel," ver. 14.

VII. To the same purpose was the veil of the tabernacle and temple, which kept the Israelites from entering and beholding the sacred things. These two veils may be thus compared together. By the veil of the temple they were reminded of something which they were not yet suffered to behold, because something stood in the way; namely guilt, which was removed in the flesh of Christ, Heb. 10:19, and that the way to the heavenly sanctuary was not yet set open to them. Heb. 9:8. By the veil over the face of Moses, they were put in mind that the eyes of their understandings were weaker, than that they could bear the naked declaration of the truth. For if it were thus at that time with Christ's apostles, John 16:12, how much more with ancient Israel.

VIII. It is remarkable that the Lord Jesus himself, in the days of his flesh, suited his doctrine to that more obscure dispensation; and laid before the promiscuous multitude the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, scarce in any other manner than under the veil of parables, the meaning of which was to be rather guessed at than thoroughly understood. And himself gives this reason for it, Matt. 13:10, 11, when his disciples asked him, "Why speakest thou unto them in parables?" He answered, "Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given." And ver. 13, "Therefore speak I to them in parables, because they seeing, see not; and hearing, they hear not, neither do they understand." But as the time of his consummation was drawing nearer, he more clearly, and without further circumlocution, proposed the truths of salvation, John 16:25; which the disciples themselves observed. ver. 29.

IX. The third defect was the great rigour and unrelenting severity of that economy, on account of the threatenings of the law, which so often occur, and of the promises of grace, which are more seldom and more obscurely repeated. To this purpose is what we have Heb. 12:18, that believers are not now come to the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, where nothing was to be heard or seen, but what was apt to strike the mind with dread and terror, so that Moses himself quaked and feared; where the terrible voice sounded in their ears, which all of them entreated they might not hear any more, to all which he opposes the mild sweetness of Mount Sion, and of the heavenly Jerusalem. Neither was that rigour and terror without reason; for it was scarce possible, by any other means, to conquer the forwardness of the Israelites, whom Moses and the prophets so often reproached as a stiff-necked generation, and a people whose heart was like an adamant.

X. The fourth defect of the Old Testament was the bondage under the elements of the world, of which Paul speaks, Gal. 4:3, 9. By the elements of the world, he understands the ceremonies of the old economy; which he calls στοιχεια, elements, because of their rudeness and imperfection; by a twofold metaphor, the one borrowed from nature, the other from art. Nature hath her elements, that is, bodies more simple and rude, from whose various combination and mixture others more perfect are generated. And the rudiments of art, or the first more easy precepts suited to the capacities of children, are usually called elements, Paul himself using this term in that sense, Heb. 5:12, "the first principles (elements) of the oracles of God." He adds, the elements of the world, either because they were earthly borrowed from the world, and from those things which even worldly men have in common with the pious, and which contain not in themselves the blessings and privileges of the inheritance; or because God being willing to instruct the

world, that is, the inhabitants of the world, began from these slender principles, having first set up a lower form or school, as it were in one corner of the world only. The Israelites were in bondage to these elements. For God had also given these elements with a severe commination, lest they should be either neglected, or used any other way than he had prescribed; and they had princes and elders, with sufficient authority, and sitting in Moses' seat, to keep and constrain them to the observance of the rites. In fine, the observance itself had an air of servility inconsistent with the full liberty of sons.

XI. But let us take a more particular view of what was hard and unpleasant in this bondage. 1st. There was, in that vast multitude of rites, which were enjoined upon Israel under such a severe threatening, a grievous burden, and a yoke hard to be borne, Acts 15:10, which the apostle calls the "yoke of bondage," Gal. 5:1. Circumcision, which was as it were the first undertaking of the yoke, caused such pain, that even adults were heavily afflicted with it. Gen. 34:25. The number of the other ceremonies exceedingly fatigued the people, and involved them in difficulties. They were not allowed to light a fire on the Sabbath; nor to sow on the seventh year. All their males were obliged thrice a year to go up to Jerusalem. The paying the first-fruits and tithes was to be scrupulously observed. They were put to great expense in all kinds of sacrifices. Moreover there were many washings, distinctions of meats, legal pollutions from the touch of a dead body and of any unclean thing whatever, and pollution in sleep. And all these things wherewith they were harassed, were but weak and beggarly elements, Gal. 4:9, which could not make the comers thereunto perfect, Heb. 10:1, and in the observation of which, of themselves, there was no holiness, nor the image of God, nor a reasonable service. Rom. 12:1. However their mystical signification, and the relation they bore to the Messiah and his grace, made believers cheerfully undertake and joyfully bear that yoke, grievous in itself, and beggarly and useless separately from Christ.

XII. 2dly. There was also, in that bondage, the reproach of children; for it was wholly pedagogical, or adapted to children, Gal. 4:2, which consisted of little minute precepts and ordinances, such as are prescribed to young children, "touch not, taste not, handle not." Col. 2:21. On which place Theophylact says elegantly, "See also how he tacitly upbraids them, saying 'Ye are subject to ordinances,' ver. 20. You sit as children, says he, as just beginning their elements, who require what they ought to do to be said before and prescribed to them."

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

the Gentiles from the Jews (on which account they resembled the breast-work of the first inclosure) and the Jews themselves, in some measure, from God, and familiar access to him. For they themselves were commanded to stand at a distance, while God kept himself, as it were, concealed in the inner sanctuary, and to treat with him about the expiation of sins, only by the intervention of a priest. And in this respect the ceremonies are compared with the latter inclosure.

XIV. 4thly. Besides this, the apostle calls the law of commandments, contained in ordinances, enmity, because, in a certain respect, they were a symbol of the enmity both between God and man, and between Israel and the Gentiles. For the ceremonies, in their legal consideration, were signs of that hatred wherewith God, from the righteousness of his nature, pursues sinful man; because our guilt was typified by these, and man behoved to be expiated and purged by those rites, before he could be allowed, with hope of pardon, to have access to God. They also begat a mutual hatred and contempt between Jews and Gentiles. The Jews, being proud of the ceremonies of God's institution, despised the Gentiles, who were enslaved to human or even diabolical superstitions. The heathen, on the other hand, looked upon many of the Jewish ceremonies, as is plain from Tacitus and others, as hateful, ridiculous, and absurd. And hence arose a mutual and national hatred and enmity, by no means commanded, far be it, but yet as it were rivetted by that law of discriminating rites. And this alienation of minds was at such a height, that the godly themselves judged it a crime in a Jew to come near or approach to a stranger. Acts 10:28.

XV. 5thly and lastly. There was a hand-writing in the religion of ceremonies ὑπεναντίον, "contrary (in part) to those who loved and observed them." Col. 2:14. On which Calvin particularly has learnedly discoursed, as well in other places as in his Institutions, lib. iii. cap. 7. §. 17. In his commentary on Col. 2:14, he declares that no one had given him any satisfaction in explaining this matter. "But I trust," says he, "I have reached the genuine meaning, if it be only granted me as a truth, what Augustine has somewhere very truly written; nay which he deduced from the plain words of the apostle, that in the Jewish ceremonies, there was rather a confession than an expiation of sins; for what else did they by their sacrifices, than confess their being conscious to themselves that they were worthy of death, who in their own stead substituted despicable animals? What by their purifications, but to testify their uncleanness? So upon this they renewed the hand-writing of their guilt and impurity. Yet in that declaration there was no manner of payment. Justly therefore does the apostle call them handwritings, contrary to those who loved and observed them; since by them they openly declared their own condemnation and uncleanness."

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

also an evangelical consideration, believers were at the same time confirmed, by the use of them, in the faith of the Messiah, who was to come and satisfy for them. And thus the hand-writing was only in part contrary to them, ὑπεναντίον. For though it showed that satisfaction was not yet made, a circumstance which was against them, yet it assured them that satisfaction was never to be demanded of them, but was certainly to be performed by the surety; which certainly was very much for them.

XVII. The fifth thing, in which the Old Testament was inferior to the new, was a spirit suited to that servile economy, which Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, chap. 8:15, calls the spirit of bondage. "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear." Where the particle again denotes a distinction, by which the present condition of the Christian church is contradistinguished from the preceding condition of the church of Israel, as interpreters generally observe. But they do not by this explain the full force of that particle. I take it in this light. The Romans, having now become believers, were united into one body with believing Israel. Eph. 3:6. For in Christ there is a gathering together of all in one. Eph. 1:10. "He made both one," Eph. 2:14, and would have believers both of the Jews and of the Gentiles be accounted one seed. Gal. 3:16. And therefore what was formerly granted to Israel, was accounted to have been also granted to them. And if the Gentiles, after the liberty of a more joyful testament was proclaimed, should put on the ancient fetters of the Israelites, they were said to return to bondage; "How turn ye (back) again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire, πάλιν ἄνωθεν, returning back to the former, to be in bondage?" As Paul chides the Galatians. chap. 4:9. In this sense therefore it might also be said to the Romans; You, who are now believers, living under the New Testament, have not received again the spirit of bondage, or the spirit of bondage, again to fear; such as believers of the Old Testament had, with whom you have been incorporated, and such consequently as you had in and with them.

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

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

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

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

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

XXII. Sixthly. There was also, under the Old Testament, a more scanty measure of the gifts of grace; both with respect to extent and degree. That the extent of these was very much confined, appears from these. 1st. Because God communicated himself to the nation of Israel alone, who yielded themselves to him, as his portion, and the lot of his inheritance: Deut. 32:9, and in the mean time suffered other nations, as if they had no concern or intercourse with him, "to walk in their own ways;" Acts 14:16, so that, as they were "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel," they were also "strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." Eph. 2:12. "Darkness covered the earth, and gross darkness the people;" while Jehovah did arise, and shine upon Israel alone. Isa. 60:2. 2dly. In that one nation of Israel, very few were partakers of saving grace; 1 Cor. 10:5, "with many of them God was not well pleased:" and therefore Moses said to the whole people, with a reference to the generality of them, Deut. 29:4, "Jehovah hath not given you a heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear:" for they who were favoured with that grace, compared with the rest, were inconsiderable.

XXIII. If we consider the degree, the measure of the grace was commonly small. 1st. With respect to the knowledge of spiritual mysteries. For it was proper, since the Sun of righteousness was not yet risen, that there should be neither that clearness of revelation, nor such quickness of understanding. And therefore Paul expresses this slenderness of conception by the term childhood. Instances of gross stupidity are all along obvious in the very disciples of our Lord;

Isa. 42:19, "Who is blind, but my servant? Or deaf, as my messenger that I sent? Who is so blind as he that is perfect, and blind as Jehovah's servant?" 2dly. With respect to the abundance of spiritual consolations. This is a necessary consequence from what we have said before concerning the condition and manner of that economy, and the operations of the Spirit, who suited himself to that dispensation. 3dly. With respect to holiness: and this also depends on the preceding two. For where there is a smaller degree of spiritual light, a less abundance of the love of God shed abroad in the heart, a less measure of familiarity and friendship with God, it is reasonable to believe that there was also a smaller degree of holiness.

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

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

XXVI. They come nearer to our Lord's meaning, who, by the least in the kingdom of heaven, think is intended the least minister in the Christian church, who is intrusted to preach the gospel in its perfect state. He is compared to John, not in respect of knowledge, holiness, and gifts of the like nature; but in respect of his ministry, as John himself was compared to his predecessors the prophets. For John was greater than all of them, because he was the immediate harbinger and brideman of the Messiah; and pointed him out with the finger, as present, or come. Again, any preacher of the gospel is greater than John in that respect, as he declares Christ not only born, but also dead and risen, and ascended to heaven, and as sitting at the right hand of God, and as having happily erected the kingdom of liberty. The comparison therefore is not so much of persons in their absolute qualities, as of their ministry. The ministry of Moses, and the other prophets, may not improperly be compared to the night, distinguished by many prophecies concerning Christ, as by many interlucient constellations: the ministry of John, to the dawn; when the sun not being yet risen, yet drawing towards the horizon, the heavens brighten with some light: but the gospel, to the day, when the sun, being risen, fills all things with the brightest and purest light.

XXVII. It may, however, seem strange that the Lord Jesus, who, in the whole of his discourse, speaks so many excellent things concerning John, should presently, when one could have least expected it, represent him as less than the least of his disciples. And, therefore, some of the ancients think there is a comparison rather made between John and Christ, who calls himself the least in the kingdom of heaven; either because he was really so in the opinion of men; or rather, because he was younger than he, and posterior to him in the ministry. In which sense, James, the son of Alpheus, was called the Less, Mark 15:40; that is, the younger, in respect of James, the son of Zebedee, who is called the elder. What Christ then intended was, that though John was truly far greater than all the other prophets, yet he was not that great prophet, not the Messiah, which some, but falsely, imagined, Luke 3:15; but that himself, though inferior to John in age, and posterior to him in preaching the kingdom of heaven, yet very far excelled him in dignity. And thus this saying of Christ would very well agree with the testimony of John concerning himself and Christ, John 1:15: "He that cometh after me, is preferred before me; for he was before me." To this same purpose, almost, Epiphanius adversus Gnosticos, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius, Clarius, Zegerus, Salmero, Jansenius, and others, from whose opinion, I own, I am not averse.\*

XXVIII. Seventhly, All these things joined together, excited an ardent desire in the ancient church, and a kind of hunger and thirst after a better condition, which God had promised with the coming of the Messiah. For, as most of all the things hitherto bestowed upon them, were evidences of their imperfection, and, in the mean time, better things were pointed out to them at a distance, they could not, without throwing contempt on the grace of God, but desire these things. Whatever the mercy of God had thus far bestowed on them, especially when more precious promises were added, tended rather to raise than quench their thirst. Even Abraham, to whom God so familiarly revealed himself, "rejoiced to see Christ's day," John 8:56. The whole church cried out, "O that thou wouldst rend the heavens, that thou wouldst come down!" Isa. 64:1. "O that thou wert as my brother, that sucked the breasts of my mother!" Cant. 8:1. That is, O that thou wert made partaker of flesh and blood, that thou wouldst show thyself familiarly in the midst of our congregation, in the communion of the same worship! We cannot have a better interpreter of this their desire, than our Lord himself, Matt. 13:17, "Verily I say unto you, many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them." The ancient fathers certainly enjoyed the grace of God, with a quiet and joyful heart, knowing that it was sufficient for their salvation; they glorified God, and gave him thanks on that account: yet, as a better condition was made known as at a distance, they reached out, also, in desire after it. "These all died in faith," and therefore calmly and happily; yet, "not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, were persuaded of them, and embraced them," Heb. 11:13.

XXXIX. I dare not, for this purpose, wrest Deut. 29:19, הצמאה את הרוה ספות לטען, to add the drunken, or the watered, to the thirsty: as if a twofold state of the church was imitated here; that of thirst, under the Old, and of watering, under the New Testament: and to add the watered to the thirsty, was to reduce the church, when satisfied with the exhibition of the promise, to the order or rank of the thirsting church; to load the believers of the New Testament with the ancient ceremonies: and, from another signification of the word ספות, to destroy the satiated with the thirsty: to endeavour the destruction of those in covenant with God, first, while they expect the salvation of God; and then when they have received the gospel of salvation. To these

interpretations, we have a third to this purpose, that the full shall destroy the thirsty; that is, that those who falsely think themselves full, shall, at the time expected, oppress those that are thirsty; and, afterwards, harass those that are filled. And these things are so joined, as, taken together, to complete the full meaning of the words. See *Ult. Mosis*, §. 121–138; and *Lexicon ad vocem רָוָה*. But I think that, as these things are altogether new; so they are remote from the meaning of Moses, for the following reasons.

XXX. 1st. Because in these words, Moses describes the language of an idolater, whose heart is turned away from the Lord God, to go after the worship of the gods of the Gentiles, and who, having renounced all fear of God, slights the solemn engagements of the covenant, and, notwithstanding this, promises peace to himself, ver. 16, 28; such as were those of whom, Jer. 44:17. But surely such an idolater as this can give himself no trouble to force New Testament believers, who are free, to submit to the yoke of the Mosaic bondage, which he himself has shaken off, and has in abhorrence. 2dly. The person whom Moses here represents, is one of abandoned impiety, which he himself does not so much as conceal, and an avowed despiser of God and religion; but they whom the celebrated interpreter imagines to be here pointed out, put on a great appearance of sanctity, and, in all their actions, made religion a pretence, as is well known from the gospel history. 3dly. If the thirsty signifies the church of the Old Testament, and the watered the church of the New; to add the watered to the thirsty, can only signify, to add the New Testament church to that of the Old, and join both together; which the Scripture declares was done by Christ, Eph. 2:13 and Eph. 3:6. But it is one thing to add the satiated to the thirsty; another, to reduce the satiated to the condition of the thirsty. The obstinate zealots for the ceremonies are nowhere said to have joined to themselves the free Christians; but rather to have separated them from themselves, and expelled them the synagogues, Isa. 65:6, and Isa. 66:5. 4thly. As there can be only one literal sense, it is asserted, contrary to all rules of right interpretation, that the word סָפַח can, in the very same proposition be taken partly for, to destroy, or consume; partly, to join, and unite; and the participle אָח, partly, for עִם, with; partly, for the sign of the accusative. It is one thing, under the general signification of one word to comprize more things pertaining to the same signification, which often takes place in explaining Scripture: another, to ascribe to the same word, at the same time, different or opposite significations, which is contrary to all reason. If סָפַח signifies here, to join, it cannot signify, to destroy. If אָח signifies with, it cannot be the sign of the accusative. 5thly. What is more absurd than, after having established at large, that the full signifies the church of the New Testament, to understand by the thirsty, that which is oppressed with the ceremonies; and immediately to undo all this, and turn the words to this meaning, that the full shall destroy the thirsty; that is, the Jews, who are zealous for the discarded ceremonies, who seem to themselves to be full, shall persecute those that pant after Christ. What is it to put white for black, if this is not? Can any thing more absurd be devised, than that one word should signify, at the same time, the Christian church which suffers persecution, and the congregation of the malignant Jews, who persecute her? And yet learned men fondly please themselves with such inventions.

XXXI. What then, you will say, is the genuine meaning of the words of Moses? I really think it is plain and obvious. When any person commits, with pleasure, the crime he has conceived in his mind, he is said proverbially, "to drink iniquity as water," Job 15:16. When a person ruminates on impious projects, in his mind, he is as one that thirsteth after evil; but, when he executes his premeditated designs, he surfeits himself with diabolical delights, and becomes as it were



satiated or drunk. Finely says the celebrated Cocceius, on Zech. 9 §. 14: "Outrageous, savage men, are said to thirst after blood, and, while they shed it with pleasure, are said, to drink it," Rev. 16:6. What any one is delighted with, is said to be his meat, and he is said to drink it as water, John 4:34; Job 15:16; and Job 34:7. To add, therefore, the drunken, or the satiated, to the thirsty, is not only to burn with an eager desire to commit wickedness, but also to accomplish it by abominable actions, and to follow after it, till his mind, which is bent upon evil, is fully satisfied. This the despisers of the Deity do, who, secure in their crimes, call the proud happy, and give way, in all things to their, unbridled lusts. And these are they whom Moses here describes. Should these things give less satisfaction, I recommend, above others, the discourses of the very learned Lud. de Dieu, who is large on this passage.

XXXII. They also seem to be as far from the meaning of Zechariah, who think that he compares the condition of the fathers of the Old Testament, "to the pit wherein is no water," Zech. 9:11. For, 1st, Those very fathers sung, Ps. 23:2, "He maketh me to lie down in green pastures, he leadeth me beside the still waters;" which is quite different from the pit, wherein is no water. 2dly. We admit, as a most certain rule of interpretation, which the brethren usually insist upon, that the words, unless any thing should hinder, are to be taken in their full import. But the emphasis is far greater, if, by the pit without water, we understand the condition of an unregenerate sinner, who, while in himself, he is without Christ, is wholly destitute of all those things which can yield him consolation, and quench his thirst after happiness. And there is no reason why we may not thus explain it. For, the prophet speaks concerning what is impetrated by the blood of Christ, which is the blood of the covenant, or New Testament, and shed not only to remove the yoke of ceremonies, but especially to abolish the bondage of sin. Why shall we confine what is spoken to that which is the less, since the words may not only bear, but also persuade, nay almost constrain us, to interpret them of what is greater? 3dly. The prophet here comforts the mourners in Zion, and promises them deliverance from that evil, with which they were most of all oppressed, and for which they expected a remedy from the Messiah, who was to come. But that evil was not the bondage of ceremonies, which yielded little or no comfort; but rather the abyss of spiritual misery, into which sin had plunged them. The yoke of which, under the Devil who exacts it of them, is infinitely more grievous than that yoke of ceremonies that God laid upon them. 4thly. Though the ceremonies, considered in themselves, and separate from Christ, could not yield so much as a drop of comfort; yet the fathers were not, on that account, in a pit wherein is no water. For, what they could not draw from the ceremonies, they drank out of the streams of divine grace flowing from Christ, an everlasting fountain, to whom they looked by their faith. We therefore dare not say, the ancient condition of the fathers was a pit wherein is no water: though, with Scripture, we maintain, that they had a thirst after better things; nevertheless they were not destitute of the waters of saying grace, for their necessary consolation.

## CHAPTER XIV: Of the Abrogation of the Old Testament

I. IT now remains that we speak of the abrogation of the Old Testament, or of those things which were formerly superadded to the covenant of grace, as shadows, types, and symbols of the Messiah to come. For the more exact prosecution of this subject we shall proceed in the following order. 1st, Show that the ancient ceremonies were of such a nature, that, in a way consistent with the honour of God they might be abrogated. 2dly, Prove that they were really and actually to be abrogated. 3dly, Make it appear that they ought, one time or other, to be abrogated, and that it was not possible the case should be otherwise. 4thly, Explain the progress itself and the various degrees of their abrogation.

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

III. 2dly, Because God himself frequently, on many accounts, prefers the moral to the ceremonial precepts; and as the same Maimonides, More Nevoc. p. 3. c. xxxii. has wisely observed, God very often by the prophets, rebukes men for their too great fondness and excessive diligence in bringing offerings, inculcating upon them, that they are not intended principally, and for themselves, and that himself has no need of them. Thus Samuel speaks, 1 Sam. 15:22: "Has the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord?" In like manner, Isa. 1:11: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord." And, Jer. 7:22: "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices; but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people." On this place Maimonides observes: "It seems strange how Jeremiah should introduce God speaking in this manner, since the greatest part of the precepts is taken up about sacrifices and burnt-offerings." But he answers, the scope of these words is thus: "The first intention certainly is, that ye cleave to me, and not serve another, that I may be your God, and you my people. But this precept concerning offerings and my house, is given you to the end you might learn it hence for your advantage." The parallel places are many, Ps. 50:9–11; Jer. 6:2; Hos. 6:6; Am. 5:22. If God, therefore, when these precepts were still in full force, rebukes men for their too great attachment to them, we speak nothing unworthy of God, when we affirm, that for very weighty reasons, it was possible he should entirely abrogate them.

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

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

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

VII. But let us now proceed to the second head; namely, that God really intended they should cease in their appointed time. This is evident from the following arguments: 1st, The very institution of the ceremonies leads us to this; for since they were given to one people, with a limitation to their particular state, country, city, and temple, the legislator never intended that they should be binding on all whom he favours with saving communion with himself, "and at all times and in all place." But this was really the case. And the Jews have always boasted in this, that the body of the Mosaic law was only given to their nation, "even the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob," Deut. 33:4. And God confined it "to their generations," Gen. 17:7; Lev. 7:36; and 24:3. But as these generations are now confounded, and the Levites by no certain marks can be distinguished from the other tribes, or the descendants of Aaron from the other Levites; it follows, that the law ceases which was confined to the distinction of generations, which almost all depended on the tribe of Levi, and the family of the priests. God also appointed a certain country for the observation of the ceremonies, Deut. 4:14; 6:1; and 11:31, 32: a certain city and house, Deut. 12:5, 13, 14, 16. Since therefore the prophets all along foretold, that the church should afterwards be enlarged, by having many nations added to it, who, as they belong not to the generations of Israel, so neither could they inhabit the same country with them, nor

meet in the same city, much less house; it is evident, that the lawgiver never intended that his people should at that time be bound to the practice of the ceremonies. For, as we shall more fully prove in the sequel, the condition of the Israelites could not then be different from the other nations, since all were to be united in one body with Israel.

VIII. This argument will have further strength when we shall have observed, that the reasons of most of the ceremonies were altogether peculiar, and taken from the special consideration of those times, and of the countries bordering on that of the descendants of Abraham, from whose errors and worship, God would have his own people to keep at the greatest distance. Abraham, the patriarch of the nation of Israel, came forth from among the Sabians. God therefore generally so framed his ceremonies, as to be directly opposite to the rites of the Sabians. Maimonides has frequently insisted upon this, and acknowledges that he came to know the reason of many laws, from the alone knowledge of the faith, rites, and worship of the Sabians. For instance, these idolaters offered only leavened bread, made choice of sweet things for their offerings, which they used to anoint with honey, but made no use of salt. God therefore prohibited to offer either leavened bread or honey, but expressly commanded, that salt should be used in all sacrifices, Lev. 2:13. Again, when these worshippers of the sun were to pray, they turned themselves to the east, and hence the Holy of Holies was placed in the west. Again, the Sabians did eat blood, though they looked upon it as a most impure thing; for they imagined it was the food of devils, and by eating it, one might attain to some familiarity with them; God therefore, under a severe threatening, prohibited the eating of blood, Lev. 17:10. Nor did God prescribe rites contrary to the Sabians alone, but also to the other neighbouring nations. The Egyptians worshipped the sign of the ram, and therefore were forbid to kill sheep. But in the sacrifices of the Israelites, no beasts were more acceptable and more frequent than sheep. Plutarch assures us, that rabbits and hares, on account of their swiftness and the perfection of their natural senses, were sacred to the Egyptians. But God would have his people to account all these unclean and profane. The worshippers of Baal-peor adored their idol by uncovering their nakedness, and hence the priests of God are commanded to make to themselves breeches to cover their nakedness, Exod. 28:42, with many other things to the same purpose, which Maimonides has collected in More p. 3. c. xlv. xlvi. And after his example, Hottinger in Hist. Oriental. lib. i. c. viii. and Selden de Jure nat. &c. lib. ii. c. vii. And we now quote them, to make it appear that these and the like commandments were given to one nation only, for reasons peculiar to them, and appropriated to those times, without affecting other nations in such a manner, or having now that weight as formerly, the madness of the ancient superstitions being now long since abolished.

IX. Secondly, we argue from the prophecies, by which the abrogation of the ceremonies is very clearly foretold; but these are either more general, or more special. In general Moses himself has prophesied concerning this thing, Deut. 18:15, 18. Where God, and Moses in God's name, promise to Israel a prophet from among their brethren, like unto Moses himself; into whose mouth, God says, he would put his words, and threatens to take vengeance on the person, who should not hearken to the words of that prophet.

IX. Secondly, we argue from the prophecies, by which the abrogation of the ceremonies is very clearly foretold; but these are either more general, or more special. In general Moses himself has prophesied concerning this thing, Deut. 18:15, 18. Where God, and Moses in God's name, promise to Israel a prophet from among their brethren, like unto Moses himself; into whose

mouth, God says, he would put his words, and threatens to take vengeance on the person, who should not hearken to the words of that prophet.

X. For understanding that place, and the force of our argument taken from it, we must observe the following things. 1st. Moses forbids Israel to have any communion with soothsayers and diviners, holding forth himself and recommending the law given by his ministry, which contained every thing necessary to be known for that time. At least they should pretend, that upon his removal, something more would be granted them in this matter, he intimates, that his law would be sufficient till God should raise up another prophet, like unto himself, to whose words they were afterwards to give diligent attention. 2dly. That prophet was to be like unto Moses; but it is without all dispute, that there was never any in Israel equal to him, except this, of whom we are now speaking. Deut. 34:10. Moreover that likeness and equality were not to consist in some minute circumstances, or such qualities, as the following prophets had in common with Moses; but principally in the authority and exercise of the prophetic office. As Moses by the authority of God had polished the more gross worship of the ancients, and reduced it to a more perfect form: so himself was to change that carnal worship of Moses into another more spiritual. 3dly. God promises, that he would put his words into the mouth of that prophet, not only in that sense, in which all the true prophets spoke the words of God, as his faithful ministers; but those words, which God had reserved to be spoken by himself in the last days, and which none but God can speak, see John 3:35. Hence it follows, that prophet was not to be a bare interpreter of the law of Moses, but the true Lord of the law, and to speak those words of God, which were not hitherto spoken in that manner. 4thly, That prophet can be none but the Messiah, whose prophecy, according to Abarbanel in Prophet. fol. 27. col. 1, was in the highest pitch of prophetic degrees; and who, according to the saying of the Rabbins, which he subjoins, is more exalted than Abraham, higher than Moses, and more sublime than the ministering angels. Compare Acts 3:22. 5thly. The scripture all along insists upon it, see Isa. 42:4, and the Hebrew doctors do not deny it, that the Messiah was to bring in a new form of doctrine. See Isa. 42:4, Jonathan thus paraphrases on Isa. 12:3, "and you shall receive a new doctrine with joy from the chosen from among the just. Kimchi gives a remarkable reason why the paraphrast called this doctrine new; because really that doctrine will be new; and then they shall learn the knowledge of the Lord in such a manner, as none ever learned before that time. 6thly. God commands them to hearken to that prophet, and to subdue and captivate every thought, which exalts itself against him. Baal Hatturim has observed, that ver. 15 contains ten words, to set forth that he is to be obeyed equally with the decalogue. Though this observation be a specimen of Jewish fancy, yet the thing is certain: for, the words of that prophet are as much the words of God as the decalogue. 7thly. God threatens to take vengeance on every one who should disobey him. The stubborn rebellious Jews have experienced this; for they obstinately contended for the discarded ceremonies of Moses against Jesus and his disciples. All this tended to recommend to Israel another prophet, who was to institute a new form of worship, just as Moses had done before.

XI. Let us now take a view of the principal exceptions of the Jews. 1st. This promise contains God's gracious answer to the prayers of the Israelites at Horeb, when they entreated that God would speak to them by a Mediator, lest perhaps the glory of his majesty should overwhelm them. But it is certain that at Horeb they did not ask for a prophet, to substitute another law, when that of Moses was abrogated. Thus Lipmannus Sepher Nitzachon, No. 137. 2dly. By the prophet is here understood the whole order of prophets in every age, and who may be said to be

like unto Moses in point of authority and faithfulness, as they declared the words of the living God, as Moses had done: and the Israelites had such a number of them, that they had no occasion, in doubtful cases, to consult soothsayers or diviners. The same author. 3dly. If any one is pointed out in particular, he was either Joshua, of whom it is said, Deut. 34:9, "and the children of Israel hearkened unto him," as seems to be the opinion of Aben Ezra and Bechai; or Jeremiah, because the words, להם אקים נביא "I will raise up a prophet to them," are by the Gematria, equal in number to these יהוה ידמהו this is Jeremiah, according to Baal Hatturim. And Abarbanel de præfat. ad Perenniam, least it should be thought he had nothing to say, runs the parallel between Moses and Jeremiah, in fourteen particulars. 4thly. Our Jesus cannot be here intended, because neither according to us, nor according to the Jews, was he like unto Moses. Not according to us, because we believe him to be God, but Moses was a mere man; not according to the Jews, who firmly maintain, that there never afterwards was a prophet equal to Moses. But it is absurd, a less should abrogate the ordinances of a greater.—Lipmannus. 5thly. The same author likewise says, that our explication contradicts the words of Christ, who protested, that he came not to destroy the law, Matt. 5:17.

XII. To the first of these we answer, 1st. God indeed by this prophecy, answers the petition of the Israelites; for though they did not directly pray for the abrogation of the Mosaic manner of worship; yet that was no reason why God might not promise a prophet, who was to do and teach, what they had not once thought of in their petition. For God frequently hears the prayers of his people, so as to grant them more than they had either asked or thought of. The Israelites had prayed, that for the future God would speak to them by a mediator; he promises that he would not only do this, but also, by giving the character instead of the proper name, he promises them a certain prophet equal to Moses, who would perform as great, nay greater things for the true Israel. We are to consider well, what was transacted when the Israelites presented this their petition to God; they certainly expected, after hearing the decalogue, that God would publish more laws and statutes which they were as yet ignorant of, and in a word, give them a model of a new and complete formulary of religion, Deut. 5:33. They prayed, that these might be declared to them, not as the decalogue was, by an awful and immediate manifestations of the divine majesty, but by the intervening ministry of Moses. God complies with their request, ver. 37; but does not stop there, for he promises to deal with them in a like manner, when a like case should fall out. As in forming the old economy he made use of the ministry of Moses; so at the time, when the new should succeed the old, and be much more glorious than the former, he promises to make use of an interpreter who should veil the awful majesty of the Deity, and deal with them in a way of grace and mercy. As God therefore constituted Moses a mediator, when he was resolved, in the place of the ancient plain way of religion, to institute a more burdensome kind of worship; so when he promises another prophet, equal to Moses, he intimates that by him he would do something like what he had done by Moses, in reforming the Mosaic economy; which remarkable goodness of God Moses here inculcates.

XIII. To the second I answer, That indeed for ordinary, Israel was not without prophets, whom they might more piously and safely consult than either soothsayers or diviners, or the like impostors; nevertheless this was not absolutely perpetual, 1 Sam. 3:1; 2 Chron. 15:3. But there is nothing said here of a mutual succession of prophets; but concerning some prophet eminently so called, and distinguished by his character; since it is allowed, that in the whole series of prophets, none came up to Moses. But it is unpleasant to pursue minutely the feigned similitudes of a

person, who puts not a due value on the greatness of God's promise; or which is still worse, knowingly depreciates it. But I would have the mutual coherence of the context well observed, which represents the matter thus. Moses dissuades the people from giving ear to astrologers and diviners by this argument, because God was to raise up a prophet, equal to himself, to whom they were to hearken in all things. But you will say, that was not to be till after many ages. What then? They had a written law, which was abundantly sufficient for them, till the time of that prophet. This, upon any doubt arising, was to be consulted, Isa. 8:19, 20. For ordinarily they were to have prophets, to interpret that law, who were familiar with God. And when the common prophets ceased, and the period of the law was drawing towards its final conclusion, that great prophet was to arise, at whose mouth they were to inquire, and in whose ordinances they were to acquiesce. What probable reason then could make them have recourse to astrologers or diviners?

XIV. I answer to the third. The sacred text evidently shows, that the prophet here pointed out is not Joshua, Deut. 34:9, 10; for after he had told, that Joshua succeeded upon the death of Moses, it is immediately and expressly subjoined, and there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto (as) Moses: as if God would purposely take care, that none should imagine Joshua to be the prophet, he had promised to give them, Deut. 18. What is added, "and the children of Israel hearkened unto him," cannot confirm such a considerable point without farther proof. Abernabel being to prove, that Jeremiah is here meant, contends for it by argument of a quite contrary nature, and makes the similitude to consist in this, that as his countrymen opposed and resisted Moses, so they also did Jeremiah. But both are absurd. It was the common lot of all the prophets, to be sometimes listened to, but more frequently to be rejected; to have sometimes pious hearers, who trembled at the words of the living God; sometimes profane despisers and scoffers, who made a jest of them. You will nowhere find a more perfect fulfilment of this word than in the Lord Jesus himself, of whom the Father proclaimed from heaven, "Hear ye him," Matt. 17:5.

XV. Much less are we to explain these things of Jeremiah, to whom the things that have been said before are no more applicable than to any other of the prophets. For 1st, The Cabalistical Gematria, which is the entertainment only of idle minds, has perhaps now and then, something ingenious, but nothing solid. We may justly say of it, what, in a similar case, Aben Ezra says on Isa. 7:6, הַתָּק רִזָּה, "this is vanity." For the master of the Cabala expressly contradicts himself; since he had a little before declared, that the prophet here promised would open all the fifty gates of intelligence, because the fifteenth verse begins and ends with the letter nun, which is the numeral character of fifty. But to say this of Jeremiah is altogether contrary to the hypothesis: for in that case he would be preferred to Moses, to whom, as they foolishly talk, forty-nine gates of intelligence were set open. The similitudes assigned by Abarbanel are trifling; for either they are common to Jeremiah with the other prophets, or only taken from external circumstances, or even some of them false. And then among the prophets there were others, whom he himself greatly prefers to Jeremiah. In his preface to Isaiah he at large contends, that he is the next to Moses in the excellence of his prophetic qualifications; nay, he even prefers Ezekiel in many respects to Jeremiah. It is therefore astonishing that he should select him from the rest of the prophets rather than some other.

XVI. To the fourth I answer: This prophecy is on all accounts to be applied to the Lord Jesus, who was like to Moses in the exact Knowledge of divine things, in familiarity with God, in miracles, in fine, in every pre-eminence by which Moses excelled the other prophets. He was of

their brethren, who spoke such words as God had reserved to be declared in the last times: to whom the Father bore testimony from heaven, with an express charge to hear him in all things. Nor is it any objection that we affirm him to be greater than Moses. For he who is greater has every thing that is in the less, and thus far is like and equal unto the less. Besides, Moses did not intend an absolute equality between himself and that prophet, who was promised to be given them; but that at least he was not to be less than himself. But the greater he is, the stronger is the argument, and the stricter restraint is put upon idle curiosity. The general assertion, that a prophet did not arise like unto Moses, is improperly objected; for what is said of the time past is not to be understood in prejudice of the future; and it is self-evident that this saying puts no bar to the excellence of that prophet, whom Moses himself affirms was in all respects to be equal to himself. It is also improperly urged, that the less cannot abrogate the ordinances of the greater; for besides that, the doctrine of the prophets has not its authority from them, but from God. Christ was so much greater than Moses, by how much the son is greater than the servant, and the builder than the house, Heb. 3:3, 5, 6.

XVII. I answer to the fifth, 1st, When Christ says, he came not to destroy the law and the prophets, he principally means the moral law, for this is what he there explains, vindicates, and inculcates; and he subjoins to the sum of it, which he elsewhere publishes, "on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets," Matt. 22:30. Whence we learn what our Lord means by the law and the prophets. 2dly, *Καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον*, does not signify to abrogate the law when it had performed its part, but to overturn, and destroy it, loosen its frame, either by perverting its true meaning, or abolishing its scope, or in fine by falsifying and rendering it ineffectual. In which sense our Lord says, John 10:35, "the scripture cannot be broken." That is, what the Scripture says cannot but be true. Briefly, to destroy the law and the prophets is to contradict them, either in doctrine or practice. And it is certain our Lord came not in this manner to destroy the law and the prophets, not even the ceremonial; since, on the contrary, he accomplished, in the most exact manner, whatever the law commanded, most faithfully explained its genuine sense, and most exactly fulfilled whatever either the ceremonies presignified, or the prophets predicted. 3dly, That abrogation of the ceremonies, which we say was made by Christ, is their glorious consummation and accomplishment, all their signification being fulfilled; not an ignominious destruction, which our Lord justly disclaims.

XVIII. The prophecy of Jeremiah concerning the abrogation of the Old Testament, Jer. 31:31–34, is no less remarkable than illustrious. Where observe, 1st, That by the Old Covenant is meant that which God made with the Israelites on their departure out of Egypt, the tenure of which Moses has fully set forth, Exod. 24:3, and following verses. Thus Moses rehearsed by the command of God to the people, not only the Decalogue, but also many judicial and ceremonial precepts, which are declared in chap. 20 and the following, and stipulated obedience from the people; which stipulation being performed, he proceeded to the solemnity of the covenant, and on the day following erected an altar, representing Christ and twelve pillars, which represented the twelve tribes of Israel. And then, as God's ambassador, he read out of a book in their hearing, all those precepts, moral, judicial, and ceremonial. The people answered, that they would perform all that was read before them. Then Moses sprinkled both the altar of the Lord and the twelve pillars of the people with the blood of the sacrifices. This blood he called the blood of the covenant. Where we are to observe, that all the solemnities of that covenant were entirely ceremonial; the altar, the sacrifices, the blood, the sprinkling. And therefore that covenant itself



which consisted in rites, was ceremonial too, Heb. 9:1. For though these were only the accidents of the covenant, or at least appendages thereto, yet because they were the instruments of its administration they are called the Covenant. And therefore, in sum, the solemn manner of ratifying this Covenant consisting in ceremonies and sacrifices, is, in this place, called the Old Covenant.

XIX. 2dly, To that Old Covenant is contradistinguished the New, which can be no other but God's agreement with Israel, without the veil of ceremonies, in which there can be nothing typical or shadowy, but all things real and substantial; the sacrifice not brutal, but rational; the blood, not of beasts, but of the Messiah; the sprinkling, not of an altar of earth on one hand, and of pillars representing the people on the other, but of heavenly things, which are represented by earthly on the one, and of the consciences on the other hand. As the apostle sets the one over against the other, Heb. 9 and 10.

XX. The Old Covenant is here found fault with, accused, and charged with defects: not only because the New is promised, for which there would have been no place, had nothing been deficient in the former, Heb. 8:7, but also because the former is said to have been made void by Israel. It had not, therefore, at least as old and shadowy, and as explained by Moses in the said place, the promise of sanctifying grace. It had the decalogue engraven on tables of stone, the rest of the laws written down in a book; but in the whole solemnity of the covenant there is not the least mention of writing the law on the heart. The Old Covenant was, therefore, of such a nature, as to leave room for a new and a better.

XXI. 4thly, The New Covenant that was promised to succeed the Old, has the following superior privileges: 1st, It shall be sure and stable, because it was not to be external but spiritual; engraven, not on tables of stone, but on the fleshly tables of the heart. 2dly, Clearly proposed and made known by a more plentiful unction of the Spirit, so that there would be no necessity for one to be taught by another, 1 John. 2:27, as formerly, when the mysteries of salvation were exhibited to be guessed at rather than contemplated. 3dly, It shall have a true expiation and remission of sins, which the Old Economy, as legal excluded, and as typical could not give. Whence it appears that the New Covenant, which is here promised, consists in mere promises of an irrevocable grace, is held forth to us without the veil of ceremonies, and has the reality of those things, of which the types were only the shadows.

XXII. 5thly, From these things, moreover, it is now easy to conclude, that the New Covenant was not promised to stand, together with the Old, and be superadded to supply its defects; but to come in the place of the former, when that, as obscure and typical, should be entirely removed; as is plain from those words: "Not according to the Covenant that I made with their fathers, &c. In that he saith a new Covenant he hath made the first old; now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away," Heb. 8:13.

XXIII. The exceptions of the Jews against this strong argument are very weak. 1st, That the establishment and not the renewal of that Covenant is here promised: thus Kimchi. 2dly, That it does not necessarily follow from the mention of the New Covenant that the Lord will give a new law, only renew the former on their hearts. For whatsoever was not sufficiently manifest at first, when afterwards more fully declared, is said in Scripture to be New. Thus Samuel says to Saul, 1

Sam. 11:14, "come and let us go to Gilgal, and renew the kingdom there." Where it is plain there was no new kingdom given, but only the old one confirmed: thus Menasse Ben Israel, quæst. 7, in Levit

XXIV. I answer, to the first, 1st, That it is begging the question. 2dly, A direct contradiction of God's word. God says, I will make a New Covenant, not like the former, which was made void; man ventures to answer, it is not an establishment of a New, but a repetition of the Old; and so far the New Covenant confirmed the Old; yet at the same time this was its abrogation, because the presence of the truth and of the body is the removal of the figure, and the shadow. But these things the Jew did not understand.

XXV. To the other: we say, that here is no promise of a new law, because none can be better and more perfect than that of the ten commandments: however, we have a promise of a New Covenant, not a Covenant of works, or of the law but of grace, promising to write the same law on the heart, which before was written on stone. 2dly, That the renewal of the Covenant does not consist only in a clearer repetition of the law, or inscription on the heart. For the New Covenant is opposed to the Old, and substituted in its place, and completes it, so as likewise to put an end to it, as we have just now shown. 3dly, That the two cases are not parallel; for Samuel says not to Saul, Let us go to Gilgal, and I will give thee a new kingdom, unlike to the former; as God speaks here to Israel. These are things very different, I will renew the Covenant which I made, and I will make a new Covenant, not like unto the former.

XXVI. Let us now descend to particulars: where the first thing that offers is the prophecy concerning the removal of the Ark of the Covenant, not only out of the world, but also out of the memory and heart of believers; expressed Jer. 3:16, 17, in the following words: "And it shall come to pass, when ye be multiplied and increased in the land; in those days, saith Jehovah, they shall say no more, the ark of the Covenant of Jehovah; neither shall it come to mind, neither shall they remember it, neither shall they visit it, neither shall that be done any more; at that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of Jehovah, and all the nations shall be gathered into it."

XXVII. On this prophecy we observe, 1st, That the ark of the Lord was the centre and compendium of all the ceremonies. It was the holiest of all sacred places, to which they looked in all their ceremonial worship, and before which they were also to adore, 2 Sam. 6:2, and to sacrifice; the throne of God erecting a priestly kingdom; in fine, it was the principal symbol of the whole typical covenant; whence it is also called the ark of the covenant, both here and in many other places; because in it, at least in its side, was kept the book of the covenant, Deut. 31:26, 27; and "the ark of the testimony," Exod. 26:33; or also the testimony itself, Lev. 16:13, because it testified concerning the covenant of God with Israel, of which it was a pledge. 2dly, That the entire removal of the ark is here foretold, not only out of the world, but also from the memory, love, and desire of believers; all opinion of typical holiness, which formerly the ark was eminently possessed of, being erased out of the minds of God's people. To this purpose is that repetition, by way of climax or gradation, "they shall say no more, neither shall it come to mind, neither shall they remember it, neither shall they visit it or seek it, neither shall that be done any more." They shall not make a new one when the old shall be lost, or have it in any esteem. Poor Abernethy looks on this repetition with a kind of astonishment. 3dly, That it is not here foretold in the form of a threatening of misery, such as was the loss of the ark, while the ceremonies were

in force, but as a promise of the most happy times, in which the church shall have that in reality, which formerly she had typically in the ark; and while she enjoys the substance will bear the loss of the shadow, not only with equanimity and composure of mind, but also with gladness of heart. 4thly, It is added, that all Jerusalem, and not the cover of the ark only, as formerly, should be the throne of glory. "For all Jerusalem shall obtain a degree of the ark in holiness and glory," says Aberbanel. That is, God will manifest himself by much more glorious indications of his grace in the whole church of believing Jews, and converted Gentiles united together into one holy city, than he did formerly within the inclosure of the sanctuary; words which overturn the typical holiness of places. 5thly, That all those benefits accompany the coming of the Messiah, whose distinguishing characters are the multiplying and the increasing of the people in the land; see Deut. 30:5, even above their ancestors, after having subdued and incorporated Edom with themselves; the giving of pastors according to God's heart, who, as Kimchi interprets, are "the rulers of Israel, who shall be the attendants on the king Messiah." We call these the apostles of the Lamb, and their faithful assistants and successors, and in fine, the gathering together the Gentiles into the church, who could neither be burdened with ceremonies, as we shall presently show; nor, while the religion of ceremonies continued, live peaceably in the same holy city with the Jews without them. The sum of the whole comes to this, that when the Messiah should discover those things which were signified by the ark and the other ceremonies, he would then abolish all the holiness of the ark and the like types, as well in reality, as out of the minds of believers.

XXVIII. It is excepted, 1st, That the ark which was wanting in the second temple, is to be restored by God under the Messiah. Thus Sephar Afkat Rochel refuted by Hulsius on the tenth sign of the Messiah's coming. 2dly, That the meaning of this prophecy is, that, during these prosperous circumstances, Israel would have no reason to fear the envy of the other nations; for they should not make war so as to be obliged to go out, and take the ark of the covenant with them, as they usually did in the days of Eli, and as often as war happened to break out. And therefore there was no prediction of the removal of the ark simply, but in some respect, namely, as to its special use in time of war. Thus Jonathan, Kimchi, and Menasse, Quæst. 2 in Levit. and others. 3dly, That the abrogation of the ceremonies cannot be inferred from the absence of the ark, since it is without controversy that these remained in force, though the ark has been wanting ever since the Babylonish captivity. 4thly, That the ten commandments, formerly inclosed in the ark, are even at this day accounted and regarded by all as eternal, Menasse, *ibid*.

XXIX. I answer to the first, that it is a mere Jewish tradition, without any foundation in Scripture, and directly contrary to this prophecy of Jeremiah.

XXX. To the second, 1st, That it is supposed without proof, that the principal use of the ark was in time of war. They took it with them to the field of battle in the time of Eli, but with bad success, being found "to have in vain put their confidence in the ark," Joseph. *Antiq. Lib. 5. c. 11*. 2dly, That, after the dedication of the temple, and the solemn introduction of the ark into it, it was never any more moved from its place, and carried out to the field of battle, 1 Kings 8:8, 2 Chron. 5:9. Therefore the temple is called, "the resting place of Jehovah, and of the ark of his strength," 2 Chron. 6:41; "and an house of rest for the ark of the covenant of Jehovah," 1 Chron. 28:2, so that the Levites were relieved from the burden of carrying it, 2 Chron. 35:3. What new thing then could Jeremiah foretell here, should he prophesy, that, in the time of the Messiah, the

ark was not to be carried out to battle, as all knew that was prohibited so many ages before? 3dly, That reiterated repetition of phrases plainly indicates an entire removal of the ark. And justly said Abarbanel of this exposition: "All these things are foreign to the purpose, there is not a single word in the text concerning war and the other things of which they speak, and therefore I cannot be satisfied with this explication."

XXXI. To the third, the absence of the ark in the second temple, which was to be honoured with the presence of him who was prefigured by it, did even then signify the future abrogation of the types in due time. 2dly, We do not argue from the bare absence of the ark, but from its being foretold that it was neither to be in the world, nor so much as have a place in the mind, love, and desire of believers; and this was promised as a great blessing, as a token and evidence of the liberty purchased by the Messiah; which was not the case before the coming of the Messiah, when the memory of the ark was still dear to the godly among them. 3dly, We likewise argue from this; namely, that the holiness and glory of the ark may be said to be imparted to all Jerusalem inhabited by Jews as well as Gentiles, in the sense we have just explained. Whence the abrogation of that typical holiness, which the ark formerly had above all is most evidently concluded.

XXXII. To the fourth 1st, The laws of the covenant, of which the ark was the symbol, were not only the ten commandments, but all the laws of Moses. Accordingly the book which contained them was placed in the side of the ark. That symbol therefore of the covenant being thus abolished, both the covenant itself, and the laws, so far as they comprised the conditions of that covenant, are abrogated. The case of the laws of the decalogue is different from the rest; for they were engraven on tables of stone, and laid up in the ark, to represent that they were to be the perpetual rule of holiness, and continually to be kept in the heart both of the Messiah and of his mystical body; while the others were only written on paper or parchment, and placed in the side of the ark. Their abrogation, therefore, would be ill concluded from the removal of the typical ark; seeing their being engraven on stone, and kept in the ark signified their indelible inscription on, and continual preservation in the hearts of believers.

XXXIII. David prophesied concerning the abrogation of the priesthood, Ps. 110:4, "The Lord hath sworn and will not repent; thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." From which place the apostle long ago argued, thus, Heb. 7:11–13: "If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law), what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law; for he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar." The following observations will show that this reasoning is solid and conclusive.

XXXIV. 1st, The inscription proves, that the author of this psalm was David, a psalm of David, which is nowhere found in the titles of psalms composed by another. 2dly, The person, to whom both the kingdom and priesthood are promised, is not David himself, but the Lord of David, as appears from the connexion of ver. 4 with ver. 1. 3dly, The Lord of David is not Abraham, but the Messiah. Because the things asserted and declared in this psalm, as the sitting at God's right hand, the sending the rod of his strength out of Zion, the making all his enemies his footstool, his eternal priesthood, &c., do not agree to the former, but to the latter. 4thly, All are agreed, that the

Messiah is not of the tribe of Levi, to which, by the law of Moses, the priesthood was limited; but of Judah and of the family of David. But by the Mosaic law that family was not allowed to exercise the priesthood, 2 Chron. 26:18. 5thly, A priesthood, even an eternal priesthood, is promised to the Messiah, and that by an oath, see Zech. 6:13. Which cannot be, while the Mosaic law concerning the priesthood remains in force. 6thly, That priesthood is of another than that of Aaron, namely, of Melchisedec; which cannot subsist at the time with the Levitical both for other reasons, which it is not to the purpose now to unfold, and especially on account of the diversity of descent. 7thly, If the Aaronical priesthood had been perfect, and could have perfected the consciences, there neither had been nor ought there to be a place for this change. But the weakness and unprofitableness thereof made way for an amendment. 8thly, With the change of the priesthood is conjoined the change of the law. Because the priesthood is not only a great part but also the foundation of all the ceremonies.

XXXV. The Jewish interpreters wonderfully perplex themselves in darkening this illustrious passage; but it is not worth our while to discuss all their misinterpretations here; they are both so many and so impertinent. We shall only run over such exceptions as are more plausible, and directly contrary to what we maintain. It is therefore objected, 1st, That this is not a psalm of David's, but composed by some inspired finger in commendation, and on the account of David; and that the inscription is no objection; ל sometimes, even in the inscription of psalms, is the sign of the dative case, and signifies the same thing as בעבור for, as Psal. 72:1, לשלמה, to, for, or concerning Solomon; nay, that we have the same inscription לרוד prefixed to some psalms, of which he does not seem to be the author, as Ps. 20 and 21. Where the singer prays for the preservation of the king; under which name it is not very likely that David should pray for himself. 2dly, That therefore the singer means David by his Lord; whom he calls not Adonai, a sacred name, but Adoni, a human and common appellation. 3dly, That the term כהן, Cohen, does not here signify a priest but a king and prince, as 2 Sam. 8:18, where the sons of David are called כהנים, that is, princes of the court; and 2 Sam. 20:26. where Ira the Jairite is called a prince of David. Accordingly even the Chaldee has translated it, "thou art constituted a prince." 4thly, That על מלכי דברתי signifies, "because thou art the king of righteousness, as if the meaning was, thou shalt be a prince for ever, shalt reign by a long succession of descendants, not as Saul, whose government was execrable, and of short continuance, "because of righteousness, for thou art a righteous king," as the Chaldee paraphrases. If this be a true explication nothing is here said about the change of the priesthood.

XXXVI. I answer to the first. 1st, If you say, that this is not a psalm of David, you cannot prove him to be the author of any psalm that has the same inscription. 2dly, The ancients all acknowledge that it is David's. If it had not been so, Christ would not have asserted it as a thing of undoubted truth, Mat. 22:45. and the Pharisees might easily have eluded that argument, by which they were constrained to hold their peace. The Chaldee also has it, a hymn by the hand of David. 3dly, We allow, that the letter ל is sometimes the sign of the dative; but we deny, that here or elsewhere, when the title runs לשלמה מזמור, ל signifies the same with בעבור nor, by any other description are those psalms distinguished which we all believe to be David's, in consequence of that inscription. 5thly, The instances mentioned do not prove any thing to the contrary, for in Ps. 72 we read not לשלמה מזמור, a psalm for Solomon, but לשלמה absolutely for Solomon, and then there is no reason why it may not be a psalm of Solomon's, which he received, as it were from David's mouth, since he likewise wrote several proverbs from the

mouth of his mother, Prov. 31:1. And there is as little reason why Psams 20 and 21 may not be accounted David's. For, as God had appointed him to the office of a prophet, he justly also dictated to the people those forms of prayer, with which they were to intercede for their king. And that he might sing this in one spirit with them, it is not without reason, that he speaks of himself as king in the third person. And thus he might properly name himself; but he could not call himself, his Lord, whether singing by himself or with others. Besides the appellation king, even in those psalms, may look further and be applied to the Messiah. For, how could the church in after times by singing, pray for David and his posterity, when they were extinct? And in what sense should she sing these things of an earthly king, when there was no such king in Israel?

XXXVII. To the second we reply. 1st, It is affirmed without proof, that these things were foretold concerning David, when David speaks them concerning his Lord. 2dly, David's Lord is the Messiah, for David was his servant. He sits at God's right hand, having the next degree of honour to God; all the other things which are declared in the psalm emphatically belong to him. 3dly, As he could be called Adonai by David on account of the excellency of the divine essence; so he is also justly called Adoni on account of the eminence of his power and dominion. 6thly, The more ancient Jews themselves explained this psalm of the Messiah, from whom we have testimonies in Munsterus on this psalm, and in Cocceius on Heb. 7. §. 12.

XXXVIII. To the third we say: 1st, Though the term **כהן**, Cohen, may sometimes denote a political dignity, yet royal majesty is never expressed by that word. Cohen, as Aben Ezra has well observed, signifies **משרה**, a minister, who is next to the king. But there is a king, who has power over conscience, and God only is such a king; and there is a king who has power over the body, and such are the supreme rulers of this world. Therefore there is a twofold cohen, namely, with respect either to God or to kings. With respect to God, such are called cohanim, who were over the people in performing divine service, because they appear to be next to God. With respect to kings, these are cohanim, who are next to them. In that sense, Ira the Jairite, is called David's cohen, and David's sons cohanim. That is as it is explained, 1 Chron. 11:15: captains, or principal men next to the king. And if we may believe the Jews, because Absalom was not admitted to partake of this dignity, he therefore took occasion to form his unnatural conspiracy. But in none of these senses could David be called cohen; not in the former, because the priesthood was confined to the descendants of Aaron alone; nor in the latter, for thus he himself had his cohanim. But the Messiah is in such a manner a king, as at the same time to be priest; just like Melchisedec, who distinctly discharged both offices, for the Holy Spirit directs us to this.

XXXIX. To the fourth we answer, that there is a mistake through the misinterpretation of these words, **מלבי צדק רבדתי על**. For, 1st, **מלכי צדק**, Melchi-zedek, is always in the sacred writings a proper name. The Hebrews should appellatively call the king of righteousness, **צדק מלך**. 2dly, **רבדתי על** never signifies because but when it is placed as here, according to the order or manner, Eccl. 3:18, and 8:2, if **ש** follows in Hebrew, or **רי** in Chaldee, it signifies with that intention or design, as Eccl. 7:14. Dan. 2:30, and Dan. 4:14. Seeing then neither **כהונה**, nor **מלכי צדק**, nor **על דברתי**, signify what the Jews would have, our argument remains in its full force.

XL. And indeed, the event has confirmed this prophecy: for about the time when our true Melchizedek began his priestly office, the Levitical had lost its dignity, till it was at last entirely

abolished, without any hopes of a restoration, all the distinction of tribes being confounded. And the Jews themselves have taken notice of this, whose opinion we have in the Mishna, tit. Sota, c. ix.: "From the death of Rabbi Ismael, the son of Phabi, the splendor of the priesthood has ceased." But this man was made High Priest by Valerius Gratus, president of Judea under Tiberius Cæsar. About that time, this most sacred office was tossed about and sported with, like a ball, and any of the most profligate, as he favoured and made presents to the Roman president, grasped at it by the foulest ambition and the basest arts. And matters at length came to such a pitch of profaneness and wickedness, that the high-priests were not only chosen by lot, but even the high-priesthood fell by lot to one Phannias, who not only was a "worthless High-priest, but also, through his gross ignorance, incapable to distinguish what was the nature of the high-priesthood," Josephus de Bel. Jud. lib. iv. c. xii. Yet from the utmost contempt and derision they constrained this man, whom they forced even against his will from the country, and brought him on the stage like a kind of actor, and clothed in the sacred vestments, to act the part of High-Priest, who like a child had prompters always at hand to remind him how to behave and maintain his character. Which impiety, as Josephus justly calls it, sufficiently shows, that God no longer regarded that office, after the true priest according to the order of Melchizedeck had once appeared.

XLI. From the priesthood let us proceed to the sacrifices. Daniel speaks of the ceasing of these, chap. 9 last verse: "And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week, he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease."

XLII. We are here to observe: 1st, That the prophet speaks concerning the times of the Messiah, who, ver. 25, is called "the Messiah the prince," by way of eminence and with respect to his character and office: compare Isa. 55:4. His office was to "finish (restrain) the transgression, and make an end of (seal) sins, and to make reconciliation for (expiate) iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness," ver. 24. These are the offices and benefits of the true Messiah alone.

XLIII. 2dly, That the abolishing of the sacrifice and oblation is foretold to be done by the Messiah; for, he "who confirmed the covenant with many, (whom Paul calls) the surety of a better covenant," Heb. 7:22, even he shall cause the sacrifices to cease. But whatever the Messiah does is undoubtedly right; since at least he is a prophet, and faithful in the house of God.

XLIV. 3dly, That this abolishing was both just and actually took place. It was just by reason of the introduction of a new covenant, which was confirmed, not by sacrifice and the blood of brute beasts, but by the offering of the Messiah himself, that lamb without blemish, whose blood is the blood of the New Testament, shed in order to procure or obtain true remission for many. Accordingly the future abolishing of the sacrifices was foretold to be in the middle of that week in which the Messiah was to be cut off, when he was to "make his soul an offering for sin," Isa. 53:10. His sacrifice put an end to typical sacrifices. And the abrogation of the sacrifices is joined with the confirmation of the new covenant; for that being sealed by the sacrifice of Christ, and preached by the apostles, and confirmed by the effusion of the Holy Ghost, and by very many miracles; the sacrifices of beasts, which constituted a great part of the Old Covenant, immediately lost all their efficacy and dignity, and so were justly abrogated. It actually took place not long after, on the destruction of the city and temple; for, all the sacrifices ceased upon that. Josephus relates, that Titus answered the priests who begged for their lives after the burning

of the Temple, that "that was destroyed, on account of which he would have justly saved them; but that it was proper for the priests to perish with the Temple." And what Chrysostom relates, Orat. 3. contra Judæos, agrees with this, that the Jews should have said to Julian, when he exhorted them to sacrifice in the ancient manner, "If you would see us sacrifice, restore our city, rebuild our Temple, and we will sacrifice even now as before." As the profane emperor, from the hatred he bore to Christianity attempted this, and furnished the expense out of the public treasury, God prevented it by his Almighty hand, thereby showing, that he had no pleasure in new sacrifices. Not only our own writers have this history, but also Ammianus Marcellinus, lib. xxiii., among the Gentiles, and Zemach David, P. ii. p. 36, among the Jews. Both these kinds of the abrogation of sacrifices may be ascribed to the Messiah. He had a right to do it, as a priest who had offered a better sacrifice; and as a king who appoints religious ceremonies for his church. He actually did it, as the asserter of his own majesty and grace, which the rebellious Jews trampled under foot; for which end, he made use of Titus and his armies as his ministers.

XLV. 4thly, That the removal of sacrifices and offerings infers the abrogation of the whole ceremonial worship. Not only because sacrifices constitute a principal part of the ceremonies, and we may say the same of things of a like nature; but also because the whole external worship is sometimes expressed by the name sacrifice, as Hos. 6:6. "זבח ולא הפצתי חסד כי" for I desired mercy and not sacrifice; חסד, which the Septuagint here translate by ἔλεος, as also Matt. 12:7, signifies ὁσεότης, (a word very plainly derived from the Hebrew חסדוּתָהּ, or the Chaldee חסידוּתָהּ), or a diligent love of God. But ὁσεότης is that internal purity and holiness of heart, which comprehends all those virtues or graces wherein the image of God consists. And therefore זבח, in order to a just opposition, will signify the whole external and ceremonial worship. Which Kimchi himself seems to have observed, who explains sacrifice by "the worship of the Lord in the house of his sanctuary." The interpretations which the blind and foolish Jews give of this prophecy of Daniel, are so foreign to the words of the text, to the designation of the time, and to the history of the events, that they confute and overthrow themselves. Whoever desires to see them exploded, may consult Const. l'Empereur on Daniel, and the celebrated Cocceius, Hornbeck, and Hulsius, in their writings against the Jews.

XLVI. The Spirit, which spoke by the prophets, not thinking it sufficient to foretel the ceasing of the ceremonies, foretold also, that in the days of the Messiah, such rites should be instituted, as are entirely repugnant to the ancient institutions: that he would take for himself Priests and Levites out of all nations without distinction. Isa. 46:20, 21. That in all places incense and a pure offering should be offered to his name, Mal. 1:11: that there should be an altar, acceptable to himself in the midst of the land of Egypt, Isa. 19:19: that on the bells of the horses should be engraven HOLINESS TO JEHOVAH; which was formerly engraven only on the golden plate fastened to the mitre of the high-priest; and God has graciously promised, that all the pots in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, should be holiness unto him. Zech 14:20, 21. These things cannot be reconciled with the ancient privileges of the priests and Levites, and with the earthly sanctuary, and the prerogatives of the land of Canaan, and with the special holiness of the pontifical pomp. God intimates that he would be worshipped in the use of other sacred ordinances, which should not be confined to any forms of the ancient ceremonies, but be duly performed in spirit and in truth, by every believer, in all places whatever.



XLVII. Let us now come to the third thing proposed, and show that the ceremonies ought to be abrogated in the time of the Messiah, and that it was not possible the case should be otherwise. This may be shown two ways: First, if we consider the material, or matter of the ceremonies, as they are acts of the obedience, prescribed by the law of ordinances: secondly their formal, or essence, as they were types and shadows: but in neither of these ways can they have place in the kingdom of the Messiah. I make the first of these appear thus.

XLVIII. It is evident from the prophecies, that a great multitude of the Gentiles would be called by the Messiah to communion with God and Israel. That God would allure Japheth to dwell in the tents of Shem, Gen. 9:27: that in the seed of Abraham all nations of the earth should be blessed, Gen. 22:18; that unto the Messiah should the obedience of the people be, Gen. 49:10; that the Egyptians and Babylonians should be mentioned among those, who know Jehovah; and that it should be said of the Philistine, the Tyrian, and the Ethiopian, they were born in Zion. Ps. 87:4. And that all nations should flow to the mountain of the house of Jehovah, Is. 2:2. and that Israel should be the third of Egypt and Assyria; and that the Lord shall say, blessed be my people the Egyptians, and the work of my hands, the Assyrians, and Israel mine inheritance, Is. 19:24, 25, and numberless other passages, which frequently occur in Scripture to the same purpose.

XLIX. Moreover, Isaiah declares, that both Israel and the converted Gentiles should obey the same laws, and be bound together by the same religious ties, chap. 42:4, "and the isles shall wait for his (the Messiah's) laws. Again, Isa. 2:3. "And many people shall go and say, come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem." And he adds, no stranger who hath joined himself to Jerusalem shall say, Jehovah hath utterly separated me from his people: but on the contrary, even unto the eunuchs shall be given, in the house of God and within his walls, a place and a name better than that of sons and of daughters, Isa. 56:3, 5; that is, that the converted Gentiles should, in matters of religion, be on an equal footing with the Israelites. To this purpose is that of Zephan. 3:9, 10, "For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of Jehovah, to serve him with one consent: from beyond the rivers of Ethiopia, my suppliants, even the daughters of my dispersed shall bring mine offering:" and Zechar. 14:9. "And Jehovah shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Jehovah, and his name one:" one shall be the worship, and one the veneration of the one God. The Jews themselves also frequently declare, that in the time of the Messiah, many nations shall be converted to the God of Israel, and that then they shall walk in the doctrine of that law, as the Chaldee speaks on Is. 2:3, and "shall embrace one common law with the Israelites," as Menasse speaks, de Resur. lib. 2. c. 3, and so shall be incorporated into one people with Israel, and be partakers of the same privileges, as being proselytes of righteousness.

L. Whenever this shall come to pass, it is plain that the ancient ceremonies cannot possibly be observed by all the subjects of the Messiah. For how is it possible the paying of vows and tithes, the presenting the first-born, the observation of the passover, pentecost and feast of tabernacles, which were confined to the place, which God had chosen, should be binding on those who are to be at a great distance from Judea? And how can men, who dwell in the outermost parts of the earth, come to Jerusalem, to offer sacrifice for every sin, and every pollution, in order to avoid the curse? How could women, newly delivered, undertake so long a journey, and present

themselves in the place chosen by God, to perform the offerings commanded? Where could so many beasts, so many priests, so many altars be found, sufficient for all the sacrifices? What extent of country, much less town, could be large enough to hold such numbers? Menasse, if I rightly remember, idly says, that then the gates of Jerusalem should be extended to Damascus; but had he extended them, which he might with equal ease, beyond the Portæ Caspiæ, or pass of Teflis, he would have more commodiously provided for so prodigious a conflux of people, flocking from all parts to the sacrifices. Put the case of the leprosy, and of a house infected with that plague, of which Lev. 13; must the priests make incursions to the Scythians, the Sarmatians and the Indians; to the Britons separated from the rest of the world, and to the outmost Thule, to form a judgment of the scab or scall? To omit many other considerations, which might with equal propriety be urged; and which Eusebius among the ancients, Demonstr. Evangel. lib. 1, and among the moderns, Spahemius Dubior Evang. p. 3, Dub. 112, have fully and learnedly done.

LI. You may possibly allege, that God will grant a kind of dispensation of, and relax these impossible laws. But where is there any promise to that purpose? Have not these laws been made by the same authority with the others? Is not their duration in like manner extended לעולם, for ever, which in other respects is so much objected to us? Do not these and the like laws constitute the principal part of the ceremonial? And if the conscience can be set free from the obligation of these, why not also from that to the others, which are of the same nature?

LII. But shall they not cease to bind because the observation of them is impossible, in the same manner as the moral law which we teach is binding, though we allow the perfect performance thereof to be a thing impossible? But who does not see a very wide difference here? That the moral law cannot now be perfectly performed, is a thing accidental, owing to our corruption. That these other laws cannot be observed under the kingdom of the Messiah, arises from the nature of the laws themselves, without any default of man. And thus we have demonstrated, that the ceremonies, in so far as they are acts of the obedience, prescribed by the old law, cannot be observed in the universal church, gathered together from among Jews and Gentiles, under the king Messiah.

LIII. This will be more manifest, if we moreover consider the formal of the ceremonies: thus there was a yoke in them that must be broken off; a pedagogy, and an accusation of childhood, which cannot take place in a more advanced age. There was a partition-wall to be broken down, when, on removing all distinction of nations, the Messiah is to be all in all; an enmity to be abolished at the time, in which the Messiah is to publish to the Gentiles, that they should have peace both with Israel and with God. There was, in fine, a hand-writing, bearing testimony concerning guilt not yet expiated, and payment not yet made. This, when all things are fulfilled by the Messiah, is to be taken out of the way, left any institution of God should be found to testify against the truth and Son of God. Such are either ignorant of, or overturn all the signification of the ceremonies and their true efficacy, who bind the obligation of them on the consciences, after the Messiah had perfected all things.

LIV. There now remains the fourth head, namely, to explain the progress and the various degrees of this abrogation, which we digest in the following order: 1st. When Christ came and was manifested to Israel, the ceremonies lost much of their splendour, as when the sun in the heavens

extinguisheth the stars. Nevertheless they were binding while Christ was not yet made perfect by sufferings, but yet their abrogation was drawing near: "Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." John 4:21, 23. To this purpose is that proclamation, which John several times published, that the kingdom of heaven is at hand. 2dly. They were abrogated in point of right by the death of Christ; for all their typical presignification being fulfilled in Christ, and the blood of the New Testament being shed, and the guilt expiated which they were appointed to be a charge of, with what right could ceremonies lately discarded claim any longer to keep their former station? Hence Christ is said "to have taken the hand-writing out of the way, nailing it to his cross," Col. 2:14, and to "have abolished in his flesh (on his flesh being broken by death) the law of commandments contained in ordinances." Eph. 2:15. Certainly the flesh of Christ was the veil; and while that was still entire, a new and living way was not opened to the heavenly sanctuary. Heb. 10:20. For while Christ was not yet made perfect by sufferings, the ceremonies which required that perfection or consummation, were in full force. But when the utmost farthing was paid by the death of Christ, the veil and inclosure of the ceremonies being taken down, there was a free access to God; which was signified and confirmed by the rending the veil of the temple upon the death of Christ. 3dly. God declared, confirmed, and sealed this abrogation by the resurrection of Christ from the dead, and his ascension into heaven, and the plentiful effusion of the Holy Spirit. For the hand-writing was then discharged. He who hitherto was in bondage to the elements of the world, equally with the other worshippers of God, was placed with his people in heavenly places, where no such bondage takes place; and the spirit was given, as the seal of a more delightful dispensation of the Covenant. 4thly. But this liberty was for sometime not sufficiently known even to the apostles themselves, till Peter was instructed therein by a heavenly vision. Acts 10:11. 5thly. Then, by a solemn decree of a synod of the apostles, under the presidency of the Holy Spirit, it was ordained that a yoke was not to be put on the neck of the disciples, besides those few things necessary for that time; namely, "to abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled;" to which was subjoined, though of a different kind, fornication, Acts 15:10, 28, 29. 6thly. Afterwards Paul preached freedom from these things also, excepting fornication, that being contrary to the moral law. 1 Cor. 8:4, 8, and 1 Cor. 10:25–29. 7thly. Yet because the Jews, who were converted to Christ, having been accustomed to the ceremonies, were with very great difficulty drawn from them, the apostles, and other believers with them, that they might not offend the weak, according to the rules of Christian charity and prudence, freely used those ceremonies, not with any opinion of holiness; but in order not to wound tender consciences, accommodating themselves to all, to gain some to Christ. See Acts 21:22. 8thly. But after that the church seemed now to be sufficiently instructed in her liberty, and the fondness for the ceremonies was no longer a degree of weakness but of obstinacy, Paul would not give place by subjection, no not for an hour, and sharply rebuked Peter, whose conduct was rather too remiss, Gal. 2:5, 14, and exhorted every one in particular to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, and not to be entangled again with the yoke of bondage, nor to make Christ of no effect to themselves. Gal. 5:1, 2. 9thly and lastly. All the ceremonies were actually taken away at the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and buried as it were in their ruins, never to be revived any more. See what we have said concerning circumcision. Chap. ii. §. 21, &c.

## CHAPTER XV: Of the Benefits of the New Testament

I. As the darkness of the night is only dispelled by the beams of the rising morn, so the Old Testament was abrogated only by the introduction of the New. But at what time this first began to take place, by what degrees it advanced, by what intervals of time it was confirmed and completed, we have explained in the third chapter of the foregoing book. We are now, in the first place, to treat of the benefits of the New Testament; then of the sacraments; the other particulars are obvious, from what we have spoken concerning the covenant of grace, simply considered, and by comparing with them what we have more largely treated of concerning the Old Testament.

II. We rehearse the benefits of the New Testament in the following order: 1. The first is the exhibition of the Messiah made perfect. 2. The Gospel under another name or designation. 3. The calling of the Gentiles. 4. A more abundant and delightful measure of the Spirit. 5. A greater and better liberty. 6. The restoration of Israel. 7. The revival of the whole church, as from the dead.

III. The first spring of our glorying, and the sum of our felicity beyond those that expected the consolation of Israel, is, that "Christ Jesus came into the world," 1 Tim. 1:15. He, who was promised from the beginning, shadowed forth by so many types, so ardently longed for, and for so many ages expected, came forth in the fulness of time, in that place, from that tribe and family, in that manner from a virgin, and appeared in the flesh, just as the holy prophets had long before prophesied he should come. "Through the tender mercy of our God, whereby the day-spring from on high hath visited us," Luke 1:78: "We have found him, of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph," John 1:45. This, as the angel told the shepherds of Bethlehem, was matter of great joy, and not only Mary and Zacharias and Simeon, but also the whole choir of the heavenly angels, celebrated this in their songs: see Zech. 9:9.

IV. And the Messiah was not only exhibited, but also "made perfect through sufferings," Heb. 2:10; and thus being "made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all," Heb. 5:9. For, in the sufferings and death of Christ, there is a true expiation, a cancelling, a blotting out of our sins, a bringing in of everlasting righteousness, a tearing and removing of the hand-writing, nay, there is an eternal redemption.

V. But this was not all; for he was also received up into glory, and being placed in the throne of his majesty, he brought the kingdom of heaven to us, having removed every thing, by which the spiritual and mystical government of God over the conscience, which is the government of liberty, was formerly obscured. While David, in spirit, had this kingdom of the Messiah before him, as in a figure, he joyfully sung, "Jehovah reigneth, let the earth rejoice, let the multitude of isles be glad," Ps. 97:1: "Jehovah reigneth, let the people tremble," Ps. 99:1. This is that kingdom of heaven which the Baptist so often proclaimed was at hand, and concerning which our Lord declared that there were some of his hearers, "which should not taste death, till they saw the Son of man coming in his kingdom," Matt. 16:28. It cannot but be most delightful to all, that love the Lord Jesus, "to see him crowned with glory and honour, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death," Heb. 2:9. This great benefit the apostle has set forth in these important words, 1 Tim 3:6. "God made manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of

angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." And our Saviour himself has taught us, that a great part of our happiness consists in the enjoyment of this blessing, Matt. 13:16, 17.

VI. The second benefit is the gospel of the kingdom, "which God had promised afore by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures," Rom. 1:2. Namely, the gospel as completed, "which, at the first, began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him," Heb. 2:3. For, this "mystery was kept secret since the world began: but now is made manifest, and, by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith," Rom. 16:25, 26. Not that they had no gospel before: for, even unto the ancients was the gospel formerly preached, Heb. 4:2. But that this proclamation of future grace was προεὐαγγελισμὸς, the gospel preached before, Gal. 3:8; and the preaching of the present grace is eminently the gospel now. Hence it is mentioned as an argument of the presence of the Messiah, that the poor have the gospel preached to them, Matt. 11:5.

VII. Moreover, the gospel of the New Testament has the following excellencies above the Old. 1st. That it sets forth Christ as come, and declares that all those things are fulfilled, which were formerly foretold to come to pass long after, 1 Cor. 2:7–10. 2dly. That it declares in clear terms, every thing relating to the common salvation, without the covering of figures, or the labyrinths of dark sayings, 2 Cor. 3:14. 3dly. That it now allures the hearts of believers with the sweetest and most abundant consolations, and without that severity, which, according to the old legal dispensation, mixed the words of grace with so much rigour, whence it is called "the ministration of righteousness," 2 Cor. 3:9, and "the word of reconciliation," 2 Cor. 5:18. "The mouth of our beloved is most sweet," Cant. 5:16; and Isaiah prophesied concerning his servants, chap. 52:7. "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings!" &c. Add Isa. 40:1, and Isa. 61:1, and Isa. 66:10–12. 4thly. That it dwells now more abundantly in us, and is preached more fully and frequently, and with a greater demonstration of the Spirit, and a deeper insinuation or sinking into the conscience, Rom. 10:8.

VIII. The third benefit is the calling of the Gentiles by the Gospel, which followed upon the Messiah's being made perfect: according to the promise, Ps. 2:8. "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession:" likewise Isa. 49:6, Luke 2:40. Paul, as in other places, so especially Eph. 2 and 3, has in a magnificent manner, set forth the perfections of God, as being illustriously displayed in this admirable work, and, above all, the unsearchable riches of the patience, goodness, and manifold wisdom of God in Christ. "And, indeed, who can but stand amazed at such a surprising thing," we may justly exclaim with Eusebius, "to see those who from the beginning paid divine honour and worship to stocks and stones and devils, to ravenous beasts feeding on human flesh, and to venomous reptiles, to fire and to earth, to the very inanimate elements of the universe; to see, I say, such calling on the most high God, the creator of heaven and earth, the very Lord of the prophets, the God of Abraham and his ancestors, after the coming of our Saviour?" Pray, read what follows; as it is too long to be here transcribed. This very circumstance assures us, that the Lord Jesus is the true and only Messiah, by whose word, Spirit, and ministry, so astonishing a work was accomplished, the like, or equal to it, was never seen or heard, were we to go back to the remotest antiquity.

IX. But we are to observe, 1st. That these things were accomplished by the apostles of Christ, and their fellow labourers, who were not remarkable, either for any excellence of worldly wisdom, or furnished with any charms of Greek and Roman excellence, or supported by any human assistance; but, by the naked demonstration of an admirable and almost incredible truth to the conscience, while the gates of hell raged, the lords and dreaded tyrants of the world opposed, and the schools of conceited philosophers clamoured; that the glory of God and his Christ might shine forth with the greater lustre and brightness, the meaner and less adapted for the work were the instruments he used, 1 Cor. 2:4, 5.

X. 2dly. That the kingdom of Christ was set up among the Gentiles with an astonishing quickness. For, "as the lightning, that lighteth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven, so shall also the Son of man be in his day," Luke 17:24. Isaiah had foretold this, with a kind of astonishment, chap. 66:7, 8: "Before she travailed, she brought forth; before her pain came, she was delivered of a man-child. Who hath heard such a thing? who hath seen such things? Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day, or shall a nation be born at once? For, as soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children."

XI. 3dly. That this calling extended very far, Rom. 10:18. "Their sound went into all the earth, and their words into the ends of the world," Col. 1:6, 24, Mark 16:20. Tertullian *adversus Judæos*, says, c. 7. "In what other person besides, have all the Gentiles believed but in Christ, who is now come? On whom else have the Parthians believed, the Medes, Elamites, the inhabitants of Mesopotamia, Armenia, Phrygia, Egypt, that part of Africa beyond Cyrene; the Romans; the Jews then in Jerusalem, and other nations; and at this day, the various tribes of Getulians, many parts of Mesopotamia, Spain in all its extent, the different nations of Gaul, and the parts of Britain inaccessible to the Roman arms, made subject to Christ; the Sarmatians, Dacians, Germans and Scythians, many nations yet undiscovered, many provinces and islands unknown to you, and which we cannot enumerate? among which the name of Christ, as now come, prevails." In a like strain has Jerome celebrated this abundance of heavenly grace, in *Epitaphium Nepotiani ad Heliiodorum*, and in *Epist. ad Lætam*, and in general, the other fathers, exulting in so great a happiness of the New Testament. Yet we are not to think that there was no corner of the world, where the name of Christ was not preached: nor to believe that the apostles sailed over to America, and to countries then unknown to the rest of the world; these universal expressions only intimate, that the gospel of Christ was extensively propagated, without any distinction of countries or people, on each side of the sun's course. See the expressions, Rom. 1:8, Luke 2:5.

XII. 4thly. The gospel did not reach to the Gentiles till after it was rejected and despised by the Jews. "Through their fall salvation came to the Gentiles. The fall of them was the riches of the world," Rom. 11:11, 12. We have an exposition of this passage, Acts. 13:46, 47, where Paul and Barnabas speak thus. "It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you, (the Jews.) But seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles; for so hath the Lord commanded us," &c. We may add Acts 18:6.

XIII. 5thly, However the polity of the Jews was not overturned, before the kingdom of the Messiah was made illustrious among the Gentiles. Matt. 24:14. "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come,"

namely of Jerusalem and the temple; which was very wisely so ordered; for by this means, 1st. The ungrateful Jews had not the least shadow of excuse left; for what excuse could they have for continuing in their hardness, who had seen his power in a very short space of time, shining like lightning through the whole world? This is Chrysostom's observation Serm. 76 in Matthæum. 2dly. By the preaching of the gospel he would have all the world know the crimes of the Jews, the guilt they had contracted by the parricide of Christ, and their obstinate and invincible malice in stubbornly rejecting all offers of mercy. Before he would execute so terrible a vengeance on a people, who were under so many obligations to him: that all nations might be obliged to adore his justice with trembling. 3dly. He would not cast off his ancient people by an ultimate destruction, before he had gathered, from among the Gentiles, another people for himself. Nor make the material temple an Anthema, till he had built a spiritual temple of lively stones: for it was never intended, that Christ should be a king without a kingdom.

XIV. The fourth benefit is a more abundant and delightful measure of the Spirit, frequently foretold by the prophets, to be sent together with, and poured out on the church by Christ. To this purpose, if I mistake not, is Zech. 9:12, "even to day, מְשֻׁנָּה מִיָּד \* another declarer do I render unto thee." That day is meant, on which the king of Zion had, by the blood of the covenant set at liberty those who were bound in Zion, and was delivered from death. At that time, מְנַיֵד, a declarer, discoverer, or shower forth, is promised, the participle being used as a noun: and he is indeed another discoverer. The first is the Son of God, and who is the other, but the Holy Spirit? who is also a discoverer, as he teaches the elect, and brings all things to their remembrance, John 14:26, "the next to Christ, or another comforter," ver. 16. Him God promises to give, that is, in place of the Son, after he was gone to the Father, John 16:7. To this likewise I apply, what the Messiah says, Isa. 48:16, "וְרוּחַ שְׁלַחְנִי יְהוָה אִדְּנִי," which is very properly translated, "the Lord God hath sent me and his Spirit." Add the like promises Isa. 44:2, 3; and Isa. 35:7; and Joel 2:28. The fulfillment of which is in Christ, who baptizeth his people "with the Holy Ghost and with fire," Matt. 3:11, compare John 7:38, 39, of which passages we have spoken elsewhere.

XV. The effects of this Spirit are: 1st. A more clear and distinct knowledge of the mysteries of faith, Isa. 11:9, and Isa. 54:13; Jer. 31:34: 1 John 2:27. 2dly. A more generous, a more sublime, and cheerful degree of holiness, Isa. 33:24, and Isa. 35:9, and Isa. 60:21, 22: Zech. 10:5, and Zech. 12:8. 3dly. A more delightful consolation, Isa. 40:1, 2, and Isa. 60:1, 2, and Isa. 55:11, and Isa. 66:12, 13, 14; John 14:16; Acts 9:31. Eph. 1:13; 2 Cor. 1:22. 4thly, A filial boldness, which is now the greater, as adoption itself and its effects are more conspicuous, Gal. 4:6. 5thly. The extraordinary and altogether miraculous gifts which were plentifully bestowed at the beginning of the gospel, not only on the apostles, but also often to other ministers, nay, on common believers, and even virgins, Mark 16:16–18, Acts 10:45, 46, and Acts 19:6, and Acts 21:8, 1 Cor. 12:7–11. But in what manner the New Testament is to be compared with the Old, we have frequently shown already.

XVI. The Fifth benefit is Christian liberty, which Paul, the most diligent interpreter of, and warmest advocate of usually so considers, that he makes it generally to consist in a freedom from that bondage, which the Jews were under; and he rarely treats of it, unless when he compares Christians with Jews, and sets the Old dispensation in opposition to the New. Yet divines have prudently observed from Paul himself, that Christian liberty may be considered, either as

common to believers in every age; or as a special immunity of the children of God, who live under the New Testament dispensation.

XVII. This common liberty consists in a manumission or freedom, 1st. From the tyranny of the devil, whose destruction was promised, as early as in Paradise, Col. 1:13. 2dly. From the reigning and condemning power of sin, Rom. 6:14, Rom. 8:1. 3dly, From the rigour of the law, so far as it is contradistinguished from grace, Rom. 6:14. For, thus far it is to the sinner "the law of sin and death," opposite "to the law of the Spirit and of life in Christ Jesus," Rom. 8:2. Moreover this rigour consists, (1) In the severe demand it makes of obedience, without a promise of sanctifying grace. (2) In requiring a most perfect holiness, to be performed by man himself, as the condition of eternal life. (3) In threatening the curse for the least deviation. For, so far the law belongs to the covenant of works, which in regard to all believers, is abrogated, by the introduction of the covenant of grace. 4thly. In a freedom from an accursed death, both of body and soul. For though the body of believers is dead because of sin. Rom. 8:10, yet death has lost its sting, 1 Cor. 15:55, and is become the period of sin and misery, and the passage to eternal life, John 5:24. And thus far believers are freed from that death, with which God threatened sinful man, as a punishment properly so called, and the effect of his dreadful displeasure, John 8:51, 52. Nor is the formal nature of punishment only removed from the death of believers; but whatever belongs to the remains of death, will at last be destroyed by a glorious resurrection, 1 Cor. 15:54. As therefore liberty with respect to sin, as to its right, is adjudged to believers in justification, and as to its power, performed gradually and by some certain steps; the same also is the case with respect to corporal death; the curse and penalty of which so to speak, are removed, so soon as the person is ingrafted into Christ by faith, who is the fountain of life, but at the last day all its powers will be swallowed up in victory. 5thly. From human empire, or constraint with respect to divine worship, and the actions of religion, as such; for God alone has dominion over the conscience, James 4:12. Nor is it lawful for the sons of God, who know themselves to be bought with a price, to become the servants of men, 1 Cor. 7:23, Matt. 15:9, Col. 2:18, 22, 23. Though formerly the Scribes and Pharisees sat in Moses's chair, yet God never gave them a power, to load the conscience with new institutions, beyond and besides the law of God, to which all were equally bound. Deut. 4:2, and Deut. 12:34. All the authority of the doctors of the law tended to keep the people to the observance of the law of Moses; Christ justly rebuked them, when they went beyond that. Whatever man has devised from his own invention, in matters of religion, has ever been displeasing to God. 6thly. From the obligation to things indifferent, and which are neither good nor bad in themselves, and which God has neither commanded, nor forbidden. When the knowledge and sense of this liberty is wanting, the conscience in that case is disquieted, and superstition has neither measure nor end, Rom. 14:5, 14, 23. The possession, however, is to be distinguished from the use; the right from the exercise of it, the former ought ever to remain inviolable to the conscience, the latter to be circumscribed by the rules of prudence and charity, to avoid giving offence to weak brethren, 1 Cor. 6:12, and 2 Cor. 10:13, Rom. 14:19.

XVIII. The liberty, we have thus described, absolutely belongs to the benefits of the covenant of grace, and should not be reckoned among those, which are peculiar to the New Testament. Unless so far, as it is more clearly explained, more frequently insisted upon, more effectually and abundantly applied by the Spirit of Christ, and insinuated into the conscience for the greater consolation and joy, and finally demonstrated by more glorious effects. And as I imagine, none



will question, that the rigour of the old economy greatly obscured the sense and joy of that liberty, which believers in other respects enjoyed. At least none will deny, that the liberty, as to things, in their own nature indifferent, was greatly diminished by the institutions of Moses.

XIX. That liberty, therefore, which is peculiar to the New Testament is, 1st. A discharge from the bondage of the elements of the world, or of the ancient ceremonies, from whose religious obligation, as of things necessary, the consciences of men were first set free, Acts 15:10. Though their arbitrary use continued for some time, and might with prudence be advised, Acts 21:24. Afterwards their use was entirely forbid, so that now we are to abstain from them altogether, Gal. 3:25, 4:5, 6, and 5:1. For, from being in force, they first lose their vigour, of necessary become arbitrary; afterwards, from being dead they become hurtful and deadly; and from being arbitrary become unlawful, never to be revived, after the full promulgation of the gospel, and the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem, which was the seat of the ceremonies. 2dly. Liberty with respect to many things indifferent in their own nature, the use of or abstinence from which was formerly enjoined the Israelites, Tit. 1:15, Col. 2:20, 21, 1 Cor. 10:25. 3dly. Immunity from the forensic or judicial laws of the Israelites; not as they were of universal, but as of particular right or obligation, made for the Jews, as such, distinguishing them from other nations, adapted to the genius of the people and country, and subservient, for the greatest part, to the Levitical priesthood, with which almost the whole polity was interwoven. 4thly. There is a clearer and more perfect promulgation, knowledge, and practice of Christian liberty, in all its parts and degrees.

XX. Sixthly. We may reckon among the benefits of the New Testament the restoration of the Israelites, who were formerly rejected, and the bringing them back to the communion of God in Christ. Paul has unfolded this mystery to the Gentiles, Rom. 11:25–27: "For, I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery (lest ye should be wise in your own conceits), that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved; at it is written, There shall come out of Sion the deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob. For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins."

XXI. On this place observe, 1st. That the apostle here explains some mystery; that is, a secret thing, not known but by revelation, and taken notice of by few, and happening beyond the expectation and judgment of reason; in fine, the whole method and manner of executing which, lies in a great measure concealed; see 1 Cor. 2:7, 15:51, and Eph. 3:3. 2dly. That it is the interest of the Gentiles to be acquainted with this mystery, to prevent their entertaining higher thoughts concerning themselves, and lower concerning the Israelites: we are therefore to take care to enquire diligently, and with attention, into what the prophets have foretold concerning this matter. 3dly. The apostle here speaks of the people of Israel, not figuratively but properly so called; who were at this time blind, obdurate, stupid, and hardened, of which ver. 7. Isaiah foretold this judgment of God against Israel at large, chap. 6:9, 10, compared with Acts 28:26, Isa. 29:10, 11. To this also seems applicable, that whirlwind of the Lord, that fury, and continuing whirlwind, which shall abide on the head of the wicked, of which Jer. 30:23. In short, this is that forlorn condition of the blinded nation of Jews, which taking its rise in the apostles' time, continues to this our day. 4thly. That this blindness is in part happened to Israel. The whole nation, from its first origin even to the end of the world, is considered as one whole; a certain

part of which are those, who either have, or now do, or hereafter shall live in the days of the wrath and indignation of God: blindness has seized that part only. 5thly. That blindness is to continue upon them no longer, than till the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; that is, till the Gospel is preached among all nations of the world whatever. Which, indeed, began to be done by the apostles and their fellow-labourers; but could not be done perfectly, both on account of the extent of the world, and the shortness of human life, and likewise because many nations (as all the American) were at that time unknown. This therefore still remains to be done successively; God, in his admirable providence, paving the way for his word. The offer of grace was first made to the Israelites. When they refused it, it was sent to the Gentiles; but when the fulness of them shall be brought in, it will be again given to the Israelites, "that the last may be first, and the first last," Luke 13:30; see Luke 21:24. 6thly. That when the fulness of the Gentiles is brought in, all Israel shall be saved; that is, as our Dutch commentators well observe, not a few, but a very great number, and in a manner the whole Jewish nation, in a full body. Peter Martyr has judiciously explained the fulness of the Gentiles, and the whole body of Israel, in the following words: "But we are to understand a limited fulness, and a fixed or determined collection; which is therefore called fulness, because there will be an exact and a very great number of believers, so that the church shall be publicly owned, and had in great esteem among the Gentiles, just as all Israel is to be taken for a great number of Jews, among whom Christ should be publicly acknowledged; not that some, as well of the Gentiles as Jews, shall not be lost."

XXII. From what we have said before, it appears, that they depart from the apostle's meaning, who, by all Israel, understand the mystical Israel, or the people of God, consisting both of Jews and Gentiles, without admitting the conversion of the whole Jewish nation to Christ, in the sense we have mentioned. Notwithstanding this may be confirmed by the following arguments. 1st. The apostle speaks of that Israel, to whom he ascribes his own pedigree, ver. 1; whom he calls his flesh, that is, his kindred, ver. 14, and the natural branches, ver. 21; whom he constantly distinguishes from the Gentiles; to whom, he testifies, blindness is happened. All this is applicable to Israel properly so called. 2dly. He lays before us a mystery; but it was no mystery, that a very few Jews were converted to Christ together with the Gentiles; for we have daily instances of that. 3dly. He reminds the Gentiles, not to exult over, or despise the Jews, from this argument, that, as they themselves were now taken in among the people of God, so, in like manner, the Jews were in due time to be taken in again. But if the apostle meant, that the body of the Jewish nation was to continue in their hardness; and but a few of them to be saved, who, joined to the Gentiles, should form a mystical Israel, the whole of that discourse would be more adapted to the commendation of the Gentiles, than of the Israelites; and encourage, rather than repress, the pride of the Gentiles. 4thly. As the fall and diminishing of Israel, ver. 12, and their casting away, ver. 15, are to be understood; so likewise the receiving and saving them; for here the rules of a just opposition must be observed. But the fall, diminishing, and casting away of Israel, are to be understood of the generality of the Jewish nation; therefore, the receiving and saving of Israel in like manner.

XXIII. From which it is evident, that Grotius trifles, when he is positive, that this prophecy was fulfilled, at that time, when the idols and military ensigns of the Romans were openly seen in the temple; because, that then many who had embraced Christianity, together with those who had been Christians before, were exempted from the following calamities. To which was added the conversion of many Jews, upon the destruction of the city and temple, since now the truth of

Christ's predictions appeared in a much clearer light, and the galling yoke of personal bondage had broke the obstinacy of many, as Vespasian and Titus put no bar in the way; for proving this he quotes a passage from Justin, adversus Tryphonem. But such absurd imaginations are contrary to the light of all history. For, during the siege, the whole of the Jewish nation, which was all over plunged in their guilt and perfidy, were made to suffer the just punishment of their sins. Which is very far from that salvation, which Paul here assures us of. If any joined the Christians at that time, their number was so inconsiderable, compared with the rest, as, that it is ludicrous to give them the name of all Israel. Justin says nothing, but that some of them, being daily instructed in the name of Christ, had quitted the way of error; which differs very much from all Israel. We may add, that by that fancy of Grotius, the times of casting away and receiving are entirely confounded. For never was the breaking off and cutting away the natural branches more palpably seen, according to the Baptist's prophecy, Matt. 3:10, than at that time that Grotius imagines they were grafted in.

XXIV. In fine, the prophetic testimony, alleged by the apostle from Isa. 59:20, confirms our explanation; where the Hebrew words properly denote, the Redeemer shall come לְצִיּוֹן, to Zion; or, according to the Septuagint, ἐνεκεν Σιών, on account of Zion, and unto them that turn from defection in Jacob. Paul, generally following the Septuagint, has rendered the words somewhat differently, but to the same purpose and meaning.

XXV. Observe, 1st. That the apostle here very justly explains Zion and Jacob of the Jews; for these are the natural sons of Jacob, natives, citizens of Zion; the others are only naturalized, that name therefore primarily, and of itself, agrees to them. And then also he speaks of those with whom the covenant was made; as it is said in the text, ver. 21, "This is my covenant with them:" but that testament and covenant belong to Israel, "whose are the covenants and promises," Rom. 9:4; see Lev. 26:44, 45. Moreover, Zion and Jacob denote, not some few of Israel, but the whole body of that notion, as Gen. 49:7. For in Zion all the tribes had a right, Ps. 122:4.

XXVI. 2dly. The גּוֹאֵל Goel is promised to Zion, that is, the Kinsman-Redeemer, who can justly say these are mine, and that in right of consanguinity, for I am the nearest kinsman. True it is, Christ may be called the Goel and near kinsman of all nations, on account of his being of the same human nature with them, which he assumed; yet he is chiefly and first of all the Goel of Israel, because of them are the fathers, of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, Rom. 9:5. And therefore, perhaps, the apostle said, the Redeemer shall come out of Zion; for as the relation, which is expressed by the term Goel, could not be set forth by the Greek ῥυόμενος, he was willing, by this means, to make up the imperfection of the Greek language, by intimating, that the Redeemer was in such a manner to come to Zion, as at the same time, with respect to his human nature, to come out of Zion. The advent of the deliverer supposes also such a time, in which other lords, besides Jehovah, were to rule over Zion, Isa. 26:13, from whose illegal dominion he was, with a stretched-out arm, to set free and deliver his people.

XXVII. 3dly. The work of this redeemer will be to turn away iniquity from Jacob. In the Hebrew it runs, "he shall come to those that return from defection." The meaning is the same; he will impart his grace and salvation to those who, by a true faith and repentance, shall return unto God. And as they cannot give this repentance to themselves, the Redeemer will bestow it upon them, see Acts 5:31. Not only the Greeks have thus rendered the words of the prophet, but also also the

Chaldee, "and to turn the rebellious of the house of Jacob to the law." And to this purpose is what follows in Isaiah 59:21, concerning giving the Spirit of God in Israel, and the putting his word in their mouth. The sum of the whole is, that, by the efficacy of the Redeemer, the Jews are in due time to be converted from their rebellion and transgressions.

XXVIII. 4thly. As this is not yet accomplished as to the whole body of the Israelites, and yet the Scripture must be fulfilled, the apostle has justly inferred, that in the last times it will be perfectly fulfilled. For, seeing the foundation thereof is God's covenant with Israel, and this a firm covenant, stable, immutable, and suspended on no ambiguous condition (for what condition could that covenant admit, which allots both remission of sins and repentance to Israel?) it is not possible, but that every thing shall happen exactly according to the promise and prediction. And this is my covenant with them, saith God. But concerning this covenant he speaks as follows, Isa. 54:10: "For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith Jehovah, that hath mercy on thee." And again, Jer. 33:25, 26: "Thus saith Jehovah, if my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth, then I will cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant." Add Ps. 105:8, 9, and Deut. 4:31. All this being addressed to the whole body of the nation, it must of necessity be fulfilled at the appointed time.

XXIX. 5thly. But because some perhaps might think, that those horrid crimes, of which the Israelites had been guilty, might hinder that blessing of God from coming to them; the apostle adds a testimony whereby God promises to take away their sins, which cannot but be accompanied with repentance and faith in the Messiah, and the communication of his grace. True, indeed, it is, we have not those words in Isa. 54. But yet they are in Isa. 27:9, where the Greek Version has the very words, ὅταν ἀφελωμαι τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν. It is not unusual with the apostle to collect several testimonies into one, and to explain the words of one passage by those of another. And indeed this observation was of great importance; for, if any thing should seem to stand in the way of the restoration of the Jews, it was their extreme impiety. Wherefore there are frequent promises concerning the expiation of the crimes they had committed, as Deut. 32:43, Jer. 33:8, and Jer. 50:20.

XXX. Some perhaps may say, are there not clearer expressions in proof of this matter in the prophets? Why then does the apostle pitch upon these, the force and cogency of which does not at first sight appear? I answer, there are such, which we shall presently produce: but here the supreme and admirable wisdom of the Holy Spirit shines forth, partly because by selecting these he would bring us to consider entire prophecies, which, as it were, he points out to us, and of such a nature, as to give full conviction of this matter. Partly that, by arguing from prophecies less evident, he might constrain us to give credit to such as are more clear and express. For who will take upon him to wrest to a different meaning such evident testimonies, as by the very sound of their words lead to this sense, when he observes, that Paul draws his reasons from such as seemed much more remote from the purpose?

XXXI. Should any one desire clearer testimonies, we offer the following to his consideration: from Moses, Lev. 26:41–45; Deut. 4:30, 31; Deut. 30:1–6; and Deut. 32:43. From the Psalms, Ps. 102:14–18, and Ps. 85:9, 10. From Isaiah, Isa. 11:11, 12; Isa. 19:24, 25; Isa. 49:14, &c.; Isa. 62 throughout. From Jeremiah, Jer. 3:18, &c.; Jer. 31:1, and from ver. 31 to the end; Jer. 32:37, &c.;

Jer. 33:24–26. From Ezekiel, Ezek. 36:24, to the end; Ezek. 37 throughout, especially from ver. 15; Ezek. 39:25, to the end. Add Hosea 3:5. All these promises are more sublime, than that the time can be assigned, in which they can be supposed to have been as yet fulfilled. From the New Testament, add Matt. 23:29; Luke 21:24; 2 Cor. 3:16. The reader may please to see what we have said on this head in a particular book concerning the ten tribes of Israel, from chap. 9. to the end; where he will find most of those prophecies carefully, and at greater length explained.

XXXII. From all this it is evident, we are to expect the general conversion of the Israelites in time to come, not indeed of every individual, but of the whole body of the nation, and of the twelve tribes. We choose not to multiply minute questions, either out of curiosity or incredulity, concerning the time, place, manner, means, and the like circumstances of this mystery, which God has reserved in his own power. Let us maintain the thing itself, and leave the manner of it to God. We shall then best of all understand those obscure prophecies which describe it, when we shall be able to compare the event with them. Our Calvin, as his manner is, speaks with prudence and gravity: "Whenever the longer delay is apt to throw us into despair, let us recollect the word mystery, by which Paul clearly puts us in mind that this conversion is not to be in the ordinary or usual manner. And therefore they act amiss who attempt to measure it by their own private sentiments. For what more perverse than to account incredible what falls not in with our opinion? Being therefore called a mystery, because incomprehensible, until the time of its revelation. Moreover, it is revealed to us, as it was to the Romans, that our faith, acquiescing in the word, may support our expectation, until the effect itself be made manifest." We shall conclude these things with the wish and words of Maimonides, at the end of his More Nevochim. "But may the great and good God himself purify all Israel, according to his promise; then the eyes of the blind will be opened. The people sitting in darkness have seen a great light: to those who sat in the shadow of death the light is arisen."

XXXIII. Lastly, To this restoration of Israel shall be joined the riches of the whole church, and, as it were, life from the dead, Rom. 11:12: "Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness!" and ver. 15: "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" The apostle intimates that much greater and more extensive benefits shall redound to the Christian church from the fulness and restoration of the Jews, than did to the Gentiles from their fall and diminution, greater, I say, intensively, or with respect to degrees, and larger with respect to extent.

XXXIV. As to intenseness or degrees, it is supposed that, about the time of the conversion of the Jews, the Gentile world will be like a dead person, in a manner almost as Christ describes the church of Sardis, Rev. 3:1, 2; namely, both that light of saving knowledge, and that fervent piety, and that lively and vigorous simplicity of ancient Christianity, will, in a course of years, be very much impaired. Many nations, who had formerly embraced the Gospel with much zeal, afterwards almost to be extinguished by the venom of Mahometanism, popery, libertinism, and atheism, would verify this prophecy; but, upon the restoration of the Jews, these will suddenly arise, as out of the grave; a new light will shine upon them, a new zeal be kindled up; the life of Christ be again manifested in his mystical body, more lively, perhaps, and vigorous than ever. Then, doubtless, many scripture prophecies will, after their accomplishment, be better understood; and such as now appear dark riddles shall then be found to contain a most distinct

description of facts; many candles joined together give a greater light; a new fire laid near another gives a greater heat. And such will the accession of the Jews be to the church of the Gentiles.

XXXV. And not only so, but also many nations, among whom the name of Christ had long before been forgotten, shall be seen to flock again to the standard of salvation then erected. For there is a certain fulness of the Gentiles, to be gathered together by the successive preaching of the Gospel, which goes before the restoration of Israel, of which ver. 25; and another richness of the Gentiles, that comes after the recovery of Israel. For, while the Gospel for many ages was published now to this, then to that nation, others gradually departed from Christ; but when the fulness of the Jews is come, it is altogether probable that these nations will in great numbers return to Christ. An almost innumerable multitude of Jews reside in Asia, and Africa, among the Persians, Turks, Indians, Chinese, Japanese, and Tartars. When, therefore, by the almighty hand of God, these shall be brought to the communion of the Messiah, their love to him will be the more ardent, as their hatred against him had been formerly more bitter. And is it not more than probable, that the nations, among whom they live, being excited by their example and admonitions, shall come into the fellowship of the same faith? Certainly the words of the apostle lead us to this.

XXXVI. Agreeably to which James has said, Acts 15:15–17: "And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down, and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doth all these things. The reparation of the fallen tabernacle of David signifies the restoration of true and spiritual worship, among the Israelites. And when that shall come to pass, the rest of mankind who never gave up their names to Christ, and the nations upon whom his name was formerly called, but who, by their thoughtlessness, lost the benefit of the gospel, will then with emulation seek the Lord.

XXXVII. And what is more evident than that prophecy in Isaiah? The prophet, chap. 59:20, 21, having foretold the restoration of Israel, according to the apostles commentary, immediately, chap. 60:1, exclaims, "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of Jehovah is risen upon thee:" ver. 3, "And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising," &c. Moreover, the riches of the church at that time are described, ver. 17, "for brass I will bring gold, and for iron I will bring silver, and for wood brass, and for stones iron;" the most magnificent words to the same purpose, follow these. From the consideration of which Peter Martyr has said, "that, indeed, according to almost all the prophets, especially Isaiah, the happiness of the church will be great; which it has not yet attained to, but it is probable that it will then (on the conversion of the Jews) attain to it. We have not, indeed, the least doubt, that there are many prophecies, both in the Old and New Testament, to this purpose, the full meaning of which we ardently pray the Supreme Being may teach his people by the event, the only undoubted interpreter of prophecies. It is, however, our duty to be modest on the head, and not rashly intrude into the secrets of providence, nor boldly abuse, what we are neither allowed to know, nor suffered to search into.

## CHAPTER XVI: Of Baptism

I. THE ordinary sacraments of the New Testament are only two; baptism, and the Lord's supper. These are signalized by the express institution of our king. These were made use of by our Lord himself, to set us an example, and by this use they were consecrated to the elect. These are recommended to the Corinthians, as excellent privileges of the New Testament church, and two like them, but of an extraordinary nature, were granted to Israel in the wilderness, 1 Cor. 10:1–4. These are held forth by the apostle, 1 Cor. 12:13, as sacred seals of the union and communion of believers, both with Christ, and with one another; and if there were any more of the kind, the apostle, according to his usual accuracy and diligence, would not have passed them over in silence. These, in short, are sufficient to signify and seal the fulness of grace we have in Christ. For, as two things are requisite to complete our happiness: first, our being absolved from our sins, and washed from our pollution, that we may be regenerated by the communication of the Spirit of Christ to a new life of grace: and then nourished in that life of grace, that is, sustained, strengthened, and increased therein, until we be promoted to the life of glory; both these are sufficiently confirmed to us by these two sacraments. Our first engrafting into Christ, and our regeneration by his Spirit, are set forth by baptism, and the nourishment of our spiritual life by the holy supper.

II. Concerning both these sacraments of the New Testament, we are to observe that something corresponding to them, but only of ecclesiastical use, not of divine institution, was practised by the ancient Israelites. And herein the Lord Jesus discovers his exceeding great wisdom and goodness, that he would not discompose the weak minds of his people by too much innovation, but retained the ancient rites, established them by his own authority, and rendered them more illustrious, by their signifying the most noble and mystical things, which depended wholly on his own institution.

III. And with respect to baptism, of which we are first to speak, it appears that there was a two-fold baptism in use among the Jews; the one of which they called נדה טבילה, the baptism of uncleanness, or of Lustration, whereby legal uncleanness was washed away; the other נדוה טבילה, the baptism of Proselytism or initiation, whereby those of the Gentiles, who were converted to Judaism, were initiated into the church of Israel. Omitting the former, which is not so material to the present subject, we shall mention a few things concerning the latter.

IV. When a Gentile was received into the Israelitish covenant, and as the Jews speak became a Proselyte of righteousness, three ceremonies of initiation were used, without which even the Israelites themselves, according to their received notion, could not enter into that covenant; to wit, וקרבן טבילה מילה, circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice. And the Jewish masters have fixed it as a law, that this baptism is so necessary, that without it, as much as without circumcision, there can be no proselytism; but this along with sacrifice is all the initiation that is necessary in the case of a female Proselyte.

V. The manner of baptism among the Israelites was this. 1st. They examined the proselyte, who was to be initiated, with respect to the sincerity of his conversion to Judaism: whether he desired to make a profession thereof, from the hopes of riches or honours in a flourishing republic; or from fear; or from affection for an Israelitess; or any other such like motive that was not good.

And after he declared that his motive was the alone regard he had for God, and an unfeigned love to the divine law, they instructed him in the several articles thereof; as concerning the unity of God, the abominable nature of idolatry, the reward of obedience, and concerning the future world, and other heads of their divinity. Which after he solemnly professed to receive, without the least exception, he was directly circumcised. 2dly. After the wound of circumcision was perfectly healed, he was led to baptism; which was not performed, but in the presence of Triumvirs, or three men, who were the disciples of the wise לְדוֹן כְּשָׂרִים, who could exercise judgments, that is, Israelites of the purest blood. It was their business not only to take care that every thing was duly performed, and to testify concerning this due performance, according to the practice of their ancestors; but further to instruct the person to be baptized, and already placed in the water, concerning some more, and some less, important precepts of the law. Such Triumvirs are generally in Scripture called Elohim. Christ in like manner declares, that in the baptism of the New Testament, the Elohim are present, Matt. 28:19, who are called the three witnesses in heaven. 1 John 5:7. 3dly. It was unlawful to administer baptism but in מֵיִם טְקוּהָה, a natural current, or collection of waters; as a river, lake, fountain: because, according to them, none could be duly baptized in water fetched from any place, and received in artificial receptacles. 4thly. The entire body was to be plunged at once: for if but the tip of a finger was undipt, such a person was accounted to remain still in his uncleanness. Yet it was not necessary that the person to be baptized should put off all his clothes, provided they were such, as the water could easily penetrate. 5thly. But we are especially to observe, that even little children were baptized, generally at the same time with their parents. For thus it is said in Talmud. Babylon. Tit. Erub. fol. 11, c. 1. "They baptize the little young proselyte in consequence of the mind of the Sanhedrim."

VI. The effect of this initiation was, 1st. That the person so baptized, being taken out from among the body of the Gentiles, was accounted בְּרִיית בֶּן a son of the covenant, who was permitted to come, and have a safe retreat, under the wings of the Divine Majesty. 2dly. He was looked upon as one that was new born. Hence that common saying in the Talmud, "Whenever one becomes a proselyte, he is accounted an infant newly born." For they suppose that some new soul, instead of his Gentile soul, is sent down from some palace in heaven, into the body of the proselyte, after he is once come under the wings of the Divine Majesty, and honoured with his kiss. Assertions, which either have no meaning, or enigmatically signify regeneration by the Spirit of God. 3dly. The consequence of this regeneration was a new kindred; so that he was not to look upon his former relatives (as brothers, sisters, parents, children) as belonging to him; nay, after this regeneration, he was to have no more any heathen kindred, or stand related to those born in the time of Gentilism; just as, by the imperial law, all servile relation ceased upon manumission. Hence Tacitus says, Hist. lib. v. "Nor do they entertain any notion more than that of making no account of their parents, children, brethren." With which may be compared Luke 14:26.

VII. They make the first practice of this baptism to be very ancient. Some ascribe it to the patriarch Jacob, when he received into his family and domestic church the Shechemite young women and other Gentiles, who resided with him: because it is said, Gen. 35:2, "Then Jacob said unto his household, and to all that were with him, Put away the strange gods that are among you, הִטְהַרְרָה, and be clean, and change your garments." Where Aben Ezra explains the words, be clean, by the washing of the body. Others derive the first testimony, or practice of this baptism, from



what is said to Moses, *Exod. 19:20*: "Go unto the people, and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes." And again, *ver. 14*, "And he sanctified the people, and they washed their clothes." Thus they would have the washing of the persons to be included in, or set forth by, the washing of their clothes. But these things are uncertain. They would have spoken more to the purpose, had they observed with Paul, that the "Israelites were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea," *1 Cor. 10:1, 2*, of which we have formerly spoken at large. It is more probable, what they say elsewhere, that in the time of David and Solomon, when the republic of Israel was in its most flourishing state, a great number of proselytes were initiated by baptism. Whoever would know more of this baptism, and learn the testimonies of the Jews themselves, may consult Selden, *de jure Nat. and Gent. lib. 2, cap. 2 and 4*; as also *de Successionibus ad leges Hebræor. c. 26*. And again *de Synedriis lib. 1. c. 3*; and Lightfoot on *Matt. 3:6*. Also *Altingii dissertat. de Proselytis, Thes. 27 seq.*

VIII. But whatever be the case as to the antiquity of that rite, no divine institution can be assigned for it prior to John, the harbinger of Christ, who was sent by God to baptize. For this was expressly given him in charge, "the word of the Lord came unto John." *Luke 3:2, John 1:33*. From this, however, it appears whence it arose that the Scribes and Pharisees are never said to have found fault with John for his baptism, but that they only asked him, by what and whose authority, he baptized? *John 1:25*: hence also it was that such numbers of people flocked to his baptism: for he was celebrated both for his piety and doctrine; nor did he use a new rite; he taught that the kingdom of heaven, which was ardently longed for and expected by all at that time, was at hand; exhorted every one that came to him, to suffer himself to be initiated therein, as it was now at the door, by taking upon him his baptism, and by a profession of repentance. From that time baptism was of divine institution among the Jews.

IX. But it was not yet a sacrament of the New Testament: for as the whole of John's ministry was, as it were, something intermediate between both Testaments, and tended to prepare the way for the Lord, the author and herald of the New Testament: so in like manner his baptism initiated the penitent and believing into the kingdom of heaven; which indeed was near, but not yet actually come. *Mark 1:2–8*. Hence Tertullian, *adversus Marcionem, lib. 4. c. 33*, calls John "the boundary set between the Old and New, at which Judaism should terminate, and from which Christianity should begin." Nazianzenus also, *Orat. 39, quæ est in Sancta lumina*, calls him "the middle person between the Old and New Testaments." Yet his ministry belonged rather to the New, than to the Old Testament: as a forerunner is rightly judged to be of and with that king, whom he precedes. Whence the baptism of John is by the author of *Quest. ad Orthodoxos*, which we have in Justin Martyr's works, *Quest. 37*, called the prelude or introduction to the gospel of grace. To which that baptism came nearest, which John administered unto the faith of the Messiah, now present, and manifesting himself to Israel. *John 1:29, 31*.

X. I take the first baptism of the New Testament to have been that which was administered by Christ's disciples, at the command of their master, for a confession of the presence of the Messiah. *John 3:22*. Yet at that time it was confined for the most part to the Jews. But it was made a sacrament of the universal church, after the New Testament was sealed by Christ's blood, and confirmed by his resurrection, to be preached all over the world by the apostles, who were very soon to be baptized with the Holy Ghost. *Matt. 28:19*.

XI. John's baptism differed from that administered by Christ's disciples, not in essence, but in circumstances only. For 1st. Both were from heaven, and grounded on God's command: which we are sure of with respect to Christ's baptism, and as to John's appears from John 1:33, Luke 7:30, Matt. 21:25. 2dly. In both there was a dipping in water, Matt. 3:11. Acts 8:36. 3dly. Both administered into the faith and confession of Christ. Acts 19:4, 5. 4thly. Both were a sign and seal of the remission of sins. Matt. 3:6, Luke 3:3, Acts 2:38. 5thly. In the participation of both, there was an obligation to repentance on the person: see the last text. Nevertheless they differ, 1st. In that John's baptism was indeed from God, but not from Christ, as the incarnate mediator, acting as the king of his church. 2dly. In that, as we have said, it was rather a preparation for, than a sacrament of the New Testament. Basil in his treatise *quomodo baptizetur aliquis* baptizate, *quod est in Evangelio Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, How a person is baptized with the baptism which is in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, distinguishing between John's and Christ's baptism, ingeniously writes, "the baptism of the former was introductory, or initiatory; that of the latter, perfective." 3dly. In that God communicated therein a more sparing measure of the Spirit; whereas in the beginning of the Gospel, the gift of tongues and prophecy, which in Scripture comes under the appellation Spirit, was conferred on very many who were baptized with Christ's baptism.

XII. But we are principally to treat concerning this baptism which has Christ for its author. For the fuller understanding of which we are distinctly to explain, 1. The external sign. 2. The spiritual thing signified. In the sign we are to distinguish between the element and the ceremony, or sacred rite employed about the element. The element here to be used is true, plain, natural water: such as John baptized with, Matt. 3:6, 16, John 3:23; the apostles and others, as Acts 8:28, and Acts 10:40. Accordingly, Eph. 5:26, it is called "the washing of water." The sacred rite consists. 1. In the application of the water to the body of the person to be baptized. 2. In pronouncing a certain form of words.

XIII. Concerning the former it is queried, whether baptism may be duly administered by immersion only, or also by effusion of the water out of a vessel, or by aspersion or sprinkling? To which we answer in the following positions. 1st, It is certain, that both John and the disciples of Christ ordinarily used dipping; whose example was followed by the ancient church, as Vossius, *Disput. 1. de baptismo*, Thes. 6, and Hoornbeck *de baptismo Veterum*, sect. iv. have shown from many testimonies both of the Greeks and Latins. 2dly, It cannot be denied, but the native signification of the words, βάπτειν and βαπτίζειν, is to plunge or dip; so as to be altogether something more than ἐπιπολάζειν, to float on the surface; but less than δύνειν, to go to the bottom and perish, as Vossius remarks, Thes. 1. *ibid.* However, I have observed, that the term κατάδύσις, going to the bottom, is frequently used by the ancients in the matter of baptism. Athanasius, quest. 94, "τὸ καταδύσαι τὸ παιδίον ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρα, &c. the going down or dipping of the child in the bath." And Sozomen, lib. vi. c. xxvi. has charged Eunomius with heresy, for teaching that "the sacrament of baptism ought to be performed by once dipping." Similar examples are everywhere to be met with. Salmasius, in his observations on Sulpicius Severus, *de Vita Martini*, c. xv. has made the following observation, "Βάπτειν, from which Βαπτίζειν, signifies immersion, not aspersion; nor did the ancients baptize any but by dipping, either once or thrice, except clinics, or persons confined to a sick bed, because these were baptized in a manner they could bear; not in an entire font, as they who put their head under water, but their body was sprinkled all over," Cypr. iv. epist. vii. "Thus when Novatus, in his

sickness, received baptism, he was but sprinkled all over," Euseb. vi. Hist. c. xliii. Nor are we to conceal, 3dly, That there is a greater copiousness of signification, and a fuller similitude, between the sign and the thing signified in immersion, as we shall show when we come to that point. 4thly, Nay, that immersion may be performed in cold countries, without any great danger of health and life, appears from the example of the Russians, who plunge the children that are to be baptized three times all over; not believing, that baptism can be duly performed any other way, and never use lukewarm water but for persons infirm; as the Muscovite writers relate at large, in Georgiis Fenlavii, Annotationes ad Enchiridion Christophori Angeli de Statu hodiernorum Græcorum, p. 470, seq. 5thly, But, that if cold water should be thought more inconvenient or dangerous, it may be warmed, which the said Christophorus Angelus testifies, c. xxiv. is done among the Greeks. "The Greeks (says he) keep in their churches a kind of large vessels called baptisteries, that is, vessels so large as are sufficient to admit the infant to be plunged all over therein. When therefore any child is to be dipped in this font, 'the relations of the infant first of all warm the water with some odoriferous herbs.' And if the water was in like manner warmed in our climate, there would seem to be no such great hazard in the dipping of persons to be baptized."

XIV. 6thly, But then we are not to imagine, that immersion is so necessary to baptism, as that it cannot be duly performed by pouring water all over, or by aspersion; for, both the method of pouring, and that of aspersion, are not without arguments for them. 1st, Though we find the apostles dipped, it does not follow they always observed this method. It is more probable, the three thousand who were baptized in one day, Acts 2:41, had the water poured or sprinkled on them, rather than that they were dipped. For it is not likely, that men who were so much employed in preaching as the apostles were, could have leisure for so tedious an immersion of so many thousands. Nor is it probable, that Cornelius, Lydia, and the jailer, who were baptized in private houses with their families, had baptistries at hand in which they could be plunged all over. Instances of pouring the water over persons are brought from antiquity by Vossius, Disput. 1. de Baptis. Th. 9. which Joshua Arndius, without mentioning Vossius, has inserted in the same order in his Lexicon Antiquitat. Ecclesiast. p. 66. 2dly, Though βαπτίζειν, properly signifies to plunge or dip, yet it is also more generally used for any washing, as Luke 11:38. Well therefore says Dominicus a Soto, Distinct. 3. Quest. un. Art. 7: "In baptism there is something essential, as the washing, according to Eph. 5:26, where the apostle calls baptism, 'the washing of water,' something accidental, namely, the washing in this or the other manner." 3dly, The thing signified by baptism is explained both in the Old and New Testament by the terms of pouring water over, and of aspersion: concerning pouring water over, see Isa. 44:3: concerning aspersion, Isa. 52:15; Ezek. 36:25. Heb. 12:24; 1 Peter. 1:2. I deny not, that in these quotations, there is an allusion to the Levitical sprinklings; yet from them it appears, that the application of the blood and Spirit of Christ which believers of the New Testament enjoy, is properly shadowed forth by the rite of aspersion. To this the apostle leads us in express terms, Heb. 9:13, 14: "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ purge your conscience from dead works?" 4thly, We add, that the whole nature of the New Testament, which is wholly made up of mildness and liberty, frees the tender age of infants to be baptized, especially in northernly climates, from the necessity of being stripped naked and plunged all over. Though that possibly might be done without hazard of life, yet not without some other inconvenience. 5thly, Others add, that in ancient times, in which candour and simplicity flourished more, the persons to be

baptized were, without any indecency, stripped naked; yet afterwards, as the lewdness of others, so of those on whom it was incumbent to administer baptism increased, experience clearly testifying it to the whole world, this could no longer be done with decency; and therefore, for five centuries back, that custom has been gradually discontinued almost all over the west. See Vossius in the place already quoted, who has this from Josephus Vicecomes, de ritibus Baptismi, lib. iv. c. x, 15: to whom, however, Gisbert Voetius, a divine of immortal memory, opposes his learned considerations, Polit. Eccles. t. p. 690, proving, by no contemptible arguments against Vicecomes and Vossius, that the baptism of persons half naked did not obtain in the ancient church. But though this act of stripping should be more reserved and modest than is usually represented by painters; yet on account of the depravity of men, the rite of affusion or aspersion seems safer, for which no such naked exposure of the body is requisite. From all which we conclude, that the Latins were very unkindly, and therefore without reason, called by some Greeks in the council of Florence anabaptists, because they did not go into the water and were plunged. See the history of that council, sect. xi. c. xi.

XV. Whether immersion or aspersion be done once or thrice, I take not to be material, as we have no precept of our Lord concerning this. Yet the trine immersion was more usual among the ancients, who also therein placed some mystery. For thereby they would have it to signify, 1st, A confession of the adorable Trinity, in whose name baptism was submitted to. 2dly, "The death and resurrection of Christ after three days," as Athanasius speaks, quest. 94. 3dly, Ambrose adds a third reason but of less weight, lib. ii. de Sacram. c. vii.: "Thou hast plunged for the third time, that the third confession might wipe away the manifold failures of thy former life." But afterwards in Spain, while the Arians numbered the immersions, in order to divide the divinity, Leander, bishop of Seville, consulted Gregory II. bishop of Rome, about the question concerning the trine or single immersion, who answered, that though the church of Rome dipped thrice, yet the church of Spain would rather be content with a single immersion; and it was decreed in the fourth council of Toledo, in the year 633, that it should be so; where Canon v. or according to another edition, Canon vi. "both is accounted right, and both irreprovable in the holy church of God." Yet the mystery of this simple sacrament is preferable; that every one may see the unity of the Godhead, and the trinity of persons therein. "The unity, when we dip once; the Trinity, while we baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost:" See Vossius, Disput. 2. de Baptis.; and Forbes, lib. x. c. v. § 48, seq.

XVI. Indeed, it is not proper to administer baptism without some words, by which the mystery of it may be briefly explained, according to that well known saying of Augustine, "Take away the word, and what is the water, but water only?" Yet we are far from thinking, that Christ prescribed a form of words, which all were to make use of at all times and in all places. Christ indeed commanded to baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but not precisely to say, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, &c. The apostles are said "to have baptized in the name of Jesus," Acts 2:38; 8:16; 19:5; and yet it does not follow, that they used this form, "I baptize thee in the name of Jesus." But as baptism ought by all means to be performed in the name of the Sacred Trinity, to whose obedience and worship we are consecrated by the washing of water, it also seems necessary in the administration of it, to make either an explicit or at least an implicit mention of the Trinity. Nor is it to be doubted, but he maintains some mischievous error, who refuses to follow a custom received by all the Christian world, and probably derived from apostolic example. But I dare not absolutely condemn the baptism administered and

received in the name of Christ, without any mention of the Father and the Holy Spirit, both because the baptism of the apostles is described in those words by Luke, and because, as Basil has ingeniously observed, *de Spiritu Sancto*, "To name Christ is to confess the whole Trinity; for this sets forth both God who anoints, the Son who is anointed, and the unction, even the Holy Ghost." We have something like this in Ambrose, *de Spir. Sancta*, lib. i. c. iii. quoted also by Peter Lombard, *Sentent. lib. iv. distinct. iii.* where he treats of the form of baptism. Neither is it an improper observation, that there is some difference in the case of baptized persons, who, from Judaism, and of those who from Gentilism, embraced Christianity; for is it proper that the Gentiles, who are converted from idols to the true God, to that God, I say, who by the distinction of the three persons in one essence, is discriminated from those that are not gods, should be baptized into the express confession of the Trinity; but as the God of the ancient Israelites and of the Christians is one and the same, the professing the Lord Jesus seems to have been sufficient in the baptism of the Israelites. And it is possibly for this reason enjoined Matt. 28, that the Gentiles should be baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but the Jews, either such by birth, or formerly become such by professing the Jewish religion, are said to be baptized in the name of Jesus.

XVII. Peter, 1 Eph. 3:21, gives us to know that baptism is a kind of type or figure, which signifies to commemorate and teach something more heavenly and sublime. And therefore having explained what is external and sensible, we are now to treat of the spiritual thing signified, which may be considered either generally or particularly.

XVIII. The thing signified by baptism in general, is the reception into the covenant of grace, as administered under the New Testament. As circumcision was the sign and seal of the Old Testament, Gen. 17:11, so baptism, which succeeds circumcision, Col. 2:11, is the sign of the new covenant, and, as Basil speaks, the inviolable seal thereof. Moreover that reception into the covenant of grace imports two things. 1st. Communion with Christ and his mystical body, and consequently a participation of all his benefits. 2dly. An engagement to incumbent duty. Both are signified and sealed by baptism. In respect of the former, we are said "to be baptized into one body," 1 Cor. 12:13, and "saved by baptism," Tit. 3:5, 1 Pet. 3:21. With respect to the latter, baptism is called *συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεόν*, "the answer of a good conscience towards God," 1 Pet. 3:21.

XIX. A passage certainly that merits an accurate explication. Therefore we shall first show what is a good conscience; then what *ἐπερώτημα*, answer, imports; lastly to what the words *εἰς Θεόν*, towards God, are to be referred, whether to *ἐπερώτημα*, answer, or to a good conscience. A conscience is good in a two-fold respect: 1st. Sincerely good, when it faithfully, in God's name, lays before a man what is to be done and what to be avoided, and continually excites him to the careful practice of holiness. 2dly. Cheerfully good, when it makes him joyful, by giving him the testimony of a sincere holiness. And therefore to have a good conscience, as our apostle speaks. ver. 16, is to live according to the dictates of the mind in such a manner, that you may be assured that you do well and please God. This Paul calls *ἀπροσκόπος συνείδησις*, a conscience void of offence, Acts 24:16.

XX. The word *ἐπερώτημα* (which we translate answer) is variously explained by the learned. Œcumenius explains it by *ἀρραβών*, *ἐνεχυρον*, and *ἀποδειξις*; earnest, pledge, and

demonstration. Which the celebrated Cocceius has adopted, who generally insists, that ἐπερώτημα denotes an argument, a ground of asking God as a Father; and a sign and seal which we may use with boldness, and when we draw near to God may beg his saving graces without fear. But this explication does not seem to agree with the origin of the word; and I doubt, whether any example of such a signification can be produced from any approved author. Vossius, in my opinion, observes much better, that ἐπερώτημα does not simply signify an interrogation, but that which is answered to another interrogation. For the persons to be baptized ask of God whether he will be their God; and God, on the other hand, asks and restipulates, whether they themselves will maintain a good conscience towards him. Grotius's annotations here are very learned; he observes, that ἐπερώτημα is a law term, and generally used in Theophilus, and the other Greek interpreters of the Roman law, for a stipulation; as also in the Glossary, ἐπερωτῶ, I stipulate. But adds, that by a metonymy, as is often the case in the law, an answer or promise is comprehended under the name stipulation. Hence in the same Glossary, ἐπερωτῶμαι, I promise, I engage. If Beza had attended to this, possibly he would not have said that it was harsh to translate ἐπερωτᾶν, to answer, as Erasmus has done.

XXI. But which of these significations, whether that of stipulating or of promising, should here take place, depends very much on the construing the words towards God. Which may either be so connected, as that a good conscience may be said to be towards God, that is before God, or respecting him in all its actions, as Acts 24:16; or so, that ἐπερώτημα may be said to be towards God. If the former, it seems more agreeable to translate ἐπερώτημα, stipulation, as Beza has learnedly done. For it is God who stipulates with, or requires of the Christian, that he maintain a good conscience towards him. But should the latter be more agreeable, and the conscience itself or the Christian considered as ἐπερωτῶν, giving an answer to God concerning a good conscience; it is plain answer or promise is the more proper signification. And both so beautifully agree with the apostle's design, that I can scarce tell which to prefer.

XXII. For there are these two things in baptism. God stipulates or requires a good conscience towards himself; and the conscience answers and promises to God that it will endeavour to be so; or, which seems more plain, man engages to keep a good conscience. Formerly the bishop, or some other person in his name, interrogated thus, or which is the same thing, stipulated, Λποτάσση τῷ Σατανᾷ, Dost thou renounce the devil? The person to be baptized made answer, Αποτασσομαι, I do renounce. Again being asked, Dost thou consent to Christ? He answered, I do consent. Tertullian de Baptismo calls this the engagement of salvation. And De Resurrectione Carnis says, "The soul is established, not by washing, but by the answer." Cyprian called it the interrogation of baptism, Epist. 76 and 80. To the very same purpose are the words of Peter; for it is probable, that if not the very same, yet at least a similar form of asking and engaging, and of the same import, was used in the susception of baptism even from the days of the apostles. And though there had been no express form of this, yet baptism, being the first entering into covenant, virtually contains such a stipulation and engagement.

XXIII. But we are likewise more particularly to explain: first, what may be signified by the water in baptism; and then what by the rites, commonly used about the water. And the water certainly denotes both the blood and Spirit of Christ. It is plain such effects are in the sacred writings ascribed to these, as to the mystical water, that signify and seal the communication of them by baptism; namely, to the blood, as the impetrating cause; to the Spirit, as the applying cause. Paul,

Heb. 12:24, and Peter 1 Epist 1:2, speak of the blood of Christ, with which we are sprinkled. But the Spirit is expressly represented by the term water, Isa. 44:3, Ezek. 36:25–27.

XXIV. The analogy or signification of this sacrament principally consists in these three things: 1st. Water is of all things most proper, either from the nitre, with which it is replete, or from some other quality, to wash away the filth of the body. But the blood of Christ washes the soul from all the pollution of sin, 1 John 1:7; because by his sufferings he certainly merited, that we should be presented pure before God, Eph. 5:25, 26. And the Spirit of Christ, who applies the merits of his blood, actually cleanses us, 1 Cor. 6:11. 2dly. Water also has a power to drown and to suffocate; the same efficacy is exerted by the blood and Spirit of Christ, for the mortification of the old man; of which we shall hear more presently, and on this account Gregory Nanzianzen called baptism the deluge of sin. With which Ambrose agrees, de Initiandis, c. 3, "the water is that in which the flesh is drowned, in order to wash away all sin." 3dly. Water is the principle of very many living things, and in their creation the Spirit brooded on the waters, Gen. 1:3. The earth scarce produces any living thing, either of the vegetable or reptile kind, unless impregnated with water, Ps. 65:10. The very generation of the human foetus is said to be from water, Isa. 48:1, Ps. 68:27. Thus in like manner, the blood and Spirit of Christ, as the mystical water, are the principles of our regeneration and new creation, John 3:5. And as that is signified by the water of baptism, so baptism itself is called, Tit. 3:4, "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."

XXV. With respect to the ceremonies in the administration, we are distinctly to take notice, I. Of the immersion into the water, and the washing that is the consequence of it. II. The continuing under the water. III. The emersion out of the water. These rites referred either to the remembrance of those things which Christ underwent, or signify the benefits which Christ bestows upon us, or put us in mind of our duty.

XXVI. First therefore, the immersion into the water, represents to us that tremendous abyss of divine justice, in which Christ was plunged for a time, in some measure, in consequence of his undertaking for our sins; as he complained under the type of David, Ps. 69:2: "I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing: I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me." But more particularly an immersion of this kind deprives us of the benefit of the light, and the other enjoyments of this world; so it is a very fit representation of the death of Christ. The continuing how short soever under the water, represents his burial, and the lowest degree of humiliation, when he was thought to be wholly cut off while in the grave, that was both sealed and guarded. The emersion, or coming out of the water, gives us some resemblance of his resurrection, or victory, obtained in his death over death, which he vanquished within its inmost recesses, even the grave: all these particulars the apostle intimates, Rom. 6:3, 4.

XXVII. Moreover, baptism also signifies those benefits, which believers obtain in Christ; and these are either present or future. Among the present, the principal is fellowship in the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ; and the consequence of it, viz. the mortification and burying of our old man, and the raising of the new, by the efficacy of the blood and Spirit of Christ. For, the immersion into the water represents the death of the old man, even in such a manner that it can neither stand in judgment to our condemnation, nor exercise dominion over our bodies, that we should serve it in the lusts thereof. In the former respect, the death of the old man appertains to

justification; in the latter, to sanctification. The continuing under the water, represents the burying of the body of sin, whereby all hopes of a revival are cut off; so that after this, it is neither able to condemn nor rule over the elect. For, as in burying, the dead body, which is covered over with earth, is removed from the sight of men, and so weighed down by the earth thrown upon it, that should we suppose some life to have remained in the buried person to be bestowed upon him anew by a miracle, yet it cannot fail to be stifled by the load of earth lying upon it, nor recover to any degree of permanence. In the same manner, when in baptism the person, sunk under the water, is for some time detained therein; this signifies and seals to us, that our sins are removed from the view of the divine justice, never to be imputed to our condemnation; or, as Micah speaks, chap. 7:19, "he will subdue our iniquities, and cast all our sins into the depth of the sea:" likewise that the power of sin is so depressed and weakened, that it can no longer drive us at its pleasure, or hinder our salvation, or be able to resume the power which it has once lost, in order to bring us again under its dominion. The emersion out of the water is a symbol of the revival of the new man, after our sins are now sunk, to a spiritual life by the resurrection of Christ. And this also the apostle declares, Rom. 6:3–6, and Col. 2:11, 12, where he intimates that our baptism is such a memorial of the things that happened to Christ, as at the same time to seal our communion with him in all these things, and our union as it were into one plant.

XXVIII. But future blessings are also signified by baptism. For as in baptism, after we are immersed in the water, we directly come out of it in safety; so in like manner it shall be, that though we may be pressed with afflictions in this life, yet we shall not be overwhelmed by them, but being at last delivered from them, shall be translated into everlasting joys. That calamities in scripture are compared to waters, appears from many passages, as Ps. 18:4, Ps. 32:6, Ps. 42:7, Ps. 144:7. And afflictions are sometimes called by the name of baptism, Matt. 20:22, Mark 10:32, Luke 12:30. Therefore the coming out of the water, or the wiping off the water signifies, that we shall happily surmount all the difficulties of this life. See 1 Pet. 3:20, 21: "Wherein (in the ark of Noah) few, that is eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us." And as the Israelites when they entered the Red Sea, under great apprehensions of danger, were, upon the Egyptians being drowned, amazed that at length they came safe to land; so in like manner believers, having surmounted all the miseries of this life, and standing on the sea of glass, shall sing "the song of the Lamb," Rev. 15:3, saying, "He brought me up also out of an horrible pit, out of the miry clay, and set my feet upon a rock, and established my goings," Ps. 40:2.

XXIX. Moreover, as in baptism are set forth the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ; and his resurrection is a pledge of our glorious resurrection; we may learn from our baptism, that after being buried, as it were in the water, we directly rise out of it, so at the last day we shall be raised out of our graves to eternal life. Hence Theodoret says of baptism: "It is an earnest of good things to come, a type of the future resurrection, a communion in the sufferings, and a participation of the resurrection of our Lord." Agreeably to the words of Christ, Mark 16:16, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved."

XXX. From what we have said, it appears that the rite of immersion into the water, upon which emersion follows, as was generally the practice among the ancients, has some significancy and analogy to represent both the effect and the cause of that effect: yet we are not to imagine that all



analogy is destroyed by the practice of aspersion, or pouring on the water. For the pouring out or aspersion of the water, answers to the immersion into it, and perhaps it would be better, if it was so copious, as to run over the whole face, and as it were cover it; by which means, the emersion out of the water would be answered by the dissipation of it. But the face and head represent, as it were, the whole person; so that what things are done in that part, may be accounted as done in the whole body; and as the face is covered with the water, the whole person may seem to be immersed; and with the running off of the water on every side, the whole person may be accounted as taken out of it; and the communion in the thing signified, should not be rated by the quantity of the external sign. A very small portion of water may no less seal the abundance of the divine grace in baptism, than a small morsel of bread, and a more sparing draught of wine, in the holy supper.

XXXI. Thus far concerning the rites of immersion and emersion: let us now consider the ablution or washing, which is the effect of the water applied to the body. In external baptism there is "the putting away the filth of the flesh," 1 Pet. 3:21, which represents the ablution, or washing away the filth of the soul contracted by sin, Acts 22:16, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." But the filth of sin may be considered either with respect to the guilt, which is annexed to the filth or stain, and so it is removed by remission, which is a part of justification; or with respect to the stain itself, or spiritual deformity and dissimilitude to the image of God, and so it is taken away by the grace of the sanctifying Spirit; and both are sealed by baptism. Of the former Peter speaks, Acts 2:38: "Be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Concerning the latter, Paul writes, Eph. 5:25, 26. "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." And they are laid before us both together, 1 Cor. 6:11, "but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." Ye are washed sacramentally in baptism, which washing is a symbol of the mystical washing: but the mystical washing comprehends both justification and sanctification, both which are performed in the name of the Lord Jesus, that is by the efficacy of his merits, and by the Spirit of our God, which effectually applies the merits of Christ to the elect.

XXXII. But because we who, while polluted with sins, were plunged in the water, come out cleansed, and encompassed with the light of the Holy Spirit, as with a shining garment; we are said, in that baptism, to put on Christ, Gal. 3:26, 27, "for we are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." This putting on of Christ may be explained two ways; either as by the Spirit we are ingrafted into Christ, and so by this our union with the only begotten and natural Son of God, we become the sons of God by grace; or as by the Spirit of God we are inwardly renewed to a new life, and therewith encompassed as with a shining garment, so that the native stains and wrinkles of the old man may be covered, and, instead of them, piety and holiness shine forth in our conversation and lives. Thus the baptized are "like a flock of sheep, that are even shorn, which come up from the washing," Cant. 4:2. And their case is the same, as was formerly that of Joshua the priest, whose filthy garments were, at the command of God, changed for splendid raiment, adding, "Behold I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee," Zech. 3:3–5. In token of this, the newly baptized, among the ancients, put on white garments, which they wore the whole week after baptism, and did not put them off till the eighth day after Easter or Whitsuntide; which was therefore called Dominica in Albis, as the candidates, or those in white, were called Albatii. Most

of what we have said, Basil, bishop of Cæsarea, has emphatically and briefly comprised in Exhortatione ad Baptismum, where he calls baptism, "the remission of our debts, the death of sin, the regeneration of the soul, the shining garment, the inviolable seal, the chariot conveying up to heaven, the procurement of the kingdom, the grace of adoption."

XXXIII. There now remains the third signification of baptism, which is to admonish us of our duty: and that is threefold, towards God and Christ, ourselves, and our neighbour.

XXXIV. And as we are baptized in the name, so we are consecrated to the worship and service of the Holy Trinity, and renouncing the devil, the world, and the lusts of the flesh, are taught to devote ourselves wholly to God. Hence these things are joined together, Matt. 28:19, 20, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

XXXV. And as we are especially baptized into Christ, we are also commanded to acknowledge him for our Lord, husband and head, and to frame the whole of our lives in such a manner, that we may not be found a disgrace to him, with whom we are so closely united, nor to his Spirit, the bond of that union: but, on the contrary, that the sanctifying efficacy both of his blood and Spirit, may appear in the whole tenour of our conversation. In fine, as we are most especially baptized into the communion of the death and resurrection of Christ, in both an extraordinary pattern is set before us, to the likeness of which we should be conformed. For as Christ, when he suffered death, was deprived of the enjoyment of the light, and of the function of his senses, and of all the other operations of life, and thus was broke off from all commerce with the world, that he might have nothing farther to do with it; so it behoveth us, if we would have any true union with Christ, to cease from all those works, to which we were formerly addicted, and to renounce the world, almost as if we were dead. And as Christ, when he arose, commenced a new kind of life, quite different from that natural life, which he enjoyed in this world before his death; so it becomes us, if we would have any communion with him in his resurrection, to rise to a new life, and altogether different from that life which was corrupted and stained with sin, to which we were devoted before our calling: as those things are urged by the apostle, Rom. 6:3–6.

XXXVI. As to ourselves, we are reminded in baptism, that being once washed, we do not again pollute ourselves with the filth of sins; nor, being baptized into Christ, we do not again mix with, or immerse ourselves in the world, lest it should happen unto us, according to the true proverb, "the dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed, to her wallowing in the mire," 2 Pet. 2:22.

XXXVII. Besides, seeing "by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body," 1 Cor. 12:13, we are also reminded, as members of one body, to love one another, and keep up brotherly concord; being careful to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace: for there is one baptism, Eph. 4:3, 5. In a word, as baptism is the seal of God's covenant, by the susception thereof we bind ourselves to that holiness of life which becomes God's covenant people.

XXXVIII. To all these things, very great weight is added, in that baptism it is administered in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For thereby God the Father promises to those who are truly baptized, that, with respect to them, he will suffer nothing to be wanting, which they can

reasonably expect from a most affectionate Father: God the Son, in like manner, promises to execute in their behalf all the offices of a most perfect Saviour: the Holy Ghost, likewise, appoints for them, both sanctification, consolation, indwelling, and perpetual conservation. And they who are thus baptized, not only profess their faith in the mystery of a Trinity, which we have treated of more fully elsewhere; but also bind themselves to filial obedience to God the Father; give up themselves to Christ, as a Prophet, to be his disciples; as a King, to serve him; and as a Priest, for the expiation of their sins. In fine, they bind themselves to the Holy Spirit, not to grieve him, but reverently to obey all his inspiration, and motions.

XXXIX. What we have thus far said concerning the signification of baptism, we have borrowed for the most part from Vossius's disputations, which we have already often commended, as I, likewise, observe others have done before me. Things also similar to these, and sometimes almost in the very same words, I find in Gomarus' Theses; but which of these learned men first led the way to such very accurate and solid conceptions, I cannot now say. The other usual disputes about baptism have been fully discussed by our writers, and are generally to be met with in their *Loci Communes*, and unnecessary to be repeated here. Should any be desirous to know the rites of the ancient church about baptism, they may consult Josephi Vicecomitis *Observationes Ecclesiasticæ de Antiquis baptismi ritibus*: and among our writers, Vossius, and Voetius's *Polit. Eccl.* p. 1, lib. ii. tr. 2, Forbesius, lib. x. and Hoornbeck in *Disput. de bapismo Veterum*. Georgius Fehlavius ad cap. 24. Christophorus Angelus de *Statu hodiernorum Græcorum*, has collected from different authors the ceremonies used by the Greeks and Muscovites in baptism.

XL. There is one thing that, I think, ought not to be omitted here, seeing it is of very great moment to our consolation; namely, that baptism is, by the will of God, to be administered, not only to adult believers, but also to their children. The grounds for this, and those beyond all exceptions, are to be met with in Scripture: so that there is no necessity, with the Papists, who shamefully prevaricate in a good cause, to have recourse in this matter to unwritten tradition.

XLI. We readily acknowledge that there is no express and special command of God, or of Christ, concerning infant baptism: yet there are general commands from which this special command is deduced by evident consequence. For, to begin with what is most general, God declared to Abraham, that it was his constant and unchangeable will, that the sign of the covenant should not be denied to those in covenant with him, when he said, Gen. 17:13, "And my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." By these words he commands the sign of his covenant to be in the flesh of all the posterity of Abraham, with which he had entered into a covenant of grace. From this general injunction he infers, ver. 14, the necessity of circumcision, because he then gave it as a sign of the covenant. When therefore, upon the change of the economy, he substituted in the place of circumcision, another sign of the covenant, in consequence of that general command all those in covenant are bound to take upon them the new sign. Moreover, believers under the New Testament belong to the spiritual posterity of Abraham, and are, if we consider its substance, partakers of the same gracious covenant, Rom. 4:16, 17; not adults only but also their children, as we shall presently show. Whence it follows, that the sign of the covenant in their body, is not to be denied to the young children of believers, any more than to believers themselves.

XLII. There is another command of Christ, Mat. 28:19, "Go ye, therefore, and μαθητεύσατε, disciple all nations, baptizing them," &c. There Christ commands disciples to be gathered into his school, and sealed, as persons in covenant with him, with the seal of baptism. But it is evident, when parents become the disciples of Christ, their children are also accounted in the number of disciples. Just as among the Jews, together with the proselyte parents, their young children were initiated in the Jewish rites. It was not therefore necessary that Christ should expressly mention the baptism of infants. For as it was a received custom among the Jews that, together with the parents, who gave up their names to the God of Israel, their young children should be baptized (as we have shown above), the apostles being sent to baptize the nations, and accustomed to the rites of their own country, could not but think that, together with the parents, who made a profession of the faith of Christ, they ought to baptize their infants, unless Christ had repealed the received custom by a contrary command. Which as we nowhere read he did, we are absolutely to conclude that what we have now explained was our Lord's intention.

XLIII. Peter supplies us with another argument, Acts 2:38, 39, "Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children," &c. Where the apostle argues thus: they to whom the promise of grace was made are to be baptized. We add, but the promise of grace was made, not only to parents, but also to their children: it therefore follows, that not only parents but also their children are to be baptized. Both propositions are the apostle Peter's. Now the whole difficulty consists in this, who are we here to understand by the children who partake of the promise of grace: whether adults only actually called, who are capable of making a profession of their faith; or also younger children and infants? The Orthodox justly affirm the last; not only because mention simply is made of children, without distinction of age; but also because God expressly promised to Abraham, to be the God of his seed, which he applies to an infant eight days old. Gen. 17:7, 12. We add that Christ permitted little children to come to him, laid his hands upon them, and declared that of such was the kingdom of heaven. Matt. 16:13–15. But whom Matthew calls παῖδια, little children, Luke, chap. 18:15, calls βρέφη, infants; which word, according to Eustathius, properly signifies a new-born child at the breast. Hence also Peter says, "ὡς ἀρτιγεννητα βρεφη, as new-born babes, 1 Pet. 2:2. And here it appears we are, by all means, to keep to the propriety of the terms, both in the noun βρεφος, and the verb προσφέρειν; when it is said, προσφερον δὲ αὐνῶ τὰ βρέφη, and they brought unto him also infants, they appear to have been carried in arms. It is therefore evident, that to infants are also made the promises of grace and salvation.

XLIV. Let the fourth argument stand thus: it is unjustifiable to exclude from baptism those who are made partakers of the Holy Spirit: for thus Peter, Acts 10:47, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" True indeed it is that the Holy Spirit discovered himself in those, of whom Peter there speaks, by some extraordinary gifts, which of themselves were not saving: yet the principal argument for the right to baptism cannot be drawn from hence. The apostle therefore considers those extraordinary gifts as the effects of the sanctifying Spirit bestowed on all the elect, and as special indications of the divine bounty towards them: whereby the truth of the gospel was sealed in them, and the sincerity of their faith adorned; compare Gal. 3:2; and thence, as from the thing signified, he argues to the participation of the sign. We moreover subsume, even the children of believers have received the Holy Spirit. For otherwise they could neither be holy, which yet Paul declares

them to be, 1 Cor. 7:14; nor be Christ's, to whom none belongs who has not his Spirit, Rom. 8:9; nor see the kingdom of heaven, to which none is admitted but he who is born of water and of the Spirit. John 3:5. Whence it follows that water cannot be forbid, that infants should not be baptized.

XLV. Fifthly. They who belong to the church of God have a right to baptism. The reason is, because baptism is the sign of association with, and seal of initiation into the church, Acts 2:41, "they were baptized, and the same day there were added, (namely to the church) about there thousand souls." And then it is represented as the privilege of the whole church, that she is "cleansed by Christ with the washing of water, by the word." Eph. 5:26. But that infants belong to the church appears from this, that when God commanded his church to be gathered together he did not suffer their "little ones, and those that sucked the breasts to be absent," Deut. 29:10, 11, Joel 2:16, and protests that "they were born unto him." Ezek. 16:20.

XVI. Sixthly. We argue from this, that baptism has succeeded in the room of circumcision. The apostle declares this, Col. 2:11, 12, where he proves the abrogation of the ceremonial law, and especially of circumcision with respect to believers of the New Testament, from this consideration, that the spiritual thing formerly signified and sealed by circumcision, is now signified and sealed by baptism; intimating that what circumcision was to the Old Testament church, the same now is baptism to the New, and indeed in a far more eminent and perfect manner, because baptism is an introduction at once into the liberty and grace of the New Testament, whereas circumcision contained the profession of a bondage and yoke. But it is evident that circumcision was administered to infants: it therefore follows that we are to have the same sentiment concerning baptism. And indeed nothing can be advanced against the baptism of infants which may not equally militate against their circumcision.

XLVII. Here certainly appears the extraordinary love of our God, in that as soon as we are born, and just as we come from our mother, he hath commanded us to be solemnly brought from her bosom as it were into his own arms, that he should bestow upon us, in the very cradle, the tokens of our dignity and future kingdom; that he should put that song in our mouth, "Thou didst make me hope, when I was upon my mother's breast: I was cast upon thee from the womb: thou art my God from my mother's belly," Ps. 22:9, 10, that, in a word, he should join us to himself in the most solemn covenant from our most tender years: the remembrance of which, as it is glorious and full of consolation to us, so in like manner it tends to promote Christian virtues, and the strictest holiness, through the whole course of our lives.

XLVIII. Nothing ought to be dearer to us than to keep sacred and inviolable that covenant of our youth, that first and most solemn engagement, that was made to God in our name. Nor is it any objection that we were first bound in that covenant without our knowledge. For no adult person, when he is informed of the excellency of that holy sacrament which was bestowed in infancy, can be offended that, according to the will of God, he was devoted so early by his pious parents to the Supreme Being; unless at the same time, he is resolved to renounce entirely the name of a Christian, and all his hopes of eternal salvation.

XLIX. It cannot also fail to be very delightful to godly parents, to present to God and his Christ their dearest pledges, just began to enjoy the light, and consecrated in the water of the mystical

font, or, as Dionysius the Pseudareopagite elegantly expressed it, "in the divine symbols of a divine birth," and recommended to the grace of God by the prayer of the whole church. Let this be the first care of their piety. Gregory Nazianzene, Orat. 40, in sanctum baptisma, speaks as follows: "Hast thou a child? give not time to vice to gain upon him: let him be sanctified from a child, and consecrated to the Spirit from his tender years." And certainly, if no other benefit accrued from infant baptism, every prudent person will own it to be very great, that it lays the most inviolable necessity on parents, carefully to train up their children, which they have so early devoted to God, in the mysteries of the Christian religion, and the practice of true piety, both by instruction, admonition and good example. "They incur the guilt of an infamous robber or thief," as Bucer has gravely observed, de Regno Christi, lib. ii. c. 9, "who are not at the greatest pains to bring up and form those they have consecrated by baptism to the Lord Christ, to the obedience of Christ. For by this neglect, as much as in them lies, they again rob God of the children they gave up to him, betray and enslave them to the devil." See what we have more fully written on Infant-baptism in a particular dissertation.

L. And therefore it was a very laudable practice of the Bohemian brethren, who were wont to present their children at about twelve years old, in the church to the pastor, in order to make a public profession of their faith, and to show whether the parents had done their duty in instructing them, to which they had bound themselves at the baptism of their children, as Lasitius relates, de Moribus et Institutis Fratrum Bohemorum, c. 12. §. 28, 29. Which, with the solemnity they usually performed this, is related at large in Ratione disciplinæ Ordin. Trat. Bohem. p. 46 Calvin, Instit. lib. 4. c. 19. §. 4, has hinted that a like practice obtained in the ancient church, and that from hence, in latter times, arose the imaginary sacrament of Confirmation. And Durel, in Vindiciis Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, observes, that the like custom is still retained in the church of England.

## CHAPTER XVII: Of the Lord's Supper

I. THE other sacrament of the New Testament is the Holy Supper of the Lord; which the Lord Jesus instituted immediately after his last passover, because it was to succeed the Passover, from which he transferred also to this most of the rites and phrases used by the ancient Jews in their passover. As this has long ago been observed by the learned, so it will appear from the brief explication, we are now to give of this sacred symbol.

II. This sacrament is called ΔΕΙΠΝΟΝ the supper, 1 Cor. 11:20, not because its celebration is necessarily confined to the evening or night. For though in the ancient church this was frequently done; yet that was owing not so much to the religion of Christians, as to the cruelty of persecutors, who by their tyranny obliged believers to meet together privately, and in the night time, but because the Lord instituted this feast after the passover, which was to be slain between the two evenings, and eaten in the night. It was likewise instituted in the very night in which he was betrayed, 1 Cor. 11:23, and which was the last before his death; hence this most sacred feast was constantly called the Supper. Besides most sumptuous entertainments among the ancients, especially in the Jewish nation, at least their nuptial feasts were generally in the evening, as appears from the parable of the ten virgins, Matt. 25. And therefore it was proper, that that feast, which represents the unspeakable dainties of heaven, and is an earnest of the Marriage-Supper of the Lamb, Rev. 19:9, should be held forth to us under the name and emblem of a supper. Nor is it for nothing, that Paul observes, that Christ gave the supper to the church, in that night in which he was betrayed. For, besides that we have in this an illustrious display of Christ's infinite love to men, in that he should vouchsafe to have such an anxious concern for us, especially at that time, when his mind was otherwise so much taken up, and distressed with the horror of his approaching sufferings; but what above all ought to make it sacred to us, and very highly valuable, is, that it was instituted by our Lord, just as he was preparing himself to die.

III. Again, it is called ΚΥΡΙΑΚΟΝ δεῖπνον the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. 11:20, both because the Lord was the author of it, and because the whole of it agrees to the Lord, and to the remembrance of him; so that the Lord himself, in the right use of it, is exhibited to believers; and lastly, because it ought to be celebrated by us, according to the will and prescription of the Lord.

IV. But the Lord's Supper, to pass on from the name to the thing, is the sacrament of education, or nourishment, in the New Testament church, wherein, by the symbols of bread broken, and wine poured out, the dreadful sufferings of Christ are represented to believers; and the promises of the New Testament and enlivening communion with Christ, made perfect by sufferings both in grace and glory, are signified and sealed unto them.

V. For the illustration of this description it will be useful we first distinctly consider the external signs, then the things signified by them. The signs are either the symbols\* themselves, or certain actions about the symbols. The symbol is twofold; bread and wine: and both of them are joined together, to signify the superabundant fulness we have in Christ. Here we are to adore the divine providence, which hath given to his church things so simple and easily obtained, as pledges of things heavenly, and several reasons may be assigned. 1st. That this sacrament might in all places, even to the end of the world, be in perpetual use among the faithful, it was suitable such symbols should be instituted, as might, in all places and at all times, be ready at hand for the

church's use. 2dly. It is more consistent with the spiritual economy of the New Testament, to be led by some plain and ordinary symbol, which should neither detain the eye nor the mind, presently to behold, meditate on and receive the thing signified, than to be so dazzled by some illustrious and miraculous sign, like what was granted to the Israelites in the wilderness, as to be made to give less attention to the mystical signification. 3dly. And then, the danger of superstition, which can scarcely be altogether avoided in the case of bread and wine, would have been far greater in that of a more illustrious sign. 4thly. Nor is it from the purpose, that Christ has not again given us the flesh of slain animals, nor bloody meals, such as the fathers formerly eat in their sacred feasts; but has furnished out his table with plain bread and wine, for Christ's blood by which all our debts are cancelled, and the fire of divine wrath is quenched, being once shed, it became a crime any longer to shed any blood in the sacred rites of Christians.

VI. Common and ordinary bread is to be made use of, as Christ used that which lay before him, Matt. 26:26. But it was an old subject of debate between the Greek and Latin churches, whether it ought to be leavened or unleavened, both of them appealing to the example of our Lord. The Latins insist, that Christ used unleavened bread, because immediately after the paschal feast he instituted the supper; at which time it was altogether unlawful for any leaven to be seen among the Israelites. The Greeks, on the other hand, contend, that Christ eat the paschal lamb the day before the Jews celebrated their passover; from which they infer, that the days of unleavened bread were not yet come, when our Lord celebrated the first supper, and therefore it is most probable, that our Lord used leavened bread, which before the days of unleavened bread came, was most commonly made use of. And indeed, as to Christ's example, we make no manner of doubt, but the Latins have the better of the Greeks in this argument. For, whether our Lord celebrated the passover on the same or on a different day from the other Jews; what was the day of the passover to him, was also to him the day of unleavened bread; which the evangelists expressly affirm, Matt. 26:17, Mark 14:12, Luke 22:7. Nor is it certain, that Christ celebrated the passover before the Jews, as Gerard Vossius imagines with the Greeks. The disputes of the celebrated John Cloppenburg and Lud. Capellus have already laid before the learned world what probably may be said on both sides of the question. Nay, the opposite opinion seems to be much better founded, as Bochart, whom we have already so often quoted, has made out by cogent arguments, who seems to have taken off all the difficulty of this question, Hierozoic. lib. ii. c. 1. However, we agree not with the Latins, who would have the example of Christ, in so slender a circumstance, to retain the force of a perpetual law. For as this is no part of the essence of the sacrament, so the use of either sort of bread at this sacred feast, as occasion shall offer, is indifferent and arbitrary; since Christ, without any decision of this question on either side, used that bread which was then at hand. Wherefore it is a matter both of astonishment and grief, that the Greek and Latin churches should have disputed, with so much eagerness and warmth, now for above five hundred years about such a trifling matter. Du Plessis de Eucharistia, lib. ii. c. 5, may be consulted on this subject.

VII. But we can by no means approve of the small round things, made of meal, commonly called hosts or wafers, such as now the Romish church is pleased to make use of. 1st. Because they are most disagreeable to the institution and practice of Christ. For it is very probable, that Christ used such an unleavened cake, as the master of the family, in whose house he kept the passover, laid before him, according to the custom of the Jews. But these cakes were something large, in order to be distributed in pieces among the guests at the table: they were also thin and broad, but



yet of a moderate thickness like our sweet and round cakes, that they might be adapted for the nourishment of the body. As to their matter, form, and preparation, see Buxtorf's *Synagoga Judacia*, c. xii. 2dly. Because in that case, there is either no analogy, or an obscure one, between the sign and thing signified. Neither is there that serviceableness for supporting life, nor that nourishing quality, nor sweetness of flavour in those wafers, as in common bread; by which both the serviceableness, and nourishing efficacy and grateful sweetness of the grace of Christ are represented. 3dly. Because they were unknown in the church for near a thousand years. Vossius in his *Theses de S. cœnæ Dominicæ Symbolis* has laid open their origin from Honorius Augustodunensis. His words are these. "It is said that formerly the priests received from every house or family, a quantity of meal, which custom at this day the Greeks still observe, and of that made the Lord's bread, which they offered for the people, and after consecration, distributed among them. But after the church really increased in numbers, but abated in holiness, it was decreed, on account of the carnal, that such as could, should communicate every Lord's-day, or every third Lord's-day, or on the high festivals, or thrice a year. And because the people did not communicate, there was no occasion to make so large a cake, it was decreed to make it in the form of a penny." This is the true reason why the host has the form of a penny: but afterwards men of subtlety sought, as is usual in such cases, for a ministry where there was none, whence he immediately subjoins; "and that the people, instead of offering meal, should offer a penny, as an acquittance for receiving the Lord." Durandus in *Rationali*, lib. iv. c. 14, has words also to the same purpose. "It is prepared in the form of a penny, both because the bread of life was betrayed for pennies, and because a penny was given as wages to the labourers in the vineyard." These are foolish conceits, and foreign to the august mystery of the holy supper.

VIII. The other symbol is wine: which the evangelists call *γεννημα της ἀμπελου*, the fruit of the wine, in conformity to the Hebrew phraseology, *הנפך פרי* Matt. 26:29: Mark 14:25, Luke 22:18. But it does not certainly appear, whether it was red or white. The Jews ordered the best and most generous wine to be purchased for celebrating the passover. But in that country the red was generally accounted such, Prov. 23:31, Isa. 27:3. Hence in the Jerusalem Talmud, Tractat. de Sabbato, fol. 11, it is commanded, that red wine be used for that purpose. But if it appeared that the white was better than the red, the preference was given to that. It is therefore probable, and only probable, that Christ used red wine. And it seems we should not altogether overlook the similitude there is between the blood of the grape, by which name red wine is chiefly intended, and the blood of Christ.

IX. And with no greater certainty can we determine, whether Christ used pure neat wines, or wine mixt with water. Those speak too freely, who affirm, that it was the custom of that country, in order to moderate the strength of their wine, to mix it with water that all might drink of it. For that this was left to the discretion of the Jews, as a matter of indifferency, on the very solemnity of the passover, appears from *Sepher Mitzvoth Haggadol*, fol. 118, col. 1. "The measure of the cup is a quart of wine either new or old; either neat or diluted." On the other hand, the argument of those is also weak who contend, that Christ used pure wine, because it is called the fruit of the vine; but the vine produces wine not water. We have shown above, that Christ speaks after the manner of his country. But the Jews called the wine, even that mixed with water, in their solemn blessings over it, *הנפך פרי*, the fruit of the wine, having regard to the greater and better part of it. Thus the Jewish masters expressly write in Talmud. Babylon. Tit. Berachot, fol. 50. col. 2. "They

pronounce not the blessing on the wine, in which no water is mixed, saying, Blessed be he who created the fruit of the vine-tree, but, Blessed be he who created the fruit of the tree."

X. Nothing, therefore, can here with any certainty be affirmed concerning Christ's practice. Yet it has been the prevailing custom of the ancients, as well the western as eastern church, if we except the Armenian, to mix the wine with the water; because, after the supper, they kept their Agapæ or love-feasts with the same wine, not choosing to give any handle to the Gentiles, as if they used pure wine to excess. They add a threefold mystery in this, in framing which they have given too much scope to their own fancy: 1st, That by the wine and water might be held forth the blood and water, which flowed from the pierced side of Christ. 2dly, That by that mixture the union of the two natures in Christ might be represented. 3dly, That since, in the revelation of St. John, the people are called water, the union of the same faithful people with Christ the head is exhibited by that mixture. And as it is the way of human nature to be fond of its own fancies, the Greeks put not only water, but also boiling water into the wine, and lest it should on any account cool before they receive it, they do not pour it in till after the elevation; to signify, say they, that from the side of our Lord on the cross, flowed hot blood and water, as quickening things from a quickening body: or even (adds Cabasilas in Exposit. Liturg. c. 37), "to sanctify the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the church, who is otherwise compared to fire." Nor did the rashness of their determining and allegorizing stop here. In the synod of Tribur, under the emperor Arnalphus, in the year 895, or according to others, 899, it was provided that "none should perform the holy mysteries without mixing wine and water; but that two parts should be wine, because the majesty of the blood of Christ is greater than the weakness of the people."

XI. Our judgment is this: it does not appear whether Christ mixed the wine or drank it pure. Yet we grant the former to be probable, because it was a more frequent practice among the Jews on account of the generousness of their wines; hence, in the rubric of the festivals, when they speak of the wine, they always use the phrase, "they mix him a cup." There are also those who forbid pronouncing a blessing over the cup before the wine is mixed with water. It is probable Christ did what seemed to be most suitable to the rules of sobriety. However, we imagine it cannot thence be proved that Christ would prescribe any thing by this his example, especially to those people whose wines are not so generous as to require mixing in common use. For every thing that Christ did, according to the custom of his nation, and on occasion of the passover, does not belong to the essence of the sacrament, nor has a mystical signification, nor in all its circumstances obtains the force of a perpetual law. The allegorical interpretations of the ancients appear somewhat insipid, and without any foundation in the sacred writings. Nor is the practice of the ancient church to be too much insisted upon in this case; for as the thing is indifferent, the modern church has the same right that the ancient had. In such things the liberty which Christ hath left his people ought to remain inviolable: we are to look on nothing as binding and necessary, but his word only. Nay, after the rite of mixing began to be accounted necessary, it was prudently done in the reformed churches for the preservation of liberty to prefer pure wine. Just as if ever the necessity of pure wine should begin to be established, it would be, perhaps, better to return to the practice of mixing it. Certainly those plainly show that they put a greater value on their own imaginations than on the very institution of Christ, who have thought it superfluous to use wine in the holy supper, which, by the command and prescription of our Lord, is a necessary part; but on the contrary, have judged water necessary, which is of human appointment, as if we were left to our own liberty by the divine institution.

XII. But as it is possible, nay, frequently happens that in some countries neither bread nor wine are used, as in America and other parts of the world, where, instead of bread, they have a food prepared of pulse, or herbs, or of the fruits or even the barks of trees; and instead of wine, their drink is made of honey, or sugar, or other aromatics, or even the juice of the cocoa-tree. It is justly queried whether, in those countries, they are wholly to abstain from the Lord's Supper, or whether, instead of bread and wine, it may be lawful to use that food in the supper which answers the purposes of bread and wine, and is adapted for strengthening the body and cheering the heart. Indeed, we think that no rash innovations should be made in the use of the sacraments; but then necessity has no law. And it seems very hard should any one take upon him to order that the natives and the foreigners in those spacious countries of the world should be deprived of the Lord's Supper, and their christianity maimed without the sacramental food. Especially as the principal thing in the analogy is retained, when that food and drink is made use of by which the body may be properly nourished, and the heart made glad. Thus much for the symbols or elements.

XIII. Let us now consider the actions with respect to the symbols. And they are either those of Christ, to be performed, after his example by his ministers, or of the disciples, to be imitated by the guests or communicants. The actions of Christ are either words or deeds and both these again either about the bread, or about the wine.

XIV. With respect to bread, there are four things mentioned which Christ did. 1st, He took the bread, namely, into his hand. For it was provided, by an express canon of the Jewish law, that the master was not to pronounce the blessing till he took the bread into his hand that all might see over what he pronounced the blessing.

XV. 2dly, He blessed it. This action is in the Evangelists called *εὐλογία*, blessing, Matt. 26:26, Mark 14:22; at other times *ευκαριστια*, giving of thanks, Luke 22:19. It is a fine saying of the Jews, mentioned by Buxtorf on this occasion, "Man is forbid to enjoy any thing in this world without a blessing." But the usual form of blessing pronounced over the bread was this: "Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, king of the world, who producest bread out of the earth." Yet it is more probable Christ used a peculiar form, and one adapted to the present case, whereby he consecrated the bread to be a sacred symbol of his body. For as in other respects Christ sanctified, by blessing and giving of thanks, bread and other food for natural use, Matt. 14:19, Luke 9:16; so by this blessing and giving of thanks he dedicated the bread as he did afterwards also the wine, set them apart from their natural use to be sacraments of his body and blood.

XVI. 3dly, He broke the bread. And this also after the manner of the Jews. For thus the Talmud. tit. Berachot, fol. xxxxi. col. 22; "he (the master of the family) blesses and afterwards breaks." This the apostles also carefully observed; hence, 1 Cor. 10:16, "the bread which we break." And therefore this is a mystical rite, and, as it were, essential to the holy supper; at least so necessary to the purity and completeness of it, that this whole feast is therefore called the "breaking of bread," Acts 2:42, and Acts 20:7. Nor do they sufficiently clear themselves of a violation of the Lord's institution, who keeping their bread (if it may deserve that name) whole, maintain, that they have fulfilled its purport, because with them the lump is divided into many small wafers. For that breaking of the lump is culinary, not mystical, being performed in the kitchen, not in the church, and done before the sacrament, not at the administration of it. It is to no purpose objected

that breaking among the Jews is sometimes equivalent to distributing, as Isa. 58:7, "deal (break) thy bread to the hungry," and Lam. 4:4, "the young children ask bread, and no man breaketh unto them." For to break is there a metalepsis taken for that distribution, which is made after the breaking. But that none should feign any such metalepsis in the words of the supper, these two actions of Christ are distinctly mentioned, he broke and he gave.

XVII. 4thly, The bread broken "he gave to the disciples," Matt. 26:26. And this also was according to the ancient custom of the Jews, of whom there is an express canon on this head in Maimonides: "Breaking it, he sets a piece before each, and the other (to whom it is given) takes it up in his hand; nor is it allowed to put it into the hand of the eater, unless he is mourning." If therefore it was not a Jewish custom to put the piece broken off into the hand of the eater, but to lay it before him that he might take it up with his own hand; how much less probable is it that Christ put that morsel into the mouths of his disciples! They who at this day observe that custom depart both from the practice of Christ and from the purer antiquity. For believers were formerly wont "to reach out their hands to take the sacred food," as Dionysius Alexandrinus speaks in Eusebius, lib. vii. c. 8. But the other custom of putting the bread into the mouth seems to have begun about the year 600; and was owing to nothing but a superstitious veneration for the signs, which at length degenerated into Artolatry or bread worship. See Vossius de S. Cœn. Symbol. Disput. iii. §. 4, 5.

XVIII. These then are the actions of Christ about the bread. Let us now consider his words. And they are twofold; either. preceptive or explicatory. The preceptive either simply enjoin some acts, or at the same time point out the end of those acts. The former are contained in these words: take, namely, that which is broken, and set before you on the table: eat, exactly as in the paschal solemnity: "Whoever is hungry let him come and eat of this bread of affliction." The latter, in which the end is set forth, are these: "Do this in remembrance of me." To do, does not here signify to make the body of Christ or to sacrifice, as in Virgil, cum faciam vitula, as some ridiculously contend for; but is to be referred, partly to what our Lord did; the like to which was to be done by the apostles in the discharge of their office; partly to what he commanded the disciples as communicants to do; and regards both the dispensing and the receiving. And this command ought to be compared with that concerning the passover. Exod. 12:24: "And ye shall observe this thing for an ordinance to thee and to thy sons for ever." Moreover, what he recommends concerning the remembrance of himself is also borrowed from the paschal ceremonies. For the whole passover was celebrated for a memorial of their miraculous deliverance out of Egypt, Exod. 12:14. And almost every circumstance, even what the later Jews added to the divine institution, had its peculiar memorial. But how the supper is a memorial of our Lord shall be afterwards explained.

XIX. The explicatory words, in which the mystery of the sacrament is explained, are these: "This is my body," Matt. 26:26, Mark 14:22: "which is given for you," Luke 22:19, and "broken for you," 1 Cor. 11:24. And these things are also borrowed from the Jewish antiquities and the paschal phrases. For when the Israelites did eat their paschal bread, they were wont to say, "This is that bread of affliction which your fathers did eat in the land of Egypt." And what seems to come nearer the purpose, they called the roasted lamb, which was served up in the paschal supper, "the body of the passover." But no one understood, or even could understand it otherwise, but that the bread, which they yearly eat on the festival day, was a symbol and

memorial of that bread which their ancestors were formerly fed with in Egypt. In the same sense, therefore, the bread of the holy supper is called the body of Christ. Hitherto they had slain and eat the body of the paschal lamb, which was a type of the body of Christ, afterwards to be delivered up to death for them; at present, Christ, instead of the paschal lamb, gave them bread for a symbol of his body; in the partaking of which holy bread, they were to have, for the future, not a kind of type of things to come, or a memorial of a typical deliverance, but the body of Christ, Col. 2:14, the very substance, as it were, of things already done, and of a solid and eternal deliverance. It is therefore evident that they have wandered a great distance from the scope of our Lord's words, who would infer from them a change of the substance of the bread into the body of Christ; because as this is most contrary to all reason, so also to the nature of sacraments and sacramental language. Thus much concerning the actions and words of Christ with respect to the bread.

XX. Now follows what he both did and said with respect to the cup. There are three things Christ did with respect to this: 1st, He took the cup as the master of the family usually did among the Jews, taking it in both his hands before he pronounced the blessing over it.

XXI. 2dly, He gave thanks: separately over the cup. For though blessing the bread consecrates all other kinds of food and liquors, without any further consecration, yet, according to the doctors of the Jewish law, that does not serve for the wine; but a peculiar blessing is appointed for it on account of its singular excellency. The ordinary form of blessing was thus: "Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, king of the world, who createst the fruit of the vine." But we are here to maintain what we asserted concerning blessing the bread, that it is consistent with truth that Christ, at this time, made use of a peculiar form of consecration. On account of this blessing Paul calls it the "cup of blessing," 1 Cor. 10:16, probably in imitation of that cup which the Jews called the "cup of blessing the table," or of thanksgiving, with which the feast was closed. And this cup Christ also took "after supper," 1 Cor. 11:25.

XXII. 3dly, He gave it to them; namely, his disciples. For it was the custom of the Jews that all the guests, after the master of the family had tasted it, should drink some of it. Hence it is probable that Christ, after blessing, first drank of the cup; which those words seem to intimate, which we have in Matt. 26:29: "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine," then distributed it among his disciples.

XXIII. We might here inquire why nothing is said of pouring out the wine, which, in other respects, answers to breaking the bread. But Buxtorf in *Exercitat. de primæ cœnæ ritibus, et forma*, by which I gratefully own I have profited very much on this subject, learnedly assigns the reason of that, namely, that the Jews, in their ordinary entertainments, observed no peculiar rite about pouring out the wine. This was done promiscuously by a servant, or any other person, as occasion offered. But in the feast of the passover, they order that, if by any means it can be done, the master of the family do not pour it out himself, but endeavour to get it done by another; because every thing at this feast ought to be done with an air of magnificence, to denote their liberty from Egyptian bondage to which they were restored. And therefore it is very probable that neither our Lord himself, nor his apostles, but some servant attending at the feast, belonging to the family of him who gave the furnished room to Christ, poured out the wine at the command of

our Lord. Whence it appears that our churches also in this respect come nearest to antiquity, in which the Elders or Deacons perform that office.

XXIV. Christ's words with respect to the cup, correspond with those he had spoken about the bread, and they are, first, simply perceptive, "drink ye all of it," Matt. 26:27, where that universal particle has its peculiar emphasis: then he shows the end, "this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me," 1 Cor. 11:25; all which is clear from what was aforesaid. The explicatory words are, "this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins," Matt. 26:28. That is, the wine contained in this cup is the symbol of blood, not the typical blood, as was that of the paschal lamb, but of my blood; by which is ratified, not that same Old Testament, which the blood of the lamb they had now eaten did ratify and confirm; but a new and a better testament, which brings not a typical but a real remission; conjoined, not with the rigorous demands of the handwriting, but with the giving a discharge in virtue of my blood, very soon to be shed, not to a few among the Israelites, but to very many nations all over the world. Thus much concerning the actions of Christ about the symbols.

XXV. Next follow the actions of the disciples, and consequently of the other guests. And these, according to Christ's appointment, are three: first, to receive both the bread and the cup; but each separately, for so Christ distributed them: in this manner he commanded his people to take them; thus the body of Christ, as broken for us; his blood as poured out of his body, are more distinctly represented; and in fine, as a complete entertainment requires both meat and drink, so this most complete spiritual repast which we have in Christ, is thus most excellently represented. And therefore we cannot so well approve of that custom which prevailed in Cyprian's time, to give a piece of bread dipt in wine to infants and the sick; which was the practice in some places, about the year of Christ 340, in the public and ordinary celebration of the sacrament. The same judgment we are to pass on the custom of the Greeks, who crumble the consecrated bread into the wine, and take it out with a spoon.

XXVI. The other action of the guests is to eat the bread taken; for this is the immediate end of its being distributed and taken. Whence it follows, that those destroy the end of the sacrament who take the bread, or host, as they call it, that they may keep it honourably in a pyx or box. This is altogether contrary both to the institution of Christ and the custom of the ancient church. For Christ has expressly commanded they should directly eat. And indeed, as the ancient Christians under heathen emperors, by reason of the danger of persecution, could not at all times have priests, they ate part publicly, and part they carried home; yet they by no means kept it in a religious manner, in order to adore, but to eat it on the next occasion. To this purpose is the decree of the council of Saragosa, which was held in the year 381, canon 3: "If any person is convinced that he has not used the received grace of the Eucharist, let him be Anathema for ever." For that purpose also the Eucharist was publicly kept by the priest, to be carried out of the ordinary course to the sick, not to be adored, but eaten. But in the earliest times, as the sacrament was celebrated every day, it was to no purpose to lay by the Eucharist; but when the supper was publicly administered, it might be sent by the hands of the deacon to the sick, or to those who were absent on some other account. Which Justin. Apolog. Secunda, mentions, was often done in his time. But what was left of the supper, or not made use of, was either thrown into the fire or given to the school-boys to eat; as Vossius has proved from the second council of Mascon, from Hesychius and Evagrius Scholasticus, Disput. 3, de S. cœnæ Domin. Symbol, § 8.

XXVII. The third action of the guests is, to drink the consecrated wine out of the cup. It is remarkable that our Lord said concerning the cup, not only "take this, and divide it among yourselves," Luke 22:17, but likewise added a mark of universality, "drink ye all of it," Matt. 26:27. And we are told how they complied with this command, Mark 14:24, "and they all drank of it." As if the Lord Jesus purposely intended to obviate the sacrilegious boldness of those men who deprive the Laics, as they call the common people, of the consecrated cup. It is an insipid exception, that the all ought to be restricted to the apostles, to whom our Lord is there only speaking. For the apostles in that case represented the whole church. And unless the papists will own this, whence will they ever prove that the eating of the bread belongs to the laity or common people; especially as no universal particle is added to that command. We add the authority of the apostle Paul, who dissuades the whole church of Corinth by this topic from the worship of idols; because, says he, "ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils," 1 Cor. 10:21; and again, writing to the whole church, "as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death," &c. Where he all along joins the eating of the bread and the drinking of the cup, as actions to be alike performed by the same persons. 1 Cor. 11:26–29.

XXVIII. But who are they on whom it is incumbent to observe these duties according to Christ's command. Paul has briefly resolved this, 1 Cor. 11:28, 29: "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup; for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." In which words he shows, 1st. That no person should approach the table of the Lord but he who, having a knowledge of the sacred mysteries, can discern the Lord's body, and, in some measure at least, understands the analogy between the sacred symbols and the thing signified by them, and on that occasion can show the Lord's death. 2dly. That there is also required in the communicant that experience of the ways of God about the elect as to be able to examine himself; whether, besides the external profession of faith, he hath also the genuine marks of the Holy Spirit dwelling in him, or, which is the same thing, of a sincere and internal christianity; such as the sorrow of a penitent heart, which is after a godly manner; a lively faith resting on Christ, as the alone author of life; in fine, an unfeigned love towards God and his neighbour, joined with an effectual purpose of reformation of life. Whoever upon a previous examination finds these things in himself, is not to account himself as an unacceptable guest to the Lord.

XXIX. These things were carefully observed in the ancient church while zeal was fervent, and discipline in its vigour. How diligent they were in instructing the Catechumens, with what circumspection they acted in admitting them to the holy sacrament, cannot be unknown to those who have but just looked into the writings of the fathers. And that none but the worthy might come to the communion, the deacon called out with a loud voice to all, before the administration, Sancta sanctis, holy things to the holy; and the priest, Sursum corda, to heaven with your hearts. To which words the faithful answered, Habemus ad Dominum, we have raised them to the Lord. In Clement also Constit. lib. ii. c. 61, the deacon duly, at the beginning of the communion, says to the people, Let none have a grudge against another, none be in a state of hypocrisy. And the custom of the Greeks at his day differs not from this; among whom they who are to communicate, turn themselves to every side of the church, and on bended knees address those around them, Forgive us, brethren, we have sinned both in word and deed. To which they who were present answered in this manner, Brethren, God will forgive us. Moreover, just when the communicant was to partake of the sacred feast, he addresses himself to Christ in these words, "I

will not kiss thee as Judas did, but after the example of the thief, I confess to thee: Lord, remember me, when thou comest into thy kingdom." These things we have in Christophorus Angelus, de Statu hodiernorum Græcorum, c. 23.

XXX. We may easily gather from what we have quoted from Paul what to think of the communion of infants. It appears to have been a custom in the ancient church to put the symbols of the holy supper into the mouths of infants just after baptism. A practice still observed by the Orientals. I will here subjoin the words of Metrophanes Critopulus Hieromonachus, confess. c. ix: "But even infants themselves are partakers, beginning immediately upon their baptism, and afterwards as often as the parents will. And if any one should blame us for the communion of infants, we can easily stop his mouth. For, if he be an Anabaptist, we use this saying against him: 'Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me,' Matt. 19:15. Also that other: 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,' John 6:53. But the prophetess Anna makes very much for us, who dedicated Samuel from his early infancy to God; who also requires the first-born of the Jews to be given up to him, from their very birth, though not yet endowed with a competent measure of understanding. But if our adversary be no Anabaptist, we will also use the very same arguments against him, which he uses for infants against the Anabaptists; that as they ought to be baptized, so also to be made partakers of the Lord's Supper. And thus with the help of God we have got the better of our argument." Thus far Metrophanes.

XXXI. But we are of a quite different opinion. For, all the words of our Lord's command (with respect to this sacrament) are so expressed that they cannot belong to infants, who can neither receive the bread nor eat it, unless it be chewed for them or soaked. For "babes are fed with milk, and not with meat," 1 Cor. 3:2, Heb. 5:12. Infants cannot examine themselves nor discern the Lord's body, nor show his death, all which we have just heard the apostle requires of communicants.

XXXII. The arguments of Metrophanes are very easily refuted. For, 1st. It does not follow because our Lord was willing that young children should come unto him, and declared that theirs was the kingdom of heaven, that they are to partake of the supper. Christ is there speaking of spiritual and mystical communion with himself, which does not imply any sacramental communion whatever; but that only, of which the subjects he is speaking of are capable. 2dly. The nature of baptism and of the supper is different. Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration and ingrafting in the church; in the administration of which, the person to be baptized is merely passive; to the receiving of that the Scripture does not so universally require self-examination and the showing the Lord's death. And therefore it may be properly applied to young children. But the supper is the sacrament of nutrition by means of a solid food; to the partaking whereof, the communicants are required to perform certain actions both by the body and the soul, of which infants are incapable, and therefore it belongs to those who are come to the years of discretion, and not to little children. 3dly. Our Lord, John 6:53, is not treating of a sacramental but of a spiritual and mystical eating by faith. For neither was the Eucharist then instituted or known; nor will any one readily urge such an absolute necessity for the eucharist as that without it none can be saved; which yet our Lord asserts of that eating of his flesh. 4thly. The example of the prophetess Anna, who consecrated Samuel a little child to God, is not at all to the purpose. For nothing can be concluded from that, but that it is a part of the duty of parents to give up their



children as early as possible to the obedience and service of God. 5thly. And what they pretend concerning the dedication of the first-born of the Jews to God, is still more impertinent. For that dedication of the first-born, previous to the setting apart the tribe of Levi, showed that they were God's, and to be employed in his service; in them the other children were accounted to be consecrated, and even the whole family; and in a word, they were types of Christ, in whom, as the first-born among many brethren, all the families of the earth are blessed. All which has nothing to do with the participation of the eucharist.

XXXIII. In the ancient church, the communion of the Lord's Supper was far more frequently celebrated than it is at this day. It is the advice of Basil to Cæsaria Patricia, epist. 289: "Certainly to communicate every day, and to partake of the holy body and blood of Christ, is a good and useful practice." Thus also Augustine relates in his former epistle to Januarius, that some "communicated every day." And to this sense some people wrested the "daily bread" mentioned in the Lord's prayer, as Fortunatus: "But the asking our daily bread, seems to insinuate, that we should every day, if possible, reverently take the communion of his body." Afterwards the church increasing in numbers, but abating in zeal, the clergy communicated daily with the priest, while the people thought they had done their duty if they communicated every Lord's day. But neither did they stop here, for the people knowing no measure to their neglect, it was decreed in several synods, that whoever did not communicate every third Lord's day at lead, should be cut off from the church. At last matters came to that pass, that the people scarce communicated on any other days than the most solemn festivals, especially on the Easter holydays. Compare what we have already quoted, sect. vii, from Honorius Augustodunensis. This neglect of the common people was frequently reprimanded with severity by the holy men of God. But that custom, which enjoins the communicating once a year, was so displeasing to Calvin, that he did not scruple to call it a "most certain device of the devil;" and thinks, we are by all means so to order matters, "as that no meeting of the church be without the word, prayers, and partaking of the supper;" gathering from Acts 2:42, that such was the practice of the apostolical church, where Luke says, that the "faithful continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." He at least imagines, the supper may be most decently administered, if each week at least it be set before the church. See Institut. lib. iv. c. xvii. § 43–47. Alas! what a departure is there at this day from the sanctity and zeal of the ancients! yet, as our Lord has determined nothing as to the time, and in general only recommended frequent communion by that word "as oft," 1 Cor. 11:25, 26, a certain medium, especially amidst such a corruption of manners should seem to be observed; lest, either by the too frequent use of this sacred food should be disesteemed, or we should slight or neglect that august table of the Lord.

XXXIV. Let us now come to the mystical signification of the supper, and introduce the beloved spouse of Christ into the inner bedchamber, where she may delight herself, not with any outward appearance or figure, but exult and melt away in the most desirable embraces of her husband, and in the pleasures of the purest love; and forgetting the world, forgetting herself, but full of Christ, she may dissolve away in reciprocal returns of mutual fondness. For this purpose the holy supper is to be considered. I. As a sign, teaching us by the institution of Christ. II. As a seal, ratifying the promises of the New Testament. III. As a stipulation, or solemn engagement, binding on us every duty of piety and love.

XXXV. If we consider the supper as a sign given us for instruction, it exhibits a remembrance of Christ, and a lively representation of most of *φρικτῶν της εὐσεβειας ἡμῶν μυστηρίων*, the awful mysteries of our religion, as the Greek fathers often speak. The bread signifies the body of Christ. For, as "bread strengtheneth man's heart," Ps. 104:15, so the flesh of Christ, and the spiritual blessings and graces purchased for us by Christ when he was incarnate, are the food of our soul, supporting and strengthening it in the spiritual life, into the hope of life eternal. "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I give for the life of the world," John 6:51. Again, as corn from which bread is prepared, is ground to meal, kneaded to dough, and baked in the oven, before it can be agreeable and wholesome food for man; so in like manner, the captain of our salvation was made perfect through various sufferings, Heb. 2:10, and scorched both in the fire of the divine wrath kindled against our sins, and in the flames of his own love.

XXXVI. The wine signifies the blood of Christ. For as wine allays the thirst, revives the animal spirits, cheers the heart, Ps. 104:15; Prov. 31:6, 7, and makes the maids cheerful (eloquent), Zech. 9:17; so in like manner, the grace purchased by the blood of Christ, allays the thirst of our soul, abundantly satisfying all our holy longings, John 4:14, to a kind of a holy and mystical ebriety, Ps. 36:8; Canticl. 5:1; it supports and sustains the soul when sick of love, Canticl. 2:5; and "puts gladness into the heart, more than in the time that the corn and wine of worldly men are increased," Ps. 4:7; in fine, "causes the lips of those that are asleep to speak," Canticl. 7:9, and to become eloquent in the praises of God and of his Christ. And hence it is, that the Lord compares the participation of his grace to a "feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined," Isa. 25:6. And we must not omit, that as wine is squeezed with much force from the grapes when trodden in the wine-press; so in like manner, the Lord Jesus "was straitened," Luke 12:50, and oppressed with much anguish, that the blood might flow to us from his blessed body, and his spiritual grace with his blood.

XXXVII. When the dispenser of the mysteries of God, takes the bread and the cup of blessing into his hands before the eyes of the faithful, that seems to intimate, that Christ was thus constituted and taken to be mediator, and "set forth" to believers, "to be a propitiation through faith in his blood," Rom. 3:25. The blessing and thanksgiving pronounced over the bread and wine, teach us that Christ is that blessed seed of Abraham, "in whom God hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places," Eph. 1:3, and the greatest gift of divine bounty, for which to all eternity we shall not be able to render suitable thanks; nor are we to set about this sacred feast otherwise than by devout prayers, and a grateful acknowledgement of that infinite mercy, which the Lord vouchsafes to us who are so unworthy. The breaking of the bread represents the breaking of Christ's body, especially that by death; for the soul is the band by which all the parts of the body are preserved united. But on its departure, the carcase is nothing but a heap of dusty particles, which are soon to be separated upon its putrefaction. Which would also have been the case with the dead body of Christ, had not a speedy resurrection prevented that holy one of the Lord from seeing corruption. The pouring out of the wine represents the shedding of Christ's blood, that especially which was done on the cross, for the confirmation of the New Testament. And thus in the holy supper, there is a commemoration of the death of Christ, not in words only, but also by those mystical rites. The distribution of these sacred pledges is a figure or emblem of that gratuitous offer, by which the Lord Jesus, with all his saving benefits, is presented to the elect, with the most alluring invitations to accept of him; nor

offered only, but actually reached out and freely given to believers for their eternal salvation. In the preaching of the Gospel, there is also a certain but a more general offer of Christ made to all who seriously long after his grace. But in the distribution of the sacrament, a much more particular offer and communication of spiritual grace is given to every believing communicant.

XXXVIII. But when believers receive the bread and wine, they declare by that action, that they receive by a true faith Christ himself and all he is, that they may have a right to become the sons of God, John 1:12. But the eating the bread and drinking the wine signify something more. And first, they really set forth the devote and lively employment of the soul, engaged in holy meditations on Christ, who is all its desire that it may derive from him every thing it knows to be needful for its spiritual life. For, what feeding is to the body, that meditation is to the soul; whereby, from the things the thoughts are employed about, it sucks a suitable aliment, as the body is nourished by eating. Again, these actions also signify that intimate union which subsists between Christ and believers; as meat and drink, when put into the mouth are not only received into the stomach, but also converted into the very substance of the person. This union the Scripture calls an abode, John 14:23; "a joining," 1 Cor. 6:17; "the same body," Eph. 3:6. Lastly, they represent that sweetest delight which the hungry and thirsty soul enjoys from the fruition of Christ and his grace; not only believing, but seeing and tasting that the Lord is good, Ps. 34:9; 1 Peter. 2:3. And as all are partakers of one bread and of one wine, this is a figure of that amicable unity, whereby they who partake of the same sacred feast, are united together as domestics of the same Lord: "For we being many are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread," 1 Cor. 10:17.

XXXIX. But in the holy supper, we have something more than an instructing sign. It is likewise a seal ratifying to us the promises and grace of God. And first it really seals all the promises of the covenant of grace, which were formerly sealed to believers by the passover, and all those other sacrificial feasts to which they were admitted. Again, more especially the promises of the New Testament, better than those of the Old, which the fathers were obliged to be satisfied with. And in this respect the supper of the Christians greatly excels the passover. "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins," Matt. 26:28; in order to a real and not a typical expiation of sin, blotting out the hand-writing, quenching our thirst, and enjoying a fulness of delight in a perfect liberty. In fine, it most especially seals some saving blessings, both of this life and of that to come.

XL. The blessings of this life, which are sealed to us by the supper, are principally three. 1st. Intimate union and communion with Christ, as made perfect by sufferings. Had it pleased our Lord to give to his disciples a piece cut off from his body for them to eat, or some drops of his blood to drink, even that of itself would not be sufficient to salvation, nor have accomplished a saving communion with Christ, which is not a carnal, but a spiritual thing: yet the disciples would thereby have had a very effectual sign of the mystical union. But now he substitutes bread in place of his body, wine in place of his blood, when he says, "this is my body; this is my blood:" and bids us be no less assured by that pledge of his mystical communion, than if we took his very body and blood into our hands and mouth. 2dly. The conservation and nourishment, the strength and increase of spiritual life, which flow from communion with Christ. As, by the use of bread and wine, he who communicates experiences his bodily strength renewed; so, at the same time, it is intimated to the believing soul that he shall not want that grace of Christ, which

"giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might increaseth strength," Isa. 40:29. 3dly. A satisfying fulness of every desirable good, which neither the world could bestow upon any, nor the beggarly elements of the world, separated from Christ, furnish the ancient Jews with: while the Lord Jesus, presenting these symbols, calls out to believer, "Ho! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? and your labour for that which satisfieth not? hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness," Isa. 55:1, 2.

XLI. The blessing of the life to come, an earnest of which Christ gives us in the supper, is that most abundant satisfactory fulness of glory, both in soul and body, which the psalmist has described, Ps. 16:11, and Ps. 17:15: and which is frequently represented under the similitude of a marriage-feast.

XLII. Last of all, with respect to us, the holy supper is a kind of solemn engagement, strongly binding us to every duty of piety and love, both to Christ and to our neighbour. It binds us to Christ in several respects. 1. In general, on receiving this earnest of the covenant of grace, in which Christ joins himself to us in a marriage covenant, we, by that very thing, promise and openly declare, and avow, by an oath, that we will fulfil every duty of a chaste, faithful, and loving spouse towards him. Every one of the communicants, by this public and solemn feast, which is appointed for confirming this mystical marriage, makes an open profession of that before God, angels and the whole church. Whoever partakes of the bread broken, and wine poured out, says to Christ, if not in plain words, and an explicit meditation on the thing, yet in the implicit meaning of his act; as, "I desire, Lord, to be a partaker of thy body broken, and blood shed for my salvation; so I declare that I deserve to have my body, no less than this bread, broken or torn in pieces, to have my blood, no less than this wine, poured out, if, in the renewal of this covenant, I shall, with an evil and perfidious heart, break my word to thee." 2dly. Besides, as in the communion of the holy supper, the greatest and an almost incredible instance of the love of the Lord Jesus towards us is held forth not only before our eyes, but exhibited to our taste; in like manner it is proper that the flames of our love towards him be, in the participation of that feast, kindled up, and the love of him beyond all other love kept inviolate, and become the object of our admiring thoughts. In the same breath, that the spouse was setting forth the love of her beloved to be better than wine, and infinitely preferring the kisses of his mouth to all other things, the most desirable in other respects, she also adds, Cant. 1:2, 3, "therefore do the virgins love him." 3dly. As the holy supper is especially instituted in remembrance of our Lord, and in commemoration of his death, believers, in the use of it, are bound to have always fresh in their memory the Lord Christ, and the dreadful sufferings he underwent, which are the most solid foundation of our hope, and the only matter of our consolation; and to esteem Christ crucified, as "a bundle of myrrh, lying all night betwixt our breasts," Cant. 1:13. 4thly, and lastly. As a greater mark of familiarity, our Lord desires a mutual supper, "I will sup with him and he with me," Rev. 3:20. It is therefore proper that they, who are entertained by our Lord with so magnificent a feast, should be careful to give him a becoming entertainment in return: invite him to "come into his garden, and eat his pleasant fruits," Cant. 4:16; and give him to "drink of spiced wine, and of the juice of their pomegranate," Cant. 8:2. That is, they should give him delight by the sincere practice of internal Christianity; than which neither spices, nor the honeycomb, nor milk, nor wine, can be sweeter to him.

XLIII. To conclude, by the use of the supper we are also bound to the practice of brotherly concord, and the sincerest love towards our brethren and sisters, partakers with us of the same table: that in the hearing, and with the applause of angels, may be sung in the church of God, with one mouth and one heart, "Behold! how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity," Ps. 133:1. Thus the apostolic church both set us an example for our imitation: "and they continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart," Acts 2:46. To this purpose was the holy kiss, by which they, on all occasions, kept up a mutual peace, of which frequent mention is made in Scripture, and of which, especially in these rites of the supper, the innocent use was for some time continued among Christians. God grant we may in such a manner solemnize this mystical supper on earth, that we may eternally feast with Christ in heaven. AMEN.