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This work was a protest against the Calvinistic theology as preached by the clergy of that day, and proves Mr. Pynchon to have been a profound scholar, a logical writer, and an independent thinker. He read his Bible in the original tongues, and while a sincere believer in the literal truth of the Scriptures and in the exact fulfillment of prophecy, he was his own interpreter and he would not accept as a part of his faith the system which Calvin had framed in all its terrible details. In his book he condemned specially the doctrine that Christ suffered the wrath of God and the torments of hell to pay man's debt to his Creator. His theory of the atonement was that, inasmuch as sin came into the world through Adam's disobedience, so Christ by his perfect obedience, paid the full price of our redemption.” The killing of Jesus was not the display of God's wrath, but was the work of the devil through his instruments, the Jews and the Roman soldiers. The theory that the guilt of the world was laid upon or imputed to Christ he denounced unsparingly. “If Christ bare Adam's sin,” he says, “by God's imputation, and his curse really, then you make Christ to be dead in sin.” Again:—

“If our Mediator had stood as a guilty sinner before God by his imputing of our sins to him, Then he could not have been a fit person in God's esteem to do the office of Mediator for our Redemption.”

A large part of the work deals with the subtleties and abstractions of now by-gone theology, but the one thought stands out strongly that God the Father is a God of Justice,

In view of the rigid adherence to the established doctrines enforced by the Massachusetts clergy, at that time, it is not to be wondered that Mr. Pynchon's book should have aroused a storm of wrath and indignation. The book, which was printed in London by James Moxon (very likely a kinsman of the Springfield minister), was received in Boston early in October, 1650. Copies of it were laid before the General
Court, which was then in session, and were read by the members with undisguised horror. Such a heretical publication, in their view, tended to undermine the very foundations of the colony. The following vote was passed:

"October 16, 1650.—The General Court now sittinge at Boston in New England, this sixteenth of October, 1650. There was brought to our hands a book written, as was therein subscribed, by William Pynchon, gent, in New England, entitled The Meritorious Price of our Redemption, Justification, &c., clearing it from some common Errors, &c., which booke, brought over here by a shippe a few days since, and containinge many errors & heresies generally condemned by all orthodox writers that we have met with, we have judged it meete and necessary for vindication of the truth, so far as in us lyes, as also to keep and preserve the people here committed to our care & trust in the true knowledge & faيث of our Lord Jesus Christ, & of our own redemption by him, as likewise for the clearing of ourselves to our Christian brethren and others in England, (where this book was printed and dispersed,) hereby protest our innocency, as being neither partyes nor privy to the writing, composing, printing, nor divulging thereof; but that on the contrary, we detest and abhorre many of the opinions & assertions therein as false, erroneous, heretical; yea, & whatsoever is contayned in the said book which are contrary to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, & the generall received doctrine of the orthodox churches extant since the time of the last and best reformation, & for proof and evidence of our sincere and playne meaning therein, we do hereby condemn the said book to be burned in the Market Place, at Boston, by the Common Executioner, on the morrow immediately after lecture, & doe purpose with all convenient speed to convent the said William Pynchon before authority, to find out whether the said William Pynchon will owne the said book as his or not: which if he doth, we purpose (God willing) to proceed with him according to his demerits, unless he retract the same, & give full satisfaction both here & by some second writing, to be print-
ed and dispersed in England: all which we thought needful, for the reasons above alleged, to make known by this short protestation & declaration. Also we further purpose, with what convenient speed we may, to appoynt some fitt person to make particular answer to all materiall and controversyall passages in the said book, & to publish the same in print, that so the errors and falsityes therein may be fully discovered, the truth cleared, & the minds of those that love & seek after truth confirmed therein.”

It being put to vote in the House of Deputies six of its members voted in the negative, viz: Capt. William Hathorne, the Speaker, and Henry Bartholomew of Salem; Joseph Hills of Malden, Richard Walker of Reading, Stephen Kingsley of Braintree, and Edward Holyoke, sitting for Springfield,—the father of Elizur Holyoke.

The following was also adopted immediately after the passage of the preceding:—

“It is agreed uppon by the whole Court that Mr. Norton, one of the reverend elders of Ipswich, should be entreated to answer Mr. Pynchon’s book with all convenient speed.”

“It is ordered that the foregoing declaration concerning the book subscribed by the name of William Pynchon, in New England, gent. should be signed by the Secretary, and sent into England to be printed there.”

“It is ordered that William Pynchon shall be summoned to appeare before the next General Court of Election, on the first day of their sitting to give his answer for the book print-ed and published under the name of William Pynchon, in New England, gent., entitled the Meritorious Price of our Redemption, Justification, &c., & not to depart without leave from the Court.”

He attended the May session of the General Court in 1651, both in the capacity of a witness against the unfortunate Mary Parsons and to answer to the complaint as to his book. He was detained a fortnight or so in Boston, and at the request of the Court he conferred with the leading clergy-men of the colony about his alleged heresies. One layman
even with Mr. Pynchon's learning, could hardly compete in argument with three eminent divines skilled in the discussion of the metaphysical niceties in which the schools of that day delighted. As a result of a prolonged conference he practically acknowledged himself in error on a single point—that Christ's sufferings were more than mere trials of obedience, as he said, but were appointed as the "due punishment for our sins." He did not admit, however, nor did he ever afterward, that Christ actually suffered the torments of hell. Still, it was a great concession and was so regarded by the Court, as will be seen by the record:

"May 22, 1651.—Mr. William Pynchon, being summoned to appeare before the Generall Court, according to their order, the last session, made his appearance before the Court, and being demandeth whether that book which goes under his name, and then presented to him, was his or not, he answered for the substance of the book, he owned it to be his. Whereupon the Court, out of their tender respect to him, ordered him liberty to conferre with all the reverend elders now present, or such of them as he should desire and choose. At last he took it into consideration, and returned his mind at the present in writing, under his hand, viz:—

According to the Court's advice, I have conferred with the Reverend Mr. Cotton, Mr. Norrice, and Mr. Norton, about some points of the greatest consequence in my booke, and I hope I have so explained my meaning to them as to take off the worst construction, and it hath pleased God to let me see that I have not spoken in my booke so fully of the price and merit of Christ's sufferings as I should have done. For in my book I call them but trials of his obedience, yet intending thereby to amplifie and exalt the mediatiorial obedience of Christ as the only meritorious price of man's redemption. But now at present I am much inclined to think that his sufferings were appointed by God for a farther end, namely, as the due punishment for our sins by way of satisfaction to divine justice for man's redemption.

Subscribed your humble servant in all dutiull respects.

Boston 9: 3mo., 1651.  WILLIAM PYNCHON.
"The Court finding by Mr. Pynchon's writing, given into the Court, that through the blessing of God on the paines of the reverend elders to convince him of his errors in his booke, conceive that he is in a hopeful way to give good satisfaction, and therefore at his request, judge it meete to grant him liberty, respecting the present troubles of his family, to return home some day the next week if he please, and that he shall have Mr. Norton's answer to his booke up with him, to consider thereof, that so at the next session of this Court, being the 14th of October next, he may give all due satisfaction as is hoped for and desired, to which session he is hereby enjoyned to make his personall appearance for that end.

"It is ordered that thanks be given by this Court to Mr. John Norton for his worthy paynes in his full answer to Mr. Pynchon's book, which at their desire he made, & since presented them with: & as a recompence for his paynes and good service therein, doe order that the Treasurer shall pay him twenty pounds out of the next levy."

The Court met according to adjournment on the 14th of October, but Mr. Pynchon did not appear. Ten days later, on the 24th, the following was entered on the records:

"The Court doth judge it meete and is willing, that all patience be exercised toward Mr. William Pynchon, that, if it be possible, he may be reduced into the way of truth and that he might renounce the errors and heresies published in his book, and for that end, doe give him time to the next Generall Court, in May, more thoroughly to consider of the said errors and heresies in his said book, and well to weigh the judicious answer of Mr. John Norton, and that he may give full satisfaction for his offence, which they more desire than to proceed to so great a censure as his offence deserves. In case he should not give good satisfaction, the Court doth therefore order, that the judgment of the case be suspended till the honorable Court in May next, and that Mr. William Pynchon be enjoyned under the penalty of one hundred pounds to make his personall appearance at and before the next Generall Court, to give full answer to satisfaction if it may be, or
otherwise to stand to the judgment and censure of the Court.”

“It is ordered by this Court that the answer to Mr. Pynchon’s book written by Mr. John Norton, shall be sent to England to be printed.”

Here ends the record history of this remarkable case. Mr. Pynchon and his wife, and Rev. Mr. Moxon and family, left Springfield and returned to England, but the date of departure is not known. His son-in-law, Henry Smith, followed him early the next year. Whether the prosecution was quietly dropped, or whether he went in defiance of the authorities, there is nothing of record to show. In the rural village of Wraysbury, England, not far from Windsor, Mr. Pynchon passed the rest of his life in tranquility. He published several theological works, among others a rejoinder to Mr. Norton’s reply to his former book. He died October 29, 1662, aged 72.

Several of Pynchon’s friends in England addressed appeals to the Governor and Council and the clergy in his behalf. The first which is printed in Mr. Norton’s book, is a signed reply by five of the leading Massachusetts ministers to the appeal of certain English clergymen, and the second is the reply of the Governor and Council to a letter from Sir Henry Vane.

Reverend and Beloved Brethren in our Lord Jesus:—

We see by your Letters you have thought it meete to address yourselves to us (the Elders of these Churches) in behalf of Mr. Pinchon and his Book, to incline us to a favorable construction of the Tenents held forth in it as Disputable, and (to some of note) probable; and for himself to move us to intercede with our Magistrates to deal favorably with him as a Gentleman pious and well deserving. In both which we shall give you a just account of our Proceedings.

When Mr. Pinchon’s Book came to us it was the time of the sitting of our General Court, wherein both Magistrates and Deputies of every Town in the Country, do assemble to consider and determine of the chiefest affairs which concern this Colony: At the same time a Ship in the Harbor was ready to set sail for England. Now the Court (both parts of them, the Magistrates and Deputies) perceiving by the Title Page that
the Contents of the Book were unsound, and Derogatory, both to the Justice of God and the Grace of Christ, which being published in England might add to the heap of many errors and Heresies already too much abounding, and this Book being published under the name of a New English Gentleman, might occasion many to think that New England also concurred in the allowance of such Exorbitant Aberrations: They therefore judged it meet, not to stay till the Elders could be gathered together but whilst the Ship yet stayed, to declare their own judgment against the Book, and to send a Copy of their Declaration to England by the Ship, then ready to depart: Had the Tenets therein seemed to them to be matters, either of doubtful disputation, or of small moment, we doubt not, they would either not at all have declared themselves against the Book, or if they had, they would have stayed for some opportunity of previous consultation with the Elders: but some of the Tenets seemed to them so directly to shake the Fundamentals of Religion, and to wound the vitals of Christianity, that they being many of them well versed both in Dogmatical and Controversial points of Divinity, thought it their duty to profess their Orthodox faith against all destructive Paradoxes, and dangerous Innovations vented from amongst ourselves; for according as they believe, they do also profess (as ourselves likewise do.) That the

Obedience of Christ to the whole Law, which is the Law of Righteousness, is the matter of our Justification; and the Imputation of our sins to Christ (and thereupon his suffering the sense of wrath of God upon him for our sin) and the Imputation of his obedience and sufferings are the formal cause of our Justification and that they that do deny this, do now take away both these, both the matter and the form of our Justification (as this Book doth) and take away also our Justification, which is the life of our souls and of our Religion, and therefore called Justification of life. Rom. 5.18. As for the Notion which you conceive he declineth, of Infinite wrath, we readily conceive with you, that though God's wrath be (as himself is infinite, yet no creature can bear infinite wrath) but he swallowed up of it; and therefore the wicked are put to suffer finite wrath in an infinite time; yet this suffering in an infinite time is accidental, in regard to the finiteness of the creature, but Christ being infinite God, as well as finite man, his manhood suffering, though in a finite measure, the sense of God's wrath both in soul and body, the infiniteness of his Godhead (whereto his manhood was united in one person) made his finite suffering, in a finite time to become of infinite value and efficacy, for the satisfaction of God's Justice and transaction of our Redemption. (Thus much for the Book.)

Now for the Author of the Book: before your letter came to our hands the Court dealt favorably with him, according to your desire. Before they knew your desire, they appointed three of our fellow Elders and Brethren, all of them his friends and acquaintances (such as himself chose) to confer with him, and finding him yielding in some main points (which he expressed willingly under his own hand) the Court readily accepted the same, as a fruit of his ingenuity, and a pledge of more full satisfaction; withal they gave him a Book penned (at their appointment by our
Reverend Brother Mr. Norton) in way of answer to all his grounds, which he thankfully accepted, and promised upon due perusal & consideration thereof, to return further Answer. All which, though it pleased God to have done, before your letter came to our hands: yet we acquainted our Magistrates with the contents of your Letter, whereto they returned this Answer. They doubted, either you had not read the Book throughout, or that having seriously weighed it (as the matter required) you would find some Fundamental Errors in it, meet to be duly witnessed against: For ourselves we thankfully accept of this your labor of love in advertising us of what you think behoofful; wherein though we differ, and (as we believe) justly differ from you, yet if we did not lovingly accept advertisement from our Reverend Brethren sometimes when there is less need we might discourage ourselves and other Brethren from sending us due advertisement when there is more need. Now the Lord Jesus Christ, the God of Truth and Peace, lead you by his Spirit of Truth into all Truth: and support you with a Spirit of faithfulness and holy zeal, to stand in the gap against the Inundation of all the Errors and Heresies of this present Age; and by his Spirit of Peace, guide and bless your Studies and holy Labours, to the advancement and establishment of Peace with Truth throughout the Nation: So desiring the fellowship of your prayers, we take leave and rest.

Your loving Brethren in the Lord Jesus and in the Fellowship of his Gospel.

John Cotton.
Richard Mather.
Zech. Symmes.
John Wilson.
Will. Thompson.

Sir Henry Vane wrote from England to the Colonial authorities at Boston, his former associates, asking them to deal lightly with Mr. Pynchon, to which they replied:—

Honoured Sir:—

We received your letter bearing date the 15th of April, 1652, written in the behalf of Mr. William Pincheon, who is one that we did love and respect. But his book and the doctrine therein contained we cannot but abhor as pernicious and dangerous; and are much grieved, that such an erroneous pamphlet was penned by a New England man, especially a Magistrate amongst us, wherein he taketh upon him to condemn the judgment of most, if not all, both ancient and modern divines, who were learned, orthodox and godly in point of so great weight and concernment, as tend to the salvation of God’s elect, and the contrary, which he maintains to the destruction of such as follow it. Neither have we heard of any one godly orthodox divine, that ever held what he hath written; nor do we know of any one of our ministers in all the four jurisdictions that doth approve of the same; but all do judge it erroneous and heretical.
And to the end that we might give satisfaction to all the world of our just proceedings against him, and for the avoiding of any just offence to be taken against us, we caused Mr. John Norton, teacher of the church of Ipswich, to answer his book fully, which, if printed, we hope it will give yourself and all indifferent men full satisfaction.

Mr. Pincheon might have kept his judgment to himself, as it seems he did above thirty years, most of which time he hath lived amongst us with honour, much respect and love. But when God left him to himself in the publishing, and spreading his erroneous book here amongst us, to the endangering of the faith of such as might come to read them (as the like effects have followed the reading of other erroneous books brought over into these parts,) we held it our duty, and believed we were called of God to proceed against him accordingly. And this we can further say, and that truly, that we used all lawful Christian means, with as much tenderness, respect, and love, as he could expect, which we think he himself will acknowledge. For we desired divers of our elders such as he himself liked, to confer with him privately, lovingly and meekly, to see if they could prevail with him by arguments from the scriptures, which accord-

ingly was done, and he was then thereby so far convinced that he seemed to yield for substance the case in controversy signed with his own hand.

And for the better confirming of him in the truth of God, Mr. Norton left him with a copy of the book he writ in answer to him; and the Court gave him divers months to consider both of the book, and what had been spoken unto him by the elders. But in the interim (as it is reported) he received letters from England, which encouraged him in his error, to the great grief of us all, and of divers others of the people of God amongst us. We therefore leave the author, together with the tantalors and maintainers of such opinions to the great Judge of all the earth, who judgeth righteously and is no respecter of persons. Touching that which you honoured self doth advise us unto, viz. not to censure any person for matters of a religious nature or concernment, we desire to follow any good advice from you, or any of the people of God, according to the rule of God's word. Yet we conceive, with submission still to better light, that we have not acted in Mr. Pincheon's case either for substance or circumstance, as far as we can discern, otherwise than according unto rule, and as we believe in conscience to God's command, we were bound to do. All which we hope will so far satisfy you as that we shall not need to make further defence touching this subject. The God of peace and truth lead you into all faith, and guide your heart aright in these dangerous and apostatising times, wherein many are fallen from the faith, giving heed to errors, and make you an instrument (in the place God hath called you unto) of his praise, to stand for his truth against all opposers thereof, which will bring you peace and comfort in the saddest hours, which are the prayers of, Sir, your unworthy servants.

John Endecott, Gov'r
Tho Dudley Depty
Rich Bellingham
Increase Nowell

Win Hibbins
Sam. Sumonds
Robt Bridges
John Glover

20 October, 1652.
THE

MERITORIOUS PRICE

OF

Our Redemption, Justification, &c.

Cleering it from some common Errors;

And proving,

1. That Christ did not suffer for us those unutterable torments of God's wrath, that commonly are called Hell-torments, to redeem our souls from them.

Part I.

2. That Christ did not bear our sins by God's imputation, and therefore he did not bear the curse of the Law for them.

3. That Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law (not by suffering the said curse for us, but) by a satisfactory price of atonement; viz. by paying or performing unto his Father that invaluable precious thing of his Mediatorial obedience, whereof his Mediatorial Sacrifice of atonement was the master-piece.

Part II.

4. A sinner's righteousness or justification is explained, and cleared from some common Errors.

By William Pinchim, Gentleman, in New England.

The Mediator saith thus to his Father in Psal 40.8, 10.

I delight to do thy will O my God, yea thy Law is within my heart: (viz.) I delight to do thy will, or Law, as a Mediator.

I have not hid thy righteousness within my heart, I have declared thy faithfulness, and thy salvation: Namely, I have not hid thy righteousness, or thy way of making sinners righteous, but have declared it by the performance of my Mediatorial Sacrifice of atonement, as the procuring cause of thy atonement, to the great Congregation for their everlasting righteousness.

LONDON,

Printed by F. M. for George Whittington, and James Moxon, and are to be sold at the blue Anchor in Cornhill neer the Royal Exchange. 1650.
Grace and Peace to the wise and conscientious Reader.

Have laboured in this Dialogue to explicate the meritorious price of our Redemption, Justification and Adoption, and to clear it from some common Errors, hoping that others who are better learned, will take occasion by this Dialogue to do it more thoroughly.

I find variety of opinions touching the point of Christ's satisfaction for our Redemption, and Justification: namely, what it was that he did or suffered to satisfy God's wrath for our Redemption and Justification.

1. Some hold that Christ did satisfy God's Justice for our Redemption from the curse of the Law, by bearing the said curse for us: and they stick not to affirm it in these terms: The curse of the Law: The wrath of God: The torments of Hell: The pains of the Damned: The second Death, &c.

2. Others will not indure such harsh terms as some of these are, and yet they affirm that Christ did suffer the wrath of God for our Redemption, namely, so much of it as was equivalent to the punishment of the sins of the Elect: See Mr. Jacob upon Christ's sufferings, p. 33.

3. Others do affirm that Christ did not suffer that kind of wrath which the damned do suffer, but that kind of wrath only which the Elect do suffer in this life; but yet in a far greater measure, and thus Mr. Ainsworth did at last explain his apprehensions in a letter to my self (having had two or three turns in writing, not long before his death.)

Such jarring there is among Divines, about the kind of sufferings which they say Christ bare for our Redemption.

4. Others disagree about the part of Christ's human nature, that did bear the wrath of God for our Redemption: for some affirm that Christ suffered the wrath of God in his soul only, and not in his body: 2. Others affirm that he suffered the wrath of God in his body,
To the Reader.

The things are never cleared by false Divines that hold that Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, by fulfilling the Law.

Refutation.

The things are never cleared by false Divines that hold that Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, by fulfilling the Law.

Objection.

Send this to be printed, as well as our Foul, to recede our bodies from God's wrath, as well as his foul.
To the Reader.

suite doth often deride us with great scorn and disdain, for ascribing unto Christ such perturbations of soul as did arise from the sense of God's wrath: and the Remonstrants in their Annotations upon the New Testament do the like in several places.

And yet they do also greatly mistake of the right understanding of the meritorious price of our Redemption: For they join their own merits with the merits of Christ, as necessary to the purchasing of their Redemption.

2. They do most superstitiously look at the grosse substance of Christ's flesh and blood, and at his bodily pains and stripes which he suffered from Satan and his instruments as a Malefactor, as the meritorious price of their Redemption.

3. They do most grossly hold that the soul of Christ went down into the lowest hell to perfect their Redemption, for they make four hells, or four stories in hell: In the first of which they place the souls of all the holy men that died before the coming of Christ: In the second they place the souls of all those children that die without Baptism: In the third they place the souls of all those that suffer the pains of Purgatory, and in the fourth hell, which is the lowest of all, they place the souls of the damned; and then they propound this question, Into which of these places did the soul of Christ descend after his death? They answer thus, That Christ descended into all these parts of hell to triumph over Satan, and to deliver the souls of the Fathers, and to comfort others as their Advocate and Redeemer: see Bellarmin in his Christian Doctrine.

But in all these tenets of theirs, they mistake most grossly of the true meritorious price of their Redemption; for they do never explicate wherein the efficacy of his mediatorial sacrifice of Atonement doth lie: they never shew how his death was a mediatorial death, by the actual and joynt concurrence of both his natures, which mediatorial death of his must be considered as the only procuring cause of his Fathers Atonement, for our full Redemption, Justification, and Adoption.

2. There is the like need to clear the meritorious price of our Redemption, for the poor Jews sake: For as Mr. Broughton doth often affirm, they do greatly stumble at these two positions of ours; first in that we do make Christ to stand before God as a guilty sinner, by his imputing all our sins to him; and secondly they stumble at this, in that we do make the Messiah to redeem us from the curse of the Law, by bearing the said curse for us.
To the Reader.

But the Ebrew Doctors do in a jesting and scoffing manner say unto us, That every Fox shall pay his own skin to the Flayer: See Weems on the Jew, p.318, and yet woe and alas! the poor Jews are lamentably blinded about the meritorious price of our Redemption: For,

1. Though some of the Ebrew Doctors have affirmed, that the Messiah should suffer death for their Redemption, and that his sufferings should be marvellous great, yet I cannot perceive that they do look upon the death of Christ in a right construction, because they do not look upon it as a mediatorial death actuated by his own power, even by the joynt concurrence of both his natures.

2. The most of the Jews (except a few) do hold that the Messiah shall never suffer any kind of death at all: The Jews in generall were once persuaded for a time, that one Rabbi Akibab was the King Christ: yea both himself, and all the wise men of that age thought he had been Christ the King untill he was killed for his iniquities, and when he was kill'd then they knew he was not so. See Ains. on Deut.8.19. By this testimony of theirs it is evident that the Jews in generall did hold that their Messiah should never die at all: and in our Savions daies, when he told the Jews that he must be put to death, and that the bowr was come in which the Son of Man should be glorified, John 12.23,32. then the Jews did stumble at this Doctrine, and said, We have heard out of the Law that Christ abideth for ever, How then sayest thou that the Son of Man must be lifted up? v.34. From hence it is evident, that the Jews in generall did hold that the Messiah should not redeem his people by suffering any kind of death at all: but their common tenent was, that the Messiah should redeem them from the Nations of the world by outward power, as a stately King and Conqueror, and in this carnall sense, they did ordinarily understand that spiritual promise made unto David, in 2 Sam.7.13. 1 will establish the Throne of his Kingdom for ever. This eternall Throne the Jews (except a few) do understand it of the outward pompous Kingdom of the Messiah; yea the very Apostles themselves for a good while together, understood not the spiritual nature of the Kingdom of the Messiah, Mar.9.30. Luke 24.21,22.

Therefore it follows from the premises; that the Jews as long as they are ignorant of the spiritual nature of the Kingdom of Christ, cannot understand the true meritorious price of their Redemption.
To the Reader.

demption; for the Messiah must break the Devill's headplot, not by his outward power as a stately King and Conqueror, but by his mediatorial sacrifice of Attonement.

Therefore for the poor Jews sake, we ought as much as may be to clear up the true meritorious price of our Redemption.

The Apostle Paul did not differ from the Scribes, but in two points mainly; the first was concerning the death of Christ; the second was concerning his Resurrection: See Acts 17.3. Acts 26.23. 1 Cor.15.3. and according to those tenents, Paul's preaching had a differing effect upon the Jews in their Synagogues: some were persuaded by Paul's preaching to embrace those tenents, but others resisted and raised up persecution against him for this Doctrine: and in his Epistle to the Hebrews in general, he doth labour might and main to prove that Christ was God, and that in his human nature he was to die to make his soul a sacrifice of Attonement by the power of his divine nature; that so through death, he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the Devill, Heb.2.

In like sort when Stephen was convented before the great Counsell of Jerusalem, he affirm'd before them all that he did then see Jesus Christ whom they had crucified, now living and sitting at the right hand of God, Acts 7.56. But the Judges of the great Sanhedrin stopped their ears at this Doctrine of Stephen, and the common multitude did fo detest this Doctrine of his death and Resurrection, that in a confused uproar and rage they took him from the Counsell and stoned him to death.

Hence it is evident that the Jews in general did hold, that the Messiah should neither die nor rise again by the power of his divine nature; and they do also greatly stumble at our common Doctrine of Imputation, because by it we make the Messiah more odious to God (in their apprehensions) then any leper can be to us.

But ah and alas! as the poor Jews will not acknowledge that their Messiah must die, to make his soul a mediatorial sacrifice of Attonement for their Redemption.

So many of them are so far blinded by Satan, that they deny his divine nature, and so in effect they deny him to be a Mediator: The Lord in mercy open their eyes to see him whom they have crucified (not only as a base malefactor, but as an obedient Mediator, with mourning and bleeding hearts: and the Lord in mercy help us to remove all errors from our Doctrine, and to make the path of our Religion plain before them. Amen; even so, Amen.

Thine in the Lord ever. W.P.
This Argument was thus framed by M. Henry Smith a godly Preacher, near thirty years since, in my presence.
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The Proposition I take forgranted, because every article of our faith is set down in the Scripture, and what ever is not proved by Scripture I am not bound to believe.

The Assumption is thus proved.

**If the Scripture doth any where affirm that Christ hath suffered the infinite wrath of God for our redemption, then is doth affirm it.**

Therefore Christ hath not suffered the infinite wrath of God for our redemption.

The Proposition I take forgranted, because every article of our faith is set down in the Scripture, and what ever is not proved by Scripture I am not bound to believe.

The Assumption is thus proved.

If the Scripture doth any where affirm that Christ hath suffered the infinite wrath of God for our redemption, then is doth affirm it. These places are chiefly alluded by Divines for that purpose; as in Hab. 3:3-6; Gal. 3:13, 2 Cor. 5:21, Psalm 22:1-30.

But the Scripture doth not affirm it in any of those places; therefore it doth no where affirm it.

Your first place is Hab. 3:3-6, whence the conclusion must be this. He that had the iniquity of us all laid upon him, did suffer the infinite wrath of God.

But Christ had the iniquity of us all laid upon him: therefore Christ did suffer the infinite wrath of God.

I answer by denying your Proposition, which must be well proved before I can assent to the Conclusion.

Your second place is Gal. 3:13, whence the conclusion must be this. He that was made a curse for us, suffered the infinite wrath of God.

Christ was made a curse for us; therefore Christ did suffer the infinite wrath of God.

I answer by denying your Proposition as above said.

Your third place is 2 Cor. 5:21, whence the Conclusion must be this. He that was made sin for us did suffer the infinite wrath of God.

Christ was made sin for us; therefore Christ did suffer the infinite wrath of God.

I answer by denying your Proposition: and so I shall deny your Proposition of all the other places.

All these Scriptures & many more I have expounded in this ensuing Discourse.
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The death of Christ was of a far different nature from the death of all the fallen Sons of Adam. 1
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The body of Christ after he was dead and laid in his grave could not see corruption, because Lamb of God. If he had born the guilt of his Godhead did still reside in his dead body as well as in his departed soul. 10
The holy Ghost both in Hebrew and Greek Heaven, as much as ever he did implore them to make the death of Christ to be both to him when he was alive here upon earth, active and passive, wherein doubtles a great mystery is couched. 90
The death of Christ may be called either himself as much as ever he did implore them.
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The Meritorious Price of Man's Redemption, Reconciliation, Justification, &c. Clearing it from some common Errors.

And Proving

1. That Christ did not suffer for us those unutterable Torments of God's Wrath, which commonly are called Hell-Torments, to redeem our Souls from them.

2. That Christ did not bear our Sins by God's Imputation, and therefore he did not bear the Curse of the Law for them.

PART I.

The Discourse is acted between a Tradesman, and A Divine.

TRADESMAN.

Elli set Reverend Sir; I have long desired to see you, that I might confer with you about the Meritorious Price of Man's Redemption, namely, What it was that either Christ did or suffered to satisfy God's Wrath for Man's Redemption, Reconciliation, &c. for I perceive there is a great difference among Divines about the kind of satisfaction that Christ made to his Father for Man's Redemption; and it doth not a little trouble me that you should differ in so weighty a point from the most Divines.

Divine, it my difference from the most Divines be agreeable to the Scriptures rightly expounded, then I hope there is no just offence given on my part; neither do I desire any man to believe me further than I bring the Word of God rightly expounded for
my Warrant: Therefore I pray you (with religious Fear and Reverence) put me to the Tryal, and propound your Objections against me.

Trade. If I be not mistaken, you hold that Christ did not Redeem us by his Sufferings.

Divine. This word Suffering is a doubtful term, because you do not explain your meaning; and therefore before that you and I do proceed any further, we must explain one another's meaning, for it is needful in all Controversies, that each side should know what each other do grant, and what they hold differing: Therefore in the first place before we proceed any further, I will tell you what I hold touching the meritorious price of our Redemption.

First, I hold that Jesus Christ our Mediator did pay the full price of our Redemption to his Father by the merit of his Mediatorial Obedience, which (according to Gods determinate Counsel) was tried through sufferings, inflicted upon his body as upon a Malefactor, by Satan and his Instruments.

I put as much weight, virtue, and efficacy in Christ's Mediatorial Obedience (so tried, as they do that plead most for our Redemption by his suffering of God's wrath for us.

They place the price of our Redemption in his suffering of God's wrath for us in full weight and measure, as it is due to our sins by the curse of the Law.

I place the price of our Redemption in the merit of his Mediatorial Obedience, whereof his Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement was the Master-piece.

I agree with others in this, that Divine wrath is fully satisfied for the sins of all the Elect by the merit of Christ's Mediatorial Obedience: I differ from others in this, namely, in the manner of his satisfaction.

I say, That Christ did not satisfy God's wrath for our sins by suffering the extremity of his Wrath, neither did he suffer the torments of hell neither in his body, nor in his soul, nor any degree of God's wrath at all.

Secondly, Though I say that Christ did not suffer his Father's Wrath, neither in whole, nor in part, yet I affirm that he suffered all things that his Father did appoint him to suffer, in all circumstances, just according to the predictions of all the Prophets, even to the
Part I. **Redemption and Justification cleared.**

nodding of the head, and the spitting in the face, as these Scriptures do tell us.

1. Peter told the Jews, *That they had killed the Prince of Life,* as God before had shewed by the mouth of all his Prophets; *That Christ should suffer,* and be fulfilled it: *So Acts 3. 17, 18.*

2. Christ did expressly tell his Disciples, *That he must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the Elders,* and chief Priests, and Scribes, and be killed, and raised again the third day, *Mat. 16: 21.*

3. After his Resurrection, he said to the two Disciples, *O Fools,* and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken; *ought not Christ to have suffered these things,* and to enter in his Glory? *Luke 24. 25, 26.* and in verse 44, and 46, he said thus to all his Disciples: *These are the words which I spake unto you,* *That all things must be fulfilled which are written in the Law of Moses, in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me: Thus it is written,* and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead on the third day.

4. Paul told the men of Antioch, *That the Rulers of the Jews condemned him, because they knew not the voices of the Prophets concerning him;* and therefore, though they found no cause of death in him, they desired Pilate that he should be slain: *and when they had fulfilled all things that were written of him, they took him down from the Tree, and laid him in a Sepulcher: Acts 13. 27, 28, 29.* Mark the phrase, *They fulfilled all things that were written of him: If they fulfilled all his sufferings, then it was not Gods wrath,* but mans wrath that he suffered.

5. The Lord told *Adam,* not only that the Promised Seed should break the Divels Head-plot, but also that the Divel should crucifie him, and pierce him in the Foot-foals; *Gen. 3. 15.* The Divel did it by his Instruments, the Scribes and Pharises, by Pilate, and the Romans Soldiers.

From all these Scriptures, I hold it necessary that Christ should suffer all things that were written of him, for the Tryal of his Mediatorial Obedience; but yet I say also, that no Prophet did ever speak anything that Christ should suffer the Wrath of God; that is an addition from Mans Brain.

Therefore those Divines must needs speak erroneously, that affirm that Christ did suffer the Wrath of God, as it is due to our sins,
the Curse of the Law, the Torments of Hell, the pains of the Damned, the second Death, and many such like, to redeem us from them.

These terms I reject, as not agreeable to the Divine Melody of the Holy Scriptures.

Thus I have briefly told you what I affirm, and what I deny; now therefore I pray you to produce your Arguments and Objections against me: I desire to see how you can prove that Christ did suffer the Wrath of God for our Redemption.

Tr. I will fetch my first Proof from the immutability of the first Curse annexed to the breach of the first Law of Prohibition: The Law of Prohibition runs thus, of the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat. The Curse annexed follows,

In Gen. 2. 17. In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die the death. This is a Definative sentence, and it is doubled in the Hebrew for certainty sake; in dying, thou shalt die: That is to say, Thou shalt certainly die the death, even death Eternal in hell, unless thy Redeemer do suffer the said Curse for thee, to redeem thee from it.

Div. I pray you shew me how you do gather from this Text that our Redeemer was necessitated to suffer this Curse to redeem fallen man from it: Let me see how you can infer your Argument to prove it.

Tr. My Argument lies thus; In the day thou eatest thereof, in dying, thou shalt die; that is to say, Thou Adam, in thine own Person, and Thou in thy Posterity, or else Thou in thy Redeemer, there is no escaping from this definitive cursed Death: If Adam did but once eat of the Forbidden Fruit, either he must die eternally, or else his Redeemer must suffer the said cursed death in his stead.

Div. Your Exposition of this Text is true in part, but in part I dislike it; You say well that the term Thou, is thou in thine own Person, and thou in thy Posterity; thus far I approve of your exposition: But whereas you extend the term Thou unto the Redeemer, this last clause I dislike, for the Death and Curse here threatened, cannot extend itself unto the Redeemer in the manner of his working out our Redemption.

This Text doth not comprehend Jesus Christ within the compass of it: for 1. This Text is a part of that Covenant only that God made with Adam and his Posterity; respecting the keeping or
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or losing of that happiness which they had by Creation. This Text doth not comprehend within the compass of it any part of that Covenant which God made with the Mediator respecting man's Redemption: they are two differing Covenants, and both of them cannot be contained within the compass of this Text. Any man may say from this Text, That God doth herein declare unto Adam the rule of his justice upon him and his posterity, in case he disobeyed, by eating the forbidden fruit, they must certainly die the death. But none can truly gather from this Text, what was the rule of his justice and mercy in man's Redemption by Christ; this cannot be fetched from some other Scriptures: but either from Gen. 2. 15, or from the like Scriptures: this Text in Gen. 2. 17, doth not tell us that Christ should redeem us, in the day that Adam should die: the Redeemer, and the way of Redemption; was wholly hid from Adam for that present.

Secondly, If the death here threatened do concern Adam only and his posterity, (with whom the Covenant for life or death was made, in case he did eat of the forbidden fruit) then it cannot respect Christ, because he is not to be held as one of the fallen sons of Adam's posterity; for he was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and not by natural generation, as all the fallen sons and daughters of Adam are: therefore the Mediator cannot be included within this death here threatened to fallen Adam.

Thirdly, God laid down this rule of his justice to Adam, in the time of his innocency, before he had any need of the knowledge of the Mediator: therefore why should the Mediator be comprehended within this term Thou, or any thing of man's Redemption by Christ.

Fourthly, The nature of the cursed death here threatened, is such, that it is altogether unpossible that the Mediator could suffer it for our Redemption, and therefore the Mediator cannot possibly be included within this word [Thou] in this Text?

Tract. If you can make it appear by good consequence, that the Mediator could not suffer that kind of cursed death that is here threatened in this Text, then I shall easily acknowledge that my interpretation is not sound: therefore I pray you let me hear your Reason why it was not possible for the Mediator to suffer the said cursed death for our Redemption.

Divine. For your better understanding of the true nature of that death,
death that is here threatened, I will observe two things,
First, I will explain unto you what kind of cursed death it
is, that of necessity must primarily be meant in this Text.
Secondly, I will branch out this cursed death in all the con-
sequences of it; and then I will apply all to Christ: by which ap-
lication you may the better be able to discern whether Christ
could suffer the cursed death that is meant in Gen. 2. 17. or No.
First, I will explain unto you the particular kind of cursed death
that God threatened to fall upon Adam, as soon as he had eaten the
forbidden fruit; and that must be understood of a Spiritual death
principally; for the curse runs thus, In the day thou eatest thereof,
shalt die the death. That is to say, in the very first same natural
day, in which thou first eat of the forbidden fruit, in dying thou
shalt die: and what death else can it be that fell upon Adam in
the very same natural day in which he eat the forbidden fruit, but a
Spiritual death? It cannot be understood of the death of Adam's
body, for his body lived nine hundred and thirty years after this
day, Gen. 5. 5. besides, the death of Adam's body was threatened to
fall upon him after this day, (in Gen. 3. 19.) either as another dis-

tinct curse, or else as a branch of the former death which might be
repeated after his fall.
Secondly, Neither can the death here threatened be understood
primarily of eternal death in Hell, as you would have it; for that
dead cannot fall upon any man till after this life is ended: that death
doth not agree to the circumstance of time expressed in the Text.
Thirdly, Therefore it follows, that the kind of death that was
threatened to fall upon Adam in the very first same natural day in
which he did eat the forbidden fruit, must be understood primarily
of a Spiritual death, or of the death of his pure nature in corruption
and sin.
At the first, Adam was created after God's image, Gen. 1. 27. full
of natural purity and uprightness, Ephes. 4. 24. which would have
kept his body alive and in God's favour for ever, if he had not eaten
of the forbidden fruit; but as soon as ever he had but eaten of the
forbidden fruit, he became dead in corruption and sin, Ephes. 2. 2.
and then it might be said of Adam in the day of his eating, as it was
said of the Church of Sardis, Thou hast a Name that thou livest;
but thou art dead, Rev. 3. 1. Adam was still alive corporally, but
he was dead spiritually.
Mr Calvines in Gen. 2. 17. demandeth what kind of death it was that God threatened to fall upon Adam in this Text: he answereth to this purpose: It seemeth to me (faith he) that we must fetch the definition thereof from the contrary: Consider (faith he) from what life Adam fell; At the first (faith he) he was created in every part of his body and soul with pure qualities, after the image of God: therefore on the contrary (faith he) by dying the death, is meant, that he should be emptied of all the image of God, and possessed with corrupt qualities, as soon as ever he did but eat of the forbidden fruit.

So then, by the judgement of Mr Calvines, the death that fell upon Adam, in the day of his disobedient eating, must be, understood of the spiritual death of Adams pure nature in corrupt and sinful qualities: and none of Adams posterity that are begotten by natural generation can be exempted from this spiritual death, no not the very Elect, they are dead in corruption and sin, as well as the Reprobates, as soon as ever they have life in the Womb.

And it is further evident by certain other circumstances that did befall Adam in the day of his transgression, that the kind of death which was threatened to fall upon Adam in the very day of his disobedient eating must needs be understood of a spiritual death primarily.

1. He was ashamed. 2. He was afraid. And 3. He did hide himself from Gods presence, Gen. 3.7,8,9,10.

First, He was ashamed. Because he was now stripped naked of Gods image, for he was now deprived of his pure qualities which he had by Creation, and instead thereof he was now possest with other shameful and corrupt qualities, both in his body and in his soul.

Secondly, He was afraid of Gods wrath, for now the terrors of a guilty conscience fell upon him, for his sinful eating.

Thirdly, He did now hide himself from God, because he did now find himself to be out of Gods favour, until it pleased God of his free grace to renew his favour towards him, by the free promise of a mediator, to break the Devils head-plot by his mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement, thereby procuring Gods Atonement.

For as by one man sin entered into the world, (namely the mother-sin, by Adams sinful eating) and death by sin, So (a spiritual) death
death passed over all men, in whom (that is to say, in whose loins all men have sinned, Rom. 5. 12. and that Adam by his one sin in eating the forbidden fruit, procured not only his own spiritual death; but also he did thereby procure an Hereditary sinful nature to all his posterity, and that corruption of our nature is now called The Law of death, and the body of death, Rom. 7. 23, 24. because it fell upon Adam and his posterity for his transgressing of the first law of prohibition, by his bodily eating of the forbidden fruit: and in this respect also the Apostles are said to preach to the dead in sin, 1 Pet. 4. 6. Col. 2. 13.

So then, from all the premises I may well conclude, that the kind of death which God threatened to execute upon Adam in the very day of his sinful eating, was a spiritual death; or it may be called the death of his pure nature in corruption and sin; and this Spiritual death may well be called The first death, or the original death, because it was the original cause of all other deaths and curses whatsoever; and truly unless we can get into the Mediator by Faith, before our souls be separated from our bodies, this first death will bring us unto the second death at last.

This exposition of Gen. 2. 17. I conceive to be full, fair and clear: Secondly, I come now in the next place (according to my promise) to apply this cursed Spiritual death together, with all other cursed deaths unto Christ, that so you may thereby the better see whether it be not altogether impossible for our Mediator to suffer the said Curses of the Law in our stead for our Redemption there-from or no.

First, Did Christ suffer the curse of the first spiritual death that was threatened to Adam, for his sinful eating of the forbidden fruit; then truly he was dead in corruption and sin, as Adam and all his posterity were? This is a blasphemous inference; (and yet you cannot avoid it by the common doctrine of imputation) but the Holy Scriptures do often tell us that Christ was pure in nature, and without the least tincture of sin, either in his corruption or life. He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, without sin, Luk. 1. 35. and all his life long, there was no sin found in him, 1 Pet. 2. 22, 23. Heb. 4. 15. John. 8. 46. therefore seeing he was along time sinless; both in nature and life, it was altogether impossible for him to suffer that kind of cursed death that was threatened to fall upon Adam in the day
day of his sinfull eating, and therefore it follows by necessary con-
sequence, that he did redeem us from that cursed death, by suffer-
ing that cursed death in our stead. 2. Hence it follows also by nec-
cessary consequence, that God the Father hath found out some other
way where by he takes satisfaction for the sins of all the Elect, and
not by inflicting this cursed spiritual death upon our Mediator for
our Redemption.

Secondly, If there be good and necessary Reason (as there is)
to exempt our Mediator from suffering the first cursed Spiritual
death: Then there is as good reason to exempt him also from suf-
fering any other curse of the Law whatsoever.

Examine the Particulars.

First, Consider the first degree of our bodily death, and that is
Diseases, and deadly dangers, which God doth usually inflict upon
the fallen sons of Adam, for sin: Did Christ bear these diseases
and bodily infirmities, upon his own body, to redeem us from
them? By the common Doctrine of Imputation you must affirm
it; and yet many absurd consequences will follow, if it be affirmed,
as plain experience doth shew us: for when Christ healed all that
were sick of sundry kinds of infirmities, he did not take their dis-
eases, and lay them upon his own body; he did not take the lepro-
seye from the Lepers, and lay it upon his own Body: he did not take
the unclean spirits from them that were possessed, and put them in-
to his own Body; but he bare them; that is to say, he bare them
away from the sick, by the power of his Godhead, as I have ex-
ounded, Esai 53. 4. and Mat. 8. 17.

Secondly, Another curse of the Law which all the fallen sons
of Adam do ly under, is Death natural. Now consider, Whether
did Christ suffer this bodily death in our stead, to redeem our bo-
dies or No? I say No, it is a groffe conceit to think so: and though
the Apostle doth say, that God appointed Christ to dy one, as
he appointed all men once to dy, Heb. 9. 27, 28. yet the Apo-
istle doth not mean that God appointed Christ to dy such a kind of na-
tural death as he hath appointed to all the fallen sons of Adam:
there is a wide difference: for God hath appointed all the fallen
sons of Adam, to dy one, by the justice of that curse that was laid
upon Adam for sin; so that they cannot by their natural power
withstand it: But the death of Christ was not inflicted upon him

The death of
Christ was of a
far differing na-
ture from the
death of all the
fallen Sons of
Adam.
by the justice of that curse, as I have opened the matter in Psalm 22. 15. because he dyed not as a fallen son of Adam, but voluntarily as a Mediator, for he had a power in nature to withstand it, and therefore his death was not a forced passive death, but a voluntary Mediatorial death, according to his own voluntary Covenant with his Father, for Mans Redemption. I grant notwithstanding, that Christ was a Patient as well as an Agent, in his death; because he suffered many wounds in his Body, from the violence of Tyrants, by means whereof he shed much blood; but yet for all that he dyed not of those wounds, I mean his Soul was not separated from his Body by the violence of those wounds, as the Souls of the two Theeves were that were crucified with him: for our Saviour before his sufferings told his Disciples That no man could take away his life from him, till himself pleased to lay it down, by his own will, desire and power, according as he had covenanted with his Father, John 10. 17, 18.

And it is farther evident, that the manner of Christ's death was far differing from that kind of natural death that God hath inflicted as a curse upon all the fallen sons of Adam, because none of the fallen Sons of Adam have any power in nature to withstand the power of death; much lefs have they any power in nature to raise up their dead bodies again after death: But our blessed Mediator had a power in himself, not only to lay down his life when he pleased; but he had a power also in himself to take it up again, when he pleased, John 10. 18. Therefore I may well conclude, that the death of Christ was far different from the death of all the fallen sons of Adam; and therefore he did not redeem us from the curse of our bodily death, by bearing it in our stead.

Thirdly, There is another curse annexed to the death of our bodies, and that is the putrefaction of our bodies after death, Genesis 3. 19. Dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return: this Text implies both the death of the body by sickness, and the putrefaction of the body also after death. Now examine whether Christ did redeem us from this particular curse by bearing it in our stead?

The Apostle denies it in plain words, saying, Thou wilt not suffer thy Holy One to see corruption. Acts 2. 27. in this Text there is a reason given, why the body of Christ could not see corruption, after his Soul was separated from it; namely, because it was the Holy
ly Habitation of his Godhead; but our sinful bodies after the Soul is departed, are but a corrupt mass of putrefied earth; and therefore immediately after our Souls are departed, our bodies begin to purge and purrifie; but the body of Christ had his Divine nature in it, when his Soul was separated from it: for his body had its subsistance, not only from his Soul (as our sinful bodies have from our Souls) but from his Godhead also: yea not only his dead body, but his Soul also, after it was separated from his body, had their subsistance and dependance on his Godhead, by vertue of personal union. Col. 2. 9. Yea his Godhead did still reside substantially or essentially in his dead body, when it was in his grave, as well as in his Soul, when it was in Paradise.

Therefore I may well conclude, that it was not possible for the Mediator to suffer this cursed piece of death for us, without destroying his personal union: for if his body had seen corruption, it could not have been called the Holy one of God, that could see no corruption.

Fourthly, There is yet another cursed death, which all the fallen sons of Adam are subject to by nature, and that is death eternal; this Death is the wages of Sin, as well as the rest, Rom. 6. 26. and this death is called the second death, because it is never executed upon any, till after this life is ended, Rev. 2. 11. Rev. 20. 6. Now examine, whether did Christ redeem us from this cursed death, by suffering the same for us, or No? I say No: and my Reasons are these,

First, If he had redeemed us from this cursed death, by suffering the same for us; then by the same reason he must have suffered all the other curses of the Law, to redeem us from them, as well as from this cursed death: but I have shewed an utter impossibility for that, immediately before.

Secondly, If Christ hath redeemed us from death eternal, by suffering the said death for us, then he did descend locally into the very place of Hell it self, to suffer it there; for no man can suffer death eternal in this life: no man can suffer the second death till after this life is ended. All the deaths that the fallen sons of Adam do suffer in this life, being put together, may be called the first death, because they are inflicted upon mens souls and bodies in this life; but death eternal is not inflicted upon mens souls and bodies
till after this life is ended; and therefore it is fitly called the second death: and therefore our Saviour could not suffer it while he was alive, neither in the Garden, nor upon the Cross.

Trades. I confess, as you have opened the first cursed death, in Gen. 2.17. both in the root and in the branches thereof, I dare not maintain what I have formerly affirmed: and yet I am not satisfied in the point in question: Therefore I pray give me leave to alledge the Reasons and Arguments which I find cited by sundry learned men, to prove that Christ did redeem us by suffering the curse of the Law for us.

Learned Divines affirm, that Christ hath borne the curse of the Law two manner of ways, for our Redemption.

First. (say they) He bare the guilt of our sins, both original and actual, by God's imputation.

Secondly. They say also, that he bare the wrath of God, in due proportion to the curse of the Law, not by imputation only, but really in our stead, for our freedom and redemption therefrom. And these assertions they prove from several Scriptures, and especially from God's definitive sentence, in Gen. 2. 17.

Divine. I pray let me see how you can infer from Gen. 2. 17. that Christ did bear Adams sin by imputation; and his cursed death really: and before you go about to make your inference, consider advisedly, 1. What Adams sin was. And 2. What was the true nature of that cursed death that was inflicted upon him for his sin, and then I believe you will soon see into what grosse absurdities the common doctrine of Imputation will lead you.

First. I say, Consider Adams sin, what it was, and you will find it to be his disobedient eating of the forbidden fruit, contrary to Gods express prohibition, in Gen. 2.17.

Secondly, Consider also what was the true nature of that cursed death that was inflicted upon Adam for his sinfull eating, and that was the present Spiritual death of his pure nature, in corruption and sin; if so, then you may well tremble at the inference: for if Christ bare Adams sin, by Gods imputation and his curse really, then you make Christ to bear his Spiritual curse, and then you make him to be dead in corruption and sin, and then he had more need to get a Mediator to save him, then to be a Mediator to save others. Such wofull inferences as this will often follow upon the common Doctrine of Imputation.
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Trade. It is strange to me that you should deny the common received Doctrine of Imputation: I pray he me see what other grounds you have against it, besides the former inference.

Divine. I have divers other Reasons against it, and I suppose more then I can think on at this time. First, Consider the true force of the word impute, in the natural signification thereof, and then I believe you will acknowledge that it cannot stand with the justice of God to impute our sins to our innocent Saviour. For,

To impute sin to any, is to account them for guilty sinners: and to impute the guilt of other mens sins to any, is to account them guilty of other mens sins by participation: but in such there be no participation with other men in their sins, then it cannot stand with justice to impute other mens sins to them. Shimei said thus unto David, Let not my Lord impute iniquity unto me, neither remember that I did perversly. 2 Sam. 19. 19. By this speech of Shimei it is evident, that to impute sin to any, is to charge them with sin, and to remember it, and to reckon it up against them: but many times men do unjustly impute sin to others, either upon bare surmiseth, or out of a malicious intent against them: but God is the righteous Judge of all the world, therefore he cannot chuse but do right, when he doth impute sin to any, Gen. 18. Rom. 3. 4. We are sure (faith the Apostle) that the judgement of God is according to Truth. Rom. 2. 2. He doth never impute sin to any, but according to the exact rule of Justice, reckoning up and remembering both the number and the nature of every sin: if he impute blood to any, he doth it upon certain grounds of knowledge and truth, therefore that man shall certainly be cut off, Lev. 17. 4.

Secondly, Not to impute sin to any, is to acquit them from the guilt of Sin, as Shimei's speech to David doth declare, Let not my Lord (faith he) impute iniquity to me, neither remember that I did perversly. By this speech he intreated David to forgive his sin, and to blot it out of his remembrance, and so confequently to make him sinnifl, by his Atonement and forgivenefl: and so David doth also explain the matter, saying, Blessed is the man to whom the Lord doth not impute sin. Rom. 4. 8. His meaning in the affirmative mufl needs ly thus, Blessed is the man with whom God the Father is reconciled by his mercifull pardon and forgivenefl. And thus the Apostle doth also explain the matter, saying, God was in Christ,
Christ, reconciling the World to himself (or making Atonement between the World and himself) not imputing their sins to them. 2 Cor. 5. 19.

Therefore it follows by necessary consequence, that seeing to impute sin to any, is to make them guilty of sin, God cannot in justice impute our sins to our innocent Saviour; and if he should so do, he should be as unjust as the Jews were.

Secondly, If our Mediator had stood as a guilty sinner before God, by his imputing our sins to him, then he could not have been a fit person in God's esteem to do the office of a Mediator for our Redemption: who will accept of such a Mediator as he doth account to be vile, by the imputation of sin? Doubtless, if God had but once imputed our sins to Christ, he could not have accepted him as the immaculate Lamb of God, but he would have esteemed him as a Lamb full of blemishes, and then Satan would have found somewhat against him, and have accused him to God, as an unfit person to do the office of a Mediator: but our Saviour doth tell us that Satan could not find anything against him; and his Father did tell us that he was his wellbeloved Son, in whom he was well pleased. Therefore it follows by good consequence, that Christ did not stand as a guilty sinner before God, by his imputing our sins to him: and therefore it doth also follow by as good consequence, that God could not in justice inflict the curse of the Law upon him for our Redemption.

Thirdly, I will hereafter shew you when I come to open the Type of the two goats, in Lev. 16. that you may with as good reason affirm that God the Father doth still impute our sins to Christ now he sit at the right hand of God in glory, as affirm that he did impute our sins to him, when he was alive here upon the earth: the one follows from as good consequence from the common Doctrine of Imputation, as the other.

Fourthly, I will also hereafter shew you in opening the Hebrew phrase, in Psal. 25. 18. and in Psal. 32. 1. that the Father doth lay all our sins upon himself, by imputation, as much as ever he did lay them upon Christ by imputation: but he doth not lay our sins upon Christ by imputation, therefore not upon Christ by imputation.

Fifthly, I will also hereafter shew you in opening the Hebrew
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brev phrase is Esai. 53. 10. that Christ did make his own Soul a Trefpafler or a guilt, by imputing all our Trefpafles to himfelf, as much as ever the Father made him a Trefpafler, by imputing all our trefpafles to him: and that Christ made himself fin, as much as ever the Father made him fin: for he finished trefpafle, and ended fin,

Dan. 9.24.

Sixthly, The common Doctrine of imputation, is I know not what kind of imputation; it is such a strange kind of imputation that it differs from all the several sorts of imputing fin to any that ever I can meet with all in all the Scripture, and therefore it may well be suspected to be but a device of Satan, to darken the truth of the most needful doctrine of a Sinners justification.

First, I find that man doth impute fin to man, sometimes juftly, and sometimes unjuftly; but always with an intent to make such persons to be guilty of fin. See 1 Sam. 22.15.

Secondly, The Jews and Romans did impute fin to Christ, upon pretended grounds of guiltinefle, and thereupon they did punish him really, as a guilty malefactor.

Thirdly, God doth impute fin to man, but he doth ever do it upon certain grounds of guiltinefle: I cannot find that ever God did impute fin to an innocent; such a Tenent hath been gathered from certain figurative expreffions of Scripture, by some Godly learned, but upon due search, I find they are deceaved, and many other Godly persons have been deceived by them, because they have taken such expreffions upon truft from them: But it is more agreeable to the mind of God that every Godly Christian should with their own eye search into the true scope of those figurative expreffions: It is the duty of every wise Christian to search out the miftrial fenfe of fuch like phrases, as well as the literal; then they might soon have seen how fuch phrases have been wrested, to maintain an old received Error, which God never intended, by fuch figurative expreffions. If fuch figurative phrases had been well underflood at the first, doubtfle the doctrine of Gods imputing our fins to Christ had never been broached. Take heed therefore how you do father fuch a kind of imputation upon God the Father, towards the Mediator, as he never exercised towards any other man, left he impute fin to you for it.

Trade, I confeffe, I cannot for the prefent object any further a-

against
gainst your interpretation of the Original Curse, in Gen. 3.17. and you are not satisfied in the point in question: Therefore I will propound another Scripture to your consideration, to prove that Christ bare our sins by imputation, and our punishments really, as it is received and interpreted by a learned Divine.

In Esa. 53. 4. He bare our iniquities, and sustained our sorrows. He saith not only, he sustained Sorrows, but [our] Sorrows: yea the Text hath it more significantly [our very] Sorrows; or our Sorrows themselves; that is to say, those very Sorrows that else we should have borne.

Divine, I do much wonder at the learned Author, that he should so grossly mistake the true scope of this Text, seeing the Evangelist Matthew hath so fully expounded it to his hand, in a quite contrary sense: and his exposition is beyond all exception.

The coherence of Matthew in opening this place of Esaie, lies thus: After that Iesus had cured Peter's wife, sister of her Fever, Mat. 8.14. then in vers. 17. they brought unto him many that were possessed with Devils, and he cast out the spirits with his Word; and healed all that were sick: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaie the Prophet: He took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses. But here it may be considered how Christ did bear our infirmities and sicknesses, whether he took them from the sick, and laid them upon his own body, or how did he bear them? The answer is, that he did not bear them from the sick, as a Porter bears a burden, by laying them upon his own body, but he bare them away from the sick, by his divine Power, in curing their infirmities. And this action of Christ is allledged by Matthew, as a proof of the Divine nature, dwelling in the human nature of Christ: for inasmuch as he was able to bear away their sorrows and diseases by a word speaking, which no other man was able to do, it did evidently prove that he had a Divine nature dwelling in his human nature.

Therefore though your Author make such a great flourish about the signification of the Hebrew word, as if he saw further into the meaning of it than the Evangelist Matthew did, affirning that Christ bare our iniquities by imputation, and our sorrows (namely Hell sorrows) * really, yet it is evident that he doth grossly mistake the meaning of the Holy Ghost, if Matthew's exposition be of any credit;
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credic; yehe doth grofsly mistake the meaning of the word Iniquities, and of the word Sorrows, and of the word Bearing.

Trade. Sir, in my apprehensions Matthew doth not undertake to expound the full meaning of Elay, for Elay makes mention of iniquities, as well as of sorrows; but Matthew makes no mention that Christ bare our iniquities; therefore it may still be concluded from Elay, that Christ bare our iniquities by Gods imputation: if so, then he must of necessity bear our sorrows, namely the wrath of God, as it is due to our iniquities, for our redemption therefrom.

Divine. Although your Author doth translate the Hebrew word in Elay, by the word Iniquities, yet the Holy Ghost by the Evangelist Matthew doth translate it Infirmities; and sundry other learned men do also translate it Infirmities, Maladies, Diseases, &c. But what need is there to alledge the testimony of learned Translators, seeing the Holy Ghost in Matthew doth so translate it to our hands: and truly me thinks your Author should not be more learned than the Holy Ghost.

I grant notwithstanding, that the word in Elay, doth signify Iniquities, as your Author doth translate it; but yet the sense of the word must not be wrested, to maintain the common doctrine of Imputation, as your Author doth intend it: but in this place the word Iniquities must be taken figuratively, for the punishment of our Iniquities, by infirmities and sicknesses; and so Matthew doth express the meaning to be: and so Job doth open the Hebrew word to mean, Job 5. 6. John 5. 14. Christ bare our iniquities when he bare our infirmities and sicknesses which God had inflicted upon many persons for their iniquities, but yet he did not take the leprosy from the lepers, and bear it upon his own body, as a Porter bears a burden; but he bare it away from the sick, by the power of his Godhead; and thus Christ bare our iniquities, according to the true meaning of Elay and Matthew, compared together.

Trade. Sir it seemeth strange to me that you should make Elay to speak nothing at all, neither of Christ bearing our iniquities by Gods imputation, nor of his bearing our sorrows, from the wrath of God; really seeing it is not my Author alone, but sundry other learned Divines, that do so expound this Text. But I desire you for my better satisfaction, to make your exposition good from the coherence.

Divine. I will endeavour to satisfie your desire: The coherence
of this Text must be fetched from chap. 52. 13. as Tremelius doth
well observe: There the Prophet speaks of the most excellent ser-
vice of the Mediator, which he should most wisely and prudently
accomplish for our Redemption: then in chap. 53. he begins to
tell us, that the knowledge thereof shall be published abroad in the
world, by the report of the Gospel: but in ver. 1. the Prophet
breaks out into admiration, at the strange unbeleef of most of the
Jews that would not imbrace the report of their glad tidings: and
thereupon the Prophet doth enquire into the reason of their unbe-
lef: and the first reason was, because they held the person of the
mediator to be but baily descended, verse 1. 2. they held him to
be no better than a base and base man; without any such form or
beauty as they expected should be in their Messiah: for they ex-
pected that their Messiah should come among them, like a glori-
ous conquering King; and therefore because his birth, breeding,
and parentage, wa. lo poor and obscure, they despised him as a poor
shoo from a dry decayed stock: and in this respect the Jews said
in scorn, Is not this the Carpenter? Mark 6. 3. and Is not this
the Carpenter's Son? Mat. 13. 55. and in scorn they said, that
they knew not whence he was; John 9. 24. and in scorn they asked
him where he had his Learning? John 7. 15. In these and such like
respect, they were ashamed to acknowledge him to be their Messi-
ah; and therefore they refused to believe on him, John 12. 37.

But the truth is, if their eyes had been in their heads, they might
have seen that he was descended of the right Kingly line of David,
and that he was the next apparent heir to the Crown, if Tyrants
had given him his right, according to the common Law of Nations,
as it is evident by his Genealogy from Joseph his reputed Father, in
Mat. 1. and by his mother Mary's Genealogie, in Luke 3. But at
this time his parents durst not openly manifest their Kingly right,
for fear of Tyrants, they kept their descent only in private records,
for the latter part of their Genealogie, in Mat. 1. and in Luk. 3.
is not cited from the publick Scripture Records, as the first part is:
and in this regard Christ's parents might well say to their faithful
friends and kindreds, as it is said in Esai 3. 7. Make me no Prince
of the People, for there is no bread nor clothing in my house: for now
the Tabernacle or Family of David was fallen into decay, as Amos
foretold it should (Amos 9. 11.) Therefore seeing there was no
outward
outward form of Kingly Majesty in him, (as they expected should be in their Messiah) they set him at naught.

And therefore it was now high time for the Prophet to shew forth the true worth and dignity of his person, in this fourth verse; not from his Kingly descent, from David's loins, but from the dignity of his Godhead, which he did clearly manifest unto them, by bearing away their ininfinites from them, which God had inflicted on them for their iniquities. So then, the first part of this verse, (I mean so much as you have cited) speaks nothing at all of the sufferings of Christ; much less, of his sufferings from God's wrath. But yet the latter part of this fourth verse doth speak of the sufferings of Christ, though nothing at all of his sufferings from God's wrath for our sins. The last clause of this fourth verse runs thus, yet we esteemed him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. That is to say, though the glory of his Godhead did shine in our eyes, by his miraculous cures, yet we in our posterity, (the Scribes and Pharisees) did esteem him no better than a gross impostor, and therefore we put him to death, as a vile malefactor, and then we judged him to be smitten and stricken of God, for his deserved faults. And this interpretation is further confirmed by the next verse.

Trade. I must needs acknowledge that you have given me good satisfaction in the interpretation of this fourth verse: but yet I am not satisfied in the point in question: therefore I will propound the next verse also, to your consideration. The text runs thus, in Esa. 53. 5. 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.

From this Text sundry learned Divines do conclude, that Christ was wounded and bruised with the wrath of God, for our sins.

Divine. These words (I confess) do plainly prove, that Christ did bear divers wounds, bruises, and stripes, for our peace and healing; but yet the text doth not say that he bare these wounds, bruises, and stripes, from God's wrath, for our sins, as you would have it. But for your better understanding of the true scope and drift of this Text, I will propound and answer three questions.

1. Who did wound him, and bruise him?
2. Where did he bear those wounds, bruises and stripes?
3. For what end was he wounded?
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1. To the first question, who did wound him, bruise him, and stripe him? The answer is, it was Satan, by his instruments, according to God's prediction in Gen. 3. 15. Thou shalt pierce him in the loins: that is to say, Thou Satan shalt put the promised seed to death as a wicked malefactor, by thy instruments, the Scribes, Pharisees, and the Roman Soldiers: thou shalt pierce his hands and feet, by nailing them to the Cross, Acts 4. 27, 28. All this was done according to the determinate counsel of God, and in that respect God may be said to wound him; but yet God did not wound him as an angry judge, for our sins, as you would have it; but for the trial of his Mediatorial obedience; and therefore he is said to learn obedience by the things that he suffered. Heb. 5. 8.

2. The second question is this, Where did Christ bear these wounds, bruises, and stripes, whether in his body, or in his Soul, or in both?

The answer is, that he bare them in his body only, and not in his Soul: his Soul was not capable of bearing wounds, bruises, and stripes: Satan could not wound his Soul, but yet he did wound his body, by stirring up the wicked Jews and Romans to wound, bruise and stripe him in his body: and this Paul affirmeth, saying, That the Jews fulfilled all his sufferings, just as it was foretold by all the Prophets. Acts 13. 27, 29. If so, then the wounds, bruises and stripes here spoken of, cannot be understood of inward wounds, bruises and stripes, from God's wrath, for our sins: as you would have it.

Secondly, Peter doth teach us to expound this Text of Christ's bodily sufferings only: His words run thus, He bare our sins in his body on the Tree: (1 Pet. 2. 24.) That is to say, He bare our punishments, (for such punishments after the Hebrew phrase are called Sin,;) when he suffered as a sinful malefactor, upon the Tree. If Peter's phrase (he bare our sins in his Body, on the Tree,) had meant any thing of his bearing our sins, by God's imputation, or of his bearing of God's wrath for our sins; as you would have it; then truly his case of sufferings had not been a fit example to have been applied to the case of those believing servants, that suffered unjust bodily punishments, from their cruel Heathen Malters; the Apostle doth exhort those believing Servants to patient suffering, from the example of Christ, who did no sin, neither was there any guile found in his mouth: and when he suffered, he threatened not, but
but committed his case to him that judgeth righteously. Why did Christ commit his case to him that judgeth righteously? surely, because he suffered unjustly from the hands of wicked men, if he had suffered the wrath of God for our sins; this appeal to God for justice against himself had not bin suitabie.

Therefore by the judgement of the Apostle Peter, the wounds, bruises, and stripes, which Christ suffered, were not inflicted upon his Soul, from Gods wrath, for our sins; but upon his body only from the unjust wrath of Satan and his instruments.

The third question is this: For what end was Christ wounded bruised and striped?

Answer. The end is expressed in the latter part of the Text, by a double phrase. First, It was for the Chastisement of our Peace. And secondly, It was for our healing. Both these phrases are Synonymia, and express one and the same end of Christs sufferings.

1. First, He was wounded by Satan and his instruments; but yet it was done by Gods appointment, as a chastisement upon him, for our Peace: in the matter of his chastisement God aimed at the tryal of his Mediatorial obedience: for Christ learned obedience by that which he suffered, *Heb. 5. 8.* Secondly, It was for our Peace, for when his Mediatorial oblation was found perfect through trials, it became the meritorious procuring cause of the Fathers atonement; which was for our peace: he was made perfect (through sufferings) and so he became the Author (or procurer) of eternal salvation to all that obey him, (by believing in him,) *Heb. 5. 9.* God appointed Satan by his Instruments, to wound him, bruise him, and stripe him, as a malefactor, and to do his worst, to make him shrink, if he could, from the exact performance of his Mediatorial oblation: and in this respect, the Lord delighted to bruise him, and to put him to griefe, when he made his Soul an offering for sin, *Etsai. 53. 10.* This was the end of Gods chastisement; but Sarans end was quite contrary, for he wounded him to make him grudge at his sufferings, and to make him unwilling to dy, that so he might spoile the perfection of his Mediatorial obedience. The like wicked end he had, in wounding the body of Job; God aimed at the tryal of Jobs Faith and patience; but Satan aimed to bring him unto a sinful distemper, by his sufferings, that so he might provoke him to curse God; and that thereby he
might provoke God to punish Job more deeply.

Secondly, God's end in suffering Satan and his instruments to wound and stripe our blessed Mediator, was that by his stripes we might be healed: Stripes properly taken do not heal, but wound the flesh: but as stripes are as a Synecdoche of his sufferings, for the tryal of his Mediatorial obedience; so they have a healing vertue: for when God had tryed his obedience, and found it perfect and intire, lacking nothing; then he became the Author, or the Meritorious procuring cause of God's atonement for our healing; for by his Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement (tryed through sufferings,) he procured his Fathers Atonement for our pardon, or for our Healing; for pardon and forgivenesse doth heal our sinful Souls; as David doth expresse it, in Psal. 41. 14. and in Psal. 103. 3. This healing of the Soul is also ascribed to the Mediator, as well as to the Father; namely, as he is the Meritorious procuring cause of the Fathers Atonement; and therefore Matthew doth tell us, that Christ did not only heal mens bodies, but forgive sins; Mat. 9. 2. 6. and healing in Mat. 13. 15. is expounded to be forgiving of sins, in Mark 4. 12. and Christ faith thus to his people, I am Jehovah, that healeth thee, Exod. 15. 26. and he came to his people with healing in his wings: Mal. 4. 2. Psal. 147. 3. Ezek. 34. 16. Esai. 33. 24. And thus we are healed by his stripes; namely by the perfection of his Mediatorial obedience, (which was found perfect through sufferings,) he procured his Fathers Atonement for our healing: and thus Christ himself doth open the perfection of his obedience, through sufferings, in Esai. 50. 5. 6. The Lord hath opened mine Ear (to attend my Fathers will, through all my sufferings and tryals,) And I was not rebellious, nor turned away back (namely, I did not grudge at the sharpnesse, nor at the shamefulness of my wounds and stripes,) I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to the nippers, (not only as an outward Patient, but as an inward Agent: I freely gave my self to be tryed by stripes, in all my obedience to my Fathers will, without the least inward unwillingnes to have any part of my appointed sufferings abated. Our Saviour did twice give his back to the smiters, 1. in Mat. 26. 67. and 2. in Mat. 27. 26. He might if he would, have eloped out of their hands; he had power to do it, but he would not do it, because he minded not the fame of his flesh, but that he might do his Fathers
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Fathers will; for as his Father delighted to break him with stripes, &c. for the tryal of his Mediatorial obedience, Esai. 53. 10. so the Son delighted to learn obedience, by that which he suffered; and so being found perfect, (through afflictions) he became the Meritorious Author of eternal Salvation, to all that obey him, by believing in him, Hob. 5. 8, 9. He gave his back to the smirers, not only as a patient malefactor, but also as an active Mediator; he did in all points order his affections to do God's will through all his sufferings: and so the healing vertue of his stripes, proceeded not from his bare passive obedience, but from his active Mediatorial obedience, which was wrapped up, and conjoin'd with his patient passive sufferings, as I have expounded the matter more at large, in Gal. 3.13.

But I think it necessary to give you a word of caution more, touching this phrase, By his stripes we are healed. Take heed of the error of the Papists, for they do attribute a healing vertue to his bodily stripes inflicted upon him by the Jews, as a patient malefactor; take heed of this literal sense; for as the flesh of Christ doth not profit us, Job. 6. 63. so in like sort no outward pain that was inflicted upon his flesh, (simply considered) doth heal our souls: the healing vertue lies in another ingredient, (which our Saviour did mingle together, with his outward sufferings) and that was his inward active Mediatorial obedience, in doing God's will in and through all his sufferings: his Godhead did carry on his humain nature, with such an inward active power of obedience, to his Fathers will, through all his sufferings, that he delighted to give his back to the smirers, and his cheeks to the nippers; without the least turning away back, or without any the least natural unwillingness to make his oblation: and truly if this ingredient of his divine nature, concurring with his humain nature in the active power of his obedience to his Fathers will had been wanting, all his sufferings (which he suffered as a mere patient) could not have profited us for our Redemption; for no other obedience is Mediatorial for our Redemption, but that which proceeded from the joyous concurrance of both his natures; his flesh, or humain actions alone considered, cannot profit us; therefore not his Blood, nor his Cross, nor his Stripes, can heal us, alone considered; as the blind Papists do superstitiously affirm. They (out of their blind devotion)
tion) adore these things as the meritorious cause of their salvation; they adore the nails, and the woorden Cross, wherein our Lord was crucified as a malefactor: and they pretend it is out of love to Christ; but they might do well to consider whether it is the property of a dutiful child to love the knife of the murderer that killed his Father.

But I will leave them to their blind devotion, and speak a little more of the healing virtue of his stripes.

I hold it necessary often to remember this distinction; namely, that Christ suffered both as a malefactor, and as a Mediator, at one and the same time: he did not only patiently suffer others to scourge him, (for many blessed Martyrs have done as much as that) but he did more than patiently suffer; for he delighted to give his back to the smiters, and he delighted to give his Soul to God (in the time of his sufferings) as a Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement, for the procuring of his Fathers Atonement to poor sinners, Isai. 53. 10. John 10. 18. This kind of obedience I call his Mediatorial obedience: and yet it was performed in the time of his passive obedience: and thus by his Mediatorial obedience through death, and through stripes, he hath destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the Devil. Heb. 2. 14.

Trade. I confess I dare not deny your interpretation, neither of Esay, nor of Peter; and yet I am not fully satisfied touching that phrase of Peter, how Christ bare our sins in his body, on the Tree: I pray you therefore open that phrase a little more fully.

Divine. You know that the Rulers of the Jews did account our Saviour as a notorious sinner, and that therefore they did instigate Pilate to punish him as a sinner, in his body, on the Tree: 1 Pet. 2. 24. and in this sense he bare our sins; namely the punishment of sin, in his body on the Tree: for he was crucified as a sinful malefactor, and sin is often put for the outward punishment of sin, as in Psal. 49. 5. and in Psal. 31. 10. My strength faileth me because of mine iniquities: the Geneva reads it thus, My strength faileth me because of my pain; or because of the punishment of mine iniquity. So in 2 Kin. 7. 9. Sin will come upon us: that is, we shall be punished for our sins. So in Psal. 46. 6. They search out iniquities; that is to say, wicked Tyrants do search out the Godly, whom they count as the cheef of sinners, that they may punish them for
for their supposed iniquities, such as they please to lay to their charge. So in Gen. 19. 15. Lot was bidden to fly out of Sodom, that he might not be destroyed in the iniquity or in the punishment of the City: And Aaron and his sons must not omit any of their Priestly garments in the time of their administration, lest they bear Iniquity, and dy. Exod. 28. 43. Yea Sin and Iniquity is frequently put for the outward punishment of sin and iniquity, either from God's justice, or from man's justice, as all these places do witness, Lev. 5. 17. Lev. 10. 17. Lev. 20. 17. 19. 20. Num. 5. 31. Num. 12. 11. Ezek. 4. 4, 5. Zach. 14. 19. Gen. 4. 7. Also in sundry other Scripture the term Sin is put for the punishment of sin, by outward reproaches, wounds, bruises, stripes, and death, which God or man doth inflict upon men for their sins: and in this sense Peter means that Christ bare our sins in his Body on the Tree; when he was punished and crucified as a Sinful malefactor.

But now seeing I am upon the phrase of Bearing Sin, I will shew you how Christ did bear our sins divers ways, in several senses.

First, He bare our sins, and carried our sorrows when he bare away our diseases (as they were the effects of sin) by the power of his Godhead; as I have expounded, Isa. 53. 4.

Secondly, Christ bare our sins, as our Priest and Sacrifice, by making Atonement with his Father, for our sins; as I have expounded, Isa. 53. 6.

Thirdly, Christ bare our sins, as a Porter bears a burden, when he bare our punishments, which we inflicted upon him for sin, in his body on the Tree: as I have expounded, 2 Pet. 2. 24.

Fourthly, Christ bare our sins when he did patiently bear our sinful imputations: and this is proved by the complaint of Christ, in Psal. 40. 12. Innumerable troubles have compassed me about; my sins have taken such hold upon me, that I am not able to look up: they are more in number than the hairs of my head; therefore my heart faileth me. In these words Christ doth nor complain against his Father for his imputing of our sins to him (as the common doctrine of Imputation doth make the stream of Interpreters to speak for if Christ had but grudged against his Fathers dealing with him, but in the least measure; he had spoiled the efficacy of his Mediatorial obedience. These words of Christ are a complaint indeed, but
but he doth not complain against God's dealing, but against the dealing of the wicked Scribes and Pharisees, because they compassed him about with innumerable false accusations and imputations of sin; so that he was not able to look up, he was not able to justify himself before Pilate, because he was a corrupt Judge, and favoured his false accusers: and this interpretation needs not seem strange to any that do but seriously compare with consideration, verse 11. and verse 14. with this 12 verse, and that do but compare together the manifold tumultuous accusations and imputations of sin that the generality of the Jews did lay against our Saviour, both before Pilate, and before the multitude, at sundry times.

The like instance we have in Psal. 55. 3. where David doth complain against his malignant adversaries, because they brought iniquity upon him, and did furiously hate him: The Geneva note upon the word Iniquity, is this, They have defamed me, as a wicked person; namely, by devising false and sinful imputations against me; they took them for true reports, and thereupon, they grew irritated, and did furiously hate him; and thus David bare sin; by bearing patiently their false accusations and imputations of sin.

There is yet another Scripture that doth evidently prove that Christ bare our sins, by bearing the false imputations of sin, from the malignant Jews, in Psal. 69. 5. O God thou knowest my foolishness, and my guiltinesse are not hid from thee. In these words our Saviour doth not complain to his Father of his hard dealing with him, by imputing all our sins to him; but he complains to God against the malignant Jews, because they did lay many false and sinful imputations to his charge; for by foolishness, and guiltiness, in the plural number, is meant sin and wickedness in abundance: when one accusation could not prevail, they multiplied their accusations one after another.

The common doctrine of imputation makes this Query: How did Christ complain to God of his foolishness, and guiltiness, seeing he was in himself free from all sin? They answer it thus, That Christ doth here complain to God, of the heavy load of sin, that he had put upon him, by imputing the sins of all the Elect unto him; and thus they make Christ to grudge against his Father, which if it were true, would have spoiled the efficacy of his Mediatorial obedience: Therefore I reject this interpretation, as not confo-
consonant to the mind and meaning of the holy Ghost.

Secondly, I answer more directly thus, that Christ doth here complain to his Father against the malignant Jews, because they did most unjustly lay many false and grievous imputations of sin to his charge; yea, through this whole Psalm, our Saviour doth complain to God against the malignant Jews, for imputing to many sinful crimes to his charge; and in the fifth verse he doth appeal to God to judge in the cause, laying, O God, thou knowest my foolishnes, and my guiltinesses; if any such be as my malignant Adversaries do charge me withal: and this appeal is like to that which David makes in Psalm 7. 3. O Lord my God, if I have done this thing, if there be any wickedness in my hands; then &c. and in this very sense Chrift faith, O God, Thou knowest my wickedness, whether I am a Blasphemer, or an Impostor, or a Traytor against Caesar, as my malignant Adversaries do charge me.

And thus Christ bare our sins, by bearing patiently our false imputations of sin; But he doth not complain against God for loading him with our sins by his imputation; neither the phrase, nor the coherence will accord to that sense.

Trade. Sir, I dare not gainsay any of your Interpretations hitherto, and yet I am not satisfied in the point in question: and therefore I desire to propound the next verse to your consideration;

In Isa. 53. 6. All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all.

King James Translation doth render the last clause thus, The Lord hath made the iniquity of us all to meet upon him; namely, by imputing all our sins to him; and so consequently, The Lord did impose upon him all our deserved punishments.

Divine, I see that the common Doctrine of Imputation is very strongly fastened in your mind, and therefore you do readily take the advantage of every word that hath but any shew of a literal sense that way, though in the true sense of the place it looks a quite contrary way.

But for the better understanding of this Text, I will propound two questions.

1. Whose sins did the Lord lay upon Christ?

2. After what manner, and for what end did the Lord lay all our sins and iniquities upon Christ?
To the first question I answer thus. That the Lord laid all the iniquities of all the Elect only upon Christ; They are the lost sheep that are here spoken of; and this exposition the Apostle Peter doth make of this place, 1 Pet. 2. 24. he tells unbelieving servants, that before their conversion they were gone astray like lost sheep, but now faith he, by your conversion to the Faith, you are returned to the Shepherd and Bishop of your Souls. So then, it is the iniquities of the elect Believers only that the Lord laid upon Christ.

The second question is this, after what manner and for what end did the Lord lay their iniquities upon Christ?

First, I answer negatively, not by Imputation.

Secondly, I answer affirmatively, That the true manner how the Lord did lay all our iniquities upon Christ, was in the very same manner as the Lord laid the sins of all Israel upon the Priest and Sacrifice, and no otherwise.

1. The Lord did lay all our iniquities upon Christ, as upon our Priest; and this was typified in the Law, where the Lord appointed the High Priest to bear the iniquity of all the holy things of the sons of Israel: And how must he bear their iniquities? The answer is by his Priestly appearing before Jehovah with his Priestly apparel, and especially with his golden plate upon his forehead, wherein was engraven Holiness to Jehovah: Exod. 28. 38. and herein the High Priest was a lively Type of the Priestly Nature of Christ, namely of his Divine Nature (which was engraven in his Human Nature, Heb. 4. 3.) by which he did sanctify himself, Lev. 16. 19. when he went into the holy Place of Heaven to appear before God for our Atonement, Heb. 9. 14. as the high Priest did with his golden Plate when he went to make Atonement for all Israel in the holy Place.

Secondly, The Lord laid all our Iniquities upon Christ as upon our Priest; and this was typified by the Lords laying of all the sins of all the Congregation of Israel upon the Priests by their eating of the peoples Sin-offering in the holy Place, for the Lord gave it to them to Bear the Iniquity of the Congregation, and to make Atonement for them before Jehovah, Lev. 10. 17. Two things are observable in this verse; 1. The manner how the Lord did lay the Iniquity of all the Congregation upon the Priests; and that was by eating the Peoples Sin-offering (as Mediators) in the holy Place. 2. The end why they did eat the Peoples Sin-offering in the holy Place,
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was to make Atonement for them before Jehovah: The former part of the verse saith, That the Peoples Sin-offering was given to the Priests (namely, by the Lords appointment) that they should Bear the Iniquity of the Congregation: and the latter part of the verse sheweth the manner how they did bear the Iniquity of the Congregation; and that was, by making Atonement for them; and their Atonement was made allsoon as ever they had eaten the Peoples Sin-offering in the holy place. So then, by this Scripture it is evident, That to Bear Iniquity, and to make Atonement for Iniquity, is all one.

Secondly, The Lord laid all our sins upon Christ, as upon our Sacrifice; and this is elegantly expressed by Isaiah, He poured out his Soul to death, and bare the sin of many, and made Intercession for Transgressors: Isa. 53. 12. All these three terms are Synonimous, and they are all joned together in this Text, to declare unto us the true manner how the Lord did lay all our Iniquities upon Christs Sacrifice. 1. He poured out his soul to death, as the blood of the Sacrifice was poured out upon the Altar in great plenty; and 2. He bare the sin of many, namely, by his Mediatorial Sacrifice; for thereby he procured his Fathers Atonement, and so he bare away their sins from them. And 3. He made intercession for Transgressors, for he by his own blood entred into the holy Place, to make intercession for Transgressors, Heb. 9. 12. 14. Heb. 12.24. namely, for all the Elect, who are Transgressors by Nature and Life, and have need of a Mediator to make Atonement for them by his Sacrifice of Atonement.

Thirdly, God laid all our sins upon Christ, as upon our Sacrifice of Atonement; and in this sense the Apostle Paul doth explain the true nature of the Levitical bearing of sin, in Heb. 9.26. Christ appeared to put away (or to bear away) Sin: This was the end of his coming into the World; and then in v. 28. Christ was once offered (namely as our Sacrifice of Atonement) to bear the sins of the many: This was the means by which he obtained his end: So then, by Pauls exposition of the Levitical bearing, Christ bare our sins, not by his Fathers imputation, but) by procuring his Fathers Atonement for us, both as he was our Priest and Sacrifice.

Fourthly, If you will build the common Doctrine of Imputation upon this phrase, The Lord laid all our Iniquities upon Christ, then
then by the same phrase you must affirm, That the Father laid all our sins upon himself, by imputing the guilt of all our sins to himself; for the Father is said to bear our sins as well as Christ; for David prayed thus to the Father, in Psal. 25. 18. Bear all my sins: so the Hebrew is. So then, the Father doth bear our sins as well as the Son: The Son bears our sins Mediatorially, by his Sacrifice of Atonement, namely, as it was the meritorious procuring cause of his Fathers Atonement; but the Father doth bear away our sins by his Atonement, Pardon, and Forgiveness, and thereby a sinner is made formally just: and thus David meant when he prayed to the Father to bear all his sins, namely, to bear away the guilt of them from him, by his free pardon and merciful forgivenes: and as soon as ever a sinner hath obtained the Fathers bearing of his sins, he is formally just, and so he is in a blessed condition: and so David doth explain the matter in Psal. 32. 1. Blessed is the man whose Transgression is born: (So the Hebrew is) namely, whose Transgression is born away by the Fathers Atonement and Forgiveness: and the Apostle Paul doth so expound the Hebrew Word in Rom. 4.7. Blessed is the man whose Transgression is forgiven: So then by this comparing of Davids Hebrew word with Pauls Greek word, it follows, that the Father bears our sins from us by his Atonement, that is to say, his Forgiveness: and this Interpretation is also confirmed by other Scriptures; David said, I will confess my Transgressions to the Lord, and thou barest the Iniquity of my sin: Psal. 32. 5. and Job doth thus expostulate with the Father, Why dost thou not bear my Transgressions, and pass over mine Iniquity? So the Hebrew is in Job 7. 21. and David said, I beseech thee, O Lord, Bear away the Iniquity of thy servant: 2 Sam. 24. 10. And the godly Converts in Hosea pray thus, Take away (lift up, or bear away) all Iniquity: Hosea 14. 2. that is to say, Pard on or Forgive our Iniquities; not only as a Judge when he forgives or acquits a Malefactor, but as a Father forges his children, and receives them into favor; and therefore the godly Converts in the next words say thus, Receive graciouslly, or do us good; and indeed when the Father doth bear away our sins, by his Atonement, he doth mercifully forgive them, and receive them at the same time into favour, as his adopted children: and therefore Moses doth describe the nature of Gods pardon and forgivenes, thus: Jehovah is long suff
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fearing, and much in mercy; bearing Iniquitie and Trespass. Numb. 14. 8. and then in verse 19; he prayeth thus, Bear I beseech thee, the iniquitie of this People, according to the greatness of thy mercy: and in Ezod. 32. 31. he prays thus, If thou wilt bear their sin, &c. and in Gen. 50. 17. Joseph's brethren said thus to Joseph, I pray thee bear now the Trespass of thy brethren, and their sin: Joseph had pardoned and bore away their sin before; but now they desire a further assurance of his full Atonement: In like sort God said to Cain thus, If thou do well, is there not Bearing? that is to say, Is there not a bearing away of thy sin, by my merciful Atonement? Gen. 4. 7. Nasa, the Hebrew word to Bär, is used for bearing away, as in Ezod. 10. 19. He took away the Locusts, and cast them into the Red sea, there remained not one: and so doth the Father bear away our sins, by his forgivenesse.

And it is further evident, that the Fathers bearing of Sin, is a term of his merciful and Fatherly Atonement, by Psal. 32. 1. for there David doth describe the true nature of the Fathers Atonement, to poor believing sinners, by three terms, which are all Synonima.

1. Blessed is the man whose transgression is born.
2. Blessed is the man whose sin is covered.
3. Blessed is the man, whose iniquity is not imputed.

All these three terms may thus be opened.

First, Blessed is the man whose sins are born away, or forgiven; (namely) by Gods merciful Atonement, as the Apostle doth expound it, in Rom. 4. 7.

Secondly, Blessed is the man whose sins are covered; namely, by the Fathers merciful Atonement: for that person that covers sin in this Text, must not be understood of the Mediators covering, but of the Fathers covering, and of the Fathers bearing of sin away: in like sort in other places of Scripture, the Godly do pray to the Father, mercifully to cover their sins, or to free them from their sins; both expressions are joyned together in Psal. 79. 9. rid us free, and mercifully cover our sins, and our trespasses; thou wilt mercifully cover them, or expiate them, by thy pardoning mercy, Psal. 65. 4. Again, Thou hast forgiven the iniquitie of thy people; thou hast covered all their sins. Selah. Psal. 85. 2. In this Text the Prophet doth open and expound the Fathers covering to be no-
thing else but his merciful forgivenes. Again, God being compassionate, did mercifully cover their iniquity; that is to say, he did mercifully forgive their Iniquity, Psal. 78. 38. On the contrary, when the enemies of Gods people grew implacable, in their malicious designes, the Godly did thus imprecate the wrath of God upon them; saying, Cover not their iniquities, nor let their sin be blotted out. Neb. 4. 5. Psal 69. 27. therefore it follows by good consequence from the premises, that whenever the Father doth cover any mans sins, he doth blot them out of his remembrance, by his merciful Atonement, pardon, and forgivenes.

The Mediator also doth cover sin; namely as a Mediator, by procuring the Fathers pardon and forgivenes; for by his Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement, he procured his Fathers Atonement; and in that respect he is called the propitiation for our sins, 1 Thes. 1. 2.

and in that respect also, the burnt offerings, Sin offerings, and trespass offerings, (being types of Christs sacrifice of Atonement) are said to cover sin; namely, by procuring the Fathers Atonement. Exod. 29. 36. Lev. 1. 4. Lev. 4. 20. Lev. 5. 6. 10. 13. And so Jacob, by a guilt of Atonement, did cover Esau's face; that is to say, He did procure Esau's Atonement, Gen. 32. 20. And the mercy seat that covered the Ark, is called The covering mercy seat, Exod. 25. 17. but the 70. translate it the propitiatory covering; which term the Apostle doth apply to Christs Sacrifice of Atonement; saying, whom God hath fore-ordained to be a propitiation through Faith in his blood, Rom. 3. 25. But as I said ere-while, David speaks not of the Mediators covering, but of the Fathers covering of sin, by his merciful Atonement, which is the only formal cause of a sinners justice or justification, for it is God the Father that doth justify poor believing sinners. Rom. 8. 33.

Thirdly, Blessed is the man whose iniquity is not imputed, namely by the Fathers legal justice: A malefactor that is legally acquir'd from his sin, by the Judge, (it may be for want of due proof) hath no sin imputed to him legally: but yet the Judge may still suspect him to be a sinner; therefore the Judges Atonement or Reconciliation towards such a sinner, doth much differ from God the Fathers non-imputation of sin: for whenever God the Father doth not impute sin to any, he doth fully acquit such sinners, not only as a Judge, but also as a reconciled Father: 2 Cor. 5. 18, 19.
and therefore they must needs be fully blessed, whose iniquities are not imputed by the Father.

All these 3 terms are Synonima and they do all sweetly expound each other, and they do all set out the true manner, how sinners are made just and blessed, namely, when their sins are borne away, Covered and not imputed by the Fathers mercifull Attonement, pardon and forgiveness.

But now I will againe returne unto that phrase in Esa. 53. 6. How the Lord laid all our iniquities upon Christ; namely, not as the common doctrine of imputation reacheth, from the phrase of the Lords laying our iniquities upon Christ, for then this absurd consequence will pretendly follow; that the Father must lay all our sins upon himselfe by imputation, as well as upon Christ by imputation, for the Father doth beare our sins as well as Christ.

2 17. If God the Father was angry with the mediator because he did beare our sins, then God the Father must be angry with himselfe, because he in like sort doth beare our sins: such absurd consequences as these, the common doctrine of imputation doth often fall into. The word mess, which is translated in ver. 6. hath laid upon, is translated in the 12. ver. of this 53. chap. hath made intercession & therefore the verb signifying both incurere fecti et intercessis is too weak a foundation for the doctrine of imputation, and of Christ sufferinge Gods wrath.

Trad. I do not take this phrase of the Lords laying our iniquities upon Christ, from that kind of bearing sin, which was performed by the Priests and Sacrifices, as you do, but from an other Levitical practise, namely, from the imposition of hands upon the head of their sacrifices: every owner must impose both his hands upon the head of his sin-offering, and so make confession of his sins, upon the head of his sin-offering: this imposition of hands, did typifie the Lords laying our sins upon Christ, by imputation, and so Godly expositors do understand it; see Exod. 29. 10. Levit. 1. 4. 4. 29. Lev. 8. 14. Levit. 16. 12, 21.

Divine. You do exceeding groly mistake the meaning of this imposition, for first A private mans imposition upon the head of his sin-offering, can not in reason represent Gods act. I cannot see how a private mans imposition, can represent Gods imputing of all the sins of all the Elect unto Christ. Secondly, neither can that imposition
position of hands which was done by the Elders of Israel upon the head of the publicque sin-offering, represent Gods act in his imputing all the sins of all the Elect to Christ, Levit. 4. 13, 14, 15. for the Elders action doth represent the Churches action, and not Gods action. Thirdly, neither can that imposition of hands which was done by the Priest, Levit. 4. 3. nor by the High Priest in Lev. 16. 21. represent God the Fathers action, for the Priests and High Priests, were types of Christs Priestly nature, and not of the Father; therefore, their imposition could not represent the Fathers action, in his imputing our sins to Christ.

Trade. What then I pray you did this imposition of hands, with confession of sin, upon the head of the sin offering signify?

It signified the owners faith of dependance, upon his Sacrifice of Atonement, for the procuring of the Fathers Atonement for all those sins that he had confessed and repented of; for no mans sin-offering was accepted of God, except he made confession of his particular sins unto God, Levit. 5. 5, 6. which confession of sin was ever joyned with a promise for fake sin, Pro. 28. 13. Psal. 51. 20, 21. and the Hebrew Doctors do also say, that Atonement is not made for any man until they confess, and turne away from doing the like againe for ever, see Amos in Levit. 5. 5. and in Num. 5. 7. Atonement is not made for sins past, without particular confession, and without a promise of forsaking the same sins for time to come; and therefore the practice of the Ceremoniall Law, was to renew their sacrifices of Atonement, as they renewed their sins.

Secondly, No mans sin-offering was accepted upon the Altar, unless he imposed both his hands, and leaned with all his might upon the head of his sin offering: and this imposition, was to typise and to realize his faith of dependance in resting and leaning upon Christs Sacrifice of Atonement, as the meritorious procuring cause of the Fathers Atonement: And in this sense the Apostle doth teach us to understand this imposition of hands; Let us draw nearer with a true heart to him and with fulness of faith, Heb. 10. 22. that is to say, with the faith of full dependance, leaning upon Christs mediatoriall Sacrifice of Atonement, for the procuring of his Fathers Atonement; and the Hebrew Doctors do thus expound this imposition of hands, with confession of sin upon the head of the
Part I. Redemption and Justification cleared.

The Sacrifice. They say that neither reconciliation doth in Levit. 16. nor the sin offering nor the trespass offering, do make Atonement for any, but for them that repent and believe in their Atonement: See Ains. in Levit. 4. 4. and in Levit. 1. 4. and what other sacrifice of Atonement can any man believe in and depend upon, but the Sacrifice of Christ, who made his Soul an sacrifice of Atonement for all our sins.

And because Cain wanted this faith of dependance, therefore his Sacrifice made no Atonement for him; but on the contrarie, it was evil in God's sight, 1 John 3. 12. and therefore God did reject it, Gen. 4. 5. But Abel offered a greater sacrifice then Cain, Heb. 11. 4. because it was offered with faith of dependance upon the mediatorial sacrifice of Christ, as the procuring cause of his Fathers Atonement; and the true nature of faith is defined by resting or leaning upon, as in Pro. 3. 5. Esa 50. 10. as the house doth lean upon the foundation, Esa. 28. 16. Esa. 10. 20.

Trades. Your exposition of this Leviticall imposition, is different from the exposition of sundry learned men, who do expound it of laying our sins upon Christ by God's imputation.

Divin If you will make this imposition of hands upon the head of the sin offering to represent God's laying of all the sins of the Elect upon Christ by imputation, then the same act of imputation upon the head of their Sacrifices of praise, must have the same signification; for every owner must impose both his hands with all his might upon their Sacrifices of praise (as well as upon the head of their sin offerings) Levit. 3' 2' but they did not impose hands upon the head of their Sacrifices of praise, with confession of sin, but with the confession of such particular mercies as they had received from God: see Ains. in Levit 3. 2. Therefore that act of imposing hands upon the head of their Sacrifices of praise, cannot signify God laying of our sins upon Christ by imputation; but it must needs signify the laying of our persons by our faith of dependance upon the Sacrifice of Christ, for the procuring of God's favourable acceptation, as well when we make confession of particular mercies, as when we make confession of particular sins.

And I will now give you some considerable Arguments, why the act of imposing hands upon the head of their Sacrifices, did signify the owners faith of dependance upon Christ.
First, They imposed hands and leaned with all their might upon their burnt-offerings, Levit. 1. 4. and this they did with prayer and supplication to the Lord, for such mercies as they wanted, Iob. 49. 8. 1 Sam. 13. 12. Ezra 6. 9. 10. Secondly, they imposed hands and leaned with all their might, upon their sin-offerings Levit. 4. and then they confessed their sins. Thirdly, They impose hands upon their sacrifices of praise Levit. 3. 2. 8. 13, and then they made confession of such mercies as they had received: therefore this act of imposition, must needs represent their faith of dependance in resting and leaning upon the mediatorial Sacrifice of Christ, as the procuring cause of God's favourable Atonement and acceptance, and in this respect the Father doth testify his acceptance of all the Elect that depend upon the mediator by faith, saying, Behold my servant whom I have chosen, my beloved in whom my soul is well pleased: in him shall all the Heathen trust: Mat. 12. 18. 21. that is to say, in his mediatorial person and Sacrifice, shall the Heathen trust, or depend for their acceptance.

Secondly, When our Saviour ascended into Heaven, he gave his Disciples power to cure diseases, by imposing their hands upon the sick, Mark 16. 18. but our Saviour did not mean that they should cure sick persons by the bare act of laying their hands upon the sick, but by their faith especially, which they testified by the act of laying on their hands.

Thirdly, When Peter and John came to Samaria, they prayed for certain believers, that they might receive the Holy Ghost, namely, that they might receive miraculous faith, and other such like gifts of the Holy Ghost, Acts 8. 15. 17. Acts 19. 6. and after prayer as soone as they did but lay their hands upon them, they received the Holy Ghost: and many other signs and wonders were wrought amongst the people by the hands of the Apostles, that is to say, by their miraculous faith, represented by the laying on of their hands: but if any did impose hands upon the sick without miraculous faith, they could not by that action worke miracles.

Fourthly, When Ananias was commanded to recover Paul's sight, he laid his hands upon his eyes and said, brother Saul receive thy sight, Acts 9. 17, and so Paul to represent his faith in the power of Christ, did lay his hands upon the father of Publius, and to did recover him, Acts 28. 8.

Hence
Part I. Redemption and Justification considered.

Hence I reason thus, if laying on of hands was used in the primitive Church, as a sign of their miraculous faith, then why may not the same act of laying on of hands upon the head of their sacrifices, signify their faith of dependence upon the Sacrifice of Christ, as the procuring cause of the Fathers Atonement, and truly when faith of dependence is joined with sacrifices, or with prayers to God, then God is highly well pleased, with such sacrifices and with such prayers, 2 Chron. 13. 18. 2 Chron. 16. 7, 8. 2 Kings 18. 20, 22. Fiftly, The action of the hands in holy duties, is often used to represent the faith of the Godly.

As for example, When Moses lift up his hands in prayer against the Amalakites, it is said that his hands were faith, Exod. 17. 12. that is to say, were steady, for they were made steady by Aaron and Hur, as a signe of his faith which was steady, in the expectation of Gods assistance against the Amalakites. Again, the lifting up of hands in prayer hath been often used as a signe of the faith of expectation: when the soules of Gods people have expected to receive such and such mercies from God, they have lift up their hands to receive what they pray for: In thy name faith, David, will I lift up my hands. Psal. 63. 5. and let the lifting up of my hands be acceptable as evening Sacrifice, Psal. 141. 2.

And as soon as Ezra had ended his prayer, all the people said amen, amen, with lifting up their hands by that action, they testified their faith of dependence upon the mediator, for the receiving of what they had prayed for, Neh. 8. 6.

Sixthly, when Moses deprecated, that God would take away his Plagues from Pharaoh, he spread abroad his hands to signify his faith in God for the averting of those judgements from Pharaoh, Exod. 9. 29. 33, but spreading abroad the hands without faith, will work no miracles.

Seventhly, The lifting up of hands was commanded to be used by the Priests, as a priestly action, when they blessed the people in the Temple, immediately after the dayly morning Sacrifice, Num. 6. 23. and in Lev. 9. 22. Aaron lift up his hands toward the people and blessed them: in like manner after the reading of the Law, in their Synagogues, if any Priests were present, they lift up their hands and bless the people: and this gesture they used to signify their faith of expectation, that God would certainly bless these
those that did truly seek his face in his Ordinances: In like sort when our Lord Christ had fulfilled his ministration here upon earth, he lifted up his hands and blessed his Disciples, Luk. 24. 50.

These several gestures of the hands, did all represent the faith of the actor, and therefore we are warned to bring clean hands and a pure heart unto God's worship, that is to say, such a clean heart, as purified by faith, Acts 15, and such clear hands as are also purified by faith, Psal. 24. 4. Psal. 26 6. 1 Tim. 2. 8.

From all these considerations laid together, it is evident that the act of laying on of hands with all their might, upon the head of their sacrifices, was to signify the fullness of their faith of dependence upon the mediatorial Sacrifice of Christ, as the procuring cause of his Fathers Atonement, which comprehends under it, his merciful pardon for our justification, and his favourable acceptance of our persons, with his adoption.

Eighthly, If you will make the act of laying on of hands upon the head of the sin offering, to signify God's laying our sins upon Christ by imputation. Then the same act of laying on of hands with confession of sin upon the head of the scape goat, must also signify that God did impute our sins to Christ, as well after he was escaped from death by his resurrection and ascension, as when he made his oblation here upon earth; for the High Priest in the name of all Israel did impose his hands, and confess the sins of all the congregation, upon the head of the live scape goat, as well as upon the head of the goat that was slain for a sin offering: The High Priest cast lots upon these two goats, the one was to be killed for a sin offering of the whole Church, and then the High Priest in the name of the whole Church, did impose both his hands upon the head of this sin offering, as it may be certainly proved by Lev. 4. 15.

Secondly, The High Priest also in the name of the whole Church, did impose both his hands upon the head of the live scape goat, and so sent him away alive into the wilderness, Lev. 16. 7. &c. these two goats signified the death and resurrection of Christ: the goat that was killed for a sin offering, signified his death, and the live scape goat signified the escaping of Christ from death, by his resurrection, and so bearing away the sins of all the Elect from them by his resurrection, ascension and intercession for them in Heaven, and
and it is evident that these two goats did typifie the death and resurrection of Christ, for he was put to death concerning the flesh, but he was quickned by the spirit, 1 Pet. 3. 18. and Paul opens it thus, He powdered our sin soule to death for our sins, and rose againe for our justification, Rom. 4. 25. to read the text, because Paulyts Greek is borrowed from the 70. in Esd. 53. 12. where the Hebrew is, powdered our.

The High Priest did impose both his hands upon the head of the live scape goat; and confessed over him all the iniquities of the Sons of Israel, and all their trespasses, and all their sins, and put them upon the head of the live scape goat, and sent him away by a man into the wilderness, and to the live goat Buck did heare upon him all their iniquities, Levit. 16. 10. 21. 22. and thus by the doctrine of imputation, Christ is gone as a guilty sinner into Heaven.

But the Hebrew Doctors did not understand this imposition of hands, with confession of sin, of Gods imputation, but they understood it to be as a typicall signe of their faith of dependance upon Christis Sacrifice of Atonement; and so much the prayer of the High Priest doth import, for when he imposed his hands upon the head of the live scape goat, he said, O Lord, make Atonement now for the sins, and for the iniquities, and for the trespasses of thy people Israel, see Ains. in Levit. 16. 21. and thus the Lord laid upon him the iniquity of as all; or as King James translation hath it, the Lord made the iniquity of us all to meet upon him; namely the iniquities of the whole Church.

From this act of laying on of hands upon the head of each of these two goats; I reason thus.

If the High Priests laying on of hands upon the head of the sin-offering, did represent Gods laying the sins of all the Elect upon Christ by imputation, when he made his soule a Mediatoriall sacrifice of Atonement for our sins: Then the same action of the High Priest done upon the head of the live scape goat, did also represent the Lords laying the sins of all the Elect upon Christ by imputation, when hee ascended into heaven to make intercession for them.

2. If Gods imputing of all the sins of the Elect to Christ, was the cause of Gods extreme wrath upon him, when hee made his soule
soul a sacrifice for sinne here on earth: then by the same reason Christ doth still bear the wrath of God for our sins in heaven; for Christ doth still bear our sins in heaven, as much as ever he bare them here upon earth. And thus by the common doctrine of imputation (which is built upon this phrase of Bearing sin) you cannot avoid the blasphemous consequence.

Trades. I confesse I am not able to gain-say any of your interpretations hitherto, and yet I am not satisfied in the point in question: and therefore I desire to propound another Scripture to your consideration, which is much alleged by Divines to prove the common Doctrine of Imputation.

In 2 Cor. 5. 21. God made him to be sin for us, which knew no sinne.

How else did God make him to be sin for us, but by imputing the sins of all the Elect to him.

Divine. If this Text be rightly expounded, it will not prove any such matter as you alledge it for: for this phrase, he was made sin for us, must not be taken in the proper literal sense, but in a metaphorical sense: for it is borrowed from the Levitical Law, where the sacrifices for sinne are often called Sin in the Hebrew Text, though our English Translations have added by way of Explication the word Sacrifice: as for example, in Exod. 29. 14. 36. the Hebrew saith thus, It is a Sin: but we translate it thus, it is a Sin-offering: we adde the word offering to the word Sin, as the Hebrew Text also sometimes doth: but most usually the Hebrew Text doth call it a Sin and no more, as in Lev. 4. 3. 8. 21. 24. 25. 29. 32. 33. 34. & 5. 9. 11. & 6. 17. 25. 30. & 7. 7. 37. & 8. 14. & 9. 7. 8. 10. 22. & 12. 6. & 14. 13. 31. & 15. 15. & 16. 3. 5. 9. 25. 27. & Lev. 23. 19. & Numb. 6. 11. 16. & Numb. 7. 16. & 8. 12. & Numb. 15. 24. 25. & Numb. 18. 9. & Numb. 28. 22. in all these and sundry other places, the Sin-offering is called a Sin in the Hebrew Text, and this Hebraisme Paul followeth in 2 Cor. 5. 21. saying, God made him to be Sin for us.

The Apostle never meant that God made him to be sin for us, by a Judicall imputing of our sins unto him, as Judges doe, when they impute sin and inflict punishment upon malefactors: but the word made, and the word Sin must have another sense.

1. The word made is a word of Election and Ordination: God made
made him to be sin, that is, lay, he ordained him to be our Mediator, namely, as he ordained him to be our Priest and Sacrifice; that so he might make his soul a sin-offering for our atonement.

Christ faith thus, Burnt-offering and Sin thou hast not required, Ps. 40. 6. Christ calls the sin-offering, nothing but sin, but the Apostle in Greek doth expound it thus [For sin] Heb. 10. 6. hee joynes the particle For to the word sin, and thereby he doth teach us, that the sin-offering was not made sin by imposition of hands and by confession of sin upon the head of it: the particle For is not suitable to that sense, therefore seeing the Apostle doth explain the word sin by the particle For, I may well conclude that Christ was not made sin for us by Gods imputation, but he was made sin for us, that is to say, A sacrifice for our sins: and so the Hebrew Text doth sometimes explain it itself, by joyning the word for to the word sin, as in Lev. 6. 26. and in Lev. 9. 15. The Priest did offer it [For sin.]

2. This phrase he was made sin for us, is further opened by another Levitical phrase, taken from the water of purification, which is called sin in Hebrew, in Numb. 19. 9, but it was not called sinne in respect of any sinfull quality that was imputed to it, neither was it called sin, because it was imploied to any sinfull use: but it was therefore called sin-water, because it was the water of purification from sin, and because it sanctified the unclean, Numb. 8. 7, and because it figured the bloud of Christ which purgeth the conscience from sin, Heb. 9. 13, 14.

3. This phrase he was made sin for us, is further opened by another Levitical phrase, taken from the money that was provided to buy the publike sacrifices withall; That money was called sin-mony, and Trespass-mony, not because it was sinfully gotten, or sinfully imploied, but because it was imploied to buy the publike sacrifices for sin, and the publike sacrifices for trespass-offerings for the whole Church, 2 Kings 12. 16. Nehem. 10. 32, 33. and in this sense God made Christ to be sin for all his true Israel, not by imputing their sins to him, but by electing and ordaining him to be a sin-offering and a trespass-offering, and a whole burnt-offering of atonement, He is the Lamb of God that doth bear away the sins of the world, John 1. 29. 1 Joh. 3. 5. namely, by his Mediatoriall sacrifice of Atonement.

4. If
4. If you will stand to the common doctrine of imputation, and still lay that God made Christ to be sin for us, by imputing all our sins to him; then from the same kind of phraze, you must hold that Christ made himself a Trespass for us, by imputing all our trespasses to himself: for *E* says, doth tell us that he made himself A Trespass, or a guilt for us: to the Hebrew Text speaks in *E*.

53. 10.

And if Christ made himself a Trespass for us, by imputing all our trespasses to himself; then he must likewise inflict upon himself all the curses of the Law that are due to us for our trespasses: this absurd consequence you cannot avoid by the common doctrine of imputation, because it is raised upon the like phraze of speaking: and thus you make Christ to be his own lawgiver and executioner.

But the truth is, Christ did no otherwise make himself a Trespass or a guilt for us; but as he made himself a Trespass-offering for our sins, he is called a Trespass answerable to the sacrifices of the Law, which are sometimes called A Sin, and sometimes A Trespass: see *Ains* in Lev. 5. 6, and in Lev. 6. and in Lev. 7. 38. &c. Thus *Paul* and *Isa* do sweetly agree in their Levitical phrazes: *Isa* faith that Christ made himself A Trespass for us, and *Paul* faith, that God made Christ to be sin for us: therefore the exposition of both must be framed from the same Leviticaall Typicaall Sense and meaning.

I confess I am not able to contradict your interpretations hitherto: and yet I am not satisfied in the point in question: therefore I will propound some other Scriptures to your consideration, out of the Evangelists, which are usually alleged to prove that Christ bore the wrath of God for our Redemption, as it is due to our sins from the curse of the Law.

*Mat.* 26. 37, Matthew faith, That Christ was sorrowful and grievously troubled.

*Mat.* 14. 33, Mark faith, That he was sore afraid and amazed.

*Luke* 22. 44, Luke faith, That Christ was in an Agony: and most Divines doth affirm, that this Agony was not caused from his striving with the terrors of death, but it was caused by the infinite wrath of God, which lay much more heavily upon him than the terrors of death; and they enforce this assertion with a threefold Reason.

1. They
Part I. Redemption and Justification cleared.

1. They say that his Agony was so great, that it made him sweat great drops of blood, which trickled down from his body to the ground.

2. They say that his Agony was so great, that God was fain to send an Angel from heaven to support him under it.

Luke doth set down the appearance of this Angel before his Agony: But Mr. Calvin doth affirm that his Agony went before, and that it was the true cause why God sent an Angel to comfort him.

3. They say, that if Christ had made all this ado against a mere bodily death, he should have shewed himself to be more fearfull of death than many Martyrs have done; for many Martyrs have died with more courage and less fear of death a great deal, and it is not credible that Christ would shew more fear of death than many Martyrs have done, but that something else was the cause of it, namely God's wrath.

Divine. I will by degrees examine the interpretation of all these Scriptures, Matthew faith, That he was grievously troubled, and Mark faith, That he was sore afraid: Hence you infer, that Christ could not be thus troubled and thus afraid at a mere bodily death; Therefore you conclude, that he was thus troubled and afraid at the wrath of God inflicted upon his soul for our sins.

This interpretation is taken upon trust from other Expositors: but however, I conceive you will see reason by and by to think that Christ made all this ado against a mere bodily death only.

1. Doe but consider what a horrid thing to true humane nature the death of the body is, and then consider that Christ had a true Humane Nature like unto all other men, except in the point of sin: and therefore why should not he be troubled with the fear of death, as much as his Humane Nature could bear without sin.

2. Doe but consider that all mankind ought to desire and endeavour to preserve their natural lives as much as in them lies in the use of means, in obedience to the sixth Commandment: and therefore seeing Christ as he was true Man could not prevent his death by the use of means, he was bound to be troubled with the fear of death as much as any other man.

From these two considerations wee may easily collect what was
was the true cause why Christ was so much pained in his minde with the fear of death, not only in the night before his death, but at other times also, even long before the time of his death came. 

I have a Baptism (faith Christ) to be baptised withal, and how I am pained (or distreßed, as a woman in travel) until it be ended, Luke 12. 50.

But Matthew and Mark in the places cited, speak onely of those sorrows which fell upon him in the night before his death; Matthew faith, he began to be grievously troubled, that is to say, he began aftraight to be troubled, with the neerer approach of his death then formerly: M. Calvin in his Harmony upon these words, speaketh to this effect: We have seen (faith he) our Lord wrestling with the fear of death before; but now (faith he) hee buckletli his hands with the temptation: Matthew calls it the Beginning of sorrow, because the pains of death were now approaching: his naturall fear of death lay hid before, but now it doth betrayment, and the most inward affections of nature lay themselves open: God had already exercised his Son with some taft of death before, but now hee woundeth deeper by the approach of death; and striketh with an unwonted fear.

And in another place M. Calvin faith thus: When Jesus saw Mary and the Jews weep for the death of Lazarus, he wept also and groaned in spirit, and troubled himself, Jo. 11. 33. 35. upon these words M. Calvin asketh this question: How doth this groaning and perturbation agree to the Sonne of God? In my judgement (faith he) it is plain, that when the Son of God did put upon him our flesh, he did also willingly take upon him human affections, that so he might not differ from his brethren in any thing, sin excepted: and by this means faith he, the glory of Christ is no whit impaired, seeing that his submission was onely voluntary, whereby it came to passe that he was like unto us in the affections of his soul: and by this he proved himself to be our brother, that so we might know that we have such a Mediatour as is touched with our infirmities; and is ready to help us in that which he felt in himself.

And when Jesus groaned again, v. 38. M. Calvin faith, that it is no marvell that he groaned again: for the violent tyranny of death (which he was to overcome) was present now before his eyes.

By
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By these sentences out of M. Calvin wee may see that Christ was deeply touched with the fear of death, for he wept and groaned in spirit, and troubled himself with sorrow for the death of Lazarus: I cannot apprehend that he was afraid of the wrath of God for our sins in the night before his death, for then he could not have said as he did: I have set the Lord alwayes before mine eyes, he is at my right hand therefore I shall not be moved: Ps. 16.8. I cannot apprehend that his troubled fear did exceed the bounds of true natural fear.

Mr. Calvin faith that we must distinguish between the infirmities of our Saviours flesh, and our infirmities: for in us (faith he) there is no affection without sinne, because all men doe exceed the measure of a right moderation, but Christ (faith he) was so troubled with sorrow and fear, that he never murmured against God, but remained stedfast to the rule of temperance: Hec was pure without all spot, and therefore his affections were pure and unspotted, and yet his affections did witness his true humane infirmity; And therefore as much as true humane nature could bear, he was stricken with the fear of death: and in John 11.33. he faith thus, Mens affections they are corrupted two manner of ways.

1. They are carried with a troublesome motion, because they are not ordered according to the Rule of modesty.

2. They doe not always arise from a lawfull cause, or at least they are not referred to a lawfull end.

But at the first it was otherwise, for when God created Adam he gave him affections that were dutifull to reason, and inasmuch as they are now disorderly, it is an accidentall fault: But the affections (faith he) that were in Christ were without any disorder, because they were framed wholly to obey Gods will: so that if you confer his passions with ours, they will differ no leffe then clear water from filthy puddle.

These sentences of M. Calvin, may advise us how we doe attribute such a kinde of fear to Christ as might disorder his pure natural affections, which doubtlese would have fallen upon him, if he had undergone the pain of losse for our sins, such as the damned doe feel in hell, as the common doctrine of imputation doth teach.
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I apprehend that the quality of our Saviours troubled fear which he suffered the night before his death, did arise onely from his natural fear of death: and if he had died without any manifest fear of death, it would have occasioned wofull Heresies, yea although Christ was so carefull as he was, to give such evident proof of the truth of his humane nature as he did, yet sundry Heretiques have risen up that have denied the truth of his Humane Nature, affirming that he took no flesh of the Virgin Mary, but that his body was from heaven of a heavenly nature; it was necessary therefore that he should be stricken with the fear of death as much as his true Humane Nature could bear without sin, as M. Calvin doth well observe.

Secondly, If the qualitie of his troubled feare of death which he expressed to his Disciples, in the night before his death, had arisen from the fene of his Fathers wrath inflicted upon him for our sins, then you must also say that he suffered his Fathers wrath for our sins, yet did he, for 6. dayes before this, for 6. dayes before this, he laid to his Disciples, I have a baptism to be baptized withall, and how am I pained, (or distressed in mind as a woman in travell) until it be ended, Luke 12. 50. in this speech our Saviour doth express as much distress of mind, as he did in that place of Matthew and Mark, which you have cited, and yet I know no Expositor that did ever collect such a tenent from this place of Luke.

Thirdly, Our Saviour doth explicate the qualitie of those sorrows which he suffered at the time of his death, unto the two Sons of Zebedeous: He tells them they must drink of his cup, and be baptized with his baptisme, Mark 10. 39. He tells them that they must be conformable to the qualitie and kind of his sufferings, though perhaps there might be some difference in the degree of their sufferings, and he doth explain the kind of their sufferings, by a two fold expression.

First, He tells them that they must drink of his cup, that is to say, of the same bitter portion of death, for the term cup is often used for a measure or portion; sometimes it is put for a measure or portion of joy and comfort, as in Psal. 16. 5. and in Psal. 23. 5. and sometimes it is put for a measure or portion of punishment, or affliction, as in Psal. 11. 6. Psal. 75. 8. Psal. 51. 17. Jer. 25. 15. 17. 28. and this cup is filled sometimes from the Lords hand, and sometimes
times from mans hand: But in the present case, between Christ and the Sons of Zebedewa, the cup or portion wherein they must parallel each other, is persecutions and death from the hand of wicked Tyrants; yea sometimes the Godly do not only drink a cup, but a full cup of bitter affliction, Psal. 73. 10. yea a very great measure, called in Hebrew, Shalish, of three, which is a third part of the greatest measure, four times as big as the usual cup to drink in: see Mins. in Psal. 80. 6.

Secondly, He tells them that they must be baptized with his baptism, that is to say, they must be put to death by the malice of tyrants, as he must be, and this is expressed by the metaphor of baptism for baptizing is a diving; or drowning of the whole body under water, and therefore Christ ordained baptizing to be used of his people as a typical signe of drowning and mortifying the body of sin in his blood: But baptizing by tyrants, was used to drown mens bodies by death; and therefore Christ faith, I am entered into the deep waters Ps. 69. 2. 15. Ps. 88. 16. and in this very fence the Apostle faith, Else what shall they do that are baptized for death (namely, that are baptized with death as Martyrs are) If the dead rise not at all, why are they then baptized for death? 1 Cor. 15. 29. Godly Martyrs would never be baptized with death, if the hope of a better resurrection did not animate their spirits to suffer death for the truths sake, being thereby conformable to the death of Christ, as Paul doth intimate in Phi. 3. 10, 11.

By these two expressions, which are synonyma or equivalent, our Savior doth inform the two Sons of Zebedewa what the true nature of his sufferings should be, namely, no other but such only as they should one day suffer from the hands of tyrants: therefore the troubled feare which Matthew and Mark do ascribe unto Christ a little before his apprehension, must be underflood of his natural feare of death, and not of his Fathers wrath, and so consequently, all the sufferings of Christ were from mans wrath and malice, incited by the Devill (with Gods allowance) but not from Gods wrath: his soule was not touched with any suffering (from Gods wrath at all) except by way of sympathy from his bodily sufferings only.

Trades. I conceive you are greatly mistaken to say that Christ did so much trouble himself with the fear of his natural death only.
only, seeing Luke doth affirm that his troubled fear, caused him to sweat drops of blood, I think no natural fear of death could have caused such an agony: Therefore doubtles his troubled fear was caused by the feeling of his Father's wrath, which now had seised upon his soul for our sins.

Divine, if the circumstances of his Agony be well weighed, it will appeare that it did not proceed from his Father's wrath, but from his natural fear of death only: The text runs thus: Being in an Agony, his sweat was as it were great drops of blood, and in another place Luke doth tell us, That the remembrance of his death, did breed a great pain in his minde, long before the time of his death came, even like the pains of a woman in travail; and such kind of pains in the mind might well be called sweating paines; and as he was true Man he must be touched with the fear of death in a very great measure, as the Prophets did foretell in 1. 2. and in Psal. 69. therefore it was necessary that he should be stricken with the fear of death as much as his true Humane Nature could bear without sin, as I noted ere while from M. Calvin.

2. Adde to these pains of his minde, his earnest prayer to be delivered from his natural fear of death, for he must fully and wholly overcome his natural fear of death before he could make his oblation; and therefore he did pray often and earnestly with strong crying and tears to be delivered from the fear of death, and such prayers may well be called sweating prayers.

These two things concurring together in our Saviour, might well cause a violent sweat over all his body with great drops like drops of blood.

The fear of death doth often cause men to sweat; and earnest prayer doth often cause men to sweat.

Hence I reason thus: If the natural fear of death, and the striving of the spirit in earnest wrestling prayer, may cause men to sweat, then it might cause our Saviour's Humane Nature to sweat much more, 1. because he must be stricken with the fear of death as much as his true Humane Nature could bear without sin to fulfill the predictions of all the Prophets; and 2. because he could pray above measure, more earnestly than any man, because he had the spirit of prayer above measure, therefore he might and did so strive in prayer with God for power to overcome his natural
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tural fear of death, in which respects it might well cause him to sweat great drops like drops of blood; so then Christ had two things to doe at this time: the one as he was true Man, and the other as he was the Mediator: 1. as he was true Man, he must be touched with the fear of death as much as his true Humane Nature could bear without sin; and secondly, as he was Mediator, he must fully and wholly overcome his natural fear of death by prayer, before he could make his oblation: for by mutual covenant with his Father, his oblation must be an active Mediatorial oblation, he must lay down his own life by his own active will, desire and power; without the least natural unwillingness to die, John 10.17,18. so that if there had remained in him but the least natural unwillingness to die when he made his oblation, the efficacy of his oblation had been lost: therefore there was a necessity for him to pray, and to strive in prayer until he overcame it, as I shall further explain the matter by and by in Heb. 5.7.

No marvel then, that our Saviour fell into such an Agony in the night before his death, seeing it was not an easy thing to alter the property of nature from a desire to live, to a desire to die, and that not for his own ends or benefit, but for the sake of the Elect solely; and all this he must perform in exact obedience to his Fathers will; he must observe the due time of every action, the manner, the place, and the persons, and all other circumstances to fulfill every circumstance just as the Prophets had foretold, nothing must fail, if he had but failed in the least circumstance, he had failed in all, and his Humane Nature could not be exact in all these circumstances without the concurrence of his Divine Nature.

In all these respects his natural fear of death could not choose but be very often in his mind, and as often to put him into pain till he had overcome it.

2. Though it be very rare among men to sweat blood, and yet live after it, yet I conceive it is not beyond the power of Humane Nature so to doe: M. Foxe in his Booke of Martyrs reporteth from other Histories, that one Scanderbeg was in such an Agony when he was fighting against the Turks, That the blood hath been seen to burst our of his lips with very eagerness of spirits only; and I have heard also from credible persons, That Alexander the Great
Great did sweat blood in the courageous defence of himself and others in a desperate assault: and it is not unknown unto many that divers years since there was a sweating sickness or a violent sweating Fever, that caused many persons to sweat out of their bodies a bloody humor, and yet many of them did recover and live many years after. But if their sweating blood had been a sign of God's wrath up in their souls (as you say it was in Christ) then I think they could not have lived any longer by the strength of nature.

3. Doe but consider a little more seriously what a horrid thing to nature the approach of death is: see how many horrid expressions David doth describe it, in Psal. 116. 3. and in Psal. 28. 4. 5. and in Psal. 55. 4. 5. in this last place David saith thus, My heart is sore pained within me, and the terrors of death are fallen upon me, fearfulness and trembling are fallen upon me, and horror hath overwhelmed me: be faith, that his heart was sore pained (namely, as the pains of a woman in travail) and in v. 5. horror hath overwhelmed me; namely, with an amazed quaking, as it often falls out when the human senses are smitten with sudden fear, and so our Saviour was pained in his mind with the thought of his death a long time before the time of his death came: and therefore it must needs affect him the deeper when the time of his death was at hand.

Suppose that Adam in his innocency had grasped with the fear of death, would it not have wrought a strange disturbance in his natural affections? and would it not have wrought a strange pain in his mind? doubtless it would, and like enough it would have caused a violent sweat over all his body; no marvel then, if it wrought such a sweating Agony upon our Saviour pure Nature.

4. It is no strange new doctrine to make the natural fear of death to be the cause of Christ's Agony, seeing other learned men doe affirm it: Christopher Carlyle in his Treatise of Christ's descent into hell, p. 26. saith thus: Was not Christ extremly afflicted, when he for fear of death sweats drops in quantity as thick as drops of blood? and so: If with a godly Martyr saith thus in his Answer to Sir Tho. Moore B. 2. Christ did not only weep, but he feared so sore, that he sweats drops like drops of blood running down upon the earth, which was more then to weep: now (faith he) if
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I should ask you, why Christ feared and sweat so sore? what would you answer me? was it for fear of the pains of purgatory? hee that shall so answer, is worthy to be laughed to scorn: wheretoe then was it? verily even for fear of death, as it appeareth plainly by his prayer, for he prayed to his Father, saying, If it be possible, let this Cup passe from me: what Cup was it that Christ would have to passe from him? Surely, it was no other Cup but such as the two sons of Zebedeus must drink of: and what Cup must they drink of, but the bitter Cup of their natural death; therefore the Cup which Christ drank of, was nothing else but the bitter Cup of death.

True. I confesse that your interpretation of the case of Christ's Agony, doth make me doubt of my interpretation, and yet I am not satisfied in the point in question, because it is farther objected that Christ's Agony was so extreme, that his Father was fain to send an Angel to strengthen him, which M. Calvin thinks was not sent till after he was in an Agony, and in all likelihood God would not have sent an Angel to support him against the fear of his bodily death, therefore it was to support him under the sense of his Fathers wrath.

Divine. It paffeth my understanding to finde out how an Angel could support our Saviour under the sense of his Fathers wrath, can Angels appease Gods wrath? or can Angels support a mans soul to bear it? it is absurd to think so: God will not afford the least drop of water to cool any mans tongue that is tormented in the flames of his wrath: therefore that cannot be the reason why God sent an Angel to comfort him.

But on the contrary it is evident, that God doth often use to comfort his people against the fear of death by the Ministry of Angels: as for example, when Eliau came to destroy Iacob, God sent an Angel to comfort him, Gen. 33: and when Daniel was call into the Lions den to be devoured, God sent an Angel to comfort him, Dan. 6: and he sent his Angel to deliver Peter out of prison when his death was determined: why then should not God send an Angel to comfort the Man Christ against the fear of death, seeing as he was true Man, he stood in need of comfort against the fear of death.

2. The Lord had bound himself by promise to support the Mediator.
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Mediator under all his temptations by the Ministry of Angels, as in Ps. 91.11, 12. He shall give his Angels charge over thee to keep thee in all thy ways; They shall bear thee up in their hands, left thou dash thy foot against a stone. Therefore the Fathers sending of an Angel to comfort his Son in his Agony, was not an evidence that his Father was angry with him for our sins, but it was a sure evidence to him that his Father was highly pleased with him even in the time of his Agony; and therefore also he sent an Angel to comfort him even in the view or knowledge of his Disciples, that they might take notice of the love of the Father to his Son in the time of his Agony: and that they might leave it upon record to the Church of God to the world end: it is likely that God sent this Angel to allure him that his prayer was heard, and to allure him that his natural fear of death should be wholly taken from him before he made his fourth sacrifice for sin.

3. It is one chief part of the office of Angels to attend upon the Mediator both at his Birth, Baptism and Death; God hath ordained them to attend upon Christ and upon all his members, especially in the time of their most bitter trials and temptations; and therefore in the time of Christ's threelfold temptation, the Angels came and ministered to him, Matt. 4. 11. and this ministry of Angels in the time of his threelfold temptation, was a sure argument not of his Father's wrath, but of his Father's love, The Angels of God must ascend and descend upon the Son of Man, John 1. 51.

Thadeus. Sir me thinks the natural fear of death should not put our Saviour into such an Agony, for many Martyrs have gone through the fears and pains of death with more courage and less fear of death a great deal.

Divine. I have given you I think sufficient reasons formerly to prove that the fear of death was the cause of his Agony, and good reasons there are why Christ should be more afraid of death then many Martyrs have been, namely, for the clear manifestation of the truth of his Humane Nature, and also for the accomplishment of the predictions that went before touching his sufferings: But if he would he could have shewed little fear of death, and more true valour then ever any Martyrs have done, as it is evident by his walking in the midst of the fiery furnace with the three Noble Martyrs in Babylon: But then his death would not have been so

There is good reason why Christ should shew more fear of death then many Martyrs have done.
usefull to his children, which for feare of deatx are all their life time subject to bondage.

Trades. Sir, I must needs acknowledge that I cannot contradict any of your expositions hitherto: but yet I am not satisfied in the point in question; and therefore I will propose another place of Scripture to your consideration, which is much cited by Divines to prove that Christ's troubled fear in the night before his death was from the sense of his Fathers wrath for our sins.

In Heb.5.7. Christ in the days of his flesh when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able save him from death: And he was heard in that which he feared.

Dr. Fulk doth maintain Beza for expounding this word Fear to mean the fear of astonishment at the feeling of God's wrath for our sins, which lay infinitely more heavy upon his soul then any torments did upon his body.

Divine. I reverence your Authours, but yet I must tell you that there are other learned and godly Divines, that are contrary to them in the interpretation of this word Fear.

King James Translators doe read it thus in the margine: Hee was heard, because of his piety: and M. Tyndall, and M. Overdale translate it thus, He was heard for his Reverence: and the Geneva in other places translate the same Greek word [godly] fear: as in Luke 2.25. Simeon feared God, and in Act. 8.2. Those that buried Stephen, are called Religious men fearing God, and in Heb. 12.28. they translate the same Greek word godly fear, Let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably with Reverence and Godly Fear: and in this very sense must the Greek word bee translated in Heb.5.7. He was heard because of his godly Fear, or because of his Reverence, or pious Fear.

The Greek word doth properly signifie such a Fear as makes a man exceeding wary and heedful how he toucheth any thing that may hurt him: it signifies such a wary fear, as men have of the apple of their eye: they are exceeding careful that not so much as a little mote may hurt it. This kind of wary and tender fear is proper to godly persons: true godly persons will be very wary, not onely how they may doe every thing that may please God,
but also how they may avoid every thing that may offend the tender eye of God, 1 Es. 1. 1. and such a wary Godly fear was in Christ, (and therefore he is called the Holy one of God, Ps. 16. 10.) he feared to offend God, lest there should remain in him but the least natural unwillingness to die, when he came to make his oblation, and therefore he offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death: and he was heard because of his godly fear. And by this Greek word, the 70 translate, the Hebrew word Chafe, which signifies a gracious Saint or one that is Pious, Merciful, and full of Godly fear and care, Mi. 7. 2. Pr. 2. 8. And by this Greek word the 70 express the Godly fear of the Rubenites 1 Es. 22. 24. & in Le. 15. 31. Ye shall religiously separate the Sons of Israel, the 70 lay, Ye shall make them wary; to M. Minsloth. doth render the Greek word from the 70.

Secondly, I come now to explain the very thing itself, from which Christ prayed to be saved, and that was, that he might be delivered from death, and this petition was the Masterpiece of all his prayers.

But for the better understanding of the very thing itself, that he did so often and so earnestly pray to be delivered from, wee must consider him with a twofold respect: first, as he was true man, and secondly as he was our Mediator. First as he was true man, he prayed to be saved from death conditionally: If it be possible, let this cup pass from me. Mat. 26. 39.

Secondly, We must consider him in this Text, as he was our Mediator, and so he prayed to be saved from death absolutely, namely, to be saved from his natural fear of death; while he was to make his oblation, for he knew well enough, that if there and remained in him the least natural unwillingness to die, when he came to make his oblation, it would have spoiled the Mediatorial efficacy of his oblation, for he had from Eternity Co-vinated with his Father, to give his soule (by his own active power) as a Mediatorial Sacrifice or Atonement for our sins; 1 Esb. 10. 17. therefore he must not die a passive death, by the power of man, but he must die as a Mediator, by the actual and joint concurrence of both his natures, no man must or could force his soule out of his body, by all the torments they could devise, but he must separate his own soule from his own body, by the joint concurrence of

Christ in the days of his flesh did often and earnestly pray to his Father to be delivered from his natural fear of death, when he came to make his oblation, for he knew well enough that if there and remained in him the least natural unwillingness to die, when he came to make his oblation, it would have spoiled the Mediatorial efficacy of his oblation, for he had from Eternity Co-vinated with his Father, to give his soule (by his own active power) as a Mediatorial Sacrifice or Atonement for our sins; 1 Esb. 10. 17. therefore he must not die a passive death, by the power of man, but he must die as a Mediator, by the actual and joint concurrence of both his natures, no man must or could force his soule out of his body, by all the torments they could devise, but he must separate his own soule from his own body, by the joint concurrence of
of both his natures; and truly, if there had remained in him but
the least natural unwillingness to die, at the time of his oblation,
it would have appeared one way or other, for the Lord did
try him at his death, with sundry wrath and sharp trials, for he
gave Satan liberty to instigate the Jews and Romans against him,
and with lyon-like cruelty, to raise his hands and feet to the
cross, where he abode in great torment, three full hours together,
but in all that time Satan could not finde any thing against him,
because he testified his full acceptance by miracles at
his death, and thereupon, the Centurion said, truly this man was
the Son of God; Christ made his oblation in exact obedience to
Gods will, both for matter, manner and time; and therefore as
foone as the just appointed hour (which was foretold by Daniel)
was come; he did but say, Father Into thy hands I commend my
spirit; and at that very instant he breathed out his soul, by the
power of his God-head, Heb. 9. 14. and this Mediatorial action of
his, was the highest degree of obedience, that the Father required,
or that the Son could performe for mans Atonement and Redem-
tion; his obedience in his death, was not legal, but Mediatorial
obedience; neither was his death, a bare humane death, but it was
a Mediatorial death; it was the death and obedience of God-man:
if he had died a passive death, it had been but a humane death
and if he had performed no other obedience but legal obedience, it
had been but humane obedience; and then it could not have been
meritorious for the procuring of Gods Atonement for our Redem-
tion, justification and adoption.

But the death of Christ was Mediatorial, and therefore it was
very often in his minde, and in his speech long before the time of
his death came, as it may appeare by his often telling of it to his
Disciples, as in Mat. 16. 21. and in Mat. 17. 22. 23. and in Mat.
20. 18, 19. 24. and in Mat. 21. 38. see also in Mark. 8. 31, 32:
22. 15. John 12. 27. by these Scriptures it is evident, that Christ did
often speake of his death to his Disciples: therefore seeing this
action of his, was so often in his minde and mouth, he could not
chuse but make it the Masterpiece of all his prayers, and doub'tles
Luk. 21. 37. Yea he spent 40. dayes together in fasting and prayer; when he did first enter publiquely into his Mediators office, then he prayed for power and strength to do the office of the Mediator, and therefore it is no question but he did then pray in a speciall manner to be delivered from his naturall unwillings Nesse to die, when he came to make his oblation; for if there had remained in him but the least naturall unwillings Nesse to die at the time of his oblation, it would have spoyled the efficacie of his Mediatorial oblation.

Secondly. He prayed also to be delivered from the dominion of death, after he had made his oblation, and God heard him, and delivered him by his Resurrection on the third day, Acts. 2. 24. 27.

Therefore, seeing Christ was so deeply possossed with this Godly fear, lest he should offend God by his naturall unwillingness to die, it must needs banish far from him that horrid fear of Gods wrath which your Authors say this word fear doth signify: I confess I cannot but wonder that such learned men should expound the word fear, in this text, to meane such a dreadful fear as they must needs feele that lie under the sense of Gods wrath.

Secondly, Neither doth the word fear in this text, signify such an amazed naturall fear of death, as that other word fear doth signify in Mark. 14. 33. which word I have expounded, to signify our Saviors troubled naturall fear of death, and no more.

But I think I have said sufficient already, to prove that this word fear in Hebrews. 5. 7. must be understood of Christ's Godly, tender, wary fear, lest he should offend God by his naturall unwillingness to die, when he came to make his oblation; and therefore it caused him in the dayes of his flesh, to offer up many prayers and supplications, with strong cryings and teares unto him that was able to save him from death (namely, from his naturall fear of death) and he was heard because of his Godly fear.

Trades. Sir, I cannot for the present gainsay your Exposition of this Text, and yet I am not satisfied in the poyn in question; and therefore I will alledge another Scripture, which is much cited by Divines, to prove that Christ did suffer the Wrath of God for our simes.

In Psalm. 22. 1. My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?
Most Interpreters conclude from this Text, that God did for sake his Son in Anger, because he had imputed to him all our sins.

Divine. Many Divines I confesse, do make such an Exploitation upon the word for saken, in this text, as you do, but yet other Divines do differ from them.

Mr. Broughton faith, My God my God, forweth that Chrift was not for saken of God, but that God was still his hope. Secondly faith he, The word for saken is not in the text, but why doft thou leave me, but namely, why doft thou leave me to the griefs following from the malleice of the Jews, as they are expressed in the body of the Psalm. Thirdly faith he, None ever expounded one matter, and made his amplification of another.

But Ps 22. hath amplification of griefes caused by men, and not from Gods anger. Therefore the proposition in Ver. 1. is not a complaint to God, that he forsooke his soule in anger for our sins.

M. Roberts Wilnot also in his Treatise upon the Articles of Chrift descending into Hell, sheweth at large, that the term for saken, is not so proper in this place, as the termme leave: and he doth parallel it with the word leave, in Ps. 16. 10.

M. Ainsworth faith that this Hebrew word in Ps. 22. 1. which we translate Forsaken, may be translated, why leavest thou me, and faith M. Ainsworth in a Letter to my feife, There is no material difference betweene leaving and forsaking, so as the meaning be kept sound, for as God did never for sake his Son, Joh. 16. 32. so God did never leave his Son, 10h. 7. 29. Ps. 16. 8. But especially, God did not for sake his Son in anger, while he performed the highest act of obedience that ever God required, or that the Son could perform; when he made his soule a Mediatoriall Sacrifices of Atonement, yea, Chrift himselfe doth teftifie that his Father did not for sake him then, but on the contrarie, that he did then stand at his right hand to assist him, that he might not be moved Ps. 16. 8. Ps. 159. 31. Ps. 42. 6. Eze. 50. 7. 10. yea, he doth teftifie that he did always, able in his Fathers love, because he did alwaies keep his Commandments, Joh. 15. 10.

Therefore it follows by good consequence, that Chrift doth not complaine in Ps. 22. that God had for saken him in anger for our sins: But our Saviours complaint must run thus, why haft thou left me into the hands of my Malignant adveraries, to be K used
used as a notorious malefactor? It is not so fit a phrase to say, Why hast thou forsaken me into the hands of my malignant adversaries as to say, Why hast thou left me into the hands of my malignant adversaries.

God forsook the damned totally and penally, because there is no place of repentance left open to them: but he did not so forsoke his Son; neither did he forsoke his Son by any inward defertion, as hee doth sometimes forsoke his own people for the trial of their grace: But he left his Son only outwardly when he left him into the hands of Tyrants to be punished as a malefactor without any due trial of his cause.

Therefore the complaint of Christ lies fair and round thus: Why hast thou left me in my righteous cause into the will of my malignant adversaries to be condemned and put to death as a wicked malefactor: formerly they sought daily to take me in the Temple, but they could not apprehend me, because they did not stand by me in my just cause; But now the bowre and power of darkness is come upon me, because thou hast left me into their hands; Luke 22. 53. For now thou hast given the Devil leave to enter into Judas to betray me, and into the Scribes and Pharisees to apprehend me, and to accuse me to Pilate with sundry grosse and false imputations: Now thou hast left me also into the hands of the Roman Deputy to condemn me, and to crucifie me with Lion-like rage, as if I were a grosse Malefactor, without any legall proof of these things which my Malignant adversaries the Jews doe lay unto my charge.

And after this manner that blessed Martyr John Hus did expostulate his cause with God, for he maintained the truth of the Gospel: and yet God left him (as he did Daniel) unto the will of his malignant adversaries, namely, unto the will of the Papish Councell of Constance, so that he could not obtain so much justice at their hands as to have his cause duly tried: they accused him for an Heretike, and yet they refused to make proof of any particular Heresie against him, and at last they condemned him to bee burnt for an Heretike; In this case he appealed to Jesus Christ for justice, saying, My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me? but doubtlfully, if John Hus had thought that Jesus Christ had forsaken his soul in anger, when he used that phrase, he would nev
ver have died a Martyr. Therefore his meaning by that speech was no more but to expostulate his case with Christ, why he left him into their merciless hands in so good a cause, seeing he could not obtain so much common justice as to have his cause duly tried.

Another godly Martyr and Preacher at Burdeaux: Amon de Laroy by name, being examined with extreme tortures for the truth of the Gospel, fainted away in the time of his torments, but as soon as he came to himself again, he said, Lord, Lord, why hast thou forsaken me? Ex Fox Tom. 2, p. 130.

And truly if God had not forsaken John Hus in his good cause, his precious faith and constant perseverance, had not been so well known and manifested, for the glory of God, for the witness of the truth, and for the good example of others, neither had the tyranny of Antichrist been so much detected, nor so much abhorred of the Bohemians, as it was by their unjust proceedings against him.

And for such like holy ends as these, God forsook David in a good cause: see Ps. 43. 2. & Ps. 74. 1. & Ps. 44. 23, 24. & Ps. 13. 1-12. and in Ps. 42. 9. David doth there complain to God, saying, My God, my Rock, why hast thou forgotten me? why goe I mourning because of the oppression of the enemy? and just after this most suit the complaint of Christ be understood in Ps. 22. 1. Why hast thou left me in my righteous cause to be condemned against law and justice. I know no evil in my hands, neither can my malignant adversaries justly and legally prove those sinses against me which they lay to my charge, and yet they bear others in hand that I suffer death justly, and therefore in a scoffing manner they say, If thou be the Son of God come down from the Cross, Mat. 27. 40. 42. he saved others, himselfe hee cannot save, if God will have him, let him deliver him; and then after all these reproachfull speeches, Christ burst out into this speech, My God, my God, Why hast thou left me, Mat. 27. 46.

Christ was forsaken in his good cause, not onlyly by his Father for holy ends, but also by his own dear Disciples; but they did not forsake him in the inward affections of their souls, they forsooke him onlye outwardly through humane iniquity for a time; and thus Christ was left alone in a good cause, as a sparrow upon the
house top, as an Owl in the Desert, and as a Pelican in the Wilderness, Ps. 102.

And Christopher Carlisle upon the Article of Christ's defeat into Hell, makest this interrogation in pa. 46. did not Christ upon the Cross say, Lord, Lord, why hast thou forsaken me? was not death a great terror to him? In this speech he makes the word Forsaken to signify God's forsaking of his Son no otherwise but as he left him into the hands of wicked men to be condemned to death: and in all his Treatise he hath not one word about suffering of his Fathers wrath: and yet he makes use of Ps. 22. 1. and he doth also make use of M. Calvin's judgement in other points though he doth differ from him in his Explication of Ps. 22. 1.

Trade! Sir I pray you shew me the drift of Psalm 22.

Divine. Your request is good and necessary, for by this means you may the better see how Christ was forsaken of God: First, therefore take notice of this one thing as a foundation rule to the right understanding of this Psalm.

That the Holy Ghost hath indited this Psalm by the Prophet David in the Person of Christ: if so, then all the words of this Psalm must have relation to the Person of Christ.

This appears evidently, first, by the Title, and secondly, by several passages in the Psalm, which are applied by Christ in the New Testament.

1. The Title, by some of the Hebrew Doctors is translated The Morning Star; and so Christ doth style himself in Rev. 22. 16. I am the Bright and the Morning Star: and in Rev. 22. 28. Hee doth promise to give to all victorious Christians, The Morning Star, and in Num. 24. 17. Christ was Prophetically styled The Star of Jacob: and at his Birth a strange Blazing Star did demonstrate the same, Mat. 2. 2. 7. 9. so then in Rev. 22. 16. Christ doth Thalmuide.

Others of the Hebrew Doctors translate it, The fore and strength of the morning: but this translation may well accord with the former: for as the Morning Star is called the Sonne of the Morning, Esay 14. 12. so it may as well be called The Force or Strength of the Morning; for as a mans first-born son is counted the chiefest of his strength, Gen. 49. 3. so the Morning Star is the first-born son of the morning, and therefore it may also be called
called The Strength of the Morning.

Others translate it The Hind of the Morning; and this Translation also may well accord with the former, for a Hind is called in Hebrew _SIGNAL, that is to say, Prowess or Fortitude; but why a Hind is called The Hind of the Morning, I cannot make out, except it be by way of allusion to the Morning Star, which may as fitly be called the Hind of the Morning, as the (first begotten) Son (or strength) of the morning.

2. It is evident that this Psalm is all spoken in the Person of Christ, because the New Testament doth apply sundry passages of this Psalm unto Christ, as these places of Scripture do witness,


The Psalm itself hath two principal parts.

The first part is from v. 1. to v. 21. in which verses Christ doth complain to his Father of his unjust usage from his malignant adversaries.

The second part of this Psalm is from v. 22. to the end of the Psalm, wherein in the glory of the Mediator is described by the Gospel, namely, the efficacy of his Death and Resurrection is published by the Gospel to all the world, and by means thereof he obtained a name above every name, That at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow, as the Apostle Paul doth expound v. 29. in Phil. 2.10.

V.1. My God, my God: This term My God, my God, doth set forth the property of God; mercy to his people, as in Psalms 118. 8. The Lord is El, or, The Lord is my God that giveth light among us: and Christ doth comfort Mary Magdalene with this title of alliance in God: my God, and your God, Joh. 20. 17. and when Thomas had overcome his unbelief, he expresseth the force of his faith by doubling the term of his alliance, saying, My Lord, and my God, Joh. 20. 28. Therefore seeing Christ in this place doth double the term of his alliance in God, saying, My God, my God, it proves evidently that God had not forlorn his soul in anger for our sakes; but that God was still his Hope, and that he would at last turn all his sufferings but unto the trial of his perfect obedience.

V. 1. Why hast thou left me: namely, in my good cause to be condemned.
condemned and crucified: or else these words may be taken as an expostulating prayer, I pray thee leave me not in a good cause, but at last justify me in my cause by my Resurrection, and by revenging my unjust usage upon my malignant adversaries, as it is implied in the second part of this Psalm, and as God had promised to do for him in Ps. 89. 23. the like imprecation Christ makes upon his implacable enemies, Ps. 109. 28, 29. see also Mat. 21. 40. & Mat. 22. 7. and thus God justified the cause of Daniel, and the cause of David against Nabal, 1 Sam. 25. 39. and the cause of John Huss (at last) by revenging him upon his enemies, as the victories of the Bohemians against them doe witness to all posterities, and God doth promise to plead against those that plead against his people, Isa. 49. 25.

V. 1. Why art thou so far from my help, and from the words of my roaring? why dost thou leave me unto the will of my malignant adversaries? not withstand my prayers and my righteous cause?

V. 2. O God I cry in the day time, and thou hearest not, and in the night season, and there is no silence to me.

The diligence and perseverance of Christ in prayer to be delivered from the power of his malignant adversaries took effect: for though he died, yet he died not by their power, and God did hear him because he stood at his right hand to assist him, that so he might not be moved from his steadfast obedience by any temptations whatsoever, as I have expounded Heb. 5. 7. see also his perseverance, and how he spent whole nights in prayer, Luke 6. 12. Luke 21. 37. John 17.

V. 3. Thou sittest, O thou that inhabittest the praises of Israel, namely, thou sittest as a King upon thy Throne of Justice, therefore I appeal to thee for justice against my malignant adversaries, as Psal. 47. 8. Judge thou my cause, for I commit my cause to thee that judgest righteously, 1 Pet. 2. 23. Ps. 9. 7. Deliver me also from the power of my malignant adversaries, namely, by my Resurrection at last, and so thou shalt inhabit the praises of all my true Israel.

V. 6. But I am a worm and no man: namely, I am no better esteemed of my malignant adversaries than a base worme: they think if I had been the true Messiah, that I would never have lived so poor a life, nor died so base a death, Isa. 53. 2.

V. 7. All
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V.7. All that see me laugh me to scorn, they mock out the lip, they shake the head: thus the Jews scoffed our Saviour when he was crucified, Mat. 27.39.

V.8. He trusted in the Lord that he would deliver him: with these words the Jews did ironically scoff our Saviour when he was crucified, Mat. 27.43. the like scoffing behaviour is also expressed in Ps. 109.25.

V.9, 10. Thou art he that tookest me out of the womb, when there was no midwife in the land to help me: and thou didst also save my life from Herod by warning my parents to fly into Egypt: therefore deliver me still from the dominion of death by my Resurrection.

V.11. Be not far from me, for trouble is near, and there is not a helper, for even my own Disciples have through humane infirmity forsaken me in my just cause.

V.12. Many Bulls have compassed me: that is to say, my malignant adversaries the Jews doe use me in their fury like the fierce Bulls of Bashan, and so the Prophets foretold that they should be like them in their fierce qualities, Deut. 32.15. Amos 4.1. Hof. 4.16.

V.13. They have gaped upon me with their mouth like a ravening and roaring lion: that is to say, my malignant adversaries are like the ravening lions in their behavious towards me, whose fierce nature is described in Ps. 3.2. and in Ps. 17.12, and in Job 4.

V.14. I am poured out like water: my malignant adversaries have used their endeavours to dried out my life like water on the ground, that it may never be gathered up again; they know that I have power to lay down my life, and power to take it up again. All my bones are out of joint: by their cruel racking and straining my body upon the Cross.

My heart is melted in the midst of my bowels: that is to say, the evil spirit that is in my malignant adversaries, and their tortures, doe make my humane affections to melt in the midst of my bowels.

My strength is dried up like a petticoat, through the anguish of my torments.

My tongue cleaveth to my jaws, through vehement thirst arising from my tormentors; see Job 19.13.

V.15. Thou
V. 15. Thou hast brought me into the dust of death: here it may
jutly be enquired, whether God brought Christ into the dust of
Death, after the manner of other malefactors, or how? The an-
swer is, that God did not so bring Christ into the dust of death, as
he doth other men, namely, not so as death is laid upon man for
sin, Gen. 3. 19.

But for the better understanding of the true difference, I will
distinguish upon the death of Christ: for God appointed him to
die a double kind of death; first, as a Malefactor; and secondly,
as a Mediator: and all this at one and the same time.

First, he died as a Malefactor by God's determinate counsel and
decree: he gave the devil leave to enter into Judas to betray him,
and into the Scribes and Pharisees, and Pontius Pilate to condemn
him, and to doe what they could to put him to death, and in that
respect God may be truly said to bring him into the dust of death;

Secondly, notwithstanding all this, Christ died as a Mediator:
and therefore his death was not really finished by those torments
which he suffered as a Malefactor, for as he was our Mediator he
separated his own soul from his body by the power of his God-

All the Tyrants in the world, could not separate his soul from
his body, (Job. 19. 11.) no not by all the tortures they could devise,
till him self pleas'd to actuate his own death, by the joint con-
currence of both his natures, Job. 10. 18. This thing considered,
there must needs be an exceeding wide difference between the
death of Christ, and the death of the two Malefactors that were
crucified with him: for though they were crucified all alike by the
hand of man, yet they did not die all alike death, for the two Ma-
lefactors died of those torments that were inflicted upon their bo-
dies, and so God brought them into the dust of death, according
to the proper meaning of that curse that was inflicted upon
Adam for sin, Gen. 3. 19. But the death of Christ, namely, the se-
paration of his soul from his body was done, not by his torments,
but by his own active power, even by the joint concurrence of
both his Nature: Nebuchadnezzar could not by all his power
separate the souls of the three Noble Martyrs from their bodies in
the fiery furnace till Christ pleased, for he was with them in the
midst
midst of the fire to preserve their souls in their bodies, until the
time that he had appointed; neither could the hungry Lyons de-
troy Daniel's body till God pleased; neither could the Divil by
all that he could do, separate Job's soul from his body, though he
had leave to poison his body with a pestilent inflammation, which
broke out into grievous Biles over all his body, from the crown of
his head, to the soles of his feet; I say, notwithstanding all this,
the Divil could not separate Job's soul from his body, because God
had reserved Job's life in his own power; Job 2. 6. neither could
the Sea-drown Jonah, nor the Whale take away his life, because
God had appointed to save his life, as a type of the Burial and Re-
surrection of Christ, Mat. 12. 40. The souls of all these persons
could not be separate from their bodies by the power of any Ty-
rants, till Gods appointed time was come, and yet all these were
sinners, and therefore they were subject to death, as it was a curse
inflicted by God upon man for sin, because he was without sin;
and therefore his death must be considered as it was Mediatorial,
Active and Voluntary: and yet in some sense he also dyed a passive
death, for he suffered the feres of death as the two Malefactors did,
and in this last sense it is that Christ faith in this Text, Thou hast
brought me into the dust of death: Thou didst it, because thou didst
give Satan leave to do it; and Satan did it, because he did stir up
his Instruments to do it; and his Instruments the Scribes and Pha-
risees did it, because they did endeavor to do it; for what wicked
men endeavor to do, they are often said to do, as is declared at large
in the second part: and what God did foretell should be done by
Satan to the seed of the Woman, he may be said to do it; Gen.
3. 15. see also Ainfw. in Gen. 49. 7. and in Gen. 48. 22.

V. 16. Dogs have compassed me, the Assembly of the wicked
have enclosed me.

The high Priests and Rulers of Israel, together with Pilat and
the Roman Souldiers, did assemble themselves like so many dogs
to worry our Saviour to death, Mat. 20. 18. 19. Acts. 4. 25, 26,
27. and you may see the rancorous disposition of dogs in Job 30. 1.
Prov. 26. 11. Mat. 7. 6. Phil. 3. 2. Rev. 22. 15. Psal. 59. 7, 15.

They have Lion-like pierced my Hands and my Feet: In the
Original there is a double reading in the margent Caare [like
a Lion] and in the Text Cara [They digged or pierced; name-
ly,
And the Massorites Bible doth follow both readings [They did bite as a Lion.] I agree with M. Ainsworth and M. Broughton, that both readings are alike the work of the holy Ghost, because sometimes the holy Ghost doth annex both readings together; as in Luke 4. and from that example Translators may well join both readings together, especially where no uncouthness of phrase is put into the Translation, as in this Text they may set well together; and therefore I join them together thus, They have Lion-like pierced. This piercing is borrowed from Gen. 3. 15, where God foretold that the feet or foot-soles of the seed of the Woman should be pierced; but David in this Psalm doth foretell, that his hands should be pierced as well as his feet: and the manner also is here expressed, namely, that it should be done with Lion-like cruelty; David did not think one word sufficient to set out the rage of the Scribes and Pharisees, and therefore he doth couple two words together to express it; see with what violence and eagerness of spirit the Scribes and Pharisees did persecute our Saviour, to have his body rent and torn by crucifying, in Mat. 27. 18. 35. it was done with Lion-like cruelty.

V. 18. They parted his Garments among them, and cast lots upon his Vesture: and this they did, because his coat was without seam, Mat. 27. 35. John 19. 23, 24.

V. 19, 20, 21. Be not far from me, O Lord, my strength, but hasten to help me: Deliver my soul from the sword, and my darling from the power of these Dogs, and save me from the Lions, and from the horns of these Unicorns: Answer thou me; that is to say, Hear, and Deliver me, as Psal. 3. 6. Psal. 38. 17. namely, by delivering my soul out of the hands of all my malignant Adversaries by my resurrection, and by revenging my unjust usage upon them.

V. 22. I will declare thy Name to my Brethren, in the midst of the Congregation (namely, of thy eke Church) I will praise thee: See also Psal. 109. 31. Acts 2. 25.

Thus have I shewed unto you the dependance of the first part of this Psalm, by which you may see how the scope of this Psalm doth set out the sufferings of Christ to proceed not from Gods wrath, but from mans wrath only: neither do I find any thing of Gods wrath, either in this, or in any other Psalm; and yet Christ doth make
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Mr. Kytson and Justice, and I have no complaint to God of his sufferings, both in this Psalm, and in Psalm 69, as any can be found in all the Bible: Therefore if he had suffered any thing from God's wrath at all, how could David in these Psalms have past it over without any mention of it?

Trade. Sir, I cannot contradict your Exposition of this Psalm, and yet I am not satisfied in the point in question, and therefore I will propose another Scripture to your consideration, which is much cited by Divines, to prove that Christ bare the Curse of the Law for our Redemption: In Gal. 3. 13.

Christ hath redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, being made a Curse for us; as it is written, Cursed is every one that hangs upon a Tree.

In these words it seems to me that Christ bare the curse of the Law, even the eternal curse, because he bare our sins by God's imputation, and the hanging on the Tree was a typical sign of it.

Divine. For your better understanding of this Scripture, you must first observe the Apostle's drift in this Epistle, which chiefly is to prove, that we are justified by faith only, without the works of the Law: which he proves by many Arguments; but in this Text he proves it thus, By the Law (faith he) we are cursed, as it is written in Deut. 27. 26. Cursed is every one that continues not in all things that are written in the book of the Law to do them; and from this curse no corruption of Adam is able by his own works to free himself.

But faith the Apostle (in v. 13.) Christ hath (freed us; or) Redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, when he was made a Curse for us; as it is written (in Deut. 21. 23.) Cursed is every one that is hanged upon a Tree.

In this Text the Apostle speaks of a two-fold curse.

1. He speaks of the Eternal Curse, in v. 10.

2. He speaks of an outward temporary Curse in v. 13. such as all men do suffer that are hanged upon a Tree.

The Apostle brings in this latter curse in a Rhetorical manner only; saying thus, Christ hath redeemed us from the Curse of the Law (namely from the eternal curse, at the very self same time) when he was made (not that curse, but) a Curse for us; according to Deut. 21. 23.
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Trade. Sir, I conceive you do not fully express the meaning of that Curse in Deut. 21. 22. for there it is said, that he that is hanged is the Curse (not of man, but) of God: And that rare learned Divine Martin Luther in Gal. 3. 13. saith, That although these two sentences, He was made a Curse for us, and He was made Sin for us, may well be expounded after this manner, He was made a Curse, that is to say, a Sacrifice for the Curse, and Sin, that is to say, a Sacrifice for Sin; yet in my judgement (laith he) it is better to keep the proper signification of the words, because there is greater force and coherence therein: and in the conclusion he affirmeth, That Christ bare all our sins by Imputation, and that he bare the Curse of the Law really for us: and in respect of bearing our sins by Imputation, he saith, that Christ was the greatest Sinner in the World, namely, the greatest Thief, Whoremaster, Blasphemer, &c.

Divine, I confess that Dr Luther was a rare Instrument in the Church of God in his days, and he hath expounded the Epistle to the Galatians better than many others; but yet I believe he is far from the Apostles meaning in this matter, and it seemeth to me that he had some doubt also about his exposition: But he thinketh that the latter curse may well be expounded of his Sacrifice for the curse (and yet that expostition is not right neither) for this latter curse is no other than an outward temporary curse; for the Text in Deut. 21. 22. runneth us, If there be in a man a sin worthy of death, and thou hang him upon a Tree, &c. then he that is hanged is the curse of God. What curse of God is it that is meant? I answer, That may be discerned by taking in notice of what kind of persons, and for what kind of sins this curse of God doth fall upon any.

First, Take notice of the kind of persons that are here said to be the Curse of God; and the Text describes them thus; namely, He that is put to death as a Malefactor by the Magistrate.

Secondly, Take notice of the kind of sins that are said to deserve his curse of hanging upon a Tree; and they are described by this general term; A sin worthy of death, namely, of this death, of hanging upon a Tree: Hence it is evident, that not every sin that deserved death [by Thos. the Sanhedrin] is here meant, but such sins only are meant as deserved a double death [by Thos. the Sanhedrin] namely, such sins as deserved 1. Stoning to death, and 2. such as deserved the Hanging up of their bodies upon a Tree, after they were stoned to death.

M.Calvin
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M. Calvin in Deut. 21. 23. faith, THAT THE HANGING OF CHRIST UPON A TREE WAS NOT AFTER THE MANNER THAT IS HERE SPOKEN OF, FOR SUCH AS WERE STONED TO DEATH AMONG THE JEWS, WERE ALSO HANGED UPON A GIBBET AFTER THEY WERE DEAD, AND ALTHOUGH THEY WERE NOT STRANGLED NOR BEHEADED, BUT OVERWHELMED WITH STONES, YET WERE THEIR BODIES TAKEN AND HANGED UP AFTERWARDS, THAT ALL OTHERS MIGHT TAKE EXAMPLE AT THEM.

And M. Goodwin in Moses Rites, doth from the Hebrew Doctors, reckon up the particular sins for which men were first stoned to death, and after hanged, to be eighteen in number.

And M. Ainsworth doth also say, THAT THE HEBREW DOCTORS DO NOT UNDERSTAND THIS HANGING, OF BEING PUT TO DEATH BY HANGING, BUT OF HANGING A MAN UP AFTER HE WAS STONED TO DEATH; WHICH WAS DONE FOR THE GREATER DETRIMENT OF SUCH HAINOUS MALEFACTORS: AND HE RECKONS UP EIGHTEEN PARTICULAR CAPITAL OFFENCES (FROM THE HEBREW DOCTORS) THAT WERE FIRST PUNISHED BY STONING TO DEATH, AND THAT BY HANGING UP THEIR DEAD BODIES UPON A TREE.

And the rebellious son in Deut. 21. 21. is brought as an instance of this double punishment; he was first stoned to death, and then he was hanged up upon a tree after he was stoned to death: and from this particular instance Moses doth infer in v. 22. THAT IF THERE BE IN A MAN (THAT IS TO SAY, IN ANY OTHER MAN BEYOND THE REBELLIOUS SON) A SIN (THAT IS TO SAY, ANY OTHER CAPITAL SIN) THAT IS WORTHY OF DEATH, (NAMELY, OF THIS DOUBLE KIND OF DEATH) AND THOU (THE HIGH SANHEDRIN) DO HANG HIM UPON A TREE (THAT IS TO SAY, AFTER HE IS FIRST STONED TO DEATH) THOU SHALT NOT LET HIS CARCASS REMAIN ALL NIGHT UPON THE TREE, (THAT IS TO SAY, NOT AT ALL IN THE NIGHT) BUT THOU SHALT SURELY BURY HIM IN THE SAME DAY, AT THE GOING DOWN OF THE SUN; AND THE REASON IS ADDED, BECAUSE HE IS THE CURSE OF GOD; NAMELY, BECAUSE SUCH SINNERS ARE MORE EMINENTLY CURSED OF GOD THAN OTHER MALEFACTORS, BECAUSE THEY WERE PUNISHED WITH THE HEAVIEST KIND OF DEATH THAT THE JUDGES OF ISRAEL DID USE TO INFlict UPON ANY MALEFACTORS.

But in some capital cases God dispensed with this Law; as for example, Rechab and Baanah were by David's commandment first slain, and then their hands and feet (which were the instruments of their treason) were hanged up many days together, for the greater detriment of such like Traytors; 2 Sam. 4. 11, 12. And so were those sons of Elisha served, in Numb. 25. 4, that the bodies...
bodies of the chiefest of them were slain, and then their dead bodies were hanged up to appease the Lords wrath: And Achan was first stoned to death, and afterwards his dead body was condemned to be burned, and all that he had. 10. 7. 25.

Having thus opened the true nature of the Curse in Deut. 21, let us now examine in what sense the Apostle doth apply it to the death of our Savior; for I confess there is some likenss, and yet I say also, that there is a great deal of difference.

First, Every kind of death is the curse of God for sin, Gen. 3. 19. But such kind of sinners as are put to death by the Magistrate for capital sins, are more eminently cursed than those that dy by sickness; and therefore, the greater punishment they suffer from the Magistrate, the greater outward curse they suffer.

Tran. I grant that the hanging upon a Tree in Moses, was but an outward curse, but yet it was a type of that Eternal curse which Christ must suffer when he was hanged upon the Tree for our Redemption; and so much the Apostle Paul doth say at in Gal. 3. 13.

Divine, I think I have sufficiently proved that God did not appoint the hanging upon a Tree to be a type of the Eternal Curse, for if it had bin appointed by God to be a type of the Eternal Curse, then every one that is now hanged upon a Tree, should be eternally cursed, and then divers godly Martyrs that were crucified as Christ was, are eternally cursed, and then the penitent thief was eternally cursed.

But if the circumstances of the Text be well marked, they will tell you plainly that this hanging upon a Tree cannot be a Type of the Eternal Curse: For

First, This Law of Moses must not be understood of putting any man to death by hanging, but of hanging a dead body upon a Tree after it was first put to death by stoning: But Christ was crucified, or hanged upon a Tree not after he was dead, but whiles he was alive.

Secondly, This Hanging in Moses was done by the Judicial Law, and by the Civil Magistrates, and not by the Ceremonial Law, nor by the Priests.

Thirdly, This Hanging in Moses was commanded to be practised by the Magistrates of the Jews Common-wealth, But the death which Christ suffered, was a Roman kind of death; for Christ
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Christ was not condemned to death by the Scribes and Pharisees, but by Pilate the Roman Deputy. John 18. 31.

The Jews had no power in their hands at that time to put any man to death, for if they had had the power of life and death in their own hands at that time, they would first have stoned our Saviour to death, because they made him guilty of Blasphemy and Witchcraft, John 19. 7. John 10. 33. which sins were punished by stoning to death by Mosaic Law. But the Jews own Writers do testify that the Romans had taken away the power of Life and Death from them before this time, namely forty yeers before the Destruction of Jerusalem, which was about two yeers before the death of Christ; That the saying of Jesus might be fulfilled, signifying what death he should dy; John 8. 32. For Jesus had told his Disciples in Matth. 10. 19. That the Priests and Scribes should deliver him to the Gentiles, to mock, and to scourge, and to crucifie him: and just so it fell out, for the Scribes and Pharisees could not condemn him to death, therefore they delivered him to Pilate the Roman Deputy, to be condemned and crucified; and then the Roman Souldiers took him, and led him to the Cross; they did mock him, and crown him with thorns, they whipt him with whips, and nailed him to the Cross. This kind of Roman death was used by them for the punishment of notorious malefactors, especially for the punishment of thieves, and fugitive slaves; as M. Goodwin noteth in his Roman Antig. lib. 3. c. 4.

In these particulars you see there was a great difference between the Roman Crucifying, and the Hanging upon a Tree among the Jews.

And yet there was some likeness in this kind of death, for both Jews and Romans did hang the basest Malefactors upon a Tree, for a signe of their greater infamy, and so consequentely, for a signe of their greater outward curse.

Hence I reason thus, when the Romans did put Christ to that kind of death which they used to inflict upon their basest fugitive slaves, they made him cursed in his death in the highest degree they could.

And yet at that very self same time Christ did redeem us from Christ dyed both the Curse of the Law, even from the Eternal Curse, because Christ dyed not only as a malefactor by the power of the Roman Souldiers,
but he dyed also as a Mediator by his own Mediatorial power: In the Jews account he dyed as a malefactor only, but in God's account he dyed as a Mediator only; In the Jews account he dyed a passive death as a malefactor, by the power of man, but in God's account he dyed by the active power of his own God-head, even by the joint concurrence of both his Natures; In the Jews account he dyed a common cursed death, as the other malefactors did that were crucified with him, but in God's account he dyed a supernatural death, even by the power of his own God-head; In the Jews account his death was vile and base, but in God's account it was the highest degree of obedience that the Mediator could perform for man's Redemption; and therefore it was accepted of God as a Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement, and as the meritorious procuring cause of God's Atonement to all the Elect, for their full Redemption, Justification, &c. This act of Christ was no corruptible thing, but it was an everliving act of Mediatorial obedience, it was no legal obedience, nor was it any humane act of obedience, as all legal obedience must be; but it was a super-natural act of obedience, it was no less than a Mediatorial oblation; and therefore it was the meritorious procuring cause of our Redemption from the Curse of the Law, even at that very same time when Christ was made a Curse for us, by Hanging as a Malefactor upon a Tree. The Jews made no other account but that they had put Christ to death (by those Torments which the Roman Soldiers did inflict upon him) as a malefactor; but yet notwithstanding they were greatly deceived, for he shed his own blood; I mean, he did separate his own soul from his own body by his own active power; and therefore as soon as the just appointed hour was come wherein God had appointed him to make his own oblation, He did but say, Father, Into thy hands I commend my Spirit; and at that very instant he yielded up his soul into the hands of God, as a Mediatorial Sacrifice for our Redemption from the Curse of the Law.

Therefore the Tree on which Christ was crucified as a Malefactor, cannot be the Altar; neither were the Roman Soldiers the Priests by whom this Mediatorial Sacrifice was offered up to God; But it was his own God-head that was the Priest, and his own God-head was the Altar by which he offered up a Soul to God as a Mediatorial
a mediatorial sacrifice, for the procuring of our Redemption from
the curse of the Law.

Trade. Sir, I acknowledge that you have given me good satis-
faction touching the curse which Christ suffered in his body upon the
Tree, but yet I am not satisfied in the point in question; for good
Divines do affirm, that Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of
the Law, not by his bodily, but by his soul sufferings only, which
God inflicted upon his soul when his body was crucified upon the
Tree.

Divine. This kind of reasoning is very absurd, for as Mr.
Broughton well observeth, if Christ suffered the wrath of God in his
soul only to redeem our souls, and not in his body, to redeem our bodies,
then our bodies are not yet redeemed.

But if you will make Christ to be a perfect Redeemer, then you
must make him to redeem our bodies as well as our souls; therefore if
Christ suffered the wrath of God in his soul, to redeem our souls from
the eternal curse, he must also suffer the wrath of God in his body,
to redeem our bodies from the eternal curse, or else our bod-
ies must still continue under the eternal curse, though our souls
be redeemed by his soul sufferings: Is not this to make Christ an
imperfect Redeemer: and to leave a doubting conscience in a la-
byrinth of doubts and Queries?

The truth is, I find much uncertainty among Divines what to
affirm in this point: for first, some do affirm that Christ suffered
the wrath of God in his soul only. Secondly, others affirm that
he suffered the wrath of God in his body as well as in his soul
to redeem our bodies from God's wrath as well as our souls.

Urfsinus doth plainly deny that Christ suffered the pains of the
damned in his body: in Catech. p. 512, printed 1611. these
pains (faith he) he suffered not in his body; for the sufferings of
his body were only external: therefore (faith he) he suffered these
pains in his soul: and yet in the same Catech. p. 487, he affirms
that Christ suffered the wrath of God both in his body and in his
soul to deliver our souls and bodies from eternal damnation.

The like contradiction may be shewed in sundry other Authors,
Polanus divides the sufferings of Christ into outward and inward,
and he applies his suffering of Hell torments to his inward soul suf-
fierings only: see his Substance of Religion. p. 141, 144. and Bu-
M
Singius doth the like p. 160. and what do these contradictions argue else, but that they were in a great uncertainty in their own minds, how to explicate the true meritorious price of our Redemption.

Tradef. I confess I am at a loss what to think, that none of all these Scriptures should hit, which I have alluded, and which many learned Divines do allude, as the most principal Scriptures to prove that Christ did suffer the wrath of God for our Redemption.

Divine. We see but in part, and know but in part; God hath some truth to bring to light in every age: the common doctrine of imputation hath much obscured the meritorious price of our Redemption and Justification; to that some Scholars do allude. Some Scriptures to prove that Christ suffered the wrath of God, and yet they speak nothing at all of any part of his sufferings, as Ezek. 63. 3. I have trodden the wine-press of God's wrath alone; but they greatly mistake the meaning of this text, for this text speaketh nothing at all of any part of Christ's sufferings, neither from God's wrath, nor from man's wrath: it speaks only of the triumphant victories of Christ over his and his Churches enemies: others allude, Rev. 19. 15. which hath no more affinity with Christ's sufferings then the former. Others allude the Article of Christ's descent into Hell to prove that Christ suffered the torments of hell in his soul for our redemption: But the truth is, that Article speaks only of his foul passage from his body to Hades, which hath a double lot (when it is applied to souls departed) a place of joy, and a place of torment; so that all souls (both good and bad) go to Hades as soon as they are seperated from the body: the bad do go to the place of torment in Hades, and the good do go to the place of pleasure in Hades: therefore seeing Christ was a good man, even the Holy one of God, he must needs go to the place of pleasure in Hades, even to the paradise Luke 23. 43. and that Hades doth comprehend under it a double lot (as great Britain doth comprehend England and Scotland) is evident by the use of the Greek word in many Greek Authors: and according to this sense Mr. Robert Willet hath expounded this Article, wherein he doth also approve of the judgement of Mr. Broughton in his explication upon this Article.
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Tract. I confess I am at a loss what to think touching the point of Christ's sufferings; whether he suffered the Torments of Hell for our Redemption or no: and therefore for my better satisfaction I desire you to describe unto me the Torments of Hell; for by that means I shall be the better able to judge whether Christ did suffer the Torments of Hell for our Redemption or not.

Divine. I do much approve your motion; and therefore I will labor to satisfy your desire.

The Torments of hell are usually divided into two parts.

1. Into the pain of loss.
2. Into the pain of sense.

1. The pain of loss, is the privation of God's favour by an everlasting separation: This is the first part of the Torments of hell which is death Eternal; for as the favour of God through Christ is the fountain of life, because it is the beginning of life eternal: Psal. 33. 5. To the contrary, to be totally separated from God's favour by an eternal separation, must needs be the beginning of hell Torments or of death eternal; for he that is once separated totally from the favour of God, is at the same time separated from all other comforts, he is separated from the company of millions of Angels, and from the general assembly of the first born that are written in Heaven, and from the spirits of just men made perfect; and from Jesus Christ the mediator of the New Testament, whose blood speaks mightier things than the blood of Abel, Hebr. 12. 22, 23. And this pain of loss is accounted the heaviest part of the Torments of hell, by all divines.

But yet I think it needful to give you a word of caution, that you do not mistake my meaning in this description of the first part of the Torments of hell; for I do not mean that every loss of God's favour is to be accounted as a part of the Torments of hell for then many of God's dear children should often suffer the Torments of Hell in this life; neither do I mean that Reprobates (though they be totally and for ever separated from the favour of God in Christ) do suffer this part of the Torments of hell in this life; for as long as they live in this life, they do partake of many common favours from God; therefore as long as they live in this life, God doth not confine them with such a total forbidding as he doth after
this life: God forsakes wicked men in this life but in part only; he doth not leave wicked men in this life to be as wicked as they would be, but as long as they live in this life, he doth put a bridle upon their corruptions, and by his restraining grace doth keep them in, so that they cannot be as wicked as else they would be; and this is no small favor of God which he doth vouchsafe to reprobates as long as they live in this world: yea the very devils themselves as long as they live in this world (being Spirits) in the aire, are not so forsaken of God as they shall be at the day of judgement, for as yet they are not in hell, but in this aire, and therefore they have not their full torments as yet; and so much the very devils themselves did acknowledge to Christ, saying, are these come to torment us before the time? Mat. 8. 29. this speech implies a prayer: I pray thee torment us not to the full, for the time of our full torment is not yet till the day of judgement be come.

Hence I may well conclude; that the pain of los which the damned do suffer in hell, is of a far more terrible nature then any wicked man can feel or apprehend in this life: but how terrible it is, I am not able fully to describe, but in general I may well call it a total seperation from God's favour with no any limitation of time: and it is called an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, 2 Thes. 1. 9.

And yet this pain of los may be a little further explained, by opening the term second death, which may be in part described by comparing it to the first death, which I have at large described to be our spiritual death, or a los of the life of our first pure nature; or, I may call it a death in corrupt and sinful qualities, as I have opened Gen. 2. 17. yea all other miseries which fall upon us in this life, even till our bodies be rotten in the grave, I call them altogether the first death, because they do all befall us in this world therefore on the contrary the second death must needs imply a deeper degree of corrupt and sinful qualities then did befall us under the first death; for though Adam and his posterity became dead in corrupt and sinful qualities as soon as ever he had but eaten of the forbidden fruit, yet the Lord in mercy did mingle some restraining grace with those corrupt and sinful qualities, so that the very reprobates cannot be so bad as they would as long as they live in this life: but as soon as they do but once come into the very
very place of hell it self, they shall have their full torment of the Second death, and then doubtles God will utterly take from them all restraining grace, so that they shall have full liberty to exercise their corrupt and sinful qualities, they may sin as much as they will, without any mixture of restraining grace, and then their liberty of sinning shall fill up the measure of their torments to the full; then they shall hate God with a total and an endless hatred, and God will hate them with a total and an endless separation from his favour: Mr. Broughton speaking of the torments of the damned faith, that their hatred against God is the greatest part of their punishment; neither can they moderate their hatred against God and his Will (as the reprobates do in this life) because God denies them the help of his restraining grace, they hate God because of his justice and holiness, therefore they shall be tormented with the gnawing worm of an accusing conscience, which shall never die; Esay 56. 24, and thus the very term second death doth plainly tell us, that it is such a degree of death as surpasseth all the deaths of this life, and that the full measure of it cannot be inflicted upon any man till this life is ended, and then their end shall be without mercy. Jam. 2. 13.

The Second part of the torments of hell: is the pain of sense, or the sense of all torturing torments;
1. Inflicted upon the foulés of all reprobates as soon as they dy; and secondly upon their bodies also at the day of judgement. Rev. 20. 14. Rev. 21. 8. No tongue can fully describe the true extent of these torments, yet we may guess at the extremity of them by their particular Scripture phrases.
1. The Lord is said to prepare a fire for them; Mat. 25. 41, and this fire is fierce and vehement, for the pile thereof is fire, and much wood; and the breath of the Lord like a stream of Brimstone doth kindle it. Esay 30. 33, and Daniel lay the four persecuting Monarchies tormented in a River of fire before the Throne of God, Dan. 7. 10, and John describes the pain of it, he upon the damned by a lake of fire, which is the second death. Rev. 19. 14.
2. The torments of hell are aggravated, because they are said to be endless eternal. 2 Pet. 2. 4. Jude 1. 7, Mat. 5. 41, and the smock of their torments is said to ascend for evermore Rev. 14. 10, 11. neither hate they any more penances, Col. 1. 25, and therefore
fore they continued under the Torments of despairation for ever, neither have they any rest day or night. Rev. 14.10,11.

3. They have no means to help them out of their misery, for the mediator is become their angry judge, and the good Angels do cast them into the place of their Torments, and there they are shut up as in a prison. 1 Peter 3.19. being fast bound hand and foot therein, Matthew 22.13. and the Lord hath set a gulf of separation between them and the blessed in heaven, Luke 16. therefore is it not possible they should ever get out thence.

4. They have none to pity them in their torments with the least drop of water to cool their tongues, Luke 16:

5. As God's Rejection is the principal efficient cause of their damnation, so Jesus Christ the mediator is the principal instrumental cause thereof; because they believed not in him, that was promised to be the seed of the woman, to break the devil's head, therefore he doth pour out his wrath upon them for ever. Ps. 2.12. Luke 19.27. Rev. 6.16,17. with Rev. 14.10. John 3.18.36. And thus in some measure I have unfolded unto you the torments of hell, which also are sometimes called the Second death.

Now come we to examine the particulars, and whether Christ did suffer these Torments of Hell for our Redemption.

1. Did Christ suffer the Second death? was he spiritually dead in corrupt and sinful qualities, without any restraining grace? and did God leave him to the liberty of those corrupt and sinful qualities to hate and blaspheme God for his justice and holiness, as the inexpressible companions of God's total separation? for these sinful qualities are inexpressibly joyned to them that suffer Hell torments, as the effect is to the cause; did Christ suffer this pain of loss, when he said my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?

2. Did Christ at any time feel the gnawing worm of an accusing conscience? was he at any time under the torment of despairation? truly, if he had at any time suffered the torments of Hell, he must of necessity have suffered these things, for they are as nearly joyned to those that suffer the torments of Hell, as the effect is to the cause.

3. Did Christ suffer the torments of Hell in the proper place of Hell? seeing none can suffer the torments of Hell as long as they live
live in this world; none can suffer the Second death till after this life is ended.

4. Did Christ suffer the torments of hell in his body as well as in his soul, to redeem our bodies as well as our souls from the torments of Hell?

5. How long did he suffer the torments of hell? was it for ever? or how long did he suffer them? and when did the torments of hell first seize upon him? and when was he freed from them? or did he suffer the torments of hell at several times, or in several places, or but at one time or place only?

6. Was he tormented without any forgiveness? or did Abraham deny him the least drop of water to cool his tongue?

7. Did Christ inflict the torments of hell upon his own humane nature? was his Divine nature angry with his humane nature? or did his Divine nature forsake his humane nature in anger? as it must have done if he had suffered the torments of hell: if so, then he destroyed the personal union of his two natures, and then he made himself no Mediator, but a cursed damned sinner.

These and such like gross absurdities the common Doctrine of imputation will often fall into.

Trade. Do you think that Christ did not suffer the torments of hell at all, neither in his body nor in his soul, nor any other torments equivalent to the torments of Hell, at one time or other, before he died for our redemption?

Divine. It is evident to me that Christ did not suffer any part of the torments of Hell, neither in his body, nor in his soul, nor any other torments from God's wrath that were equivalent thereto; neither could he suffer any part of the torments of hell as long as he lived in this world, because the very Devils as long as they live in this air do not suffer the torments of hell, as it is evident by their fearful crying out to Christ and saying, Art thou come to torment us before the time? Mat. 8. 29. as long as they remain in this world, in the air, they suffer but the first spiritual death of their pure nature in corrupt and sinful qualities: they shall not suffer the torments of hell until the great day of judgement, and then they shall be cast into the very place of hell itself, and then, and not till then, they shall be tormented with the torments
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Hell torments are confined to the proper place of hell; for hell torments are confined to the proper place of hell.

Reason cannot be (faith Mr. Broughton in a Manuscript) bow in this world a just soul could suffer Hell sorrows: neither did any fillable from God ever glance that way: by natural light the Heathen may judge (as Aratus, Menander, and Epimenides) and for the words of the old Testament, and their proper sense, the Hebrew nation may judge; and for the Greek Testament the Greek from whom the language is taken: But neither Greeks nor Hebrews will give any wit of help to them who say that our Lord suffered the torments of hell, and such as contain both, will not long find approbation.

Again the same Author in another manuscript faith thus: The sense of all the words in the Bible are plain, either by natural light: (such as learned Poets do handle) or else they are by God's authority some where explained: But no words in the Bible do express anything that Christ suffered the wrath of God for our sins, therefore it is no small impiy for men, from general (Metaphorical) terms, to gather such a strange particular: none that ever spake Greek (Spirit or man) gathered hell Torments for the just from Hades, or from any other Greek or Hebrew text.

Again the same Author affirmeth in Rev. 11. 7. that Hell place, and hell torments are not in this life.

And truly it seems to me that the holy Scriptures do confine hell torments to the proper place of hell itself, which is seated on high before the throne of the Lamb; Rev. 14. 10. and Solomon doth tell us, that all men's souls (both good and bad) do ascend, Eccl. 3. 21. and the Hebrew Doctors do hold generally, that hell is above as well as heaven, and learned Mr. Richardson doth probably conjecture in his Philosophical Annotations on Gen. 1. that Hell place is seated within the Elements of fire: and why may it not be so, seeing that place is next before the Throne of the Lamb, where John doth place it? Rev. 14. 10. and it is certain by Luke's parable, that hell is seated neer unto heaven, or else the comparisons that Luke useth to describe their torments were absurd. 1. He describes their torments by two persons talking together, the one in Heaven place, and the other in hell place. 2. He describes their torments by seeing each others case, Luke 14. and so doth Esay in ch. 66. 24. Thirdly,
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Thirdly, Hence we may see the reason why Haides is put as a common name to both places; both places are usually call'd Hades in sundry greek writers, as if they were but two regions in the same world of souls, one region for the godly, and the other for the wicked, where the godly and wicked may see each other's condition, and talk together in their next adjacent parts, Luke 16. 23. Therefore hell place is not in the midst of the earth among the moles and worms, as some blind Papists do affirm, but 'tis on high, before the throne of the Lamb, and within the view of the glorified Saints.

But whether the Element of fire be the proper place of hell or no, I need not dispute that point, yet this conclusion doth arise from the premises that no man can suffer the torments of hell as long as they live in this world, therefore our Savior could not suffer the torments of hell in this world, as the common doctrine of imputation doth teach, neither did his soul go into the proper place of hell after death, to suffer the torments of hell for our redemption, for he told them there that he went that day to paradise: neither can any soul that goes to hell ever return any more into this world; except at the day of judgement, and then every foul must come to be reckoned to its own body, that so both together may be cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death.


2. It is evident that Christ did not suffer the torments of hell in this world, because there was no necessary use or end of such sufferings, for such sufferings are no way satisfactory to the justice of God for our sins; for the rule of God's justice doth require that soul only to dy which sins: the soul that sins shall dy: one man shall not dy for another man's sin, Ezek. 18. By this rule of justice God cannot inflict the torments of hell upon an innocent, to redeem a guilty person; and as God doth ty himself to this rule of justice touching the everlasting state of mens souls, so he doth appoint civil magistrates to observe this rule of justice touching the bodies of sinful malefactors, they may not punish an innocent for a guilty person, but that man only that sins must dy, as 2 Kings 14. doth expound the meaning of the Judicial law in Deu. 24. 26. I hold it a point of gross injustice for any Court of magistrates to torture an innocent person for the Redemption of a guillo malefactor.
By this rule of justice the Son cannot dy eternally for the sin of his Father, Ezek. 18. 20, 21. Jer. 31 30. but the father must dy eternally for his own sin: and therefore God cannot in justice impute our sins to our innocent Savior, nor yet inflict the torments of Hell upon him for our sins: if God should do so, he should make himself as unjust in his proceedings against our innocent Savior, as the wicked Jews were when they imputed sin and inflicted punishment upon our innocent Savior, as if he had bin a sinful malefactor: for they condemned him that was the holy one, and the just, and delivered a murderer, and so they made Christ a worse malefactor then Barrabas.

Trades. You say that God cannot by the rule of his own justice punish an innocent for a guilty person: and yet God did punish many thousands of Davids innocent subjects for Davids sin in numbring the people.

Divine. This case is different from the former: for the former case was propounded touching the eternal estate of mens souls: and in that case I said that God cannot in justice punish an innocent soul eternally for the sins of another man: But that instance is touching Gods dealing with mens bodies, In this case I grant that God may by the rule of his own justice punish the bodies of many innocent for another mans sin, and the reason is plain, because men in the world, both elect and reprobates are liable to Gods justice for their bodily death, Gen. 3. 19. And therefore God may call them to dy whenever he pleaseth: thereupon sometimes it is his good will and pleasure to let men live long; and sometimes it is his good will and pleasure to call for their lives upon occasion of some provoking sin or other in some other man, and then it is his good will and pleasure to punish that provoking sin by the death of many thousands that had no hand in that sin: and in this sense God doth often punish the sin of the Father upon the children, and the sin of the Children upon the father, and the sin of the King upon his subjects: as in the case of David: he alone sinned in numbring the people: and thereupon, God was pleased to punish his sin With the death of many thousands of his good subjects, and yet God did no injustice to any man in so doing, because they were all indebted to his justice for their bodily death; whenever it pleased him to call for it.

But
But if any desire further satisfaction in this point, let them read in Gataker in Ieroboms Sons decease, and there they may have further satisfaction in this point.

And this distinction of the souls case from the bodies case, may sufficiently serve as an answer to Mr. Reynolds, who doth labour to justify the imputation of our sins and punishment unto our innocent Savior in Ps. 110. p. 444, 445.

Trades. I dare not go about to prove by any more Arguments that Christ did bear our sins by God's imputation: or that he bore the curse of the Law for our Redemption: I dare not justify the common Doctrine of imputation any further.

But now I desire to enter upon a new discourse with you about the Meritorious price of our Redemption.

PART. II.

Wherein is proved,

1. That Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law (not by suffering the said curse for us and) by a satisfactory price of Atonement, namely, by paying or performing unto his Father that invaluable precious thing of his Mediatorial Obedience, whereof his Mediatorial sacrifice of atonement was the master-piece.

2. A Sinners Righteousness or Justification is explained, and cleared from some common Errors.

TRADESMAN,

What matter or thing was it that Christ paid or performed to his Father for our Redemption? or after what manner did Christ Redeem us from the curse of the Law?

Divine. That which Christ did to Redeem us from the curse of the Law, was not by bearing the said curse really in our stead, (as the common doctrine of imputation doth teach) but by procuring his Father's Atonement by the invaluable price or performance of his own Mediatorial Obedience, whereof his Mediatorial
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The meritorious Mediatorial obedience does more than counterbalance the demerit of Adam's Disobedience. The Saviour of God's people was the finishing Master piece: This kind of Obedience was a rich thing of price, which the Father required and accepted as satisfactory for the procuring of his Atonement for our full Redemption, Justification, and Adoption.

And according to this Tenor, the Apostle Paul doth explain the matter: he doth teach us to place the obedience to the Mediator in due opposition to the first Disobedience of Adam: Rom. 5. 19. He makes the merit of Christ's Mediatorial Obedience, to counterbalance the demerit of Adam's Disobedience; for the Disobedience of Adam was but the Disobedience of a mere man, but the obedience of Christ was the obedience of God-Man: and in that respect God the Father was more highly pleased with the obedience of the Mediator, than he was displeased with the Disobedience of Adam: If so, then there is no need that our blessed Mediator should pay both the price of his Mediatorial Obedience and also bear the curse of the Law really for our Redemption.

I never heard that ever any Turkish Tyrant did require such a double satisfaction of any redeemer for the redemption of Galley-slaves, I never heard that ever any Tyrant did require any redeemer to pay both the full price which they demanded for their redemption of their Galley-slaves, and to bear the punishment of their cruelties: slavery also in their stead: I think no cruel Tyrant did ever exact such a double satisfaction; therefore I cannot choose but wonder at the common doctrine of imputation, because it makes God the Father more ridged in the price of our redemption, than ever Turkish Tyrant was.

Neither have I ever heard that ever any cruel creditor did require such a double satisfaction of any surety for the redemption of any debtor, as to pay both his full debt, and yet to bear his imprisonment also: no creditor ever did or could by any law of justice exact such a double satisfaction of any surety for the redemption of a debtor, why then doth the doctrine of imputation make God the harter to be a harder creditor in the point of satisfaction, than ever any ridged creditor was among men?

Traded. I pray give me leave to reply for my better satisfaction, for redemption is not always done by a price, but sometimes it is done by exchange of one prisoner for another: therefore, why may not Christ stand in our stead, and bear our curse for our Redemption?
Divine. 1 grant that the ways of redemption are rank'd into three sorts. 1. By exchange of one captive for another; but we are not thus redeemed, for God did not give his Son into the hands of Satan to redeem us from under the power of Satan. 

2. There is a redemption by force and strength; but this may be called a deliverance rather than a redemption; but however, Christ did not thus redeem us from God's wrath, for then Christ must be stronger than his Father; but himself doth testify, that his Father is greater or stronger then he; John 14. 28. Therefore Christ did not redeem us from his Father's wrath by force and strength; but yet after this sort he doth deliver us daily from the power of Satan, for he is stronger than that strong man Luke 11. 22.

3. Therefore, Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, and so consequently from his Father's wrath, by no other way or means but by that rich and unvaluable price or merit of his Mediatorial Obedience; and this way of redemption is often taught and confirmed by the Holy Scriptures: as in, 1 Cor. 6. 20. To are bought with a price: Namely with the precious blood of Christ as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot; 1 Pet. 1. 19. It is called precious, because it was the blood of that person that was God as well as man; and 2, it is called precious by the figure Metonymia, because it is put for all his Mediatorial Obedience, whereof his Mediatorial Sacrifice was the Master Piece; for that act of his was the highest act of obedience that ever God required, or that the Mediator could perform for our Atonement and redemption; and in this sense only we have Atonement, Rom. 5. 11. and redemption through his blood Eph. 1. 7. and in this sense he gave his life a ransom for the many; Mat. 20. 28. and in this sense he gave himself to redeem us from all iniquity, and to cleanse us to himself; Titus 2. 14. the gross substance of that blood that was shed by the Romans in a passive manner, is not to be taken by itself alone considered, for that precious price; neither doth the gross substance of blood cleanse any, but defiles; therefore we must take the blood of Christ by the figure Metonymia, for his Mediatorial Obedience, whereof his Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement was the Master piece: and in that sense it procures the Father's Atonement, and in that sense it doth cleanse the soul from sin; for as soon as we have the Father's Atonement, we are freed
freed from the guilt of all sin; and in this sense the blood of Jesus Christ his Son, doth cleanse us from all sin. John 1:7. Rev. 1.5. His sacrifice did procure his Fathers Atonement, because it was a Mediatorial Sacrifice, for he offered himself by his eternal Spirit. Heb. 9.14. In the Jews account Christ died only a passive death, but in God's account he died a mediatorial active death; and therefore it was accepted of God as a pleasing sacrifice, for the procuring of our Atonement and redemption: neither silver nor gold, or any other corruptible thing could procure our Atonement and redemption; no other thing could procure it but the highest degree of obedience which the mediator could perform, which was his mediatorial sacrifice of Atonement: it was no legal obedience, nor any other human action that was a sufficient price for our redemption, but it was that precious thing or act of his Mediatorial Obedience in his obligation which was a supernatural obedience; and therefore it was accepted of God the Father as the meritorious procuring cause of our Atonement and redemption: and so consequently it was that precious thing of price by which Christ did redeem us from the curse of the law, and from his Fathers wrath.

2. This way of our redemption was taught and typified by that price that all Israel gave for the redemption of their lives immediately after their coming out of Egypt: the rich might not pass, nor the poor might not diminish from half a shekel: both must give a like price for their redemption: (and these half shekels were after used to buy the daily morning and evening sacrifices, which were publick sacrifice for the whole Church of Israel) and this Redemption money was given yeer by yeer, because the law made nothing perfect at once: see Ains. on Exo. 30.15. Neh. 10.32, 33.

And this redemption money (or part of it at least) was called sin money, and Trespass money, 2 Kings 12.16. because it was employed to buy the publick sin offerings, and trespass offerings as well as the daily Burnt Offerings; and it was employed also to build the Sanctuary, or to repair the Temple, as I have formerly noted on Cor. 5.21.

And this ceremony might teach them and us, that Christ should redeem us by making his soul a sin offering, and a trespass offering for the procuring of his Fathers atonement for our full redemption.

3. It is evident by another Typical ceremony of redemption that
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that Christ hath redeemed us by a price only (and not by bearing the curse of the law for us) for in Lev. 25. 25. 39. 47. it is said if any man through poverty be not able to redeem himself or his land from bondage, then his brother or his nearest kinsman must redeem them by a price of money or money-worth; and not by going into his brother's poverty to suffer his misery in his stead; and in this sense Christ the antitype became man, that he might become our brother and near kinsman in the flesh, that so by the right of brotherhood he might have a direct entrance to do the office of a redeemer for us by the rich and weighty price and merit of his Mediatorial Obedience, whereof his Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement was the Master Piece, for that was the most precious thing that either God the Father could require, or that the mediator could perform for our Atonement and Redemption.

Trade's. You make the mediarionial sacrifice of Christ to be the only satisfactory price to God's justice for our redemption: and in effect the Lutherans say as much, they set as high a price upon the blood of Christ as you do, for they commonly say that one drop of the blood of Christ is sufficient to redeem the whole world, and yet notwithstanding they do also say and affirm that Christ suffered the wrath of God according to the curse of the Law, for our redemption; and this suffering of God's wrath they make to be as necessary for our redemption as his Mediatorial Sacrifice, therefore in their judgement and in the judgement of divers other Protestant Writers, Christ hath redeemed us both these ways: Namely by paying unto God the price of his precious blood, and by bearing his Father's wrath also in the same proportion as it is due to us from the Curse of the Law.

Divine. There are two dangerous errors in this tenent of the Lutherans. 1. It is a most dangerous error to affirm that Christ hath redeemed the whole world. And 2. It is another error as dangerous as the former to say that one drop of the blood of Christ is sufficient to redeem the whole world.

1. It is a dangerous error to affirm that Christ hath redeemed the whole world, he never intended to redeem all Mankind in general, he never intended to redeem any but the Many: he confirmed the promise or covenant only for the Many. Dan. 9. 27. And when he ordained his last supper to be one of the seals of this covenant,
covenant, he said of the wine this is the blood of the new Testament or covenant which is shed for you and the many Mat. 26. 28. And was once offered (namely as a mediatorial sacrifice of Atonement) to bear the sins of the many. Heb. 9. 28. and he gave his life a ransom for the many; Mat. 20. 28.

Tract. These many may be understood of all mankind in general, for Paul saith thus, Through the offence of one the many were made sinners Rom. 5. 19. That is to say all the world, for all mankind in general were made sinners through Adam's fall.

Divine. I grant that the term Many in some places of Scripture may be understood of mankind in general; but yet not in the place that you have cited: I grant that all mankind in general are become sinners through Adam's fall, but yet that text which you have cited aims only to prove, that the Elect number are made sinners through Adam's fall, because the Apostle doth by and by after counterpoise many to many, laying, As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; So by the Obedience of One shall many be made righteous: Rom. 5. 19. Here the last term many must parallel the first term many; and this last term many cannot be understood of any others but of that many only that have the benefit of Christ's Mediatorial obedience to cure their sinful condition that came by Adam's disobedience.

In brief therefore, the sense of the Apostle must ly thus: as by one man's disobedience the many (that is to say the elect number were made sinners as well as the reprobates, Eph. 2. 1. Rom. 3. 9.) So by the Obedience of One the many are made righteous: no reprobates can be included in this many, because they are not made righteous by the Mediatorial Obedience of Jesus Christ: but the many elected ones only: for by the Mediatorial Obedience of Jesus Christ, where of his sacrifice of Atonement was the Matter piece, he procured his Fathers Atonement to all the elect for their full righteousness, redemption, or freedom from the guilt of sin, and so consequently from the curse of the law, and from his Fathers wrath: and for these many only and not for the rest of the world doth Christ make intercession to his Father; John 17, 19. Ps. 16. 4. And for these only he did sanctifie himself John 17, 19, 20.

Therefore this speech of the Lutherans whereby they labor to promote the doctrine of a general redemption, doth argue their great
great ignorance in the Articles of the Eternal Covenant which was made between the Father and the Son for mans Redemption.

But they labor to prove their tenant by several Scriptures, as by John 1.19, where Christ is said to be the Lamb of God that takes away the sins of the World; also they allledge, 1 John 2.2, where Christ is said to be the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole World: To these Scriptures I answer, that the word World must not be taken for the universal number of all mankind, but it must be taken for the World of Believers only, as the matter is explained by John 3.16. God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whatsoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life: In this Text the word World is explained, to mean such only as believe in Christ; and in verse 18. They that believe not in the only Son of God, are exempted from Righteousness and Redemption by Christ.

Again, they allledge that Christ died for all men in general, because it is said in 2 Cor. 5.15. That Christ died for All: To this I answer, that the word All in this Text, must be taken for all the Elect only, and no more; it must be limited to all of that sort of persons of which he speaks; namely, to that All which live not to themselves, but unto him that died for them; he never shed his blood for such as live to themselves, but for such as live unto him that died for them: and this Interpretation is further cleared by another Scripture, in John 1.16. of his fulness we all receive; that is to say, all we which do believe: So Christ healed all that were sick, Mat. 8.16. that is to say, all the sick persons that were brought unto him: and therefore another Evangelist doth explain it thus, He healed many, Mark 1.34. and the word All is often put for many, as in Mat. 21.26. Luke 21.17. Phil. 2.21. Gen. 41.57.

Therefore I may well conclude, that this Allrtion of the Lutherans and Arminians is a dangerous Error, for by it they make every profane person believe, that they have as good a share in the blood of Christ, as any of Gods people have, if they can but repent, intimating thereby that they may repent when they will.

Secondly, It is another most dangerous Error of the Lutherans, to ascribe the price of our Redemption to one drop of the corporal blood of Christ; for it is a common saying among them, that one drop of the blood of Christ is sufficient to redeem the whole world.
But if this speech of theirs be well examined, it will appear
that one drop of the blood of Christ was not sufficient to redeem
the Elect; much less was it sufficient to redeem the whole world in
general: for Christ must by God's appointment shed as much blood
as was sufficient to make his oblation valid: But one drop was
not sufficient to make his Oblation; Therefore one drop was not
sufficient to redeem the Elect, much less was it sufficient to redeem
the whole world: Christ knew well enough that the blood of the
burnt offering, and the blood of the trespass offering, (which was
a type of his own blood) must be shed in such a large quantity, that
the Altar must be filled with it round about, Lev. 1. 5. See also
Ains. in Lev. 3. 2. this sprinkling must be made with such a large
quantity of blood, that the four corners of the Altar might be filled
with it, Zach. 9. 15. The Original word doth signify A pouring
out with sprinkling: And the Hebrew Cannons tell us, that the
Priests must endeavor to receive all the blood in bowls, that there
might be sufficient at twice sprinkling to ly thick upon all the four
sides of the Altar; as it is written in Lev. 1. 5. Round about the
Altar: and the rest of the blood that was left, the Sacrificers
poured out at the bottom of the Altar; Exod. 29. 12. and thence
it was conveyed by spouts into the Brook Kidron: See Ains. in
Lev. 4. 7. yea it was the Lord's express commandment concerning
all Sacrifices in general, to pour out the blood (namely by a large
and liberal sprinkling) upon the Altar of Jehovah, Deut. 12. 17.
and Christ did fulfill this type when he poured out his soul to death,
 Isa. 53. 12. as the Hebrew is; but Paul's Greek in Rom. 4. 25. is
taken from the seventy on this place, which is passive: He was de-
levered to death for our sins: and thus the holy Ghost in Hebrew
and Greek both make the death of Christ to be both Active and
Passive, because in his death he died both actively and passively: for
he suffered passively from man as a Malefactor, and yet he did
actuate his own death, by seperating his soul from his body by his
own active power, or by the joint concurrence of both his Na-
tures: and because he did freely pour out his soul to death, therefore
his death was typified by a large quantity of blood, which was
sprinkled by the Priest upon the Altar. It was the practice of Ido-
laters also, to pour out the blood of their Sacrifices; but of such
the Mediator faith, I will not pour out their poured out Oblations of
blood.

The holy Ghost in Hebrew and
Greek doth make the death of
Christ to be both active and passive
wherein a great mystery is
couched.
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blood: that is to say, I will not make Atonement for them, by pouring out my blood for them; Psal. 16. 4. I am loth (faith D. Hampton) to believe that either the Father was so prodigal of his Son's life, or that the Son was so careless of his own blood, that he would have poured out all, if one drop would have served the turn.

Secondly, As the quantity of his blood must answer the type of pouring out, so the quality and manner of shedding it, must answer to the Typical Sacrifice: First, no blood was acceptable in sacrifce, but that which was of a clean beast: and secondly, No blood was acceptable but that which was sprinkled by the Priest: It was not the blood of Christ which was shed as a Malefactor, neither was it the blood of Christ as it was shed by the Roman Soldiers, that was sufficient for our Redemption; but it was the blood of Christ who was the Lamb of God without spot: and secondly, it was the blood of Christ that was poured or sprinkled by his Priestly Nature, namely, by his God-head, that God accepted as the meritorious procuring cause of his Atonement for our full Redemption: It was not the gross substance of his blood that God the Father regarded, no otherwise but as it was a Metanoia of his Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement; for his material or corporeal blood was spilt upon the ground, and it was soon dried up, and God knows what is become of it now, but it was the meritorious efficacy of his blood that he regarded, which I call his Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement; that blood is never dried up, but it doth ever live to procure Gods Atonement for the full Redemption of all the Elect.

Therefore it must needs be a dangerous and a superfluous error of the Lutherans, to ascribe so much to one drop of the material blood of Christ.

Tragedy. I must needs acknowledge that you have given me good satisfaction touching this speech of the Lutherans and Arminians, I now see plainly that it hath bin an occasion to corrupt the minds of many touching the true meritorious price of our Redemption: I pray you therefore let me hear you speak a little more fully wherein the true meritorious efficacy of the blood of Christ doth lie, for the procuring of the Fathers Atonement for our full Redemption.

Divine. The true meritorious efficacy of the blood of Christ,
lies not in this, that it was a part of the corporeal subsistence of the Lamb of God without spot; nor in this, that he suffered his blood to be shed by the Roman Souldiers in a passive manner of obedience; but it lies in this, that it was shed by his own active Priestly power, by which means only it became a Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement: and yet notwithstanding, though I do not place the efficacy of his blood neither in the material subsistence of his blood, nor in the passive shedding of it; yet I do freely grant that both his material blood, and the passive shedding of it, are often put by the figure Synecdoche, and by the figure Metonymia, for his Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement: as for example, in Eph. 1,7. we have Redemption through his blood; This term blood, must be understood with a grain of Salt, for the term blood here, must be understood by the figure Metonymia, for the signe and token of his death; and secondly, the term blood and death in the passive action, is often put by the figure Synecdoche, for his active Mediatorial death; because at one and the same time Christ died both as a Mediator actively, and as a malefactor passively; as I have explained the matter in Gal. 3, 13. and in other places also; therefore being there is such a concannation of his active Mediatorial death with his passive death, they may well be put the one for the other interchangeably, because they were so interwoven together at the same time; and in this respect the holy Scriptures do indifferently put the one for the other: this distinction I hope the wise will easily understand.

But for your better understanding of the meritorious efficacy of the blood of Christ, consider two things. First, Consider what was the Priestly Nature of Christ; and Secondly, Consider what was his Priestly Action.

First, His Priestly Nature was his Divine Nature; for he is laid to be a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek, of whom it is witnessed, that HE liveth, or that HE ever liveth: Heb. 7, 8. This term HE importeth the nature Ever-living; and then it must needs mean his Divine Nature, for his Human Nature was dissolved by death; The like Emphasis is in the word HE, in Psal. 102, 27. Thou art HE, and thy years fail not; The Apostle Paul doth expound this HE of the God-head of Christ, in Heb. 1, 10, 12. In like sort the term HE runs in this sense, in the first promise made to Adam.
Adam and Eve, HE shall break thy head, Gen. 3. 15. who else can HE be that shall break the Devil's head-plot, but that HE that is the Son of God? And thus the Apostle John doth expound that HE, saying, For this cause [HE] the Son of God was made manish, that HE might destroy the work of the Devil, or that he might break the Devil's head-plot in pieces: 1 John 3. 8. He is also called, The Son of God that shall shortly bruise Satan under our feet. Rom. 16. 20. From all these places compared together, it is evident that Jesus Christ in his Divine Nature is a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek.

But yet withal take notice, that the term HE in Gen. 3. 15. doth comprehend under it his Human Nature as well as his Divine; yea it doth also comprehend under it the personal union of both his Natures. First, The term HE describes him to be true man, because he is called the seed of the Woman. Secondly, the term HE describes him to be true God, because he must break the Devil's head-plot. Thirdly, the term HE is a Noun singular, and so it describes the Person of the Mediator to be individual; after that his two Natures were united by an Hypostatical union; and so the Apostle calls this seed of the woman, or this seed of Abraham [one], which is Christ, Gal. 3. 16.

Secondly, Consider what was his Priestly action, and that was the sprinkling of his own blood by his own Priestly Nature, that is to say, by his Divine Nature; for he poured out his soul to death, Isa. 53. 12. namely, by the active power of his own Divine Priestly Nature; for he offered himself by his Eternal Being or God-head, Heb. 9. 14. that is to say, he separated his soul from his body by the power of his God-head, when he made his soul a Trespass-offering for us; Isa. 53. 10. if his blood had bin sprinkled only passively by the hand of man, and not actively by the power of his Priestly Nature, it had made no Atonement: As for example, If the blood of the typical sacrifice of Atonement had not bin sprinkled by a Priest, it had made no Atonement, because it was an action that did properly belong to the Priest's office to sprinkle the blood of every sacrifice upon the Altar; the Levites might not sprinkle the blood of every sacrifice upon the Altar, the Priests only must do it: the Levites indeed might kill sacrifices, and receive the blood in vials, as Ablutants to the Priests, but yet they might not sprinkle the
the bloud of any sacriifice upon the Altar; God had reserved that
action to be done by the Priests only, because it was one of the es-
sential parts of the sacriifice: See Ains. on Lev. 1. 5. Maymomy
faith, That the action of sprinkling bloud upon the Altar, is a
weighty matter; it is the root or principal of the Sacriifice; See Ains.
in Exod. 12. 4. I noted it already; and the manner of sprinkling
must be done with a large and liberal quantity; and therefore it is
called pouring out, as I have formerly noted it in Lev. 1. 5. and
this sprinkling with pouring out did represent the death of the
beast; and also it did typifie the death of the Mediator; for the soul
of the beast is in the bloud, and so also the soul or vital spirits of
man is in his bloud, or with his bloud: and therefore a large quan-
tity of bloud shed, must needs be a true evidence of death.

Secondly, Bloud was given or sprinkled upon the Altar to make
Atonement for mens souls.

Thirdly, It pleased God in this respect to separate bloud from
the common use of food, as long as the partition wall of Ceremo-
nies stood betwixt Jews and Gentiles.

Fourthly, Therefore the Lord did threaten the Jews, that if any
of them did eat bloud, that soul should be cut off from among his
people: Lev. 17. 11. 4. Lev. 7. 26. But now the partition Wall is
broken down, and both Jews and Gentiles may eat bloud and
things strangled as lawfully as any other food.

And because this large and liberal sprinkling of bloud by the
Priest upon the Altar did represent the death of the sacriifice, and
typifie the death and sacriifice of Chrift; therefore bloud was much
used as a purging type, for almost all things are by the Law purged
with bloud; Heb. 9. 21, 22. to signifie unto us, the purging na-
ture of Christs sacriifice of Atonement: Material Bloud doth not
purge, but defile; but Mediatorial Bloud doth cleanse and purge
away sin; and therefore Chrift made his oblation by the joynct con-
terence of both his Natures in a Mediatorial way of obedience;
his Human Nature was the Lamb without spot, and his Divine
Nature was both the Priest and the Altar whereby and whereon
his human Nature was sacrificd and offered; and by this means
his death became a sacriifice of propitiation to procure Gods Aton-
ment to all the true Israel of God; and in this respect his death is
called the sprinkling of the bloud of Christs, 1 Pet. 1. 2. which
speakest
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And secondly, in this respect the Blood of Christ is called the Blood of God, Act. 20. 28. not only because his Human Nature was united to his Divine Nature; for by the communication of properties that may be attributed to the Person which is proper but to one Nature only: But secondly, It is called the Blood of God in another respect; namely, because he shed his Blood by his own Priestly Nature; that is to say, by the actual power of his Divine Nature; for he offered himself by his Eternal Spirit, Heb. 9. 14. and poured out his soul to death: Isa. 53. 12. In like sort he is called Jehovah our righteousness: Jer. 23. Because his Mediatorial Obedience (whereof his oblation was the Master-piece) was actuated by Jehovah, that is to say, by his Divine Nature as well as by his Human.

So then, I may well conclude, that the death of Christ was a Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement, because it was the Act of the Mediator in both his Natures: In his Human Nature he was the Lamb of God without spot; and in his Divine Nature he was the Priest to offer up his Human nature to God, as a Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement, for the procuring of his Fathers Atonement for the full Redemption of all the Elect.

But I will remember my former caution, that you may understand my words with a grain of salt; for when I say he did pour out his own Blood by the active power of his own God-head, I mean that he by the active power of his God-head did pour out his soul, or separate his soul from his body, when he made his soul a Trespass offering for our sins and trespasses; Isa. 53. 10. 12. Blood is often put for the separation of his Soul from his Body; and so Isaiah doth explain it, He poured out his soul to death; Isa. 53. 12. The Roman Souliiers did shed a part of his Blood, but yet all that ever they could do unto him, could not separate his soul from his Body, till himself pleased to do that by the power of his own God-head.

His Divine nature was the Altar upon which he sanctified his Human nature; and this was typified by the Levitical Altar, which at the first was anointed and sanctified, that so it might sanctify the sacrifice that was offered thereon, Exod. 27. 1. Numb. 7. 1. 88. for as soon as the Altar was sanctified, it was called Holiness of Holiness; Exod. 29. 37. because it sanctified all the sacrifices that were

Christ in his human nature was the Lamb of God without spot; and in his divine nature he was the Priest to offer it up to God as a Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement for our Redemption.
were thereon, Mat. 23. 14. This did teach and typifie unto us, that Christ was not only anointed and sanctified by the holy Ghost to be the mediator, but that he himself did also sanctifie his own humane nature, which he did offer up to God upon the Altar of his own God-head, as a sacrifice of a sweet smelling favor to God for the procuring of his Fathers Atonement for our full Redemption. Eph. 5. 2. John 17. 19.

It was the holynes of his divine nature that gave the quickning power to the oblation of his humane nature. John 6. 63. When Christ said to his Disciples be that eateh my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him, verse 56. then many of his Disciples understood his words in a literal and corporal sense (as the Papists do, this is my body) and thereupon they were offended and flied unto him, this is a hard saying, who can hear it? v. 60. that is to say, who can endure to hear of such a gross and carnal eating of thy body? Thereupon Jesus explained his own mind and meaning thus: it is the spirit that quicketh, the flesh provieth nothing; the words that I speake unto you are spirit and life, John 6. 63. In this answer our Saviour declareth two things. 1. That the gross and carnal substance of his flesh and blood, considered by itself alone, had no meritorious efficacy to procure our union with his person, or to procure our communion with him in his sacrifice of Atonement; neither his flesh, nor the actions of his flesh alone considered, can profit us; and therefore his Legal obedience cannot profit us; whether by way of merit, nor yet by way of imputation for our righteousness, because it is but a part of his flesh; for legal obedience is but humane obedience, it cannot be accounted as Mediatorial Obedience.

2. Our Saviour in his answer declared wherein the true force and efficacy of his sacrifice did lie: namely in these two things. 1. In the personal union of his humane nature with his divine nature: 2. It lies in his priefully offering up of his humane nature by his divine nature. The flesh of Christ as it suffered death paffively by the Roman Souldiers cannot profit us; but as his God-head gave the quickning power to his oblation, so it doth profit us; for by that means it became the meritorious procuring cause of his Fathers Atonement for our full Redemption.

Therefore when we come to the Lord Table to receive the bread and
and wine, as the signs of his body broken, and of his blood shed; we must not do as the Papists do, we must not look at the gross substance of his body and blood, neither must we look at the shedding of it in a passive manner by the Jews and Romans; but we must look upon the bread and wine by the figure Metaphoria, as the signs or tokens of his Mediatorial death; for he poured out his own soul to death by the active power of his God-head, as a Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement, even at the same time when his body was broken, and his blood shed in a passive manner by the Jews and Romans; I say the death of Christ must be considered of all faithful receivers as a Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement, because it was performed by the actual power of his God-head, yea by the joint concurrence of both his natures: there was not the least unwillingness in his humane nature to dye, when he came to make his soul a trespass offering for our sins; as I have expounded Hebr. 5. 7. neither did he dye a passive death, by the power of the Roman soldiery, as the Jews thought, and as the Papists and other carnal Protestants do think; all the men and devils in the world could not put him to death by their power, I mean they could not separate his soul from his body, till himself pleased to do it by his own prieffly power, John 10. 17. 18. his soul was not separated from his body by the sense of those pains which the Roman soldiery inflicted upon him, as the souls of the two thieves were that were crucified with him; for Christ dyed neither sooner nor later then the very punctual hour in which God had appointed him to make his oblation; for the Angel Gabriel was sent to tell Daniel at the time of the evening oblation, that from that very hour to the death of Christ, should be 490 years exactly cut out: Dan. 9. 24. and accordingly at the time of the evening sacrifice, Christ did but say, Father into thy hands I commend my spirit; and at that very instant he gave up the Ghost; Mark 15. 37. And when the Centurion saw that he so cried out and gave up the Ghost, he said, truly this man was the Son of God: Mark 15. 39. The Centurion did plainly see a manifest difference between the manner of Christ's death and the death of the two thieves that were crucified with him; for as yet they did still continue alive in their torments, till after the time that Joseph of Arimathaea had begged out Saviour's dead body of Pilate, at the Sapphire evening (for Joseph
The Septuagint did not go to Pilate to beg our Saviour's dead body until the evening was come, *Matt. 27. 57.* *Mark 15. 52, 53.* And that was at Sun-set; it could not be when the first evening was come, for that was at mid-day, therefore it was the latter evening of which he speaks; and that doth not begin till Sun-set, and then the two thieves were alive, and like enough they might have lived longer in their torments, if the Roman Souldiers had not broken their legs to hasten their death: but Christ was dead long before this, for he gave up the Ghost at the ninth hour, which was about 3 hours before the two thieves were killed; and for that reason the Souldiers did not break his legs, because he had bin dead three hours before, and yet by the course of his nature he might have lived in his torments as long as the two thieves did, for the Roman Souldiers did crucifie all three alike: what then was the true reason why Christ died three hours before the two thieves? had he less strength of nature to bear his torments then they? or did the Roman Souldiers ad more torments upon his body then upon the two thieves? or did the Fathers wrath kill him sooner then the two thieves, as some think? surely none of all these things did hasten his death before the two thieves: but the only true reason was, because he did actualize his own death as a Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement (at the just hour appointed by his Father) by the joint concurrence of both his Natures: his human nature alone could not actualize his own death, because it is not in the power of any man's nature to dy when he will (except he use some sinful violence against nature) neither could his God-head make his soul a Mediatorial Sacrifice, till his human nature had accomplished two things. 1. Not till he had overcome his natural fear of death, which by strange crying and tears he obtained at last; and 2. His Divine nature could not make his soul a Mediatorial Sacrifice, until his human nature did put out an active willingness to dy, for his death could never have bin a Mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement unless he did actualize his own death by the joint concurrence of both his natures: and therefore that act of his obedience was the Master peice of all his obedience, it was the choicest thing that the Father required, or that the Mediator could perform, as the pro- curing cause of Gods Atonement for our full Redemption, Justification, and Adoption.

*Tract*
Part II.

Redemption and Justification cleared.

Trades. You seem to make the death of Christ an active death only; is not this directly contrary to the very letter of the Scripture? Seing the Scripture doth often testify, that the death of Christ was a passive death; Peter saith, That he was put to death concerning the flesh, 1 Pet. 3. 18. and that he was crucified and slain, Acts 2. 32. and that they killed the Lord of life, Acts 3. 15. 1 Thes. 2. 15. Jam. 5. 6. Therefore how can you affirm that he dyed an active death only?

Divine. I have already shewed you that Christ died a two-fold death, for he died both as a Malefactor, and as a Mediator at one and the same time; as a Malefactor he died a passive death, but as he was a Mediator, he died an active death: and the Scripture doth often speak of both these deaths, sometimes joyntly, and sometimes severally; when the Scripture doth mention his passive death, then it saith that he was put to death, killed, and slain: But secondly, the Scripture doth sometimes speak joyntly of his passive and of his mediatorial death together in one sentence as in Rom. 8. 3. and Gal. 3. 13. Which scripture I have opened at large in the first part. And so when Christ ordained his last supper, he took the bread and brake it, and said, this is my body which is given for you; Luke 22. 19. compared with 1 Cor. 11. 24. Both actively and passively; for as Christ brake the bread, so he brake his own body, because he did separate his own soul from his body; so likewise he took of the wine, this is the cup of the new Testament which is shed for you; that is to say, which I have given to be shed for you; Luke 22. 20. actively and passively as aforesaid; to 1 Thes. 4. 14. with Rom. 6. 6.

3. The Scripture doth sometimes speak of his mediatorial death only; as in Isa. 53. 10. he gave his soul to be a Transgression offering for our sins, and he offered himself by his eternal Spirit; Heb. 9. 14. and he laid down his own life, John 10. 17. 18. And he sanctified himself, John 17. 19.

Therefore seeing the holy Scriptures do teach us to observe this distinction upon the death of Christ, it is necessary that all God's people should take notice of it, and ingraive it in their minds and memories.

When I speak of the death of Christ as a malefactor, then the Scribes and Pharisees must be considered as the wicked instruments.
thereof: but yet this must be remembered also, that I do not mean that they by their torments did separate his soul from his body; in that sense they did not put him to death, (himself only did separate his own soul from his body, by the power of his God-head) but they put him to death, because they inflicted the sore of death upon his body; they did that to him which they thought sufficient to put him to death: and men are often said to do that which they endeavour to do: As for example, Abraham is said to offer his only son, because he endeavoured to do it: Hebr. 11. 17. And Haman is said, to lay his hands upon the Jews, because he endeavoured to do it: Esth. 8. 7. And Amaleck is said to lay his hand upon the throne of Ish, because he endeavoured to do it: Exo. 17. 16. And Saul is said to smite Davids life to the ground, because he endeavoured to do it: Psal. 143. 3. And the Magicians are said to make lice miraculously, as Moses did, because they endeavoured to do it; but yet the text saith that they could not do it, Ex. 8. 18. And the Israelites are said to go up to the top of the mountain, because they endeavoured to do it; Num. 14. 40. As the matter is explained in Deut. 1. 41. In like fort men are said to do that which they command others to do; 2 Sam. 12. 9. Num. 19. 3. and in this sense it is said that the Jews did kill and slay the Lord of life, because they endeavoured to do it, by stirring up Pilate to condemn him; and to crucify him, and in the conclusion, they verily thought that they had killed him, because they crucified him and tormented him with sore of death, as the two thieves were; but the truth is, they were deceived, for he was not a base and base man, as the two thieves were, and therefore they could not separate his soul from his body by all the torments the devil could devise, (for he was stronger than Satan) till himself pleased to actuate his own death by his own Priestly nature, as a mediatorial sacrifice of Atonement, by the joint concurrence of both his natures; in this last sense Christ dyed as a mediator only; he did actuate his own death as a mediator at the very same time when the Jews put him to death as a malefactor, he laid down his own life by the same power by which he took it up again; John 10. 17, 18. And how else did he raise himself up out of his grave, but by the joint concurrence of both his natures? therefore he must needs actuate his own death by the joint concurrence of both his Natures. See a further answer to this in Ps. 22. 15.
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By this distinction imprinted upon the mind and memory, a man may easily see the reason why the death of Christ is sometimes called a passive death, and sometimes an active death.

Ye 5 his mediatorial death may well be called a miraculous death, it was no less miraculous then the raising of the dead body of Lazarus when Christ went about to raise the dead body of Lazarus he did but cry out to Lazarus with a loud voice, saying, come forth; and at that very instant he came out of the grave: John 11.43. In like manner when the just appointed hour was come wherein the Father had appointed the mediator to make his soul a sacrifice for sin, he did but cry out to his Father with a loud voice, saying, Father into thy hands I commend my spirit; and at that very instant he breathed out his soul into the hands of God.

Christ dyed not by degrees (with Mr. Nichols in his Day-star) as his Saints do: his senses did not decay; no pains of death took hold upon him; but in perfect sense, Patience, and Obedience both of body and soul, he by his infinite power did voluntarily resign his spirit (as he was praying) into the hands of his Father, without any trembling or struggling, or without any show of sense of his pains.

And Austin faith thus: who can sleep (faith he) when he will, as Christ dyed when he would? who can lay aside his Garment, so as Christ laid aside his Flesh? who can leave his place, so as Christ left his life? his life was not forced from him by any imposed punishment, but he did voluntarily render it up to God as a Mediatorial Sacrifice: in his life time he was often touched with the fear of death, but by his strong crying unto God with daily prayers and tears, he obtained power against his natural fear of death before he came to make his oblation; as I have expounded Heb. 5.7.

And it is further evident that his death was miraculous, by the speech of the Centurion, for when he saw that Christ did but cry out and give up the Ghost, at the same instant he said, truly this man was the Son of God; Mark 15.39.

Again it is evident that his death was miraculous, because at that instant when he breathed out his soul into the hands of God, the wall of the temple (which typified his human nature,) rent itself in twain from the top to the bottom; and at that time all the graves of the Saints did open themselves, and many of the dead Saints did arise: Mat. 27.51. These miracles declared that now the true Holy
Holy of Holies did separate his soul from his body, and so entered into heaven with his own blood, having found Eternal redemption for us, Heb. 9.12.

Hence we may learn, that the doctrine of the Papists and Lutherans in their Transubstantiation, and in their opinion, is very erroneous; for they place the meritorious price of their redemption in the gross substance of Christ's flesh and blood, and in the passive shedding of it upon the cross by the Romans; and they also do make the wooden cross on which Christ was crucified as a malefactor, to be the Altar; they may as well make the Roman soldiers to be the priests that did offer up his human nature in sacrifice to God for our redemption: O woful blindness, that they should thus corrupt the meritorious price of our Atonement and redemption!

But I have formerly confuted this carnal and superstitious doctrine. I have formerly proved that the God-head of Christ was the Altar, and that the God-head of Christ was the priest whereby he made his mediatorial sacrifice of Atonement: I have shewed that neither the substance of Christ's flesh, nor the substance of his blood, nor the passive action of shedding it by the Roman soldiers, could make his death to be a mediatorial sacrifice: and so our Saviour told the Jews when they undertook to eat the substance of his flesh, and of drinking the substance of his blood: he told them plainly, that it was not his flesh nor his blood, but the Spirit of God-head that gave the quickening virtue to his flesh and blood: John 6.63. It is a gross conceit to think that the substance of blood can cleanse any man's soul, for the gross substance of blood doth defile, and in that respect it was counted unclean: Lev. 6.26.

But the cleansing virtue of his blood lies in his own mediatorial shedding of it, for though he did not break his own body, and pour out his own blood with nails and spear as the Roman soldiers did, yet he brake his own body in pieces, by separating his own soul from his body by the power of his divine nature: and then he did actually shed his own blood, when he did pour out his own soul to death: Heb. 9.28. as a mediatorial sacrifice of Atonement, for the procuring of his Father's Atonement for our full redemption, justification, and Adoption: and in this sense only the blood of Christ doth concern Tit. 2.14. And cleanse us. John 1.2, and wash us from our sin.
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A Discourse touching the Obedience of Christ to the Moral Law: whether it were done for our Justification or no, by way of Imputation.

TRADES MAN,

Here to you have spoken abundantly touching the efficacy of Christ's Mediatorial Obedience: But yet you have said nothing touching the efficacy of his absolute Obedience to the Moral Law: And yet you know, that sundry learned Divines do teach and affirm, that his obedience to the Moral Law was done for us, and that the Father in that respect doth impute it to us, as if it had been done by us, for our full Atonement and Justification in his sight.

Divine. Before I can speak anything touching Christ's Obedience to the moral Law: I must first understand what you mean by this term the moral Law.

Trad. By the term Moral Law, I mean the Decalogue or ten Commandments: and I call it the Moral Law, because every one of these ten Commandments were engraven in our nature in the time of Adam's innocency.

Divine. I did imagine that you did take the term Moral Law in this sense, but in my apprehension in this sense the term Moral Law is very ill applied to the ten Commandments, because it makes most men look at no further matter in the ten Commandments, but at moral duties only; or it makes them look no further but at Sanctified walking in relation to moral duties.

But the truth is, they are greatly deceived, for the ten Commandments do require faith in Christ as well as moral duties: but faith in Christ was not engraven in Adam's nature in the time of his innocency, he knew nothing concerning faith in Christ till after his fall, therefore the ten Commandments, in the full latitude of them, were not given to Adam in his innocency, they were not given till after Christ was published to be the seed of the woman, to break the Devil's head-plots. Therefore the ten Commandments do require faith in Christ as well as moral duties.

Mr. Broughton faith that the two Tables do contain them all, dome both of faith and manners: and in another place he
faith that there is no precept in all the Bible, but it must come within the compass of one or other of the ten commandments, and in this sense our Saviour affirmed to the Scribes that there are but two great Commandments in the Law, (which are the first Table and the Second) and that on these two commandments do hang the whole Law and the Prophets, Mat. 22. 40. Hence I reason thus, if the whole Law and the Prophets do hang upon the ten Commandments, as the general heads of all that is contained within the Law and Prophets, then the ten commandments must needs contain in them rules of faith in Christ as well as moral duties.

And this is further evident by the preface of the ten commandments which runs thus, I am Jehovah thy God which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt: hence it may be demanded who that Jehovah was that brought them out of the Land of Egypt? whether was it the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Ghost? the answer is, that though the term Jehovah be common to all the three persons, yet in this place it must be applied to Jesus Christ especially (not excluding the other persons) he is often called Jehovah, as Mat. 4. 7. doth expound Deut. 6. 16. and HE is that Jehovah that brought them out of Egypt: He it was that first appeared to Moses in the Bush, and that lent Moses unto Pharaoh with miraculous power to bring his people out of Egypt, Ex. 3. 2. At the first he is called the Angel of Jehovah, (the Father) v. 2. But in v. 6. He is called, the God of Abraham; and after this he was called the Angel of God's presence that went before his people in the wilderness, Ex. 23. 20, and he is also called the Angel that brought them out of Egypt, Num. 20. 16. Ex. 14. 19. He is that Angel that spake to Moses in mount Sinai, Acts 7. 38. and he is also called Jehovah, that went before them in a pillar of a cloud by day, and in a pillar of fire by night: Ex. 13. 21. And the Hebrew Doctors do acknowledge that their Redemption from Egypt was by the hand of the Angel the Redeemer, with the power of the great God; as it is said in Ex. 32. 11. (see also Ains. in Ex. 12. 17.)

From all these places compared together, it is evident that Christ was that Jehovah that brought them out of the Land of Egypt, and that gave them the ten commandments on Mount Sinai; and so the Apostle Paul saith, that it was HE that spake unto them, whose voice then shook the Earth, Heb. 12. 25. 20. Therefore
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Therefore it was Christ that gave the first Commandment saying, Thou shalt have none other Gods but me, Ex. 20.3. That is to say, thou shalt have none other Gods but the Trinity, and no other Mediator but me alone to be thy Redeemer and Saviour: for there is no other name given under heaven by which we can be saved: Acts 4.12.

In like sort Christ in the second Commandment doth require obedience to all his outward worship, and in speciall to all his Levitical worship, for that was the present outward worship which he commanded at Mount Sinai, immediately after he had given them the ten commandments: and the observation of that worship is especially called the Law of Works (though the ten commandments must also be included) but the right application of the typical signification of the levitical worship to the soul, is called the Law of Faith, or the Gospel part of the Law, for all their levitical worship was given on purpose to guide their souls to Christ; therefore faith in Christ must needs be comprized typically under the second commandment: the Tabernacle, the Ark, the Altar, and the Sacrifices, whose blood was sprinkled upon the Altar by the Priest, did teach and typifie how the mediator should make our Atonement by his Mediatorial Sacrifice, all this and much more is comprized under that outward worship, which is commanded by the second Commandment.

The second Commandment doth teach holy Reverence to the person of the mediator, because it commandeth reverence to his sanctuary; where his divine nature did reside in the cloud of his presence upon the Mercy-seat: Lev. 19.30.

4. Faith in Christ is also typically comprehended under the fourth Commandment, for the Sabbath was not ordained till after Adam's fall, nor till he was convinced of his sin, nor till the seed of the woman was promised to break the Devil's head-plot; for Adam fell in the very same first day in which he was created, and in that very day the Lord did effectually convince him of his miserable condition by his disobedient eating of the forbidden fruit: and in that day also the Lord in great Mercy did set before him an effectual remedy, by promising to him that the seed of the woman should break the Devil's head-plot: and so through the mighty operation of God, Adam and Eve, were enabled to believe their Atonement through
the mediation of the promised seed; and so by that means Adam and Eve, that were before dead in corruption and sin, were made alive again through grace; and so the whole creation was made new, perfected and finished by the Redemption in the evening of the first day, and then on the seventh day God rested from all his works, because he rested in the Mediator for the perfecting of the creation by the redemption of the promised seed, and he commanded Adam to rest on that day both bodily and spiritually. 1. Bodily, from all bodily labor, that he might spend the whole day in God's outward worship; 2. That he might rest spiritually, by causing his faith to rest upon the promised seed for his full redemption: and thus God ordained the first Sabbath that ever was, to be observ'd both as a sanctified sign of resting on Christ, and also as a sanctified time to be wholly spent in God's worship, and as a help to us to meditate on our redemption by the promised seed.

Hence it follows by good and necessary consequence from the promises.

1. That the ten commandments do contain in them rules of faith in Christ as well as moral rules.

2. Hence it is evident that the term moral law, is not a sufficient title for the ten commandments; because it doth not sufficiently comprehend under it the scope of the ten commandments, which every general title ought to do.

The title which our favour puts upon them is, the two great Commandments on which the whole Law and Prophets do hang: But the most usual fit title is the Ten commandments.

Tract 1. I do now perceive that the term moral law is not a very suitable title to be put upon the ten Commandments: neither doth it fully express my own mind and meaning: for when I spoke of the obedience of Christ to the moral law, I meant it of his obedience to the whole law of works; which obedience of his was done for us to this very end, that God the Father might impute it to us as our righteousness in his sight.

Divine. I cannot see how the Common Doctrine of imputation can stand with God's justice: God cannot in justice impute our Saviour's legal obedience to us, for our justice, righteousness or justification.

1. Because it is point blank against the conditions of the Legal covenant.
covenant so to do; for the legal promise of Eternal life is not made over to us upon condition of Christ's personal performance, but upon condition of our own personal performance: Nay the law binds every singular person to perform exact obedience by his own natural power, without any help from any creature whatsoever, or without any supernatural help of faith: for the Condition of the legal promise runs thus: the man that doth these things shall live thereby, Lev. 8. 5. Eze. 20. 11. Namely that man that, as others personally observe the whole law by his own natural power shall live thereby: and thus the Apostle Paul doth explain the meaning of the legal condition in Gal. 3. 12. The law is not of faith, but the man that doth them shall live in them; he doth plainly exclude faith and such like supernatural helps, as being no part of the condition of the legal promise; therefore it requires every singular person to perform it by his own natural power; and this is further evident by the curse that is added to every one that continues not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them, Gal. 3. 10. The curse of the law runs thus, if any singular person doth fail but once in the course of his life, though it be but in the least circumstance, he shall by the justice of the law be eternally cursed: he and no other for him shall be eternally: therefore he and no other for him shall keep the whole law it ever he doth look to be justified in God: light by legal righteousness: and therefore it follows by good consequence, that God cannot in justice justify any man by imputing to him Christ's legal obedience for his justice.

2. It is evident that God never propounded the law of works to the fallen sons Adam, with any intent at all that ever any of the fallen sons of Adam should seek for justification and Atonement in God's light by legal obedience, but God's intent was directly contrary, for when he propounded the legal promise of life eternal to the fallen sons of Adam, he did propound it upon condition of their own personal obedience, to allure them thereby to search into their own natural unrighteousness by this perfect rule of legal righteousness, which being laid to a man corrupted nature and waives, will discover to each man (as in a glass) his own unjust and crooked nature and waives; for the corrupted nature of man is directly contrary to every branch of the ten commandments; and in this respect the Apostle doth tell us, that the law of works...
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It is too weak a means (namely in respect of our corrupt flesh) to bring any man to life and salvation; Rom. 5. 3. Rom. 7. 14. And therefore when God gave the law of works to the fallen sons of Adam, he intended it to be the Minister (not of life but of death) to make the sons of the fallen sons of Adam to be sensible of their own spiritual death in corruption, and thereby to provoke our souls to seek for life some other way, namely by the mediation of the Mediator promised, neither doth the ceremonial part of this law of works cleanse any man's conscience from the guilt of his sin, though the laws did thereby cleanse themselves to the purifying of their flesh, Heb. 9. 9. Therefore it follows by good consequence, that God did never intend to justify any corrupt son of Adam by legal obedience done by his own person, nor yet by our Saviour's legal obedience imputed as the formal cause of a sinner's justice or righteousness.

3. God cannot in justice justify a sinner by our Saviour's legal obedience imputed, because legal obedience is altogether insufficient to justify a corruption of Adam from his original sin; for our corrupt and sinful nature did not fall upon us for the breach of any of Moses' laws, but for the breach of another law of works which God gave unto Adam in his innocency (by way of prohibition) in the day that he was created, thou shalt die by the death. Gen. 2. 17. Therefore God cannot in justice impute our Saviour's legal obedience to any corruption of Adam for his fall and perfect righteousness, because it is altogether insufficient to make a sinner righteous from his original sin.

4. If Christ's legal obedience imputed were sufficient to justify a sinner from all kind of sin both original and actual, then Christ made his oblation in vain; for it had been altogether needless for him to give his flesh as a memorial sacrifice of atonement for the procuring of our justice in God's sight, if his legal righteousness performed by his life had been sufficient to justify us from all sin in God's sight, for if righteousness could have come to sinners by the law, then Christ died in vain. Gal. 2. 21

5. Christ's legal obedience was but the work of his flesh; or of his humane nature; therefore it could not be the procuring cause
of God's Atonement for our justification; for no obedience is meritorious, but that obedience which was mediatorial: I never heard that the Father required the Mediator to perform legal obedience as a proper condition of his mediators office, nay our favour himself doth testify, that his flesh (alone considered) doth not profit to life and salvation, John 6. 63. Therefore not his legal obedience, for that was but the work of his flesh or humane nature, and therefore it could not be meritorious to procure God's Atonement for sinners righteousness.

Many such like absurdities as these the common doctrine of imputation doth lead men into.

6. There is great jarring among Divines about the right stating of the doctrine of imputation.

First, Some affirm that God the Father doth impute Christ's legal obedience to sinners as their obedience for their full and perfect justification.

Secondly, Others do affirm that Christ's legal obedience imputed, is not sufficient of itself to make a sinner perfectly righteous, and therefore they affirm that God doth impute another kind of Christ's righteousness to sinners for their full justification, namely the purity of his nature in his conception and birth, to justify us from our original sin.

Thirdly, Others go further in the point of imputation, for they do affirm that God doth impute another kind of Christ's righteousness to sinners for their full justification, namely his passive obedience, and so by necessary consequence they do make sinners to be their own mediators, because they do make Christ's mediatorial obedience to be a sinners obedience by God's imputation; but I have confused this kind of imputation in a particular discourse about it in the close of this Treatise.

Many such like absurd consequences as these, do often follow at the heels of the common doctrine of imputation: but against all these ways of imputation, I may well frame this Argument.

The Actions of Christ's obedience, neither active nor passive, can be made ours by God's imputation, no more then our sinful actions can be made his by God's imputation.

But our sinful actions cannot be made his by God's Imputation as I have at large proved in the opening of Gen. 2. 17.
Therefore neither can the actions of Christ's active or passive obedience be made ours by God's imputation.

If God do make sinners righteous by the active obedience of Christ imputed, then Christ must perform all manner of acts of obedience for us that God doth require of us; or else God cannot in justice make us perfectly righteous by the active obedience of Christ imputed.

But Christ did not perform all manner of acts of obedience for us that God doth require of us; because he was never married, &c. and yet we have as much need to be made righteous in such like actions as in any.

Therefore God cannot in justice make us perfectly righteous by the actions of Christ's active obedience imputed.

Thus. I will not reply to your Arguments as yet, because I desire some further satisfaction touching that distinction which you make between Christ's Legal and Mediatorial Obedience: Was it not the Will of God that our Mediator should fulfill all Righteousness for the procuring of our Redemption and Justification? Why then should not his legal obedience be a part of his mediatorial obedience?

Divine. It is a necessary thing to observe a right difference between Christ's Legal and Mediatorial Obedience, which I have in part distinguished already; but for your further satisfaction, I will again distinguish between them: I grant that God required the Mediator to fulfill all righteousness, but yet his obedience to the Law of Works, and his obedience to the Law of Mediatorship, must be considered as done for several ends and uses.

First, God appointed the Mediator to fulfill the Law of V Works, I mean so much of it as fell within the compass of his human course of life, not as a proper condition belonging to the Law of Mediatorship (as Mediator) but as true man only, for he was bound to observe the Law of V Works as he was true man, as much as any other Jew by a native right, as the Apostle testifieth in Gal. 4. 4. and the Law of V Works doth require every Jew to observe it by his own natural power, without any supernatural help from God; therefore Christ's legal obedience cannot be accounted as a part of his mediatorial obedience; for nothing can be accounted as a part of his mediatorial obedience, but that which he did actuate by the joint concurrence of both his natures.

Secondly,
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Secondly, Though I do make his Legal Obedience to be no more but human obedience, yet I grant, that he was thereby qualified and fitted to make his soul a mediatorial Sacrifice; for he could not have bin the Lamb of God without spot, if he had not bin exact in the performance of so much legal obedience as fell within the compass of his human course of life; See Heb. 7. 26.

Thirdly, The rewards which his Father did promise unto him for his mediatorial Obedience, do far exceed the rewards which he doth promise to legal obedience; for I cannot find, that ever the Father did promise to reward any man's legal Obedience with such special rewards as he doth promise unto Christ's mediatorial obedience. I will give thee the end of the earth for thy possession, Ps. 2. and He shall see his seed and prolong his days, when he shall make his soul a Trespass offering: Isa. 53. 10. These and many such like rewards are promised to the Mediator, not for his legal, but mediatorial Obedience; therefore we must not confound his legal obedience and his mediatorial obedience together, as the common doctrine of imputation doth very often.

Fourthly, Christ was not bound to fulfil personal obedience to every branch of the Law of Works (for he had not wife and children to instruct, &c.) But he was bound to fulfill every branch and circumstance of the Law of Mediatorship, he must not be wanting in the least circumstance thereof; if he had bin wanting in the least circumstance, he had bin wanting in all.

M. Calvin observes rightly, that some of the actions of Christ were proper to his God-head only, and some of his actions were proper to his human nature only, and some of his actions were common to both his Natures: and this observation (faith M. Calvin) shall do no small service to assuage many doubts, if the Reader can but truly apply it.

It is absurd to affirm that all the Acts of Christ's Obedience were mediatorial, because his person consisted of two Natures; for then his natural actions should be mediatorial as well as any other; you may as well say that all the actions of the Son and of the holy Ghost are the actions of the Father, because they are united into one God-head, as say that the acts of Christ's legal obedience were mediatorial, because his person consisted of two Natures, but in the acts of each person in Trinity, we shall observe distinctly.
each other in the manner of their working, so must the acts of Christ's obedience be distinguished, either according to his divine nature, or according to his human nature, or according to the personal union of both his natures; for sometimes his natures do work severally, and sometimes jointly.

As for example, all the actions of Christ from his birth until he began to be thirty years of age, must be considered but as natural, or but as legal acts of obedience; for till he began to be thirty years of age, he lived a private life with his Parents, and was subject to them, and learned the Trade of a Carpenter of his Father Joseph; and in that respect he was sometimes called the Carpenter, and sometimes the Carpenters' Son: in all which space he was obedient to his parents as a good Son, and he was obedient to the Law of Works as a godly Jew, being circumcised; and walked in all the ordinances of Moses without reprofe; but I cannot see how any of these actions can be properly called Mediatorial obedience.

But Secondly when he began to be 30 years of age, he did then begin to declare himself to be the mediator; for when he was baptized of John in Jordan, the holy Ghost did light upon him in a visible manner, before all John's auditory, and then the Father by his voice from heaven declared that he was the mediator in whom he was well pleased and immediately upon this he was led aside from thence (by the holy Spirit) into the wilderness to be tempted and tried by the devils, whether he would be a faithful Mediator or no: and he continued in the wilderness in fasting and prayer for forty days together, that he might be able by his Mediatorial obedience to break the devils' head-ploit in pieces: and after this the Father did again anoint him by the Holy Ghost in the time of his transfiguration; for the better enabling him to accomplish his Mediatorial oblation at Jerusalem; Luke 9. 31. and after he was installed into the mediators office at his baptism, he did freely and frequently fall to preaching in their Synagogues, which was the act of his human nature, but yet it was often accompanied with the miracles of his God-head; and this was done to declare his person to be the person of the mediator, and therefore he did not only heal the sick, but also he forgave sins.

This was the progress of the mediator after that he was publicly
likely installed into his office at his baptism, when he began to be thirty years of age.

Thirdly, In the upshot of his life, as soon as he had fulfilled all things that were written of him, he sanctified himself, and finished his obligation by the joint concurrence of both his natures; and this was the Master-piece of all his mediatorial obedience.

Having thus distinguished the actions of the mediator according to each of his natures, or according to the personal union of both his natures, we may and must rank his acts of obedience accordingly; his obedience to the law of Works must be ranked among the actions of his humane nature, and his obedience to the law of mediator-ship must be ranked among his mediatorial actions which he performed by the personal union of both his natures; and by this rule of distinction, I can find no other place for his legal obedience but among his humane acts of obedience; for as he was true man he was made unto the law of Works as much as any other Jew was, and therefore he must observe it by his human power.

Tract. You said one while, that Christ did no mediatorial acts of obedience until he began to be thirty years of age: how can that be seeing he was born a Mediator?

Divine. I did not expressly say that Christ did no mediatorial acts of obedience, until he began to be thirty years of age, for I make no question but he did offer up many mediatorial prayers of intercessions to his Father for the elect in that space, but he did no publick acts of a mediator in all that space: I grant that he took upon him our human nature into the personal union of the mediator in the womb of the Virgin, as soon as ever he was conceived by the holy Ghost, and I grant also that some few Godly persons had the knowledge thereof in the time of his infancy by spiritual revelation, as Mary, Symon, Anna, and a few others.

But he did not publicly take upon him to do the office of a mediator until the Father did publicly install him into the mediators office when he began to be thirty years of age, and then as he was baptized before all Joins auditory, the holy Ghost did light upon him in the visible shape of a Dove, and then the Father testified by an audible voice that he was his beloved Son in whom he was well pleased.
It may be you think (as many others do) that Christ began to pay the price of our redemption from the very first beginning of his incarnation, for many affirm that he was conceived by the holy Ghost without any original sin, that he might thereby justify us from our original sin; which opinion I have confuted: but the open History of the Evangelists do speak nothing at all of any of his mediatorial actions till he was publiquely installed into the office of the mediator at John's baptism; and truly his abating so long from the doing of any publick mediatorial action, was not without a divine mystery; for the Priests in the Law might not enter into their office to do the publick actions of a Priest, until they began to be thirty years of age. Num. 4. 47. In like sort the Father did not install the mediator to do the publick office of the mediator, until that very age: and then the Father did anoint him with the holy Ghost; Mat. 3. 15, 16, 17. By means whereof he received power and strength to do the office of the mediator without any turning away back. Acts 10. 38. As it was foretold by the Prophet Esay, c. 61. 2, 3. Esay 11. 2, 3.

Yea when Christ began to be thirty years of age, he was publiquely installed into the mediators office by the joint consent of all the Trinity: and so our Saviour doth explain the matter unto John, saying: Thus our desire is (or, bus it becometh us) to fulfil all righteousness Mat. 3. 14.

Trades. Do you take this word [Our] to mean the Trinity, seeing most interpreters do understand it only of the joint desire of John and Christ, Christ said thus unto John, it is our desire to fulfil all righteousness?

Divine. These two terms, first our desire, secondly our fulfilling all righteousness, had need to be explained.

First the term Us, or our desire, cannot be meant of the joint desire of John with Christ's desire, for it is plain by the text that John did not desire to baptize Christ according to Christ's desire; because he earnestly put him back and forsook him at the present: therefore the term our desire must have relation to some others, namely to the joint desire of all the Trinity; for it was now the joint desire of all the Trinity to install the Mediator publiquely into his office: and the Father had foretold John how he should know the person that should be installed to baptize with the holy Ghost and
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and fire; saying, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit come down and tarry still upon him, that is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost: John 1. 33. by this foretelling, John might easily understand Christ to mean the Trinity by the term our.

And it is further evident that it was the desire of all the Trinity to instal the mediator publiquely before all John's Auditory then present. First because the holy Ghost did light upon him in the visible shape of a Dove, and secondly, because the Son came and stood forth before all that Auditory and accepted that office; and thirdly, because the Father by his voice from heaven did openly testify that he was his beloved Son in whom he was well pleased.

The second word of the latter sentence to be explained is this, what is meant by the word Righteousness which all the Trinity did now desire to fulfil? The answer is, that they desired to fulfil all that Righteousness which appertained to the Mediator's person and office, at this time they desired to fulfil that part of righteousness which appertained to his publike infaliment; for he might not do the office of the Mediator till he was publiquely insta.lled.

From the time of his birth hitherto, he did not heal infirmities, nor forgive sins, neither did he prove his person to be the person of the Mediator by any miracles of his God-head: but as soon as he was publiquely insta.lled, then he left his dwelling at Nazareth, and removed his dwelling to Capernaum, for there he must first begin to shew forth the light of his person and office to them of Galilee, to fulfil that light which Esay foretold should shine in Galilee, Mat. 4. 13, 14. And from that time forth he did openly declare himself to be the Mediator; saying, the Spirit of the Lord is upon me, and he hath anointed me; Luke 4. 18. Psal. 45. And to do he did for three years and a halfe together prove himself to be the Mediator by his works of his God-head; and at last he finished his mediatorial oblation as the Master-piece of all his obedience, and then God did more especially declare him to be the Holy of Holies, by the manner of his death, which was miraculous, and exceeding pleasing in the sight of God for the procuring of his Atonement for all believing sinners.

Therefore, Sir I desire now to return again to the efficacy of Christ's legal obedience, both hath a great influence into the true form of our justification through God's imputation; and so with the Apostle.
Paul that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, Rom. 8. 4. How else can the righteousness of the Law be fulfilled in us but by the Fathers imputing of the Mediators legal obedience to us as our Obedience for our justice or justification?

Divine. You do greatly mistake the Apostle’s meaning in this text; for the Apostle doth not in this place speak of that part of legal obedience which God requires of every man that looketh to be justified thereby, but in this place he speaks only of that part of righteousness which the Gospel part of the Law taught and typified by their sacrifices of Atonement, which Sacrifices are called Sacrifices of Righteousness, because they taught and typified how Sinners might attain unto God’s Atonement for their full and perfect righteousness; namely they taught Sinners how they might obtain the Fathers Atonement by the Mediators sacrifice of Atonement for their full and perfect righteousness; and this righteousness of the Law is in other places of the New Testament called God’s righteousness: the context will not suffer it to be meant of legal Righteousness by the works of the Law; for the former verse runs thus, God sent his Son in the Similitude of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh, v. 3.

Rom. 8. 3. 4. Did Christ condemn sin in the flesh by his legal obedience? no, but by his mediatorial obedience only: which may the better be discerned by answering these two Questions.

Question, 1. How did God send his Son in the Similitude of sinful flesh?

Answer God sent him in the Similitude of a sinner, or of sinful flesh, by ordaining him to suffer as a Sinful malefactor in the flesh; for when God promised to Adam that the seed of the woman should break the Devil’s head-plot, then he did also tell the Dives in the Serpent, thou shalt pierce him in the soul; Gen. 3. 15. that is to say, thou Sathan by thy instruments shalt crucifie the seed of the woman as a sinful malefactor; and in this sense God sent his Son in the similitude of sinful flesh.

Question 2. How did God send him for sin? and how did he condemn sin in the flesh?

Answer God sent him for sin, when he sent him to make his soul a sacrifice of atonement for sin, as I have opened the phrase at large in 2 Cor. 5. 21; In the first part.

And
And he condemned sin in the flesh, when he made his flesh or human nature a sacrifice of Atonement for sin; for by that means he procured his Fathers Atonement to all believing Sinners: and therefore there is no condemnation to such sinners. v. 1.

In brief the meaning of the Apostle is thus, when God sent his Son to dy as a malefactor in the Similitude of sinful flesh, Christ did at the same time condemn sin, because he did at the same time dy as a mediator and made his soul a mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement for sin; and so he procured his Fathers Atonement to poor sinners: and by this means he condemned sin in the flesh, and made sinners sinless, that is to say righteous.

But this distinction of the double death of Christ I have opened more at large in Gal. 3. 13, and in Luke 22. 19, and in Tis. 22. 15.

Then in v. 4. the Apostle makes application of all this unto us that are in Christ, saying, that the righteousness of the law (namely that righteousness which was taught and typified in the Law by their sacrifices of Atonement) might be fulfilled in us: for the burnt offerings, Sin offerings, and Trespass offerings, did teach and typify to poor believing sinners how they must be made righteous, namely by Gods Atonement; which must be obtained and procured by Christ mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement; there is no other way or means to make a sinner righteous but this way; and in this sense the ceremonial law taught sinners (except willful sinners) how they might be made righteous or sinless; and therefore as soon as ever any sinner had accomplished his sacrifice of Atonement he was by the Law accounted a righteous person in Gods sight, and such persons might freely come to the Sanctuary, and feast there before Jehovah with rejoicing and with acceptance,

And in this very sense all sacrifices of Atonement are called sacrifices of Righteousness; as in Deut. 33. 19. Psal. 4 5. Ps. 51. 19. But these sacrifices of Righteousness were but shadows of good things to come: Heb. 10. 1. For the Law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope by which we draw nigh to God, Heb. 7. 19. Therefore when ever any sinner did bring his sacrifice of Righteousness before God, he was thereby directed, how to stir up his faith of dependance upon Christ's sacrifice of Atonement, for the procuring of his Fathers Atonement for his full and perfect righteousness:
righteousness: and in this sense Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth: Rom. 10. 4. namely, as his mediatorial sacrifice of Atonement was typified by their legal sacrifices, as the procuring cause of his Fathers Atonement, which is a sinners righteousness: And thus Christ himself doth expound the meritorious efficacy of his sacrifice of Atonement, saying thus to his Father, In Burnt Offerings and Sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure: Then said I, Lo I come, In the volume of my book it is written of me, that I should do thy Will O God: He taketh away the first, that he might establish the second: Heb. 10. 8, 9. namely, he taketh away all Legal Sacrifices of Righteousness, that he might establish his own Mediatorial Sacrifice of Righteousness; for his sacrifice doth make sinners righteous; namely as it is the meritorious procuring cause of the Fathers Atonement (which is a sinners everlasting righteousness) By which Vwith (of the Father in sending Christ to be our Sacrifice of Atonement) we are sanctified (or made perfectly righteous or sinless) through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all: Heb. 10. 5, 6. So then, the righteousness of the Law that is fulfilled in us, is no other righteousness but the Fathers merciful Atonement, Pardon, and Forgiveness, procured by Christs mediatorial sacrifice of Atonement.

And thus I think I have fully explained the true nature of a sinners righteousness, justice, or Justification; which I have described to be nothing else but the Fathers merciful Atonement, pardon, and forgiveness, so that I may more finely call a sinners righteousness a merciful justice or righteousness put upon poor believing sinners by Gods Fatherly pardon and Forgiveness, than a strict legal passive righteousness imputed to us from Christs legal obedience, as our actual righteousness; as the Common doctrine of imputation doth teach.

The Hebrew word Tsede, which we translate Justice or righteousness, is often Translated into Greek by the 70. Mercy, Charity, or Almes And in this sense you shall often find it translated by the 70. very suitable to the true scope of the text; as in Ps. 94. 5. Ps. 33. 5. Ps. 103. 6. Is. 1. 27. Dan. 4. 2. Dan. 9 7. 16. Dan. 24. 13. And in other places also; for God doth promise unto repentant sinners, that Judgment shall return unto justice, that is to say, unto mercies through his merciful Atonement and pardon Ps. 94. 15.
And indeed the righteousness which God the Father bestowed upon poor believing sinners in making them sinless by His Atonement, is an example of the highest degree of Mercy, Charity, or Alms, that the world can afford; it is a high degree of mercy in man to do justice to the oppressed, Ps. 82. 3. Jer. 22. 3. Job 29. 12, 13, but it is a far higher degree of mercy in God to reconcile himself to his enemies, and to make sinners just and innocent by his merciful Atonement; and in this sense Peter Martyr calls Gods Righteousness or Justice, Gods Mercy; Rom. 3. 21. and in this sense the Apostle faith, that God had appointed a day in which he will judge the world in Righteousness, Acts 17. 31. that is faith M. Broughton, He hath appointed a day in which he will favor the world in mercy, and he doth exemplify his meaning how God doth judge the world in righteousness or in mercy, by Ps. 98. 9. and 146. 7. 8. God's justice to believing sinners is his mercy, but his justice to unbelievers is his wrath; and his justice is innumerable ways administered, Ps. 71. 15. and 40. 5. Elihu telleth Job, that the Almighty is king of strength, and that we cannot always find out the reason of his corrections, but yet faith he, God doth what he doth out of judgement, and out of plenty of justice, Job 37. 2. M. Broughton on this place faith, that God's justice to poor humbled sinners is his mercy: and in ch. 33. 23. Elihu telleth Job, that if a messenger or teacher one of a thousand be sent to such as are under God's affliction hand to teach them their righteousness (M. Broughton calls it Gods mercy), that is to say, to teach them how they may be made righteous or sinless, by Gods merciful Atonement received by faith, then God will have mercy upon such righteous persons and spare them from descending into the pit, saying, I have found a ransom, namely, I have found satisfaction in Christ's sacrifice of Atonement, which is the ransom of poor believing sinners from God's displeasure; and then in v. 26. he shall pray to the puissant, and he shall accept him; and he shall see his face with joy, and he shall restore to man his justice, that is to say, he shall restore to such persons his merciful Atonement, which for the present was hid from their conscience by fin: The Geneva note on v. 26. faith, that God will forgive him his sins, and accept him as just: and the Geneva note on P. 130. 3. is excellent, and speaketh thus, He declareth that we cannot be just before God, but by forgiveness of sins for God's forgiveness is a part of His merciful Atonement; and Elihu telleth Job in c. 36. 6, 7.
6.7. that God yeildeth right to the poor, and with-holdeth not his eyes from the just: M. Broughton calleth it Gods defence and mercy to the poor in spirit: and they are called just, because of their faith in Gods merciful Atonement; and thus the eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous when they cry, Ps. 34.15. and dast judge them, Ps. 68.5.

Hence it is evident that Gods merciful Atonement, Pardon, and Forgiveness communicated to poor believing sinners, must needs be the formal cause of a sinners righteousness; and in this respect God is called a God of pardons, being gracious and merciful: Neh. 9.17. keeping mercy for thousands of them that fear him, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin: Exod. 34.7. and therefore all prosperous as the godly do fall into sin, they do pray unto God to be merciful to their iniquities, Ps. 103. Mic. 7.18. Ps. 51.1. Ps. 86.3, 5, 13, 15, 16. that is to say, they do-pray for the remission of his merciful Atonement; and in this respect they do hope and trust in his mercy, Ps. 13.5. Ps. 33.18. 22. Ps. 51.8. Ps. 147.1. and they do also fear him for his mercy, Ps. 130.4, 7. and God is called the Father of mercies, 2 Cor. 1.3. So much pittyng poor believing sinners (who are called vessels of mercy, Rom. 9.23.) that he doth affect them with bowels of tender mercy: Luke 1.78. and it is further evident that Gods justice towards poor believing sinners is nothing else but his merciful atonement, because his justice and mercy is often coupled together as terms Synonyms, as in Ps. 36.10, 56. Ps. 85.10. and indeed I cannot see any other way how a finner can be made just by the justice of God, but by Gods merciful Atonement; and in this respect the Apostle saith, the free gift is of many offences to justification, Rom. 5.16. and in v. 17. he calleth his free forgiveness, the gift of justice or righteousness; he doth make Gods free and merciful forgiveness, and sinners righteousness to be all one; so then a sinners righteousness is nothing else but his being made sinless or guiltless by the Fathers merciful Atonement; and this is confirmed by the several terms of Gods merciful Atonement in pardoning and forgiving sin, blotting out and covering sin, bearing and taking away of sin, purging and cleansing of sinners, passing over and not imputing sin, and many such like terms there are of Gods merciful Atonement: all which do plainly declare that a sinners righteousness is nothing else but his being made sinless by Gods merciful Atonement; and the voice of Gods people when they pray for Gods Atonement runs thus purifie
purify me from sin, or make me innocent, to the Hebrew phrase speaketh: Ps. 51.7. Ex. 29.36. Num. 8.21. Num. 19.12. Therefore once again I will describe a sinner's righteousness thus.

The justice or righteousness of a sinner doth (not ly in his own righteous nature, nor in his own just actions, nor yet in the righteousness of Christ imputed; but it doth) ly only in the Father's merciful Atonement, pardon and forgiveness procured by the mediators sacrifice of Atonement: and conveyed by the Father through the Mediator to every believing sinner as soon as they are in the Mediator by faith.

This doctrine of a sinner's righteousness hath ever bin well known and witneffed among the godly in all ages, from the beginning of the world.

1. It is witneffed by the practice of all sacrifices of Atonement before the Law.

2. It is witneffed by the practice of all sacrifices of Atonement under the Law.

3. It is witneffed by the doctrine of the Prophets.

4. It is witneffed by the doctrine of the New Testament.

And it never was so much obferved as it hath bin of late days by the common doctrine of Imputation.

1. It is evident that our first parents were well acquainted with the doctrine of a sinner's justification by God's Atonement, for as soon as ever God had told them that the seed of the woman should break the devil's head-plot, he explained unto them, the manner how the seed of the woman should do it, namely by his mediatiorial sacrifice of Atonement, which was represented to Adam by the death of some cleane best or beasts which God burnt with fire from heaven, (and with the skins of those beasts he appointed our first Parents to cloath themselves) by this means he taught them how the promised seed should make his soul a mediatiorial sacrifice of Atonement, for the procuring of his Father's Atonement to make their souls sinless: that is to say righteous; and this mediatiorial way of Atonement by the promised seed they believed, and thereupon they were made sinless, that is to say perfectly just or righteous.

2. After the flood when Noah offered a sacrifice of atonement, Jehovah smelled a smell of rest; Gen. 8.21. Hence it is evident...
that God had no rest in the workes of Creation neither before the
flood nor after the flood, until he rested in the mediator, and in
his mediatorial sacrifice of Atonement; for Adam ell in the day
of his creation, and then God ordained and promised that the seed
of the woman should break the devils head-plot, and then God rest-
ed on the seventh day, because he had now found out a mediator
that should perfect the creation by a redemption: and to that rest-
ing of God in the promised seed, the sweet smell of rest which
God smelt in Noah's sacrifice did look, the word rest implies that
now God's spirit was quieted, and that he did rest satisfied and well
pleased in the sacrifice of Christ, which was thereby typified: confer
to this Eph. 5.2, The Fathers by faith saw Christ Sacrifice.
By this means Noah knew and believed that he was made
righteous or sinless by God's mercyfull Atonement, procured by
Christ's mediatorial Sacrifice of Atonement.
Yea doubtles all the Fathers could not choose but know that:
Cain's person was rejected, because he wanted faith in God's Ato-
mentation through the mediators sacrifice of Atonement; and that
Abel was righteous in God's sight, because he had faith in God's
Atonement: and by that means he offered his sacrifice in righte-
ousness: Mal. 3.3, that is to say, in faith.
3. When God called Abraham from his idolatrous kindred
1. From Ur of the Chaldees; and 2. From Charan to go into
the Land of Canaan (which was 430. years before the law was
given at mount Sinai, and 2083. years after the promise to Ad-
am) God was pleased to renew his promise of the promised seed
to Abraham, saying, in thee (that is to say in thy seed Christ)
shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. Gen. 12.1.3.
Abraham was twice called, 1. he was called to the Faith, in
Gen. 11.31. at Ur, with Acts 7.2. and Neh. 9.7. Therefore he
was a justified person in God's sight at that time, for the God of glo-
ry Jesus Christ appeared to him while he dwelt at Ur of the Chal-
dees; Acts 7.2. No doubt but Jesus Christ did then tell him in
what a miserable lost condition he was, and how he should be the
seed of the woman that should break the devils head-plot by his
sacrifice of Atonement, and how he should thereby procure his
Fathers Atonement to all poor broken-hearted sinners; all which
Abraham believed, and so his sins were done away by Gods Ato-
mentation
tonement, which he received by his faith; and so he was made perfectly just and righteous in God's sight.

But Secondly, in Gen. 12. God was pleased to call Abraham again from Charan, to go into the Land of Canaan; and then he did promise that the promised seed should come out of his loins in special: Gen. 12. 3. Thereupon Abraham's faith was increased and his former justification confirmed by a fresh act of faith: and when God made his promise, he preached the Gospel to Abraham Gal. 3. 8. 16. if so, then he expounded to him the person of the mediator in both his natures, and how he should in due time die for the ungodly, and so make his soul a mediatorial sacrifice of Atonement for the procuring of God's Atonement to all believing sinners in all the nations of the world; for such only are the children of Abraham by promise, that embrace the promised seed by faith as Abraham did: Gal. 3. 29. Rom. 9. 8.

And this doctrine of a sinners justification he represented to Abraham by sacrifice either before he came into the Land of Canaan, or else as soon as ever he came into the Land of Canaan, Gen. 12. 7. for the Apostle doth tell us, that the covenant of God in Christ was confirmed to Abraham: Gal. 3. 17. How else was it confirmed but by sacrifice first, and afterwards by circumcision, as the seal of that righteousness which he had by his faith in God the Fathers Atonement procured by that sacrifice of Atonement that was to be made by the promised seed in the fulness of time Rom. 4. 11. he had no other righteousness to rejoice in but the forgiveness of his sins through the Fathers Atonement, which he received through the Mediator, and did appropriate it to himself by faith.

2. The doctrine of a sinners justification or righteousness was abundantly taught under the law by their sacrifices of Atonement, namely by their burnt offerings, sin offerings, and the pass offerings, in Lev. 1. Lev. 4. Lev. 5. &c. as I have explained their use above.

3. The Doctrine of a sinners Justification or righteousness by the Fathers Atonement is taught and explained by the prophets.

1. The Prophet David faith thus in the person of Christ, I have preached thy righteousness to the great congregation Ps. 40. 9. what righteousness was it that he by himself and by his officers preached
preached to the Church of the first born? was it his legal righteousness made theirs by his Fathers imputation? no, the text denies that, and faith that it was such a righteousness as he obtained by his sacrifice of Atonement saying, sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, &c. Then said I, lo I come, I delight to do thy will O my God, Ps.80. 8. by the doing of which will (faith Paul) we are sanctified from sin or made perfectly righteous: for by the Mediators sacrifice of Atonement, Gods Atonement is procured; which is a sinners full and perfect righteousness, and as soon as Christ had obtained this righteousness of God for sinners, then said he in v. 9. I have preached thy righteousness to the great congregation; Christ preached not his own righteousness, but Gods righteousness to the great congregation.

2. The Prophet Daniel doth emphatically express the true nature of a sinners righteousness in the words of the Angel Gabriel, who was sent unto him to declare two things unto him; the first was, the exact time of Christs death which he knew not before: the second was the efficacy of his death, which he knew before: namely that the Messiah by his should sin offerings and end sins; and make reconciliation for unrighteousness and bring in everlasting righteousness Dan. 9. 24.

But for your better understanding of the Ang. Gabeils meanings, two questions may briefly moved and answered: 1. How did Christ by his death sin offerings, and end sins? Answer. By making his own soul a Trespass and a Sin-offering: by that means he finished the ceremonial use of all Trespass offerings, and ended the ceremonial use of all Sin offerings: and this he accomplished by his death just 490 years after the Angel Gabriel had done this message to Daniel. He took away the first sacrifices of the Law, and established his own sacrifice in the place of them for ever. Heb.10. 8, 9.

Secondly, How did Christ bring in everlasting Righteousness? Answer. By the same way and means by which he made reconciliation for unrighteousness: and how must he make reconciliation for unrighteousness? The Angel Gabriel told Daniel, that he should do it by finishing all Trespass offerings, and by ending all Sin offerings, when he made his own soul: Burnt offering and a Sin offering once for all. Heb.10. 5. This was the direct way and means whereby the Messiah made reconciliation for unrighteousness, and
whereby he brought in eternal righteousness to all believing sinners.

Or thus, Christ purchased or procured such a righteousness of his Father for sinners as shall last to all eternity, by the same way and means by which he purchased their eternal redemption. But he did not purchase their redemption and freedom from sin by his active legal obedience, but by his active mediatorial obedience, when he made his soul a mediatorial sacrifice of Atonement for the procuring of his Fathers Atonement to poor sinners: compare Heb. 9. 12. 14. with this Text of Dan. 9. 24., therefore Christ purchased and procured such a righteousness for sinners as shall last to all eternity, by no other way or means but by his mediatorial sacrifice of atonement; and therefore his Fathers Atonement is a sinners righteousness to all eternity, and so it cannot fail. Isa. 54. 14. and 51. 6. 8.

Thirdly, The new Testament doth also bear witness to this doctrine: 1. Paul the Apostle doth tell us in Rom. 3. 4. that the righteousness of the Law (namely that righteousness which was taught and typified by the sacrifices of the Law) might be fulfilled in us, that walk not after the flesh but after the spirit: as I have explained this Text a little before.

Secondly, The Apostle Paul doth in another place confirm this doctrine, saying, God made him to be sin for us (that is to say, God ordained him to be a sacrifice of Atonement for our sins) that we might be made the righteousness of God in him; that is to say, that we might be made righteous or holy by God, Atonement which a sinner receives, or he is in him, namely as he is in Christ by faith, for all spiritual blessings doth come from the Father through the mediator, and are received by faith.

Therefore, You sinner while that Christ's Sacrifice of Atonement could procure no other righteousness for sinners but the Fathers Atonement, and therefore you say, that Gods Atonement is often called Gods righteousness; but Moles and Paul do both affirm that God imputed Abrahams Faith to him for righteousness, Gen. 15. 6 Rom. 4. 3. Now if Abrahams Faith was his righteousness, then the Fathers Atonement was not only his righteousness.

Divine, God imputed Abrahams Faith to him for righteousness, not barely because he believed that the promised Seed should proceed out of his loins, for our Savior reproved the woman that said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee; Yea rather (with Christ)
blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it, Luke 11. 47. Hence it may be gathered, that it is possible that Abraham might have believed the truth of God's promise concerning Christ to come out of his loins, and yet have wanted saving faith.

Therefore that faith which Abraham had, and which God imputed to him for righteousness, was such a faith as did enable him to receive God's Fatherly Atonement in and through the mediation of that seed that was promised to come out of his loins; for doubtless when God made the promise of the mediator to come out of his loins, he did open and declare unto him how that promised mediator should procure his Fatherly Atonement for Abraham's Righteousness; for God is said to preach the Gospel unto Abraham, Gal. 3. 8. 16. &c. therefore God did open and declare unto Abraham the true nature both of the person and office of the Mediator, in the very same tenor as he had declared the first promise in Gen. 3. unto him at his first conversion in Gen. 11. 31. compared with Acts 7. 2, 3. with Neh. 9. 7. and God doth testify of Abraham when he renewed the said promise unto him, that he did obey his voice, and keep his charge, his commandments, his statutes, and his laws, Gen. 26. 5. and that he would teach his children and his household after him to keep the way of the Lord; namely, the way of true Religion as well as Justice: therefore God did fully instruct Abraham in the way ofvation, by the seed that was promised to come out of his loins: Ye shall do verily believe that as often as ever God did make any promise to the Fathers, concerning Christ to come out of their loins, (from Adam to the Virgin Mary) he did at the same time preach and declare unto them the true nature both of the Person and Office of the Mediator; how and after what manner he should redeem his people from the guilt of all their sins: and in this sense Zechariah doth bless the Lord God of Israel, because he had now sent the Seed of the woman (that had been so often promised to the Fathers) to fight and redeem his people according as he had spoken by the mouth of all his holy Prophets even since the world began; Luk. 1. 68. 70. from this testimony of Zechariah, it is plain that all the holy Prophets from the beginning of the world (even from Adam to the Virgin Mary) did preach and teach from God how the promised seed should redeem his people; they were all preachers of justice or righteousness as well as Noah, 2 Pet. 2. 5. and
and therefore of old time they had not only Prophets, but divers other learned men also, that did every Sabbath preach the Gospel in every City, that is to say, in every Synagogue or School, which were plentifully erected in every City; Acts 15.21. compared with Heb. 4.2. and with Gal. 3.8. and 1 Pet. 3.19. Acts 10.43. 35.

Secondly, This doctrine of a sinners justification and redemption by the promised seed, was daily and familiarly explained unto them by several sacrifices of Atonement, by which they saw (as in a glass) how the Mediator by his sacrifice of Atonement should procure his Fathers Atonement for their full and perfect redemption and justification.

And thus after this manner Abraham and all the Fathers and faithful (from Adam to the Virgin Mary) knew as well as we do now (and I think better also, because the common doctrine of imputation did not blind their eyes as it doth ours) how Christ should make his soul a mediatorial sacrifice of Atonement for the procuring of his Fathers Atonement for the justification of their own persons, and for the justification of all the Elect in general. And because Abraham believed all this, both in Gen. 11.31. and again in Gen. 12, therefore God imputed that Faith to him for righteousness; for by that faith he apprehended and received the Fathers Atonement, and applied it to his own soul as an effectual remedy to acquit him from the guilt of all his sins; and by that means he became sinless, that is to say, just and righteous in Gods sight.

And in this sense the Apostle Paul doth prove that Abrahams Faith was accounted to him for righteousness, by a testimony taken from David in Ps. 32. saying, even as David also describes the blessedness of that man unto whom God imputeth Righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are Forgiven, and whose sins are covered: Blessed is the man to whom the Lord doth not impute sin: Came this blessedness upon the Circumcision only? No, it comes upon any other Country-men as well as upon the Circumcision, if they have but faith as Abraham had to apprehend and receive the Fathers Atonement; by which means their sins are forgiven, covered, and not imputed.

What other reason can any man else render why the Apostle should interlace this testimony in this place, but to describe unto us the true manner how Abrahams faith did make him righteou s, namely,
namely because by his faith he did apprehend and receive the Fathers atonement, by which his sins were forgiven, covered, and not imputed.

And thus after this, the Apostle doth bring in forgiveness of sins, as an effect of justifying faith; for faith is the only instrument of the Spirit, by which sinners come to be united to the Mediator, in and through whose mediation they apprehend and receive the Fathers atonement, pardon, and forgiveness, for their full and perfect justification.

This was the only true reason why God imputed Abraham's faith to him for righteousness, namely, because he believed in God's atonement through the mediation of the Seed promised.

And it is further evident that this doctrine of a sinner's righteousness by faith, was taught and preached by all the Prophets, as Peter afterward; for all the Prophets (faith he) do witness that through the name of Christ whatsoever believeth in him shall receive remission of their sins: Acts 10. 43. 35. that is to say, they shall receive remission of their sins for their justification by the Fathers atonement, procured by Christ's sacrifice of atonement.

From all the premises I conclude, that a sinner is justified by faith, no otherwise but as faith is that grace of the Spirit whereby a sinner is enabled to apprehend and receive the Fathers merciful atonement by which their sins are forgiven, covered, and not imputed: and because Abraham did thus apprehend and receive the Fathers atonement by faith, through the mediation of the Seed promised, therefore God did impute that faith to him for his righteousness.

And to this Tenor, the Apostle Paul doth explain the use of faith in the point of a sinner's justification, in Tit. 3. 9. and in Rom. 10. 4. 6. 10. with the heart (faith he) man believeth unto righteousness; he doth not say that faith is a sinner's righteousness, but that by it a sinner believeth unto righteousness.

And in this sense all sacrifices of atonement are called sacrifices of righteousness, not only as they are the procuring cause of the Fathers atonement for a sinner's righteousness, but also because they must be offered in righteousness; Mal. 3. 3. that is to say, in faith, because poor believing sinners do by faith receive the Fathers atonement for their full and perfect righteousness.

On the contrary, when Christ doth imprecate his implacable enemies,
by the Fathers Atonement.

Part II.

that is to say, let them not have faith to receive thy merciful A-
tonement for their justification: the like curse is in John 12. 39. 40.

And it is further evident that faith doth no otherwise justify a
sinner but as it is that grace or instrument of the spirit whereby a
sinner is, enabled to apprehend and receive the Fathers atonement,
by the Apostles discourse in Rom. 3. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25. all which
verses I will briefly expound unto you.

The Apostle in these words doth teach us the true nature of a
sinners justification.

1. He calls it the righteousness of God: he doth not call it the righte-
oufness of Christ, but the righteousness of God the Father: because
the formal cause and principal act of a sinners righteousness or justification
doth come down from God the Father upon all believing
sinners: a sinner cannot be made righteous by the works of the
Law, as the former verse doth conclude, but by the law men come
to know themselves to be sinners: and they that are once sinners,
are for ever sinners in themselves: therefore if ever sinners can be
made righteous, they must be made righteous by such a kind of
righteousness as it pleaseth God the Father to bestow upon them,
and that can be no other righteousness but a passive righteousness;
proceeding from God's merciful atonement, pardon, and forgive-
ness: I have declared thy righteousness to the great congregation: faith Christ to his Father. in. Psa. 40, 9, 10. he calls a sinners righte-
ousness God the Fathers righteousness: in the former verses he
speaks of his own mediatorial facricide of atonement for the proc-
curing of his Fathers atonement to all the great congregation, and
then in v. 10. he professeth his readiness to declare the true na-
ture of his righteousness to the great congregation: a sinner's righte-
ousness is very often called God's righteousness, as in Rom. 1.

God there calls it his righteousness: but, and in Psa. 119. 142. Yes
all their righteousness is of me faith the Lord: Is. 54. 17. And
when God sent the mediator of this righteousness into the world, he
faith that righteousness did look down from heaven? Psa. 85, and yet
also this righteousness of God is sometimes called a sinners right-
eousness, because God the Father doth make it to be a sinners own
righteousness as soon as they can get faith to apprehend it and

apply
apply it to their own souls, as the next verse doth declare.

But yet the Apostle doth further describe this righteousness of God in verse, by two other circumstances. 1. Negatively. 2. Affirmatively. 1. Negatively, he saith that this righteousness is without the works of the Law; he doth plainly affirm that the works of the Law have no influence at all in the point of a sinners justice or justification.

2. He doth affirm that this righteousness of God whereby sinners are made righteous, is such a righteousness as is witnessed by the Law and by the Prophets.

1. It is witnessed by the Law;namely by that part of the Law which did teach and typifie unto sinners how they might be made sinless by Gods Atonement, through their sacrifices of atonement, as the procuring cause thereof: as I have opened the matter more at large already.

2. This doctrine of a sinners righteousness by Gods merciful atonement, is witnessed by the Prophets, as I have already declared in verse 22. Even the righteousness of God which is by faith in Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all that do believe, is no difference.

In these words the Apostle doth declare the instrumental cause or means how and after what manner the righteousness of God doth come to be a sinners righteousness; namely by faith in Jesus Christ. 1. He declares the extent of this righteousness (in the next clause) unto all, and upon all that do believe, whether they be Jews or Gentiles.

He doth not say that faith is their righteousness: but that the righteousness of God is theirs by faith: with the heart man believeth unto righteousness. Rom. x. 10. Faith is the way, or it is the instrumental means whereby sinners do receive Gods merciful atonement for their full and perfect righteousness; for as soon as a polluted sinner doth believe in Christ, and in his mediatorial sacrifice of atonement, he cannot choose but believe in the Faiths merciful atonement, Pardon, and Forgiveness, which is a sinners full and perfect righteousness.

Faith itself is not a sinners righteousness: and therefore it cannot be accounted a sinners righteousness instead of the righteousness of the Law, as some would have it: for if faith were a sinners righteousness
righteousness no otherwise but in the place or stead of the righteousness of the law, then faith could not justify a sinner any further then the law would do; if it could be supposed that a sinner could by any means attain to the righteousness of the law: and then truly faith would be but a poor righteousness to cover a sinner naked; for if a sinner could keep the whole law in every circumstance of it: from his birth to his death, yet it could not be sufficient to justify him from his original sin: Therefore it is not a well season'd speech to say, that God hath ordained faith to be a sinner's righteousness instead of the righteousness of the law: and yet I do also grant that the law taught sinners how they might be made righteous by faith: therefore I will briefly explain the manner how.

The true manner how the law taught sinners to get righteousness by faith.

When a poor humbled sinner brought his sacrifice of atonement to the priest to be offered for him upon the Altar: he must lay both his hands with all his might upon the head of his sacrifice of atonement: this kind of imposition was ordained by God, to teach and typifie unto sinners how they must by faith rest and depend upon the sacrifice of Christ, as the only meritorious procuring cause of the Fathers atonement for their full and perfect righteousness.

And no man's sacrifice of Atonement did make atonement for him without this imposition, as I have explained the matter in the first part; this act of imposition was a necessary typical action, for it did typifie unto sinners, that if they desired to obtain the Fathers atonement, they must receive it and apply it to their own souls by their faith of dependance upon the mediators sacrifice of atonement, as the meritorious procuring cause thereof: And thus after this the righteousness of God by faith in Jesus Christ was witnessed by the law.

V. 24. Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ: in the words the the Apostle lays down the efficient cause of a sinner's righteousness or justification, by letting down the principal efficient cause of the meritorious procuring cause of our justification, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ.

It was the free grace and mercy of God in himself that moved him to ordain Jesus Christ to be the meritorious procuring cause of
our redemption: and therefore also it must needs proceed from his free grace in himself that he doth justify sinners, or make them sinners by his merciful atonement, pardon and forgivenes.

And thus it pleaseth the Father (of his free grace) to reconcile all things to himself (even) by Jesus Christ Col, 1. 20.

V. 25. Whom God hath fore-ordained to be a propitiation (or a sacrifice of Atonement) through faith in his blood: by his blood is meant his sacrifice of Atonement, and by faith in his blood is meant that grace or instrument of the spirit whereby sinners do rest upon Christ's sacrifice of Atonement as the procuring cause of God's atonement for their justification: the Apostle explains the matter by another sentence in Rom. 5. 11. by whom we have received the Atonement: the Apostle doth imply three things in this sentence. 1. That Christ is the mediator by whom sinners do receive. 2. That the main thing which they do receive by him, is the Father's Atonement. 3. That the means or instrument by which they do receive the Father's atonement, is the grace of faith; that is the only hand by which the spirit doth enable sinners to receive the Father's atonement for their full and perfect justification.

V. 25. To declare his righteousness by passing over sins that are past through the forbearance of God.

1. God declared his righteousness towards sinners by ordaining Jesus Christ to be a propitiation. 2. By ordaining the grace of faith as the instrument of the spirit whereby poor sinners might be enabled to believe in the mediator's propitiatory sacrifice, and to receive through him the Father's atonement for their righteousness: 3. By passing over sins that are past: this phrase may well allude to God's atonement when he sent his Angel to pass over the Israelites houses through the blood of the Paschal Lamb, which was sprinkled upon their door posts for the procuring of God's atonement, that so God's destroying Angel might not kill them, as he did the Egyptians,

And in this sense Nathan the Prophet said unto penitent David: the Lord hath also passed over thy sins, thou shalt not die: 2 Sam. 12. 13. And thus God passed over his sins that were past, through the forbearance of God: and this title of God's forbearance or long sufferings, is one of the attributes of his atonement to poor believing sinners, in Ex. 34. 6, and in this sense also David prayed
ed unto the Father; saying, I beseech thee O Lord, pass over the i
nignity of thy servant; for I have done very foolishly: 2 Sam. 24.10.
1 Chr. 21.8. and thus Job prayed to the Father saying, why dost thou
not bear my transgression, and pass over mine iniquity? Job 7.21

Hence it may be concluded, that God's atonement doth properly
respect sins that are past; and therefore as often as God's people do
fall into sin, they must labor to renew their atonement with God:
God will have his people to labor for his atonement every day,
because they fall into sin every day: and therefore justified persons
have need of new justice to their consciences every day; Ps. 130.3,
4. and 143.2. and 51.2.7. And then the work of righteousness shall
be peace, and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance for
ever: Isa. 32.17. Rom. 5.1.

And sundry uses of consolation do belong to all justified persons,
Firstly, they are blessed, Ps. 32.1.2. Secondly, they must rejoice in that
condition, Ps. 32.11. Thirdly, there is a reward due to such after their
hard trials, Jam. 3.18. Fourthly, the Lord upholdeth them, Ps. 37.25.
Fifthly, they shall inherit the heavenly Canaan, Ps. 37.29. Sixthly, the
Lord will bless them with favorable acceptation, Ps. 5.12. Seventhly
the Lord will hear them when they cry, Ps. 34.15. Eighthly, blessed are
they that hunger and thirst after this righteousness, for they shall be
filled, Mat. 5.6.

And now for a conclusion I will sum up the doctrine of Justification
into six heads:

First, The Subject matter of Justification is, Believing sinners of
all sorts, both Jews and Gentiles all the world over.

Secondly, The Formal cause of Justification, or of a Sinners
Righteousness is, The Father's Atonement, Pardon, and Forgiveness.

Thirdly, The meritorious procuring cause of the Father's atonement
for a sinners Justification is, Christ's Mediatorial Sacrifice of
Atonement.

Fourthly, The next Instrumental means by which a sinner doth
receive and apprehend the Father's Atonement for his Justification
is, Faith in Christ.

Fifthly, The only efficient cause of all the former Causes and Ef
fects is, God's free grace and mercy in himself.

Sixthly, The End of all is, The glory of God's free grace and mercy
in the believing sinners justification and Salvation.

New
New Objections.

Trade. There doth yet remain some new objections against your way of justification, which I desire to propound unto your consideration out of Mr. John Forbes his Treatise of justification, which was printed at Middelburgh 1616.

He affirmeth that sinners are justified or made righteous by the passive obedience of Christ in his death and satisfaction; which obedience (faith he) God doth impute unto sinners for their righteousness, as truly and as fully as if every believing sinner had done the same in his own person; and this he proves by many arguments.

Divine, I pray you produce some of his arguments, that they may be tried and examined whether there be any weight of truth in them or no.

Trade. He affirmeth in chap. 23. That nothing can be a sinner's righteousness, but that only which is made of God to be a sinner's righteousness: But (faith he) nothing is made of God to be a sinner's righteousness but Jesus Christ alone and his righteousness: and this he proves by 1 Cor. 1. 20, where Christ is said to be made of God unto us, Wisdom, Righteousness, &c. and in Jer. 23. 6. He is called Jehovah our Righteousness, with other places more. Therefore nothing else can be a sinner's righteousness but Christ and his obedience.

Divine. The Apollie faith, that Christ was made of God unto our righteousness, but how? not as the Doctrine of Imputation speaketh; but thus, God made him to be our righteousness in a mediatorial way, by ordaining him to be the only meritorious procuring cause of his atonement, which is a sinner's only righteousness: Christ is not a sinner's righteousness any otherwise but in a mediatorial way only, as I have often warned.

Christ is called Jehovah our Righteousness; but still it must be understood in a mediatorial way, and no other wise:

First He is called Jehovah, because of his divine nature.

Secondly He is said to be Our Righteousness, because he did procure his Father's atonement for our righteousness, by his mediatorial sacrifice of atonement; for his sacrifice was a mediatorial sacrifice of atonement, because he did offer his humane nature by Jehovah, that is to say, by his eternal Spirit or God's head, Heb. 9. 14.

And thus Christ is our righteousness in one respect, the Father in another, and the holy Ghost in another: each Person is a sinners righteousness in several respects.
Part II. by Christ's passive obedience impuned.

First, Christ is called Jehovah's righteousness, because he was made or appointed by God to be the Mediator of our righteousness, 

By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify the many: He is called God's righteous servant, because he knew how to do the service of a Mediator for the procuring of our righteousness; and therefore the next clause faith, he shall bear their iniquities: So then the manner how Christ should justify the many was, by bearing their iniquities: and how else did he bear their iniquities, but by his sacrifice of Atonement; for by that means he did procure God's atonement, whereby they are made sinless, that is to say, just and righteous; and in this sense Christ is said to justify us with his blood, Rom. 5:9. that is to say, by his sacrifice of atonement; for thereby he did procure his Fathers atonement, which is a sinners righteousness or justification. So also Christ is called Melchisedec, that is to say, King of righteousness, and King of Peace; Heb. 7:2. but still it must be understood in a mediatorial way; for the Son of man came not to be served (like an ambitious king) but to serve (like a mediatorial king) and to give up his life for the many: Matt. 20:28. therefore his righteousness cannot be the formal cause of a sinners righteousness, it is but the procuring cause of the Fathers atonement, which is the only formal cause of a sinners righteousness.

Secondly, The Father is a sinners righteousness. 1. Efficiently, 2. Formally. 1. Efficiently, because it was his own free grace in himself that moved him to ordain a mediator to procure his atonement, Rom. 3:24. Secondly his atonement so procured must needs be the formal cause of a sinners full and perfect righteousness; and in this respect a sinners righteousness is called the Fathers gift of righteousness, Rom. 3:17, and in v. 16. it is called the free gift of many offences to justification; and thus sinners by the free gift of many offences through God's fatherly atonement, pardon, and forgiveness, are made sinless, that is to say, just and righteous in God's sight: All their righteousness is of faith the Lord, Isa. 54:17.

Thirdly, The holy Ghost also doth make sinners righteous instrumentally, by setting, preparing, and qualifying sinners for the Fathers atonement by quickening their souls with the lively grace of faith; by which grace sinners are enabled to go to the mediator for union and communion, by which grace also sinners are enabled to apprehend and receive the Fathers atonement, which he doth offer and
and render unto all poor believing sinners in and through the mediator, as soon as the holy Ghost hath united sinners unto the mediator by faith; and thus the Father doth meet a believing sinner with his atonement in the Mediator; and the believing sinner doth also meet with the Fathers merciful atonement in the mediator; and all this was thus contrived by Gods free grace in himself: it was his free grace to ordain a Mediator, and it was his free grace to ordain the holy Ghost to beget faith in sinners, and by that faith to bring them to the Mediator, that so in him they might receive Gods Fatherly atonement for their full and perfect righteousness; and in this respect faith is called the operation of God, Col. 2.12, and the working of his mighty power, Eph. 1.18, 19. that men can come to the Father but by the Mediator, and no sinner can come to the Mediator except the Father draw him by his Spirit, John 6.44,45. The Fathers free grace in himself is the efficient cause of all these effects.

Tract 1. The former Author doth allege another Argument, that only must be our righteousness which filleth all in all things.

But Christ only filleth all in all things, Col. 3.11. and God the Father, is to be blessed for filling us with all spiritual blessings in Christ; Eph. 1.3. Therefore with righteousness in him.

Divine, These places of Scripture do prove no more but this, that Christ is the only Mediator, in whom, by whom, and through whom the Father doth bless us with all spiritual blessings: The Father of his free grace ordained the Mediator to be a propitiation: Rom. 3.25. therefore Christ must be considered but as a propitiatory sacrifice of atonement for the procuring of his Fathers atonement to poor believing sinners for their righteousness: Therefore the Fathers Atonement only (and not Christs obedience) must be the formal cause of a sinners righteousness.

Tract 2. The former Author doth also allege this Argument, Nothing can be the matter of our righteousness which is not the matter of our redemption: for we are justified faith the Apostle freely by his grace through the redemption; that is in Jesus Christ Rom. 3.24. Redemption is in this place interpreted to be remission of sins, which in effect is righteousness. Eph. 1.7. Col. 2.14.

Divine, It is well that your Author will grant remission of sins to be righteousness in effect; it remission of sins be a sinners righteousness.
Part II. by Christ's passive obedience imputed.

outrage, then (I pray) consider whose act it is to forgive sins formally: I have already proved it to be the Father's act to forgive sins formally, and not Christ's; he doth forgive sins no otherwise but as a Mediator, by procuring his Father's pardon and forgiveness: Christ indeed is called the Redeemer that shall come from Zion, because he is the only procurer of our redemption; but it is the Father only that must grant our full redemption from all sin, as the formal cause of our redemption and justification, or else poor sinners can never be redeemed from sin, or made righteous any other way.

The like answer I shall return to all his other arguments that he hath laid down in ch. 23. namely, that Christ is but the Mediator, or the meritorious procuring cause of a sinner's righteousness: the full forming or stating of a sinner in a righteous condition, is by the Fathers Atonement only.

Trade. My said author saith in chap. 24. that no other obedience of Christ, is a sinner's righteousness, but his passive obedience only: he doth ty the matter of our Redemption and Justification, exactly and only to his bloody Sacrifice, and not to his Priest-hood; he doth distinguish between Christ as he is our Sacrifice, and as he is our Priest, and then he doth limit the matter of our righteousness to his bloody Sacrifice in his human nature only; and doth exclude him as is our Priest from being any part of our righteousness, yea he doth ty the matter of our righteousness (namely that thing by which a sinner is made righteous) so exactly to his death and blood shed, that he will not have any other part of his obedience which he did either before or after his bloody Sacrifice, to be any part of a sinner's righteousness.

Divine. Although your author doth labour to confute the common Doctrine of imputation by Christ's active obedience to the law of works, yet he doth labor to maintain the same doctrine of imputation of Christ's passive obedience, which is as much erroneous from the truth at the other: your author doth affirm that sinners are made righteous by the passive obedience of Christ imputed, but he is put to his shifts to declare it, by a distinction between Christ as he was our Lamb for Sacrifice in his human nature, and as he was our Priest in his divine nature, for else he did foresee that he should run into an exceeding gross absurdity if he had made any action of Christ's God-head or Priestly nature to
have bin a sinners righteousnes by imputation, therefore to avoid
that absurdity, he doth place a sinners righteousness in his passive
obedience only, which Christ suffered in his human nature and
which he thinks God doth impute to sinners as their passive
obedience, as if every believing sinner had done the same in his
own person for his full satisfaction and perfect righteousness.

But I have often declared that Christ is a sinners righteousness, no
otherwise but as he is the mediatorial procuring cause of his Fathers
Attonement, where by sinners are made sinners, that is to say, formally just and righteous: they that will draw in Christ as the
formal cause of a sinners righteousness, do in effect make him the
principal efficient also, and so by that means they make the Fa-
ther of an inferior consideration to the Son in the point of a sinners
Righteousnes and Redemption, which is a great error.

2. His distinction between Christ as he was our Lamb for sacri-
ifice in his human nature, and as he is our Priest in his divine nature,
is very ill applied, because he makes Christ's passive obedience to
be meritorious and satisfactory, excluding him as he is our Priest:
But the truth is, his Priestly nature and action must not be sepa-
rated from his passive action in his Human nature, they were united
as one in the making of his mediatorial sacrifice: therefore I will
take occasion hereby once again to declare unto you the efficacy of
Christ's mediatorial oblation in both his natures, both as he was the
Lamb of God, and as he was the Priest.

First, It was a chief part of Christ's mediatorial obedience, in
that he did assume and take the seed of the woman into the unity
of his God-head; by which action he declared himself to be the
Mediator.

Secondly, Hence it follows, that his passive obedience in his
human nature, could not have bin accounted or accepted of God as
a mediatorial oblation, if it had not bin offered by his divine Priest-
ly nature; Therefore whole Christ in both his natures must be con-
sidered in his oblation as the meritorious procuring cause of his Fa-
thers Attonement, not only as he was the Lamb for sacrifice, but al-
so as he was our Priest; and this is evident by comparing the type
with the anti-type.

First, The high Priest under the Law was a type of the Priestly
nature of Christ, and by his Priestly appearing before Jehovah, he
made
made daily atonement for all Israel, namely by appearing before Jehovah in his Priestly Habit, for he came before Jehovah with a golden plate upon his fore-head, wherein was engraven Holiness to Jehovah, that so by that means he might Bear away the iniquity of the holy things of the Sons of Israel, and procure their favorable acceptance before Jehovah: Exod. 28. 36, 37, 38. Hence it is evident, that the high Priest by his Priestly appearing before Jehovah, did procure Gods favorable atonement for all Israel; and this did typifie that Jesus Christ by the holiness of his God-head (which was his Priestly nature, and which was engraven in his Human nature, Heb. 1. 3.) did bear the iniquities; that is to say, did make atonement for the iniquities of all Gods true Israel, as well by his God-head, as by his bloody sacrifice in his Human nature.

2. All the Priests in general were types of the Priestly nature of Christ, and these Priests in general do procure atonement for all Gods people, not only by the blood of the peoples sacrifice, but also by their Priestly appearing and communion with God in his Sanctuary; as for example, they made atonement for the people by two sorts of sin-offerings.

By the one sort they made atonement for the people with the blood of their sin-offering, and by the other sort they made atonement for the people without blood; for none of the blood thereof was carried into the holy place; Lev. 6. 30. but the Priests did make atonement for the people only by their Priestly appearing and by their Priestly eating it before Jehovah, Lev. 6. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29. for the Priests by their Priestly appearing and eating it before Jehovah in the holy place, did bear or take away the peoples sins; See Ains. in Lev. 10. 17, 18. Solomon Parey saith, That the Priests were they that did eat, and the Owners were they that had the Atonement. And thus the Priests were ordained to be mediators between God and the People. They were ordained by God, and yet they were taken from among men, that they might be touched with their infirmities; Heb. 5. 1, 4 therefore the Priests had an interest in both parties, they were for God to the people, and they were for the people to God; for a mediator is not a mediator of one, but he must mediate between two parties: Therefore the Priests must eat the peoples sin-offering in the holy place, to signify their double interest and communion with both parties, both with God and
with the people; for eating with any signifies communion, as it is demonstrated by Peter's vision of eating, he heard a voice from heaven saying, Arise Peter, kill and eat; namely, kill and eat such beasts and fowls at were counted unclean by the Law; which was done to signify unto him, that he must go to Cornelius house and family, who was an unclean Heathen, and have familiar converse and communion with him by eating, see Acts 10, 13, 14, 15, 28. Hence I infer, that when the Priests did eat the people's sin-offering in the holy place, they had communion both with Jehovah and with the people in eating their sacrifice, and lo they were mediators for the peoples atonement, and this must needs typifie the double interest of the Mediator, which he had in his Priestly nature both with God and with all the Elect, for the procuring of Gods atonement for them.

Thirdly, Christ by his Priestly prayers, or mediatorial prayers, procured Gods Atonement for all the Elect (even before his death) as well as by his bloody oblation; and this was typified by the sweet Incense which the Priests must burn daily both morning and Evening upon the golden Altar, Exod. 30. 1. 8. 36. The golden Altar was a type of the divine nature of the mediator, and the sweet Incense burned thereon by the Priests every day, did typifie his daily mediatorial prayers, as well before as after his death; by which means (among others) he procured his Fathers atonement for his Elect Israel. Once a year the high Priest made atonement upon the horns of the golden Altar of Incense with the blood of the sin-offering of Atonements; Exod. 30. 10. but all the rest of the year the Priests in general made atonement upon the golden Altar with sweet Incense only, without the blood of any sacrifice of atonement.

And when the Lords anger was poured out upon the murmuring Israelites, Moses bid Aaron take fire from the Altar, and put Incense thereon, and run quickly into the Congregation, to make atonement for them, and Aaron did so, and made atonement for them. Num. 16. 46. Chalcken on this place faith, That the Incense caused death when it was not in the hand of the Priest, but it gave life when it was in the hand of the Priest; for the Priests were anointed and ordained for that service, and so was not Korah and his company, he was a chief Levite, but he was not a Priest, and therefore he might...
not burnt incense; for it did properly belong to the Priest’s office to put in-cese (before J ebo- vah) in thy nostrils (or in thine anger) Deut. 33. 10. so then, it is evident that Aaron’s incense did stay the plague as well as the blood of David’s burnt-offerings did; 2 Sam. 24. 5 and as well as the Passah Lamb did; Ex. 12. 23. He. 11. 28.

From these typical resemblances we may learn, that Christ our Mediator did procure his fathers Atonement for all the Elect, by more acts of his mediatorial obedience then one, even by his priestly prayers, as well as by the blood of his oblation; in the dais of his flesh he did often perfume the nostrils of his Father with the sweet incense of his Priestly or mediatorial prayers; 10b. 17. and himself expressed the efficacy of his mediatorial prayers for Peter’s atonement; saying thus to Peter, thou wilt deny me three times, but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not. Luke. 22. 32.

4. The living Scape-goat made atonement for the whole church without shedding of any blood, as well as the Goat that was slain for the people’s sin offering did by the blood thereof; Lev. 16. 10. 21, 22. This living Scape-goat did typifie the escaping of Christ from death by the power of his divine nature; it signified also his ascending into heaven, that he might there present the works of our atonement by his continual intercession; for none of God’s people have the full fruition of God’s atonement, till they come both body and soul into heaven itself: Rom. 8. 23.

From all the premises, I think I may well conclude, that your Author is in a great error, to ascribe the whole matter of a sinners righteousness to Christ’s bloody sacrifice only: neither was his bloody sacrifice the only procuring cause of his Fathers atonement, but his priestly nature must concur thereto, he made his oblation by his divine nature as well as by his human, & therefore that action was the Matter-price of the mediatorial obedience, as I have often declared.

Tradef. My said Author doth labor to prove by another very likely argument, that the bloody death of Christ in his humane nature is the only matter of a sinners righteousness; for in 1 John 1. 7. it is said that the blood of J eus Chrift his Son doth cleuse us from all sin. Hence he doth frame this argument, if the blood of Jesus Christ doth cleuse us from all sin, then it is a needless thing to ad any thing else to it as the matter of our righteousness; for wherefo-
ever doth cleanse us from all sin, must needs accomplish our full righteousness; &c.

Divine. These words of the Apostle John must not be taken literally, but in a figurative sense, by the figure Synecdoche & secondly by the figure Metonymia; first the blood of Jesus Christ doth cleanse us from all sin, by the figure Synecdoche; for the Apostle doth not say that his blood alone without any thing else doth cleanse us from all sin (as your Author would have him speak) but he names his blood as a Synecdoche of his death, or as a Synecdoche of his mediatorial obedience which at last he sealed with his blood, when he made his soul a mediatorial sacrifice; and usually the holy Scripture doth name one part of a thing for all the parts that are of the same kind; as we may see in the ten commandments, one principal head is named for all the branches that are of the same kind; yea sometimes contrary things do suffer together; and in that case any one of those actions may by the figure Synecdoche be named for the other; as for example, Christ dyed both as a malefactor and as a mediator at one and the same time; by the figure Synecdoche any one of these actions may be named for the other: and in this sense the wooden cross on which he suffered as a malefactor, &c. his strips which were inflicted upon him as a malefactor, may by the figure Synecdoche he named for his active mediatorial obedience, because at the self same time he did not only obey as a patient sufferer, but as an active mediator also: and in this very sense his blood which was shed passively, may be put by the figure Synecdoche for the separation of his soul from his body which he did actuate by the power of his own God-head: and in this last sense only the blood of Jesus Christ doth cleanse us from all sin, namely as it was shed in a mediatorial way, or in that sense it was the procuring cause of the Fathers atonement which doth fully cleanse us from all sin.

2. His blood is often named by the figure Metonymia as a visible token of his death: but still his death (I mean the separation of his soul from his body) must be considered as it was his own active mediatorial death, or as it was his own mediatorial oblation, (all the Tyrants in the world could never have separated his soul from his body till himself pleased to do it by his own active power) and in this sense as his blood was a Metonymia of his death, doth cleanse us from all sin: but still it must be understood mediatorial, for the
passive action was not the formal cause of his oblation. But I will yet
a little further shew you the insufficiency of your argument by a
like instance: Isaias faith, that by his stripes we are healed: from
hence I will draw this argument.

If the very stripes of Jesus Christ do heal us, then it is an needless
thing to ad any thing else to them as the matter of our righteousness;
for whatsoever doth heal our souls, must needs accomplish all
righteousnes.

But the stripes of Christ do heal us, Is. 53. 6. Therefore &c.

And from this consequence another consequence doth follow
it close at the heels; namely this, if his stripes do heal us, then his
death and oblation was needless.

The like argument may be drawn from the wooden cross
whereon Christ suffered as a malefactor; Paul faith, that Christ
hath reconciled us to God by his cross: Eph. 2. 16. therefore no-
thing else is the matter of our reconciliation but the wooden cross
on which Christ was crucified.

He placeth the matter (I suppose he means the Form) of
the sinners righteousness in Christ's passive obedience imputed to
sinners as their obedience for their justification, if he had but placed
it in the Father's atonement, then he might better have framed
his argument thus: if the Father's atonement doth cleanse us from
all sin, then it is a needless thing to ad any thing else to it as the
formal caufe of our righteousness; for whatsoever doth cleanse us
from all sin, must needs accomplish our full righteousness. He
might as well attribute our justification to the resurrection of Christ
as to his death, for the Apostle faith that Christ dyed for our sins
and rose again for our justification: but the Apostle must not to be
understood as if he applied two distinct blessings unto this twofold
action of Christ: but the Apostle must be understood thus, namely
that Christ dyed and rose again as a mediator for the procuring of the pardon of our sins from his Father, which
is a poor believing sinners justification: and in this sense only Christ
dyed for our sins, and rose again for our justification: Rom. 4. 25. his
death had not bin mediatorial, if he had not rose again by his own
power; and so it became meritorious to procure his Father's atone-
ment and pardon, which is a sinners justification.

Tract: My former Author doth yet labor to prove by another.
argument that Christ's passive obedience is by God's imputation made a sinners righteousness; by comparing our union with the first Adam in his disobedience, to our union with the second Adam in his passive obedience.

We are one (faith he) with the first Adam by a natural union, and by that union we did all with him, and in him, disobey Gods commandment in eating forbidden fruit, and by reason of our natural union with him, God imputed his sinful eating to all men, as if they had eaten it in their own persons.

Even so (faith he) are we one with the Second Adam by a spiritual union compleated by our faith, and by virtue of that union, we did all with him, and in him, satisfie the justice of God in his passive obedience; for by reason of our spiritual union with him, God doth impute his passive obedience to all believers as their obedience; see ch. 24. and also the conclusion of his book.

Divine. I grant that all mankind are one with Adam by a natural union, as proceeding from the same root and fountain of nature; but I fear your Author doth stretch our natural union with Adam unto a personal union (I mean he doth so by consequence) to the end that he might make Adam's personal action to be ours by imputation.

Eve was taken out of Adam's side, and there was a natural union, and presently after she was married to Adam, and so there was a matrimonial union; but yet for all this, she was not united as one person with Adam, they still remained two distinct persons, and therefore their personal actions must needs be distinguished.

As for example, in the case of eating the forbidden fruit, Eve's act in eating the forbidden fruit was her own personal disobedience; and Adam had not bin made a sinner by it (if he had forborne eating) notwithstanding his natural and matrimonial union with her: on the contrary, Adam's act in eating the forbidden fruit was his own personal act of disobedience, and Eve could not have bin corrupted thereby if she had not disobeyed in her own person, notwithstanding her natural and matrimonial union with Adam: But as soon as both had eaten, both were under the curse of the law by their own personal disobediences; and according to the curse of the law, they both became dead in corruption and sin; and thereby
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thereby they procured not only a corrupt nature to themselves, but to all their posterity; and in this respect the Apostle doth compare the efficacy of Christ's mediatorial obedience, to the efficacy of Adam's disobedience; Rom. 5. 19.

Adam's disobedience had this effect, that it procured a corrupt and sinful nature to himself and to all his posterity, which otherwise had continued righteous and sinless.

In like sort Christ's mediatorial obedience had this effect, that it procured God's Fatherly atonement and acceptance of all his posterity or seed that should be born of the same promise; Gen. 3. 15.

for Christ is the father of all the elect, by procuring their new birth, or by procuring their acceptance in the adoption of sons: By one man (faith the Apostle) sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed over all men, in whom all men have sinned: that is the common doctrine of Impartial, in whose person all men have sinned, in eating the forbidden fruit (by imputation) as Adam did: this exposition I do not like; but the true meaning of the Apostle lies thus.

By one man sin entered into the world (namely by Adam's sin of disobedience, in eating the forbidden fruit) sin entered into the world and death by sin, (namely that spiritual death in corruption and sin which fell upon Adam and his posterity for his sin in eating the forbidden fruit) and so death (namely the said spiritual death) passed over all men; in whom all men have sinned; that is to say, in whose loines all men have sinned (by receiving from his loines his corrupt nature, which is sin) not whose act of disobedience in eating the forbidden fruit; all men have sinned in eating the forbidden fruit, for then we must have bin united to Adam as one person with him; but in whom, or in whose loines, all men have sinned, for we drew a corrupt nature from Adam's loines which is both sin in itself, and also it is the punishment of Adam's sinful eating: and in this sense David doth acknowledge, that he was conceived or warmed in sin; Ps. 51. and this sin and corruption dwelleth in us; Rom. 7. 17.

I confess that the doctrine of spiritual union with Christ by faith is a most comfortable doctrine to all true believers, provided we do not corrupt the right meaning of it by the common doctrine of imputation, as many do, and as your Author doth in particular.
for in p. 47, he calls our spiritual union our unity with Christ, and in p. 53, (he faith) that we are made the sons of God, by being one in unity with the Son of God; by which unity alone (faith he) we are made the sons of God: and in other places he often calls our spiritual union our unity with Christ.

This phrase I do not like, for though all believers are one mystical body with Christ by faith, yet they are not one with him in the personal unity of both his natures: but your Author in effect doth affirm that all believers are one with Christ in the personal unity of both his natures; for he affirmeth, that a believing sinner is made righteous in God's sight by the passive obedience of Christ, which (faith he) God doth impute to all believers as their righteousness: but it passeth my understanding to conceive how God in justice can impute the act of Christ's mediatorial sacrifice of atonement to us as our act, unless he do first make us one with Christ in the personal unity of both his natures, (which is a gross absurdity to affirm) for Christ did actuate his oblation by his eternal spirit; and how can the action of the eternal spirit be imputed to us as our act? I see not: neither can I see how any of the actions of Christ can be imputed to believers as their actions.

You may as well say that the actions of the head ought to be imputed to the hand, or to the foot, as their proper actions; as say the mediatorial actions of Christ are imputed to each several member of his mystical body, acknowledge that the actions which are done by the head, are done for the good and benefit of each several member of the body, by reason of their natural union with the head, as fully and as effectually as if every member could have done the very same actions of the head.

In like sort our blessed Mediator (as he is the mystical head of all believers in the covenant of grace) did take care to do all and every act of mediatorial obedience that might procure his Fathers atonement, for the good and benefit of every member of his mystical body, as fully and effectually as if every member could have performed those acts of mediatorial obedience themselves: and in this sense God doth impute the efficacy of all Christ's mediatorial obedience to all believers as the only meritorious price for the procuring of his Fathers atonement for them: which atonement of the Father doth comprehend under it our full redemption and freedom from sin.
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...sinwhich is a sinners full and perfect justification; and also it doth comprehend under it, Gods favourable accepting of believing sinners unto the adoption of Sons.

2. This also must be remembered as another sure foundation to the form of our spiritual union with Christ that the holy spirit doth not unite any soul to Christ, until it hath first wrought in that soul the grace of actual believing: he that believeth not on the son shall not see life; John 3. 18. 36. Christ doth first procure the spirit of his Father, and then he doth take hold on a poor soul by that spirit, and thereby he doth enable that soul to take hold on him again by faith, and so the union is made up; for as there can be no good marriage union made between man and woman but by mutual giving and taking each other, so in like sort there can be no true spiritual marriage union made between Christ and the souls of the elect, but by giving and taking each other: Christ doth first take hold of them by his spirit, and at the same time he doth enable them to believe, by which faith he doth enable them to take hold on him again, and then the union is made up: John 15. 4. 5. So then, the only grace of the spirit whereby our union with Christ is formed and made complete, is the grace of faith: Then, and not till then, a soul hath a true personal right and interest in the Fathers atonement, which doth comprehend under it our Redemption, Justification, and Adoption.

3. This also must be remembered as another necessary consideration in the point of our spiritual union; namely that our union with the Mediator by faith doth bring us in a familiar way to be united to his Father as to our father, for we cannot come to the Father by any other way or means but by the Mediator; John 14. 6. For Christ as mediator, is God's Son by ordination; and in that respect he is often called Gods Son and Gods Servant; and so faithful servants are often called children and sons; and his service was meritorious to procure God's atonement for our Adoption as well as for our Justification.

Therefore whenever the Father doth actually adopt any to be his Children, he doth it by his spirit through the Mediator; and by that spirit he doth enable them to express their Child-like union, by crying unto him Abba, Father; Rom. 8. 15. and in this sort the Apostle John, doth teach us to extend our union unto the Father.

Adoption is never communicated to any by the Father until we be spiritual united to the mediator by faith. And then by that union he doth bring us to be united to his Father as to our father, namely by faith, bringing us to receive the grace of adoption.
Father, saying, whereby we know that we dwell in him, because he hath given us of his spirit, John 4. 13. So then, as soon as ever a believing sinner is united to Christ by faith, he is at the same instant united to his Father also by the spirit of adoption: and thus we come in a familiar way to be united first to the Mediator, and then to his Father as to our Father, which is the highest degree of happiness that ever any poor sinner can think on.

Truelt, You make our union with the Father to begin first in the Mediator, but the Apostle James doth tell us, that the Father doth beget us of his own good will; James 1. 18. Hence I infer that the Father doth unite us immediately to himself by Adoption, even from Eternity, for he that begets, and they that are begotten of him, are immediately united.

Divine The Father begets none (neither from eternity nor in time) without his mean, that is, to say, without the Mediator, nor yet without the holy Spirit; and therefore in that respect the holy Spirit is called the Seed of God. 1 John 3. 9.

Hence I infer, that all the persons in Trinity may be truly called our Father in the act of our spiritual generation, though in a differing manner.

1. God the Father is our Father efficiently, and in that sense the Apostle James saith, that of his own good will he begat us by the word of truth; his meaning is, that the Father's good will and pleasure was the only efficient cause of our adoption, by ordaining the word of truth as the effectual instrument thereof.

2. The mediator is our Father in the act of our spiritual generation, because he is the meritorious procuring cause of our new birth; and in this respect he is called our everlasting Father: Isa. 9. 6. because he did from everlasting covenant with his Father to make his soul a mediatorial sacrifice of atonement for the procuring of his Fathers atonement to all the elect, not only for the pardon of their sins, but also for their favorable acceptation; that is to say, for their receiving into the favour of children by adoption; and in this sense Christ is called our everlasting Father: namely because he was ordained by the Father to be the procuring cause of our adoption.

The Father from eternity propounded the conditions of his good will and pleasure to the mediator to this effect; if thou wilt...
bchcmec the seed of the woman, and if thou wilt break thee dices heead-plot by giving thy soul a sacrifice for sin, then (I will reward thee for it) I will prolong thy days and thou shalt see thy seed, Is. 53. 10. Ps. 22. 30. Is. 45. 16. Ps. 89. 4. In all these places the elect are called the seed or the children of Christ the mediator, namely because God gave them to Christ; Heb. 2. 13, or elected them unto the adoption of sons in and through the mediator: for he ordained Christ to be the Meritorious procuring cause of their Adoption, Ep. 1. 4, 5.

Christ submits to these conditions and faith, sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not have, but a body hast thou prepared me: then said I, lo I come to do thy will O God; by the doing of which will we are sanctified (or freed from sin, and so made fit to be the children of God) by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all, Heb. 10. Ps. 40. Hence it is evident that Christ is our Father, because by his sacrifice of atonement he hath procured his Fathers atonement for our Redemption, Justification, and Adoption; and therefore Moses makes this interrogation, is not he thy Father that hath bought thee? Deut. 32. 6. Is. 64. 8.

3. The holy Spirit is our Father also in the first act of our spiritual generation, because he is the principal instrumental cause of our new birth, and therefore he may well be called our Father; for if Paul might truly call himself a Father of souls, because he was a sub-ordinate instrument in their new birth; 2 Cor. 4. 15. Then much more may the holy spirit be called our Father, because he is the principal instrumental cause of our new birth: and in this respect our new birth is a tributary to water and the spirit; John 3. 5. 6. 8. that is to say, to the word and Spirit.

Hence also we may see the reason why our Saviour taught us to pray (not to any one person in the Trinity severally, but) to all the Trinity jointly under the name Father, saying, when ye pray, say, O our Father which art in heaven, Matt. 6. 9.

2. Hence we may learn that none can make an effectual prayer except he pray to all the Trinity; namely to the Father through the Mediator, by the holy Ghost; to pray to any one person alone is idolatry: and thus each person in Trinity is our Father, and therefore all the Trinity must have a hand in our regeneration or adoption.

3. Hence we may also see the reason why the Father doth not unite
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unite a soul to himself immediately by his spirit in the first act of our new birth; namely, because he begets not by himself alone, but by and through his means, that is to say by and through the mediator: Eph. 2. 18. We cannot come unto God any other way but through the mediator; John 14. 6. He doth bring us unto God, Heb. 2. 10. none else can be saved but those that come unto God by him; Heb. 7. 25. Therefore Christ the mediator is the only meritorious procuring cause of God's favourable acceptance, receiving us into the favor of sons.

And now for brevity sake I will explain the point of Adoption in six Heads.

1. The subject matter of God's Adoption, is reconciled sinners, Eph. 2. 16. 18. 2 Cor. 5. 18, 19. Rom. 5. 10. Col. 1. 20.

2. The meritorious procuring cause of our adoption, is Christ's mediatorial sacrifice of Atonement: for by his sacrifice of atonement he hath procured his Fathers atonement, which doth comprehend under it, not only God's pardoning mercy for our justification, but his Fatherly acceptance, by which he doth receive sinners unto the adoption of sons, Gal. 4. 4, 5. Heb. 2. 10. together with all the other places above cited.

(But your Author denies this, and faith in chap. 19. That adoption doth neither depend upon, nor flow from the death of Christ, but from his personal property of being the Son of God: this assertion doth directly cross the very scope of that scripture, in Gal. 4. 5. which makes the death of Christ to be the mediatorial procuring cause of the fathers adoption, yea Christ is the mediatorial procuring cause and way of conveyance of every spiritual blessing that the Father bestows upon us, Eph. 1. 3.)

3. The formal cause of our adoption, must needs proceed from the Fathers merciful Atonement in receiving sinners into favour, this is the second part of Gods atonement (but your Author in chap. 9. doth greatly blame another learned man, for the dividing the Fathers atonement into justification and adoption: he might as well blame our Saviour for dividing the whole law into two great commandments, as blame him for that division; and I think I have already sufficiently justified that division, and yet once more I will do it by and by, in opening the Fathers atonement.)

4. The instrumental means whereby we receive adoption from
from the Father, is faith in and through the mediator; and under this instrument of faith, I do comprehend both the word and the spirit; for we cannot be born from the death of sin to the life of faith, but by water and the spirit: that is to say, by the word and spirit; John 3:5, 6. 8. John 1:12. 1 John 1:18. Gal. 3:26. John 11:25, 26.

5. The efficient cause of all former causes, is the free grace of God in himself; Eph. 1:5. It was his free grace to ordain a mediator to procure our atonement and adoption; and it is his free grace to elect a certain number of the fallen Sons of Adam to adoption in and through the mediator, as the only way by whom believing sinners must have access to the Father; Eph. 2:18. John 14:6. and also it was the free grace of God to ordain the holy spirit to proceed from the Father and the Son, to work the grace of faith in all the Elect, whereby they might receive the fathers adoption in and through the mediator; for the holy spirit doth proceed from the Father efficiently, and from the mediator as the procuring cause of it, and therefore the Father doth send the comforter in Christ's name; John 14:26. and of it John 15:26. the Son doth send the comforter from the Father as the procuring cause; and thus all the works, both of the Son of us, and of the holy Ghost in us, do proceed efficiently from the free grace of God the Father, Eph. 1:15.

6. The end of all these causes and effects, is the glory of God's free grace in our adoption and salvation.

The Fathers Atonement described, comprehended under its justification, and Adoption.

These two parts of the Fathers atonement or reconciliation are evident by the effects which all the sacrifices of Atonement under the law did procure to poor believing sinners (for all sacrifices of atonement under the law did typifie Christ's sacrifice of atonement) and they procured the fathers atonement, which hath a three fold effect towards poor believing sinners;

1. All sacrifices of Atonement in general were ordained to procure a favor of rest unto Jehovah, namely to procure a Savior of rest to God the father.

2. The sin offerings (which were sacrifices of atonement) were ordained
ordained by God to procure God's merciful pardon and forgiveness to poor believing sinners, by which means only sinners are made sinners; that is to say, just and righteous in God's sight.

3. The burnt offerings (which also were sacrifices of atonement) were ordained by God to procure His favorable acceptance towards poor believing sinners, by receiving them into special favour as adopted sons.

I will begin with the first principal effect of the mediators sacrifice of atonement in procuring the Father's atonement; and that is, God's rest and sweet content in the mediator, and in his mediatorial sacrifice; nothing in the whole world can be found wherein God can be said to rest, until he did first rest in the mediator, and in his mediatorial sacrifice: God cannot be said to rest neither in the creation, nor in the first seventh day after the creation, until he found rest in the mediator; in all things the mediator must have the preeminence; Col. 1. 17, 18, 19. in the first day of the creation, as soon as God had made man and woman after his own image, God saw every thing that he had made, and lo it was very good: Gen. 1. 31. but presently after Satan by his subtil head-plot did draw them both into the sin of disobedient eating, whereby they became dead in corrupt and sinful qualities, and to the glory of all God's creation was spoiled; and then God was displeased, grieved, and burdened with their sin, & the evil consequence of it: (for all sin is a grievous burden to God; Amos 2. 13. Es. 1. 14. Col. 2. 23.) And in this regard God could not rest neither in the works of the creation, nor in the first seventh day, until of his great mercy he had manifested his secret counsell from eternity, which was to perfect his creation by the mediator: and for the effecting of this thing to Adam, God was pleased to convince Adam of his sin, and thereby made him see his miserable lost condition; and then he was pleased to promise unto him that the seed of the woman should break the devil's head-plot; & he did also teach him the manner how the seed of the woman should break the devil's head-plot, namely by teaching him how to offer a Lamb in sacrifice, as a type of that sacrifice of atonement which Christ the Lamb of God should one day make in the fullness of time (for he was typically slain from the beginning of the world; Rev. 13. 8.)

All this was done upon the first day, and then God rested the seventh
seventh day from all his works, because in the evening of the sixth day, he had declared the Mediator by whom he did in the creation: namely by a price of redemption, which was performed by his mediatorial sacrifice of atonement: this was the only true reason of God's rest in the first seventh day after the Creation.

2. This also was the only true reason why God commanded Adam and his posterity to rest every seventh day from all their bodily labour, namely first, that it might be a typical sign to them of their closing, and of God's resting in Christ; and secondly, that it might be (s)pent as a meditated time of rest in the meditation of their redemption by Christ.

And according to the Tenor the Hebrew doctors have a true and a common saying, that God rested not until he made his Son heir of all; this (and in the visible works of creation barely considered) was the true reason why God kept the first Sabbath that ever was as a day of rest, namely because it was the last day wherein God reigned from all his works which he had created, perfected, and established by the Mosaic; Gen. 2. 3. for the visible creation did not continue perfect one whole day in Adam's innocency, as I have explained the matter more at large in my treatise upon the foundation of the Sabbath.

3. This also was the only true reason why all sacrifices of atonement were ordained to procure a favor of rest unto Jehovah.

1. The burnt offerings were ordained to procure a favor of rest unto Jehovah; Exo. 22. 18. 25. 41. Lev. 1. 9. Num. 28. 6. 8. A. 2. The sin offerings were ordained to procure a favor of rest unto Jehovah; Lev. 4. 3. 1. Year all offerings in general were ordained to procure a favor of rest unto Jehovah; Lev. 17. 6. Num. 15. 3. But the seventy times three is a sweet savour in the land, which I have declared in the Apocalypse. Paul doth follow, laying Christ hath given himself for an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet savour of men unto God, while the devil. 2. But the fainest of them that is appointed in the fire is not a very sweet savour in the nostrils of man; therefore we must conceive that the sweetmeats of Christ's sacrifice doth lie in his presens sufferings but in his mediatorial ob dience, when he died by his own p. was actually given up his soul to God as a mediatorial sacrifice, by the joint concurrence of both his natures. This mediatorial act of his did make his death to be the most sweet mediatorial
sacrifice that ever God could desire; or that the mediator could perform, for the procuring of God's rest and sweet content: (the phrase of sweet smell is borrowed from men who use to be delighted with sweet savours; Isa. 3. 24. Cant. 1. 2.) and in this respect as soon as ever the Father had installed the Mediator into his office, he declared his sweet rest and content in the Mediator, saying this is my well beloved Son in whom I delight; Mat. 3. 17. on the contrary, when God rejecteth a people for their sins he saith, I will not smell the smell of your sacrifices of rest: Lev. 26. 31.

4. From hence also we may see the true reason why the tabernacle and Temple (which did typifie the humane nature of Christ) were called God's rest, Psa. 132. 8. 14. 2 Chr. 6. 41. not because he needed a house of stone to rest in, for both Ephay and Steven do tell us there is no house that any man can build with stone or wood that can properly be called the place of God's rest; Isa. 66. 1. Matt. 7. 49, but they were only called God's rest typically, namely, to typifie God's rest in the Mediator: In him God delighteth to dwell for ever, for he is the only procuring cause of his atonement to poor believing sinners; which atonement of his hath a double effect, namely forgiveness of sins, and receiving into favour.

The first effect of the Fathers atonement thus procured by Christ's medierial sacrifice towards poor believing sinners is his merciful pardon and forgivenes.

This was typified and promised to all sacrifices of atonement under the Law, first, it was typified and promis'd to the sin offerings: they were ordained to procure God's merciful pardon and forgivenes to the owners; Lev. 4. 20. 26. 31. 35. Secondly the burnt offerings; and thirdly the Trespass offerings were ordained to procure God's merciful pardon and forgivenes to poor believing sinners: Lev. 5. 10. 13. 16. 18. Lev. 6. 7. Lev. 19. 22. Num. 15. 25. 26. and See Ains. in Ps. 25. 11.

2. The true nature and extent of God's merciful forgivenes is of weighty consideration, for it is of a differing nature from legal forgivenes: for legal forgivenes doth no more but barely acquit a man of his fault and so leaves him: but God's forgivenes is always mixed with his Fatherly love and pity; as I have opened the nature of it in Pf. 25. 18. so that God's forgivenes doth comprehend under it his receiving of poor believing sinners into special grace
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grace and favor: and in this sense Moses pray'd thus to the Father, Pardon our iniquity and our sin, and take us for thine inheritance: Exod. 34. 9. If God did no more but acquit a sinner of the fault, and so leave him, it could not make a man blessed: but God's forgiveness doth make a man blessed, Ps. 32. 1. therefore his forgiveness is not only a bare acquittance of the fault, but it doth also comprehend under it his receiving of sinners into favor; and yet I do also grant that his receiving of sinners into favor, must be distinguished as another part of God's atonement, for clearer light take, into the full nature of his atonement.

Thirdly, This also must be remembered, that no other person in Trinity doth forgive sins formally but God the Father only, Mark 2. 7. Col. 2. 13. he of his free grace did ordain the Mediator as the meritorious procuring cause of his forgivenes; and therefore it is laid that he doth forgive us all our sins for Christ's sake, Eph. 4. 32. sometimes Christ is laid to forgive sins; Col. 3. 13. but still we must understand his forgivenes to be in a mediatorial way, and not formally.

And according to God's promise in the new Covenant, his forgivenes is of that nature, that it doth make a sinner perfectly just or righteous; for the promise runs thus, I will be merciful to their unrighteousness: Heb. 8. 12. that is to say, I will make themperfectly righteous by my merciful pardon and forgivenes.

The second effect of the Father's atonement procured by the Mediator's sacrifices of atonement (as it was typified and promised in the law to their sacrifices of atonement) is God's favorable acceptation in receiving poor sinners into special favor: First God ordained burnt offerings, that poor believing sinners might find favorable acceptance into his presence; Lev. 1. 4. Secondly, He ordained the sacrifice of first-fruits to be waved or offered before him for his favorable acceptation of the whole Church of Israel; Lev. 23. 11. and in this respect they are styled, his first-fruits, and his first born: Rom. 8. 30. Heb. 12. 23. Jam. 1. 18. Jer. 14. 4. Jer. 23. 3. Thirdly the High Priest (who was a type of the Mediator) did often present himself before Jehovah with his golden plate upon his forehead, wherein was Holiness to Jehovah: and this appearing of him before Jehovah was to procure his favorable acceptation of the whole Church of Israel; Exe. 28. 38.

The Hebrew Raa'son, which signifies God's favorable acceptation.
ous acceptance, is derived from a word signifying Accept, as the Apostle in He.12.6. doth expound Pr.3.12. and as Mat.12.18. doth expound Is. 42.1. in whom he is well pleased or delighted; See Ains. in Ps. 5.13. and so in him God is well pleased with all believing sinners receiving them into the favor of Sons by adoption.

Yoursly, The godly did always understand the Fathers atonement to comprehend under it his gracious favor to poor believing sinners, and therefore Amosah laid to David when he went to offer a burnt offering, the Lord thy God accept thee: 1 Sam. 7.2. 23. he knew well enough that burnt offerings were ordained not only to pacifie God, but also by an acquaintance of bare forgiveness, but also to procure his gracious acceptance of poor believing sinners; and therefore sometimes God did visibly manifest his gracious acceptance of poor believing sinners, when he did burn their offerings into ashes, by sending a fire from heaven to consume them into ashes; Ps. 22.4. 1 Kings 18.38. Lev.9.24. and in this late Moses's wife doth interpret a miraculous fire that consumed their offering to signify, she said this to her husband, If the Lord would kill us, he would not have accepted a burnt offering at our hands; Judg. 13. 23. he knew that God accepted them into favor, because he sent a fire from heaven to burn their sacrifice.

God doth not accept of unbelieving sinners, because they want faith in the Mediator, but as poor sinners is in the Mediator by faith, God doth receive all or all in the Mediator's sacrifice of Atonement, and doth receive them into special favor; and therefore when the Lord doth promise to accept his one-man, he tells them that they may be planted to him with their favor of rest in the height of a holy Mount, Ezek. 20.40.41.

In like wise the Lord did promise the flocks of Kedar and Nebaioth, as thy soul shall come with acceptance upon his Altar (that is, with a peace offering) and then I will glorify the house of my glory; Mic. 7.18. and thereby God's manifesting mercy to his people, consecrating to Moses Tabernacle, and Solomon's Temple; then God did glorify the house of his glory, because he did then burn their sacrifices with fire from heaven. I will declare thereby his gracious acceptance, Exod. 40.34. 1 Kings 8.26. 34. 18. 35. 5. 24. 25. 26. 67. 1 Pet. 2.5. Acts. 10.35.

But in the new Testament doth also explain God's favorable acceptance in this, God hath made us accepted in his beloved, Eph. 2.6. that is to say, God hath ordained the Mediator to be the procuring
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curing cause of our acceptance: and through him we have access by one spirit unto the Father, Eph. 1:18. that is to say, through Christ we have access with acceptance unto the Father, Rom. 5:2. and the Apostle Peter hath thus, We are built up a spiritual house, a holy Priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ: 1 Pet. 2:5. Mal. 3:3, 4. Hence it is evident, that nothing else but Christ, and faith in Christ the Mediator, can make us acceptable to God; not the blood of Goats and Bulls upon a thousand Mountains. Ps. 50. In like sort when Paul had received that liberal blessing from the Philippians, he doth call it a sweet smelling savour, a sacrifice acceptable and well pleasing unto God, Phil. 4:18. he tells them that their gift to him was acceptable to God, because it was sent to Paul in and for the Name of Christ; this is the only true reason why the Apostle doth call it a sweet smelling savour, and a sacrifice acceptable and well pleasing to God: and this was the true reason also why God accepted of Job's person and prayer for his three friends that had provoked God's anger by their deceitful and erroneous disputations; namely, because he presented God with a burnt offering for them, that is to say, because he did by faith present God with Christ's mediatorial sacrifice of Atonement, typified by his burnt-offerings, Job 42:8, 9.

And because God's people are apt to lose the sense of God's love by their sinful abominations, they must often go unto God by prayer, & intreat him to turn his face, that is to say, to receive them again into his willed favour, Ps. 69:16. Ps. 25:16. Ps. 67:1. Num. 6:26.

But on the contrary, when God doth reject the persons of unbelieving and unrepentant sinners, he speaks to them thus, Your burnt offerings are not acceptable to him; Jer. 6:6. When they fast I will not hear their cry; when they offer burnt offerings and oblations, I will not accept them to favor; but will consume them by the sword, by the famine, and by the pestilence: Jer. 14. 20. 10. Am. 5:22.

And because apostate sinners do through corruption of nature and Satan's temptations fall daily into sin, therefore God was pleased in great mercy to teach them how they might renew the assurance of those mercies to their souls, either by presenting the Lord with sacrifices of atonement as oft as their peace was broken, or else by presenting the Lord daily with renewed repentance and faith of dependance; or else by daily coming to the Lord's Table there to behold Christ's mediatorial sacrifice of Atonement as the procuring
procuring cause of God's Atonement for the better alluring of their justification and Adoption; and whereas I have often times in this treatise made God's Atonement to comprehend under it our redemption from sin as well as our justification and Adoption, I would have you to take notice that I do not mean that God's Atonement doth contain under it redemption as another distinct point differing from justification: but I make our redemption and freedom from sin by the Fathers Atonement to be all one with our justification from sin.

The Fathers Atonement or reconciliation is the top mercy of all mercies that makes a poor sinner happy.

But the truth is, a sinner's Atonement must be considered as it is the work of all the Trinity.

1. The Father must be considered both as the efficient and as the formal cause of a sinner's Atonement.

2. The mediator must be considered as the only meritorious procuring cause of the Fathers Atonement Rom. 5. 19.

3. The holy Ghost must be considered as the principal instrumental cause of the Fathers Atonement, by working in sinners the grace of faith by which sinners are enabled to apprehend and receive the fathers Atonement, for their further up to justification and Adoption; which spiritual blessings the sinner receive into their souls as soon as ever they do believe in Christ.

But this work of the holy Ghost is diversely called or named in Scripture: sometimes it is called effectual operation; sometimes it is called Regeneration, or our new birth; sometimes our first Reformation, namely from the death of sin to the life of grace; sometimes it is called our Repentance or Conversion, sometimes Believing; sometimes our union with Christ; but no sinner can be united to Christ until he be turned from sin and drawn to Christ by faith, so that faith is the only grace of our union with Christ.

Or thus, The Father must be considered as the efficient cause, the Son as the mediatorial procuring cause, and the Holy Ghost as the principal instrumental cause of all spiritual blessings that poor believing sinners do enjoy; Eph. 1. 3.

To conclude, if thou hast gotten any spiritual blessing by any thing that I have said in this treatise, let God have all the glory: Amen.

FIN. I