



**The Baptist Standard Bearer, Inc.**

NUMBER ONE IRON OAKS DRIVE • PARIS, ARKANSAS 72855

## **THE SERMONS OF JOHN BRINE**

**The True Sense of Atonement for Sin, By Christ's  
Death, Stated and Defended, In Answer to a  
Pamphlet entitled "The Scripture Doctrine of  
Atonement Examined" by Mr. Taylor of Norwich**

*by John Brine*

*(London: John Ward, 1750)*

*Thou hast given a standard to them that fear thee;  
that it may be displayed because of the truth  
— Psa. 60: 4*



**The Baptist Standard Bearer, Inc.  
Version 2.0 © 2007**

# SERMON 17

## THE TRUE SENSE OF ATONEMENT FOR SIN, BY CHRIST'S DEATH,

**STATED AND DEFENDED; IN ANSWER TO A PAMPHLET,  
ENTITLED, THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT  
EXAMINED, BY MR. TAYLOR, OF NORWICH,**

*WITH An APPENDIX, CONTAINING*

*An ANSWER to the OBJECTIONS of an anonymous Author to the  
Doctrine of SATISFACTION, in a Pamphlet, entitled,*

*Second Thoughts concerning the Sufferings and Death of CHRIST, etc.*

Printed by DAN. NOTTAGE, for JOHN WARD, at the *King's Arms*, in  
*Cornhill*, against the *Royal-Exchange*: And Sold by GEORGE  
KEITH, at *Mercers' Chapel, Cheapside*; and by JOHN EYNON, at a  
Print-Shop, on the North Side of the *Royal-Exchange*. London  
1752

## THE PREFACE

*As some Remarks on Mr. Taylor's Piece have been published very  
lately, the Reader may reasonably expect an Account from me why  
I now appear, wherein I am willing to gratify him.*

*The Author of those Remarks, is not fond of the Use of the Word  
Imputation, on the Subject of Christ's Obedience and Sufferings; though  
he thinks it may be safely applied to both, as Dr. Doddridge hath  
explained it, i.e. explained it away. <sup>f1</sup> He consents to the Truth of false  
Representation of our Opinion by Mr. Taylor, viz. that we think the Death  
of Christ made God merciful; and wishes, that what he has said, to correct  
that Mistake, may not be without Effect. <sup>f2</sup> I am not sensible, that any  
Person ever imagined this. Mr. Hampton grants, that the Sufferings of  
Christ were not penal, and that there is not a natural Connection between*

his Death and Remission of Sin; but that his Death is a Ground of our Redemption from Death, through the Will and Appointment of God; <sup>f3</sup> as any insignificant Action might have been. This is plainly giving up the Doctrine of proper Satisfaction for sin, or of real Atonement for it. I have some other Reasons for my Dissatisfaction, with Mr. Hampton's Remarks; but I shall not trouble the Reader with them. I suppose, enough is mentioned to convince, that, if our Opinion on this important Point is to be defended, no Occasion was administered by these Remarks, to stifle what I had prepared in answer, to Mr. Taylor. I cheerfully refer my Thoughts on this glorious Subject to the Approbation, or Censure of such Persons as have a proper Conviction of the evil Nature and just Demerit of Sin, a true Sense of the Holiness of God, and his righteous Displeasure with moral Evil; who are willing to be determined by the Holy Scriptures, without wresting them, in their Sentiments concerning this Doctrine, of which we can know, nothing at all, but by Revelation.

## CHAPTER 1 — SOME THINGS PREMISED, RELATING TO THE SUBJECT

I FREELY grant, that the Doctrine of Atonement, or Satisfaction for Sin, by the Death of Christ, is not to be explained, by any Judicial Procedures among Men. If it might be illustrated and confirmed by Rules, which do, or can lawfully obtain in human Conduct, towards the Innocent in a Way of Penalty, and towards the Innocent in Consequence thereof: That Doctrine could not reasonably be represented, as a Mystery, which it is by the Sacred Writers. It is called *the Wisdom of God in a Mystery, the hidden Wisdom: And the deep Things of God.*

I will allow, that human Governments have no *Power, or Right*, to charge an innocent Person with the Crimes of any Offender, and inflict Punishment on him in his Stead.

And that no Man hath *Power over himself*, either in his *Members* or his *Life*, lawfully to consent to suffer *Mutilation, or Death*, or any kind of *corporal* Punishment, in the Room of a guilty Person.

The Reason of both is very clear to me; Rulers as well as Subjects are under a Law, which is *superior* to any they have Power to enact, and by which their Constitutions ought, in all Instances, to be directed; *viz. natural Justice*, according to which, Innocency ever is to be protected, and Guilt *alone* punished. And, as a Power to punish results from Guilt only, the infliction of Penalty is, in Equity, limited to its own proper Subject, and never ought to be extended farther, It is as just to punish *without* the Being of Guilt at all, as it is to punish, in any Degree, a Person wholly clear of that Guilt, for which the Law directs unto the Infliction of Penalty. Nor is Guilt transferable from one Man to another, as pecuniary Debts are. This is not pretended.

**II.** As various of the Terms, which are sometimes used on the Subject of the Atonement of Christ, are borrowed from the *Civil* Law; it may not be improper to inquire into the Sense of them.

**1.** *Novation*: That designs taking away a *former* Obligation, by a new Stipulation or Agreement, wherein the Consent of the Creditor is required and given. This hath Place in the Affair of Christ's Death. For, according to the Law, we, the Transgressors, were bound over to Punishment for our

Crimes; but God, of his infinite Mercy, freed us from that Obligation, by admitting Christ to be our Surety: Or, in virtue of his Stipulation, we are let free, and he became *responsible* unto God for us. This was an Act of Sovereignty in God.

**2. Satisfaction:** This is a Term, that is also borrowed from the *Civil Law*, and it intends a Creditor's accepting what is offered and paid to him, by, or in Behalf of a Debtor, though it is not what he might, according to the Obligation, have demanded. *Satisfaction*, therefore, does not necessarily imply a *full* Payment, for that may be, where the latter is not. When we use the Word on this Subject, we mean, that no Demand will, or can be made upon us, because God agreed to accept of the Payment of our Debt by *Jesus Christ*, and he hath discharged it, or made good his Engagement in our Behalf. The Death of Christ is to be considered, as the *procatartitic* Cause; and *Satisfaction*, as the Effect.

**3. Acceptilation:** That imports a Creditor's agreeing to accept *another* Thing, or *less* than what is in the Obligation, whereby the Debtor is no less freed from the Obligation he was under, than if the *Idem*, or same, was paid, that the Obligation expresses. This is, indeed, understood of Obligation by Words among *Civilians*, and is not *properly* applicable to this Affair. But some do at least allude unto it: Yet they allow not that Force unto *Acceptilation* in this Matter, which, according to the Opinion of *Civilians*, it contains in it, *viz. The Removal of the Obligation*. If it should not so do, in this Business, Christ would be injured; for it is not just to require an innocent Person to die in the *Room* of the Guilty, and suffer the Obligation to remain on him.

**4. Solution:** This is the *Payment* of what is in the Obligation, from whence *Satisfaction*, by Right, follows. *Satisfaction*, as has been observed, may be, where *Solution* is not, because the Creditor may be content with receiving less than he had a Right to require: But *Satisfaction* must needs be, where there is *Solution*, because, in Right, the Creditor can make no farther Demand. And this is the Case, in this Affair. For Christ paid the *Idem*, or the same that was in our Obligation. We stood obliged to suffer the Curse of the Law, and that includes the whole Penalty our Sins demerit; no farther Punishment is due to Sin, than what is contained in the Law's Curse: And, therefore, the Death of Christ was a *proper* and *full Payment of our Debt*; consequently, it must be *satisfactory* to God, our righteous Judge. God might have insisted upon Payment from us, and not have accepted of the Engagement of another for us; but since, by

*Novation*, he dissolved our Obligation, or admitted of a Surety, his Payment of what was required in the Obligation upon the Ground of Justice, gives us a Right to Impunity. And, therefore, when it is said that the *Satisfaction* of Christ was *refusable*, we must be careful, that we understand it in a right Sense.

(1.) If by it is meant, that God was at Liberty to admit, or not admit of his *Sponson*, or *Engagement for us*, it is true. For he might justly have retained us under the Obligation, and *not have allowed* of the Payment of our Debt by a Surety. The *Acceptation* of his Undertaking for us was an Act of sovereign Favour, and, therefore, it is, that we are said to be freely forgiven, although our Surety discharged our whole Debt.

But, (2.) If by it is intended, that what Christ suffered for us was *refusable*, or might not have been accepted, or allowed to be the *Solution* of our Debt, it is most false; because he suffered that Curse which the Law threatened, and he was, in his Person, such as gave that Worth unto his Death, which the Justice of God required, unto Sufferings *satisfactory for Guilt*. The Appointment of Christ to suffer, in our Stead, was an amazing Act of sovereign Mercy, Kindness, and Grace; but the Acceptation of his Sufferings, for our Discharge, *was an Act of Justice*, because they were, both in *Kind* and *Value*, what that required, in Case of a Violation of the Law.

And, therefore, it is a Mistake to think, that, God having required his Son to die for us, he may, that notwithstanding, only grant unto us Terms, or Conditions of Pardon, and, for Want of our Performance of those Conditions, impute our Guilt to us, and inflict upon us the Penalty our Sins deserve.

It is Matter of Favour to be content with *the Payment of less than is due*; but of Right *to be satisfied with the Payment of the Whole*, which can in *Justice* be demanded, whether it be by the *Principal* or *Surety*.

The Agreement between God and Christ, as our Surety, did not render his Sufferings available to procure the Pardon of Sin; if so, then, their Value is not *intrinsic*; but is *extrinsical* only, or it is of *arbitrary* Appointment. His Death was the Result of the sovereign Decree of God, and of his own free and voluntary Engagement to submit to the sovereign Pleasure of the Father. But the *Merit*, *Virtue*, and *Efficacy* of his Sacrifice to take away Sin, or atone for our Guilt, spring not from any Agreement between God, our righteous Judge, and Christ, our Surety. The Merit of it arises wholly

from the Nature of his Sufferings, as they were *properly penal*, and the *infinite Dignity* of his Person. As the *infinite Demerit* of Sin is not the Effect of the Divine Will, but results from *the infinite Greatness* of God, against whom it is committed: So the Value of Christ's Sufferings is not of Divine Constitution and Appointment; but it is the proper and necessary Result of the *infinite Dignity* of the Person of the Sufferer. Hence it follows, that the Compact between God and Christ did not give Merit to his Death and Sacrifice, nor constitute how far, and unto what Ends, it should be accepted, on our Account: But *merely* his Act of offering himself a Sacrifice for our Sins. Sovereign Love to our Persons determined upon his becoming a Sacrifice for us, and Justice grants those Effects, which that Sacrifice, because of its *intrinsic Worth* without an *arbitrary* Appointment, merits at the Hand of God, our Lawgiver and Judge.

**III.** It is a Consideration of great Importance, that God acted in this Business, *merely in a sovereign Manner*, both towards us, and towards our Savior.

**1.** *Towards us.* His Resolution to pardon and save us was an Act of his Goodness; but it was his Goodness acting in an *arbitrary* Way: For it is not Goodness *merely* that ordains the Salvation of a criminal Creature; if it was, it would be contrary to Divine Goodness to inflict Punishment on Sinners, which certainly it is not, and, therefore, this was a free Act of God's Will: Or a Purpose of Grace, which is wholly to be attributed to his *absolute* Pleasure. It was not a *natural* Act of his Goodness, as his rewarding Innocence is; but a free and sovereign Act of Clemency and Favour.

**2.** *Towards Christ.* The Divine Decree to punish Sin was an Act of Justice; but the Decree of punishing it in him was an Act of Sovereignty. The Justice of this Decree is apparent, in that Respect was had unto Sin, as the meritorious Cause of Penalty: And the Sovereignty of that Divine Purpose clearly shines, in fixing upon Christ to be the Subject of the Punishment Sin demerits. It was not a free Act of the Divine Will to decree to punish Sin; if it was, God might have decreed to permit the Creature eternally to sin against him, without suffering any Punishment for his Rebellion. But it was a *free* and *sovereign* Act of his Will to decree, that Christ should bear Sin, and suffer the Penalty due unto it. Justice directs to the Punishment of Sin, as what is fit and *proper*. *Sovereignty* appointed and provided the innocent subject, on whom Penalty was inflicted, in order to our Pardon

and Impunity. So that *Sovereignty* is that, from which our Salvation *originally* springs, into which it must be *entirely* resolved, and whereupon it *absolutely* rests. And, if we deprive God of his *Sovereignty*, we must *inevitably* damn ourselves. For that alone could provide for our Recovery and Salvation. Hence,

(1.) We see the Reason why no finite Mind could ever have thought of this Method of saving Sinners. All Acts of Goodness and Justice which proceed not *naturally* from those Attributes in God, but are *free* and *sovereign* Acts of his Will, must be undiscoverable by Reason; because it hath no Rule to guide it into the Knowledge of such Acts as spring from *Sovereignty alone*. And, therefore, it is proper to infinite Wisdom to contrive the Way of our Salvation. And such a *Mystery* this is, as will eternally fill the Minds of Angels and Saints, with holy *Adoration*.

(2.) This will enable us to discern, why our Lord put his Sufferings wholly upon the Will of God, and why his Sacrifice was so pleasing unto him. He put his Sufferings wholly upon the Will of God; because, though it was *natural* to God to will to punish Sin, it was a free Act of his Will to impute Sin to him, and punish him for it. The Sacrifice of Christ was infinitely pleasing unto God; because his Will was therein subjected to the Will of God, in such Sort, as the Will of no Angel or Saint is, or ever will be. This was such an Act of Obedience, as never was, nor ever will be required of any Creature. And herein God was more honored by our blessed Lord, in all his glorious Perfections, than he will be, by the Sufferings of the Damned, or the Obedience of Angels and Saints unto Eternity. This, among other Considerations, is the Reason why the Sacrifice Christ offered, was of a *sweet-smelling Savor unto God*; not *merely* as Sufferings, but as submitted unto, with his whole Soul, out of a Regard unto his Glory, as a *gracious, holy, and just God*.

(3.) Hence we also discern, that there was an *intrinsic* Worth and Efficacy in the Sacrifice of Christ. According to Mr. *Taylor*, what Virtue it had, or which he is pleased to allow unto it, (that I intend to consider, with the Assistance of the Grace of him, whose this Sacrifice is) arose from the Will and Appointment of God. If so, then there was no *intrinsic* Virtue in it to answer any important End, either respecting God, to whom it was offered, or Men for whom it was offered. And, consequently, God is no more honored in any of his Attributes, in the Salvation of Men, than if he had saved them, without requiring this Sacrifice; nor do any Advantages accrue to Men from it, that they might not as well have enjoyed without it.



Which Supposition is such a Reflection on the Wisdom of God, who appointed Christ to suffer and die, as would certainly cause Men to blush who advance it, if they were not wholly given over to Blindness and Stupidity. As our Savior, in his Sufferings, was, in such an unparalleled Manner, obedient to the Father's Will, his Death hath Virtue and Efficacy in itself, *independent of any Act of the Divine Will*, to attain the great Ends whereunto it was designed. This Transaction was the Effect of the sovereign Will of God; but the Worth, Virtue, and Efficacy of his Death and Sacrifice are intrinsic, and not of *arbitrary* Appointment. If it was, God might have willed his Death, without decreeing it should answer any important End, either respecting himself, or Men; and he certainly did, for aught we know, Besides, was it possible for infinite Goodness, Holiness, and Wisdom, to will the Sufferings of the innocent *Jesus* to an End, which they, in their own Nature, had no Virtue or Efficacy at all to answer? but it is wholly of arbitrary Appointment, that such an End is answered by his Sufferings and Sacrifice.

They are but *swelling Words of Vanity* which those Men use, concerning the Goodness of God, in this Affair, who deny the *real* Merit of the Sacrifice of Christ. If Divine Goodness is, as they say it is, exalted gloriously, in freely pardoning Sin, without Satisfaction for it, and the Death of Christ could not, nor was intended to satisfy for Sin, nor had any Virtue in *itself*; but, what Efficacy soever it hath, *it is extrinsical*, and of *Divine Appointment only*; then how is Goodness displayed in delivering him up to Suffering and Death for us? Towards Christ it was an Act of *Severity*, and to us no Instance of Goodness, which was at all necessary to our Pardon and Salvation. For the Death of Christ could not be *necessary* to our Remission, if it had no *intrinsic* Worth in it, *meritorious* of Forgiveness. There was no Goodness manifested to us Sinners, in the Gift of Christ for us, if his Death had no *intrinsic* Virtue in it: All the Kindness, which can be pretended in this Matter towards us, is God's Decreeing, that his Death shall be a *Condition*, or *Reason* of our Pardon, without any Virtue in it to take away, or atone for our Guilt. And *such a Virtue as this*, God might have assigned unto the *Death of any Martyr*, or even of a *Beast* offered to him in Sacrifice, if that had been his Pleasure. For such Virtue is assignable to another Person or Thing, if it is assignable unto Christ.

**IV.** The Government of the *Jews* was *Theocratical*, or a *Theocracy*: God took upon himself the Government of that People. And,

**1.** He gave them a perfect Law, which required the Practice of all Holiness, and forbid every Sin. *God*, who is infinitely holy, cannot require less than perfect Purity, however depraved the Subjects of his Rule are. He can make no Allowance for their Weaknesses, Temptations, or Occasions to Evil.

**2.** His Law threatened Sin with Death. *The Soul that sins shall die*. And this Threatening respected every Sin, and all Degrees of Sin. So that every Deviation from the Rule of Duty, and the Want of perfect Conformity to the Law, in the Manner of the Performance of it, subjected to that awful Menace. If, as their King, he had proceeded according to this Law, no Man among them could have enjoyed any Favour, or even Life; and therefore,

**3.** God appointed the Offering of Sacrifices to make Atonement for Sin, in many Cases. Wherein we may observe,

**(1.)** He did not charge or impute Guilt unto the Offerer of those Sacrifices, as the Governor of that People.

**(2.)** Nor were they subject unto the Commination of Death, upon their Offering those Sacrifices. But,

**(3.)** Were to be continued in Life, and in the Enjoyment of such Favors and Privileges, as were granted unto them by God, who took upon himself the Rule over them, as a Nation. The Law of Sacrifices was, therefore, *political*; but intended of God, if the divine Writer to the *Hebrews* mistakes not their Meaning, as *Types* of far greater Things than any they *really* contained, *viz.* the actual Removal of Guilt, Freedom from the Condemnation, and Curse of the Law, and Escaping Divine Vengeance.

**4.** Some Sins were not to be atoned for by Sacrifices, in this *political* and *typical* Sense; but the guilty Persons must suffer *corporal* Death for those Crimes, *viz.* *Murder, Adultery, Blasphemy, etc.*

**5.** Sacrifices were appointed for some *atrocious Crimes*, *viz.* *Defiling a Servant-maid, Theft, and Perjury*; and therefore it is not true, that they were instituted only for *common* Frailties, and Sins of *Ignorance*. Lev. 5: 1, Lev. 6: 4, 5, Lev. 19:20.

**6.** The anniversary Sacrifice was offered for Sins of all Sorts, as the Terms used concerning it do clearly and abundantly evince, *Iniquities and Transgressions in all their Sins*. Those Terms include all Sorts of Sins,

which was intended to signify, that a spiritual Atonement was to be made even for such Offences, on Account of which, the guilty Person must suffer *corporal* Death, according unto that Law, which was the *Instrument of the Jewish Polity*. As to the *temporal* Life of that People, it was preserved or forfeited, as they were innocent or guilty of such Crimes, for which no Sacrifices were appointed of God: But that was not the Rule according to which God proceeded in the Business of Salvation. If it had been so, no *Murderer, etc.* could have been pardoned and saved.

It was the Design of the Institution of Sacrifices for *lesser* Crimes, to teach that People, that the Remission of them, *small*, as they might be inclined to esteem them, could not be without Atonement made: And the Institution of the anniversary Sacrifice furnished them with a Ground of Hope of the Pardon of such Crimes, for which those, who were guilty of them, must suffer *corporal* Death. And this seems to be one Reason, why the *Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews* particularly observes, that that anniversary Sacrifice could not *take away Sin*, in order to prove the Necessity of another. That being more comprehensive than the others, it was most apposite to his Purpose to instance in that, for that Reason; and for that Reason, chiefly, it was so, Lev. 16:16, 21.

Yet, it also seems to be instanced in, with a farther View, *viz.* to prove the Necessity of another Sacrifice to be offered for lesser Sins, than what the *Levitical* Law required. For, in this anniversary Sacrifice, there was a *Remembrance* even of such Sins, for which other Sacrifices had been before offered. And, therefore, though the Offerer was not liable to Penalty, by the *political* Law, yet he could not plead his Pardon in a higher View, by Virtue of that Sacrifice which he offered before unto God; neither could he by Virtue of this anniversary one, for that must be repeated at the Return of the Year.

**7.** That Law, Commandment, or Covenant which consisted of the *Moral, Ceremonial, and Judicial* Laws given unto that People, did not contain, promise, or convey *real, spiritual* Remission, Peace, and Reconciliation to Sinners. It was impossible, that those Blessings should be enjoyed by Virtue of that Constitution, wherein there was neither a Priest fit to make *real spiritual* Atonement for Sin, nor any Sacrifice offered, which could be of Efficacy unto so important an End. *The Law made nothing perfect*, neither Persons nor Things; neither those who officiated in Divine Service, nor them for whom they acted, in the Execution of the sacerdotal Office. Hence the inspired Writer speaks of the Whole of their Service in

such depreciating Terms as he does, *viz. carnal Ordinances, weak and beggarly Elements; the Rudiments of the World; a Shadow, and not the Image.* The highest Excellency and Glory of all that *Apparatus* of Service was its *typical* Relation unto the glorious Things promised, exhibited, and conveyed in another, and infinitely better Covenant, which is abundantly proved in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*.

**8.** The new Covenant promises, contains, and conveys those glorious Things themselves, which the Law was a *typical* Representation of, and no more: Nothing greater or nobler, can be attributed unto it. And those Things are *real spiritual* Remission, eternal Redemption, Reconciliation, Freedom of Access unto God, and the everlasting Enjoyment of him, by Virtue of the Blood of this Covenant. As it was not an Offer of *political* Pardon that was obtained by legal Sacrifices, but Pardon *itself*, in that Sense: So the Blood of Christ procured not an Offer of Remission, but Remission *itself*, taken in that Sense which is *proper* and *peculiar* unto the new Covenant, wherein his Sacrifice was appointed and provided. The Blood of *Bulls* and of *Goats* availed unto the Procurement of *political* Pardon of Sin, according to the *old* Covenant, and not unto an Offer of Forgiveness: And the *precious* Blood of our dear Lord *Jesus* obtained for us *real* Pardon in a spiritual Sense, and not an Offer of it, according to that *better Covenant, which is established upon better Promises.* These Things serve fully to discover the *Fallacy* and *inconclusive* Nature of the Reasoning of the *Socinians*, on the momentous Subject of the Satisfaction of Christ. What Force is there in those Arguments, which are drawn from the *Levitical* Sacrifices, to prove the Non-imputation of Sin to him? That he did not suffer the Penalty our Guilt demerits? And that *real spiritual* Remission results not from his Death? None at all. Since that whole Economy only was a *Shadow* and *obscure Representation* of these Matters, it is not to be expected, that we can find the Things *themselves* therein. And, because they were only *typical* of those Things, therefore was it necessary, that there should be another Priest to act for us, *in Things pertaining to God.* Another Sacrifice was *absolutely* needful to be offered, in order to make *proper, real, and spiritual* Atonement for Sin. *Real Spiritual* Atonement was not, nor could be made by any, or *all the Rites of the first Covenant;* nor was it the Intention of that Covenant to supply the *Federates* with *real spiritual* Pardon. That Pardon was not *spiritual*, but *typical* only of *such* Remission; and that Atonement was *homogeneous*, or *typical* only. As the new Covenant dispenses *real spiritual* Pardon, so *real*

*spiritual* Atonement is made by the Sacrifice, which that Covenant provides.

## CHAPTER 2 — OF CHRIST'S BEARING SIN

**I.** AS I intend, in this Chapter, to prove the Imputation of our Sins to Christ, I would first inquire into the Ground of the Charge of our Guilt to him, and of his Bearing it for us. If no Foundation can be shown, whereon our Crimes might, in Justice, be placed to his Account, I readily acknowledge, that the Opinion of his bearing our Sin is indefensible, and it must necessarily sink, together with our Hope of Salvation by him. But, blessed be God, our Hopes of Remission, by Virtue of his Sacrifice, are built upon a most solid Basis. For, Christ and the Church constitute one *mystical* Person. He is the Head, and his People are the Members: Or such a Union subsists between him and them, as is a proper Foundation for the Act of the Imputation of their Sins to him. And he is their Surety. *By so much was Jesus made the Surety a better Testament* (Heb. 7:22). A Surety is one who undertakes to pay, suffer, or do something for others, either because they are *defective* in Credit, or Ability. Thus *Judah* became Surety to his Father for his Brother *Benjamin*: *I will be Surety for him; of my Hand shalt thou require him; if I bring him not unto thee, and set him before thee, then let me bear the Blame, (or I will be Sin, i.e. accounted guilty) for ever* (Gen. 43: 9). And the Apostle *Paul* undertook to satisfy *Philemon* both for Wrong and Debt, in Behalf of *Onesimus*: *If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee aright, put that on mine Account, I will repay it* (Phm. 1:18, 19). *Judah's* Sponson respected the Security of the Person of his Brother: The Apostles related unto the Satisfaction of *Philemon*, for Wrong and Debt. The Suretyship of Christ includes both: The Safety of the Persons of his People, and the Payment of their Debt, or making Satisfaction for that Wrong which they have done.

The latter is here principally intended, which was Christ's undertaking to accomplish the Will of the Father in our Redemption: *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 Heart* (Psa. 40: 7, 8). The Father's Will, and his own voluntary Engagement, brought upon him an Obligation to suffer and die: *Ought not Christ to have suffered these Things* (Luk. 24:26)? And, therefore, it is false, which one asserts, *viz. that Christ was not under a moral Obligation to suffer for us*. This Sponson is the Ground of the Imputation of our Sins to him, and of the Infliction of Penalty upon him.

Mr. *T.* objects several Things to evade the Evidence, which is given unto this important Truth, where Christ is expressly called a Surety. Says he, 1. *This is the only Place where he is so called.* He is no less truly a Surety, than if he had been so called in a thousand Places. One express Testimony from God is a sufficient Evidence of Truth. 2. *Not our Surety.* It is not difficult to determine whose Surety he is, and must be. He is the Surety of the *defective* Party in the Covenant, which is not God, but us. 3. *A Surety is one who undertakes for the Performance of a Promise.* 1. This is but an imperfect Account of a Surety. *Judah* was a Surety for his Brother unto his Father, but did not undertake for the Performance of any Promise of his. 2. It is *blasphemous* to imagine, that God had Need of a Surety, to secure the Performance of his Promises, or to assure us by his Sponson of their Fulfillment. No Creature can be of equal Credit or Ability, with God. And such only Mr. *T.* thinks Christ is. 3. He confounds *Mediation and Suretyship.* <sup>f4</sup> A Person may be a Mediator, and yet not be a Surety. *Moses* was the former, but not the latter. Christ is both Mediator and Surety. Again, Christ is a Surety in the Discharge of his sacerdotal Office, as the Words evidently suppose. And, therefore, he offered himself a Sacrifice, as a Surety: Or that Act was a Fulfillment of his Sponson. *Schilctingius* was aware of this, and endeavors to enervate the Force of the Argument, taken from hence to prove, that Christ is our Surety; but it is in a very *weak and frivolous* Manner. His Reason, that we did not send Christ, is trifling. For, not his Mission, but his Undertaking makes him a Surety. <sup>f5</sup> If Christ acted as a Surety, in the offering of himself a Sacrifice for Sin, that was the Matter of his Undertaking, in his Sponson, and he must be our Surety, and not God's: And that he did so, is evident, because he is a Surety, as he is inverted with, and acts in the priestly Office.

**II.** In his bearing Sin, we may observe the Act of the Father, which was the Imputation of our Sins to him, or placing that Wrong we have done to his Account. This is clearly expressed: *The Lord hath laid on him the Iniquities of us all.* Iniquities mean sinful Actions, the same as *Transgressions*, for which he was *wounded*. No Instance can be produced, where (עֲוֹן) Iniquity intends Suffering, *merely*, or in an *abstracted* Consideration from Guilt, as the Cause of Suffering. He made our Iniquities to *meet*, or *fall* upon Christ; so (פָּנֵעַ) is sometimes rendered. <sup>f6</sup> The same Thought is expressed in these Words: *When thou shalt make his Soul (נַשְׁמָה) Guilt, or Sin*, as it is sometimes translated. <sup>f7</sup> Christ could not become a Sacrifice for Sin, without a Charge of Guilt or Sin to him. And

this Point of Doctrine is asserted by the Apostle: *He hath made him to be Sin for us, who knew no Sin*. The Sufferings of Christ were the Consequence of the Imputation of Sin unto him; hence, in Suffering, he *was made a Curse*, which he could not be, in Justice, considered as innocent.

### III. Two Acts of Christ are observable, with Respect to his bearing Sin.

**1.** The Susception of it. He took it upon himself: Or fully and freely consented unto the Charge of our Guilt to him. This Act is expressed by the Word (שָׁנָה); *he bare the Sin of many*. In various Places the *Septuagint* render this Word by, (λαμβάνω) which is used to express Taking upon, or Receiving, as may be seen in the *Margin*.<sup>f8</sup> Our blessed Savior received our Guilt, by consenting unto the Imputation of it to himself.

**2.** He bare it as a Burden; so the Word (סבל) whereby his Bearing of Sin is expressed, properly signifies: *He shall bear (סבל) their Iniquities* (Isa. 53:11). He stood under the heavy Load of our Guilt, until it was fully atoned for, which would have sunk us deeply into the *infernal* Pit. The former Word expresses his Taking Sin upon him, and this represents his Standing under that *massy* Weight. Several Things may be observed, which confirm the Thought of Christ's bearing the Guilt of Sin, in Suffering for it.

**(1.)** *Making his Soul Guilt, and causing our Iniquities to meet in, or fall upon him*, express an Act of God, which is distinct from *Bruising and Putting him to Grief*; and, therefore, they design an Imputation of Sin, in order to suffering Punishment.

**(2.)** He bare that which we *have Conscience of*, which must be Guilt. That which our Consciences are purged from, by the Blood of Christ, he bare in his Sufferings for us, which is Sin or Guilt.

**(3.)** He bare that for which Sacrifices were offered, and that must be Sin committed. Hence, in Opposition to the *legal* Sacrifices, it is said of him, that *he was once offered to bear the Sin of many*, without which *he will appear the second Time*.

**(4.)** Christ bare that which there was a *Remembrance* of in the anniversary Sacrifice, which was Guilt contracted.



(5.) He bare that, which, the Blood of *Bulls* and *Goats* could *not take away*, viz. our Guilt, or Sin, which we have committed. I think, that a proper Consideration of the Scope and Connection of the Divine Writer, in the 9th *Chapter of Hebrews*, and the Beginning of the 10th, will be sufficient to convince of the Truth of these Things.

(6.) The Death of Christ could not be *penal*, without an Imputation of Guilt to him, as the meritorious Cause of his suffering and Death. For, where no Charge of Sin is, no *Penalty* can be inflicted, in Justice. And, therefore, when Christ suffered Punishment, or was made a Curse for us, he was made Sin, by the Imputation of our Sins to him.

**IV.** Mr. *Taylor* is pleased to observe, That *there are nine Bearers of Sin*.

1. *God* (Exo. 32:32; Exo. 34: 7; Num. 14:18; Jos. 24:19; Psa. 25:18; Psa. 32: 1, etc.). *i.e.* he forgives it.

1. He imputed it to Christ.
2. Punished Sin in him, when he was made a Curse.
3. Acquits us of our Guilt.

2. *Christ* (Isa. 53:11, 12). How he bare Sin hath been shown,

1. Our Lord took upon himself, or received our Guilt, in consenting unto the Charge of it to him.
2. Bare it as a Burden, laid on him by God.

3. *The Angel who was with the Israelites in the Wilderness* (Exo. 18:21). This was Christ. And Pardoning Sin is intended, as we translate the Word.

4. *The Priests and Levites* (Exo. 28:38; Lev. 10:17; Num. 17: 1-23), *i.e.* ministerially, or as they performed those sacrificial Services, which were appointed to take away Sin, in a *typical* Sense.

5. *Such who were offended* (Gen. 50:17; Exo. 10:17; 1Sa. 15:25-1; *Samuel* 25:28). This designs Forgiveness.

6. *The Scape-Goat* (Lev. 16:22). That is to say, *typically*.

7. *The Criminals themselves* (Lev. 7:18, etc.).

1. Sin was imputed to them.
2. They suffered Punishment.

**8.** *The Children of the Israelites bore the Sins of their Parents* (Num. 14:33; Lam. 5: 7).

1. They were not, nor could be considered innocent.
2. It was Punishment which they suffered.

**9.** *The Prophet Ezekiel.*<sup>f9</sup> Unto what Purpose this last Instance is produced, it is difficult to conjecture, and he seems to be entirely at a Loss, how to improve it to his Advantage.

**V.** The *Author* proceeds to make Observations, on his *labored* Collection of Texts, wherein Bearing Sin is mentioned.

**1.** *No Levitical Sacrifice is ever said to bear Sin. The Scape-Goat did bear Sin; but it was not sacrificed, or slain.*<sup>f10</sup>

**Answ. 1.** The Imposition of Hands on the Sacrifice, there is Reason to think, was attended with an Acknowledgment of Guilt.

**2.** If those Sacrifices did not bear Sin, why are they called (אשם) Guilt, or Sin?

**3.** The *Scape-Goat*, which he allows bore Sin, belonged unto the anniversary Sacrifice, and by that was Atonement made (Lev. 16:10)

**4.** Not to mention any of the *Stories* which the *Jewish* Writers, relate, concerning the *Scape-Goat*, two Things are to be observed in real spiritual Atonement for Sin, *viz.* the Punishment of it in Christ, and its Removal. The slain Goat *typically* represented the former, and the *Scape-Goat* the latter. As the anniversary Sacrifice was more comprehensive, or of greater Extent than the other Sacrifices, in that Atonement which was made by it for Sin: So there was in it a fuller *typical* Representation of *spiritual* Atonement than in any other. The slain Goat typified Christ's Sufferings, and the *Scape-Goat* his Removal of our Guilt, thereby, from us, and out of the Sight of God as a Judge.

**2.** *When the great God is said to bear Sin, the Meaning, I apprehend, must be that he took or carried it away, for this is a common and current Sense of the Word (אשא) f11*

**Answ. 1.** I grant that the Word is often to be understood in that Sense. But,

**2.** He must allow, that it is also used to express Taking up and Bearing.

**3.** Let us consider, how God takes or carries away Sin. Is it making that undone, which is done? No, for that implies a Contradiction. Is it taking away the criminal Action, *physically* considered? No, that is impossible. Is it reckoning or accounting the Sinner not to have committed the criminal Acts, which are taken away? No, for that is contrary to Truth. It is not imputing, or not reckoning those Actions to him, as *relatively* considered, or as Breaches of his holy Law. Hence, the Apostle expresses Pardon thus: *Blessed is the Man to whom the Lord will not impute Sin.*

**4.** Though God cannot otherwise bear Sin, than by pardoning it; Christ could, and did take it upon himself, and bear it as a Burden, in order to take it away, by making Satisfaction for it.

He adds, סבל, too, Isa. 53:11, *will admit the Sense of carrying off, or away*, Isa. 46: 4. *Even I will carry you off and I will deliver you.* This Word is also used, Isa. 53: 4. *He hath carried our Sorrows; which, doubtless, St. Matthew (Mat. 8:17.) understood in the Sense of removing, or carrying off, when he saith, himself took [away] our Infirmities, and bare [carried off] our Sicknesses.*<sup>f12</sup>

**Answ. 1.** He well knows, that this Word properly signifies to *bear, sustain, or carry*, as a Man bears a *Burden*; nor can he produce an Instance, where it is used in a *different* Sense.

**2.** Bearing in Isa. 46: 4, is a distinct Act from delivering, which is afterwards promised, and therefore the Sense of carrying off, cannot be admitted in that Place.

**3.** That Sense cannot be allowed in Isa. 53: 4, because it is evidently the Design of the Prophet to represent, or express what our Savior endured, or underwent for us.

**4.** *Matthew* did not understand the Term in that Sense, for he renders it by a *Greek* Word, which signifies to bear, (ο αἶψον) as a Man bears a Load.

**5.** Christ's Curing bodily Sicknesses was an Evidence and Effect, of his Bearing our Sins, and that Penalty which they merit, and, therefore, he applies, or accommodates the Thing unto its Evidence and Effect, which is not unusual with the *New Testament* Writers. A plain Instance of this we have: *And gave Gifts unto Men*: in the *Prophet*, it is, *received Gifts for Men*.<sup>f13</sup>

**3.** *And in the same Sense, or one near akin to it, our Blessed Lord, and the Jewish High-Priests, Priests, and Levites, bare Sin, as they made Atonement for Sin, or suffered or in those Things which God was pleased to appoint, as proper, on their Part, either for the Removal, or to signify the Removal, or Taking away of Guilt. In the Margin, says he: This Idea the Writers of the New Testament give us of Atonement and Pardon; particularly, in Relation our to Lord. Joh. 1:29. The Lamb of God, (ο αἰρων) which taketh away the Sin of the World. 1Jo. 3: 5. He was manifested that he (αρη) might take away our Sins. Rom. 11:27. When (αφαρειν) I shall take away their Sins. Heb. 10: 4. It is not possible that the Blood of Bulls and Goats should (περιελειν) take away Sins. Put away Sin, and bear the Sins of many, signify the same Thing, Heb. 9:26, 28.*<sup>f14</sup>

**Answ. 1.** In *Levitical Services*, there was a *typical Bearing of Sin*.

**2.** As the Effect of that, a *typical and political Pardon of Sin*, or Removal of Guilt.

**3.** What Christ took away, he bare, and was made, if we may believe the *New Testament Writers*: *He bore our Sins in his own Body on the Tree: He hath made him to be Sin for us who knew, no Sin.*

**4.** That he took away our Guilt, is a *certain and precious Truth*; but not believed by Mr. *Taylor*, for, according to his Opinion, Christ obtained *nothing more, than an Offer of Forgiveness*, and it is left to us to do that, where upon follows the Removal of our Guilt. In his Opinion, Christ neither bare, nor bare away our Sin.

**5.** In Rom. 11:27, God's Act of Pardon is expressed, and not what our Savior did and suffered, in order to the Removal of our Guilt.

**6.** It is false, which he affirms, that to *put away Sin, and bear the Sins of many, signify the same Thing*, in Heb. 9:26, 28. For putting away Sin, by the Sacrifice of himself, is the Effect, and his bearing

Sin, in the offering of himself, is the Cause. Therefore, they differ as a Cause, and its Effect resulting from it, do differ, and are not the same Thing.

**4.** His fourth Observation not being to the Purpose, I shall take no Notice of it, *viz. Forbearing, for a Season, to inflict deserved Punishment.* <sup>f15</sup>

**5.** Says he, *The Word also denotes to bear a Burden; and so metaphorically to bear, or to be liable to bear, or endure Punishment and Suffering. Thus Criminals bore their own Iniquities.* <sup>f16</sup>

**Answ. 1.** He allows that the Word denotes to bear a Burden, and, therefore, when it is used to express Christ's Bearing our Sin, it may intend his Bearing it upon himself, as a Load. But,

**2.** He will never be able to prove, that the Word (כָּבַד) bear, hath any other Signification, which is used to express Christ Bearing our Sin, or Guilt.

**3.** When Descendants bore the *Whoredoms* or *Iniquities of their Parents*, which he mentions, we must observe,

**(1.)** They were not innocent, but guilty, and guilty of the same Sins, as their Fathers were.

**(2.)** Guilt was charged on them. And,

**(3.)** They suffered Punishment. Therefore,

**(4.)** The Terms used in Relation unto the Sufferings and Death of Christ, or his Bearing Sin, are properly expressive of a Charge of Guilt, of Bearing it, and of suffering Punishment, in Consequence of that Imputation of Sin or Guilt. No *unnatural* and *forced* Sense is put upon them, when we interpret them to such a Meaning. This is well worthy of Observation.

**6.** He seems conscious to himself, that his sixth Observation, which relates unto *Ezekiel's* Bearing the Iniquities of the Children of *Israel*, cannot convey any Light to us on this Subject: And, therefore, I may justly pass that over. Now he comes to his Conclusion.

**7.** Upon the Whole, says he, *It is abundantly evident, no Proof can be drawn from Scripture, that Bearing Sin includes the Notion of transferring Guilt from the Nocent to the Innocent.* <sup>f17</sup>

**Answ. 1.** According to the Scripture all Men universally, are become guilty before God. There is no innocent Person among the Race of *Adam*, who naturally descend from him; how, therefore, can we expect to find any Account, in Scripture, of transferring Guilt from the Nocent to the Innocent: All this Labour of Mr. *Taylor's* is but *solemn* Trifling on this momentous Subject. Nor,

**2.** Is it to be proved from Scripture, that God ever did, or will decree, that the Innocent shall suffer, on Occasion of the Crimes of the Nocent; will Mr. *Taylor* for that Reason deny, that Christ suffered, on Occasion of our Sins? He cannot, if he really thinks, that the Death of Christ is a Condition, Reason, or Motive with God to forgive sin.

**3.** The Affair of Christ's Death is a *singular* and *unparalleled* Case, and, therefore, it is *preposterous* and *absurd* to argue, that, that cannot be in this Case, which is not to be found in other Cases, which cannot be compared with it.

In another Place, he farther objects unto the Transferring of our Guilt to Christ, and recommends a *Pamphlet*, intituled, *Second Thoughts concerning the Sufferings and Death of Christ*. I shall consider briefly what that *Author* offers on the Subject, in an *Appendix* to these Sheets. Says Mr. *Taylor*, *Guilt is my doing Wrong, whereby I become obnoxious to Punishment. And, therefore, Guilt in its own Nature cannot be transferred. For Punishment is necessarily connected with the Wrong done, and the Wrong is done by none but myself: Therefore Punishment can be due to none, and, consequently can possibly be inflicted upon none but myself.*<sup>f18</sup>

**Answ. 1.** Actions good or bad, *physically* considered, cannot be transferred. But,

**2.** Actions *relatively* considered, or in their Relation to the Law, may be transferred, or reckoned, or imputed to others, when there is a proper Foundation for it, as there is in the Affair of the Imputation of our Sins to Christ, *viz.* his Sponson, or his becoming a Surety to God for us.

**3.** It is not supposed, that he did the Wrong, nor was Christ reputed to have done the Wrong; but the Wrong done by us was put to his Account. As the Apostle *Paul* desired, that the Wrong as well as

Debt of *Onesimus*, might be imputed to him, or placed to his Account. And,

**4.** Hence Punishment, in Justice, was inflicted on Christ, upon the Ground of his Suretyship-Engagement to God for us.

**5.** The Reason, why nothing *parallel* to this may be acted among Men in criminal Cases, is, Rulers and Subjects are equally bound by *natural* Justice, and, therefore, Lawgivers have no Power to require, or accept of the Sponson of an innocent Person for the Guilty, in criminal Cases; nor hath any innocent Man Power over himself, or a Right to put himself under the Obligation of any Criminal, if he would.

**6.** The Righteousness of God's Nature will not permit him to suffer Sin to go unpunished. His Will to punish Sin is necessary, though free; if it were not, he might have willed to permit the Creature to sin for ever, without suffering Punishment. But,

**7.** As God is above the Law, wherein it is constituted or appointed, that Punishment shall be inflicted on the Guilty, by Perpetration of Offence; he can dispense with it in that Particular, and admit of the Sponson of another, who hath Power over himself, to put himself under our Obligation. We know, full as well as any *Socinian* whatever, that nothing like this may be transacted among Men; but, if we are not greatly mistaken, the Judicial Procedures of God, in the Imputation of Sin to Christ, and punishing it in him, and pardoning Sin to the Guilty, are not to be measured by, compared with, or accommodated unto the Judicial Proceedings of Men, in criminal Cases. And herein consists much, both of the *Glory* and *Mystery* of our Redemption, by the Death of Christ. If there was not something *singular* and *unparalleled* in this Affair, there would be neither *Mystery* nor *Glory* in it. And this is what some Men are laboring to prove, out of *Hatred* to the Glory of God, as it shines through *Jesus Christ*, in the fulness of our Salvation, by his Death, as the meritorious Cause thereof.

Mr. Taylor elsewhere speaks thus: *It may be alleged, that the Lord laid on him the Iniquities of us all, Isa. 53: 6. But who knows not, that our Redemption is imaged by various figurative Expressions? As, healed by his Stripes; washed from our Sins in his Blood; he was made Sin for us:*

Which, if understood literally and strictly, would supply very strange Doctrine. <sup>f19</sup>

- Answ. 1.** The Stripes and Blood of Christ are the meritorious Cause.
- 2.** Our Healing, Peace, and Pardon are the Effect.
- 3.** He was made Sin, by a Charge of our Guilt to him. Which Things are not *strange*, but *glorious*, and will eternally be so esteemed by those who are the subjects of Redemption.

He adds, *Taking the Passage, as it stands in our Translation, we ought in Reason to interpret it agreeably to the preceding Phrases, which relate to the same Thing. Isa. 53: 5, He was wounded for our Transgressions, he was bruised for our Iniquities; the Chastisement of our Peace was upon him, and with his Stripes we are healed. — And the Lord hath laid on him, (it is in the Margin, hath made to meet on him) the Iniquities of us all; that is, the Sufferings by which we are all redeemed.* <sup>f20</sup>

- Answ. 1.** Let an Instance be produced, where (עוֹבָה) signifies *merely* Suffering, or Suffering without Relation to Guilt, and take what is contended for.
- 2.** In Isa. 53: 5 the Prophet declares for what he suffered, *viz.* our Transgressions: And, in these Words, he expresses God's Act of charging our Sins to him, when he suffered, and in order to his Suffering.
- 3.** He opposes the Imputation of our Sins to him unto that false Opinion the Jews had of Christ's being *stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted*, for his own Guilt. And, therefore, it is not his Suffering, which is meant, but the *meritorious* Cause of his Sufferings, Guilt, not his own, but ours.

He subjoins, *But, considering the Metaphor of Sheep going astray, by which the Wanderings of Mankind are represented, and the Turn which St. Peter gives to this Passage, I am inclined to think, that the Spirit of God, in Isaiah, has Reference to the Meeting of stray Sheep, in order to bring them back again to the Shepherd, 1Pe. 2:24, 25; Isa. 53: 6. — And the Lord hath made to meet by him the Iniquities of us all. That is to say, by him the Lord hath caused to meet and stop the Iniquities of us all,*



*wherein we have wandered from him, to turn us back to himself, who is the Shepherd of our Souls.*

**Answ. 1.** The Word signifies to meet, without including the Idea of Stopping.

**2.** Christ is the Subject, *in, upon, or against whom* our Iniquities, were made to meet, as the whole Scope of the Place fully proves.

**3.** The *Prophet* speaks not of our Persons, but of our Crimes. And,

**4.** He speaks of Crimes committed, or of Guilt already contracted.

**5.** Stopping us in a sinful Course, and making us to turn back to the Shepherd of our Souls, is not stopping our Sins which we have before committed.

He observes, that the Word we translate, hath laid, *is, in Hiphil, which only adds the Idea of causing or making, the same that we render meet, Exo. 23: 4. If thou meet thine Enemy's Ox or Ass going, astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again;* to no other Purpose, which I can discern, than letting the Reader know, that he is acquainted with the *different Sense of Verbs, in different Conjugations, in the Hebrew Language;* and that is a Matter of no great Importance. However, this Instance proves, that the Word (פגע) does not necessarily include in it the Idea of Stopping, for a Man might meet his Enemy's Ox or Ass, and not stop either. Whether Men act with *upright and sincere* Intentions, who thus shamefully pervert the Scripture, Mr. *Taylor*, and others, will do well, in a *most serious* Manner, to consider, lest they continue to *wrest it unto their own Destruction.* Thus far of Christ's Bearing Sin.

## CHAPTER 3 — OF THE GREATNESS OF CHRIST'S SUFFERINGS, AND OF THE EVIDENCES, THAT THEY WERE VICARIOUS.

**I.** IF our Savior really bore the Sins of the *many*, who obtain eternal Salvation, through the Merit of his Sacrifice, his Sufferings, certainly, were exceedingly great. For the Imputation of such a *Mass* of Guilt must be followed with Sorrows, Grief and Distress of Soul, inexpressible.

**1.** Let us consider several Expressions of his, in Relation to this Matter. And, our blessed Lord speaks thus: *Now, is my Soul* (τεταρακται) *troubled, and what shall I say?* The Word, which we render *troubled*, is very significant, and expressive of *Terror* (Joh. 12:27; Est. 7: 6), *Consternation* (Gen. 41: 8), *Trembling* (Isa. 64: 2), and *Bowing down* (Psa. 42: 6) through *Grief* and *Fear*, in each of these Senses, the *Septuagint* use it, as the Reader will see by examining the Places referred unto. And, therefore, the Anguish and Distress, which our Savior was now the Subject of, must be extremely great. Add to this: *My Soul is* (περιλυπος) *exceeding sorrowful even unto Death.* The Word signifies to be *surrounded, or encompassed with Sorrow on every Side.* And the *Septuagint* use it to express a *Dejection and Casting down of the Mind, through overwhelming Grief* (Mat. 26:38; Psa. 43: 5; Mat. 26:37). This our Lord said, to express the Sorrow and most grievous Anguish which then attended him: *He began to be sorrowful, and* (αδημονειν) *very heavy, or exceedingly full of Anguish, insomuch that he was ready to faint.*

**2.** The Prostration of our Lord shows both his Humility, and the depressing Weight of Sorrow, which his holy Soul labored under. *He fell on his Face to the Earth* (Mat. 26:39), and lay in the Dust, through the Force of that pungent Grief, which took deep and firm Possession of his pure Mind. And he became thus prostrate three Times (Mat. 26:44).

**3.** His Agony is an Evidence unto what Height the afflictive Passions of Fear and Sorrow role in him: *And, being in an Agony, he prayed more earnestly* (Luk. 22:44). The Word (αγωνια) Agony, signifies great Anxiety, or Perturbation of Mind.

**4.** The *Tears he shed, and the strong Cryings he poured forth*, prove the inconceivable Anguish, Grief, and Sorrow, his whole Soul was filled with

(Heb. 5: 5) His Supplication unto the Father, is called *Roaring* (Psa. 22: 1), because of the *vehement* and *intense* Manner, wherein he addressed him, through the Greatness of that *prevailing* Sorrow, which *overwhelmed* his Heart.

**5.** The extraordinary Effect, which the Distress of his Soul produced in his animal Frame, is a full Evidence of its unparalleled Greatness. Through the extreme Anguish of his Mind, he *sweat as it were great Drops of Blood falling down to the Ground* (Luk. 22:44) Instances of the like are not at all needful to be produced, to prove the Credibility of the Fact; because, as there never was such a Subject of Suffering, in this World, so never did any one, upon Earth, suffer like him: *His Visage was so marred, more than any Man's, and his Form more than the Sons of Men* (Isa. 52:14).

**II.** We shall be at no Loss, in accounting for the *extreme* Dolours of our Savior, if we duly consider the *positive* Acts of God, which he, as a righteous Judge, taking Vengeance on Sin, put forth, upon the Soul of Christ immediately. Men wounded him in his Body; but his Father bruised and put him to Grief, in his Soul, when he made *that an Offering for Sin*. Wherein the Particulars following, are observable:

**1.** The Father *made him Sin for us*, and *caused our Iniquities to meet in, or fall upon him*. Not that the Father accounted him to have committed those Sins, or Iniquities, or produced a Consciousness in him of the Perpetration of those Crimes, which he bore, in order to atone for them; but he impressed his Mind with a *piercing* Sense of the Charge of our Guilt to him, and excited a most painful Sensation, in his Soul, of *the dreadful Malignity and Demerit* of Sin, wherewithal he stood charged, as the Surety of his People.

**2.** He made him a Curse: Christ *hath redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, being made a Curse for us* (Gal. 3:13). Our Savior was as really made a Curse for us, as we are, in Fact, delivered from the Law's Curse, in Consequence of his Sufferings and Death. To say, as the *Socinians* do, as it were, he was made a Curse, or he seemed to be made a Curse, is an *impious* Contradiction of the express Assertion of the holy Spirit, and not an Interpretation of it. This was not the Act of Men, for they could not make our blessed Lord a Curse; nor the Act of *infernal* Spirits. It was the Act of God, which he put forth, immediately upon the Soul of our Redeemer, whereby he most deeply pierced and put him to Grief.

**3.** The Father *withdrew* from him, or *forsook* him. This Dereliction affected not his Union to, or with the Father, for no Breach was made on that: Nor the Interest he had in his Approbation and Delight: Neither that Sustentation under his Sorrows by the Father, which he had promised to him; but it was the Want of the Enjoyment of his *ravishing* and *delightful Presence*. As in his Crucifixion he enjoyed not the cheering Rays of the natural Sun: So in that *most awful* Season, he suffered the Loss of the *comforting Rays* of heavenly Light, by the thick Cloud of our Guilt, interposing, between his holy Soul and the Father of Glory. He was encompassed by Darkness without, and deprived of the Light of Divine Favour *within*. And, therefore, he uttered that sore Complaint: *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me* (Psa. 22: 1), This was the *Punishment the Loss*, which he endured. Farther,

**4.** The Father impressed his Mind with a Sense of his vindictive Displeasure against Sin. As he had decreed, that Christ should suffer for us, and he had consented to become a Victim for our Guilt: He (**οὐκ ἐφείσατο**) *did not spare him* (Rom. 8:32), or deal tenderly with him; but commanded the Sword of Justice to awake against, and smite him: *Awake, O Sword against my Shepherd, and against the Man that is my Fellow, smite the Shepherd* (Zec. 13: 7). Sovereign Mercy towards us provided and presented the Victim before Divine Justice, with his free Consent; and God, as a Judge, calls upon Justice to execute Vengeance: Justice, *armed with all its flaming Terrors*, rises, and falls upon the *willing Sacrifice*, and his Soul is *absorbed* of Grief and Anguish, in Consequence thereof.

**III.** The Sufferings of our blessed Lord from Men, previous unto, and in his Crucifixion, were *extremely* great. What Indignity and Reproach were cast upon him! Unto what Scorn, Derision, and Shame was he exposed! How cruelly and inhumanly was he used, in his Examination and Trial! Men do not treat the most *villainous* Malefactor, in such a Manner, as the *innocent* and *meek* Jesus was treated! He was the Subject of the most contemptuous Speeches: *Spit upon: Buffeted: Blindfolded, and struck in the Face*, taunted at, and called upon to prophesy, or declare who smote him: *He gave his Back to the Smiters, and his Cheeks to them that plucked off the Hair, and hid not his Face from Shame and Spitting: Scourged: Delivered by the Governor, convinced of his Innocency, and of the Malice of his Enemies, into the Hands of barbarous, rude, and merciless Soldiers to be mocked, derided, and crucified. They stripped him of his Garments, arrayed him in Robes of mock Majesty: Platted a Crown of Thorns, and*

put it on his Head, and smote him with a Reed, whereby his sacred Flesh was torn, and Veins pierced: And, in Derision, *bowed the Knee before him, crying, Hail King of the Jews*. They led him forth to the Place of Execution, he bearing his Cross, until, as they might reasonably suppose, he was ready to faint, through the cruel Usage he had received: His Limbs were *violently stretched*, which must put him unto great Torture, and his Hands and Feet were nailed to *the accursed Tree*; and, by how much more tender and curious the Texture of his Body was, by so much the more, he was sensible of Pain, and, therefore, the Piercing of his Hands and Feet must be attended with exquisite Sensations of Pain. In these dreadful Circumstances, he was *forsaken by his Friends*, and unpitied by the *relentless* Number of *inhuman* Spectators, who surrounded his Cross. Every *tender* Passion was banished from the Breasts of the Beholders of him, in his Sufferings; nothing but a *savage* Disposition possessed them. Hence, instead of Pity, he met with *Reviling, Insult, and Blasphemy*. They *wagged their Heads*, and cried out, *He saved others, himself he cannot save. Let him come down from the Cross, and we will believe on him; he trusted in God, let him deliver him now, if he will have him*.

And when the Extremity of his Pains, through the *Dislocation* of his Bones, and the Piercing of his Hands and Feet, had brought on him a *scorching* Fever, which was attended with extraordinary Thirst; there bloody Miscreants presented to him *Gall and Vinegar* to drink, a most *bitter* and *biting* Potion. Thus the innocent *Jesus* was delivered up into the Hands of Sinners, *according to the determinate Counsel and Foreknowledge of God*, to be crucified and slain. When we consider these Things, surely, we can't but say: Oh, what Wickedness is in the Mind of Man! Oh, what *intense* Love to poor Sinners filled the Soul of our blessed Lord, that made him willing to undergo such Sufferings, in order to save them from deferred Destruction! Oh, what an *evil* Thing is Sin, that was the procuring Cause of all the Ignominy, Reproach, Dolours, and Agonies, which our Savior was exposed unto, and expired under, on the Cross! Oh, how *hard* are our *cursed* Hearts, that they are not *broken, dissolved, and melted* within us, by the Consideration of his *agonizing* Pains, unparalleled Reproaches, and taunting Insults from his Enemies, when he suffered for us, to redeem our Souls from Hell and Destruction! And, surely, we must be convinced, if we duly consider what our Lord suffered from the Hand of the Father, what he underwent from Men, by his *Appointment and Decree*, with a View to our Redemption from Sin, and its *penal* Effects, that the Transaction of his Death was necessary in order

to our Salvation. Can we possibly persuade ourselves to think, that this Affair was willed and decreed of God, without any Necessity, or with no View to the Vindication of his Authority, and Satisfaction of his Justice, in saving us from Misery? Or, that there is no Fitness in the Death of Christ to atone for our Guilt, and procure the Remission of our Sins, for which he suffered, both in his Soul and Body, in this *amazing*, Manner? Surely, no such Imagination can find Admittance in our Minds, if we will allow ourselves seriously to consider of those Things.

**IV.** Christ suffered in our Stead: Or, his Sufferings were vicarious and in our Room.

**1.** This is evident from what is observed above. For, if he was *made Sin*, if he was *made a Curse*, and if he suffered from *the Hand of God immediately*, or if God himself, by *positive Acts*, put forth upon him, did *bruise and put him to Grief*, or *make his Soul an Offering for Sin*, his Sufferings were *penal*, and, consequently, *vicarious*. Because no innocent Person can be the Subject of *Penalty*, for Sins of his own, by Reason he hath committed none; therefore, his penal Sufferings must be the Effect of the Guilt of others, and he must endure those Sufferings, in their *Place and Stead*. It hath not yet been proved, nor ever will be, that the Sufferings of Christ were not penal, since in Suffering he was *made a Curse*.

**2.** He suffered for our Crimes: Says the *Prophet: But he was wounded for Transgressions, and bruised for our Iniquities*. And the Apostle asserts, that he *died for our Sins, that he was delivered for our Offenses*: The unbelieving *Jews* thought he was *stricken, smitten of God and afflicted*, for Guilt of his own: But he was wounded for our Transgressions, *etc*. This is spoken in Opposition to the false Opinion of the *incredulous Jews*, who imagined, that he had contracted Guilt, which rendered him worthy of Death, and very clearly suggests, that it was not without a *meritorious Cause* he so suffered, but that, that Cause were not Sins of his own, but those of others.

**3.** Our blessed Savior died for us: *God commended his Love towards us, in that, while we were yet Sinners, Christ died for us*. That is to say, not for our Good only, but in our Room, and so for our Profit, as is clear from the Use of the Preposition, and the Scope of the Place. The Preposition is used to express in the *Place or Stead* of another. *That* (**ὑπερ σου**) *in thy Stead*, and (**ὑπερ Χριστου**) *in Christ's Stead*. The Scope of the Place evidently

evinces, that this is the Sense intended. For, the Apostle supposes, that for *a good Man some might dare to die* (Rom. 5: 7). Not hazard Life, to preserve a good Man in imminent Danger, as Mr. *Taylor* paraphrases the Text; but actually to resign Life for him, or to die in his Stead. A Man may hazard his Life, and yet preserve it. The Apostle designs an actual Resignation of Life, and not Exposing Life to Danger, which may be, and often is done, without Dying. And Christ is said to *give his Life* (*αὐτὶ πολλῶν*) *for many, i.e. in their Stead.*

**4.** The Life of Christ was given as a *Ransom*, (*λυτρων*) a *Price* of Redemption for *many* (Mat. 20:28), which necessarily supposes, that he died in their Stead. For they were obnoxious unto Death, on Account of Guilt, and he gave his Life to redeem them from that Obnoxiousness to Death, and, therefore, his Death was *vicarious*, or, he died in their Stead.

**5.** All those Effects are ascribed unto the Death of Christ, which it may be thought to procure for us, as taken in that Point of Light.

- (1.) Expiation of Sin.
- (2.) Peace and Reconciliation.
- (3.) Redemption from the Curse of the Law.
- (4.) Security from suffering Divine Wrath and Vengeance.

There are such Effects as might be expected to arise from his Death, if he died in our *Room*; and, therefore, there is clear and cogent Reason to conclude, that he not only died for our *Good*, but in our *Stead*, considered as Criminals, and for that Reason obnoxious to Death.

**6.** Our Forgiveness, on the Foundation of Christ's Death, is an Act of Righteousness. God *set forth his Son to be a Propitiation*, — *to declare his Righteousness*: Not his *saving Grace and Mercy*, as Mr. *Taylor* speaks, <sup>f21</sup> but his Holiness and Justice. If God is just in forgiving Sin, his Justice must be satisfied for the Sin pardoned, which it could not be by the Death of Christ, if he died not in our Stead.

**7.** This Method of Pardon and Salvation became God: *It became him, for whom are all Things, and by whom are all Things, in bringing many Sons to Glory, to make the Captain of their Salvation perfect through Sufferings* (Heb. 2:10). The Condecency of this Procedure respects the Righteousness of God's Nature, and, therefore, Christ's Sufferings must be referred unto Justice, and, consequently, in Suffering, he was our Substitute.





## CHAPTER 4 — OF ATONEMENT, OR RECONCILIATION FOR SIN

MR. *Taylor* apprehends, that the Sense of Atonement hath not yet been understood. Let us; therefore, see what additional Light he strikes upon this Subject. If he discovers any Thing of Importance relating to this Matter, which we did not discern before, I promise to give him those Praises, which such a Discovery demands.

**I.** *Spiritual* Atonement for Sin, as it hath been understood, includes these Things in it: The Expiation of Guilt. Reconciliation, or Peace with God. And the Sinner's Impunity, or Deliverance from an Obnoxiousness to Suffering Punishment, for his Guilt. Our *Author's* Design, is, if possible to explain away this Notion of Atonement, or Reconciliation for Sin by the Death of Christ. The Reader ought carefully to observe, that the Atonement made by Sacrifices was not followed with *real, spiritual* Remission of Sin, as the proper Effect of those Sacrifices, by whomsoever they were offered. Sacrifices were not required unto that End, nor was it possible, that such an End could be brought about by them, which is clearly asserted, and abundantly proved in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*.

**II.** Mr. *Taylor* opposes the Opinion of the Substitution of the Sacrifice, in Stead of the Offender, and offers various Reasons against it, which I shall take into Consideration.

**1.** *The Sins for which Sacrifices were generally offered were Sins of Ignorance, and ceremonial Uncleanness, which were not capital by Law. The Victim therefore could not die in the Offender's Stead, when his Offence was not punishable with Death.* <sup>f22</sup>

**Ans. 1.** According to the moral Law, all and every Sin was punishable with Death: "*The Soul that sins shall die. Death, therefore, is the Wages* of every Transgression of that Law.

**2.** As all Men are degenerate and guilty, the moral Law cannot be the Rule of Judgment, as to Life and Death, in human Societies, because there is no Man but hath forfeited his Life, according to that Law. For it allows no Sinner to live.

3. The *political* Law, given to the *Jews*, made some Breaches of the moral Law capital; as Murder, Blasphemy, and Adultery: And other Breaches thereof it did not make capital: As Theft, Uncleanness, in one Instance, and Perjury. And, therefore, some *atrocious* Crimes did not subject a Man guilty of them to Death, in a *political* Sense.

4. Sacrifices were not instituted for any Breach of the moral Law, which the *political* Law made capital. Hence, *David*, in Relation unto a capital Offence, whereof he had been guilty, says: *Thou desirest not Sacrifice, i.e.* for this Sin of mine, *else would I give it* (Psa. 51:16). But it follows not, that those Sins for which they were instituted, were not capital by the moral Law, or that those Breaches of the moral Law, did not render a Person worthy of, and subject him to Death, according to that Law. Therefore,

5. The *Author's* Reason, why the Victim could not die in the Offender's Stead, entirely vanishes, *viz.* that it was offered for Crimes not punishable with Death.

6. The *political* Law required the Shedding of Blood for Transgressions of the moral Law, which were not capital, in a *political* Sense; and, if the Sinner wilfully neglected to offer Sacrifice for his Offence, he was to die without Remedy. And, therefore,

7. The *political* Law, or God, as the Governor of that People, accepted of the Death of the Victim, as an Atonement for the Sin of the Offerer of it, and allowed him to live, though by his Crime he had forfeited his Life; and the Death of the Beast offered in Sacrifice was *vicarious*.

8. This was a lively *Type* of the Substitution of Christ in our Room, and of his Sufferings and Death in our Stead, to make *real spiritual* Atonement for our Sins, in order to deliver us from that Curse, whereunto they subjected us. The *Socinians*, as they are Enemies to the Whole of *real* Christianity: So (*dicam quod fentio*) they are the *greatest Triflers*, where they seem to reason most, in objecting against it.

2. *If the Virtue or Efficacy of every particular Sacrifice consisted in Suffering a vicarious Punishment, then, whereas that Punishment was the*

same in all such Sacrifices, by whomsoever offered, it must have had its Effects in all those Sacrifices; and they must all have been equally acceptable to God, as such. Which is well known to be false. <sup>f23</sup>

**Answ. 1.** Who says, that *proper* Punishment was inflicted on those Sacrifices?

2. Those Sacrifices were offered, that the Offender might not die.

3. The Offering of those Sacrifices, as Mr. *Taylor* allows, did discharge the Sinner from *political Penalties*: Let him prove, if he is able, that, *that* Penalty was not *Death*. <sup>f24</sup> Yet,

4. It is not pretended, that these Sacrificial Services were equally acceptable to God, whether performed in Faith, or not.

3. *Indeed, the Victim might, and, I suppose, did, represent the Person who offered it; whatever was done to that, was to be applied to himself.* Then, observe, 1. As the Beast was slain, surely, it signified to him, that he deserved to be slain, or to die for his Sin. 2. It was Sin committed, or Guilt already contracted, on Account whereof he offered Sacrifice. *To show him, adds he, the Demerit of Sin in general; how he ought to slay the Brute in himself, and devote his Life and Soul to God, etc.* <sup>f25</sup> — *But this is very remote from the Victim's Suffering, in his Stead, the Death which he deserved to die for his Sins, or Suffering a vicarious Punishment.* <sup>f26</sup> How does this appear? He gives no Evidence of it. Hereby the Offender was discharged from *political Penalties*, he grants; and that those Penalties were not *Death*, he will never prove. — 1. The *Death* of the Beast was not, *properly* speaking, Punishment. But, 2. That *typically* represented the *vicarious* Punishment, which the Lamb of God was to bear, in order to make *real, spiritual* Atonement for Sin. With him, *vicarious Punishment is a Contradiction in Terms. For as there cannot be a vicarious Guilt, or as no one can be guilty in the Stead of another; so there cannot be a vicarious Punishment, or no one can be punished instead of another.* <sup>f27</sup>

**Answ. 1.** No one can contract Guilt instead of another. But,

2. One may bear Guilt which is contracted, instead of another. And,

3. Suffer Punishment in the Place of another. *Because, says he, Punishment, in its very Nature, connotes Guilt in the subject which bears it.* <sup>f28</sup>

**Answ. 1.** Guilt is not an *inherent* Quality, but a Charge of Sin, and an Obnoxiousness to Condemnation on that Account.

**2.** An innocent Person may come under such a Charge, for it is not a Transfusion of a sinful Action, or of the corrupt Habits of the guilty Person but only an Imputation of his Sin, or Guilt. Thus,

**3.** He may bear it, though he becomes not the Subject of Sin, as an *inherent* Quality.

**4.** He asks a very surprising Question, *But is not vicarious Punishment, or the Victim's suffering Death in the Offender's Stead, as an Equivalent to Divine Justice, included in the Notion of Atonement?*

**Answ. No.** <sup>f29</sup> **1.** Why is this Query put? Did ever any Person think so? Is it possible that a Man in his Sense can imagine, that the Death of a Brute, is an *Equivalent* for Sin committed against God? But, **2.** This is no Objection unto an *Equivalent* being required and given, in order to *real, spiritual* Remission. He seems to proceed as *gravely* to prove the Negative, as if the Affirmative was believed and professed, whereas, I suppose, it was never dreamt of, by any Man professing Christianity, in the World. But some Men must be allowed *solemnly to trifle*, when, and where, they find themselves unable to *reason*. He goes on to say,

**(1).** *Atonement was made with the Scape-Goat, though he was not slain.*  
f30

**Answ. 1.** That belonged unto the Sacrifice, Lev. 16: 5.

**2.** The slain Goat typified the Sufferings of the Lamb of God.

**3.** The Scape-Goat *represented*, in the same Manner, the Removal of Guilt, as the Effect, of his Sufferings and Death.

**(2).** Says he, *If the Offender was not able to bring a Lamb, etc. — he was allowed to bring the tenth Part of an Ephah of fine Flour for a Sin-Offering, etc. — Which could never suggest the Idea of vicarious Punishment.* f31

**Answ. 1.** This Exception did not *weaken*, but *strengthen* the general Law.

2. Inasmuch as *Bread is the Staff of Life*, the Burning of the Flour may well be thought to represent to the Offender, that he deserved to die. And,

3. That, in order to *real spiritual* Remission, a Life must be parted with. Farther,

4. Though this Change was allowed because of the Poverty of the Offender, it follows not that his Thoughts were to be taken off from the Sacrificing of an Animal for his Sin, which, but for his Poverty, he stood obliged unto.

5. *Nor did the Shedding Blood, in itself, imply Atonement by vicarious Punishment. For it is never said, that Atonement was made for Sin by, Peace-Offerings, etc.* <sup>f32</sup>

**Answ. 1.** In legal Sacrifices, *proper* Punishment was not inflicted. But,

2. Shedding of Blood was *fitly typical* of taking away Life, in a Way of Punishment for Sin.

3. Though in some Instances Blood might be shed, when Atonement was not made for Sin, it is not to be concluded from thence, that Shedding Blood, in *typical* Atonement, was not a Type of that *vicarious* Punishment, which Christ the *Anti-type* was to bear.

6. — *It is the Blood that maketh Atonement for the Soul. But how? By Way of vicarious Punishment? Not a Word of that.* <sup>f33</sup>

**Answ. 1.** That Atonement was *typical* only.

2. *Proper* Punishment was not borne. Yet,

3. It fitly represented Christ's Shedding his Blood, in order to *make spiritual* Atonement.

**III.** Mr. Taylor proceeds unto an *elaborate*, but very *trifling* Enquiry, into the Sense of Atonement. After a Collection of all the Places in the *Old Testament*, where the Term expressing Atonement is used, as a *Verb* and *Noun*, seemed good to him to employ himself in examining into the Sense of the original Word, (כִּפֶּר) where it is used without any Relation, unto the Offering of Sacrifices, for Sin. Not to find out Truth, but to amuse and

mislead his Reader, and prevent his discerning what Atonement for Sin, by the Death of Christ, includes in it. In this Labour he spends almost twenty Pages, wherein it is entirely needless to follow him. If he had been disposed, as he ought, to have learned what Atonement signifies, or contains in it, he might without any Difficulty. For, 1. The Word, actively used, signifies to *appease, pacify, reconcile, or make Reconciliation* (Gen. 32:20; Pro. 16:14). 2. When used passively, it imports, that a Person is appealed, pacified, or reconciled (Eze. 16:63). 3. As a Noun, it is taken for a Price, or Ransom (Job. 33:24). Hence, 4. When Atonement is made by a Price, or Ransom, nothing is to be feared from the Party who was before displeased. And there Things have Place in the Atonement made by Christ for our Sins.

**(1.)** Guilt is covered or removed, and taken away out of the Sight of God, as a Judge.

**(2.)** The Death of Christ is our (**כּוּפֵר**) Atonement, or Ransom, and Price of Redemption, and nothing else.

**(3.)** *God is pacified towards us, for all that we have done* (Eze. 16:63), in Consequence of his Sufferings and Death. And, therefore,

**(4.)** We have no Reason, on this Foundation, to be afraid of his Terrors: For, *being justified by his Blood, we shall be saved from Wrath through him.*

**IV.** Mr. Taylor makes some Reflections upon his *long and impertinent Examination of the Texts*, wherein Atonement is mentioned.

**1.** *Forgiveness of Sin is Exemption from Punishment. — A Pardon only in Thought or Word, and which effecteth nothing, as in Effect no Pardon at all.* <sup>f34</sup> Very well said, this is true, and, therefore, the Death of Christ procured our Exemption from Punishment, or Right to Impunity, and not an Offer of Pardon, for an Offer of Remission is not Pardon. Truth will sometimes out, when Men are very far from an Intention to express it.

**2.** *The Means of making Atonement for Sin are not uniform, etc.* <sup>f35</sup>

**Answ. 1.** The Blood of Christ is the only Mean, of *spiritual Atonement for Sin.*

**2.** Pardon of Sin, in a *spiritual* Sense, is solely the Effect of his Blood-shedding and Sacrifice.

**3.** We see the Reason why he asserted above, that *Pardon only in Thought or Word, etc. is no Pardon at all*; it was to prove, that *real, spiritual* Atonement for Sin might be, and was made, by other Means than Christ's Blood; because we read of Atonement, without Relation to that as the Mean of it. But,

**4.** That Atonement was *typical* and *allusive* only: That, by the Death of Christ is *real, Spiritual, and eternal*.

**3.** *The giving an Equivalent to God, is no Ways included in the Nation of Atonement.* <sup>f36</sup>

**Ans. 1.** Giving an Equivalent is not included in *typical* and *allusive* Atonement. I know of none who think it was.

**2.** If any other Sacrifice than that of Christ had been an *Equivalent*, his Sacrifice was unnecessary.

**3.** Though there was not an *Equivalent* in *typical* Atonement, it follows not, that an *Equivalent* was not given to the Law and Justice of God, in *real, spiritual* Atonement for Sin.

**4.** *The Transferring of Guilt doth not belong to the Sense of Atonement.* <sup>f37</sup>

**Ans.** As before,

**1.** Not in Atonement *typical* and *allusive*. But,

**2.** In *real, spiritual* Atonement it is found, as we have seen.

**3.** With equal Truth, he might say, that Exemption from suffering eternal Punishment is not included in the Pardon of Sin, by the Death of our Blessed Savior. In this Branch of his Work, our Author makes a great Shew of Labour and Diligence; but he could not have acted a more *needless* and *impertinent* Part, than he hath done herein; and is as remote from answering the End he had in View, as possibly he could be. For nothing he offers, in the least Degree, affects the Doctrine of *real, Spiritual* Atonement for Sin, by the Death of Christ, as an *Equivalent* given to the Law and Justice of God, for our Transgressions.

## CHAPTER 5 — OF THE EFFECTS OF CHRIST'S DEATH

**I.** CHRIST submitted unto Death, or gave his Life for us: *This is my Blood which is shed for many. I am the good Shepherd: The good Shepherd giveth his Life for the Sheep. He loved the Church, and gave himself for it.* 2. Our Blessed Savior *died for us*, considered as Criminals. *God commended his Love towards us, in that, while we were yet Sinners, Christ died for us; he that was just, suffered for the unjust.* 3. In Dying he was made a Curse for us. *Christ hath redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, being made a Curse for us.* And, therefore, 4. His Death was *penal*, and in our *Stead*.

Mr. Taylor is guilty of two Errors here:

1. He suggests, that Christ only died on our *Account*, and not in our *Place* and *Stead*.

2. He insinuates, that the former of these Scriptures, and others parallel to them, express the Benefit of Atonement, <sup>f38</sup> which they do not; but that glorious Mean whereby Atonement was made.

Herein he hath acted a Part beneath his Character, as a Scholar; for it is below a Man of Learning to introduce the End of an Action, when the Action is spoken of only.

**II.** Our Lord suffered for our Sins: Or our Sins were the *meritorious* Cause of his Death. *He was wounded for our Transgressions, and bruised for Iniquities. He died for our Sins according to the Scriptures. He was delivered for our Offenses. For the Transgression of my People was he stricken.*

1. None can deny that these Modes of Speaking, are capable of this Construction, without the least Force, that our Sins were the procuring Cause of his Death. For, that Thought cannot be expressed more properly by any Phrases, than it is by there.

2. Several Reasons may be offered to confirm this Sense.

(1). God made our Sins to meet in him.



- (2). He took our sin upon him.
- (3). Bare it as a Burden in his own Body on the Tree.
- (4). In Dying, he became a Sacrifice for Sin.
- (5). He was awfully bruised and put to Grief, by *positive* Acts of God put forth upon him.
- (6). In no other View can our Pardon be an Act of Righteousness, through his Death.
- (7). If Sin was not the procuring Cause of his Death, in Dying he could not be made a Curse, which, as has been before observed, he certainly was.
- (8). Unless this is allowed, we shall never be able to account for the *extreme* Anguish our Savior was in, consistent with his Honour.

**III.** The final Cause of his Death, with Respect to Sin, was the Pardon of it, and that End he obtained by it. *This is my Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many, for the Remission of Sins. In whom we have Redemption through his Blood, viz. the Forgiveness of Sins, Having obtained eternal Redemption for us.* There was a Fitness in his Death to procure the Remission of our Guilt. Because,

1. His Sufferings were *penal*; he was made a Curse.
2. His Death had Merit in it equal to the Dignity of his Person, which is infinite.

For his Blood is *the Blood of God*. Pardon includes in it a Non-imputation of Sin, Freedom from Condemnation, and Exemption from suffering Punishment. The Death of Christ gives us a Right to neither of these, in the Opinion of Mr. *Taylor*; Men have no Title to any saving Benefit, in Virtue of the Sufferings of Christ, as he thinks. They have an Offer of them, and no more, in Consequence of his Death. Right to Pardon they must: obtain for themselves, or perish in their Sins. An Offer of Pardon is not Pardon, nor gives Right to Remission; that must be acquired by the Sinner himself, or else his Sins will never be forgiven. In this Place, Mr. *Taylor* endeavors to confound the Ideas of Christ's Bearing Sin, and Bearing it away. <sup>f39</sup> *He shall bear their Iniquities. He bare the Sin of many. Who his own Self bore our Sins in his own Body on the Tree.* There

Scriptures express the Imputation of our Guilt to him, and his Suffering that Penalty which it demerited. And, his Sufferings being *satisfactory*, he bore our Guilt away. *Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the Sin of the World. Now, once in the End of the World, hath he appeared to put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself.* These Texts express the proper Effect of the Death of Christ, as it was *satisfactory* for our Sins, *viz.* The Bearing away, or Removal of our Guilt. But Mr. *Taylor* denies, that Christ bore our Sin, or that he bore it away. Obtaining an Offer of Pardon for a Criminal, is not the Removal of his Guilt, he very well knows. Nor is our Lord's Death a *Ransom* for us, or a *Propitiation for our Sins*, according to his Opinion. For his Death neither redeemed our Persons from Misery, nor atoned for our Crimes, as he thinks. Neither, does his Death deliver us from Wrath, or the future Punishment of Sin. For that not the *least Right* unto an Exemption, from suffering Penalty, arises from the Death of Christ to any Sinner in the whole World, is that *blessed Doctrine*, which he would force upon our Belief.

**IV.** Mr. *Taylor* represents the *Death of Christ*, as the *Cause of our Resurrection*.<sup>f40</sup>

1. Some will be railed from the State of Death, not to enjoy Happiness, but to endure eternal Misery, which is not a Benefit.
2. Our Resurrection, *merely*, is not an Effect of the Death of Christ. But,
3. Our Resurrection unto Life and a happy Immortality is the proper Fruit thereof.
4. What he advances, in his *Note* on Rom. 5:20, is false, relating to our *Law, which makes Felony Death, viz. that if a Malefactor, who is executed, should come to Life again, he must suffer again*, that is to say, if he was *really* dead. For, in that Case, the Law would have no Power over him; because he hath already suffered what the Law threatened for his Offence.
5. He hath not proved, nor ever will prove, that, by Death in the Divine Law, is intended Retaining the Body of the Transgressor in the Grave for ever.
6. It is false, that *the Saints under the Mosaic Dispensation died under the Curse of the Law*; which he asserts they did.<sup>f41</sup>

- 7.** Christ was not made a Curse *by Hanging on the Tree*, but in Suffering and Dying; and his Hanging on the Tree is produced as an Evidence of it.
- 8.** Nor will this serve to explain Dan. 9:24. For (הַפְּשָׁע) the Transgression, does not mean *Adam's* first Sin, which is called by the Apostle (παράπτωμα) *Offence*; but (פְּשָׁע) *the Transgression*, or the whole Guilt of all those for whom he suffered, Isa. 53: 8.
- 9.** It is most false, that all *nominal* Christians are not *under the Law*, but *under Grace*.<sup>f42</sup>
- 10.** He hath not proved, nor can prove, that *Righteousness*, in Rom. 3:25, intends *pardonning Mercy*. It is the Justice or Holiness of God that is intended.
- 11.** Reconciliation, is Freedom from an Obnoxiousness to Punishment, in the Divine Account, or Peace with God through the Blood of Christ.

**V.** *Another Effect*, says he, *ascribed to Christ's Sufferings and Death*, is *our Sanctification, spiritual Healing, or Deliverance from the Power of sin*.<sup>f43</sup>

1. Healing does not mean our Sanctification, in Isa. 53: 5, but Freedom from Curse and Wrath.
2. Our Sanctification is a *certain* Effect of the Death of Christ; but this he allows not.
3. *Vain*, in 1Pe. 1:18, intends a sinful Conversation, whether *Heathenish* or not.

*In both these Senses, as he delivers us from the Guilt and Tower of Sin, he may be said to purge, wash, and cleanse us from Sin.*<sup>f44</sup>

1. Mr. *Taylor* believes not, that Christ delivers us from the Guilt of Sin. Nor,
2. From its Power.
3. What he ascribes to our Savior's Death, he might as well attribute to his Life.

For his Birth and Life are as much a Cause of the Removal of our Guilt, and of our Sanctification, as his Death is, according to the Principles of Mr. *Taylor*.

**VI.** *The Honors and Happiness, says he, of the future State are another Effect of Christ's Atonement.* <sup>f45</sup>

**Answ. 1.** It is true, that our eternal Life is a *real* and *certain* Effect of the Death of Christ. But,

**2.** He believes it not. For,

**3.** He thinks, that Christ's Death procured only an Offer, or *conditional* Grant of Life: Not a Right unto it; that we are left to obtain for ourselves by our own Works, and, if we do not, we must die eternally.

**VII.** and Lastly, says he, *all the Blessings of the new Covenant are in, or by his Blood.* — *The Apostle argues at large, that, according to the Divine Constitution, the Death of Christ was necessary to make valid, or to ratify the Covenant of Grace,* Luk. 22:20; 1Co. 11:25; Heb. 10:29; Heb. 9:15-19. <sup>f46</sup>

**Answ. 1.** The new Covenant is confirmed by the Blood of Christ.

**2.** All its Blessings are sure unto all the Federates.

**3.** They are not all, but some Men only.

He adds, *so far, and in all these preceding Senses, Christ may be said to have purchased or bought us with his Blood.* <sup>f47</sup>

**1.** Christ's Death was a Price of Redemption which he gave unto God, as Lawgiver and Judge, for us.

**2.** Our Persons are his Purchase, Act. 20:28; 1Co. 6:19, 20.

**3.** It is false, that Righteousness means *Salvation*, which he says it does, in 1Co. 1:30.

**4.** He does not believe, that Christ is made *Salvation* unto us. For, notwithstanding all he hath done and suffered for us, he did not procure *Salvation*, but only an Offer or *conditional* Grant, which invests us with no Right at all unto it; we are left to save ourselves by our own Works, and, if we do not, we must eternally perish.

**VIII.** He tells us, That *these Things are abundantly sufficient to satisfy him of the following Particulars:* <sup>f48</sup>

**1.** That *Christ's Blood was shed, etc. for us, on our Account, to free us from some Evil, and to procure us some Benefit.* <sup>f49</sup>

**Answ. 1.** Christ died in our *Place* and *Stead*, as hath been before proved.

**2.** Let me inquire, what Evil the Death of our Lord frees us from. Does it free us from a Charge of Sin? No. Is our Freedom from Condemnation an Effect of his Death? No. Are we delivered from Divine Wrath and Vengeance, by his *Blood-shedding* and *Sacrifice*? No.

**3.** What Benefit did his Death procure for us? Did he, by Dying for us, obtain Grace to sanctify our Hearts? No such Thing. Did he procure for us Grace to preserve us in the Midst of our numerous Snares and Dangers, in this World, until we arrive unto the heavenly State? No. Did he merit for us eternal Life and Blessedness? No. What was it, then, that he did obtain by offering himself a Sacrifice for us? Nothing at all, but an Offer of Pardon and Life. He hath left us to procure for ourselves a Right to both, and, if we do not, we shall never have a Claim to either.

**2.** That *it was an Offering and Sacrifice presented unto God, and really had its Effects with God, as highly pleasing and grateful to him.* <sup>f50</sup>

**Answ. 1.** Christ offered himself a Sacrifice for Sin, and, therefore, he bore Sin and suffered Punishment.

**2.** I would inquire what those Effects are, which the Death of Christ had with God. Does it cause God not to impute Sin to us? No. He holds us guilty still. Does it cause him to deliver us from Malediction? No. Does it cause him to deliver us from eternal Vengeance? No. Something else must do that, or *his fiery Indignation will devour us*. These Effects sink into a *bare* Offer of Pardon, upon the Terms of Repentance and future Obedience.

**3.** *And it was offered unto God for our Sins, in order to their being forgiven by him. — If the Redemption we have, through his Blood, be the Forgiveness of Sins; then it is certain, that the Shedding of his Blood had its Effect with God, as it supplied such a Reason for the Forgiveness of Sins, as the Wisdom and Goodness of God, our Savior, thought most*

*proper and expedient, and without which he did not think it proper or expedient to forgive them.* <sup>f51</sup>

**Answ. 1.** He allows not, that Forgiveness of Sin is obtained by the Blood of Christ, though he thus speaks. If Pardon is the *proper* Effect of Christ's Death, then Right to Remission must result therefrom; but this he will deny.

**2.** Permit me to ask, Why the Death of Christ is a Reason with God for the Forgiving of Sin? Is it because his Mercy to Sinners is greater, and more illustrious in pardoning them, upon that Condition, previously required of Christ? Not at all. Was his Indignation against Sin, or his *vindictive* Displeasure with it, manifested in the Affair of Christ's Death? No. For the Holiness and Justice of God had no more Concern in the Business of Christ's Sufferings, than if Sin had never been committed, or were never to be pardoned. God might have pardoned Sin, and saved Sinners, with full as much Honour to himself, without the Death of Christ, as he can with it. But, perhaps, this Mean of Pardon might be *proper* and *expedient*, in Relation unto Men, I proceed, therefore, with my Inquiry, and ask, Would it not have been *fit* and *proper* to pardon Sin, on the Terms of Repentance and future Obedience, if Christ had not died? Or does the Death of Christ constitute that Fitness? No, by no Means. Does the Death of Christ effect these Terms on which it is proper and expedient to forgive Sin? No more than his Birth or Life, or his making Clay to cure a Man of Blindness with it. Does his Death render these Terms more easy to Men? No more than his Exaltation to Dignity in Heaven. Men might with the same Ease have repented of their Sins, and yielded Obedience unto God, if Christ had not died; for his Death procured no Grace *from* God to bring them to Repentance, and to influence them unto Obedience, as Mr. *Taylor* thinks. It is somewhat strange, that Men can possibly be *grave*, in speaking of the Death of Christ, as a *proper* and *fit* Expedient of the Remission of Sin, whose Principles lead them to assert these Things, and that they can expect to be believed, in their Assertions, by any Christian in the World.

**4.** *He offered one Sacrifice for Sins; — nobody can doubt, but the Jewish Sacrifices, in those Cases wherein they were admitted, did obtain the Pardon of Sin in some Degree or other. It must therefore be true, that the*

*Sacrifice of our Lord did obtain the Forgiveness of our Sins, as the Wisdom of God judged it the fittest Method of granting the Remission of them, and that it is with Respect to his Sacrifice that our Sins are forgiven, whenever they are forgiven.* <sup>f52</sup>

**Answ. 1.** It was not Pardon in a *Spiritual* Sense, which the *Levitical* Sacrifices obtained; it was not possible that they should procure Remission of Sin in that Sense.

**2.** They did obtain Pardon in a *political and typical* Sense, which was an Exemption from suffering Penalty, and not an Offer of Remission.

**3.** The anniversary Sacrifice was *typical* of Atonement made for all Sin, that is pardoned unto Men.

**4.** The Blood and Sacrifice of Christ procured not a *bare conditional* Grant, or Offer of Forgiveness; but a Right to *spiritual* Remission, or unto an Exemption from deferred Punishment. And,

**5.** The Virtue and Efficacy of his Death extends unto all the Sins of all the Persons for whom he suffered. *The Blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all Sin.*

**6.** When Mr. Taylor says *it is with Respect to his Sacrifice, that our Sins are forgiven, whenever they are forgiven:* He means not, that Christ's Death merited our Pardon: Or that any Right to Remission was procured by his Sacrifice: Or that God is in any Sense or Degree more honored in this Way of Remission, than he would have been without the Offering of that Sacrifice: Or that Christ would have sustained the *least Injury*, if no Sinner, for whom he died, had ever been pardoned and saved. For, the utmost he was to expect, as a Reward for his *dolorous* Sufferings, and *bloody* Death, in Relation to the Pardon of Sin, was a Declaration from God, that he would forgive Men their Sins, in Case they took Care to acquire for themselves a Right to Impunity, by doing what he intended to enjoin upon them, with that View, or unto that End.

**5.** *If God of his own mere Grace had pardoned Sin, says he, without any Respect to the Offering of Christ, there would have been no Occasion at all, that Christ should have offered himself a Sacrifice for the Remission of them.* <sup>f53</sup>

**Answ. 1.** If the Death of Christ was not needful, as a Punishment for Sin, it could not be needful as *mere* Suffering, in order to the Remission of it. If the Righteousness and Justice of God did not require the Death of Christ, as a *Penalty* due to Sin, which was to be forgiven in Consequence of his Death, it did not require his Death, considered *merely* as Suffering, to that End. If his Death was needful to our Pardon, it must be, because there is some *Fitness* in it, why Remission should be extended unto us on that Foundation. Now, there is no *Fitness* in the *mere* Sufferings of an innocent Person, however great those Sufferings are, why Criminals should go unpunished. The Decree of the Death of Christ, therefore, must be *merely arbitrary*, and it is what God might have willed, without the least Intention of pardoning Sin, if it had so pleased him.

**2.** If there was no *Fitness* in the Death of our Blessed Savior to procure Remission of Sin, there could be no *Fitness* therein to obtain a Declaration or Promise from God, that he would forgive it. This *Socinian*, nor any other, will ever be able to show, that there was the least Degree of *Fitness* in the Death of Christ: to obtain for us either an Offer of Forgiveness, or a Right unto Impunity, upon their Principles. No *Fitness* can possibly be in it to attain either of these Ends, but considered, and as it *really was*, *penal*.

**3.** It is *fit* and *proper* to forgive Offenders, *Justice* requires it, if an innocent Person is allowed to take their *Place*, and suffer Penalty in their *Stead*. And this is the Fact in this Case.

**4.** If it is said, that this is not to be allowed of; I grant it is not among Men. Neither,

**5.** Is it allowable for Men to require an innocent Person to suffer any bodily Pains, much less Death, as a Condition of Pardon to the Guilty.

**6.** If it is said, that God proceeded in this Affair, *merely* on the Ground of his *absolute Dominion* and *Sovereignty*, or without Respect to Justice, then it must be granted, that the Death of our Lord had no *Fitness* in it to procure either a Declaration and Promise to forgive Sin, on certain Conditions, or Remission itself. God might have willed his Death, if Sin had never entered into the



World, and without any Design of pardoning Sin, or of saving one Sinner.

**IX.** *I conclude, therefore, says he, that the Sacrifice of Christ was truly, and properly, in the highest Degree, and far beyond any, other, PIACULAR and EXPIATORY, to make Atonement for, or to take away Sin. Not only to give us an Example; not only to assure us of Remission; or to procure our Lord a Commission to publish the Forgiveness of Sins; Out moreover to obtain that Forgiveness, by doing what God in his Wisdom and Goodness judged fit and expedient to be done, in order to the Forgiveness of Sin; and without which he did not think it fit or expedient to grant the Forgiveness of Sin.*<sup>f54</sup>

**Ans. 1.** Christ did not bear sin, as he thinks.

**2.** Nor suffer Punishment. Nor,

**3.** Make Satisfaction for Sin.

And, therefore,

**(1).** He did not bear away Sin, or remove our Guilt. *Nor,*

**(2).** Obtain the Forgiveness of Sin. *Neither,*

**(3).** Answer any Demand of the Law and Justice of God for our Sin. *Consequently,*

**(4).** The Death of Christ was no more than a Condition or Cause, (*sine qua non*) without which God would not pardon our Crimes, not on Account of any Fitness therein to procure Remission for us; but he willed his Death, unto that End, because it was his Pleasure; and to make a *Shew* of great Kindness to us, in delivering him up to Death; whereas, in Fact, there was not any at all. For there was, it seems, no *Fitness* in his Death to bring Glory to him, in pardoning Sin, nor to procure the Benefit of Remission for us. If there was a *Fitness* in his Death to obtain that great End, Delivering him up to Death for us would justly be considered, as an *amazing* Act of Kindness, Grace, and Mercy; but, as this is *absolutely* denied, the Transaction of his Sufferings, was *merely arbitrary*, and without any Reason, other than the *absolute* Will of God; without the least Necessity, either in Respect to his own Glory, or our Good and Happiness. And, therefore, this Language is only calculated to deceive and impose upon us, of which the *Author* cannot be insensible. For which Reason it justly deserves a *severe* Censure. He presents us with a *piacular* and *expiatory*

Sacrifice, without Sin being borne, or the least Degree of Penalty suffered by him, who became that Sacrifice; and he pretends, that Atonement is made for our Sins; but the Charge of our Guilt still lies upon us, we are as much as ever obnoxious, before God, to Condemnation, and full as liable to suffer eternal Vengeance, as if that Sacrifice had not been offered, and shall as certainly descend to Hell, if we do not procure for ourselves a Right to Impunity and Life, by our own Works, as if our Savior had not suffered. The Effect of Christ's Death is only a *conditional* Grant of Pardon; the Removal of our Guilt, and our Right to Impunity, are the proper Effects of our Repentance and future Obedience. Our Repentance and Reformation are of *infinitely greater Value* than the Death of Christ, for that only availed to obtain a Declaration, or Promise from God to pardon Sin but they have a *Fitness* in them to procure Remission *itself*, according to the Principles of this Author.

## CHAPTER 6 — OF THE EFFICACY OF CHRIST'S DEATH

MR. *Taylor*, in his Ninth Chapter, corrects our Mistakes about the Efficacy of the Death of Christ.

**I.** *The Design of it could not be to make God merciful; or to dispose him to spare and pardon us, when, as some suppose, so great was his Wrath, that, had not Christ interposed, he would have destroyed us. This is directly contrary to the most plain and certain Notions of Divine Goodness, and to the whole Current of Revelation; which always assures us, that the pure Love of God to a sinful World, was the first Mover and original Spring of the Whole of our Redemption by Christ, Joh. 3:16. All that Christ did and suffered, was by the Will and Appointment of God: And was conducive to our Redemption, only in Virtue of his Will and Appointment, Heb. 10: 7; Joh. 5:30- Joh. 6:27-38.*<sup>f55</sup>

**Answ. 1.** None suppose, that the Design of the Death of Christ was to make God merciful, or to procure a Disposition and Will in God to show us Mercy.

**2.** He does not seem to understand what Divine Anger against Sin and Sinners is; it is not a *Passion*, but a holy *Displeasure* with both, necessarily arising from the infinite Purity of his Nature. God can no more suffer Sin to go unpunished, than he can disapprove of and neglect Innocence. As he necessarily loves Holiness, so he necessarily hates Sin, and his Will to punish it is necessary, though free; if it was not, he might decree to permit his Creatures to sin against him eternally, without suffering Punishment.

**3.** Infinite Love to poor Sinners provided and gave Christ to be a Savior to them, as the whole Gospel testifies, with this infinitely wise Purpose, that Divine Resentment against Sin might be fully manifested, as well as the Glory of rich Grace be displayed, in their Remission. *God set forth his Son to be a Propitiation, to declare his Righteousness.*

**4.** Those Notions which Men entertain, and please themselves with, of the Exercise of Divine Goodness towards guilty Creatures,

without a proper Provision for the Glory of Divine Justice, are *mere Dreams*, and infinitely dishonorable to God.

**5.** It is most false, that all that Christ did and suffered was conducive to our Redemption, only in Virtue of God's Will and Appointment.

(1). If this is true, then there was no *Fitness* in the Death of Christ to obtain the Pardon of sin, any more than there is in the Death of a *Brute*. Then,

(2). This was not a wise Constitution. Wisdom would choose a moral *Mean* that hath a *Fitness* in it to attain the End designed.

(3). Then God might have willed the Death of Christ without any Intention to pardon Sin and save Sinners. For, if there is no *Fitness* in his Death to procure Remission, God certainly might have decreed his Death, without appointing it to be so much as a Condition, or Cause, (*sine qua non*) of the remission of our Sins. And who knows but he did?

(4). The Scriptures he refers unto, do not in the least suggest this. They express, that what Christ did was the Will of God; but are far from giving any Hint, that the Virtue and Efficacy of what he did, or suffered, is owing unto the Will and Appointment of God. To scruple the Uprightness of the Author in the Interpretation of Scripture, probably, might displease him; but he must excuse me, that being allowed in his Favour, if I shall say, that his Ability for this Service is far below that of a common Reader.

**II.** *Nor can it be true, that by his Sufferings he satisfied Justice, or the Law of God. For it is very certain, and very evident, that Justice and Law can no otherwise be satisfied, than by the just and legal Punishment of the Offender. — Law in its own Nature must always condemn the Criminal; and Justice, acting according to Law, must precisely inflict the Punishment. In the Margin he says, by Justice, in this Case, is not meant Justice, as it is an Attribute in God, or that Branch of his moral Rectitude, which we call Righteousness; but Justice stinted and directed by Law commanding Duty, and denouncing Penalty in Case of Transgression. Here, therefore, Justice and Law come to the same Thing; only Law is the Rule, and Justice is Acting according to, or the Execution of that Rule.* <sup>f56</sup>

**Answ. 1.** It is the Holiness and Righteousness of God, which wills Good to be done, and Evil to be avoided, and which ordains that Sin shall expose the Creature to, or bring him under an Obnoxiousness unto Penalty.

**2.** Law is the Expression of the Divine Will in all these Respects, or the Constitution of Divine Righteousness. The Law, therefore, springs from Justice and Holiness: Or, it is Justice, which gives Being to the Law, and not the Law which gives Being to Justice.

**3.** Is Justice, which is stinted and directed by Law, something in God? If it is, then it must be either a Divine Purpose or Perfection. It cannot be a Purpose or Decree of God, because God must then immutably will the Destruction of a Sinner; neither can it be any Divine Perfection, because, then, God would not be at Liberty to act towards any Criminal, otherwise than the Law directs, and the Salvation of a Sinner must be absolutely impossible. And, therefore,

**4.** Justice must mean something *out of God*, and what that is, Mr. Taylor knows not, nor can declare. It is a *Non-ens*, there can be no such Thing.

**5.** God necessarily, though freely, wills to punish Sin.

**6.** It is Matter of Liberty and free Choice with him either to punish Sin in the Offender, or in a Surety, who agrees to bear his Sin and suffer its Demerit.

**7.** The Infliction of Penalty on the Sinner's Sponsor, is the Execution of Justice on, or against Sin; and his Sufferings, if they have a Sufficiency of Worth in them, arising from his personal Dignity, are satisfactory both to Law and Justice. And such were the Sufferings of our Savior, who is God as well as Man.

**8.** Unless these Things are granted, we must deny that the Rectitude and Righteousness of the Nature of God is exercised and displayed, in punishing Sinners themselves, or in pardoning and saving them by Jesus Christ. There is no Discovery of the Holiness of God, in the most wonderful of all his Works, if Sinners are pardoned and saved, without Regard to Justice and the Law in their Redemption.

**III.** *Nor will the Notion of Christ's Dying in our Stead, Paying an Equivalent, or Suffering a vicarious Punishment, bear the Test of Scripture or Reason. Because this Notion never enters into the Notion of Atonement by Sacrifice.* <sup>f57</sup>

**Ans. 1.** It is freely granted, that there was no *Equivalent* in *legal* Sacrifices.

**2.** They could not, nor were intended to take away Sin, in a *spiritual* Sense.

**3.** The Death of Christ was designed to that great End, and it had a *Fitness* in it to answer that important and glorious End.

**4.** The *Author* with equal Truth might say, that the Notion of Christ's taking away Sin, in a *spiritual* Sense, will not bear the Test of Scripture; because that Notion never enters into the Notion of Atonement by Sacrifice. As the Death of Christ effected that which *legal* Sacrifices could not effect: So there was that in his Death, which was not in any or all of them, *viz. a Fitness* to take away Sin. If we are not to limit our Notions of the Efficacy of the Death of our Savior, by that Virtue which attended those Sacrifices; neither must we limit our Notions of the Value of his Sufferings, by that Worth which was found in them. In those Sacrifices there was no *Fitness* to take away Sin: In the Sacrifice of Christ there was such a *Fitness*. And in them there was not an *Equivalent* to make Compensation for Guilt; but in the Death of Christ there was an *Equivalent*, and it was *satisfactory* to the Justice and Law of God.

**2.** *Law and Justice can never admit of one Man's Dying in the Stead of another, or of his Suffering the Punishment, which in Law and Justice is due to the Offender only.* <sup>f58</sup>

**Ans. 1.** The Whole is granted, as to Men. But,

**2.** Surely God may do that which Men may not. He had Power over the innocent *Jesus*, and might will, that he should bear our Sin, and suffer for it. Christ had Power *over* himself to put himself in our Place, to take upon him our Guilt, and to consent unto the Suffering Punishment for us. His Father's Will was, that he should, and he voluntarily agreed so to do, and hath received an ample and

satisfactory Reward of the Father, for this his Submission unto his holy, sovereign Will. And, therefore, there is no Injustice in this Procedure, Here was no Exercise of *unlawful* Power in God: No Violence offered to our Savior, nor was his Consent required unto that, which he had not a proper Right to comply with. For *he had Power to lay down his Life, and Power to take it again*. Nor is that Reward with-held from him, which it was *fit* he should receive upon accomplishing the Will of the Father, in this wonderful Affair.

**3.** *Punishment may be considered as just and fitting; but I cannot conceive how it should be a Sacrifice of a Sweet-smelling Savor, Eph. 5: 2, pleasing and grateful unto God – much less such unequitable Punishment.*<sup>f59</sup>

**Answ. 1.** He seems to grant, that Punishment, *i.e.* for Sin, *is just and fitting*; but I am apprehensive, that he will not abide by this Grant, in Favour of our Principles; because, *it stabs his own to the Heart*. If Punishment for Sin is *just and fitting*, it *becomes* God to inflict it, and not suffer Sin to go unpunished. Nor, indeed, can he, for he can no more omit to do that, which is *just and fit* to be done, than *he is able to deny himself*.

**2.** His Want of Capacity to discern the Nature of heavenly Mysteries is not the least Objection to their Truth, though he is, it seems, *a Master in Israel*.

**3.** The Sacrifice of Christ was pleasing to God, not considered, merely, as he, in Offering of himself, suffered Penalty; but as he so did, with a holy Submission to his Will, with a View to his Glory, and the Salvation of his People.

**4.** Because there was that Value in the Sacrifice of Christ, resulting from the infinite Dignity of his Person, as the Father's Equal, which renders it *fit* to answer all the glorious Ends of his *eternal Love, infinite Wisdom, and inflexible Justice*, in the Business of our Salvation.

**5.** This was not *unequitable* Punishment, for it was on Account of, and for Sin, And God had Power to will, that Christ should bear our Guilt, and undergo those Sufferings which we were liable unto, as Sinners. Christ took our Guilt upon himself, and freely consented to endure those Penalties, which were due unto us.

**4.** *Vicarious Punishment or Suffering, (in which, upon this Scheme the Efficacy of Christ's Death for the Remission of Sin solely consists) gives us too low Ideas of the Sufferings of the Son of God, as it sinks them to the Pain and Sufferings of a Malefactor, the very meanest Idea we can have of them. He suffered, as if he had been the Criminal, the Pain and Punishment, which we, or equivalent to that which we, the real Criminals, should have suffered; or he was executed by the Hand of Justice in our Stead. A Representation quite too low and insipid, for an Affair concerted in the Council of God, and accomplished by his only begotten Son.* <sup>f60</sup>

**Ans. 1.** As it was in the *primitive* Age of the Christian Church, so it is now, in Respect to the Doctrine of the Cross. The Reason of which is clear, *the deep Things of God* are what they always were, and the Nature of Man is still the same; and, therefore, we need not wonder, if we hear some Men pronounce them *low, mean, and insipid*. I confess, that this is, in my Opinion, a very *corroborating* Proof of the Divine Verity of our Principles. If *heavenly Mysteries* retain their own Nature, and Men continue to be what they formerly were, we must expect them to express the same Language, concerning those *Mysteries*, which others have done before them.

**2.** Our Blessed Savior, in himself, was innocent, or *holy, harmless, and undefiled*, and he was so reputed, or no otherwise considered, as in himself.

**3.** It was no Dishonor to Christ to bear our Guilt, and suffer that Punishment in our *Stead*, whereunto we were obnoxious, in Obedience to the Will of the Father; except it may be deemed a mean Thing in Christ to *magnify the Divine Law and make it honorable*; and to glorify his Father, in all his infinite Perfections, by accomplishing a Design, wherein, above all others, the Glory of his Grace, and Mercy, Wisdom, Holiness, and Justice illustriously shines.

**4.** I am under no Surprise at all at this Author's boldly Asserting, that this was an Affair too *low and insipid* to be concerted in the Council of God, and accomplished by his only begotten Son. For it is no Wonder to me, that some Sort of Persons dare to affirm, that *the Wisdom of God is FOLLY*. I wish them to consider, that, *if our*



*Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are LOST: And that those, to whom the Doctrine of the Cross is Foolishness, PERISH.*

**5.** *This Notion, as it includes the Imputation of our Sins to Christ, and of his Righteousness, or Fulfilling of the Law, to us, supplies, Consequences very hurtful to Piety and Virtue: And some Christians have actually drawn such Consequences from it.* <sup>f61</sup>

**Ans.** This is a false Charge, and is mere Calumny. For,

**1.** The Imputation of our Sins to Christ, in order to his suffering Punishment, that we might be pardoned and saved in a Way becoming all the Perfections of God, shows us clearly the Malignity of Sin, how hateful it is to God, and is a most persuasive Motive to excite us to forsake every Evil.

**2.** The Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ to us, and our Justification in the Sight of God, by Virtue of it, is a glorious Instance of rich Grace and Mercy, and is a full Evidence that such is the infinite Purity of the Nature of God, that he cannot justify a Sinner, as considered in himself; which influences us to *adore* his Kindness and Compassion to us in Misery, and to *loath* ourselves on Account of our Imperfections and Sins.

**3.** This Doctrine by no Means infers, that we may enjoy future Happiness without present Holiness. A Title to eternal Life renders not a *Meetness* for it unnecessary.

**4.** Justification by the Righteousness of Christ dissolves not our Obligation to Duty. For, though we are not under the Law, as a Covenant, to obtain Life by our Obedience to it, yet we are as much as ever, and in its *full Extent*, under it, in its Precepts.

**5.** Those Men who approve of Duty, *only* as the Reward of Life may be expected of God, for their Attendance to it, whatever they think of themselves, I am bold to affirm, have not a *Dram* of Holiness in them.

**6.** They are not Christians who turn the Grace of God into *Lasciviousness*: Or who draw Consequences from this Doctrine hurtful to Piety and Virtue, though Mr. *Taylor* is pleased to call them so. God forbid, that we should ever esteem them Christians, who can dare *to sin*, that *his Grace may abound*. Nothing more

contrary to Christianity can be conceived, than that dreadful Impiety is.

**7.** Some Men, even now, give sad Evidence, what *blasphemous* Thoughts, concerning the Holiness, Justice, and Grace of God, will spring up in their *cursed* Minds, when they will justly suffer his *dreadful*, but *righteous* Vengeance, for their Crimes.

He adds, **6.** *That the Preposition υπερ, when applied to Christ's Dying for us, doth not signify in the Place or Stead of, I have shown in my Paraphrase upon the Romans, in the Note upon Rom. 5: 7. Nor doth the Preposition αντι, imply that Sense in those Texts, Mat. 20:28. αυτρον αντι πολλων, a Ransom for many, 1Ti. 2: 6. Αντιλυτρον υπερ παντων, a Ransom for all. Αντι, indeed, doth signify, in the Place or Stead of, in such Phrases as these, Life for Life, Tooth for Tooth, by Way of Retaliation, or just Punishment. But, that it also signifies for, on Account of, for the Sake of, in Favour of, will appear to any one who consults a good Lexicon. [See Eph. 5:31; Heb. 12: 2; Mat. 17:27.] And, therefore, in such Phrases as λυτρον αντι ψυχης, where Redemption or Ransom is spoken of, it may signify, and I conceive doth signify, no more than a Ransom for, or on Account of Life, to preserve it from being destroyed. And in this Sense our Lord may very properly be said to give himself a Ransom for all, i.e. to redeem them from Death, or to atone for those Lives which we had forfeited: Which is the true Sense of the Place.*

f62

**Answ. 1.** We allow, that the Preposition (υπερ) for, frequently signifies on Account of, or for the Sake of, or in Behalf of.

**2.** That it is used to express Substitution, or in Stead of, cannot be denied, and *Socinus* himself, allows that it is so used. This is its Sense, in these Texts, (ινα υπερ σου διακονη μοι) *that in thy Stead he might minister unto me* (Phm. 1:13). (Δεομεθα υπερ Χριστου) *we pray you in Christ's Stead* (2Co. 5:20).

**3.** And this must be the Sense of it, in these Words, (γενομενος υπερ ημων καταρα) *being made a Curse for us* (Gal. 3:13), which cannot be denied, without directly contradicting the Apostle, and saying, Christ was not made a Curse.

**4.** Our Savior was made Sin, he died for us, considered as Sinners, and on that Account obnoxious to Death. He died for our Sins. *He*

was delivered for our Offences. His Death is our *Ransom* or *Price* of Redemption. And by it he *obtained eternal Redemption* for us. Which Things fully evince, that he was our *Substitute*, and suffered in our *Stead*.

**5.** Christ did not *hazard*, but lay down, or actually resign his Life for us. The *Author's* Paraphrase and Note, therefore, are a bold Corruption of the Text, as the Reader, if he pleases, may see (Rom. 5: 7).

And with Respect unto the Preposition ( $\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota$ ) for,

**1.** I grant that, it is sometimes used, when *Substitution* is not intended, as when it is put to express Opposition. But,

**2.** He very well knows, that it properly expresses *Substitution*, and signifies in the *Place* and *Stead* of. In this Sense the *Septuagint* use it a great many Times. <sup>f63</sup>

**3.** Christ gave his Life, as a *Ransom*, or *Price of Redemption*, unto God, our righteous Judge, for us, and, therefore, he died in our *Stead*, or suffered in our *Place*.

**4.** I dare say, that our *Author* cannot express *Substitution*, in Language *more proper*, than in that which is used in Relation unto the Death of Christ for us. And, therefore,

**5.** He ought to assign some very *cogent* Reasons, for his explaining away that Sense, in Respect unto the Affair of Christ's Death. But, as to Reasons for it, he has none, only his *Dislike*, that God should fix upon such a Method to glorify himself, in the Salvation of Sinners. A Method it is infinitely wise, for herein God displays the immense Riches of his Grace towards our Persons, and his infinite Abhorrence of, and Detestation against our sins. And this is that which such Sort of Men, as our *Author* is, cannot patiently bear with. *If the Almighty will not save Sinners without taking Vengeance on Sin, or without a Regard to the Honour of his Law and Justice; this Sort of Men, will dare to reproach him to his Face, and pronounce his wise Procedures mean, low, insipid, and unworthy, and yet pretend unto great Uprightness and Sincerity at the same Time.*

## CHAPTER 7 — OF SANCTIFICATION, AS A FRUIT OF CHRIST’S DEATH, ETC.

MR. *Taylor* having, as he thinks, entirely demolished the Doctrine of Satisfaction for Sin, by the Death of Christ: He proceeds to discourse concerning his Sufferings, as a Mean of our Sanctification, and, in that View, as a Condition, or Reason with God, of our Remission. Wherein, I confess, he is very *rhetorical*. His Ideas are infinitely below the *Sublimity* and *Grandeur* of the Subject, but his Expressions are lofty and very *florid*. The intelligent Reader will easily perceive this *material* Difference between the Divine Writers and our *Author* on this *Topic*. They convey noble Sentiments, in Language suited to the Nature of the glorious subject; Mr. *Taylor* presents us with *low* Thoughts, in a *pompous* Dress. A few brief Remarks, on this Part of his Performance, will sufficiently discover, that it may justly be said to him, *Thou art* (*Vox, and praeterea nihil*) *Words, and nothing else*. I am no Enemy to *Rhetoric*, nor would I detract from the due Praises of any Excellency, which I am not capable of imitating. But, if *Rhetoric* is not animated by *Logic*, or sound Reasoning, and good Sense, as the *Soul* of it, I esteem it no other than a *pretty Jingle*, calculated to please less discerning Minds. A *glib* Tongue and a *flowing* Pen, not directed by a good Understanding, in my Opinion, are Accomplishment not much to be admired.

**I.** He speaks of the Dignity of the Person of our Savior: And says, *When I consider, that a Person of so transcendent Eminence and Excellency, who was in the Form of God, and in the highest Degree of Glory and Felicity with the supreme Father; of such Wisdom and Power, that by him he made the Worlds; of such Splendor and Majesty, that he was the Brightness of God’s Glory, and the express Image of his Person, etc.* <sup>f64</sup>

But in order to prevent our entertaining an Opinion, infinitely too high, of the personal Dignity of Christ: Or lest we should imagine, that he is the Father’s Equal; he attempts to obscure that illustrious Testimony to the important Truth of our Lord’s Equality with him: *Who, being in the Form of God, thought it not Robbery to be equal with God* (Php. 2: 6), *i.e.* as he says, *like to God*. And in the Margin he observes, that the Phrase, (τὸ εἶναι ἰσὰ θεῷ) to be equal with God, is the same as (ἴσα θεῷ), (ἴσοθεος), (θεός ὡς) *like God, or as God*, and answers to the Hebrew

(כאלהים) Zec. 12: 8. *The House of David shall be as God.* To which I answer, as a *learned Author* does, that, with the Greeks, (το ειναι junctum ισα), is most significant. *Perfect Equality cannot be more fully expressed, than it is by that Phrase.*<sup>f65</sup> The Instances, with which he would make it parallel, express *Likeness*, but this *Equality*. Mr. Taylor paraphrases: *He did not regard the Dignity and Glory, which he had with the Father, as Soldiers do the Spoil and Plunder, which they take by Force, and resolutely hold against all the World.*<sup>f66</sup>

**Answ. 1.** The Apostle says, Christ did not think, esteem, or account it *Spoil*. Mr. Taylor says, *he did not regard it*, that is, *he did not forcibly hold it, as Soldiers do their Plunder*, between which the Difference is as wide, as it can be.

**2.** The Apostle, in this Phrase, asserts the Dignity of our Savior. Mr. Taylor interprets it of his Condescension, which is as directly contrary to the Intention of the sacred Writer, as any Thing can be. In his *Notes* on Rom. 9: 5, he first observes, that the Power delegated to Christ by the Father, over all Things, is *his supreme Godhead*. Not content with that *depraved Interpretation* of the Phrase: *Who is over all, God blessed for ever*: He ventures at a bold Corruption of the Text. It seems *what this Part of Christ's Character, has to do with the Jews, is not to him very clear*. Nor, can he *conceive, why the Apostle neglected to mention, in this Place, the Jews Relation to God, as their God. How could he overlook the main Article in this List, i.e. of their Privileges?* In order to supply this Defect, and to wrest the Words from our Savior of whom they are spoken, he delivers this Conjecture, that there is a Transposition in the Text, viz. thus, (ο ων for ων ο) *i.e. who is, for whose is*, and so he applies the Phrase to the Father: *Whose is the God over all*. Thus, says he, *the grand Privilege will be inserted to Advantage, and stand at the Top of a lofty Climax, rising from the FATHERS, to CHRIST, to GOD*. Probably, our Author may be much pleased with this *ingenious Conjecture* of his; since he fancies, that it throws such admirable Beauty on the Apostle's Discourse. But it falls out very unhappily for him, that this grand Privilege is the first mentioned, the Apostle begins with it in the 4th Verse: *To whom pertaineth the Adoption*, which is expressive of the *Jews Relation* unto God. And, Mr. Taylor discerned this, when he wrote his Paraphrase, for in that he thus

speaks on the Words: *Dignified with the Character of the Sons and First-born of God*, (Exo. 4:22; Jer. 31: 9; Hos. 11: 1). We must, therefore, conclude, that he had forgot his Paraphrase, when he wrote his Notes. If that had occurred to his Thoughts, it would have prevented him assigning this Reason for his *bold and daring* Corruption of the Text. Again, it is absurd to suppose, that a *limited and precarious* Being is the Brightness of the Father's Glory, and the express Image, or Character, of his Person. It would not be so far from Truth to say that a *Glow-worm*, is the *Brightness* of the Sun's Splendor, and the *Character* of his dazzling Rays. I am bold to affirm, that God is not capable of giving Existence to a Creature, unto whom those Things are properly applicable. God is eternal, all-knowing, all-wise, almighty, supremely good, absolutely immutable, *etc.* No voluntary Production is eternal, unlimited in Knowledge, Wisdom, Goodness, Power, or immutable, nor can be in its Nature, yea, it may cease to be at all. And such a Being Mr. *Taylor* thinks Christ is. Besides, Creation is not a Work of almighty Power, if it was effected by the Agency of such a Being as Mr. *Taylor* imagines our Savior is.

The Fact is undoubtedly this: Either Creation was wrought by the Power and Wisdom which *reside* in the Father: Or by the Power and Wisdom which *reside* in Christ: If by that Wisdom and Power which reside in the Father; then the Wisdom and Power, which *reside* in Christ had no more Efficiency, in the Production of all Things, than the Wisdom and Power of Mr. *Taylor* had. And, if the Creation was effected by the Wisdom and Power which *reside* in Christ, that is not a Work of infinite Wisdom and Omnipotence, but it is the Effect of finite Wisdom and limited Power. The *old Philosophers* were not greater *Fools*, who *professed themselves to be wise*, than those among us are, who reject evangelical Mysteries; for they advance most evident *Absurdities*. God cannot give a Sufficiency of Wisdom and Power to any Being whatever, to create a World; the Reason is as clear as the Sun. Infinity is not *communicable*; if it was, God might produce his Equal, which he can no more do, than he can become *finite*. I am sure, I say nothing here, but what agrees with the *peerless* and *incomprehensible* Perfections of my almighty Creator; and I express these Things, with a View to vindicate his Glory, to assert the true Dignity of Christ, and to expose the *Stupidity* of *Arianism*, which at this Time is greatly spreading amongst us, with all other *detestable* Errors. For my Part, I am fully resolved never to own any Person whatever, as my Savior,

who is *finite* in his Nature, *mutable* in his Being, *precarious*, and *may cease to be*; such a God Mr. Taylor would fain persuade us to believe Christ is. Those may so do, who imagine, that *infinite Wisdom, Power, Merit, and Compassion are not Requisites in a Savior*, and who can be content to trust in themselves, and their own Obedience, for Pardon and Acceptation with God in Judgment. From which I pray the good Lord, of his Mercy, eternally to deliver *my poor perishing Soul*.

**II.** Mr. Taylor observes, that *God's granting Remission of Sin, through the Blood of Christ, is the properest Way to affect our Minds with the Malignity of Sin, and to show us how odious and detestable all Sin is to God.*<sup>f67</sup>

**Answ. 1.** He allows not, that God does grant us Remission of Sin, through Christ's Blood, though he thus speaks. For, his Opinion is, that the Death of Christ procured *only* a Declaration or Promise from God to pardon Sin; and that we must, by our own Works, acquire a Right to Remission.

**2.** If the malign, odious, and detestable Nature of Sin is seen, in God's requiring the Death of Christ, *only* as a Condition of giving a Promise to pardon; it is infinitely more discovered, in the Infliction of proper Punishment, for Sin, on Christ in Dying; and, therefore, our Opinion of the *penal Nature of his Death*, according to his own Reasoning, bids much fairer for Truth, than that which he advances does. If it is an Instance of Divine Wisdom to pardon Sin in such a Way, as the Malignity, odious and detestable Nature of it to God, may be seen: Surely, it is reasonable to conclude, that it is the *wisest and fittest Method* to dispense Pardon, in such a Way, as most clearly discovers God's Abhorrence of it. Now, whether *only* Requiring that Christ should die, without enduring Penalty in his Death: Or the Infliction of Punishment on him, in Dying, in order to the Remission of Sin, more fully discovers its Malignity and evil Nature, may, I think, be safely left to the Determination of any unprejudiced Person, who hath the least Discernment in the Things of God.

**III.** He says, *How forcibly, far beyond any abstract Reasonings, do these Considerations, viz. God's delivering up Christ for us all, etc. urge us to love God and our Savior, to devote our all to his Honour? etc.*<sup>f68</sup> Still our Opinion hath the Advantage infinitely above his. For, surely, every one

must see, that it is a greater Instance of Love to suffer a *penal* Death, than it is *barely* to die, or without enduring Divine Punishment in Dying. And, consequently, our Obligations to God and the Redeemer are far greater, on our Principles, than it can be thought they are, upon those of Mr. *Taylor*: Therefore, that there is, at least, a great Probability of the Truth of our Opinion, and of the Falsehood of his, the Nature of his own Reasoning evinces. But the Reader must observe, That, though he uses *swelling* Words, he is very *low* in Sense and Meaning. Some Men have an *admirable Knack* of expressing themselves, in a *lofty* Manner, when they convey exceedingly low Ideas, which I can never prevail with myself to admire, on any Subject. Such a Way of discoursing on this, which is of all other Subjects the most glorious, important, and astonishing, I heartily despise; because it is calculated to deceive, and cause weak People to imagine that a Sense is intended, which is agreeable to its Nature, whereas nothing is more remote from, or contrary to the Design of the Person himself. Nor is Mr. *Taylor* insensible of this.

**IV.** It is granted, that *Christ was an Example to us in Suffering*; but not as he bore Sin, suffered for it, and was made a Curse, to redeem us from the Law's Curse; in neither of these Views, is he proposed to us an Example. These Things are peculiar to him, in the Character of the Redeemer of the Church of God. Yet, we freely allow, that, from this glorious Pattern of Meekness, Love, and Zeal for the Honour of God, we may learn *Usefulness*, <sup>f69</sup> *Love*, <sup>f70</sup> *Humility, Condescension*, <sup>f71</sup> *Trust in God*, <sup>f72</sup> *Mortification of fleshly Lusts*, <sup>f73</sup> *Patience, Meekness, and Fortitude under Sufferings*, <sup>f74</sup> *Deadness to the World*, <sup>f75</sup> as Mr. *Taylor* observes. And I think, that he is not so *stupid*, as not to discern, that our Opinion furnishes us with these Advantages, in a Degree, at least, equal with his own.

**V.** Faith in Christ is not, it seems, *a Reliance or Dependence on his Blood and Righteousness for Pardon and Acceptance with God*; but it is the *Attention of our Minds fixed upon him*, as our Example, whereby we become like him, in our Temper and Behavior; and, being so, on that Account, we have a Claim upon God for the Remission of our Sins, and the eternal Salvation of our Souls. This it is to be baptized into Christ's Death. This it is to eat his Flesh and drink his Blood, in the Institution of the Lord's Supper. And this is Approaching to God through Christ's Blood with Boldness. <sup>f76</sup> These Things are not true, and I am bold to affirm, that they agree not with the Experience of a *single* Christian, in the *whole World*. Indeed, it is not to be expected of Men, after they have



destroyed the *Fundamentals* of Christianity, to give us a true Account of Christian Experience. Mr. *Taylor* ought not to take it amiss, that I am so very brief in my Remarks here; because, though he throws out a *Flood of Words*, he expresses *very little* Matter. Which, I confess, is a Way of Writing not at all grateful to me.

## **VI.** The Death of Christ is the Cause of our Sanctification.

**(1).** *Meritoriously*: For, 1. His Sufferings and Death were required, by the Divine Father, of him, as a Condition of communicating Grace to us, to sanctify our Hearts and make us meet for Heaven. (Isa. 53:10.) 2. He, therefore, may claim the Communication of Grace to us, unto that great End, as a Debt due to him (Rom. 4: 4), according to the Reasoning of the Apostle, in the Place referred to.

**(2).** *Influentially*: As his Blood is applied to our Consciences, by the Blessed Spirit, it assures us of the Remission of our Sins, and effects in us an Abhorrence of Evil, and a Desire of perfect Conformity to him, in every Branch of Purity and Holiness. Hence, the Divine Writer to the *Hebrews* thus prays in their Behalf: *Now the God of Peace, that brought again from the Dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the Sheep, through the Blood of the everlasting Covenant, make you perfect in every good Work, to do his Will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his Sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be Glory for ever and ever.* Amen (Heb. 13:20, 21).

## APPENDIX

MR. *Taylor's* Recommending a Pamphlet, entitled, *Second Thoughts concerning the Sufferings and Death of Christ*, excited in me a Desire to read it. Upon the Perusal of it, I quickly perceived, what was the Reason of his Recommendation. The Author wholly explains away, and, as he thinks, evinces the Absurdity of the Doctrine of Atonement, by the Blood of Christ, or of Salvation through his Sufferings and Death, as the *meritorious* Cause of it. My narrow Limits will not allow me to enlarge, in animadverting on this Performance.

**I.** I would observe that some Principles want Proof, which the Author takes for granted, and upon which the main of his Reasoning is founded, and, therefore, his Superstructure which he hath built upon them, will no more stand than a Castle erected in the Air. They are these.

- 1.** Unblemished and perfect Holiness is not necessary to an Interest in the Approbation and Favour of God: Or, God can account a Person righteous, who is, at least, in some Degree, unrighteous. For, he allows, that no Character in human Life is unmixed or perfect. <sup>t77</sup>
- 2.** There is a *Fitness* in Repentance and Reformation to procure the Pardon of Sin: Or to regain an Interest in the Favour and Approbation of God. Although a Man hath been, through the Course of his Life, *luxurious, incontinent, perfidious, oppressive, fraudulent, rapacious, cruel, proud, envious, wrathful, malicious, revengeful, or brutal and diabolical in his Disposition and Behavior; hath neither feared God, nor regarded Men:* Such is the *intrinsic Value and Worth* of Repentance, that it will justly fit him for the Pardon of all his aggravated Guilt, and procure him a Title to Happiness.
- 3.** Repentance is in the Power of every Sinner. Or no Criminal whatever needs *Supernatural* Strength to bring him to repent of his Sins, and to practice that Virtue, which will recommend him to the Approbation and Favour of his Maker.
- 4.** The Death of Christ is not the Cause of Repentance in any Sinner, and, consequently, it was not at all necessary unto the Being of Repentance.

**5.** *The Justice of God is only Goodness, acting under the Direction of his Wisdom for the Good,* <sup>f78</sup> *i.e. the Happiness, of the Creation, though apostate and corrupt. And, therefore,*

**6.** The End of the Infliction of Punishment must be the Good and Happiness of the guilty Creature. This is a most pleasing Representation of Divine Justice, for this will never leave us without a Ground of Hope of Deliverance from Misery, let our Guilt be ever so heinous and accumulated.

**7.** Divine Love to Men follows upon their Love to God and Goodness: Or, *they become amiable, and then God loves them.* <sup>f79</sup>

**8.** *The Communication of all personal Worth or Merit is impossible.* <sup>f80</sup> I suppose he means, what Christ did and suffered cannot possibly be imputed to us.

**Answ. 1.** Personal Worth may intend inherent Powers and Perfections: These always reside in their proper Subject, and cannot be transfused into another. But,

**2.** If he means the Obedience of Christ: to the Law and Will of God, we allow, that is not communicated, or transfused into us, nor can be. Yet,

**3.** It is imputed to us, or placed to our Account. This is a Grant of his Righteousness to us. And,

**4.** God sees that Righteousness to be ours, not *inherently*, indeed, but by gracious Imputation.

**5.** Thereupon, he accepts, or justifies us. In no other Sense can it be said, *that Righteousness is imputed without Works.*

The *Author* hath not given the least Proof of the Truth of these Principles, either from Revelation or Reason; but takes them all for *self-evident* Principles, which need no other Confirmation, than their own evidencing Light, which he thinks sufficient to gain the Consent of every one who considers them. But I must crave Leave to withhold my Assent from them all, until he shall be pleased to offer something for their Proof.

**II.** I proceed to consider, what the *Author* asserts and argues for, from these unproved Principles. And,

**1.** He thinks, That *the Justice of God cannot require a Satisfaction for the Sins of sincere Penitents, because sincere Repentance certainly renders them the Objects of Divine Favour and Approbation. This is with him a most insuperable Difficulty.* <sup>f81</sup>

**Ans. 1.** He supposes, that Repentance might be without a Satisfaction made for Sin. This I deny, and affirm, that Repentance is the Effect of the Satisfaction of Christ, nor can he prove the contrary.

**2.** Repentance procures not Divine Love, nor does it render a Person a fit Object of a justifying Act of God.

**2.** *Another Difficulty arises from the Representations of that Severity of Justice, which makes an Expiation necessary. — Every sin deserveth God's Wrath and Curse, both in this World and that which is to come. — It is an infinite Evil, and requires Satisfaction of infinite Value; and God cannot pardon any Sin without a Satisfaction. — Such a Severity shocks my Imagination.* <sup>f82</sup>

**Ans. 1.** Every Sin deserveth God's Wrath and Curse for ever. *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all Things that are written in the Book of the Law to do them.*

**2.** Sin is an infinite Evil *objectively*, or as it is committed against an infinite Object. But I expect, that some Sort of Men will soon dare to say, that Sin committed against God, is not attended with greater Demerit, than Sinning against a Creature is. For, though they pretend, that Reason is their Religion, they argue upon religious Principles, as if they had really lost their Reason.

**3.** There is no Weight at all in his Imagination being shocked. For it is common with some to think, that *God is unrighteous who taketh Vengeance*, of which Number there is too much Reason to fear, that he is one: *I cannot reconcile it to infinite Goodness*, says he. <sup>f83</sup> And what if he cannot? That is no Objection of the least Importance. Is the Exercise of punitive Justice towards a criminal Creature incompatible with Divine Goodness? By no Means; if it is, punitive Justice cannot be exercised at all, for it is not possible to God to act inconsistently with any of his Perfections.

He proceeds to object unto his being brought into that State, wherein he finds himself, if it is so, that every sin deserveth Punishment; and is *very severe*, if not *impious*, in the Manner of expressing himself. *This one might dread from a malevolent Being*. Horrid, indeed! *But is not to be expected under the Administration of the original, essential, perfect, and unchangeable Goodness, which gave Birth to the Universe, with an Intention of communicating Happiness to the Creatures in it*. And concludes thus: *It would have been as fully consistent with the Goodness of my Maker to have made me what I originally am, out of the Earth, as to make me what I am, as a Descendant from Adam.* <sup>f84</sup> The Apostacy of Adam, therefore, can be no just Reason, why his Descendants should be placed in unhappy Circumstances.

Our present Situation is entirely withdrawn from the Bar of Justice, and is wholly referred unto Divine Goodness, which, as it is said, designs nothing but the Happiness of the Creature. Infinite Benevolence, therefore, hath determined to give Existence to innumerable rational Creatures, so situated in Consequence of the Sin of him from whom they spring, in their successive Generations, as is certainly followed with the Depravation of every Individual, who continues in Being so long as to be affected by the evil Temptations, which are inseparable from the present State. This Depravation is the Loss of the true Glory and Felicity of the reasonable Creature. This, it seems, is owing to infinite Benevolence. Again, for that is not all, by this Depravation, Men are, at least in Danger of being hurried on through the Force of Temptations, which easily work upon depraved Minds, to act a Part which naturally tends to their everlasting Destruction, and actually much the superior Number of Men, perish for ever. And it seems, that it is the Decree of Divine Beneficence to place them in so *disadvantageous and exceedingly dangerous a State*. Farther, it is the Appointment of the same immense Kindness, that a great Part of the human Species, who are not chargeable with Guilt contracted by another, and have never offended themselves, shall endure *Tortures* which would pierce a *Heart of Stone*, and expire in *dreadful Agonies*. Moreover, it is the Goodness of God which ordained, that so great a Part of Mankind shall be subject to a Train of Miseries in the present State of Things, which the most rigid Virtue cannot possibly defend a Person from, *viz. extreme Poverty, Contempt, Oppression, and vile Cruelty*. This is that *lovely Condition*, which the Goodness of the great Creator hath ordained the human Species unto; for Justice, it seems, hath no Concern at all in this Appointment! Prodigious, indeed! One would imagine that Men, who

ascribe this Situation to the Goodness of God, cannot, themselves, believe the *specious* Things, which they express concerning it, nor can possibly have any pleasing Expectations from it, how much soever, to serve a Purpose, they think well to extol and applaud it. But all these Things are accounted for, by bringing them to the Bar of Divine Justice, unto which alone they can in Reason be referred.

**3.** A Third Difficulty is, *Innocence cannot be punished. Perfect Innocence can know no Pains of Conscience. Perfect Innocence can have no Apprehension of the Wrath and Displeasure of God.*<sup>f85</sup>

**Ans. 1.** If Men may be allowed to express themselves, in what Way they shall think proper, upon a Subject, they may prove or disprove any Thing, It is not Innocence, nor an innocent Person, as so considered, that is punished.

**But, 1.** An innocent Person may bear the Sins of others, or have their Guilt imputed to him.

**2.** In Consequence of that, suffer Punishment.

**3.** He hath no Consciousness of having contracted that Guilt, which is placed to his Account. But,

**4.** He may have a painful Sensation of the Charge of that Guilt to him. And,

**5.** Of that Wrath and Displeasure, which the Sin that is imputed to him demerits.

**6.** A *mere* Consciousness of having sinned is not Punishment, nor does that enter into the Nature of Punishment. For,

**(1).** That is no other than a *natural* Act of the Mind, as it is endued with a Power of Recollection.

**(2).** Such a Consciousness will always be in those who are pardoned, except it is supposed, that they will forget that they once were Sinners; which if they do, then the Benefit of Salvation from Sin, and its Consequences, they can have no Remembrance of. Some, indeed, seem to imagine, that thus it shall be with the Saints in Heaven, but without any Foundation: And unto the total and eternal Eclipse of the Glory of the Grace of God, in our Salvation by *Jesus Christ*.

**4.** He objects, That *the Ends of Government are not answered, but evaded, by the Punishment of Sin in Christ.*<sup>f86</sup>

**Answ. 1.** It is granted, that this Appointment was of the Father, as he says.

**2.** That Christ did not procure the Love of the Father to Men. His Sacrifice was the Fruit of Divine Love, and not the Cause of it. In order farther to prove, that the Ends of Government are evaded by this adorable Scheme of Salvation, he,

(1) Supposes *it was possible, that Christ might not have been willing to die for us.*<sup>f87</sup> This is a Supposition of what is not to be supposed. For, 1. The Will of the Father was an Obligation upon Christ in his human Nature, which was that wherein he suffered. 2. As a Divine Person, he assumed that Nature into Union with himself, in order to give it up to Suffering and Death. 3. The Will of Christ's human Nature was wholly under the Direction of the Will of his Divine Nature. 4. He could not but consent unto the Pleasure of the Father, in this Matter; yet his Consent was voluntary, and not forced.

(2). He inquires thus: *How could his willing Submission to the Father alter the Case, with Respect to the Ends of Government? It will be confessed, that the Father's giving him up, without a willing Compliance, could not have answered these Ends.*<sup>f88</sup>

**Answ. 1.** If Christ had not consented to take our Guilt upon himself, and to suffer Punishment in our Stead, in his Death, he would not have offered himself a Sacrifice to God, nor would there have been any Thing in his Death pleasing to him, as a Sacrifice for Sin, and, consequently, nothing of a *Fitness* in it to atone for Sin: And, of Course, no Display of Justice, but a *mere arbitrary* Act of Violence put forth upon him.

**2.** How much soever the Author may be pleased with this *bold* Inquiry, it affects himself as well as us: Since he must grant, that, if Christ had not consented unto his Death, nothing of Wisdom, Goodness, and Mercy towards us had been therein manifested.

**5.** The Author thinks, That, *if this Point is of so much Importance, it should be plain and level to every Capacity, etc.*<sup>f89</sup>

**Answ.** The *deep Things of God* are certainly of the greatest Importance; but it does not follow, that, therefore, they are plain and level to any Capacity, especially the Capacities of those, who think, that their Reason is the *Standard and Test* of Truth. They are the *wise and prudent from whom heavenly Mysteries are hid, and to whom they are Folly and Weakness.*

**6.** He inquires, *What is the Fruit of the Satisfaction of Christ? Is it an Indemnity to the World? No Man says this.*<sup>f90</sup>

**Answ. 1.** Christ did not die for the whole human Race.

**2.** Those who affirm, that he did, deny his *proper and full* Satisfaction, whereof, as I suppose, the Author, was not ignorant. And, therefore, I cannot but consider his Reasoning here, as an Instance of Unfairness and Disingenuity; and his Insult upon it, is very unworthy of him, who gives full Evidence, that he is no Stranger to the Controversies this Matter. Why, therefore, does he with such an *Air of Insult say, Is this an Administration worthy of God? How can Justice have received a full Satisfaction, and yet Satisfaction is to be made again, as if no Satisfaction had been made at all?*<sup>f91</sup> He very well knows, I am persuaded, that those who maintain the *universal* Extent of the Death of Christ, do not allow, that his Death was *satisfactory* to Divine Justice for Sin, though he is pleased thus to express himself.

**3.** I freely grant, that, if the Death of Christ is of *unlimited* Extent, his Death was not *satisfactory* to the Law and Justice of God, for the Sins of any Part of Mankind. If it is once proved, that he died for Men *universally*, it will never be proved, that he made a *proper and full* Satisfaction for the Sins of any one Man in the World. And this the Author, in my Opinion, full well knows.

**7.** He inquires thus: *If their Offences have been fully satisfied for, and a Punishment every Way equal to them actually borne, in what Sense can Pardon be said to be free?*<sup>f92</sup>

**Answ. 1.** As he says, *to Sinners it is free.*

**2.** The Scripture, by free Remission, does not mean Pardon, without Satisfaction, but Forgiveness, without any *moving* Consideration in the sinner pardoned. **3.** It is false which he



affirms, that on the Part of the Father, considered as a moral Governor, it can in no Sense be so, *i.e.* free. For the Father, out of infinite Love to Men, provided and appointed that Sacrifice, by which Satisfaction is made. And, therefore, the Satisfaction his Justice hath received for Sin, is no Objection to the Freeness and Riches of his Grace and Mercy, in pardoning it to the Sinner.

**8.** *After all, could it be proved, that there is any Thing in the Divine Nature, or, in the Thing itself any Expediency amounting to a moral Necessity, which should render it unfit or impossible for God to forgive any, even the least Sin, upon sincere Repentance, without such a Satisfaction, all that hath been said must be given up. But I really despair of seeing that proved.*<sup>193</sup>

**Answ. 1.** The Author supposes, that sincere Repentance might be, without this Satisfaction, which is false, for Repentance is a Fruit of Satisfaction by the Death of Christ.

**2.** He suggests, that Remission follows upon Repentance, which is not true; a Man's Sins, at least, *in Order of Nature*, are forgiven, before he exercises Repentance. Because God wills not to impute Sin to, a Man, therefore, he gives him Repentance, unto Life.

**3.** I cannot but apprehend, that he has seen *clear* Proof given of the Necessity of Satisfaction, though, through *Prejudice*, he will not allow of it. If I thought him a Person unacquainted with what hath been written, on that important Subject, I would point out to him, where he might meet with full Proof of this Matter; but, as I am persuaded, that he is one, who has been conversant in Writings of that Kind, I think it entirely needless to refer him to any Writer, on that Subject. Let him review and reconsider what he has read, in Relation to that Point, and if he is not *apostatized* from Truth, through *carnal Reason, Pride, Unbelief, and Contempt of heavenly Mysteries*, probably, he may discern, what, at present, he professes not to do. If he is such a one, I pray *God, to give him Repentance unto the Acknowledging of the Truth.*



## FOOTNOTES

- <sup>Ft1</sup> (a) Candid Remarks, *etc.* by Mr. *Hampton*, Pages 68, 69.
- <sup>Ft2</sup> Page 54.
- <sup>Ft3</sup> Pages 67, 68, 79, 80, 82.
- <sup>Ft4</sup> Mr. *Taylor's* Key to the Apostolic Writings, Chap. 9, No. 166, and Note.
- <sup>Ft5</sup> Sponsor Foederis appellatur Jesus, quod nominene Dei nobis spondonderit, id est, fidem fecerit, Deum Foederis Promissiones servaturum esse. Non vero quasi pro nobis sponsonderit Deo, nostrorumve debitorum Solutionem in se receperit. Nec enim nos inisimus Christum; sed Deus, cujus nomine Christus ad nos venit, Foedus nobiscum panxit, ejusque Promissiones ratas fore sponsondit and in se recepit; ideoque nec Sponsor simpliciter, sed Foederis Sponsor nominatur: Sponsondit autem Christus pro Foederis divini Veritate, non tantum quatenus id firmum ratumque fore Verbis perpetuo testatus est, sed etiam quatenus Muneris sui Fidem maximis rerum ipsarum comprobavit Documentis, tum Vitae Innocentia and Sanctitate, tum Divinis plane, quae patravit, Operibus; tum Mortis adeo truculentae, quam pro Doctrinae suae Veritate subiit, Perpessione. Comment. in Epist. ad *Hebroeos*, Cap. 7:22.
- <sup>Ft6</sup> Isa. 53: 6. פִּגְע־בּוֹ, *fall upon him*, 2Sa. 1:15. So also in 1Ki. 2:29. And thus, in Jud. 8:21, פִּגְע־כִּנּוּ, in other Instances, the Word is used in this Sense.
- <sup>Ft7</sup> Isa. 53:10. *And thou shouldst have brought* (אָשָׁם) *Guiltiness, or Guilt upon us*, Gen. 26:10. *Fools make a Mock at* (אָשָׁם) *Sin*. Pro. 14: 9. *Thou knowest my Foolishness, and my Sins* (וְאִשְׁמוֹתַי) *are not hid from thee*, Psalm 69.
- <sup>Ft8</sup> *Arise, lift, or take up* (שָׂא. 70 λαβε) *the Lad*, Gen. 21:18. *I will take* (שָׂא. 70 ληψομαι) *the Cup of Salvation*, Ps. 116:13. Let the Reader consult *Trommii Concord*, and he will find many Instances, wherein the 70 thus render the *original* Word. The Apostle uses this Word to express Christ's Assumption of our Nature: *But he made himself of no*

*Reputation, taking upon him (λαβων) the Form of a Servant,*  
 Php. 2: 7, Isa. 53:12.

- Ft<sup>9</sup> Eze. 4: 4, 5, 6. Scripture-Doctrine of Atonement examined, *Pages 26, 27, 28, 29, 30.*
- Ft<sup>10</sup> Page 30.
- Ft<sup>11</sup> Gen. 47:30; Exo. 10:19; Num. 16:15. *etc.* Page 30, 31.
- Ft<sup>12</sup> Page 32.
- Ft<sup>13</sup> Eph. 4: 8; Psa. 68:18; לקחת מתנות באדם
- Ft<sup>14</sup> Page 33.
- Ft<sup>15</sup> Pages 33, 34.
- Ft<sup>16</sup> Page 34.
- Ft<sup>17</sup> Page 35.
- Ft<sup>18</sup> Page 96.
- Ft<sup>19</sup> Page 99.
- Ft<sup>20</sup> Ibid.
- Ft<sup>21</sup> See his Paraphrase on Rom. 3:25, 26.
- Ft<sup>22</sup> Page 37.
- Ft<sup>23</sup> Pages 37, 38.
- Ft<sup>24</sup> Page 73.
- Ft<sup>25</sup> Page 38.
- Ft<sup>26</sup> Ibid.
- Ft<sup>27</sup> Page 38.
- Ft<sup>28</sup> Ibid.
- Ft<sup>29</sup> Ibid.
- Ft<sup>30</sup> Page 38.
- Ft<sup>31</sup> Page 39.
- Ft<sup>32</sup> Page 59.
- Ft<sup>33</sup> Ibid.
- Ft<sup>34</sup> Page 65.
- Ft<sup>35</sup> Ibid.
- Ft<sup>36</sup> Page 66.

- Ft<sup>37</sup> Ibid.
- Ft<sup>38</sup> Page 77.
- Ft<sup>39</sup> Pages 78, 79.
- Ft<sup>40</sup> Page 82.
- Ft<sup>41</sup> Page 82, and in his *Note* on Rom. 5:20.
- Ft<sup>42</sup> Ibid.
- Ft<sup>43</sup> Page 83.
- Ft<sup>44</sup> Page 84.
- Ft<sup>45</sup> Pages 84, 85.
- Ft<sup>46</sup> Page 85.
- Ft<sup>47</sup> Ibid.
- Ft<sup>48</sup> Page 86.
- Ft<sup>49</sup> Page 87.
- Ft<sup>50</sup> Page 87.
- Ft<sup>51</sup> Page 87.
- Ft<sup>52</sup> Pages 87, 88.
- Ft<sup>53</sup> Page 89.
- Ft<sup>54</sup> Pages 91, 92.
- Ft<sup>55</sup> Pages 93, 94.
- Ft<sup>56</sup> Pages 94, 95.
- Ft<sup>57</sup> Page 96.
- Ft<sup>58</sup> Page 96.
- Ft<sup>59</sup> Page 97.
- Ft<sup>60</sup> Pages 97, 98.
- Ft<sup>61</sup> Page 98.
- Ft<sup>62</sup> Pages 98, 99.
- Ft<sup>63</sup> The LXX render אַחַר by **αντι** in many Places, Gen. 4:25; Gen. 22:13; Gen. 30: 2; Est. 2: 4; 2Sa. 18:33. *etc.* *Hesiod* uses this Preposition in that Sense, when he says, (**Διος αντι**) *in the Place of Jove*. **Τως γαρ οι εφρασατην, ινα μη βασιληϊδα τιμην Αλλος εχη, Διος αντι Θεων αιειγενεταων Θεογ**, Ver. 892, 893.

- Ft<sup>64</sup> Page 109.
- Ft<sup>65</sup> Graecis Auribus significantissimum est, **το ειναι** junctum **ισα**.  
 Integra sane AEqualitas Verbis plenius exprimi non potest. *Fortuita Sacra*, page 213.
- Ft<sup>66</sup> Page 120.
- Ft<sup>67</sup> Pages 109, 110.
- Ft<sup>68</sup> Page 113.
- Ft<sup>69</sup> Page 119.
- Ft<sup>70</sup> Page 119.
- Ft<sup>71</sup> Ibid.
- Ft<sup>72</sup> Page 120.
- Ft<sup>73</sup> Ibid.
- Ft<sup>74</sup> Ibid.
- Ft<sup>75</sup> Page 121.
- Ft<sup>76</sup> Pages 127, 122, 131, 122, 123, 124, 104, 126.
- Ft<sup>77</sup> Second Thoughts concerning the Sufferings and Death of Christ, *Page* 8.
- Ft<sup>78</sup> Page 15.
- Ft<sup>79</sup> Pages 9, 10.
- Ft<sup>80</sup> Page 9.
- Ft<sup>81</sup> Page 14.
- Ft<sup>82</sup> Page 15.
- Ft<sup>83</sup> Page 15.
- Ft<sup>84</sup> Page 16.
- Ft<sup>85</sup> Page 17.
- Ft<sup>86</sup> Page 19.
- Ft<sup>87</sup> Ibid.
- Ft<sup>88</sup> Page 19.
- Ft<sup>89</sup> Page 21.
- Ft<sup>90</sup> Page 21.
- Ft<sup>91</sup> Page 22.

F192 Page 23.

F193 Page 23.