

THE DEATH OF DEATH IN THE DEATH OF CHRIST

JOHN OWEN



THE DEATH OF DEATH IN THE DEATH OF CHRIST

THE DEATH OF DEATH IN THE DEATH OF CHRIST

John Owen



A free edition from

CHRISTIAN READER

A reading & audiobook app for classic Christian literature

ABOUT THIS BOOK



A rigorous defense of **definite atonement**, arguing that Christ's death was specifically intended for the elect and effectually secures their salvation. Structured across four books, Owen dismantles Arminian and universalist positions by examining the **ends of Christ's death**, the nature of God's redemptive will, the covenant of grace, and scripture proofs marshaled by opponents. A landmark of **Reformed soteriology** and the most thorough treatment of particular redemption in the Puritan tradition.



ABOUT CHRISTIAN READER



Christian Reader is a free reading and audiobook app for classic Christian literature, with high-quality narration available as a premium upgrade.

Available on iOS and Android.

<https://apps.apple.com/us/app/christian-reader/id6755921023>

https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.samfrisch.christian_reader

CONTENTS



Dedicatory Epistle to Robert, Earl of Warwick	6
Chapter 1	8
Chapter 2	13
Chapter 3	18
Chapter 4	35
Chapter 5	41
Chapter 6	44
Chapter 7	48
Chapter 8	56
Chapter 1	77
Chapter 2	82
Chapter 3	90
Chapter 4	111
Chapter 5	127
Chapter 1	133
Chapter 2	140
Chapter 3	149
Chapter 4	154
Chapter 5	165
Chapter 6	170
Chapter 7	178

Chapter 8	188
Chapter 9	197
Chapter 10	207
Chapter 11	212
Chapter 1	218
Chapter 2	248
Chapter 3	268
Chapter 4	281
Chapter 5	298
Chapter 6	305
Chapter 7	336

DEDICATORY EPISTLE TO ROBERT,
EARL OF WARWICK



My Lord,

It is not for the benefit of any protection to the ensuing Treatise, let it stand or fall, as it shall be found in the judgments of men: nor that I might take advantage to set forth any of that worth and honor which being personal have truly ennobled your Lordship, and made a way for the delivering over of your family unto posterity; with an eminent luster added to the roll of your worthy progenitors; which if by myself desired, my unfitness to perform, must needs render unacceptable in the performance; neither yet have I the least desire to attempt a further advancement of myself into your Lordship's favor, being much beneath what I have already received; and fully resolved to own no other esteem among the sons of men, but what shall be accounted due (be it more or less) to the discharge of my duty to my Master Jesus Christ, whose wholly I would be: it is not all, nor one of these, nor any such as these, the usual subjects and ends of Dedications, real or pretended, that prevailed upon me, unto this boldness of prefixing your honored name to this ensuing Treatise, (which yet for the matter's sake contained in it, I cannot judge unworthy of any

Christian eye) but only that I might take the advantage, to testify (as I do) to all the world, the answering of my heart unto that Obligation, which your Lordship was pleased to put upon me in the undeserved undesired favor, of opening that door wherewith you are entrusted, to give me an entrance to that place for the preaching of the Gospel, whither I was directed by the Providence of the Most High, and where I was sought by his people. In which place this I dare say by the grace of God, that such a stock of prayers and thankfulness, as your heart, which has learned to value the least of Christ in whomsoever it be, will not despise, is tendered for and to your Lordship, even on his behalf who is less than the least of all the saints of God, and unworthy the name which yet he is bold to subscribe himself by,

Your Honor's most obliged Servant in the service of Jesus Christ, John Owen.

CHAPTER 1



By the end of the death of Christ, we mean in general, both first, that which his Father, and himself, section 1, intended in it; and secondly, that which was effectually fulfilled and accomplished by it. Concerning either, we may take a brief view of the expressions used by the Holy Spirit.

For the first: will you know the end wherefore, and the intention wherewith Christ came into the world? Let us ask himself (who knew his own mind, as also all the secrets of his Father's bosom) and he will tell us, that the Son of Man came to save that which was lost (Matthew 18:11), to recover and save poor lost sinners; that was his intent and design, as is again asserted (Luke 19:10). Ask also his Apostles, who know his mind, and they will tell you the same. So Paul (1 Timothy 1:15): "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners." Now if you will ask who these sinners are, towards whom he has this gracious intent and purpose, himself tells you (Matthew 20:28), that he came to give his life a ransom for many; in other places called us, believers, distinguished from the world; for he gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father (Galatians 1:4). That was the will and intention of God, that

he should give himself for us, that we might be saved, being separated from the world: they are his Church (Ephesians 5:25-27). He loved his Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it, with the washing of water, by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish. Which last words express also the very aim and end of Christ, in giving himself for any, even that they may be made fit for God, and brought near unto him: the like whereof is also asserted (Titus 2:14): he gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquities, and purify unto himself, a peculiar people zealous of good works. Thus clear then and apparent, is the intention and design of Christ and his Father in this great work, even what it was, and towards whom, namely, to save us, to deliver us from the evil world, to purge and wash us, to make us holy, zealous, fruitful in good works, to render us acceptable, and to bring us unto God, for through him we have access into the grace wherein we stand (Romans 5:2).

The effect also, and actual product of the work itself, or what is accomplished and fulfilled by the death, bloodshedding, or oblation of Jesus Christ is no less clearly manifested; but is as fully and very often more distinctly expressed, as first Reconciliation with God, by removing and slaying the enmity that was between him and us: for when we were enemies, we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son (Romans 5:10). God was in him reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their sins unto them (2 Corinthians 5:19); yes, he has reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ (verse 18). And if you would know how this reconciliation was effected, the Apostle will tell you, that he abolished in himself

the enmity, the law of Commandments consisting in ordinances, for to make in himself of two, one new man, so making peace. And that he might reconcile both unto God, in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby (Ephesians 2:15-16), so that he is our peace (verse 14). Secondly, Justification, by taking away the guilt of sin, procuring remission and pardon of them, redeeming us from their power, with the curse and wrath due unto us for them, for by his own blood he is entered into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us (Hebrews 9:13). He redeemed us from the curse being made a curse for us (Galatians 3:13). His own self bearing our sins in his own body on the tree (1 Peter 2:24). We have all sinned and come short of the glory of God; but are justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ; whom God has set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins (Romans 3:23-25). For in him we have redemption through his blood even the forgiveness of sins (Colossians 1:13). Thirdly, Sanctification, by the purging away of the uncleanness and pollution of our sins, renewing in us the image of God, and supplying us with the graces of the Spirit of holiness for the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself unto God, purges our consciences from dead works that we may serve the living God (Hebrews 9:14). Yes, the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all our sins (1 John 1:7). By himself he purged our sins (Hebrews 1:3). To sanctify the people with his own blood he suffered without the gate (Hebrews 13:12). He gave himself for his Church to sanctify and cleanse it, that it should be holy and without blemish (Ephesians 5:25-26). Peculiarly amongst the graces of the Spirit, it is given to us for Christ's sake to believe on him (Philippians 1:29).

God blessing us in him, with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places (Ephesians 1:3). Fourthly, Adoption, with that evangelical liberty, and all those glorious privileges which appertain to the sons of God; for God sent his Son made of a woman, made under the law; to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the Adoption of sons (Galatians 4:4-5). Fifth, Neither do the effects of the death of Christ rest here, they leave us not, until we are settled in heaven, in glory and immortality forever, our inheritance is a purchased possession (Ephesians 1:14). And for this cause he is the Mediator of the new Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions, that were under the first Testament, they which are called may receive the promise of eternal inheritance (Hebrews 9:15). The sum of all is: the death and bloodshedding of Jesus Christ has wrought, and does effectually procure, for all those that are concerned in it, eternal redemption, consisting in grace here, and glory hereafter.

Thus, full, clear, and evident are the expressions in the Scripture, section 3, concerning the end and effects of the death of Christ, that a man would think every one might run and read: but we must stay. Among all things in Christian Religion, there is scarce anything more questioned, than this which seems to be a most fundamental principle, a spreading persuasion there is of a general ransom to be paid by Christ for all, that he died to redeem all and every one, not only for many, his Church, the Elect of God, but for every one also of the posterity of Adam. Now the masters of this opinion, do see full well and easily, that if that be the end of the death of Christ which we have from the Scripture asserted, if those before recounted be the immediate fruits and products thereof, that then one of these two things will necessarily follow:

that either, First, God and Christ failed of their end proposed, and did not accomplish that which they intended; the death of Christ being not a fitly proportioned means, for the attaining of that end, (for any cause of failing cannot be assigned) which to assert, seems to us blasphemously injurious to the wisdom, power and perfection of God, as likewise derogatory, to the worth and value of the death of Christ, or else, that all men, all the posterity of Adam, must be saved, purged, sanctified, and glorified, which surely they will not maintain, at least the Scripture, and the woeful experience of millions will not allow. Wherefore to cast a tolerable color upon their persuasion, they must, and do deny that God, or his Son, had any such absolute aim or end, in the death or bloodshedding of Jesus Christ: or that any such thing, was immediately procured and purchased by it, as we before recounted: but that God intended nothing, neither was anything effected by Christ, that no benefit arises to any immediately by his death, but what is common to all and every soul, though never so cursedly unbelieving here, and eternally damned hereafter, until an act of some, not procured for them by Christ: (for if it were, why have they it not all alike?) to wit, faith, do distinguish them from others. Now this seeming to me, to enervate the virtue, value, fruits, and effects of the satisfaction and death of Christ, serving besides for a basis and foundation, to a dangerous, uncomfortable, erroneous persuasion, I shall by the Lord's assistance declare, what the scripture holds out in both these things, both that assertion which is intended to be proved, and that which is brought for the proof thereof: desiring the Lord by his Spirit to lead us into all truth, to give us understanding in all things, and if any one be otherwise minded, to reveal that also unto him.

CHAPTER 2



The end of any thing, is that which the Agent intends to accomplish, in, and by the operation which is proper unto section 1 its nature, and which it applies itself unto: that which any one aims at, and designs in himself to attain, as a thing good and desirable unto him, in the state and condition wherein he is. So the end which Noah proposed unto himself in the building of the Ark, was the preservation of himself and others, according to the will of God, he made an Ark to preserve himself and his family from the flood, according to all that God commanded him, so did he (Genesis 6:22). That which the Agent does, or whereto he applies himself, for the compassing his proposed end, is called the means, which two do complete the whole reason of working in free Intellectual Agents, for I speak only of such as work according to choice or election: so Absalom intending a revolt from his father to procure the Crown and kingdom for himself, he prepared him horses and chariots, and fifty men to run before him (2 Samuel 15:1), and further, by fair words and fawning compliances, he stole the hearts of the men of Israel (verse 6), then pretends a sacrifice at Hebron, where he makes a strong conspiracy (verse 12), all which were the means he used for the attaining of his foreproposed end.

Between both these, end and means, there is this relation, that (though in sundry kinds) they are mutually causes one of another: section 2, the end is the first principal moving cause of the whole: it is that, for whose sake the whole work is, no Agent applies itself to action but for an end: and were it not by that, determined to some certain effect, thing, way, or manner of working, it would no more do one thing than another. The inhabitants of the old world, desiring and intending unity and cohabitation, with (perhaps) some reserves to provide for their safety against a second storm, they cry, go to, let us build us a City and a Tower, whose top may reach unto heaven, and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth (Genesis 11:4). First they lay down their aim and design, and then let out the means in their apprehension conducing thereunto, and manifest then it is that the whole reason and method of affairs, that a wise worker, or Agent according to counsel proposes to himself, is taken from the end which he aims at, that is in intention and continuance the beginning of all that order which is in working. Now the means are all those things which are used for the attaining of the end proposed: (as food, for the preservation of life: sailing in a ship, for him that would pass the sea: laws for the quiet continuance of human society,) and they are the procuring cause of the end in one kind or another, their existence is for the end's sake, and the end has its rise out of them: following them either morally as their desert, or naturally as their fruit and product. First, in a moral sense, when the action and the end, are to be measured or considered in reference to a moral rule, or Law prescribed to the Agent, then the means are the deserving, or meritorious cause of the end: as if Adam, had continued in his innocence, and done all things according to the

Law given unto him, the end procured thereby, had been a blessed life to eternity: as now the end of any sinful act, is death, the curse of the law. Secondly, when the means are considered only in their natural relation, then they are the instrumentally efficient cause of the end: so Joab intending the death of Abner, he struck him with his spear under the fifth rib, that he died (2 Samuel 3:27), and when Benaiah by the command of Solomon fell upon Shimei, the wounds he gave them were the efficient of his death (1 Kings 2:46), in which regard there is no difference, between the murdering of an innocent man, and the executing of an offender: but as they are under a moral consideration, their ends follow their deservings, in respect of conformity, section 3, to the rule, and so there is a distinction between them.

The former consideration, by reason of the defect and perverseness of some Agents, (for otherwise these things are coincident) holds out a two-fold end of things. First of the work, and Secondly of the workman: of the act, and the agent, for when the means assigned for the attaining of any end, are not proportioned unto it, nor fitted for it, according to that rule which the agent is to work by, then it cannot be, but that he must aim at one thing, and another follow in respect of the morality of the work, so Adam is enticed into a desire to be like God: this now he makes his aim which to effect, he eats the forbidden fruit, and that contracts a guilt which he aimed not at. But when the Agent acts aright, and as it should do: when it aims at an end that is proper to it, belonging to its proper perfection and condition, and works by such means as are fit, and suitable to the end proposed, the end of the work, and the workman, are one and the same: as when Abel intended the worship of the Lord, he offered a sacrifice through faith acceptable

unto him: or as a man desiring salvation through Christ, applies himself to get an interest in him. Now the sole reason of this diversity is, that secondary Agents, such as men are, have an end set and appointed to their actions, by him which gives them an external rule or Law to work by; which shall always attend them in their working, whether they will or not. God only, whose will and good pleasure is the sole rule of all those works which outwardly are of him, can never deviate in his actions, nor have any end attend or follow his acts, not precisely by him intended.

Again, the end of every free Agent is either that which he effects, or that for whose sake he does effect it, when a man builds, section 4, a house, to let to hire, that which he effects is the building of a house, that which moved him to do it, is love of gain. The Physician cures the patient, and is moved to it, by his reward: the end which Judas aimed at, in his going to the Priests, bargaining with them, conducting the soldiers to the garden, kissing Christ, was the betraying of his Master: but the end for whose sake the whole undertaking was set on foot, was the obtaining of the thirty pieces of silver: what will you give me and I will do it? The end which God effected by the death of Christ, was the satisfaction of his justice, the end for whose sake he did it, was either supreme, or his own glory, or subordinate, ours with him.

Moreover the means are of two sorts, First, such as have a true, section 5, goodness in themselves, without reference to any further kind; though not so considered as we use them for means: no means as a means, is considered as good in itself, but only as conducive to a further end: it is repugnant to the nature of means, as such, to be considered as good in themselves: study is in itself the most noble employment of the soul; but aiming at wisdom or

knowledge, we consider it as good, only insofar as it conduces to that end; otherwise as a weariness to the flesh (Ecclesiastes 12:12). Secondly, such as have no good at all, in any kind as in themselves considered, but merely as conducing to that end, which they are fit to attain, they receive all their goodness (which is but relative) from that whereunto they are appointed; in themselves no way desirable: as the cutting off a leg or an arm for the preservation of life; taking a bitter portion for health's sake, throwing corn and cargo into the sea to prevent shipwreck: of which nature is the death of Christ, as we shall afterwards declare.

These things being thus proposed in general, our next task must be to accommodate them to the present business in hand, section 6, which we shall do in order, by laying down the Agent working, the means wrought, and the end effected in the great work of our Redemption; for those three must be orderly considered and distinctly, that we may have a right apprehension of the whole, into the first whereof we make an entrance in.

CHAPTER 3



The Agent in, and chief Author of this great work of our Redemption, section 1, is the whole blessed Trinity, for all the works which outwardly are of the Deity are undivided, and belong equally to each person; their distinct manner of subsistence and order being observed, it is true, there were other sundry instrumental causes in the oblation, or rather passion of Christ; but the work cannot in any sense be ascribed unto them: for in respect of God the Father, the issue of their endeavor was exceeding contrary to their own intentions; and in the close they did nothing, but what the hand and counsel of God had before determined should be done (Acts 4:28). And in respect of Christ, they were no way able to accomplish what they aimed at, for he himself laid down his life, and none was able to take it from him (John 10:17-18), so that they are to be excluded from this consideration. In several persons of the holy Trinity, the joint Author of the whole work, the Scripture proposes, section 2, distinct and sundry acts or operations peculiarly assigned unto them, which, according to our weak manner of apprehension, we are to consider severally and apart: which also we shall do, beginning with them that are ascribed to the Father.

Two peculiar acts there are in this work of our Redemption by the blood of Jesus, which may be and are properly assigned to the person of the Father. First the sending of his Son into the world, for this employment. Secondly a laying the punishment due to our sin upon him. The Father loves the world and sends his Son to die. He sent his Son into the world that the world through him might be saved (John 3:16-17). He sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us (Romans 8:3). He set him forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood (Romans 3:25). For when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption of sons (Galatians 4:4-5). So more than twenty times in the Gospel of John, there is mention of this sending; and our Savior describes himself by this description, him whom the Father has sent (John 6:39), and the Father, by this, he who sent me (John 8:16). So that this action of sending is appropriate to the Father, according to his promise, that he would send us a Savior, a great one to deliver us (Isaiah 19:20), and to the profession of our Savior. I have not spoken in secret from the beginning, from the time that it was, there am I, and now the Lord God and his Spirit has sent me (Isaiah 48:16). Hence the Father himself is sometimes called our Savior (1 Timothy 1:1): according to the commandment of God our Savior. But directly this is the same with that parallel place (Titus 1:3): according to the commandment of God our Savior, where no interposition of that conjunctive particle can have place, the same title being also in other places ascribed to him, as Luke 1:47: my spirit has rejoiced in God my Savior. Also (1 Timothy 4:10): we have hoped

in the living God, who is the Savior of all men, especially of them that believe: though in this last place, it is not ascribed unto him, with reference to his redeeming us by Christ, but his saving and preserving all by his providence (Titus 2:11; 3:4; Deuteronomy 32:15; 1 Samuel 10:19; Psalm 24:5; 25:5; Isaiah 12:2; 11:10; 45:15; Jeremiah 16:8; Micah 7:7; Hebrews 3:17), most of which places, have reference to his sending of Christ, which is also distinguished, section 3, into three several acts which in order we must lay down.

First, an authoritative imposition of the office of Mediator, which Christ agreed to, by his voluntary acceptance of it, willingly undergoing the office, wherein by dispensation the Father had and exercised a kind of superiority, which the Son, though in the form of God, humbled himself unto (Philippians 2:6-7), and of this there may be conceived two parts.

First the purposed imposition of his Counsel; or his eternal Counsel for the setting apart of his Son, incarnate to this office: saying unto him, you are my Son, this day have I begotten you, Ask of me, and I will give you the nations for your inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for your possession (Psalm 2:7-8). He said unto him, sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool, for the Lord has sworn and will not repent, you are a Priest forever after the order of Melchizedek (Psalm 110:1, 4). He appointed him to be heir of all things (Hebrews 1:2), having ordained him to be Judge of the living and dead (Acts 10:42), for unto this he was ordained, before the foundation of the world (1 Peter 1:20), and determined to be the Son of God with power (Romans 1:4), that he might be the firstborn of many brothers (Romans 8:29). I know that this is an act eternally established in the mind and will of God, and so not to be ranged in order with the

others which are all temporary, and had their beginning in the fullness of time, of all which this first, is the spring and fountain according to that of James (Acts 15:18): known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world; but yet, it being no unusual form of speaking, that the purpose should also be comprehended in that which holds out the accomplishment of it, aiming at truth and not exactness, we pass it thus.

Secondly the actual Inauguration, or solemn admission of Christ unto his office, committing all judgment unto the Son (John 5:22), section 4, making him to be both Lord and Christ (Acts 2:36), appointing him over his whole house (Hebrews 3:1-3), which is that anointing of the Most Holy (Daniel 9:24). God anointing him with the oil of gladness above his fellows (Psalm 45:7), for the actual setting apart of Christ to his office, is said to be by Unction, because all those holy things which were types of him, as the Ark, the Altar, etc., were set apart and consecrated by anointing (Exodus 30:25-27). To this also belongs that public declaration by innumerable Angels from heaven of his nativity, declared by one of them to the shepherds; behold said he, I bring you good tidings of joy, which shall be unto all people, for unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior which is Christ the Lord (Luke 2:10-11), which message was attended by, and closed with that triumphant exultation of the host of heaven, Glory be to God on high, on earth peace, toward men goodwill (verse 14). With that redoubled noise which afterwards came from the excellent glory, this is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased (Matthew 3:17; 17:5; 2 Peter 1:17). If these things ought to be distinguished, and placed in their own order, they may be considered in these three several acts. First, the glorious proclamation which he made of his

Nativity; when he prepared him a body (Hebrews 10:5), bringing his firstborn into the world, and saying, Let all the Angels of God worship him (Hebrews 1:6), sending them to proclaim the message which we before recounted. Secondly, sending the Spirit visibly in the form of a dove, to light upon him, at the time of his baptism (Matthew 3:16), when he was endued with a fullness thereof, for the accomplishment of the work, and discharge of the office whereunto he was designed; attended with that voice, whereby he owned him from heaven as his only beloved. Thirdly, the crowning of him with glory and honor, in his resurrection, ascension, and sitting down on the right hand of Majesty on high (Hebrews 1:3), setting him as his King upon his holy hill of Zion (Psalm 2:7-8), when all power was given unto him in heaven and in earth (Matthew 28:18), all things being put under his feet (Hebrews 2:7-8), himself highly exalted, and a name given him above every name, that at, etc. (Philippians 2:9), of which it pleased him to appoint witnesses of all sorts, Angels from heaven (Luke 24:4; Acts 1:10), the dead out of the graves (Matthew 27:52), the Apostles among and unto the living (Acts 2:32), with those more than five hundred brothers to whom he appeared at once (1 Corinthians 15:6). Thus gloriously was he inaugurated into his office, in the several acts and degrees thereof God saying unto him, it is a light thing that you should be my servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel, I will also give you for a light unto the Gentiles, that you may be my salvation to the ends of the earth (Isaiah 49:6).

Between these two acts I confess there intervenes a two-fold promise, section 5, of God; one of giving a Savior to his people, a Mediator according to his former purpose, as (Genesis 3:15): the

seed of the woman shall break the serpent's head, and the scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, till Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be (Genesis 49:10). Which he also foresignified by many sacrifices, and other types with prophetic predictions, for of this salvation the Prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you, searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow, unto whom it was revealed: that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that preached the Gospel unto you, with the Holy Spirit sent down from Heaven, which thing the Angels desire to look into (1 Peter 1:10-12). The other is a promise of applying the benefits purchased by this Savior so designed to them that should believe on him, to be given in fullness of time, according to the former promises; telling Abraham, that in his seed the nations of the earth should be blessed, and justifying himself by the same faith (Genesis 15:6). But these things belong rather to the application wholly, which was equal both before and after his actual mission.

The second act of the Father's sending the Son, is the furnishing of him in his sending, with a fullness of all gifts and graces, that might any way be requisite for the office he was to undertake, section 6, the work he was to undergo, and the charge he had over the house of God. There was indeed in Christ a two-fold fullness and perfection of all spiritual excellencies; first the natural all-sufficient perfection of his Deity, as one with his Father in respect of his Divine nature: for his glory was the glory of the only begotten

of the Father (John 1:14). He was in the form of God and counted it no robbery to be equal with God (Philippians 2:6), being the fellow of the Lord of Hosts (Zechariah 13:7), from which that glorious appearance (Isaiah 6:3), when the Cherubim cried one to another and said, holy, holy, holy, the Lord of Hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory, and the posts of the doors moved at the noise of him that cried, and the house was filled with smoke, and the Prophet cried, my eyes have seen the King the Lord of Hosts (verse 4). Even concerning this vision, the Apostle says, Isaiah saw him and spoke of his glory (John 12:41), of which glory he as it were emptied himself for a season, when he was found in the form or condition of a servant humbling himself unto death (Philippians 2:7-8), laying aside that glory which attended his Deity, outwardly appearing to have neither form, nor beauty, nor comeliness that he, section 7, should be desired (Isaiah 53:2). But this fullness we do not treat of it being not communicated to him, but essentially belonging to his person, which is eternally begotten of the person of his Father.

The second fullness that was in Christ, was a communicated fullness, which was in him by dispensation from his Father bestowed upon him to fit him for his work and office, as he was and is the Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus (1 Timothy 2:5), not as he is the Lord of Hosts, but as he is Immanuel God with us, as he was a Son given to us, called Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, upon whose shoulders the government was to be (Isaiah 9:6). It is a fullness of grace, not that essential which is of the nature of the Deity, but that which is habitual and infused into the humanity, as personally united to the other: which though it is not absolutely infinite as the other is, yet it extends itself to all perfec-

tions of grace, both in respect of parts and degrees, there is no grace that is not in Christ, and every grace is in him in the highest degree; so that whatsoever the perfection of grace, either for the several kinds, or respective advancements thereof, requires, is in him habitually by the gift of his Father, for this very purpose, and for the accomplishment of the work designed; which though (as before) it cannot properly be said to be infinite, yet it is boundless and endless: it is in him as the light in the beams of the Sun, and as water in a living fountain, which can never fail, he is the candlestick from which the golden pipes do empty the golden oil through themselves (Zechariah 4:12), into all that are his; for he is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, in all things having the pre-eminence, for it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell (Colossians 1:18-19). In him he caused to be hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge (Colossians 2:3), and in him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily or personally (verse 9), that of his fullness we might all receive grace for grace (John 1:16), in a continual supply. So that setting upon the work of redemption he looks upon this, in the first place the Spirit of the Lord God (said he) is upon me, because the Lord God has anointed me, to preach the glad tidings to the meek, he has sent me to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God, to comfort all that mourn (Isaiah 61:1-2). And this was the anointing with the oil of gladness which he had above his fellows (Psalm 45); it was upon his head and ran down to his beard, yes, down to the skirts of his clothing (Psalm 133:2), that every one covered with the garment of his righteousness might be made partaker of it. The Spirit of the

Lord did rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord (Isaiah 11:2), and that not in parcels and beginnings as in us, proportioned to our measure and degrees of sanctification, but in a fullness, for he received not the Spirit by measure (John 3:34), that is, it was not so with him when he came to the full measure of the stature of his age, as (Ephesians 4:13); for otherwise it was manifested in him, and bestowed on him by degrees, for he increased in wisdom and stature and favor with God and man (Luke 2:52). To this was added all power in heaven and earth which was given unto him (Matthew 28:18), power over all flesh to give eternal life to as many as he would (John 17:2). Which we might branch into many particulars, but so much shall suffice to set forth the second act of God, in sending his Son.

The third act of this sending, is, his entering into Covenant, section 8, and compact with his Son concerning the work to be undertaken, and the issue or event thereof: of which there be two parts. First his promise, to protect and assist him, in the accomplishment and perfect fulfilling of the whole business and dispensation about which he was employed, or which he was to undertake. The Father engaged himself, that for his part, upon his Son's undertaking this great work of Redemption, he would not be wanting in any assistance in trials, strength against oppositions, encouragement against temptations, and strong consolation in the midst of terrors, which might be any way necessary or requisite to carry him on through all difficulties to the end of so great an employment. Upon which he undertakes this heavy burden, so full of misery and trouble: for the Father before this engagement, requires no less of him, than that he should become a Savior, and be

afflicted in the afflictions of his people (Isaiah 63:8-9), yes, that although he were the fellow of the Lord of Hosts, yet he should endure the sword that was drawn against him, as the shepherd of the sheep (Zechariah 13:7), treading the winepress alone, until he became red in his apparel (Isaiah 61:2-3), yes, to be stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted, wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities: to be bruised and put to grief, to make his soul an offering for sin, and to bear the iniquity of many (Isaiah 53), to be destitute of comfort so far as to cry, My God, my God, why have you forsaken me? (Psalm 22:1). No wonder then if upon this undertaking, the Lord promised, to make his mouth sharp like a sword, to hide him in the shadow of his hand, to make him a polished shaft, and to hide him in his quiver, to make him his servant in whom he would be glorified (Isaiah 49:2-3), that though the kings of the earth should set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against him, yet he would laugh them to scorn, and set him as King upon his holy hill of Zion (Psalm 2:2, 4-5). Though the builders did reject him, yet he should become the head of the corner; to the amazement, and astonishment of all the world (Psalm 118:22-23; Matthew 21:42; Mark 12:10; Luke 12:17; John 4:11; 2 Peter 2:4), yes he would lay him for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation (Isaiah 28:16), that whosoever should fall upon him, should be broken, but upon whomsoever he should fall, he should grind them to powder. Hence, arose that confidence of our Savior in his greatest and utmost trials, being assured by virtue of his Father's engagement, in this covenant, upon a treaty with him about the redemption of man, that he would never leave him nor forsake him. I gave (said he) my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off

the hair, I hid not my face from shame and spitting (Isaiah 50:6). But with what confidence, blessed Savior, did you undergo all this shame and sorrow? Why, the Lord God will help me, therefore I shall not be confounded, therefore have I set my face like a flint, and I know that I shall not be ashamed, he is near that justifies me, who will contend with me? Let us stand together; who is my adversary? Let him come near to me; behold, the Lord God will help me, who is he that shall condemn me? Look, they shall all wax old as a garment, the moth shall consume them (verses 7-9). With this assurance he was brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before the shearers is silent, so opened he not his mouth (Isaiah 53:7), for when he was reviled, he reviled not again, when he suffered he threatened not, but committed himself to him that judges rightly (1 Peter 2:23). So that the ground of our Savior's confidence and assurance in this great undertaking, and a strong motive to exercise his graces received, in the utmost endurings, was this engagement of his Father, upon this compact of assistance and protection.

Secondly of success, or a good outcome out of all his sufferings, section 9, and a happy accomplishment and attainment of the end of his great undertaking: now of all the rest this chiefly is to be considered, as directly conducing to the business proposed, which yet would not have been so clear without the former considerations: for whatsoever it was that God promised his Son, should be fulfilled and attained by him, that certainly was it, at which the Son aimed in the whole undertaking, and designed it as the end of the work, that was committed to him, and which alone he could and did claim upon the accomplishment of his Father's will. What this was, and the promises whereby it is at large set forth, you have

(Isaiah 49): you shall be my servant (said the Lord) to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel, I will also give you for a light to the Gentiles, that you may be my salvation to the end of the earth: Kings shall see and arise, Princes also shall worship because of the Lord that is faithful. And he will certainly accomplish this engagement: I will preserve you and give you for a covenant of the people to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritage, that you may say to the Prisoners, go forth, to them that are in darkness, show yourselves, they shall feed in the ways, and their pasture shall be in all high places, they shall not be hungry neither shall they be thirsty, neither shall the heat smite them, nor the Sun, for he that has compassion on them, shall lead them, even to the springs of waters shall he drive them; and I will make all my mountains as a way, and my paths shall be exalted, behold these shall come from far, and look these from the North, and from the West, and these from the land of Sinim (verses 6-12). By all which expressions, the Lord evidently and clearly engages himself to his Son, that he should gather to himself a glorious Church of believers, from among Jews and Gentiles through all the world, that should be brought unto him, and certainly fed in full pasture, and refreshed by the springs of water, all the spiritual springs of living water, which flow from God in Christ for their everlasting salvation. This then our Savior certainly aimed at, as being the promise upon which he undertook the work, the gathering of the sons of God together, their bringing unto God, and passing to eternal salvation; which being well considered, it will utterly overthrow the general ransom, or universal redemption, as afterward will appear. In the 53rd chapter of the same prophecy, the Lord is more express and punctual in these promises to his

Son, assuring him, that when he made his soul an offering for sin he should see his seed, and prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord should prosper in his hand, that he should see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied: by his knowledge he should justify many, that he should divide a portion with the great, and the spoil with the strong (verses 10-12). He was (you see) to see his seed by covenant, and to raise up a spiritual seed unto God, a faithful people to be prolonged and preserved throughout all generations: which how well it consists with their persuasion, who in terms have affirmed, that the death of Christ might have had its full and utmost effect, and yet none be saved; I cannot see, though some have boldly affirmed it and all the assertors of universal redemption, do tacitly grant, when they come to the assigning of the proper ends and effects of the death of Christ. The pleasure also of the Lord was to prosper in his hand: which what it was he declares (Hebrews 2:10), even bringing of many sons unto glory, for God sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him (1 John 4:9), as we shall afterward more abundantly declare. But the promises of God made unto him in their agreement, and so consequently his own aim and intention may be seen in nothing more manifestly, than in the request that our Savior makes upon the accomplishment of the work about which he was sent, which certainly was neither for more, nor less, than God had engaged himself to him for. I have (said he) glorified you on earth, I have finished the work which you gave me to do (John 17:3), and now what does he require after the manifestation of his eternal glory, of which for a season he had emptied himself (verse 4). Clearly a full confluence of the love of God, and fruits of that love upon all his elect in faith, sanctification and glory; God gave them

unto him, and he sanctified himself to be a sacrifice for their sake, praying for their sanctification (verse 17-18), their preservation in peace, or communion one with another, and union with God (verse 20-21). I pray not for them alone, (that is his Apostles,) but for them also which shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one, as you Father are in me, and I in you, that they also may be one in us: and lastly their glory (verse 24): Father, I will that they also whom you have given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which you have given me. All which several requests, are no doubt grounded upon the forecited promises, which by his Father were made unto him: and in this not one word concerning all and every one, but expressly the contrary (John 17:9). Let this then be diligently observed, that the promise of God unto his Son, and the request of the Son unto his Father are directed to this peculiar end of bringing sons unto God. And this is the first act, consisting of these three particulars.

The second is of laying upon him the punishment of sins, every where ascribed unto the Father: Awake O sword against my Shepherd, against the man that is my fellow (said the Lord of Hosts) smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered (Zechariah 13:7). What here is set down imperatively by way of command, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad (Matthew 26:31). He was stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted, yes the Lord laid upon him the iniquity of us all, yes, it pleased the Lord to bruise him, and to put him to grief (Isaiah 53:4, 6, 10). He made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him (2 Corinthians 5:21). The predicate in both places is put for the subject, as the opposition between his being made sin, and our being

made righteousness declares: him who knew no sin, that is who deserved no punishment, him has he made to be sin, or laid the punishment due to sin upon him; or perhaps in the latter place, sin may be taken for an offering or sacrifice for the expiation of sin, answering in this place to the word in the Old Testament which signifies both sin and the sacrifice for it. And this the Lord did, for as for Herod, Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, when they were gathered together they did nothing but what his hand and counsel had determined before to be done (Acts 4:27-28). From which the great shaking of our Savior, were in his close conflict with his Father's wrath, and that burden which by himself he immediately imposed on him, when there was no hand or instrument outwardly appearing to put them to any suffering or excruciating torment; then began he to be sorrowful even unto death (Matthew 26:37-38), to wit when he was in the garden with his three chosen Apostles, before the traitor or any of his accomplices appeared; then was he greatly amazed and very heavy (Mark 14:34), that was the time in the days of his flesh when he offered up prayers and supplications with strong cries and tears unto him that was able to save him from death (Hebrews 5:7), which how he performed the Apostle describes (Luke 22:43-44): there appeared an Angel unto him from heaven strengthening him, but being in agony he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground. Surely it was a close and strong trial and that immediately from his Father he now underwent: for how meekly and cheerfully does he submit without any regret or trouble of spirit, to all the cruelty of men, and violence offered to his body, until this conflict being renewed again, he cries, My God, my God, why have you forsaken me? And this by the way

will be worth our observation, that we may know with whom our Savior chiefly had to do, and what was that which he underwent for sinners, which also will give some light to the grand question, concerning the persons of them for whom he undertook all this: his sufferings were far from consisting in mere bodily persecutions and afflictions, with such impressions upon his soul and spirit, as were the effects and issues only of them: it was no more, nor less, than the curse of the Law of God, which he underwent for us, for he freed us from the curse by being made a curse (Galatians 3:13), which contained all the punishment that was due to sin, either in the severity of God's justice, or according to the demand of that law which required obedience. That the condemnation of the Law should be only temporal death, as the law was considered to be the instrument of the Jewish polity, and serving that economy or dispensation, is true; but that it should be no more as it is the universal rule of obedience and the bond of the covenant between God and man, is a foolish dream. Nay but in dying for us Christ did not only aim at our good, but also directly died in our stead: the punishment due to our sin and the chastisement of our peace was upon him: which that it was the pains of hell in their nature and being, in their weight and pressure, though not in duration and continuance, (it being impossible that he should be detained by death,) who can deny, and not be injurious to the justice of God, which will inevitably inflict those pains to eternity upon sinners? It is true indeed, there is a relaxation of the Law, in respect of the persons suffering, God admitting of commutation: as in the old Law when in their sacrifices, the life of the beast was accepted (in respect to the carnal part of the ordinances) for the life of the man; this is fully revealed, and we believe it: but for any change of the

punishment, in respect of the nature of it, where is the least intimation of any alteration? We conclude then this second Act of God, in laying the punishment on him for us, with that of the Prophet: All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord has laid upon him the iniquity of us all (Isaiah 53:6). And add thereunto this observation, that it seems strange to me, that Christ should undergo the pains of hell in their stead, who lay in the pains of hell before he underwent those pains, and shall continue in them to eternity, for their worm does not die, neither is their fire quenched. To which I may add this dilemma to our universalists: God imposed his wrath due unto, and Christ underwent the pains of hell for, either all the sins of all men, or all the sins of some men, or some sins of all men. If the last, some sins of all men, then have all men some sins to answer for, and so shall no man be saved, for if God enter into judgment with us, though it were with all mankind for one sin no flesh should be justified in his sight: if the Lord should mark iniquities who should stand? (Psalm 130:3). We might all go to cast all that we have, to the moles and to the bats, to go into the clefts of the rocks, and the tops of the ragged rocks for fear of the Lord and for the glory of his Majesty (Isaiah 2:20-21). If the second; that is it which we affirm, that Christ in their stead, and place, suffered for all the sins of all the elect in the world. If the first, why then are not all freed from the punishment of all their sins? You will say, because of their unbelief, they will not believe, but this unbelief, is it a sin or not? If not, why should they be punished for it? If it be, then Christ underwent the punishment due to it, or not; if so, then

why must that hinder them more than their other sins for which he died, from partaking of the fruit of his death: if he did not, then did he not die for all their sins. Let them choose which part they will.

CHAPTER 4



Secondly, the Son was an Agent in this great work, concurring by a voluntary acceptance, or willing undertaking of the office imposed on him: for when the Lord said, sacrifice and offerings, section 1, he would not, in burnt offerings and sacrifice for sin he had no pleasure, then said Christ, look, I come, in the volume of the book it is written of me to do your will O God (Hebrews 10:17-18). All other ways being rejected or insufficient, Christ undertakes the task, in whom alone the Father was well pleased (Matthew 3:13). Hence he professes that he came not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him (John 6:38), yes that it was his food and drink, to do his Father's will, and to finish his work (John 4:34). The first words that we find recorded of him in Scripture are to the same purpose, did you not know, that I must be about my Father's business? (Luke 2:49), and at the close of all he says, I have glorified you on earth, I have finished the work which you gave me to do (John 17:4), calling it everywhere his Father's work that he did, or his Father's will which he came to accomplish, with reference to the imposition, which we before treated of. Now this undertaking of the Son may be referred to three heads: the first being a common foundation for both the others, being as it were the means in respect of them as the End, and

yet in some sort partaking of the nature of a distinct action, with a goodness in itself, in reference to the main end proposed to all three; we shall consider it apart: and that is

First his Incarnation, as usually it is called, for his taking of flesh, section 2, and pitching his tent among us (John 1:4), his being made of a woman (Galatians 4:4), is usually called his Incarnation, for this was the mystery of godliness, that God should be manifested in the flesh (1 Timothy 3:13), thereby assuming not any singular person but our human nature into personal union with himself; for, forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil (Hebrews 2:14). It was the children that he considered, the children whom the Lord gave him (verse 13), their participation in flesh and blood, moved him to partake of the same: not because all the world, all the posterity of Adam, but because the children were in that condition, for their sakes he sanctified himself. Now this emptying of the Deity, this humbling of himself, this dwelling among us, was the sole act of the second Person or the Divine nature in the second Person, the Father and the Spirit having no concurrence in it, but by liking, approbation, and eternal counsel.

Secondly, his oblation or offering himself up to God for us, section 3, without spot to purge our consciences from dead works (Hebrews 9:14), for he loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood (Revelation 1:5); he loved his Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it (Ephesians 5:25-26), taking the cup of wrath at his Father's hands, due to us, and drinking it off, but not for himself (Daniel 9:6), for, for our sakes he

sanctified himself (John 17:19), that is, to be an offering, an oblation for sin; for when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly (Romans 5:6). This being that, which was typified out by all the institutions, ordinances and sacrifices of old, which when they were to have an end then said Christ, Look, I come to do your will. Now though the perfecting or consummating of this oblation, be set out in the scripture chiefly in respect of what Christ suffered, and not so much in respect of what he did, because it is chiefly considered as the means used by these three blessed Agents, for the attaining of a further end, yet in respect of his own voluntary giving up himself, to be so an oblation and a sacrifice, without which it would not have been of any value, (for if the will of Christ had not been in it, it could never have purged our sins) therefore in that regard, I refer it to his actions. He was the Lamb of God that takes away the sins of the world (John 1:29), the lamb of God, which himself had provided for a sacrifice; and how did this lamb behave himself in it? With unwillingness, and struggling? No, he opened not his mouth, he was brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before the shearers is silent, so he opened not his mouth (Isaiah 53:7). From which he says, I lay down my life, no man takes it from me, but I lay it down of myself, I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again (John 10:17-18). He might have been crucified on the part of God, but his death could not have been an oblation and offering had not his will concurred. But he loved me said the Apostle, and gave himself for me (Galatians 2:20). Now that alone deserves the name of a gift, which is from a free and willing mind, as Christ's was, when he loved us and gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling fragrance (Ephesians 5:2). He

does it cheerfully, Look, I come to do your will O my God (Hebrews 9:10), and so his own self bore our sins in his own body on the tree (1 Peter 2:24). Now this oblation or offering of Christ, I would not tie up to any one thing, action, or passion, performance or suffering, but it comprises the whole economy and dispensation of God manifested in the flesh, and conversing among us, with all those things which he performed in the days of his flesh, when he offered up prayers and supplications, with strong cries and tears, until he had fully by himself purged our sins, and sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high (Hebrews 1:3), expecting until his enemies be made his footstool. All the whole dispensation of his coming and ministering, until he had given his soul a price of redemption for many (Matthew 26). But for his entering into the holiest of holies, sprinkled with his own blood, and appearing so for us, before the majesty of God, by some accounted as the continuation of his oblation we may refer unto third, his Intercession, for all and every one of those, for whom he gave, section 4, himself for an oblation, he did not suffer for them, and then refuse to intercede for them, he did not do the greater, and omit the lesser. The price of our redemption is more precious in the eyes of God and his Son, than that it should (as it were) be cast away on perishing souls, without any care taken, of what becomes of them afterwards. Nay, this also is imposed on Christ, with a promise annexed. Ask of me (said the Lord) and I will give you the nations, for your inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for your possession (Psalm 2:8). Who accordingly tells his disciples, that he had more work to do for them in heaven, I go, said he, to prepare a place for you, that I may come again and receive you unto myself (John 14:2-3). For as the high priest went into the second taberna-

cle alone, once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and the errors of the people (Hebrews 9:7), so Christ having come a high Priest of good things to come, by his own blood entered once into the holy place having obtained for us eternal redemption (Hebrews 9:11-12). Now what was this holy place whereinto he entered, thus sprinkled with the blood of the Covenant, and to what end did he enter into it? Why; he is not entered into the holy place, made with hands, which is the figure of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us (verse 24), and what does he there appear for? Why; to be our advocate to plead our cause with God, for the application of the good things, procured by his oblation unto all them for whom he was an offering; as the Apostle tells us, if any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, even Jesus Christ the righteous (1 John 2:1). Why? How does that come to pass? He is a propitiation for our sins (verse 2); his being a propitiatory sacrifice for our sins, is the foundation of his interceding, the ground of it: and therefore they both belong to the same persons. Now (by the way) we know, that Christ refused to pray for the world, in opposition to his elect: I pray for them said he, I pray not for the world, but for them you have given me, out of the world (John 17:9); and therefore there was no foundation for such an interceding for them, because he was not a propitiation for them. Again, we know the Father always hears the Son, for I know said he, that he hears me always (John 11:42), that is so to grant his request, according to the aforementioned engagement (Psalm 2:8), and therefore if he should intercede for all; all should undoubtedly be saved. For he is able to save to the uttermost, them that come unto God by him, seeing he ever lives to make intercession for them (Hebrews 7:25). Hence is that

confidence of the Apostle, upon that intercession of Christ, Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifies, who is he that condemns? It is Christ that died, yes rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us (Romans 8:33-34). Where also we cannot but observe, that those for whom he died, may assuredly conclude he makes intercession for them, and that none shall lay anything to their charge: which breaks the neck of the general ransom, for according to that, he died for millions, that have no interest in his intercession, who shall have their sins laid to their charge, and perish under them. Which might be further cleared up, from the very nature of this intercession, which is not a humble dejected supplication, which is unbecoming that glorious state of advancement, which he is possessed of, that sits at the right hand of the Majesty on high; but an authoritative presenting himself before the throne of his Father, sprinkled with his own blood, for the making out to his people all spiritual things that are procured by his oblation; saying, Father, I will that those whom you have given me be where I am (John 17). So that for whomsoever he suffered, he appears for them in heaven with his satisfaction and merit. Here also, we must call to mind what the Father promised his Son, upon his undertaking of this employment; for there is no doubt, but that for that, and that alone does Christ upon the accomplishment of the whole, intercede with him about, which was in sum, that he might be the Captain of salvation to all that believe on him, and effectually bring many sons to glory. And hence it is, having such a high Priest over the house of God, we may draw near with

the full assurance of faith, for by one offering he has perfected them that are sanctified (Hebrews 10:13). But of this more must be said afterwards.

CHAPTER 5



In few words we may consider, the actions of that Agent, who in order is the third in that blessed one, whose all is the whole, the Holy Spirit, who is evidently concurring in his own distinct operation, to all the several chief or grand parts of this work, we may refer them to three heads.

First, the Incarnation of the Son, with his full assistance in, section 1, the course of his conversation whilst he dwelt among us; for his mother was found to have conceived in her womb of the Holy Spirit (Matthew 1:18). If you ask with Mary, how that could be, the angel resolves both her and us, as far as it is lawful for us to be acquainted with these mysterious things (Luke 1:35): the Holy Spirit shall come upon you, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow you, therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of you, shall be called the Son of God: it was an overshadowing power in the Spirit, so called by an allusion taken from birds that cover their eggs, so that by their warmth young may be hatched, for by the sole power of the Spirit was this conception, who did incubate the fetus, as in the beginning of the world. Now in process as this child was conceived by the power, so he was filled with the Spirit, and grew stronger in it (Luke 1:80), until having received a

fullness thereof, and not by any limited measure in the gifts and graces of it, he was thoroughly furnished and fitted for his great undertaking.

Secondly in his oblation or passion, for they are both the same, section 2, with several respects, one to what he suffered, the other to what he did with, by, and under those sufferings, how by the eternal Spirit he offered himself without spot unto God (Hebrews 9:14), whether it be meant of the offering himself a bloody sacrifice on the Cross, or his presentation of himself continually before his Father, it is by the eternal Spirit. The willing offering himself through that Spirit, was the eternal fire under this sacrifice, which made it acceptable unto God. That which some contend, that by the eternal Spirit is here meant our Savior's own deity, I see no great ground for; some Greek and Latin copies read, not as we commonly, 'holy Spirit' but 'eternal Spirit', and so the doubt is quite removed: and I see no reason, why he may not as well be said to offer himself, through the Holy Spirit, as to be declared to be the Son of God, according to the Spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead (Romans 1:3), as also to be quickened by the Spirit (1 Peter 3:18); the working of the Spirit was required as well in his oblation as resurrection, in his dying, as quickening.

Thirdly, In his resurrection of which the Apostle (Romans 8:11): but if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he that raised Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwells in you, section 6, and thus have we discovered the blessed agents, and undertakers in this work, their several actions and orderly concurrence unto the whole, which though they may be thus distinguished, yet they are not so divided, but that every one must be ascribed to the

whole nature, whereof each person is in full possession as a partner. And as they begin it, so they will jointly carry along the application of it unto its ultimate issue, and accomplishment, for we must give thanks to the Father who has made us fit (that is by his Spirit) to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light, who has delivered us from the power of darkness, and has translated us into the Kingdom of his dear Son, in whom we have redemption through his blood even the forgiveness of sins (Colossians 1:11-13).

CHAPTER 6



Our next employment following the order of execution, not, section 1, intention, will be the discovery or laying down of the means in this work, which are indeed no other but the several actions before recounted, but now to be considered under another respect, as they are a means ordained for the obtaining of a proposed end, of which afterwards. Now because the several actions of Father and Spirit, were all exercised towards Christ, and terminated in him, as God and man, he only, and his performances are to be considered as the means in this work, the several concurrences of both the other persons before mentioned, being presupposed as necessarily antecedent or concomitant, section 2.

The means then used or ordained by these agents for the end proposed, is that whole economy or dispensation carried along to the end from which our Savior Jesus Christ is called a Mediator; which may and are usually as I mentioned before distinguished into two parts. First his oblation, secondly his Intercession: by his oblation we do not design only the particular offering of himself upon the cross, an offering to his Father, as the lamb of God without spot or blemish, when he bore our sins or carried them up with him in his own body on the tree, which was the sum and completion of his oblation, and that wherein it did chiefly consist, but also

his whole humiliation, or state of emptying himself, whether by yielding voluntary obedience unto the Law, as being made under it, that he might be the end thereof to them that believe (Romans 10:4), or by his subjection to the curse of the law, in the antecedent misery, and suffering of life, as well as by submitting to death, the death of the cross: for no action of his as Mediator is to be excluded, from a concurrence to make up the whole means in this work. Neither by his Intercession, do I understand only that heavenly appearance of his in the most holy place for the applying unto us all good things purchased and procured by his oblation; but also every act of his exaltation conducing thereunto, from his resurrection, to his sitting down at the right hand of Majesty on high, Angels and principalities and powers, being made subject unto him. Of all which his resurrection (being the basis (as it were) and the foundation of the rest, for if he had not risen, then is our faith in vain (1 Corinthians 15:13-14), and then are we yet in our sin (verse 17), of all men the most miserable (verse 19)) is especially to be considered, as that to which a great part of the effect is often ascribed, for he died for our sins, and rose for our justification (Romans 4:25), where, and in such other places, by his resurrection the whole following dispensation and the perpetual intercession of Christ for us in heaven is intended, for God raised up his Son Jesus to bless us, in turning every one of us from our iniquities (Acts 3:26).

Now this whole dispensation, with special regard to the death and bloodshedding of Christ, is the means we speak of agreeable, section 3, to what we said before, of such in general. For it is not a thing in itself desirable, for its own sake, the death of Christ had nothing in it, (we speak of his suffering distinguished from his obe-

dience) that was good, but only as it conducted to a further end, even the end proposed for the manifestation of God's glorious grace. What good was it, that Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and people of Israel should with such horrid villainy, and cruelty gather themselves together against God's holy child whom he had anointed (Acts 4:27), or what good was it, that the Son of God should be made sin, and a curse to be bruised, afflicted, and to undergo such wrath as the whole frame of nature, as it were trembled to behold; what good, what beauty and form is in all this, that it should be desired in itself, and for itself? Doubtless none at all. It must then be looked upon, as a means conducing to such an end, the glory and luster thereof must quite take away all the darkness and confusion that was about the thing itself. And even so it was intended by the blessed Agents in it, by whose determinate counsel and foreknowledge he was delivered and slain (Acts 2:23), there being done unto him, whatsoever his hand and counsel had determined (Acts 4:28), which what it was, must be afterwards declared; now concerning the whole, some things are to be observed.

That though the oblation and intercession of Jesus Christ, are distinct acts in themselves, and have distinct immediate products, section 4, and issues, assigned often times unto them (which I should now have laid down, but that I must take up this in another place) yet they are not in any respect, or regard to be divided or separated, as that the one should have any respect to any persons, or any thing, which the other also does not in its kind equally respect: but there is this manifold union between them.

First, in that they are both alike intended for the obtaining and accomplishing the same entire and complete end proposed; to wit, the effectual bringing of many sons to glory for the praise of God's

Grace, of which afterwards.

Secondly, that what persons soever the one respects, in the good things it obtains, the same, all, and none else, does the other respect, in applying the good things so obtained; for he died for our sins, and rose again for our justification (Romans 4:25). That is in brief the object of the one, is of no larger extent, than the object of the other: or, for whom Christ offered himself, for all those; and only those, does he intercede: according to his own word, for this cause I sanctify myself (to be an oblation) that they also might be sanctified through the truth (John 17:19).

Thirdly, that the oblation of Christ is as it were the foundation of his intercession, inasmuch as by the oblation was procured everything, that by virtue of his intercession is bestowed, and that because the sole end why Christ procured anything by his death, was, that it might be applied to them for whom it was so procured. The sum is, that the oblation and intercession of Jesus Christ, are one entire means for the producing of the same effect, the very end of the oblation, being that all those things, which are bestowed by the intercession of Christ, and without whose application it should certainly fail of the end proposed in it, be effected accordingly, so that it cannot be affirmed, that the death or offering of Christ, concerned any one person or thing, more in respect of procuring any good, than his intercession does for the bestowing of it. For interceding there for all good purchased, and prevailing in all his intercessions, (for the Father always hears his Son) it is evident that every one for whom Christ died must actually have applied unto him, all the good things purchased by his death; which because it is evidently destructive to the adverse cause we must a little stay to confirm it, only telling you the main proof of it lies in our following

proposal of assigning the proper end, intended and effected by the death of Christ, so that the chief proof must be deferred until then, I shall now only propose those reasons which may be handled apart, not merely depending upon that.

CHAPTER 7



Our first reason is taken from that powerful union which the Scripture makes of both these, almost always joining, section 1, them together, and so manifesting those things to be most inseparable, which are looked upon as the distinct fruits and effects of them. By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many for he shall bear their iniquities (Isaiah 53:11): the actual justification of sinners, the immediate fruit of his Intercession, certainly follows his bearing of their iniquities. And in the next verse, they are of God so put together, that surely none ought to presume to put them asunder; he bore the sin of many (behold his oblation) and made intercession for the transgressors: even for those many transgressors, whose sin he bears. And there is one expression in that chapter (verse 5) which makes it evident, that the utmost Application of all good things for which he Intercedes, is the immediate effect of his passion, for by his stripes we are healed: our total healing, is the fruit and procurement of his stripes, or the oblation consummated thereby. So also (Romans 4:25): he was delivered for our offenses, and rose again for our justification; for whose offenses he died, for their justification he rose: and therefore if he died for all, all must also be justified, or the Lord fails in his aim and design, both in the death and resurrection of his Son,

which though some have boldly affirmed, yet for my part I cannot but abhor the owning of so blasphemous a fancy. Rather let us close with that of the Apostle, grounding the assurance of our eternal glory, and freedom from all accusations, upon the death of Christ, and that because his intercession also for us does inseparably and necessarily follow it; Who (said he) shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect, (it seems also that it is only they for whom Christ died) it is God that justifies; who is he that condemns? It is Christ that died: (shall none then be condemned for whom Christ died? what then becomes of the general ransom?) yes rather who is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us (Romans 8:33-34). Here is an equal extent of the one, and the other: those persons who are concerned in the one, are all of them concerned in the other. That he died for all, and intercedes only for some, will scarcely be squared to this text, especially considering the foundation of all this which is (verse 32): that love of God, which moved him to give up Christ to death, for us all, upon which the Apostle infers a kind of impossibility in not giving us all good things in him, which how it can be reconciled with their opinion, who affirm that he gave his Son for millions, to whom he will give neither grace nor glory, I cannot see. But we rest in that of the same Apostle, when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly, so that being justified by his blood, we shall be saved from the wrath by him (Romans 5:6, 9). The same union between the oblation and intercession of Christ, with their fruits and effects, being intimated in very many other places.

To offer and to intercede, to sacrifice and to pray, are both acts of the same priestly office, and both required in him, section 2, who is a Priest, so that if he omits either of these, he cannot be a faithful Priest for them; if either he does not offer for them, or not intercede for the access of his oblation on their behalf, he is wanting in the discharge of his office by him undertaken. Both these we find conjoined (as before) in Jesus Christ (1 John 2:1-2): if any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is a propitiation for our sins: he must be an advocate to intercede, as well as offer a propitiatory sacrifice, if he will be such a merciful High Priest over the house of God, as that the children should be encouraged to go to God by him. This the Apostle exceedingly clarifies, and evidently proves in the Epistle to the Hebrews describing the Priesthood of Christ in the execution thereof, of offering up himself in, and by the shedding of his blood, and interceding for us to the uttermost; upon the performance of both which, he presses an exhortation to draw near with confidence to the throne of grace, for, he has come a High Priest of good things to come, not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered into the holy place, having obtained for us eternal redemption (chapter 9:11-12). His bloody oblation, gave him entrance into the holy place not made with hands, there to accomplish the remaining part of his office: the Apostle comparing his entrance into heaven for us, with the entrance of the High Priest into the holy place, with the blood of bulls and goats upon him (verses 12-13) (which doubtless was to pray for them in whose behalf he had offered, verse 1), so presenting himself before his Father that his former oblation might have its efficacy: and hence he is said to have an unchangeable priesthood because he contin-

ues forever (Hebrews 7:24), so being able to save to the uttermost them that come unto God by him, therefore we have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus (chapter 10:19-22). So then it is evident that both these are acts of the same priestly office in Christ, and if he performs either of them for any; he must of necessity perform the other for them also: for he will not exercise any act or duty of his priestly function in their behalf, for whom he is not a Priest. And for whom he is a priest, he must perform both, seeing he is faithful in the discharge of his function to the uttermost, in the behalf of the sinners for whom he undertakes. These two then, Oblation and Intercession, must in respect of their objects be of equal extent, and can by no means be separated. And here by the way (the thing being by this argument in my apprehension made so clear) I cannot but demand of those who oppose us about the death of Christ, whether they will maintain that he intercedes for all or not; if not, then they make him but half a Priest; if they will, they must be necessitated either to defend this error, that all shall be saved; or own this blasphemy that Christ is not heard of his Father, nor can prevail in his Intercession; which yet the saints on earth are sure to do, when they make their supplications according to the will of God (Romans 8): besides that of our Savior, it is expressly said that the Father always hears him (John 11:42). And if that were true, when he was yet in the way, in the days of his flesh, and had not finished the great work he was sent about, how much more then now, when having done the will, and finished the work of God, he is set down on the right hand of majesty on high, desiring and requesting the accomplishing of the promises that were made unto him upon his undertaking this work, of which before.

The nature of the intercession of Christ, will also prove no, section 3, less than what we assert, requiring an inseparable conjunction, between it, and his oblation; for as it is now perfected in heaven, it is not a humble dejection of himself, with cries, tears and supplications, nay it cannot be conceived to be vocal, by the way of entreaty, but merely real, by the presentation of himself sprinkled with the blood of the Covenant before the throne of Grace in our behalf. For Christ (said the Apostle) is not entered into the holy place made with hands, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us (Hebrews 9:24). His Intercession there, is an appearing for us in heaven in the presence of God, a demonstration of his sacred body, wherein for us he suffered. For (as we said before) the Apostle in the ninth chapter to the Hebrews compares his entrance into heaven for us, unto the entrance of the High Priest into the holy place, which was with the blood of bulls and goats upon him (verses 12-13), our Savior's being with his own blood, so presenting himself, that his former oblation might have its perpetual efficacy, until the many sons given unto him are brought to glory. And herein his Intercession consists, being nothing (as it were) but his oblation continued. He was a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Revelation 13:8); now his Intercession before his actual oblation in the fullness of times, being nothing but a presenting of the engagement that was upon him for the work in due time to be accomplished, certainly that which follows it, is nothing but a presenting of what according to that engagement is fulfilled, so that it is nothing but a continuation of his oblation, in postulating by remembrance and declaration of it, those things which by it were procured. How then is it possible, that the one of these should be of larger compass and

extent than the other? Can he be said to offer for them for whom he does not intercede when his Intercession is nothing but a presenting of his oblation in the behalf of them for whom he suffered, and for the bestowing of those good things which by that were purchased.

Again if the Oblation and death of Christ procured and obtained that every good thing should be bestowed, which is actually, section 4, conferred by the intervening of his Intercession, then they have both of them the same aim, and are both means tending to one and the same end. Now for the proof of this assumption, we must remember that which we delivered before, concerning the compact and agreement, that was between the Father and his Son, upon his voluntary engaging of himself unto this great work of redemption: for upon that engagement the Lord proposed unto him as the end of his sufferings, and promised unto him as the reward of his labors, the fruit of his deservings, everything which he afterwards intercedes for. Many particulars I before instanced in, and therefore now to avoid repetition will wholly omit them, referring the Reader to Chapter 3 for satisfaction. Only I shall demand, what is the ground and foundation of our Savior's Intercession, understanding it to be by the way of entreaty, either virtual or formal, as it may be conceived to be either real or oral, for the obtaining of anything, must it not rest upon some promise made unto him? Or is there any good bestowed, that is not promised? Is it not apparent that the intercession of Christ does rest on such a promise, as (Psalm 2:8): Ask of me and I will grant you the nations to be your inheritance, etc.? Now upon what consideration was this promise and engagement made unto our Savior, was it not for his undergoing of that about which the Kings set themselves, and the Rulers

took counsel together against him (verse 3), which the Apostles interpret of Herod and Pontius Pilate with the people of the Jews, prosecuting him to death, and doing to him whatsoever the hand and counsel of God had before determined should be done (Acts 4:27-28)? The intercession of Christ then, being founded on promises made unto him, and these promises being nothing but an engagement to bestow, and actually bestow upon them for whom he suffered, all those good things which his death and Oblation did merit, and purchase, it cannot be but that he intercedes for all, for whom he died, that his death procured all and every thing, which upon his Intercession is bestowed, and until they are bestowed, it has not its full fruits and effects. For that which some say, namely, that the death of Christ does procure that which is never granted, we shall see afterwards, whether it does not contradict Scripture, yes and common sense.

Further, what Christ has put together, let no man presume to put asunder, distinguish between them they may, but separate, section 5, them they may not. Now these things concerning which we treat (the oblation and intercession of Christ) are by himself conjoined, yes united (John 17), for there, and then he did both offer and intercede, he did then as perfectly offer himself in respect of his own will and intention (verse 9) as on the cross: and as perfectly intercede as now in heaven, who then can divide these things, or put them asunder? Especially considering that the Scripture affirms that the one of them without the other would have been unprofitable (1 Corinthians 15:17), for complete remission and redemption could not be obtained for us without the entering of our high priest into the most holy place (Hebrews 9:12).

Lastly, a separating and dividing of the death and intercession of Christ, in respect of the objects of them, cuts off all that consolation, section 6, which any soul might hope to attain by an assurance that Christ died for him. That the doctrine of the general ransom is an uncomfortable doctrine, cutting all the nerves and sinews of that strong consolation which God is so abundantly willing that we should receive, shall be afterwards declared: for the present I will only show, how it tends upon our comfort in this particular, the main foundation of all the confidence and assurance whereof in this life, we may be made partakers, (which amounts to joy unspeakable, and full of glory) arises from this strict connection of the oblation and intercession of Jesus Christ, that by the one he has procured all good things for us, and by the other he will procure them to be actually bestowed; whereby he does never leave our sins but follows them into every court, until they be fully pardoned, and clearly expiated (Hebrews 9:26). He will never leave us until he has saved, to the uttermost, them that come unto God by him: his death without his resurrection would have profited us nothing, all our faith in him had been in vain (1 Corinthians 15), so that separated from it with the Intercession following, either in his own intention, or in the several procurements of the one or the other, it will yield us but little consolation, but in this connection it is a sure foundation for a soul to build upon (Hebrews 7:25). What good will it do me to be persuaded that Christ died for my sins, if, notwithstanding that, my sins may appear against me for my condemnation, where? And when Christ will not appear for my justification? If you will ask with the Apostle, who is he that condemns, it is Christ that died? (Romans 8:34). It may easily be answered; why, God by his Law may condemn me, notwithstand-

ing Christ dying for me! Yes but said the Apostle, he is risen again, and sits at the right hand of God, making intercession for us, he rests not in his death, but he will certainly make intercession for them, for whom he died, and this alone gives firm consolation, our sins dare not appear, nor any of our accusers against us, where he appears for us. Caviling objections against this text, shall be afterwards considered, and so I hope I have sufficiently confirmed and proved what in the beginning of this Chapter I did propose, about the identity of the object of the oblation, and intercession of Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER 8



By what was said in the last Chapter it clearly appears, that the Oblation and intercession of Christ are of equal compass, section 1, and extent, in respect of their objects, or the persons for whom he once offered himself, and does continually intercede, and so are to be looked on, as one joint means for the attaining of a certain proposed end: which, what it is comes next to be considered: but because I find some objections laid by some against the former truth, I must remove them before I proceed, which I shall do as a man removes dung until it is all gone.

The sum of one of our former arguments was that to sacrifice and intercede belong both to the same person as high Priest, section 2, which name none can answer, neither has any performed that office until both by him be accomplished. Where our Savior being the most absolute, and indeed only true High Priest, in whom were really all those perfections which in others received a weak typical representation, does perform both these in the behalf of them for whose sakes he was such.

An argument not unlike to this I find by some to be undertaken to be answered, being in these words proposed: (the ransom and Mediation of Christ is no larger than his office of Priest, Prophet

and King, but those offices pertain to his Church and chosen, therefore his ransom pertains to them only.)

The intention and meaning of the argument is the same with what we proposed, namely that Christ offered not for them for whom he is no Priest, and he is a Priest only for them, for whom he does also intercede: if afterwards I shall have occasion to make use of this argument, I shall by the Lord's assistance give more weight and strength to it, than it seems to have in their proposal, whose interest it is, to present it as slightly as possible, that they may seem fairly to have waived it; but the evasion, such as it is, let us look upon.

This (said the answerer) is a sober objection, which friendly term I, section 3, imagined at first, he had given this reason, because he found it kind and easy to be satisfied: but reading the answer and finding it so wide from yielding any color or appearance of what was pretended, that it only served him some new weak false conceptions, I imagined that it must be some other kindness that caused him to give this objection (as he calls it) so much milder an entertainment, than those others, which equally trouble him, which hear nothing, but this is horrid, that blasphemy that detestable abominable and false, as being indeed by those of his persuasion, neither to be endured nor avoided: and at length I conceived that the reason of it was intimated in the first words of his pretended answer which are, that, this objection does not deny the death of Christ for all men, but only his ransom and mediation for all men. Now truly if it be so, I am not of his judgment, but so far from thinking it a sober objection, that I cannot be persuaded that any man in his right mind would once propose it; that Christ should die for all, and yet not be a ransom for all, himself affirm-

ing, that he came to give his life a ransom for many (Matthew 20:28), is to me a plain contradiction. The death of Christ, in the first most general notion and apprehension thereof, is a ransom. Nay, do not this answer, and those who are of the same persuasion with him, make the ransom of as large extent, as anything in, or about, or following the death of Christ? Or have they yet some further distinction to make, or rather division about the ends of the death of Christ? As we have had already, for such he not only paid a ransom, but also intercedes for them, which he does not for all for whom he paid a ransom: will they now go a step backwards and say, that for some he not only died, but also paid a ransom for them, which he did not for all for whom he died? Who then were these that he thus died for? They must be some beyond all and every man, for as they contend, for them he paid a ransom? But let us see what he says further, in so easy a cause as this, it is a shame to take advantages.

The answer to this objection (said he) is easy and plain in the section 3, Scripture, for the mediation of Christ, is both more general, and more special, more general as he is the one Mediator between God and man (1 Timothy 2:5), and more special as he is the Mediator of the New Testament that they which are called may receive the promise of eternal inheritance (Hebrews 9:15). According to that it is said he is the Savior of all men especially of those that believe (1 Timothy 4:10). So in all the offices of Christ the Priest, the Prophet, the King, there is that which is more general and that which is more special and peculiar.

And this is that, which he calls a clear and plain answer from the Scripture, leaving the application of it, unto the argument, section 4, to other men's conjecture, which as far as I can conceive

must be thus. It is true, Christ paid a ransom for none but those for whom he is a Mediator and Priest, but Christ is to be considered two ways, First, as a general Mediator and Priest for all. Secondly, as a special Mediator and Priest for some, now he pays the ransom as a general Mediator. This I conceive may be some part of his meaning, for in itself, the whole is in expression so barbarous, and remote from common sense, in substance such a wild unchristian madness: as contempt would far better suit it, than a reply. The truth is; for sense and expression, in men who from their manual trades leap into the office of preaching, and employment of writing, I know no reason why we should expect. Only it can never enough be lamented that wildness, in such tattered rags should find entertainment, whilst sober truth is shut out of doors. For what I pray you is the meaning of this distinction, Christ is either a general mediator between God and man, or a special mediator of the New Testament, was it ever heard before, that Christ was any way a Mediator, but as he is so of the New Testament? A Mediator is not of one, all mediation respects an agreement of several parties, and every mediator, is the mediator of a Covenant; now if Christ be a mediator more generally, than as he is so of the new Covenant: of what Covenant I ask you was that? Of the Covenant of works? Would not such an assertion overthrow the whole Gospel? Would it not be derogatory to the honor of Jesus Christ, that he should be the mediator of a cancelled Covenant? Is it not contrary to Scripture affirming him a surety (not of the first but) of a better Testament? (Hebrews 7:22). Are not such bold asserters fitter to be catechized than to preach? But we must not let it pass thus, the man harps upon something that he has heard from some Arminian Doctor, though he has had the ill fortune, so poorly to

make out his conceptions? Therefore being in some measure acquainted with their occasions which they color with those texts of Scripture which are here produced, I shall briefly remove the poor shift, that so our former argument, may stand unshaken.

The poverty of the answer as before expressed, has been sufficiently already declared: the fruits of Christ's mediation have been distinguished by some, into those that are more general, and those which are more peculiar, which in some sense may be tolerable: but that the offices of Christ should be said to be either general or peculiar, and himself in relation to them so considered is a gross unshapen fancy. I answer then to the thing intended, that we deny any such general mediation, or function of office in general, in Christ, as should extend itself beyond his Church or chosen. It was his Church which he redeemed with his own blood (Acts 20:28), his Church that he loved and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of water and the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church (Ephesians 5:25-27). They were his sheep he laid down his life for (John 10), and appears in heaven for us (Hebrews 9:26). Not one word of mediating for any other in the scripture. Look upon his Incarnation, it was because the children were partakers of flesh and blood (Hebrews 2:14), not because all the world were so. Look upon his Oblation, for their sakes (said he, those whom you have given me) do I sanctify myself (John 17:19), that is to be an Oblation, which was the work he had then in hand. Look upon his Resurrection, he died for our sins and rose for our justification (Romans 4:25). Look upon his Ascension, I go (said he) to my Father and your Father, and that to prepare a place for you (John 14). Look upon his perpetuated Intercession, is it not to save to the uttermost

them that come unto God by him? (Hebrews 7:25). Not one word of this general mediation for all. Nay if you will hear himself, he denies in plain terms to mediate for all; for I pray not said he for the world but for those whom you have given me (John 17:9).

But let us see what is brought to confirm this distinction; (1 Timothy 2:5) is quoted for the maintenance thereof. For there is one God and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, what then I pray? What will be concluded from this? Cannot Christ be a Mediator between God and man, but he must be a Mediator for all men? Are not the elect, men? Do not the children partake of flesh and blood? Does not his Church consist of men? What reason is there to assert out of an indefinite proposition a universal conclusion? Because Christ was a Mediator for men, (which were true had he been so only for his Apostles) shall we conclude therefore he was so for all men? Away with such nonsense, but let us see another proof which happily may give more strength to the awkward distinction we oppose, and that is (1 Timothy 4:10): who is the Savior of all men especially of them that believe, had it been who is the Mediator of all men especially of them that believe, it had been more likely. But the consciences, or at least the foreheads of these men! Is there any word here spoken of Christ as Mediator? Is it not the living God in whom we trust that is the Savior here mentioned, as the words going before in the same verse are? And is Christ called so in respect of his Mediation? That God the Father is often called Savior I showed before, and that he is here intended, as is agreed upon by all sound interpreters, so also it is clear from the matter in hand, which is the protecting providence of God, general towards all, special and peculiar towards his Church, thus is he said to save man and beast

(Psalm 36:6), translating the Hebrew, you shall save or preserve. It is God then that is here called the Savior of all by deliverance and protection in danger of which the Apostle treats, and that by his providence, which is peculiar towards believers; and what this makes for a universal mediation I know not.

Now the very context in this place will not admit of any other interpretation, for the words render a reason why, notwithstanding all the injury and reproaches, wherewith the people of God are continually assaulted, yet they should cheerfully go forward to run with joy the race that is set before them, even because as God preserves all, for in him we live and move and have our being (Acts 17; Psalm 145:14-16), so that he will not suffer any to be injured, and unrevenged (Genesis 9:5), so is he especially the preserver of them that do believe, for they are as the apple of his eye (Zechariah 2:8; Deuteronomy 32:10), so that if he should suffer them to be pressed for a season yet let them not let go their hope and confidence, nor be weary of well-doing, but still rest on and trust in him. This encouragement being that which the Apostle was to lay down, what motive would it be for this purpose, to tell believers, that God would have those saved, who neither do, nor ever will, or shall believe? That I say nothing how strange it seems, that Christ should be the Savior of them who are never saved, to whom he never gives grace to believe, for whom he denies to intercede (John 17:9), which yet is no small part of his mediation whereby he saves sinners. Neither the subject then, nor the predicate of the proposition (he is the Savior of all men) is rightly apprehended, by them who would wrest it to the maintenance of universal redemption. For the subject, he, is God the Father, and not Christ the Mediator, and for the predicate it is a providential preservation, and not a purchased

salvation that is intimated, that is the providence of God, protecting and governing all, but watching in an especial manner for the good of them that are his, that they be not always unjustly and cruelly traduced and reviled, with other pressures that the Apostle here rests upon. As also he shows that it was his course to do (2 Corinthians 1:9-10): but we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God that raises the dead, who delivered us from so great a death, and does deliver us, and whom we trust, that he will yet deliver us, for he is the Savior of all men especially of them that do believe. If any shall conceive that these words, (because we hope in the living God who is, etc..) do not render an account of the ground of Paul's confidence, in going through with his labors and afflictions, but rather are an expression of the head and sum of that doctrine, for which he was so troubled and afflicted, I will not much oppose it, for then also it includes nothing but an assertion of the true God and dependence on him, in opposition to all the idols of the Gentiles, and other vain conceits whereby they exalted themselves into the throne of the Most High. But that Christ should be said to be a Savior of first, those who are never saved from their sins, as he saves his people (Matthew 1:21); second, of those who never hear one word of saving or a Savior; third, that he should be a Savior in a two-fold sense, first for all, second for believers; fourth, that to believe is the condition whereby Christ becomes a Savior in an especial manner unto any, and that condition not procured nor purchased by him; that this I say, is the sense of this place, let those believe who can; to me nothing is more certain, than that to whom Christ is in any

sense a Savior in the work of redemption, he saves them to the uttermost from all their sins of unbelief and disobedience, with the saving of grace here, and glory hereafter.

Further attempts also there are to give strength to this evasion, section 7, and so to invalidate our former argument, which I must also remove.

(Christ said they) in some sort intercedes and puts in for transgressors, even the sons of men, yet in, and of the world, that the Spirit may so still unite and bless those that believe on him, and so go forth in their confessions and conversations, and in the ministration of his Gospel by his servants, that those among whom they dwell, and converse might be convinced and brought to believe the report of the Gospel (Isaiah 53:12), as once (Luke 23:34), as himself left a pattern to us (John 17:21, 23), that so the men of the world might be convinced and the convincers allured to Christ and to God in him (Matthew 5:14-16), yes so as that he does in some measure enlighten every man that comes into the world (John 1:9). But in a more special manner does he intercede, etc.

Here is a two-fold intercession of Christ as Mediator, first for all sinners, that they may believe, (for that is it which is intended by the many cloudy expressions wherein it is involved,) second for believers that they may be saved. It is the first member of the distinction which we oppose, and therefore must insist a little upon it.

First our author says, it is an interceding in some sort, I ask in what sort? Is it directly, or indirectly? Is it by virtue of his bloodshed for them; or otherwise? Is it with an intention and desire to obtain for them the good things interceded for, or with purpose that they shall go without them? Is it for all and every man, or only

for those who live in the outward pale of the Church? Is faith the thing required for them, or something else? Is that desired absolutely, or upon some condition? All which questions must be clearly answered before this general intercession can be made intelligible.

First, whether it be directly, or indirectly, and by consequence only, that this intercession after a sort is used, for that thing interceded for is represented, not as the immediate issue or aim of the prayer of Christ, but as a reflex arising from a blessing obtained by others: for the Prayer set down, is that God would so bless believers, that those among whom they dwell, may believe the report of the Gospel. It is believers that are the direct object of this intercession, and others only glanced at through them: the good also so desired for them is considered, either as an accident that may come to pass, or follow the flourishing of believers, or as an end intended to be accomplished by it: if the first, then their good is no more intended than their evil; if the latter, why is it not effected? Why is not the intention of our Savior accomplished? Is it for want of wisdom to choose suitable and proportionable means to the end proposed, or is it for want of power to effect what he intends?

Secondly, is it by virtue of his bloodshed for them or otherwise? If it be, then Christ intercedes for them, that they may enjoy those things which for them by his oblation he did procure: for this it is, to make his death and bloodshedding to be the foundation of his intercession; then it follows that Christ by his death procured faith for all, because he intercedes that all may believe, grounding that intercession upon the merit of his death. But First, this is more than the assertors of universal redemption will maintain; among all the ends of the death of Christ by them assigned, the ef-

fectual and infallible bestowing of faith on those for whom he died, is none. Secondly, If by his death he has purchased it for all, and by intercession entreats for it, why is it not actually bestowed on them? Is not a concurrence of both these sufficient for the making out of that one spiritual blessing? But secondly, If it is not founded on his death, and bloodshedding, then we desire, that they would describe unto us this intercession of Christ, differing from his appearing for us in heaven sprinkled with his own blood.

Thirdly, does he intercede for them that they should believe with an intention or desire that they should be so, or not? If not, it is but a mock intercession, and an entreaty for that which he would not have granted: if so, why is it not accomplished? Why do not all believe? Yes, if he died for all, and prayed for all that they might believe, why are not all saved? For Christ is always heard of his Father (John 11:42).

Fourthly, is it for all and every one in the world, that Christ, makes this intercession, or only for those who live within the pale of the Church? If only for those latter, then this does not prove a general intercession for all, but only one more large than that for believers: for if he leaves out any one in the world, the present hypothesis falls to the ground: if for all, how can it consist in that petition, that the Spirit would so lead, guide and bless believers? And so go forth in the ministration of the Gospel by his servants, that others (that is all and every one in the world) may be convinced and brought to believe? How I say can this be spoken with any reference to those millions of souls that never see a believer, that hear no report of the Gospel?

Fifthly, if his intercession be for faith, then either Christ intercedes for it absolutely, that they may certainly have it, or upon condition; and that, either on the part of God, or man; if absolutely, then all do actually believe, or that is not true, the Father always hears him (John 11:42). If upon condition on the part of God, it can be nothing but this, if he will or please, now the adding of this condition may denote in our Savior two things. First, an ignorance of what is his Father's will in the thing interceded for: which first cannot stand with the unity of his person as now in glory, and secondly, cannot be, because he has the assurance of a promise to be heard in whatever he asks (Psalm 2:8). Or secondly, an advancement of his Father's will, by submission to that, as the prime cause of the good to be bestowed, which may well stand with absolute intercession, by virtue whereof all must believe. Secondly, is it a condition on the part of those for whom he does intercede? Now I ask you what condition is that, where in the Scripture assigned; where is it said that Christ does intercede for men that they may have faith, if they do such and such things? Nay, what condition can rationally be assigned of this desire? Some often suggest that it is, if they allow the Spirit to have its work upon their hearts, and obey the grace of God: now what is it to obey the grace of God? Is it not to believe? Therefore it seems that Christ intercedes for them that they may believe, upon condition that they do believe. Others more cautiously assert the good using of the means of grace, that they do enjoy, to be the condition upon which the benefit of this intercession does depend; but again, first what is the good using of the means of grace, but submitting to them, that is believing; and so we are as before. Second, all have not the means of grace to use well or ill. Third, Christ prays that they may use the means of grace

well, or he does not: if not, then how can he pray, that they may believe, seeing to use well the means of grace, by yielding obedience unto them, is indeed to believe? If he does, then he does it absolutely or upon condition, and so the argument is renewed again as in the entrance. Many more reasons might be easily produced to show the madness of this assertion, but those may suffice. Only we must look upon the proof and confirmations of it.

First, then the words of the prophet (Isaiah 53:12): he made intercession for the transgressors, are insisted on. Answer: the transgressors here for whom our Savior is said to make intercession, are either all the transgressors for whom he suffered, as is most likely, from the description we have of them (verse 6), or the transgressors only by whom he suffered, that acted in his sufferings as some suppose? If the first, then this place proves that Christ intercedes for all those for whom he suffered, which differs not, from that which we contend for. If the latter, then we may consider it as accomplished, how he then did it, so it is here foretold that he should, which is the next place urged, namely (Luke 23:34): then said Jesus Father forgive them, they know not what they do.

Answer: the conclusion which from these words is inferred, being, therefore there is a general intercession for all that they may believe, I might well leave the whole argument to the silent judgment of men, without any further opening and discovery of the invalidity and weakness, but because the ablest of that side, have usually insisted much on this place, for a general unsuccessful intercession, I will a little consider the inference, in its dependence on these words of the Gospel, and search whether it has any appearance of strength in us: to which end we must observe.

That this prayer is not for all men, but only for that handful of the Jews by whom he was crucified, now from a prayer for them, to infer a prayer for all and every man, that ever were, are, or shall be, is a wild deduction.

It does not appear that he prayed for all his crucifiers either, but only for those who did it out of ignorance, as appears by the reason annexed to his supplication, for they know not what they do. And though (Acts 3:17) it is said that the rulers also did it ignorantly, yet that all of them did so is not apparent, that some did is certain from that place, and so it is that some of them were converted as afterwards, indefinite propositions, must not in such things be made universally. Now does it follow, that because Christ prayed for the pardon of their sins, who crucified him out of ignorance, as some of them did, that therefore he intercedes for all that they may believe? Crucifiers who never once heard of his crucifying.

Third, Christ in those words does not so much as pray for those men that they might believe but only, that that sin of them in crucifying of him might be forgiven, not laid to their charge: hence to conclude therefore he intercedes for all men that they may believe, even because he prayed that the sin of crucifying himself might be forgiven them that did it, is a strange inference.

Fourthly, there is another evident limitation in the matter; for among his crucifiers he prays only for them that were present at his death, among whom doubtless, many came more out of curiosity to see and observe, as is usual in such cases, than out of malice and spite, so that whereas some urge that notwithstanding this

prayer, yet the chief of the Priests, continued in their unbelief, it is not to the purpose, for it cannot be proved that they were present at his crucifying.

Fifthly, it cannot be affirmed with any probability, that our Savior should pray for all and every one of them, supposing some of them to be finally impenitent: for he himself knew full well what was in man (John 2:25), yes he knew from the beginning who they were that believed not (John 6:64). Now it is contrary to the rule which we have (1 John 5:16): there is a sin unto death, etc., to pray for them whom we know to be finally impenitent, and to sin unto death.

Sixthly, it seems to me that this supplication was effectual and successful, that the Son was heard in this request also: faith and forgiveness being granted to them for whom he prayed: so that this makes nothing for a general ineffectual intercession, it being both special and effectual. For (Acts 3), of them whom Peter tells, that they denied the Holy One and desired a murderer (verse 14), and killed the Prince of life (verse 15), of these I say five thousand believed (Acts 4:4): many of them which heard the word, believed, and the number of them was about five thousand. And if any other were among them, whom our Savior prayed for, they might be converted afterwards. Neither were the Rulers, without the compass of the fruits of this prayer, for a great company of the Priests were obedient to the faith (Acts 6:7). So that nothing can possibly be hence inferred for the purpose intended.

We may, nay we must grant a two-fold praying in our Savior, one by virtue of his office as he was Mediator, the other in answer of his duty, as he was subject to the law and a private person. It is true, he who was Mediator was made a subject to the law, but yet

those things which he did in obedience to the Law as a private person, were not acts of mediation: nor works of him as Mediator, though of him who was Mediator: now as he was subject to the Law, our Savior was bound to forgive offenses, and wrongs done unto him, and to pray for his enemies, as also he had taught us to do, whereof, in this he gave us an example (Matthew 5:44): I say unto you love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which spitefully use you and persecute you, which doubtless he infers from that Law (Leviticus 19:18): you shall not avenge nor bear any grudge against the children of your people, but shall love your neighbor as yourself, quite contrary to the wicked gloss put upon it by the Pharisees. And in this sense, our Savior here, as a private person, to whom revenge was forbidden, pardon enjoined, prayer commended, prays for his very enemies and crucifiers: which does not at all concern his interceding for us as Mediator, wherein he was always heard, and so is nothing to the purpose in hand.

Again (John 17:21, 23) is urged to confirm this general intercession, which we have set aside, our Savior praying that by the unity, concord, and flourishing of his servants, the world might believe and know, that God had sent him, from which words though some make a seeming flourish, yet the thing pretended is no way confirmed.

First, if Christ really intended and desired that the whole world, or all men in the world should believe, he would also no doubt have prayed for more effectual means of Grace to be granted unto them, than only a beholding of the blessed condition of his, (which yet is granted to a small part of the world) at least the preaching of the word to them all, that by it, as the only ordinary

way, they might come to the knowledge of him. But this we do not find that ever he prayed for, or that God has granted it; nay he blessed his Father that so it was not, because so it seemed good in his sight (Matthew 11:25-26).

Secondly, such a gloss or interpretation must not be put upon the place, as should run cross to the express words of our Savior (verse 9): I pray not for the world, for if he here prayed, that the world should have true, holy, saving faith, he prayed for as great a blessing and privilege for the world, as any he procured, or interceded for, for his own.

Thirdly, say some, the world is here taken for the world of the elect, the world to be saved, God's people throughout the world. Certain it is that the world, is not here taken properly, for the world containing, but figuratively, for the world contained, or men in the world, neither can it be made to appear that it must be taken universally for all the men in the world, as seldom it is in the scripture, which afterwards we shall make appear: but may be understood indefinitely, for men in the world few, or more, as the elect are in their several generations. But this exposition though it has great authorities, I cannot absolutely adhere unto, because through this whole chapter, the world is taken, either for the world of reprobates, opposed to them that are given to Christ by his Father, or for the world of unbelievers, (the same men under another notion) opposed to them who are committed to his Father by Christ. Therefore, I answer,

Fourthly, that by believing (verse 21) and knowing (verse 23) is not meant believing in a strict sense, for a saving comprehension and receiving of Jesus Christ and so becoming the sons of God; which neither ever was, nor ever will be fulfilled in every man in

the world, nor was ever prayed for, but a conviction and acknowledgment, that the Lord Christ is not, what before they had taken him to be, a seducer and a false prophet, but indeed what he said, one that came out from God, able to protect and do good for, and to his own; which kind of conviction and acknowledgment that it is often termed believing in the scripture, is more evident than that it should need to be proved, and that this is here meant the evidence of the thing is such, as that it is consented unto by expositors of all sorts. Now this is not for any good of the world but for the vindication of his people and the exaltation of his own glory, and so proves not the thing in question. But of this word world afterward.

The following place of (Matthew 5:15-16) (containing some instructions given by our Savior to his Apostles, so to improve the knowledge and light which of him they had, and were further to receive, in the preaching of the word, and holiness of life, that they might be a means to draw men to glorify God) is certainly brought in to make up a show of a number, as very many other places are, the author not once considering, what is to be proved by them, nor to what end they are used, and therefore without further inquiry may well be laid aside as not at all belonging to the business in hand, nor to be dragged within many leagues of the conclusion, by all the strength and skill of Mr. More.

Neither is that other place of (John 1:9) anything more advisably or seasonably urged, though wretchedly glossed, and rendered in some measure enlightening every one that comes into the world: the scripture says that Christ is the true light, that lights every man that comes into the world in some measure says Mr. More; now I ask you in what measure is this? How far, into what degree, in what measure, is illumination from Christ? By whom, or

by what means separated from him, independent of him, is the rest made up? Who supplies the defect of Christ. I know your aim is, to draw in your illumination by the light of nature, and I know not what common helps, that you dream of, towards them, who are utterly deprived of all Gospel means of grace, and that not only for the knowledge of God as Creator, but also of him as in Christ the Redeemer. But whether the idols of your own setting up should be thus worshiped, with wresting and perverting the word of God, and undervaluing of the grace of Christ, you will one day I hope be convinced. It suffices us, that Christ is said to enlighten every one, because he is the only true light, and every one that is enlightened, receives his light from him, who is the source, the fountain thereof. And so the general defense, of this general ineffectual intercession is vanished, but yet further, it is particularly replied concerning the Priesthood of Christ, that

As a Priest in respect of one end, he offered sacrifice, that is, propitiation for all men (Hebrews 9:26; John 1:29; 1 John 2:2), in respect of all the ends, propitiation, and sealing the New Testament, and testification to the truth, and of the uttermost end in all, for his called and chosen ones (Hebrews 9:14-15; Matthew 26:26) (what follows after, being repeated out of another place has been already answered.)

Answer, First, these words as here placed have no tolerable sense in them, neither is it an easy thing to gather the mind of the Author out of them, so far are they from being a clear answer to the argument as was pretended. Words of Scripture indeed are used, but wrested; and corrupted, not only to the countenance of error, but to bear a part in unreasonable expressions. For what I pray is the meaning of these words, he offered sacrifice in respect

of one end, then of all ends, then of the uttermost end in all? To inquire backwards, first, what is this uttermost end in all? Is that in all, in, or among all the end proposed and accomplished? Or in all those for whom he offered sacrifice? Or is it the uttermost end and proposal of God and Christ in his oblation? If this latter, that is the glory of God, now there is no such thing once intimated in the places of Scripture quoted (Hebrews 9:14-15; Matthew 26:26). Second, do those places hold out the uttermost end of the death of Christ (subordinate to God's glory)? Why in one of them it is the obtaining of redemption, and in the other, the shedding of his blood for the remission of sins is expressed? Now all this you affirm to be the first end of the death of Christ, in the first words used in this place, calling it propitiation, that is, an atonement for the remission of sins, which remission of sins and redemption, are for the substance one and the same, both of them the immediate fruits, and first end of the death of Christ, as is apparent (Ephesians 1:7; Colossians 1:14). So here you have confounded the first, and last end of the death of Christ, spoiling indeed and casting down (as you may lawfully do, for it is your own) the whole frame and building, whose foundation is this, that there be several and diverse ends of the death of Christ, towards several persons, so that some of them belong unto all, and all of them only to some, which is the main point of the whole Book. Third, Christ's offering himself to put away sin, out of (Hebrews 9:26) the place for the first end of the death of Christ, and his shedding of his blood for the remission of sins, from (Matthew 26:26) to be the last, pray when you write next, give us the difference between these two. Fourth, you say, he offered sacrifice, in respect of one end, that is

propitiation for all men: now truly, if you know the meaning of sacrifice and propitiation, this will scarcely appear sense unto you upon a second view.

But to leave your words and take your meaning, it seems to be this in respect of one end, that Christ proposed to himself, in his sacrifice, he is a Priest for all, he aimed to attain and accomplish it for them, but in respect of other ends, he is so only for his chosen and called. Now truly this is an easy kind of answering, which if it will pass for good and warranted, you may easily disappoint all your adversaries, even first by laying down their arguments, then saying your own opinion is otherwise, for the very thing that is here imposed on us for an answer is the chief matter in debate, we absolutely deny, that the several ends of the death of Christ, or the good things procured by his death are thus distributed as is here pretended. To prove our assertion, and to give a reason of our denial of this dividing of these things in respect of their objects, we produce the argument above proposed, concerning the Priesthood of Christ; to which the answer given is a bare repetition of the thing in question. But you will say diverse places of Scripture are quoted for the confirmation of this answer. But these, as I told you before, are brought forth for pomp and show, nothing at all being to be found in them to the business in hand; such are (Hebrews 9:26; John 1:29), for what consequence is there from an affirmation indefinite, that Christ bore or took away sin, to this, that he is a Priest for all and every one in respect of propitiation? Besides in that of (John 1:29), there is a manifest allusion to the Passover Lamb, by which there was a typical ceremonial purification, and cleansing of sin, which was proper only to the people of Israel, the type of the elect of God, and not of all in the world, of all sorts,

reprobates and unbelievers also. Those other two places of (Hebrews 2:9; 1 John 2:2) shall be considered apart, because they seem to have some strength for the main of the cause; though apparently there is no word in them that can be wrested to give the least color to such an awkward distinction, as that which we oppose. And thus our argument from the equal objective extent of the oblation and intercession of Jesus Christ, is confirmed and vindicated: and with it, the means used by the blessed Trinity for the accomplishment of the proposed end, unfolded: which end what it was is next to be considered.

CHAPTER 1



The main thing upon which the whole controversy about the death of Christ turns, and upon which, section 1, the greatest weight of the business depends, comes next to our consideration, being that which we have prepared the way unto, by all that has been already said. It is about the proper end of the death of Christ, which whoever can rightly constitute and make manifest, may well be admitted for a mediator, and umpire in the whole contestation; for, if it be the end of Christ's death, which most of our Adversaries assign, we will not deny, but that Christ died for all and every one; and if that be the end of it, which we maintain so to be, they will not extend it beyond the elect, beyond believers. This then must be fully cleared, and solidly confirmed by them who hope for any success in their undertakings. The end of the death of Christ we asserted in the beginning of our Discourse to be our drawing near unto God, that being a general expression for the whole reduction and recovery of sinners from the state of alienation, misery and wrath, into grace, peace, and eternal communion with him. Now there being a two-fold end in things, one of the worker, the other of the work wrought, we have manifested, how, that unless it be, either for want of wisdom and certainty of mind in the Agent, in choosing and using unsuitable means for the at-

taining of the end proposed, or for want of skill and power to make use of, and rightly to improve, well-proportioned means to the best advantage, those things are always co-incident; the work effects, what the workman intends. In the business in hand, the Agent is the blessed Three in One, as was before declared; and the means whereby they aimed at the end proposed, was the Oblation and Intercession of Jesus Christ, which are united, intending the same object, as was also cleared. Now unless we will blasphemously ascribe want of wisdom, power, perfection, and sufficiency in working unto the Agent, or affirm that the death and intercession of Christ, was not suitable and proportioned for the attaining the end, proposed by it to be effected, we must grant that the end of these is one and the same, whatsoever the Blessed Trinity intended by them, that was effected; and whatsoever we find in the issue ascribed unto them, that by them the Blessed Trinity intended. So that we shall have no cause, to consider these apart, unless it be sometimes to argue from the one to the other; as where we find anything ascribed to the death of Christ, as the fruit thereof, we may conclude, that, that God intended to effect by it, and so also on the contrary.

Now the end of the death of Christ is either supreme and ultimate, section 2, or intermediate and subservient to that last end. The first, is the glory of God, or the manifestation of his glorious Attributes, especially of his justice, and mercy, tempered with justice unto us. The Lord does necessarily aim himself in the first place, as the highest good; yes indeed that alone which is good, that is absolutely and simply so, and not by virtue of communication from another. And therefore in all his works, especially in this which we have in hand the highest of all, he first intends the mani-

festation of his own glory, which also he fully accomplishes in the close, to every point and degree by him intended, he makes all things for himself (Proverbs 16:4), and everything in the end must redound to the glory of God (2 Corinthians 4:15), wherein Christ himself is said to be God's (1 Corinthians 3:23), serving to his glory in that whole Administration that was committed to him. So (Ephesians 1:6), the whole end of all this dispensation, both of choosing us from eternity, redeeming us by Christ, blessing us with all spiritual blessings in him, is affirmed to be the praise, the glory of his grace, and (verse 13) that we should be to the praise of his glory. This is the end of all the benefits we receive by the death of Christ; for, we are filled with the fruits of Righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ unto the glory and praise of God (Philippians 1:11), which also is fully asserted (chapter 2:11): that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. This the Apostle fully clarifies in the ninth chapter to the Romans; where he so asserts the supreme Dominion and independence of God in all his actions, his absolute freedom from taking rise, cause or occasion, to his purposes, from anything among us sons of men, doing all things for his own sake, and aiming only at his own glory. And this is that which in the close of all, shall be accomplished, when every creature shall say, Blessing, Honor, Glory and Power, be unto him that sits upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever (Revelation 5:13). But this is beyond our present subject.

Second, there is an end of the death of Christ which is intermediate and subservient to that other, which is the last and most supreme, section 3, even the effects which it has in respect of us, and that is it of which we now treat; which as we before affirmed, is, the bringing of us unto God. Now this though in reference to the

Oblation and Intercession of Christ, it be one entire end, yet in itself, and in respect of the relation which the several acts therein have one to another, it may be considered distinctly, in two parts, whereof one is the end, and the other the means for the attaining of that end, both, the complete end of the mediation of Christ in respect of us. The ground and cause of this is, the appointment of the Lord, that there should be such a connection and coherence, between the things purchased for us by Jesus Christ, that the one should be a means and way of attaining the other, the one the condition, and the other the thing promised upon that condition, but both equally and alike procured for us by Jesus Christ; for if either be omitted in his purchase, the other would be vain and fruitless, as we shall afterwards declare. Now both these consist in a communication of God and his goodness unto us, (and our participation of him by virtue thereof) and that either to grace or glory, holiness or blessedness, faith or salvation. In this last way, they are usually called, faith being the means of which we speak, and salvation the end; faith the condition, salvation the promised inheritance: under the name of Faith we comprise all saving grace, that accompanies it: and under the name of salvation, the whole glory to be revealed, the liberty of the glory of the Children of God (Romans 8), all that blessedness which consists, in an eternal fruition of the blessed God. With faith go all the effectual means thereof, both external and internal, the Word and Almighty sanctifying Spirit: all advancement of state and condition attending it, as Justification, Reconciliation, and Adoption into the family of God: all fruits flowing from it in sanctification, and universal holiness, with all other privileges and enjoyments of believers, here, which follow the redemption and reconciliation purchased for them by

the oblation of Christ. A real, effectual and infallible bestowing, and applying of all these things, as well those that are the means, as those that are the end, the condition, as the thing conditioned about, faith and grace, as salvation and glory, unto all, and every one, for whom he died do we maintain to be the end proposed and effected, by the bloodshedding of Jesus Christ, with those other acts of his Mediatorship, which we before declared to be therewith inseparably conjoined, so that every one for whom he died, and offered up himself, has, by virtue of his death, or oblation, a right purchased for him, unto all these things, which in due time he shall certainly and infallibly enjoy, or, which is all one, the end of Christ's obtaining grace and glory with his Father was, that they might be certainly bestowed upon all those for whom he died, some of them, upon condition that they do believe, but faith itself absolutely upon no condition at all: all which we shall further illustrate and confirm after we have removed some false ends assigned.

CHAPTER 2



That the death, oblation, and bloodshedding of Jesus Christ, section 1, is to be considered as the means for the compassing of an appointed end, was before abundantly declared; and that such a means, as is not in itself any way desirable, but for the attaining of that end: Now, because that which is the end of anything, must also be good, for unless it be so, it cannot be an end, (for goodness and end are convertible) it must be either his Father's good, or his own good, or our good, which was the end proposed. That it was not merely his own, is exceedingly apparent; for in his divine nature, he was eternally and essentially partaker of all that glory which is proper to the Deity, which though in respect of us it is capable of more or less manifestation, yet in itself it is always alike eternally and absolutely perfect. And in this regard, at the close of all, he desires and requests no other glory, but that which he had with his Father before the world was (John 17:5). And in respect of his human nature, as he was eternally predestined, without any foresight of doing or suffering to be personally united; from the instant of his conception with the second Person of the Trinity; so neither while he was in the way, did he merit anything for himself by his death and oblation: he needed not to suffer for himself, being perfectly and legally righteous, and the glory

that he aimed at, by enduring the curse, and despising the shame, was not so much his own, in respect of possession, by the exaltation of his own nature, as the bringing of many children to glory, even as it was in the promise set before him; as we before at large declared. His own exaltation indeed, and power over all flesh, and his appointment to be judge of the living and the dead, was a consequence of his deep humiliation and suffering, but that it was the effect and product of it, procured meritoriously by it; that it was the end aimed at by him in his making satisfaction for sin, that we deny. Christ has a power and dominion over all, but the foundation of this dominion is not in his death for all: for he has dominion over all things being appointed Heir of them, and upholding them all by the word of his power (Hebrews 1:3-4). He is set over the works of God's hands, and all things are put in subjection under him (Hebrews 2:7-8). And what are those all things, or what are among them, you may see in the place of the Psalmist from which the Apostle cites those words (Psalm 8:6-8). And did he die for all these things? Nay, has he not power over the Angels, are not principalities and powers made subject to him? Shall he not at the last day, judge the Angels, for with him the saints shall do it, by giving attestation to his righteous judgments (1 Corinthians 6)? And yet, is it not expressly said that the Angels have no share in the whole dispensation of God manifested in the flesh, so as to die for them to redeem them from their sins? Of which some had no need, and the other, are eternally excluded (Hebrews 2:16): He took not on him the nature of Angels, but he took upon him the seed of Abraham. God setting him King upon his Holy hill of Zion, in spite of his enemies to crush them and to rule them with a rod of iron (Psalm 2:9). Is not the immediate effect of his death for them;

but rather all things are given into his hand, out of the immediate love of the Father to his Son (John 3:35; Matthew 11:27). That is the foundation of all this sovereignty and dominion over all creatures, with his power of judging that is put into his hand.

Besides, be it granted (which cannot be proved) that Christ by his death did procure this power of judging; would anything hence follow that might be beneficial to the proving of the general ransom for all? No doubtless, this dominion and power of judging is a power of condemning as well as saving, it is all judgment that is committed to him (John 5:22). He has authority given unto him to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man, that is at that hour when all that are in their graves, shall hear his voice, and come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of condemnation (verses 28-29; 2 Corinthians 5:10). Now can it be reasonably asserted, that Christ died for men to redeem them, that he might have power to condemn? Nay, do not these two overthrow one another? If he redeemed them by his death, then he did not aim at the obtaining of any power to condemn them; if he did the latter, then that former was not in his intention.

Nor secondly, was it his Father's good; I speak now of the proximate and immediate end and product of the death of Christ, not of the ultimate and remote, knowing that the supreme end of, section 1, Christ's oblation and all the benefits purchased and procured by it was the praise of his glorious grace; but for this other it does not directly tend to the obtaining of anything unto God, but of all good things from God to us. Arminius with his followers, with the other universalists of our days, affirm this to be the end proposed, that God might, his justice being satisfied, save sinners, the hindrance

being removed by the satisfaction of Christ, he had by his death a right and liberty obtained, of pardoning sin upon what condition he pleased: so that after the satisfaction of Christ yielded and considered, it was in God's free disposal, (as his words are) as it was holy in God's free disposal, whether he would save any or not, and upon what condition he would, whether of faith, or of works. God (said they) had a good mind and will to do good to humankind, but could not by reason of sin, his justice lying in the way: whereupon he sent Christ to remove that obstacle, that so he might upon the prescribing of what condition he pleased and its being by them fulfilled have mercy on them. Now because in this they place their chief, if not the sole end of the oblation of Christ, I must a little show the falseness and folly of it, which may be done plainly by these following reasons.

First the foundation of this whole assertion seems to me to be false and erroneous, namely, that God could not have mercy on mankind, unless satisfaction were made by his Son: it is true indeed, supposing the decree, purpose and constitution of God, that so it should be, that so he would manifest his glory by the way of vindicative justice, it was impossible that it should otherwise be, for with the Lord, there is neither change nor shadow of turning (James 1:17; 1 Samuel 15:29). But to assert positively, that absolutely and antecedently, to his constitution he could not have done it, is to me an unwritten tradition, the Scripture affirming no such thing, neither can it be gathered from there in any good consequence; if any one shall deny this, we will try what the Lord will enable us to say unto it, and in the mean time rest contented in that of Augustine, though other ways of saving us were not want-

ing to his infinite wisdom, yet certainly the way which he did proceed in, was the most convenient, because we find he proceeded therein.

Secondly this would make the cause of sending his Son to die, to be a common love, or rather wishing that he might do good, or show mercy to all, and not an entire act of his will or purpose of knowing, redeeming, and saving his elect, which we shall afterwards disprove.

Thirdly, if the end of the death of Christ were to acquire a right to his Father, that notwithstanding his justice he might save sinners, then did he rather die to redeem a liberty unto God, than a liberty from evil unto us; that his Father might be enlarged from that estate, wherein it was impossible for him to do that which he desired, and which his nature inclined him to, and not that we might be freed from that condition, wherein, without this freedom purchased, it could not be but we must perish. If this be so, I see no reason why Christ should be said to come and redeem his people from their sins, but rather plainly to purchase this right and liberty for his Father: now where is there any such assertion, wherein is anything of this nature, in the Scripture? Does the Lord say that he sent his Son out of love to himself or unto us? Is God or men made the immediate Subject of good attained unto by this oblation? But it is said that although immediately and in the first place this right did arise unto God by the death of Christ, yet that that also was to tend to our good, Christ obtaining that right, that the Lord might now bestow mercy on us if we fulfilled the condition that he would propose. But I answer that this utterly overthrows all the merit of the death of Christ towards us, and leaves not so much as the nature of merit unto it; for that which is truly

meritorious indeed, deserves that the thing merited or procured and obtained by it, shall be done, or ought to be bestowed, and not only that it may be done; there is such a relationship between merit and the thing obtained by it, whether it be absolute or arising on contract, that there arises a real right to the thing procured by it in them, by whom or for whom it is procured. When the laborer has worked all day, do we say now his wages may be paid or rather now they ought to be paid? Has he not a right unto it? Was ever such a merit heard of before, whose nature should consist in this, that the thing procured by it might be bestowed, and not that it ought to be: and shall Christ be said now to purchase by his meritorious oblation, this only at his Father's hand, that he might bestow upon, and apply the fullness of his death to some or all, and not that he should so do? To him that works (said the Apostle) the reward is not due of grace, but of debt (Romans 4:4). Are not the fruits of the death of Christ, by his death as truly procured for us, as if they had been obtained by our own working? And if so, though in respect of the persons on whom they are bestowed, they are of free grace, yet in respect of the purchase, the bestowing of them is of debt.

Fourthly, that cannot be assigned as the complete end of the Death of Christ, which being accomplished, it had, not only been possible, that not one soul might be saved, but also impossible that by virtue of it any sinful soul should be saved, for sure the Scripture is exceedingly full in declaring that through Christ we have remission of sins, grace and glory (as afterwards) but now notwithstanding this, that Christ is said to have procured and purchased by his death such a right and liberty to his Father, that he might bestow eternal life upon all, upon what conditions he would,

it might very well stand, that not one of those should enjoy eternal life; for suppose the Father would not bestow it, as he is by no engagement according to this persuasion bound to do, he had a right to do it, it is true; but that which is anyone's right he may use, or not use at his pleasure. Again, suppose he had prescribed a condition of works, which it had been impossible for them to fulfill, the death of Christ might have had its full end, and yet not one been saved. Was this his coming to save sinners, to save that which was lost? Or could he upon such an accomplishment as this pray as he did, Father I will; that those whom you have given me, may be where I am to behold my glory? (John 17:24). Diverse other reasons might be used to overturn this fancy, that would make the purchase of Christ in respect of us, not to be the remission of sins, but a possibility of it, not salvation but a salvability, not reconciliation and peace with God, but the opening of a door towards it: but I shall use them in assigning the right end of the death of Christ.

Ask now of these, what it is that the Father can do, section 3, and will do upon the death of Christ, by which means his justice, that before hindered the execution of his good will towards them is satisfied? And they tell you, it is the entering into a new Covenant of grace with them, upon the performance of whose condition, they shall have all the benefits of the death of Christ applied to them. But to us it seems that Christ himself, with his death and passion, is the chief promise of the new Covenant itself, as (Genesis 3:15), and so the Covenant cannot be said to be procured by his Death. Besides the nature of the Covenant overthrows this Proposal, that they that are covenanted with shall have such and such good things, if they fulfill the condition, as though that all depended on this obedience, when that obedience itself, and the whole condi-

tion of it, is a promise of the Covenant (Jeremiah 31:32), which is confirmed and sealed by the blood of Christ. We deny not, but the death of Christ has a proper end in respect of God, to wit, the manifestation of his glory, hence he calls him his servant in whom he will be glorified (Isaiah 49), and the bringing of many Sons to glory wherewith he was entrusted, was to the manifestation and praise of his glorious grace, that so his love to his elect might gloriously appear, his salvation being borne out by Christ to the uttermost parts of the earth. And this full declaration of his glory by the way of mercy tempered with justice, for he set forth Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood that he might be just, and the justifier of them that believe in Jesus (Romans 3:25). Is all that which accrued to the Lord by the death of his Son, and not any right and liberty of doing that which before he would have done, but could not for his justice. In respect of us the end of the oblation and bloodshedding of Jesus Christ was, not that God might, if he would, but that he should by virtue of that compact and covenant, which was the foundation of the Merit of Christ, bestow upon us all the good things, which Christ aimed at, and intended to purchase and procure by his offering of himself for us unto God, which is in the next place to be declared.

CHAPTER 3



What the Scripture affirms in this particular, we laid down, section 1, in the entrance of the whole discourse; which, now having enlarged in explication of our sense and meaning therein, must be more particularly asserted by an application of the particular places (which are very many) to our Thesis as before declared, whereof this is the sum: Jesus Christ according to the counsel and will of his Father, did offer himself upon the Cross, to the procurement of those things before recounted, and makes continual intercession: with this intent and purpose; that all the good things so procured by his death, might be actually and infallibly bestowed on, and applied to, all and every one for whom he died, according to the will and counsel of God. Let us now see what the Scripture says hereunto, the sundry places whereof we shall range under these heads.

- First, those that hold out the intention and counsel of God, with, section 2, our Savior's own mind, whose will was one with his Father's in this business. - Secondly, those that lay down the actual accomplishment or effect of his oblation, what it did really procure, effect and produce. - Thirdly, those that point out the persons, for whom Christ died, as designed peculiarly to be the object of this work of redemption in the end and purpose of God.

For the first, or those which hold out the counsel, purpose, mind, intention, and will of God, and our Savior in this work. (Matthew 18:11): the Son of Man came to save that which was lost, which words he repeats again upon another occasion (Luke 19:10). In the first place they are in the front of the parable of seeking the lost sheep, in the other, they are in the close of the recovery of lost Zaccheus, and in both places set forth the end of Christ's coming, which was to do the will of his Father, by the recovery of lost sinners; and that as Zaccheus was recovered by conversion, by bringing into the free Covenant, making him a son of Abraham; or as the lost sheep, which he lays upon his shoulder, and brings home; so that unless he finds that which he seeks for, unless he recovers that which he comes to save, he fails of his purpose.

Second (Matthew 1:21), where the Angel declares the end of Christ's coming in the flesh, and consequently of all his sufferings therein, is to the same purpose, he was to save his people from their sins. Whatsoever is required for a complete and perfect saving of his peculiar people from their sins, was intended by his coming; to say that he did but in part, or in some regard effect the work of salvation, is of ill report to Christian ears.

Thirdly, the like expression is that also of Paul (1 Timothy 1:15), evidently declaring the end of our Savior's coming according to the will and Counsel of his Father, namely, to save sinners; not to open a door for them to come in, if they will or can; not to make a way passable, that they may be saved: not to purchase reconciliation and pardon of his Father, which perhaps they shall never enjoy; but actually to save them from all the guilt and power of sin, and from the wrath of God for sin, which if he does not accomplish, he fails of the end of his coming; and if that ought not to be

affirmed, surely he came for no more than toward whom that effect is procured. The compact of his Father with him, and his promise made unto him, of seeing his seed, and carrying along the pleasure of the Lord prosperously (Isaiah 53:10-12), I before declared; from which it is apparent, that the decree and purpose of giving actually unto Christ a believing generation, whom he calls the children that God gave him (Hebrews 2:13), is inseparably annexed to the decree of Christ's making his soul an offering for sin, and is the end and aim thereof.

Fourthly, As the Apostle further declares (Hebrews 2:14-15): For as much as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil, and deliver them who through fear of death, etc. Than which words nothing can more clearly set forth the entire end of that whole dispensation of the incarnation and offering of Jesus Christ, even a deliverance of the children whom God gave him from the power of death, Hell, and the Devil, so bringing them near unto God. Nothing at all of the purchasing of a possible deliverance for all and every one: Nay all are not those children which God gave him, all are not delivered from death, and him that had the power of it, and therefore it was not for all for whom he then took flesh and blood.

Fifthly, the same purpose and intention we have (Ephesians 5:25-26): Christ loved his Church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy, and without blemish. As also (Titus 2:14): He gave himself

for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works. I think nothing can be clearer than those two places, nor is it possible for the wit of man to invent expressions so fully, and lively to set out the thing we intend, as it is in both these places by the Holy Spirit.

Sixthly, what did Christ do? He gave himself say both these places alike; for whom? For his Church, said one; for us, said the other; both words of equal extent and force, as all men know. To what end did he this? To sanctify and cleanse it, to present it to himself a holy and glorious Church without spot or wrinkle, said he to the Ephesians; to redeem us from all iniquity, and to purify to himself a peculiar people zealous of good works, said he to Titus. I ask now, are all men of this Church? Are all in that rank of men, among whom Paul places himself and Titus? Are all purged, purified, sanctified, made glorious, brought near unto Christ? Or does Christ fail in his aim towards the greatest part of men? I dare not affirm any of these.

Seventhly, Will you have our Savior Christ himself expressing this more evidently, restraining the object, declaring his whole design, and purpose, and affirming the end of his death? (John 17:19): For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified through the truth: for their sakes? Whose I pray? The men whom you have given me out of the world (verse 6). Not the whole world, whom he prayed not for (verse 9). I sanctify myself; whereunto? To the work I am now going about, even to be an oblation; and to what end? That they also may be truly sanctified, that word 'that' there signifies the intent and purpose of Christ, it designs out the end he aimed at, which our hope is, and that is the hope of the Gospel, that he has accomplished, for the deliverer that

comes out of Zion, turns away ungodliness from Jacob (Romans 11:26), and that herein there was a concurrence of the will of his Father, yes that this his purpose was to fulfill the will of his Father, which he came to do.

Eighthly, And that this also was his counsel, is apparent (Galatians 1:4): for our Lord Jesus gave himself for our sin, that he might deliver us from this present evil world according to the will of God, and our Father, which will and purpose of his, the Apostle further declares (chapter 4:4-6): God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption of sons: and because sons, our deliverance from the Law, and thereby our freedom from the guilt of sin; our adoption to sons, receiving the Spirit, and drawing near unto God, are all of them in the purpose of the Father, giving his only Son for us.

Ninthly, I shall add but one place more, of the very many more that might be cited to this purpose, and that in (2 Corinthians 5:21): He has made him to be sin for us that knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. The purpose of God in making his Son to be sin is, that those for whom he was made sin might become righteousness: that was the end of God's sending Christ to be so, and Christ's willingness to become so; now if the Lord did not purpose what is not fulfilled, yes what he knew should never be fulfilled, and what he would not work at all, that it might be fulfilled, (either of which are most impious expressions) then he made Christ sin for no more, than do in the effect become actually righteousness in him, so that the counsel and will of God, with the purpose and intention of Christ by his oblation and blood-shedding, was to fulfill that will and counsel, is from these places

made apparent. From all which we draw this argument: that which the Father and the Son intended to accomplish, in, and towards all those for whom Christ died by his death, that is most certainly effected; (if any shall deny this proposition, I will at any time by the Lord's assistance take up the assertion of it). But the Father and his Son intended by the death of Christ, to redeem, purge, sanctify, purify, deliver from death, Satan, the curse of the Law, to remove all sin, to make righteousness in Christ, to bring near unto God, all those for whom he died, as was above proved. Therefore Christ died for all, and only those in and towards whom, all these things recounted are effected: which whether they are all and every one, I leave to all and every one to judge that has any knowledge in these things.

Secondly, the second rank contains those places, which lay down the actual accomplishment, and effect of this oblation, or, section 4, what it does really produce and effect in and towards them, for whom it is an oblation. Such are (Hebrews 9:12, 14): By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us — the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purges your consciences from dead works to serve the living God. Two things are here observed of the blood of Christ, one referring to God, it obtains eternal redemption, the other respecting us, it purges our consciences from dead works: so that justification with God by procuring for us an eternal redemption from the guilt of our sins, and his wrath due unto them, with sanctification in ourselves, (or as it is called Hebrews 1:3, purging our sins,) is the immediate product of that blood, by which he entered into the holy place, of that oblation which through the eternal Spirit he pre-

sented to God. Yes this meritorious purging of our sins is peculiarly ascribed to his offering, as performed before his ascension (Hebrews 1:3): for when he had by himself purged our sins, he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; and again most expressly (Hebrews 9:26): He has appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, which expiation or putting away of sin by the way of sacrifice, must needs be the actual sanctification of them for whom he was a sacrifice, even as the blood of bulls and goats and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean sanctifies to the purifying of the flesh (verse 13). Certain it is that whoever was either polluted or guilty, for whom there was an expiation or a sacrifice allowed in those carnal ordinances, which had a shadow of good things to come, that he had truly, first, a legal cleansing and sanctifying to the purifying of the flesh; and secondly, freedom from the punishment which was due to the breach of the law, as it was the rule of conversation to God's people, so much his sacrifice carnally accomplished for him that was admitted thereunto. Now these things being but shadows of good things to come, certainly the sacrifice of Christ did effect spiritually for all them for whom it was a sacrifice, whatever the other could typify out, that is spiritual cleansing by sanctification, and freedom from the guilt of sin, which the places produced do evidently prove. Now whether this is accomplished in all, and for them all, let all that are able judge. Again, Christ by his death and in it is said to bear our sins: so (1 Peter 2:24): His own self bore our sins; where you have, both what he did, bore our sins, he carried them up with him upon the cross, and what he intended, that we being dead unto sin, should live to righteousness, and what was the effect, by his stripes we are healed: which latter as it is taken from the same place of the

Prophet, where our Savior is affirmed to bear our iniquities and to have them laid upon him (Isaiah 53:6, 11), so it is expository of the former, and will tell us what Christ did by bearing our sins, which phrase is more than once used in the Scripture to this purpose. Christ then so bore our iniquities by his death, that by virtue of the stripes and afflictions which he underwent in his offering himself for us; this is certainly procured and effected, that we should go free, and not suffer any of those things which he underwent for us. To which also you may refer all those places which evidently hold out an exchange in this point of suffering between Christ and us (Galatians 3:13): He delivered us from the curse, being made a curse for us, with diverse others which we shall have occasion afterwards to mention. Peace also and reconciliation with God, that is, actual peace by the removal of all enmity on both sides, with all the causes of it, is fully ascribed to this oblation (Colossians 1:21-22): and you that were sometimes alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now has he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and blameless and above reproach in his sight. As also (Ephesians 2:13-16): you who were sometimes far off, are made near by the blood of Christ, for he is our peace, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments, that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby. To which add all those places wherein full deliverances from anger, wrath, death, and him that had the power of it, is likewise asserted as the fruit thereof, as (Romans 5:8-10). And you have a further discovery made of the immediate effect of the death of Christ, peace and reconciliation, deliverance from wrath, enmity, and whatever lay against us to keep us from enjoying the love and favor of God; a re-

demption from all these he effected for his Church with his own blood (Acts 20:28), from which all and every one for whom he died may truly say, Who shall lay anything to our charge? It is God that justifies; who is he that condemns? It is Christ that died, yes, rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us (Romans 8:33-34). Which that they are procured for all and every one of the sons of Adam, that they all may use that rejoicing in full assurance, cannot be made to appear; and yet evident it is that so it is with all for whom he died, that these are the effects of his death in and towards them for whom he underwent it; for by his being slain he redeemed them to God by his blood out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation, and made them Kings and Priests unto our God (Revelation 5:9-10), for he made an end of their sins, he made reconciliation for their iniquity, and brought in everlasting righteousness (Daniel 9:24). Add also those other places, where our life is ascribed to the death of Christ, and then this enumeration will be perfect (John 6:33): he came down from heaven to give life to the world; sure enough he gives life to that world, for which he gave his life; it is the world of his sheep for which he lays down his life (John 10:15), even that he might give unto them eternal life that they might never perish (verse 28). So he appeared to abolish death to bring life and immortality to light (2 Timothy 1:10), as also (Romans 5:4-10). Now there is none of all these places but will afford a sufficient strength against the general ransom or the universality of the merit of Christ. My time will not serve for so large a prosecution of the subject as that would require, and therefore shall take from the whole this general argument. If the death and oblation of Jesus Christ (as a sacrifice to his Father) does sanctify all them for whom

it was a sacrifice, does purge away their sin, redeem them from wrath, curse, and guilt, work for them peace and reconciliation with God, procure for them life and immortality, bearing their iniquities and healing all their diseases, then did he die only for those that are in the event sanctified, purged, redeemed, justified, freed from wrath and death, quickened, saved, etc. But that all are not thus sanctified, freed, etc. is most apparent: and therefore they cannot be said to be the proper object of the death of Christ. The assumption was confirmed before, the inference is plain from scripture experience, and the whole argument (if I mistake not) solid.

Thirdly, many places there are that point out the persons for whom Christ died, as designed peculiarly to be the object of this work of redemption, according to the aim and purpose of God; of which, some we will briefly recount: in some places they are called many. (Matthew 26:28): the blood of the new Testament is shed for many, for the remission of sins: and, by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities (Isaiah 53:11). For the Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve, and give his life a ransom for many (Mark 10:45; Matthew 20:28). He was to bring many sons unto glory, and so was to be the captain of their salvation through suffering (Hebrews 2:10). And though perhaps the word Many itself be not sufficient to restrain the object of Christ's death unto Some, in opposition to All, because Many is sometimes placed absolutely for All, as (Romans 5:19), yet these Many being described in other places to be such, as it is most certain all are not, so it is a full and evident restriction of it; for those Many are the sheep of Christ (John 10:15), the children of God that were scattered abroad (John 11:52), those whom

our Savior calls brothers (Hebrews 2:11), the children that God gave him, which were partakers of flesh and blood (verses 13-14), and frequently those who were given unto him of his Father (John 17), who should certainly be preserved. The sheep whereof he was the shepherd through the blood of the covenant (Hebrews 13:20), his elect (Romans 8:34), and his people (Matthew 1:21), further explained to be his visited and redeemed people (Luke 1:68-69), even the people which he did foreknow (Romans 11:2), even such a people as he is said to have at Corinth before their conversion; his people by election (Acts 18:10), the people that he suffered without the gate, that he might sanctify (Hebrews 13:12), his Church which he redeemed by his own blood (Acts 20:28), which he loved and gave himself for (Ephesians 5:25), the many, whose sins he took away (Hebrews 9:28), with whom he made a Covenant (Daniel 9:24). Those many being thus described, and set forth with such qualifications as by no means are common to all but proper only to the elect, do most evidently appear to be all and only those that are chosen of God, to obtain eternal life through the offering and bloodshedding of Jesus Christ. Many things are here excepted with much confidence and clamor, that may easily be removed. And so you see the end of the death of Christ, as it is set out in the Scripture.

That we may have the clearer passage, we must remove the hindrances that are laid in the way, by some pretended answers, section 6, and evasions used to escape the force of the argument, drawn from the Scripture, affirming Christ to have died for many, his sheep, his elect, and the like. Now to this it is replied, that this reason, as it is called, is weak and of no force, equivocal, subtle, fraudulent, false, ungodly, deceitful and erroneous; for all these

several terms are accumulated to adorn it with (universality of free Grace, page 16). Now this variety of terms, (as I conceive) serves only to declare with what abundance of words the unlearned eloquence of the author is woven with; for such terrible names imposed on that, which we know not well how to contradict, is a strong argument of a weak cause. When the Pharisees were not able to resist the Spirit whereby our Savior spoke, they call him devil and Samaritan. Waters that make a noise are usually but shallow. It is a proverb among the Scythians, that the dogs which bark most, bite least. But let us see what this respondent worthy of such a great opening will bring forth, and hear him speak in his own language, he says then

First, this reason is weak and of no force, for the word 'many,' is often so used, that it both signifies all and every man, and also amplifies or sets forth the greatness of that number, as in (Daniel 12:2; Romans 5:19), and in other places where 'many' cannot, nor is by any Christian understood for less than all men.

Reply: First that if the proof and argument were taken merely from the word many, and not from the annexed description of those many, with the presupposed distinction of all men into several sorts by the purpose of God, this exception would bear some color, but for this see our arguments following: only by the way observe that he that shall divide the inhabitants of any place, as at London, into poor and rich, those that want, and those that abound, afterward affirming that he will bestow his bounty on many at London, on the poor, on those that want, will easily be understood to give it unto, and bestow it upon them only. Secondly, neither of the places quoted prove directly, that many must necessarily in them be taken for all, in (Daniel 12:2) a distribution of the

word to the several parts of the affirmation must be allowed, and not an application of it to the whole, as such: and so the sense is, the dead shall arise, many to life, and many to shame: as in another language it would have been expressed: neither are such Hebraisms unusual, besides perhaps it is not improbable, that many are said to rise to life, because as the Apostle says all shall not die. The like also may be said of (Romans 5:19), though the many there seem to be all, yet certainly they are not called so, with any intent to denote all, with an amplification, (which that many should be to all, is not likely) for there is no comparison there instituted at all, between number, and number, of those that died by Adam's disobedience, and those that were made alive, by the righteousness of Christ, but only in the effects of the sin of Adam, and the righteousness of Christ, together with the way and manner of communicating death, and life from the one and the other, whereunto any consideration of the number of the participants of those effects, is not inserted. Thirdly the other places whereby this should be confirmed, I am confident our Author cannot produce, notwithstanding his free inclination of such a reserve, those being what are in this case commonly urged by Arminians, but if he could, they would be no way material to infringe our argument, as appears by what was said before.

Secondly, this reason (he adds) is equivocal, subtle and fraudulent, seeing where all men and every man is affirmed of, the death of Christ, as the ransom and propitiation, and the fruits thereof only is assumed for them; but where the word many is in any place used in this business, there are more ends of the death of Christ, than this one affirmed of.

Reply 1: It is denied that the death of Christ, in any place of Scripture is said to be for all men, or for every man, which with so much confidence is supposed and imposed on us, as a thing acknowledged. 2. That there is any other end of the death of Christ, besides the fruit of his ransom and propitiation, directly intended, and not by accident attending it, is utterly false; yes, what other end, the ransom paid by Christ, and the atonement made by him, can have but the fruits of them, is not imaginable; the end of any work, is the same with the fruit, effect, or product of it: so that this wild distinction, of the ransom and propitiation of Christ with the fruits of them to be for all, and other ends of his death to be only for many; is an assertion neither equivocal, subtle nor fraudulent. 3. The observation, that where the word many, is used, many ends are designed, but where all are spoken of, there only the ransom is intimated, is, first, disadvantageous to the Author's persuasion, yielding the whole argument in hand, by acknowledging that where many are mentioned, there all cannot be understood, because more ends of the death of Christ, than do belong to all are mentioned, and so confessedly all the other answers, to prove that by many, all, are to be understood, are against the Author's own light. Second, it is frivolous for it cannot be proved, that there are more ends of the death of Christ, besides the fruit of his ransom. Third, it is false, for where the death of Christ is spoken of as for many, he is said to give his life a ransom for them (Matthew 20:28), which are the very words where he is said to die for all (1 Timothy 2:6). What difference is there in these, what ground for this observation? Even such as these are diverse others of that Author's observations: as his whole chapter 10 is spent to prove, that wherever there is mention of the Redemption purchased by

the oblation of Christ, there they for whom it is purchased are always spoken of in the third Person, as by all, the world, or the like, when yet chapter 1 of his book, himself produces many places to prove this general Redemption, where the persons for whom Christ is said to suffer, are mentioned in the first or second persons (1 Peter 2:24; 1 Peter 3:18; Isaiah 53:5-6; 1 Corinthians 15:4; Galatians 3:13, etc.)

Thirdly, He proceeds, this reason is false, and ungodly, for it is nowhere in scripture said, that Christ died or gave himself a ransom but for many, or only for many, or only for his sheep, and it is ungodliness to add to, or diminish from, the words of God in Scripture.

Reply: To pass by the loving terms of the Author, and allowing a grain to make the sense current. First, that Christ affirming that he gave his life for many, for his sheep, being said to die for his Church, and innumerable places of Scripture witnessing, that all men are not of his sheep, of his Church, we argue and conclude, by just and undeniable consequence, that he died not for those who are not so. If this be adding to the word of God, (being only an exposition and unfolding of his mind therein,) whoever spoke from the word of God and was guiltless.

Secondly, let it be observed, that in the very place where our Savior says, that he gave his life for his sheep, he presently adds, that some are not of his sheep (John 10:26), which if it is not equivalent, to his sheep only, I know not which is.

Thirdly, it were easy to recriminate, but

Fourthly, but said he, this reason is deceitful and erroneous, for the scripture does nowhere say that those many he died for are his sheep, (much less his elect as the reason intends it.) As for the place (John 10:15) usually instanced to this end, it is therein much abused, for our Savior (John 10) did not set forth the difference, between such as he died for, and such as he died not for; or such as he died for so and so, and not so and so, but the difference between those that believe on him, and those who believe not on him (verses 4-5, 14, 26-27). One hears his voice and follows him, the other not. Nor did our Savior here set forth the privileges of all he died for, or for whom he died for so and so, but of those that believe on him through the ministration of the Gospel, and so to know him, and approach to God, and enter the Kingdom by him (verses 3-4, 9, 27). Nor was our Savior here setting forth the excellence of those for whom he died, or died for so only, wherein they are preferred before others, but the excellence of his own love, with the fruits thereof, to those (not only that he died for, but also) that are brought in by his ministration to believe on him (verses 11, 27). Nor was our Savior here treating so much of his ransom giving and propitiation making, as of his ministration of the Gospel, and so of his love and faithfulness therein, wherein he laid down his life, for those ministered to, and therein gave us example, not to make propitiation for sin, but to testify love in suffering.

Reply: I am persuaded that nothing but an acquaintedness, with the condition of the times wherein we live can afford me sanctuary from the censure of the Reader to be lavish of precious hours, in considering and transcribing such confused lines, as these last repeated. But yet seeing better cannot be afforded: we must be content, to view such evasions as these, all whose

strength, is in incongruous expressions, incoherent structure, cloudy, windy Phrases, all tending to raise such a mighty fog as that the business in hand might not be perceived, being lost in this smoke and vapor cast out to darken the eyes, and amuse the senses of poor seduced souls. The argument undertaken to be answered, being, that Christ is said to die for many, and those many are described, and designed to be his sheep, as (John 10). What answer I pray or anything like thereunto, is there to be picked out of this confused heap of words which we have recited, so that I might safely pass the whole evasion by, without further observation on it, but only to desire the Reader to observe, how much this one argument presses, and what a nothing, is that heap of confusion which is opposed to it. But yet lest anything should adhere, I will give a few annotations to the place answering the marks wherewith we have noted it; leaving the full vindication of the place, until I come to the pressing of our arguments. I say, then First, that the many Christ died for, were his sheep, was before declared, neither is the place of (John 10) at all abused, our Savior evidently setting forth a difference between them for whom he died, and those for whom he would not die, calling the first his sheep (verse 15), those to whom he would give eternal life (verse 28), those given him by his Father (chapter 17), evidently distinguishing them from others who were not so. Neither is it material what was the primary intention of our Savior in this place from which we do not argue, but from the intention and aim of the words he uses, and the truths he reveals, for that end aimed at, which was the consolation of believers.

Secondly, for the difference between them he died for, so and so, and those he died for so and so, we confess he puts none, for we suppose that this so and so, does neither express, nor intimate

anything that may be suitable to any purpose of God, or intent of our Savior in this business, to us for whom he died he died in the same manner, and for the same end.

Thirdly, We deny, that the primary difference that here is made by our Savior, is between believers and not believers, but between elect and not elect, sheep and not sheep, the thing wherein they are thus differenced, being the believing of the one, called hearing of his voice and knowing him, and the not believing of the other: the foundation of these acts being their different condition, in respect of God's purpose, and Christ's love, as is apparent from the antithesis and opposition which you have in (verses 26-27): you believe not because you are not of my sheep, and my sheep hear my voice: first, there is a distinction put in the act, of believing, and hearing, (that is, therewithal to obey) and then is the foundation of this distinction asserted, from their distinguished state and condition, the one being not his sheep, the other being so, even them whom he loved, and gave his life for.

Fourthly, first it is nothing to the business before us, what privileges our Savior here expresses, our question is for whom he says he would give his life, and that only. Second, this frequent repetition of that useless, so and so, serves for nothing but to puzzle the poor ignorant Reader. Third, we deny that Christ died for any but those who shall certainly be brought unto him by the ministration of the Gospel. So that there is not a distinction between only those whom he died for, but also those that are brought in unto him, for he died for his sheep, and his sheep hear his voice, they for whom he died, and those that come into him, may receive different qualifications, but they are not several persons. Fifth, first the question is not at all, to what end our Savior here makes mention of his

death, but for whom he died, who are expressly said to be his sheep, which all are not. Second, his intention is to declare the giving of his life for a ransom, and that according to the commandment received of his Father (verse 18). Sixth, first, the love and faithfulness of Jesus Christ, in the ministration of the Gospel, that is, his performing the office of the Mediator of the New Covenant, is seen in nothing more, than in giving his life for a ransom (John 15:13). Second, here is not one word of giving us an example, though in laying down his life he did that also, yet here it is not improved to that purpose. From these brief annotations I doubt not, but that it is apparent, that that long discourse before recited, is nothing but a miserable mistaking of the text and question, which the Author perhaps perceiving, he adds diverse other evasions which follow.

Besides, (said he) the opposition appears here to be, not so much between elect, and not elect, as between Jews called and Gentiles uncalled.

Reply: the opposition is between sheep and not sheep, and that with reference to their election, and not to their vocation: now who would he have signified by the not sheep? Those that were not called, the Gentiles, that is against the text, terming them sheep, that is in designation, though not as yet called (verse 9), and who are the called, the Jews? True they were then outwardly called, yet many of them were not sheep (verse 26). Now truly such evasions from the force of truth as this, by so foul corrupting of the word of God, is no small provocation of the eye of his glory. But he adds.

Besides, there is in Scripture, great difference between sheep, and sheep of his flock and pasture, of which he here speaks (verses 4-5, 11, 15-16).

Reply: First, this unrighteous distinction well explained must needs no doubt, (if any know how) give a great deal of light to the business in hand. Second, if there be a distance to be allowed, it can be nothing, but that the sheep who are simply so called, are those who are only so to Christ, from the donation of his Father, and the sheep of his pasture, those who by the effectual working of the Spirit are actually brought home to Christ, and then of both sorts we have mention in this chapter (verse 16; verse 27), both making up the number of those sheep for whom he gave his life, to whom he gives life. But he proceeds;

Besides, (said he) sheep (verses 4-5, 11, 15) are not mentioned, as all those for whom he died, but as those who by his Ministration are brought in to believe, and enjoy the benefit of his death, and to whom he ministers and communicates the Spirit.

Reply 1: the substance of this and the other exceptions is that by sheep is meant Believers, which is contrary to (verse 9, 16) calling them sheep who are not as yet gathered to his fold. Second, that his sheep are not mentioned as those for whom he died, is in terms contradictory to (verse 15): I lay down my life for my sheep. Third, between those for whom he died; and those whom he brings in, by the ministration of his Spirit, there is no more difference, than is between Peter, James and John, and the three Apostles that were in the Mount with our Savior at his Transfiguration. This is childish sophistry to beg the thing in question, and thrust in, the opinion controverted into the room of an answer. Fourth, that bringing in, which is here mentioned to believe and enjoy the benefit of the death of Christ, is a most special fruit and benefit of that

death, certainly to be conferred on all them for whom he died, or else most certainly his death will do them no good at all. Once more and we have done.

Besides, here is more ends of his death mentioned, than ransom or propitiation only, and yet it is not said only for his sheep, and when the ransom or propitiation only is mentioned, it is said for all men. So that this reason appears weak, fraudulent, ungodly and erroneous.

Reply 1: here is no word mentioned nor intimated of the death of Christ, but only that which was accomplished by his being a propitiation, and making his death a ransom for us, with the fruits which certainly and infallibly spring therefrom. Second, if more ends, than one of the death of Christ are here mentioned, and such as belong not unto all, why do you deny, that he speaks here of his Sheep only? Take heed, or you will see the truth. Third, where it is said of all men, I know not, but this I am sure that Christ is said to give his life a ransom, and that only mentioned where it is not said for all, as (Matthew 20:28; Mark 10:45), and so from those brief annotations I hope any impartial Reader will be able to judge, whether the reason opposed, or the exceptions against it devised, be to be accounted weak, fraudulent, ungodly and erroneous.

Although I fear that in the particular I have already encroached, section 7, upon the Reader's patience, yet I cannot let pass the Discourse immediately following in the same Author, to those exceptions which we last removed, laid by him against the arguments we had in hand without a note, as also an observation of his great abilities, to cast down a man of straw, which himself had set up to manifest his skill in its destruction. To the preceding discourse he adds another exception which he imposes on those

that oppose universal redemption, as though it were laid by them against the understanding of the general expressions in the Scripture in that way and sense wherein he conceives them; and it is, that those words were fitted for the time of Christ and his Apostles, having another meaning in them than they seem to import. Now having thus neatly trimmed and set up this man of straw, to whose framing I dare boldly say, not one of his adversaries did ever contribute a penful of ink, to show his rare skill, he charges it with I know not how many errors, blasphemies, lies, set on with exclamations, and vehement outcries, until it tumbles to the ground. Had he not sometimes answered an argument, he would have been thought a most unhappy disputant. Now to make sure that once he would do it, I believe he was very careful that the objection of his own framing, should not be too strong for his own defacing. In the meantime, how blind are they, who admire him for a combatant, who is skillful, only at fencing with his own shadow, and yet with such empty janglings as these, proving what none denies, answering what none objects, is the greatest part of Mr. More's book stuffed.

CHAPTER 4



Further reasons confirming the preceding discourse will be deferred until we come to oppose the arguments for the general ransom. For now it will suffice to remove that general answer which is usually given to the scripture passages we have produced — an answer that our adversaries use as a catchall defense for all the weight brought against them. They say that in the offering of Christ, and regarding the good things procured by him, two things are to be considered: first, the obtaining or obtaining of them; and second, the application of them to particular persons. The first, they say, is general in respect of all — Christ obtained and procured all good things by his death from his Father: reconciliation, redemption, forgiveness of sins, for all and every person in the world, if they will believe and lay hold upon him. But in respect of application, these are actually bestowed and conferred on only a few, because only a few believe, which is the condition on which they are bestowed. In this latter sense, they say, all the scripture texts we have argued from are to be understood — so that they do not at all challenge the universality of merit they assert, but only the universality of application, which they also deny. Now

this answer is commonly set forth by them in various terms and diverse expressions, according to what seems best to those who use it and most suited to their several positions.

First, some of them say that Christ by his death and passion did absolutely — according to the intention of God — purchase for all and every person: remission of sins and reconciliation with God, or a restoration into a state of grace and favor, all of which shall actually benefit them provided that they believe. So the Arminians.

Second, others say that Christ died for all indeed, but conditionally for some — if they do believe, or will do so (which he knows they cannot of themselves) — and absolutely for his own, even those on whom he purposes to bestow faith and grace, so that they actually become possessors of the good things purchased by him. So Cameron and the divines of France who follow the new method he devised.

Third, some distinguish between a twofold reconciliation and redemption: one wrought by Christ with God for man, which they say is general for all and every person; and a second, a reconciliation wrought by Christ in man toward God, bringing them actually into peace with him.

And there are various other ways in which people express their conceptions in this matter. The sum of it all comes to this, and the weight of it all rests on that distinction just recounted — namely, that in respect of obtaining, Christ secured redemption and reconciliation for all; but in respect of application, it is bestowed only on those who believe and continue therein. Their arguments for the generality of the ransom and universality of the reconciliation will

be considered afterward; for now we address only the distinction itself, the meaning and misapplication of which will be briefly declared.

First, the true nature and meaning of this distinction and its true use: we acknowledge that it may be used in a sound sense and right meaning, however it is expressed — whether by obtaining and application, or by procuring reconciliation with God and working reconciliation in us. By obtaining, we mean the meritorious purchase of all good things made by Christ for us, with and of his Father; by application, we mean the actual enjoyment of those good things upon our believing. As an illustration: if a man pays a price for redeeming captives, the paying of the price fills the role of the obtaining we speak of, and the freeing of the captives is as the application of it. Yet here we must observe the following things.

First, that this distinction has no place in the intention and purpose of Christ, but only in respect of the things procured by him; for in his purpose, both are united, his full end and aim being to deliver us from all evil and procure all good to be actually bestowed on us; but in respect of the things themselves, they may be considered either as procured by Christ or as bestowed on us.

Second, that the will of God is not at all conditional in this matter, as though he gave Christ to obtain peace, reconciliation, and forgiveness of sins on condition that we believe. There is a condition in the things, but none in the will of God — that is absolute, that such things should both be procured and bestowed.

Third, that not all the things Christ obtained for us are bestowed on condition — some are bestowed absolutely. And as for those that are bestowed on condition, the condition on which they

are bestowed is actually purchased and procured for us not on any condition, but solely by virtue of the purchase. For instance: Christ has purchased remission of sins and eternal life for us, to be enjoyed on our believing — upon the condition of faith. But faith itself, which is the condition on whose performance they are bestowed, he has procured for us absolutely, on no condition at all; for whatever condition might be proposed on which the Lord would bestow faith, I will afterward show it to be vain and circular.

Fourth, that both obtaining and application have for their objects the same individual persons — that is, for whomever Christ obtained any good thing by his death, to them it shall certainly be applied and actually bestowed; so that it cannot be said that he obtained anything for any one person that that person shall not or does not in due time enjoy. For whomever he worked reconciliation with God, in them does he work reconciliation toward God; the one is not extended to some to whom the other does not reach. Now because once this is established the opposing interpretation and misapplication of the distinction vanishes, it will be briefly confirmed with reasons.

First, if the application of the good things procured is the end for which they are procured — the very reason Christ obtains them — then they must be applied to all for whom they are obtained. Otherwise Christ fails in his end and aim, which must not be granted. That this application was the end of the obtaining of all good things for us appears, first, because if it were otherwise, and Christ did not aim at applying them but only at obtaining them, then the death of Christ might have had its full effect and issue without the application of redemption and salvation to any soul at all — that not being aimed at. And so, notwithstanding all he did

for us, every soul in the world might have perished eternally. Whether this can stand with the dignity and sufficiency of his offering, with the purpose of his Father, and his own intention — who came into the world to save sinners, to seek that which was lost, and to bring many sons to glory — let all judge. Second, God in the act of sending his Son, laying the weight of iniquity upon him, and giving him up to an accursed death, must be said to have been altogether uncertain what outcome all this would have in respect of us. For did he intend that we should be saved by it? Then the application of it is what he aimed at, as we assert. Did he not? Then certainly he was uncertain what end it would have — which is blasphemy, utterly contrary to scripture and right reason. Did he appoint a Savior without thought of those to be saved? A Redeemer without determining who would be redeemed? Did he resolve on a means without determining the end? This is an assertion opposed to all the glorious perfections of God.

Second, if what is obtained for any person becomes theirs by right, by virtue of the action by which it is obtained, then for whomever anything is obtained by Christ, it is to them applied. For what is theirs in right must be made theirs in fact. But it is most certain that whatever is obtained for any person belongs to them by right for whom it is obtained. The very sense of the word — whether you call it merit, obtaining, purchase, acquisition, or procuring — speaks of a right in those for whose good the merit was effected and the purchase made. Can something be said to be obtained for me that is in no way mine? When I obtain anything by prayer or entreaty from another, once obtained it is my own. What is obtained by one person is granted by the one from whom it is obtained, and if granted, it is granted to those for whom it was ob-

tained. But, it will be objected, it is obtained conditionally, and until the condition is fulfilled no right accrues. I answer: if this condition is equally purchased and obtained along with the other things that are to be bestowed upon that condition, then this does not prevent everything procured from being applied. But if it is uncertain whether this condition will be fulfilled or not, then first, this makes God uncertain what end the death of his Son will have; and second, this does not answer but rather denies the very thing we are in the process of proving, which is thereby confirmed.

Third, because scripture perpetually conjoins these two things together and will not permit us to separate them so that the one belongs to some and not to others, as though they could have different persons as their objects. Isaiah 53:11: 'By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many' — there is the application of all good things — 'for he shall bear their iniquities' — there is the obtaining. He justifies all whose iniquities he bore. Also verse 5 of that chapter: 'But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed.' His wounding and our healing, obtaining and application, his chastisement and our peace are inseparably joined. So Romans 4:25: 'He was delivered for our offenses and was raised again for our justification.' So Romans 5:18: 'By the righteousness of one' — that is, his obtaining — 'the free gift comes upon all men to justification of life' — there is the application. See there who are called 'all men.' Most clearly, Romans 8:32-34: 'He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifies; who is he that condemns? It is Christ that died, yes rather that

is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us.' From these words we have several reasons for our position. First, that for whom God gives his Son, to them in him he freely gives all things — therefore all things obtained by his death must be bestowed, and are, on those for whom he died (verse 32). Second, those for whom Christ died are justified, are God's elect, cannot be condemned, nor can anything be laid to their charge — all he has purchased for them must be applied to them, for it is by virtue thereof that they are so saved (verses 33-34). Third, for whom Christ died, for them he makes intercession. Now his intercession is for the application of those things, as is conceded, and in this he is always heard. Those to whom the one belongs, theirs also is the other. So John 10:10: the coming of Christ is that his sheep might have life and have it abundantly; also 1 John 4:9; and Hebrews 10:10: 'by which will we are sanctified' — that is the application — 'through the offering of the body of Jesus' — that is the means of obtaining — 'for by one offering he has perfected them that are sanctified' (Hebrews 10:14). In brief, it is proved by all those passages which we produced to properly identify the end of the death of Christ. So this may be rested on as firm and immovable: the obtaining of good things by Christ and the application of them concern the same individual persons.

Second, we may consider the meaning of those who seek to maintain universal redemption by this distinction, and to what use they apply it. Christ, they say, died for all people, and by his death purchased reconciliation with God for them, and forgiveness of sins — which is applied to some, who thereby actually become reconciled to God and have their sins forgiven, but not to others, who therefore perish in a state of unreconciliation and enmity under

the guilt of their sins. This application, they say, is not procured or purchased by Christ — for then, he dying for all, all must be actually reconciled and have their sins forgiven and be saved. Rather, it depends on the fulfillment of the condition God has been pleased to prescribe for them — that is, believing. Some say this condition can be performed by our own strength, at least by direct consequence if not in express terms; others deny this and hold that God must give it. So when scripture says that Christ has reconciled us to God, redeemed us, saved us by his blood, undergone the punishment of our sins, and thereby made satisfaction for us, they assert that no more is meant than that Christ did what, upon the fulfillment of the required condition, will result in these things. To the death of Christ they indeed assign many glorious things, but what they give with one hand they take away with the other — by suspending the enjoyment of these things on a condition to be fulfilled by us and not procured by him. They expressly assert that the proper and full end of the death of Christ was the doing of what would enable God — his justice being satisfied — to save sinners if he would, and on whatever condition pleased him. Thus a door of grace might be opened to all who would enter, but not that actual justification, remission of sins, life, and immortality were procured by him — only a possibility of those things. Now, so that all the error lying under this exposition may be more fully apparent, the whole mind of those who use it will be set down in a few assertions.

First, God, they say, considering all humanity as fallen in Adam and utterly excluded from attaining salvation by the covenant of works, yet by his infinite goodness was inclined to desire the happiness of them all — that they might be delivered from

misery and brought to himself. This inclination they call his universal love and antecedent will, by which he would earnestly desire them all to be saved, and out of this love he sends Christ.

That God has any natural or necessary inclination, by his goodness or any other attribute, to do good to us or to any of his creatures, we deny. Everything that concerns us is an act of his free will and good pleasure, not a natural or necessary act of his deity, as will be declared.

Second, ascribing an antecedent conditional will to God — whose fulfillment and accomplishment would depend on any free contingent act or work of ours — is injurious to his wisdom, power, and sovereignty, and cannot easily be excused from blasphemy. It is contrary to Romans 9:19: 'Who has resisted his will?'

Third, a common affection and inclination to do good to all does not seem to express the freedom, fullness, and dimensions of that most intense love of God which scripture asserts to be the cause of sending his Son. John 3:16: 'God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son.' Ephesians 1:6: 'Having made known to us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he has purposed in himself.' Colossians 1:19: 'It pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell.' Romans 5:8: 'God commended his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' These two points will, the Lord willing, be fully clarified if the Lord gives life and strength, and his people encouragement, to continue through the second part of this controversy.

Fourth, we deny that all humanity is the object of that love of God which moved him to send his Son to die. God has made some for the day of evil (Proverbs 16:4), hated them before they were

born (Romans 9:12), long before ordained them to condemnation (Jude 4), fitted them for destruction (Romans 9:22), made them to be taken and destroyed (2 Peter 2:12), appointed them to condemnation (1 Thessalonians 5:9), and to go to their own place (Acts 1:25).

Second, the justice of God being injured by sin, unless something were done to satisfy it, that love of God by which he wills good to all sinners could in no way be brought into act, but must have its eternal residence in the bosom of God without producing any effect.

That neither scripture nor right reason will compel or prove an utter and absolute lack of power in God to save sinners by his own absolute will without satisfaction to his justice — supposing his purpose that it should be so — is granted. Indeed, without such a purpose it could not be otherwise, but certainly he could have effected it; it does not imply any violation of his holy nature.

An actual and necessary inclination toward doing something that cannot possibly be accomplished without some work fulfilled outwardly by him is opposed to his eternal blessedness and all-sufficiency.

Third, God therefore, to fulfill that general love and goodwill of his toward all, and so that it might put itself forth in such a way as seemed good to him, sent his Son into the world to die — thereby satisfying his justice, which stood in the way and was the only hindrance.

The failure of this assertion will be laid out when we come to declare that love of which the sending of Christ was the proper issue and effect.

Fourth, therefore the proper and immediate end and aim of God's purpose in sending his Son to die for all people was — in Arminius's view — that he might in whatever way he pleased save sinners, his justice which had been the hindrance now being satisfied; or — in Corvinus's view — that he might will to save sinners. And the intention of Christ was to make such satisfaction to the justice of God that he might obtain for himself a power of saving, upon whatever conditions seemed good to his Father to prescribe.

Whether this was the intention of the Father in sending his Son, let it be judged. Something was said earlier upon examining those passages of scripture which describe his purpose; let it be determined from them whether God in sending his Son intended to procure for himself a liberty to save us if he would, or to obtain certain salvation for his elect.

That such a possibility of salvation — or at most a velleity, a willing of it upon an uncertain condition to be fulfilled by us — should be the full, proper, and only immediate end of the death of Christ will scarcely sit well with tender spirits.

The expression of procuring for himself ability to save upon a condition to be prescribed does not seem to answer that certain purpose of our Savior in laying down his life, which scripture says was to save his sheep and to bring many sons to glory, as shown before; nor has it any ground in scripture.

Fifth, Christ therefore obtained for all and every one reconciliation with God, remission of sins, life and salvation — not that they should actually be partakers of these things, but so that God (his justice now no longer hindering) might and would prescribe a condition to be fulfilled by them, whereupon he would actually apply it

and make them partakers of all the good things purchased by Christ. And here enters their distinction of obtaining and application, which was intimated earlier, and on the explication of this assertion they are wonderfully divided.

Some say that this proceeds so far that all people are thereby received into a new covenant — in which Adam was a common person as well as in his fall from the old — and that all are again restored in him, so that none shall be damned who do not actually sin against the condition in which they are born and fall from the state into which all are assumed through the death of Christ. So Borrius, Corvinus, and one of late who in plain terms says that all are reconciled, redeemed, saved, and justified in Christ. But others, more cautiously, deny this and assert that by nature we are all children of wrath, and that until we come to Christ the wrath of God abides on all, so that it is not actually removed from any.

Again, some say that Christ by this satisfaction removed original sin in all, and consequently only that — so that all infants, even of Turks and pagans outside the covenant, dying before the use of reason, must undoubtedly be saved. But others, more cautiously observing that the blood of Christ is said to purge all our sins (1 John 1:8; 1 Peter 1:18; Isaiah 53:6), say he died for all sins alike — absolutely for none, but conditionally for all. Further, some affirm that after the satisfaction of Christ it was absolutely undetermined what condition should be prescribed, so that the Lord might have reduced all again to the law and covenant of works. Others say that procuring a new way of salvation by faith was part of the fruit of the death of Christ.

Again, some of them hold that the prescribed condition is to be performed by our own strength, with the help of such means as God is at all times and in all places ready to afford to all. Others deny this and affirm that effectual grace flowing peculiarly from election is necessary for believing — the first establishing the idol of free will to maintain their own assertion, the others overthrowing their own assertion for the establishment of grace. So Amyraut, Cameron, etc.

Moreover, some say that God's love in sending Christ is equal to all. Others go a degree higher and maintain an inequality in the love of God, although he sent his Son to die for all — and though no greater love can there be than that whereby the Lord sent his Son to die for us (Romans 8:32) — yet they say Christ purchased a greater good for some and less for others. And here they involve themselves in innumerable strange distinctions, or rather as one calls them, 'extinctions' — blotting out all sense, reason, and true meaning of scripture. Hence that multiplicity of several ends of the death of Christ, with Christ dying for some in one way and others in another, hiding themselves in innumerable unintelligible expressions, making it most difficult to know what they mean and harder to find their mind than to answer their reasons.

In one particular they agree well enough — namely, in denying that faith is procured or merited for us by the death of Christ. So far they are all consistent with their own principles, for once to grant it would overturn the whole structure of universal redemption. But in assigning the cause of faith they go in different directions again.

Some say God sent Christ to die for all, but only conditionally — if they did and would believe — as though if they believed, Christ died for them, and if not, he did not, thereby making the act the cause of its own object. Others say he died absolutely for all, to procure all good things for them, which yet they should not enjoy until they fulfill the prescribed condition. Yet all conclude that in his death Christ had no more respect to the elect than to others — not to sustain their persons or to stand in their place — but that he was a public person standing in the place of all humanity.

Concerning the final outcome and immediate product of the death of Christ, various writers have expressed themselves differently. Some locate it in the power of God, some in his will, some in the opening of a door of grace, some in a right Christ purchased for himself to save whom he pleased. Some say that in respect of us he had no end at all, so that all humanity might have perished after he had done everything. Others devise several distinct ends of this one act of Christ, corresponding to the diversity of the persons for whom he died — whom they grant to be distinguished and differentiated by a prior decree. But to what purpose the Lord should send his Son to die for those whom he himself had determined not to save, but at least to pass by and leave to irremedial ruin for their sins, is not apparent — nor is the meaning of the twofold destination invented by some. Such is the powerful force and evidence of truth that it scatters all its opponents and makes them flee to various hiding places. Those who are not willing to yield and submit themselves shall surely lie down in darkness and error. Truth has no need of intricate and involved distinctions; it does not compel its defenders to such poor shifts and devices; it needs no windings and turnings to bring itself into a defensible posture. It is not liable

to self-contradiction in its own fundamentals. Without any further qualifications, the whole of it in this matter may be summed up as follows.

God, out of his infinite love to his elect, sent his dear Son in the fullness of time — whom he had promised at the beginning of the world, and made effectual through that promise — to die and pay a ransom of infinite value and dignity, for the purchasing of eternal redemption and the bringing to himself of all and every one of those whom he had before ordained to eternal life, for the praise of his own glory. So that freedom from all the evil from which we are delivered, and enjoyment of all the good things bestowed on us in our passage from death to life, from wrath and hell to heaven and glory, are the proper issues and effects of the death of Christ as the meritorious cause of them all. This may be clarified in all its parts by the following assertions.

First, the fountain and cause of God's sending Christ is his eternal love to his elect and to them alone — which will not be further confirmed here, being reserved for the second general heading of this whole controversy.

Second, the value, worth, and dignity of the ransom which Christ gave himself to be, and of the price which he paid, was infinite and immeasurable — fit for the accomplishing of any end and the procuring of any good for all and every one for whom it was intended, had there been millions more than were ever created. Of this also more will be said later. See Acts 20:28: 'God purchased his church with his own blood'; 1 Peter 1:18: 'redeemed not with silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ' — answering the mind and intention of Almighty God. John 14:31: 'As the Father gave me commandment, so I do' — he who would have such

a price paid as might be the foundation of that economy and dispensation of his love and grace which he intended, and of the way by which he would have it dispensed. Acts 13:38-39: 'Through this man is preached to you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which you could not be justified by the law of Moses.' 2 Corinthians 5:20-21: 'We are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be reconciled to God — for he has made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.'

Third, the intention and aim of the Father in this great work was the bringing of those many sons to glory — namely, his elect, whom by his free grace he had chosen from among all people, of all sorts, nations, and conditions — to take them into a new covenant of grace with himself, the former being as to them in respect of the outcome null and abolished. Of this covenant Jesus Christ is the first and chief promise, as the one who was to procure for them all other good things promised in it, as shall be proved.

Fourth, the things purchased or procured for those persons — which are the proper effects of the death and ransom of Christ, certainly to become theirs in possession and enjoyment in due time — are remission of sin, freedom from wrath and the curse of the law, justification, sanctification, reconciliation with God, and eternal life. For the will of his Father in sending him for these things, his own intention in laying down his life for them, and the truth of the purchase made by him, is the foundation of his intercession — begun on earth and continued in heaven — whereby he whom his Father always hears desires and demands that the good things procured by him may actually be bestowed on all and every one for

whom they were procured. So the whole of what we assert in this great matter is exceedingly clear and apparent, without any intricacy or the least difficulty at all — not clouded with strange expressions and unnecessary divisions and tearings of one thing from another, as is the opposing opinion. That opposing opinion will in the next part be dealt with by arguments confirming the one and overturning the other. But because its whole strength lies in, and the weight of it all rests on, that one distinction of which we spoke earlier — variously expressed and maintained by our adversaries — it will be considered a little further, and then we will come to our arguments and afterward to the answering of the objections raised against them.

CHAPTER 5



The allowable use of this distinction — how it may be taken in a sound sense, the various ways people have expressed what the phrase intimates, and some arguments for overturning the false use of it however expressed — have already been stated and declared. Now since this is the main support of the opposing opinion, understood in the sense and according to the use they make of it, one further blow will be given to it, and it is hoped left dying. It will be briefly declared that although these two things may admit of a distinction, they cannot admit of a separation — so that for whomever Christ obtained good, to them it might be applied, and for whomever he worked reconciliation with God, they must actually be reconciled to God. Thus the blood of Christ and his death, in the virtue of it, cannot be viewed as a medicine in a box laid up for all who shall come to take some of it — applied now to one, then to another, without any respect or difference, as though it were intended no more for one than for another. That would mean that although he has obtained all the good he purchased for us, it remains uncertain whether it shall ever be ours. For it is well known that notwithstanding all those glorious things assigned by the Arminians to the death of Christ — which they say he purchased for all, such as remission of sins, reconciliation with

God, and the like — yet those for whom this purchase and procurement was made may be damned, as the greatest part both are and certainly shall be. Now that there should be such a distance between these two things:

First, it is contrary to common sense and our ordinary way of speaking, which must be twisted and our understanding forced in order to comprehend it. When a person has obtained an office, or another has obtained it for him, can it be said that it is uncertain whether he shall have it or not? If it is obtained for him, is it not his by right, though perhaps not yet in possession? What is obtained by petition is his by whom it is obtained. It is to offer violence to common sense to say a thing may or may not belong to a man when it has been obtained for him — for in so saying we declare that it is his. And so it is with the purchase made by Jesus Christ and the good things obtained by him for all those for whom he died.

Second, it is contrary to all reason that the death of Christ, in God's intention, should be applied to anyone who shall have no share in the merits of that death. God's will that Christ should die for any person is his intention that that person shall have a share in the death of Christ — that it should belong to him, that is, be applied to him. For in this context, what is said to be applied to any is what is theirs in any respect according to the will of God. But according to the opinion we oppose, the death of Christ is said to be applied to all, and yet the fruits of this death are never once made known to by far the greatest part of that 'all.'

Second, that a ransom should be paid for captives by compact for their deliverance, and yet upon that payment those captives not be made free and set at liberty — this seems strange and very im-

probable. The death of Christ is a ransom (Matthew 20:28), paid by compact for the deliverance of captives for whom it was a ransom. The promise in which his Father stood engaged to him at his undertaking to be a Savior and undergoing the office imposed on him was their deliverance, as was before declared. Upon his performance of these things, that the greatest number of these captives should never be released seems very unlikely.

Third, it is contrary to scripture, as was at large declared before. See chapter 10.

But now all this our adversaries suppose they shall brush aside with one slight distinction that will, as they say, make all we affirm on this point vanish. And it is this: it is true, they say, that all things absolutely procured and obtained for any person at once become theirs by right for whom they are obtained. But things obtained upon condition do not become theirs until the condition is fulfilled. Now Christ has purchased by his death for all persons all good things — not absolutely, but upon condition — and until that condition is fulfilled, unless they perform what is required, they have neither part nor portion, right nor possession of them. What this condition is they state in various terms: some call it 'not resisting this redemption offered to them'; some, 'yielding to the invitation of the gospel'; some in plain terms, 'faith.' Now suppose Christ did purchase all things for us to be bestowed on this condition, that we believe. Then I affirm the following. First, certainly this condition ought to be revealed to all for whom this purchase was made, if it was seriously intended for them. All for whom he died must have means to know that his death will benefit them if they believe — especially since it is in his power alone to grant them those means, he who intends good to them by his death. If I were

to obtain a physician's promise to cure all who came to him, but left many ignorant of this grant — when no one but I could inform them of it, so that they might go to him and be healed — could I be supposed to intend their healing? Doubtless not; the application is easy. Second, this condition required of them is either in their power to perform, or it is not. If it is, then all people have power to believe — which is false. If it is not, then the Lord will either grant them grace to perform it, or he will not. If he will, then why do not all believe? Why are not all saved? If he will not, then this obtaining of salvation and redemption for all by the blood of Jesus Christ comes at length to this: God intended that Christ should die for all, to procure for them remission of sins, reconciliation with him, eternal redemption and glory — but yet so that they shall never have the least benefit from these glorious things, unless they perform what he knows they are in no way able to do, and which none but he himself can enable them to perform, and which concerning the greatest part of them he is resolved not to do. Is this to intend that Christ should die for them, for their good? Or rather that he should die for them to expose them to shame and misery? Is it not the same as if a man were to promise a blind man a thousand pounds upon condition that he will see? Third, this condition of faith is either procured for us by the death of Christ, or it is not. If they say it is not, then the chief grace — without which redemption itself, however expressed, is of no value — does not depend on the grace of Christ as its meritorious and procuring cause. This is, first, exceedingly dishonoring to our blessed Savior and serves only to diminish the honor and love due to him. Second, it is contrary to scripture. Titus 3:5-6; 2 Corinthians 5:21: 'He became sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him' — and

how we can become the righteousness of God except through believing, is not clear. Indeed the Apostle expressly says: 'It is given to us, for Christ's sake, to believe on him' (Philippians 1:29). God blessing us with all spiritual blessings in him (Ephesians 1:3) — of which faith is surely not the least. If faith is a fruit of the death of Christ, why is it not bestowed on all, since he died for all? Especially since the whole obtaining of redemption is altogether unprofitable without it? If they invent a condition upon which faith is bestowed, the vanity of that will be discovered later. For now, if the condition is that they do not refuse or resist the means of grace, then I ask: if the fruit of the death of Christ is to be applied to all who fulfill this condition of not resisting the means of grace, then either the answer is no — in which case why produce this condition at all? — or the answer is yes, in which case all must be saved who have not and do not resist the means of grace — that is, all pagans, unbelievers, and those infants to whom the gospel was never preached. Fourth, this whole assertion tends to make Christ only half a mediator — one who procures the end but not the means leading to it. So notwithstanding this exception and new distinction, our assertion stands firm: the fruits of the death of Christ in respect of obtaining good and applying it to us ought not to be divided, and our arguments confirming this are unshaken. For a conclusion of all: what we affirm in this matter may be summed up thus. Christ did not die for any upon condition if they believe, but he died for all God's elect that they should believe, and believing have eternal life. Faith itself is among the principal effects and fruits of the death of Christ, as shall be declared. It is nowhere said in scripture, nor can it reasonably be affirmed, that if we believe, Christ died for us — as though our believing should

make to be what otherwise was not, the act creating its own object. Rather, Christ died for us that we might believe. Salvation indeed is bestowed conditionally, but faith which is the condition is absolutely procured. The question being thus stated, the difference laid open, and the matter in controversy made known, we proceed in the next place to draw forth some of those arguments, demonstrations, testimonies, and proofs by which the truth we maintain is established, in which it is contained, and upon which it is firmly founded. Only this request to the reader: retain in mind some notion of those fundamentals which in general were laid down before, for they stand in such relation to the arguments that follow, that not one of those arguments can be thoroughly answered before those fundamentals are overturned.

CHAPTER 1



The first argument may be taken from the nature of the covenant of grace, which was established, ratified, and confirmed in and by the death of Christ. That was the testament of which he was the testator, ratified in his death — which is why his blood is called the blood of the new testament (Matthew 26:28). No effects of the covenant can be extended beyond its compass. But now this covenant was not made universally with all, but particularly only with some — and therefore those alone were intended in the benefits of the death of Christ. The assumption appears from the very nature of the covenant itself, described clearly in Jeremiah 31:31-32: 'I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah — not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, which my covenant they broke, though I was a husband to them, says the Lord.' And Hebrews 8:9-11: 'Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, says the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my laws in their mind and write

them in their hearts, and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people; and they shall not teach every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest.' Wherein, first, the condition of the covenant is not said to be required of them — it is absolutely promised: 'I will put my fear in their hearts.' And this is the main difference between the old covenant of works and the new covenant of grace: in the former, the Lord only required the fulfillment of the prescribed condition; in the latter, he promises to effect it himself in those with whom the covenant is made. Without this spiritual efficacy the new covenant would be as weak and unprofitable for the end of a covenant — the bringing and binding of us to God — as the old. For in what did the weakness and unprofitableness of the old covenant consist, for which God in his mercy abolished it? Was it not in this — that by reason of sin we were in no way able to fulfill its condition, 'Do this and live'? The connection remains true: he who does these things shall live. But are we of ourselves any more able to fulfill the condition of the new covenant? Is it not as easy for a person by his own strength to fulfill the whole law as to repent and savingly believe the promise of the gospel? This then is one main difference between these two covenants: in the old the Lord only required the condition; in the new, he will also effect it in all the members of the covenant to whom this covenant is extended. If the Lord were only to exact the obedience required in the covenant from us and not also to work and effect it in us, the new covenant would be a show to increase our misery, not a sincere imparting and communicating of grace and mercy. If then this is the nature of the new testament, as appears from its very words, and might be abundantly proved —

namely, that the condition of the covenant shall certainly by free grace be worked and accomplished in all who are taken into covenant — then no more are in this covenant than those in whom those conditions of it are effected. But it is apparent that this is not the case with all, for all people do not have faith; it belongs to God's elect. Therefore the covenant is not made with all, nor is its compass to be extended beyond the remnant that are according to election. Indeed, every blessing of the new covenant being certainly shared and to be communicated to all the covenant members, either faith is not one of those blessings, or all must have it, if the covenant itself is general. But some may say that God does promise to write his law in our hearts and put his fear in our inner parts — but upon condition. Name that condition, and the argument will be conceded. Is it 'if they believe'? Nothing else can be imagined. That is: if they have the law written in their hearts (as every believer has), then God promises to write his law in their hearts. Is this likely? I cannot then be persuaded that God has made a covenant of grace with all — especially with those who never heard a word of covenant, grace, or its condition — much less received grace for fulfilling the condition, without which the whole would be altogether unprofitable and useless. The covenant was made with Adam and he was acquainted with it (Genesis 3:15); renewed with Noah and not hidden from him; again established with Abraham, accompanied with a full and rich declaration of its chief promises (Genesis 12) — which is most certainly not to be effected toward all, as will afterward appear. Indeed, that first distinction between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent is sufficient to overthrow the pretended universality of the covenant of grace. For who dares affirm that God entered into a

covenant of grace with the seed of the serpent? Most apparent it is, then, that the new covenant of grace and all its promises are of distinguishing mercy, restricted to the people whom God foreknew — and therefore not extended universally to all. Now the blood of Jesus Christ being the blood of this covenant, and his offering intended only for the procurement of the good things intended and promised in it — for he was the surety of that covenant (Hebrews 7:22) and of that alone — it cannot be conceived to have respect to all, or to any but those who are intended in this covenant.

If the Lord intended that Christ should — and that by his death he did — procure pardon of sin and reconciliation with God for all and every person, to be actually enjoyed upon condition that they believe, then this good will and intention of God, with this purchase on their behalf by Jesus Christ, ought to be made known to them through the word, so that they might believe. For faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God (Romans 10:14-15). For if these things are not made known and revealed to all and every one who are concerned in them — that is, to whom the Lord intends them and for whom he has procured so great a good — then one of these things will follow. Either, first, that they may be saved without faith in and knowledge of Christ (which they cannot have unless he is revealed to them) — which is false and has been proved so. Or else, second, that this good will of God and this purchase made by Jesus Christ is plainly vain and frustrated in respect of those persons — indeed a plain mockery of them, which will neither do them any good to help them out of misery, nor serve the justice of God to leave them without excuse. For what blame can fall on them for not embracing and making good use of a benefit they never heard of in their lives? Does it befit the wisdom of God

to send Christ to die for people that they might be saved, and never cause these people to hear of any such thing — and yet to purpose and declare that unless they hear of it and believe it they shall never be saved? What wise person would pay a ransom for the deliverance of captives who he is certain shall never come to know of any such payment, and so shall never benefit from it? Is it consistent with the goodness of God to deal thus with his poor creatures — to hold out toward them all in pretense the most intense love imaginable, beyond all comparison, as his love in sending his Son is set forth to be, and yet never let them know of any such thing, but in the end to damn them for not believing it? Is it consistent with the love and kindness of Christ toward us to assign to him at his death such a resolution as this: 'I will now by the offering of myself obtain for all and every one peace and reconciliation with God, redemption and everlasting salvation, eternal glory in the high heavens — even for all these poor, miserable, wretched, condemned creatures who every hour ought to expect the sentence of condemnation. And all these shall truly and really be communicated to them if they believe. But yet I will so order things that innumerable souls shall never hear one word of all this that I have done for them, shall never be persuaded to believe, nor have the object of faith proposed to them, whereby they might possibly come to partake of these things.' Was this the mind and will, the design and purpose of our merciful high priest? God forbid. It is the same as if a prince were to proclaim that there being a number of captives held in severe bondage in some place, and he having a full treasury, he is resolved to redeem every one of them — so that every one who will thank him for his goodwill shall come out of prison — and in the meantime never takes any care to let these

poor captives know his mind and pleasure, being fully assured that unless he himself accomplishes it, it will never be done. Would this not be conceived a vain and ostentatious flourish without any genuine intent toward the poor captives? Or as if a physician were to say that he has a medicine that will cure all diseases and intends to cure the diseases of all, but lets very few know his mind or anything of his medicine — and yet is assured that without his informing them it will be known to very few. Shall he be supposed to desire, intend, or aim at the recovery of all? Now it is most clear from scripture and the experience of all ages — both under the old and the new dispensation of the covenant — that innumerable people, whole nations, have for long seasons been passed by in the declaration of this mystery. The Lord did not procure that it should by any means in the least measure be made known to all. They never heard so much as a rumor or report of any such thing. Under the old testament, 'In Judah is God known; and his name is great in Israel. At Salem is his tabernacle, and his dwelling place in Zion' (Psalm 76). 'He showed his word to Jacob, and his judgments and statutes to Israel. He has not dealt so with any nation; and as for his judgments, they have not known them' (Psalm 147:19-20). Hence those designations of the heathen and those imprecations, as in Jeremiah 10:25: 'Pour out your fury upon the heathen that know you not, and upon the families that call not upon your name.' Of these you have a full description in Ephesians 2:12: 'without Christ, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.' And under the new testament, though the church has extended her cords and strengthened her stakes, and many nations have come to the mountain of the Lord — so many as to be called

'all people,' 'all nations,' indeed 'the world' and 'the whole world' in comparison with the small area of the Jewish church — yet now also scripture and experience make clear that many are passed by. Indeed millions of souls never hear a word of Christ or of reconciliation through him. Of this we can give no other reason but: 'Yes, O Father, because it seemed good to you' (Matthew 11:25-26). For in scripture, Acts 16, the Holy Spirit expressly forbade the apostles to go to certain places with the word, but sent them another way — corresponding to the former dispensation in some particulars, in which he allowed all people to walk in their own ways (Acts 14:16). And for experience, without multiplying particulars — ask any of our brothers who have at any time been in the Indies, and they will readily confirm the truth of this.

The exceptions against this argument are poor and frivolous, and are reserved for a reply. In brief: how is this good will of God revealed to those thousands of offspring of unbelievers whom the Lord cuts off in their infancy, that they may not overrun the world, persecute his church, or disturb human society? How is it revealed to the parents Paul speaks of, who by the works of God might be led to knowledge of his eternal power and godhead — yet to know anything of redemption or a Redeemer was utterly impossible for them?

CHAPTER 2



If Jesus Christ died for all people — that is, purchased and procured for them, according to the mind and will of God, all those things we recounted and that scripture sets forth as the effects and fruits of his death (which may be summed up in the phrase 'eternal redemption') — then he did this, and that according to the purpose of God, either absolutely or upon some condition to be fulfilled by them. If absolutely, then all and every one ought absolutely and infallibly to be made actual partakers of that eternal redemption so purchased. For what should hinder the enjoyment of that by any person which God absolutely intended and Christ absolutely purchased for them? If upon condition, then he either procured this condition for them, or he did not. If he did procure this condition for them — that is, that it should be bestowed on them and worked within them — then he did so either absolutely again or upon a further condition. If absolutely, then we are back where we were before. For to procure anything for another to be conferred on him upon such a condition, and at the same time to procure that condition absolutely to be bestowed on him, is equivalent to procuring the thing itself absolutely. For so we affirm in this very matter: Christ procured salvation for us, to be bestowed conditionally if we believe; but faith itself he has absolutely pro-

cured without prescribing any condition. Hence we affirm that the purchasing of salvation for us is equivalent to what it would have been had it been absolutely purchased, in respect of the outcome and issue. So thus also must all be absolutely saved. But if this condition is procured upon a further condition, let that condition be assigned and the same question will be renewed concerning whether its procuring was absolute or conditional. And so the chain never terminates until they fix somewhere, or runs in a circle forever. On the other side: if this condition is not procured by Christ — the condition upon the performance of which all the good things purchased by him are to be actually enjoyed — then first, this condition must be made known to all, as in the second argument. Second, all people are either able of themselves to perform this condition, or they are not. If they are, then since that condition is faith in the promises, as is conceded on all sides, then all people are of themselves, by the power of their own free will, able to believe. This is contrary to scripture, as will by the Lord's help be declared. If they cannot, but this faith must be bestowed on them and worked within them by the free grace of God, then when God gave his Son to die for them and to procure eternal redemption for all upon condition that they believe, he either purposed to work faith in all of them by his grace so that they might believe, or he did not. If he did, then why does he not actually perform it, seeing he is of one mind and who can turn him? Why do not all believe? Why do not all have faith? Or does he fail in his purpose? If he did not purpose to bestow faith on all — or what amounts to the same thing, if he purposed not to bestow faith on all, for the will of God does not consist in a mere negation of anything; what he does not will to be, he wills should not be — then the sum of it comes to

this. God gave Christ to die for all people, but upon this condition: that they perform what of themselves they cannot perform, without him; and he purposed for his part not to accomplish it in them. Now if this is not extreme madness — to assign to God a will to do what he himself knows and orders shall never be done, to grant a thing upon a condition which without his help cannot be fulfilled, and which help he purposed not to grant — let all judge. Is this anything but to delude poor creatures? Is it possible that any good at all should arise to anyone from such a purpose, such a giving of a Redeemer? Is it consistent with the goodness of God to intend so great a good as the redemption purchased by Christ, and to pretend he would have it profitable for people, when he knows they can no more fulfill the required condition than Lazarus could of himself come out of the grave? Does it befit the wisdom of God to purpose what he knows shall never be fulfilled? If a man were to promise a thousand pounds to a blind man upon condition that he open his eyes and see — knowing full well that he cannot — would that promise be supposed to come from a heart pitying his poverty, or rather from a mind to mock his misery? If a king were to promise to pay a ransom for the captives in Algiers upon condition that they conquer their tyrants and come away — knowing full well they cannot do so — would this be a kingly act? Or as if a man were to pay a price to redeem captives, but not so that their chains might be taken off, without which they cannot come out of prison? To promise dead men great rewards upon condition that they rise of themselves? Are not these as pointless as the obtaining of salvation for people upon condition that they believe, without obtaining that condition for them? Would this not be assigning to Jesus Christ such a will and purpose as this: 'I will obtain eternal life to be be-

stowed on people and to become theirs by the application of the benefits of my death, but upon this condition that they believe. Yet as I will not reveal my mind and will in this matter, nor this condition itself, to innumerable of them — so concerning the rest, I know they are in no way able of themselves, any more than Lazarus was to rise or a blind man is to see, to perform the condition I require, without which none of the good things intended for them can ever become theirs. Neither will I procure that condition ever to be fulfilled in them. That is, I will that what shall never be done shall be done — and not only know that it cannot be done, but also that it cannot be done because I will not do what is necessary for its accomplishment.' Now whether such a will and purpose befits the wisdom and goodness of our Savior, let the reader judge. In brief, an intention to do good to anyone upon performance of a condition which the intender knows is absolutely above the strength of the one required to perform it — especially when he knows it can in no way be accomplished without his own concurrence, and he has resolved not to yield that assistance necessary for its actual accomplishment — is a vain, fruitless flourish. That Christ should then obtain from his Father eternal redemption, and the Lord through his Son should intend it for those who shall never be made partakers of it — because they cannot perform, and God and Christ have purposed not to bestow, the condition on which alone it is to be actually made theirs — is unworthy of Christ and unprofitable to those for whom it is obtained. That anything Christ obtained for the sons of men should be so to them is indeed a hard saying. Again: if God through Christ purposes to save all if

they believe, because he died for all, and this faith is not purchased by Christ, nor are people able of themselves to believe — how does it come about that any are saved?

God bestows faith on some and not on others. I reply: is this distinguishing grace purchased for those some in comparison with those who are passed by without it? If it is, then Christ did not die equally for all — for he died that some might have faith and not others. Indeed, in comparison, he cannot be said to have died for those other some at all, not dying that they might have faith, without which he knew that all the rest would be unprofitable and fruitless. But if it is not purchased for them by Christ, then those he saved have no more to thank Christ for than those who are damned — which would be strange and contrary to Revelation 1:5: 'To him that has loved us and washed us with his own blood, and has made us kings and priests to God and his Father.' For my part, I consider that Christ has obtained salvation for people not upon condition if they receive it, but so fully and perfectly that they shall certainly receive it. He purchased salvation to be bestowed on those who believe, but also purchased faith that they might believe. Nor can it be objected that according to our doctrine God requires of people what they cannot do — namely, faith to believe in Christ. For, first, commands do not signify what God intends to be done, but what is our duty to do — which may be made known to us whether or not we are able to perform it. A command signifies no intention or purpose of God. Second, for the promises which are proposed together with the command to believe — these do not hold out the intent and purpose of God that Christ should die for us if we do believe (which would be absurd, since the act cannot be the maker of its own object, which must exist before it, and is pre-

supposed to exist before we are asked to believe it). Nor, second, do they hold out the purpose of God that the death of Christ should be profitable to us if we believe — which we refuted above. But third, only that faith is the way to salvation which God has appointed. So that all who do believe shall undoubtedly be saved, faith and salvation being inseparably linked together, as shall be declared.

If all humanity, by the eternal purpose of God, is distinguished into two sorts and conditions — severally and distinctly described and set forth in scripture — and Christ is peculiarly said to die for one of these sorts and nowhere for those of the other, then he did not die for all. For of the one sort he dies for all and every one, and of the other for no one at all. But first, there is such a discriminating distinction among people by the eternal purpose of God as those whom he loves and those whom he hates (Romans 9:11-12); those whom he knows and those whom he does not know (John 10:14: 'I know my sheep'; 2 Timothy 2:19: 'God knows who are his'; Romans 8:29: 'whom he foreknew'; Romans 11:2: 'the people whom he foreknew'); 'I never knew you' (Matthew 7:23); so also John 13:18: 'I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen.' Those appointed to life and glory, and those appointed to and fitted for destruction; elect and reprobate; those ordained to eternal life and those long before ordained to condemnation. Ephesians 1:4: 'He has chosen us in him.' Acts 13:48: 'ordained to eternal life.' Romans 8:30: 'Whom he predestined, them he also called; whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.' So on the other side, 1 Thessalonians 5:9: 'God has not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation' — implying those appointed to wrath. Romans 9:18-21: 'He has mercy on

whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardens. You will say then to me, Why does he then find fault? For who has resisted his will? Nay but, O man, who are you that reply against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why have you made me thus? Has not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel to honor and another to dishonor?' Jude 4: 'ordained to this condemnation.' 2 Peter 2:12: 'made to be taken and destroyed.' Sheep and goats (Matthew 25:32; John 10 throughout); those on whom he has mercy and those whom he hardens (Romans 9); those who are his peculiar people and children according to promise, who are not of the world — his church — and those who in opposition to them are the world, not prayed for, not his people (Titus 2:14; John 17:9-10; John 11:51; Hebrews 2:10-13). This distinction among people is everywhere ascribed to the purpose, will, and good pleasure of God. Proverbs 16:4: 'The Lord has made all things for himself, even the wicked for the day of wrath.' Matthew 11:25-26: 'Father, I thank you that you have hid these things from the wise and prudent and have revealed them to babes; even so, O Father, for so it seemed good in your sight.' Romans 9:11-12: 'The children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works but of him who calls, it was said to her, The elder shall serve the younger.' Romans 9:16-17: 'So then it is not of him that wills nor of him that runs, but of God that shows mercy. For the scripture says to Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised you up, that I might show my power in you, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth.' Romans 8:28-30: 'Who are called according to his purpose, for whom he did foreknow, he did also predestinate to be conformed to the im-

age of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brothers. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.' So the first part of the proposition is clear from scripture. Now Christ is expressly and pointedly said to die for those on the one side: for his people (Matthew 1:21); his sheep (John 10:11-12, 14); his church (Acts 20:28; Ephesians 5:25); as distinguished from the world (Romans 5:8-9; John 11:51-52); his elect (Romans 8:32, 34); his children (Hebrews 2:12-13) — as set out at greater length before. From this we may surely conclude that Christ did not die for all and every one — that is, not for those he never knew, whom he hates, whom he hardens, on whom he will not show mercy, who were long before ordained to condemnation; in short, not for a reprobate, not for the world, for which he would not pray. The objection that though Christ is said to die for his sheep, for his elect, his chosen, yet he is not said to die for them only — that the word 'only' is nowhere expressed — is of no weight. For is it not, without any forced interpretation, in common sense and according to the ordinary way of speaking, when people are distinguished into two such opposite conditions as elect and reprobate, sheep and goats, and then it is affirmed that he died for his elect — equivalent in meaning to 'he died for his elect only'? Is not the sense as clearly restricted as if that limiting word had been expressly added? Or is that word always added in scripture in every indefinite assertion which yet must of necessity be limited and restricted as if it were expressly added? As where our Savior says, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life' (John 14) — he does not say that he only is so, and yet of necessity it must be so understood. Also in Colossians 1:19: 'It pleased the Father that in him should

all fullness dwell' — he does not express the limitation 'only,' and yet it would be nothing less than blasphemy to suppose a possibility of extending the affirmation to any other. So this objection notwithstanding, this argument is, as far as can be seen, unanswerable. It might further be urged by a more extended treatment of God's purpose of election and reprobation, showing how the death of Christ was a means set apart and appointed for the saving of his elect, and not at all undergone and suffered for those whom in his eternal counsel he determined should perish for their sins and so never be made partakers of the benefits thereof. But of this more must be spoken, if the Lord preserves us and grants assistance for the other part of this controversy concerning the cause of sending Christ.

That is not to be asserted and affirmed which scripture nowhere precedes us in. But scripture nowhere says Christ died for all people, much less for 'all and every person' (between which two there is a wide difference, as will be declared). Therefore this is not to be asserted. It is true, Christ is said to give his life a ransom for all, but nowhere for 'all people.' And because it is expressly affirmed in other places that he died for many, for his church, for those who believe, for the children God gave him, for us, for some of all sorts — though not expressly, yet clearly in equivalent terms (Revelation 5:9-10) — it must be clearly proved that where 'all' is mentioned it cannot be taken to mean all believers, all his elect, his whole church, all the children God gave him, some of all sorts, before a universal affirmative can be concluded from it. If people will but consider the particular passages and restrain themselves until they have done what is required, the controversy will, I am persuaded, be settled.

CHAPTER 3



For whom Christ died, he died as a surety in their stead, as is apparent from Romans 5:6-8: 'For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly; for scarcely for a righteous man will one die, yet perhaps for a good man some would even dare to die; but God commended his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' Galatians 3:13: 'He was made a curse for us.' 2 Corinthians 5:21: 'He has made him to be sin for us.' All these passages plainly signify an exchange of persons, one being accepted in the place of another. Now if he died as the surety of those for whom he died, standing in their stead, then at least two things follow. First, that he freed them from that wrath and guilt of death which he underwent for them — so that in and for him they should all be reconciled and freed from the bondage of death. For no other reason can be assigned why Christ should undergo anything in another's place except that the other might be freed from what he endured for him. All justice requires this, as is also indicated when our Savior is said to be the surety of a better testament (Hebrews 7:22), undergoing the chastisement of our peace and the burden of our iniquities (Isaiah 53:5-7): 'He was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him' (2 Corinthians 5:21). But

now not all are freed from wrath and actually reconciled to God. For until people come to Christ, the wrath of God abides on them (John 3:36) — it was never removed. And to them the gospel is a savor of death, bringing condemnation through its being despised, added to the guilt they already lay under. Some have affirmed that all are redeemed, justified, and made righteous in Christ by his death — but truly this is so direct a contradiction to scripture that I judge it fruitless to go about removing such objections. Second, it follows that Christ made satisfaction for the sins of all and every person, if he died for them — for the reason he underwent death as a surety was to make satisfaction to God's justice for our sins. But Christ has not satisfied the justice of God for all the sins of all and every person, as may be demonstrated by several reasons.

For first, for whose sins he made satisfaction to the justice of God, for their sins justice is satisfied — or else his satisfaction was rejected as insufficient, which to affirm would be blasphemy in the highest degree. But now the justice of God is not satisfied for all the sins of all and every person. For those who must themselves undergo eternal punishment for their sins in order that the justice of God may be satisfied — for their sins, justice was not satisfied without their own punishment, by the punishment of Christ; they are not healed by his stripes. That innumerable souls shall throughout eternity undergo the punishment due to their own sins needs, I hope, no proving among Christians. Now how can the justice of God require satisfaction from them for their sins, if it had already been satisfied for those sins in Christ? To be satisfied and to require satisfaction in order to be satisfied are contradictory and

cannot be affirmed of the same thing in respect of the same. But that the Lord will require from some the uttermost farthing is most clear (Matthew 5:26).

Second, Christ by undergoing death for us as our surety satisfied for no more than he intended to satisfy for — so great a thing as satisfaction for the sins of men could not accidentally happen beyond his intention, will, and purpose, especially since his intention and willingness in sanctifying himself as an offering was absolutely necessary to make his death an acceptable sacrifice. But Christ did not intend to satisfy for the sins of all and every person, for innumerable souls were already in hell under the punishment of their own sins — from which there is no redemption — even at the very moment our Savior made himself an offering for sin. Are we to suppose that Christ would make himself an offering for those whom he knew to be past recovery, for whom it was utterly impossible that they would ever have any fruit or benefit from his offering? Are we to think that the blood of the covenant was cast away on those for whom our Savior intended no good at all? To intend good to them he could not without direct opposition to the eternal decree of his Father and therein of his own eternal deity. Did God send his Son? did Christ come to die for Cain and Pharaoh, damned so many ages before his suffering? The exception that Christ died for them and his death would have been available to them if they had believed and fulfilled the condition required is, in my judgment, of no force at all. First, for the most part they never heard of any such condition. Second, Christ at his death knew full well that they had not fulfilled the condition and were actually cut off from any possibility of ever doing so, so that any intention to benefit them by his death must be vain and futile — which cannot

be assigned to the Son of God. Third, this conditional redemption — 'if they believe' — will be rejected shortly. Nor is that other exception of any more value — that Christ might as well satisfy for those eternally damned at the time of his suffering (for whom it could not be useful) as for those then already saved (for whom it was not needful). For those who were saved were saved on this ground: that Christ should certainly suffer for them in due time, which suffering was as effectual in the purpose and promise as in the execution and accomplishment — being reckoned for them in the mind of God as accomplished, the covenant with Christ about it being firmly ratified on mutually unchangeable promises, so that it was needful for them. But for those actually damned, there was no such inducement, ground, or expected issue. To illustrate: if a man were to send word to a prison that he would pay the ransom due for the captives' release, and desire the prisoners to come out, since the one who detains them accepts his word and engagement; when he comes to make payment, if he finds some have gone forth as proposed and others remained stubbornly in their dungeon — some hearing of what he had done, others not, and all according to his own appointment, and long since dead — does he in paying his promised ransom intend it for those who died stubbornly and obstinately in the prison? Or only for those who went forth? Doubtless only for the latter. No more can the passion of Christ be supposed to be a price paid for those who died in the prison of sin and corruption before the payment of his ransom — though it could very well be for those delivered by virtue of his engagement to pay such a ransom. Third, if Christ died in the place of all people and made satisfaction for their sins, then he did so either for all of their sins or for only some of their sins. If for only some, then who

can be saved? If for all, then why are not all saved? They say it is because of unbelief — they will not believe, and therefore are not saved. But is that unbelief a sin or is it not? If it is not a sin, how can it be a cause of damnation? If it is a sin, then Christ either died for it or he did not. If he did not die for it, then he did not die for all the sins of all people. If he did, then why is it an obstacle to their salvation? The only answers available are: either Christ did not die for their unbelief, or he did not by his death remove their unbelief because they would not believe, or he died for their unbelief conditionally — that is, on condition that they were not unbelievers. These do not appear to be sober assertions.

For whomever Christ died, for them he is a Mediator — which is apparent, since the offering of Christ, which he made of himself to God in the shedding of his blood, was one of the chief acts of his mediation. But he is not a Mediator for all and every person, which is no less evident, because as Mediator he is the priest for those for whom he is a Mediator; and to a priest it belongs, as was declared, to sacrifice and intercede, to procure good things and to apply them to those for whom they are procured, as Hebrews 9 makes clear and as was proved at length before — none of which Christ does indiscriminately for all. That Christ is not a Mediator for every person needs no proof: experience sufficiently demonstrates it, besides innumerable passages of Scripture. It is replied by some that Christ is a Mediator for some in respect of certain acts and not others — but this, if I can judge at all, is a dishonest subterfuge with no ground in Scripture, and would make our Savior a half-mediator in respect of some, which is an unsavory expression. But this argument was vindicated before.

CHAPTER 4



Another argument may be taken from the effect and fruit of the death of Christ for sanctification: if the blood of Jesus Christ washes, purges, cleanses, and sanctifies those for whom it was shed, or for whom he was a sacrifice, then certainly he died, shed his blood, or was a sacrifice only for those who in the outcome are washed, purged, cleansed, and sanctified. That not all are so, is most apparent — faith being the first principle of the heart's purification (Acts 15:9), and all people do not have faith (2 Thessalonians 3:2); it belongs to the elect of God (Titus 1:1). The consequence is undeniable and not to be evaded with any distinctions. This will now be made evident from the types of Christ's blood, and then by plain expressions concerning the thing itself. First, for the type: the sacrifice of expiation, which the apostle expressly compares with the sacrifice and oblation of Christ, is said in Hebrews 9:13 to legally sanctify those for whom it was a sacrifice — 'the blood of bulls and goats and the ashes of a heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifies to the purifying of the flesh.' Now what was done carnally and legally in the type must be spiritually effected in the antitype, the sacrifice of Christ, typified by those bloody sacrifices of beasts. The apostle asserts this in the following verse: 'How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the

eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?' The answer of Arminius and others — that the sacrifice sanctified not as offered but as sprinkled, and that the blood of Christ answers it not in respect of the oblation but of its application — is weak and unsatisfactory, for it only asserts the very division between oblation and application which we are now disproving, and proposes that same division to weaken our argument. We grant that the blood of Christ sanctifies in respect of the application of the good things procured by it, but we also prove that it is so applied to all for whom it was an oblation. Second, it is expressly affirmed in various places that the blood-shedding and death of our Savior does effect these things and was intended for that purpose. Romans 6:5-6: 'For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection, knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.' 2 Corinthians 1:20: all the promises of God are in him, yes, and in him Amen — confirmed, ratified, unchangeably established, and irrevocably made over to us, confirmed by the death of him the testator (Hebrews 9:16), who was the surety of this better testament (Hebrews 7:22). The summary of these promises is in Jeremiah 31:33, repeated by the apostle in Hebrews 8:10-12, setting out the nature of that covenant ratified in the blood of Jesus — which contains the summary description of all free grace toward us, both in sanctification (verses 10-11) and in justification (verse 12). Among these promises is that most famous one of circumcising our hearts and giving new hearts and spirits to us (Deuteronomy 30:6; Ezekiel 36:26). So our whole sanctification, holiness, justification,

and reconciliation to God are procured by and established to us with unchangeable promises in the death and blood-shedding of Christ. We have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins (Colossians 1:14); by death he destroyed him who had the power of death, that is the devil, that he might free those who through fear of death were in bondage all their lives (Hebrews 2:14-15). Note especially Titus 2:14 and Ephesians 5:25-26, in both of which our cleansing and sanctification are assigned as the end and intention of Christ the worker, and therefore as the certain effect of his death and oblation. And adding only 1 Corinthians 1:30 — 'who of God is made to us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption' — our sanctification, with all other effects of free grace, are the immediate procurement of the death of Christ. The sum of all that has been said: sanctification and holiness are the certain fruit and effect of the death of Christ in all those for whom he died; but not all and every person are partakers of this sanctification, purging, cleansing, and working of holiness; therefore Christ did not die for all and every person. It is altogether in vain to object that the death of Christ is not the sole cause of these things, since they are not actually wrought in any without the Spirit's working in them and faith apprehending the death of Christ. For while many total causes of the same kind cannot concur to produce the same effect, several causes of several kinds may concur to one effect and each be the sole cause in its own kind. The Spirit of God is the efficient cause of sanctification; faith is the instrumental cause, apprehending the righteousness of Christ; and these do not hinder the blood of Christ from being the sole moral and meritorious cause of these things — rather they presuppose it, for it is the sole foundation of the Spirit's operation

and the sole cause of faith's existence. To illustrate: a captive is held by an enemy and someone pays a ransom for his deliverance, whereupon the captor grants a warrant to the jailer to unshackle the prisoner and clothe him — shall we say the ransom was not the cause, indeed the sole cause, of the prisoner's deliverance, merely because the jailer unlocked the shackles and the judge's warrant was brought? None of the latter would have occurred had not the ransom been paid; they are no less the effect of that ransom than the prisoner's own delivery. Similarly in our deliverance from the bondage of sin, the operation of the Spirit and the grace of God are causes in their own kinds, but these are no less the fruit and effect of the death of Christ than the deliverance wrought by them, so that the death of Christ is manifestly the one chief cause of the whole. Second, to remove this exception entirely along with all of its kind: faith itself is a proper and immediate fruit and procurement of the death of Christ for all those for whom he died. If this is true it utterly overthrows the general ransom and universal redemption; and if it is not true, this whole controversy may gladly be laid down, for whichever way it falls, free will must be established. This will be proved in the next argument.

Before coming to press the argument intended, a few things must first be premised.

Whatever is freely bestowed on us in and through Christ is entirely the procurement and merit of the death of Christ. Nothing is bestowed through him on those who are his which he has not purchased — the price of his purchase being his own blood (1 Corinthians 6). For the covenant between his Father and him, of

making out all spiritual blessings to those given to him, was expressly founded on this condition: that he should make his soul an offering for sin (Isaiah 53).

It is conceded on all sides that faith is of such absolute and indispensable necessity to salvation — there being no substitute accepted for lack of it under the new covenant — that whatever God has done in his love by sending his Son, and whatever Christ has done or does in his offering and intercession for all or some, without faith in us is, in regard of the outcome, of no value, worth, or profit to us, but serves only to increase and aggravate condemnation. For whatever else may be accomplished, this is most certainly true: 'He that believes not shall be damned' (Mark 16:16). So if there is in ourselves a power of believing, and the act of it proceeds from that power and is our own, then certainly and undeniably it is in our power to make the love of God and the death of Christ effectual toward us or not, by believing. This is so evident that the most sharp-sighted of our adversaries have expressly confessed it, as I have declared elsewhere. This being then the absolute necessity of faith, it seems to me that the cause of faith must needs be the prime and principal cause of salvation — as being the cause of that without which the whole would not exist, and by which the whole exists and is effectual.

I shall give those who are of a contrary mind their choice and option, provided they will answer directly, categorically, and without strange and obscure distinctions: whether our Savior by his death and intercession (which we proved to be conjoined) did merit or procure faith for us, or not? Or, what amounts to the same thing: whether faith is a fruit and effect of the death of Christ or not? And according to their answer I will proceed. If they answer

affirmatively — that it is, or that Christ did procure it by his death (provided they do not deliberately equivocate, speaking of faith as a doctrine rather than as a grace inhering in a particular person) — then I demand: whether Christ procured faith for all for whom he died, absolutely or upon some condition on their part to be fulfilled? If absolutely, then surely if he died for all, all must absolutely believe. For that which is absolutely procured for any person is absolutely his without doubt. But this is contrary to the apostle: 'All people do not have faith' and 'faith is of the elect of God' (Titus 1:1). If they say he procured faith for them to be bestowed conditionally, I ask that they state that condition plainly — without equivocation — so we may know what it is. Is it, as some say, 'if they do not resist the grace of God'? But what is it not to resist the grace of God? Is it not to obey it? And what is it to obey the grace of God? Is it not to believe? So the condition of faith is faith itself. Christ procured that they should believe upon condition that they believe. Can they assign a condition on our part required for faith that is not faith itself? If they can, let us hear it, and we will inquire whether that condition was procured by Christ or not. If not, then the cause of faith is still resolved into ourselves and Christ is not the author and finisher of it. If it was, then we are back where we were before and must ask whether that condition was procured absolutely or conditionally, and so on without end.

But second, if they will answer negatively — as, consistently with their own principles, they ought to do — and deny that faith is procured by the death of Christ, then:

First, they must maintain that it is an act of their own wills, so entirely their own as not to be worked in them by grace, and that it is wholly in their power to perform that spiritual act. Nothing be-

ing bestowed on us by free grace in and through Christ but what was procured by him in his death and oblation, as was declared before. This is, first, contrary to express scripture in very many places, which need not be recounted.

Second, it is contrary to the very nature of the new covenant, which does not merely prescribe and require its condition but effectually works it in all the covenant members (Jeremiah 31:32-33; Ezekiel 36:26; Hebrews 3:8).

Third, it is contrary to the advancement of the free grace of God — setting up the power of free will in the state of corrupted nature to the slighting and undervaluing of that grace.

Fourth, this doctrine is contrary to the received teaching of our natural depravity and inability toward anything good, and by inevitable consequence it overthrows that foundational article of original sin.

Fifth, it is contrary to right reason, which will never grant that a natural faculty can of itself, without some spiritual elevation, produce an act that is purely spiritual (1 Corinthians 2:14).

Second, the advocates of universal redemption must resolve almost the sole cause of our salvation ultimately into ourselves — placing it in our own power to make all that God and Christ do for that end effectual, or to frustrate their utmost endeavors toward it. For all that is done — whether in the Father's loving us and sending his Son to die for us, or in the Son's offering himself as an oblation in our place — is confessedly of no value or profitable issue unless we believe; and whether we will believe, Christ has neither effected nor procured by his death, nor can the Lord work it in us in such a way that the sole casting vote as to whether we will be-

lieve is not left to ourselves. Whether this is not to assign to ourselves the cause of our own happiness and to make us the chief builders of our own glory, let all judge. These things being premised, I will briefly prove what is denied — namely, that faith is procured for us by the death of Christ, and therefore consequently he did not die for all and every person, since not all people have faith; and this will be done by the following reasons.

The death of Jesus Christ purchased holiness and sanctification for us, as was proved at length in the eighth argument; but faith, as a grace of the Spirit dwelling in us, is formally a part of our sanctification and holiness; therefore he procured faith for us. The minor premise is most certain and not denied; the major was sufficiently confirmed in the foregoing argument, and I see no objection to the truth of the whole. If any should say that Christ may have procured some part of holiness for us — for we speak of parts, not degrees or measure — but not all, such as the sanctification of hope, love, meekness, and the like: first, what warrant is there for any such distinction between the graces of the Spirit, that some should be of Christ's purchasing and others of our own store? Second, are we more naturally inclined to believe and more naturally able than to love and hope? Where would such a claim be grounded?

All the fruits of election are purchased for us by Jesus Christ, for we are chosen in him (Ephesians 1:4) as the only cause and fountain of all those good things to which the Lord chooses us, for the praise of his glorious grace, that in all things he might have the preeminence. I need not be anxious about proving that the Lord Jesus is the only way and means by and through whom the Lord will certainly and actually bestow upon his elect all the fruits and

effects and intentions of that love by which he chose them. But now faith is a fruit — a principal fruit — of our election, for the Apostle says we are chosen in him before the foundation of the world that we should be holy (Ephesians 1:4), of which holiness, faith that purifies the heart is a principal share. Moreover, 'whom he predestinated, those he also called' (Romans 8:29) — that is, with that calling which is according to his purpose, effectually working faith in them by the mighty operation of his Spirit, according to the exceeding greatness of his power (Ephesians 1:19) — and so those who are ordained to eternal life believe (Acts 13:48), their ordination to eternal life being the fountain from which their faith flows; and so the election obtained it when the rest were hardened (Romans 11).

Third, all the blessings of the new covenant are procured and purchased by him in whom the promises thereof are ratified and to whom they are made, for all the good things of the covenant are contained in and exhibited by those promises, through the working of the Spirit of God. Concerning the promises of the covenant and their being confirmed in Christ and made to his own, as Galatians 3:16, what is to be understood in those expressions was declared before. Therefore all the good things of the covenant are the effects, fruits, and purchase of the death of Christ — he and all things for him being the substance and whole of it. That faith is among the good things of the new covenant is apparent from the description of it in Jeremiah 31:33, Hebrews 8:10-12, and Ezekiel 36:26, with various other places.

Fourth, that without which it is utterly impossible that we should be saved must of necessity be procured by him by whom we are fully and effectually saved. Let those who can explain how he

can be said to procure salvation fully and effectually for us while not being the author and purchaser of that without which it is utterly impossible to attain salvation. Now without faith it is utterly impossible that anyone should attain salvation (Hebrews 11:6; Mark 16:16). But Jesus Christ, according to his name, perfectly saves us (Matthew 1:21), procuring for us eternal redemption (Hebrews 9:12), being able to save to the uttermost those who come to God through him (Hebrews 7:25); and therefore faith also must fall within the compass of those things procured by him.

Fifth, Scripture is clear in express terms — and in terms so equivalent as to admit of no evasion. Philippians 1:29: 'It is given to us, on behalf of Christ, for Christ's sake, to believe on him.' Faith or belief is the gift, and Christ the procurer of it. 'God has blessed us with all spiritual blessings in him in heavenly places' (Ephesians 1:3). If faith is a spiritual blessing, it is bestowed on us in him and so also for his sake. If it is not a spiritual blessing, it is not worth contending about in this sense and way. So whatever direction others may look, I desire to look to Jesus 'as the author and finisher of our faith' (Hebrews 12:2). Various other reasons, arguments, and passages of Scripture could be added for the confirmation of this truth, but enough has been said; the sum of the whole reason may be reduced to this:

If the fruit and effect procured and worked by the death of Christ — absolutely, not depending on any condition in man to be fulfilled — is not common to all, then Christ did not die for all. But the premise is true, as is evident in the grace of faith: being procured by the death of Christ to be absolutely bestowed on those for whom he died, it is not common to all. Therefore our Savior did not die for all.

The eleventh argument is from the type to the antitype, or the thing typified, which will evidently restrict the offering of Christ to God's elect. The people of Israel were certainly, in all remarkable things that happened to them, typical of the church of God, as the Apostle shows at length in 1 Corinthians 10:11. Their institutions and ordinances were all representative of the spiritual things of the Gospel — their priests, altar, and sacrifices being nothing but shadows of the good things to come in Jesus Christ. Their Canaan was a type of heaven (Hebrews 4:3, 9), as also Jerusalem or Zion (Galatians 4:26; Hebrews 12:22). The whole people itself was a type of God's church — his elect, his chosen and called people — whence as they were called a holy people, a royal priesthood, so also in allusion to them are believers called the same (1 Peter 2:5, 9). Indeed, God's people are in innumerable places called his Israel, as is further expounded in Hebrews 8:8. A true Israelite is as much as a true believer (John 1:47), and 'he is a Jew who is so in the hidden man of the heart.' It need not be proved that the people of Israel — as delivered from bondage, preserved, brought near to God, and brought into Canaan — were typical of God's spiritual church, his elect and believers. Therefore we argue: those only are really and spiritually redeemed by Jesus Christ who were designated, signified, and typified by the people of Israel in their bodily and typical redemption, for no reason in the world can be rendered why some should be typified as participants in the same condition and benefits and not others. But by the people of the Jews — in their deliverance from Egypt, their bringing into Canaan, and all their ordinances and institutions — only the elect and church of God were typified, as was proved before. In truth it is the most senseless thing imaginable to suppose that the Jews were types for

the entire world, or indeed for any but God's chosen ones, as is proved at length in Hebrews 9-10. Were the Jews and their ordinances types for the seven nations they destroyed and displaced in Canaan? Were they so to Egyptians, unbelievers, and haters of God and his Christ? We conclude therefore with certainty, from the proper proportion that ought to be observed between types and the things typified, that only the elect of God — his church and chosen ones — are redeemed by Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER 5



That doctrine which cannot by any means be made to suit or conform to the thing it signifies, nor to the literal and derived expression by which it is held out in Scripture — but implies evident contradictions to both — cannot possibly be sound and sincere, like the pure milk of the Word. Such is this persuasion of universal redemption: it can never be suited or fitted to the thing itself, redemption, nor to those expressions by which it is held out in Scripture. Universal redemption and yet many dying in captivity is in itself an irreconcilable contradiction. To make this plain, let us consider some of the chief words and phrases by which the matter we are treating is expressed in Scripture — such as redemption, reconciliation, satisfaction, merit, dying for us, bearing our sins, suretyship, his being God, a common person, a Jesus, saving to the uttermost, a sacrifice putting away sin, and the like. To these may be added the significance of certain prepositions and other words used in the original in connection with this matter. It will easily be found that the general ransom, or rather universal redemption, hardly suits any of them — it is too long for the bed and must be cut at head or feet.

Begin with the word 'redemption' itself — both name and thing. Redemption — which in Scripture is one Greek word sometimes but most frequently another — is the delivery of anyone from captivity and misery by means of a price or ransom. That this ransom or price of our deliverance was the blood of Christ is evident; he calls it by terms meaning 'ransom' (Matthew 20:28) and 'substitutionary ransom' (1 Timothy 2:6) — that is, the price of such a redemption, what was received as a valuable consideration for our release. What is aimed at in paying this price is the deliverance of those for whom it is paid from the evil by which they were oppressed, this being the same in spiritual redemption as in bodily and civil redemption, only with some alteration of circumstances as the nature of the thing requires. The Holy Spirit demonstrates this by comparing the blood of Christ in this work of redemption with silver and gold and such other things as are the intervening ransom in civil redemption (1 Peter 1:18). The evil from which we were oppressed was the punishment we had deserved — the satisfaction required when the debt is sin — from which we are also delivered by the payment of this price. So: 'We are justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ' (Romans 3:24); 'In him we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins' (Ephesians 1:7; Colossians 1:14). Free justification from the guilt and pardon of sin, in deliverance from the punishment due to it, is the effect of the redemption procured by the payment of the price mentioned. As if a man should have his friend in bondage, and go lay out his estate to pay the price of his friend's freedom set by the one who detains him, and so set him at liberty. Only, as was noted before, this spiritual redemption has some surpassing features not found in other deliverances.

First, he who receives the ransom also gives it. Christ is a propitiation to appease and atone the Lord; but the Lord himself set him forth as such (Romans 3:24-25). God himself is often said to redeem us. His love is the cause of the price in respect of its procurement, and his justice accepts the price in respect of its merit; for Christ came down from heaven to do the will of him who sent him (John 6:38; Hebrews 10:9-10). It is otherwise in redemption among people, where the one who receives the ransom has no hand in providing it.

Second, the captive or prisoner is not so much freed from the power of the one who detains him as brought into his favor. When a captive among people is redeemed by the payment of a ransom, he is at once to be set free from the power and authority of the one who detained him. But in this spiritual redemption, upon the payment of the ransom for us — which is the blood of Jesus — we are not removed from God but are brought near to him (Ephesians 2:13). Not delivered from his power but restored to his favor, our misery being a punishment both by way of banishment and of bondage.

Third, as the judge was to be satisfied, so the jailer was to be conquered. God the judge gave him leave to fight for his dominion which had been wrongfully usurped, though that by which he had it was justly inflicted by the Lord and our bondage was rightly deserved by us (Hebrews 2:14; Colossians 2). He lost his power, strong as he was, for striving to grasp more than he could hold. The foundation of his kingdom being sin, in assaulting Christ who had no sin he lost his power over those Christ came to redeem, having no part in him; so the strong man was bound and his house plundered.

In these and some other few circumstances our spiritual redemption differs from civil redemption, but in the main it answers the word in its proper meaning as used among people. There is a twofold way in which this is expressed in Scripture: sometimes our Savior is said to die for our redemption, and sometimes for the redemption of our transgressions, both tending to the same purpose. Of the latter you have an example in Hebrews 9:15, which some say is a metonymy with transgressions put for transgressors; others that it is a proper expression for the paying of a price whereby we may be delivered from the evil of our transgressions. The other expression appears in Ephesians 1:7 and various other places where the Greek words for 'redemption' and 'ransom' occur, as also in Matthew 20:28 and Mark 10:45. These words — especially the term in 1 Timothy 2:6 — always denote, by their genuine meaning not to be forced, the payment of a price, or an equal compensation in lieu of something to be done, or a grant made for the one to whom that price is paid. Having given these few observations concerning redemption in general, let us now see how applicable it is to a general redemption.

Redemption is the freeing of a person from misery by means of a ransom, as appears from the above. Now when a ransom is paid for the liberty of a prisoner, is it not all the justice in the world that he should have and enjoy the liberty so purchased for him by a valuable consideration? If I were to pay a thousand pounds for a man's deliverance from bondage to the one who detains him, who has power to set him free and is content with the price I give, would it not be unjust to me and to the poor prisoner if his deliverance were not accomplished? Can it possibly be conceived that there should be a redemption of people and those people not actu-

ally redeemed? That a price should be paid and the purchase not consummated? Yet all this must be made true, and innumerable other absurdities besides, if universal redemption is asserted. A price is paid for all, yet few are delivered; the redemption of all consummated, yet few of them actually redeemed; the judge satisfied, the jailer conquered, and yet the prisoner still captive. Doubtless 'universal' and 'redemption,' where the greatest part of humanity perishes, are as irreconcilable as 'Roman' and 'Catholic.' If there is a universal redemption of all, then all people are redeemed. If they are redeemed, they are delivered from all misery in which they were enthralled — virtually or actually — by the intervention of a ransom; so why are not all saved? In a word: the redemption worked by Christ being the full deliverance of the redeemed persons from all misery in which they were ensnared by the price of his blood, it cannot possibly be conceived to be universal unless all are saved. So the opinion of the universalists is incompatible with redemption.

CHAPTER 6



Reconciliation is the renewing of friendship between parties previously at variance — both parties being properly said to be reconciled: both the one who offended and the one who was offended. God and man were set at distance, at enmity and variance by sin. Man was the offending party; God the offended. The alienation was mutual on either side, but with this difference: man was alienated in respect of his affections — the ground and cause of anger and enmity; God in respect of the effects and issue of anger and enmity. The word in the new testament means 'reconciliation' and 'to reconcile,' derived from a root meaning to change or to turn from one thing or one mind to another. Hence the first native meaning of those words is 'exchange' and 'to exchange.' For most commonly those who are reconciled are changed in respect of their affections, and always in respect of the distance and variance and in respect of the effects. The word may not be applied to any matter or to any persons until both parties are actually reconciled and all differences removed in respect of any former grudge and ill will. If one is pleased with the other and that other remains unappeased and implacable, there is no reconciliation. When our Savior gives the command that whoever brings his gift to the altar and there remembers that his brother has something against him — be-

ing offended for any cause — should go and be reconciled to him, he fully intends a mutual returning of minds to one another, especially in respect of appeasing and reconciling the one who was offended. Nor are these words used among people in any other sense — but always denote, even in common speech, a full restoration of friendship between dissenting parties, with reference most often to some compensation made to the offended party. The reconciling of the one party and of the other may be distinguished, but both are required to make up an entire reconciliation. Therefore the folly of Socinus and his followers is remarkable, who would have the reconciliation mentioned in scripture to be nothing but our conversion to God without the appeasing of his anger and turning away his wrath from us — which is a reconciliation hopping on one leg. And the distinction drawn by some between the reconciliation of God to man, making that universal toward all, and the reconciliation of man to God, making that only for a small number of those to whom God is reconciled, is an equally monstrous invention. Mutual alienation must have mutual reconciliation, being correlatives. The state between God and man before the reconciliation made by Christ was a state of enmity. Man was at enmity with God — 'we were his enemies' (Colossians 1:20-21; Romans 5:10) — hating him and opposing ourselves to him in the highest rebellion to the utmost of our power. God also was thus far at enmity toward us: his wrath was on us (Ephesians 2:3), which remains on us until we believe (John 3:36). To make perfect reconciliation — which Christ is said in many places to accomplish — it is required: first, that the wrath of God be turned away, his anger removed, and all the effects of enmity on his part toward us; and second, that we be turned away from our opposition to him and brought into volun-

tary obedience. Until both of these are effected, reconciliation is not perfected. Now both of these are in scripture assigned to our Savior as the effects of his death and sacrifice. First, he turned away the wrath of God from us and so appeased him toward us — that was the reconciling of God by his death. 'When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son' (Romans 5:10). That this means the reconciling of God as that part of reconciliation which consists in turning away his wrath from us is most apparent — it being that whereby God chiefly commends his love to us, which certainly is in the forgiveness of sin by the turning away of his anger due to it. It is also set over against 'being saved from the wrath to come' in the latter end of the verse, which comprises our conversion and whole reconciliation to God. Besides, in verse 11 we are said to 'receive this reconciliation' (which for unknown reasons our translation renders 'atonement') — which cannot mean our reconciliation to God or our conversion, which we cannot properly be said to accept or receive, but rather his reconciliation to us, which we receive when it is apprehended by faith. Second, he turns us away from our enmity toward God, redeeming and reconciling us to God by the blood of his cross (Colossians 1:21) — that is, meritoriously and satisfactorily, by the way of acquisition and purchase, accomplishing it in due time actually and efficiently by his Spirit. Both of these are jointly mentioned in 2 Corinthians 5:18-20, where we see: first, God being reconciled to us in Christ, which consists in a non-imputation of iniquities and is the subject matter of the ministry (verses 18-19); second, the reconciling of us to God by accepting the pardon of our sins, which is the end of the ministry (verse 20). The same is also at length declared in Ephesians 2:13-15. The actual and effectual accomplish-

ment of both of these together — in respect of procurement by the one offering, and in process of time through the ordinances of the gospel in respect of final accomplishment on the part of individuals — makes up that reconciliation which is the effect of the death of Christ. So it is assigned to be in many places: 'We are reconciled to God by the death of his Son' (Romans 5:10); 'And you who were sometime alienated has he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death' (Colossians 1:21-22). This is in various places so evident in scripture that none can possibly deny reconciliation to be the immediate effect and product of the death of Christ. Now how this reconciliation can possibly be reconciled with universal redemption, I am in no way able to see. For if reconciliation is the proper effect of the death of Christ, as is conceded by all, then if he died for all, I ask: First, how is it that God is not reconciled to all? For he is not — his wrath abides on some (John 3:36), and reconciliation is the turning away of wrath. Second, how is it that all are not reconciled to God? For they are not — by nature all are children of wrath (Ephesians 2:3), and some throughout their lives do nothing but store up wrath against the day of wrath (Romans 2:5). Third, then how can it be that reconciliation should be worked between God and all people, and yet neither God reconciled to all nor all reconciled to God? Fourth, if God is reconciled to all, when does he become unreconciled toward those who perish? By what alteration — in his will or in his nature? Fifth, if all are reconciled by the death of Christ, when do those who perish become unreconciled, seeing they are born children of wrath? Sixth, seeing that reconciliation on God's part consists in the turning away of his wrath and the non-imputation of iniquity (2 Corinthians 5:18-19), which is justification rendering us blessed (Romans 4:6-8): why, if

God is reconciled to all, are not all justified and made blessed through a non-imputation of their sin? Those who have found a redemption in which none are redeemed, and a reconciliation in which none are reconciled, may easily answer these and such other questions. To do so I leave them to their leisure. In the meantime, I conclude this part of the argument: that reconciliation — which is the renewing of lost friendship, the slaying of enmity, the making of peace, the appeasing of God and turning away of his wrath, attended with a non-imputation of iniquities, and on our part conversion to God by faith and repentance — this reconciliation being the effect of the death and blood of Christ, cannot be asserted in reference to any, nor Christ said to die for any other, but only those of whom all its properties and acts may truly be affirmed. Whether they may be affirmed of all people or not, let all people judge.

Reconciliation is the renewing of friendship between parties previously at variance — both parties being properly said to be reconciled, both the one who offended and the one who was offended. God and man were set at distance, at enmity and variance by sin; man was the offending party, God the offended, and the alienation was mutual on both sides, though with this difference: man was alienated in respect of his affections (the ground and cause of his enmity), while God was alienated in respect of the effects and issue of anger and enmity. The Greek word for reconciliation means a change or turning from one thing and one mind to another — its primary meaning is exchange or substitution — since those who are reconciled are always changed in respect of the distance and variance between them, and in respect of its effects. The word cannot be affirmed of any matter or any persons until both parties are

actually reconciled and all differences removed; if one is well pleased with the other but the other remains unappeased and implacable, there is no reconciliation. When our Savior commands that one who brings his gift to the altar and remembers his brother has something against him should go and be reconciled to him, he fully intends a mutual returning of minds to one another, especially the appeasing and atoning of the one offended. As then the folly of Socinus is remarkable — who would have the reconciliation mentioned in scripture be nothing but our conversion to God without the appeasing of his anger and turning away of his wrath, which is a reconciliation limping on one leg — so, that distinction of some between the reconciliation of God to man (making it universal toward all) and the reconciliation of man to God (making it only for a small number of those to whom God is reconciled) is an equally monstrous invention. Mutual alienation must have mutual reconciliation, since they are correlates. The state between God and man before the reconciliation made by Christ was a state of enmity: man was at enmity with God (Colossians 1:20-21; Romans 5:10), hating him and opposing himself to God in the highest rebellion. God also was in this respect an enemy to us, in that his wrath was upon us (Ephesians 2:3), which remains on us until we believe (John 3:36). To make perfect reconciliation (which Christ is said in many places to accomplish) it is required: first, that the wrath of God be turned away, his anger removed, and all the effects of enmity on his part toward us; second, that we be turned away from our opposition to him and brought into voluntary obedience. Until both are effected, reconciliation is not perfected. Now both are assigned in scripture to our Savior as the effects of his death and sacrifice. First, he turned away the wrath of God from us

and so appeased him toward us — that is the reconciling of God: 'When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son' (Romans 5:10). That this means the reconciling of God in that part of reconciliation which consists in turning away his wrath from us is most apparent — it being that whereby God chiefly commends his love to us, which certainly consists in the forgiveness of sin by the aversion of his due anger. Moreover, we are said to receive this reconciliation (verse 11), which cannot mean our reconciliation to God or conversion — which we cannot properly be said to receive — but rather his reconciliation to us, which we receive when apprehended by faith. Second, he turns us away from our enmity toward God, redeeming and reconciling us to God by the blood of his cross (Colossians 1:21) — meritoriously and satisfactorily by way of acquisition and purchase, accomplishing it in due time actually and efficiently by his Spirit. Both are jointly mentioned in 2 Corinthians 5:18-20: first, God being reconciled to us in Christ, which consists in a non-imputation of iniquities and is the subject matter of the ministry (verses 18-19); second, our reconciliation to God by accepting the pardon of our sins, which is the end of the ministry (verse 20). The same is at large declared in Ephesians 2:13-15. Now how this reconciliation can possibly be reconciled with universal redemption, I am no way able to discern. For if reconciliation is the proper effect of the death of Christ — as all confess — then if he died for all, I ask: first, how is it that God is not reconciled to all, since his wrath abides on some (John 3:36) and reconciliation is the aversion of wrath? Second, how is it that all are not reconciled to God, since by nature all are children of wrath (Ephesians 2:3) and some all their lives do nothing but treasure up wrath against the day of wrath (Romans 2:5)? Third, how

then can reconciliation have been wrought between God and all people, if neither God is reconciled to all nor all are reconciled to God? Fourth, if God is reconciled to all, when does he begin to be unreconciled toward those who perish, and by what alteration — in his will or nature? Fifth, if all are reconciled by the death of Christ, when do those who perish begin to be unreconciled, having been born children of wrath? Sixth, since reconciliation on God's part consists in the turning away of his wrath and the non-imputation of iniquity (2 Corinthians 5:18-19) — which is justification, rendering us blessed (Romans 4:6-8) — why, if God is reconciled to all, are not all justified and made blessed through a non-imputation of their sins? Those who have invented a redemption where none are redeemed and a reconciliation where none are reconciled may easily answer these questions. In the meantime I conclude: this reconciliation — the renewing of lost friendship, the slaying of enmity, the making of peace, the appeasing of God and turning away of his wrath with a non-imputation of iniquities, and on our part conversion to God by faith and repentance — being the effect of the death and blood of Christ, cannot be asserted of any, nor Christ said to have died for any, except only those of whom all its properties and constituent acts may be truly affirmed; which whether they may be affirmed of all people or not, let all judge.

CHAPTER 7



A third way in which the death of Christ for sinners is expressed is satisfaction — that by his death he made satisfaction to the justice of God for the sins of those for whom he died, so that they might go free. It is true that the word 'satisfaction' does not appear in the Latin or English Bibles as applied to the death of Christ, and in the New Testament not at all, and in the Old only twice (Numbers 35:31-32). But the thing itself intended by that word — a compensation made to God by Christ for our debts — is everywhere ascribed to the death of our Savior, with other words in the original languages equivalent to the one we use to express the matter. That Christ did thus make satisfaction for all those for whom he died, or rather for their sins, is (as far as I know) confessed by all who are but outwardly called by his name, the wretched Socinians excepted, with whom we have no present concern. Let us first see what this satisfaction is, then how inconsistent it is with universal redemption.

Satisfaction is a term borrowed from law, applied properly to things, thence translated and accommodated to persons, and it is a full compensation to the creditor from the debtor. To whoever anything is due from any person, that person is his creditor and the other is his debtor, upon whom there is an obligation to pay or re-

store what is due from him, until he is freed by a lawful dissolution of that obligation — by rendering satisfaction to what his creditor may require by virtue of it. If I owe a man a hundred pounds I am his debtor by virtue of the bond in which I am bound, until something is done that recompenses him and moves him to cancel the bond — which is called satisfaction. From things real this was and is translated to things personal: personal debts are injuries and faults, which when a person has committed he is liable to punishment. He who is to inflict that punishment, or upon whom it rests to see that it is done, is the creditor — which he must do unless satisfaction is made. Now there may be a twofold satisfaction: first, by a payment of the very thing that is in the obligation, either by the party bound or by someone else in his place — as if I owe a man twenty pounds and my friend goes and pays it, my creditor is fully satisfied; second, by a payment of so much in another kind, not the same thing that is in the obligation, which by the creditor's acceptance stands in its place — upon which also freedom from the obligation follows, not of necessity but by virtue of an act of favor.

In the matter at hand: first, the debtor is man, owing the ten thousand talents (Matthew 18).

Second, the debt is sin — 'forgive us our debts' (Matthew 6).

Third, what is required in lieu of it, to make satisfaction for it, is death — 'in the day you eat of it you shall die' (Genesis 3); 'the wages of sin is death' (Romans 6).

Fourth, the obligation by which the debtor is bound is the law — 'cursed is everyone' (Deuteronomy 27); the justice (Romans 1:32) and the truth of God (Genesis 3).

Fifth, the creditor who requires this of us is God, considered as the offended party, the severe judge and supreme Lord of all things.

Sixth, what intervenes to destroy the obligation is the ransom paid by Christ — 'God set him forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood' (Romans 3:24-25).

I shall not enter upon any long discourse of the satisfaction made by Christ, but only clear it so far as is necessary to give light to the matter in hand. To this end two things must be clarified: first, that Christ did make such satisfaction as we speak of, and wherein it consists; and second, what is that act of God toward man the debtor which does and ought to follow the satisfaction made. For the first: the word itself does not appear in Scripture in connection with this matter, but the thing signified by it — a compensation made to God by Christ for our debts — does. To make satisfaction to God for our sins, it is required only that he undergo the punishment due to them, since that is the satisfaction required when sin is the debt. Now this Christ has certainly effected: 'he himself bore our sins in his own body on the tree' (1 Peter 2:24); 'by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities' (Isaiah 53:11). The Hebrew word 'nasa' in verse 12 likewise argues a taking of the punishment of sin from us and transferring it to himself, signifying as much as we mean by the word satisfaction. So also does Peter's Greek term used in its place; for to bear iniquity in scriptural language is to undergo the punishment due to it (Leviticus 5:17), which we call making satisfaction for it. This is further illustrated by the declaration of how he bore our sins — 'he was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities' (Isaiah 53:5) — to which is added that

the chastisement of our peace was upon him. Every chastisement is either for instruction or for punishment and correction; the first cannot apply to our Savior the Son of God, who had no need to be taught with thorns and briars; it must therefore be punishment and correction for our sins laid upon him, whereby our peace — our freedom from punishment — was procured.

Moreover in the New Testament there are various words and expressions concerning the death of our Savior expressing what we intend by satisfaction. First, it is called a sacrifice of expiation (Ephesians 5:2), as is apparent by that type of it with which it is compared in Hebrews 9:14-15. Of the same force is the Hebrew word 'asham' (Isaiah 53:10; Leviticus 7:2): 'He made his soul an offering for sin' — a piacular sacrifice for the removing of sin — which the apostle abundantly clarifies by saying he was made sin itself (2 Corinthians 5:21), sin there being put for its adjunct, the punishment due to it. So also he is called a propitiation (1 John 2:2), to which answers the Hebrew word that means to undergo the debt and make compensation for it, which was the office of the one who was to be Job's redeemer (Job 19:25). All these and various other words declare the very same thing we intend by satisfaction: a taking upon himself the whole punishment due to sin, and in the offering of himself doing that which God, who was offended, was more delighted and pleased with than he was displeased and offended by all the sins of all those for whom he suffered and offered himself. There can be no more complete satisfaction made to any person than by doing that which pleases him more than it displeases him to have the offense against him repeated. God was more pleased with the obedience, offering, and sacrifice of his Son than he was displeased with the sins and rebellions of all the elect.

As, if a good king had a company of his subjects stand out in rebellion against him, moved thereby to destroy them, and the only son of that king were to intercede for their pardon by offering himself to undergo the punishment his justice had allotted for the rebels — he would properly make satisfaction for their offense, and in strict justice they ought to be pardoned. This was Christ, as that sent-away goat that bore and carried away all the sins of the people of God, falling himself under them, though with assurance to break all the bonds of death and to live forever. Now, whereas there is a twofold satisfaction — payment of the very thing that was in the obligation, and payment of something else accepted by the creditor's grace in its place — it is worth inquiring which of these our Savior performed.

Fifth, that whereas discharge from further trouble is equitably due to a debtor who has been under obligation, his debt being paid — the Lord, having accepted payment from Christ in the stead of all those for whom he died, ought in justice, according to that obligation which in free grace he has put upon himself, to grant them a discharge. Sixth, that considering the relaxation of the law which by the supreme power of the lawgiver was effected as to the persons suffering the required punishment, such actual satisfaction is made to it that it can lay no more charge against those for whom Christ died than if they had actually fulfilled in the way of obedience whatever it required (Romans 8:32-34). Now how consistent these things — in themselves evident and clearly following from the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction declared above — are with universal redemption is easily discerned. For first, if the full debt of all is paid to the utmost extent of the obligation, how is it that so many are shut up in prison to eternity, never freed from their

debts? Second, if the Lord as a just creditor ought to cancel all obligations and cease all suits against those whose debts are so paid, why does his wrath smoke against some to all eternity? Let no one tell me it is because they do not walk worthy of the benefit bestowed — for that failure to walk worthy is part of the debt, which is fully paid. As the third inference states: the debt so paid is all our sins. Third, is it probable that God calls any to a second payment and requires satisfaction from those for whom, by his own acknowledgment, Christ has made what is full and sufficient? Does he have a later reckoning he had not thought of? For concerning what was before him he spared him not (Romans 8). Fourth, how is it that God never gives a discharge to innumerable souls, though their debts are paid? Fifth, why does any soul live and die under the condemning power of the law, never released, if that law is fully satisfied on their behalf — so that it would be as if they had done whatever it could require? Let those who can reconcile these things do so. I am no Oedipus for them. The poor beggarly distinctions by which it is attempted have already been discussed. And so much for satisfaction.

In answer: refer this reason to God, which is its aim, and it will appear to be of no value. We deny that there is anything in God or done by him primarily for the good of any but himself; his self-sufficiency will not allow him to do anything with an ultimate respect to anything but himself. And when Grotius says the right of punishing is for the good of the community, we answer that the good of the community is the glory of God and that only — so these things in him cannot be distinguished.

Second, he adds: punishment is not in and for itself desirable, but only for the community's sake; now the right of dominion and the right of a creditor are things in themselves valuable and desirable, without consideration of any public aim.

In answer: first, the comparison ought not to be between punishment and the right of dominion, but between the right of punishment and the right of dominion; the act of the one is not to be compared with the right of the other.

Second, God desires nothing, nor is anything desirable to him, except for himself; to suppose a good desirable to God for its own sake is intolerable.

Third, there are some acts of supreme dominion that are in themselves and for their own sake as little desirable as any act of punishment — such as the annihilation of an innocent creature, which Grotius will not deny that God may do.

Third, he proceeds: anyone may without wrong relinquish the right of supreme dominion or creditorship, but the Lord cannot omit the act of punishment for some sins, as those of the impenitent.

In answer: God may by virtue of his supreme dominion omit punishment without any wrong or prejudice to his justice. It is as great a thing to impute sin where it is not and to inflict punishment on that imputation, as not to impute sin where it is and to remove or not inflict punishment on that non-imputation. Now the first of these God did toward Christ, and therefore he may do the latter.

Second, the wrong or injustice of not punishing any sin or sins does not arise from any natural obligation but from consideration of an affirmative positive act of God's will, by which he has purposed to do it.

Fourth, he adds: no one can be called just for using his own right or lordship; but God is called just for punishing or not remitting sin (Revelation 16:5).

In answer: however it may be in other cases, in this matter God may certainly be said to be just in exacting his debt or using his dominion, because his own will is the only rule of justice.

Second, we do not say that punishing is an act of dominion, but an act of exacting a due debt — the requiring of this from Christ in our place, presupposing the intervention of an act of supreme dominion.

Fifth, his last reason is: because that virtue by which one relinquishes his dominion or remits his debt is liberality, but the virtue by which a person abstains from punishment is clemency — so punishment can be no act of exacting a debt or exercising dominion.

In answer: the virtue by which a person relinquishes the exacting of what is due, universally considered, is not always liberality. For as Grotius himself acknowledges, a debt may arise through injury to one's reputation, credit, or name by a lie, slander, or otherwise. The virtue by which a person is moved not to exact payment in the form of reparation is in this case not liberality but either clemency or that grace of the Gospel for which moralists have no name. And so it is with every offended party who has a right to require punishment from his offender but does not exercise it. So

that notwithstanding these exceptions, this is eminently seen in this matter of satisfaction: that God as a creditor does exactly require the payment of the debt by way of punishment.

The second thing eminent in it is an act of supreme sovereignty and dominion, requiring the punishment of Christ for the full and complete answering of the obligation and fulfilling of the law (Romans 8:3; 10:4).

Now these things being thus at length unfolded, we may see briefly some natural consequences following from them as they are laid down. First, the full and due debt of all those for whom Jesus Christ was surety was fully paid to God according to the utmost extent of the obligation. Second, the Lord, who is a just creditor, ought in all equity to cancel the bond and cease all suits, actions, and proceedings against the debtor, full payment being made for the debt. Third, the debt thus paid was not this or that sin but all the sins of all those for whom and in whose name this payment was made (1 John 1:7), as was demonstrated before. Fourth, a second payment of a debt once paid, or a requiring of it again, is not answerable to the justice which God demonstrated in setting forth Christ to be a propitiation for our sins (Romans 3:25).

Fifth, since it is equitably due to a debtor who has been under obligation to receive a discharge from further suit once his debt is paid, the Lord, having accepted payment from Christ in the stead of all those for whom he died, ought in justice — according to that obligation which in free grace he has put upon himself — to grant them a discharge. Sixth, considering the relaxation of the law which the supreme power of the lawgiver effected as to the persons suffering the punishment required, such actual satisfaction is made to it that it can lay no more to the charge of those for whom

Christ died than if they had really fulfilled in obedience whatever it required (Romans 8:32-34). Now how consistent these things — in themselves evident, and clearly following the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction — are with universal redemption is easily discerned. For first, if the full debt of all is paid to the utmost extent of the obligation, how is it that so many are shut up in prison to eternity, never freed from their debts? Second, if the Lord as a just creditor ought to cancel all obligations and cease all suits against those whose debts have been so paid, why does his wrath smoke against some to all eternity? Let none tell me it is because they do not walk worthy of the benefit bestowed — for that not walking worthy is part of the debt, which is fully paid, as the third consequence states: the debt so paid is all our sins. Third, is it probable that God calls any to a second payment and requires satisfaction from those for whom by his own acknowledgment Christ has made what is full and sufficient? Has he an after-reckoning that he did not think of? For in respect of what was before him, he spared him not (Romans 8). Fourth, how is it that God never gives a discharge to innumerable souls, though their debts are paid? Fifth, why does any soul live and die under the condemning power of the law, never released, if that law has been fully satisfied on his behalf, so that it is as though he had done whatever the law could require? Let those who can reconcile these things do so. The poor distinctions by which it is attempted have already been discussed. And so much for satisfaction.

CHAPTER 8



Consider what it is to lie under the effects of God's wrath according to scripture, and then see how the elect are delivered from it before their actual calling. This consists in various things. First, to be in such a state of alienation from God that none of their services are acceptable to him — 'The prayer of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord' (Proverbs 28:9). Second, to have no outward enjoyment sanctified, but to have all things unclean to them (Titus 1:15). Third, to be under the power of Satan, who rules at his pleasure in the children of disobedience (Ephesians 2:2). Fourth, to be in bondage to death (Hebrews 2:14). Fifth, to be under the curse and condemning power of the law (Galatians 3:13). Sixth, to be obnoxious to the judgment of God and guilty of eternal death and damnation (Romans 3:19). Seventh, to be under the power and dominion of sin reigning in them (Romans 6:17). These and such like are what we call the effects of God's anger. Now let anyone tell me what more the reprobates in this life lie under. And do not all the elect until their actual reconciliation in and by Christ lie under the very same? For first, are not their prayers an abomination to the Lord? Can they without faith please God (Hebrews 11:6)? And faith we suppose them not yet to have — for if they have it, they are already actually rec-

onciled. Second, are they not under the power of Satan? If not, why does Christ come in and for them to destroy the works of the devil? Did he not come to deliver his people from him that had the power of death, that is, the devil (Hebrews 2:14; Ephesians 2:2)? Third, are their enjoyments sanctified to them? Has anything a sanctified relation without faith (1 Corinthians 7:14)? Fourth, are they not in bondage to death? The apostle plainly affirms that they are so all their lives until actually freed by Jesus Christ (Hebrews 2:14). Fifth, are they not obnoxious to judgment and guilty of eternal death? How then does Paul say there is no difference, but that all are subject to the judgment of God and guilty before him (Romans 3:9)? And that Christ saves them from this wrath — which in respect of merit was to come upon them (Romans 5:9; 1 Thessalonians 1:10)? Sixth, are they not under the curse of the law? How are they freed from it? By Christ being made a curse for them (Galatians 3:13). Are they not under the dominion of sin? 'God be thanked,' says Paul, 'you were the servants of sin, but have obeyed,' etc. (Romans 6:17). In brief, scripture is in nothing more abundant than in laying and charging all the misery and wrath due to an unreconciled condition upon God's elect until they actually partake in the deliverance by Christ.

But now some men think to sweep away all that has been said in a word, telling us that all this is so only in the elect's own apprehension — not that these things are so in themselves in truth. But if these things are so to them only in their apprehensions, why are they any different for the rest of the whole world? Scripture gives no difference or distinction between them. And if it is so with all, then let all get this apprehension as quickly as they can, and all shall be well with the whole world — now miserably captivated un-

der a misapprehension of their own condition. That is, let them say scripture is a fable, and the terror of the Almighty a scarecrow to frighten children, that sin is only in the imagination, and square their conduct accordingly to their blasphemous fancies. Some men's words eat like a gangrene.

Fourth, of the particular passages of scripture that might abundantly be produced to our purpose, I will content myself to name only one. John 3:36: 'He that believes not the Son, the wrath of God abides on him.' It abides — there it was, and there it will remain if unbelief continues. But upon believing it is removed. But is not God's love unchangeable, by which we shall be freed from this wrath? Who denies it? But is an apprentice free because he shall be so at the end of seven years? Because God has purposed to free his people in his own time and will do it — are they therefore free before he does it? But are we not in Christ from all eternity? Yes, chosen in him we are, and therefore in some sense in him. But how? Even as we are? A person cannot actually be in Christ until he actually is. Now how are we so from eternity? Are we eternal? No — only God from eternity has purposed that we shall be. Does this give us an eternal being? Alas, we are of yesterday. Our being in Christ respects only a like purpose, and from it therefore can be drawn only a like inference.

This being now clarified, it is I hope apparent to all how miserable a strained consequence it is to argue from God's decree of election to the overthrow of Christ's merit and satisfaction. The redemption wrought by Jesus Christ is indeed the chief means of carrying that purpose through to execution — the pleasure of the Lord prospering in his hand. Indeed the argument may be turned back and will hold undeniably on the other side. The consequence

is evident from God's purpose to save sinners to the satisfaction of Christ for those sinners. The same act of God's will which sets us apart from eternity for the enjoyment of all spiritual blessings in heavenly places also sets apart Jesus Christ to be the purchaser and procurer of all those spiritual blessings, and to make satisfaction for all their sins. That he did so — being the main thing opposed — will be proved by the following arguments.

First, the eternal love of God toward his elect is nothing but his purpose and good pleasure — a pure act of his will whereby he determines to do such and such things for them in his own time and way.

Second, no purpose of God, no immanent eternal act of his will, produces any outward effect or changes anything in the nature and condition of that thing concerning which his purpose is; it only makes the event and outcome necessary in respect of that purpose.

Third, the wrath and anger of God under which sinners lie is not any passion in God, but only the outward effects of anger — such as guilt, bondage, and the like.

Fourth, an act of God's eternal love which is immanent in himself does not exempt the creature from the condition in which it lies under anger and wrath, until some temporal act of free grace actually changes its state and condition. For example: God beholding the mass of humanity in his own power as the clay in the hand of the potter, determining to make some vessels to honor for the praise of his glorious grace and others to dishonor for the manifestation of his avenging justice, and to this end permitting all to fall into sin and the guilt of condemnation whereby they all became li-

able to his wrath and curse — his purpose to save some of these does not at all exempt or free them from the common condition of the rest, in respect of themselves and the truth of their estate, until something actual is accomplished to bring them near to himself. So that notwithstanding his eternal purpose, his wrath in respect of its effects abides on them until that eternal purpose makes itself out in some distinguishing act of free grace. This may receive further demonstration from the following arguments.

First, if the sinner lacks nothing for acceptance and peace but a manifestation of God's eternal love, then justification in the gospel sense is nothing but an apprehension of God's eternal decree and purpose. But this cannot be made out from scripture — that God's justifying of a person is his making known to him his decree of election, or that justification consists in a person's apprehension of that decree, purpose, or love. It is true there is a discovery of it made to justified believers (Romans 5:5), but this is after they are justified by faith and have peace with God (verse 1). Justification in scripture is an act of God pronouncing an ungodly person, upon his believing, to be absolved from the guilt of sin and invested in the all-sufficient righteousness of Christ (Romans 4:5; 3:22). But of this manifestation of eternal love as the form of justification, there is not the least foundation in scripture.

Second, scripture is exceedingly clear in placing all people before actual reconciliation in the same state and condition, without any real difference at all — the Lord reserving to himself his distinguishing purpose of the change he will afterward effect by his free grace. 'There is none that does good, no not one' (Romans 3:10) — for we have proved that Jews and Gentiles are all under sin (verses 9-10). All humanity is in the same condition in respect of them-

selves and their own real state. 'For every mouth is stopped, and all the world is become guilty before God' (Romans 3:19), obnoxious to his judgment. 'Who makes you to differ from another? Or what do you have that you did not receive?' (1 Corinthians 4:7). All distinction in respect of state and condition is by God's actual grace. 'Even believers are by nature children of wrath, as well as others' (Ephesians 2:3). The condition of all people during their unregenerate state is one and the same; the purpose of God concerning the difference that shall be is reserved to himself. Now I ask: whether reprobates in that condition lie under the effects of God's wrath or not? If you say no, who will believe you? If yes, why not the elect also? The same condition has the same qualities — we have proved there is no actual distinction. Produce some difference that has a real existence, or the argument is lost.

Third, consider what it is to lie under the effects of God's wrath according to scripture, and then see how the elect are delivered from it before their actual calling. This consists in various things: first, to be in such a state of alienation from God that none of their services are acceptable to him — 'the prayer of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord' (Proverbs 28:9); second, to have no outward enjoyment sanctified, but to have all things unclean to them (Titus 1:15); third, to be under the power of Satan, who rules at his pleasure in the children of disobedience (Ephesians 2:2); fourth, to be in bondage to death (Hebrews 2:14); fifth, to be under the curse and condemning power of the law (Galatians 3:13); sixth, to be obnoxious to the judgment of God and guilty of eternal death and damnation (Romans 3:19); seventh, to be under the power and dominion of sin reigning in them (Romans 6:17). These are what we call the effects of God's anger. Let anyone now tell me: what more

do the reprobates in this life lie under? And do not all the elect, until their actual reconciliation in and by Christ, lie under the very same? First, are not their prayers an abomination to the Lord? Can they without faith please God (Hebrews 11:6)? Second, are they not under the power of Satan? If not, why does Christ come for them to destroy the works of the devil, and deliver his people from him who had the power of death (Hebrews 2:14; Ephesians 2:2)? Third, are their enjoyments sanctified to them? Has anything a sanctified relation without faith (1 Corinthians 7:14)? Fourth, are they not in bondage to death? The apostle plainly affirms that they are so all their lives until actually freed by Jesus Christ (Hebrews 2:14). Fifth, are they not obnoxious to judgment and guilty of eternal death? How then does Paul say there is no difference, but that all are subject to the judgment of God and are guilty before him (Romans 3:9), and that Christ saves them from this wrath which was to come upon them (Romans 5:9; 1 Thessalonians 1)? Sixth, are they not under the curse of the law? How are they freed from it? By Christ being made a curse for them (Galatians 3:13). Are they not under the dominion of sin? 'God be thanked,' says Paul, 'you were the servants of sin, but have obeyed' etc. (Romans 6:17). In brief, scripture is in nothing more plentiful than in laying and charging all the misery and wrath of an unreconciled condition upon the elect of God until they actually partake in the deliverance by Christ.

But some think to wipe away all that has been said with a word, telling us that all this is so only in their own apprehension — not that these things are actually so. But if these things are so only in their apprehension, why are they otherwise to the rest of the whole world? Scripture gives us no distinction between them. And if it be

so with all, then let all get this new apprehension as fast as they can, and all will be well with the whole world, now miserably captive under a misapprehension of their own condition — that is, let them say scripture is a fable, and the terror of the Almighty a scarecrow to frighten children, that sin exists only in the imagination, and so order their lives according to their blasphemous fancies. Some men's words eat as a canker.

Fourth, of particular passages of scripture which might abundantly be produced for our purpose, I shall content myself to name only one: John 3:36 — 'He that believes not the Son, the wrath of God abides on him' — it abides: there it was, and there it shall remain if unbelief continues, but upon believing it is removed. But is not God's love unchangeable, by which we shall be freed from this wrath? Who denies it? But is an apprentice free because he shall be so at the end of seven years? Because God has purposed to free his people in his own time and will do it, are they therefore free before he does it? But are we not in Christ from all eternity? Yes, chosen in him we are, and therefore in some sense in him — but how? Actually a person cannot be in Christ until he is; now how are we from eternity? Are we eternal? No — only God from eternity has purposed that we shall be. Does this give us an eternal being? Alas, we are of yesterday. Our being in Christ respects only the like purpose, and therefore from that can be made only the like inference.

This being cleared, it is, I hope, apparent to all how miserable a strained consequence it is to argue from God's decree of election to the overthrow of Christ's merit and satisfaction. The redemption wrought by Jesus Christ is indeed the chief means of carrying that purpose into execution — the pleasure of the Lord prospering in his hand. Yes, the argument may be retorted and will hold undeni-

ably on the other side: the consequence is evident from the purpose of God to save sinners, to the satisfaction of Christ for those sinners. The same act of God's will which sets us apart from eternity for the enjoyment of all spiritual blessings in heavenly places also sets apart Jesus Christ to be the purchaser and procurer of all those spiritual blessings, and to make satisfaction for all their sins. That he did this — being the main thing opposed — we prove by the following arguments.

CHAPTER 9



If Christ so took our sins and had them by God so laid and imposed on him that he underwent the punishment due to them in our stead, then he made satisfaction to the justice of God for them so that the sinners might go free. But Christ so took and bore our sins and had them so laid upon him that he underwent the punishment due to them, and that in our stead. Therefore he made satisfaction to the justice of God for them. The consequent of the proposition is apparent and was proved before. Of the assumption there are three parts to be separately confirmed: first, that Christ took and bore our sins, God laying them on him; second, that he so took them as to undergo the punishment due to them; third, that he did this in our stead.

For the first, that he took and bore our sins: 'Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world' (John 1:29); 'Who his own self bore our sins in his own body on the tree' (1 Peter 2:24); Isaiah 53:11: 'Their iniquities he shall bear,' and verse 12: 'He bore the sin of many.' That God also laid or imposed our sins on him is no less apparent. Isaiah 53:6: 'The Lord made to meet on him the iniquity of us all.' 2 Corinthians 5:21: 'He made him to be sin for us.'

The second branch is that in doing so, our Savior underwent the punishment due to the sins he bore and that were laid upon him. Death and the curse of the law contain the whole of the punishment due to sin. Genesis 3: 'Dying you shall die' — that was the threat; death was what entered by sin (Romans 5:12), which word in those places is comprehensive of all misery due to our transgression, as also expressed in the curse of the law (Deuteronomy 27:26): 'Cursed is he who does not confirm all the words of this law to do them' — that all punishments whatsoever are comprised in these is unquestionably evident. Now Jesus Christ, in bearing our sins, underwent both: 'By the grace of God he tasted of death' (Hebrews 2:9), delivering from death by death (verse 14); 'He was not spared, but given up to death for us all' (Romans 8:32). So also the curse of the law (Galatians 3:13): 'He was made a curse for us' — made accursed. And this by way of undergoing the punishment that was in death and the curse: 'It pleased the Lord to bruise him and put him to grief' (Isaiah 53:10), 'he spared him not' (Romans 8:32), but 'condemned sin in his flesh' (Romans 8:3). It remains only to show that he did this in our stead, and the whole argument is confirmed.

Now this also our Savior himself makes apparent. Matthew 20:28: 'He came to give himself a ransom for many' — the word always supposes a substitution and exchange of one person or thing in the place of another (so Matthew 2:22). So 1 Timothy 2:6; 1 Peter 3:18: 'He died for us, the just for the unjust.' And Psalm 69:4: 'I restored what I did not take' — namely, our debt — so fully that thereby we are discharged (Romans 8:34), where it is asserted on this very ground that he died in our stead. So the several parts of this first argument are confirmed.

If Jesus Christ paid into his Father's hands a valuable price and ransom for our sins as our surety — thereby discharging the debt we lay under so that we might go free — then he bore the punishment due to our sins and made satisfaction to the justice of God for them. For to pay such a ransom is to make such satisfaction. But Jesus Christ paid such a price and ransom as our surety into his Father's hands. Therefore he made satisfaction.

There are four things to be proved in the assumption or second proposition: first, that Christ paid such a price and ransom; second, that he paid it into the hands of his Father; third, that he did it as our surety; fourth, that we might go free. All of which will be proved in order.

First, for the first: our Savior himself affirms it. Matthew 20:28: 'He came to give his life a ransom for many' (Mark 10:45), which the apostle terms 'a ransom to be accepted in the stead of others' (1 Timothy 2:6). Hence we are said to have deliverance through the ransom-paying of Christ (Romans 3:24). 'He bought us with a price' (1 Corinthians 6:20), which price was his own blood (Acts 20:28), compared to and exalted above silver and gold in this work of redemption (1 Peter 1:18). So this first part is most clear and evident.

Second, he paid this price into the hands of his Father. A price in the case of deliverance from captivity must be paid to the judge or jailer — that is, to God or the devil; to say the latter would be the height of blasphemy, for Satan was to be conquered, not satisfied. For the former, scripture is clear: it was God's wrath that was upon us (John 3:36); it was he who had shut us all up under sin (Romans 3); he is the great King to whom the debt is owed (Matthew 18:23-24); he is the only lawgiver who can kill and make

alive (James 4:12). Indeed, the ways in which this ransom-paying is expressed in scripture abundantly confirm that payment was made into the hands of the Father. For his death and blood-shedding is called an oblation and sacrifice (Ephesians 5:2), and his soul a sacrifice or offering for sin (Isaiah 53:10). Now certainly offerings and sacrifices are to be directed to God alone.

Third, that he did this as surety we are assured in Hebrews 7:22 — he was made a surety of a better covenant — and in performance of the duty that lay upon him as such, 'he paid what he never took' (Psalm 69:4). All of which could not possibly have any other end than that we might go free.

To make atonement for sin and to reconcile God to sinners is in effect to make satisfaction to the justice of God for sin and all that we understand by that. But Jesus Christ by his death and offering did make atonement for sin and reconcile God to sinners — therefore this cannot be denied.

The first proposition is self-evident; the minor is confirmed by Romans 3:24-25: 'We are justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God has set forth to be a propitiation' — an atonement, a mercy seat, a covering of iniquity — 'for the manifestation of his justice, declared in the going forth and accomplishment thereof.' Similarly, Hebrews 2:17 says he is a merciful high priest to make reconciliation for the sins of the people — to reconcile God who was offended by the sins of his people — which reconciliation we are said to receive (Romans 5:11). And all this is said to be accomplished by 'one righteous act' or satisfaction of Christ (the words will not bear the sense in which they are usually rendered, 'by the righteousness of one,' for then it must

have been expressed differently in the original). Hereby we were delivered from that from which it was impossible to be otherwise delivered (Romans 8:3).

The exercise of the priestly office of Jesus Christ while he was on earth, consisting in bearing the punishment due to our sins, making atonement with God by undergoing his wrath, and reconciling him to sinners upon the satisfaction made to his justice — cannot be rejected or denied without damnable error. That this was the exercise of Christ's priestly office is most apparent: first, from all the types and sacrifices by which it was prefigured, their chief end being propitiation and atonement; second, from the very nature of the priestly office appointed for sacrificing, Christ having nothing to offer but his own blood through the eternal Spirit; and third, from various and indeed innumerable scriptures affirming the same. One or two passages will serve: Hebrews 9:13-14 — 'If the blood of bulls and goats... how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God?' — where the death of Christ is compared to, exalted above, and in the antitype answers the sacrifices of expiation made by the blood of bulls and goats, and so must spiritually effect what they carnally accomplished and typically prefigured — namely, deliverance from the guilt of sin by expiation and atonement. For as in them the life and blood of the sacrifice was accepted in the place of the offerer who was to die for the breach of the law, so in this the blood of Christ was accepted as atonement and propitiation for us, himself being priest, altar, and sacrifice. Hebrews 10:10, 12 expressly states that he offered up his own body a sacrifice for sins —

in the place of all the old insufficient carnal sacrifices which could not make perfect those who approached them — for the remission and pardon of sins through that offering of himself (verse 19).

We also affirm that in performing this, our Savior underwent the wrath of God which was due to us. Since some question this, I will briefly confirm it with the following reasons.

First, the punishment due to sin is the wrath of God (Romans 1:18; 2:5; Ephesians 2:3; John 3:36). Jesus Christ underwent the punishment due to sin (2 Corinthians 5:21; Isaiah 53:6; 1 Peter 2:24). Therefore he underwent the wrath of God.

Second, the curse of the law is the wrath of God received passively (Deuteronomy 29:20-21). But Jesus Christ underwent the curse of the law (Galatians 3:13) — made a curse for us, the same curse that falls on those who are out of Christ and under the works of the law (verse 10). Therefore he underwent the wrath of God.

That doctrine cannot be true nor agreeable to the Gospel which strikes at the root of Gospel faith and pulls away the foundation of all that strong consolation God is so abundantly willing we should receive. But such is the doctrine of denying the satisfaction made by Christ and his enduring of the wrath of his Father. It makes the poor soul like Noah's dove in its distress, not knowing where to rest the sole of her feet. When a soul is turned out of its self-righteousness and begins to look abroad at heaven and earth for a resting place, perceiving a flood and inundation of wrath covering all the world — the wrath of God revealing itself from heaven against all ungodliness — so that it can find no rest, unable to reach heaven by its own flight and unwilling to fall to hell: if the Lord Jesus Christ does not appear as an ark in the midst of the waters,

upon whom the floods have fallen and yet who has risen above them all, as a refuge, what shall that soul do? When the flood fell, there were many mountains glorious in the eye, far higher than the ark — yet those mountains were all drowned while the ark kept on the top of the waters. Many appearing hills and mountains of self-righteousness and general mercy at first view seem to the soul much higher than Jesus Christ; but when the flood of wrath comes and spreads itself, all those mountains are quickly covered. Only the ark — the Lord Jesus Christ — though the flood falls on him also, gets above it entirely and gives safety to those who rest upon him. Let me now ask any of those poor souls who have ever been wandering and tossed with fear of the wrath to come: whether they ever found a resting place until they came to this — that God spared not his only Son but gave him up to death for us all; that he made him to be sin for us; that he put all the sins of all the elect into that cup which he was to drink; that the wrath and flood they feared did fall upon Jesus Christ (though now as the ark he is above it, so that if they could get into him they would be safe) — the storm having been his and the safety theirs; as all the waters that would have fallen upon those in the ark fell upon the ark, they being dry and safe, so all the wrath that should have fallen on them fell on Christ, which alone causes their souls to dwell in safety? Has not this been your foundation, your resting place? If not — for the substance of it — I fear you have but rotten foundations. Now what would you say if a man should come and pull this ark from under you and give you an old rotten post to swim upon in the flood of wrath? It is too late to tell you no wrath is due to you — the Word of truth and your own consciences have given you other information: you know the wages of sin is death in whomsoever it

be; he must die on whomsoever it is found. So the soul may well say: deprive me of the satisfaction of Christ and I am bereaved. If he did not fulfill justice, I must; if he did not endure wrath, I must, to eternity. O do not rob me of my only pearl. Denying the satisfaction of Christ destroys the foundation of faith and comfort.

Another argument we may take from some few particular passages of Scripture. First, 2 Corinthians 5:21: 'He made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin.' He made him to be sin for us — how could that be? Are not the very next words 'he knew no sin'? Was he not a lamb without spot and blemish? Certainly he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. What then is this — God made him to be sin? It cannot be that God made him sinful or a sinner by inherent sin; that will not stand with the justice of God nor with the holiness of the person of our Redeemer. What is it then — he was made to be sin who knew no sin? Clearly: by divine appointment and consent God laid to his charge what he was not guilty of. He charged upon him and imputed to him all the sins of all the elect, and proceeded against him accordingly. He stood as our surety, really charged with the whole debt, and was to pay the uttermost farthing, as a surety must if it is required of him — though he borrowed not the money nor has a penny of what is in the obligation, yet if he is sued to execution he must pay all. The Lord Christ, if I may so say, was sued by his Father's justice to execution; in answer to which he underwent all that was due to sin — which we proved before to be death, wrath, and curse. If it is objected that God was always well pleased with his Son, testifying so again and again from heaven, how then could he lay his wrath on him?

In answer: it is true he was always well pleased with him, yet it pleased him to bruise him and put him to grief. He was always well pleased with the holiness of his person, the excellence and perfectness of his righteousness, and the sweetness of his obedience — but he was displeased with the sins that were charged on him, and therefore it pleased him to bruise and put to grief the one with whom he was always well pleased. Nor is the other exception of any more value — that Christ underwent no more than the elect lay under, and they lay not under wrath and the punishment due to sin.

In answer: the proposition is most false, nor is there any truth in the assumption. First, Christ underwent not only the wrath (taken passively) that the elect lay under, but also the wrath they should have undergone had he not borne it for them — he delivered them from the wrath to come. Second, the elect in their several generations do lie under all the wrath of God in respect of merit and procurement, though not in respect of actual endurance — in respect of guilt, not present punishment. So notwithstanding these exceptions it stands firm: he was made sin for us who knew no sin.

Isaiah 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.' Something was said before on this passage; some small enlargements will be added that help discover the meaning of the words. 'The chastisement of our peace was upon him' — that is, he was chastised or punished that we might have peace, that we might go free. Our sins being the cause of his wounding, and our iniquities of his being bruised, all our sins meeting upon him as verse 6 states. That is, he bore our

sins — in Peter's interpretation: 'he bore our sins' (1 Peter 2:24). He bore our sins not, as some think, by declaring that we were never truly sinful, but by being wounded for them, bruised for them, undergoing the chastisement due to them — consisting in death, wrath, and curse — thus making his soul an offering for sin. 'He bore our sins' — that is, say some, he declared that we have an eternal righteousness in God because of his eternal purpose to do us good. But is this to interpret Scripture, or to corrupt the Word of God? Ask the Word what it means by Christ's bearing of sins, and it will tell you: his being smitten for our transgressions (Isaiah 53:8), his being cut off for our sins (Daniel 9:26). Nor has the expression 'bearing sins' any other meaning in Scripture. Leviticus 5:1: 'He that hears swearing and does not reveal it shall bear his iniquity' — meaning not that he shall declare himself or others to be free from sin, but that he shall undergo the punishment due to sin, as our Savior did in bearing our iniquities. He must be a very cunning player indeed who would cheat a believer out of this foundation.

More arguments or texts on this subject will not be urged or produced here, though the cause itself would compel even the most unskilled to abound in them. I have proceeded as far as the nature of a digression will well bear. Nor shall I undertake at this time to answer objections to the contrary. A full discussion of the whole matter of Christ's satisfaction — which would require searching out, drawing forth, and refuting all objections — is not my present intention. As for the objections raised in that debate which gave occasion to this discourse, I dare not reproduce them here, lest some might conjecture that I deliberately framed such

weak objections in order to obtain an easy conquest over a man of straw of my own construction. So weak were they, and of so little force against so fundamental a truth as that which we maintain.

CHAPTER 10



A fourth thing ascribed to the death of Christ is merit — or that worth and value of his death whereby he purchased and procured for those for whom he died all those good things which scripture assigns as the fruits and effects of his death. Of this much need not be said, having already considered the thing itself under the notion of impetration. The word 'merit' is not found in the New Testament in any translation I have seen from the original. But the thing itself intended by that word is evident in both testaments. Isaiah 53:5: 'The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed' — the procurement of our peace and healing was the merit of his chastisement and stripes. Hebrews 9:12: 'obtaining by his blood eternal redemption' is as much as we intend by the merit of Christ. The nearest word to it in meaning is found in Acts 20:28: 'purchased with his own blood' — purchase and merit, impetration and acquisition being equivalent terms in this matter. What we understand by merit is the performance of such an action whereby the thing aimed at by the agent is due to him according to the equity and equality required in justice: 'To him that works, the reward is reckoned not of grace but of debt' (Romans 4:4). That such merit attends the death of Christ is apparent from what was said before, and is not contested by our ad-

versaries. Christ then by his death merited and purchased for all those for whom he died all those things which scripture assigns as the fruits and effects of his death. These may be referred to two heads: first, privative — deliverance from the hands of our enemies (Luke 1:74), from the wrath to come (1 Thessalonians 1), from death in its power (Hebrews 2:14), from the works of the devil (1 John 3:8), from the curse of the law (Galatians 3:13), from vain conduct (1 Peter 1:18), from the present evil world (Galatians 1:4), and purging of our sins (Hebrews 1:3); second, positive — reconciliation with God (Romans 5:10; Ephesians 2:16; Colossians 2:20), appeasing of God by propitiation (Romans 3:25; 1 John 2:2), peace-making (Ephesians 2:14), and salvation (Matthew 1:21). All these our Savior by his death merited and purchased for all those for whom he died — so procured them of his Father that they ought in respect of that merit, according to the equity of justice, to be bestowed on them for whom they were procured. It was absolutely of free grace in God that he sent Jesus Christ to die for any and for whom he sent him to die; it is of free grace that the good things procured by his death are bestowed on any person in respect of the persons on whom they are bestowed. But considering his own appointment and constitution — that Jesus Christ by his death should merit and procure grace and glory for those for whom he died — it is of debt in respect of Christ that these things be communicated to them; and not only that they may be, but that they ought to be, and it is injustice if they are not. Having said this of the nature of the merit of Christ, it quickly appears how irreconcilable the general ransom is with it. For if Christ has merited grace and glory for all those for whom he died, and if he died for all, how is it that these things are not communicated and bestowed

upon all? Is the defect in the merit of Christ, or in the justice of God? How vain is it to object that these things are not bestowed absolutely but upon condition and were so procured — seeing that the very condition itself is also merited and procured (Ephesians 1:3-4; Philippians 1:29), as has already been declared.

Fifth, the very phrases of 'dying for us,' 'bearing our sins,' 'being our surety,' and the like, whereby the death of Christ for us is expressed, will not stand with the payment of a ransom for all. To die for another is in scripture to die in that other's stead so that the other might go free — as Judah entreated his brother Joseph to accept him as a bondservant in place of Benjamin that Benjamin might be set at liberty (Genesis 44:33), Judah thereby making good the engagement wherein he stood bound to his father as surety for him. He who is surety for another (as Christ was for us, Hebrews 7:22) is to undergo the danger that the other might be delivered. So David, wishing he had died for his son Absalom (2 Samuel 18:33), intended a commutation and substitution of his life for Absalom's, so that Absalom might have lived. Paul also intimates the same in Romans 5:7, supposing that such a thing might be found among people, that one should die for another — alluding to those who voluntarily gave themselves up to death for the deliverance of their country or friends, thereby continuing the liberty and freedom from death of those who were to undergo it. This plainly is the meaning of the phrase 'Christ died for us' — that in the undergoing of death there was a substitution of his person in the room and stead of ours. Some indeed object that where the Greek preposition meaning 'for the benefit of' is used, as in Hebrews 2:9 ('that by the grace of God he should taste death for every man'), it intends only the good and profit of those for whom

he died, not enforcing the necessity of any commutation. But this exception has little force, for the same preposition used in a similar construction in other places does confessedly indicate a commutation — as Romans 9:3, where Paul says he could wish himself accursed from Christ for his brethren, that is in their stead. And concerning the Greek word 'anti' which is also used, there is no doubt: it always signifies a commutation and exchange, whether applied to things or persons — as 'a serpent instead of a fish' (Luke 11:11), 'an eye for an eye' (Matthew 5:38), and Archelaus is said to reign in the stead of his father (Matthew 2:22). This word is used of the death of our Savior in Matthew 20:28: 'The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many' — that is, in the stead of many. So that plainly, Christ dying for us as a surety (Hebrews 7:22) and thereby bearing our sins in his own body (1 Peter 2:24), being made a curse for us, was an undergoing of death, punishment, curse, and wrath — not only for our good but directly in our stead. A commutation and substitution of his person in the room and place of ours was allowed and accepted by God. This being established, I demand: first, whether Christ died thus for all — that is, whether he died in the room and stead of all, his person substituted in the room of theirs; as, whether he died in the stead of Cain and Pharaoh and the rest who long before his death were under the power of the second death, never to be delivered? Second, whether it is justice that those, or any of them, in whose stead Christ died bearing their iniquities, should themselves also die and bear their own sins to eternity? Third, what rule of equity or example is there for the surety, having answered and made satisfaction to the uttermost of what was required in the obligation, to have those for whom he was surety afterward proceeded against?

Fourth, whether Christ hung upon the cross in the room or stead of reprobates? Fifth, whether he underwent all that was due to those for whom he died? If not, how could he be said to die in their stead? If so, why are they not all delivered? I shall add no more but this: to affirm that Christ died for all people is the readiest way to prove that he died for no person in the sense Christians have hitherto believed, and to plunge poor souls into the depths of Socinian blasphemy.

CHAPTER 11



Our next argument is taken from some particular passages of Scripture clearly and distinctly in themselves holding out the truth of what we affirm; out of the great number of them I shall take a few to insist upon and therewith to close our arguments.

The first is the very first mention of Jesus Christ — the first revelation of the mind of God concerning a discrimination between the people of Christ and his enemies — in Genesis 3:15: 'I will put enmity between you (the serpent) and the woman, and between your seed and her seed.' By the seed of the woman is meant the whole body of the elect: Christ in the first place as the head, and all the rest as his members. By the seed of the serpent is meant the devil with the whole multitude of reprobates, making up the malignant state in opposition to the kingdom and body of Jesus Christ. That by the first — the seed of the woman — is meant Christ with all the elect is most apparent: for those in whom all things foretold of the seed of the woman concur are the seed of the woman (the properties of a thing prove the thing itself). But in the elect and believers, in and through Christ, are found all the properties of the seed of the woman — for for them, in them, and by them is the head of the serpent broken, and Satan trodden down under their

feet, the devil disappointed in his temptations, and the devil's agents frustrated in their undertakings; this is principally and especially spoken of Christ himself and collectively of his whole body, which bears a continual hatred to the serpent and his seed.

Second, by the seed of the serpent is meant all the reprobate — people of the world, the impenitent and unbelievers.

For first, the enmity of the serpent lives and exercises itself in them; they hate and oppose the seed of the woman, they have a perpetual enmity with it, and everything said of the seed of the serpent belongs properly to them.

Second, they are often so called in Scripture: 'O generation of vipers' (Matthew 3:7; 23:33); Christ told the reprobate Pharisees 'you are of your father the devil and his works you will do' (John 8:44); so also 'child of the devil' (Acts 13:10), meaning the seed of the serpent, 'for he who commits sin is of the devil' (1 John 3:8). These things being undeniable, we proceed thus: Christ died for no more than God promised him he should die for; but God did not promise him to all — he did not promise the seed of the woman to the seed of the serpent, Christ to reprobates; rather in the very first word about him he promises an enmity against them. In sum: the seed of the woman did not die for the seed of the serpent.

Second, Matthew 7:23: 'I profess to you I never knew you.' Christ on the last day professes to some that he never knew them. Christ says directly that he knows his own, for whom he lays down his life (John 10:14, 17). And surely he knows whom and what he has bought. Were it not strange that Christ should die for people and buy them, and then will not own them but profess he never knew them? If they are bought with a price, surely they are his own

(1 Corinthians 6:20)? If Christ so bought them and laid out the price of his precious blood for them, and then at last denied that he ever knew them — might they not well reply: 'Ah Lord! was not your soul heavy unto death for our sakes? Did you not for us undergo that wrath that made you sweat drops of blood? Did you not bathe yourself in your own blood that our blood might be spared? Did you not sanctify yourself to be an offering for us as well as for any of your apostles? Was not your precious blood poured out for us by stripes, by sweat, by nails, by thorns, by spear? Did you not remember us when you hung upon the cross? And now do you say you never knew us?' What can be answered to this plea upon the granting of a general ransom, I do not know.

Third, Matthew 11:25: 'I thank you, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and prudent and have revealed them to babes; even so, O Father, for so it seemed good in your sight.' Those from whom God in his sovereignty as Lord of heaven and earth, of his own good pleasure, hides the Gospel — either in respect of the outward preaching of it or the inward revelation of its power in their hearts — for those certainly Christ did not die. For to what end should the Father send his only Son to die for the redemption of those whom he of his own good pleasure had determined should be everlasting strangers to that redemption and never so much as hear of it in the power of it revealed to them? Now that such there are, our Savior here affirms and thanks his Father for that dispensation — at which so many today are repining.

Fourth, John 10:11, 15-16, 27-28: This clear passage, which by itself is sufficient to overturn the general ransom, has been considered briefly before and will therefore be passed over more briefly

now. First, that not all people are the sheep of Christ is most apparent: he himself says so in verse 26 — 'you are not of my sheep'; the distinction on the last day will make it evident when the sheep and the goats are separated; and the properties of the sheep here — that they hear the voice of Christ, that they know him, and the like — are not in all. Second, the sheep mentioned here are all his elect, both those yet to be called and those already called (verse 16), some not yet of his visible fold — so they are sheep by election, not by believing. Third, Christ says so plainly that he lays down his life for his sheep that he evidently excludes all others: first, he lays down his life for them as sheep, and what belongs to them as such belongs only to such — if he lays down his life for sheep as sheep, he does not do so for goats and wolves and dogs; second, he lays it down as a shepherd (verse 11) and therefore for them as the sheep — what has the shepherd to do with wolves unless it be to destroy them?; third, dividing all into sheep and others (verse 26), he says he lays down his life for his sheep, which is the same as saying he does it for them only; fourth, he describes those for whom he died as those whom his Father gave to him (verse 29; 17:6), 'yours they were and you gave them to me' — which are not all — and he gives to them eternal life and they shall never perish (verse 28). Let but the sheep of Christ keep close to this evidence and all the world shall never deprive them of their inheritance. To confirm this further, add Matthew 20:28 and John 11:52.

Fifth, Romans 8:32-34: the Apostle's intention here is to hold out consolation to believers in affliction or under any distress — which he does in verse 31 in general, from the assurance of God's presence with them and his assistance at all times, enough to conquer all opposition. To manifest this his presence and kindness,

the Apostle recalls that most excellent, transcendent, and singular act of love toward them: God sending his Son to die for them, not sparing him, but requiring their debt at his hand. He then argues from the greater to the lesser — if God has done the greater, will he not do the lesser? If he gives his Son to death, will he not also freely give us all things? From this we may observe: first, that the greatest expression of God's love toward believers is in sending his Son to die for them — this is made the chief of all; now if God sent his Son to die for all, he has as great an act of love and has made as great a manifestation of it to those who perish as to those who are saved, which is most untrue. Second, for whomever he has given and not spared his Son, to them he will assuredly freely give all things; but he does not give all good things — faith, grace, and glory — to all; from which we conclude that Christ did not die for all. Again, verse 33 describes those who have a share in this consolation as God's elect — not all, but only those whom he has chosen; and verse 34 further confirms that those of whom he speaks shall be freely justified and freed from condemnation, first because Christ died for them and second because he is risen and makes intercession for them for whom he died. This yields two invincible arguments: first, the death of Christ infallibly frees from condemnation all for whom he died; second, the Apostle makes an inseparable connection between the death and intercession of Jesus Christ — for whom he died, for them he makes intercession, and he saves to the uttermost those for whom he intercedes (Hebrews 7:25). From all this it is undeniably apparent that the death of Christ with the fruits and benefits thereof belongs only to the elect of God.

Sixth, Ephesians 1:7: 'In whom we have redemption' — if his blood were shed for all, then all must have a share in those things that are to be had in his blood; but among these is the redemption that consists in the forgiveness of sins, which certainly not all have, for those who have it are blessed (Romans 4) and shall be blessed forevermore, which blessing comes not upon all but upon the seed of righteous Abraham.

Seventh, 2 Corinthians 5:21: 'He made him to be sin for us, that we might become the righteousness of God in him.' It was in his death that Christ was made sin or an offering for it; now for whomever he was made sin, they are made the righteousness of God in him. 'By his stripes we are healed' (Isaiah 53); 'Greater love has no one than this, that he lay down his life for his friends' (John 15:13). Intercession is not of greater love than dying, nor is anything else he does for his elect. If then he laid down his life for all — which is the greatest — why does he not also do everything else for them and save them to the uttermost?

Eighth, John 17:9: 'I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for those whom you have given me, for they are yours.' And verse 19: 'For their sakes I sanctify myself.'

Ninth, Ephesians 5:25: 'Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved his church and gave himself for it' (as Acts 20:28). The object of Christ's love and his death is here asserted to be his bride, his church — as properly as a man's own wife is the only lawful object of his conjugal affections. And if Christ had a love for others so as to die for them, then in the exhortation a latitude is left to men in conjugal affections for other women besides their wives.

I had intended to add other arguments, planning a full discussion of the whole controversy. But upon reviewing what has been said, I take up and conclude with confidence that what has already been urged will be sufficient to satisfy those who will be satisfied by anything, and that those who are obstinate will not be satisfied by more. So here our arguments come to an end.

CHAPTER 1



A second thing to be considered is the economy or administration of the new covenant in the times of the gospel, with the breadth and enlargement of the kingdom and dominion of Christ after his appearance in the flesh. By this, all external differences having been removed, the distinction of Gentiles taken away, the dividing wall broken down, the promise to Abraham that he should be heir of the world as he was the father of the faithful was now fully to be accomplished. Now this administration is so opposed to that dispensation which was restricted to one people and family who were God's peculiar people — all the rest of the world being excluded — that it gives rise to many general expressions in scripture. These are far from comprehending a universality of all individuals, but denote only the removal of all such restricting qualifications as were previously in force. So consideration of the end for which these general expressions are used — and what they aim at — will clearly show their nature, and how they are to be understood, and who those are intended and comprised in them. For it being only this enlargement of the visible kingdom of Christ to all nations in respect of right — and to many in respect of fact, God having elect in all those nations to be brought forth in the several generations in which the means of grace are employed in

those places — it is evident that these expressions import only a distribution of people through all differences whatsoever, and not a universal collection of all and every one. The thing intended by them requires the one and not the other. Hence those objections raised against the particular nature of the ransom of Christ and its restriction only to the elect — drawn from the terms 'all,' 'all people,' 'all nations,' 'the world,' 'the whole world,' and the like — are all exceedingly weak and invalid. They wrest the general expressions of scripture beyond their aim and intent. They are used by the Holy Spirit only to evidence the removal of all personal and national distinction, the breaking of all the narrow bounds of the old testament, the enlarging of the kingdom of Christ beyond the borders of Judea and Jerusalem, the abolishing of all old restrictions, and the opening of a way for the elect among all peoples — called 'the fullness of the Gentiles' — to come in. There being now 'neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, slave nor free, but Christ is all and in all' (Colossians 3:11). Hence the Lord promises to 'pour out his Spirit on all flesh' (Joel 2:28), which Peter interprets as accomplished by the filling of the apostles with the gifts of the Spirit, enabling them to preach to several nations (Acts 2:17). 'Having received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations' (Romans 1:5) — not the Jews only, but some among all nations. The gospel being 'the power of God to salvation to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek' (verse 16) — intending only, as to salvation, the particular people bought by Christ, whom he redeemed out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation (Revelation 5:9), where an evident distribution is given of what in other places is set down in general terms. The gospel being commanded to be

preached to all these nations (Matthew 28:19), that those redeemed ones among them all might be brought home to God (John 11:52). This is what the apostle sets forth at length in Ephesians 2:14-17. Now in this sense — which we have explained — and no other, are those many passages to be taken which are usually urged for universal grace and redemption, as will afterward be declared in particular.

Third, an exact distinction must be made between human duty and God's purpose, there being no connection between them. The purpose and decree of God is not the rule of our duty, nor is the performance of our duty in doing what we are commanded any declaration of what God purposes to do or has decreed that it shall be done. This is especially to be seen and considered in the duty of the ministers of the gospel in dispensing the Word — in exhortations, invitations, precepts, and warnings committed to them. All of these are perpetual declarations of our duty and manifest the approbation of the thing exhorted and invited to, along with the truth of the connection between one thing and another. But they are not declarations of the counsel and purpose of God in respect of individual persons in the ministry of the Word. A minister is not to inquire after, nor to trouble himself about, those secrets of the eternal mind of God — namely, whom he purposes to save and for whom in particular he sent Christ to die. It is enough for them to search his revealed will and take their directions from there, from which they have their commission. Therefore there is no sequence from the universal precepts of the Word concerning things to God's purpose in himself concerning persons. They command and invite all to repent and believe, but they do not know in particular on whom God will bestow repentance to salvation, nor in whom he

will effect the work of faith with power. When they make offers and tenders in the name of God to all, they do not say to all: it is the purpose and intention of God that you should believe. Who gave them any such authority? Rather, they declare that it is his command, which makes it the duty of those addressed. They do not declare his mind as to what he himself in particular will do. The external offer is such that from it every person may conclude their own duty — no one can conclude God's purpose, which yet may be known upon the performance of that duty. Their objection is then vain who affirm that God has given Christ for all to whom he offers Christ in the preaching of the gospel. For his offer in the preaching of the gospel is not declarative to any in particular — neither of what God has done nor of what he will do in reference to that person — but of what that person ought to do, if he would be approved of God and obtain the good things promised. From this it will follow: first, that God always intends to save some among those to whom he sends the gospel in its power. The ministers of it, being first, unacquainted with his particular purpose; second, bound to seek the good of all and every one as much as in them lies; third, to hope and judge well of all, even as it is fitting for them — they may make an offer of Jesus Christ with life and salvation in him, notwithstanding that the Lord has given his Son only to his elect.

Now the infinite value and worth we assert to be in the death of Christ is exceedingly undervalued by the assertors of universal redemption. That it should be extended to this or that object, fewer or more, is external to it, as we showed before. But its true worth

consists in the immediate effects, products, and issues of it — with what in its own nature it is fit and able to do. And these they openly and apparently undervalue, indeed almost annihilate.

First, that by it a door of grace was opened for sinners — they know not where — but that any were effectually carried in at the door by it, they deny. Second, that God might, if he would and upon whatever condition he pleased, save those for whom Christ died — but that a right of salvation was purchased by him for any, they deny. Hence they grant: first, that after the death of Christ, God might have dealt with humanity again on a legal condition; second, that all and every man might have been damned, and yet the death of Christ have had its full effect. They also grant that faith and sanctification are not purchased by his death — indeed, no more is procured for any than what he may go to hell with. And in various other ways do they express their low thoughts and slight imaginations concerning the innate value and sufficiency of the death and blood-shedding of Jesus Christ. To the honor then of Jesus Christ our mediator, God and man, our all-sufficient Redeemer, we affirm: such and so great was the dignity and worth of his death and blood-shedding, of so precious a value, of such an infinite fullness and sufficiency was this offering of himself, that it was in every way able and perfectly sufficient to redeem, justify, reconcile, and save all the sinners in the world, and to satisfy the justice of God for all the sins of all mankind, and to bring them every one to everlasting glory. Now this fullness and sufficiency of the merit of the death of Christ is a foundation for two things.

First, the general publishing of the gospel to all nations with the right it has to be preached to every creature (Matthew 28:19; Mark 16:16). Because the way of salvation which it declares is wide

enough for all to walk in. There is enough in the remedy it brings to light to heal all their diseases and to deliver them from all their evils. If there were a thousand worlds, the gospel of Christ might on this ground be preached to them all, there being enough in Christ for the salvation of them all, if they will derive virtue from him by touching him in faith — the only way to draw refreshment from this fountain of salvation. It is then altogether vain which some object: that the preaching of the gospel to all is needless and useless if Christ did not die for all, and that it is to make God call upon men to believe what is not true — namely, that Christ died for them. For first, besides that among those nations to which the gospel is sent there are some to be saved ('I have many people there') who cannot be saved in the way God has appointed unless the gospel is preached to others as well as themselves. And besides second, that the economy and administration of the new covenant — by which all external differences and privileges of peoples, tongues, and nations were abolished and taken away — required the word of grace to be preached without distinction, and all men everywhere called to repent. And besides third, that when God calls upon men to believe, he does not in the first place call upon them to believe that Christ died for them, but that there is no name under heaven given to men whereby they may be saved, but only Jesus Christ, through whom salvation is preached. This one thing of which we speak — the sufficiency we have described — is a sufficient basis and ground for all those general precepts of preaching the gospel to all men.

Second, the preachers of the gospel in their particular congregations, being utterly unacquainted with the purpose and secret counsel of God, and also forbidden to pry or search into it

(Deuteronomy 29), may from this ground justifiably call upon every man to believe, with assurance of salvation to every one in particular upon so doing. They know and are fully persuaded of this: that there is enough in the death of Christ to save every one who shall so do. They leave the purpose and counsel of God — on whom he will bestow faith and for whom in particular Christ died, as they are commanded — to himself.

And this is one principal thing which, being well observed, will crush many of the vain boasts of our adversaries, as will in particular afterward appear.

A second thing to be considered is the economy or administration of the new covenant in the times of the gospel, with the breadth and enlargement of the kingdom and dominion of Christ after his appearance in the flesh. By this, all external differences having been removed, the distinction of Gentiles taken away, the dividing wall broken down, the promise to Abraham that he should be heir of the world as he was the father of the faithful was now fully to be accomplished. Now this administration is so opposed to that dispensation which was restricted to one people and family who were God's peculiar people — all the rest of the world being excluded — that it gives occasion to many general expressions in scripture. These are far from comprehending a universality of all individuals, but denote only the removal of all such restricting qualifications as were previously in force. So a consideration of the end for which these general expressions are used — and what they aim at — will clearly show their nature, and how they are to be understood, and who those are intended and comprised in them. For it being only this enlargement of the visible kingdom of Christ to all nations in respect of right — and to many in respect of fact, God

having elect in all those nations to be brought forth in the several generations in which the means of grace are employed in those places — it is evident that these expressions import only a distribution of men through all differences whatsoever, and not a universal collection of all and every one. The thing intended by them requires the one and not the other. Hence those objections raised against the particular nature of the ransom of Christ and its restriction only to the elect — drawn from the terms 'all,' 'all men,' 'all nations,' 'the world,' 'the whole world,' and the like — are all exceedingly weak and invalid. They wrest the general expressions of scripture beyond their aim and intent. They are used by the Holy Spirit only to evidence the removal of all personal and national distinction, the breaking of all the narrow bounds of the old covenant, the enlarging of the kingdom of Christ beyond the borders of Judea and Jerusalem, the abolishing of all old restrictions, and the opening of a way for the elect among all peoples — called 'the fullness of the Gentiles' — to come in. There being now 'neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all and in all' (Colossians 3:11). Hence the Lord promises to 'pour out his Spirit on all flesh' (Joel 2:28), which Peter interprets as accomplished by the filling of the apostles with the gifts of the Spirit, that they might be enabled to preach to several nations (Acts 2:17). 'Having received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations' (Romans 1:5) — not the Jews only, but some among all nations. The gospel being 'the power of God to salvation to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek' (verse 16) — intending only, as to salvation, the peculiar people bought by Christ, whom he redeemed out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation

(Revelation 5:9), where an evident distribution is given of what in other places is generally stated. The gospel being commanded to be preached to all these nations (Matthew 28:19), that those bought and redeemed ones among them all might be brought home to God (John 11:52). This is what the apostle sets forth at length in Ephesians 2:14-17. Now in this sense — which we have explained — and no other, are those many passages to be taken which are usually urged for universal grace and redemption, as will afterward be declared in particular.

Third, we must exactly distinguish between human duty and God's purpose, there being no connection between them. The purpose and decree of God is not the rule of our duty, nor is the performance of our duty in doing what we are commanded any declaration of what is God's purpose to do or his decree that it should be done. This is especially to be seen and considered in the duty of the ministers of the gospel in dispensing the word — in exhortations, invitations, precepts, and warnings committed to them. All of these are perpetual declarations of our duty and manifest the approval of the thing exhorted and invited to, along with the truth of the connection between one thing and another. But they are not declarations of the counsel and purpose of God in respect of individual persons in the ministry of the word. A minister is not to inquire after, nor to trouble himself about, those secrets of the eternal mind of God — namely, whom he purposes to save and for whom in particular he sent Christ to die. It is enough for them to search his revealed will and take their directions from there, from which they have their commission. Therefore there is no inference from the universal precepts of the word concerning things to God's purpose in himself concerning persons. They command and invite

all to repent and believe, but they know not in particular on whom God will bestow repentance to salvation, nor in whom he will effect the work of faith with power. And when they make offers and tenders in the name of God to all, they do not say to all: it is the purpose and intention of God that you should believe. Who gave them any such authority? Rather, they declare that it is his command, which makes it their duty to do what is required of them. They do not declare his mind as to what he himself in particular will do. The external offer is such that from it every man may conclude his own duty — none can conclude God's purpose, which yet may be known upon performance of that duty. Their objection then is vain who affirm that God has given Christ for all to whom he offers Christ in the preaching of the gospel. For his offer in the preaching of the gospel is not declarative to any in particular — neither of what God has done nor of what he will do in reference to that person — but of what that person ought to do, if he would be approved of God and obtain the good things promised.

From this it will follow: first, that God always intends to save some among those to whom he sends the gospel in its power. The ministers of it, being first, unacquainted with his particular purpose; second, bound to seek the good of all and every one as much as in them lies; third, to hope and judge well of all, even as it is fitting for them — they may make an offer of Jesus Christ with life and salvation in him, notwithstanding that the Lord has given his Son only to his elect.

Second, that this offer is neither vain nor fruitless, being declarative of their duty and of what is acceptable to God if it be performed as it ought to be, even as it is required. And if any ask what it is of the mind and will of God that is declared and made

known when men are commanded to believe for whom Christ did not die — I answer: first, what they ought to do if they will do that which is acceptable to God. Second, the sufficiency of salvation that is in Jesus Christ to all who believe on him. Third, the certain, infallible, inviolable connection between faith and salvation — so that whoever performs the one shall surely enjoy the other. For whoever comes to Christ, he will in no way cast out — of which more afterward.

Fourth, the ingrained erroneous persuasion of the Jews — which for a while had a strong influence upon the apostles themselves — restricting salvation and deliverance by the Messiah, or promised seed, to themselves alone, who were the offspring of Abraham according to the flesh, must be considered as the ground of many general expressions and enlargements of the objects of redemption. These expressions, being so occasioned, give no appearance of any unlimited universality. That the Jews were generally infected with this proud opinion — that all the promises belonged only to them and theirs — is most apparent. Hence, when they saw the multitude of the Gentiles coming to the preaching of Paul, they were filled with envy, contradicting, blaspheming, and stirring up persecution against them (Acts 13:45, 50). Which the apostle again relates of them in 1 Thessalonians 2:15-16: 'They please not God and are contrary to all men, forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved.' That the apostles themselves had also deeply drunk in this opinion, learned by tradition from their fathers, appears not only in their questioning about the restoration of the kingdom to Israel (Acts 1:6), but most evidently in this: that after they had received a commission to teach and baptize all nations (Matthew 28:19-20) or every creature (Mark 16), and were

endued with power from above to do so, they seem to have understood their commission to extend only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. For they went about and preached only to the Jews (Acts 11:19). And when the contrary was evidenced and demonstrated to them, they glorified God, saying, 'Then has God also to the Gentiles granted repentance to life!' (Acts 11:18) — marveling at it as something before unknown to them. And no wonder that men were not easily or soon persuaded of this, it being the great mystery that was not made known in other ages as it was then revealed to God's holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit — namely, that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs of the same body and partakers of his promises in Christ by the gospel (Ephesians 3:5-6). But now, this being made known to them by the Spirit, and the time having come for the little sister to be considered, the prodigal to be brought home, and Japheth to be persuaded to dwell in the tents of Shem, they labored by all means to root out the old error from the minds of their brethren according to the flesh, of whom they had a special care. They also sought to leave no doubt in the mind of the eunuch that he was a dry tree, or of the Gentile that he was cut off from the people of God. To this end they used various general expressions carrying a direct opposition to that former error which was absolutely destructive to the kingdom of Jesus Christ. Hence are those terms 'the world,' 'all men,' 'all nations,' 'every creature,' and the like, used in the business of redemption and the preaching of the gospel — these things being not restricted, as they supposed, to one certain nation and family, but extended to the universality of God's people scattered abroad in every region under heaven. These expressions are especially used by John, who living to see the first coming of the Lord in that fear-

ful judgment and vengeance he executed upon the Jewish nation some forty years after his death, is very frequent in asserting the benefit of the world by Christ, in opposition as I said before to the Jewish nation. He gives us a rule for understanding such phrases: 'He signified that Jesus should die for that nation, and not for that nation only, but that he should also gather together in one the children of God who were scattered abroad' (John 11:51-52). Conformable to this he tells the believing Jews that Christ is not a propitiation for their sins only, but for the sins of the whole world (1 John 2:2) — that is, the people of God scattered throughout the whole world, not tied to any one nation, as they once vainly imagined. This gives much light into the meaning of those places where the words 'world' and 'all' are used in the business of redemption. They do not denote a collective universality, but a general distribution into men of all sorts, in opposition to the erroneous persuasion described above.

Fifth, the extent, nature, and signification of those general terms which are frequently used indefinitely in scripture to describe the object of the redemption by Christ must be seriously weighed. Upon these expressions hangs the whole weight of the opposing cause. The chief — if not the only — argument for the universality of redemption is taken from words which seem to have a breadth in their meaning equal to such an assertion: 'the world,' 'the whole world,' 'all,' and the like. Once they have fastened upon these terms, they cry triumph as though the victory were surely theirs: 'The world, the whole world, all, all men — who can oppose it?' Call them to the context of the several places where the words are, appeal to rules of interpretation, remind them of the circumstances and scope of the passage, the sense of the same

words in other places, and the other guides the Lord has given us for discovering his mind in his word — and they immediately cry out that the bare word and the letter are theirs, away with gloss and interpretation, give them leave to believe what the word expressly says. Little do they imagine, being deluded by the love of their own opinion, that if this assertion is general and they will not allow us interpretation agreeable to the analogy of faith, they at one stroke confirm the cursed madness of the Anthropomorphites — assigning a human body, form, and shape to God who has none — and the equally cursed fiction of transubstantiation, along with various other most pernicious errors. Let them then continue such empty clamors as long as they please. For the truth's sake we will not be silent, and we hope to make it very easily apparent that the general terms used in this business will give no support to any argument for universal redemption, whether absolute or conditional.

Two words are mightily seized upon: first, 'the world'; second, 'all.' The particular passages in which they appear, and from which the arguments of our adversaries are urged, we will consider afterward. For the present we only show that the words themselves, according to scriptural usage, do not necessarily carry any collective universality regarding those of whom they are affirmed. Being words of various meanings, they must be interpreted according to the scope of the passage where they are used and the subject matter the scripture treats in those places.

First then, for the word 'world' — which in the New Testament is a term of highly varied meanings, as any acquainted with the scriptures well knows — I will briefly give you enough distinct us-

ages to make plain that from the bare use of a word so exceedingly ambiguous, no argument can be drawn until it is distinguished and its meaning in that particular passage determined.

The word 'world' may be taken: subjectively, for the physical creation or the habitable earth; collectively, for all people, for many, or for specific groups (good or evil); or as denoting worldly corruption or a worldly condition.

All these distinctions of the usage of the word are made out in the following observations.

The word 'world' in scripture is in general taken four ways. First, for the world as container — generally for the whole fabric of heaven and earth with all things in them contained, which God created in the beginning (Job 34:13; Acts 17:24; Ephesians 1:4); and distinctly, first for the heavens and all things belonging to them distinguished from the earth (Psalm 90:2), and second for the habitable earth, very frequently (Psalm 24:1; Psalm 98:7; Matthew 13:38; John 1:9; John 3:17, 19; John 6:14; John 17:11; 1 Timothy 1:15; 1 Timothy 6:7).

Second, for the world as contained — especially men in the world — and that either universally for all and every one (Romans 3:6; 3:19; 5:12), or indefinitely for men without restriction or enlargement (John 7:4; Isaiah 13:11), or for many which is the most usual meaning (Matthew 18:7; John 4:42; John 12:19; John 16:8; John 17:21; 1 Corinthians 4:9; Revelation 13:3), or comparatively for a great part of the world (Romans 1:8; Matthew 24:14; 26:13; Romans 10:18), or restrictively for the inhabitants of the Roman Empire (Luke 2:1), or for men distinguished in their several conditions: first for the good, God's people either by designation or pos-

session (Psalm 22:27; John 3:16; John 6:36, 51; Romans 4:13; 11:12, 15; 2 Corinthians 5:19; Colossians 1:6; 1 John 2:2), and second for the evil — wicked, rejected men of the world (Isaiah 13:11; John 7:7; John 14:17, 22; John 15:19; John 17:25; 1 Corinthians 6:2; 1 Corinthians 11:32; Hebrews 9:11; Hebrews 11:38; 2 Peter 2:5; 1 John 5:19; Revelation 13:3).

Third, for the world as corrupted — or that universal corruption which is in all things in it (Galatians 1:4; 4:1, 4; 6:14; Ephesians 2:2; James 1:27; James 4:4; 1 John 2:15-17; 1 Corinthians 7:31, 33; Colossians 2:8; 2 Timothy 4:10; Romans 12:2; 1 Corinthians 1:20-21; 1 Corinthians 3:18-19).

Fourth, for a worldly estate or condition of men or things (Psalm 73:12; Luke 16:8; John 18:36; 1 John 4:5; and very many other places).

Fifth, for the world as cursed and under the power of Satan (John 7:7; John 14:30; John 16:11, 33; 1 Corinthians 2:12; 2 Corinthians 4:4; Ephesians 6:12). And the word has various other meanings in holy scripture which are needless to recount. These I have noted to show the vanity of the clamor some men fill their mouths with — frightening unstable souls with the scripture's frequent mention of 'world' in the business of redemption, as though some strength might be drawn from it for supporting the general ransom. Their greatest strength is but sophistical craftiness taken from the ambiguity of an equivocal word, and their whole endeavor is likely to prove fruitless. Now as I have shown that it has various other meanings in scripture, so when I come to consider their objections that use the word for this purpose, I hope by God's assistance to show that in no one place where it is used in the business of redemption can it be taken for all and every man in the

world — as indeed it is in very few places besides. So, concerning this word, our way will be clear if to what has been said you add these observations.

First, as in other words so in this one, the scripture often uses the same word in a different sense within the same passage, so that Matthew 8:22 reads: 'Let the dead bury their dead' — 'dead' in the first instance denoting those spiritually dead in sin, and in the second those who are naturally dead by dissolution of soul and body. So John 1:11: 'He came to his own' — all things he had made — and 'his own,' that is the greater part of his people, received him not. So again John 3:6: 'That which is born of the Spirit is spirit' — 'Spirit' in the first place being the Almighty Spirit of God, and in the latter a spiritual life of grace received from him. Now in such passages to argue that because a word has a certain meaning in one place it must have the same meaning in another would violently pervert the mind of the Holy Spirit. Thus also is the word 'world' commonly varied in its meaning. So John 1:10: 'He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.' — In the first it plainly means some part of the habitable earth; in the second the whole frame of heaven and earth; and in the third some men living in the earth, namely unbelievers. So again, John 3:17: 'God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved.' By 'the world' in the first is necessarily understood that part of the habitable world where our Savior conversed. In the second, all men in the world — as some suppose, and there is also truth in this reading, for our Savior came not to condemn all men in the world: first because condemnation of any was not the prime aim of his coming; second because he came to save his own people and so not to

condemn all. In the third, God's elect or believers living in the world in their several generations — those whom he intended to save, and none else, or he failed in his purpose and the endeavor of Christ was insufficient for the accomplishment of that for which it was designed.

Second, no argument can be taken from a phrase of speech in scripture in any particular place if in other places where it is used the meaning pressed from that place is evidently denied — unless the scope of the place or the subject matter enforces it. For instance, God is said to love the world and send his Son, to be in Christ reconciling the world to himself, and Christ to be a propitiation for the sins of the whole world. If the scope of the places where these assertions appear, or the subject matter they treat, will force a universality of all persons to be meant by the word 'world,' so let it be. But if not — if there is no such enforcement from the places themselves — why should 'world' there mean all and every one more than in John 1:10 ('the world knew him not'), which if meant of all without exception would mean no one believed in Christ, contrary to verse 12? Or more than in Luke 2:1 ('that all the world should be registered'), when none but the chief inhabitants of the Roman Empire can be understood? Or in John 8:26 ('I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him'), where he addresses only the Jews to whom he was then speaking? Or in John 12:19 ('Perceive you not that the world is gone after him?'), where 'the world' was nothing but a great multitude of one small nation? Or in 1 John 5:19 ('The whole world lies in wickedness'), from which believers are nonetheless exempted? Or in Revelation 13:3 ('All the world wondered after the beast'), which few would take as meaning every individual person on

earth? That 'all nations,' an expression of equal breadth with 'the world,' is to be understood in like manner is apparent from Romans 1:5; Revelation 18:3, 23; Psalm 118:10; 1 Chronicles 14:17; Jeremiah 27:7. It is evident that the words 'world,' 'all the world,' 'the whole world,' when taken as referring to men in the world, usually and almost always denote only some or many men in the world, distinguished into good or bad, believers or unbelievers, elect or reprobate — by what is immediately affirmed of them in the several places. I see no reason why they should be wrested to any other meaning in the places that are in controversy between us and our opponents. The particular places we will consider afterward.

Now as we have said of the word 'world,' so we may say of the word 'all,' wherein much strength is placed and many baseless boasts are raised. That it is nowhere affirmed in scripture that Christ died for 'all men,' or gave himself a ransom for 'all men,' much less for all and every man, we have before declared. That he gave himself a ransom for all is expressly affirmed in 2 Timothy 2:6. But who this 'all' should be — whether all believers, or all the elect, or some of all sorts, or all of every sort — is in debate. Our adversaries affirm the last, and the main reason they bring to assert their interpretation is the force of the word itself. For the circumstances of the passage, the analogy of faith, and other helps for exposition do not at all favor their reading, as we shall show when we come to the particular passages urged. For the present let us look upon the word in its usual meaning in scripture, and search whether it always necessarily requires such an interpretation.

That the word 'all,' when spoken by anyone expressing themselves but especially in holy scripture, is to be taken either collectively for all in general without exception, or distributively for some of all sorts excluding none — is more apparent than it needs any illustration. That it is sometimes taken in the first sense, for all collectively, is granted and need not be proved. They whom we oppose affirm that this is the only sense of the word, though I dare boldly say it is not one time in ten so to be understood throughout the whole book of God. That it is commonly and indeed properly used in the latter sense — for some of all sorts, concerning whatever it is affirmed — a few instances for the many that might be urged will make clear. So John 12:32: 'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all to me.' Who are these 'all'? Are they all and every one? Then all and every one are drawn to Christ, made believers, and truly converted, and shall certainly be saved — for those the Father draws to him he will in no way cast out (John 6:37). 'All' then can here be no other than many, some of all sorts, no sort excluded, according as the word is interpreted in Revelation 5:9: 'You have redeemed us out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation' — these are the 'all' he draws to him. So also Luke 11:42, where our translators have rendered 'all manner of herbs' — taking the word distributively for herbs of all sorts, not for every individual herb, which the Pharisees did not and could not tithe. And in the very same sense is the word used again in Luke 18:12: 'I give a tithe of all that I have,' where it cannot mean every individual thing, as is apparent. Most evident also is this restrained meaning of the word in Acts 2:17: 'I will pour out of my Spirit on all flesh' — whether this means every individual person, let every man judge. In Acts 10:12 our translators render

the phrase as 'all manner of beasts' — beasts of sundry sorts. In the same sense also must it be understood in Romans 14:2: 'One believes that he may eat all things' — that is, what he pleases of things that may be eaten. Indeed, in the very chapter where men so eagerly contend that 'all' is to be taken for all and every one (though fruitlessly and falsely, as shall be demonstrated) — namely 1 Timothy 2:4, where it is said that God would have all men to be saved — in that very chapter the word must be expounded according to the sense we give it: verse 8, 'I will therefore that men pray everywhere,' which cannot mean every individual place in heaven, earth, and hell, as all confess. No more than when our Savior is said to cure all diseases (Matthew 8:35) does this prove that he cured every disease of every man — but only all sorts of diseases. Numerous other instances could be given to show that this is the most usual and frequent meaning of the word 'all' in holy scripture, and therefore from the bare word nothing can be inferred to enforce an absolute unlimited universality of all individuals. The particular passages insisted on we will consider afterward. I will conclude all concerning these general expressions used in scripture about this business with the following observations.

First, the word 'all' is certainly and unquestionably sometimes restricted to all of some sorts, although the qualification limiting it is not expressed. So for all believers: 1 Corinthians 15:22; Ephesians 4:10. Romans 5:18: 'The free gift came upon all men to the justification of life' — which 'all men' who are so actually justified are no more nor fewer than those who are Christ's, that is, believers. For justification is certainly not without faith.

Second, the word 'all' is sometimes used for some of all sorts (Jeremiah 31:34; Hebrews 8:11; John 12:32; 1 Timothy 2:1-3), which is made apparent by the mention of kings as one sort of people there intended. And I make no doubt that it will appear to all that the word must be taken in one of these senses in every place where it is used in the business of redemption, as shall be proved.

Third, let a diligent comparison be made between the general expressions of the New Testament and the predictions of the Old, and they will be found to correspond to and explain one another — the Lord affirming in the New that what he foretold in the Old had been accomplished. Now in the predictions and prophecies of the Old Testament — that all nations, all flesh, all people, all the ends and families of the earth, the world, the whole earth, the isles, shall be converted, look up to Christ, come to the mountain of the Lord, and the like — none doubts that the elect of God in all nations are only signified, knowing that in them alone those predictions have the truth of their fulfillment. Why then should the same expressions used in the gospel — many of them aiming directly to declare the fulfilling of the other — be stretched to a larger extent, so contrary to the mind of the Holy Spirit? In sum: just as when the Lord is said to wipe tears from all faces it does not prevent the reprobates from being cast out to eternity where there is weeping and wailing, so when Christ is said to die for all, it does not prevent those reprobates from perishing to eternity for their sins, without any effectual remedy intended for them, though occasionally proposed to some of them.

Sixth, observe that scripture often speaks of things and persons according to the appearance they have and the account that is taken of them among men — or the esteem that those to whom it

speaks have of them — frequently speaking of men and to men as in the condition they appear to be in, according to outward appearance upon which human judgment must proceed, and not what they are in reality. Thus many are called and said to be wise, just, and righteous according as they are so esteemed, though the Lord knows them to be foolish sinners. So Jerusalem is called the holy city (Matthew 27:53) because it was so in esteem and appearance, when in reality it was a den of thieves. And 2 Chronicles 28:23 says of Ahaz that wicked king of Judah that he sacrificed to the gods of Damascus that had struck him — when it was the Lord alone who struck him, and those idols to whom he sacrificed were stocks and stones, the work of men's hands, which could no way help themselves, much less strike their enemies. Yet the Holy Spirit uses an expression answering his idolatrous persuasion and says they struck him. Indeed, is it not said of Christ in John 5:18 that he had broken the Sabbath, which yet he only did in the corrupt opinion of the blinded Pharisees? Add moreover to what has been said this equally undeniable truth: that many things which are proper and peculiar to the children of God are frequently assigned to those who live in the same outward communion with them and partake of the same external privileges, though in reality they are strangers to the grace of the promise. Put these two things together — which are most evident — and it will easily appear that those places which seem to express a possibility of perishing and eternal destruction for those said to be redeemed by the blood of Christ are in no way advantageous to the adversaries of the effectual redemption of God's elect. For such may be said to be redeemed in respect of appearance, not reality — as is the use of scripture in various other things.

Seventh, that which is spoken according to the judgment of charity on our parts must not always be exactly squared to correspond to truth in respect of those of whom anything is affirmed. For the rectitude of our judgment it is sufficient that we proceed according to the rules of judging that are given us. What is beyond our knowledge — whether those we judge in charity are truly so — belongs not to us. Thus often the apostles in the scriptures write to men and call them holy, saints, even elect — but from this to positively conclude that they were all so indeed, we have no warrant. So Peter in 1 Peter 1:2 calls all the strangers to whom he wrote, scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, 'elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father' — and yet that we have any warrant to conclude with certainty that all were such, none dare affirm. So Paul tells the Thessalonians — the whole church to whom he wrote — that he knew their election of God (1 Thessalonians 1:4), and in 2 Thessalonians 2:13 he blesses God who had chosen them to salvation. Now did not Paul make this judgment of them by the rule of charity? as he affirms in another place: 'It is right for me to think this of you all' (Philippians 1:3). And can it, ought it, hence be infallibly concluded that they were all elected? If some of these should be found to have fallen away from the gospel and perished, would an argument from this be valid — that the elect might perish? Would we not presently answer that they were said to be elected according to the judgment of charity, not that they were so indeed? And why is not this answer equally sufficient and satisfying when given to the objection taken from the perishing of some who were said to be redeemed — merely by the judgment of charity — as when it is given to the objection taken from those who were said to be elected?

Eighth, the infallible connection — according to God's purpose and will — between faith and salvation, which is frequently the thing intended in gospel proposals, must be considered. The Lord has established this in his counsel and revealed in his word that there is an indissoluble bond between these two things, so that whoever believes shall be saved (Mark 16:16). This is indeed the substance of the gospel in its outward proclamation. This is the testimony of God that eternal life is in his Son — which whoever believes sets his seal to that God is true; he who believes not does what in him lies to make God a liar (1 John 5:9-11). Now this connection between the means and the end, faith and life, is the only thing signified and held out to innumerable hearers to whom the gospel is preached. All the commands, offers, and promises made to them intimate no more than this will of God: that believers shall certainly be saved. This is an unquestionable divine truth and a sufficient object for supernatural faith to rest upon. And not being embraced, it is a sufficient cause of damnation: 'If you believe not that I am he — that is, the way, the truth, and the life — you shall die in your sins' (John 8:24). It is a vain imagination of some that when the command and promise of believing are extended to any man, even if he is of the number of those who shall certainly perish, yet the Lord has a conditional will of his salvation and intends that he shall be saved on condition that he believes. When in fact the condition lies not at all in the will of God — which is always absolute — but only between the things proposed to them, as was before declared. Those who with great fanfare hold out the broken pieces of an old Arminian argument — that as is God's offer so is his intention, and since he calls all to believe and be saved, he therefore intends it for all — exceedingly betray their own igno-

rance. For first, God does not offer life to all upon the condition of faith, passing by a great part of mankind without any such offer made to them at all. Second, if by God's offer they understand his command and promise — who told them that these things are declarative of his will and purpose or intention? He commands Pharaoh to let his people go, but did he intend he should do so according to his command? Had he not foretold that he would so order things that Pharaoh should not let them go? God's commands and promises reveal our duty, not his purpose — what God would have us do, not what he will do. His promises, as particularly applied, hold out his mind to the persons to whom they are applied; but as indefinitely proposed, they reveal no other intention of God than what we before discovered — his determinate purpose infallibly to connect faith and salvation. Third, if the offer is universal and the intention of God is answerable to it — that is, he intends the salvation of those to whom the tender of it upon faith is made — then first, what becomes of election and reprobation? Neither can consist with this universal purpose of saving all. Second, if he intends it, why is it not accomplished? Does he fail in his purpose? They say he intended it only on condition, and the condition not being fulfilled, he does not fail in his purpose though the thing is not conferred. But did the Lord foreknow whether the condition would be fulfilled by those to whom the proposal was made or not? If not, where is his foreknowledge, his omniscience? If he did foreknow, how can he be said to intend salvation for those of whom he certainly knew they would never fulfill the condition — and moreover knew this with the circumstance that the condition was not to be attained without his bestowing, and that he had determined not to bestow it? Would they ascribe such a will and purpose to a wise

man as they do ignorantly and presumptuously to the only wise God — namely, that he should intend to have a thing done upon the performance of such a condition as he knew full well could never be performed without him, and he had fully resolved never to effect it? This then is the main thing demonstrated and held out in the proclamation of the gospel, especially concerning unbelievers: the strict connection between the duty of faith assigned and the benefit of life promised, which has a truth of universal extent grounded upon the plenary sufficiency of the death of Christ toward all who shall believe.

Ninth, the mixed distribution of the elect and reprobate, believers and unbelievers, according to the purpose and mind of God throughout the whole world and in the several places thereof — in all or most of the single congregations — is another ground of holding out a tender of the blood of Jesus Christ to those for whom it was never shed, as is apparent in the event by the ineffectiveness of its proposals. The ministers of the gospel, who are stewards of the mysteries of Christ and to whom the word of reconciliation is committed, being acquainted only with revealed things — the Lord lodging his purposes and intentions toward particular persons in the secret ark of his own bosom, not to be searched into — are bound to admonish all and warn all men to whom they are sent. They give the same commands, propose the same promises, and make tenders of Jesus Christ in the same manner to all, that the elect whom they know not but by the event may obtain, while the rest are hardened. Now these things being thus ordered by him who has the supreme disposal of all — first, that there should be such a mixture of elect and reprobate, of tares and wheat, to the end of the world; and second, that Christ and reconciliation

through him should be preached by men ignorant of his eternal discriminating purposes — there is an absolute necessity of two other things. First, that the promises must have a kind of unrestrained generality, to be suitable to this dispensation. Second, that they must be proposed to those toward whom the Lord never intended the good things of the promises, they having a share in this proposal by their mixture in this world with the elect of God. So from the general proposition of Christ in the promises, nothing can be concluded concerning his death for all to whom it is proposed, as it has another rise and occasion. In sum: the word of reconciliation being committed to men unacquainted with God's distinguishing counsels, to be preached to men of a various mixed condition in respect of his purpose, and the way he has determined to bring his own home to himself being by exhortations, entreaties, promises, and like means accommodated to the reasonable nature of all to whom the word is sent — which are also suited to accomplishing other ends toward the rest, as conviction, restraint, hardening, and inexcusableness — it cannot be but that the proposal and offer must necessarily be made to some upon condition who intentionally, in respect of the purpose of God, have no right to it in its just aim and intent. Only for a close, observe these two things: first, that the offer itself neither is nor ever was absolutely universal to all, but only indefinite, without respect to outward differences. Second, that Christ being not to be received without faith, and God giving faith to whom he pleases, it is manifest that he never intends Christ to those on whom he will not bestow faith.

Tenth, the faith enjoined and commanded in the gospel has various acts and different degrees, in the exercise of which it proceeds in an orderly way according to the natural method of propos-

ing the objects to be believed. The consideration of this is of much use in the business at hand. Our adversaries pretend that if Christ did not die for all, then in vain are those for whom he did not die exhorted to believe, there being no proper object of faith for innumerable persons because Christ did not die for them. As though the gospel, from the very beginning, holds out this doctrine: that Christ died for every one, elect and reprobate alike. Or as though the first thing any one living under the means of grace is exhorted to believe were that Christ died for him in particular. Both of these are notoriously false, as I hope will be made manifest to all by the close of our undertaking. For the present I will only indicate something of what I said before, concerning the order of exercising the several acts of faith, whereby it will appear that no one in the world is commanded or invited to believe without having a sufficient object to fix the act of faith on — of truth enough for its foundation and latitude enough for its utmost exercise.

First then, the first thing which the gospel enjoins sinners — and which it persuades and commands them to believe — is that salvation is not to be had in themselves, inasmuch as all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, nor by the works of the law, by which no flesh living can be justified. Here is a saving gospel truth for sinners to believe, which the apostle dwells upon wholly in Romans chapters 1, 2, and 3, to prepare the way for justification by Christ. Now what countless numbers are there to whom the gospel is preached who never come so far as to believe so much as this? — among whom you may reckon almost the whole nation of the Jews, as is apparent from Romans 9 and 10. A contempt of this object of faith is the sin of unbelief.

Second, the gospel requires faith that there is salvation to be had in the promised seed — in him who was ordained to be a captain of salvation to those who believe. And here also, at this test, some millions of the great company of men outwardly called drop off and never believe with true divine faith that God has provided a way for the saving of sinners.

Third, that Jesus of Nazareth who was crucified by the Jews was this promised Savior, and that there is no other name under heaven given whereby men may be saved besides his. This was the main point on which the Jews broke off, refusing to accept Christ as the Savior of men but rather prosecuting him as an enemy of God — and they are therefore so often charged with unbelief and damnable infidelity. The question was not between Christ and them whether he died for them all or not, but whether he was the promised Messiah, which they denied and perished in their unbelief. Now before these three acts of faith are performed, it is in vain to exhort the soul to climb the uppermost steps while missing all the foundational ones.

Fourth, the gospel requires a resting upon this Christ — so discovered and believed to be the promised Redeemer — as an all-sufficient Savior, with whom is plenteous redemption, and who is able to save to the uttermost those who come to God through him, and to bear the burden of all weary laboring souls who come by faith to him. In this proposal there is a certain and infallible truth grounded upon the superabundant sufficiency of the offering of Christ in itself for whoever — fewer or more — it may be intended. Now much self-knowledge, much conviction, much sense of sin, God's justice, and free grace is required for the exercise of this act of faith. Good Lord! how many thousand poor souls within the

pale of the church can never be brought to it? The truth is, without the help of God's Spirit none of those three acts before, much less this last, can be performed — which Spirit works freely, when, how, and in whom it pleases.

Fifth, these things being firmly seated in the soul — and not before — we are each one called in particular to believe in the efficacy of the redemption that is in the blood of Jesus toward our own souls in particular. Every one may assuredly do this in whom the free grace of God has worked the former acts of faith and does work this also, without either doubt or fear of want of a right object to believe. For certainly Christ died for every one in whose hearts the Lord by his almighty power works effectually the faith to lay hold on him and assent to him, according to that orderly proposal held forth in the gospel. Now according to this order — as some have observed — are the articles of our faith disposed in the Apostles' Creed, that ancient summary of Christian religion, the remission of our sins and life eternal being in the last place proposed to be believed. So it is senseless vanity to cry out of the nullity of the object to be believed if Christ did not die for all, there being an absolute truth in every thing which any is called to assent to according to the order of the gospel.

And so I have proposed the general foundations of those answers which we shall give to the following objections, to which making particular application will be an easy task, as I hope will be made apparent to all.

CHAPTER 2



Now we come to the consideration of the objections with which the doctrine we have undeniably confirmed from the word of God is usually assaulted with great noise and clamor. Concerning these I must give you three cautions before I come to lay them down.

The first is this: for my own part I had rather they were all buried than once brought to light in opposition to the truth of God, which they seem to deface. Therefore were it left to my choice, I would not produce any one of them — not that there is any difficulty or weight in them that their removal would be burdensome, but only that I am not willing to be in any way instrumental in giving breath or light to what opposes the truth of God. But because in these times of liberty and error most of them have been already objected to the reader by men lying in wait to deceive, or are likely to be, I shall therefore show you the poison and also furnish you with an antidote against the venom of such self-seekers as our days abound with.

Second, I must ask you: when you hear an objection, do not be carried away by the sound of words, nor allow it to take impression upon your spirits. Remember with how many demonstrations and

innumerable places of scripture the truth opposed by them has been confirmed. Rest yourselves until the places be well weighed, the arguments pondered, the answers set down — and then may the Lord direct you to try all things and hold fast that which is good.

Third, that you would diligently observe what comes near the stress of the controversy and the thing in which the difference lies, leaving all other flourishes and swelling words of vanity as of no weight and no importance.

Now the objections laid against the truth we maintain are of two sorts: the first taken from scripture perverted, the other from reason abused. We begin with the first. All the passages of scripture that may in any way seem to contradict our assertion are referred by our strongest adversaries to three heads: first, those passages that affirm that Christ died for the world, or otherwise mention the word 'world' in the business of redemption; second, those that mention 'all' and 'every man' either in the work of Christ's dying for them or where God is said to will their salvation; third, those which affirm that Christ bought or died for some who perish. From these they draw out three principal arguments on which they much insist, all of which we will consider in their several order. The first is taken from the word 'world' and is proposed by them thus.

He who was given out of the love with which God loved the world (John 3:16), who gave himself for the life of the world (John 6:51), and who was a propitiation for the sins of the whole world (1 John 2:2) — to which add John 1:29; John 4:42; 2 Corinthians

5:19 — he was given and died for every man in the world. But the first is true of Christ as appears by the passages alleged. Therefore he died for all and every one.

But granting them the liberty of boasting, we flatly deny the consequence of the first proposition and will by the Lord's help at any time put it to the trial whether we have good cause to do so or not. There are two ways by which they attempt to prove this consequence from 'the world' to 'all and every one': first by reason and the meaning of the word, and second from the consideration of the particular passages urged. We will try them in both.

First, if they will make it out by way of reasoning, I conceive they must argue thus:

The whole world contains all and every man in the world. Christ died for the whole world. Therefore Christ died for all and every man.

There are manifestly four terms in this syllogism, arising from the ambiguity of the word 'world,' and so no true middle term on which the weight of the conclusion should hang. The word 'world' in the first proposition is taken for the world as container, in the second for the world as contained — or men in the world — as is too apparent to need proof. So unless you render the conclusion as 'therefore Christ died for that which contains all the men in the world' and assert in the assumption that Christ died for the world as container (which is absurd), this syllogism is most sophistically false. If then any proof will be taken from the word 'world,' it must not be from the thing itself but from the meaning of the word in scripture, argued thus:

This word 'world' in scripture means all and every man in the world. But Christ is said to die for the world. Therefore he died for all and every one.

The first proposition concerning the meaning of the word 'world' is either universal — comprehending all places where it is used — or particular, intending only some. If the first, the proposition is apparently false as was shown before. If the second, then the argument must be formed thus:

In some places in scripture the word 'world' means all and every man in the world of all ages, times, and conditions.

But Christ is said to die for the world. Therefore he died for all and every man.

That this syllogism is no better than the former is most evident — a universal conclusion being inferred from a particular premise. But now the first premise being rightly formed, I have one question about the second or assumption: whether in every place where there is mention made of the death of Christ it is said he died for the world, or only in some? If you say in every place, that is apparently false as has been already shown by the many texts of scripture that restrict the death of Christ to his elect, his sheep, his church, in comparison with which these are but few. If the second, then the argument must run thus:

In some few places of scripture the word 'world' signifies all and every man in the world. But in some few places Christ is said to die for the world. Therefore he died for all and every man.

This argument is so weak, ridiculous, and sophistically false that it cannot but be evident to any one. And yet from the word 'world' itself it cannot be made any better. It concludes a universal

from particular affirmatives, and besides contains four terms apparently in the syllogism, unless the 'some places' in the first premise are proved to be the very 'some places' in the assumption — which is precisely the thing in question. So if any strength is to be taken from this word, it must be argued in this form:

If the word 'world' signifies all and every man in those places where Christ is said to die for the world, then Christ died for all and every man. But the word 'world' in all those places where Christ is said to die for the world does signify all and every man in the world. Therefore Christ died for them all.

First, it is in but one place said that Christ gave his life for the world or died for it in a way that holds out the intention of our Savior. All the other places seem only to hold out the sufficiency of his offering for all — which we also maintain. Second, we absolutely deny the assumption and appeal for trial to a consideration of all those particular passages in which such mention is made.

Thus I have called this argument to rule and measure, that it might be evident where its great strength lies — which is indeed great weakness. Those who having caught hold of the word 'world' run presently away with it as though all were clear for universal redemption, when if you ask them to set out and manifest the strength of their reason, they know not what to say but 'the world' and 'the whole world,' understanding neither what they say nor what they affirm. A weaker argument, I dare say, was never produced by rational men in so weighty a cause. This will be further shown by considering the several particular passages brought to support it, which we will take in order.

The first passage we address is that which our adversaries first propose and not a little rest upon. And yet, notwithstanding their clamorous claim, there are not a few who think that very text is as fit and ready to overthrow their whole opinion as Goliath's sword to cut off his own head — many unanswerable arguments against the universality of redemption being easily drawn from the words of that text. May the great peaceable King of his church guide us to make good the interest of truth to the passage in controversy. The passage is John 3:16: 'God so loved the world that he sent his only begotten Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.'

This passage the universalists greatly boast in, for which we are persuaded they have so little cause that we do not doubt with the Lord's assistance to demonstrate that it is destructive to their whole defense. To this end I will give you briefly a double paraphrase of the words: the first containing their meaning, the latter ours. Our adversaries explain the words thus: 'God so loved' — had such a natural inclination and propensity toward the good of — 'the world' — Adam with all and every one of his posterity of all ages, times, and conditions — 'that he sent his only begotten Son,' causing him to be incarnate in the fullness of time, 'to die' — not with a purpose and resolution to save any, but 'that whoever' — whatever persons of those toward whom he had this propensity — 'believes on him, should not perish but have life everlasting,' should have this fruit and issue: to escape death and hell and live eternally. In this explanation of the sense of the passage these things are to be observed.

First, what that love is which was the cause of sending or giving of Christ, which they make to be a natural propensity to the good of all.

Second, who are the objects of this love — all and every man of all generations.

Third, wherein this giving consists — of which I cannot find whether they mean by it the appointment of Christ to be a recoverer or his actual exhibition in the flesh for the accomplishment of his ministry.

Fourth, 'whoever' — they make this distributive of the persons in the world and so not restrictive in its intention to some.

Fifth, that eternal life is the fruit obtained by believers, but not the end intended by God.

Now look in the second place at what we conceive to be the mind of God in those words, whose aim we take to be the advancement and setting forth of the free love of God to lost sinners in sending Christ to procure for them eternal redemption, as may appear in this following paraphrase.

'God' — the Father — 'so loved' — had such a peculiar and transcendent love, being an unchangeable purpose and act of his will concerning their salvation, toward — 'the world' — miserable, sinful, lost men of all sorts, not only Jews but Gentiles also, whom he peculiarly loved — 'that' — intending their salvation as in the last words for the praise of his glorious grace — 'he gave' — prepared a way to prevent their everlasting destruction by appointing and sending — 'his only begotten Son' — to be an all-sufficient Savior to all who look up to him — 'that whoever believes in him' — all believers whatsoever, and only they — 'should not perish but have ev-

erlasting life' — and so effectually be brought to the obtaining of those glorious things through him which the Lord in his free love had designed for them. In this enlargement of the words for setting forth what we conceive to be the mind of the Holy Spirit in them, these things are to be observed.

First, what we understand by the love of God here — even that act of his will which was the cause of sending his Son Jesus Christ, being the most eminent act of love and favor to the creature. For love is to will good to any, and never did God will greater good to the creature than in appointing his Son for their redemption. I would have it observed, however, that I do not make the purpose of sending or giving Christ to be absolutely subordinate to God's love to his elect, as though that were the end of the other absolutely. Rather they are both coordinate to the same supreme end — the manifestation of God's glory by the way of mercy tempered with justice. But in respect of our understanding of the relation they stand in to one another: this love we say to be that, greater than which there is none.

Second, by the world we understand the elect of God only — though not considered in this place as such, but under a notion that, being true of them, serves for the further exaltation of God's love toward them, which is the end here designed. And this is as they are poor, miserable, lost creatures in the world, of the world, scattered abroad in all places of the world, not tied to Jews or Greeks, but dispersed among any nation, kindred, and language under heaven.

Third, 'that whoever believes' is for us a declaration of the intention of God in sending or giving his Son, containing no distribution of the beloved world, but a direction to the persons whose

good was intended — that love being an unchangeable intention of the greatest good.

Fourth, 'should not perish but have everlasting life' contains an expression of the particular aim and intention of God in this business, which is the certain salvation of believers by Christ. And this in general is the interpretation of the words which we adhere to. It will yield us various arguments, each sufficient to overthrow the general ransom. To make these more firmly grounded and clearly convincing, we will lay down and compare the several words and expressions of this passage about whose interpretation we differ, with the reason for rejecting one sense and embracing the other.

First, the first difference in the interpretation of this place is about the cause of sending Christ, here called 'love.' Second, the second is about the object of this love, here called 'the world.' Third, concerning the intention of God in sending his Son, said to be that believers might be saved.

For the first: by 'love' in this place all our adversaries agree that a natural affection and propensity in God toward the good of the creature lost under sin in general is intended — which moved him to take some way whereby it might possibly be remedied.

We on the contrary hold that by 'love' here is meant not an inclination or propensity of his nature, but an act of his will — which is where we conceive his love to be seated — and an eternal purpose to do good to man, being the most transcendent and eminent act of God's love to the creature.

That both these interpretations may be weighed to see which is most agreeable to the mind of the Holy Spirit, I will give you first some of the reasons by which we oppose the former interpretation,

and second those by which we confirm our own.

First, if no natural affection whereby he should necessarily be carried to anything outside himself can or ought to be ascribed to God, then no such thing is here intended by the word 'love' — for that cannot be here intended which is not in God at all. But that there neither is nor can be any such natural affection in God is most apparent, and may be evidenced by many demonstrations, of which I will briefly recount a few.

First, nothing that includes any imperfection is to be assigned to Almighty God. He is God all-sufficient, he is our rock, and his work is perfect. But a natural affection in God toward the good and salvation of all — being never completed nor perfected — carries along with it a great deal of imperfection and weakness. And not only so, but it must also be exceedingly prejudicial to the absolute blessedness and happiness of Almighty God. For however much anything falls short of fulfilling that toward which it is carried out with any natural or voluntary desire, so much does it fall short of blessedness and happiness. So without impairing the infinite blessedness of the ever-blessed God, no natural affection toward anything that is never to be accomplished can be ascribed to him — such as this general love to all is supposed to be.

Second, if the Lord has a natural affection to all — loving them so far as to send his Son to die for them — where does it come that this affection of his does not receive accomplishment? Why is it hindered and does not produce its effects? Why does the Lord not engage his power for the fulfilling of his desire? They say it does not seem good to his infinite wisdom to do so. Then there is an af-

fection in God toward that which in his wisdom he cannot pursue — and among the sons of men, the worms of the earth, such a thing would be called a brutish affection.

Third, no affection or natural propensity to good is to be ascribed to God which the scripture nowhere assigns to him and which is contrary to what the scripture does assign to him. Now the scripture nowhere assigns to God any natural affection whereby he should be naturally inclined toward the good of the creature — the passage to prove it clearly has yet to be produced. And that it is contrary to what the scripture assigns to him is apparent: for it describes him as free in showing mercy, every act of it being performed freely, even as he pleases — 'for he has mercy on whom he will have mercy.' Now if every act of mercy shown to any proceeds from the free and distinguishing will of God, as is apparent, then certainly there can be in him no such natural affection. And the truth is, if the Lord should not show mercy and be carried out toward the creature merely upon his own distinguishing will, but should be naturally moved to show mercy to the miserable: first, he should be no more merciful to men than to devils; nor, second, to those that are saved than to those that are damned — for that which is natural must be equal in all its operations, and that which is natural to God must be eternal. Many more effective reasons are produced by our divines for the denial of this natural affection in God, in the resolution of the Arminian distinction of God's antecedent and consequent will, to which the learned reader may turn for satisfaction. So the love mentioned in this place is not that natural affection toward all in general — which does not exist.

Second, it is the special love of God to his elect, as we affirm. The love here intimated is absolutely the most eminent and transcendent love that God ever showed or bore toward any miserable creature. Indeed the intention of our Savior is so to set it forth, as is apparent by the emphatic expressions used in this place. The particles 'so' and 'that' declare no less, pointing out something especially remarkable in the thing affirmed above any other thing of the same kind. Expositors usually lay weight upon almost every particular word of the verse for the exaltation and demonstration of the love here mentioned. 'So' — that is, in such a degree, to such a remarkable and astonishing height. 'God' — the glorious all-sufficient God who could have manifested his justice to eternity in the condemnation of all sinners and in no way needed them as partakers of his blessedness. 'Loved' — with such an earnest and intense affection consisting in an eternal, unchangeable act and purpose of his will, for the bestowing of the highest good — the choicest and most effectual love. 'The world' — men in the world, of the world, subject to the iniquities and miseries of the world, lying in their blood, having nothing to make them commendable in his eyes. 'That he gave' — he did not, as when he made all the world at first, merely speak the word and it was done, but proceeded further to the performance of a great deal more and longer work. 'His Son' — not any favored or otherwise pleasing creature, not sun, moon, or stars, not the rich treasure of his creation — all too mean and coming short of expressing this love — but his Son. 'Begotten Son' — and that not so called by reason of some near approach and filial obedience to him, as the angels are called sons of God, for it was not an angel he gave, which yet would have been an expression of most intense love, nor any son by adoption as believers are sons of

God, but his begotten Son, begotten of his own person from eternity. 'His only begotten Son' — not any one of his sons, but whereas he had but one only begotten Son, always in his bosom — his Isaac — he gave him. And how could the infinite wisdom of God make or give any higher testimony of his love? Especially adding what is here evidently included though the time was not yet come to express it openly — namely, whereunto he gave his Son, his only one: not to be a king and worshiped in the first place, but 'he spared him not but gave him up to death for us all' (Romans 8:34). And for a close of all, cast your eyes upon his design and purpose in this whole business, and you shall find that it was that believers — those whom he thus loved — might not perish, that is, undergo the utmost misery and wrath to eternity which they had deserved, but have everlasting life, eternal glory with himself, which of themselves they could in no way attain. And you will easily grant that greater love has no man than this. Now if the love here mentioned is the greatest, highest, and chief of all, certainly it cannot be that common affection toward all which we discussed before. For the love by which men are actually and eternally saved is greater than that which may exist with the perishing of men to eternity.

Second, the scripture positively asserts this very love as the chief act of the love of God and what he would have us take notice of in the first place. Romans 5:8: 'God commended his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.' And fully in 1 John 4:9-11: 'In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our

sins.' In both which places the eminence of this love is set forth exceedingly emphatically to believers, with such expressions as can in no way be accommodated to a natural inclination toward the good of all.

Third, seeing all love in God is but to will good to those who are beloved, they certainly are the objects of his love to whom he intends that good which is the issue and effect of that love. But now the issue of this love, or the good intended — not perishing and obtaining eternal life through Christ — happens to and is bestowed on only the elect, the believers. Therefore they certainly are the object of this love, and they alone — which was the thing we had to declare.

Fourth, that love which is the cause of giving Christ is also always the cause of the bestowing of all other good things. Romans 8: 'He that spared not his Son but gave him up to death for us all, how shall he not in him also freely give us all things?' Therefore, if the love there mentioned is the cause of sending Christ, as it is, it must also cause all other things to be given with him. And so it can be toward none but those on whom those things are bestowed — who are only the elect, only believers. Who else has grace here or glory hereafter?

Fifth, the word here used means to love so as to rest in that love — which how it can stand with hatred and an eternal purpose of not bestowing effectual grace, as the Lord has toward some, will not easily be made apparent. Now let the Christian reader judge whether by the love of God mentioned in this place is to be understood a natural inclination in God toward the good of all — both elect and reprobate — or the peculiar love of God to his elect, being

the fountain of the greatest good that was ever bestowed on the sons of men. This is the first difference about the interpretation of these words.

Second, the second thing in controversy is the object of this love, expressed by the word 'world.' Our adversaries would have it signify all and every man. We hold it to be the elect of God scattered abroad in the world, with a tacit opposition to the nation of the Jews, who alone — excluding all other nations (some few proselytes excepted) before the actual coming of Christ in the flesh — had all the benefits of the promises appropriated to them (Romans 9:4). In this privilege all nations were now to have an equal share. To confirm the universalist exposition of the word, nothing of weight that I could ever see is brought forth but the word itself. For neither the love mentioned at the beginning nor the design pointed at in the end will possibly agree with the meaning they impose on the word in the middle. Besides, how weak and infirm an inference from the word 'world' is — by reason of its ambiguous and wonderfully varied meanings — we have at large declared before.

Three poor shifts I find in the great champions of this cause to prove that the word 'world' does not signify the elect. We might justly have expected some reasons to prove that it signifies or implies all and every man in the world — which was their own assertion. But of this there is deep silence, being doubtless conscious of their inability for any such performance. Only as I said, three pretended arguments they bring to disprove what no one went about to prove — namely that by 'the world' is meant the elect as such. For though we conceive the persons directly designed here — men in and of the world — to be all and only God's elect, yet we do not say they are here so considered, but rather under another notion

as men scattered over all the world, in themselves subject to misery and sin. So whoever will oppose our exposition of this place must either first prove that by 'the world' here must necessarily be understood all and every man in the world, or second that it cannot be taken indefinitely for men in the world who are materially elect, though not here considered under that description. All those vain flourishes that some men make with these words by putting the word 'elect' in the place of 'world' and then coining absurd consequences are quite beside the business at hand. Yet further we deny that by supplying the word 'elect' into the text any absurdity or untruth will justly follow. Suppose we should read it thus: 'God so loved the elect that he gave his only begotten Son that whoever believes in him should not perish' — what inconvenience follows? They say: that some of the elect, whom God so loved as to send his Son for, may perish. Why so? Because it is said that whoever of them believes on him should not perish, which implies that some of them might not believe. Very good! but where is any such implication? God designs the salvation of all those for whom he sends his Son — in express words — and certainly all who shall be saved shall believe. But they say it is in the word 'whoever,' which is distributive of the world into those who believe and those who do not. I answer: first, if this word 'whoever' is distributive, then it is also restrictive of the love of God to some and not to others — to one part of the distribution and not the other. And if it does not restrict the love of God intending the salvation of some, then it is not distributive of the foregoing object of it. And if it does restrict it, then all are not intended in the love which moved God to give his Son. Second, I deny that the word here is distributive of the object of God's love, but only declarative of his end and aim in giving Christ

in the pursuit of that love — namely, that all believers might be saved. So the sense is: God so loved his elect throughout the world that he gave his Son with this intention, that by him believers might be saved. And this is all that is objected from this place to disprove our interpretation — besides a few worthless cavils.

First, our first reason is taken from what was before proved concerning the nature of that love which is here said to have the world for its object, which cannot be extended to all and every one in the world, as all will confess. Now such is the world here as is beloved with that love which we have described and proved to be here intended — a love that is first the most transcendent and remarkable, second an eternal act of the will of God, third the cause of sending Christ, fourth of giving all good things in and with him, and fifth an assured fountain and spring of salvation to all beloved with it. So the world beloved with this love cannot possibly be all and every one in the world.

Second, the word 'world' in the next verse — which carries along the sense of this and is a continuation of the same matter, being a discovery of the intention of God in giving his Son — must needs signify the elect and believers, or at least only those who in the event are saved. Therefore so also in this verse. It is true, the word 'world' is used three times in that verse in a varied sense, by a device not unusual in scripture as was before declared. The latter occurrence is what this verse has reference to and is of the same meaning as 'the world' in verse 16: 'that the world through him might be saved' — that it should be saved, this shows the aim, purpose, and intention of God toward the world he so loved, even its salvation. Now if this is understood of any but believers, God fails of his aim and intention — which as yet we dare not grant.

Third, it is not unusual with the scripture to call God's chosen people by the name of 'the world,' as also 'all flesh,' 'all nations,' 'all families of the earth,' and the like general expressions. Therefore no wonder if they are so called here, the intention of the place being to exalt and magnify the love of God toward them. So they are called where Christ is said to be their Savior (John 4:42) — which he certainly is only of those who are saved. A Savior of men not saved is a strange thing. In John 6:51, where he is said to give himself for their life — and clearly in verse 33, he gives life to the world — whether this is any but his elect, let all men judge. For Christ himself affirms that he gives life only to his sheep and that those to whom he gives life shall never perish (John 10:27-28). So Romans 4:13: Abraham is said by faith to be heir of the world, who in verse 11 is called the father of the faithful. And Romans 11:12: the fall of the Jews is said to be the riches of the world, which world comprises only believers of all sorts in the world, as the apostle affirmed that the word bore fruit in all the world (Colossians 1:6). This is that world which God reconciles to himself, not imputing to them their trespasses (2 Corinthians 5:19), which is attended with blessedness in all those to whom that non-imputation belongs (Romans 4). And for evident reasons they have this appellation: first, to distinguish the object of this love of God from angelic nature which utterly perished in all the fallen individuals — which the scripture also carefully does in express terms (Hebrews 2:16); second, to overturn and reject the boasting of the Jews as though all the means of grace and all the benefits intended were appropriated to them; third, to denote that great distinction between the old administration of the covenant, when it was tied up to one people, family, and nation, and the new, when all boundaries being

broken down, the fullness of the Gentiles and the corners of the world were to be made obedient to the scepter of Christ; fourth, to manifest the condition of the elect themselves who are thus beloved, for the declaration of the free grace of God toward them — they being stripped of all qualifications but only those that speak of them as earthly, lost, miserable, and corrupted. So this much at least may easily be obtained: that from the word itself, nothing can be justly opposed to our exposition of this place.

Fourth, if every one in the world is intended, why does the Lord not reveal Jesus Christ to every one whom he so loved? Strange, that the Lord should so love men as to give his only begotten Son for them, and yet not once by any means signify this his love to them — as to innumerable he does not. That he should love them and yet order things so in his wise dispensation that this love should be altogether vain and fruitless. Love them, and yet determine that they shall receive no good by his love, though his love is indeed a willing of the greatest good to them.

Fifth, unless you will grant: first, that some are both beloved and hated from eternity; second, that the love of God toward innumerable is fruitless and vain; third, that the Son of God is given for those who never hear a word of him and who have no power granted to believe in him; fourth, that God is mutable in his love, or else still loves those who are in hell; fifth, that he does not give all things to those to whom he gives his Son, contrary to Romans 8:32; sixth, that he does not certainly know beforehand who shall believe and be saved — unless all these blasphemies and absurdities are granted, it cannot be maintained that by 'the world' here is meant all and every one of mankind. It means only men in common scattered throughout the world — who are the elect.

Third, the third difference about these words concerns the means by which this love of the Father — whose object is said to be the world — is made out to them. Now this is by believing: 'that whoever believes,' or 'that every believer.' The intention of these words we take to be the designating or manifesting of the way whereby the elect of God come to be partakers of the fruits of the love here set forth — namely, by faith in Christ, God having appointed that as the only way by which he will communicate to us the life that is in his Son. Something was said before, having proved that the term 'whoever' is not distributive of the object of the love of God. To which we may add these following reasons.

If the object be here restrained, so that some only believe and are saved of them for whose sake Christ is sent, then this restriction and determination of the fruits of this love depends on the will of God, or on the persons themselves. If on the persons themselves, then they make themselves to differ from others, contrary to 1 Corinthians 4:7. If on the will of God, then you make the sense of the place to be: God so loved all, as that but some of them should partake of the fruits of his love.

Seeing that these words, 'that whosoever believes,' do peculiarly point out the aim and intention of God in this business; if it does restrain the object beloved, then the salvation of Believers is confessedly the aim of God in this business, and that distinguished from others; and if so, the general ransom is an empty sound, having no dependence on the purpose of God, his intention being carried out in the giving of his Son only to the salvation of believers.

These words then, 'whosoever believes,' containing a designation of the means whereby the Lord will bring us to a participation of life through his Son whom he gave for us; and the following

words of having life everlasting, making out the whole Counsel of God in this matter subordinate to his own glory, it follows:

That God gave not his Son for those who never do believe; much less for those who never hear of him, and so invincibly want means of faith; nor for those on whom he has determined not to bestow effectual grace that they might believe.

Let the Reader weigh all, try all things, especially whether the love of God is only a general affection and a natural willingness to the good of all, which may stand with the perishing of all so beloved: or the peculiar transcendent love of the Father to his elect, as before laid down; and then determine, whether a general ransom, fruitless in respect of the most for whom it was paid, or the effectual Redemption of the elect only, has the firmest and strongest foundation in these words of our Savior.

CHAPTER 3



Next to the place before considered, that which is urged with most confidence and pressed with most importunity for the defense of the general ransom is 1 John 2:1-2: 'If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is a propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.' The weight of the whole argument hangs upon this, that the Apostle affirms Christ to be a propitiation for the sins of the whole world — which, say they, manifestly means all and every one in the world, and that:

First, from the words themselves without any wresting: for what can be signified by the whole world but all men in the world?

Second, from the opposition that is made between 'world' and 'believers' — all believers being comprised in the first part of the Apostle's assertion that Christ is a propitiation for our sins, and therefore by the world opposed to them, all others are understood.

Before I come to the fuller clarification of the mind of the Holy Spirit in these words, I must say that I might answer the objection from hence very briefly, and yet so solidly as quite to cut off all the caviling exceptions of our adversaries — namely, that as by 'the world' in other places men living in the world are denoted, so by

'the whole world' in this can nothing be understood but men living throughout the whole world, in all the parts and regions thereof, in opposition to the inhabitants of any one nation, place, or country as such, as the redeemed of Christ are said to be (Revelation 5:9). But because they much boast of this place, I shall with God's assistance so open the sense and meaning of it that it shall appear to all how little reason they have to place any confidence in their wrested interpretation of it.

To make out the sense of this place, three things are to be considered: first, to whom the Apostle writes; second, what is his purpose and aim in this particular place; third, the meaning of those two expressions — Christ being a propitiation, and the whole world. Having done this, according to the analogy of faith, the scope of this and other parallel places, and the use of the words themselves, we shall easily manifest by undeniable reasons that the text cannot be so understood as it is urged and wrested for universal redemption.

First, a discovery of those to whom the epistle was particularly directed will give some light into the meaning of the Apostle. Although this and all other parts of divine scripture were given for the use, benefit, and direction of the whole church, yet that many parts of it were directed to particular churches and persons is evident. Now though we have nothing expressly nominating those to whom this epistle was primarily directed, yet by clear and evident deduction it may be made more than probable that it was intended for the Jews or believers of the circumcision. For first, John was in a peculiar manner a minister and apostle to the Jews, and therefore they were the most immediate and proper objects of his care — James, Cephas, and John gave to Paul and Barnabas the right

hand of fellowship that they should go to the Gentiles and themselves to the circumcision (Galatians 2:9). Now as Peter and James, in the prosecution of their apostleship toward them, wrote epistles to them in their dispersion (James 1:1; 1 Peter 1:1), as Paul did to all the chief churches among the Gentiles by him planted, so it is more than probable that John writing this epistle directed it chiefly and in the first place to those who were chiefly and in the first place the objects of his care and apostleship.

Second, he frequently intimates that those to whom he wrote were of those who heard and received the word from the beginning, as twice in this chapter (verse 7): 'That commandment which you heard from the beginning.' Now that the proclamation of the gospel had its beginning among the Jews, and its first entrance with them before the conversion of any of the Gentiles — which was a mystery for a season — is apparent from the story of the Acts of the Apostles (chapters 1-6, 12). 'To the Jew first and then to the Greek' was the order divinely appointed (Romans 1:16-17).

Third, the opposition the Apostle makes between 'us' and 'the world' in this very place is sufficient to show to whom he wrote. As a Jew, he reckons himself with and among the believing Jews to whom he wrote, and sets himself with them in opposition to the residue of believers in the world. This is a pattern of speaking common with this Apostle — and how he is to be understood is declared in his Gospel at John 11:51-52.

Fourthly, the frequent mention and cautions he makes of false teachers, seducers, and Antichrists — who in those first days were, if not all of them, yet for the greatest part, of the circumcision — evidently declares that to those in especial was this Epistle directed. He is a propitiation for our sins, that is, our sins who are

believers of the Jews; and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world, that is, the children of God throughout the world, of what Nation, Kindred, Tongue, or Language soever they were. So that we have not here an opposition between the effectual salvation of all believers, and the effectual Redemption which belonged to the Jews believers, to all other believers, or children of God throughout the whole world.

The aim of the Apostle being to make out consolation to believers in their failings, he can speak of none but them only: and if he should extend that whereof he speaks, namely that Christ was a propitiation, to all and every one, I cannot perceive how this can possibly make anything to the end proposed, or the consolation of believers. For what comfort can arise from hence to them, by telling them that Christ died for innumerable that shall be damned? The children's bread must not be cast to dogs.

The meaning and purport of the word 'Propitiation,' which Christ is said to be for us and the whole world, is next to be considered. The word propitiation signifies that which was done or typically effected by the mercy seat, namely to appease, pacify, and reconcile God, in respect of his turning away for sin. Christ is said to be the mercy seat because it was placed upon the Ark and covered it; God thereby declaring himself to be pacified or reconciled, the cause of anger and enmity being hidden. Whether God can be tolerably said to be a propitiation for the whole world, taking it for all and every man in the world — are the sins of every one expiated? Is God reconciled to every one? Is every sinner pardoned? — let all the men in the world that are able, judge. Doubtless all these things are true of every believer, and of no one else in the whole world.

Fourth, let us consider the phrase 'the whole world.' I will not here fully declare how the word 'world' is of various meanings in scripture, partly because I have already done so to some degree, and partly because it is not so much the word itself that is insisted upon here but only with reference to its general adjunct 'whole' — the whole world. Concerning this expression I say:

First, whereas this expression, with its equivalent 'all the world,' is used seven or eight times in the New Testament, it cannot be made to appear clearly and undeniably that in any place it comprises all and every man in the world. Unless some circumstance in this particular place enforces that sense — which it does not — it will be a plain wresting of the words to force that interpretation upon them. Let us briefly look at the places. Revelation 3:10: 'I will keep you from the hour of temptation which shall come upon the whole world' — where it cannot signify all and every one, because some are promised to be preserved from what is said to come upon it. Colossians 1:6: 'Which is come unto you as in all the world' — where first, all and every man cannot be understood, for they had not all then received the gospel; and second, only believers are here signified living abroad in the world, because the gospel is said to bring forth fruit in them to whom it comes, and there is no true gospel fruit without faith and repentance. Romans 1:8: 'Their faith is spoken of in the whole world' — did every one in the world hear and speak of the Roman faith? Luke 2:1: 'There went a decree from Augustus Caesar that the whole world should be taxed' — which yet was but the Roman Empire, far short of comprising all singular persons in the world. If then the expression itself does not hold out any such universality as is pretended, unless the matter and circumstances of the place require it — and neither

does so here — there is no ground to fasten such an interpretation upon it. Rather we may conclude that 'all the world' and 'the whole world,' being in other places taken indefinitely for men of all sorts throughout the world, are no otherwise to be understood here.

Second, 'the whole world' can signify no more than 'all nations,' 'all the families of the earth,' 'all flesh,' 'all men,' 'all the ends of the world' — these surely are expressions equivalent to and as comprehensive as 'the whole world.' But all these expressions we find frequently to mean believers only, yet of all sorts and throughout the world. 'All the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God' (Psalm 98:3). 'All the ends of the world shall remember and turn to the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before you' (Psalm 22:27). 'All nations shall serve you' (Psalm 72:11). These general expressions denote only the believers of all the several nations of the world. So Joel 2:18: 'I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh' — repeated in Acts 2:17 and Luke 3:6: 'All flesh shall see the salvation of God.' Believers are called all nations (Isaiah 2:2; 66:18), yes all men (Titus 2:11), for to them alone the salvation-bringing grace of God is manifest. If they, the children of God, are in scripture phrase 'all flesh,' 'all nations,' 'all kindreds,' 'all the ends of the world,' 'all men,' why not also 'the whole world'? Third, 'the whole world' does sometimes signify the worse part of the world (Revelation 12:9: 'the devil who deceives the whole world' — meaning the wicked in the world; 1 John 5:19: 'the whole world lies in evil' — where the whole world is opposed to those who are of God). Why may it not by like usage also signify the better part? This being clarified, it is evident that there is nothing in the words themselves that should compel anyone to conceive that all

and every man in the world are denoted by them, but rather believers — even all who did or should believe throughout the whole world — in opposition only to believers of the Jewish nation.

This place treats not of the ransom of Christ in respect of imputation but of application: for it affirms Christ to be by his death what he is only by faith, as was shown from Romans 3:25. And also from application alone does consolation arise. Now never any said that the application of the death of Christ was universal: therefore this place cannot have regard to all and every one.

Secondly, Christ is here said to be a propitiation only for such as are intended in the place, which is apparent. But now Believers only are here intended; for it is to give them consolation in their failings, in which case consolation belongs to them alone. Therefore it is believers only, though of all sorts, times, places and conditions, for whom Christ is said to be a propitiation.

Thirdly, this kind of phrase and expression in other places cannot possibly be stretched to comprehend all and every one, as was apparent from the places before alleged. To which add Matthew 3:5: 'Then went out unto him all Judea, and all the region about Jordan'; among whom notwithstanding the Pharisees rejected his Baptism. Why then should it be so understood here, especially when all circumstances are contrary to such an interpretation?

Fourthly, the most clear parallel places in the Scripture are opposite to such a sense as is imposed. See Colossians 1:6 and John 11:52.

Fifth, if the words are to be understood to signify all and every one in the world, then is the whole assertion useless as to the chief end intended, namely to administer consolation to believers. For

what consolation can arise from hence unto any believer, that Christ was a propitiation for them that perish? To say that he was a sufficient propitiation for them, though not effectual, will yield no more comfort than it would have done Jacob and his sons to have heard from Joseph that he had grain enough to sustain them — but that he would do so was altogether uncertain. The whole world then in this place is the whole people of God, opposed to the Jewish Nation, scattered abroad throughout the whole world, of what Nation, Kindred, Tongue, or Family soever, who are some of all sorts, not all of every sort — so that this place makes nothing for general Redemption.

Some few objections there are which are usually laid against our interpretation of this passage of the Apostle; but they are all prevented or removed in the explication itself, so that it shall suffice us to name one or two of them.

Objection 1: It is the intention of the Apostle to comfort all in their fears and doubts; but every one in the world may be in fears and doubts; therefore he proposes this, that they all may be comforted.

Answer: The 'all' that may be in fears and doubts, in the business of consolation, must of necessity be restrained to believers, as was before declared.

Objection 2: All Believers are comprehended in the first branch, 'for our sins'; and therefore in the increase and extension of the assertion, by adding 'for the sins of the whole world,' all others are intended.

Answer: In the first part, the believing Jews alone are intended, of whom John was one; and the addition is not an extending of the propitiation of Christ to others than Believers, but only to other Believers. If it might be granted that in the first branch all believers then living were comprehended, yet the increase or accession must be, by analogy, only those who were to be in after ages and remoter places than the name of Christ had then reached — even all those who, according to the prayer of our Savior in John 17, should believe on his name to the end of the world. And thus the two main places produced for the confirmation of the first Argument are vindicated from the false glosses and violent wrestings of our adversaries; the rest will be easily cleared.

The next place urged in the argument is John 6:51, where our Savior affirms that he will give his flesh for the life of the world. This giving of himself was the sanctifying and offering up himself, an acceptable oblation, for the sins of those for whom he suffered — his intention being that they for whom, dying, he so offered himself might have eternal life thereby. Because this was not for the Jews only but also for all the Elect of God everywhere, he calls them the world. That the world here cannot signify all and every one that ever were or should be is as manifest as if it were written with the beams of the sun, for it is made the object of Christ's intentions to purchase for them and bestow upon them life and salvation. Who can imagine that Christ in his oblation intended to purchase life and salvation for all whom he knew to be damned many ages before, the irreversible decree of wrath being gone forth against them? So that if we had no other place to show that the

word 'world' does not always signify all but only some of all sorts — as the elect of God are — this one place produced by our adversaries would be sufficient.

Diverse other places I find produced by T.M. in chapter 14 of the universality of free grace, to the pretended end in hand; which with that whole chapter shall be briefly considered.

The first insisted on by him is 2 Corinthians 5:19: 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.'

Answer: Those who are called 'the world' in verse 19 are termed 'us' in verse 18: 'He hath reconciled us to himself by Christ.' They are further described in verse 21 by Christ being made sin for them and their being made the righteousness of God in him — which things cannot be true of all in the world. God's reconciling the world to himself consists in, or necessarily infers, a non-imputation of sin to them, further interpreted as an imputation of the righteousness of Christ. This is the blessedness of justification in Christ (Romans 4:7), so this whole world which God in Christ reconciles to himself is a blessed, justified world — not all and every one of the sons of men, the greatest part of whom lie in evil. Moreover, this 'God in Christ reconciling' holds out an actual work of reconciliation: if absolute, why are not all actually and absolutely reconciled, pardoned, and justified? If conditional, what is that condition? If faith, then the sense is that God reconciled an unbelieving world on condition that it believe — which is circular. The world here then is only the world of blessed pardoned believers, who are made the righteousness of God in Christ.

What T.M. brings to enforce the opposite signification of the word is, in many words, very little. He spends much time to prove a twofold reconciliation in the text — the first of God to us by Christ, the other of us to God by the Spirit — which we also grant, though we do not divide them but make them several parts of the same reconciliation. The former is the rule of the latter: whoever God is reconciled to in and by Christ shall certainly be reconciled to God by the Spirit. And as the rule, so it is the chief motive toward the latter, being the subject of the gospel message whereby it is effected. So the assertion of this twofold reconciliation establishes our persuasion that the world can be taken only for the elect therein.

He brings further light from the context to strengthen his interpretation: those of the world here are called men (verse 11), men who must appear before the judgment seat of Christ (verse 10), who were dead (verse 14), and who ought to live unto Christ (verse 15) — therefore all men. But one thing more must be done for the cause to be his: he must prove that the elect of God are not men, that they must not appear before the judgment seat, that they were not dead, and that they ought not to live unto Christ. He adds further that of these some are reconciled to God (verse 18).

Answer: It is most false that there is any limitation or restriction of reconciliation to some of those concerning whom he treats — it is rather evidently extended to all of them. And there is not a word in the text about some being unreconciled, nor can the least color be wrested from it for any such assertion.

A second place he urges is John 1:9: 'He is the true light that lightens every man that comes into the world.' This world (says he) is the world of mankind made by Christ, which was his own by cre-

ation, mercy, and purchase, yet received him not (verses 3-4) — therefore it is manifest that Christ died for all.

Answer: By 'the world' here is meant not men in the world, all or some, but the habitable part of the earth — the phrase 'coming into the world' cannot possibly be otherwise understood; it is as much as 'born, and coming to breathe the common air.' Among the expositions of this place, that which seems most consonant to the discourse of the Apostle refers the word 'coming' to 'light' and not to 'man,' so that the words should be rendered: 'that was the true light which, coming into the world, lights every man' — as in John 3:19 and John 12:46. So nothing can be extorted from the word 'world' here for the universality of grace or ransom. The whole weight must lie on the words 'every man': which yet T.M. does not insist upon. Christ, coming into the world, is said to enlighten every man, partly because every one that has any light has it from him, and partly because he is the only true light, so that he enlightens every one that is enlightened — which is all the text avers; but whether all and every one before and after his incarnation were actually enlightened with the knowledge of Christ, let Scripture, experience, and reason determine.

A third place is John 1:29: 'Behold the Lamb of God which takes away the sin of the world.' And this (says he) is spoken of the world in general.

Answer: If it should be spoken of the world in general, yet nothing could thence be inferred as to a universality of individuals. That Christ takes away, bears, purges, and pardons the sin of the world is most certain, but that he takes it away from, bears it for,

and purges it out of all and every man in the world is not in the least manner intimated in the text, and is in itself exceedingly false.

John 3:17 is next urged: 'God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved.'

Answer: There is a notable inversion of the word 'world' in this place. By the world in the first place, that part of the world where our Savior conversed has the name of the whole assigned to it; in the second, you may take it for all and every one if you please, for the prime end of our Savior's coming was not to condemn any but to save his own. In the third place, they only are designed whom God sent his Son on purpose to save. That these are not all men but only believers of Jews and Gentiles throughout the world is evident: first, because all are not saved, and the Lord has said his purpose shall stand; second, because most men were at that instant actually damned — did he send his Son that they might be saved?; third, because Christ was appointed for the fall of some (Luke 1). The saved world is the people of God scattered abroad throughout the world.

John 4:42 and 1 John 4:14, with John 6:51 (which was before considered), are also produced by T.M., in all of which places Christ is called the Savior of the world.

Answer: Christ is said to be Savior of the world either because there is no other Savior for any in the world and he saves all that are saved — the people of God, not the Jews only, all over the world — or because he does actually save all the world and every one in it. If in the latter way, Mr. More has won; if in the former,

we are still where we were. The following places of John 3:16, 18, and 1 John 2:1-2 have been already considered; some other texts are produced but so exceedingly wrested and strangely perverted that I dare not try the reader's patience by giving a repetition of them.

And this is our defense and answer to the first principal argument of our opposers, our explication of all those texts of Scripture which they have wrested to support it: the bottom of their strength being but the ambiguity of one word. Let the Christian reader try all things, and hold fast that which is good.

CHAPTER 4



The second Argument wherewith our adversaries make no less flourish than with the former is raised from those places of Scripture where there is mention made of all men and every man in the business of Redemption. The chief places insisted on are 1 Timothy 2:4-6, 2 Peter 3:9, Hebrews 2:9, 2 Corinthians 5:14-15, 1 Corinthians 15:22, and Romans 5:18.

For the use and signification of the word 'all' in Scripture, so much has been said already by many that it would be needless for me to insist upon it. No strength of Argument can be taken from the word itself; wherefore I shall apply myself only to the examination of the particular places urged, and the objections from them raised.

The first and chief place is 1 Timothy 2:4-6: 'God will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth; Christ gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time.'

If God will have all men to be saved, then Christ died for all; but God will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth: therefore Christ died for all men.

Answer: The whole strength of this Argument lies in the ambiguity of the word 'all,' which being of various significations and to be interpreted suitably to the matter in hand, may be granted or denied according as the acceptation of the word is enforced. That 'all' or 'all men' do not always comprehend all and every man that were, are, or shall be may be made apparent by near five hundred instances from the Scripture. Taking then 'all' and 'all men' distributively for some of all sorts, we grant the whole; taking them collectively for all of all sorts, we deny the minor: namely, that God will have them all to be saved.

The will of God is usually distinguished into his will intending, and his will commanding. If they say he wills it with his will commanding, requiring, approving, then the sense of the words is this: God commands all men to use the means whereby they may obtain the end, or salvation. Now if this be the way whereby God wills the salvation of all men here mentioned, then certainly those 'all' can possibly be no more than those to whom he grants and reveals the means of grace. Besides, taking God's willing the salvation of men in this sense, we deny the sequence that Christ died for as many as God thus wills should be saved.

Secondly, if the will of God be taken for his efficacious will, the will of his purpose and good pleasure, then certainly it must be fulfilled, and all those saved whom he would have saved. If then 'all' here is to be understood of all men universally, one of these two things must of necessity follow: either that God fails of his purpose and intention, or else that all men universally shall be saved. He does whatsoever he pleases in heaven and earth (Psalm 115), and according to his will in the host of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth (Daniel 4:35).

By 'all men,' the Apostle here intends all sorts of men, indefinitely living under the Gospel, or in these latter times under the enlarged dispensation of the means of grace. The scope of the Apostle, treating of the amplitude, enlargement, and extent of grace in the outward administration thereof under the Gospel, will not suffer it to be denied. We say then that by the words 'all men' are here intended only men of all sorts, suitable to the purpose of the Apostle, which was to show that all external difference between the sons of men is now taken away.

First, the word 'all,' being in the Scripture most commonly used in this sense — that is, for many of all sorts — and there being nothing in the subject matter which should impel to another acceptance, especially for a universal collection of every individual, we hold it safe to cleave to the most usual sense and meaning of it.

Secondly, Paul himself plainly leads us to this interpretation: for after he has enjoined us to pray for all, because the Lord will have all to be saved, he expressly intimates that by 'all men' he understands men of all sorts, ranks, conditions, and orders, by distributing those all into several kinds, expressly mentioning some of them, as Kings and all in authority. Pray for all men (says he), that is all sorts of men, as Magistrates, all that are in authority, the time being now come wherein, without such distinctions as formerly have been observed, the Lord will save some of all sorts and Nations.

Thirdly, we are bound to pray for all whom God would have to be saved. Now we ought not to pray for all and every one, knowing that some are Reprobates and sin unto death, concerning whom we have an express caution not to pray for them.

Fourthly, all shall be saved whom God will have to be saved; this we dare not deny, for who has resisted his will? Seeing then it is most certain that all shall not be saved, it cannot be that the universality of men should be intended in this place.

Fifth, God would have no more to be saved than he would have come to the knowledge of the truth. But it is not the will of the Lord that all and every one in all ages should come to the knowledge of the truth. He suffered the Gentiles in former ages to walk in their own ways, and winked at the time of their ignorance (Acts 17:30), hiding the mystery of salvation from those former ages (Colossians 1:26). It is then evident that God does not will that all and every one in the world of all ages and times should come to the knowledge of the truth, but only all sorts of men without difference, and therefore they only are here intended.

These and the like reasons, which compel us to understand by 'all men' only men of all sorts, also prevail for the same acceptation of the word 'all' in verse 6, where Christ is said to give himself a ransom for all. Paying and accepting of a ransom intimate a commutation and setting free of all those for whom the ransom is paid and accepted. By 'all' then can none be understood but the Redeemed, Ransomed ones of Jesus Christ, such as are vindicated into the glorious liberty of the Children of God — as some of all sorts are expressly said to be (Revelation 5:9), while that all in the world universally are so is confessedly false.

Our answer to the objection — whose strength is a mere fallacy from the ambiguous sense of the word 'all' — is easy: for if by 'all men' you mean the 'all' in the Text, that is, all sorts of men, we

grant the whole, namely that Christ died for all; but if by 'all men' you mean all universally, we absolutely deny the assumption, having sufficiently proved that there is no such 'all' in the Text.

The reinforcing of an objection from this place, T.M. in his 'Universality of Grace' makes the subject of one whole chapter; it is also one of the two places which he lays for the bottom and foundation of the whole building, and whereunto at a dead lift he always retires. I therefore thought to have considered that chapter at large, but upon second consideration have laid aside that resolution, and that for three reasons.

First, because I desired not to do again what has already been done, especially the thing itself being such as scarcely deserves to be meddled with at all. The learned work of Master Rutherford, about the death of Christ and the drawing of sinners thereby, came to my hand, wherein he has fully answered that chapter of Master M.'s book, whither I remit the Reader.

Secondly, I find that he has not once attempted to meddle with any of those Reasons and Arguments whereby we confirm our answer to the Objection from the place, and prove undeniably that by 'all men' is meant only men of all sorts.

Thirdly, because, setting aside those bare naked assertions of his own whereby he seeks to strengthen his Argument from and interpretation of this place, the residue wherewith he flourishes is a poor fallacy running through the whole. The strength of all his argumentations consists in this: that by 'all we are to pray for' are not meant only all who are at present Believers — which as no man in his right wits will affirm; so he that will conclude from thence

that because they are not only all present believers, therefore they are all the individuals of mankind, is not to be esteemed very sober.

2 Peter 3:9: 'The Lord is long-suffering toward us, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to Repentance.' The will of God for the salvation of all is here set down both negatively, that he would not have any perish, and positively, that he would have all come to repentance. Now seeing there is no coming to repentance, nor escaping destruction, but only by the blood of Christ, it is manifest that that blood was shed for all.

Answer: That indefinite and general expressions are to be interpreted in an answerable proportion to the things whereof they are affirmed is a rule in the opening of the Scripture. See then of whom the Apostle is here speaking: 'The Lord is long-suffering toward us, not willing that any should perish.' Will not common sense teach us that 'us' is to be repeated in both the following clauses: 'Not willing that any of us should perish, but that all of us should come to Repentance'? Now who are these of whom the Apostle speaks, to whom he writes? Such as had received great and precious promises (chapter 1:4), whom he calls Brethren (chapter 3:1), whom he opposes to the scoffers of the last days (verse 3), to whom the Lord has respect in the disposal of these days, who are said to be elect (Matthew 24). To argue that because God would have none of those to perish, but all of them to come to repentance, therefore he has the same will and mind towards all and every one in the world — even those to whom he never makes known his will, nor ever calls to repentance, who never once hear of his

way of salvation — comes not much short of extreme madness and folly. The Text is clear, that it is all, and only the Elect, whom he would not have to perish.

Hebrews 2:9: 'That he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.'

Answer: That 'for every one' is here used for 'for all' by an enallage of the number is by all acknowledged. The whole question is who these all are — whether all men universally, or only all those of whom the Apostle there treats. That this expression 'every man' is commonly used in Scripture to signify men under some restriction cannot be denied — as in Colossians 1:28, 'warning every man and teaching every man,' that is, all those to whom he preached the Gospel. I have frequently met with this present place produced in behalf of universal Redemption, but never once found any endeavor from the text to prove that 'all' here is to be taken for all and every one — although they cannot but know that the usual acceptance of the word is against their purpose. Mr. M. spends a whole chapter about this place, but with abundance of smooth words he does nothing but humbly and heartily beg the question, to which petition, though he be exceedingly earnest, we cannot consent.

First, to taste death is to drink up the cup due to sinners; certainly for whomsoever our Savior did taste of it, he left not one drop for them to drink after him. He tasted or underwent death in their stead, that the cup might pass from them, which passed not from him. Now the cup of death passes only from the elect, from believers; for whomsoever our Savior tasted death, he swallowed it up into victory.

Second, there is an evident apparent cause that should move the Apostle here to call those for whom Christ died 'all' — namely, that he wrote to the Hebrews who were deeply tainted with the erroneous persuasion that all the benefits purchased by the Messiah belonged only to their nation, excluding all others. To root out this pernicious opinion it was fitting for the Apostle to speak of the extent of free grace under the Gospel and to hold out a universality of God's elect throughout the world.

Third, the description given in the same passage of the 'all' for whom Christ tasted death by the grace of God will not suit to all and every person, but only to the elect of God. For in verse 10 they are called 'many sons to be brought to glory'; in verse 11, 'those who are sanctified, his brothers, the children that God gave him'; in verse 13, 'those delivered from the bondage of death' (verse 15) — none of which can be affirmed of those who are born, live, and die as children of the wicked one. Christ is not a captain of salvation, as he is here styled, to any but those who obey him (Hebrews 5:9). Righteousness comes by him 'unto all and upon all who believe' (Romans 3:22). For these and similar reasons we cannot be induced to accept our adversaries' interpretation, being fully persuaded that by 'everyone' here is meant all and only God's elect, in whose stead Christ by the grace of God tasted death.

Another passage is 2 Corinthians 5:14-15: 'For the love of Christ constrains us, because we thus judge: that if one died for all, then all died; and that he died for all, that those who live should live no longer for themselves but for him who died for them.' They say: in verse 14 you have two 'alls' that must both be of equal extent — if 'all' died, then Christ died for 'all,' that is, for as many as were dead; again, he died for 'all' that should live to him, but that

is the duty of every person in the world, and therefore he died for them all. Further, that 'all' means every individual is clear from verse 10 where it is said that all must appear before the judgment seat of Christ, from which appearance none shall be exempted.

In answer: first, taking the words as some of our adversaries take them, yet it does not appear from the texture of the Apostle's argument that the two 'alls' of verse 14 are of equal extent. He does not say Christ died for all who were dead, but only that all were dead for whom Christ died — which proves no more than this: all those for whom Christ died were dead with that kind of death of which he speaks. The extent of the words is to be taken from the first 'all,' not the latter. The Apostle affirms so many to be dead as Christ died for, not that Christ died for so many as were dead. So the 'all' that were dead can give no light to the extent of the 'all' that Christ died for, being merely regulated by it. Second, that all and every person are morally bound to live to Christ by virtue of a precept, we deny — only those are bound to live to him to whom he is revealed, and indeed only those who live by him and have a spiritual life in and with him. Third, it is true that all and every person must appear before the judgment seat of Christ, since he is ordained to be judge of the world — but that they are intended in verse 10 of this chapter is not true; the Apostle speaks of 'us all,' all believers and especially all preachers of the Gospel, neither of which is all people. So despite what has been said, it does not appear that by 'all' here is meant any but the elect of God and all believers.

First, the resurrection of Christ is here joined with his death — he died for them and rose again. Now for whomever Christ rises, he rises for their justification (Romans 4:25), and they must be

justified (Romans 8:34); our adversaries themselves have always confessed that the fruits of the resurrection of Christ are peculiar to believers.

Second, the Apostle speaks only of those who by virtue of the death of Christ live to him (verse 15), who are new creatures (verse 17), to whom the Lord does not impute their trespasses (verse 19), who become the righteousness of God in Christ (verse 21) — which are only believers, not all.

Third, the Greek article joined to the noun 'all' evidently restricts that 'all' to all of some particular group — 'then were they all (or rather, all these) dead': what 'all'? All these believers of whom he treats, as above.

Fourth, all those of whom the Apostle treats are proved to be dead because Christ died for them: 'if one died for all, then all died' — what death is spoken of here? Not natural death but spiritual — specifically not the death that is in sin, but the death that is to sin. Even the greatest champions of the Arminian cause, such as Vorstius and Grotius on this passage, convinced by the evidence of the text, acknowledge that it is a death to sin by virtue of the death of Christ that is spoken of here. It is apparent from the text itself: the Apostle's intention is to prove that those for whom Christ died are so dead to sin that they should no longer live to it but to him who died for them — the same subject he handles at greater length in Romans 6:5, where we are said to be dead to sin by being planted together in the likeness of the death of Christ. These words then — 'if Christ died for all, then all died' — concern the death to sin of those for whom Christ died; and what does this have to do with a general ransom?

Fifth, the Apostle speaks of the death of Christ in respect of application: the effectualness thereof toward those for whom he died, to cause them to live unto him, is insisted on. That Christ died for all in respect of application has not yet by any been affirmed. Then must we live unto him — yes, live with him forevermore — if there is any virtue or efficacy in his applied oblation for that end. In sum, here is no mention of Christ's dying for any but those that are dead to sin and live to him.

A fifth place urged to prove universal Redemption from the word 'all' is 1 Corinthians 15:22: 'For as in Adam all men die, so in Christ shall all be made alive.'

Answer: There being another place hereafter to be considered wherein the whole strength of the argument usually drawn from these words is contained, I shall not need to speak much to this. Those concerning whom Paul speaks in this chapter are called 'all'; those are they who are implanted into Christ, joined to him as the members to the head, receiving a glorious resurrection by virtue of his. That Paul in this whole chapter discourses of the resurrection of believers is manifest from the arguments he brings to confirm it, which are taken from the resurrection of Christ, the hope, faith, customs, and expected rewards of Christians — all of which would have been exceedingly ridiculous had they been held out to the men of the world to prove the resurrection of the dead in general. All who by virtue of the resurrection of Christ shall be made alive are all those who are partakers of the nature of Christ, who in verse 23 are expressly called 'those that are Christ's'; and certainly Christ is not the first-fruits of the damned. Lastly, granting all that can be

desired — namely the universality of the word 'all' in both places — yet I am no way able to discern a medium that may serve as an argument to prove the general ransom.

Romans 5:18 is the last place urged in this kind: 'As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men unto condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life.' It might suffice to declare briefly that by 'all men' in the latter place can none be understood but those whom the free gift actually comes unto justification of life — those who in verse 17 are said to receive abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness, and so reign in life by Christ. Some believe not; all men have not faith; on some the wrath of God abides (John 3:36) — upon whom surely grace does not reign through righteousness to eternal life by Jesus Christ.

Verse 14: Adam is called the type and figure of him that was to come — not an instituted type ordained for that end only, but one in whom there was a resemblance between himself and Jesus Christ. The Apostle prosecutes this resemblance to show an alike, though not equal, efficacy of the demerit and transgression of the one to condemn all those in whose room he was a public person, and of the righteousness and death of the other for the absolution and salvation of all those to whom he was a spiritual head. That these last were all and every one of the first is not the least mentioned. The comparison is solely to be considered intensively, in respect of efficacy, not extensively in respect of object — though the 'all' of Adam be called his 'many,' and the 'many' of Christ be called his 'all,' as indeed they are, even all the seed which is given unto him.

T.M. in his 'Universality of Free Grace,' chapter 8, lays down the comparison instituted by the Apostle between Adam and Christ as one of the main foundations of his universal Redemption, affirming it to consist in four things.

First, that Adam in his first sin and transgression was a public person in the room and place of all mankind, by virtue of the covenant between God and him, so that whatever he did therein all were alike sharers with him; and so also was Christ a public person in his obedience and death in the room and place of all mankind, represented by him — every one of the posterity of Adam.

Answer: To that which concerns Adam, we grant he was a public person in respect of all his who were to proceed from him by natural propagation, and that Christ also was a public person in the room of his, prefigured by Adam. But that Christ in his obedience, death, and sacrifice was a public person standing in the room of all and every one in the world — including reprobate persons hated of God from eternity, those he never knew, concerning whom in the days of his flesh he thanked his Father for hiding from them the mysteries of salvation, whom he refused to pray for, the greatest part of whom were already damned in hell — is to us such a monstrous assertion as cannot be apprehended without horror. That any should perish in whose room the Son of God appeared before his Father with his perfect obedience, that any of those for whom he is a Mediator and Advocate should be plucked out of his arms — his satisfaction and intercession in their behalf being refused — is a doctrine that will scarcely be owned by those who strive to preserve the witness and testimony of the Lord Jesus.

First, he stood not in the room only of the elect, because Adam lost not election, not being entrusted with it. Second, if he stood not in the room of all, then he had come short of his figure. Third, it is said he was to restore all men lost by Adam (Hebrews 2:9). Fourth, he took flesh, was subjected to mortality, became under the law, and bore the sins of mankind. Fifth, he did it in the room of all mankind once given unto him (Romans 14:9; Philippians 2:8, 11). Sixth, he is called the last Adam. Seventh, he is said to be a public person in the room of all ever since the first Adam (1 Corinthians 15:45, 47; 1 Timothy 2:5; Romans 5).

Answer: Never surely was a rotten conclusion bottomed upon more loose and tottering principles, nor the word of God more boldly corrupted for the maintenance of any error. To the first: though Adam lost not election, yet in him all the elect were lost, whom Christ came to seek, whom he found, in whose room he was a public person. To the second: Christ is nowhere compared to Adam in respect of the extent of the object of his death, but only of the efficacy of his obedience. To the third: the third is a false assertion — see our foregoing consideration of Hebrews 2:9. To the fourth: he took flesh because the children were partakers of the same — it was necessary for saving his elect. To the fifth: no such thing is once affirmed in the whole book of God, that all the sons of men were given to Christ to redeem; Christ himself plainly affirms the contrary in John 17:6, 9. To the sixth: he is called the last Adam in respect of the efficacy of his death unto the justification of the seed given unto him, which proves not that he stood in the room of all those to whom his death was never known nor in any way profitable. To the seventh: that he was a public person is confessed; that he was so in the room of all is not proved by what has

been alleged. Another strange assertion of his is that the end of the death of Christ was his presenting himself alive and just before his Father — as though it were the ultimate thing intended; whereas the Holy Ghost expressly affirms that he loved his church and gave himself for it, that he might present it a glorious church unto himself (Ephesians 5:25-27).

The following parallels which he institutes between Adam and Christ have nothing of proof in them to the business in hand — namely that Christ was a public person standing in his obedience in the room of all and every one concerned in the disobedience of Adam. They are a confused medley of some truths and diverse unsavory errors, and I shall only give the reader a taste of some of them whereby he may judge of the rest.

First, in the second part of his parallel he affirms that when Christ finished his obedience in dying and rising, it was accepted with God for Christ's sake as the death, resurrection, sacrifice, satisfaction, and redemption of all — that is, all and every one. Now that the death of Christ should be accepted before God as the death of all, and yet the greatest part of these all be adjudged to eternal death in their own persons by the same righteous God; that all and every one should arise in and with Jesus Christ, and yet most continue dead in their sins and die for sin eternally; that satisfaction should be made and accepted for those who are never spared one farthing of their debt; that all the reprobates — Cain, Pharaoh, Ahab, and the rest — who were actually damned in hell when Christ died and rose, should be esteemed with God to have died and risen again with Christ: such senseless contradictions and abominable assertions, thrust upon Christians without the least color of proof, are enough to make any man amazed.

Secondly, in the third of his parallels he goes one step higher, affirming that as by the sin of Adam all his posterity were deprived of life, so by the efficacy of the obedience of Christ, all men without exception are redeemed, restored, made righteous, and justified freely — wickedly corrupting Romans 3:22 by cutting off the following words 'and upon all that believe.' What remains then but that all should also be saved? That men should be restored and yet continue lost; that they should be made righteous and yet remain detestably wicked; that they should be justified freely by the grace of God and always lie under the condemning sentence of his law — these are not only exceedingly opposite to the Gospel, but so absolutely at variance with one another that no salve of Mr. More's following cautions will heal their mutual wounds. I shall now transgress the rule of disputation slightly and produce some few reasons to demonstrate that Christ in his obedience to the death was not a public person in the room of all and every man in the world.

First, the seed of the woman was not to be a public person in the place and room of the seed of the serpent. Jesus Christ is the seed of the woman; all the reprobates are the seed of the serpent. Therefore Jesus Christ was not, in his oblation and suffering, a public person in their room.

Secondly, Christ as a public person represents only those for whose sake he set himself apart to that office and employment wherein he was such a representative. But on his own testimony in John 17:19, he set himself apart for the sake only of some who were given him out of the world, and not of all and every one. Therefore he was not a public person in the room of all.

Thirdly, Christ was a surety as he was a public person (Hebrews 7:22), but he was not a surety for all: for first, all are not taken into that covenant whereof he was a surety; second, none can perish for whom Christ is a surety unless he is not able to pay the debt. Therefore he was not a public person in the room of all.

Fourthly, for whom he was a public person, in their rooms he suffered and for them he made satisfaction (Isaiah 53), but he suffered not in the stead of all, nor made satisfaction for all; for some must suffer themselves, which makes it evident that Christ did not suffer for them (Romans 8:33-34), and the justice of God requires satisfaction from themselves to the payment of the utmost farthing.

Fifth, Jesus Christ as a public person did nothing in vain in respect of any for whom he was a public person; but many things which Christ as a public person performed were altogether in vain and fruitless in respect of the greatest part of the sons of men, being under an incapability of receiving any good by anything he did — to wit, all that then were actually damned. In respect of these, redemption, reconciliation, satisfaction, and the like, could possibly be no other than empty names.

Sixth, if God were well pleased with his Son in what he did as a public person in his representation of others (as he was, Ephesians 5:2), then must he also be well pleased with them whom he did represent, either absolutely or conditionally. But with many of the sons of men, God in the representation of his Son was not well pleased neither absolutely nor conditionally — to wit, with Cain, Pharaoh, Saul, Ahab, and others dead and damned before. Therefore Christ did not as a public person represent all.

Seventh, for testimonies, see John 17:9; Matthew 20:28; Matthew 26:26-28; Mark 10:45; Hebrews 6:20; Isaiah 53:12; John 10:15; Hebrews 13:20; Matthew 1:21; Hebrews 2:17; John 11:51-52; Acts 20:28; Ephesians 5:2, 23-25; Romans 8:33-34.

CHAPTER 5



I come in the next place to the third and last Argument drawn from the Scripture, wherewith the Arminians strive to maintain their figment of universal Redemption; and it is taken from such Texts of Scripture as seem to hold out the perishing of some of them for whom Christ died. Who can but believe that this persuasion tends to the consolation of poor souls, whose strongest defense lies in making vile the precious blood of the Lamb? I am persuaded it was not so unvaluable in the eyes of his Father, as to cause it to be poured out in vain in respect of any one soul.

If Christ died for Reprobates and those that perish, then he died for all and every one; for confessedly he died for the elect and those that are saved; but he died for Reprobates and them that perish; therefore Christ died for all.

Answer: We positively deny that Christ, by the command of his Father and with intention to make satisfaction for sins, did lay down his life for Reprobates and them that perish.

This they prove from Romans 14:15, 1 Corinthians 8:11, 2 Peter 2:1, Hebrews 10:29. The first is Romans 14:15: 'But if your brother be grieved with your meat, then you walk not charitably, destroy not him with your meat for whom Christ died.'

Answer: The Apostle exhorts strong and sound believers to such a moderate use of Christian liberty that they do not grieve the spirit of the weak ones — who were also believers, professors, called Saints, elect believers, redeemed and so in charity esteemed — and so give them occasion of stumbling and falling off from the Gospel. In this place there is no mention at all of anyone perishing for whom Christ died; only others are commanded not to do that which goes in a direct way to destroy him, by grieving him with their uncharitable walking. May not a man be exhorted from attempting that which yet, if he should attempt, he could not effect?

A second place is 1 Corinthians 8:10-11: 'And through your knowledge shall your weak brother perish for whom Christ died.' A brother is said to perish for whom Christ died: that by perishing here is understood eternal destruction and damnation, I cannot apprehend. Every time we sin, for anything that lies in us, we perish, we are destroyed; so did the eater of things offered to idols. But that God always revenges sin with damnation, on all in whom it is, we deny. He that is said to be a brother is a believer; we are brethren only by faith, whereby we come to have one Father. That a true believer cannot finally perish may easily be proved, therefore he who does perish is manifestly declared never to have been any. As he is said to be a brother, so Christ is said to die for him — even in that judgment which the Scripture allows to us of men. We cannot count a man a brother, and not esteem that Christ died for him.

The next place much insisted on is 2 Peter 2:1: 'There shall be false teachers denying the Lord that bought them and bringing on themselves swift destruction.' All things here as to any proof of the business in hand are exceedingly dark, uncertain and doubtful.

Uncertain: whether by 'the Lord' is meant the Lord Christ, the word in the original being rarely if ever ascribed to him. Uncertain: whether the purchase or buying of these false teachers refers to the eternal Redemption by the blood of Christ, or a deliverance by God's goodness from the defilement of the world in idolatry or the like, by the knowledge of the truth — which the text expressly affirms. Most certain: that there are no spiritual distinguishing fruits of Redemption ascribed to those false teachers, but only common gifts of light and knowledge, which Christ has purchased for many for whom he did not make his soul a ransom.

For the first uncertainty — whether Christ as Mediator is here intended by 'Lord' or not — there is not anything in the text to enforce us so to conceive. The name 'despotes' properly denotes 'sovereign' and is not usually, if at all, given to our Savior in the New Testament; he is everywhere called 'kyrios,' nowhere clearly 'despotes' as is the Father (Luke 2:29; Acts 4:24).

But suppose he should be so understood; it is most uncertain that by the buying of these false teachers is meant his purchasing of them with the ransom of his blood. The word translated 'buying' in the Old Testament signifies any deliverance, as Deuteronomy 7:8, 15:15, Jeremiah 15:21. The Apostle sets forth at large the deliverance they had and the means thereof (verse 20): it consisted in the escaping of the pollution of the world, as idolatry, false worship, and the like, by the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Of washing in the blood of the Lamb he is wholly silent. So our Adversaries' argument from this place is this: God the Lord, by imparting the knowledge of the Gospel and working them to a professed acknowledgment of it, separated and delivered from the world divers who were saints in show, really wolves and hyp-

ocrites, of old ordained to condemnation; therefore Jesus Christ shed his blood for the redemption and salvation of all Reprobates and damned persons in the whole world. Who would not admire our Adversaries' strange chemistry?

Thirdly, neither is it more certain that the Apostle speaks of the purchase of the wolves and hypocrites in respect of the reality of the purchase, and not rather in respect of that estimation which others had of them. It is the perpetual course of the Scripture to ascribe all those things to every one that is in the fellowship of the Church which are proper only to them who are true spiritual members of the same — as to be Saints, Elect, Redeemed, etc. Now after all this, if our adversaries can prove universal Redemption from this text, let them never despair of success in anything they undertake, be it never so absurd.

The last place produced for the confirmation of the argument in hand is Hebrews 10:29: 'Of how much sorer punishment, suppose you, shall he be thought worthy, who has trodden under foot the Son of God, and counted the blood of the Covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and has done despite to the Spirit of grace?' Nothing (say our Adversaries) could be affirmed of all this concerning Apostates — namely that they trod under foot, etc. — unless the blood of Christ was in some sense shed for them.

Answer: The intention of the Apostle in this place is the same with the general aim and scope of the whole Epistle: to persuade and urge the Jews who had embraced the doctrine of the Gospel to perseverance and continuance therein. He urges a strong argument from the miserable dangerous effects and consequences of the sin of backsliding and willful renunciation of the truth known and professed, upon any motives and inducements whatsoever. He

assures them this sin is no less than a total casting off and depriving themselves of all hopes and means of recovery, with dreadful horror of Conscience in expectation of judgment to come (verses 26-27).

First, he speaks here only of those that were professors of the faith of the Gospel, separated from the world, brought into a Church state and fellowship, professing themselves to be sanctified by the blood of Christ, receiving and owning Jesus Christ as the Son of God, and endued with the gifts of the holy Spirit. Now it is most certain that these things are peculiar only to some, yes to a very few in comparison of the universality of the sons of men. From the condition of a very few, with such qualifications as the multitude have not, nothing can be concluded concerning all.

Secondly, the Apostle does neither declare what has been, nor assert what may be; but only adds a threatening upon a supposition of a thing. His main aim is to deter from the thing, rather than to signify that it may be. When Paul told the soldiers (Acts 27) that if the mariners fled away in the boat they could not be saved, he did not intend to signify to them that in respect of the event they should be drowned; for God had declared the contrary unto him the night before. A commination of the judgment due to apostasy, being an appointed means for the preserving of the Saints from that sin, may be held out to them, though it is impossible for the Elect to be seduced.

Thirdly, it is most certain that those of whom he speaks did make profession of all these things whereof mention is made: namely that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, that they were sanctified by the blood of the Covenant, and enlightened by the Spirit of grace. A renunciation of all these, with open detestation of them,

was a sin of so deep an abomination, attended with so many aggravations, as might well have annexed to it this remarkable commination, though the Apostates never had themselves any true effectual interest in the blood of Jesus.

Fourthly, it was the manner of the Saints and the Apostles themselves to esteem all baptized, initiated persons ingrafted into the Church as sanctified persons; so that speaking of backsliders, he could not mention them any otherwise than as they were commonly esteemed to be.

Fifth, if the text be interpreted positively and according to the truth of the thing itself, in both parts — that these of whom the Apostle speaks were truly sanctified, and that such may totally perish — then these two things will inevitably follow: first, that faith and sanctification is not the fruit of Election; second, that Believers may fall finally from Christ; neither of which are owned by our new Universalists.

Sixth, there is nothing in the Text of force to persuade that the persons here spoken of must needs be truly justified and regenerated believers, much less that Christ died for them. The expression 'sanctified by the blood of the Covenant' is to be understood in view of: first, the manner and custom of the Apostles writing to the Churches, calling them all Saints; second, that these persons were baptized, wherein by a solemn aspersion of the symbol of the blood of Christ, they were externally sanctified, separated and set apart; third, the various signification of the word 'sanctified' in the Scripture, one most frequent meaning being to consecrate and set apart to any holy use.

If we shall consider these things, it will be most apparent that here is indeed no true, real, internal, effectual sanctification proper to God's elect at all intimated, but only a common external setting apart from the ways of the world and customs of the old Synagogue, to an enjoyment of the Ordinance of Christ representing the blood of the Covenant. To those that were truly sanctified, the commination declared the certain connection between apostasy and condemnation, thereby warning them to avoid it; in respect of those who were only apparently so, it held out the odiousness of the sin, with their own certain inevitable destruction if they fell into it.

And thus by the Lord's assistance I have given you a clear solution to all the arguments which the Arminians pretended to draw from the Scripture in the defense of their cause. Because of late we have had a multiplication of arguments on this subject, I shall in the next place remove all those Objections which T. M. in his Book of the universality of free grace has gathered together against our main Thesis of Christ's dying only for the Elect.

CHAPTER 6



The title pretends satisfaction to them who desire to have reason satisfied, which that it is a great undertaking, I easily grant. That ever Christian reason, rightly informed by the word of God, should be satisfied with any doctrine so discrepant from the word, so full of contradiction in itself and to its own principles, as the doctrine of universal Redemption is, I should much marvel. I am persuaded that the author of the arguments following will fail of his intention with all that have so much reason as to know how to make use of reason, and so much grace as not to love darkness more than light.

Argument 1: That which the Scripture often and plainly affirms in plain words is certainly true and to be believed (Proverbs 22:20-21; Isaiah 8:20; 2 Peter 1:19-20). But that Jesus Christ gave himself a ransom, and by the grace of God tasted death for every man, is often and plainly affirmed in Scripture, as is shown before.

Therefore the same is certainly a truth to be believed (John 20:31; Acts 26:27).

The proposition of this Argument is clear, evident, and acknowledged by all professing the name of Christ — but with this proviso: that by the Scripture affirming anything in plain words to

be believed, you understand the plain sense of those words, which is clear by rules of interpretation. It is the thing signified that is to be believed, and not the words only, which are the sign thereof. If by 'plain words' you understand the literal importance of the words, which may perhaps be figurative or of various signification, then there is nothing more false than this assertion; for how can you then avoid the blasphemous folly of the Anthropomorphites, assigning a body and human shape unto God?

Secondly, the Assumption we absolutely deny as to some part of it — that Christ should be said to give himself a Ransom for every man — it being neither often, nor once, nor plainly, nor obscurely affirmed in the Scripture. For the expression 'tasting death for every man' (Hebrews 2:9), we grant the words are found there; but we deny that 'every man' does always necessarily signify all and every man in the world. 'Warning every man and teaching every man' (Colossians 1:28): every man is not there every man in the world, nor can we believe that Paul warned and taught every particular man, for it is false and impossible. So that 'every man' in the Scripture is not universally collective of all of all sorts, but either distributive for some of all sorts, or collective with a restriction to all of some sort.

Thirdly, that 'every one' is there clearly restrained to all the members of Christ and the children by him brought to glory, we have before declared. So that this place is no way useful for the confirmation of the Assumption, which we deny in the sense intended.

To the conclusion of the syllogism, the Author adds some further proofs, conscious it seems that it had little strength from the propositions. Such logic is fit to maintain such Divinity.

Argument 2: Those for whom Jesus Christ and his Apostles in plain terms without any exception or restraint affirm that Christ came to save, and to that end died, and gave himself a ransom for, and is a propitiation for the sin — he certainly did come to save, and gave himself a ransom for them, and is the propitiation for their sins.

But Jesus Christ and his Apostles have in plain terms affirmed that Christ came to save sinners (1 Timothy 1:15), the world (John 3:17), that he died for the unjust (1 Peter 3:18), the ungodly (Romans 5:6), for every man (Hebrews 2:9), gave himself a ransom for all men (1 Timothy 2:6), and is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world (1 John 2:2) — and every one of these affirmations without any exception or restraint.

Therefore Jesus Christ came to save, died and gave himself a ransom for all men, and is the propitiation for their sins (John 1:29).

To the proposition of this argument I desire only to observe that we do not affirm that the Scripture does in any place lay an exception or restraint upon those persons for whom Christ is said to die, as though in one place it should be affirmed he died for all men, and in another some exception against it. Only we say, one place of Scripture interprets another, and declares that sense which before in one place was ambiguous and doubtful. When the Scripture shows that Christ died or gave himself a ransom for all, we believe it: and when in another place it declares that 'all' to be his Church, his Elect, his sheep, all believers, some of all sorts out of all kindreds and nations and tongues under heaven, this is not

to lay an exception or restraint upon what was said before, but only to declare that the all for which he gave himself for a ransom were all his Church, all his elect, all his sheep, some of all sorts.

The assumption affirms that Christ and his Apostles say that he died to save sinners, unjust, ungodly, the world, all; whereupon the conclusion ought barely to be: Therefore Christ died for sinners, unjust, ungodly, the world, and the like. The whole strength of this Argument lies in turning indefinite propositions into universals: concluding that because Christ died for sinners, therefore he died for all sinners. If you extend the words in the conclusion no further than the intention of them in the places of Scripture recited in the Assumption, we may safely grant the whole: namely, that Christ died for sinners and the world, for sinful men in their several generations living therein. But if you intend a universality collective of all in the conclusion, then the syllogism is sophistical and false.

Fourthly, for particular places of Scripture urged — 1 Timothy 1:15, 1 Peter 3:18, Romans 5:6, 1 John 3:17, Hebrews 2:9, 1 John 2:2 — these have been already considered. Romans 3:10, 19, 23; Ephesians 2:1-3; Titus 3:3; John 3:4 — these prove that all are sinners and children of wrath; but of Christ's dying for all sinners, or for all those children of wrath, there is not the least intimation. This may suffice to answer to the two first Arguments.

Argument 3: That which the Scripture sets forth as one end of the death of Christ, and one ground and cause of God's exalting Christ to be the Lord and Judge of all, is certainly to be believed.

But the Scripture sets forth this for one end of the death and resurrection of Christ, that he might be the Lord of all (Romans 14:9; 2 Corinthians 5:14-15), and for that cause God has exalted him to be the Lord and Judge of all men (Romans 14:9, 11-12; 2 Corinthians 5:10; Philippians 2:7, 11; Acts 17:31; Romans 2:16). Therefore that Christ so died and rose again for all is a truth to be believed (1 Timothy 2:6-7).

Answer: The unlearned framing of this Argument, the uncouth expressions of the thing intended, and failing in particulars by the way, being to be ascribed to the person and not the cause, I shall not much trouble myself withal. His interpreting 'for this cause God exalted Christ' to mean his death and resurrection, when his resurrection wherein he was declared to be the Son of God with power (Romans 1:4) was itself a glorious part of his exaltation, exemplifies the weakness that abounds in this treatment. God give them understanding and repentance to the acknowledgment of the Truth.

Secondly, to this whole Argument as it lies before us, I have nothing to say but to entreat Master More that if the misery of our times should call upon him to write again, he would cease expressing his mind by syllogisms. He asserts and infers in the conclusion — strengthening it with a new testimony — what was not once dreamed of in either of the premises, they speaking of the exaltation of Christ to be Judge of all (which refers to his own glory), the conclusion being of his dying for all (which necessarily aims at their good). Were it not a noble design to banish all human learning and to establish such a way of arguing in the room thereof.

Thirdly, the force and sum of the Argument is this: Christ died and rose again that he might be Lord and Judge of all; therefore Christ died for all. Now ask what he means by dying for all, and the whole Treatise answers that it is a paying a ransom for them all, that they might be saved. How this can be extorted out of Christ's dominion over all, with his power of judging all committed to him — which also is extended to the Angels, for whom he died not — I confess it flies my thoughts.

The meaning of Argument 6 is that universal Redemption may be proved by the Scripture: which being the very thing in question, it constitutes no real argument. To the second proposition — that Christ gave himself a ransom for all and tasted death for all — this is the very word of Scripture and was never denied by any. The making of 'all' to mean all men and every man in both the places aimed at is your addition, and not the Scripture's assertion. If you intend to prove those 'all' to be all and every man of all ages and kinds, elect and reprobate, and not all his children, all his elect, all his sheep, all the children given him of God, some of all sorts, nations, tongues, and languages only — I will willingly join issue with you to search out the meaning of the word and mind of God in it.

Proof 1: God so loved the world that he gave his Son to be the Saviour of the world (1 John 4:14), and sends his servant to bear witness of his Son that all men through him might believe (John 1:4, 7), that whosoever believes on him might have everlasting life (John 3:16-17), and he is willing that all should come to the knowledge of the truth (1 Timothy 2:4) and be saved (1 Timothy 1:15).

Answer: The main, yes indeed the only thing to be proved is that those indefinite propositions in the Scripture concerning the death of Christ are to be understood universally — that the terms

'all' and 'world' signify all and every man in the world. To this there is nothing at all urged in this pretended proof, but only a few ambiguous places barely recited, with a false collection from them.

Answer: No ingenious man acquainted with this controversy will expect that I should spend many words about such poor flourishes, vain repetitions, confused expressions, and illogical deductions as this pretended new Argument — indeed the same as the two first and with almost all that follow. I answer: First, that whatever the Scripture holds forth as a truth to be believed is certainly so and to be embraced. Second, that the Scripture sets forth the death of Christ, to all to whom the Gospel is preached, as an all-sufficient means for the bringing of sinners unto God, so that whoever believes and comes in unto him shall certainly be saved. Third, what can be concluded hence but that the death of Christ is of such infinite value as to be able to save every one to whom it is made known, if by true faith they obtain an interest therein? Fourth, the conclusion should at least include and express the whole and entire assertion contained in the Proposition — namely that Christ is so set forth as Savior of the world that whoever of the particulars believes, etc. — which we fully grant, as making nothing at all for the universality of Redemption, but only for the fullness and sufficiency of his satisfaction.

Argument 5: That which God will one day cause every man to confess to the glory of God is certainly a truth, for God will own no lie for his glory.

But God will one day cause every man to confess Jesus, by virtue of his death and ransom given, to be the Lord, even to the glory of God (Philippians 2:7-11; Isaiah 45:22-23; Romans 14:9, 12; Psalm 86:9).

Therefore it is certainly a truth that Jesus Christ has given himself a ransom for all men, and has thereby the right of lordship over them; and if any will not believe and come into this government, yet he abides faithful and cannot deny himself, but will one day bring them before him and cause them to confess him Lord to the glory of God, when they shall be denied by him for denying him in the days of his patience (2 Timothy 2:12-14; Matthew 10:32-33; 2 Corinthians 5:10).

Answer: The conclusion of this Argument ought to be thus, and no otherwise: 'Therefore, that Jesus Christ is the Lord and to be confessed to the glory of God is certainly a truth.' What is inserted concerning his giving himself a ransom for all, and what follows of the conviction and condemnation of those who believe not, is altogether heterogeneous to the business in hand. We do not ascribe a fruitless, ineffectual Redemption to Jesus Christ; we deny not that he shall also judge the Reprobates — all who know not, deny, and disobey the truth of his Gospel — and that all shall be convinced he is Lord of all at the last day. Secondly, for the clause 'by virtue of his death and ransom given,' we deny that it is anywhere in Scripture intimated that the ransom paid by Christ in his death was the cause of his exaltation to be Lord of all; it was his obedience to his Father in his death, and not his satisfaction for us, that is proposed as the antecedent of this exaltation (Philippians 2:7-11).

Argument 6: That which may be proved in and by the Scripture, both by plain sentences therein and necessary consequences imported thereby, without wrestling, wrangling, adding to, taking from, or altering the words of Scripture, is a truth to be believed.

But that Jesus Christ gave himself a ransom for all men, and by the grace of God tasted death for every man, may be proved in and by the Scripture by both plain sentences and necessary consequences, without any alteration of the words, as is already shown in chapters 7-13 — which will now be ordered into several proofs. Therefore that Jesus Christ gave himself for all men and by the grace of God tasted death for every man is a truth to be believed.

The meaning of this argument is that universal Redemption may be proved by Scripture — which being the very thing in question, there is no reason why it should itself serve as an argument except to make up a number. In answer: first, to the first proposition, the meaning I take to be this: what is affirmed in Scripture or may be deduced from it by just consequence is certainly to be believed — which is granted by all, and is the only foundation of that article of faith you seek to oppose. Second, to the second: that Christ gave himself a ransom for all and tasted death for all is the very word of Scripture and was never denied by anyone. Making 'all' to mean all people and every individual in both passages is your addition, not the Scripture's assertion. If you intend to prove that 'all' means all and every person, elect and reprobate, and not all his elect, his sheep, some of all sorts of nations and languages only — I will by the Lord's assistance willingly join issue with you to search out the meaning of the Word and mind of God in it. The assertion to be proved is that Jesus Christ, according to the counsel and will of his Father, in his own mind and intention, by his death paid a ransom for all and every person — elect and reprobate alike, both those saved and those who perish — and not only for

his elect or church chosen before the foundation of the world. To confirm this, various passages have been produced which we shall consider in order.

PROOF 1 OF ARGUMENT 6.

God so loved the world that he gave his Son to be the Savior of the world (1 John 4:14), and sent his servant to bear witness of his Son that all people through him might believe (John 1:4, 7), that whoever believes on him might have everlasting life (John 3:16-17), and he is willing that all should come to the knowledge of the truth (1 Timothy 2:4) and be saved (1 Timothy 1:15), nor will he be wanting in sufficient help to those who, as light comes, suffer themselves to be wrought on and receive it (Proverbs 1:23; 8:4-5) — is not this plain in Scripture?

ANSWER.

In answer: first, the main — indeed the only — thing to be proved is that those indefinite propositions in Scripture concerning the death of Christ are to be understood universally: that the terms 'all' and 'world' signify, when they define the object of Christ's death, all and every person in the world. Unless this is demonstrated, all other labor is altogether useless and fruitless. Now toward this, nothing at all is urged in this pretended proof but a few ambiguous passages barely cited, with a false collection or observation drawn from them that they give no color to.

Answer regarding 1 John 4:14: God's sending his Son to be the Savior of the world is nothing but to be the Savior of men living in the world, which his Elect are. As for John 1:4, 7 — that all men

through him might believe — the words of verse 7 refer to John the Baptist, not Christ: he was sent as a witness that all through him might believe. By 'all' here is meant only some of all sorts to whom his word came, so the necessary sense of the word 'all' here is wholly destructive to the proposition. As for what is urged from John 3:16-17, that God so sent his Son that whoever believes might have eternal life, as far as I know this is not under debate as to the sense among Christians. Regarding 1 Timothy 2:4 — God's willingness that all should be saved — I ask: what act of God does this willingness consist in? If it is the eternal purpose of his will that all should be saved, why is it not accomplished, for who has resisted his will? Grant that salvation is only to be had in Jesus Christ as a Redeemer, and give me an instance how God in any act has declared himself to all men of all times and places concerning his willingness of their salvation — and I will never more trouble you in this cause. By 'all men' we understand some of all sorts throughout the world. What follows in the close of this proof — of God not being wanting in sufficiency of helpfulness to those who suffer themselves to be wrought upon — is the whole Pelagian poison of free-will and Arminian sufficient grace, to neither of which there is the least witness given in the place produced.

The sum and meaning of the whole assertion is that there is a universality of sufficient grace granted to all, even grace enabling them to obedience — which is a position so contradictory to innumerable places of Scripture, so derogatory to the free grace of God, so destructive to the efficacy of it, such a clear exaltation of the old idol free-will into the throne of God, as anything that the decaying

estate of Christianity has invented. So far is it from being plain and clear in Scripture, that it is universally repugnant to the whole dispensation of the new Covenant.

PROOF 2.

The second proof: Jesus Christ the Son of God came into the world to save the world (John 12:47), to save sinners (1 Timothy 1:15), to take away our sins and destroy the works of the devil (1 John 3:5, 8), to take away the sins of the world (John 1:29), and therefore died for all (2 Corinthians 5:14-15), and gave himself a ransom for all (1 Timothy 2:6), to save that which was lost (Matthew 18:11) — so his propitiation made was for the world (2 Corinthians 5:19), the whole world (1 John 2:2) — all of which is fully and plainly in Scripture.

ANSWER.

In answer: the passages in this proof that mention 'all' or 'world' — John 12:47, John 1:29, 2 Corinthians 5:14-15, 1 Timothy 2:6, 2 Corinthians 5:19, 1 John 2:2 — have already all been considered, and I am unwilling to trouble the reader with repetitions. See those places, and I doubt not but you will find that they are so far from giving any strength to the thing intended to be proved, that they rather overturn it. As for the rest — 1 Timothy 1:15, Matthew 18:11, 1 John 3:5, 8 — I cannot see how anything can be extracted from them to give color to the universality of redemption, and what they make against it has been declared.

PROOF 3.

The third proof: God in Christ does, in some means or other of his appointment, give some witness to all people of his mercy and goodness procured by Christ (Psalm 19:6; Romans 10:8; Acts 14:17), and thereby at one time or other sends forth some stirrings of his Spirit to move and knock at the hearts of people, to invite them to repentance and seeking God, and so to lay hold on the grace and salvation offered — and this not in show or pretense but in truth and good will ready to bestow it on them; and all this is fully testified in Scripture (Genesis 6:3; Isaiah 45:22; Acts 17:30-31; John 1:9).

ANSWER.

In answer: if universal redemption needs such proofs as these it has great need and little hope of support. Universal vocation is here asserted to maintain universal redemption — the two legs of the idol of free will set up for people to worship, each propping the other up when it stumbles. First, it is true that God at all times since the creation has called people to the knowledge of himself as the great Creator through the visible creation (Romans 1:19-20; Psalm 19:1-2; Acts 14:17). Second, that after the death of Christ, he did by the preaching of the Gospel call home to himself the children of God scattered abroad in the world (Mark 16:15; Romans 10:18; Acts 17:30-31). But third, that God should at all times, in all places and ages, grant means of grace or call to Christ as a Redeemer, with stirrings and motions of his Spirit for people to close with — this is so gross and groundless an imagination, so contrary to God's distinguishing mercy and contradictory to express passages of Scripture, that I wonder how anyone has the

boldness to assert it. Let the reader consult Psalm 147:19-20, Matthew 11:25, Matthew 22:14, Acts 14:16, Acts 16:7, and Romans 10:14-15.

PROOF 4.

The fourth proof: the Holy Spirit who comes from the Father and the Son shall convict the world of sin — because they believe not on Christ, and it is their sin that they have not believed on him. And how could it be their sin not to believe in Christ and they for that cause under sin, if there were neither enough in the atonement made by Christ for them, nor truth in God's offer of mercy to them, nor will nor power in the Spirit's moving sufficient to have brought them to believe at one time or other? And yet this is evident in Scripture (John 3:18-19; 8:24; 12:48; 15:22, 24; 16:8-11).

ANSWER.

The intention of this proof is to show that men shall be condemned for their unbelief — for not believing in Christ — which cannot be, says the author, unless three things be granted: first, that there is enough in the atonement made by Christ for them; second, that there is truth in God's offer of mercy to them; third, that there is sufficient will and power given them by the Spirit at some time to believe. To the first: if by 'enough in the atonement for them' you understand that the atonement has enough in it for them, we deny it not because the atonement lacks sufficiency, but because the atonement was not for them; if you mean there is a sufficiency in the merit of Christ to save them if they should believe, we grant it, and affirm this sufficiency is the chief ground of proposing it to

those to whom the Gospel is preached. To the second: there is an eternal truth in God's offer of mercy, which is that God will assuredly bestow life and salvation upon all believers, the proffers being declarative of our duty and of the connection between faith and life — not at all of God's intention toward the particular soul to whom the offer is made. To the third: I say, first, that you set the cart before the horse, placing will before power; second, that I deny any internal assistance is required to render a man inexcusable for not believing if he has the object of faith propounded to him; third, how a man may be given a will to believe and yet not believe, I pray declare. The text in John 16:7-11 about the Spirit convicting the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment principally intended the plentiful effusion of the Spirit upon the Apostles at Pentecost after the ascension of Christ — which abundantly did this in that sermon of Peter (Acts 3) when enemies and haters of Christ cried out, 'Men and brethren, what shall we do to be saved?' What this has to do with universal Redemption, let those that can understand it keep to themselves, for I am confident they will never be able to make it out to others.

PROOF 5.

Proof 5 asserts that God has testified by his word and oath that Christ should work a redemption for all men, and that God wills that all come to the knowledge of the truth (1 Timothy 2:4; John 3:17), and has no pleasure in the death of the wicked but rather that they turn and live (Ezekiel 18:23, 32; 33:11). And dare any say that the God of truth says and swears that of which he has no inward and serious meaning?

ANSWER.

Answer: First, the assertion that God testified by word and oath that Christ should save only 'so far' is a bold falsehood — God revealed that Christ saves to the uttermost those who come to him (Hebrews 7:25), not merely in some partial degree. Second, that Christ should bring all to the knowledge of the truth is another bold corruption of the word. Third, John 3:17 speaks of being fully saved from sins (Matthew 1:21) and to the uttermost (Hebrews 7:25) — which confirms that only the world of God's elect is intended. In 1 Timothy 2:4, there is something of the will of God for saving all sorts of men, but nothing supporting the bold assertion here used. Fourth, Ezekiel 18:23, 32 might give some color to a general call to repentance, but gives no support to universal redemption, since there is no mention of Christ or his death in that passage. The words are addressed to the house of Israel alone (verse 25), not to all humanity. 'God wills not the death of a sinner' means either that God has purposed they shall not die — but then why do sinners die, his counsel being immutable? — or that he commands those he calls to do what leads to life. The entire passage in Ezekiel concerns God's temporal judgment on Israel for their sins; it has nothing to do with a universal design in the death of Christ.

PROOF 6.

The very words and phrases used by the Holy Spirit in Scripture concerning the death of Christ — all nations (Matthew 28:19-20), the ends of the earth (Isaiah 45:22; 49:6), every creature (Mark 16:15), all (2 Corinthians 5:14-15; 1 Timothy 2:6), every man

(Hebrews 2:9), the world (John 3:16-17; 2 Corinthians 5:19), the whole world (1 John 2:2), that which was lost (Luke 19:10), sinners (Matthew 9:13), the unjust (1 Peter 3:18), the ungodly (Romans 5:6) — imply no less than all people without exception. And since whoever repents and believes in Christ shall receive his grace (John 3:16, 18; Acts 10:43), would it not be pride and error to devise glosses that restrict the sense Scripture holds forth so fully for all people?

ANSWER.

In answer: first, this argument from words and phrases is essentially the same argument repeated throughout the whole book — it does no more than restate the very point under debate, namely whether 'all' and 'the world' are to be taken universally, and merely asserts that they are without proving it. Second, the places that speak of Christ dying for sinners, the ungodly, and that which was lost have already been shown to give no real support to universal redemption. Third, all the passages where 'all,' 'every man,' 'the world,' and 'the whole world' appear have been considered at length. Fourth, 'all nations' and 'every creature' refer to those to whom the Gospel is to be preached without national restriction — they do not encompass every individual at all times, and the command to preach the Gospel to all does not in the least prove that Christ died with the intention to redeem all. Fifth, 'the ends of the earth' in Isaiah 45:22 refers to those who look to God and are saved; and Christ being given as salvation to the ends of the earth (Isaiah 49:6) means gathering the preserved remnant of his elect — which is the correct interpretation of 'all' and 'the world' wherever they appear.

PROOF 7.

The seventh proof argues that Scripture speaks of certain high and peculiar privileges of the Spirit belonging only to the saints and chosen of God, yet when these privileges are mentioned together with the ransom and propitiation they are not expressed in exclusive terms but with language that leaves room to apply the ransom to all people. Scripture says Christ died 'for his sheep' and 'for many,' but nowhere says 'only for his sheep' or 'only for many,' which the author takes as strong proof that the ransom is for all.

ANSWER.

The answer to the seventh proof is this: the claim that where these peculiar privileges are mentioned together with the ransom there is room to extend the ransom to all is said but never attempted to be proved. First, it is certain that all peculiar saving privileges belong only to God's elect, purchased for them alone by the blood of Jesus Christ (Ephesians 1:3-4); the death of Christ for them is itself among those privileges — he redeemed his church with his own blood (Acts 20:28), gave himself for it (Ephesians 5:25-26). Second, that room is merely asserted, not demonstrated. Third, whether 'many,' 'sheep,' or 'all' is used, the language concerning the ransom is handled identically in Scripture. Fourth, in several passages the ransom and peculiar privileges are so inseparably united that it is impossible to apply the privileges to some and extend the ransom to all — Revelation 5:9-10 assigns the redemption by blood precisely to those crowned ones distinguished from the rest of the nations, from among whom they were taken. Fifth, enough has been said before on the sheep passages.

PROOF 8.

The eighth proof asserts that the restoration Christ wrought in his own body for humanity is as large and full for all people and of as much force as Adam's fall was for all people, Christ the second Adam being therefore a figure corresponding to the first Adam in universal scope (Romans 3:22-24; 5:12, 14, 18; 1 Corinthians 15:21-22, 45-47).

ANSWER.

In answer: first, it is true that Christ and Adam are compared in Romans 5:12, 18, but the comparison concerns intensity of efficacy, not the extent of the object — the Apostle asserts that the righteousness of Christ is as effectual for justification as the transgression of Adam was for condemnation, Adam's sin communicating to all his natural seed, and Christ's righteousness to all his spiritual seed, the children given to him by the Father. Second, 1 Corinthians 15:22-23 speaks of the resurrection to glory by virtue of Christ's resurrection — verse 23 restricts those 'all' to all who are Christ's; the others shall also rise, but not to a resurrection of glory. Third, the comparison in verse 45 is between the principles of life each communicated to those ingrafted into them: Adam a living soul giving natural life, Christ a life-giving Spirit giving grace to his own. Fourth, Romans 3:23 — 'all have sinned' — was stated to show that salvation comes only through Christ; when Paul specifies to whom Christ's righteousness extends, he says plainly: 'unto all and upon all those who believe,' verse 22, whether Jew or Gentile.

PROOF 9.

The Lord Jesus Christ has sent and commanded his servants to preach the Gospel to all nations and to every creature, and to tell them that whoever believes and is baptized shall be saved (Matthew 28:19-20; Mark 16:15-16), and his servants have so preached to all (2 Corinthians 5:19; Romans 10:13, 18). And our Lord Jesus Christ will make it appear one day that he has not sent his servants on a false errand, nor put a lie in their mouths, nor wished them to dissemble in offering to all what they knew belonged only to the few — but to speak truth (Isaiah 44:26; 61:8; 1 Timothy 1:12).

ANSWER.

The strength of this ninth proof is not easily apparent. First, it is true that Christ commanded his apostles to preach the Gospel to all nations and every creature — calling all people without distinction of persons or nations to repent and believe, except where the Spirit withheld them (Acts 16:6-7). Second, his servants did obey, beseeching people to be reconciled to God across the nations without discrimination (2 Corinthians 5:19-20; Romans 10:18). Third, it is most certain that Christ did not send his servants with a lie to offer what belonged only to some. But what follows from all this for universal redemption is not discernible. The Gospel has never been preached to every individual person — and the requirement is to prove that Christ died for all people, including those who never hear the Gospel. What do preachers of the Gospel offer? Life and salvation through Christ on the condition of faith and repentance — and the truth of that offer consists in this: that everyone who be-

lieves shall be saved, which truth stands firm as long as Christ is all-sufficient to save all who come to him. God has entrusted ministers with his commands and promises, not his secret purposes and counsels — and it is no lie to tell people 'he who believes shall be saved,' even if Christ did not die for some of them.

PROOF 10.

The tenth proof: the Lord wills believers to pray even for the unjust and their persecutors (Matthew 5:44, 48; Luke 6:28), yes even for all people, yes even for kings and all in authority (1 Timothy 2:1, 4), on this ground: it is good in the sight of God who will have all people saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. Surely there is a door of life opened for all (2 Timothy 1:10).

ANSWER.

The strength of this proof rests on several unfounded assumptions. First, it supposes that indefinite assertions are equivalent to universal ones — which is false (Romans 4:5). Second, it supposes that 'all' in 1 Timothy 2:1 does not mean all sorts of people, when the Apostle's enumeration of various kinds plainly shows a distributive meaning. Third, it supposes we are bound to pray for every individual person that they may be saved — for which there is no warrant, rule, precept, or example in Scripture; it is contrary to the apostolic direction (1 John 5:16), to our Savior's example (John 17:9), and to the revealed counsel and purpose of God (Romans 9:11-12, 15; 11:7). Fourth, it supposes the only thing we are to pray for people is that they may be saved through Christ, which is obviously false (Jeremiah 29:7). Fifth, it supposes our ground for pray-

ing for anyone is assurance that Christ died for them in particular – which is not true (Acts 8:22, 24). From our duty to God's secret purpose is no valid conclusion, though from his command to our duty is most certain.

PROOF 11.

The eleventh proof states that the Lord has given his word and promise to be with his servants as they preach the Gospel to all and as his people pray for all, so that they may proceed with confidence in both (Matthew 28:20; 1 Timothy 2:3, 8; Luke 10:6; Isaiah 54:17).

ANSWER.

That God will be with his people whether in preaching or praying according to his will and their duty is as apparent as it is obvious that this makes nothing for universal redemption.

PROOF 12.

The Lord has already performed and made good his word to his servants and people, showing mercy to the very end – mercy to people of all sorts and all kinds of sinners – so that none might exclude themselves but all might be encouraged to repent, believe, and hope (Acts 2; 3; 8; 9; 10; 11; 16; 19; 28; 1 Corinthians 6:10-11; 1 Timothy 1:13-17).

ANSWER.

Had the author told us that God had already made good his word by saving every individual person and proved it clearly, he would have undeniably confirmed his main opinion. But by affirming only that God has shown mercy to some of all sorts and all kinds of sinners — so that others of the same sort might be induced to believe — he has actually betrayed his own cause and established that of his adversaries: showing that in the event God declares himself on their side, saving in the blood of Jesus only some of all sorts, not every individual.

PROOF 13.

The thirteenth proof argues that the blessing of life has flowed in the doctrine of God's love to humanity, and that in the gracious discovery of the ransom given and atonement made by Christ for all people, God has in the first place overcome his chosen ones to believe and turn to God (Acts 13:48; Titus 2:11, 13; 3:4-5).

ANSWER.

In answer: first, the freedom of God's grace and the transcendence of his eternal love toward humanity, with the sending of his Son to die for them and recover them to himself from sin and Satan, is a most effectual motive for conversion — and we acknowledge this most willingly. But that this motive has ever been effectual by extending that love to all, or that any efficacy lies in that aggravation of it, we utterly deny. First, it is false and a corruption of the Word of God, and from a lie no good consequence can follow. Second, this notion destroys the efficacy of this heavenly motive by converting the most intense and incomparable love of God toward his

elect into a common desire and failing affection contrary to his nature. Third, the passages cited contain none of this common love to all: the grace in Titus 2:11-13 is the grace that certainly brings salvation (not a common love) and came to redeem a peculiar people; so too the love and kindness in Titus 3:4-5 is that by which we receive the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit — a peculiar, not a common love. Fourth, Acts 13:47 speaks only of the extension of God's mercy through the Gospel to the Gentiles as well as the Jews, which is far from proving universal grace.

PROOF 14.

The fourteenth proof urges that those who, when the Gospel and its spiritual light come to them, refuse to believe and are drawn away by other things, are said to love darkness rather than light (John 3:19), to follow lying vanities and forsake their own mercies (Jonah 2:8), to harden their own hearts (Romans 2:5), to lose their souls (Matthew 16:26), and to destroy themselves (Hosea 13:9). And since they had already fallen through Adam into darkness, hardness, and death, how could these things be said of them if no life had been obtained by Christ, no atonement made, no restoration of their souls, no means provided that they might be saved?

ANSWER.

First, the sum of this argument is: those who do not believe when the Gospel is preached are the causes of their own ruin and destruction; therefore Jesus Christ died for all and every person in the world. Though it might seem like wasted labor to answer such

a non sequitur, a few observations are necessary lest any scruple remain with weaker readers. First, not all people have the Gospel preached to them — from the beginning of the world the greatest part of humanity has been passed over in the distribution of the means of grace (Romans 2; Acts 17); all such people must be excluded from this conclusion, which makes it entirely useless to the matter at hand, since the universality of redemption falls to the ground if even one soul is not included in the payment of the ransom. Second, what destroys people is not their failure to believe that Christ died for every individual soul (which Scripture nowhere requires as an article of faith), but their failure to trust in the all-sufficiency of Christ's passion for sinners, accepting the mercy obtained thereby on the terms set forth in the Gospel — terms which do not attend to God's purpose for whom Christ died, but to the sufficiency and efficacy of his death for all who receive him. Third, the other Scriptures cited — Jonah 2:8, Romans 2:5, Matthew 16:26, Hosea 13:9 — give no color to the argument; Jonah 2:8 concerns those who forsake the true God for idols and so forfeit their temporal and spiritual mercies; Romans 2:5 speaks of Gentiles who had the works of creation to instruct them and the patience of God to wait on them, yet hardened themselves further. Fourth, the conclusion of this proof seems to reveal a deeper intention — that all people are in a restored condition by Christ; not merely that a door of mercy is opened for all, but that all are actually restored into grace and favor, so that if they do not fall away they will certainly be saved. The argument for this is that since they fell in Adam into darkness and hardness, they could not be said to love darkness and harden themselves unless they had first been restored and enlightened by Christ. If this is the author's intention

(as is too apparent), there are several things to say. First, as to the argument itself: this is equivalent to saying that because original sin makes people guilty of death, they cannot by actual sins aggravate their condemnation; or that because people are naturally blind they cannot be said to undervalue light. It is precisely because they are blind that they do so — and people who have time, opportunity, and means to save their souls may be said to lose them by their own fault. Second, as to the thing itself — the assertion of an actual restoration of all people by Christ into covenant: there is nothing in Scripture giving the least color to this gross error. It is contrary to very many passages affirming that we are dead in trespasses and sins (Ephesians 2:1), that unless one is born again he cannot see the kingdom of God (John 3:3), and that until one comes by faith to Christ the wrath of God remains on him (John 3:36), along with countless other passages showing the universal alienation of all people from God until actual peace and reconciliation is made through Christ. It is contrary to the very nature of the new covenant of grace, which proceeds from God's free mercy to his elect, is made with his own people in distinction from the world, and is effective in actually working every good thing promised in all to whom it belongs — which is certainly not all people. It is contrary to the eternal purpose of God in election and reprobation, the latter being a resolution to leave people in their fallen condition without any reparation by Christ. This position also carries many absurd consequences: first, all infants who die before actual sin must necessarily be saved, placing the infants of Turks, Pagans, and persecutors in a far happier condition than the apostles of Christ who died in maturity — yet Christ said that without being born again no one can see the kingdom of God (John

3:3), and Paul says the children of unbelievers are unclean (1 Corinthians 7:14), and no unclean thing shall enter the new Jerusalem (Revelation 21:27). Second, nothing more is required of anyone to be saved than remaining in the state in which he was born — when the whole Word of God declares that all who remain in that state shall certainly perish eternally. Third, every person who perishes in the whole world must have fallen away from the grace of the new covenant — yet its promises declare there shall never be a total falling away of those who are in covenant. Fourth, no one can come to Christ except those who have first fallen from him in their own persons, since all others already abide in him. Countless other absurdities follow necessarily from this false and heretical assertion, which is absolutely destructive to the free grace of God.

PROOF 15.

The fifteenth proof urges God's earnest expostulations, pleadings, and protests to those many of whom perished (Romans 11:27; Isaiah 10:22) — such as: 'Oh that there were such a heart in them to fear me, that it might be well with them' (Deuteronomy 5:29); 'What more could have been done for my vineyard?' (Isaiah 5:4-5); 'What iniquity have your fathers found in me?' (Jeremiah 2:5); 'Oh my people, what have I done to you?' (Micah 6:3); 'How often would I have gathered you, and you would not' (Matthew 23:37); 'Because I called and you refused' (Proverbs 1:24-25, 32) — arguing that since God so pleads with all, a ransom must have been given for them and genuine mercy shown them.

ANSWER.

In answer: first, in all these expostulations there is no mention of any ransom given or atonement made for those who perish — they all concern temporal mercies and the outward means of grace. Second, all the passages cited (except Romans 1:28 and 2:5, which plainly ground the inexcusableness of sin on the knowledge available through creation and providence) are addressed only to those who enjoyed the means of grace — a very small portion of all humanity, so nothing can be concluded from them about God's mind toward all others (Psalm 147:19-20). Third, there are none who enjoy the means of grace who have not received so many mercies from God that he may justly plead with them about their ingratitude. Fourth, all the things God expostulates about for their lack — he could if he pleased effectually work them in human hearts by his exceeding power — so these expostulations cannot be declarative of his purpose. Fifth, desires and wishes should not properly be ascribed to God — these expressions are to be understood anthropomorphically. Sixth, all these are nothing but emphatic declarations of our duty, strong convictions of the disobedient, and a vindication of the excellence of God's ways; the conclusion 'therefore Christ died for all people' does not follow.

PROOF 16.

The sixteenth proof urges the Scripture's manner of describing the sin of those who despise and refuse grace — that they turn the grace of God into wantonness (Jude 4), trample underfoot the Son of God, profane the blood of the covenant by which they were sanctified, and insult the Spirit of grace (Hebrews 10:29), deny the Lord who bought them (2 Peter 2:1), and perish, those for whom Christ died (1 Corinthians 8:11), being trees twice dead, plucked up

by the roots (Jude 12-13), bringing upon themselves swift destruction (2 Peter 2:1). The argument is: how could all this be said of them if God had in no way given his Son for them, if Christ had shed no blood to procure their remission, if he had not bought them?

ANSWER.

First, the three scripture passages most frequently urged in this case — Hebrews 10:29, 2 Peter 2:1, and 1 Corinthians 8:11 — have already been considered at length elsewhere, where it was demonstrated that they in no way support what they are violently pressed to prove. Second, as for the passages from Jude, verses 4, 12, and 13, it is not apparent how they can be drawn into the matter at hand. Those who are said in verse 4 to 'turn the grace of God into wantonness' are abusing the doctrine of the Gospel to encourage themselves in sin — from which it is a strange inference to conclude that Christ died for all people, especially since the Apostle indicates that Christ did not die for these abusers of his grace, affirming that they were of old ordained to condemnation.

PROOF 17.

The seventeenth proof argues that Jesus Christ by virtue of his death shall be the Judge of all, and that by the Gospel in which they might have been saved he will judge them to a second death — and how can this be if he never died the first death for them, and if there were no truth in the Gospel preached to them? (Romans 14:9-12; Philippians 2:7-11; Romans 2:16; John 12:47-48, 50)

ANSWER.

In answer: first, that Jesus Christ shall be Judge of all and that all judgment is committed to him is admitted; but it does not follow that he died for all — unless one will also affirm that he died for the devils, since they too must be judged by him. Second, that all people shall be judged by the Gospel — including those who never heard a word of it — is directly contrary to Scripture: 'as many as have sinned without the law will perish without the law, and as many as have sinned in the law will be judged by the law' (Romans 2:12). Every person shall be judged according to the light and rule they did or might have enjoyed, not according to that of which they were invincibly deprived. Third, that Christ is said to die only 'the first death' is neither a Scriptural expression nor deducible from Scripture. Fourth, the implication that there is no truth in the Gospel preached unless Christ died for all is actually one of the most contrary assertions imaginable; the passages cited speak of Christ as Lord, exalted above all, Judge of all — but how they can be twisted to support universal atonement is not apparent.

PROOF 18.

The eighteenth proof urges that believers are exhorted to contend for the faith of this common salvation once delivered to the saints (Jude 3-5), which some having heard oppose and others turn into wantonness; and that by not heeding and not walking in it, people deprive themselves of the salvation already wrought by Christ and wind themselves out of the salvation to come.

And every one of these proofs being plain and according to Scripture, and each of force — how much more altogether — still justifying the sense that 1 Timothy 2:6 and Hebrews 2:9 import, and the truth of the proposition at the beginning?

ANSWER.

In answer: all that can be found here is that the salvation purchased by Christ is called 'common salvation.' If the author concludes from this that it is common to all people, he might as well conclude that faith belongs to all people, since it is called 'the common faith' (Titus 1:4) — though also 'the faith of God's elect' (verse 1). There is a community of believers, and the common salvation is that by which they are all saved — having nothing to do with the strange kind of 'common salvation' maintained here, the kind whereby no one is in fact saved. The remainder of this proof is fullness of words suited to the author's persuasion but in large part exceedingly unsuitable to the Word of God and derogatory to the merits of Christ, making the salvation purchased by him in itself of no effect, left to the will of sinful and corrupted people to make effective or to reject.

These are the proofs which this author calls plain and according to Scripture — they amount to a recapitulation of nearly all that he has said in his whole book, with nothing of weight omitted. Whether the thing intended to be proved — the payment of a ransom by Christ for all and every person — is plainly and evidently confirmed from Scripture, as the author would have us believe; or whether this whole heap of words called arguments, reasons, and proofs is not in their manner of expression obscure, in their manner of inference childish, weak, and ridiculous, in their allegations

and interpretations of Scripture perverse, violent, and in direct opposition to the revealed mind and will of God — this is left to the judgment of the Christian reader who shall examine them together with the answers annexed.

CHAPTER 7



The removal of certain common sophisms and captious arguments of the Arminians will close our treatise and wind up the whole controversy. I will labor to be as brief as possible, partly because others have handled these things at length, and partly because, all scriptural support for the opposing view having been removed, all other objections will naturally collapse of themselves. Yet because great boasting and swelling words of vanity have accompanied some of what follows, something must be said to expose the emptiness of such rhetoric so that weaker readers will not be ensnared.

We begin with an argument of as great fame and as little merit as any used in this controversy: What everyone is bound to believe is true; but everyone is bound to believe that Jesus Christ died for him; therefore it is true that Jesus Christ died for everyone.

This argument is one which the Arminians and their friends never produce without adding some notable commendation of it and some terms of affront and threat toward their adversaries — so much so that by common consent it has obtained the name 'the Remonstrants' Achilles.' For my part I heartily wish that the many labored and lengthy answers drawn forth by the boasting of our

adversaries had not given this poor nothing far more reputation than its own strength could have secured. Suppose: first, the term 'believe' is used in the same sense in both propositions; second, 'believing' means a saving application of Christ to the soul as offered in the promise; third, believing Christ died for any person must be with reference to the purpose of the Father and the intention of Christ himself; fourth, 'everyone' must refer to all people in the one condition common to all — the state of wrath and death (Ephesians 2:3). So the minor proposition reads: all people in the world, as standing in a state of wrath and unregeneracy, are bound to believe that it was the intention of God that Christ should die for every one of them in particular. This minor premise is absolutely false and has not the least support from reason or Scripture. First, some would then be bound to believe what is false — which cannot be, since every obligation to believe comes from the God of truth; and it is false that Christ died for every individual. Second, people would be bound to believe what has not been revealed — though divine revelation is the object of all faith; Scripture nowhere declares that Christ died for this or that particular person as such, but only for sinners indefinitely. Third, the purpose and intention of God is not proposed in Scripture as an object of faith, but is left to be gathered and assured to the soul through the experience of its effects in the heart. Fourth, no command in Scripture to believe can be interpreted as meaning 'God intended that Christ should die for you in particular.' Fifth — which alone is enough to break the neck of this argument — not all people have any object of faith as Christ's death proposed to them: how can they believe unless they hear? How many millions in remote nations have gone to their place without hearing the least report of Jesus Christ? Is not

unbelief the great damning sin where faith is required (John 3:30)? And yet does not Paul prove that many shall be condemned for sinning against the light of nature (Romans 2)? — a clear demonstration that faith is not required of all.

Perhaps our adversaries will reply — as they must, if they intend to preserve any appearance of strength for this argument — that they mean it only with respect to those who are called by the Word. Let it then be proposed as follows:

That which every one called by the Word — to whom the Gospel is preached — is bound to believe, is true.

But that Christ died for him in particular, every one so called is bound to believe; therefore it is so.

In answer: first, this reformed version of the argument removes only the last objection raised; all the rest remain in full force and are sufficient to overturn it. Second, does anyone not see that this very reforming of the argument has made it altogether useless to the cause it was produced to defend? If even one person is excepted — much more the greatest part of humanity, which is now excluded from the scope of this argument — the general ransom falls to the ground; from the innumerable multitudes of all, we have come to the many who are called, and no doubt we will soon descend to the few who are chosen. In answer to the exception that what is true for those to whom it is proposed would also be true for all others if it were proposed to them: first, the argument must be taken from the scriptural obligation to believe and can extend no further than it actually extends; second, it is not safe to dispute about what would or should be if things were otherwise than God has appointed and ordained. If the Gospel were preached

to all the world, all that the mind and will of God could in general convey through it would be this: 'He who believes and is baptized shall be saved; but he who does not believe shall be damned' — that is, God has linked faith and salvation together, so that whoever would enjoy the latter must perform the former. What unbelieving Turks and Indians would be condemned for upon hearing and rejecting the Gospel is not for failing to believe that Christ died for them in particular, but for rejecting the counsel and wisdom of God to save sinners by the blood of Jesus — for not believing the necessity of a Redeemer and that Jesus of Nazareth is that Redeemer.

The minor proposition of the reduced syllogism is still denied, partly for the reasons already given and partly for these additional ones. First, those to whom the Gospel is preached are bound to believe only with that faith which is required for justification — and this is not a full persuasion that Christ died for any one person in particular by the intention and purpose of God. Second, there is a natural order, established by God's appointment, in the things that must be believed, so that until some are believed, others are not yet required — as a man cannot be reasonably commanded to leap to the top of a ladder by skipping all the lower rungs. The order is: (1) repent and believe the Gospel to be the word of God, containing his will, and that Jesus Christ revealed therein is the power and wisdom of God unto salvation; (2) believe the inseparable connection by God's appointment between faith and salvation; (3) receive a particular conviction by the Spirit of the need for a Redeemer in one's own soul, becoming weary, heavy laden, and burdened; (4) with a full and serious resting and rolling of the soul upon Christ in the Gospel promise, as an all-sufficient Savior able to save to the

uttermost all who come to God through him. In doing all this, no one called by the Gospel is once required to inquire into the purpose and intention of God concerning the particular object of Christ's death; everyone is fully assured that his death is profitable to those who believe in him and obey him. Only after all this — and not before — does it lie upon a believer to assure his soul, according to the fruit of Christ's death experienced in him, of the eternal love of God in sending his Son to die for him in particular. What a preposterous and Gospel-opposing course it would be to call on a person to believe and be assured that it was the purpose of God that Christ died for him individually, before he is convicted of the truth of the Gospel in general, or that faith is the only way of salvation, or that he himself stands in need of a Savior, or that there is enough in Christ to save and recover him if he gives himself to Christ.

The argument when properly formed is this: what every person who is convinced of the need for a Savior, who knows the right way of salvation, and who hungers, thirsts, and pants after Jesus Christ as the only one who can refresh him — what such a person is bound to believe is true; but every such person is bound to believe that Christ died for him in particular; therefore it is true. And some grant this whole argument without any prejudice to the cause we are defending. It is now apparent, first, that not all who are called by the Word are bound, in whatever state they remain, to believe that Christ died for them by name — only those who are qualified as described. Second, the duty of believing with fiduciary confidence that Christ died for any person in particular is not proposed to all who are called, nor is the failure to perform it a sin in any other sense than as it is rooted in unbelief or in not turning to

God in Christ for mercy. Third, no one for whom Christ did not die shall be condemned for not believing that Christ died for him in particular, which would not be true — but for not believing those things to which he was called, all of which are true and applicable to him. Fourth, the command to believe on Christ, so often urged as given to all, is not, as to this particular point, obligatory on anyone except upon fulfilling the conditions required. Fifth, to believe on the name of Jesus Christ — which is the command of 1 John 3:23 — is not to believe that it was the intention of God that Christ should die for us in particular, but to rest on him for salvation (Isaiah 50:11). Sixth, the testimony of God to which we ought to set our seal is no other than this: he who has the Son has life, but he who does not have the Son of God does not have life (1 John 5:12); and those who deny this do what in them lies to make God a liar and are justly condemned for it. For further reading on this argument, the reader may consult Piscator, Perkins, Twisse, the Synod of Dort, Moulin, Baronius, Rutherford, Sparhemius, Ames, and others.

A second objection: that doctrine which fills the minds and souls of poor, miserable sinners with doubts and scruples about whether they ought to believe when God calls them cannot be agreeable to the Gospel; but the doctrine of particular redemption does this — it fills the minds of sinners with fears about whether they may believe, since they are uncertain whether it was the intention of God that Christ died for them in particular, not knowing whether they are among the elect for whom he died.

In answer: first, that doubts, fears, and scruples — the proper offspring of unconquered unbelief — will often arise in the hearts of sinners, sometimes against and sometimes taking occasion from

the truth of the Gospel, is only too evident from experience. The question is whether the doctrine itself, when rightly received, gives cause for such fears to those who properly perform their duty, or whether all those fears and scruples are the natural product of corruption and unbelief setting itself against the truth as it is in Jesus. The first we deny concerning the doctrine of particular effectual redemption; the latter God alone can remedy. Second, this objection supposes that a person is bound to know and be persuaded — that is, to believe — that Jesus Christ died by God's appointment for him in particular, before he believes in Jesus Christ. In fact, they make this the very foundation of their argument: that people according to our persuasion may scruple whether they ought to believe, because they are not first assured that Christ died for them by God's designation. Now if this is not a plain self-contradiction I do not know what is — for what is it, according to Scripture, for a person to be assured that Christ died for him in particular? Is it not the highest attainment of faith? Does it not include a sense of the spiritual love of God shed abroad in our hearts? Is it not the crown of the Apostle's consolation (Romans 8:34) and the foundation of all his joyful assurance (Galatians 2:20)? So they evidently require that a person must believe before he believes — that he cannot believe and will greatly fear whether he ought to do so unless he believes before he believes. Such a removal of scruples would be the readiest way to entangle doubting consciences in further inextricable perplexities. Third, we deny that a persuasion that it was the will of God that Christ died for a sinner in particular is necessary to draw that sinner to believe. The call of Christ (Matthew 11:28; Isaiah 55:1), the command of God (John 3:23), the promise of life upon believing (John 3:36), the all-sufficiency

of the blood of Christ to save all believers (Acts 20:21; Ephesians 5:2), and the assured salvation of all believers without exception (Mark 16:16) are all that Scripture holds out to remove doubts and fears and draw sinners to faith. Fourth, the doctrine that asserts the certainty of salvation by the death of Christ to all believers whatsoever; affirms the command of God and the call of Christ to be infallibly declarative of one's duty; holds out purchased free grace to all distressed, burdened consciences; and discloses a fountain of blood all-sufficient to purge the sin of everyone who uses the appointed means to come to it — that doctrine cannot possibly cause any doubt or scruple in convinced and burdened sinners about whether they ought to believe. All this is held forth by the doctrine of particular effectual redemption in its proper Gospel dispensation. One final question for the advocates of universal redemption: what is it that, according to them, people are bound to believe when they already know beforehand that Christ died for them in particular? It cannot be a persuasion of the love of God and the goodwill of Christ, since they already have that. Nor can it be a coming to God through Christ for the enjoyment of the fruits of his death — for what are those fruits according to them but things common to all, which may end in damnation as well as salvation, in unbelief as well as faith? In the end their position will resolve itself into Socinian obedience.

There are two remaining matters about which there is no small contention: both are excellent and valuable things, and both are claimed by each side in this debate. These are first, the exaltation of God's free grace and the merit of Christ, and second, the consolation of our souls; let us consider them in order and let each position receive its due.

Concerning the first — the exaltation of God's free grace — men have come to believe that the opinion of universal redemption exceedingly magnifies the love and free grace of God: they say God loves all, gave Christ to die for all, and is ready to save all who come to him — that this is free grace magnified indeed. But consider: what precisely is this so-called free grace that is universal? Is it the grace of election? Certainly not — God has not chosen all to salvation (Romans 9:11-12; Ephesians 1:4; Romans 8:28). Is it the grace of effectual calling? No — for whom God calls he also justifies (Romans 8:30) and glorifies, and not all have received even an outward call (Psalm 147:19-20; Romans 10:14). Is it the grace of cleansing and sanctification? Are all purged and washed in the blood of Jesus? Surely only the church (Ephesians 5:24-26), for some are still defiled (Titus 1:15), and faith is the principle by which the heart is purified, and all people do not have faith. Is it the grace of justification — the free love and mercy of God in pardoning and accepting sinners? But is this universal? Are all pardoned and accepted? See Romans 1:17; 3:22; 5:1. Is it the grace of redemption in the blood of Christ? See Revelation 5:9. What then is this universal free grace? Is it not universally a figment of the imagination, or a new name for the old idol of free will? Is it not destructive to free grace in every branch of it? Does it not tend to overturn the whole covenant of distinguishing grace, denying that its conditions are effectually worked in any of its members by virtue of the covenant's own promises? What are the two great aims of their free grace, but to mock God and exalt themselves? They propose God as making a pretense of love, goodwill, free grace, and pardon to all, yet never acquainting — incomparably — the greatest number of them with any such love at all, though he

knows that without his working in them they can never come to any such knowledge. For those who are outwardly called, they feign the Lord as pretending to love them all, sending his Son to die for them all, desiring that they all be saved — yet on such a condition as, without his enabling grace, they can no more fulfill than climb to heaven by a ladder, which grace he will not provide. They would have God say, in effect: 'Such is my love, my universal grace, that by it I will freely love you and gladly embrace you in all things, except in the one thing that would do you good.' Would they not call a man a gross counterfeiting hypocrite who went to a blind man and said, 'Poor man, I pity your case, I see your need, I love you exceedingly — open your eyes and I will give you a hundred pounds'? And yet they dare assign such conduct to the most holy God of truth. Is their universal grace anything but a mockery? Did it ever do any soul good, as to salvation, that is, anything common to all? Are not the two properties of God's grace in Scripture that it is discriminating and effectual? And is their grace either of these? Granting all they say about the extent of grace to be true: is it such grace as any soul was ever saved by? If so, why are not all saved? Because, they will say, people do not believe — so then, the bestowing of faith is no part of this free grace. Here is their second aim exposed: to exalt themselves and their free will in the place of grace, or at least to leave room for free will to come in and claim the decisive share in salvation — namely believing itself, which makes all the rest profitable. In a word: to bring reprobates within the scope of free grace, they deny free grace to the elect; to make it universal, they deny it to be effectual; so that all may have a share of it, they deny that any are saved by it — for saving grace must be restricted.

On the other side: in what single respect does the doctrine of the effectual redemption of God's elect alone by the blood of Jesus impair the free grace of God? Is it in its freedom? We say it is so free that if it is not altogether free it is no grace at all. Is it in its efficacy? We say that by grace we are saved, ascribing the whole work of our recovery and return to God entirely to it. Is it in its extent? We affirm it to be extended to every one who ever was, is, or shall be delivered from the pit. We do not call grace that goes to hell 'free grace' in the Gospel sense, for we deem the free grace of God so powerful that wherever it has designed and chosen a subject for itself, it brings God and Christ and salvation along with it to eternity. You say we do not extend it to all, that we tie it up to a few — but is the extending of God's love and favor in our power? Does he not have mercy on whom he will have mercy and harden whom he will (Romans 9:18)? And do we not affirm that it is extended to the universality of those who are saved? Should we throw the children's bread to dogs? We believe that the grace of God in Christ works faith in every one to whom it is extended; that all the conditions of the covenant ratified in his blood are effectually worked in the heart of every covenant member; that there is no love of God that is not effectual; that the blood of Christ was not shed in vain; that of ourselves we are dead in trespasses and sins and can do nothing except what the free grace of God works in us. Therefore we cannot conceive that it can be extended to all — for those who affirm that millions taken into a new covenant of grace perish eternally, that it is left to men to believe, that the will of God may be frustrated and his love ineffectual, that we distinguish ourselves one from another — you may extend it wherever you please, since it is indifferent to you whether its objects go to heaven or to

hell. But in the meantime, I beg you: is what you speak of God's free grace, or your fond imagination? His love, or your will? Our prayers shall be that God give you infinitely more of his love than is contained in that ineffectual universal grace with which you so flourish. Only we shall labor that poor souls not be seduced by the specious pretenses of free grace for all — not knowing that this so-called free grace is a mere painted cloth that will give them no help at all to deliver them from their condition, but only give them leave to be saved if they can, while they suppose, from the name you have given to the offspring of your own imagination, that you mean an effectual, almighty, saving grace that will certainly bring all to God to whom it is extended — which is what they have heard of in Scripture. While you in effect say to such souls: go on your way, be saved if you can, in the revealed way — God will not hinder you.

Both parties also contest about the exaltation of the merit of Christ; something has been said on this already, so I will be brief. Take only a short view of the difference between them on this point and the plea will soon be decided.

There is only one thing concerning the death of Christ in which the advocates of a general ransom take the affirmative and by which they claim to set forth the excellence of his death — namely, that its benefits extend to all and every person, whereas their adversaries restrict it to a few, the elect alone, which they say is derogatory to the honor of Christ. In answer: first, the measure of Christ's honor is not for us poor creatures to assign — he takes as honor what he himself gives and ascribes to himself, and he has no need of our lies for his glory. Even if this seemed in our eyes to exalt Christ's glory, arising from a lie of our own hearts it would be

an abomination to him. Second, we deny that extending the efficacy of Christ's death to all serves to set out the nature and dignity of that death, because such extent of efficacy would not arise from the death's own innate sufficiency but from the free pleasure and determination of God — which is enervated by a pretended universality, as was declared before. Third, the value of a thing arises from its own native sufficiency and worth for any purpose to which it is employed; and the maintainers of effectual redemption assert this of the death of Christ to be far greater than anything their adversaries ascribe to it.

Should I now declare in how many ways the honor of Christ and the excellence of his death and passion — with all its fruits — is held forth in the doctrine we have opened from Scripture, above all that can be assigned to it consistent with the principles of those who maintain universal redemption, I would be forced to repeat much already said. It will suffice to present the reader with the following antithesis.

Universalists hold: (1) Christ died for all and every person, elect and reprobate alike. (2) Most of those for whom Christ died are damned. (3) Christ by his death purchased no saving grace for those for whom he died. (4) Christ took no care that the greatest part of those for whom he died should ever hear one word of his death. (5) Christ in his death did not ratify or confirm a covenant of grace with any covenant members, but only procured by his death that God might, if he willed, enter into a new covenant with whomever he pleased and on whatever conditions he chose. (6) Christ might have died and yet no one be saved. (7) Christ had no more intention to redeem his church than the wicked seed of the serpent. (8) Christ did not die for the unbelief of any. Scriptural re-

demption holds: (1) Christ died for the elect only. (2) All those for whom Christ died are certainly saved. (3) Christ by his death purchased all saving grace for those for whom he died. (4) Christ sends the means and reveals the ways of life to all those for whom he died. (5) The new covenant of grace was confirmed to all the elect in the blood of Jesus. (6) Christ by his death purchased, on covenant and compact, an assured peculiar people — the pleasure of the Lord prospering to the end in his hand. (7) Christ loved his church and gave himself for it. (8) Christ died for the unbelief of the elect.

Many other instances of the same nature could easily be collected; upon the first view of these the matter in dispute would quickly be determined. These few are sufficient in the eyes of all experienced Christians to demonstrate how little the general ransom contributes to the honor and glory of Jesus Christ or to setting forth the worth and dignity of his death and passion.

The next and last matter under debate in this contest is Gospel consolation — that which God in Christ is abundantly willing we should receive. A brief inquiry into which of the two opinions gives the firmest basis and soundest foundation for such consolation will, by the Lord's assistance, bring us to an end of this long debate. The God of truth and comfort grant that all our undertakings may end in peace and consolation. To clear this, certain things must first be premised.

First, all true evangelical consolation belongs only to believers (Hebrews 6:17-18); God's people (Isaiah 40:1-2); upon unbelievers the wrath of God remains (John 3:36).

Second, to make consolation out to those to whom it does not belong is no less a crime than to hide it from those to whom it does belong (Isaiah 5:20; Jeremiah 23:14; Ezekiel 13:10).

Third, the attempt to present the death of Christ in such a way that all — meaning every individual in the world — might be comforted by it is a proud attempt to make straight what God has made crooked, and is most contrary to the Gospel.

Fourth, that doctrine which holds out consolation from the death of Christ to unbelievers cries 'peace, peace' when God says there is no peace.

These things being premised, I will briefly demonstrate four following positions.

First, that extending the death of Christ to all people universally in its object cannot give the least ground of consolation to those whom God would have comforted by the Gospel.

Second, that denying the efficacy of the death of Christ toward those for whom he died cuts the very sinews of all strong consolation — such as is proper for believers to receive and peculiar to the Gospel to give.

Third, that there is nothing in the doctrine of the redemption of the elect only that can in the least deprive those to whom comfort is due of any portion of their consolation.

Fourth, that the doctrine of the effectual redemption of the sheep of Christ by the blood of the covenant is the true and solid foundation of all durable consolation.

Beginning with the first: that extending the death of Christ to an unlimited universality in respect of its object has nothing in it, as such, that can give the least ground of consolation to those whom God would have comforted. Gospel consolation, properly so called, being a fruit of actual reconciliation with God, belongs only to believers. That no consolation can be made out to them as such from anything peculiar to the persuasion of a general ransom is easily proved.

First, no consolation can arise to believers from what is nowhere in Scripture proposed as a ground or cause of consolation — and the general ransom is not so proposed; for what has no being can have no operation, and all the foundations and materials of consolation are things particular and peculiar to some.

Second, no consolation can accrue to believers from what is common to them with those whom God would not have comforted, who shall assuredly perish eternally, who stand in open rebellion against Christ, and who never hear one word of the Gospel. Yet to all such people the alleged foundation of consolation arising from the general ransom equally belongs as it does to the choicest of believers.

Let a person try, not in the moment of disputation but in desertion and temptation, what consolation or peace of soul he can obtain from such a collection as this: Christ died for all people; I am a person; therefore Christ died for me. Will not his own heart tell him that, notwithstanding all he is assured of by that conclusion, the wrath of God may abide on him forevermore? Does he not see that notwithstanding this, the Lord shows so little love to millions of people — of whom this same conclusion is equally true — that he does not once reveal himself or his Son to them? What

good will it do me to know that Christ died for me, if I may still perish forever? If you intend to comfort me with what is common to all, you must tell me what all enjoy that will satisfy my desire — which is carried out after assurance of the love of God in Christ. If you give me no more consolation than what you might have given Judas, can you expect settlement and peace from it? Truly, you are miserable comforters, physicians of no value, skilled only to add affliction to the afflicted. 'Be of good comfort,' the Arminians will say, 'Christ is a propitiation for all sinners, and now you know yourself to be one.' True — but is Christ a propitiation for all the sins of those sinners? If so, how can any of them perish? If not, what good does this do me, whose sins (such as unbelief) may be among those for which Christ was not a propitiation? 'Do not exclude yourself — God excludes none; the love that moved him to send his Son was universal toward all.' Tell me nothing of God's excluding — I have sufficiently excluded myself; will he powerfully take me in? Has Christ not only purchased that I shall be admitted, but procured me the ability to enter into his Father's arms? 'He has opened a door of salvation to all.' Alas, is it not a vain endeavor to open a grave for a dead man to come out? Who lights a candle for a blind man to see by? To open a prison door for one who is blind and lame and bound — indeed dead — is to mock his misery, not to procure his liberty. Never tell me that what millions enjoy together with those who perish eternally will yield me strong consolation.

Second, the opinion of a general ransom is so far from yielding firm consolation to believers from the death of Christ that it quite overthrows all the choicest ingredients of strong consolation that flow from it: first, by strange divisions of what ought to be joined

together to make one certain foundation of confidence; and second, by denying the efficacy of his death toward those for whom he died — both of which are necessary attendants of that persuasion.

First, they so divide the obtaining of redemption from the application of it — the former being in their view the only proper immediate fruit of Christ's death — that the one may belong to millions who have no share in the other; that redemption may be obtained for all and yet not one have it applied so as to be saved by it. Now, an ineffectual and merely possible redemption — notwithstanding which all humanity might perish eternally — being the whole object of Christ's death as they assert, separated from all such application of redemption to any as might make it in the least profitable: what comfort this can in any degree afford to any poor soul does not enter my understanding. 'What shall I do?' says the sinner; 'the iniquity of my steps surrounds me, I have no rest in my bones because of my sin — where shall I send my sorrow?' 'Be of good cheer — Christ died for sinners.' 'Yes, but shall the fruits of his death certainly be applied to all for whom he died? If not, I may perish forever.' Let those who can answer him according to universalist principles, without sending him to his own strength in believing — which in the end resolves into the same thing — and I will acknowledge their great help; but if they send him there, they admit that the consolation they boast of properly proceeds from ourselves and not from the death of Christ.

Second, their separating between the oblation and the intercession of Jesus Christ does little for the consolation of believers — indeed it quite overthrows it.

There are two eminent passages of Scripture in which the Holy Spirit holds forth consolation to believers against those two general causes of all their troubles — afflictions and sins: Romans 8:32-34 and 1 John 2:1-2. In both places the Apostles ground the consolation they hold out to believers upon the tight and inseparable connection between the oblation and intercession of Jesus Christ, and the identity of their objects. Let the reader examine both texts and he will find that on this inseparable union lies the whole stress and strength of the several proposals for consolation — which is the principal intention in both places. Now the advocates of universal redemption sever and separate these two: they allow no connection between them nor any dependence of one on the other beyond what is effected by the will of man; they stretch the oblation to all but restrict the intercession to a few. The death of Christ separated from his resurrection and intercession is nowhere proposed as a ground of consolation — indeed it is positively declared to be unsuitable for any such purpose (1 Corinthians 15:14) — and those who hold it out in that separated form are no friends to Christian consolation.

Third, the denial that faith, grace, holiness, the whole intention of the new covenant, and perseverance therein were purchased by the death and blood of Christ for those for whom he died does not appear to be a suitable basis for raising consolation from his cross. What solid consolation can be drawn from such dry breasts as these, from which none of these things flow? That these things have no immediate dependence on the death of Christ, according to the view of the assertors of universal grace, has been declared before and is not only confessed but undertaken to be proved by them. But where should a soul look for these things if not in the

purchase of Christ? Is this a way to comfort a soul from the death of Christ — to let him know that Christ did not procure those things for him without which he cannot be comforted? It is then most apparent that the general ransom, so called, is so far from being the foundation of any solid consolation that it is directly destructive of and diametrically opposed to all the ways by which the Lord has declared himself willing that we should receive comfort from the death of his Son.

Third, we must demonstrate that the doctrine of the effectual redemption of the elect only by the blood of Jesus is not liable to any just objection on this point and does not in any way deprive believers of any portion of the consolation God is willing they should receive. The only objection raised by its opponents with any color of reason — for we are not at all moved by the exclamation that innumerable souls are shut out from any share in the blood of Christ, seeing that these are confessedly reprobates, unbelievers, and persons finally impenitent — comes to this:

That there is nothing in Scripture by which any person can assure himself that Christ died for him in particular, unless we grant that he died for all.

That this is notoriously false, the experience of all believers who by God's grace have assured their hearts of their share and interest in Christ as held out in the promise — without the least thought of universal redemption — is sufficient testimony. Second, that the assurance arising from a practical syllogism, of which one proposition is true in the Word and the second is established by the witness of the Spirit in the heart, is infallible, has been acknowledged by all. All believers may have such assurance that Christ died for them with an intention and purpose to save their

souls. For example: Christ died for all believers — that is, for all who choose him and rest upon him as an all-sufficient Savior; not that he died for them as believers, but that all such are among those for whom he died. He did not die for believers as believers, but for all the elect as elect, who by the benefit of his death become believers and so obtain assurance that he died for them. This first proposition is true in the Word in innumerable places; and second, the heart of a believer witnesses: 'But I believe in Christ — I choose him as my Savior, cast and roll myself on him alone for salvation.' From these the conclusion follows: therefore the Lord Jesus Christ died for me in particular, with an intention and purpose to save me. This is a collection that all believers, and only believers, can justly make. The all-sufficiency of the death of Christ to save every person without exception who comes to him is enough to fill all the Gospel's invitations to sinners to believe; and when they do believe, this infallible assurance of Christ's intention and purpose to redeem them by his death (Matthew 1:21) is made known. Whether this is not a better foundation than the universalist reasoning — 'Christ died for all people; I am a person; therefore Christ died for me' — let any person judge, especially considering that the first proposition is absolutely false. All this is said not as though either opinion of itself can give consolation — which God alone by the sovereignty of his free grace creates — but only to show what principles are suitable to the means by which he works on and toward his elect.

Fourth, the drawing of Gospel consolation from the death of Christ as held out to be effectual toward the elect only, for whom alone he died, should close our discourse. But considering first how abundantly this has already been done by divers eminent and

faithful laborers in the Lord's vineyard; second, how it is the daily task of Gospel preachers to make it out to the people of God; third, how it would carry me beyond my purpose to speak of things in so practical a way, this discourse having been designed to be purely polemical; and fourth, that such practical things are no more expected or welcome in learned controversies than knotty scholastic objections in popular sermons intended merely for edification — I shall not proceed further therein. Only, for a close, I desire the reader to peruse that one passage, Romans 8:32-34, and I make no doubt that he will — if not infected with the leaven of the error we have opposed — conclude with me that if there is any comfort, any consolation, any assurance, any rest, any peace, any joy, any refreshment, any exaltation of spirit to be obtained here below, it is all to be had in the blood of Jesus, long since shed, and his intercession still continuing — both united and applied to the elect of God by their precious effects and fruits, drawing them to believe and preserving them in believing, to the obtaining of an immortal crown of glory that shall not fade away.

THANKS FOR READING



If you spotted a typo or have feedback, the email is **sam@goodsoilapps.com** — or use the in-app feedback form in *Christian Reader*.