

A DISCOURSE OF THE NECESSITY OF CHRIST'S DEATH.

Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?
—LUKE XXIV. 26.

THE words are an answer of our Saviour's to the discourse of two of the disciples who were going to Emmaus, ver. 13. He came *incognito* to them while they were discoursing together of the great news of that time, viz., the death of their master, whom they acknowledge 'a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people,' ver. 19; confirmed by God to be so by miracles, and confessed to be so by the people. Yet they questioned whether he were the Messiah that should redeem Israel, and erect the kingdom so much promised and predicted in the Scripture. They could not tell how to reconcile the ignominy of his death with the grandeur of his office, and glory of a king. And though they had heard by the women of 'a vision of angels' that assured them 'he was alive,' yet they do not seem in their discourse to give any credit to the report, but relate it as they heard it; though both by what they said before, ver. 21, that they had 'trusted that it was he that should have redeemed Israel,' and also by the sharp reproof Christ gives them, ver. 25, 'O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken!' we may conclude that they thought it a mere illusion, or a groundless imagination of the women. Christ, to rectify their minds, begins with a reproof, and follows it with an instruction, that what they thought a ground to question the truth of his office, and the reality of his being the Messiah, was rather an argument to confirm and establish it, since that person characterised in the Old Testament to be the Messiah was to wade to his glory through a sea of blood, and such sufferings in every kind as cruel and shameful as that person in whom they thought they had been deceived, had suffered three days before; and afterwards discourseth from the Scripture that his death, and such a kind of death, did well agree with the predictions of the prophets; and therefore, 'beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.' He might well sum up in two or three hours' time (wherein we may suppose he was with them) most of those testimonies which did foretell his sufferings for the expiation of sin. The proposition which he maintains from Moses and the prophets, is in the text, 'Ought not Christ

to have suffered those things ?' which is laid down by way of interrogation, but equivalent to an affirmation ; and he backed, without question, his discourse with many reasonings for the confirmation of it, to reduce them from the distrust they had to a full assent to the necessity of his death, in order to his own glory, and consequently theirs ; the foundation of his own exaltation, and the redemption of mankind, being laid in his being a sacrifice.

Ought not ?

1. It is not said, it is convenient or becoming. As it was said of his baptism, Matt. iii. 15, 'It becomes us to fulfil all righteousness.' His baptism had more of a convenience than necessity.* He might have been the Messiah without subjecting himself to the ceremonial law, or passing under the baptism of John. But it was impossible he should be a redeeming Christ without undergoing an accursed death. No sin was expiated merely by his submission to the yoke of legal rites, or the baptismal water of John ; all expiation of sin was founded only in his bloody baptism.

2. It is said, *he ought*. Not an absolute, but a conditional *ought* ; not his original duty as the Son of God, but a voluntary duty as the redeemer of man. He voluntarily engaged at first in it, and voluntarily proceeded to the utmost execution, yet necessarily after his first engagement. Necessity there was, but not compulsion. All necessity doth not imply constraint, and exclude will. Paul must necessarily die by the law appointed to all men, but willingly he 'desires to be dissolved, and to be with Christ.' God is necessarily holy and true, yet not unwillingly so. Angels and glorified souls are necessarily holy by their confirmation in a gracious and glorious state, yet voluntarily so by a full and free inclination ; necessary by the decree and counsel of God, necessary by the engagement and promise of Christ, necessary by the predictions and prophecies of Scripture.† All which causes of necessity are linked together, because the restoration of man required such a suffering ; therefore it was from eternity decreed by God, embraced by Christ, published in Scripture. It was ordained in heaven, and set out in the *manifesto* of the Old Testament ; so that if this death had not been suffered, the counsel of God concerning redemption had been defeated, the word and promises of Christ violated, and the truth of God in the predictions of the prophets had fallen to the ground. The decree of God was declared in many prophecies before the execution ; and this will of God is an evidence of the necessity of it.‡ Why did he ordain it, if it were not necessary to so great an end ? Though the end, the redemption of man, was not necessary, yet, when the end was resolved on, this, as the means, was found necessary in the counsel of God. The natural inclination and will of Christ, as man, did startle at it, when he desired that this cup might pass from him. It was contrary to the reason and common sense of men. How, then, should that infinite Wisdom, that wills nothing but what is unquestionably reasonable, have determined such a means, if it had not been necessary for his own glory and man's recovery ? But both the Father and the Son were moved to it by the height of that good will they bore to the fallen creature.

These things, ταῦτα. Every one of those severe and sharp circumstances. The whole system of those sufferings, not a dart that pierced him, not a reproach that grated upon him, but was ordained ; every step he took in blood and suffering was marked out to him. Since Christ was to die for the reparation of man, for the expiation of sin, it was necessary that his death should be attended with those particular sharpnesses that might render his love more admirable, the justice of God more dreadful, the evil of sin more abominable,

* Daillé, Sermon de Resurrect. de Christ, p. 226.

† Gerhard in loc.

‡ Daillé, Sermon de Resurrect. de Christ, p. 226.

and the satisfaction itself more valuable. The intenseness of his love had not been set off so amiably in a light and easy death, as in a painful and shameful suffering; and though the greatness of his merit and the fulness of his satisfaction did principally arise from the dignity of the suffering person, yet some consideration might be also had of the greatness of his suffering. Not only his death, as he was considered equal with God, but his shameful death in the circumstance of the cross, is a mark of his obedience and a cause of his exaltation, Philip. ii. 8. Both were regarded in the crown of glory, and that high dignity wherein he was instated, so that the sum of Christ's speech amounts to this much: be not doubtful whether the person so lately suffering, whom you account so great a prophet, were the Messiah. You clearly may see in the prophets that nothing hath been inflicted on him but what was predicted of him; so that it is not merely the malice of man that hath caused those sufferings; that was only a means God in his infinite wisdom used to bring about his own counsel. He was not forced to what he suffered, but willingly delivered up himself to perform the charge and office of a Redeemer, which could not else have been accomplished by him; and that glory which you expected, was not by the order of God to be conferred upon him till he abased himself to such a passion. He will have a glory to your comfort, though not answering your carnal expectations. Be not dejected, but recover your hopes of redemption which you seem to have lost, and let them be rectified in the expectation, not of an earthly, but an heavenly, glory.

Observe,

1. The nature of Christ's sufferings, *these things*.
2. The necessity, *Ought not Christ to suffer?*
3. The consequence, *and to enter into his glory*.

There are two doctrines to be insisted on from these words:

1. There was a necessity of Christ's death.
2. Christ's exaltation was as necessary as his passion.

For the first, there was a necessity of the death of Christ. It was necessary by the counsel of God, Acts ii. 23; 'Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, Acts iv. 28. It was not a fruit of second causes, which God only suffered by a bare permission, but it was a decree of his will fixed and determined, and that before the world began, an irrevocable decree God made to deliver his Son to death for the sins of men, and according to this counsel he was in time delivered, and by the merit of his death hath reconciled to God all those that believe in him.

In handling this doctrine, I shall shew,

- (1.) What kind of necessity this was.
- (2.) That it was necessary.
- (3.) The use.

1. What kind of necessity this was.

Prop. 1. His death was not absolutely necessary, but conditionally.

(1.) It supposeth, first, the entrance of sin. There was no necessity that sin should enter into the world. There was no necessity on man's part to sin. Though he was created with a possibility of sinning, yet not with a necessity; he was created mutable, but not corruptible: 'God made man upright,' Eccles. vii. 29. His faculties, as bestowed upon him, stood right to God. He had an understanding to know what of God was fit for him to know, a will without any wrong bias to embrace him, and affections to love him. God permitted him to fall, the devil allured him to sin, but neither the one nor the other did immediately influence his will to the commission of his crime. There was no necessity on God's part that sin

should enter ; though his wisdom thought good to permit it, yet there was no absolute necessity that it should step up in the world. He might have fixed man, as well as the holy angels, in an eternal purity ; he might have enlightened the mind of man by a particular act of grace at the first proposal of the temptation by the devil, to discern his deceit and stratagem, and so might have prevented man's sin as well as permitted it. Had not sin entered, there had been no occasion for the death of the creature, much less for the death of Christ. The honour of God had not been invaded ; there had been no provoked justice to satisfy, nor any violated law to vindicate. Some indeed there are* that think the incarnation of Christ had been necessary without the entrance of sin, because they consider God of so holy a nature that it had been impossible for him to be pleased with any creature, though the work of his own hands, so that neither angels nor men could have stood one moment in his sight without beholding him in the face of a mediator. Several had anciently imagined† that if man had continued in obedience till the time appointed for his confirmation, then Christ would have been incarnate, and man have become one mystical person with him for his confirmation, as the angels were confirmed by him ; but none assert the death of Christ but upon supposition of sin. All sacrifices for sin imply the guilt of sin antecedent to them ; but after man had transgressed the rule by his disobedience, and thereby made himself incapable of answering the terms of that righteous law which God had set him, the death of Christ became as necessary as his incarnation, for the righting the injured law and satisfying offended justice, and the conveyance of mercy to the creature, with the honour of God and preservation of his rights. As Christ's rejoicing from eternity, 'in the habitable parts of the earth,' supposeth the creation of the world in the order of God's decree, Prov. viii. 31, so the eternal counsel of God, for the making his Son a sacrifice, supposeth the rise of sin and iniquity in the world. Had not man run cross to the preceptive will of God, he had enjoyed the presence of God without a sacrificed mediator, and would have had an everlasting communion with him in happiness ; but after sin entered upon the world, there was need of a propitiation for sin. An infinitely pure God could not have communion with an impure creature. It was not fit a sovereign majesty should make himself savingly known to his creature without a propitiatory.

(2.) It supposeth death to be settled by God as the punishment of sin. Some question whether it were absolutely necessary that death should have been threatened upon the breach of the law. It is true, as the law depends upon the will of the lawgiver, so doth the punishment. And it is in his liberty, if you consider him as an absolute sovereign, to annex what penalty he pleaseth ; yet, as all laws are to spring from righteousness, so all punishments are to be regulated by righteousness and equity, that a punishment deserved by the greatest crime should not be ordered as the recompense of offences of a lighter nature. But in the case of transgressions against God, no penalty less than death, and eternal death, could, according to the rules of justice, have been appointed. It is certain sin doth naturally oblige to punishment : it is senseless to imagine that a law should be transgressed without some penalty incurred. A law is utterly insignificant without it, and it is inconsistent with the wisdom of a lawgiver to enact a precept without adding a penalty. If, therefore, a punishment be due to sin, it is requisite, according to the rules of justice and wisdom, to proportion the punishment to the greatness of the offence. I say this is the rule that

* Bacon's Confession of Faith, at the end of his Remains, pp. 117, 118.

† Jackson, vol. ii. quart. p. 191.

righteousness requires. And it is as natural that a crime should be punished suitably to its demerit as that it should be punished at all. Why doth any fault deserve punishment, but because there is an unreasonableness in it, something against the nature of man, against the nature of a subject, against the authority of the lawgiver, against the order and good of a community? The punishment therefore ought to be as great as the damage to authority by the crime. To order a punishment greater than the crime is tyranny; to order it less than the crime is folly in the government: unrighteousness in both, because there is an inequality between the sin and the penalty. Now, such is the excellency of God's nature, and so inviolable with his creature ought his authority to be, that the least offence against him deserves the highest punishment, because it is against the best and most sovereign being. It seems therefore to us that God had not acted like a righteous governor if he had not denounced death for the sins against him; the offence being the highest, the punishment in the order of justice ought to be the highest. What could be supposed more just and reasonable than for God to deprive man of that life which he had given him, that life which man had received from the goodness of his Creator, and had employed against his authority and glory? As his sin was against the supreme good, so the punishment ought to be the depriving man of his highest good. The vileness of the person offending, and the dignity of the person offended, always communicate an aggravation to the crime. The sin of man, being infinite, did, in the justice of God, merit an infinite punishment. And this is not only written upon the hearts of men by nature, that it is so, but that it is deservedly so, Rom. i. 32, 'that they are worthy of death.' The justice of God in inflicting death for sin is as well known as his power and Godhead, and the justice of it is universally owned in the consciences of men when they are awakened. Adam, when he sinned, did not think the offence of so great a weight, but his roused conscience presented him with those natural notions of the justice of God, and sunk him under the sense of it, till God had revived him by a promise.

(3.) It supposeth that, after man's transgression, and thereby the demerit of death, God would recover and redeem man. There was no necessity incumbent upon God to restore man after his defection from him and rebellion against him. As God was not obliged to prevent man's fall, so he was not obliged to recover man fallen. When he did permit him to offend, he might have let him sink under the weight of his own crimes, and left him buried in the ruins of his fall. He might for ever have reserved him in those chains he had merited, and have let him feed upon the fruit of his own doings, without one thought of his delivery, or employing one finger of that power for his restoration, whereby he had brought him into being; for the restoration of man was no more necessary in itself than the first creation of him was. As God might have left him in his nothing without producing him into being, so he might have left him in his contracted misery without restoring him to happiness. Nor was it any ways more necessary than the reducing the fallen angels to their primitive obedience and felicity. The blessedness and happiness of God had no more been infringed by the eternal destruction of man, than it was by the everlasting ruin of devils. Upon the supposition that God would save sinners after his justice was so fully engaged to punish them, no way in the understanding of man can be thought of, but the sufferings of the creature, or some one for him, to preserve the justice of God from being injured. Though the thoughts of some differ in other things, yet not in this. All say it was not simply necessary that man should be freed from his fallen state. But since God would not hurl all men into the

damnation they had deserved, and treat them as he did the devils in the rigours of his justice, this way of the death of his Son was the most convenient way; * and indeed necessary, not necessary by an antecedent necessity (for there is no such necessity in God respecting created things), but a consequent necessity upon a decree of his will, which being settled, something else must necessarily follow as a means for the execution of that decree; as supposing God would create man to be Lord of the creature, and return him the glory of his works, it were then consequently necessary that he should create him with rational faculties, and fit for those ends for which he created him; but the creation of man in such a frame is not of absolute necessity, but depends upon the antecedent decree of his will, of creating such a creature as should render him the tribute of his works. So it is not necessary that God should free man from the spot of sin, and the misery contracted thereby, and reduce him from damnation to felicity; but since he determined the redemption of him after the violation of the law, which he had confirmed by the penalty of death, God could not without wrong to his justice and truth freely pardon man, because he is immutably righteous and true, and cannot lie; and since he is so righteous a judge that he can no more absolve the guilty than he can condemn the innocent, Exod. xxxiv. 7, his justice was an invincible obstacle to the pardon of sin, though men had implored his mercy with the greatest ardency and affection, unless this justice had been satisfied with a satisfaction suitable to it, *i. e.* infinite as the divine justice is infinite; and since neither man nor any other creature, being all of a finite nature, were able to give a full content to the justice of God, a necessity is then introduced of some infinite person to put himself in the place of the fallen creatures, clothe himself with their nature, and suffer in it the penalty they had merited, that they might be exempted from that which, by the transgression of the law, they had incurred.

(4.) It supposeth Christ's voluntary engagement and undertaking of this affair first. There could be no necessity upon God to redeem, nor any necessity upon Christ to be the Redeemer; but after his consent, which was wholly free, his promise engaged him to performance. He was free from all bonds till he entered into bond; he was at liberty whether he would be our surety; no compulsion could be used to him: John x. 18, he had 'power to lay down his life.' It implies a liberty either of laying down his life or not; a liberty of choice whether he would die for man or no. He had power if he pleased to avoid the cross, but he undertook it, 'despising the shame,' Heb. xii. 2. And after having once undertaken this charge, it was necessary for him to suffer. As it is in the liberty of a man's choice whether he will engage himself in bonds for an insolvent debtor, yet when he is entered into suretyship, both his own honesty and the equity of the law necessitates him to stand to his engagements, and pay the money he is bound for, if the debtor be still insolvent; † so after Christ hath promised payment for bankrupt man, he could not retract both in regard of his truth, and in regard of the tenderness which first moved him to it. He could not violate his promise, nor deny his contract; both the order of his Father and his own righteousness did not permit him to cast off this resolution. Though it was naturally voluntary, yet it was morally necessary; and therefore often when he speaks of his sufferings to his disciples, he puts a *must* to them: Mat. xvi. 21, John iii. 14 '*must* suffer many things,' '*must* be lifted up.' And his prayer from a natural inclination of the human nature, that this cup might pass from him, *if it were possible*, not being granted, shews it to be morally impossible,

* Petav. Theol. tom. iv. lib. ii. cap. 13, sect. 10.

† Dailé, Sermon de Resurrect. de Christ, p. 226.

after it was determined, that we could be saved any other way. God's not answering his own Son, manifests an impossibility to divert his death without our eternal loss. Had not that promise been past, if Christ had been incarnate, he might have lived in the world with glory and honour; he might have come, not as a surety, but as a lawgiver and judge; but after that promise made by him to his Father, and that the Father had by the covenant of redemption 'laid upon him the iniquities of us all,' and Christ on his part had covenanted to 'take upon him the form of a servant,' Philip. ii. 7, and to be 'made under the law,' Gal. iv. 4, he did owe to God an obedience as our surety according to the law of redemption, as well as an obedience to the moral law as a creature, by virtue of his incarnation. Had he been incarnate without such a promise of suffering, he had not been bound to suffer unless he had sinned; for, having no spot, neither original nor actual, he had stood firm upon the basis of the first covenant. But the obligation to the obedience of suffering was incumbent upon him by virtue of the compact between the Father and himself. Had he been incarnate without that precedent compact, he had owed an obedience to God in his humanity as a creature; but as he was incarnate for such an end, and was, pursuant to the law of redemption, made under the moral law, he owed an obedience to both those laws, an obedience as a creature, an obedience as mediator, as a son owes obedience to a father by virtue of his relation of a son; but if this son be bound apprentice to his father, he owes another obedience to him as a servant by virtue of the covenant between them; the duty of obedience as a servant is superadded to that of a son; so the necessity of obedience as a surety was added to the necessity of obedience as a creature in regard of Christ's humanity, so that this necessity is only consequent, and supposeth at first the voluntary engagement of Christ. For indeed his sufferings could not be of infinite merit for us except they had been voluntarily undertaken by him.* If his sufferings took their worth and value from his person, they must likewise have their freedom and election from his person. Whatsoever punishment, reproach, and trouble the fury of wicked men brought upon him, was not suffered by an absolute necessity, but conditional, after the engagement of his will.

Prop. 2. All things preceding his death, and all circumstances in his death, did not fall under a necessity of the same kind. Upon the former supposition, his death was necessary, and could not be avoided. Death was threatened by God as a sovereign; it was merited by man as a malefactor, and was necessary to be inflicted by God as a judge and governor. And by virtue of this threatening, and his engagement in suretyship, it was necessary that he should suffer, not as an innocent person, but under the imputation of a sinner; a reputed sinner, though he were perfectly innocent in his own nature: 1 Cor. v. 21, he was 'made sin for us.' Yet Christ, in his humiliation, did undergo some things which were not immediately necessary to our redemption. We might have been redeemed by him without his being hungry and weary. But this was mediately necessary to our redemption, in manifesting the truth and reality of his human nature. We might have been redeemed without the piercing of his side, and the letting out the water in the *pericardium*. But this was convenient to shew the truth of his death. These were necessary by virtue of God's decree, manifested in the prediction of the prophets, to be done unto him. But his incarnation and passion to death were immediately necessary to our recovery and the atonement of sin. We could not have been redeemed unless he had satisfied justice; justice could not be satisfied but by suffering; suffering could not have been under-

* Bilson on Christ's sufferings, p. 286.

gone unless he had been incarnate. A body he must have prepared for suffering; nor could he have suffered for us unless he had been incarnate in our nature.

2. Thing. To demonstrate this necessity. Having declared what kind of necessity this is, we may now demonstrate this necessity.

1. To suffer death was the immediate end of the interposition of Christ. The principal end of his undertaking was to right the honour of God, and glorify his attributes in the recovery of the creature; but the immediate end was to suffer, because this was the only way to bring about that end which was principally aimed at in Christ's interposition, and God's determination concerning him. Death being denounced as the punishment of sin, Christ interposeth himself for our security, with a promise to bear that punishment in our stead for the procuring our exemption from it; therefore, what punishment was of right to be inflicted on man for the breach of the law, was, by a gracious act of God, the governor of the world and guardian of his laws, transferred upon Christ, as putting himself in our stead. His first interposition was for the same end with his death, but his death was evidently for our sins. It was for them 'he gave himself,' Gal. i. 4; they were our sins which 'he bare in his own body on the tree,' 1 Peter ii. 24; 'for our iniquities he was wounded, and for our transgressions he was bruised,' Isa. liii. 5; our health was procured by his stripes, and therefore intended by him in his first engagement. He offered his person in our stead, which was able to bear our sin, and afford us a righteousness which was able to justify our persons; he offered himself to endure the curse of the law in his own body, and fulfil the righteousness of the law in his own person; he would be united with us in our nature, that he might make the sins of our nature his own in suffering for them, and give to us what was his, by taking to himself what was ours; he took our stripes that we might receive his medicine. This, therefore, being the end of his first undertaking, was necessary to be performed; for Christ is not yea and nay, 2 Cor. i. 19, one time of one mind, and another time of another, but firm and uniform in all his proceedings, without any contradiction between his promise and performance.

That this was the end of his first interposition is evident,

(1.) By the terms of the covenant of redemption incumbent on his part. What God demanded was complied with on the part of Christ. The demand of God was the offering of the soul, because upon that condition depends the promise of his exaltation and seeing his seed: Isa. liii. 10, 'When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed;' or as others, 'When his soul is put an offering for sin.' The word זֶבֶחַ is properly a sin-offering, and his soul is the matter of this offering, as well as the spring and principle of the offering himself to God. It was upon this condition only he was to see his seed; he had had no seed, *i. e.* none had been saved by him according to this covenant, unless his soul had made itself an offering for sin. This death of Christ was the main article to be performed by him; this was the eye of Christ fixed upon in the offering himself in the first transaction to do the will of God: Ps. xl. 6-8, 'Burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required. Lo, I come; I delight to do thy will,' Heb. x. 7, 8. The will of God for a satisfaction by sacrifice. The will of God was the demand of something above all legal sacrifices; for he had no pleasure in those which were offered by the law, wherein Christ complies with God; and it was something which was not to fall short of, but surmount those legal offerings. The denial of any pleasure or content in them implies a demand of a higher pleasure and content than all or any of them could afford. To this Christ gives his full consent, and offers himself,

according to the will of God, to be a sacrifice, and puts himself in the place of those sin-offerings wherein God had no pleasure; as if he should have said, A sin-offering, Lord, thou wilt have, and one proportionable to the greatness of the offence; since none else can be suitable to an infinite majesty, I will be the sin-offering, and answer thy will in this; and therefore the apostle infers, Heb. x. 10, that the offering the body of Christ for our sanctification, our restoration, was the particular will of God in this affair, which will Christ particularly promises in that eternal transaction to perform: Gal. i. 4, 'Who hath given himself for our sins, according to the will of God.' And, indeed, God could not have been said to enter into his rest at the foundation of the world without this transaction, as he is said to do, Heb. iv.; for foreseeing that an universal stain and disorder would overspread the world by sin, that the glory which would naturally issue to him from the creatures would meet with an obstacle from it, and no way be left for the glorifying of any other attributes after sin but his power and justice in the due and righteous punishment of the creature, he could not take any pleasure in the works of his hands, had not the second person stood up as a sacrifice of atonement to purify the bespotted world, rectify the disorder, and render a content to the justice of God, that all the other attributes of God in the creation might have their due glory perpetuated and elevated. It was in this one person, and that by his blood, that God found the best way and method to gather together those things which sin had scattered, Eph. i. 7, 10. And the first promise in paradise after the fall, of the bruising the serpent's head, in having the seed of the woman's heel bruised by the serpent, intending thereby his death (as is cleared up by considering the revelations of God afterwards), shews that this was fixed in him, since it is most likely it was the second person appeared to Adam and made that promise. This was the first promise to man, founded upon this covenant of redemption.

(2.) The command that Christ received to die, manifests his interposition for this end. He was made under the law, and his death is called 'obedience,' Philip. ii. 8.* Obedience implies a command as the rule of it. Obedience to the moral law engaged him not to die for us; it had bound him over to death, had he been a transgressor of it; but considered in itself, it obliged him not, being innocent, to suffer death for those that were delinquents. Obedience, therefore, in regard of his death, must answer to a particular command of God, flowing from some other act of his will than what was formally expressed in the moral law. Such a command he received from his Father, to lay down his life, John x. 18; which supposeth the free proffer of himself to a state of humiliation for such an end as dying. Had it not been obedience to a command, God had not been bound to accept his offering. Though in itself, and its own nature, upon the trial of God it would have been found sufficient, yet it had been a just exception, 'Who hath required this at your hands?' If he had not offered himself to this purpose, he had not been God's voluntary servant; and if he had not received a law in order to the performance of what he offered, he had not been God's 'righteous servant,' as he is called, Isa. liii. 11, there being no rule whereby to measure his righteousness in this act. The concurrence of both these made his death necessary and acceptable. Though, as I said before, this command of dying for us was not formally any command of the moral law, yet after once he had received this order, and obliged himself to the performance of it, the moral law obliged him to the highest manner of performing this, *i. e.* with the highest love to God and his neighbour, whose nature he had taken, and thereby became our kinsman. Since God was

* Cocc. de Fœd. cap. v. p. 117.

dishonoured and man damaged by sin, his love to the glory of God and the salvation of man were to be with the greatest intenseness; and this the moral law enjoins in all acts we undertake for God.

(3.) If he had not interposed himself for this end, he could not have suffered. Since God passed such a judgment on him, and laid upon him the iniquities of us all, there must be some precedent act of Christ for this end; for it was not just with God to force any to bear the punishment of another's sin. The justice of God, in his dealings with man, is regulated by his own law; he inflicts nothing but what his law hath enjoined. To punish without law, and a transgression of it, is injustice. No law of God ever threatened punishment to one in every respect innocent. Christ, by a free act of his own, put himself into the state of a reputed nocent, and by his interposition for us, as a surety, was counted by God as one person with us; as a surety and a debtor are, in a legal and juridical account, as one person, and what the debtor is liable to in regard of that debt for which the surety is bound, whether it be a pecuniary or a criminal debt, the surety being considered as one person with him, is to undergo. Christ's substituting himself in our stead was to this end, that the sins of those that God had given him might be imputed to him; for he proffered himself to make his soul an offering for sin. It could be no sin of his own; sin he did not, sin he could not. It must be another's sin, transferred upon him in a juridical manner; transferred, I say, upon him, not by any transfusion of our sins into Christ by way of inherency, but by imputation, without which he could not be a sufferer. For what reason, what justice had there been to expose one to suffering, that was wholly innocent, and had no sin, neither by inherency nor imputation? How could any be liable to punishment, that could not in any manner be regarded as guilty? To be under judgment, supposeth a man's own crime, or the crimes of others. Since God, therefore, 'made him to be sin for us,' 2 Cor. v. 21, and could not in justice make him so without his own consent; his consent, then, in the first offer of his mediation, was to be made sin for us, *i. e.* to bear our sins. He offered himself for the same end for which God accepted him, and for which God used him. Pursuant to this offer of himself, he was made under the law, and put into such a state and condition, by his investing himself with the human nature, as that the law might make its demands of him, and receive the penalties which were due by it for the offence.

Add to this, the giving of some to Christ to save, John xvii. 18, vi. 39, which presupposeth the obligation of Christ to death; for after sin, the law being to be vindicated, and justice glorified, God's committing some to him to save, presupposeth his engagement to satisfy the law and justice on their behalf.* It was for this end also he came to the hour of his death, John xii. 27; and his prayer to his Father, to 'save him from this hour,' had been groundless, if he had not passed his word to his Father to enter upon that hour. What need he have prayed to his Father to save him, who might have saved himself, if there had been no antecedent obligation to undertake this task?

He thus interposing himself for this end, it was necessary he should die. For,

[1.] Else none could have been saved from the foundation of the world. Some were saved before his actual death upon the cross. God was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; but 'God is the God of the living, not of the dead,' Mat. xxii. 32. They therefore lived in his sight before the actual oblation of Christ upon the cross; but they could no more have been saved

* Cocc. de Fœd. cap. v. pp. 118. 119.

without the credit of this death of Christ in our nature, than the fallen angels could have been saved. The reason they are not saved, is rendered by the apostle, Heb. ii. 16, because Christ took not their nature; his taking our nature therefore, and dying in it, is the cause of any man's salvation that lived after his coming; his promise of taking our nature, and dying in it, is the cause of the salvation of any that lived before. The apostle's reasoning would not else stand good; had Christ assumed the angels' nature, they would have been saved; had not Christ then assumed our nature, we could not have been saved; and had he not promised to assume our nature, none could have been saved. He could not have been called the Captain of the salvation of all the sons that are brought to glory, whereof many were before his coming, Heb. ii. 10. They must have been saved upon the account of that future death, or else there must be some other name besides that of Christ whereby they were saved; but that there is not, Acts iv. 12. Faith had not always been the way of salvation. Christ had begun to be a mediator and redeemer at the time of his death, and not before; and so had not been in that relation 'the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.' Had he not died, he could not have been set out with any good ground before his coming as an object of faith. The promises of him had wanted their due foundation, the predictions of him had been groundless; and, consequently, the faith and hope of the ancient believers had been in vain. It is certain, all that were saved, were saved upon the account of his death; for the merit of his death might have an influence before it was suffered, it being a moral, not a natural, cause of salvation; as many times a prisoner is delivered upon the promise of a ransom before the actual payment of it.

[2.] Since some were saved before upon the account of his future death, had he not died, God had been highly dishonoured. Had not Christ performed his promise of suffering, and thereby satisfying the justice of God, God, having saved many before his incarnation upon the credit of this promise, had received a manifest wrong. It would have argued a weakness in him to lay such stress upon that which would not be full and secure, which would never have been accomplished. God had not been omniscient, but had been deceived in his foreknowledge, had his expectations been frustrated. For what was the reason God saved any before, but upon the credit of this ransom, which was promised to be paid in time, and his foreknowledge, that when the term came, the surety would not be wanting to discharge himself of his promise? Had not, then, Christ really suffered, and accomplished what he had promised, God had suffered in his honour, and all things could not have been said to be present to him; he would have been deceived. As if a prisoner be delivered upon the promise of a ransom, and the ransom be not paid according to agreement, the person that hath delivered the prisoner suffers in point of wisdom in trusting a person that hath not been as good as his word, and is defeated of that which is in justice due to him. Again, since God had admitted some to happiness before the actual suffering of Christ, had not Christ performed what he had actually undertaken, God must have renounced either his justice or his mercy; his justice, had he let sinners go unpunished, and then he had denied in part his own name, which is 'by no means to clear the guilty,' Exodus xxxiv. 7; or else he must have punished sin in the persons of those whom he had already brought to happiness; and had he done so, how had the honour of his mercy suffered, in turning them out of that felicity wherein he had always* placed them! Some, therefore, make the remission of the sins past before the coming of Christ not to be properly a full pardon, but a passing by, the full remission not

* Qu. 'already'?—ED.

being to be given till the actual payment was made ; and indeed the word the apostle useth in that place, Rom. iii. 25, is different, *πάρεσις*, a passing by, a word not used for pardon in all the New Testament, but *ἄφεσις*. Had not Christ suffered, there had been nothing of the righteousness of God manifested in the remission of sins which were past ; the end of God had been frustrated, it being his end, in the death of Christ, 'to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, to declare at this time his righteousness,' *i.e.* what his righteousness was in passing by sins before committed, to declare that he pardoned no sins before, without an eye to this satisfactory death of his Son ; but that in all his former proceedings he kept close to the rules of his infinite justice. Now, had not Christ died according to his engagement, God had highly suffered in his honour, his omniscience had been defeated ; God had been deceived in the credit he gave, his righteousness had not been manifested, his justice had suffered, or his mercy to his poor creatures had been dammed up for ever from flowing out upon them.

2. The veracity of God, in settling the penalty of death upon transgression, made it necessary for redemption. God passed his word that death should be the punishment of sin, Gen. ii. 17 ; the veracity of God stood engaged to make this word good upon the conditions expressed. The sentence was immutable, and the word that went out of God's mouth must stand ; had it been revoked without inflicting the punishment, the faithfulness and righteousness of God, in regard of his word, could not have been justified : 'God cannot lie, or deny himself,' Titus i. 2, 2 Tim. ii. 13 ; his truth is not a quality in him, but himself, his essence. Had he, then, after so solemnly pronouncing, without any reverse, that the wages of sin should be no less than death, been careless of his own word, and left sin unpunished, God had made a breach upon his own nature, and had infringed his own happiness ; for a lie or falsity is the fountain and original of all evil and misery. Supposing God had other ways to deal with man (though it is beyond the capacity of man to imagine any other way of God's government of him, or any intellectual and rational creatures, than by a law, and a penalty annexed to that law, which otherwise would have proved insignificant), yet after his wisdom had settled this law, and the threatening had passed his royal and immutable word, it was no longer arbitrary, but necessary by the sovereign authority, that either the sinner himself, or some surety in his stead, should suffer the death the sinner had incurred by the violation of the precept ; we must either pay ourselves, or some other pay for us, what we stand bound in to the justice of God. Impunity had been an invasion of God's veracity, which is as immutable as his nature ; since, therefore, the inflicting of death upon transgression was the real intent of God, upon the commission of sin death must enter upon man, otherwise God would be a disregarder of himself, and his threatenings a mere scarecrow.

(1.) Had God violated his word, he had rendered himself an unfit object of trust. He had exposed all the promises or threatenings he should have made after man's impunity to the mockery and contempt of the offender, and excluded his word from any credit with man. Had God set man right again by a mere act of mercy, without any regard to his word past, and inflicting any punishment upon the offender, though he had made man more glorious promises than at the first, he would have had little reason to trust God. If he had found God unfaithful to himself in the word of his threatening, he could not have concluded that he would have been true to the word of his promise, but might reasonably have suspected that he would falsify in that as he had done him in the other. Had his truth failed in the concerns of his

justice, it had been of little value in those of his mercy. He might be as careless of the honour of the one as of that of the other. If a man fail of his word in one thing, there is little reason to believe him in another. The righteousness of God would as little have engaged him to fulfil his promise, as it did engage him to fulfil his threatening. God would have declared himself by such an act, not willing to be believed, not worthy to be trusted, feared, loved, because regardless of his truth and righteousness. And by the same reason that he denied himself fit to be trusted, he would deny himself to be a God, because he would thereby have acknowledged a weakness incompatible to the nature of the Deity. How could any trust him who had denied himself, by restoring a life to him, without righteousness and truth on his part? It had rather been an encouragement to them to disown him to be any fit object for their confidence, since the great ground of trust among men is their faithfulness to their word. Upon the supposition of God's restoring the creature, the doing it by the intervention of a satisfaction was very necessary to fix the creature's confidence in God; for when he sees God so righteous and true that he will not do anything against the rules of his truth and justice, he hath the more ground to believe God after a satisfaction made, that he will preserve the honour of his wisdom in approving and accepting that satisfaction, and his truth in promising, declared upon it.

(2.) Had God violated his word, he had justified the devil in his argument for man's rebellion. The devil's argument is a plain contradiction to God's threatening. God affirms the certainty of death, the devil affirms the certainty of life: Gen. iii. 4, 'Ye shall not surely die.' Had no punishment been inflicted, the devil had not been a liar from the beginning. God would have honoured the tempter, and justified the charge he brought against him, and owned the envy the devil accused him of, and thereby have rendered the devil the fittest object for love and trust. As the devil charged God with a lie, so, had no punishment been inflicted, God would have condemned himself, and declared Satan, instead of a lying tempter, to be the truest counsellor. He had exposed himself to contempt, and advanced the credit of his enemy, and so set up the devil as a God instead of himself. It concerned God, therefore, to manifest himself true, and the devil a liar; and acquaint the world that not himself, but the evil spirit, was their deceiver, and that he meant as he spake.

(3.) Suppose God might have altered his word, yet would it consist with his wisdom to do it at that time? It was the first word of threatening that ever went out of his lips to man; and had he wholly dispensed with it, after he had fenced his precept with such a penalty, and seen such a contradiction in his new created subject to his truth, authority, and righteousness, such a daring contempt of his rich and manifested goodness, he had emboldened the apostate creature in his sin, and encouraged him to a fresh rebellion as soon as ever he had been set right again by an infinite mercy, without any mark of his justice. Men would have thought God had either been mistaken in the reason of his threatening, and had settled a penalty too great for the offence, or had wanted power to maintain his authority in inflicting the due punishment, had he indulged man in this sin. What influence could any of his precepts have had upon the souls of men, if he had so lightly passed by the transgression of his law? Would he not have been less secured in the rights of his authority for the future, than he had been for the time past? Would not man have been encouraged to have run the same risk of disobedience, in hopes of an easy pardon, and continued the attempt which he had begun in his first apostasy, to have freed himself from all the orders of the divine law, to have been his own rule? How could a just sense and awe of

God have been preserved in the minds of men, when they should have thought God like one of themselves, and as false to his own righteousness as they had been to his authority? Ps. l. 21. This certainly would have been the issue, had man been set up in his former state without inflicting that punishment upon the human nature, which had been so righteously denounced, and so highly merited, by the disingenuity of man. Man had been more tempted by this to sin than he could have been by the devil, and when he had been brought to an account for his second transgression, he would have excused himself by God's indulgence to him for the first; and, indeed, God's denial of his truth in this, would seem to be a sufficient apology for after offences.

(4.) Therefore God, for the preservation of his truth and righteousness, accepts of a surety to bear the just punishment for man. Since God had enacted, that if man sinned he should die, upon man's apostasy God must either eternally punish him to preserve his truth and justice, or neglect his own law, and change it to discover his mercy. These things were impossible to the nature of God; he must be true to his nature, and true to his word. If justice should destroy, what way was there to discover his mercy? If mercy should absolutely pardon, without the due punishment, what way was there to preserve the honour of his truth? The wisdom of God finds out a means to preserve the honour of his truth in the punishment, and discover the glory of his mercy in a pardon, not by changing the sentence against sin, but the person; and laying that upon his Son, as a surety, which we in our own persons must have endured, had the rigour of the law been executed upon us, whereby his righteousness and veracity are preserved by the punishment due to the sinner, and the honour of mercy established by the merit of our Saviour. Death was threatened by the law, but there was no exclusion of a person by that law, that should offer himself to stand in man's stead under the punishment. Man had been for ever irrecoverably miserable, had such a clause been inserted, and would have been without hope as much as the devils. And therefore, saith a learned author of our own,* this acceptance of a surety for us was not an abrogation of the law, for then there could be no execution of the sentence upon wicked men and unbelievers for their sins against it (where no law is, there is no transgression; and where no transgression, no just execution); but it was a merciful relaxation or condescension of the sovereign lawgiver, by his infinite goodness and wisdom, to find out an expedient for the good of the fallen creature, with the preservation of the rights of those divine perfections engaged in the threatening. God was not prejudiced, or his immutability impaired, by a change of the person suffering, as long as the penalty threatened was inflicted. Though there was a translation of the penalty, yet there was not a nulling of the penalty; the person was changed, not the punishment; death was threatened, death was inflicted. Death was threatened, not so much to the person of Adam, as the human nature, whereof he was the head, and regarded the descendants from him; death was suffered by the human nature, though in another person; death was threatened to Adam as the root of all in him; death was suffered by Christ, as the mystical head of all in him by faith, so that, as in Adam sinning, all sinned that were in his loins as in their root, Rom. v. 12, 14, 18, so it may be said, that in Christ suffering all believers suffered, his sufferings being imputed to them by virtue of that union they have with him. Besides, God having created the world for the displaying his divine perfections in Christ, 'for whom all things were created,' Col. i. 16, had in his eternal counsel decreed the death of Christ as a surety for man; and this threatening, as well as the creation, being pursuant to this

* Burges of Justificat. part ii. p. 84.

eternal counsel, did not exclude, but rather include, the surety, though it be not expressed.

3. The justice of God made the death of Christ necessary for our redemption. Christ, in his coming, respected the glory of God's righteousness, for he substituted himself as a sin-offering, instead of those insufficient ones under the law: Heb. x. 8, 'Sin-offering thou wouldst not; lo, I come to do thy will,' *i. e.* the will of the divine justice as well as divine mercy, for in the legal sacrifices both were expressed; justice in the death of the beast, whereby man was taught what he had merited, and mercy in substituting the beast in his room. Christ came to do that in the room of a sin-offering, which the legal sin-offerings were not able to effect. The command of the Father did chiefly respect this satisfaction of justice. It principally required of him the laying down his life, and making his soul an offering for sin, John x. 18. And this it was which his obedience did principally respect, whence it is called an 'obedience to death,' Philip. ii. 8. Death is an act of justice. After the command was given, with the sanction of it, the authority of God in enacting it, and the justice of God in adding the penalty to it, were contemned, and man could not well be reduced to his order without a reparation of the damage done to the authority and justice of God. How could God be the judge of all the earth, doing right, Gen. xviii. 25, had he suffered such a manifest wrong to himself to go unpunished? Justice had as loud a cry for condemnation, as mercy could have for any stream of compassion. The sanction of the law was irrevocable, unless God had ceased to be immutable in his justice as well as his truth. God can do whatsoever he will, but he can will nothing against his goodness and righteousness.* God had derogated from his own righteousness, if he had not recompensed the sin of man. For as justice requires punishment, so it requires the greatest punishment for the greatest offence. Satisfaction must then be given in such a manner as the justice of God in the law required. It must be then by suffering that death it exacted as due to the crime, which must be done by the person sinning, or some other capable to do it in his stead, and answer the terms of the law, between whom and the sinner there might be such a strait union, as that there might be a mutual imputation of our sins to him, and his sufferings to us. That he might suffer, justice was to impute our sins to him; that his sufferings might be advantageous, mercy and justice were to impute his sufferings to us.

I shall lay down under this three propositions.

(1.) It seems to be impossible but that justice should flame out against sin. There is the same reason of all God's attributes. It is impossible that the goodness of God should not embrace and kindly entertain an innocent creature, for then he would not be good. It is impossible his mercy in Christ should refuse a penitent believer; then he would not be compassionate. It is impossible he should look upon sin with a pleasing† countenance; then he would not be holy. It is impossible that he can be false to his word; then he could not be true. It is impossible that he should not act wisely in what he doth; then he would be foolish. Shall we deny the same rights to his justice, that we acknowledge to belong to the other perfections of his nature? Why should not his justice be as unchangeable and inflexible as his goodness, mercy, truth, and wisdom? Shall we acknowledge him firm in the rest, and wavering in this? Justice is as necessary a perfection pertaining to him as the governor of the world, as his wisdom, or any other glory of his nature. Had God acted the part of a just governor, if he had suffered

* Dr Jackson.

† Qu. 'pleased'?—ED.

those laws to be broken with impunity, whereof he was the guardian as well as the enactor? Is there not a double reason of punishment accruing to him, both as he is the offended party and the rector of the world? And what is justice, but a giving to every one his due, reward to whom reward belongs, and punishment to whom punishment is due? If God had pardoned where punishment was due, it had been an act of mercy, but what had become of his justice? If God be not just in everything he doth, he is unjust in something, and then doth iniquity, which is utterly impossible for the divine nature; he neither will nor can do iniquity, Zeph. iii. 5. This is an inseparable property of the divine nature. What should his creatures judge of him, if he were utterly careless of vindicating his law, and did totally abstain from evidencing his holiness to his rational creatures? Is his holiness only to be manifested in precepts, and not demonstrated in punishments? If his love to righteousness be essential to him, the exercise of that righteousness upon suitable objects is necessary. His love of righteousness flows from his nature as righteous: Ps. xi. 7, 'The righteous Lord loveth righteousness.' It is not only an act of his will, but of his nature; it is not so natural to him as heat is to the fire, that doth necessarily scorch and burn, without any influence of a free and rational principle. There is a liberty of the divine will to order those acts of his justice in convenient seasons. God acts in all things according to his own nature, and cannot act below himself and the rectitude of it. The first foundation of all his actings towards his creatures is in his will. As upon the supposition that God would create man (which it was free for him to do or not to do, and so depended only upon his will), he could not, according to the rectitude of his own nature, but create him upright, otherwise he had denied his own holiness; so, upon the supposition of man's sinning (the prevention or permission of which depended upon his will), he cannot but punish him, because otherwise he had denied his justice, and seemed to have approved of the disorder man had introduced into the world; and if he had not punished it in the degree it merited, there had seemed to be some abatement of that hatred which was due to the unrighteousness of it; for so much as a punishment is lessened, so much less doth the detestation of the crime appear. The power of God is not limited hereby; his own holiness and truth, and the righteousness of his nature, bound him.* Doth any man deny the power of God, in saying he cannot forget his creature? Would it not be a weakness in him to be capable of lying? Is it not an imperfection to be capable of doing any thing unjust? And what would it be but injustice in the Judge of all the earth to let sin go unrevenge'd? It is rather an argument of strength and virtue, whereby he cannot renounce the rectitude of his nature.†

[1.] This seems to be a general and a natural notion in the minds of men. God hath settled it as an immutable and eternal law, and engraven it upon the hearts of men, that sin is to be punished with death. What other sentiment could be expressed by the universal practice of sacrificing beasts, and, in some places, men, for the expiation of their sins, implying thereby a necessity of vindictive justice, that God would not leave sin unpunished, without a compensation from the sinner himself, or some other in his stead? And therefore they thought the blood of man, the best of the creatures, a means to avert the stroke they had merited from him themselves. What other foundation could there be of all those sacrifices than a conscience of sin, and a settled notion of the vengeance of God? For that which they principally, or only, respected in those sacrifices, was the justice of God. Upon this account it was probably that the apostle so positively asserts, Rom. i. 32,

* Daillé, de la Resurrect. de Christ, p. 358.

† Turretin, de Satisfac. p. 300.

that they 'knew that they were worthy of death.' They sufficiently expressed it in subjecting other creatures to the stroke of death in their stead, to pacify the offended deity, acknowledging thereby, that he could not pardon sin without a satisfaction. This was learned by them in the school of nature, not by the revealed will of God ; or if it were handed to them by tradition from Adam, it had so near an alliance with an universal principle in their own consciences, that it met with no opposition or dispute, the practice of it being almost as universally spread, as the notion of the being of a God, since we scarce find a nation without the sacrificing animals for the appeasing the divinity they adored.

[2.] The holiness of God seems necessarily to infer it. Since justice is nothing else but the testimony or expression of God's hatred of sin, it must be by consequence unavoidable, unless the sin committed can be wholly undone, which is impossible ; or his justice be appeased some way or other. If God did not punish sin, how could his hatred of it be manifest ? His creature could not discern any aversion in him from it, without the interposition of vindictive justice ; for that perfection of God's nature, which requires that he should have an implacable detestation of sin, requires also that the sinner, remaining under guilt, should be perpetually punished. If God cannot but hate all the workers of iniquity (Ps. v. 5, 'Thou hatest all the workers of iniquity'), he cannot but punish them. The holiness of God is not only voluntary, but by necessity of nature ; were it only an act of his will, he might love iniquity if he pleased, as well as hate it. How could it be said of him by the prophet, Hab. i. 13, that he is 'of purer eyes than to behold evil, and cannot look upon iniquity,' if his purity had been only from choice, and a determination of the indifferency of his will, and not from his nature ? It is not said, He *will not* look on iniquity, *i. e.* with affection, but he *cannot*. God cannot but be holy, and therefore cannot but be just ; because injustice is a part of unholiness. And upon the holiness of God, Joshua asserts the Israelites' sins in themselves unpardonable: Josh. xxiv. 19, 'He is a holy God, he is a jealous God, he will not forgive your transgressions, nor your sins.' He is jealous of the honour of his perfections ; his holiness and jealousy stand as bars against forgiveness, without some means for preserving the honour of them ; his holiness and jealousy, whereby his justice and wrath are sometimes expressed, are linked together, and are nothing else but the contrariety in the nature of God, which is infinitely good and righteous, to the nature of sin, which is evil and unrighteous, whereby he is inclined to detest it.* All hatred is a desire of revenge ; and the stronger the hatred, the more vehement the inclination to revenge. The loathing of sin being infinite in God, as he is the rector of the world, and so necessary a perfection of his nature, that without it he would not be God ; the inclination to punish it, and thereby highly manifest his hatred of it, necessarily follows that perfection. A will to punish sin is always included in an hatred of it. Now, if the hatred of sin be as essential to God as his love to his glory, punishment must follow it. There is a certain connection between the one and the other. This hatred must necessarily be evidenced by some acts, according to the greatness of the evil. How shall it be testified, but by punishment ? If he doth not punish, how shall we certainly know but that it pleaseth him ? By his bare precept we cannot, if he suffers it to be violated at the pleasure of men without rebuke ; we may then judge him to be a negligent governor, and one that hath no regard to his own command, and cares not whether his creature observes it or no. Hatred cannot be discovered without some expressions of aversion. What signs can those be, unless God's denying his

* Amyraut, des Religions, p. 309.

communications to his creature, and a positive inflicting of evil? If a governor hates a disorder never so much, if he expresseth it not, whereby the offending person may be sensible of his hatred, it is as much as no hatred; for, *Idem est non esse, et non apparere*. What would all his prohibitions of sin amount to, if he did not punish the commission of it? He that cannot but prohibit sin, cannot but punish sin. God cannot but prohibit sin, because he cannot but hate it, it being contrary to his holy nature. The commands of God are not bare acts of his will, but of his wisdom and righteousness. If they proceeded from bare will, without any regulation by his wisdom and righteousness, he might command things contrary to the law of nature, and the necessary relation of a creature to himself. So neither is his hatred of sin only a free act of his will, but necessarily results from the rectitude of his nature. If it were only an act of his will, as the creation of the world, he might as well love sin as hate it; as he might as well have neglected the creation of the world as performed it, and let the several creatures remain in their nothing, as well as have brought them into being. But it flows from the righteousness of his nature (Prov. xv. 9, 'The way of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord'), and consequently so doth his justice, which is an expression of this hatred, otherwise God would be unjust to his own holiness.

(2.) Hence it follows, that this justice must be satisfied before man could be restored. The justice of God was the bar in the way, and must be removed by punishment. Christ could not have brought one son to glory, had he not first been 'made perfect by suffering,' Heb. ii. 10. The wrath of God for the violations of the law, was the flaming sword that guarded paradise from being entered into by guilty man. This was becoming God as the governor of the world, in which capacity he is considered in punishment. It became not God to do anything unjustly or inordinately. It was an intolerable thing that the creature should despoil God of his honour, and withdraw itself from that indispensable subjection it owed to its creator. It became God to restore that order by punishment, which had been broken by sin.

Let us consider,

[1.] Justice had at least an equal plea with mercy. If mercy pleaded for pardon, justice as strongly solicited the punishment of the sinner. The remission of the offence would appear more charitable; but the vindicating the public laws, and punishing the offence, would appear more righteous. It was not convenient the creature should be utterly ruined as soon as ever God had displayed his power in creating it, nor was it convenient the creature should be emboldened in sin by a free act of pardon, after so high and base an act of disingenuity. What could mercy plead on the behalf of the creature, that justice could not as strongly plead on the behalf of God? If the ruin of the creature be argued to move compassion, the dishonour of God on the other side would be argued to excite indignation. If the nature of God, as love, 1 John iv. 8, be pleaded by mercy, the nature of God, as righteous and a consuming fire, Heb. xii. 29, would be opposed to it by justice. His mercy would plead, It were not for his honour to let his enemy run away, just after the creation, with the spoil of the best of his works. His justice would reply, It was fit the judge of the world should do right, and be the protector of his righteous law. If his mercy inclines him to will our salvation, justice would not permit him to leave sin unpunished, and his laws trampled in the dust. Had mercy been discovered without preserving the rights of justice, when the whole nature of man fell, God had been but a half governor of the world, and exercised but one part of government.

[2.] Justice seems to have a stronger plea. (1.) The highest right falls on the side of justice. That had been declared and backed by his truth, when mercy was not yet published upon the stage of the creation. The righteous and just nature of God had been signified to man, and his veracity brought in to second it, Gen. ii. 17. No notion of pardoning mercy had yet been imprinted upon the mind of man, or revealed to him; so that God was not so much concerned in honour to shew mercy, which stood single, as I may say, and lay hid in the nature of God, without the appearance of any perfection to back and support it. Had man stood, the veracity of God had stood on the side of his goodness (for we may suppose a promise of life implied, if man continued in obedience, as well as a threatening expressed, if he fell into rebellion). But when men broke the precept, the whole force of God's truth fell on the side of justice. There being not a syllable of pardoning grace uttered in any promise before the sin of man, the truth of God had no part at that time to take with mercy; so that there were greater engagements at that time, from the manifestation of God's nature, for the making good his justice, than for the demonstration of his mercy.

(2.) Mercy could principally plead the good of the creature, justice principally insisted on the honour of God. Mercy might solicit the liberty of God's will, but justice might strongly challenge the holiness and rectitude of God's nature to support it. The creature was fallen under the hatred of God and penalty of the law, and rendered itself an unfit object of love by its rebellion and filthiness.

(3.) Besides, the wits and consciences of men cannot frame so many arguments for the necessity of mercy, in regard of God, as for the necessity of his justice. Mercy is wholly a free act, but justice is a debt due to a sinful creature. The necessity of mercy to a fallen creature, in regard of God, cannot possibly be asserted with any reason. For it would then be asserted on the behalf of devils more than men. I say, the necessity, for perhaps something may be said for the congruity of God's shewing mercy to man rather than to devils. Justice respects merit caused by the righteousness or unrighteousness of men,* according to which God immutably carries himself in rewarding or punishing of them, and never doth reward or punish any but according to their merit; but the mercy of God doth not at all respect merit, or any work done by man, but is busied wholly in giving freely, and offering graciously to man those things he hath not deserved.

(4.) Again, justice had stronger arguments from the rectitude of God's nature. Justice might argue, If God did righteously judge sinners to everlasting death, then if he had not judged them to everlasting death, he had done unjustly, being unmindful of the rectitude of his own nature. And if he should not now, after sin, inflict eternal death, but wholly lay aside his threatening, he would do unjustly; for those being contrary acts, one of them must needs be unjust. Who could call that a righteous government, wherein laws should be made with the greatest wisdom, and be broken with the greatest impunity?

(5.) Again, consider, though mercy be essential to God, yet mercy must not be unjustly exercised. The fallen creature, indeed, was an object of both: as *miserable*, he was an object of mercy; as *criminal*, he was an object of justice. But being first criminal before he was miserable, he was first the object of justice by his crime, before he was an object of mercy by his misery. Had he been miserable without being culpable (which was impossible, in regard of the goodness of God), he had then been an object of com-

* Zarnov. de satisfact. Christi, part i. cap. ii.

passion only. But falling under justice first, it was not fit mercy should wholly despoil justice of its rights.

(6.) Again. Man, as miserable by the fall, is not the object of mercy. For what mercy could pardon an obstinate rebel? And how could man have been otherwise, without some supernatural operation upon him? Mercy could not challenge any footing to exercise itself about man, till he had confessed and bewailed his crime, and been sensible, not only of his misery, but of his offence. It is not honourable for God to exercise mercy upon those that continue in their enmity; this seems to be clearly against the rectitude of the divine nature; this had been a favouring of the crime as well as the criminal. Had he been sensible of and sorrowful for his misery, without a true grief for his offence, this had been an act of love to himself, but had had in it nothing of a true affection to God. After man had contracted in his nature an enmity against God, how could he have acquired a true repentance flowing from an affection to God? Repentance for a fault against a prince, and enmity against a prince, are inconsistent. How should man have attained this quality of himself, any more than the devils have done, of whose repentance we read not one syllable in the Scripture, who are left to those habits of malice and aversion from God, which they had superinduced upon themselves? And if devils, who were creatures of greater understanding, and more sensible of their misery, because they fell from a greater happiness than man, were morally impotent to this, can we think that man had a stronger bias in his will after the revolt from God, to return again to God? Besides, repentance is made a gift of God, 2 Tim. ii. 25; and the Spirit that gives repentance, is a fruit of Christ's death; and the repentance itself is made a fruit of Christ's exaltation, due to him upon his death, Acts v. 32. To strengthen this, it may be considered that when God came to examine Adam, as a judge, about his crime, there is not a syllable that savours of any true repentance issues from him, Gen. iii. 8-10, &c., whatsoever he might exercise after the promulgation of the gospel-promise.

[3.] Consider, if there had not been a tempering of these two perfections towards man, one of them had remained undiscovered to the world. Justice only could have appeared in the creature's suffering, mercy only could have appeared in the creature's restoration. Mercy could not have been discovered by the condemnation of the creature, nor justice by the mere salvation of the creature. Had there been no punishment, or a light one below the demerit of the creature, there had been no demonstration of the highest glory of his holiness in the hatred of sin, or of the highest glory of his justice in the punishment of sin. Had the punishment due to the creature been inflicted upon him, the creature had been utterly destroyed, and mercy had been for ever obscured; and had mercy solely acted about the creature, justice had been wronged. Justice therefore must be one way or other righted, that the streams of his grace might flow out to man, since, after man's fall, justice had stopped all commerce of God with man, because sin had rendered him unfit for the communications of God. As the nature of compassion must be satisfied in acting about a miserable creature, and the love God bore to man as his creature manifested; so the nature of justice must be satisfied for the injury done, and the hatred of God to man as a sinner discovered. And this must be satisfied either by the creature's bearing the punishment, or compensating the injury, for that properly is satisfaction. God's justice could not have come off with honour without it; for since he was engaged by his word to have sin punished, would not God have been unjust had he laid by all consideration of his justice and holiness in this case? Had justice been glorified upon the person of the sinner, mercy would have lost the manifesta-

tion of itself, and have had no objects to exercise itself about; had mercy been glorified in bringing man to a happy state, without any punishment, after so base a breach of his law, where had been the demonstration of the unchangeable holiness of God, and the exactness of his justice? God therefore appointed a Mediator, in whom he might act as a righteous judge for the punishment of sin, according to his law, that his dreadful majesty might be more feared; and a tender father according to the necessity of his creatures, that his love might be commended, as a wise governor tempering both together. And therefore God, foreseeing the fall of man, elected some to eternal glory, but in Christ as the means, Eph. i. 4, not as the meritorious cause of election, but as the means and foundation of the execution of it, that the glory of his grace might issue out in the preservation of the rights of his justice, maintained by the blood of his Son, in whom we have redemption, ver. 6, 7, and without this way we cannot see how the glory of God had been preserved. God had made the world for his glory, and the communication of his goodness. After the world was polluted and disordered by sin, the justice of God, by annexing such a penalty to the law, stood as a bar in the way of any kindness to the creature, unless some way might be found out to preserve the honour of that justice. Shall God in a moment lose all the glory of his creation? Did he make the creatures, whose fall he did foresee, only to punish and damn them; and that the glory of his other perfections, save that of his justice and holiness, should be spoiled by it? His glory therefore must be preserved; that could not be if the glory of his justice or mercy were wholly lost. To preserve it, therefore, Christ is substituted in our room, and the Captain of salvation made perfect through sufferings, which was most becoming God, as he was Lord of all, and his glory the end of all, Heb. ii. 10. His love not permitting him to leave the world under the curse, nor his justice to leave sin without punishment, both those necessities are provided for by the wisdom of God; a wonderful temperament wrought, whereby sin is punished in the surety, and impunity secured to the believing sinner.*

[4.] This satisfaction must be by death, because death was threatened. Since it was the judgment of God that sin was worthy of death, God had contradicted his own judgment and holy wisdom, if he had remitted it without death, or punished it with less than death. God established our propitiation in the blood of Christ, 'to declare his justice,' Rom. iii. 25.† If justice had required less than death, it had been unjust to have demanded so much as death, for then he had demanded more than was due. Sin could not be expiated by a less punishment than it had merited, but that was death. Besides, the love of God to his Son would not have permitted him to expose him to a cursed and cruel death, merely to shew his justice implacable, had it not really been in itself implacable without it, as the most transcendent means to discover the incomprehensible purity of his nature. Certainly, that God who would not do the least injustice to the meanest of his creatures, would not have delivered up his Son to so shameful a death, and took so many counsels about it, and made it the principal work of his wisdom in all ages of the world, to order all things for the execution of it, if justice could have been contented with less than death, and remission of sin could have been granted by the pure mercy and bounty of God, at least after the threatening. Could justice have been satisfied at a lower rate than death, the Father would have answered the request of his Son when he prayed so earnestly that this cup might pass from him; nor would death have been exacted of him, if a drop of his blood had been a sufficient payment to the demands

* Daillé sur iii. Jean, p. 330.

† εἰς τὴν ἀποδείξιν, for a demonstration of his justice.

of justice. The suffering death had been superfluous, and the imposing death upon him had been an unrighteousness in God; and his giving himself up to death, without any necessity, had been an injustice to himself. Could a few drops of blood have satisfied justice, it might have been satisfied without any blood at all, as well as with a punishment beneath what the law demanded. The effusion of one drop of blood cannot pass for a punishment of sin, when death for it was required by the law, so that it could be no less than death.

Prop. 3. None could satisfy the justice of God but the Son of God incarnate.

[1.] Let us remove those things that might be supposed capable to do it. Nether could man do it for himself, nor any intellectual or rational creature do it for him, nor any observances of God's institutions do it, so that it must necessarily fall upon some one above the rank of creatures. Some divine person only was capable to undertake it and effect it. There is a necessity of satisfaction to the law, both by paying obedience to every tittle of it, and by enduring the penalty for the transgression of it. God stands so much upon the honour of his law, that the heavens shall be folded up, and the earth shaken out of its place, before one point of the law shall be disregarded, Mat. v. 18. Some one therefore must repair the breach made upon it, and restore the honour of it. Let us see if anything else could.

(1.) Man was unable to do it for himself. It must be done either by active or passive obedience, by doing or suffering; but was man capable of either as a full compensation to God? Man by sin fell in his person, and with all that he had, under the curse of the law, Gal. iii. 10; and what was under the curse, and by sin was forfeited, could not remove the curse. Man may be considered as a sinful creature or a gracious creature. A sinful creature cannot satisfy; for being a sinner in that satisfaction, he doth offend the holiness of God, and heap new provocations before the eyes of his justice instead of pacifying it. A gracious creature cannot, for that supposeth satisfaction first, whereby justice is moved to take away the bar that locks up the treasures of grace from being dispensed to man. A man might be gracious after a satisfaction, but not before; besides, grace is finite, for whatsoever is in a finite creature is finite; its effects therefore cannot be of an infinite value.

(1.) Man could not effect it by offering something to God, or by doing something equivalent to the offence.

1. Man had nothing to give. What was there he could call his own, since he was a creature, especially since as an offender he had forfeited what was his by right of creation? Had man the world to give? How came he by it? Was it created by him or for him? If not by him, it was none of his own; he was but a steward to manage all for the use of his Lord and true proprietor. Can a steward recompense his lord for the wrong done to his honour, by offering to his master those goods which are his own already, and which the steward was only entrusted with? The world was none of man's to give; he never had it as an absolute lord by right of an independent propriety, nor was it possible he should, since he was not either the creator or preserver of it; and neither man, nor any other creature in the world, could possibly be brought into a state independent on God, so that man held as a feudatory *in capite* of God. But suppose it had been his own, he had forfeited all by his rebellion; for his sake, for his sin, the earth was cursed by the sovereign Lord of it, Gen. iii. 17; and a thing cursed in all the parts of it could not be fit for an oblation to the divine Majesty.

2. Nor could his repentance be a compensation. Bare grief for an offence

is not a compensation for an injury done to man, much less for an affront of so high a nature offered to God. But we find no such thing in man at the time wherein he fell from the top of his felicity to the gulf of misery. If he who had a sense of the happy state he had lost, and the miserable condition he had contracted, was more for excuses than relentings, how can a penitent posture be found by nature in any of his descendants? Gen. iii. 9-13. If there were any blushes in him, they were occasioned more by the discovery of his crime than by the sense of the crime itself; and he was troubled more at his loss than at his offence, and so might relent that he was miserable, not that he was criminal; and so it was a repentance as it respected himself, not as it respected the honour of his Lord; and such a repentance is to be found in hell, but is unable to break those chains wherein they are held. How should man come by a repentance? Can he break himself into a true contrition? What stone was ever heard to melt itself? Is not captive man fond of his sin, in love with his chains? And how can he by nature attain that which is so contrary to what he is by nature mightily delighted with? The least spark of grace is above the power of corrupted nature. How should man, then, come by this repentance? Must it not be a melting spark from heaven lighting upon his soul, that must produce so kindly a work in a forsaken creature? Would it have consisted with the wisdom of divine justice to seize upon the forfeiture, to withdraw from man supernatural grace, and presently to restore it without any regard to the vindication of the honour of that justice? Besides, suppose man had been able to repent of himself, and had actually performed a repentance of the right stamp, what would this have signified, since no such thing was required as the condition the righteousness of God exacted in the law? That demanded not repentance, because it gave not liberty to any crime. It challenged an exact and perfect obedience, complete in all circumstances, of man in his uprightness; and, in case of failure, left man to the severity of the penalty he had incurred. Not a drop of repentance was allowed as any part of legal obedience. That was introduced upon a change of the dispensation from legal to evangelical. 'The law is not of faith,' and as little of repentance, 'but the man that doth them shall live in them,' Gal. iii. 12. Besides, if repentance and faith in the mercy of God could have razed out the sin of Adam, and broken in pieces the chains of eternal death, could we think that God should be at the expense of the blood of the promised seed? What need had there been of a sacrifice to appease God, if he had been already appeased by the relentings of man? What a vanity had that been, to go about the taking away that which the faith and repentance of Adam had already removed! * The wisdom of God would not do anything useless and in vain. Faith and repentance could never change the nature of God's righteousness, but must first suppose some satisfaction made to justice, and then step in as conditions; and the one as an instrument apprehending and applying mercy obtained by some other means, not the efficient or meritorious cause, no more than the looking upon the brazen serpent was the efficient or meritorious cause of the cure, but only the means. But how can we think man after his fall should have either faith in the mercy of God, or repentance, which flows from a sense of mercy, when no mercy had been revealed to him? He found nothing of it in the law; and though he might apprehend such a perfection in God by the consideration of his own nature, yet since he had never seen any miserable object to draw out such a perfection, it is a question whether he knew any such quality to be in himself or no, and therefore could not conclude any such perfection to be in God, since there was not the least revelation of it, and therefore could

* Zarnov. de Satisfact. part i. cap. iv. pp. 14, 15.

have no footing for any such exercise of faith and repentance till the discovery of mercy in the promised seed.

3. Nor could any after obedience to the law be a compensation for the offence. For,

(1.) Man had not power of himself after his fall to obey. He had by his revolt lost that original righteousness which enabled him to a conformity to the law : Gen. iii. 10, 'I was afraid, because I was naked.' His corporeal nakedness could be no more the cause of fear after, than it was before, his sin ; but he was naked, *i. e.* stripped of the image of God, and his primitive integrity. Man cannot now do any work commensurate to the precepts of the law. In everything he comes short of his duty ; and therefore, being defective in what he ought to do by the law of creation, cannot satisfy for the injury done to God in the state of corruption : 'How shall a man be just with God ? If he will contend with him, he cannot answer him one of a thousand,' Job ix. 2, 3. God requires an obedience to the law, not according to our measure, but according to his own righteousness, which is perfect ; and this no sinful creature can arise to of himself. If any man were able to offer God a spotless obedience, free from any defect the law could find in it ; by whose strength would he do it ? Not by his own ; for since he was a sinner, he hath been without strength. To be *sinners*, and to be *without strength*, are one and the same, Rom. v. 6, 8. From whom, then, should he have this strength ? From the Creator ? How can he then satisfy God by that which is God's already ? It is as if when a man had wronged a prince, he should satisfy him for the injury by a sum taken out of the prince's exchequer. Indeed, man is not willing to obey any command of God ; there is nothing in his nature but an enmity against God and his law, Rom. viii. 7, and therefore no complete will to give God any satisfaction, or pay him any obedience. The will is naturally enslaved to sin, and under the power of vicious habits, sins always, never obeys perfectly, but in the moment of a material obedience offends God, comes short of what the law requires. Till the will of man be changed, he cannot be willing with a complete will to obey God ; and the will cannot be changed before a satisfaction be made, because it is not reasonable that the punishment of sin, which was a spiritual as well as eternal death, and consisted in leaving the soul under the power of those ill habits it had contracted, which are indeed the death of the soul, as diseases are the death of the body, should be taken off till some satisfaction were made. Man can no more free himself from this spiritual death, than he can free himself from the death of the body ; and we have no reason to think God would do it before a satisfaction, for then the law he had enacted would be wronged by himself. Well, then, man hath not power to obey God : Job xiv. 4, 'Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean ? not one ;' *i. e.* saith Cocceius, Who can change an unclean thing into a clean ? Is there not one ? Yea, and but one ; Christ only can do it.

(2.) Supposing man had power to obey the law, and that perfectly, yet this was due to God before the sin of man, and therefore cannot be a compensation for the sin of man. After obedience will not make amends for past crimes ; for obedience is a debt due of itself, and what is a debt of itself cannot be a compensation for another. What is a compensation, must be something that doth not fall under the notion or relation of a debt due before, but contracted by the injury done. Obedience was due from man if he had not sinned, and therefore is a debt as much due after sin as before it ; but a new debt cannot be satisfied by paying an old. As suppose you owe a man money upon a bond, and also abuse him in his reputation, or some other concern ; is there not a new debt contracted upon that trespass, a debt of

reparation of him in what you have wronged him? The paying him the money you owe him upon bond, is not an amends for the injury you did him otherwise. They both in law fall under a different consideration. Or when a man rebels against a prince of whom he holds some land, will the payment of his quit-rent be satisfactory for the crime of his rebellion? So obedience to the law in our whole course was a debt upon us by our creation; and this hath relation to the preceptive part of the law, and to God as a sovereign: but upon sin a new debt of punishment was contracted, and the penalty of the law was to be satisfied by suffering, as well as the precepts of the law satisfied by observing them. And this was a debt relating to the justice of God, as well as the other to the sovereignty of God. Now, how can it be imagined that man, by paying the debt he was obliged to before, should satisfy the debt he hath newly contracted? The debts are different: the one is a debt of observance, the other a debt of suffering, and contracted in two different states; the debt of obedience in the state of creation, the debt of suffering in the state of corruption; so that the payment of what was due from us as creatures, cannot satisfy for what was due from us as criminals. All satisfaction is to be made in some way to which a person was not obliged before the offence was committed; as men wronged in their honour, are satisfied by some acts not due to them before they were injured. So that all men taken together, yea, the creatures of ten thousand worlds, cannot, by obedience to the preceptive part of the law, satisfy for one transgression of it; because, whatsoever they can do, is a debt due from themselves before. When men fell from God, and entered into league with the devil, they laid themselves at the foot of God's righteous wrath, and sunk themselves into the desert of eternal death, and so stood in another relation to God than as subjects; and God might require a reparation for the past disobedience, and security for obedience for the future; unless man could perform this, he must lie bound in chains of darkness. What compensation could man make for what was past, or what security could he give for time to come? Some other, therefore, must interpose, whose suretyship God would accept; who could give a satisfaction to God, as pleasing to him as sin had been displeasing, and offer to God what was not due to him before; who was able to perform what he undertook, and whose security for what was due for the future, might be esteemed valid; and therefore it must be some divine person, that was not bound in his own nature to those terms of obedience, which were necessary to this satisfaction.

(8.) Supposing man had power after his fall to obey, and that obedience were not due before, yet could not his obedience be compensatory for the injury by sin. Because being a finite creature, whatsoever obedience he could pay could not be infinite, and so not proportioned to an infinite majesty. Since the sin of man is infinite, in regard of the person offended, who is an infinite and eternal Being, and thereby debased below the meanest of his creatures, in the reflection that every sin casts upon him, as being not worthy to be beloved and obeyed; and that which doth satisfy must be as great as the demerit of the crime (for it must be proportionable to the disgrace and damage accruing to God by sin); this a finite creature cannot do: for though obedience is an honour paid to an infinite person, as well as sin a contempt of an infinite person, yet the offence is always aggravated by the person offended, as an injury done to a prince is by the dignity of his person and the greatness of his authority; but the satisfaction is measured from the capacity of the subject offending, which is finite, and not commensurate to the greatness of a wronged God. Nor can our obedience and holiness be counted infinite, because they are the fruits of an infinite Spirit in

us;* for by the same reason all creatures should be accounted infinite, because they are the works of an infinite power. The Spirit infuseth the habits of obedience and holiness, and excites them; but the creature, and not the Spirit, exerciseth them, the soul doth obey and believe, &c., so that though they are the Spirit's *efficiently*, yet they are the creature's *subjectively*. Besides, though the Spirit dwells in believers, yet he is not hypostatically united to them, as the divine nature of the second person was to the human. The Holy Ghost and the soul do not make one person; if so, the acts of the new creature would be subjectively infinite, as the mediatory acts of Christ were, because his person, which was the subject of them, was infinite. So that our obedience cannot be infinite; and, indeed, the best obedience any mere creature is able to pay, cannot be so honourable to God as sin is debasing, because by our obedience we honour him according to his nature, as far as our capacity reacheth, and give him no more than his due, and acknowledge him as he is the most excellent Being, the most rightful sovereign; but in sin we prefer every thing before him, do what we can to ungod him, fight against his sovereignty, snarl at his holiness, dare his justice, and render him so vile, as if he were not fit to be ranked above, or with any of his creatures in our hearts; and what rate of obedience is able to render God a satisfaction for so great a contempt and audaciousness? All the obedience a subject can pay to a prince, can never be esteemed in value equal to the contempt, which an endeavour to destroy his person, and pull down his statues, and trample his picture in the dirt, doth cast upon him. Sin is of a higher order in the rank of evils, than the works of righteousness are in the rank of good.†

2. Nor could man give a full satisfaction by suffering, so as to obtain a restoration to happiness. He is as unable to suffer out his restoration, as he is to work it out. His sufferings would be as finite, in regard of the subject, as his obedience; but the glory he had stained, and the justice he had wronged, were the glory of an infinite God; and the sufferings of a finite creature, though lengthened out to eternity, could not be a compensation to an infinite glory disgraced by sin. Alas! the wrath of an incensed God is too fierce and heavy for the strength of a feeble man to break through. But suppose it were possible for a man that had committed but one crime against God, and afterwards repented of it, and retained no more affection to that sin or any other, by suffering torments for some millions of years, to make a compensation for that one sin; yet how is it possible for men, whose natures are depraved, and have nothing of a divine purity in them, to satisfy by suffering, since they suffer, not only for sin, but in a sinful state, and are increasing their sins while they are paying their satisfactions. No suffering of any that retain their rebellious nature can be a satisfaction to the majesty of God, so as to free such a creature from suffering, while that nature remains, and he loves that sin for which he is punished, though he hath not opportunity to commit it. Besides, since man by nature is 'enmity against God,' Rom. viii. 7, God's judicial power would not render him amiable to the sinner, nor suffering inspire him with a love to his judge; if he should therefore suffer multitudes of years, without any certain hope of recovery, could he be without a hatred of God? So, then, all the time he would be suffering he would be highly sinning; and still sinning would increase the debt of suffering instead of diminishing it. A creature, while a creature, in every state is bound to love God; but no fallen creature can do it without a change of nature. Besides, if a man be not able to satisfy by suffering for one sin, how is he able to satisfy for numberless? Every

* Polhill of the Decrees, p. 188.

† Lessius.

new sin increaseth our obnoxiousness to God, both in its own nature, and as it is a virtual approbation of all former sins, at least of the same kind ; now he that cannot pay a farthing, or a shilling, or make satisfaction for a small sum, is not able to make a recompence for millions. And though a man might begin his satisfaction by suffering, where would he end ? Since he cannot give one infinite in value, he must give one infinite in time, and then he would be always paying, and never coming to a period of payment ; for when you have in your thoughts run along the line of eternity, you would have further to go than you have gone ; for in looking back you may find a beginning, but in looking forward you will never find an end ; the further you look, still more remains to come than is past.

To conclude this. The church of old saw her utter inability any way to make a propitiation for sin but by God himself : Ps. lxx. 3, ' Iniquities prevail against me ; as for our transgressions, thou shalt purge them away,' תכפרם. Our iniquities are too strong for us, we cannot make an atonement for them ; but thou shalt be the Messiah, thou shalt propitiate by the Messiah, who is typified by the legal propitiatory, and therefore the same name is given to Christ : Rom. iii. 25, ' a propitiation,' or the propitiatory for our sins. Since the first age of the world to this day, wherein so many ages are run out, there is not one man to be found that ever was his own ransom, or paid a price for his own redemption.

(2.) No creature is able to do it for us. All creatures are nothing in their original ; there could be then nothing of dignity in a mere creature to answer the dignity of the person offended. The plaster would be too narrow for the wound. The whole creation of creatures was of a finite goodness, and nothing to the honour due to so great a majesty. If a creature could satisfy, it could not be by his own strength, but by a great deal of grace conferred upon him, so that he had not paid what was his own to God, but what was God's own already. No creature but must be sustained by the grace of God, that he may not fall into utter ruin while he is satisfying. Angels themselves could not do it but by grace ; and the more any creature should do by the grace of God, the more he would be obliged by God, and the less compensate him. Again, it must be one creature, or a multitude of creatures. How one mere creature could satisfy for a numberless number of men, every one of them foully polluted, cannot well be conceived by common reason. One creature can only be supposed to be a sufficient ransom for one of the same kind. There could not be a dignity in any creature to answer the dignity and equal the value of all mankind. If a multitude of creatures were necessary, there must be as many creatures satisfying as were creatures sinning ; so God would lose one species of creature to restore another, or an equal number of creatures to them that were redeemed. But indeed no creature could satisfy if the wrong was infinite ; and by the rights of justice the satisfaction is to be proportioned to the greatness of the injury and the majesty of the person injured. Those being infinite, no creature was able to manage this affair and bring it to a happy period, because no creature but is finite, and cannot be otherwise than finite, infiniteness being the incommunicable property of the Deity ; therefore neither man nor any angel was able to effect it.

1. Not man. This is clear. All men were sunk into the gulf of misery, and he that was unable to redeem himself, could not pretend to an ability to redeem another : Ps. xlvii. 7, ' None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him.' All that a man hath is not of so much worth as the soul of man ; so that no man can pay a sufficient price for the redemption of his captive brother. All human nature could not have shewn a valuable sacrifice. Consider him as man, he is worse than

nothing and vanity. How shall God have a satisfaction for an unexpressible evil, from that which is worse than nothing? Can the drop of a bucket repair an infinite damage? But consider him in a state of rupture with God, and you find him, by his uncleanness, much more unfit for so great a task. It had been too much a debasing the majesty of God, had one mere man been sacrificed for others as a sufficient price of redemption, as if he had been equal in dignity to the offended majesty of God. And what advantage could it have been to the rest of mankind, since the sacrifice would be as corrupt and unclean as those that needed it? No such thing as an innocent mere man can be found, since Adam's revolt, in all those ages which have run out since; all were sunk into the common gulf, all come short of the glory of God, Rom. iii. 23. All were destitute of the image of God, and become filthy; every one without exception, Ps. xiv. 3. And could the sacrifice of rebels redeem rebellious creatures? Could anything morally impure content God, when a maimed beast was not thought fit for his altar? A polluted sacrifice, overgrown with uncleanness and corrupt imaginations, would rather have provoked than pacified him. But suppose an innocent man could be found out, stored with all the holiness of men and angels; yet how can we conceive that the holiness of that man should please God, as much as the sin of Adam displeased him? Such a person in his obedience would only have given God his due; whereas by sin, man robbed God of his holiness, more dear than many worlds, and unconceivable numbers of men and angels.

2. Nor could angels be a sacrifice for us; because they were not of the same nature with the offending person. And the apostle intimates that the redemption is to be made in the same nature that transgressed, when he excludes the fallen angels from the happiness of redemption, because Christ took not upon him the angelical nature, Heb. ii. 17. Though the angels were innocent, yet they were creatures and finite; nor were they the offending nature. And though they transcend man, both in the dignity and holiness of their nature, yet they come infinitely short of the dignity of God, who was injured. They are not pure in his sight, with such a purity as is commensurate with the infinite holiness of their Creator: Job iv. 18, 'He chargeth his angels with folly.' They would fall and vanish from their glory if they were not supported by the grace of God. By angels is not meant prophets, messengers God sends to men; for he speaks of persons distinct from them that dwell in houses of clay: but the prophets were of this latter number. And that he means the good angels is evident, by giving them the title of his angels, his servants, as peculiarly belonging to his service. He proves man not to be just and pure in God's sight, *a majori*, because he chargeth the angels with folly. There had been nothing in the argument to say, man is not more pure than his Maker, because the devils are not. Angels were creatures, and therefore had not a holiness adequate to the holiness of God. What proportion was there between a finite, mutable holiness, and that which is immutable? Though angels were innocent, yet in their own nature they might cease to be so. They had not strength enough to bear and break through an infinite wrath; they could not satisfy, so as to effect redemption, till their satisfaction had been completed, which could not have been even in an endless eternity. What is finite in nature, can never become infinite in nature; one cannot pass into another. If one sunk a number of them into hell, how could one angel, or a number of them, answer for the multitude of sins charged upon the world? So great also is the malignity of sin, and so great an injury to the majesty of God, that it cannot be compensated by all the services and sufferings of saints and angels. But suppose angels had

been capable to be sacrifices for us, and so our redeemers, it had not been agreeable to the wisdom of God to confer that honour upon a creature, to be the redeemer of souls, which would mount a step higher than the bare title of creator, and thereby glorify a creature above himself.

To conclude this. The most excellent satisfaction and sacrifice becomes the dignity of an injured God, and such a satisfaction, that there cannot be imagined a greater by a creature; but whatsoever satisfaction can be given by men or angels, is not so great as may be imagined and apprehended by a creature; for such an one may be imagined as may proceed absolutely holy from the person offering, and be attended with an immutable innocence, without any possibility of a charge of folly, which is a condition above a created state. God was made lower than any creature by sin; and therefore such a satisfaction was suitable, as might render God infinitely higher than any creature, and demonstrate the highest and most glorious perfections of his nature. This was wrought by the death of the Son of God, and could not have been evidenced in that height by the death of any creature.

3. Ceremonial sacrifices, under the law, could not be sufficient for this affair. The Jews, indeed, did rest upon them; thought that, if not by their own virtue, yet by the virtue of God's institution, they purged away their sin, Isa. i. 13, 14. But,

[1.] This was against common reason. Common reason would conclude, that the sin of a soul could never be expiated by the blood of a beast, and that a nature so inferior could not be a compensation for the crime of a nature so much superior to it. The prophet spake but the true reason of mankind, when he asserted, that the Lord would not be pleased with thousands of rams, or ten thousands of rivers of oil, nor the first-born of the body be a satisfaction for the sin of the soul, Micah vi. 6, 7. The first-born and fruit of a man's own body was too low, much more the first-born of a beast. The soul was the principal in sin, and what fitness had a corporeal blood to make amends for the crime of a spiritual nature? A rational sacrifice only was fit to be an atonement for the sin of a rational being. The brutish nature was not the human, there was no agreement between the nature of man and that of a bullock. The transgressing nature was to suffer, the soul that sins, that shall die, Ezek. xviii. A beast had no communion in nature with man, whereby it might respect the sinner, nor any worth in itself, whereby it might respect God, nor any willingness or intention for such an end. Can any think sin so light, as to be expiated by such pitiful mean blood? The remedy ought to be suited to the disease and the party afflicted.* The sin consisted in rebellion and hatred of God; the remedy then must consist in perfect righteousness, exact obedience, and intense love to God; all which beasts were incapable of. A man must put off his own reason, and have very debasing apprehensions of the perfections of God, if he thinks infinite holiness scorned, infinite justice provoked, infinite glory rifled, can put up all upon the offering brutish blood, that knows not why and to what end it is offered. It was too base a thing to be thought to bear a proportion to an infinite offended nature. What should the flesh and blood of goats signify to a spiritual nature, with which it had no agreement? Ps. l. 13. It was not agreeable to the wisdom of God. A wise earthly lawgiver would not think the life of a beast to be a fit recompence for the capital crime of a malefactor. The wisdom of God knew that they were unproportioned to the end of an expiatory sacrifice. And was it not inconsistent with this perfection, for God to be contented with so vile a thing, after such terrible thunders from mount Sinai, and giving the law with so much solemnity? What

* Turretin. de Satisfact., pp. 240, 241.

a ridiculous thing would all that ado appear to be, if a beast's blood were powerful enough to quench the force of those flames, and put to silence the thunders of the divine fury, if the transgression of any part of it might be washed away by so cheap an offering? Besides, the same wisdom surely would not let man, the most excellent creature, be beholden to brutes for the merit of righteousness, nor could they be agreeable to the justice of God in the law, which required the death of the party offending. If all the beasts of Lebanon were sacrificed, and the cedars cut down for wood for the burnt-offerings, all could not be a sweet-smelling savour before God. There is an infinite disproportion between this kind of satisfaction and the divine majesty. With God only is plenteous redemption, Ps. cxxx. 7, 8; with God, not in the blood of beasts, but in the true sacrifice, and ransom; yet with God, and not then manifested to the world.

[2.] The repetition of those sacrifices shewed their imperfection and insufficiency. It is from this head the apostle argues their weakness and impossibility to take away sin, Heb. x. 1-4. There was after them a remembrance of sin; the offerer was not so bettered by them, but still he had need of new ones to keep him right with God. Had any thing been perfected by them, they had ceased, only the new application of an old sacrifice had been required; but there was no ground for an after application of a past sacrifice upon new sins, because the efficacy of the blood ceased as soon as it was shed and sprinkled, so that multitudes of them could not constitute an inexhaustible treasure of reconciliation and merit. The variety of them manifested that there was nothing firm in them. As many medicines shew their own inefficacy, so the many sacrifices and purifications did evidence that a firm and efficacious propitiation was to be sought elsewhere. If the great annual sacrifice, the most solemn one in that whole institution (of which you may read, Levit. xvi. 29, xxiii. 27), could not effect it, much less could sacrifices of a lower dignity. It is from the repetition of this great sacrifice Paul argues the insufficiency of it. This was the most solemn sacrifice, because it was offered by the high priest himself, and for all the people, and the blood sprinkled in the holy of holies. A less sacrifice could not have a larger virtue than the greatest, yet the repetition of this shewed its imperfection.

[3.] God never intended them for the expiation of sin by any virtue of their own. The majesty of God, that sin fought against, was infinite; the sacrifice then must be infinite; but none of those sacrifices under the law were so. Why then did God constitute them? Not with any intention to purge away the sin of the soul, but the ceremonial uncleanness of the flesh: Heb. ix. 13, 14, 'The blood of bulls sanctifies to the purifying the flesh.' The apostle compares those and the sacrifice of Christ together, shewing that one purified only the flesh, the other the conscience. It was not a moral guilt they were intended to remove, but a ceremonial, as when one was defiled by touching a dead carcase or a leprous body, which was in estimation a defilement of the body, not of the soul. It was a guilt judged so by God, not by any law of nature, but a positive law, an arbitrary constitution, which punished it not with death, but with a suspension from communion till it were expiated by a sacrifice; and therefore God might settle what compensation he pleased of a lower nature, for that which was not a moral guilt, for there was nothing in those ceremonial impurities which might waste the conscience, or be accounted a dead work, ver. 14, or infect the soul.* But as to moral crimes, they were rather the confessions than expiations of them. And, indeed, God often discovered their weakness, and that they

* Turretin. de Satisfac., pp. 237, 238.

could not give him rest, or recompense the injury received by sin : Isa. lxvi. 1, ' Where is the house that you build me, and where is the place of my rest ? For all those things have my hands made, and all those things have been, saith the Lord.' By the house or temple, is meant all the Jewish economy, and the lump of sacrifices ; all those things, though God appointed them, and though they had been used and performed, God had no rest in. They neither satisfied his justice, nor vindicated the honour of his law, nor could they ever take away sin, Heb. x. 11. And, therefore, the only wise God never instituted them for that end, unless we will say he was deceived in his expectations, and mistaken in the end of his appointments. God therefore rejected them, not only upon the hypocrisy of the offerers (as sometimes he did), but upon the account of their own nature, being unable to attain the end of a propitiatory sacrifice, Heb. vii. 18. They were disannulled for the weakness and unprofitableness of them. Though they had been practised for so many ages, yet not one sin had been expiated by them in that long tract of time.

[4.] God did therefore appoint them to prefigure a more excellent sacrifice, able to do it. The vileness and poorness of a beast appointed for sacrifice might admonish the Jews that such light things were insufficient for so great a work as the taking away of sin, the wrath of God, and eternal punishment, and redeeming the soul of man (more precious than all the beasts of the field or birds of the air) ; they must needs conceive sin was too foul to be washed away with such blood ; and this would naturally lead them to conceive that they prefigured a sacrifice more excellent and sufficient for those ends. They were but shadows, Heb. x. 1, and did typically respect a crucified, dying Christ as the substance ; and what virtue they had was not in and from themselves, but from their typical relation to that which they shadowed. They signified the sacrifice of Christ, by whose blood, in the fulness of time, the sins that were past were to be expiated, Rom. iii. 25 ; and as shadows received what value they had from their substance. They did not as shadows purge away any sin, but represent that which should. The shadow of a man shews like a man, but hath not the virtue and power of a man, whose shadow it is, to act what he doth. They easily might collect from them that they were not able to expiate their sins themselves, that it must be done by death, and by the death of some other, not the offender, but of one too that was innocent, and whose sacrifice might be of perpetual virtue ; and this those shadows signified to any inquisitive mind.* And the Scripture evidenceth this, the will of God was the reparation of mankind ; and when those were insufficient for it, Christ steps in as the great sacrifice wherein God had pleasure, to do this will of God, viz., man's restoration in a way congruous to the honour of God, Heb. x. 6-8. So that what pleasure God had in the institution of legal sacrifices, did not arise from anything in themselves, nor was terminated in them, but in this sacrifice, more excellent than the sacrifice of worlds of creatures.

[2.] Since all these were insufficient, some other must be found out to effect it. And this was Christ only, the Son of God. To fancy a satisfaction below the demerit of the offence, and disproportioned to the injury committed, is to wrong the wisdom and justice of God, and to vilify God in such low thoughts of his nature. That only can be properly called a satisfaction, which is suited to the majesty of God, and is equivalent to the sin of man. Now, since none else were able to offer to God anything for the reparation of his glory, there must be something offered to God, which is greater

* Mornæ, Cont. Inst. p. 168, &c.

than everything that was not God. There was therefore a necessity of some divine person to give that satisfaction which was necessary for the honour of God; that, as a father saith, there might be as much humiliation in the expiation as there was presumption in the transgression. If God would have accepted a satisfaction less than infinite, he might as well have pardoned sin without a satisfaction at all.

(1.) Christ was the fittest, and only capable of effecting it. He was more excellent than all the creatures of the lowest and highest rank put together. There was none whose merit and dignity could equal the greatness and infiniteness of the injury done to God by sin. None could compensate the blackness of the offence with such a greatness of satisfaction. And indeed we cannot imagine that God would expose his Son to so cruel a death, were it not necessary or highly convenient for his honour, or that the Son himself would have taken such a task upon his shoulders, to redeem man in a way of perfect justice. The death of Christ was necessary, our redemption could not else have been in the most perfect manner. None but a divine person could offer a price of redemption worthy of God. His person was infinite, and therefore was able to compensate an infinite injury. He was the prime male in the world, and therefore called the first-born of every creature, Col. i. 15, *i. e.* the basis and foundation of the whole creation.* He was innocent; he was free from everything that might render him an unsavoury sacrifice. He was like us, and in that had what was necessary for a sacrifice, but sin excepted; and in that he wanted what would have made him incapable of effecting our redemption. It was necessary that we should have such a surety and satisfier as was not only innocent, but immutably so, that could not by any means be bespotted by sin; and that the apostle intimates, Heb. vii. 26, 'holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners,' and from sin. Had he only been holy, without being immutably so, the election of God had not stood firm; for since God chose some to bring to glory, and that in Christ, it had been a tottering and uncertain resolution, had the perfecting the redemption of his chosen ones depended upon the transactions of a mutable person, that could not eternally secure himself from offending. Had it been possible for the Redeemer to sin, it had been possible for the absolute decree of God to become vain, and of no effect. He had also strength to do it; his own arm brought salvation, Isa. lxiii. 5. He paid God that which he was not bound to pay; he paid an obedience as man, which was not due from him as God. He was made subject to the law, Gal. iv. 4; not, he was subject to the law by his nature, but made so by his incarnation. He was the fittest, in regard of his being the second person in the Trinity.† It was not fit the Father should suffer, he is regarded as the Governor of the world; who should then have been judge of the satisfaction, whether it had been sufficient or no? Was it fit the Father should have appeared before the tribunal of the Son? Nor was it so fit that the Spirit of God should undertake it; because, as there was a necessity of satisfaction to content the justice of God, so there was a necessity of applying this satisfaction, and quickening the hearts of men to believe and accept it, that they might enjoy the fruits of this sacrifice. The order of the three persons had then been disturbed; and that person whereby the Father and the Son execute all other things, had changed his operation.

He was fit, in regard of both natures in union.‡ Since neither man nor angel could do this business, and there is no nature above theirs but the

* Davenant *in loc.*

† Amvrald. sur Heb. vi. p. 156, 158, much changed.

‡ Feii Orthodox. Scholast. cap. xxii. sect. 3, p. 223.

divine, it must be the divine nature and human together : human, because man had sinned ; divine, because the satisfaction should equal the offence. Here they are both in conjunction ; the substance of the satisfaction is made in the human nature suffering, and the value of the satisfaction is from the divine. Had he not been mortal, he could not have undergone the punishment sin had merited ; and had he not been divine, he could not have given a reparation equivalent to the damage by sin ; he was man to perform it, and God to be sufficient for it.

(2.) The honour of God was most preserved and elevated thereby. This way mercy did not invade the rights of justice, nor justice trespass upon the bowels of mercy ; both contain themselves in their own spheres. Mercy was preserved from being injured by seeing man solely punished, and justice was preserved from being wronged by seeing man solely pardoned. Thus was the nature of God glorified, without one attribute clashing against the other. Justice could not so well have been declared without the death of Christ, he was therefore set forth *εις ἐνδείξιν*, Rom. iii. 25. To declare his righteousness, as an index of justice, to point to every head and part of it in the nature of God. In this way God saved us as a judge, a lawgiver, and a king, Isa. xxxiii. 22 ; as a judge in the manifestation of his righteousness, as a lawgiver in the vindication of his holiness, as a king in the demonstration of his sovereignty, in such a way as that his justice is cleared, his law righted, and his sovereignty acknowledged. His hatred of sin was more clearly manifested, and his truth in his threatenings made good and established, and sinners more obliged to God, and engaged upon the account of ingenuity to a greater abhorrency of sin, and a fear and love of God, which, by the suffering of any creature, could not have had so strong a foundation in them. God set a high value upon his law ; it was his royal law ; and had it been wholly neglected, the royalty of God had not only been violated, but his holiness and righteousness had been disparaged, which shone forth in the law, and made up the whole frame of it ; and since death was required by the law, death must be suffered, that there might be an agreement between the threatening and the suffering, the punishment and the justice of God, which required it. We may reasonably think it had been a greater act of wisdom to make no law, than to let it be violated always, without preserving the honour of it.

The doctrine of the death of Christ is the substance of the gospel.* Though there be many doctrines in it besides that, there is no comfort from any of them without the consideration of the cross of Christ ; for, though God be merciful in his own nature, yet since sin hath made a separation between God and his creature, it is impossible to renew any communion with him, without a propitiation for the offence. We see, then, Christ is the only meritorious cause of our justification ; nothing that we can do can satisfy God, we must be wholly off from ourselves and our own righteousness, as to any dependence on it, and act faith in the death of the Son of God, if we would be secure here in our consciences, or happy hereafter.

As to suffer death was the immediate end of the interposition of Christ ; and the veracity of God in settling the penalty of death did require it ; and the justice of God made the death of Christ necessary for our redemption ; so,

4. It was necessary in regard of the offices of Christ.

(1.) For his priestly office. The reason that he was to be made like his brethren, subject to the law, and the penalties and curse of it, with an exception of sin in his own person, was, that he might be a faithful and merciful high priest. Heb. ii. 17, 18, 'Wherefore in all things it behoved him to

* Amyraut, Sermons sur l'Evangile, Sermon 3.

be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people ;' faithful to God for the expiation of the guilt of sin, merciful to men for the succouring them in their miseries by sin ; faithful to God in that trust committed to him, to satisfy God for the guilt of sin, that his anger might be averted, and the sinner received into favour, and therefore he was made like to them in the curse, though not in the sin ; which was necessary for his being a merciful high priest. This qualification of compassion could not result in such a high manner from anything so well as from an experimental knowledge of the miseries we had contracted ; and this must be by a sense and feeling of them. No man is so affected with the wretched state of men in a shipwreck by beholding it in a picture, as when he sees the ship dashed against the rocks, and hears the cries, and beholds the strugglings of the passengers for life ; nor is any man so deeply affected with them upon sight, as upon feeling the same miseries in his own person. That makes a man's compassions more readily excited upon seeing or hearing of others in the like state. Now, had not Christ run through the chief miseries of human life, and the punishment of death, he had not had that experimental compassion which was necessary to qualify him for this priesthood. It was by being made perfect through sufferings that he became the author of eternal salvation, Heb. v. 10. It was a thing becoming God as a just and righteous sovereign, in bringing many sons in glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings, Heb. ii. 10 ; ' it became him, by whom and for whom are all things.' It became God, as the sovereign of all things, to have his justice vindicated, and, as the end of all things, to have the glory of his attributes exalted. Had not Christ suffered, he had not been a perfect Saviour, neither faithful to God nor merciful to man, because without blood justice had not been satisfied, and so sin, the great hindrance of salvation, had not been expiated. If he were a priest, he must have a sacrifice. A priest and a sacrifice are relatives. A priest is not properly a priest without a sacrifice, nor a sacrifice properly a sacrifice without a priest. Being settled a perpetual priest, Ps. cx. 4, he must have a perpetual sacrifice. Now, having nothing worthy of God's regard but himself, he sacrificed himself. No other sacrifice could have been perpetual in its efficacy, and consequently without a perpetual sacrifice he could not have been a perpetual priest. He as a priest purged our sins, but by himself as a sacrifice : Heb. i. 9, by his own blood as an offering, he entered into the holiest as a priest, Heb. ix. 12. He could not have entered into heaven to act as a priest there without blood, and no blood was fit to be brought in there but his own. There had been else no analogy between him and the legal priests, who were to enter into the most holy place with blood, and never without it. He could not have been an interceding priest unless he had been a sacrificing priest, because his sacrifice is the ground of his intercession. His intercession is not a bare supplication, but a supplication with unanswerable arguments, a presenting his atoning blood, which he carried with him into the holy place when he went to appear in the presence of God for us ; whence the apostle, speaking of his advocacy, joins it with his propitiation, 1 John ii. 1, 2. His propitiation on earth and his advocacy in heaven complete him a priest for ever. The one is the foundation of the other. Without it, Christ had been a bare petitioner in heaven, and would have had no ground for any plea against the demands of justice.

(2.) For his kingly office. The first thing he was to do for our reconciliation, was the offering his soul for sin, Isa. liii. 10. Upon this article did all the promises of his mediatory exaltation depend ; so that nothing of the

dignity promised could be rightly claimed, or reasonably expected, by him, without the performance of this main and necessary condition, which himself had consented to in the first agreement. For consenting to this undertaking, upon the condition of the promise of his exaltation, he implied that he would not expect any exaltation, unless he performed the condition required on his part, of making his soul an offering for sin; and therefore, without such an oblation, could not justly demand the making good the promise to him. There was an *ought to die*, and then to *enter into glory* by the way of death, as a price to be paid for the restoration of our nature to that happiness from whence it fell; his obedience to death was to precede, his exaltation to a throne and dominion was to follow; he was not to sit down on the right hand of the Majesty on high till he had purged our sins by himself, Heb. i. 3; nor had he been Lord of the dead and living unless he had died, Rom. xiv. 9. The royalty, not only over those whom he had redeemed from sin, but over the good angels, was granted him as a recompence for his sufferings, Philip. ii. 8, 9, and the conquest of the evil angels was by his death; for in his cross he triumphed over principalities and powers, Col. ii. 15. The change of laws in the church, which is a part of royalty, was to follow this sacrifice of himself, which is understood in Cant. iv. 6, 'Until the day break, and the shadows fly away, I will get me to the mountains of myrrh.' The removing the shadows of the law was to follow his being upon the mount Moriah, the place of his sufferings, there being an allusion in the word מִיָּרָה, *myrrh*, or *Moriah*. Nor had the Spirit been sent into the world, unless his death had preceded: John vii. 39, 'The Holy Ghost was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified.' This rich treasure could not be dispensed till the acceptance of this sacrifice, till his glorification; and he could not have a mediatory glory till he had offered his mediatory sacrifice. It is the Lamb slain that hath seven eyes and seven spirits, Rev. v. 6; power to prefer his people, and power to send the Spirit to them for their supply. Besides, the Spirit could not have come as a comforter without it, because the consolations he shoots into the soul are drawn out of this quiver. Without his death, we had not had a propitiation for sin, the mysteries of divine love had lain undiscerned in darkness; since we cannot be renewed without the Spirit (because the nature of man was depraved by his fall, whereupon justice denied the restoration of original righteousness), justice must be satisfied, and God reconciled, before mercy could restore it. Justice must be appeased, before it would consent to the return of that favour which had devolved into its hands by forfeiture; so great a gift as the Spirit, the author of renewing grace, was not like to be bestowed upon us by God, while he remained an enemy. The gift of the Spirit is therefore ascribed to the purchase of Christ's death.

(3.) There was some necessity of it for his prophetic office. His death was the highest confirmation of his doctrine. This was not indeed the only cause, nor the principal cause, of his death; if it were, his death would differ little in the end of it from the death of martyrs. Besides, if he had suffered death chiefly for this, what need was there of his undergoing the curse, and groaning under the desertion of his Father? There was no absolute necessity of his death for the confirmation of his doctrine, since the miracles he performed were a divine seal to assure us of its heavenly original; therefore he directs the Jews to his works, as a means of believing him to be from heaven, John x. 38. Yet in his death he set forth a perpetual pattern of that obedience, meekness, love to God and man, and trust in his Father, above what any creature had ever been able to propose to us. He taught us in his life by the words of his mouth, and in his death instructed us by

the exemplary exercise of his graces, and the voice of his blood, 1 Peter ii. 21. He taught us the highest part of obedience to the utmost, by performing the exactest and sublimest part of obedience to his Father ; and, therefore, after he had discoursed to his disciples of his death and departure, he adds the reason of it, ' That the world may know that I love the Father ; and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do,' John xiv. 31 ; that the world might know that he loved the glory of the Father, who was so merciful as to be willing to remit sin, yet so just, as not to remit it without a sacrifice.

5. The death of Christ was necessary upon the account of the predictions and types of it in the Scripture. Had not Christ suffered, all the predictions had been false, and the types to no purpose. In this the veracity of God was engaged, not only in making good the threatening of death discovered to the first man, in inflicting what was threatened, but in the way of redemption by his Son. This was not only truth to his own resolve, as he had determined it, but truth to his word, as he had published it. God having decreed and declared the redemption of mankind, and the death of the Messiah as the medium, could not appoint then another way, because his counsel had not only pitched upon redemption as the end, but the death of Christ as the means ; and there could be no change in God. Had there been a change in the end, and had God altered his purpose for man's redemption, he had obscured and lost the glory of all those attributes which sparkled in it. There could be none in the means ; if so, it must have been for the better or worse. The better it could not be ; for no way of so great a sufficiency could be found out as this, nor could any sacrifice of a higher value be thought of. Nor could it be worse ; for he could not have pitched upon any deficient way but he would have testified himself weary of, and changed in, his end for which he appointed those means. This necessity of his death, Christ, in his discourse with his staggering disciples, confirms by the exposition of all the Scriptures, which contained the things concerning himself, beginning at Moses, *i. e.* at the books of Moses, and all the prophets, Luke xxiv. 27 ; which he testifies again, ver. 43, naming the Psalms also as particularly containing things that concerned his person and death. Moses discovered it by types, as he was the minister of settling them, and by prophecies, as he was the amanuensis to write some of them. The prophets declared it in express words, they spake it all with one mouth ; and their chief prophecies centred in this, that Christ should suffer : Acts xxvi. 22, 23, ' Saying none other things than what Moses and the prophets did say should come ; that Christ should suffer.' And the apostle Peter excludes none of the prophets from speaking of those things which were to be done in the latter days, Acts iii. 21 ; and that this was the design of the Spirit in them, to testify of the sufferings of Christ, 1 Peter i. 11.

(1.) Predictions. We shall speak of a few.

[1.] The first promise : Gen. iii. 15, ' It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel ;' speaking to the serpent of the seed of the woman, which was to defeat all his devices. The Messiah here, as the seed of the woman, was promised to Adam to break the serpent's head, *i. e.* to take away sin and eternal death from man, which the devil had introduced, by the subtle contrivances of his head, into the world ; for he was to take away the strength, power, and wisdom of the devil, signified by the head. The way whereby he was to do it was by having his heel bruised, *viz.*, the heel of his humanity, by suffering. For as he was the seed of the woman, having human nature, he was to be bruised, he was to feel the power of the devil (now, the power of the devil was the power of death, Heb. ii. 14), yet so to feel the power of the devil as not utterly to sink under it ; for not his head, but his heel, was

to be bruised, *i. e.* his flesh, not his wisdom and chief design for the redemption of man. He was only to be bruised, not destroyed, or to see corruption; so that his death and resurrection are here predicted. And by suffering his heel to be bruised by the serpent, he was to break the serpent's head, *i. e.* through death to destroy him that had the power of death, Heb. ii. 14. And we know the death of Christ was the conquest of the devil. Sufferings are necessary;* for there can be no conquest of the devil but by a satisfaction performed to the righteousness of the law; for his whole empire consisted in the curse of the law; and the law, after sin, required death, called therefore a 'law of sin and death,' Rom. viii. 2. The devil was the jailor, having the power of death; the law must be satisfied before the prisoner be freed from the jailor's power. The value of those sufferings is declared,† because his bruise cannot wholly destroy the seed, nor hinder him from bruising the serpent's head. He could not by suffering bruise the serpent's head, unless he had been innocent, and from his innocence derived a dignity and worth to his sufferings; and this no fallen creature could do. Again, he must be innocent; for if he had been under the power of the devil, he could not have bruised his head. And since he was to overcome the devil by having his heel bruised, it signifies his suffering for those sins which were the foundation of the empire and dominion of the devil. Adam might well understand this conquest of the devil to be the death of the seed, because after this promise he was taught to sacrifice; and the sacrifices, he was presently taught (as may be well conjectured by the skins of beasts, *viz.*, of sacrificed beasts, wherewith God clothed him), as a comment upon this promise, shewed him in their death what he had deserved, and in what manner he was to expect his redemption, so lately promised him. And surely the wisdom and goodness of God would not teach him the way of sacrificing, without acquainting him with the reason and end of sacrifices, which the Scripture mentions as a means to make man accepted with God, Gen. iv. 7; to purge away sin, 1 Sam. iii. 14; and to make reconciliation for it, Ezek. xlv. 17. And Adam, having more natural knowledge after his fall than all his posterity have had since, might easily know by reason that the blood of beasts was too weak and vile to make an atonement for his late offence, which had brought so much misery upon him, and thereby was manifested to be infinitely offensive to God, and therefore more offensive to him than the blood of beasts could be pleasing. This he could not but know, that those sacrifices 'could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience,' as the expression is in Heb. ix. 9. And Adam, being the high priest, as head of all, could not but know that those sacrifices were offered for sin; because this was the end of the appointment of a priest, and the chief part of his office, as well as the end of the sacrifice: Heb. v. 1, 'Every high priest is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer sacrifices for sin.' Let us further consider. The end of this promise was to defeat the devil, and to comfort Adam after his revolt from God, and thereby his falling under the vindictive justice of God, and to cheer him up before he should hear his own sentence, which was pronounced, Gen. iii. 17-19. So that Adam could not reasonably understand this promise any other way for his comfort, than that this promised seed should take away sin and the death threatened for it; otherwise it had been but little comfort to Adam to see himself ruined beyond any hopes of recovery, and to hear only of the destruction of his enemy. But in this promise Adam saw the sentence of death respited, because the seed of the woman was promised, which necessarily included the continuance of his life, else there could have been no seed of the woman. This also signifies

* Cocc. in Gen. iii. 15.

† Cocc. in Gen. iii. 15.

to us that the sufferings of Christ were intended for a satisfaction of the violated law and provoked justice; for if sin and death were to be taken away by Adam's imitation of this promised seed when he should appear, Adam could take no comfort in the promise, unless he had been sure to live to see this promised seed in the flesh. How could he imitate as an example the promised seed whom he was never to see in the world, but was to return to dust long before the appearance of it in the world? And it was necessary Adam should behold this seed in the flesh, if the breaking of the fetters of sin and hell were to be brought about only by his imitation of this seed. Again, to bruise the serpent's head cannot reasonably be understood of a confirmation only of the promised mercy (which some make the end of the death of Christ). There was no need of bruising the heel barely for a confirmation of this mercy; for that was confirmed by the unalterable promise and will of God. And no question but Adam thought it sufficiently valid, since he received it from the mouth of God himself, and had so late an experience how true God was to the word of threatening. There is no other thing left, then, as the end of this bruising the heel, but to render mercy triumphant without any wrong to justice, and to vindicate the honour of the law, and, in a way of righteousness, not only of sovereign dominion, to defeat the serpent and restore the fallen creature.

[2.] Another prediction is Psalm xxii. All the circumstances of his passion are here enumerated: sufferings, revilings, contempt by men, the desertion of God, his agonies, the parting his garments; and, at last, the propagation of the gospel and the calling of the gentiles are here predicted. The Jews understood it of the body of the Jewish nation;* but the design of the psalmist is to set forth a particular person, who is distinguished from the wicked crew that oppressed him, and from those that favoured him, whom he calls his brethren, and distinguisheth himself from the congregation wherein he would praise God, ver. 23; and upon the death of this person the world was to be gathered in to God: ver. 27, 'All the ends of the world shall remember, and turn unto the Lord;' agreeable to the prediction of our Saviour, that when he should be lifted up, he would draw all men after him. Here is the prediction of the very words he spake upon the cross, when he lay under the imputation of our sins, and cried out, under the sense of his Father's wrath, ver. 1, 'My God, my God,' &c. The miserable condition he was brought to, ver. 6, as a worm and no man, exposed to such a state of misery, and to be of no more account than the most contemptible animal, a worm. The word *worm*† comes of תולע, which signifies the grain which gave a scarlet dye, because the colour proceeded from a worm enclosed in that grain. Our Saviour was as a worm crushed to tincture others with his blood. The very gesture of the people when they reviled him, wagging their heads, ver. 7, and Mat. xxvii. 29; the reproaches they belched out against him, ver. 8, Mat. xxvii. 43, 'He trusted in God, let him deliver him;' the sharpness of his death, ver. 14, 'I am poured out like water, all my bones are out of joint;' a distortion and racking of all his bones, effusion of his blood, dissolution of his vital vigour (like wax melted) under the sense of God's wrath, an expression used, Ps. lxxviii. 2, to shew the greatness of God's wrath against sin and sinners; his extreme thirst, ver. 15, 'My tongue cleaveth to my jaws;' the manner of his death by crucifixion, ver. 16, by piercing his hands and his feet, shewing it to be a lingering and painful death, which manner of death is also prophesied, Zech. xii. 10, 'They shall look upon me whom they have pierced,' which the ancient Jews understood of the Messiah,

* Dr. Owen on Heb., vol. i. Exercit. pp. 217, 218.

† תולעת. Vermillion colour is derived of *vermis*.

and is a proof that the Messiah was to be pierced or digged into. And this place is cited as a prediction of the death of Christ, John xix. 37, Rev. i. 7; and as the manner of his death, so the excellency of his person is described there. The same person is a God to pour out the Spirit, and a man to be pierced; he works wonders as God, and suffers wonders as man.

[8.] The whole 53d of Isaiah is a prediction of this. He was to be rejected of men, wounded for our transgressions, to have our sins laid upon him by God, to bear iniquity, to be led as a sheep to the slaughter, to make his soul an offering for sin. This is so plain that the Jews anciently understood it of the Messiah;* but the latter Jews, to evade it, have fancied a double Messiah, one a sufferer, another a triumpher, the sufferer of the tribe of Ephraim, the triumpher of the tribe of Judah; but where doth the Scripture mention a Messiah of the tribe of Ephraim? It always fixeth his descent from the house of David, of the tribe of Judah.

Many other prophecies there are of this: Zech. xiii. 7, 'I will smite the shepherd,' and Dan. ix. 24, the 'Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself;' he shall be counted the wickedest man, and put to death as the greatest malefactor, who hath no crime of his own to merit death, but his death shall be for the good of mankind. And the ends of it are expressed, ver. 24, to finish transgression, and make an end of sin, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy; to finish transgression, or restrain it; to abolish sin in regard of the guilt of it, and restrain it from accusing us before God, and procuring the condemnation of us; to make an end of sin, or seal up sin, covering it, that it shall no more appear against us, as the writings of the Jews were rolled up, and sealed on the back side, that the writing could no more be seen; to make reconciliation for iniquity, to expiate iniquity (a word belonging to sacrifices), to take away the obligation of sin (and it is observable, that all the words used in Scripture to signify sin, are here put in, *פֶּשַׁע*, *עֲוֹן*, *חַטָּאת*, to shew the universal removal of them, as to any guilt, by the death of Christ), and to bring in everlasting righteousness. As righteousness was lost by the first Adam, so it was to be restored by the second, to make us for ever accepted before God. And to seal up the vision and prophecy, to accomplish all the visions and prophecies in the appearance of his person, and performance of his work. All prophecies pointed to him, and centered in him; and the end of his coming and excision was to deliver us from sin, and introduce such a righteousness as might be valuable for us before God. And then he was to be a prince, when he had been a sacrifice, and cut off for the sins of the people. As the time approached for the coming of this promised seed, God made clearer revelations of the death of the Messiah, and his chief design in it. And this is such a testimony of a dying Messiah, by the hands of violence, and for those great ends which the Christian religion affirms, that the Jews, with all their evasions and obstinacy, know not how to get over it.

(2.) The second thing is the types. There were several types of Christ in the Old Testament, both in the persons of men and the ceremonies of the law. No one type, no, nor all together, could fully signify this great sacrifice. The figure hath not what the truth hath.† The image of a king represents not all that the king hath or is. Moses was a type of the Messiah, who was to be raised up like to Moses, Deut. xviii. 15. Moses, put into an ark, was exposed to the mercy of the Egyptians on the land, and the crocodiles in the river, and after that advanced to be chief governor of Israel; Jonah,

* Pugio fidei. part iii. distinct. i. cap. x. § 4, 5, and distinct. iii. cap. xvi.

† Theodoret.

buried three days in the belly of the whale ; Noah, penned up in an ark, to become the father of a second generation ; Joseph, cruelly put into a pit, and sold by his brethren, and afterwards lifted up to a throne, to be the preserver of his spiteful brethren,—these, it is likely, had all some relation, as types, to Christ. It would be endless to mention all ; let us consider in general.

[1.] Sacrifices. These were practised by all nations, as well Gentiles as Jews, and from a notion that they did pacify their offended deities. Heathen authors give us a full account of their sentiments in this case ; and the Philistines, neighbours to the Jews, declare this as their sense in their trespass offering, they would return to God after they had felt his hand, 1 Sam. vi. 3-5. The common notion of all heathens was, that they were offered to God for a propitiation for sin, and either for preventing the judgments they feared, or removing the judgments they felt.

(1.) These sacrifices could not arise from the light of nature. Being universally practised, they must arise from the light of nature, common to all men, or from some particular institution derived to all men by tradition. The light of nature could not be any ground for the framing such an imagination in men's minds, that God should be appeased by the blood of irrational creatures. The disproportion of them both to the offence, the offender, and the offended person, hath been seen and spoken of by the wiser sort of the heathens themselves. Natural light would rather have dictated to them that their devout prayers, deep repentance, and hearty reformation would have been more efficacious to avert the anger of God than the cutting the throat of a bullock or lamb, and pouring out the blood at the foot of their altars. They could no more suppose that such offerings should appease an offended God, than the cutting off a dog's neck, or the crushing a fly before the statue of a prince would have appeased the anger of their injured sovereign. And none could think but the killing a worm, and offering it to the prince, had been as well or more sufficient to have mitigated his wrath, than the killing a thousand cattle had been to allay the wrath of God, in regard of the proportionableness of a worm to the one, greater than that of all the beasts in the world to the other. The light of nature would not instruct the heathens barbarously to take away the lives of men, and offer them for the expiation of their sins. For that teacheth us to love one another, as being descended from one root, and being of the same stamp. Besides, had any law of nature obliged men at any time to bloody sacrifices in such a nature, it would have obliged them still. No law of nature is razed out by the gospel, but more cleared ; and whatsoever is due to God by the law of nature is more improved by the Christian religion. Natural light would be able to make more objections for the forbearance of such a practice, than arguments for the preserving it in the world.

(2.) They must be therefore from institution. And since the practice hath been so universal, and the head of it can less be traced than the head of the river Nilus, it must be supposed to descend from the first man by tradition, and carried by his posterity to all the places which they first peopled, and so continued by their descendants. Bloody sacrifices seem to be instituted just after the fall. How should Adam be clothed with the skins of beasts ? Gen. iii. 21. If it be meant that God only taught him to clothe himself with the skins of beasts, it implies a giving him order to slay beasts, and most probably first in sacrifice, and ordering him to take the skins for clothing, which in the Levitical service were appropriated to the priests. For food it is probable they were not killed ; the food then appointed was the herb of the field, even after the fall, Gen. iii. 18. And the

objection against this, that there were but two of a kind, male and female, created, and therefore if two beasts of the same kind had been slain, a species had been destroyed, is of no validity. For the story of the creation mentions not such a parsimonious creation, nay, it is more probable there were more than two of a sort created. However, sacrifices began early. Abel is the first we plainly read of, Gen. iv. 4. He brought of the firstlings of his flock, and Cain brought of the fruit of the ground, an offering to the Lord. They may not be out of the way who think that there was a crime in the matter of Cain's sacrifice, it not being a bloody one. No doubt but he had seen his father offer to God the fruits of the earth, as well as the bodies of beasts, and might think that the offering those fruits of the ground (the tilling whereof was his proper employment) was sufficient, that there was no need of blood for the expiation of his sin. He seems to stand upon his own righteousness, and offer only what was an acknowledgment of God's dominion and lordship over the whole world, as if he had only been his creature, and not an offending creature. It was not inconsistent with a state of innocence for a man to make such acknowledgments to God, as the Lord of creation and the Benefactor of man. But after the fall there was not only the dominion of God, but his justice, to be acknowledged, which was best signified in a way that might represent to man the demerit of his offence and the justice due to him, which could not be by the offering of fruits, but by the shedding of blood, without which there is no remission.

(3.) If then they were from the special institution of God, they must be figures of something else intended. For since we find an universal sentiment in the practisers of them among the Gentiles, that they were for expiation, and that common reason could not find ground enough to fortify such an opinion in them; and that the Scripture, the ancientest book in the world, gives us an account of their ancient practice and divine institution; they could not be instituted by God, as the prime means of appeasing him, for that could not be congruous to the nature of God. There was no proportion between the justice of God and them, nor between them and the sin of man. But the most reasonable conclusion would be, that they were ordained to signify some other thing or sacrifice intended for the expiation of sin; that they were typical of the death of some one able to bear the punishment and purge the transgression. Since they could not purge the conscience, they must be concluded to be types of something that should have a sufficiency and an actual efficacy to this end. And this the heathens might have guessed from reason and the universal practice, that they were shadows of something else, though they could not have imagined the true person they were shadows of.

To sum up, therefore, the account the Scripture gives us of them, we must consider* that after Adam's revolt, and contracting death and the curses of the law by that apostasy, there was a necessity of maintaining the honour of the law, and God's own veracity in the commination, and satisfying his provoked justice, which must be done by that nature which had offended. Upon this account, and for this end, the second person, the Son of God, voluntarily exposed himself, and stood as a screen between the consuming fire and the combustible creature. Hereupon the sufferings of the Son of God were mutually agreed upon, the particular sufferings appointed and determined, and the time when he should be incarnate, and expose himself to that which the criminal should have endured, was settled, and the redemption, the design of those sufferings, declared by promise; and because the time would be long before his coming to suffer, and the faith of men might

* Owen, Heb. vol. ii. Exercit. p. 61.

languish, God kept it up by lively representations of those sufferings, and the end of them, in the death of sacrificed beasts. Not that they should rest upon them, but use those shadows as props to their faith in the promised seed, till the fulness of time should come. All those sacrifices were a rude draught, or initial elements or rudiments, to teach the world what was to be done with a full efficacy by the person appointed to it. Whence the apostle calls them 'the rudiments of the world,' Col. ii. 20. And so they were a copy of what was resolved in heaven from eternity, to be fulfilled in time, for the expiation of sin. They all had relation to Christ. They were to be without blemish, and dedicated wholly to God, as things that were to perish for his glory; and being burnt, and the smoke ascending to heaven, God might, as it were, partake of the oblation, as the Scripture testifies: Gen. viii. 21, 'And God smelled a sweet savour,' viz., from Noah's sacrifice. So Christ offered himself as a holocaust to the Father, as the antitype of those victims that were wholly to be consumed by fire. And this blood speaks better things than the blood of Abel's sacrifice, or the blood of all the sacrifices shed from the very first; for this pacifies an angry God, purges a guilty conscience, and breaks the chains of hell and damnation. There is no question to be made, but the believers among the Jews did apprehend the heel of the promised seed bruised in every sacrifice; they could not else offer them in faith. As mathematicians measure the greatness of the stars, which are above their reach, by the shadows of the earth, which are within their compass, so did they, upon the view of those sacrifice-shadows, apprehend the virtue and efficacy of the grand oblation.* As those that did understand Christ in the manna did also eat Christ in the manna, 1 Cor. x. 3, 4, so those that did apprehend Christ in the legal sacrifices, were also sprinkled with the blood of Christ. Thus was Christ a lamb slain from the foundation of the world, not only by purpose and decree, but significantly and typically in all the ancient sacrifices. I might here instance in the two anniversary goats, Levit. xvi., one offered, the other devoted to the wilderness; in the red heifer, Num. xix., burnt upon the day of expiations, both eminent types of the death of Christ; as also in the passover or paschal lamb, the blood whereof sprinkled upon the posts was of no necessity in itself for the Israelites' preservation from the destroying angel, nor had any intrinsic virtue in it to procure their security. The angel, no doubt, had acuteness of sight enough to discern the houses and persons of the Israelites from those of the Egyptians.† We cannot justify the wisdom of God in this conduct, if we refer it not to Christ, as a representation of that great miracle of redemption to be wrought by him for the true Israelites, when he should come to free man from a bondage worse than Egyptian. This is the true Lamb of God, that hath the virtue and vigour of all that whereof the paschal lambs had but the image and shadow. Let me add the observation of one,‡ the command of God, that the bones of the paschal lamb should not be broken, signified that the redeemer of the world should die such a death wherein the breaking of bones was usual. Yet that that circumstance should not be used in his death, and therefore that that order of not breaking the bones of the paschal lamb, is cited by John, as if it had been literally meant of him and not of the lamb: John xix. 36, 'That the Scripture should be fulfilled, a bone of him shall not be broken.' I might also instance in that eminent type of the blood of Christ, the blood of the sacrifice sprinkled upon the altar, book of the law, vessels of the sanctuary; after which the elders of Israel ate and

* Mares, contra Volkel. lib iii. cap. xxxiii. p. 389.

† Dailé sur 1 Cor. v. 7. Serm. xx. p. 381.

‡ Pearson on the Creed, p. 408.

drunk in the presence of God, no longer exposed unto his anger, Exod. xxiv.; commented upon by the apostle, Heb. ix. 19, 20.

[2.] Isaac's death was a type of the death of Christ. Of his death; for he was, in the purpose of his Father, upon the command of God, cut off. And Isaac, bearing the wood, did prefigure the manner of the death of Christ, viz., such a death wherein the bearing the wood was customary.* As in crucifying, the offenders bore the cross to the place of execution, and Christ did his. And a type also of the resurrection of Christ; for it was the third day from the command of offering him that Abraham received him to life as new born, and raised from the dead, Gen. xxii. 4, and that in a figure of some nobler sacrifice and resurrection, Heb. xi. 19. Moriah was the place appointed by God where Abraham was to offer his son, Gen. xxii. 2, in one part whereof was the temple and the tower of David; another part of the mount was without Jerusalem, and was called Calvary, upon which Isaac was to be sacrificed, as Jerome tells us from the Jewish tradition. Now, upon Abraham's readiness to offer his son Isaac, God binds himself by an oath, that in his seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed, Gen. xxii. 16-18. In his seed, as dying, and to be offered up, and rising again, as Isaac did in figure. God now binds himself by an oath to do that to Abraham which he had before promised to Adam; the intent of which oath the apostle, Heb. vi. 13, 19, 20, refers to the settling of Christ as redeemer, and more positively affirms this seed to be Christ, Gal. iii. 10. This oath to Abraham was pursuant to that promise to Adam, which expressed the bruising of the seed of the woman; and now God by oath appropriates this seed to Abraham (as being singled out from the rest of the world), from whom the Messiah should descend. God obliged himself to bless the world by one of the seed of Abraham to be offered up really, as Isaac was in figure. And by his hindering him from sacrificing Isaac, and shewing him a ram, he intimates that there would be some interval of time before the blessed seed should be offered. And the words which Abraham speaks, Gen. xxii. 8, 'God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt-offering,' seem to be a prophetic speech of the death of this great sacrifice, though Abraham might not at that time know the true meaning of that speech, no more than many of the prophets knew what they prophesied of, 1 Peter i. 11; and the mount Moriah is concluded by that prophecy, ver. 14, 'In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen,' to be the place of the appearance of this seed: in the mount the Lord Jehovah shall be seen, the particle *of* not being in the Hebrew text, which was the place afterwards of the sufferings of Christ.

1. Let us here see the evil of sin. Nothing more fit to shew the baseness of sin, and the greatness of the misery by it, than the satisfaction due for it; as the greatness of a distemper is seen by the force of the medicine, and the value of the commodity by the greatness of the price it cost.† The sufferings of Christ express the evil of sin, far above the severest judgments upon any creature, both in regard of the greatness of the person, and the bitterness of the suffering. The dying groans of Christ shew the horrible nature of sin in the eye of God; as he was greater than the world, so his sufferings declare sin to be the greatest evil in the world. How evil is that sin that must make God bleed to cure it! To see the Son of God haled to death for sin, is the greatest piece of justice that ever God executed. The earth trembled under the weight of God's wrath when he punished Christ, and the heavens were dark as though they were shut to him, and he cries and groans, and no relief appears; nothing but sin was the procuring meritorious cause of this. The Son of God was slain by the sin of the lapsed

* Pearson on the Creed, p. 416.

† Charron.

creature ; had there been any other way to expiate so great an evil, had it stood with the honour of God, who is inclined to pardon, to remit sin without a compensation by death, we cannot think he would have consented that his Son should undergo so great a suffering. Not all the powers in heaven and earth could bring us into favour again, without the death of some great sacrifice to preserve the honour of God's veracity and justice ; not the gracious interposition of Christ, without becoming mortal, and drinking in the vials of wrath, could allay divine justice ; not his intercessions, without enduring the strokes due to us, could remove the misery of the fallen creature. All the holiness of Christ's life, his innocence and good works, did not redeem us without death. It was by this he made an atonement for our sins, satisfied the revenging justice of his Father, and recovered us from a spiritual and inevitable death. How great were our crimes, that could not be wiped off by the works of a pure creature, or the holiness of Christ's life, but required the effusion of the blood of the Son of God for the discharge of them ! Christ in his dying was dealt with by God as a sinner, as one standing in our stead, otherwise he could not have been subject to death. For he had no sin of his own, and 'death is the wages of sin,' Rom. vi. 23. It had not consisted with the goodness and righteousness of God as Creator, to afflict any creature without a cause, nor with his infinite love to his Son to bruise him for nothing. Some moral evil must therefore be the cause ; for no physical evil is inflicted without some moral evil preceding. Death, being a punishment, supposeth a fault. Christ, having no crime of his own, must then be a sufferer for ours : 'Our sins were laid upon him,' Isa. liii. 6, or transferred upon him. We see then how hateful sin is to God, and therefore it should be abominable to us. We should view sin in the sufferings of the Redeemer, and then think it amiable if we can. Shall we then nourish sin in our hearts ? This is to make much of the nails that pierced his hands, and the thorns that pricked his head, and make his dying groans the matter of our pleasure. It is to pull down a Christ that hath suffered, to suffer again ; a Christ that is raised, and ascended, sitting at the right hand of God, again to the earth ; to lift him upon another cross, and overwhelm him in a second grave. Our hearts should break at the consideration of the necessity of his death. We should open the heart of our sins by repentance, as the heart of Christ was opened by the spear. This doth an *Ought not Christ to die?* teach us.

2. Let us not set up our rest in anything in ourselves, not in anything below a dying Christ ; not in repentance or reformation. Repentance is a condition of pardon, not a satisfaction of justice ; it sometimes moves the divine goodness to turn away judgment, but it is no compensation to divine justice. There is not that good in repentance as there is wrong in the sin repented of, and satisfaction must have something of equality, both to the injury and the person injured ; the satisfaction that is enough for a private person wronged is not enough for a justly offended prince ; for the greatness of the wrong mounts by the dignity of the person. None can be greater than God, and therefore no offence can be so full of evil as offences against God ; and shall a few tears be sufficient in any one's thoughts to wipe them off ? The wrong done to God by sin is of a higher degree than to be compensated by all the good works of creatures, though of the highest elevation. Is the repentance of any soul so perfect as to be able to answer the punishment the justice of God requires in the law ? And what if the grace of God help us in our repentance ? It cannot be concluded from thence that our pardon is formally procured by repentance, but that we are disposed by it to receive and value a pardon. It is not congruous to the wisdom and righteousness

of God to bestow pardons upon obstinate rebels. Repentance is nowhere said to expiate sin; a 'broken heart is called a sacrifice,' Ps. li. 17, but not a propitiatory one. David's sin was expiated before he penned that psalm, 2 Sam. xii. 13. Though a man could weep as many tears as there are drops of water contained in the ocean, send up as many volleys of prayers as there have been groans issuing from any creature since the foundation of the world; though he could bleed as many drops from his heart as have been poured out from the veins of sacrificed beasts, both in Judea and all other parts of the world; though he were able, and did actually bestow in charity all the metals in the mines of Peru: yet could not this absolve him from the least guilt, nor cleanse him from the least filth, nor procure the pardon of the least crime by any intrinsic value in the acts themselves; the very acts, as well as the persons, might fall under the censure of consuming justice. The death of Christ only procures us life. The blood of Christ only doth quench that just fire sin had kindled in the breast of God against us. To aim at any other way for the appeasing of God, than the death of Christ, is to make the cross of Christ of no effect. This we are to learn from an *Ought not Christ to die?*

3. Therefore, let us be sensible of the necessity of an interest in the Redeemer's death. Let us not think to drink the waters of salvation out of our own cisterns, but out of Christ's wounds. Not to draw life out of our own dead duties, but Christ's dying groans. We have guilt, can we expiate it ourselves? We are under justice. Can we appease it by any thing we can do? There is an enmity between God and us. Can we offer him anything worthy to gain his friendship? Our natures are corrupted, can we heal them? Our services are polluted, can we cleanse them? There is as great a necessity for us to apply the death of Christ for all those, as there was for him to undergo it. The leper was not cleansed and cured by the shedding the blood of the sacrifice for him, but the sprinkling the blood of the sacrifice upon him, Lev. xiv. 7. As the death of Christ was foretold as the meritorious cause, so the sprinkling of his blood was foretold as the formal cause of our happiness, Isa. lii. 15. By his own blood he entered into heaven and glory, and by nothing but his blood can we have the boldness to expect it, or the confidence to attain it, Heb. x. 19. The whole doctrine of the gospel is Christ crucified, 1 Cor. i. 23, and the whole confidence of a Christian should be Christ crucified. God would not have mercy exercised with a neglect of justice by man, though to a miserable client: Lev. xix. 15, 'Thou shalt not respect the person of the poor in judgment.' Shall God, who is infinitely just, neglect the rule himself? No man is an object of mercy till he presents a satisfaction to justice. As there is a perfection in God, which we call mercy, which exacts faith and repentance of his creature before he will bestow a pardon, so there is another perfection of vindictive justice that requires a satisfaction. If the creature thinks its own misery a motive to the displaying the perfection of mercy, it must consider that the honour of God requires also the content of his justice. The fallen angels, therefore, have no mercy granted to them, because none ever satisfied the justice of God for them. Let us not, therefore, coin new ways of procuring pardon, and false modes of appeasing the justice of God. What can we find besides this, able to contend against everlasting burnings? What refuge can there be besides this to shelter us from the fierceness of divine wrath? Can our tears and prayers be more prevalent than the cries and tears of Christ, who could not, by all the strength of them, divert death from himself, without our eternal loss? No way but faith in his blood. God in the gospel sends us to Christ, and Christ by the gospel brings us to God.

4. Let us value this Redeemer, and redemption by his death. Since God

was resolved to see his Son plunged into an estate of disgraceful emptiness, clothed with the form of a servant, and exposed to the sufferings of a painful cross, rather than leave sin unpunished, we should never think of it without thankful returns, both to the judge and the sacrifice. What was he afflicted for, but to procure our peace? bruised for, but to heal our wounds? brought before an earthly judge to be condemned, but that we might be brought before a heavenly judge to be absolved? fell under the pains of death, but to knock off from us the shackles of hell? and became accursed in death, but that we might be blessed with eternal life? Without this our misery had been irreparable, our distance from God perpetual. What commerce could we have had with God, while we were separated from him by crimes on our part, and justice on his? The wall must be broken down, death must be suffered, that justice might be silenced, and the goodness of God be again communicative to us. This was the wonder of divine love, to be pleased with the sufferings of his only Son, that he might be pleased with us upon the account of those sufferings. Our redemption in such a way, as by the death and blood of Christ, was not a bare grace. It had been so, had it been only redemption; but being a redemption by the blood of God, it deserves from the apostle no less a title than riches of grace, Eph. i. 7. And it deserves and expects no less from us than such high acknowledgments. This we may learn from *Ought not Christ to die?*