THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

JOHN OWEN COLLECTION

THE WORKS OF JOHN OWEN

VOLUME 18

by John Owen

Books For The Ages

AGES Software • Albany, OR USA

Version 1.0 © 2000

THE WORKS OF JOHN OWEN

EDITED BY

WILLIAM H. GOOLD

AN EXPOSITION

OF THE EPISTLE

TO THE HEBREWS

INTRODUCTION

VOLUME 18

This Edition of
THE WORKS OF JOHN OWEN
first published by Johnstone & Hunter, 1855

CONTENTS

PART 4. CONCERNING THE SACERDOTAL OFFICE OF CHRIST

25. - The office of priesthood

26. - Of the origin of the priesthood of Christ

27. - The original of the priesthood of Christ in the counsel of God

28. - Federal transactions between the Father and the Son

29. - The necessity of the priesthood of Christ on the supposition of sin and grace

30. - The necessity of the priesthood of Christ on the supposition of sin and grace

31. - The nature of the priesthood of Christ

32. - The nature of the priesthood of Christ

33. - Of the acts of the priesthood of Christ, their object, with the time and place of its exercise

34. - Prefigurations of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ

PART 5. CONCERNING A DAY OF SACRED REST

1. - Differences concerning a day of sacred rest - Principles directing to the observance of it - The name of the day considered

2. - Of the original of the Sabbath

3.- Of the causes of the Sabbath

4. - Of the Judaical Sabbath

5. - Of the Lord’s Day

6. - The practical observance of the Lord’s Day

SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS DRAWN FROM THE EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE

Chapters 1., 2.

Pre-eminent dignity of Christ, both absolutely and comparatively – His superiority to angels

Chapters 3., 4:1-13

Christ's superiority to Moses, the agent in founding the old dispensation

Chapters 4:14-16, 5-8

Superiority of Christ as priest to the Levitical priesthood, from the analogy of his office with that of Melchisedec, and other considerations

Chapters 9., 10:1-18

Superiority of Christ's priesthood from the superior value of his sacrifice

Chapters 10.19-39, 11.

The obligation, advantage, and necessity of steadfast adherence to the gospel inferred and urged from the preceding doctrines, and from the triumphs of faith as exemplified by the saints

Chapters 12., 13.

Exhortations to perseverance in all Christian duty

EXERCITATIONS

ON THE

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

EXERCITATION 25.

THE OFFICE OF PRIESTHOOD.

1. *Excellence and usefulness of this Epistle — Doctrine of the priesthood of Christ fully revealed and taught therein alone.*

2. *This doctrine abstruse and mysterious.*

3. *The manner of the handling of it by the apostle; that now proposed.*

4. *Doctrine of the priesthood of Christ variously opposed and prayed, by Papists, Socinians, and others.*

5. *Other reasons of handling it in these Exercitations — Prefigurations of it.*

6, 7. כֹּהֵן, *a priest — Signification of the word,* Psalm 110. 4.

8. כהן, *to divine — Divination and prognostication by priests.*

9. *Of the priests of Egypt.*

10. *Rulers called cohanim, and why — Cohen properly & sacrificer.*

11. *Melchizedek the first priest, a sacrificer; corruption of the Targum — Of his bringing forth bread and wine — The tenth of the spoils offered to God.*

12. *Institution of a priesthood under the law to offer sacrifice — A priest and a sacrificer the same.*

1. AMONGST the many excellencies of this Epistle unto the Hebrews, which render it as useful to the church as the sun in the firmament is unto the world, the revelation that is made therein concerning the nature, singular pre-eminence, and use of the PRIESTHOOD of our Lord Jesus Christ, may well be esteemed to deserve the first and principal place; for whereas the whole matter of the sacrifice that he offered, and the atonement that he made thereby, with the inestimable benefits which thence redound unto them that do believe, depend solely hereon, the excellency of the doctrine hereof must needs be acknowledged by all who

have any interest in these things. It is indeed, in the substance of it, delivered in some other passages of the books of the New Testament, but yet more sparingly and obscurely than any other truth of the same or a like importance. The Holy Ghost reserved it unto this as its proper place, where, upon the consideration of the institutions of the old testament and their removal out of the church, it might be duly represented, as that which gave an *end* unto them in their accomplishment, and *life* unto those ordinances of evangelical worship which were to succeed in their room. When our Lord Jesus says that he came to "give his life a ransom for many," <4020>Matthew 20:28, he had respect unto the sacrifice that he had to offer as a priest. The same also is intimated where he is called "The Lamb of God," <4329>John 1:29; for he was himself both priest and sacrifice. Our apostle also mentioneth his sacrifice and his offering of himself unto God, <4902>Ephesians 5:2; on the account whereof he calleth him "a propitiation," <4525>Romans 3:25; and mentioneth also his "intercession," with the benefits thereof, chap. <4534>8:34. The dearest testimony to this purpose is that of the apostle John, who puts together both the general acts of his sacerdotal office, and intimates withal their mutual relation, <6201>1 John 2:1, 2; for his intercession as our "advocate" with his Father respects his oblation as he was a "propitiation for our sins." So the same apostle tells us to the same purpose, that he "washed us in his own blood," <6605>Revelation 1:5, when he expiated our sins by the sacrifice of himself. These are, if not all, yet the principal places in the New Testament wherein immediate respect is had to the priesthood or sacrifice of Christ. But in none of them is he called "a priest," or "an high priest," nor is he said in any of them to have taken any such office upon him; neither is the nature of his oblation or intercession explained in them, nor the benefits rehearsed which accrue unto us from his discharge of this office in a peculiar manner. Of what concernment these things are unto our faith, obedience, and consolation, — of what use unto us in the whole course of our profession, in all our duties and temptations, sins and sufferings, — we shall, God assisting, declare in the ensuing Exposition. Now, for all the acquaintance we have with these and sundry other *evangelical mysteries* belonging unto them or depending on them, with all the light we have into the nature and use of *Mosaical institutions,* and the types of the old testament, which make so great a part of the Scripture given and continued for our instruction, we are entirely obliged unto the revelation made in and by this Epistle.

2. And this doctrine, concerning the priesthood of Christ and the sacrifice that he offered, is on many accounts deep and mysterious. This our apostle plainly intimates in sundry passages of this Epistle. With respect hereunto he saith, the discourse he intended was δυσερμήνευτος, "hard to be uttered," — or rather, hard to be understood when uttered, chap. 5:11; as also another apostle, that there are in this Epistle δυσνόητά τινα, [6]2 Peter 3:16, "some things hard to be understood," which relate hereunto. Hence he requires that those who attend unto this doctrine should be past the condition of living on "milk" only, or being contented with the first rudiments and principles of religion; and that they be able to digest "strong meat," by having "their senses exercised to discern both good and evil," [5]Hebrews 5:12-14. And when he resolves to proceed in the explication of it, he declares that he is leading them "on unto perfection," chap. 6:1, or to the highest and most perfect doctrines in the mystery of Christian religion. And several other ways he manifests his judgment, as of the importance of this truth, and how needful it is to be known, so of the difficulty there is in coming to a right and full understanding of it. And all these things do justify an especial and peculiar inquiry into it.

3. Now, although our apostle, in his excellent order and method, hath delivered unto us all the material concernments of this sacred office of Christ, yet he hath not done it in an entire discourse, but in such a way as his subject-matter and principal design would admit of, and indeed did necessitate. He doth not in any one place, nor upon any one occasion, express and teach the whole of the doctrine concerning it, but, as himself speaks in another case, πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, "by various parts," or degrees, and "in sundry ways," he declares and makes known the several concernments of it: for this he did partly as the Hebrews could bear it; partly as the series of his discourse led him to the mention of it, having another general end in design; and partly as the explanation of the old Aaronical institutions and ordinances, which, for the benefit of them that still adhered unto them, he aimed at, required it of him. For me to have undertaken the discourse of the whole upon any particular occasion, would have lengthened out a digression too much, diverting the reader in his perusal of the Exposition; and had I insisted on the several parks and concernments of it as they do occur, I should have been necessitated unto

a frequent repetition of the same things. Neither way could I have given an entire representation of it, whereby the beauty and the symmetry of the whole might be made evident. This, therefore, inclined my thoughts, in the first place, to comprise a summary of the entire doctrine concerning it in these previous Exercitations. From hence, as the reader may take a prospect of it singly by itself, so he may, if he please, carry along much insight with him from it into the most abstruse passages in the whole Epistle. And this, added unto what we have discoursed on chap. 1:2, concerning the kingly right and power of Christ, will give a more full and complete account of these his two offices than, it may be, hath as yet been attempted by any.

4. Moreover, the doctrine concerning the priesthood and sacrifice of the Lord Christ hath in all ages, by the craft and malice of Satan, been either directly opposed or variously corrupted; for it contains the principal foundation of the faith and consolation of the church, which are by him chiefly maligned. It is known in how many things and by how many ways it hath been obscured and depraved in the Papacy. Sundry of them we have occasion to deal about in our exposition of many passages of the Epistle; for they have not so much directly opposed the truth of the doctrine, as, disbelieving the use and benefit of the thing itself unto the church, they have substituted various false and superstitious observances to effect the end whereunto this priesthood of Christ and his holy discharge thereof are alone of God designed. These, therefore, I shall no otherwise consider but as their opinions and practices occur occasionally unto us, either in these Exercitations or in the Exposition ensuing. But there is a generation of men, whom the craft of Satan hath stirred up in this and the foregoing age, who have made it a great part of their preposterous and pernicious endeavors in and about religion to overthrow this whole office of the Lord Christ, and the efficacy of the sacrifice of himself depending thereon. This they have attempted with much subtilty and diligence, introducing a metaphorical or imaginary priesthood and sacrifice in their room; so, robbing the church of its principal treasure, they pretend to supply the end of it with their own fancies. They are the Socinians whom I intend. And there are more reasons than one why I could not omit a strict examination of their reasonings and objections against this great part of the mystery of the gospel. The reputation of parts, industry, and

learning, which the bold curiosity of some hath given unto them, makes it necessary, at least upon unavoidable occasions, to obviate the insinuation of their poison, which that opens a way for. Besides, even among ourselves, they are not a few who embrace and do endeavor to propagate their opinions. And the same course, with their faces seeming to look another way, is steered by the Quakers, who have at last openly espoused almost all their pernicious tenets, although in some things as yet they obscure their sentiments in cloudy expressions, as wanting will or skill to make a more perspicuous declaration of them. And there are others also, pretending unto more sobriety than those before mentioned, who do yet think that these doctrines concerning the offices and mediation of Christ are, if not unintelligible by us, yet not of any great necessity to be insisted on; for of that esteem are the mysteries of the gospel grown to be with some, with many among us. With respect unto all these, added unto the consideration of the edification of those that are sober and godly, I esteemed it necessary to handle this whole doctrine of the priesthood of Christ distinctly, and previously unto our exposition of the uses of it as they occur in the Epistle.

5. There are also sundry things which may contribute much light unto this doctrine, and be useful in the explication of the terms, notions, and expressions, which are applied unto the declaration of it, that cannot directly and orderly be reduced under any singular text or passage in the Epistle. Many dawnings there were in the world unto the rising of this Sun of Righteousness, — many preparations for the actual exhibition of this High Priest unto the discharge of his office. And some of these were greatly instructive in the nature of this priesthood, as being appointed of God for that purpose. Such was the use of sacrifices, ordained from the foundation of the world, or the first entrance of sin; and the designation of persons in the church unto the office of a *figurative priesthood*, for the performance of that service. By these God intended to instruct the church in the nature and benefit of what he would after accomplish, in and by his Son Jesus Christ. These things, therefore, – that is, what belonged unto the rite of sacrificing and the Mosaical priesthood, – must be taken into consideration, as retaining yet that light in them which God had designed them to be communicative of. And, indeed, our apostle himself reduceth many of the instructions which he gives us in the nature of the priesthood

and sacrifice of Christ unto those institutions which were designed of old to typify and represent them. Besides all these, there may be observed sundry things in the common usages of mankind about this office, and the discharge of it in general, that deserve our consideration; for although all mankind, left out of the church's enclosure, through their own blindness and the craft of him who originally seduced them into an apostasy from God, had, as to their own interest and practice, miserably depraved all sacred things, every thing that belonged to the worship or service of the Divine Being, yet they still carried along with them something that had its first fountain and spring in divine revelation, and a congruity unto the inbred principles of nature. In these also, — where we can separate the wheat from the chaff, what was from divine revelation or the light of nature from what was of diabolical delusion or vain superstition, — we may discover what is useful and helpful unto us in our design. By these means may we be enabled to reduce all sacred truth in this matter unto its proper principles, and direct it unto its proper end. And these are the reasons why, although we shall have frequent occasion to insist on this office of Christ, with the proper acts and effects of it, in our ensuing Exposition, both in that part of it which accompanies these Exercitations and those also which, in the goodness and patience of God, may follow, yet I thought meet to handle the whole doctrine of it apart in preliminary discourses. And let not the reader suppose that he shall be imposed on with the same things handled in several ways twice over: for as the design of the Exposition is to open the words of the text, to give their sense, with the purpose and arguings of the apostle, applying all unto the improvement of our faith and obedience, whereof nothing will here fall under our consideration; so what may be here discoursed, historically, philologically, dogmatically, or eristically, will admit of no repetition or rehearsal in the expository part of our endeavors. These things being premised, as was necessary, we apply ourselves unto the work lying before us.

6. Our Lord Jesus Christ is in the Old Testament, as prophesied of, called כֹּהֵן, "cohen:" Psalm 110:4, אַתָּה־כֹהֵן לְעוֹלָם; — "Thou art cohen for ever." And Zechariah 6:13, וְהָיָה כֹהֵן עַל־כִּסְאוֹ; — "And he shall be cohen upon his throne." We render it in both places "a priest ;" that is, ἱερεύς, "sacerdos." In the New Testament, — that is, in this Epistle, —

he is frequently said to be ἱερεύς and ἀρχιερεύς; which we likewise express by “priest” and “high priest,” — “ pontifex,” “pontifex maximus.” And the meaning of these words must be first inquired into.

7. כָּהַן, the verb, is used only in Piel, “cihen;” and it signifies “sacerdotio fungi,” or “munus sacerdotale exercere,” — “to be a priest,” or “to exercise the office of the priesthood;” ἱερουργέω. The LXX mostly render it by ἱερατεύω, which is “sacerdotio fungor,” — “ to exercise the priestly office;” although it be also used in the inauguration or consecration of a person to the priesthood. Once they translate it by λειτουργέω, <144114>2 Chronicles 11:14, “in sacris operari,” — “to serve (or minister) in (or about) sacred things.” Ἱερουργέω is used by our apostle in this sense, and applied unto the preaching of the gospel: Εἰς τὸ εἶναί με λειτουργὸν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θοῦ, <451516>Romans 15:16; — “Employed in the sacred ministration of the gospel.” He useth both λειτουργός and ἱερουργέω metaphorically, with respect unto the προσφορά or sacrifice which he made of the Gentiles, which was also metaphorical. And ἱερατεύω is used by Luke with respect unto the Jewish service in the temple, chap. <420108>1:8; for originally both the words have respect unto proper sacrifices. Some would have the word כֵּהֵן to be ambiguous, and to signify “officio fungi, aut ministrare in sacris aut politicis,” — “to discharge an office, or to minister in things sacred or political.” But no instance can be produced of its use to this purpose. Once it seems to be applied unto things not sacred. <236110>Isaiah 61:10, כֵּחָתָן; — “As a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments;” or, “adorneth himself with beauty;” that is, beautiful garments. If the word did originally and properly signify “to adorn,” it might be thence translated unto the exercise of the office of the priesthood, seeing the priests therein were, by especial institution, to be clothed with garments לְכָבוֹד וּלְתִפְאָרֶת, <022840>Exodus 28:40, “for glory and for beauty.” So the priests of Moloch were called “chemarims,” from the color of their garments, or their countenances made black with the soot of their fire and sacrifices. But this is not the proper signification of the word; only, denoting the priesthood to be exercised in beautiful garments and sundry ornaments, it was thence traduced to express adorning. The LXX render it by περιτίθημι, but withal acknowledge somewhat sacerdotal in the expression: Ὡς νυμφίῳ περιέθνκέ μοι μίτραν· — “He hath put on

me" (restraining the action unto God) "a mitre as on a bridegroom;" which was a sacerdotal ornament. And Aquila, "as a bridegroom, ἱερατευμένος στεφάνῳ·" — " bearing the crown of the priesthood," or discharging the priest's office in a crown. And the Targum, observing the peculiar application of the word in this place, adds, וככהנא דכא, — "And as an high priest is adorned." All agree that an allusion is made to the garments and ornaments of the high priest. The place may be tendered, "As a bridegroom, he" (that is God, the bridegroom of the church) "doth consecrate me with glory," — " gloriously set me .apart for himself." The word therefore is sacred; and though כֹּהֵן be traduced to signify other persons, as we shall see afterwards, yet כֹּהֵן [properly] is only used in a sacred sense.

8. The Arabic כהן, "cahan," is "to divine, to prognosticate, to be a soothsayer, to foretell;" and כאהן, "caahan," is "a diviner, a prophet, an astrologer, a figure-caster." This use of it came up after the priests had generally taken themselves unto such arts, partly curious, partly diabolical, by the instigation of the false gods whom they ministered unto. Homer puts them together, as they came afterwards mostly to be the same, Iliad. A. 62: —

᾿Αλλ᾽ ἄγε δή τινα μάντιν ἐρείομεν, ἢ ἱερῆα
᾿Η καὶ ὀνειροπόλον·—

"A prophet, or a priest, or an interpreter of dreams."

Μάγους καὶ ἀστρονόμους τε καὶρζύτας μετεπέμπετο, Herod., lib. iv.; — "He sent for magicians, astronomers, and priests," for θύτης is a priest; for the priests first gave out oracles and divinations in the temples of their gods. From them proceeded a generation of impostors, who exceedingly infatuated the world with a pretense of foretelling things to come, of interpreting dreams, and doing things uncouth and strange, unto the amazement of the beholders. And as they all pretended to derive their skill and power from their gods, whose priests they were, so they invented, or had suggested unto them by Satan, various ways and means of divination, or of attaining the knowledge of particular future events. According unto those ways which in especial any of them attended unto were they severally denominate. Generally they were called חַכָמִים,

"wise men ;" as those of Egypt, Genesis 41:8, and of Babylon, Daniel 2:12, 13. Hence we render μάγοι, the followers of their arts, "wise men," Matthew 2:1. Among the Egyptians they were divided into two sorts, חַרְטֻמִּים and מְכַשְּׁפִים, Exodus 7:11; the head of one sort in the days of Moses being probably Jannes, and of the other Jambres, 2 Timothy 3:8. We call them "magicians and sorcerers." Among the Babylonians there is mention of these, and two sorts more are added unto them, namely, אַשָּׁפִים and כַּשְׂדִּים, Daniel 2:2. Of the difference and distinction among these we shall treat afterwards. From this practice of the generality of priests did כָּהַן come to signify "to soothsay" or "divine."

9. כֹּהֵן is then a priest; and he who was first called so in the Scripture, probably in the world, was Melchizedek, Genesis 14:18. On what account he was so called shall be afterwards declared. Sometimes, though rarely, it is applied to express a priest of false gods; as of Dagon, 1 Samuel 5:5; of Egypt, Genesis 41:45, "Joseph married the daughter of Poti-pherah, כֹּהֵן אֹן," — "priest of On," that is, of Heliopolis, the chief seat of the Egyptian religious worship. Nor is there any color why the word should here be rendered "prince," as it is, רבא, by the Targum, — the Latin is "sacerdos," and the LXX. ἱερεύς, — for the dignity of priests, especially of those who were eminent among them, was no less at that time in Egypt, and other parts also of the world, than was that of princes of the second sort; yea, we shall consider instances afterwards wherein the kingly and priestly orifices were conjoined in the same person, although none ever had the one by virtue of the other but upon special reason. It was therefore, as by Pharaoh intended, an honor to Joseph to be married unto the daughter of the priest of On; for the man, according unto their esteem, was wise, pious, and honorable, seeing the wisdom of the Egyptians at that time consisted principally in the knowledge of the mysteries of their religion, and from their excellency therein were they exalted and esteemed honorable. Nor can it be pleaded, in bar to this exposition, that Joseph would not marry the daughter of an idolatrous priest, for all the Egyptians were no less idolatrous than their priests, and he might as soon convert one of their daughters to the true God as one of any other; which no doubt he did, whereon she became a matriarch in Israel. In other places, where, by כֹּהֵן, an idolatrous priest is intended, the

Targum renders it by כומרא; “comara,” whence are chemarims. Yet the Syriac translator of the Epistle to the Hebrews calls a priest and an high priest, even when applied unto Christ, כּוּמָרָא and רַב כּוּמָרֵא, though elsewhere in the New Testament he useth כָּהֲנָא, “chahana,” constantly. The reason hereof I have declared elsewhere.

10. It is confessed that this name is sometimes used to signify *secondary princes*, those of a second rank or degree, but is never once applied unto a chief, supreme prince, or a king, though he that is so was sometimes, by virtue of some special warrant, cohen also. The Jews, therefore, after the Targum, offer violence to the text, ¹⁹Psalm 110:4, where they would have Melchizedek to be called a cohen because he was a prince. But it is said expressly he was a king, of which rank none is, on the account of his office, ever called cohen; but unto those of a second rank it is sometimes accommodated: ¹⁰2 Samuel 20:26, “Ira the Jairite was כֹּהֵן לְדָוִד,” — “a chief ruler,” say we, “about David.” A priest he was not, nor could be; for, as Kimchi on the place observes, he is called the “cohen of David,” but a priest was not a priest unto one man, but unto all Israel. So David’s sons are said to be cohanim: ¹⁰2 Samuel 8:18, וּבְנֵי דָוִד כֹּהֲנִים הָיוּ, — “And the sons of David were cohanim;” that is, “princes,” though the Vulgate renders it “sacerdotes.” So also ¹⁸Job 12:19, we translate it “princes.” And in those places the Targum useth רבא, “rabba;” the LXX sometimes αὐλάρχης, “a principal courtier,” and sometimes συνετός, “a counsellor.” It is, then, granted that princes were called כֹּהֲנִים, but not properly, but by way of allusion, with respect unto their dignity; for the most ancient dignity was that of the priesthood. And the same name is therefore used metaphorically to express especial dignity: ²Exodus 19:6, כֹּהֲנִים תִּהְיוּ-לִי מַמְלֶכֶת; — “And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests,” speaking of the whole people. This Peter renders βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ⁶⁰1 Peter 2:9, — “ A kingly” (or “royal”) “priesthood.” The name of the office is כְּהֻנָּה, ²Exodus 40:15, ἱεράτευμα, “pontificatus, sacerdotium,” “the priesthood.” Allowing, therefore, this application of the word, we may inquire what is the first proper signification of it. I say, therefore, that כֹּהֵן, “cohen,” is properly θύτης, “a sacrificer;” nor is it otherwise to be understood or expounded, unless the abuse of the word be obvious, and a metaphorical sense necessary.

11. He who is first mentioned as vested with this office is Melchizedek: (0148)Genesis 14:18, וְהוּא כֹהֵן לְאֵל עֶלְיוֹן; — “And he was a priest unto the most high God.” The Targumists make a great difference in rendering the word כֹּהֵן. Where it intends a priest of God properly, they retain it, כהן and כהנא; where it is applied unto a prince or ruler, they render it by רבא, “rabba;” and where an idolatrous priest, by כומרא. But in this matter of Melchizedek they are peculiar. In this place they use משמש, “meshamesh:” והוא משמש קדם אל עלאה, — “And he was a minister before the high God.” And by this word they express the ministry of the priests: (0192)Exodus 19:22, לשמשא קדם יי כהניא דקריבין, — The priests who draw nigh to minister before the Lord;” whereby it is evident that they understood him to be a sacred officer, or a priest unto God. But in (1904)Psalm 110:4, where the same word occurs again to the same purpose, they render it by רבא, “a prince,” or great ruler: “Thou art a great ruler like Melchizedek:” which is a part of their open corruption of that psalm, out of a design to apply it unto David; for the author of that Targum lived after they knew full well how the prophecy in that psalm was in our books and by Christians applied unto the Messiah, and how the ceasing of their law and worship was from thence invincibly proved in this Epistle. This made them maliciously pervert the words in their paraphrase, although they durst not violate the sacred text itself. But the text is plain, “Melchizedek was cohen to the high God,” — “a priest,” or one that was called to the office of solemn sacrificing to God; for he that offereth not sacrifices to God is not a priest to him, for this is the principal duty of his office, from which the whole receives denomination. That he offered sacrifices, those of the church of Rome would prove from these words, (0148)Genesis 14:18, הוֹצִיא לֶחֶם וְיָיִן; — “He brought forth bread and wine.” But neither the context nor the words will give them countenance herein; nor if they could prove what they intend would it serve their purpose. Coming forth to meet Abraham (as our apostle expounds this passage, Hebrews 7), he brought forth bread and wine, as a supply for the relief and refreshment of himself and his servants, supposing them weary of their travel. So dealt Barzillai the Gileadite with David and his men in the wilderness, (1077)2 Samuel 17:27-29. They brought out necessary provision for them, for they said, “The people is hungry, and weary, and thirsty, in the wilderness.” And Gideon punished them of Succoth and

Penuel for not doing the like, [OSB]Judges 8:5-8, 13-17. But the aim of these men is to reflect some countenance on their pretended sacrifice of the mass; which yet is not of bread and wine, for before the offering they suppose them to be quite changed into the substance of flesh and blood. The weakness of this pretense shall be elsewhere more fully declared. At present it may suffice that הוֹצִיא is no sacred word, or is never used to express the offering of any thing unto God. Besides, if it were an offering he brought forth, it was a מִנְחָה, or "meat-offering," with a נֵסֶךְ, or "drink-offering," being of bread and wine. Now, this was only an acknowledgment of God the Creator as such, and was not an immediate type of the sacrifice of Christ; which was represented by them alone which, being made by blood, included a propitiation in them. But that Melchizedek was by office a sacrificer appears from Abraham delivering up unto him מַעֲשֵׂר מִכֹּל, [OGE]Genesis 14:20, "the tenth of all;" that is, as our apostle interprets the place, τῶν ἀκροθινίων, "of the spoils" he had taken. מַעֲשֵׂר is a sacred word, and denotes God's portion according to the law. So also those who had only the light of nature, and it may be some little fame of what was done in the world of old, whilst God's institutions were of force among men, did devote and sacrifice the tenth of the spoils they took in war. So Camillus framed his vow unto Apollo when he went to destroy the city of Veil: "Tuo ductu Pythice Apollo, tuoque numine instinctus, pergo ad delendam urbem Veios, tibique hinc decumam partem praedae voveo," Liv., lib. v. cap. xxi.

The like instances occur in other authors.᾽ Ακροθίνια is not used for the spoils themselves anywhere but in this place. In other authors, according to the derivation of the word, as it signifies the top or uppermost part of an heap, it is used only for that part or portion of spoils taken in war which was devoted and made sacred: Herod. lib. i. cap. lxxxvi., Εἴτε δὴ ἀκροθίνια ταῦτα καταγιεῖν θεῶν ὁτεῳδή. And again, lib. viii. cap. cxxi., Πρῶτα μέν νυν τοῖσι θεοῖσι ἐξεῖλον ἀκροθίνια·, — "They took out the dedicated spoils for the gods." And the reason why our apostle useth the word for the *whole spoils*, whence a tenth was given to Melchizedek, is, because the whole spoil was sacred and devoted unto God, whence an honorary tenth was taken for Melchizedek, as the priests had afterwards out of the portion of the Levites; for all Levi was now to be tithed in Abraham. Among those spoils there is no question but there

were many clean beasts meet for sacrifice; for in their herds of cattle consisted the principal parts of the riches of those days, and these were the principal spoils of war. See Numbers 31:32, 33. And because Saul knew that part of the spoils taken in lawful war was to be given for sacrifices unto God, he made that his pretense of saving the fat cattle of the Amalekites, contrary to the express command of God, 1 Samuel 15:15. Abraham therefore delivered these spoils unto Melchizedek, as the priest of the most high God, to offer in sacrifice for him. And it may be there was somewhat more in it than the mere pre-eminence of Melchizedek, which was the principal consideration hereof, and his being the first and *only priest in office*, by virtue of especial call from God, — namely, that Abraham himself, coming immediately from the slaughter of many kings and their numerous army, was not yet ready or prepared for this sacred service; for even among the heathens they would abstain from their sacred offices after the shedding of blood, until they were, one way or other, purified to their own satisfaction. So in the poet, Virg. Aeneid. 2:717: —

"Tu, genitor, cape sacra manu patriosque penates;
Me, bello e tanto digressum et caede recenti,
Attrectare nefas, donec me flumine vivo Abluero."

12. The matter is yet made more evident by the solemn election of a priesthood of old among the people of God, or the church in the wilderness. Sacrificing from the foundation of the world had been hitherto left at liberty. Every one who was called to perform any part of solemn religious worship was allowed to discharge that duty also. But it pleased God, in the reducing of his church into an especial peculiar order, – to represent in and by it more conspicuously what he would afterwards really effect in Jesus Christ, – to erect among them a peculiar office of priesthood. And although this respected in general τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, all things that were to be done with God on the behalf of the people, yet the especial work and duty belonging unto it was sacrificing. The institution of this office we have Exodus 28, whereof afterwards. And herein an enclosure was made of sacrificing unto the office of the priests; that is, so soon as such an office there was by virtue of especial institution. And these two things belonged to them: —

(1.) That they were *sacrificers*; and,

(2.) That they *only* were so: which answers all that I intend to evince from this discourse, namely, that *a priest is a sacrificer*. Whereas, therefore, it is in prophecy foretold that the Messiah should be a priest, and he is said so to be, the principal meaning of it is, that he should be a *sacrificer*, one that had right and was called to offer sacrifice unto God. This was that for which he was principally and properly called a priest, and by his undertaking so to be, an enclosure of sacrificing is made unto himself alone.

This is the general notion of a priest amongst all men throughout the world; and a due consideration hereof is of itself sufficient to discharge all the vain imaginations of the Socinians about this office of Christ, whereof we shall treat afterwards.

EXERCITATION 26.

OF THE ORIGIN OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

1. *Of the origin of the priesthood of Christ — The eternal counsels of God; how to be inquired into.*

2. *No priest or sacrifices in the state of innocence.*

3. *Priesthood and sacrifices related.*

4. *The nature of the office of the priesthood,* *Hebrews 5:1, explained.*

5. *In the state of innocence some [might act] for God towards men, none for other men towards God.*

6. *No sacrifices in that state — To sacrifice is properly to slay.*

7. *Killing essential to sacrifices.*

8. *No revelation concerning sacrifices before the fall.*

9. *Opinion of some, that the Son of God should have been incarnate though man had not sinned — Of the necessity of sacrifices in all religious worship.*

10. *Pretences of reasons for the incarnation of Christ, without respect to sin or grace.*

11. *The whole unwritten;*

12. *Contrary to what is written;*

13. *And destitute of countenance from spiritual reason.*

14. *Pleas of the Pelagians and ancient schoolmen for the incarnation of the Son of God in the state of innocence — Their first argument, from the glory of God and good of the universe, proposed and answered.*

15. *The second argument, from the capacity of the human nature for the grace of union in the state of innocence, answered.*

16. *[The third argument], the mystery of the incarnation revealed to Adam in the state of innocence — The meaning of these words, "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh."*

17. *The order of God's decrees concerning his glory in the salvation of mankind considered — No order of them to be conceived that is consistent with the pre-ordination of the incarnation without respect to sin and redemption.*

18. *The arguments of Osiander — The Son, how the image of the Father — The order of subsistence and operation in the Trinity — Christ, how the head of angels and men.*

19. *The image of God in man, wherein it consisted.*

20. *How Adam was made in the image of Christ, and Christ made in the image of Adam.*

21. *The incarnation, how occasioned by the fall — The Son of God the head of angels and men even had not sin entered into the world.*

22. *[In a state of innocence, men would not have died naturally.] 23. No sacrifices in the state of innocence — Bellarmine's arguments for the necessity of a proper sacrifice in all religion.*

24. *The mass not proved a sacrifice thereby — The use and efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ in our religion.*

25. *An answer to Bellarmine's arguments — His general assertion overthrown by his own instances.*

26. *The conclusion.*

1. We have seen that Jesus Christ is a priest, that as such he was prophesied of under the old testament, and declared so to be in the new. The original of this office is in the next place to be inquired after. This, in the general, all will acknowledge to lie in the eternal counsels of God; for

> "known unto him are all his works from the beginning of the world," <44158>Acts 15:18.

But these counsels, absolutely considered, are hid in God, in the eternal treasures of his own wisdom and will. What we learn of them is by external revelation and effects:

> "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law," <051229>Deuteronomy 29:29.

God frequently gives bounds to the curiosity of men, like the limits fixed to the people in the station at Sinai, that they should not gaze after his unrevealed glory, nor pry into the things which they have not seen. It was well said, that "scrutator majestatis absorbetur a gloria" Our work is, to inquire wherein, how, and whereby, God hath revealed his eternal counsels, to the end that we may know his mind, and fear him for our good. And so even the angels desire to bow down and to look into these things, <600112>1 Peter 1:12 ; — not in a way of condescension, as into things in their nature beneath them; but in a way of humble diligence, as into things in their holy contrivance above them. Our present design, therefore, is to trace those discoveries which God hath made of his eternal counsels in this matter, and that through the several degrees of divine revelation whereby he advanced the knowledge of them, until he brought them to their complement in the external exhibition of his Son, clothed in human nature with the glory of this office, and discharging the duties thereof.

2. The counsels of God concerning us, with our relation unto him and his worship, are suited unto the state and condition wherein we are, for they also are effects of those counsels. Our first condition, under the law of creation, was a condition of innocency and natural righteousness. In reference unto this estate, God had not ordained an establishment in it of either priest or sacrifice; for as they would have been of no use therein, so there was nothing supposed in that condition which might be prefigured or represented by them. Wherefore God did not pre-ordain the priesthood of Christ with respect unto the obedience of man under the law of creation; nor did he appoint either priesthood or sacrifice, properly so called, in that state of things whilst it did continue; nor should any such have been, upon a supposition of its continuance. And this we must confirm against the opposition of some.

3. We have declared in our preceding discourse that a priest, properly so called, is a sacrificer. There is, therefore, an indissoluble relation between these two, — namely, priesthood and sacrifice, — and they do mutually assert or deny each other; and where the one is proper, the other is so also; and where the one is metaphorical, so is the other. Thus, under the old testament, the priests who were properly so by office had proper carnal sacrifices to offer; and under the new testament, believers being made priests unto God, that is, spiritually and metaphorically, such also are their sacrifices, spiritual and metaphorical. Wherefore arguments against either of these conclude equally against both. Where there are no priests, there are no sacrifices; and where there are no sacrifices, there are no priests. I intend only those who exercise the office of the priesthood for *themselves* and *others.* I shall therefore, first, manifest that there was *no priesthood* to be in the state of innocency; whence it will follow that therein there could be no sacrifice: and, secondly, that there was to be *no sacrifice,* properly so called; whence it will equally follow, that there was no priesthood therein. That which ensues on both is, that there was no counsel of God concerning either priesthood or sacrifice in that state or condition.

4. Πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμθανόμενος ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἵνα προσφέρῃ δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, saith our apostle, [HEB]Hebrews 5:1. What is here affirmed of the high priest (הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל) is true in like manner

concerning every priest; only, the high priest is here mentioned by way of eminence, because by him our Lord Christ, as unto this office and the discharge of it, was principally represented. Every priest, therefore, is one ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμθανόμενος, — " taken from amongst men." He is "naturae humanae particeps," — in common with other men partaker of human nature; and antecedently unto his assumption of his office, he is one of the *same rank* with other men, and he is taken or separated unto this office from among them. He is vested with his office by the authority, and according to the will of God. This office, therefore, is not a thing which is common unto all, nor can it take place in any state or condition wherein the whole performance of divine service is equally incumbent on all individually; for none can be "taken from among others" to perform that which those others are every one obliged personally to attend unto. But every priest, properly so called, καθίσταται ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων, — "is ordained and appointed to act for other men." He is set over a work in the behalf of those other men from among whom he is taken; and this is, that he may take care of and perform τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, or do the things that for men are to be done with God; מול הָאֱלֹהִים, — that is, to pacify, to make atonement and reconciliation, <2018>Exodus 18:19. And this he was to do by offering δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας, various sorts of "gifts and sacrifices," according unto God's appointment. Now, all slain sacrifices, as we shall manifest afterwards, were for sin. This office, therefore, could have no place in the state of innocency; for it will not hear an accommodation, of any part of this description of one vested therewithal.

5. I do acknowledge, that in the state of uncorrupted nature there should have been some ὑπὲρ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὰ πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, — to deal with others *for and in the name of God;* for some would have been warranted and designed to instruct others in the knowledge of God and his will. This the state and condition of mankind did require; for both the first relation of *man and wife,* and that which was to ensue thereon of *parents and children,* include subordination and dependence. "The head of the woman is the man," <4603>1 Corinthians 11:3, — that is, "the husband," <4523>Ephesians 5:23; and the duty of the man it had been to instruct the woman in the things of God. For a pure nescience of many things that might be known to the glory of God and their own advantage was not inconsistent with that estate, and their knowledge was capable of objective

enlargements; and the design of God was, gradually to instruct them in the things that might orderly carry them on unto the end for which they were created. Herein would he have made use of the man for the instruction of the woman, as the order of nature required: for man was originally "the head of the woman;" only, upon the curse, natural dependence was turned into troublesome subjection, <010316>Genesis 3:16. But the entrance of sin, as it contained in it the seeds of all disorder, so it plainly began in the destruction of this order; for the woman, undertaking to learn the mind of God from herself and the serpent, was deceived, and first in the transgression: <540213>1 Timothy 2:13, 14,

> "Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression."

From Adam being first formed, and the woman out of him and for him, she should have learned her dependence on him for instruction by divine institution. But going to learn the mind of God of the serpent, she was deceived. She might have learned more than yet she knew, but this she should have done of him who was her head by the law of creation. The case is the same as to the other relation, that would have been between *parents and children.* Yea, in this the dependence was far greater and more absolute; for although the woman was made out of the man, which argues subordination and dependence, yet she was made by the immediate power of God, man contributing no more to her being than the dust did to his. This gave them in general an equality. But children are so of their parents as to be wholly from them and by them. This makes their dependence and subjection absolute and universal. And whereas parents were in all things to seek their good, — which was one of the prime dictates of the law of nature, — they were, in the name and stead of God, to rule, govern, and instruct them, and that in the knowledge of God and their duty towards him. They were ὑπὲρ Θεοῦ, "for God," or in his stead unto them, to instruct them in their duty, suitably to the law of their creation and the end thereof. But every one thus instructed was in his own name and person to attend unto the things of God, or what was to be performed on the behalf of men; for in reference unto God, there would have been no common root or principle for men to stand upon. Whilst we were all in the loins of Adam we stood all in him, and we also fell all in him ἐφ᾽ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, <450512>Romans 5:12. But so soon as any one had been born

into this world, and so should have had a personal subsistence of his own, he was to stand by himself, and to be no more, as to his covenant interest, concerned in the obedience of his progenitors; for the covenant with mankind would have been distinct with each individual, as it was with angels. There might have been, there would have been, order, subordination, and subjection, among men, in respect of things from God unto them, — so probably there is among the angels, although the investigation thereof be neither our duty nor in our power, — but, as was said, every one, according to the tenor of the covenant then in force, was in his own person to discharge all duties of worship towards God. Neither could any one be taken out from the residue of men to discharge the works of religion towards God for them, in the way of an office, but it would be to the prejudice of their right and the hinderance of their duty. It follows, therefore, that the office of a priest was impossible in that condition, — that is, of one who should be ordained ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, — and had any such office been possible, there would not have been in it any prefiguration of the priesthood of Christ, as will afterwards appear.

6. The same is the state of things with reference unto *sacrifices.* There is, as was said before, a relation between them and the priesthood. Hence is that saying in Bereshith Rabba: כהניו כמזבח כן; — " As is the altar for sacrifice, so are the priests that belong unto it." And by *sacrifices* in this inquiry, we understand those that are properly so: for that which is proper in every kind is first; nor is there any place for that which is improper or metaphorical, unless something proper from whence the denomination is taken have preceded, for in allusion thereunto doth the metaphor consist. Now, the first possible instance in this matter being in the state about which we inquire, there must be proper sacrifices therein, or none at all; for nothing went before with respect whereunto any thing might be so called, as now our spiritual worship and service are, with allusion unto them under the old testament.

And concerning those sacrifices, we may consider their *nature* and their *end.* A sacrifice is זֶבַח; that is, θυσία, "victima, sacrificium mactatum," — " a slain or killed offering;" yea, the first proper signification of זָבַח is "mactavit, jugulavit, decollavit, occidit," — "to kill, to slay by the effusion

of blood," and the like. Neither is this signification cast upon it from its affinity unto טָבַח, "to kill or slay" (the change of ט and ז being frequent, as in the Chaldee almost perpetual), but it is its own native signification: <0354>Genesis 31:54, וַיִּזְבַּח יַעֲקֹב זֶבַח. Say we, "Jacob offered sacrifices." Junius, "Mactavit animalia," — "He slew beasts;" which we allow in the margin, "He killed beasts." Targum, נכס ונכס יעקב נכסתא is "to kill or slay," and is constantly so used; and נכסתא is no more but "mactatio," "a slaughter;" but because all sacrifices were offered by slaying, it is applied to signify a sacrifice also. So <2346>Isaiah 34:6. It is true, there was a covenant made between Jacob and Laban, and covenants were sometimes confirmed by sacrifices, with a feast of the covenanters ensuing thereon; but it is not likely that Jacob and Laban would agree in the same sacrifice, who scarcely owned the same God. It is, therefore, only the provision and entertainment that Jacob made for Laban and his company, for which he slew the cattle, that is intended; otherwise the sacrifice would have been mentioned distinctly from the feast. So are these things expressed <0218>Exodus 18:12. And so זָבַח is rendered by us "to kill or slay" absolutely, <0924>1 Samuel 28:24; <0525>Deuteronomy 12:15, 16; <1192>1 Kings 19:21, 1:9; and so also ought it to be translated <0420>Numbers 22:40, where it is "offered" in our books. זֶבַח, the substantive, is also "mactatio, jugulatio, occisio:" so <2346>Isaiah 34:6; <3607>Zephaniah 1:7; which James expresseth by σφαγή, chap. 5:5. And זְבָחִים are absolutely no more than σφάγια, as from the slaughter of the sacrifices the altar is called מִזְבֵּחַ. Θύω, also, and θυσία, do no otherwise signify but "to sacrifice," or sacrifice by mactation or killing.

7. It is therefore evident that there neither is nor can be any sacrifice, properly so called, but what is made by killing or slaying of the thing sacrificed; and the offerings of inanimate things under the law, as of flour or wine, or the fruits of the earth, were improperly so called, in allusion unto or by virtue of their conjunction with them that were properly so. They might be עוֹלוֹת, "offerings" or "ascensions," but זְבָחִים, "sacrifices," they were not. And the act of sacrificing doth principally consist in the mactation or slaying of the sacrifices, as shall afterwards be manifested. And whereas the oblation, as it is used to express the general nature of a sacrifice, is commonly apprehended to consist in the actings of

the sacrificer after the killing of the sacrifice or victim, it is so far otherwise that it principally consists in brining of it to be slain, and in the slaying itself, all that follows belonging unto the religious manner of testifying faith and obedience thereby. This also discovers the proper and peculiar *end* of sacrifices, firstly and properly so called, especially such as might prefigure the sacrifice of Christ, unto which our present discourse is confined. All such sacrifices must respect *sin,* and an *atonement* to be made for it. There never was, nor ever can be, any other end of the effusion of blood in the service of God. This the nature of the action ("quod in ejus caput sit") and the whole series of divine institutions in this matter do manifest; for to what end should a man take another creature into his power and possession, which also he might use to his advantage, and, slaying it, offer it up unto God, if nat to confess a guilt of his own, or somewhat for which he deserved to die, and to represent a commutation of the punishment due unto him, by the substitution of another in his room and place, according to the will of God? And this casteth all such sacrifices as might be any way prefigurative of the sacrifice of Christ out of the verge of paradise, or state of innocency; for as therein there should have been no bloody mactation of our fellow-creatures, so a supposition of sin therein implies an express contradiction.

8. Again, sacrifices require *faith* in the offerer of them: Hebrews 11:4, "By faith Abel offered a sacrifice." And faith in the subject respects its proper object, which is divine revelation. Men can believe no more with divine faith than is revealed, and all our actings in faith must answer the doctrines of faith. Now, not to insist upon this particular, that sacrifices were not revealed before the fall (which that they were cannot be proved), I say that there was no doctrine in or belonging unto the covenant of creation that should directly or analogically require or intimate an acceptance of any such religious worship as sacrifices. This might be manifested by a just consideration of the principles of that revelation which God made of himself unto man under the first covenant, and what was necessary for him to know that he might live unto God; but this I have done at large elsewhere, nor have I any thing of moment to add unto former discourses to this purpose. And this also renders it impossible that there should be any sacrifices properly so called, and prefigurative of the sacrifice of Christ, in the state of innocency.

9. But these things are opposed, and must be vindicated. And this opposition is made unto both the positions laid down, the one concerning a *priest,* the other concerning *sacrifices:* for some have been and are of a mind, that "though man had not sinned, yet the Son of God should have taken our nature on him," both for the manifestation of the glory of God and the cherishing of the creation; and if so, he should have been in some sense the priest of the world.

And those of this persuasion are of two sorts : — First, Such as knowledge a *pre-existence* of the Lord Christ in a divine nature. These affirm that [even] had not sin entered into the world, he should have been so made flesh by the uniting of our nature unto himself in his own person, as now it is come to pass. This some of the ancient schoolmen inclined unto, as Alexander ab Ales., Albertus Magnus, Scotus, Rupertus; as it is opposed by Aquinas, p. 3, q. 3; Bonaventure in Sentent., lib. iii. dist. i. ar. 2, q. 1, and others. Immediately on the Reformation this opinion was revived by Osiander, who maintained that Adam was said to be made in the image of God, because he was made in that nature and shape whereunto the Son of God was designed and destinated. And he also was herein opposed by Calvin, Instit. lib. ii. cap. xii., lib. iii. cap. xi.; by Wigandus de Osiandrismo, p. 23; and Schlusselburgius, lib. vi. Yet some are still of this judgment, or seem so to be.

The other sort are the Socinians, who contend that God would have given such a head unto the creation as they fancy Christ to be; for as they lay no great weight on the first sin, so they hope to evince by this means that the Lord Christ may discharge his whole office without making any atonement for sin by sacrifice. And this, with most of their other opinions, they have traduced from the ancient Pelagians, as an account is given in this particular by Cassianus de Incarnatione, lib. i. p. 1241.

> "Quo factum est," saith he of the Pelagians, "ut in majorem quoque ac monstruosiorem insaniam prorumpentes, dicerent Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, hunc in mundum, non ad praestandum humano generi redemptionem, sed ad praebenda bonorum actuum exempla venisse; videlicet, ut disciplinam ejus sequentes, homines, dum per eandem virtutis viam incederent, ad eadem virtutum praemia pervenirent."

Those who assert sacrifices to have been necessary in the state of innocency are the Romanists. Bellarmine, Gregory de Valentia, and others, do expressly contend for it. And these also have their peculiar design in this their peculiar opinion; for they endeavor to establish a general maxim, "That proper sacrifices are indispensably necessary unto all religious worship," thereby to make way for their missatical oblation. I shall consider the pretences of both sorts, and so proceed with our design.

10. As to the first opinion, concerning the incarnation of the Son of God without respect unto sin and redemption, there are many pretences given unto it, which shall be afterwards particularly considered. They say that "the manifestation of the glory of God required that he should effect this most perfect way of it, that so he might give a complete expression of his image and likeness. His love and goodness also were so perfectly to be represented, in the union of a created nature with his own. And herein, also, God would satisfy himself in the contemplation of this full communication of himself unto our nature. Besides, it was necessary that there should be a head appointed unto the whole creation, to conduct and guide it, man especially, unto its utmost end." And sundry other things they allege out of the Bible of their own imaginations. It is granted that even in that state all immediate transactions with the creatures should have been by the Son; for by him, as the power and wisdom of God, were they made, ⁴⁸⁰¹John 1:3; ⁵⁸⁰¹Hebrews 1:2; ⁵¹⁰¹Colossians 1:16,17. He, therefore, should have immediately guided and conducted man unto his happiness, and that both by confirming him in his obedience and by giving him his reward; an express document whereof we have in the angels that sinned not. But for the opinion of his being incarnate without respect unto redemption and a recovery from sin and misery, the whole of it is ἄγραφον, or *unwritten,* and therefore uncertain and curious; yea, ἀντίγραφον, or *contrary to what is written,* and therefore false; and ἄλογον, or *destitute of any solid spiritual reason* for the confirmation of it.

11. First, It is *unwritten,* — nowhere revealed, nowhere mentioned in the Scripture; nor can an instance be given of the faith of any one of the saints of God, either under the old testament or the new, in this matter. The first promise, and consequently first revelation, of the *incarnation* of the Son of God, was after the entrance of sin, and with respect unto the recovery of the sinner, unto the glory of God. Hereby are all other promises,

declarations, and revelations concerning it, as to their end, to be regulated; for that which is the first in any kind, as to an end aimed at, is the rule of all that follows in the same kind. And therefore that which men ground themselves upon in this opinion is indeed neither argument nor testimony, but conjecture and curiosity. They frame to themselves a notional state of things, which they suppose beautiful and comely, (as who are not enamored of the fruits of their own imaginations?) and then assert that it was meet and according unto divine wisdom that God should so order things unto his own glory as they have fancied! Thus they suppose, that, without respect unto sin or grace, God would take unto himself the glory of uniting our nature unto him. Why so? Because they find how greatly and gloriously he is exalted in his so doing. But is this so absolutely from the thing itself, or is it with respect unto the causes, ends, effects, and circumstances of it, as they are stated since the entrance of sin, and revealed in the Scripture? Setting aside the consideration of sin, grace, and redemption, with what attends them, a man may say, in a better compliance with the harmony and testimony of Scripture, that the assumption of human nature into union with the divine, in the person of the Son of God, is no way suited unto the exaltation of divine glory, but rather to beget false notions and apprehensions in men of the nature of the Godhead, and to disturb them in their worship thereof; for the assumption of human nature absolutely is expressed as a great condescension, as it was indeed, ⁵⁰¹⁴⁵Philippians 2:5-8, and that which served for a season to *obscure* the glory of the Deity in him that assumed it, ⁴³⁷⁰⁵John 17:5. But the glory of it lies in that which caused it, and that which ensued thereon; for in them lay the highest effects and manifestations of divine love, goodness, wisdom, power, and holiness, ⁴⁵³²⁴Romans 3:24-26. And this is plainly revealed in the gospel, if any thing be so. I fear, therefore, that this curious speculation, that is thus destitute of any scriptural testimony, is but a pretense of being wise above what is written, and a prying into things which men have not seen, nor are they revealed unto them.

12. Secondly, This opinion is *contradictory to the Scripture*, and that in places innumerable. Nothing is more fully and perspicuously revealed in the Scripture than are the causes and ends of the incarnation of Christ; for whereas it is the great theater of the glory of God, the foundation of all that obedience which we yield unto him, and of all our expectation of

blessedness with him, and being a thing in itself deep and mysterious, it was necessary that it should be so revealed and declared. It were endless to call over all the testimonies which might be produced to this purpose; some few only shall be instanced in. *First*, therefore, On the part of the Father, the sending of the Son to be incarnate is constantly ascribed unto his love to mankind, that they might be saved from sin and misery, with a supposition of the ultimate end, or his own glory thereby: <4316>John 3:16, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." <4525>Romans 3:25, "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation." Chap. <4508>5:8, "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ, died for us." Chap. <4503>8:3, "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." <6409>1 John 4:9; <4804>Galatians 4:4, 5. *Secondly*, On the part of the Son himself, the same causes, the same ends of his taking flesh, are constantly assigned: <4210>Luke 19:10, "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." <5015>1 Tim. 1:15, "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." <5814>Hebrews 2:14, "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." <4820>Galatians 2:20; <4837>John 18:37, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth," — namely, of the promises of God made unto the fathers concerning his coming; <4508>Romans 15:8. See <5006>Philippians 2:6-11. And all this is said in pursuit and explication of the *first promise* concerning him, the sum whereof was, that he should be manifested in the flesh to "destroy the works of the devil," as it is expounded <6008>1 John 3:8. This the whole Scripture constantly and uniformly giveth testimony unto, this is the design and scope of it, the main of what it intends to instruct us in; the contrary whereunto, like the fancying of other worlds, or living wights in the moon or stars, dissolves the whole harmony of it, and frustrates its principal design, and therefore is more carefully to be avoided than what riseth up in contradiction unto some few testimonies of it. I say, that to ascribe unto God a will or purpose of sending his Son to be incarnate, without respect unto the redemption and salvation of sinners, is to contradict and enervate the

whole design of the revelation of God in the Scripture; as also, it riseth up in direct opposition unto particular testimonies without number. Origen observed this, Hom. xxiv. in Numer.:

> "Si non fuisset peccatum, non necesse fuerat Filium Dei agnum fieri; sod mansisset hoc quod in principio erat, Deus Verbum. Verum quoniam introiit peccatum in hunc mundum, peccati autem necessitas propitiationem requirit, propitiatio vero non sit nisi per hostiam, necessarium fuit provideri hostiam pro peccato;"

— " If sin had not been, there would have been no necessity that the Son of God should be made a lamb; but he had remained what he was in the beginning, God the Word. But seeing that sin entered into the world, and stood in need of a propitiation, which could not be but by a sacrifice, it was necessary that a sacrifice for sin should be provided." So Austin, Serm. 8 de Verbis Apostoli, tom. x., "Quare venit in mundum peccatores salvos facere. Alia causa non fuit quare veniret in mundum."

13. Thirdly, This opinion is *destitute of spiritual reason*, yea, is contrary unto it. The design of God to glorify himself in the creation and the law or covenant of it, and his design of the same end in a way of grace, are distinct; yea, they are so distinct as, with reference unto the same persons and times, to be inconsistent. This our apostle manifests in the instance of justification and salvation by works and grace:

> "If it be by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more grace: otherwise work is no more work," Romans 11:6.

It is impossible that the same man should be justified by works and grace too. Wherefore God, in infinite wisdom, brought the first design, and all the effects of it, into a subordination unto the later; and so he decreed to do from eternity. There being, by the entrance of sin, an aberration in the whole creation from that proper end whereunto it was suited at first, it pleased God to reduce the whole into a subserviency unto the design of his wisdom and holiness in a way of grace; for his purpose was to reconcile and gather all things into a new head in his Son, Jesus Christ, Ephesians 1:10; Hebrews 1:3, 2:7, 8. Now, according to this opinion, the incarnation of the Son of God belonged originally unto the law of creation,

and the design of the glory of God therein. And if this were so, it must, with the whole old creation and all that belonged thereunto, be brought into a subordination and subserviency unto the succedaneous design of the wisdom of God to glorify himself in a way of grace. But this is not so, seeing itself is the fundamental and principal part of that design. "Known," indeed, "unto God are all his works from the beginning." Therefore, this great projection of the incarnation of his Son lying in the counsel of his will from eternity, he did, in wisdom infinite and holy, order all the concernments of the creation so as they might be disposed into an orderly subjection unto his Son incarnate. So that although I deny that any thing was then instituted as a type to represent him, — because his coming into the world in our flesh belonged not unto that estate, — yet I grant things to have been so ordered as that, in the retrieval of all into a new frame by Jesus Christ, there were many things in the works of God in the old creation that were *natural types,* or things meet to represent much of this unto *us.* So Christ himself is called the "second Adam," and compared to the "tree of life," whereof we have discoursed in our exposition on the first chapter.

14. Let us, therefore, now consider the arguments or reasons in particular which they plead who maintain this assertion. The principal of them were invented and made use of by some of the ancient schoolmen; and others have since given some improvement unto their conceptions, and added some of their own. Those of the first sort are collected by Thomas, 3 p. q. l, a. 3, as traduced from the Pelagians. I shall examine them as by him proposed, omitting his answers, which I judge insufficient in many instances.

His first argument, the substance whereof I have lately heard pleaded with some vehemency, is as follows: — " It belonged unto omnipotent power and infinite wisdom to make all his works perfect, and to manifest himself by an infinite effect. But no mere creature can be said to be such infinite effect, because its essence is finite and limited. But in the work of the incarnation of the Son of God alone, an infinite effect of divine power seems to be manifested, as thereby things infinitely distant are conjoined, God being made man. And herein the universality of things seems to receive its perfection, inasmuch as the last creature, or man, is immediately conjoined unto the First Principle, or God."

Answer. This argument hath little more in it than curiosity and sophistry; for, —

(1.) That God made all his works "good," that is, perfect in their kind, before the incarnation, we have his own testimony. He saw and pronounced of the whole that it was טוֹב מְאֹד, "valde bonum," — every way good and complete. It was so in itself, without the addition of that work which is fancied necessary unto its perfection.

(2.) It is merely *supposed* that it was necessary that divine omnipotency should be expressed unto the utmost of its perfection. It was enough that it was manifested and declared in the creation of all things out of nothing.

(3.) It is not possible that any effect *in itself infinite* should be produced by the power of God: for then would there be two infinites, — the producing and the produced; and consequently two Gods, — the making God and the made: for that which is in itself absolutely infinite is God, and what is produced is not infinite. Wherefore the work of the incarnation was not of itself an *infinite effect,* although it was an effect of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; and so also was the work of the first creation. And although they are all in themselves finite and limited, yet are they the effects of, and do abundantly declare, the infinite power and wisdom whence they were educed, Romans 1:19, 20.

(4.) The perfection of the *universe,* or universality of beings, is to be regulated by their state, condition, and end. And this they had in their first creation, without any respect unto the incarnation of the Son of God; for the perfection of all things consisted in their relation unto God, according to the law and order of their creation, and their mutual regard unto one another, with respect unto the utmost end, or the manifestation of his glory. And also, their perfection consisted in their subserviency unto the bringing of that creature to the enjoyment of God in blessedness for ever which was capable of it. And herein consisted the conjunction of the last creature unto the First Principle, when, by the documents and helps of them that were made before, he was brought unto the enjoyment of God; for, —

(5.) That the conjunction of the *last creature* unto the *First Principle,* by way of *personal union,* was necessary unto the good of the universe, is a

fancy that every one may embrace and every one reject at pleasure. But it may be justly conceived that it was more suitable unto order that the conjunction mentioned should have been between God and the first creature, namely, the angels; and reasons would have been pleaded for that order had it so come to pass. But the Son of God took not on him their nature, because he designed not to deliver them from sin, [3026]Hebrews 2:16, 17.

15. Secondly, It is further pleaded, "That human nature is not become more capacious of grace by sin than it was before; but now, after the entrance of sin, it is capable of the grace of union, which is the greatest grace. Wherefore, if man had not sinned human nature had been capable of this grace, neither would God have withheld any good from human nature whereof it was capable: therefore if man had not sinned God had been incarnate."

Ans. **(1.)** Place angelical nature in the argument, as to that part of it which pleads that it must have all the grace which it is capable of, instead of human nature, and the event will show what force there is in this ratiocination; for angelical nature was capable of the grace of union, and God would not, it is said, withhold any thing from it whereof it was capable. But why, then, is it otherwise come to pass?

(2.) It must be granted (though, indeed, this argument is not much concerned therein one way or other) that human nature is both capable of more grace, and actually made partaker of more, after the fall, than it was capable of, or did receive before; for it is capable of mercy, pardon, reconciliation with God, sanctification by the Holy Ghost, all which are graces, or gracious effects of the love and goodness of God; and these things in the state of innocency man was not capable of. Besides, there is no difference in this matter; for the individual nature actually assumed into union was and was considered as pure as in its first original and creation.

(3.) The ground of this reason lies in a pretense, that whatever any creature was capable of, not in, by, or from itself, but by the power of God, that God was obliged to do in it and for it. And this is plainly to say that God did not communicate of his goodness and of his power unto the creatures according to the counsel of his will, but, producing them by the unavoidable destiny of some eternal state, he acted naturally and

necessarily, “ad ultimum virium,” in their production. But this is contrary to the nature and being of God, with all the properties thereof. Wherefore, the creation is capable, in every state, of what God pleaseth, and no more. Its capacity is to be regulated by the will of God; and no more belonged unto its capacity in the state of nature than God had assigned unto it by the law of creation.

(4.) It is a presumptuous imagination, to talk of the grace of union being due unto our nature in any condition. Why is it not so unto the nature of angels? or did our nature originally excel theirs? Besides, the Scripture everywhere expressly assigns it as an effect of free love, grace, and bounty, ⁴⁸³⁶John 3:16; ⁶⁰⁴⁹1 John 4:9, 10.

(5.) That there should be an advance made both of the glory of God and the good of the creature itself by the entrance of sin, is an effect of infinite wisdom and grace. Nor did God permit the entrance of sin but with a design to bring about a glory greater and more excellent than the antecedent order of things was capable of. The state of grace exceeded the state of nature. In brief, God permitted that greatest evil, the fall of man, to make way for the introduction of the greatest good, in our restoration by the incarnation and mediation of his Son.

16. Thirdly, It is also pleaded, “That the mystery of the incarnation was revealed unto Adam in the state of innocency; for upon the bringing of Eve unto him, he said, ‘This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh.’ But ‘this,’ saith the apostle, ‘is a great mystery;’ but he speaks it ‘concerning Christ and the church,’ ⁴⁸⁵²Ephesians 5:32. But man could not foresee or foreknow his own fall; no more than the angels could theirs; it follows, therefore, that he considered the incarnation as it should have been had the state of innocency continued.”

Ans. **(1.)** It seems to be supposed in this argument that there was indeed a revelation made unto Adam, ⁰²²³Genesis 2:23, of the incarnation of Christ; so that nothing remains to be proved but that he did not foreknow his fall, whence it would ensue that the pretended revelation belonged unto the state of innocency. But, indeed, there is no intimation of any such revelation; for, —

(2.) I have manifested elsewhere how God, in his infinite wisdom, ordered the things of the first creation so as they might be laid in a subserviency, in a way of representation, unto the new creation, or the renovation of all things by Jesus Christ; that is, he so made them as that they might be natural types of what he would do afterwards. This doth not prove that they were designed to make any revelation of Christ and his grace, or prefigure them, but only were meet to be brought into an useful *subordination* unto them, so that from them instructive allusions might be taken. Thus was it in the first marriage in the law of creation. It had no other nature, use, nor end, but to be the bond of individual society of two persons, male and female, for the procreation and education of children, with all mutual assistances unto human life and conversation. And the making of woman out of the man, "bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh," was intended only for the laying that society, whose intimacy was to be unparalleled, in a singular foundation. But both these things were so ordered, in the wisdom of God, as that they might represent another union, in a state that God would bring in afterwards, namely, of Christ and his church. What Adam spake concerning the natural condition and relation of himself and Eve, that our apostle speaks concerning the spiritual and supernatural condition and relation of Christ and the church, because of some resemblance between them. Aquinas himself determines this whole matter, with an assertion which would have been to his own advantage to have attended unto upon other occasions. Saith he,

> "Ea quae ex sola Dei voluntate proveniunt supra omne debitum creaturae, nobis innotescere non possunt, nisi quatenus in sacra Scriptura traduntur, per quam divina voluntas innotescit. Unde cum in sacra Scriptura ubique incarnationis ratio ex peccato primi hominis assignetur, convenientius dicitur incarnationis opus ordinatum esse a Deo in commodum contra peccatum, quod peccato non existente incarnatio non fuisset."

17. There is yet another argument mentioned by Aquinas, and much improved by the modem Scotists, insisted on also by some divines of our own, which deserves a somewhat fuller consideration; and this is taken from the *predestination of the man Christ Jesus.* This the schoolmen consider on that of our apostle, Romans 1:4, "Concerning Jesus Christ, ὁρισθέντος Υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει:" which the Vulgate renders, "Qui

praedestinatus est Filius Dei in virtute;" — " Predestinate the Son of God with power," as our Rhemists. But ὁρισθέντος there is no more than ἀποδεδειχθέντος, "manifested, declared," as it is well rendered by ours. Nor can expositors fix any tolerable sense to their "predestinate" in this place. But the thing itself is true. The Lord Christ was predestinated or preordained before the world was. We were "redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, προεγνωσμένου πρὸ καταζολῆς κόσμου," 1 Peter 1:20, — "foreordained" ("predestinated'') "before the foundation of the world." Now, it is pleaded that "this predestination of Christ unto the grace of union and glory was the first of God's purposes and decrees in order of nature, and antecedent unto the predestination of the elect, at least as it should comprise in it a purpose of deliverance from the fall. For God first designed to glorify himself in the assumption of human nature, before he decreed to save the elect by that nature so assumed; for we are said to be 'chosen it him,' that is, as our head, Ephesians 1:4, whence it necessarily ensues that he was chosen before us, and so without respect unto us. So in all things was he to have the preeminence, Colossians 1:19; and thence it is that we are 'predestinated to be conformed to his image,' Romans 8:29. This preordination, therefore, of the Lord Christ, which was unto grace, and glory, was antecedent unto the permission of the fall of man; so that he should have been incarnate had that never fallen out."

These things are by some at large deduced and explained, but this is the sum of what is pleaded in the pursuit of this argument, which shall be as briefly examined as the nature of the matter itself will permit.

The order of the divine eternal decrees, as to their *priority* one unto another in order of nature and reason, so as not the decrees themselves, which are all absolutely free and *irrespective,* but the things decreed, should be one for another, hath been at large discoursed of and discussed by many. But there are yet not a few who suppose those very discourses on all hands to have more of nicety and curious subtilty than of solid truth unto edification. And because this is a matter wherein the Scripture is utterly silent, though one opinion may be more agreeable to sound reason than another, yet none is built upon such certain foundations as to become a matter of faith, or the principle of any thing that is so. That which explains this order most conveniently and suitably unto divine wisdom,

will, and sovereignty, and which best answers the common apprehensions of rational natures and the rules of their actings, is to be preferred before any opinion that includes what is opposite unto or alien from any of these things, which that order hath respect unto. From any such order in the decrees of God no advantage can be drawn unto the opinion under consideration; but if men may be allowed to suppose what they will, they may easily infer thereon what they please. Let us, therefore, take a view of the several series of divine decrees, which have been confirmed with a considerable suffrage of learned men, setting aside particular conjectures, which never received entertainment beyond the minds of their authors. And these may be reduced unto three: –

All agree that the glory of God is the utmost and supreme end that he intendeth in all his decrees. Although they are free acts of his will and wisdom, yet, on the supposition of them, it is absolutely necessary, from the perfection of his being, that he himself or his glory be their utmost end. His absolute all-sufficiency will not allow that he can in them have any other end. Accordingly, in pursuit of them he makes all for himself, <2006>Proverbs 16:4; and they serve to declare and make known the perfection of his nature, <1901>Psalm 19:1; <4501>Romans 1:19, 20. And it is his glory, in the way of justice and mercy, which he ultimately intends in his decrees concerning the salvation of man by Jesus Christ. Whereas many things are ordered by him in a subserviency hereunto, the decrees of God concerning them are conceived by some in that order which answers the order of their accomplishment; — as, first, they say, God decreed to make the world, and man therein upright in his image; secondly, to permit the fall and the consequents thereof, man being to that end left unto the liberty of his will; thirdly, he designed to send his Son to be incarnate, for the work of their redemption; fourthly, he decreed to give eternal life unto as many as should believe on him and obey him; and, lastly, he determined to bestow effectual grace on some persons in particular, to work faith and obedience in them infallibly, and thereby to bring them unto glory, unto the praise of his grace and mercy. According unto this order of God’s decrees, it is plain that in the order of nature the predestination of Christ is *antecedent* unto the election of other particular or individual persons, but withal that it is consequential unto the decree concerning the permission of the fall of

Adam; and, accordingly, his incarnation doth suppose it; which is inconsistent with the opinion under examination.

Others take a contrary course, and, by a misapplication of a common rule, that *what is first in intention must be last in execution,* they suppose the order of God's decrees, being his intentions or purposes, to be best conceived in a direct retrogradation unto the order of their execution. Supposing, therefore, the decree of glorifying himself in the way before mentioned, they judge God's first decree in order of nature to be for the eternal salvation and glory of some certain persons, who axe actually at last brought thereunto; for this being the last thing executed must be first intended. Secondly, In subserviency hereunto, he purposeth to give them grace, and faith, and obedience thereby, as the way to bring them unto the possession of glory. Thirdly, Unto these purposes of God they make the decrees concerning the creation and permission of the fall of man, with the incarnation and mediation of Christ, to be subservient, some in one method, some in another. But that all their conceptions must have an inconsistency with the predestination of Christ unto his incarnation antecedent unto a respect unto sin and grace, is plain and evident.

But whereas both these ways are exposed unto insuperable objections and difficulties, some have fixed on another method for the right conception of the order of God's eternal decrees in these things, which hath a consistency in itself, and may be fairly brought off from all opposition, — which is the utmost that with sobriety can be aimed at in these things, — namely, that nothing be ascribed unto God in the least unsuited unto the infinite perfections of his nature, nor any thing proposed unto the minds of men inconsistent with the general principles and rules of reason. And those lay down the general rule before mentioned, namely, that what is first in intention is last in execution. But, secondly, they say withal, that this rule concerns only such things as in their own nature, and in the will of him that designs them, have the relation of end and means unto one another; for it hath no place among such things as are not capable of that relation. And, moreover, it is required that this end be ultimate and supreme, and not subordinate, which hath also the nature of the means. The meaning of it, therefore, is no more but that in all rational purposes there are two things considered, — first, the *end* aimed at, and then the *means* of its effecting or accomplishment; and that in order of nature, the

end, which is the last thing effected, is the first designed, and then the means for it; which things are true, and obvious unto the understanding of all men. According unto this rule, they ascribe unto God but two decrees that have any order of priority between them. The first is concerning his end, which is first intended and last executed; the other concerning all those means which, being in the second place intended for the production of the end, are first accomplished and wrought. The first of these, which is the supreme end of all the dispensations of God towards the things that outwardly are of him, is his own glory, or the declaration of himself in a way of justice and mercy, mixed with infinite wisdom and goodness, as he is the first Being, sovereign Lord and Ruler over all. The second decree, of things subordinate and subservient hereunto, consisteth in an intention concerning all intermediate acts of divine wisdom, power, and goodness, which tend unto the production of this ultimate end. Such are the creation, the permission of the fall, the pre-ordination of Christ, and others in him, unto grace and glory, by the way and means thereunto appointed. Now, although these things are evidently subordinate and subservient unto one another, and although there may be apprehended singular decrees concerning them, yet because none of them do lie in the order of the means and ultimate end, there is no priority of one decree before another to be allowed therein; only a decree is supposed of disposing them in their execution, or the things executed, into that order, both in nature and time, as may constitute them all one suitable means of attaining the supreme end intended. Now, it is evident that, according unto this order, there cannot be a priority in the pre-ordination of Christ unto the decree of the permission of the fall and entrance of sin.

It is true, indeed, Christ was *pre-ordained,* or [rather] the Son of God was so, to be incarnate before the foundation of the world, 1 Peter 1:20. But how? Even as he was “manifested in these last times.” As he was pre-ordained to be incarnate, so he was to be so of the blessed Virgin: and this neither was nor could be but with respect unto the redemption of mankind; for he took flesh of her in answer to the first promise concerning the seed of the woman, which respected our recovery from sin. As he was born or made of her, he was the Lamb of God that was to take away the sin of the world. Besides, he was not ordained unto the grace of union before and without the consideration of glory and exaltation. But this

included a supposition of his suffering for sin; for he was first to "suffer," and then to "enter into his glory," ⁴²Luke 24:26. Accordingly, he ordered his own prayer, ⁴³John 17:4, 5,

> "I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self."

To fancy a pre-ordination of the Son of God unto incarnation not of the blessed Virgin after the entrance of sin, not as the Lamb of God, not as one to be exalted after suffering, is that which neither Scripture nor reason will admit of. It is said, indeed, that we are "predestinated to be conformed to the image of Christ," ⁴⁵Romans 8:29, which seems to imply an antecedency in his predestination unto ours; but "the image of Christ" there intended includes his suffering, holiness, and exaltation unto glory on his obedience, all which have respect unto sin and redemption. And, moreover, the predestination here intended is subordinate unto our election unto glory, being our designation unto the assured and infallible means thereof, ⁴⁶Ephesians 1:4, 5. It is true, it was the design of God that he "in all things should have the pre-eminence," ⁴⁷Colossians 1:18; which, as it denotes excellency, worth, use, dignity, supremacy, nearness unto God for the receiving, and unto us for the communicating, of all good, so no respect therein is had unto such a pre-ordination as should imply his incarnation without an intention of glorifying God in the redemption of sinners thereby, which alone we have undertaken to disprove.

18. The arguments of Osiander in this case have been discussed by others, Calvin. Institut. lib. ii. cap. xii. sect. 4, etc.; Wigandus de Osiandrismo, p. 23; Tarnovius, in cap. iii. in Evang. S. Johan. I shall only touch so far upon them as is necessary unto our present design, and that in such instances wherein they have no coincidence with what hath been already discussed. And some few things may be premised, which will take away the suppositions on which all his reasonings were founded; as, –

(1.) The Son was the essential and eternal image of the Father antecedent unto all consideration of his incarnation. He is in his divine person "the image of the invisible God," ⁴⁸Colossians 1:15; "the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person," ⁴⁹Hebrews 1:3: for having his essence and subsistence from the Father by eternal generation, or the

communication of the whole divine nature and all its infinite perfections, he is the perfect and essential representation of him.

(2.) The order of operation in the blessed Trinity, as unto outward works, answereth unto and followeth the order of their subsistence. Hence the Son is considered as the next and immediate operator of them. Thus, as he is said to have made all things, <43103>John 1:3, <51116>Colossians 1:16, so the Father is said to make all things by him, <49309>Ephesians 3:9; not as an inferior, subordinate, instrumental cause, but as acting his wisdom and power in him, to whom they were communicated by eternal generation. Hence, the immediate relation of all things so made is unto him; and by and in his person is God even the Father immediately represented unto them, as he is his image, and as the brightness of his glory shines forth in him. Hereon follows his rejoicing in the creation, and his delights in the sons of men, <20830>Proverbs 8:30, 31, because of their immediate relation unto him.

(3.) Therefore should he have been the immediate head and ruler of angels and men, had they all persisted in their original integrity and innocency, <51116>Colossians 1:16; for the representation of God unto them, as the cause and end of their being, the object and end of their worship and service, should have been in and by his person, as the image of the Father, and by and through him they should have received all the communications of God unto them. He should have been their immediate head, lord, and king, or the divine nature in his person; for this the order of subsistence in the blessed Trinity, and the order of operation thereon depending, did require.

These things being premised, it will not be difficult to remove out of our way the reasons of Osiander for the incarnation of Christ without a supposition of sin and grace; which we would not engage in, after they have been so long ago put into oblivion, but that they axe by some revived, and the consideration of them will give occasion unto the clearing of some truths not of small importance.

19. First, His principal plea was taken from the “image of God” wherein man was created: “For this,” he saith, “was that human nature, consisting of soul and body, in the outward shape, lineaments, and proportion, which it hath in our persons, which the Son of God was to take upon him. God having ordained that his Son should take human nature, he created Adam in a conformity unto the idea or image thereof.”

Ans. This, doubtless, is a better course for the unfolding of our creation in the image of God than that of the old Anthropomorphites, who, in the exposition of this expression, made God in the image of man; but yet is it not therefore according unto the truth. The image of God in man was in general those excellencies of his nature wherein he excelled all other creatures here below. In especial, it was that uprightness and rectitude of his soul and all its faculties, as one common principle of moral operations, whereby he was enabled to live unto God as his chiefest good and utmost end, <2Ecclesiastes 7:29. This by our apostle is termed "righteousness and true holiness," where he treats of the renovation of it in us by Jesus Christ, <Ephesians 4:24; whereunto he adds that which is the principle of them both, in the renovation of our minds, <Colossians 3:10. Nor doth this image of God consist, as some fancy, in *moral duties*, in distinction from and opposition unto any other effect of the grace of Christ in the hearts of men, which acts itself in any duty according to the will of God. "To pray, to hear the word, to celebrate religious worship," they say, "is no part of the image of God; because God doth none of these things, and an image must always correspond unto the thing it represents." But our likeness unto God doth not consist in doing what God doth, neither is his image in us in any thing more express than in our universal dependence on him and resignation of ourselves unto him, which is a thing the divine nature is incapable of; and when we are commanded to be holy as he is holy, it is not *a specificative* similitude, but *analogical* only, that is intended. Wherefore, as the image of God consists in no outward actions of any kind whatever, so the internal grace that is acted in prayer, hearing, and other acts of sacred worship, according to the will of God, doth no less belong unto the image of God than any other grace, or duty, or virtue whatever. In like manner faith doth so also, and that not only as it is an intellectual perfection, but with respect unto all its operations and effects, as the Lord Christ himself and the promises of the gospel are in their several considerations the objects of it: for as in our first creation the image of God consisted in the concreated rectitude of our nature, whereby we were disposed and enabled to live unto God according to the law of our creation, — wherein there was a great representation of His righteousness, or universal, absolute rectitude of his nature, by whom we were made, – so whatever is communicated unto us by the grace of Jesus Christ, whereby our nature is repaired, disposed, and enabled to live unto God, with all acts

and duties suitable thereunto, according to the present law of our obedience, belongs to the restoration of the image of God in us; but yet with special respect unto that spiritual light, understanding, or knowledge, which is the directive principle of the whole, for

> "the new man is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him," <5310>Colossians 3:10.

This, therefore, being the image of God, it is evident that in the creation of man therein there was no respect unto the *human nature* of Christ, which, as the Son of God, he afterwards assumed. Only, it is granted that we are both formed and re-formed immediately in his image; for as he was and is, in his divine person, the express image of the Father, the divine qualifications wherein the image of God originally consisted in us were immediately wrought in us by him, as those wherein he would represent his own perfection. And in the restoration of this image unto us, as God implanted in him incarnate all fullness of that grace wherein it doth consist, who therein absolutely represents the invisible God unto us, so we are transformed immediately into his likeness and image, and unto that of God by him, <470318>2 Corinthians 3:18.

20. It is further pleaded, "That if the Son of God should not have been incarnate if Adam had not sinned, then Adam was not made in the image of Christ, but Christ was made in the image of Adam."

Ans. How Adam was made in the image of the Son of God hath been declared, — namely, as to the principles of his nature, and their rectitude with respect unto the condition wherein and the end for which he was made; in which there was a representation of his righteousness and holiness. And in some sense Christ may be said to be made in the image of Adam, inasmuch as he was "made flesh," or partaker of the same nature with him:

> "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same," <580214>Hebrews 2:14.

> "He took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men," <500207>Philippians 2:7.

And this he was of God designed unto, even to take on himself that nature wherein Adam was created, and wherein he sinned. He was to be made like unto us in all things, sin only excepted, ⁵⁸⁰⁴⁵Hebrews 4:15. Whence, in his genealogy after the flesh, he is reduced by Luke unto the first Adam, chap. 3:38; and he is called not the first, or the exemplar of the creation of men, but the *second* Adam, ⁴⁶⁵⁴⁷1 Corinthians 15:47, being to recover and restore what was lost by the first. Wherefore, in respect of the substance and essence of human nature, Christ was made in the image of Adam; but in respect of the endowments and holy perfections of that nature, he was made in the image of God.

21. Moreover, it is objected, "That the incarnation of Christ was a thing decreed for itself, and as to its futurition depended only on the immutable counsel of God; but this supposition, that it had respect unto the fall of man and his recovery, makes it to depend on an external accident, which, as to the nature of the thing itself, might not have been."

Ans. The resolution hereof depends much on what hath been before discoursed concerning the *order of the divine decrees,* which need not to be here repeated. Only, we may remember that the foresight of the fall, and the decree of the permission of it, cannot with any reason be supposed to be consequential to the decree concerning the incarnation of the Son of God: for the reparation of man is everywhere in the Scripture declared to be the end of Christ's taking flesh; for

> "when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them who were under the law," ⁴⁸⁰⁰⁴Galatians 4:4, 5.

Neither can his incarnation be properly said either to be "for itself" on the one side, or by "accident" on the other; for it was decreed and fore-ordained for the glory of God. And the way whereby God intended to glorify himself therein was in our redemption, which, in his infinite love to mankind, was the moving cause thereof, ⁴³⁰¹⁶John 3:16. Of the same importance is it, "That if the Son of God had not been incarnate, neither angels nor men could have had their proper head and king;" for, as we have premised, the Son of God should have been the immediate head of the whole creation, ruling every thing in its subordination unto God, suitably unto its own nature, state, and condition. For as he was "the image of the

invisible God," so he was "the first-born of every creature," [Colossians 1:15] Colossians 1:15; that is, the Lord, ruler, and inheritor of them, as we have at large elsewhere declared.

22. It is pleaded in the last place, "That had men continued in their integrity, there should have been a season when they were to be changed and translated into heaven. Now, this being to be done by the Son of God, it was necessary that he should be incarnate for that purpose." And so far is this consideration urged by Osiander. But this is carried on by the Socinians, and improved on another supposition of their own. Vid. Smal. Refut. Thes. Franzii Disput. xii. p. 429.

Man, they tell us, was created absolutely mortal, and should have *actually died*, although he had never sinned. That he might be raised again from the dead, God would have sent a Messiah, or one that should have been the means, example, and instrumental cause of our resurrection.

Ans. All persons of sobriety will acknowledge that there is nothing in these reasonings but groundless curiosities and vain speculations, countenanced with false suppositions; for as God alone knows what would have been the eternal condition of Adam had he persisted in the covenant of his nature, so whatever change was to be wrought concerning him as the reward of his obedience, God could have effected it by his infinite wisdom and power, without any such instrumental cause as these men imagine. "Secret things belong unto the LORD our God ;" nor are we to be "wise above what is written." The Socinians' superfetation, that man should have died naturally, though not penally, is a figment of their own, that hath been elsewhere discussed, and is very unmeet to be laid as the foundation of new assertions that cannot otherwise be proved.

From what hath been discoursed it appears that there was no revelation of the incarnation of the Son of God in the state of innocency; neither did it belong unto that state, but was designed in order unto his priesthood, which could therein have no place nor use.

23. Our next inquiry is concerning *sacrifices*, and whether they were to have had either place or use in the state of innocency. This being determined, way will be made for the fixing of the original of the priesthood of Christ, whereof we are in the investigation, upon its right

foundation. And this inquiry is made necessary unto us by some of the Roman church, particularly Bellarmine and Gregory de Valentia, They have not, indeed, fixed any special controversy in this inquiry, whether there should have been *any sacrifices in the state of innocency;* but, in an attempt to serve a principal concern of their own, they assert and contend for that which determines the necessity of sacrifices in that state and condition of things between God and men; for they plead in general, "That there neither is, nor ever was in the world, nor can be, any religion without a true and real sacrifice." Their design herein is only to hedge in the necessity of their sacrifice of the mass; for on this supposition it must be esteemed to be of the very essence of Christian religion, which some, on the contrary, judge to be overthrown thereby. Now, it is certain that there was and should have been religion in the state of innocency, continued if that state had continued; yea, therein all religion and religious worship were founded, being inlaid in our nature, and requisite unto our condition in this world, with respect unto the end for which we were made. Herein, therefore, on this supposition, sacrifices were necessary, which Bellarmine includes in that "syllogism," as he calls it, whereby he attempts the proof of the necessity of his missatical sacrifice in the church of Christ, De Missa, lib. i. cap. 20:

> "Tanta," saith he, "conjunctio est inter legem seu religionem et sacrificium, externum ac proprie dictum, ut omnino necesse est aut legem et religionem vere et proprie in Christi ecclesia non reperiri, aut sacrificium quoque externum et proprie dictum in Christi ecclesia reperiri. Nullum autem est si missam tollas. Est igitur missa sacrificium externum proprie dictum ;"

— "There is such a conjunction between the law or religion and a sacrifice, external and properly so called, that it is altogether necessary either that there is no law or religion truly and properly to be found in the church of Christ, or there is a sacrifice, external and properly so called, to be found therein; but take away the mass, and there is none: wherefore the mass is an external sacrifice, properly so called."

24. The invalidity of this argument unto his especial purpose may easily be laid open; for setting aside all consideration of his mass, Christian religion hath not only in it a proper sacrifice, but that alone and single

sacrifice with respect whereunto any services of men in the worship of the church formerly were so called, and whereby they were animated and rendered useful. For all the sacrifices of the law were but obscure representations of, nor had any other end or use but to prefigure, that sacrifice which we enjoy in Christian religion, and to exhibit the benefits thereof unto the worshippers. This is the sacrifice of Christ himself, which was external, visible, proper, yea, the only true, real, substantial sacrifice, and that offered once for all. And it is merely ἐξ ἀμετρίας ἀνθολκής, or an immeasurable concern in a corrupt imagination, which carried Bellarmine to put in his frivolous and captious exception unto the sufficiency of this sacrifice in and unto Christian religion; — for he pretends and pleads that "this sacrifice did not belong to the Christian church, which was founded in the resurrection of Christ, before which Christ had offered himself;" as also, that "this sacrifice was but once offered," and now ceaseth so to be, so that if we have no other sacrifice but this, we have none at all: for notwithstanding these bold and sophistical exceptions, our apostle sufficiently instructs us that we have yet an *high priest*, and an *altar*, and a *sacrifice* and the *blood of sprinkling*, all in heavenly things and places. And, on purpose to prevent this cavil about the ceasing of this sacrifice as to be offered again, he tells us that it is always ζῶσα καὶ πρόσφατος, — "living and new-slain." And, beyond all contradiction, he determined either this one sacrifice of Christ to be insufficient, or that of the mass to be useless; for he shows that where any sacrifices will make perfect them that come to God by them, there no more will be offered. And it is an undoubted evidence that no sacrifice hath obtained its end perfectly, so as to making reconciliation for sin, where any other sacrifice, properly so called, doth come after it. Nor doth he prove the insufficiency of the Aaronical sacrifices unto this purpose by any other argument but that they were often offered from year to year, and that another was to succeed in their room when they were over, Hebrews 10:1-5; and this, upon the supposition of the Romanists, and the necessity of their missatical sacrifice, falls as heavily on the sacrifice of Christ as on those of the law. It is apparent, therefore, that they must either let go the sacrifice of Christ as insufficient, or that of their mass as useless, for they can have no consistency in the same religion. Wherefore they leave out the sacrifice of Christ, as that which was offered before the church was founded. But the truth is, the church was founded therein. And

I desire to know of these men whether it be the *outward act of sacrificing* or the *efficacy of a sacrifice* that is so necessary unto all religion? If it be the outward act that is of such use and necessity, how great was the privilege of the church of the Jews above that of the Romanists! for whereas these pretend but unto one sacrifice, and that one so dark, obscure, and unintelligible, that the principal μύσται and ἐπόπται of their "sacra" cannot possibly agree amongst themselves what it is, nor wherein it doth consist, they had many plain, express, visible sacrifices, which the whole church looked on and consented in. But this whole pretense is vain. Nor is any thing of the least account or worth in religion but upon the account of its efficacy unto its end. And that we have with us the continual efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ in all our religious worship and approaches unto God, the Scripture is full and express. But these things are not of our present concernment; the consideration of them will elsewhere occur.

25. As unto our present purpose, I deny the major proposition of Bellarmine's syllogism, if taken absolutely and universally, as it must be if any way serviceable unto his end. This, therefore, he proves. "Propositio," saith he,

> "prima probatur primo ex eo quod fere omnis religio, seu vera seu falsa, omni loco et tempore, semper ad cultum Dei sacrificia adhibuerit; hinc enim colligitur, id prodire ex lumine et instinctu naturae, et esse primum quoddam principium a Deo nobis ingenitum;"

— "It is proved from hence, that almost all religion, whether true or false, in all places and times, hath made use of sacrifices in the worship of God; for hence it is gathered that this proceeds from the light and instinct of nature, being a certain principle inbred in us from God himself." And hereon he proceeds to confute Chemnitius, who assigned the original of sacrificing among the heathen unto an instinct of corrupt nature, which is the root of all superstition. I shall not now inquire expressly into the original of all sacrifices; it must be done elsewhere. We here only discourse concerning those that are properly so called, and not only so, but *propitiatory* also; for such he contendeth his mass to be. It is, indeed, suitable to the light of nature that of what we have left in our possession

we should offer unto the service of God, when he hath appointed a way for us so to do; but it is denied that in the state of innocency he had appointed that to be by the way of sacrificing sensible things. All eucharistical offerings should then have been moral and spiritual, in pure acts of the mind and its devotion in them. Sacrifices of or for atonement were first instituted, and other offerings had their name from thence, by reason of some kind of analogy. And so far as *thank-offerings* were materially the same with them that were propitiatory, in the death and blood of any creature, they had in them the nature of a propitiation also. That these were instituted after the fall I have elsewhere sufficiently proved. Being therefore at first enjoined unto all mankind in general, as tokens of the recovery promised, they were retained and perpetuated amongst all sorts of men, even when they had lost all notion and remembrance of the promise whereunto they were originally annexed; for they had a double advantage for the perpetuating themselves: — First, A suitableness unto the general principle of giving an acknowledgment unto God, in a returnal of a portion of that all which comes from him. Secondly, They had a compliance with the accusation of conscience for sin, by an endeavor to transfer the guilt of it unto another. But their first original was pure divine and supernatural revelation, and not the light or conduct of nature, nor any such innate principle as Bellarmine imagineth. No such inseparable conjunction as is pretended between sacrifices and religion can hence be proved, seeing they were *originally* an arbitrary institution, and that after there had been religion in the world. He proceeds, therefore, further to confirm his first proposition: “Sacrificium cum ipsa religione natum est, et cum illa extinguitur; est igitur inter ea conjunctio plane necessaria;” — “Sacrificing was born with religion, and dies with it; there is, therefore, between them a plain necessary conjunction.” So he. This is only a repetition of the proposition in other words; for to say that there is such a conjunction between sacrifices and religion that the one cannot be without the other, and to say they are born and die together, is to say the same thing twice over. He adds, therefore, his proof of the whole: “Nam primi homines qui Deum coluisse leguntur filii Adami fuerunt, Cain et Abel, illi autem sacrificia obtulisse dicuntur,” Genesis 4; whereon he proceeds unto other instances under the Old Testament. Now, it is plain that by this instance he hath overthrown his general assertion; for he excludes from proof the state of innocency, wherein there was

unquestionably religion in the world, and that without sacrifices, if Cain and Abel were the first that offered them. He doth, therefore, by his instances neither prove what himself intends, nor touch upon our cause, that there were no sacrifices in the state of innocency, though that state is necessarily included in his general assertion.

26. From what hath been spoken it appears that there was no decree, no counsel of God, concerning either *priest* or *sacrifice*, with respect unto the law of creation and the *state of innocency.* A supposition of the entrance of sin, and what ensued thereon in the curse of the law, lie at the foundation of the designation of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ. Now, concerning the fall of man, the nature of that sin whereby he fell, the propagation of it unto all mankind, the distress, misery, and ruin of the world thereby, I have at large discoursed in our former Exercitations, prefixed unto the exposition of the first two chapters of this Epistle.[f1] I have also in them evinced in general, that it was not the will, purpose, or counsel of God, that all mankind should utterly perish in that condition, as he had determined concerning the angels that sinned, but from the very beginning he gave not only sundry intimations but express testimonies of a contrary design. That, therefore, he would provide a relief for fallen man, that this relief was by the Messiah, whose coming and work he declared in a promise immediately upon the entrance of sin, hath been also demonstrated in those Exercitations. Building on these foundations, and having now removed some objections out of our way, it remains that we proceed to declare the *especial original of the priesthood of Christ in the counsel of God*, with respect unto the especial manner of deliverance from sin and wrath designed therein.

EXERCITATION 27.

THE ORIGINAL OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST IN THE COUNSEL OF GOD.

1. *The design.*

2. *The end of God in his works in general; in the creation of man — Personal transactions in the holy Trinity concerning him.*

3. *Genesis 1:26.*

4. *Plurality of persons in the holy Deity here first revealed.*

5. *God speaks not "more regio."*

6. *Sentiments of the Jews on the words of this text inquired into and rejected.*

7. *Objections of Enjedinus unto this testimony examined at large.*

8. *Personal internal transactions in the holy Trinity with respect to mankind proved.*

9. *Proverbs 8:22-31 — Corrupt translation of the LXX. — Arian pretences rejected.*

10. *The Jewish interpretation of this place discussed and rejected — Objections of the Socinians.*

11. *A divine person intended; proved from the text and context in sundry instances.*

12. *The application of this scripture to the Son of God vindicated at large from the objections of Enjedinus.*

13. *Christ, with respect to God the Father, said to be* אָצֻלוֹ אָמוֹן*; in what sense.*

14. *The mutual delight and satisfaction of God and Wisdom in each other; what they were, and with respect whereunto,* *Psalm 40:7, 8.*

15. *The joy and delight of Wisdom with the sons of men had respect to their redemption and salvation.*

16. *Objections of the Jews and Mohammedans to the testimony given to Christ as the Son of God,* *Psalm 2:7.*

17. *The opposition of Enjedinus to the same purpose removed.*

18. *Eternal transactions between the Father and Son about the redemption of mankind hence confirmed.*

1. FROM what hath been discoursed, it is manifest that the counsel of God concerning the priesthood and sacrifice of his Son, to be incarnate for that purpose, had respect unto sin, and the deliverance of the elect from it, with all the consequents thereof; and the same truth hath also been

particularly discussed and confirmed in our exposition of the second chapter of this Epistle. That which now lies before us is to inquire more expressly into the nature of the counsels of God in this matter, and their progress in execution. And as in this endeavor we shall carefully avoid all curiosity, or vain attempts to be wise above what is written, so, on the other hand, we shall study with sober diligence to declare and give light unto what is revealed herein, to the end that we should so increase in knowledge as to be established in faith and obedience. To this end are our ensuing discourses designed.

2. God, in the creation of all things, intended to manifest his nature, in its being, existence, and essential properties; and therein to satisfy his wisdom and goodness. Accordingly, we find his expressions of and concerning himself in the work of creation suited to declare these things. See <23A402>Isaiah 40:12-17. Also, that the things themselves that were made had in their nature and order such an impress of divine wisdom, goodness, and power upon them, as made manifest the original cause from whence they did proceed. To this purpose discourseth our apostle, <451119>Romans 1:19-21, Τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φανερὸν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς· and the psalmist, <19A901>Psalm 19:1, 2; as do sundry other divine writers also. Wherefore the visible works of God, man only excepted, were designed for no other end but to declare in general the nature, being, and existence of God. But in this nature there are *three persons* distinctly subsisting; and herein consists the most incomprehensible and sublime perfection of the divine being. This, therefore, was designed unto manifestation and glory in the creation of man; for therein God would glorify himself as subsisting in three distinct persons, and himself in each of those persons distinctly. This was not designed immediately in other parts of the visible creation, but in this, which was the complement and perfection of them. And therefore the first express mention of a plurality of persons in the divine nature is in the creation of man; and therein also are personal transactions intimated concerning his present and future condition. This, therefore, is that which in the first place we shall evince, namely, “That there were from all eternity personal transactions in the holy Trinity concerning mankind in their temporal and eternal condition, which first manifested themselves in our creation.”

3. The first revelation of the counsels of God concerning the glorifying of himself in the making and disposal of man is declared (Genesis 1:26: וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ וְיִרְדּוּ בִּדְגַת הַיָּם) "And God said, Let us make man in our image, according unto our likeness, and let them have dominion." This was the counsel of God concerning the making of אָדָם; that is, not of that particular individual person who was first created and so called, but of the species or kind of creature which in him he now proceeded to create. For the word Adam is used in this and the next chapter in a threefold sense: — First, For the name of the individual man who was first created. He was called Adam from adamah, "the ground," from whence he was taken, chap. (2:19-21; ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς, χοϊκός, 1 Corinthians 15:47, "of the earth, earthy." Secondly, It is taken indefinitely for the man spoken of, chap. (2:7, יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם עָפָר מִן־הָאֲדָמָה וַיִּיצֶר; — " And the Lord God created man;" not him whose name was Adam, for "He hajediah" [He emphatic] is never prefixed unto any proper name, but the man indefinitely of whom he speaks. Thirdly, It denotes the species of mankind. So is it used in this place, for the reddition is in the plural number, "And let them have dominion," the multitude of individuals being included in the expression of the species. Hence it is added, chap. (1:27,

> "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them;"

which is not spoken with respect unto Eve, who was not then made, but unto the kind or race, wherein both sexes were included.

4. Concerning them God saith, נַעֲשֶׂה, "Let US make," in the plural number; and so are the following expressions of God in the same work: בְּצַלְמֵנוּ, "In OUR image;" כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ, "According to OUR likeness." This. is the first time that God so expresseth himself, and the only occasion whereon he doth so in the story of the creation. As unto all other things, we hear no more but וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים, "And God said;" in which word also I will not deny but respect may be had unto the plurality of persons in the divine essence, as the Spirit is expressly mentioned, chap. 1:2. But here the mystery of it is clearly revealed. The Jews constantly affirm that the elders, who translated the Law on the request of Ptolemy

king of Egypt, changed or corrupted the text in thirteen places, whereof this was the first; for נַעֲשֶׂה, "Let us make," they rendered by Ποιήσω, "I will make," and not Ποιήσωμεν, in the plural number. And this, they say, they did lest they should give occasion unto the king or others to imagine that their law allowed of any more Gods than one, or on any account departed from the *singularity of the divine nature.* Whether this were so or no I know not, and have sufficient reason not to be too forward in giving credit unto their testimony, if nothing else be given in evidence of what they affirm; for no footsteps or impressions of any such corruptions remain in any copies or memorials of the translation intended by them which are come down unto us. But this is sufficiently evident, that the reporter of this story apprehended an unanswerable appearance of a *plurality of subsistences* in the Deity, which they by whom the Trinity is denied, as we shall see immediately, know not what to make of or how to solve.

5. It is an easy way which some have taken, in the exposition this place, to solve the difficulty which appears in it. God, they say, in it speaks "more regio," "in a kingly manner," by the plural number. "Mos est," saith Grotius, "Hebraeorum de Deo, ut de rege loqui; reges res magnas agunt de consilio primorum, I Reg. 12:6, 2 Paral. 10:9; sic et Dens, 1 Reg. 22:20;" — " It is the manner of the Hebrews to speak of God as of a king; and kings do great things on the counsel of the chief about them." But the question is not about the manner of speaking among the Hebrews (whereof yet no instance can be given unto this purpose of their speaking in the first person, as here), but of the words of God himself concerning himself, and of the reason of the change of the expression constantly used before. God is king of all the world, of the whole creation; and if he had spoken "more regio" therein, he would have done it with respect unto the whole equally, and not signally with respect unto man. Besides, this "mos regius" is a custom of a much later date, and that which then was not, was not alluded unto. And the reason added why this form of speech is used, namely, "because kings do great things on the counsel of their principal attendants," requires, in the application, that God should consult with some created princes about the creation of man; which is an antiscriptural figment, and shall be immediately disproved. Least of all is any countenance given unto this interpretation from the place alleged, 1

Kings 22:20, — the application whereof unto this purpose is borrowed from Aben Ezra on this place, in his attempt to avoid this testimony given unto the Trinity, — "Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead ?" for as there is nothing spoken in the plural number to parallel this expression, so if that allegorical declaration of God's providential rule be literally pressed, Satan or a lying spirit must be esteemed to be one of the chiefs with whom he consulted. But "who hath directed the Spirit of the LORD, or being the man of his counsel hath taught him? With whom took he counsel, and who made him understand ?" [2300]Isaiah 40:13, 14.

The ancients unanimously agree that a *plurality of persons* in the Deity is here revealed and asserted; yea, the council of Sirmium, though dubious, yea, Arianising in their confession of faith, yet denounceth anathema unto any that shall deny these words, "Let us make man," to be the words of the Father to the Son, Socrat. lib. ii. cap. 26. Chrysostom lays the weight of his argument for it upon the change in the manner of expression before used; as he may do justly and solidly. "Apparet," saith Ambrose, "concilio Trinitatis creatum esse hominem." Neither have any of those who of late have espoused this evasion answered any of the arguments of the ancients for the sense we plead for, nor replied with any likelihood of reason unto their exceptions against that interpretation, which they took notice of as invented long ago. Theodoret, in his in Gen., quaest. 20, urgeth, "That if God used this manner of speech concerning himself merely to declare his mind 'more regio,' he would have done it always, at least he would have done it often." However, it would unavoidably have been the form of speech used in that kingly act of giving the law at Sinai, for that, if any thing, required the *kingly style* pretended; but the absolute contrary is observed. God, in that whole transaction with his peculiar people and subjects, speaks of himself constantly in the *singular number*.

6. But there are two sorts of persons who, with all their strength and artifices, oppose our exposition of this place, — namely, the Jews and the Socinians, with whom we have to do perpetually in whatever concerns the person and offices of Christ the Messiah, and in what any way relates thereunto. We shall, therefore, first consider what they offer to secure themselves from this testimony against their infidelity, and then further improve the words unto the end peculiarly designed. And although there is

a great coincidence in their pretensions, yet I shall handle them distinctly, that it may the better appear wherein the one receiveth aid and assistance from the other.

The Jews are at no small loss as to the intention of the Holy Ghost in this expression, and, if we may believe some of them, have been so from of old; for, as we observed before, they all affirm that these words were changed in the translation of the LXX., because they could not understand how they might be properly expressed without giving countenance unto polytheism. Philo, de Opificio Mundi, knows not on what to fix, but after a pretense of some reason for satisfaction, adds, Τὴν μὲν οὖν ἀληθεστάτην αἰτίαν Θεὸν ἀνάγκη μόνον εἰδέναι· — "The true reason hereof is known unto God alone." The reason which he esteems most probable is taken out of Plato in his Timaeus. "For whereas," he saith, "there was to be in the nature of man a principle of vice and evil, it was necessary that it should be from another author, and not from the most high God." But as the misadventure of such woful mistakes may be passed over in Plato, who had no infallible rule to guide him in his disquisition after truth, so in him, who had the advantage of the scriptures of the Old Testament, it cannot be excused, seeing this figment riseth up in opposition to the whole design of them. Some seek an evasion in the word נַעֲשֶׂה, which they would have to be the first person singular in Niphal, and not the first person plural in Kal. Having, therefore, a passive signification, the meaning is, that "homo factus est;" man, or Adam, was made in our image and likeness, — that is, of Moses and other men. Of this exposition of the words Aben Ezra says plainly, זה פירוש חסר לב, — " It is an interpretation for a fool;" and well refutes it from these words of God himself, Genesis 9:6, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man," with other considerations of the text. R. Saadias would have it that God spake these words על מנהג מלכין, "secundum consuetudinem regum;" or לשון רבי שכן מנהג המלכים, as Aben Ezra, "the plural number, which is the custom of kings." This we have already rejected, and must yet further call it into examination as it is managed by the Socinians.

But plainly the introduction of this style is comparatively modern, and which nothing but usage or custom hath given reverence or majesty unto.

Joseph Kimchi would have it that God speaks unto himself, or the earth, or the four elements; for as the soul of man was to be immediately created by God, so his body was to be from the earth, by a contemperation of the principles and qualities of it. And this man falls on the rock which he principally aims to avoid, — namely, an appearance of polytheism; for he makes the earth itself to be a god, that hath a principle of operation in itself, with a will and understanding whereby to exert it. Some of them affirm that in these words God consulted בפמליא של מעלה, "with his family above," — that is, the angels; which Aben Ezra on the place principally inclines unto. This must afterwards be distinctly examined. Others say it is God and בית דינו, "his house of judgment." ואם כתב אעשה אדם לא למדנו שהיא מדבר עם בית דינו אלא עם עצמו, says Kishi on the place; "If it had been written, 'Let me,' or 'I will make man,' he had not taught us that he spake unto his house of judgment, but unto himself;" whereof he shows the danger, from the expressions in the plural number. Hence some learned men have supposed that of old by "God and his house of judgment," they intended the persons of the holy Trinity, the Father, Word, and Spirit; but the explication which they frequently give of their minds herein will not allow us so to judge, at least as unto any of their post-Talmudical masters.

Other vain and foolish conjectures of theirs in this matter I shall not repeat. These instances are sufficient as to my present intention; for hence it is evident into what uncertainties they cast themselves who are resolved upon an opposition unto the truth. They know not what to fix upon, nor wherewith to relieve themselves. Although they all aim at the same end, yet what one embraceth another condemns, and those that are wisest reckon up all the conjectures they can think of together, but fix on no one as true or as deserving to be preferred before others; for error is nowhere stable or certain, but fluctuates like the isle of Delos, beyond the skill of men or devils to give it a fixation. And thus much also of their sense was necessary to be expressed, that it might appear whence and from whom the Socinians and those who syncretize with them in an opposition unto these testimonies given unto the Trinity do borrow their exceptions. Little or nothing have they to offer for the supportment of their cause but what they have borrowed from those avowed enemies of our Lord Jesus Christ.

7. I shall not in this instance collect the sentiments of the Socinians out of several of their writers, but take up with him who was one of the first that made it his professed design to elude all the testimonies of the Scriptures which are usually pleaded in the defence of the doctrine of the Trinity. This is Georgius Enjedinus, whose writings, indeed, gave the first countenance unto the Anti-trinitarian cause. And I shall the rather deal with him, because his perverse discourses, which were almost worn out of the world, are lately revived by a new edition, and are become common in the hands of many. Besides, indeed, there is little or nothing material added in this cause by his followers unto his sophistical evasions and exceptions, though what he came short of in the New Testament, being prevented by death, is pursued in his method by Felbinger. The title of his book is, "Explicationes locorum Veteris et Novi Testamenti, ex quibus Trinitatis dogma stabiliri solet;" whereof this under consideration is the second. To the argument from hence for a plurality of persons in the same divine essence, he gives sundry exceptions, mostly borrowed from the Jews, invented by them out of their hatred to the Christian faith. And both sorts of these men do always think it sufficient unto their cause to give in cavilling exceptions unto the clearest evidence of any divine testimony, not regarding to give any sense of their own which they will abide by as the true exposition of them.

He therefore first pleads:

> "Si ex hoc loquendi formula numerus et natura Dei venanda et colligenda est, dicimus primo, Non plus esse Trinitariis in hoc dicto ad tres Deitatis personas stabiliendas praesidii, quam gentibus et omnibus idololatris, ad sua multiplicia et numero carentia numina confirmandum. Illud enim 'Faciamus ad nostram,' etc., tam potest ad decem, centum, mille, quam ad tria referri, neque quidquam est futilius et ineptius quam sic argumentari. Hic dicuntur esse multi; ergo sunt tres, nam possunt esse viginti, triginta, quinquaginta, etc. Ergo siquid roboris in hoc argumento est, hoc tantum concludit Deos esse multos. Absit autem a nobis, certe abest a Mose ista prophanitas, ut multitudinem deorum, sacrarum literarum testimonio introducamus aut stabiliamus."

But these things are sophistical and vain. The *vanity* of the divine nature is always supposed in our disquisitions concerning the persons subsisting therein. And this is so clearly and positively asserted in the Scripture, particularly by Moses, [5804]Deuteronomy 6:4, besides that any apprehensions to the contrary are directly repugnant unto the light of nature, that no expressions can be observed to give the least countenance unto any other notion without ascribing direct contradictions unto it; which, if certain and evident, were a sufficient ground to reject the whole. No pretense, therefore, unto any imagination of a plurality of Gods can be made use of from these words. And the whole remaining sophistry of this exception lies in a supposition that we plead for three distinct persons in the Trinity from this place; which is false. That there is a plurality of subsistences in the divine nature we plead from hence; that these are three, neither more nor less, we prove from other places of Scripture without number. Many of these I have elsewhere vindicated[f2] from the exceptions of these men. Without a supposition of this plurality of persons, we say no tolerable account can be given of the reason of this assertion by them who acknowledge the unity of the divine nature; and we design no more but that therein there is *mutual counsel,* — which without a distinction of persons cannot be fancied. This whole pretense, therefore, founded on a vain and false supposition, that this testimony is used to prove a certain number of persons in the Deity, is altogether vain and frivolous.

He adds,

> “Secundo illud quodque hic perpendendum est, quod ex his Mosis verbis, non sequitur hoc, Deum, qui dixit ‘Faciamus,’ fuisse multiplicem, sive non unum fuisse locutum, sed hoc tantum, haec verba prolata coram pluribus. Unus ergo erat qui loquebatur, sed loquebatur praesentibus aliis. Hinc autem non immediate sequitur creatores hominis fuisse multos. Nam ad hanc conclusionem pluribus adhuc consequentiis opus est. Nimirum quaerendum statim est, quinam illi fuerint, quos Deus allocutus est. Deinde creaturae, an increati? Tum an illi quoque aequaliter cum Deo operati sint in formatione hominis.”

Although he only here proposeth in general what he intendeth afterwards to pursue in particular, yet something must be observed thereon, to keep

upright the state of our inquiry, which he endeavors perpetually to wrest unto his advantage. And, —

(1.) The invidious expressions which he makes use of, as "Deum multiplicem," and the like, are devoid of ingenuity and charity, nothing that answers them being owned by those whom he opposeth.

(2.) It follows not from our exposition of these words, nor is it by us asserted, that man had *many creators;* which he need not pretend that there is need of many consequences to prove, seeing none was ever so fond as to attempt the proof of it. I confess that expression in Job, עֹשָׂי אַיֵּה אֱלוֹהַּ, chap. 35:10, "Where is God my creators?" doth prove that he is in some sense *many* who made us. But whereas creation is a work proceeding from and an effect of the infinite properties of the one divine nature, our Creator is but one, although that one be equally Father, Son, and Spirit.

(3.) It is granted that *one speaks* these words, not more together; but he so speaks them that he takes those unto whom he speaks into the society of the same work with himself; neither is the speaker more or otherwise concerned in "Let US make," and "in OUR image," than are those unto whom he speaks. Neither, indeed, is it the speaking of these words before many concerned that Moses expresseth, but it is the concurrence of many unto the same work, with the same interest and concernment in it. And whosoever is concerned, speaking or spoken unto, in the first words, "Let us make," is no less respected in the following words, "in our image and likeness." They must, therefore, be of one and the same nature; which was to be represented in the creature to be made in their image. These things being premised, we may take a view of the pursuit and management of his particular exceptions: —

> "Atque quod ad primum attinet; quinam scilicet illi fuerint, quos sit Deus allocutus; primo dicere possumus non necessarium esse, propter hujusmodi locutionum formas, multa individua constituere. Saepe enim scriptores aliquem secum deliberantem et disceptantem introducunt. Ex quo non statim sequitur ei plures in consultatione adesse, sed tantum hoc, illum diligenter et solicite omnia considerare et expendere. Ita ergo Deus animal omnium

> praestantissimum creaturus, introducitur a Mose consultabundus ἀνθρωποπαθῶς more Scripturae. Unde tamen non sequitur, Deum in istud consilium alios adhibuisse."

Herein this author exceeds the confidence of the Jews, for they constantly grant that somewhat more than *one individual person* must be intended in these words, or no proper sense can be elicited from them. But the whole of this discourse, and what he would insinuate by it, is merely *petitio principii* accompanied with a neglect of the argument which he pretends to answer: for he only says that "one may be introduced, as it were, deliberating and consulting with himself," whereof yet he gives no instance, either from the Scripture or other sober writer, nor can give any parallel unto this discourse here used; but he takes no notice that the words directly introduce more than one consulting and deliberating among themselves about the creating of man in their image. And of a form of speech answering hereunto, where one only and absolutely is concerned, no instance can be given in any approved author.

Again, what he concludes from his arbitrary supposition, — namely, that hence "it doth not follow that God took counsel with others besides himself," — is nothing to the argument in hand; for we prove not hence that God consulted with others besides himself, nor would it be unto our purpose so to do. But this the words evince, that he who thus consulted with himself is in some respect more than one. But will this author abide by it, that this is the sense of the place, and that thus the words are to be interpreted? This he hath not the least thought of, nor will maintain that it is according unto truth: for so they can invent exceptions against our interpretation of any testimony of Scripture, they never care to give one of their own which they will adhere unto and defend; which way of dealing in sacred things of so great importance is very perverse and froward. Thus our author, here relinquishing this conjecture, proceeds : —

> "Sed demus esto, Deum hic aliquos compellasse, quaeramus quinam isti fuerint. Aiunt adversarii hos omnino debuisse esse sermonis et rationis capaces. Quomodo enim Deus alloqueretur eos, qui nec loqui nec intelligere possint; sed hoc non satis firmum est. Nam scimus Deum saepe etiam cum sensu et ratione carentibus colloquium instituere; ut in Esa. i., 'Audite, coeli.'"

Rather than this man would omit any cavil, he will make use of such as are sapless and ridiculous. God doth not here speak unto others that are not himself, but by speaking as he doth, he declares himself to exist in a plurality of persons, capable of mutual consultation and joint operation. But here he must be supposed, as some of the Jews fancied before him, to speak unto the inanimate parts of the creation, as he speaks in the first of Isaiah, "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth." But in such rhetorical apostrophes they are in truth men that are spoken unto, and that scheme of speech is used merely to make an impression on them of the things that are spoken. Apply this unto the words of God in the circumstance of the creation of man, and it will appear shamefully ridiculous. Wherefore he trusteth not unto this subterfuge, but proceeds to another: –

> "Sed demus etiam hoc, istos Deo praesentes fuisse rationales, quid postea? Addunt hos non fuisse creaturas, quia Deus non soleat in suum consilium adhibere creaturas; oportet ergo ut fuerint creatores, Filius cum Spiritu. Verum isti meminisse debebant, Scripturam sacrum nusquam Deum solitarium statuere, sed semper illi apparitores et agmina angelorum attribuere, ut ex visionibus prophetarum patet. Quod autem in consultationem non adhibeat creaturas Deus, hoc quoque ex eisdem visionibus refellitur. Nam etsi verum est Deum proprie cum nullo consulere, neque ullius egere consilio, tamen prophetae illum consultantem cum spiritibus representant, 3 Reg. xxii.; Esa, vi.; Job. i. Jam vero cure Adamus formabatur, extitisse angelos sequens historia Mosis docet. Ergo potuerunt illi Deo de condendo homine consultanti assistere, et coram illis potuit Deus haec protulisse."

This man seems willing to grant any thing but the truth. That which this whole discourse amounts unto is, that "God spake these words unto the angels," as the Jews pretend. So Jarchi says that God spake unto them בדרך משל, "by way of condescension," that they should not be troubled to see a creature made little less excellent than themselves. Others of them say that God spake unto them as he is attended with them, or as they wait upon his throne, which they call his "house of judgment;" and this sense Enjedinus and those that follow him fence withal. But this we have disproved already, so that it need not here be much insisted on. The Scripture expressly denies that God took counsel with any besides himself

in the whole work of the creation, <3802>Isaiah 40:12-14. Creation is a pure act of infinite monarchical sovereignty, wherein there was no use of any intermediate, instrumental causes, as there is in the government of the world. Wherefore, in *the course of providence,* God may be introduced as speaking with or unto the creatures whom he will employ in the execution thereof, and who attend his throne to receive his commands; but in the work of *creation, wherein none were to be employed,* this can have no place, nor can God be represented as consulting with any creatures in the creation without a disturbance of the true notion and apprehension of it. Besides, nothing of this nature can be proved, no not even with respect unto providential dispensations, from the places alleged. For Isaiah 6, it is the prophet only whom God in vision speaks unto, calling out his faith and obedience, "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" verse 8; but whereas he speaks both in the singular and plural number, "Whom shall *I* send, and who will go for *us ?"* there is also a plurality of persons in the same individual essence expressed; and unto the other persons besides the Father is this place applied by the Holy Ghost, <4812>John 12:41; <4028>Acts 28:26. In the other two places, 1 Kings 22, Job1, God is introduced speaking to the devil; which it is some marvel to find cited unto this purpose by persons of more sobriety and modesty than Enjedinus.

Again, man was made in the image and likeness of him that speaks and all that are as it were conferred with: "Let us make man in our image." But man was not made in the *image and likeness of angels,* but in the image and likeness of God, — that is, of God alone, as it is expressed in the next verse. And the image here mentioned doth not denote that which is made to answer another thing, but that which another is to answer unto: "Let us make man in our image," — that is, conformable unto our nature. Now, God and angels have not one common nature, that should be the exemplar and prototype in the creation of man. Their natures and properties are infinitely distant. And that likeness which is between angels and men doth no way prove that man was made in the image of angels, although angels should be supposed to be made before them; for more is required hereunto than a mere similitude and likeness, as one egg is like another, but not the image of another. A design of conforming one to another, with its dependence on that other, is required hereunto; so was man made in the image of God alone. But he further excepts: –

> “Sed quid tum, si omnia demus, Deum non creaturis praesentibus, neque illis esse allocutum his verbis? Sequitur ne eum qui locutus est cum illis quos allocutus est ejusdem esse naturae et essentiae? Hoc enim isti moliuntur. Certe fatuum est ita colligere. Ille qui loquitur et illi quos alloquitur sunt ejusdem essentiae. Sic enim serpens erit Eva, et homo diabelus et quid non?”

At whose door the censure of folly will rest, a little examination of this sophism will discover. For, whatever this man may imagine, it will certainly follow, that if God spake unto any, and they were not creatures, those to whom he spake were of the *same nature and essence with him that spake;* for God and creatures divide the whole nature of beings, and therefore if any be spoken unto that is not a creature, he is God, — unless he can discover a middle sort of being, that is not God nor a creature, neither the Maker nor made. Again, it is a wondrous vain supposition, that our argument from hence is taken from such a general proposition, “He that speaks and he that is spoken unto are of the same nature;” the absurdity whereof is obvious unto children. But here is such a speaking of *one* as declares him in some respect to be *more than one;* and they are all assumed into the same society in the forming of man in the likeness of that *one nature* whereof they are equally partakers. All these pretences, therefore, are at last deserted by our author, who betakes himself unto that which is inconsistent with them: —

> “Sed excipient fortasse, Mosem non tantum hoc significare, Deum esse allocutum praesentes illos, sed eos in societatem operis vocasse, et creationis participes fecisse? ‘Faciamus,’ inquit. At qui Creator est hominis, est etiam universi; qui universi, est solus et verus Deus. Hoc igitur jam diligentius excutiendum est; an Deus in hoc verbo ‘Faciamus,’ secum alios incluserit, atque creationem hominis aliis quoque communicavit? Nos enim dicimus, illud ‘Faciamus,’ etiamsi forma et voce sit plurale, tamen significatione et vi esse singulare; neque de ullo alio nisi de solo loquente, hoc est de Deo esse intelligendum.”

As he here at once overthrows all his former pretences, with some others also that he adds from the Jews in the dose of his discourse, sufficiently manifesting that it is not truth, or the true sense of the words, which he

inquires after, but merely how he may multiply captious exceptions unto the sense by us pleaded for, so now, when he comes to own a direct opposition unto it, his discourse, wherein he states the matter in difference, is composed of sophistical expressions; for whereas he pretends that our judgment is, that "God by these words calls in others besides himself unto himself into the society of this work," whereby it is proved that both he that speaks and they that are spoken unto are of the *same nature*, he doth but attempt to deceive the unwary reader. For we say not that God speaks unto others besides himself, nor calls in others to the work of creation; but God alone speaks in himself and to himself, because as he is one in essence, so as to personal subsistence there are three in one, as many other places of the Scripture do testify. And these three are each of them intelligent operators, though all working by that nature, which is one, and common to or in them all. Therefore are they expressed as speaking thus in the plural number, which could not be, in any congruity of speech, were he that speaks but one person as well as one in nature. And were not the doctrine of the Trinity clearly revealed in other places of Scripture, there could be no proper interpretation given of these words, so as to give no countenance unto polytheism; but that being so revealed and taught elsewhere, the interpretation of this place is facile and plain, according to the analogy thereof. But that one person alone is intended in these words, he proceeds to prove: —

> "Primo enim hoc omnibus linguis usitatum est, ut numero plurali, cum de se cum de aliis etiam singularibus passim sine discrimine utantur, sic Christus cum de se solo loqueretur. Job. 3:11, ait, 'Quod scimus loquimur, et quod videmus testamur;' in quibus verbis Christum de se pluraliter loqui sequentia ostendunt; 'si,' inquit, 'terrena dixi vobis.' Sic Deus de seipso solo, Esa 41:22, 'Accedant, et nuntient nobis quaecunque ventura sunt: et ponemus cor nostrum et sciemus novissima eorum, et quae ventura sunt indicate nobis.' Quin etiam illud observari potest, de eodem et unico singulari permixtim, nunc singularem nunc pluralem usurpari numerum. Et Esa 6:8, dicit Deus, 'Quem mittam, ant quis ibit pro nobis?' Ex quibus et similibus locis et loquendi usu vulgari apparet, posse verbum plurale de uno solo, recte intelligi et dici. Ergo

etiamsi Deus hic dicat ‘Faciamus,’ tamen tantundem est, ac dicerat ‘Faciam.’“

What he saith is so usual in *all languages*, that one speaking of himself should speak in the plural number, having respect unto no more than himself, nor letting any others into a concernment with himself in the things spoken, he can give no instance of in any language, out of any ancient approved author.

(1.) That phrase of speech is a novice in the use of speaking. Particularly it is a stranger unto the Scripture. As this author could not, no more can any of his successors, produce any one instance out of the Old Testament of any one, unless it were God alone, were he never so great or powerful, that spake of himself in the first person in the plural number. Aben Ezra himself on this place grants that no such instance can be given. He is therefore at once deprived of the Hebrew language, wherein yet alone his instances ought to be given, if he will argue from the use of speaking.

(2.) The places he cites relieve him not. ◁John 3:11▷, our Savior’s words respect not himself only, but his disciples also, who taught and baptized in his name, whose doctrine he would vindicate as his own. And as for what he adds afterwards, “If I have told you earthly things,” it relates directly unto that discourse which in his own person he had with Nicodemus, with respect whereunto he changeth his phrase of speech unto the singular number; which overthrows his pretensions. The words of the prophet, ◁Isaiah 41:22▷, are either spoken of God alone, or of God and the church, whom he called and joined with himself in bearing witness against idols and idolaters; and he may take his choice in whether sense he will admit of them. If they are spoken of God alone, we have another testimony to confirm our doctrine, that there must be, and is, a plurality of persons in the one singular, undivided nature of God; if of the church also, there is no exception in them unto our rule, that one person speaks of himself in the Scripture only in the singular number.

(3.) His other instance out of the same prophet, ◁Isaiah 6:8▷, “Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?” is home to his purpose of proving that the singular and plural numbers are used mixedly or promiscuously of one and the same. But who is that one? It is God alone. No such instance can be given in any other. And why are things so expressed by him and

concerning him? Who can give any tolerable reason but this alone, namely, because his nature is one and singular, but subsisting in more persons than one? And indeed this place, considered with its circumstances, and the allegations of it in the New Testament, doth infallibly confirm the truth we contend for. He hath not yet, therefore, attained to a proof that the word may be so used as he pretends; which, with these men, is enough to secure them from the force of any Scripture testimony. He adds, therefore:-

> "Secundo, Non solum posse, sed omnino necessarium esse, ut hic 'Faciamus,' singulare denotet individuum, inde probatur, quia si illa vox multitudinem in se includeret, nunquam ausi fuissent sacri scriptores eam immutare et in singularem numerum vertere. At prophetae, ipse Christus, et apostoli, ubicunque de hac creatione loquuntur eam uni et quidem in singulari usurpata voce attribuunt. Nam statim ipse Moses subjicit, 'Et creavit Deus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem suam.' Quod proxime dixerat 'Faciamus,' hic exprimit per 'Deus creavit;' quod ibi 'in imaginem nostram,' hic in singulari, 'ad imaginem suam.' Sic cap. 6:7, 'Delebo hominem quem creavi.' Et Christus, Matthew 19:4, 'Qui fecit hominem ab initio, masculum et foeminam fecit eos.' Marc. 10:6, 'Masculum et foeminam fecit eos Deus.' Paulus, Act, 17:26, 'Deus fecit ex uno omne genus humanum.' Act Colossians 3:10, 'Induentes novum hominem, eum qui renovatur ad agnitionem secundum imaginem illius qui creavit illum.' Cum ergo omnes testantur unicum esse illum, qui hominem creavit, sequitur etiam hoc loco per verbum 'Faciamus,' non nisi unum significari. Posse enim unum per plurale significari jam monstravimus."

Nothing can be more effectually pleaded in the behalf of the cause opposed by this man than what is here alleged by him in opposition thereunto; for it is certain that the holy writers would never have ascribed the creation of all unto one, and expressed it in the singular number, as they do most frequently, had it not been one God, one Creator, by whom all things were made. This is the position which he lays down as the foundation of his exception; and he was not so brutish as once to imagine that we believed there were more Creators, and so consequently more Gods, than one. But take this assertion also on the other side, namely, that

the holy writers would never have ascribed the creation unto more than one, unless that one in some sense or other had been more than so. Wherefore, they do not change, as is pretended, the plural expression into a singular; but the Holy Ghost, expressing the same thing, of making man in the image of God, sometimes expresseth it in the singular number, by reason of the singularity of the nature of God, which is the original of all divine operations, for God works by his nature; and sometimes in the plural, because of the plurality of persons in that nature: on which supposition these different expressions are reconciled, without which they cannot so be.

And all these exceptions or cavils are managed merely against the necessary use and signification of the word "Faciamus," "Let *us* make," in the plural number. What is alleged by the ancients and others, to clear the intention of the expression in this place particularly, he takes no notice of; for he makes no inquiry why, seeing, in the whole antecedent account of the work of creation, God is introduced speaking constantly in the singular number, here the phrase of speech is changed, and God speaks as consulting or deliberating, in the plural number. And he says not only, *"Let US make,"* but adds, *"In OUR image, and after OUR likeness."* To imagine this to be done without some peculiar reason, is to dream rather than to inquire into the sense of Scripture. And other reason besides what we have assigned, with any tolerable congruity unto the common use of speaking, cannot be given. But supposing that he hath sufficiently evinced his intention, he proceeds to give a reason of the use of this kind of speech, where one is spoken of in the plural number: –

> "Quae sit autem causa cur liceat per pluralem numerum significare unum, et quando hoc soleat fieri, variae afferri solent causae. Quidam censent fieri honoris gratia, ut de eminentibus et excellentibus personis pluraliter loquamur. Id usitatum esse linguae Hebraeae annotant docti; inter quos Cevallerius in sua syntaxi hunc tradit canonem. Quae dignitatem significant pluraliter usurpantur ad ampliorem honorem. Ut <06249>Joshua 24:19, 'Dii sancti ipse;' <02129>Exodus 21:29, 'Domini ejus,' pro dominus; <23904>Isaiah 19:4, 'In manu dominorum duri,' pro domini; <01423>Genesis 42:30, 'Domini terrae,' pro dominus. Imo hoc non tantum in Hebrea, sed in aliis quoque linguis esse usitatum, patet ex σχολ. Sophoclis, qui in

> OEdipo Coloneo [v. 1490] annotavit poetam dixisse, δοῦναί, pro δοῦναι, et addit scriptum esse κατὰ τιμὴν πληθυντικῶς, propter honorem seu dignitatem pluraliter."

We also grant that it is one who is here intended, only we say, he is not spoken of under that consideration, of being one. Nor is it enough to prove that the word may in the plural number be used in a singular sense, but that it is so in this place, seeing the proper importance of it is otherwise. Neither can that expression concerning God, [6249]Joshua 24:19, קְדֹשִׁים הוּא אֱלֹהִים, "Dii sancti ipse," be used *honoris gratia,* seeing it is no honor to God to be spoken of as *many Gods,* for his glory is that he is *one only.* It hath, therefore, another respect, namely, unto the persons in the unity of the same nature. I could easily give the reasons of all his other instances in particular, wherein men are spoken of, and manifest that they will yield him no relief; but this may suffice in general, that they are all speeches concerning others in the third person, and all our inquiry is concerning any one thus speaking of himself in the first person, whereof no one can be given. Wherefore our author, not confiding unto this his last refuge, betakes himself unto foolish imaginations of "God's speaking to the superior parts of the world, whence the soul of man was to be taken, and the inferior, whence his body was to be made;" to "a design for the instruction of men, how to use counsel and deliberation in great undertakings; to "a double knowledge in God, universal and particular;" — which are all of them rabbinical fopperies, evidently manifesting that he knew not what to confide in or rest upon as to the true cause of this expression, after he had resolved to reject that alone which is so.

8. The foundation of our intention from this place being thus cleared, we may safely build upon it. And that which hence we intend to prove is, that in the framing and producing the things which concern mankind, there were *peculiar, internal, personal transactions* between the Father, Son, and Spirit. The scheme of speech here used is in *genere deliberativo, — by* way of consultation. But whereas this cannot directly and properly be ascribed unto God, an anthropopathy must be allowed in the words. The mutual distinct actings and concurrence of the several persons in the Trinity are expressed by way of deliberation, and that because we can no otherwise determine or act. And this was peculiar in the work of the creation of man, because of an especial designation of him to the glory of

God as three in one. Neither could he have been created in the accidental image of God but with immediate respect unto the Son, as he was the essential image of the Father. The distinct personal actings of the Trinity, wherein the priesthood of Christ is founded, are not, I confess, contained herein; for these things preceded the consideration of the fall, whereby the image now proposed and resolved to be communicated unto man in his creation was lost, which Christ was designed to recover. But there is enough to confirm our general assertion, that such *distinct actings* there were with respect unto mankind; and the application hereof unto our present purpose will be directed in the ensuing testimonies. This, therefore, I have only laid down and proved, as the general principle which we proceed upon. Man was peculiarly created unto the glory of the Trinity, or of God as three in one. Hence in all things concerning him there is not only an intimation of those distinct subsistences, but also of their distinct actings with respect unto him. So it was eminently in his creation; his making was the effect of special counsel. Much more shall we find this fully expressed with respect unto his restoration by the Son of God.

9. The same truth is further revealed and confirmed, [20]Proverbs 8:22-31,

> "The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth: while as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When he prepared the heavens, I was there: when he set a compass upon the face of the depth: when he established the clouds above: when he strengthened the fountains of the deep: when he gave to the sea his decree, that the waters should not pass his commandment: when he appointed the foundations of the earth: then was I by him, as one brought up with him: and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him; rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth; and my delights were with the sons of men."

We must first secure this testimony against those who have attempted to deprive the church of God of its use and advantage, and then improve it

unto our present purpose. In the ancient church none questioned but that the Wisdom which here discourseth is the Son of God; only the Arians greatly endeavored to corrupt the sense of one passage in it, and thereby to wrest the whole to give countenance unto their heresy. Those of late who agree with them in an opposition unto the same truth, upon other principles, observing how they failed in their attempt, do leave the sense of particular passages unquestioned, and call into question the whole subject of the discourse; wherein, if they prevail, the sense of particular places must be accommodated unto what they substitute in the room thereof.

It is Wisdom that speaks and is spoken of. This we believe to be him who is the Wisdom of God, even his eternal Son. This they will not grant, although they are not agreed what it is that is intended. A property, say some, of the divine nature; the exercise of divine wisdom in making the world, say others; the wisdom that is in the law, say the Jews; or, as some of them, the wisdom that was given unto Solomon, — and of their mind have been some of late. With the Arians I shall not much contend, because their heresy seems to be much buried in the world, although some of late have endeavored to give countenance unto their opinions, or unto them who maintained them, Sand. Hist. Ecclesiastes Enucl. lib. 3. It was the 22d verse which they principally insisted on; for whereas it was granted between them and the Homoousians that it is the Son of God which is here spoken of, they hence pleaded for his creation before the world, or his production ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, and that there was [a time] when he was not. This they did from these words, יְהוָה קָנָנִי רֵאשִׁית דַּרְכּוֹ; which words were rendered by the LXX., or the Greek translation then in common use, Ὁ Κύριος ἔκτισέ με, ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ· — “Dominus condidit me initium viarum suarum.” And this is followed by all the old translations. בראני, says the Targum; and the Syriac, “Creavit me;” and the Arabic follows them; only the Vulgar Latin reads, “Possedit,” “Possessed me.” On this corrupt translation the Arians bare themselves so high as to provoke their adversaries unto a decision of the whole controversy between them by the sentence of this one testimony. But the corruption of the common translation is long since confessed. Aquila and Theodotion both render the word by ἐκτήσατο, “he possessed.” Nor doth קָנָה in any place, or on any occasion, signify to make or create, or any thing of the

like importance. Its constant use is either to acquire and obtain, or to possess and enjoy. That which any one hath, which is with him, which belongs unto him and is his own, he is קֹנֵה, the possessor of. So is the Father said to possess Wisdom, because it was his, with him, even his eternal Word or Son. No more is intended hereby but what the apostle more clearly declares, (4801)John 1:1, 2,᾽Εν ἀρχῇ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν· — "In the beginning the Word was with God." But with these I shall not contend.

10. The Jews, and those who in the things concerning the person of Christ derive from them, and who borrow their weapons to combat his deity, we must not pass by; for an examination of their pretences and sophisms in this cause, at least occasionally as they occur unto us, I do not guess, but know to be necessary.

Grotius on this place tells us, "Haec de ea sapientia quae in lege apparet, exponunt Hebraei ;" — "The Hebrews expound these things of that wisdom which is seen in the law." And as to many of them this information is true. Whereunto he adds of his own, "Et sane ei si non soli, at praecipue, haec attributa conveniunt ;" — "And thereunto, indeed, the things here attributed unto wisdom do agree, if not only, yet principally;" which whether it be so or no, the ensuing examination will evince.

The Jews, then, affirm that the wisdom here intended is the wisdom of the law, as in the law, or the wisdom that God used in giving the law; but how the things here ascribed unto Wisdom can belong unto the law given on Sinai is hard to conceive. To take off this difficulty, they tell us that the law was one of the seven things which God made before the creation of the world; which they prove from this place, verse 22, "The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way," yea, and that, as they say, two thousand years before creation, signified by the two alephs in that sentence; Midrash Bamidmar, in cap. 8. But Aben Ezra, in his preface unto his Annotations on the Bible, tells us that they are mystical allegories, and not true in their literal sense; as doth also the author of Nizachon, Sec. Beresh. sect. 3, who likewise informs us that these things are said to be made before the world, לפי גדולות וטובות, "because of their excellency and worth," whence they were first thought upon. But these figments we need not trouble ourselves about. Their apprehension that the wisdom intended

is that of the law, which Grotius gives countenance unto, shall be examined. The Socinians are not solicitous what the things mentioned are ascribed unto, so they can satisfy themselves in their exceptions unto our ascription of them unto the Son of God. I shall, therefore, first confirm our exposition of the place, and then remove their exceptions out of our way.

11. First, It is an *intelligent person* that is here intended; for all sorts of personal properties are ascribed unto it. It cannot, therefore, be a mere essential property of the divine nature, nor can the things spoken concerning it with respect unto God be any way verified in his essential attributes. Much less is it wisdom in general, or wisdom in man, as by some it is expounded, no one thing here mentioned being in any tolerable sense applicable thereunto. For, —

(1.) In the whole discourse Wisdom speaks as an *intelligent person,* whereof almost every verse in the whole chapter is an instance.

(2.) *Personal authority and power* are assumed by it: Verses 15, 16, "By me kings reign, and princes decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth."

(3.) *Personal promises* upon duties to be performed towards it, due unto God himself: Verse 17, "I love them that love me, and those that seek me early shall find me;" which is our respect unto God, Psalm 63:1, "O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee," and which is elsewhere often expressed.

(4.) *Personal divine actions:* Verses 20, 21, "I lead in the way of righteousness, in the midst of the paths of judgment: that I may cause those that love me to inherit substance; and I will fill their treasures." Verses 30, 31, "I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him; ..... and my delights were with the sons of men."

(5.) *Personal properties;* as eternity, verses 23-25, "I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was;" wisdom, verse 14, "Counsel is mine, and sound wisdom; I am understanding; I have strength."

Secondly, The name of Wisdom is the name of the Son, who is the wisdom of God. For the Wisdom mentioned, chap. 9:1, the Jews themselves

confess that it is one of the מדות, or distinct properties that are in the divine ישות, that is, substance or essence; whereby the Son of God alone can be intended.

Thirdly, The things here spoken of Wisdom are all of them, or at least the principal, expressly elsewhere attributed unto the Son, verse 11, <3108>Philippians 3:8; verse 15, <6606>Revelation 19:16; verse 22, <4801>John 1:1-3; verses 23, 24, <5015>Colossians 1:15-17; verse 30, <4814>John 1:14; verse 32, <6224>Revelation 22:14.

Fourthly, The relation of the Wisdom that speaks unto God declares it to be his eternal Word or Son: “I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him;” as he did in whom his soul is always well pleased.

And, lastly, as we shall further see, they are the eternal transactions of the Father and Son that are here described, which are capable of no other interpretation.

12. It is not my design to plead here the eternal existence of the Son of God antecedent unto his incarnation. I have done it also at large elsewhere. But because the faith thereof is the foundation of what I shall further offer concerning the original of his priesthood, the testimonies produced unto that purpose must be vindicated from the exceptions of the professed adversaries of that fundamental truth; and these, as to this place, are summed up and put together by Enjedinus. And his manner is, as was before observed (wherein also he is followed by all those of his way and persuasion), to multiply sophistical exceptions, that so by any means they may distract the mind of the reader and render him uncertain; and therefore they consider not whether what they offer be true or no, but commonly their evasions contradict and overthrow one another. But so the truth may be rejected, they regard not what is received. First, therefore, he lays his exception to the whole matter, and affirms that it is not wisdom, but prudence, that speaks these words, and is the subject of the whole discourse: —

> “Quod ad primum attinet, ne illud quidem indubitatum est, verba praescripta a sapientia dici. Si enim versio Pagnini, Merceri, et textus Hebraicus consulatur, apparebit verba illa proferri ab intelligentia vel prudentia, quae in hoc capite tum conjuncte, tum

separatim, cum sapientia ponitur, ut apparet ex ver. 1 et 14, in cujus posteriori parte incipit intelligentia de se loqui, Nam, ver. 14, secundum Pagninum haec est interpretatio, ‘Penes me est consilium et sapientia;’ et hucusque loquitur de se sapientia. Postea sequitur, ‘Ego sum intelligentia, mea est fortitudo,’ etc. Ita ut sequentia omnia ad finem capitis ab intelligentia proferantur. Cum ergo Paulus Christum non intelligentiam sed sapientiam vocet, et verba praescripta ab intelligentia proferantur, sequitur locum hunc ad Christum non pertinere.”

What those names of Pagnin, Mercer, and the Hebrew text, are produced for, I cannot well conjecture. Both in the original and in the versions of those learned men the context is as clear unto our purpose as in any other translation whatever. And the view of the text will ease us of this forlorn exception. The comparing of the first verse with the fourteenth gives no countenance unto it; for, —

(1.) In verse 1, the mention of תְּבוּנָה is not the introduction of a new person or thing, but another name of the same person or thing, as all expositors agree, whatever they apply the words unto.

(2.) The words תְּבוּנָה, verse 1, and בִּינָה, verse 14, both rendered “understanding,” and both from the same root, are yet not absolutely the same, so that several things may be intended by them.

(3.) The whole context makes it plain that it is Wisdom which speaks those words, verse 14, לִי־עֵצָה וְתוּשִׁיָּה אֲנִי בִינָה לִי גְבוּרָה. The preceding words are, “I wisdom dwell with prudence, ... and the evil way, and the froward mouth, do I hate,” verses 12, 13; whereon it follows, “Counsel is mine, and sound wisdom” (or “substance”): “I am understanding; I have strength” As in the beginning Wisdom says, לִי־עֵצָה, so in the close, by a continuation of the same form of speech, אֲנִי בִינָה לִי גְבוּרָה is a defective expression, and there is no verb following to be regulated by בִּינָה. Wherefore, according to the perpetual use of that language, the verb substantive is to be supplied, as it is in our translation, “I am understanding.” Understanding, therefore, cannot be the person speaking, but a *descriptive adjunct* of him that speaks. There is the same expression concerning Wisdom, verse 12, אֲנִי חָכְמָה “I wisdom;”

but it is not defective because of the verb following, שָׁכַנְתִּי, “have dwelt,” or “do dwell.” Supply the verb substantive here, where there is no defect, and the whole sense will be corrupted; but in this place, if it be omitted, there will be no sense remaining. Neither is אֲנִי בִינָה of any other signification than לִי גְבוּרָה, “I have” (or “am”) “understanding,” and “I have strength.” This plea, therefore, evinceth nothing but the boldness of them that use it. He proceeds to another:-

> “Deinde hic sapientiam pro substantiva et persona esse accipiendam, non aliunde probari potest aut solet, quam quod hic loqui et clamare dicitur, atque actiones quaedam ei attribuuntur. At id usitatissimum in sacris est, ut etiam accidentibus actiones adscribantur per prosopopoeiam. Sic misericordia et pax de coelo prospicere, se mutuo osculari dicuntur. Et ne longe abeamus; hic prudentia seu intelligentia vociferare, stare in semitis, clamare ad portas urbium dicitur. Neque tamen quisquam ita stolidus est ut non intelligat, misericordiam, pacem, et prudentiam esse accidentia et in his loquendi formulis prosopopoeiam non agnoscat.”

How we prove a person to be here intended, that is, the eternal Word of God, hath been declared. There are other considerations which evince it besides that here mentioned. But this prosopopoeia, or fiction of a person, is of great use to the Antitrinitarians. By this one engine they presume they can despoil the Holy Ghost of his deity and personality. Whatever is spoken of him in the Scripture, they say it is by a prosopopoeia, or the fiction of a person, those things being assigned unto a quality or an accident which really belong unto a person only. But as to what concerns the Holy Spirit, I have elsewhere taken this engine out of their hands, and cast it to the ground, so that none of them alive will erect it again. Here they make use of it against the deity of Christ, as they do also on other occasions. I do acknowledge there is such a scheme of speech used by rhetoricians and orators, whereof some examples occur in the Scripture. Unto a thing which is not a person, that is sometimes ascribed which is indeed proper only to a person; or a person who is dead or absent may be introduced as present and speaking. But yet Quintilian, the great master of the art of oratory, denies that by this figure speech can be ascribed unto that which never had it. “Nam certe,” saith he, “sermo fingi non potest, ut

non personae sermo fingatur." If you feign speech, you must feign it to be the speech of a person, or one endowed with a power of speaking. And it is hard to find an instance of such an attribution of speech unto things inanimate in good authors, unless it be where, by another figure, they introduce countries or cities speaking or pleading for themselves; wherein, by a metonymy, the inhabitants of them are intended. But such an ascription is not to be found in the Scripture at all; for a prosopopoeia, or fiction of a person, is a figure quite distinct from all sorts of allegories, pure or mixed, apologues, fables, parables; wherein, when the scheme is evident, any thing may be introduced speaking, — like the trees in the discourse of Jotham, Judges 9. The instance of mercy and peace looking down from heaven and kissing each other, is mixedly figurative. The foundation is a metonymy of the cause for the effect, or rather of the adjunct for the cause, and the prosopopoeia is evident. But that a person should be introduced speaking in a continued discourse, ascribing to himself all *personal properties,* absolute and relative, all sorts of *personal actions,* and those the very same which in sundry other places are ascribed unto one certain person, as all the things here mentioned are unto the Son of God, who yet is no person, never was a person, nor representeth any person, without the least intimation of any figure therein, or any thing inconsistent with the nature of things and persons treated of, and that in a discourse didactical and prophetical, is such an enormous, monstrous fiction, as nothing in any author, much less in the Old or New Testament, will give the least countenance unto.

There are in the Scripture, allegories, apologues, parables, but all of them so plainly, evidently, and professedly such, and so unavoidably requiring a figurative exposition from the nature of the things themselves (as where stones are said to hear, and trees to speak), that there is no danger of any mistake about them, nor difference concerning their figurative acceptation. And the only safe rule of ascribing a figurative sense unto any thing or expression in the Scripture, is when the nature of things will not bear that which is proper; as where the Lord Christ calls himself a door and a vine, and says that bread is his body. But to make allegories of such discourses as this, founded in the fiction of persons, is a ready way to turn the whole Bible into an allegory, — which may be done with as much ease and probability of truth. He further excepts: —

> ‘‘Quod secundo loco contendunt, hic nihil figurate, sed omnia proprie dici, nimis absurdum est. Nam etiamsi daremus hic sapientiam esse personam quandam, quam ipsi λόγον appellant; tamen certum esset illum tempore Solomonis in plateis non clamasse, nec cum hominibus hilariter conversatum esse, nec domum aedificasse, excidisse septem columnas, victimas obtulisse, miscuisse vinum, et caetera quae hic recitantur proprie fecisse. Alias debuerunt fateri, Christum ab aeterno fuisse incarnatum, quando quidem hae actiones proprie non possunt nisi homini jam nato competere. Itaque et impudentis et indocti est negare hanc orationem Solomonis esse figuratam.”

He names not who they are who say no expressions in this discourse are figurative. Neither doth this follow upon a denial that the whole is founded in the fiction of a person; for a true and real person may speak things figuratively, and sometimes it is necessary that so he should do. These men will not deny God to be a person, nor yet that he often speaketh of himself and his works figuratively. The same doth Wisdom also here, in the declaration of some of his works. But that which animates this exception is a false supposition, that the eternal Word cannot be said to do or act any thing but what he doth *immediately in his own person,* and that as incarnate. What God doth by the ministry of others, that he also doth himself. When he gave the law by the ministry of angels, he gave the law himself; and when he speaks by the prophets, he is everywhere said to speak himself. That, therefore, which was done in the days of Solomon by the command, appointment, authority, and assistance of Wisdom, was done then by Wisdom itself. And so all things here ascribed unto it, some properly, some figuratively, were done by the Word in the means by him appointed. In the ministry of the priests, Levites, prophets, teachers of the law, inviting all sorts of persons unto the fear of the Lord, he performed the most of them; and the remainder of the things intended he effected in his ordinances and institutions of divine worship. Besides, there is a *prophetical scheme* in these words. It is here declared not only what Wisdom then did, but especially what it should do, namely, in the *days of the gospel;* for the manner of the prophets is to express things future as present or past, because of the certainty of their

accomplishment. And these things they spake of the coming of Christ in the flesh. See 1 Peter 1:11, 12, 3:19.

But utterly to remove this pretense of prosopopoeias and figures, it need only to be observed, which none will deny, that the Wisdom that speaks here, chap. 8, is the same that speaks, chap. 1, from verse 20 unto the end. And if Wisdom there be not a person, and that a divine person, there is none in heaven; for to whom or what else can those words be ascribed which Wisdom speaks, verses 23-26, 28:

> "Turn you at my reproof: behold, I will pour out my Spirit unto you, I will make known my words unto you. Because I have called, and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof: I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh. Then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer; they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me."

If these things express not a person, and that a divine person, the Scripture gives us no due-apprehension of any thing whatever. Who is it that pours out the Holy Spirit? Whom is it that men sin against in refusing to be obedient? Whom is it that in their distress they call upon, and seek early in their trouble? The whole Scripture declares unto whom, and unto whom alone, these things belong and may be ascribed.

After an interposition of some things nothing unto the purpose, he yet puts in three more exceptions unto this testimony to the eternal personal existence of this Wisdom; as, —

> "Praeterea haec sapientia de qua agit Solomon, loquitur, docet, instituit homines. At Jesus Christus postremis tantum diebus, teste apostolo ad Hebrews 1, locutus est hominibus; ergo non aetate Solomonis."

The apostle says not that Jesus Christ spake *only* in the latter days, Hebrews 1, but that God in the last days spake unto us in his Son. And the immediate speaking unto us by the Son in the last days, as he was incarnate, hinders not but that he spake before by his Spirit in the prophets, as the apostle Peter affirms him to have done, 1 Epist. 1:11. And by this Spirit did he speak, — that is, teach and instruct men, — in

the days of Solomon, and from the foundation of the world, [40]1 Peter 3:18-20.

> “Denique prophetia ilia, Esa. 42:1, 2, ‘Ecce servus meus quem elegi, non clamabit, neque audiet aliquis in plateis vocem ejus,’ applicatur Christo, [40]Matthew 12:18, 19. At haec sapientia dicitur clamasse in plateis. Itaque falsum est hanc sapientiam Solomonis fuisse Jesum Christum.”

A man of gravity and learning ought to have been ashamed of such a puerile cavil. The prophet Isaiah, setting out the meekness and peaceableness of the Lord Christ in the discharge of his office, with his tenderness and condescension towards the poorest and meanest that come unto him, expresseth it, among others, by these words, “He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street;” intending no more but that he should do nothing by way of strife, contention, or violence, in private or public places. And this prophecy is applied unto him by Matthew at that very season when “great multitudes followed him” in the streets and fields, whom he taught and healed, [40]Matthew 12:15-17. Hence this man would conclude, that because Wisdom is said to cry in the streets, — that is, to instruct men in public places, which he did formerly by his Spirit, and in the days of his flesh in his own person, — the Son of God cannot be intended. Yet he further adds: —

> “Postremo de sapientia ista, non dicitur quod sit ab aeterno genita; sed tantum ut in Hebraeo habetur a seculo formata; quod longe aliud significat, quam ab aeterno gigni. Et potest aliquid a seculo, hoc est a mundi creatione vel etiam ante illam extitisse; inde tamen non sequitur esse aeternum.”

He tells us not where in the Hebrew text wisdom is said to be “formata a seculo;” nor is there any such passage in the context. It says, indeed, verse 23, מֵעוֹלָם נְסַכְתִּי; which words of themselves do not absolutely and necessarily declare eternity, though no other expression or antecedent eternity be commonly made use of; but as this מֵעוֹלָם is here particularly explained to denote the existence of Wisdom before the whole creation or any part of it, as it is at large in the whole ensuing discourse, especially verses 25, 26, it doth necessarily denote eternity, nor can it be otherwise

expressed. And although we do not particularly prove the relation of the Son to the Father by eternal generation from this place, yet as Wisdom is not said here to be formed or created, so the word used verse 25, חוֹלָלְתִּי, which we have rendered, “I was brought forth,” doth more than intimate that generation.

This being the whole of what the enemies of the sacred Trinity have to object unto our application of this discourse to the eternal Word or Son of God, we may upon its removal proceed unto the improvement of this testimony unto our present design.

13. A personal transaction, before the creation of the world, between the Father and the Son, acting mutually by their one Spirit, concerning the state and condition of mankind, with respect unto divine love and favor, is that which we inquire after, and which is here fully expressed; for the Wisdom or Word of God having declared his eternal existence with the Father and distinction from him, manifests withal his joint creation of all things, especially his presence with God when he made עַפְרוֹת תֵּבֵל רֹאשׁ, verse 26, “the highest part of the dusts of the habitable world ;” that is, הריאשון אדם, “The first Adam,” as Jarchi interprets it, and that not improbably. Then he declares that he was אֶצְלוֹ,”by him,” with him, before him, verse 30; that is, πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, <430101>John 1:1, 2. And he was with him, אָמוֹן, “Nutricius,” “One brought up with him.” The word seems to be of a passive signification, or the participle Pahul, and is of the masculine gender, though referring unto חָכְמָה, Wisdom, which speaks of itself and is of the feminine, and that because it is a person which is intended; such constructions being not infrequent in the Hebrew, where the adjunct agrees with and respects the nature of the subject, rather than the name or some other name of the same thing. See <010407>Genesis 4:7. The word may have various significations, and is accordingly variously rendered by interpreters. The Chaldee render it מהימן, that is, “faithful,” “I was faithful with him;” and the LXX., ἁρμόζουσα, “framing, forming,” that is, all things with him. So also Ralbag on the place expounds it actively, “One nourishing all things,” as Jarchi doth passively, עמו גדלה, brought up with him;” which sense of the words our translation follows. And it is used unto that purpose, <250405>Lamentations 4:5, תּוֹלָע הָאֱמֻגִים

עֲלֵי, “brought up in scarlet.” And although it may be not undecently taken in an active sense, yet I rather judge it to be used passively, “nutricius, alumnus,” one that is in the care and love of another, and to be disposed by him.

And we may inquire in what sense this is spoken of the Son with respect unto the Father. The foundation of the allusion lies in the eternal mutual love that is between the Father and the Son. Thereunto is added the consideration of the natural dependence of the Son on the Father, — compared unto the love of a father unto a son, and the dependence of a son on his father. Therefore most translations, with respect unto this allusion, supply “as” to the words, “As one brought up.” Again, אָמוֹן, “alumnus,” “one brought up,” is always so with and unto some especial end or purpose, or to some work and service. And this is principally here intended. It is with respect unto the work that he had to accomplish that he is called “Alumnus Patris,” “One brought up of the Father.” And this was no other but the work of the redemption and salvation of mankind, the counsel whereof was then between the Father and the Son. In the carrying on of that work the Lord Christ everywhere commits himself and his undertaking unto the care, love, assistance, and faithfulness of the Father, whose especial grace was the original thereof, Psalm 22:9-11, 19, 20; Isaiah 50:7-9. And in answer hereunto, the Father promiseth him, as we shall see afterwards, to stand by him, and to carry him through the whole of it; and that because it was to be accomplished in such a *nature as* stood in need of help and assistance. Wherefore, with respect unto this work, he is said to be אֶצְלוֹ אָמוֹן, “before him,” as one whom he would take care of, and stand by with love and faithfulness, in the prosecution of the work which was in their mutual counsel, when he should be clothed with that nature which stood in need of it.

14. With respect hereunto he adds, וָאֶהְיֶה שַׁעֲשׁוּעִים יוֹם יוֹם; — “And was delights every day.” There are ineffable mutual delights and joys in and between the persons of the sacred Trinity, arising from that infinite satisfaction and complacency which they have in each other from their respective in-being, by the participation of the same nature; wherein no small part of the blessedness of God doth consist. And by this word that peculiar delight which a father hath in a son is expressed: Jeremiah

31:20, יֶלֶד שַׁעֲשׁוּעִים; — “A pleasant child, a child of delights.” But the delights here intended have respect unto the works of God *ad extra*, as a fruit of that eternal satisfaction which ariseth from the counsels of God concerning the sons of men. This the next verse makes manifest, “Rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth, and my delights with the sons of men;” for after he had declared the presence of Wisdom with God before the first creation (which is a notation of eternity), and its cooperation with him therein, he descends to manifest the especial design of God and Wisdom with respect unto the children of men. And here such an undertaking on the part of the Son is intimated, as that the Father undertakes the care of him and his protection when he was to be humbled into the form of a servant; in the prospect whereof he delighted in him continually.

So he expresseth it, <2340>Isaiah 42:1-7, “Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth.” (רָצְתָה נַפְשִׁי, the same with יוֹם שַׁעֲשׁוּעִים לוֹ יוֹם. See <4012>Matthew 12:18, 17:5; <4906>Ephesians 1:6.) “I have put my Spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law. Thus saith God the LORD, he that created the heavens, and stretched them out; he that spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein: I the LORD have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house.” This is the delight of the Father, and [such is] his presence with the Son in his work, whereof an eternal prospect is here presented. In answer whereunto the Son delights in him, whose delight he was, בְּכָל עֵת מְשָׂחֶקֶת לְפָנָיו, “rejoicing with exultation,” with all manner of expressions of joy; for the word properly signifies an outward expression of an inward delight,— the natural overflowings of an abounding joy. And what is this delight of the Son in answering the delight of the Father in him, with

respect unto the work he had to do, the psalmist declares, <19907>Psalm 40:7, 8,

> “Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart.”

This מְגִלַּת־סֵפֶר, this “volume of the book,” which our apostle calls κεφαλίδα βιβλίου, “the beginning” (or “head”) “of the book,” <19007>Hebrews 10:7, is no other but the counsel of God concerning the salvation of the elect by Jesus Christ, enrolled as it were in the book of life, and thence transcribed into the beginning of the book of truth, in the first promise given unto Adam after the fall. This counsel being established between Father and Son, the Son with respect thereunto rejoiceth continually before God, on the account of that delight which he had to do and accomplish his will, and in our nature assumed to answer the law of mediation which was prescribed unto him.

15. For, this being declared to be the mutual frame of God and his Wisdom towards one another, Wisdom proceeds to manifest with what respect towards outward things it was that they were so mutually affected: Verse 31, “Rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth, and my delights were with the sons of men.” That the things here spoken of were transacted in eternity, or before the creation, is evident in the context. The eternal counsels, therefore, and purposes of God and Wisdom, with respect unto the sons of men, are here expressed. The Word was now “foreordained,” even “before the foundation of the world,” unto the work of mediation and redemption, <60120>1 Peter 1:20; and many of the sons of men were “chosen in him” unto grace and glory, <490104>Ephesians 1:4; and the bringing of them unto that glory whereunto they were chosen was committed unto him, as the captain of their salvation. This work, and the contemplation of it, he now delights in, because of that eternity of divine glory which was to ensue thereon. And because he was designed of the Father hereunto, and the work which he had to accomplish was principally the work of the Father, or the fulfilling of his will and the making effectual of his grace, wherein he sought his glory and not his own primarily, <430718>John 7:18, he speaketh of him as a distinct person, and the sovereign Lord of the whole. He did it בְּתֵבֵל אַרְצוֹ, “in the world of his earth.” And the same word which he

used to express his frame towards God, מְשֹׂחֲקֶת, verse 30, “rejoicing, exulting,” he useth here in reference unto his work, to intimate that it was on the same account that he is said to rejoice before the Father and in the habitable part of his earth; that is, on account of the work he had undertaken. So also he expresseth his delight in the children of men, because of the concernment of the glory of God therein, by שַׁעֲשֻׁעִים, the same word whereby he declares the Father’s delight in himself with respect unto his work.

And these things cannot refer unto the first creation, seeing they regard בְּנֵי כאָדָם, “the children of men,” the sons or posterity of him who was at first singly created. And these things are revealed for our consolation and the strengthening of our faith, whereunto they may be improved; for if there were such mutual delights between the Father and the Son in the counsel and contrivance of the work of our redemption and salvation, and if the Son so rejoiced in the prospect of his own undertaking unto that end, we need not doubt but that he will powerfully and effectually accomplish it. For all the difficulties of it lay open and naked under his eye, yet he rejoiced in the thoughts of his engagement for their removal and conquest. He now saw the law of God established and fulfilled, the justice of God satisfied, his glory repaired, Satan under his feet, his works destroyed, sin put an end unto, with all the confusion and misery which it brought into the world, — all matters of everlasting joy. Here we place the first spring of the priesthood of Christ, the first actings of God towards man for his reparation. And it is expressed by the *mutual delight* of the Father and Son in the work and effect of it, whereunto the Son was designed; and this was intimate love, grace, complacency, and infinite wisdom. God foreseeing how the designed effect of love and grace in the recovery of mankind by the interposition of his Son would issue in his own eternal glory, was pleased therewith and rejoiced therein; and the Son, considering the object of his love and the peculiar glory set before him, delighted in the counsel of the Father. Wherefore the foundation of Christ’s priesthood, herein designed, was in love, grace, and wisdom, though in its exercise it respect holiness and justice also.

16. And this also seems to be expressed by the psalmist, ◂910Psalm 2:7,

> “I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.”

The direct sense and importance of these words hath been declared in our Exposition on [Hebrews 1:5, 6]; and the testimony that is given in them unto the divine nature of Jesus Christ I have also formerly vindicated, Vindiciae Evangelicae; [f3] and I have in like manner elsewhere declared the perverse iniquity of some of the later Jewish masters, who would apply this psalm singly to David, without any respect unto the Messiah. This Rashi confesseth that they do on purpose to oppose the “heretics” or Christians. But this is contrary to the conceptions and expositions of all their ancient doctors, and the express faith of their church whilst it continued; for from this place they constantly acknowledged that the Messiah was to be the Son of God, — or rather, that the Son of God was to be the Messiah. Hence was that inquiry of the high priest, [Matthew 26:63],

> “I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God.”

According to the faith of their church, he takes it for granted that “the Christ” and “the Son of God” were the same. The same confession on the same principle made Nathanael, [John 1:49], “Thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel.” And Peter’s confession, [Matthew 16:16], [John 6:69], “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,” was nothing but a due application of the faith of the Judaical church unto the person of our Savior; which was all that he then called for. “Unless,” saith he, “ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.” And this faith of the church was principally built on this testimony, where God expressly calls the Messiah his Son, and that on the account of his eternal generation.

So Maimonides, Jarchi himself, and Kimchi, do all confess that their ancients interpreted this psalm of the Messiah. The words of Jarchi are plain: דרשו את הענין על מלך המשיח ולפי משמעו ולתשובת המינים נכון לפותרו לפותרו על דוד עצמו רבותינו; — “Our masters expounded this psalm” (or, “the construction of it”) “concerning the King Messiah; but as the words sound, and that an answer may be returned unto the heretics, it is expedient to interpret it of David himself.”

His confession is plain, that their ancient doctors looked on this psalm as a prophecy of the Messiah, as is also expressly acknowledged by Maimonides and Kimchi in their expositions. But as to these words, ולתשובת המינים, "and for an answer unto the heretics," the reader will not find them either in the edition of Basil or of Venice, — that is, of the Bible with their Masoretical criticisms and rabbinical annotations, — being expunged by such as had the oversight of those editions, or before razed out of the copies they made use of.

A great number of instances of this sort, unto excellent advantage, are collected by the learned Dr. Pococke, Notae Miscellan., cap. 8. And in the same place, that we go no farther for it, the same learned author gives us an account of the evasions invented by some of the Mohammedans against the force of this testimony, which yet they allow to respect Jesus Christ, whom they will by no means grant to be the Son of God. A prophet, if we please, he shall be; but that none may believe him to be the Son of God, the impostor himself laid in provision in the close of his Koran, in that summary of his Mussulman confession, "He is one God, God eternal, who neither begetteth nor is begotten, and to whom none is equal." The reasons of their infidelity are putid and ridiculous, as is commonly known, and their evasion of this testimony a violent escape: for they tell us the text is corrupted, and instead of "My Son," it should be "My prophet;" and instead of "I have begotten thee," it should be "I have cherished thee;" the former words in the Arabic language consisting of the same letters transposed, and the latter differing in one letter only; and the fancied allusion between or change of the words is not much more distant in the Hebrew. But it is ridiculous to suppose that the Jews have corrupted their own text, to the ruinous disadvantage of their own infidelity.

17. There is, therefore, an illustrious testimony in these words given unto the eternal pre-existence of the Lord Christ in his divine nature before his incarnation; and this causeth the adversaries of that sacred truth to turn themselves into all shapes to avoid the force of it. He with whom we have before concerned ourselves raiseth himself unto that confidence as to deny that the things mentioned in this psalm had any direct accomplishment in Jesus Christ; and his next attempt is to prove that these words, <19216 Psalm 22:16, "They pierced my hands and my feet," had no respect unto him. To this purpose doth he here discourse:—

> “Ea quae hic dicuntur si litera urgeatur, nunquam in Jesu Christo completa sunt. Nam ejus divinitati haec non competere; clarum est. Jam veto, ne cum natus quidem ex Maria est, historice haec illi evenerunt. Qui enim sunt isti, quaeso, populi, quae gentes, qui reges, qui contra Jesum jam regem constitutum consurrexerunt? Certe nec Pilatus, qui tamen rex non erat, nec Herodes ei hoc nomine ut illum solio et dignitate regia deturbarent illi, molesti fuerunt; neque consilia adversus ejus regnum contulerunt, nec copias collegerunt. Imo Pilatus quamvis illum regem dici audiret, tamen liberare et dimittere paratus erat. Et Herodes adversus eum non fremuit, sed bominem contempsit, et illaesum cum in potestate sua haberet dimisit. Pilatus Johan. 18:35, fatetur, ‘Gens tua et pontifices tradiderunt te mihi;’ soli ergo Judaei fuerunt hostes Jesu, et eorum consilia adversus eum non fuerunt inita; sed optatum finem consecuta; cujus contrarium hic narratur. In summa, taurus concursus, tanta consectatio, tantus armorum strepitus, et apparatus bellicus, quantum haec verba psalmi significant, nunquam contra Jesum extitit; praeterea isti reges et populi dicunt, ‘Dirumpamus vincula eorum,’ etc. At Jesus nec Judaeis nec gentibus imperitavit, nec vincula injecit, nulla tributa imposuit, non leges praescripsit, quibus illos constrictos tenuisset, et a quibus illi liberari concupivissent. Nam siquis haec ad doctrinam Jesu accommodet, spiritualem et mysticum introducet sensum,” etc.

Having elsewhere handled, expounded, and vindicated this testimony, I should not here have diverted to the consideration of this discourse, had it not been to give an instance of that extreme confidence which this sort of men betake themselves unto when they are pressed with plain Scripture testimonies; for not any of the Jews themselves, who despise the application of this prophecy to Christ in the New Testament, do more perversely argue against his concernment therein than this man doth. He tells us, in the entrance of his discourse on this psalm, that all the Hebrews, whose authority in the interpretation of the Scripture no sober man will despise, are against the application of this psalm unto Christ. But as he is deceived if he thought that they all agree in denying this psalm to be a prophecy of the Messiah (for, as we have showed, the elder masters were of that mind), so he that shall be moved with the authority of the

later doctors in the interpretation of those places of Scripture which concern the promised Messiah, that is, Jesus Christ, and yet pretend himself to be a Christian, will scarce retain the reputation of a sober person among such as are not stark mad. However, no Jew of them all can more perversely oppose the gospel than this man here doth, as will appear in the examination of what he says.

First, That the things spoken in this psalm regard the Lord Christ with respect unto his *divine nature alone*, or as absolutely considered, none ever affirmed or taught; for they all regard him as *incarnate*, or as he was to be incarnate, and as *exalted*, or as he was to be exalted unto his kingly rule and throne. But yet some things here spoken are distinctly verified in his divine nature, some in his human, as I have elsewhere declared. In general, they all regard his *person* with respect unto his kingly office. But what ensues in this author, namely, that these things belong none of them properly unto Jesus Christ, is above the rate of ordinary confidence. *All the apostles* do not only jointly and with one accord apply the things here spoken unto the Lord Jesus, but also give a clear exposition of the words, as a ground of that application, — a thing seldom done by the sacred writers: ◂402▸Acts 4:24-28,

> "They lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is: who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage and the people imagine vain things? The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ. For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done."

In their judgment, Herod and Pontius Pilate, with their adherents, — as exercising supreme rule and power in and over that people, with respect unto them on whom they depended, and whose authority they exerted, namely, the Romans, the great rulers over the world, — were the "kings" and "rulers" intended in this psalm. And so also the גּוֹיִם, or "heathen," they took to be the "Gentiles," who adhered unto Pilate in the execution of

his Gentile power, and the לְאֻמִּים mentioned to be "the people of Israel." Let us, therefore, consider what this man excepts against the exposition and application of these words made by the apostles, and which they expressed as the solemn profession of their faith, and we shall quickly find that all his exceptions are miserably weak and sophistical. "Pilate," he says, "was not a king." But he *acted regal power*, the power of a supreme magistrate among them, and such are everywhere called kings in the Scripture. Besides, he acted the power of the great rulers of the world, who made use of kings as instruments of their rule; so that in and by him the power of the Gentile world was acted against Christ. Herod he grants to have been a king, who yet was inferior in power and jurisdiction unto Pilate, and received what authority he had by delegation from the same monarch with Pilate himself.

Secondly, He denies that these or either of them *opposed Christ as to his kingdom;* for "Pilate moved once for his delivery, and Herod rather scorned him than raged against his kingdom." But this unbridled confidence would much better become a Jew than one professing himself to be a Christian. Did they not oppose the Lord Christ? Did they not rage against him? Who persecuted him? Who reviled him? Who apprehended him as a thief or murderer? Who mocked him, spit upon him, scourged him, crucified him, if not with their hands, yet with their power? Did they not oppose him as to his kingdom, who by all ways possible endeavored to hinder all the ways and means whatsoever whereby it was erected and established? Certainly never had prophecy a more sensible accomplishment.

Thirdly, And for what he adds in reference unto the Jews, that "their counsels were not in vain against Christ, as those were that are here mentioned, but obtained their wished end," I cannot see how it can be excused from a great outrage and excess of blasphemy. They did, indeed, whatever the hand and counsel of God determined before to be done; but that their own counsels were not vain, that they accomplished what they designed and aimed at, is the highest blasphemy to imagine. They took counsel against him as a seducer and a blasphemer; they designed to put an end to his work, that none ever should esteem him or believe in him as the Messiah, the Savior of the world, the Son of God; — was this counsel of

theirs not in vain? Did they accomplish what they aimed at? Then say there is not a word of truth in the gospel or Christian religion.

Fourthly, For that "concourse of people, consultations, and noise and preparation for war," which though, as he says, "mentioned in the text, he cannot find in the actings of men against the Lord Christ," it is all an imagination of the same folly; for there is no mention of any such preparation for war in the text as he dreameth of. Rage and consultation, with a resolution to oppose the spiritual rule of the Son of God, are indeed described, and were all actually made use of, originally against the person of Christ immediately, and afterwards against him in his gospel, with the professors and publishers of it.

Fifthly, He adds hereunto that: "Christ ruled neither Jews nor Gentiles; that he made no laws, nor put any bonds upon them, that they might be said to break." So answers Kimchi the testimony from Micah 5:2, where Christ is called the ruler of Israel. "Answer them," saith he, הם משלו בו לא משל בישראל אבל, — "that Jesus ruled not over Israel, but they ruled over him, and crucified him." But notwithstanding all this petulancy, his enemies shall all of them one day know that God hath made him both Lord and Christ; that he is a king and a lawgiver for ever; that he came to put the holy bands and chains of his laws on the world, which they in vain strive to reject and cast out of the earth, for he must reign until all his enemies are made his footstool. It is granted that in some of these words spiritual things are figuratively expressed, but their literal sense is that which the figure intends; so that no mystic or allegorical sense is here to be inquired after, it being the Lord Christ the Son of God, with respect unto his kingly office, who is here treated of primarily and directly, however any of the concernments of his kingdom might be typed out in David; and he it is who says, "I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee."

18. The foundation of this expression is laid in the divine and eternal filiation of the Son of God, as I have elsewhere evinced; but the thing directly expressed is spoken in reference unto the manifestation thereof in and after his incarnation. He that speaks the words is the Son himself; and he is the person spoken unto, as Psalm 110:1, "The LORD said unto my Lord," wherein the same eternal transaction between the Father and

Son is declared. So here, “The LORD,” that is the Father, “hath said unto me.” How? By the way of an eternal statute, law, or decree. As he was the Son of God, so God declares unto him that in the work he had to do he should be his Son, and he would be his Father, and make him his first-born, higher than the kings of the earth. And therefore are these words applied several ways unto the manifestation of his divine filiation. For instance, he was “declared to be the Son of God with power, by the resurrection from the dead,” Romans 1:4. And this very decree, “Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,” is used by our apostle to prove the priesthood of Christ, which was confirmed unto him therein, Hebrews 5:5; and this could no otherwise be but that God declared therein unto him, that in the discharge of that office, as also of his kingdom and rule, he would manifest and declare him so to be. It appears, therefore, that there were eternal transactions between the Father and Son concerning the redemption of mankind by his interposition or mediation.

EXERCITATION 28

FEDERAL TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN THE FATHER AND THE SON.

1. *Personal transactions between the Father and Son about the redemption of mankind, federal.*

2. *The covenants between God and man explained.*

3. *"Foedus," a covenant, whence so called.*

4. Συνθήκη, *why not used by the LXX.*

5. *The various use of* בְּרִית *in the Scriptures — The tables of stone, how called the covenant; and the ark — The same use of* συνθήκη *— The certain nature of a covenant not precisely signified by this word.*

6. *Covenants how ratified of old.*

7. *Things required to a complete and proper covenant.*

8. *Of covenants with respect unto personal services.*

9. *The covenant between Father and Son express — How therein the Father is a God unto him, and the Son less than the Father.*

10. *Joint counsel of the Father and Son in this covenant, as the foundation of it.*

11. *The will of the Father in this covenant absolutely free.*

12. *The will of the Son engaged in this covenant — The Son of God undertakes for himself when clothed with our nature.*

13. *The will of God how the same in Father and Son, yet acting distinctly in their distinct persons.*

14. *Things disposed of in a covenant to be in the power of them that make it — This they may be two ways: first, absolutely; secondly, by virtue of the compact itself.*

15. *The salvation of sinners the matter of this covenant, or the thing disposed of, to the mutual complacency of Father and Son.*

16. *The general end of this covenant the manifestation of the glory of God — Wherein that consists — What divine properties are peculiarly glorified thereby.*

17. *The especial glory of the Son the end of this covenant; what it is.*

18. *Means and way of entering into this covenant — Promises made to the Son, as incarnate, of assistance, acceptance and glory — The true nature of the merit of Christ.*

19. *Things prescribed to the Lord Christ in this covenant reduced to three heads — The sacred spring of his priesthood discovered.*

20. *The original reason and nature of the priesthood of Christ — Occasion and use of priesthood and sacrifices under the law.*

21. *The sum of the whole — Necessity of Christ's priesthood.*

1. Our next inquiry is after the nature of those *eternal transactions* which, in general, we have declared from the Scripture in our foregoing Exercitation. And these were carried on "per modum foederis," "by way of covenant," compact, and mutual agreement, between the Father and the Son; for although it should seem that because they are single acts of the same divine understanding and will, they cannot be properly federal, yet because those properties of the divine nature are acted distinctly in the distinct persons, they have in them the nature of a covenant. Besides, there is in them a supposition of the *susception of our human nature* into personal union with the Son. On the consideration hereof he comes to have an absolute distinct interest, and to undertake for that which is his own work peculiarly. And therefore are those counsels of the will of God, wherein lies the foundation of the priesthood of Christ, expressly declared as a covenant in the Scripture; for there is in them a respect unto various objects and various effects, disposed into a federal relation one to another. I shall therefore, in the first place, manifest that such a covenant there was between the Father and the Son, in order to the work of his mediation, called therefore the covenant of the Mediator or Redeemer; and afterwards I shall insist on that in it in particular which is the original of his priesthood.

2. First, we must distinguish between the covenant that God made *with men concerning Christ*, and the covenant that he made *with his Son concerning men.* That God created man in and under the terms and law of a covenant, with a prescription of duties and promise of reward, is by all acknowledged. After the fall he entered into another covenant with mankind, which, from the principle, nature, and end of it, is commonly called the *covenant of grace*. This, under several forms of external administration, hath continued ever since in force, and shall do so to the consummation of all things. And the nature of this covenant, as being among the principal concernments of religion, hath been abundantly declared and explained by many. The consideration of it is not our present business. That the Lord-Jesus Christ was the principal *subject-matter* of this covenant, the undertaker in it and surety of it, the Scriptures expressly declare: for the great promise of it was concerning him and his

mediation, with the benefits that should redound unto mankind thereby in grace and glory; and the preceptive part of it required obedience in and unto him new and distinct from that which was exacted by the law of creation, although enwrapping all the commands thereof also. And he was the *surety* of it, in that he undertook unto God whatever by the terms of the covenant was to be done *for* man, to accomplish it in his own person, and whatever was to be done *in* and *by* man, to effect it by his own Spirit and grace; that so the covenant on every side might be firm and stable, and the ends of it fulfilled. This is not that which at present we inquire into; but it is the personal compact that was between the Father and the Son before the world was, as it is revealed in the Scripture, that is to be declared.

3. To clear things in our way, we must treat somewhat of the name and nature of a covenant in general. The Hebrews call a covenant בְּרִית, the Greeks συνθήκη, and the Latins "foedus;" the consideration of which words may be of some use, because of the original and most famous translations of the Scripture. "Foedus" some deduce "a feriendo," from "striking." And this was from the manner of making covenants, by the striking of the beast to be sacrificed in their confirmation; for all solemn covenants were always confirmed by sacrifice, especially between God and his people. Hence are they said to "make a covenant with him by sacrifice," Psalm 50:5, offering sacrifice in the solemn confirmation of it. And when God solemnly confirmed his covenant with Abraham, he did it by causing a token of his presence to pass between the pieces of the beasts provided for sacrifice, Genesis 15:17, 18. So when he made a covenant with Noah, it was ratified by sacrifice, Genesis 8:20-22, 9:9, 10. And to look backwards, it is not improbable but that, upon the giving of the first promise, and laying the foundation of the new covenant therein, Adam offered the beasts in sacrifice with whose skins he was clothed. And how the old covenant at Horeb was dedicated with the blood of sacrifices, our apostle declares, Hebrews 9:18-20, from Exodus 24:5-8. And all this was to let us know that no covenant could ever be made between God and man, after the entrance of sin, but upon the account of that great sacrifice of our High Priest which by those others was represented. Hence is the phrase, "foedera ferire," "to strike a covenant:" Cicero pro Coelio, [cap. 14,] "Ideone ego pacem Pyrrhi diremi,

ut tu amorum turpissimorum quotidie foedera ferires?" "Foedera," "ferire," and "percutere," have the same rise and occasion. And the Hebrews also express the making of a covenant by striking hands, though with respect unto another ceremony. Some derive the word "a porcâ foede caesâ;" for a hog was clean in the devil's sacrifices: —

"Caesâ jungebant foedera porcâ." — Virg. AEn., 8:641.

And hence was the ancient formula of ratifying covenants by the striking and therewith killing of a hog, mentioned by the Roman historian, Liv. 1:24, "Qui prior defexit publico consilio dolo malo, tu illum Jupiter sic ferito, ut ego hunc porcum hodie feriam; tantoque magis ferito quanto magis potes pollesque;" upon the pronouncing of which words he killed the hog with a stone. And there was the same intention among them who, in making a covenant, cut a beast in pieces, laying one equal part against another, and so passing between them; for they imprecated as it were upon themselves that they might be so destroyed and cut into pieces if they stood not unto the terms of the covenant. See <2418>Jeremiah 34:18-20, where respect is had to the covenant made with the king of Babylon. But in the use and signification of this word we are not much concerned.

4. The Greek word is συνθήκη, and so it is constantly used in all good authors for a solemn covenant between nations and persons. Only the translation of the LXX. takes no notice of it; for observing that בְּרִית, "berith," in the Hebrew was of a larger signification, applied unto things of another nature than συνθήκη (denoting a precise compact or convention) could be extended unto, they rendered it constantly by διαθήκη, whereof we must treat elsewhere. <0114>Genesis 14:13, they render בַּעֲלֵי בְרִית, "covenanters," by συνωμόται, "confederati," or "conjurati,' "confederates sworn together." Wherefore of the word συνθήκη there is no use in this matter; and the nature of the thing intended must be inquired into.

5. בְּרִית is largely and variously used in the Old Testament, nor are learned men agreed from what original it is derived. בָּרָא, and בָּרָה, and בָּרַר, are considered to this purpose.

Sometimes it intends no more but peace and agreement, although there were no compact or convention unto that purpose: for this is the end of all

covenants, which are of three sorts, as the Macedonian ambassador declared to the Romans; for either they are between the conqueror and the conquered, or between enemies in equal power, or between those who were never engaged in enmity. The end of all these sorts of covenants is mutual peace and security. Hence they are expressed by בְּרִית, "a covenant." So ⁽¹⁸⁵³⁾Job 5:23, עִם־אַבְנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה בְּרִיתֶךָ; — "Thy covenant shall be with the stones of the field." Say we, "Thy league shall be;" that is, 'Thou shalt have no hurt from them.' And, ⁽³⁰²⁸⁾Hosea 2:18, a covenant is said to be made with the beasts of the field, and the fowls of heaven, and the creeping things of the earth. Security from damage by them, and their quiet use, is called a covenant metonymically and metaphorically, because peace and agreement are the end of covenants.

Secondly, Synecdochically, the law written on the two tables of stone was called the covenant: ⁽²³⁴⁸⁾Exodus 34:28, "He wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." Now, this law was purely preceptive, and an effect of sovereign authority, yet is it called a covenant. But this it is not absolutely in its own nature, seeing no mere precept, nor system of precepts as such, nor any mere promise, can be a covenant properly so called; but it was a principal part of God's covenant with the people, when accepted by them as the rule of their obedience, with respect unto the promises wherewith it was accompanied. Hence the tables of stone whereon this law was written are called "The tables of the covenant:" ⁽⁵⁶⁹¹⁾Deuteronomy 9:11, אֶת־שְׁנֵי לֻחֹת הָאֲבָנִים לֻחוֹת הַבְּרִית; — "The two tables of stone, the tables of the covenant." These tables were first made by God himself, ⁽²³¹⁸⁾Exodus 31:18, and given into the hands of Moses; and when they were broken, he was commanded פָּסַל, to effigiate them, or cut stones after their image, into their likeness, for the first were seen only by himself, ⁽⁵⁶⁰¹⁾Deuteronomy 10:11; ⁽²³⁴⁰⁾Exodus 34:1. And when they were broken, whereby their use and signification ceased, they were not kept as relics, though cut and written by the finger or divine power of God, — which doubtless the superstition of succeeding ages would have attempted; but the true measure of the sacredness of any thing external is use by divine appointment. And also the ark was hence called "the ark of the covenant," and sometimes "the covenant" itself, because the two tables of stone, the tables of the covenant, were in it, ⁽¹⁰⁹⁹⁾1 Kings 8:9.

So among the Grecians, the tables or rolls wherein covenants were written, engraven, or enrolled, were called συνθῆκαι. So Demosthenes, Κατὰ Ὀλμπιοδ. κεφ. ιβ΄: Συγγωρῶ ἀνοιχθῆναι τὰς συνθήκας ἐνταυθοῖ ἐπὶ τοῦ δικαστηρίου· — "I require that the covenants may be opened here in the court," or "before the judgment-seat;" that is, the rolls wherein the agreement was written. And Aristot. Rhetor. lib. i.: Οποῖοι γὰρ ἄν τινες ὦσιν οἱ ἐπιγεγραμμένοι, ἤ φυλάττοντες, τούτοις αἱ συνζῆκαι πισταί εἰσι·— "Covenants are of the same credit with those that wrote and keep them;" that is, the writings wherein such conventions are contained. For covenants that were solemnly entered into between nations were engraven in brass, as the league and covenant made between the Romans and Jews in the days of Judas Maccabeus, 1 Mac. 8:22; or in marble, as that of the Magnesians and Smyrnians, illustrated by the learned Selden; and other covenants were enrolled in parchment by public notaries.

Thirdly, An absolute promise is also called בְּרִית, "a covenant," the covenant of God: Isaiah 59:21,

> "As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the LORD; My Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth."

And God also calls his decree constitutive of the law of nature and its continuance his covenant: Jeremiah 33:20,

> "Thus saith the LORD; If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, that there should not be day and night in their season."

It is therefore certain that where God speaks of his covenant, we cannot conclude that whatever belongs unto a perfect, complete covenant is therein intended. And they do but deceive themselves who, from the name of a covenant between God and man, do conclude always unto the nature and conditions of it; for the word is used in great variety, and what is intended by it must be learned from the subject-matter treated of, seeing there is no precept or promise of God but may be so called.

6. In the making of covenants between men, yea, in the covenant of God with men, besides that they were always conceived "verbis expressis,"

there was some sign and token added, for their confirmation. This was generally the slaying of some creature, and the dividing of it into parts, before mentioned. Hence “sancire foedus” and “sanctio foederis” are “a sanguine,” from the blood shed in their confirmation. Of the slaying of a beast there is mention in all who have spoken of ancient covenants. So was it in that between the Romans and Albans, whose form is reported by Livy, as that whose tradition was of greatest antiquity among them. And there are likewise instances of the division of the slain beasts into two parts, like what we observed before concerning Abraham, and the princes of Judah in Jeremiah: Οἱ Μολοττοὶ ἐν τοῖς ὁρκωμοσίαις κατακόπτοντες εἰς μικρὰ τοῦς Βοῦς τὰς συνθήκας ἐποιούντε, Herod.; — “The Molossians in their confederations cut oxen into small pieces, and so entered into covenants.” And how these pieces or parts were disposed Livy declares, lib. 39: “Prior pars ad dextram cum extis, posterior ad laevam viae ponitur; inter hanc divisam hostiam copiae armatae traducuntur.” And hence it is that כָּרַת, which signifies “to cut” or “divide,” is used in the Scripture absolutely for the making of a covenant, without any addition of בְּרִית, 1 Samuel 20:16, 1 Kings 8:9. And although such outward things did never belong unto the essence of a covenant, yet were they useful significations of fidelity, intended and accepted in the performance of what was engaged in it; and therefore God himself never made a covenant with men but he always gave them a token and visible pledge thereof. And whosoever is interested in the covenant itself hath thereby a right unto and is obliged to the use of the sign or token, according to God’s appointment.

7. An absolutely complete covenant is a voluntary convention, pact, or agreement, between distinct persons, about the ordering and disposal of things in their power, unto their mutual concern and advantage: —

(1.) Distinct persons are required unto a covenant, for it is a mutual compact. As “a mediator is not of one,” — that is, there must be several parties, and those at variance, or there is no room for the interposition of a mediator, Galatians 3:20, — so a covenant, properly so called, is not of one. In the large sense wherein בְּרִית is taken, a man’s resolution in himself with respect unto any especial end or purpose may be called his covenant, as Job 31:1, “I made a covenant with mine eyes.” And so God

calleth his purpose or decree concerning the orderly course of nature in the instance before given. But a covenant, properly so called, is the convention or agreement of two persons or more.

(2.) This agreement must be *voluntary* and of choice upon the election of the terms convented about. Hence בְּרִית is by some derived from בָּרָא, which signifies "to choose" or "elect;" for such choice is the foundation of all solemn covenants. What is properly so is founded on a free election of the terms of it, upon due consideration and a right judgment made of them. Hence, when one people is broken in war or subdued by another, who prescribe terms unto them, which they are forced as it were to accept for the present necessity, it is but an imperfect covenant, and, as things are in the world, not like to be firm or stable. So some legates answered in the senate of Rome when their people were subdued, "Pacem habebitis qualem dederitis; si bonam, firmam et stabilem, sin haud diuturnam."

(3.) The matter of every righteous and complete covenant must be of *things in the power* of them who convent and agree about them; otherwise any, yea the most solemn compact, is vain and ineffectual. A son or daughter in their father's house, and under his care, making a vow or covenant for the disposal of themselves, can give no force unto it, because they are not in their own power. Hence, when God invites and takes men into the covenant of grace, whereunto belongs a restipulation of faith and obedience, which are not absolutely in their own power, that the covenant may be firm and stable he takes upon himself to enable them thereunto; and the efficacy of his grace unto that purpose is of the nature of the covenant. Hence, when men enter into any compact wherein one party takes on itself the performance of that which the other thinks to be, but is not, really in its power, there is *dolus malus* in it, which enervates and disannuls the covenant itself. And many such compacts were rescinded by the senate and people of Rome, which were made by their generals without their consent; as those with the Gauls who besieged the Capitol, and with the Samnites, at the Furcae Caudinae.

Lastly, The end of a covenant is the disposal of the things about which the covenant is made to the *mutual content and satisfaction* of all persons concerned. Hence was the ancient form, "Quod felix faustumque sit huic et illi populo." If either party be absolutely and finally detrimented by it, it

is no absolute, free, or voluntary covenant, but an agreement of a mixed nature, where the consent of one party is given only for the avoiding of a greater inconvenience. And these things we shall find of use in our progress.

8. As all these things concur in every equal compact, so there is an especial kind of covenant, depending solely on the personal undertakings and services of one party in order unto the common ends of the covenant, or the mutual satisfaction of the covenanters. So it is in all agreements where any thing is distinctly and peculiarly required of one party. And such covenants have three things in them: —

(1.) *A proposal of service;*

(2.) *A promise of reward;*

(3.) *An acceptance of the proposal,* with a restipulation of obedience out of respect unto the reward.

And this indispensably introduceth an inequality and subordination in the covenanters as to the common ends of the covenant, however on other accounts they may be equal; for he who *prescribes* the duties which are required in the covenant, and giveth the promises of either assistance in them or a reward upon them, is therein and so far superior unto him, or greater than he who *observeth* his prescriptions and *trusteth* unto his promises. Of this nature is that divine transaction that was between the Father and Son about the redemption of mankind. There was in it a prescription of personal services, with a promise of reward; and all the other conditions, also, of a complete covenant before laid down are observed therein. And this we must inquire into, as that wherein doth lie the foundation and original of the priesthood of Christ.

9. First, Unto a proper covenant it is required that it be made between *distinct persons.* Such have I elsewhere proved the Father and Son to be, and in this discourse I do take that fundamental principle of our profession as granted. That there were eternal transactions in general between those distinct persons, with respect unto the salvation of mankind, hath been evinced in the foregoing Exercitation. That these were federal, or had in them the nature of a covenant, is now further to be manifested. And in general this is that which the Scripture intends, where God, that is the

Father, is called by the Son his God, and where he says that he will be unto him a God and a Father; for this expression of being a God unto any one is declarative of a covenant, and is the word whereby God constantly declares his relation unto any in a way of covenant, <233331>Jeremiah 31:33, 32:38; <280123>Hosea 2:23.

For God, declaring that he will be a God unto any, engageth himself unto the exercise of his holy properties, which belong unto him as God, in their behalf and for their good; and this is not without an engagement of obedience from them. Now, this declaration the Scripture abounds in: <191602>Psalm 16:2, "Thou hast said unto the LORD, Thou art my Lord." These are the words of the Son unto the Father, as is evident from verses 9-11. <192201>Psalm 22:1, "My God, my God." <194008>Psalm 40:8, "I delight to do thy will, O my God." <194507>Psalm 45:7, "God, thy God, hath anointed thee." <330504>Micah 5:4, "He shall stand and feed in the strength of the LORD, in the majesty of the name of the LORD his God." <432017>John 20:17, "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." <660312>Revelation 3:12, "I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God; ….. and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God." All which expressions argue both a covenant and a subordination therein.

And on this account it is that our Savior says his Father is greater than he, <431428>John 14:28. This place, I confess, the ancients expound unanimously of the human nature only, to obviate the Arians, who ascribed unto him a divine nature, but made, and absolutely in itself inferior to the nature of God. But the inferiority of the human nature unto God or the Father is a thing so unquestionable as needed no declaration or solemn attestation, and the mention of it is no way suited unto the design of the place. But our Savior speaks with respect unto the covenant engagement that was between the Father and himself as to the work which he had to do: for therein, as we shall further manifest, the Father was the *prescriber*, the promiser, and lawgiver; and the Son was the *undertaker* upon his prescription, law, and promises. He is, indeed, in respect of his divine personality, said to be "God of God." No more is intended hereby but that the person of the Son, as to his personality, was of the person of the Father, who communicated his nature and life unto him by eternal generation. But the Father on that account is not said to be his God, or to

be a God unto him, which includes the acting of divine properties on his behalf, and a dependence on the other side on him who is so a God unto him. And this hath its sole foundation on that covenant and the execution of it which we are in the consideration of.

10. Again; the transactions before insisted on and declared are proposed to have been by the way of "counsel," for the accomplishment of the end designed in a-covenant: [3663]Zechariah 6:13, בֵּין שְׁנֵיהֶם וַעֲצַת שָׁלוֹם תִּהְיֶה. The counsel about peace-making between God and man was "between them both;" that is, the two persons spoken of, — namely, the Lord Jehovah, and he who was to be צֶמַח, "The Branch." And this was not spoken of him absolutely as he was a man, or was to be a man, for so there was not properly עֵצָה, or "counsel," between God and him; "for who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?" [4513]Romans 11:34. And, besides, the Son in his human nature was merely the servant of the Father to do his will, [2301]Isaiah 42:1. But God takes this counsel with him as he was his *eternal Wisdom,* only with respect unto his future incarnation; for therein he was to be both the "Branch of the LORD and "the fruit of the earth," [2302]Isaiah 4:2. Hereunto regard also is had in his name: [2306]Isaiah 9:6, "He shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor;" for these titles, with those that follow, do not absolutely denote properties of the divine nature, though they are such divine titles and attributes as cannot be ascribed unto any but to him who is God; but there is in them a respect unto the work which he had to do as he was to be a "child born" and "a son given" unto us. And on the same account is he called "The everlasting Father," a name not proper unto the person of the Son with mere respect unto his personality. There is, therefore, a regard in it unto the work he had to do, which was to be a father unto all the elect of God. And therein also was he "The Prince of Peace," — he who is the procurer and establisher of peace between God and mankind. On the same account God speaking of him, says that he is רֹעִי גֶּבֶר עֲמִיתִי, — "My shepherd, and the man my fellow," [3807]Zechariah 13:7; such an one as with whom he had sweetened and rejoiced in secret counsel, as [1914]Psalm 55:14, according unto what was before declared on [2030]Proverbs 8:30, 31.

11. Particularly, the *will* of the Father and Son concurred in this matter; which was necessary, that the covenant might be voluntary and of choice.

And the original of the whole is referred to the will of the Father constantly. Hence our Lord Jesus Christ on all occasions declares solemnly that he came to do the will of the Father: “Lo, I come to do thy will, O God,” <19A006>Psalm 40:6-8; <580105>Hebrews 10:5-10; for in this agreement the part of the enjoiner, prescriber, and promiser, whose will in all things is to be attended unto, is on the Father. And his will was *naturally* at a perfect liberty from engaging in that way of salvation which he accomplished by Christ. He was at liberty to have left all mankind under sin and the curse, as he did all the angels that fell; he was at liberty utterly to have destroyed the race of mankind that sprang from Adam in his fallen estate, either in the root of them, or in the branches when multiplied, as he almost did in the flood, and have created another stock or race of them unto his glory. And hence the acting of his will herein is expressed by *grace*, — which is free, or it is not grace, — and is said to proceed from love acting by choice; all arguing the highest liberty in the will of the Father, <430316>John 3:16; <490106>Ephesians 1:6.

And the same is further evidenced by the exercise of his *authority*, both in the commission and commands that he gave unto the Son, as incarnate, for the discharge of the work that he had undertaken; for none puts forth his authority but voluntarily, or by and according unto his own will. Now, he both sent the Son, and sealed him, and gave him commands; which are all acts of choice and liberty, proceeding from sovereignty. Let none, then, once imagine that this work of entering into covenant about the salvation of mankind was any way necessary unto God, or that it was required by virtue of any of the essential properties of his nature, so that he must have done against them in doing otherwise. God was herein absolutely free, as he was also in his making of all things out of nothing. He could have left it undone without the least disadvantage unto his essential glory or contrariety unto his holy nature. Whatever, therefore, we may afterwards assert concerning the necessity of satisfaction to be given unto his justice, upon the supposition of this covenant, yet the entering into this covenant, and consequently all that ensued thereon, is absolutely resolved into the mere will and grace of God.

12. The *will of the Son* also was distinct herein. In his divine nature and will he undertook voluntarily for the work of his person when the human nature should be united thereunto, which he determined to assume; for

what is spoken of the second person is spoken with respect unto his purpose to assume our nature, for the obedience whereof, in all that was to be done upon it or by it, he undertook. This the Scripture fully declares, and that for a double end: — First, To demonstrate that the things which he underwent in his human nature were just and equal, inasmuch as himself whose it was voluntarily consented thereunto. Secondly, To manifest that those very acts which he had in command from his Father were no less the acts of his own will. Wherefore, as it is said that the Father loved us, and gave his Son to die for us; so also it is said that the Son loved us, and gave himself for us, and washed us in his own blood. These things proceeded from and were founded in the will of the Son of God; and it was an act of perfect liberty in him to engage into his peculiar concernments in this covenant. What he did, he did by choice, in a way of condescension and love. And this his voluntary susception of the discharge of what he was to perform, according to the nature and terms of this covenant, was the ground of the *authoritative mission*, sealing, and commanding, of the Father towards him. See ⁽¹⁹⁶⁰⁷⁾Psalm 60:7, 8; ⁽⁵⁸¹⁰⁵⁾Hebrews 10:5; ⁽⁴⁸¹⁰⁷⁾John 10:17, 18. And whatever is expressed in the Scripture concerning the will of the human nature of Christ, as it was engaged in and bent upon its work, it is but a representation of the will of the Son of God when he engaged into this work from eternity. So then he freely undertook to do and suffer whatever on his part was required; and therein owns himself the servant of the Father, because he would obey his will and serve his purposes in the nature which he would assume for that end, ⁽²³⁴⁰⁵⁾Isaiah 42:1, 6, 49:8, 9; ⁽³⁸¹³⁷⁾Zechariah 13:7; and therein acknowledgeth him to be his Lord, ⁽¹⁹⁶⁰²⁾Psalm 16:2, unto whom he owed all homage and obedience: for this mind was in him, that whereas he was in the form of God, he humbled himself unto this work, ⁽⁵⁰¹⁰⁵⁾Philippians 2:5-8, and by his own voluntary consent was engaged therein. Whereas, therefore, he had a sovereign and absolute power over his own human nature when assumed, whatever he submitted unto, it was no injury unto him, nor injustice in God to lay it on him.

13. But this sacred truth must be cleared from an objection whereunto it seems obnoxious, before we do proceed. “The *will* is a natural property, and therefore in the divine essence it is but one. The Father, Son, and Spirit, have not distinct wills. They are one God, and God’s will is one, as being an essential property of his nature; and therefore are there two wills

in the one person of Christ, whereas there is but one will in the three persons of the Trinity. How, then, can it be said that the will of the Father and the will of the Son did concur distinctly in the making of this covenant?"

This difficulty may be solved from what hath been already declared; for such is the distinction of the persons in the unity of the divine essence, as that they act in natural and essential acts *reciprocally* one towards another, — namely, in understanding, love, and the like; they know and mutually love each other. And as they subsist distinctly, so they also act distinctly in those works which are of external operation. And whereas all these acts and operations, whether reciprocal or external, are either with a will or from a freedom of will and choice, the will of God in each person, as to the peculiar acts ascribed unto him, is his will therein peculiarly and eminently, though not exclusively to the other persons, by reason of their mutual *in-being*. The will of God as to the peculiar actings of the Father in this matter is the will of the Father, and the will of God with regard unto the peculiar actings of the Son is the will of the Son; not by a distinction of sundry wills, but by the distinct application of the same will unto its *distinct acts* in the persons of the Father and the Son. And in this respect the covenant whereof we treat differeth from a pure decree; for from these distinct actings of the will of God in the Father and the Son there doth arise a new habitude or relation, which is not natural or necessary unto them, but freely taken on them. And by virtue hereof were all believers saved from the foundation of the world, upon the account of the interposition of the Son of God antecedently unto his exhibition in the flesh; for hence was he esteemed to have done and suffered what he had undertaken so to do, and which, through faith, was imputed unto them that did believe.

14. Moreover, a covenant must be about the disposal of things in *the power of them that enter into it*, otherwise it is *null* or fraudulent. And thus things may be two ways; — first, Absolutely; secondly, By virtue of some condition or something in the nature of the covenant itself.

(1.) Things are *absolutely* in the power of persons, when they are completely at their disposal *antecedently* unto the consideration of any covenant or agreement about them; as in the covenant of marriage, where

the several persons engaging are *sui juris*, — they have an absolute power in themselves to dispose of their own persons with respect unto the ends of marriage. So it is in all covenants. When the things to be disposed of according to the limitations of the covenant are lawful and good antecedently unto any agreement made about them, and because they are in the power of the covenanters, they may be disposed of according to the terms of the compact. So was it in this covenant. To do good unto mankind, to bring them unto the enjoyment of himself, was absolutely in the *power of the Father.* And it was in the *power of the Son* to assume human nature, which becoming thereby peculiarly his own, he might dispose of it unto what end he pleased, saving the union which ensued on its assumption, for this was indissoluble.

(2.) Again, some things are made lawful or good, or suited unto the glory, honor, or satisfaction and complacency, of them that make the covenant, by virtue of somewhat arising in or from the covenant itself. And of this sort are most of the things that are disposed in the covenant between the Father and the Son under consideration. They become good and desirable, and suited unto their glory and honor, not as considered absolutely and in themselves, but with respect unto that order, dependence, and mutual relation, that they are cast into by and in the covenant.

Such was the *penal suffering* of the human nature of Christ under the sentence and curse of the law. This in itself absolutely considered, without respect unto the ends of the covenant, would neither have been good in itself, nor have had any tendency unto the glory of God; for what excellency of the nature of God could have been demonstrated in the penal sufferings of one absolutely and in all respects innocent? Nay, it was utterly impossible that an innocent person, considered absolutely as such, should suffer penally under the sentence and curse of the law; for the law denounceth punishment unto no such person. Guilt and punishment are related; and where the one is not, real, or supposed, or imputed, the other cannot be. But now, in the terms of this covenant, leading unto the limitations and use of these sufferings, they are made good, and tend unto the glory of God, as we shall see. So the pardoning and saving of sinners absolutely could have had no tendency unto the glory of God; for what evidence of righteousness would there have been therein, that the great Ruler of all the world should pass by the offenses of men without

animadverting upon them? What justice would have appeared, or what demonstration of the holiness of the nature of God would there have been therein? Besides, it was impossible, seeing it is the judgment of God that they who commit sin are worthy of death. But, as we shall see, through the terms and conditions of this covenant, this is rendered righteous, holy, and good, and eminently conducing to the glory of God.

15. The matter of this covenant, or the things and ends about which and for which it was entered into, are nextly to be considered. These are the things which, as we observed before, are to be disposed of unto the honor, and as it were mutual advantage, of them that make the covenant. And the matter of this covenant in general is the saving of sinners, in and by ways and means suited unto the manifestation of the glory of God. So it is compendiously expressed where the execution of it is declared, <4816>John 3:16,

> "God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

And upon the coming of the Son into the world he was called *Jesus*, because he was to "save his people from their sins," <4021>Matthew 1:21; even Jesus the deliverer, who saves us from the wrath to come, 1 Thessalonians, 1:10. To declare this design of God, or his will and purpose in and by Jesus Christ to save his elect from sin and death, to bring his many sons unto glory, or the full enjoyment of himself unto eternity, is the principal design of the whole Scripture, and whereunto the whole revelation of God unto men may be reduced. This was that on the prospect whereof the Son or Wisdom of God rejoiced before him, and had his delights with the children of men before the foundation of the world, <2030>Proverbs 8:30, 31. Man having utterly lost himself by sin, coming short thereby of the glory of God, and being made obnoxious unto everlasting destruction, the prevision whereof was in order of nature antecedent unto this covenant, as hath been declared, the Father and Son do enter into a holy mutual agreement concerning the recovery and salvation of the elect in a way of grace. This we place as the *matter* of this covenant, the thing contracted and agreed about. The distinction of the parts of it into persons and things, the order and respect in it of one thing unto another, are not of

our present consideration; the explanation of them belongs unto the covenant of grace which God is pleased to enter into with believers by Jesus Christ. But this was that in general that was to be disposed of unto the mutual complacency and satisfaction of Father and Son.

16. The end of these things, both of the covenant and the disposition of all things made thereby, was the *especial glory* both of the one and the other. God doth all things for himself. He can have no ultimate end in any thing but himself alone, unless there should be any thing better than himself or above himself. But yet in himself he is not capable of any accession of glory by any thing that he intendeth or doth. He is absolutely, infinitely, eternally perfect, in himself and all his glorious properties, so that nothing can be added unto him. His end therefore must be, not the obtaining of glory unto himself, but the manifestation of the glory that is in himself. When the holy properties of his nature are exercised in external works, and are thereby expressed, declared, and made known, then is God glorified. The end therefore in general of this covenant, which regulated the disposal of the whole matter of it, was the exercise, exaltation, and manifestation, of the glorious properties of the divine nature; other supreme end and *ultimate* it could have none, as hath been declared. Now, such is the mutual respect of all the holy properties of God in their exercise, and such their *oneness* in the same divine being, that if any one of them be exerted, manifested, and thereby glorified, the residue of them must be therein and thereby glorified also, because that nature is glorified in which they are, and whereunto they do belong. But yet, in several particular works of God, his design is firstly, immediately, and directly, to exercise in a peculiarly eminent manner, and therein to advance and glorify, one or more of his glorious properties, and the rest consequentially in and by them. So in some of his works he doth peculiarly glorify justice, in some mercy, in some his power. We may therefore, as to the end of this holy, eternal compact, consider what are those properties of the divine nature which were peculiarly engaged in it, and are peculiarly exerted in its execution, and were therefore designed to be exalted in a peculiar manner. Now these are three: —

(1.) *Wisdom,* attended with sovereignty.

(2.) *Justice,* springing from holiness.

(3.) *Grace*, mercy, goodness, love, which are various denominations of the same divine excellency.

That this covenant sprang from these properties of the divine nature, that the execution of it is the work and effect of them all, and that it is designed to manifest and glorify them, or God in and by them, unto eternity, the Scripture doth fully declare.

(1.) The *infinite, sovereign wisdom* of God, even the Father, exerted itself, —

[1.] In passing by the angels in their fallen condition, and fixing on the recovery of man, <58216>Hebrews 2:16; <610204>2 Peter 2:4; Jude 6.

[2.] In the projection or provision of the way in general to bring about the salvation of man, by the interposition of his Son, with what he did and suffered in the pursuit hereof, <441023>Acts 2:23, 4:28.

[3.] In the disposal of all things in that way in such a holy and glorious order, as that marks and footsteps of infinite divine wisdom should be imprinted on every part and passage of it, <461023>1 Corinthians 1:23-31; <451133>Romans 11:33-36; <490310>Ephesians 3:10, 11.

(2.) His *justice*, accompanied with or springing from holiness, gave as it were the *especial determination* unto the way to be insisted on for the accomplishment of the end aimed at, and it was effectually exerted in the execution of it; for upon a supposition that God would pardon and save sinners, it was his eternal justice which required that it should be brought about by the sufferings of the Son, and it was itself expressed and exercised in those sufferings, as we shall afterwards more fully declare, <450325>Romans 3:25, 26, 8:3; <480313>Galatians 3:13; <470521>2 Corinthians 5:21.

(3.) Grace, love, goodness, or mercy, chiefly induced unto the whole. And these the Scriptures most commonly cast the work upon, or resolve it into. See <430316>John 3:16, 17; <450508>Romans 5:8, 11:6; <461029>1 Corinthians 1:29-31; <490105>Ephesians 1:5-7, 3:7, 8.

In these things, in the exercise, manifestation, and exaltation, of these glorious excellencies of the divine nature, with their effects in and upon the obedience of angels and men, doth consist that peculiar glory which God, even the Father, aims at in this covenant, and which supplies the place of

that security or advantage which amongst men is intended in such compacts.

17. There must also, moreover, be an especial and *peculiar honor of the Son,* the other party covenanting, intended therein; and was so accordingly, and is in like manner accomplished. And this was twofold: — First, what he had *conjunctly* with the Father, as he is of the same nature with him, "over all, God blessed for ever;" for on this account the divine excellencies before mentioned belong unto him, or are his, and in their exaltation is he exalted. But as his undertaking herein was peculiar, so he was to have a peculiar honor and glory thereby, not as God, but as the *Mediator of the covenant of grace,* which sprang from hence. For the accomplishment of the ends of this covenant, as we shall see, he parted for a season with the glory of his interest in those divine perfections, emptying himself, or making himself of no reputation, <5004505>Philippians 2:5-9. And he was to have an illustrious recovery of the glory of his interest in them, when he was "declared to be the Son of God with power, by the resurrection from the dead," <4500104>Romans 1:4, when he was again glorified with the Father, with that glory which he had with him before the world was, <4301705>John 17:5, — namely, that peculiar glory which he had and assumed upon his undertaking to be a Savior and Redeemer unto mankind, then when his delights were with the sons of men, and he rejoiced before the Father, and was his delight on that account. And this, secondly, was attended with that peculiar *glorious exaltation* which in his human nature he received upon the accomplishment of the terms and conditions of this covenant. What this glory was, and wherein it doth consist, I have manifested at large in the Exposition on <5800103>Hebrews 1:3. See <2305312>Isaiah 53:12; <1901001>Psalm 110:1, 6, 2:8, 9; <3801007>Zechariah 9:10; <1907208>Psalm 72:8; <4501411>Romans 14:11; <2304523>Isaiah 45:23; <4001818>Matthew 28:18; <5001010>Philippians 2:10; <5801202>Hebrews 12:2, etc.

18. The manner how these things were to be accomplished, — that is, the *condition and limitation of this covenant,* as it had respect unto a prescription of personal obedience and promises of reward, — is lastly to be considered; for herein lies the occasion and spring of the priesthood of Christ, which we are inquiring after. And this sort of covenants hath most affinity unto those relations which are constituted by the law of nature; for every natural relation, such as that of father and children, of man and

wife, contains in it a covenant with respect unto personal services and rewards. Now, things were so disposed in this covenant, that on the account of bringing sinners unto obedience and glory, to the honor of God the Father, and of the peculiar and especial honor or glory that was proposed unto himself, he, the Son, should do and undergo in his own person all and every thing which, in the wisdom, righteousness, holiness, and grace of God, was *requisite or necessary* unto that end, provided that the presence and assistance of the Father were with him, and that he accepted of him and his works.

I shall a little invert the order of these things, that I may not have occasion to return again unto them after we are engaged in our more peculiar design. We may therefore, in the first place, consider the *promises* that in this compact or covenant were made unto the Son upon his undertaking this work, although they more naturally depend on the prescription of duty and work made unto him. But we may consider them as encouragements unto the susception of the work. And these promises were of two sorts: —

(1.) Such as *concerned his person;*

(2.) Such as *concerned the prosperity of the work* which he undertook. Those also which concerned his person immediately were of two sorts: — [1.] Such as concerned *his assistance* in his work; [2.] Such as concerned *his acceptance* and glory after his work.

(1.) The *person of the Son of God,* not absolutely considered, but with respect unto his *future incarnation,* is a proper object of divine promises; and so was he now considered, even as an undertaker for the execution and establishment of this covenant, or as he became the minister of God to confirm the truth of the promises made afterwards to the fathers, Romans 15:8. And herein he had promises, —

[1.] As to his *assistance.* The work he undertook to accomplish, as it was great and glorious, so also it was difficult and arduous. It is known from the gospel what he did and what he suffered, — what straits, perplexities, and agonies of soul, he was reduced unto in his work. All this he foresaw in his first engagement, and thereon by his Spirit foretold what should befall him, Psalm 22, Isaiah 53; 1 Peter 1:11. Whatever opposition hell

and the world, — which were to prevail unto the bruising of his heel, — could make against the Son of God acting in the frail nature of man, he was to encounter withal; whatever the law and the curse of it could bring on offenders, he was to undergo it. Hence in that nature he stood in need of the presence of God with him and of his divine assistance. This, therefore, was promised unto him; in respect whereunto he placed his trust and confidence in God, even the Father, and called upon him in all his distresses. See <23404>Isaiah 42:4, 6; <19600>Psalm 16:10, 11, 22:1-31, 89:28; <23503>Isaiah 50:5-9. This God promised him, and gave him that assurance of, which at all times he might safely trust unto, — namely, that he would not leave him under his troubles, but stand by and assist him to the utmost of what had a consistency with the design itself whose execution he had undertaken.

[2.] Promises were given unto him concerning his *exaltation*, his kingdom, and power, with all that glory which was to ensue upon the accomplishment of his work. See <23532>Isaiah 53:12; <19901>Psalm 110:1, 6, 2:8, 9; <38910>Zechariah 9:10; <19720>Psalm 72:8; <27014>Daniel 7:14; <45411>Romans 14:11; <23523>Isaiah 45:23; <50210>Philippians 2:10. And these promises the Lord Christ had a constant eye unto in his whole work; and upon the accomplishment of it, made his request, and expected that they should be made good and fulfilled, — as well he might, being made unto him and confirmed with the "oath of God," <42405>Luke 24:26; <43705>John 17:5; <58202>Hebrews 12:2. And these are an essential part of the covenant that he was engaged by.

(2.) The second sort of promises made unto him are such as concern *his work*, and the acceptance of it with God. By them was he assured that the children whom he undertook for should be delivered and saved, should be made partakers of grace and glory. See <58209>Hebrews 2:9-11, etc., and our Exposition thereon. And this is that which gives the nature of merit unto the obedience and suffering of Christ. Merit is such an adjunct of obedience as whereon a reward is reckoned of debt. Now, there was in the nature of the things themselves a proportion between the obedience of Christ the mediator and the salvation of believers. But this is not the next foundation of merit, though it be an indispensable condition thereof; for there must not only be a *proportion*, but a *relation* also, between the things whereof the one is the merit of the other. And the relation in this case is not natural or necessary, arising from the nature of the things

themselves. This, therefore; arose from the *compact* or *covenant* that was between the Father and Son to this purpose, and the promises wherewith it was confirmed. Suppose, then, a proportion in *distributive justice* between the obedience of Christ and the salvation of believers (which wherein it doth consist shall be declared afterwards); then add the respect and relation that they have one to another by virtue of this covenant, and in particular that our salvation is engaged by promise unto Christ; and it gives us the true nature of his merit. Such promises were given him, and do belong unto this covenant, the accomplishment whereof he pleads on the discharge of his work, <2530>Isaiah 53:10, 11; <1922>Psalm 22:30, 31; <4701>John 17:1, 4-6, 9, 12-17; <5826>Hebrews 7:26; <2405>Isaiah 49:5-9; <1907>Psalm 2:7; <4433>Acts 13:33.

19. The conditions required of, or prescriptions made unto, the undertaker in this covenant, for the end mentioned, and under the promises directed unto, do complete it. And these may be reduced unto three heads: —

(1.) That he should *assume* or take on him the nature of those whom, according unto the terms of this covenant, he was to bring unto God. This was prescribed unto him, <5809>Hebrews 2:9, 10:5; which, by an act of infinite grace and condescension, he complied withal, <5006>Philippians 2:6-8, <5824>Hebrews 2:14. And therein, although he was with God, and was God, and made all things in the glory of the only-begotten Son of God, yet he was "made flesh," <4801>John 1:14. And this condescension, which was the foundation of all his obedience, gave the nature of merit and purchase unto what he did. This he did upon the prescription of the Father; who is therefore said to "send forth his Son, made of a woman," <4804>Galatians 4:4; and to "send forth his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh," <4503>Romans 8:3: in answer unto which act of the will of the Father he saith, "Lo, I come to do thy will," <5807>Hebrews 10:7. And this assumption of our nature was indispensably necessary unto the work which he had to do. He could no otherwise have exalted the glory of God in the salvation of sinners, nor been himself in our nature exalted unto his mediatory kingdom, which are the principal ends of this covenant,

(2.) That in this nature so assumed he should be the *servant of the Father*, and yield universal obedience unto him, both according to the *general law* of God obliging all mankind, and according unto the *especial law* of the

church under which he was born and made, and according unto the *singular law* of that compact or agreement which we have described, <23A201>Isaiah 42:1, 49:5; <500207>Philippians 2:7. He came to do, to answer and fulfill, the whole will of God, all that on any account was required of him. This he calls the "commandment" of his Father, the commands which he received of him, which extend themselves to all the prescriptions of this covenant.

(3.) That whereas God was highly incensed with and provoked against all and every one of those whom he was to save and bring unto glory, they having all by sin come short thereof, and rendered themselves obnoxious to the law and its curse, he should, as the servant of the Father unto the ends of this covenant, make an atonement for sin in and by our nature assumed, and answer the justice of God by suffering and undergoing what was due unto them; without which it was not possible they should be delivered or saved, unto the glory of God, <235311>Isaiah 53:11, 12.

And as all the other terms of the covenant, so this in particular he undertook to make good, namely, that he would interpose himself between the law and sinners, by undergoing the penalty thereof, and between divine justice itself and sinners, to make atonement for them. And so are we come to the well-head or the fountain of salvation. Here lieth the immediate sacred spring and fountain of the priesthood of Christ, and of the sacrifice of himself, which in the discharge of that office he offered unto God.

20. Man having sinned, the justice of God, as the supreme Lord, Ruler, and Governor over all, was violated thereby, and his law broken and disannulled. Every sin personally added to the first sin, which was the sin of our nature in Adam, doth so far partake of the nature thereof as to have the same consequents with respect unto the justice and law of God. In one or both these ways all men had sinned and come short of the glory of God, or were apostatized from the end of their creation, without power, hope, or possibility in themselves for the retrieval thereof. Neither was there any way for our recovery, unless God were propitiated, his justice atoned, and his law repaired or fulfilled. This now was that which in this eternal covenant the Son of God, as he was to be incarnate, did undertake to perform. And this could no otherwise be done but by the obedience and suffering of the *nature that had offended;* whereby greater glory should

redound unto God, in the exaltation of the glorious properties of his nature, through their eminent and peculiar exercise, than dishonor could be reflected on him or his rule by sin committed in that nature. This was done by the death and blood-shedding of the Son of God under the sentence and curse of the law. Hereunto, in this covenant, he voluntarily and of choice gave himself up unto the will of God, to undergo the penalty due to sinners, according to the terms and for the ends of the law: for inasmuch as the sufferings of Christ were absolutely from his own will, the obedience of his will therein giving them virtue and efficacy; and seeing he did in them and by them interpose himself between God and sinners, to make atonement and reconciliation for them; and seeing that to this end he offered up himself unto the will of God, to do and suffer whatever he required in justice and grace for the accomplishment of the ends of this compact and agreement; which having effected, he would persist to make effectual unto those for whom he so undertook all the benefits of his undertaking, by a continual glorious interposition with God on their behalf; he so became the high priest of his people, and offered himself a sacrifice for them.

For when God came to reveal this counsel of his will, this branch and part of the eternal compact between him and his Son, and to represent unto the church what had been transacted within the veil, for their faith and edification, as also to give them some previous insight into the manner of the accomplishment of these his holy counsels, he did it by the institution of a priesthood and sacrifices, or a sacred office and sacred kind of worship, suited and adapted to be a resemblance of this heavenly transaction between the Father and the Son; for the priesthood and sacrifices of the law were not the *original exemplar* of these things, but a *transcript and copy* of what was done in heaven itself, in counsel, design, and covenant, as they were a type of what should be afterwards accomplished in the earth. Now, although the names of priests and sacrifices are first applied unto the office mentioned under the law and their work, from whence they are traduced under the new testament and transferred unto Jesus Christ, that we may learn thereby what God of old instructed his church in, yet the things themselves intended and signified by these names belong properly and firstly unto Jesus Christ, upon the account of this his undertaking; and the very names of priests and

sacrifices were but improperly ascribed unto them who were so called, to be obscure representations of what was past, and types of what was to come.

21. The sum is, The Son of God, in infinite love, grace, and condescension, undertaking freely, in and of his own will, to interpose himself between the wrath of God and sinners, that they might be delivered from sin with all its consequents, and saved, unto the glory of God, according to the terms of the covenant explained, his offering and giving up of himself unto the will of God in suffering and dying, in answer unto his holiness, righteousness, and law, was, in the revelation of this counsel of God unto the church, represented by his institution of a *sacred office* of men, to offer up, by slaying and other rites of his own appointment, the best of other creatures, called by him a priesthood and sacrifices; these things in the first place belonging properly unto the accomplishment of the fore-mentioned holy undertaking in and by the person of that Son of God. And if it be inquired wherefore things were thus ordered in the wisdom and counsel of God, we answer, that, with respect unto the holiness, righteousness, and veracity of God, it was absolutely and indispensably necessary that they should be so disposed; for on the supposition of the sin of man, and the grace of God to save them who had sinned, the interposition of the Son of God described on their behalf was indispensably necessary, as shall be proved in the ensuing Exercitation.

EXERCITATION 29.

THE NECESSITY OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST ON THE SUPPOSITION OF SIN AND GRACE.

1. *The necessity of the priesthood of Christ, of what nature and on what grounds asserted.*

2. *The general nature of justice or righteousness.*

3. *The nature of the righteousness of God, as declared in the Scripture — The universal rectitude of his nature.*

4. *Right of rule in God, whence it proceeds.*

5. *The righteousness of God in particular exercise.*

6. *"Justitia regiminis" in God, the nature of it.*

7. *Sundry things supposed to the necessary exercise of vindictive righteousness.*

8. *The necessity and special nature of the priesthood of Christ founded thereon.*

9. *Some attributes of God produce the objects about which they are exercised, some suppose them with their qualifications — Vindictive justice no free act of God's will — The righteousness of rule exerted in the prescription of a penal law — Punishment, as punishment, necessary; not the degrees of it — God not indifferent whether sin be punished or not, but free in punishing; yet is it necessary that sin should be punished.*

10. *Justice and mercy not alike necessary as to their exercise.*

11. *The opinion of the Socinians, in opposition to the justice of God, declared.*

12. *Positions to be proved.*

13. *First argument taken from the holiness of God,* Habakkuk 1:13 *— Of God's jealousy,* Joshua 24:19 *— In what sense compared to a consuming fire,* Hebrews 12:29.

14. *God the supreme judge and governor of the world,* Genesis 18:25.

15. *The sum of what hath been pleaded concerning the righteousness of God.*

16. *Opposition made to this righteousness of God, by whom.*

17. *The arguments of Socinus examined — Justice and mercy not opposite.*

18. *The twofold righteousness assigned unto God by Socinus examined.*

19, 20. The righteousness of God in the punishment of sin further vindicated against him;

21. *And against the exceptions in the Racovian Catechism;*

22. *As also those of Crellius, who is further refuted.*

1. It appears from the precedent discourse that the priesthood of Christ was founded in sundry free acts of the will of God. Into that, therefore, is

it principally to be resolved. The actual appointing of him also unto this office was a free act of the sovereign will and pleasure of God, which might not have been. The redeeming of man was no more necessary on the part of God than his creation. Howbeit on this supposition, that God, in his infinite grace and love, would save sinners by the interposition of his Son, there was something in the manner of it indispensable and necessary; and this was, that he should do it by undergoing the *punishment* that was due unto them or their sins who should be saved, or offer himself a sacrifice to make atonement and reconciliation for them. This God did require; nor could it have been ordered otherwise, but that an inconsistency with the glory of his holiness, righteousness, and veracity, would have ensued thereon. The priesthood of the Son of God was necessary, not absolutely and in itself, but on the supposition of the law and entrance of sin, with the grace of God to save sinners.

This being a matter of great importance, and without a due stating whereof the doctrine concerning the priesthood of Christ, or the nature and use of this office of his, cannot be rightly conceived or apprehended, I must somewhat largely insist upon it. And I shall do it the rather because the truth in this matter is strenuously opposed by the Socinians, and the defense of it deserted by some otherwise adhering unto sound doctrine in the main of our cause: for I shall not mention them who in these things are not wise beyond the writings of two or three whom they admire; nor those who, being utter strangers to the true reasons and grounds of truth herein, do boldly and confidently vent their own imaginations, and that with the contempt of all who are not satisfied to be as ignorant as themselves.

2. Whereas we assert the *necessity of the priesthood* of Christ to depend on the righteousness of God, it is requisite that some things should be premised concerning the nature of *righteousness in general,* and in particular of the righteousness of God. Aristotle divides justice into that which is universal and that which is particular; and he makes the former to be the same with virtue in general; only it hath, as he supposeth, a respect unto others, and is not merely for itself, Ethic. lib. 5 cap. 1:2. Particular justice is either *distributive* or *commutative;* and in its exercise it consists in words or deeds. That justice which consists in *words,* respects either commands, and it is called *equity;* or promises and assertions, and is *veracity* or truth. And both these, even equity in his commands, and truth

or faithfulness in his promises, are frequently in the Scripture called the "*righteousness* of God." See <151915>Ezra 9:15; <160908>Nehemiah 9:8; Psalm 31:l; <451717>Romans 1:17, 3:21; <550408>2 Timothy 4:8. And this is the righteousness of God which David and other holy men so often plead and appeal unto, whilst in the meantime they plainly acknowledge that in the strictness of God's justice they could neither stand before him nor find acceptance with him, <190103>Psalm 130:3, 143:1, 2. The righteousness which consisteth or is exercised in *works* or actions is either the righteousness of *rule* in general, or of *judgment* in particular. And this latter is either *remunerative* or *corrective;* and this also is either *chastening* or *avenging.* And all these are subordinate unto distributive justice; for commutative hath no place between God and man. "Who hath given first unto him, that it should be recompensed unto him again?"

3. And these distinctions are of use in the declaration of the various acceptations of the "righteousness of God" in the Scripture. But their explication and further illustration is not at present necessary unto us; for I shall take up with a more general consideration of the righteousness of God and distribution of it, whereunto whatever is ascribed unto it in the Scripture may be reduced. Wherefore, the righteousness of God is taken two ways: — first, *Absolutely* in itself, as it is resident in the divine nature; secondly, With respect unto its *exercise,* or the actings of God suitably unto that holy property of his nature.

In the first sense or acceptation it is nothing but the *universal rectitude of the divine nature,* whereby it is necessary to God to do all things rightly, justly, equally, answerably unto his own wisdom, goodness, holiness, and right of dominion: <360305>Zephaniah 3:5,

> "The just LORD is in the midst thereof; he will not do iniquity: morning by morning doth he bring his judgment to light."

I say it is the essential, natural readiness and disposition of the holy nature of God to do all things justly and decently, according to the rule of his wisdom and the nature of things, with their relation one to another. And this virtue of the divine nature, considered absolutely, is not πρὸς ἕτεπον, or doth not consist in a habitude of mind with respect unto others, as all justice in men doth, but is the infinite, essential rectitude of God in his being. Hence it doth so preside in and over all the works of God, that there

is none of them, though proceeding immediately from mercy and goodness on the one hand, or from severity or faithfulness on the other, but that God is said to be righteous therein, and they are all represented as acts of righteousness in God; and this not only because they are his acts and works who will do no evil, who can do none, but also because they proceed from and are suited unto that holy, absolute, universal rectitude of his nature, wherein true righteousness doth consist. So are we said to obtain faith "through the righteousness of God," <600>2 Peter 1:1, — the same with "abundant mercy," <600>1 Peter 1:3; <2506>Isaiah 51:6, "My salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished;" that is, "my faithfulness." See the description of it in general, <1840>Job 34:10-15. The absolute rectitude of the nature of God, acted in and by his sovereignty, is his righteousness, <4509>Romans 9:8, 14, 15.

4. For between the consideration of this righteousness of God and the *actual exercise of it,* which must respect somewhat without him, to be made by him, somewhat in his creatures, there must be interposed a consideration of the *right* of God, or that which we call "jus dominii," a right, power, and liberty of rule or government; for it is not enough that any one be righteous to enable him to act righteously in all that he doth or may do with respect unto others, but, moreover, he must have a right to act in such and those cases wherein he doth so. And this right, which justice supposeth, is or may be twofold: —

(1.) *Supreme* and absolute;

(2.) *Subordinate.*

For we speak of justice and right only with respect unto public actings, or actings of rule, which belong unto righteousness as it is distributive; for that which is commutative, and may have place in private transactions among private persons, we have here no consideration of. Now, for that which is subordinate, it is a right to distribute justice or things equal unto others, according to the direction and by the authority of a superior: and this superior may be either *real* only, as is a law, — in which sense the law of nature is a superior unto all rulers on the earth, and the respective laws of nations to most; or *personal* also, which is that which is denied, where any one is acknowledged as a supreme governor. That this right

hath no place in God is evident. He hath no greater whereby he may swear, and therefore swears by himself, [3863]Hebrews 6:13.

The right, therefore, which God hath to act his righteousness, or to act righteously towards others, is *supreme* and *sovereign*, arising naturally and necessarily from the relation of all things unto himself; for hereby, — namely, by their relation unto him as his creatures, — they are all placed in an universal, indispensable, and absolutely unchangeable dependence on him, according to their natures and capacities. The right of God unto rule over us is wholly of another kind and nature than any thing is or can be among the sons of men, that which is paternal having the nearest resemblance of it, but it is not of the same kind; for it doth not arise from the benefits we *receive* from him, nor hath any *respect* unto our consent, for he rules over the most against their wills, but depends merely on our relation unto him as his creatures, with the nature, order, and condition of our existence, wherein we are placed by his sovereignty. This in him is unavoidably accompanied with a right to act towards us according to the counsel of his will and the rectitude of his nature. The state and condition, I say, of our being and end, with the relation which we have unto him and to his other works, or the order wherein we are set and placed in the universe, being the product or effect of his power, wisdom, will, and goodness, he hath an unchangeable, sovereign right to deal with us and act towards us according to the infinite, eternal rectitude of his nature. And as he hath a right so to do, so he cannot do otherwise. Supposing the state and condition wherein we are made and placed, with the nature of our relation unto and dependence on God, and God can act no otherwise towards us but according to what the essential rectitude of his nature doth direct and require; which is the foundation of what we plead in the case before us concerning the necessity of the priesthood of Christ.

5. Secondly, The righteousness of God may be considered with respect unto its *exercise*, which is so frequently expressed in the Scripture, and whereon depends the rule and government of the world. This supposeth the right of God before declared, as that right itself is no absolute but a relative property of God, supposing the creation of all things, in their nature, order, and mutual respects, according unto his wisdom and by his power. On this supposition it followeth naturally and necessarily, not as a new thing in God, but as a *natural and necessary respect* which his nature

and being hath unto all creatures upon their production; for suppose the creation of all things, and it is as natural and essential unto God to be the ruler of them and over them as it is to be God. Now, the exercise of the righteousness of God, in pursuit of his right of rule, is either absolute and antecedent, or respective and consequential. As it is *absolute* and acted antecedently unto the consideration of our obedience or disobedience, so it is put forth and exercised in his laws and promises; for they are acts or effects of righteousness disposing things equally, according to their nature and the will of God. God's ways are equal. His justice in legislation is universal equity; for all things being created in order by divine wisdom, there arose from thence a τὸ πρέπον, a meetness and condecency, whereunto respect was had in God's legislation, whereby his law or the commandment became equal, holy, meet, just, and good. And whereas it was necessary that the law of God should be accompanied with promises and threatenings, the eternal rectitude of God's nature acting righteously in their execution or accomplishment is his truth. Hence truth and righteousness are in the Scripture frequently used to express the same thing.

6. Again, there is a *respective* righteousness in *actions,* which also is either of *rule* or of *judgment.* First, there is "justitia regiminis," or the particular righteousness of actual rule. I do not place this [next] as though it were absolutely consequential unto that of legislation before mentioned; for take the *righteousness of rule* or government in its whole latitude, and it comprehends in it the *righteousness of legislation* also as a part thereof. For so it is the virtue or power of the nature of God, whereby he guideth all his actions or works in disposing and governing of the things created by him, in their several kinds and orders, according to the rule of his own eternal rectitude and wisdom; for righteousness of government must consist in an attendance unto and observation of some rule. Now, this in God is the absolute righteousness of his nature, with his natural right unto rule over all, in conjunction with his infinitely wise and holy will, which is that unto him which equity or law is unto supreme rulers among men. And therefore God, in the exercise of this righteousness, sometimes resolves the faith and obedience of men into *his sovereign right over all,* Job 41:11, 33:12, 13, 34:12-15; Jeremiah 19:1-6; Isaiah 45:9; Romans 9:20, 11:32, 33; — sometimes into the *holiness of his nature,* Zephaniah 3:5;

[1908]Psalm 47:8; — sometimes into the *equity and equality of his ways and works themselves,* [2685]Ezekiel 18:25. But there is a particular exercise of this righteousness of rule which hath respect unto the law, any law given unto men immediately by God, as confirmed with promises and threatenings. The ruling and disposing of the temporal and eternal states or conditions of men, according to the tenor and sentence of the law given unto them, belongeth hereunto. And as this is actually executed, it is called "justitia judicialis," or the righteousness of God whereby he *distributes rewards and punishments* unto his creatures according to their works. Hereof one part consisteth in the punishing of sin as it is a transgression of his law; and this is that wherein at present we are concerned, for we say that the righteousness of God, as he is the supreme ruler of the world, doth require necessarily that sin be punished, or the transgression of that law which is the instrument of his rule be avenged.

7. The exercise of this righteousness in God presupposeth sundry things; as, —

(1.) The creation of all things, in their kind, order, state, and condition, by a free act of the will and power of God, regulated by his goodness and infinite wisdom: for Our God doth whatever he pleaseth; he worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will.

(2.) In particular, the creation of intelligent, rational creatures in a moral dependence on himself, capable of being ruled by a law, in order unto his glory and their own blessedness. The being and nature of mankind, their rational constitution, their ability for obedience, their capacity of eternal blessedness or misery, depend all on a sovereign *free act* of the will of God.

(3.) The nature of the law given unto these creatures, as the means and instrument of their moral, orderly dependence on God; whereof the breach of that law would be a disturbance.

(4.) The eternal, natural, unchangeable right that God hath to govern these creatures according to the tenor of that law which he hath so appointed for the instrument of his rule. This is no less necessary unto God than his being.

(5.) The sin of those creatures, which was destructive of all that order of things, which ensued on the creation and giving of the law. For it was so, —

[1.] Of the principal end of the creation, which could be no other but the glory of God from the obedience of his creatures, preserving all things in the order and state wherein he had made and placed them;

[2.] Of the dependence of the creature on God, which consisted in his moral obedience unto him according to the law; and,

[3.] It was introductory of a state of things utterly opposite unto the universal rectitude of the nature of God. Only the right of God to rule the sinning creature unto his own glory abode with him, because it belongs unto him as God. And this represents the state of things between God and the sinning creature; wherein we say, that upon a supposition of all these antecedaneous free acts, and of the necessary continuance of God's righteousness of rule and judgment, it was necessary that the sinning creature should be punished according to the sentence of the law. Only observe, that I say not that this righteousness of judgment, as to the punitive part or quality of it, is a peculiar righteousness in God, or an *especial virtue* in the divine nature, or an *especial distinct righteousness*, which the schoolmen generally incline unto; for it is only the universal rectitude of the nature of God, sometimes called his righteousness, sometimes his holiness, sometimes his purity, exercising itself not absolutely, but on the suppositions before laid down.

8. On this state of things, on the necessary exercise of this righteousness of God upon the supposition mentioned, depend both the *necessity* and especial *nature* of the priesthood of Christ. Designed it was in grace, as we have before proved, on supposition that God would save sinners. But it was this justice that made it necessary, and determined its especial nature; for this was that which indispensably required the *punishment of sin*, and therefore was it *necessary* that he who would save sinners should undergo for them the punishment that was due unto them. This was therefore to be done by the Son of God, in the interposition that he made with God on the behalf of sinners. He was to answer the justice of God for their sin. But because this could not be done by mere *suffering* or *enduring punishment*, which is a thing in its own nature indifferent, the will and obedience of

Christ in the manner of undergoing it was also required. This made his priesthood necessary, whereby whilst he underwent the punishment due unto our sins, *he offered himself an acceptable sacrifice* for their expiation. This is that, therefore, which is now distinctly proposed unto confirmation, namely, that the justice or righteousness of God, as exercised in the rule and government of his rational creatures, did indispensably and necessarily require that sin committed should be punished, whence ariseth the *especial nature* of the priesthood of Christ. And this I shall do, — First, By premising some observations making way unto the true stating and explication of the truth; Secondly, By relating the judgment or opinion of the Socinians, our professed adversaries in and about these things; Thirdly, By producing the arguments and testimonies whereby the truth contended for is established, wherewithal the exceptions of the adversaries unto them shall be removed out of the way.

9. First, There are some *attributes* of God which, as to their first exercise *ad extra,* require *no object* antecedently existing unto their acting of themselves, much less objects qualified with any sort of conditions. Such are the wisdom and power of God, which do not find but produce the objects of their first actings *ad extra.* These, therefore, in their actings must needs be absolutely and every way free, being limited and directed only by the sovereign will and pleasure of God; for it was absolutely free to God whether he would act any thing outwardly or no, whether he would make a world or no, or of what kind. But on the supposition of the determination of his will so to act in producing things without himself, it could not be but he must of necessity, by the *necessity of his own nature,* act according to those properties, that is, infinitely powerfully and infinitely wisely. But herein were they no way limited by their first objects, for they were produced and had being given unto them by themselves. But there are properties of the divine nature which cannot act according unto their nature without a supposition of an *antecedent object,* and that qualified in such or such a manner. Such are his *vindictive justice* and his *pardoning mercy;* for if there be no sinners, none can be punished or pardoned. Yet are they not therefore to be esteemed only as free acts of the will of God; for not their *existence in* him, but their *outward exercise* only, depends on and is limited by the qualification of their objects. So then, —

Secondly, The rule of God's acting from or by his vindictive justice is not a mere *free act of his will,* but the natural dominion and rule which he hath over sinning creatures, in answer unto the rectitude and holiness of his own nature; that is, he doth not punish sin because he will do so merely, as he made the world because he would, and for his pleasure, but because he is just and righteous and holy in his rule, and can be no otherwise, because of the holiness and rectitude of his nature. Neither doth he punish sin as he can, that is, to the utmost of his power, but as the rule of his government and the order of things in the universe, disposed unto his glory, do require.

Thirdly, This justice exerted itself in one signal act antecedent unto the sin of man, namely, in the prescription of a penal law; that is, in the annexing of the *penalty of death* unto the transgression of the law. This God did not merely because he *would do so,* nor because he *could do so,* but because the *order of all things,* with respect unto their dependence on himself as the supreme ruler of all, did so require. For had God only given men a law of the rule of their dependence on him and subjection unto him, and not inseparably annexed a penalty unto its transgression, it was possible that man by sin might have cast off all his moral dependence on God, and set himself at liberty from his rule, as it was some such thing that was aimed at in the first sin, whereby man foolishly hoped that he should make himself like unto God; for having broke and disannulled the sole law of his dependence on God, what should he have had more to do with him? But this case was obviated by the justice of God, in predisposing the order of punishment to succeed in the room of the order of obedience, if that were broken. And that this provision should be made, the nature of God did require.

Fourthly, The justice of God *required a punishment* of sin as a punishment. Hereunto do belong the way and degree, the time, season, and manner of it; but these things are not necessarily stated in the justice of God. The assignation and determination of them belong unto his sovereign will and-wisdom. So would things have been ordered in the execution of the sentence of the law on Adam, had it not been taken off by the interposition of the Mediator. Whatever, therefore, God doth in this kind, when he hasteneth or deferreth deserved punishments, in the aggravation or diminution of penalties, it is all in the disposal of his holy will.

Fifthly, Whereas, upon the suppositions mentioned, I do affirm that it is necessary, on the consideration of the nature of God and his natural right to govern his creatures, that sin should be punished, yet I say not that God punisheth sin *necessarily;* which would express the manner of his operation, and not the reason of it. He doth not punish sin as the sun gives out light and heat, or as the fire burns, or as heavy things tend downwards, by a necessity of nature. He doth it freely, exerting his power by a free act of his will. For the necessity asserted doth only exclude an *antecedent indifferency,* upon all the suppositions laid down. It denies that, on these respects, it is absolutely indifferent with God whether sin be punished or no. Such an indifferency, I say, is opposite unto the nature, law, truth, and rule of God, and therefore such a necessity as excludes it must herein be asserted. It is not, then, indifferent with God whether sin, or the transgression of his law, be punished or no, and that because his justice requireth that it should be punished; so far, therefore, it is necessary that so it should be. But herein is God a free agent, and acts freely in what he doth, which is a necessary mode of all divine actings *ad extra;* for God doth all things according to the counsel of his own will, and his will is the original of all freedom. But suppose the determination of his will, and the divine nature necessarily requireth an acting suitable unto itself. It is altogether free to God whether he will speak unto any of his creatures or no: but supposing the determination of his will that he will so speak, it is absolutely necessary that he speak *truly;* for truth is an essential property of his nature, whence he is "God that cannot lie." It was absolutely free to God whether he would create this world or no: but on supposition that so he would do, he could not but create it *omnipotently* and *infinitely wisely;* for so his nature doth require, because he is essentially omnipotent and infinitely wise. So there was no necessity absolute in the nature of God that he should punish sin: but on supposition that he would create man, and would permit him to sin, it was necessary that his "sin should be avenged;" for this his righteousness and dominion over his creatures did require.

10. It is objected, "That on the same suppositions it will be no less necessary that God should pardon sin than that he should punish it. For mercy is no less an essential property of his nature than justice; and if, on supposition of the proper object of justice and its qualification, it is

necessary that it should be exercised, — that is, that where sin is there also should be punishment, — why then, on the supposition of the proper object of mercy and its qualification, is it not necessary that it also should be exercised, — that is, that where there is sin and misery there should be pity and pardon? And whereas one of these must give place unto the other, or else God can act nothing at all towards sinners, why may we not rather think that justice should yield as it were to mercy, and so all be pardoned, than that mercy should so far give place to justice as that all should be punished?"

Ans. **(1.)** We shall make it fully appear that God hath, in infinite wisdom and grace, so ordered all things in this matter that no disadvantage doth redound either to his justice or his mercy, but that both of them are gloriously exercised, manifested, and exerted. That this was done by the substitution of the Son of God in their stead, to answer divine justice, who were to be pardoned by mercy, and that it could be done no otherwise, is that which we are in the confirmation of. And those by whom this is denied can give no tolerable account why all are not condemned, seeing God is infinitely righteous, or all are not pardoned, seeing he is infinitely merciful. For what they fancy concerning impenitency will not relieve them; for if God can forgive sin without any satisfaction unto his justice, he may forgive every sin, and will do so, because he is infinitely merciful; for what should hinder or stand in the way, if justice do not? But, —

(2.) There is not the same reason of the actual exercise of justice and mercy; for upon the entrance of sin, as it respects the rule of God, the first thing that respects it is justice, whose part it is to preserve all things in their dependence on God; which without the punishment of sin cannot be done. But God is not obliged unto the exercise of mercy, nor doth the forbearance of such an exercise any way intrench upon the holiness of his nature or the glory of his rule. It is true, mercy is no less an essential property of God than justice; but neither the law, nor the state and order of things wherein they were created, nor their dependence on God as the supreme governor of the whole creation, raises any *natural respect* or obligation between mercy and its object. God, therefore, can execute the punishment which his justice requireth without the least impeachment of his mercy; for no act of justice is contrary unto mercy. But absolutely to

pardon where the interest of justice is to punish, is contrary to the nature of God.

11. (3.) It is denied that sin and misery do constitute the proper object of mercy. It is required that every thing contrary to the nature of God in sin and the sinner be taken out of the way, or there is no proper object for mercy. Such is the guilt of sin unsatisfied for. And moreover, faith and repentance are required to the same purpose. Socinus himself acknowledgeth that it is contrary to the nature of God to pardon impenitent sinners. These [faith and repentance] none can have but on the account of an antecedent reconciliation, as is evident in the fallen angels. And on these suppositions even mercy itself will be justly exercised, nor can it be otherwise.

These things are premised to give a right understanding of the truth which we assert and contend for. It remains that we briefly represent what is the opinion which the Socinians advance in opposition unto this foundation of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ; for they are awake unto their concernments herein, and there is none of them but in one place or other attempts an opposition unto this justice of God, and the necessity of its exercise upon the supposition of sin, though the defense of it hath been unhappily and causelessly by some deserted. The judgment of these men is expressed by Socinus, Praelec. Theol. cap. 16 lib. 1, de Jesu Christo Servator., lib. 3 cap. 1; Catech. Racov., cap. 8 quest. 19; Ostorod. Institut. cap. 31; Volk. de Ver. Relig. lib. 5 cap 21; Crellius, Lib. de Deo, cap. 28; Vindic. Socin. ad Grot. cap. 1; de Causis Mortis Christi, cap. 16; Smalcius adv. Franzium, Disputat. Quarta; Gitichius ad Lucium. Woolzogen.; Compend. Relig. Christianae, sect, 48. The sum of what they all plead is, that there is no such thing as justice in God, requiring that sin be punished; that the cause and fountain of punishment in God is anger, wrath, or fury; that these denote *free acts of the will of God,* which he may exercise or omit at his pleasure. If he punish sin, he doth nothing against justice, nor if he omit so to do. In all these things he is absolutely free. Such a governor of his creatures do they fancy him to be! Hence it follows that there was no necessity, no just or cogent reason, why the punishment of our sin or the chastisement of our peace should be laid on Christ; for there was neither need nor possibility that any satisfaction should be made to the justice of God. Only he hath freely determined to punish impenitent

sinners, and as freely determined to pardon them that repent and believe the gospel. For this hath he sent the Lord Christ to testify and declare unto us; with respect whereunto he is called and to be esteemed our Savior. The words of Socinus are express to this purpose, De Christo Servatore, lib. 1 cap. 2,

> "Quaerente aliquo, qui fiat, ut mortem aeternam meriti, nihilominus ad vitam aeternam perveniamus, non est germanum responsum, quia Christum Servatorem habemus: sed quia supplicium morris aeternae a Deo, cujus libera voluntate atque decreto id meriti fueramus, nobis pro ineffabili ipsius bonitate condonatum fuit; atque ejus loco datum vitae internae praemium; dummodo resipiscamus, et abnegata omni impietate vitae innocentiae ac sanctimoniae deinceps studeamus. Quod si, qua ratione istud nobis innotuerit, quaeratur, cure neque Deum videamus unquam, neque audiamus loquentem, quisve nobis tantae divinae liberalitatis non dubiam fidem fecerit, respondendum est, Jesum Christum id nobis enarrasse, et multis modis confirmasse."

This is the substance of the persuasion of these men in this matter; which how contradictory it is unto the whole mystery and design of the gospel, and contains a complete renunciation of the mediation of Christ, will in our ensuing discourse be made to appear.

12. That, therefore, which we are engaged in the confirmation of may be reduced unto two heads: — First, That the justice of God, whereby he governeth the world and ruleth over all, is an *essential property* of the divine nature, whence God is denominated "just" or "righteous;" and that on the account hereof it is necessary that sin should be punished, or not be absolutely pardoned without respect unto satisfaction given unto that justice of God. Secondly, That hence it became necessary, that in the designation of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, unto his office of priesthood, he should *make his soul an offering for sin*, to make an atonement thereby for it; without which there could have been no remission, because without it there could be no satisfaction given or reconciliation made.

13. Our first argument is taken from the consideration of the nature of God and his holiness. Whatever is spoken of the purity and holiness of God,

with his hatred of and aversation from sin and sinners on the account thereof, confirmeth our assertion; for we intend no more thereby but that God, the great ruler of the world, is of so holy a nature as that he cannot but hate and punish sin, and that so to do belongs unto his absolute perfection; for the purity and holiness of God is nothing but the universal perfection of his nature, which is accompanied with a displicency in and a hatred of sin, whence he will punish it according to its desert. So is it expressed, ³⁵⁰¹Habakkuk 1:13, “Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity.” Not to be able to look on or behold iniquity, expresseth the most inconceivable detestation of it. God is עֵינַיִם טְהוֹר; which expresseth the infinite holiness of his nature, with what respect therein he hath, and cannot but have, towards that which is perverse and evil. So when the prophet had made his inference from hence, namely, that he was holy, מֵרְאוֹת רָע, that any look or aspect unsuitable thereunto towards sin or evil is not to be expected from him, he adds expressly, תּוּכַל וְהַבִּיט אֵל־עָמָל לֹא; and he cannot (that is, because of the holiness of his nature, which such an action would be contrary unto) “look on,” that is, pass by, spare, or connive at, “iniquity.” For that is the rule of what God can do or cannot do. He can do every thing that is not contrary to himself; that is, to the essential properties of his nature. He can do nothing that is contrary unto or inconsistent with his truth, holiness, or righteousness. Wherefore, whereas not to look on sin, not to behold it, do include in them, and by the negation of contrary acts express, the punishing of sin, — that is, all sin, or sin as sin, — and these are resolved into the nature of God, or his essential holiness, this testimony declares that the punishment of sin is thence necessary unto God, as he is the holy, supreme governor of the world.

Hence this holiness of God is sometimes expressed by *jealousy*, or hath jealousy joined with it, or accompanying it: ⁶²⁴⁹Joshua 24:19, “He is an holy God; he is a jealous God: he will not forgive your transgressions nor your sins.” And God makes mention of this his jealousy, when he would instruct men in his severity in the punishing of sin, ²²⁰⁵Exodus 20:5: for the nature of jealousy is not to spare, ²⁰³⁴Proverbs 6:34; nothing but the executing of vengeance will satisfy it. And this is that which God intended in the revelation of himself which he made by the proclamation of his

name before Moses, [2 Exodus 34:7](), “That will by no means clear” (or “acquit”) “the guilty,” — namely, for whom no atonement is made.

And it is to instruct us herein that this holiness of God is expressed by *fire*, [3 Hebrews 12:29](), “Our God is a consuming fire,” — “devouring fire” and “everlasting burnings,” [4 Isaiah 33:14](); and that “a fiery stream” is said to proceed from him, and that his throne is like “a fiery flame,” [5 Daniel 7:9, 10](). Now it is certain that God acteth not in any external work by a mere and absolute necessity of nature, as fire burneth. This, therefore, we are not taught by this representation of the holiness of God. But if we may not learn thence, that as eventually fire will burn any combustible thing that is put into it, so the holiness of God requires that all sin be assuredly punished, we know not what to learn from it; and it is certainly not made use of merely for our amazement.

An account of the nature and holiness of God is given us to the same purpose, [6 Psalm 5:4-6](),

> “For thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness: neither shall evil dwell with thee. The foolish shall not stand in thy sight: thou hatest all workers of iniquity. Thou shalt destroy them that speak lies: the LORD will abhor the bloody and deceitful man.”

All the actings of God in the hatred and punishing of sin proceed from his nature; and what is natural to God is necessary. The negative expression; “Thou art not a God that hath pleasure,” etc., verse 4, includes strongly the affirmative, expressed verse 5, “Thou hatest all workers of iniquity.” And this he doth because he is such a God as he is, — that is, infinitely holy and righteous. And that hatred which is here ascribed unto God contains two things in it: —

(1.) *A natural displicency;* he cannot like it, he cannot approve it, he cannot but have an aversation from it,

(2.) *A will of punishing it* proceeding therefrom, and which is therefore necessary, because required by the nature of God. Expressions are here multiplied, to manifest that *sin is contrary to the nature of God,* and that it is inconsistent therewith to pass it by unpunished. But if the punishing of sin depend upon a mere free act of the will of God, which might or might not be without any disadvantage unto his nature, there is no reason why

his holiness or righteousness should be made mention of, as those which induce him thereunto and indispensably require it. This is that which from this consideration is confirmed unto us, — namely, that such is the holiness of the nature of God, that he cannot pass by sin absolutely unpunished: for it is contrary unto his holiness, and therefore he cannot do it; for he cannot deny himself.

14. Again, God in the Scripture is proposed unto us as the *supreme judge* of all, acting in rewards and punishments according unto his own righteousness, or what the rectitude and holy properties of his own nature do require and make just, good, and holy. Although his kingdom, dominion, government, and rule, be supreme and absolute, yet he ruleth not as it were arbitrarily, without respect unto any rule or law. That God should have any external rule or law in his government of the world, is absolutely and infinitely impossible; but his law and rule is the holiness and righteousness of his own nature, with respect unto that order of all things which, in his will and wisdom, he hath given and assigned unto the whole creation. In respect hereunto he is said to do right as a ruler and a judge: Genesis 18:25, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" כָּל־הָאָרֶץ הַשֹּׁפֵט expresseth that σχέσις of the divine nature, and that office as it were of God, which in this matter he represents himself by unto us as vested withal. He is that supreme rector or governor of all the world, who useth and is to use righteousness in his government, or to govern righteously. Before such a one the just and the unjust cannot, ought not to be treated or dealt withal in the same manner; for although none be *absolutely* righteous in his sight, yet some may be so *comparatively*, with respect unto some kind of guilt and guilty persons. According as the distance is between persons, so the righteousness of God requires that they be differently dealt withal.

But it is pleaded, "That the intention of the expression here used is to plead for mercy, that the just should not be utterly destroyed with the unjust; and that we improve the testimony unto a contrary end, namely, to prove that God must punish all sin." But all that is hence aimed at is no more but that God is denominated just and righteous from that righteousness whereby he punisheth sin; which therefore can be no *free act of his will*, but is an essential property of his nature. And if so, then doth that righteousness of his require that sin be punished; for God doth right

as a judge, and a judge cannot acquit the guilty without injustice. And what an external law is to a subordinate judge, that God's righteousness and holiness is unto him, as he is the judge of all the earth. And this appeal of Abraham unto the righteousness of God as he is a judge is founded in a principle of the light of nature, and as such is repeated by our apostle, Romans 3:5, 6. And unto this end is God, as the ruler of the world, represented as on a throne, executing justice and judgment; the introduction of which solemnity is of no use unless it instruct us that God governeth the world as a righteous judge, and that justice requireth that he inflict punishment on sinners: Psalm 9:7, 16, 97:2, 3, 89:14, "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne;" that is, they always dwell and reside there, because God on his throne acts according to the justice and righteousness of his nature. And hence he is both denominated righteous, and declared so to be, in and by the punishment of sin, Revelation 16:5, 6. See Romans 1:32; 2 Thessalonians 1:6; Exodus 9:27; which places I have to the same purpose pleaded and vindicated elsewhere.

15. The whole of what hath been thus far pleaded may be reduced unto the ensuing heads: —

(1.) God is naturally and necessarily the supreme governor of his rational creatures with respect unto their utmost end, which is his own glory. Upon the supposition of his being and theirs, an imagination to the contrary would imply all sorts of contradictions.

(2.) The law of obedience in and unto such creatures ariseth naturally and necessarily from the nature of God and their own; for this original law is nothing but that respect which a finite, limited, dependent creature hath unto an absolute, infinitely wise, holy, and good Creator, suited unto the principles of the nature which it is endued withal. Therefore it is indispensably necessary.

(3.) The annexing of a penalty unto the transgression of this law was nothing but what the righteousness of God, as the supreme ruler of his creatures, did make necessary, as that without which the glory and holiness of his rule could not be preserved upon the entrance of sin.

(4.) The institution of punishment, answerable unto the sanction of the law, is an act of justice in God, and necessary unto him as the supreme governor of the universe.

16. And this is the first ground whereon the necessity of the satisfaction of Christ, and of the atonement he was to make as our high priest, is founded; for on supposition that God, in infinite grace and mercy, would eternally save sinners, the punishment due unto their sins was to be undergone by him who interposed himself between them and the justice of God which required it, Now, as there are some who believe the satisfaction of Christ, on the abundant testimonies given unto it in the Scripture, and yet resolve the reason of it into the infinite wisdom and sovereign pleasure of God only, — with whom I do not now expressly deal, because although we differ about the way, we agree in the end, — so the Socinians employ the chief of their strength in opposition unto this righteousness of God, as knowing that if it be maintained, they are cast in their whole cause. I shall therefore remove all those objections which they principally fortify themselves with against the evidence of the truth asserted, and their exceptions also which they put in to the testimonies and arguments wherewith it is confirmed, and thereby put an end unto this Exercitation.

17. He whom I shall first begin withal is Socinus himself, who in all these things laid that foundation which his followers have built upon. And as in almost all his other works he casually reflects on this righteousness of God, so in that, De Jesu Christo Servatore, he directly opposeth it in two chapters at large, lib. 1 cap. 1, lib. 3 cap. 1. In the first place he designeth to answer the arguments produced by his adversary for it, and in the latter he levieth his objections against it. And in the first place, he proceedeth solely on the supposition that the righteousness which we here plead for, and that mercy whereby God forgiveth sins, are contrary and opposite unto one another, so that they cannot be properties of his nature, but only external acts of his will and power.

This is the foundation of his whole discourse in that place, which he asserts as a thing evident, but undertakes not at all to prove. But this supposition is openly false; for the justice and mercy of God may be considered either in themselves or with respect unto their effects. In neither sense are they contrary or opposite to each other. For in

themselves, being essential properties of the nature of God, as they must be, in that they are perfections of an intelligent Being, they differ not from the universal rectitude of his holy nature, but only add a various respect unto external things; so that in themselves they are so far from being opposite, as that God is denominated just from the exercising the perfections of his nature in a way of justice, and merciful from a like exercise in a way of mercy. Absolutely, therefore, and essentially they are the same. Neither are their effects contrary or opposite to each other, only they are diverse, or not of the same kind; nor are the effects of the one contrary unto the other. To punish, where punishment is deserved, is not contrary to mercy; but where punishment is not deserved there it is so, for then it is cruelty. And yet also in that case, the part of wrong, namely, in punishing without desert, is more opposite to justice itself than the cruel part is to mercy. And so is it where punishment exceeds guilt, or where proceedings are not according unto an equal measure or standard. Nor is to spare through or by mercy contrary to justice; for if to spare and pardon be not for the good of the whole, for the preservation of order and the end of rule, it is not mercy to pardon or spare, but facility, remissness in government, or foolish pity. Secure those things in rule and government which justice takes care of and provides for, and then to spare in mercy is no way contrary unto it. If these things be not provided for, to spare is not an act of mercy, but a defect in justice. And if these things were not so, it would be impossible that any one could be just and merciful also, yea, or do any act either of justice or mercy: for if he punish he is unmerciful, that is, wicked, if punishment be contrary to mercy; and if he spare he is not just, if sparing be opposite to justice. There is therefore nothing solid or sound, nothing but an outward appearance of reason, really contrary to the highest evidence of right reason indeed, in this sophism, which is laid as the foundation of the opposition made to the righteousness of God pleaded for.

18. On this false supposition Socinus grants a twofold righteousness in God with respect unto sin and the punishment thereof; — one which he perpetually useth whilst he destroys obstinate, impenitent, and contumacious sinners; the other whereby sometimes he punisheth sinners according unto his law, which yet are not obstinate, without any expectation of their repentance. And these several sorts of justice in God

he confirms by sundry instances in the place before alleged. But it is plain that these things belong not unto the question under debate; for they respect only the *external manner and acts* of punishing, and nothing is more fond than thence to feign various righteousnesses in God, or to conclude that therefore every transgression of the law doth not require a just recompense of reward. Nor is it supposed that the justice of God doth so exact the punishment of sin as that all sin must be *immediately punished,* in the same manner, especially as unto temporal punishments, which respect this life. It belongs unto the sovereign authority and infinite wisdom of God, as the governor of the world, so to dispose of the time, season, manner, and measure of the punishment due unto sin, as may most conduce to the end aimed at in the whole. Thus he cuts off some in their entrance into a course of sin; others he "endureth with much long-suffering," though "vessels of wrath fitted to destruction," [Romans 9:22]. And this he doth because he is willing so to do, or so it pleaseth him. But hence it follows not that finally he pardoneth or spareth some, or punisheth others, merely because he will.

That, therefore, whereby he deceives himself and others in this matter, is the exclusion of the satisfaction of Christ from having the place of any cause, or from being of any consideration, in the matter of pardoning sin; for this he expressly pleads and contends for in this place, as is evident from the words before cited, wherein he allows no more to Christ and his mediation but only that he came to *declare that God would forgive us our sins.* His whole proof, therefore, is but a begging of the thing in question. For the reason why God constantly punisheth them who are obstinate in their sins and impenitent, is really because their sins deserve, in his justice and according to his law, so to be punished; and they are not spared, because they obstinately refuse the remedy or relief provided for them, in that they fulfill not the condition whereby they might be interested in the sufferings of Christ for sin. "He that believeth not shall be damned;" that is, shall personally be left unto the justice of God and sentence of the law. [As to] those whom God spareth and punisheth not, it is not because their sins do not deserve punishment, or because the justice of God doth not require that their sins should be punished, but because they are interested by faith in the satisfaction made by Christ when he underwent the punishment due to their sins by the will of God. And this is the rule of

punishment and sparing, as they are final and decretory, according unto a sentence never to be repealed nor altered. As for temporary punishments, whether they are corrective only or vindictive, their dispensation depends absolutely on the will and pleasure of God, who will so order and dispose them as that they may be subordinate unto his final determination of the eternal condition of sinners. But this exclusion of the consideration of the interposition of Christ, in a way of suffering punishment for the procuring of the pardon of sin, is that which disturbs the whole harmony of what is taught us concerning the justice and mercy of God in the Scripture.

And the venom hereof hath so infected the minds of many, in these latter days, that they have even rejected the whole mystery of the gospel, and taken up with a religion which hath more of Judaism, Mohammedanism, and Gentilism in it, than of Christianity. And indeed if it be so, that in the remission of sins there is no respect unto the Lord Christ, but only that he hath declared it, and showed the way whereby we may attain it, it must be acknowledged that there is no righteousness in God requiring the punishment of sin; as also, that it was merely from an act of the will and pleasure of God that by any sins we deserve everlasting punishment. For neither, then, was the sanction of the law, or the constitution of the penalty of its transgression, any act of justice in God, but of his will absolutely, which might not have been; and so, notwithstanding the state and condition wherein we were created, and our moral dependence on God, and God's government over us, man might have sinned, and sinned a thousand times, and broken the whole law, and yet have been no way liable unto punishment, — namely, if God had so pleased; and it was as free unto him to reward sin as to punish it. For if you allow any reason to the contrary from the nature and order of things themselves, and our relation unto God as rational creatures, made meet to be subject unto him in a way of moral obedience, you introduce a necessity of punishment from the righteousness of God, which is denied. And on this supposition, upon an alike act of the will of God, *sin* might have been made to be *virtue*, and *obedience sin*, and so it might have been the duty of man to have hated God, and to have opposed him to the uttermost of his power; for all the merely free acts of God's will might have been otherwise, and contrary to what they are. And if you say it could not be so in this case, because the nature of God and his righteousness required it should be otherwise, you

grant all that is contended for. This false supposition made way for the twofold righteousness which Socinus feigns in God; and the instances which he gives in the confirmation of it respect only God's actual punishing of sin and sinners in this world, some sooner, and some after more forbearance, which none deny to proceed from his sovereign will and pleasure.

19. The same author in the same place betakes himself to another plea, and will not allow that God doth at all punish sin because he is just, or that his so doing is an act of justice in him; for so he speaks, lib. 1 cap. 1 p. 1: "Ea res quae ad Deum relata, misericordiae opponitur, non justitia appellatur, sed vel severitas, vel ira, vel indignatio, vel furor, vel vindicta, vel simili alio quopiam nomine nuncupatur." *Ans.* There are no things in God that are opposite or contrary one unto another; and this sophism was before discovered. Nay, anger and fury, though they denote not any thing in God, but outward effects from that which is in him, are not opposed to mercy; for mercy being a virtue and a divine perfection, whatever is contrary unto it is evil. Only, as they denote effects of justice, they are diverse from the outward effects of mercy. This therefore proves not that that, from whence it is that God punisheth sin, is not justice; which must be proved, or this man's cause is lost. I do acknowledge that both צֶדֶק and δικαιοσύνη are variously used in the Scripture when applied unto God, or do signify things of a distinct consideration; for upon the supposition of the rectitude of the divine nature in all things, righteousness may be variously exercised, yea, it is so in all that God doth. Hence Socinus gives sundry instances where God is said to be righteous in acts of mercy and goodness, as very many may be given; for besides that the rectitude, equality, and holiness, which are in all his ways, are known from his righteousness in the declaration that he makes of himself and his dealings with men, in a way of goodness, kindness, benignity, and mercy, there is universally a supposition of his promise of grace in Jesus Christ, the accomplishment whereof depends on his righteousness; which therefore may be pleaded, even when we pray for mercy, as it is often by David. For the faithfulness of God in fulfilling his promises, whether in the pardon of our sins or the rewarding of our obedience, is his righteousness in his word. Thence is he "justified in his sayings," Romans 3:4; that is, he is declared righteous in the fulfilling his promises and threatenings. Yet

this hinders not but that God is just when he “taketh vengeance;” that is, when he doth so and in his so doing, Romans 3:5.

That anger and fury are not properly in God all do acknowledge. The outward effects of the righteousness of God in the punishing of sin are so expressed, to declare the certainty and severity of his judgments. To say that God prescribes a penalty unto the transgression of his law, and *executeth* accordingly, merely in anger, wrath, or fury, is to ascribe that unto him which ought not to be done unto any wise law-maker or governor among men. Nor will it follow that because God is said to punish sin in anger and wrath, therefore he punisheth sin only because he will, and not because he is just, or that his justice doth not require that sin be punished. Yea, it thence follows that the justice of God is the cause of the punishment of sin; for to act in anger and fury any otherwise than as they are effects of justice is vicious and evil. God doth not, therefore, punish sin because he is angry; but to show the severity of his justice, he maketh an appearance of anger and wrath in punishing. These things belong to the outward manner, and not the inward principle of inflicting punishment.

20. In the first chapter of his third book he again attempts an opposition unto this righteousness of God. “Justitia ista,” saith he, “cui vos satisfaciendum esse omnino contenditis, in Deo non residet, sed effectus est voluntatis ipsius. Cum enim Deus peccatores punit, ut digno aliquo nomine hoc opus ejus appellemus, justitia tunc eum uti dicimus.” Therefore it seems do we deal benignly with God; and what he doth only in anger and fury we give it a worthy name, and say he doth it in righteousness! But what shall we say when God himself ascribeth his punishing of sin to his justice and judgment in governing the world? This he doth plainly Psalm 9:7, 8, 50:6, 98:9; Romans 1:32, 3:5. Shall he also be said to find out a worthy name for what he doth, though he do it on such accounts as wherein the thing signified by that name is not concerned? It is a hard task, doubtless, to prove that God doth not “judge the world in righteousness.” But he hath reason, as he supposeth, for his assertion; for he adds,

> “Quod antem justitia ista in Deo non resideat ex eo maxime apparere potest, quod si ea in Deo resideret nunquam is ne minimum quidem delictum cuiquam condonaret; nihil enim unquam

facit cut facere potest Deus quod qualitatibus quae in ipso resident adversatur. Exempli cause, cum in Deo sapientia et aequitas resideat, nihil unquam insipienter, nihil inique facit aut facere potest;"

— "That there is no such justice in God appears from hence, that if there were, he could never forgive the least sin unto any; for God doth nothing, nor can do any thing, that is contrary to the qualities which reside in him. For instance, whereas there is wisdom and equity in God, he can do nothing unwisely, nothing unjustly." So he. But he seems not to observe that herein he pleads our cause more forcibly than his own: for we say, that because this justice is a natural property of God, he can do nothing against it, and so cannot forgive any sin absolutely without respect unto satisfaction made unto that righteousness; and when this is done, to pardon and forgive sin is no way adverse or contrary unto it. This whole difficulty is reconciled in the cross of Christ, and can be so no otherwise; for God set him forth to be a propitiation, εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης, Romans 3:25; which when it is done, as pardon is a fruit or effect of mercy, so it is consistent with the severity of justice. See 2 Corinthians 5:21; Romans 8:3; Galatians 3:13, 14; Hebrews 9:13-15. And the whole ensuing discourse of Socinus in that chapter may be reduced unto these two heads: — First, A supposition that Christ did not nor could undergo the punishment due to our sins; which is to beg the matter in question, contrary to Scripture testimonies innumerable, many whereof I have elsewhere vindicated from the exceptions of himself and his followers. For let this be granted, and all his discourse about the *impossibility of pardoning any sin,* upon the supposition of such a righteousness in God, falls to the ground. And if he will not grant it, yet may he not be allowed to make a supposition on the contrary to be the ground of his argument whereby he endeavors to overthrow it. Secondly, He confounds the *habits of justice and mercy* with the acts of them. Hence would he prove an inequality betwixt justice and mercy, because there is so between punishing and pardoning. And so also God declares that he delights in mercy, but is slow to anger. But actually to pardon is no way opposite to justice, where satisfaction is made; nor to punish [opposite] unto mercy, where the law of obtaining an interest in that satisfaction is not observed. And all that God declares in the Scripture concerning his

justice and mercy, with the exercise of them towards sinners, is grounded on the supposition of the interposition and satisfaction of Christ. Where that is not, as in the case of the angels which sinned, no mention is made of mercy, more or less, but only of judgment according to their desert.

21. The author of the Racovian Catechism manageth the same plea against the vindictive justice of God, and gathers the objections unto a head, which Socinus more largely debated on, cap. 8. De Morte Christi. And although little be added therein unto what I have already cited, yet it containing the substance of what they are able to plead in this cause, I shall take a view of it in the words of these catechists:

> "Eam misericordiam et justitiam qualem hic adversarii inseri volunt, negamus Deo inesse naturaliter. Nam, quod attinet ad misericordiam, eam Deo non ita natura inesse ut isti sentiunt hinc patet; quod si natura Deo inesset non potest Deus ullum peccatum prorsus punire; atque vicissim si ea justitia natura Deo inesset ut illi opinantur, nullum peccatum Deus remitteret. Adversus enim ea, quae Deo insunt natura, nunquam potest quidquam facere Deus. Exempli causa, cum Sapientia Deo insit natura nunquam contra eam quidquam Deus facit, verum quaecunque facit, omnia facit sapienter. Verum cum Deum constet remittere peccata et punire, quando velit, apparet Deo ejusmodi misericordiam et justitiam, qualem illi opinantur, non inesse natura, sed esse effectus ipsius voluntatis. Praeterea eam justitiam quam adversarii misericordiae opponunt; qua Deus peccata punit, nusquam literae sacrae hoc nomine justitiae insigniunt, verum iram et furorem Dei appellant; imo justitiae Dei in scripturis hoc attribuitur cum Deus peccata condonat, 1 John 1:9; Romans 3:25, 26."

And hereon they conclude that there was no need, nor can there be any use, of the satisfaction of Christ. *Ans.* First, The design of this discourse is to prove that justice and mercy are not properties of the divine nature; for if they be, it cannot be denied but that the sufferings of Christ were necessary that sin might be pardoned. Now, herein we have against our adversaries the light of nature, and that not only as teaching us, by the conduct of right reason, that there is a singular perfection in these things, which must therefore be found in Him who is so the author of all goodness

and limited perfections unto others as to contain essentially and eminently all goodness and perfection in himself, but also it is not difficult to evince the actual consent of all mankind who acknowledge a Deity unto this principle, that God is just and merciful, with that justice and mercy which have respect unto the sins and offenses of men. There is, indeed, this difference betwixt them, that justice is ascribed unto God properly, as a habit or a habitual perfection; mercy analogically and reductively, as an affection. And therefore mercy in God is not accompanied with that sympathy and condolency which are mixed with it in our human nature. But that natural goodness and benignity whence God is ready to relieve, whereof his sparing and pardoning are proper effects, are that mercy of God which he represents unto us under the highest expressions of tenderness and compassion. See <19A308>Psalm 103:8-14. And in such declarations of himself he instructs us in what apprehensions we ought to have of his nature; which if it be not gracious and merciful, we are taught by him to err and mistake. So when God showed unto Moses his glory, and made a declaration of himself by his name, he did it not by calling over the free acts of his will, or showing what he would or could do, if so be he pleased, but he described his nature unto him by the essential properties of it, that the people might know who and what he was with whom they had to do, <023406>Exodus 34:6, 7. And yet among them is that mercy reckoned which is exerted in the pardoning of iniquity, transgression, and sin. The same is to be said concerning the justice of God; for this vindictive justice is nothing but the absolute rectitude of the nature of God with respect unto some outward objects, namely, sin and sinners. Had there, indeed, never been any sin or sinners, God could not in any outward acts have exercised either vindictive justice or sparing mercy; but yet he had been notwithstanding eternally just and merciful

And there is this difference between the justice and mercy of God on the one hand, and his power and wisdom on the other, that these latter, being absolute properties of the divine nature, without respect unto any other thing, do constitute their own objects; so that in all the works of God he doth not only not act against them, but he cannot act without them, for all that he doth must necessarily be done with infinite power and wisdom. But for the other, they cannot outwardly exert or act themselves but towards objects antecedently qualified; whence it is enough that God

neither doth nor can do any thing against them. And this he cannot do; for, secondly, it is weakly pleaded that if God be merciful, he cannot punish any sin. For to punish sin absolutely is no way contrary to mercy. If it were, then every one who correcteth or punisheth any for sin must needs be unmerciful. Nor is it contrary unto justice to pardon sin when satisfaction is made for it; without which God neither doth nor can pardon any sin, and that for this reason, namely, that it is contrary to his justice so to do. Thirdly, Whence God is said to pardon sin in his righteousness, or because he is righteous, hath been declared before. His faithfulness in his promises with respect unto the mediation of Jesus Christ is so called, which our adversaries cannot deny.

22. Crellius in almost all his writings opposeth this justice of God, ofttimes repeating the same things; which it were tedious to pursue, — besides, I have long since answered all his principal arguments and objections, in my Diatriba de Justitia Divina. I shall therefore here only call one of his reasons unto an account, whereby he would prove that there was no necessity for making any satisfaction unto God for sin, because I find it to prevail among many who are less skilled in disputations of this nature. And this is that which he insists on, Lib. de Deo, cap. 3 de Potestate Dei. He lays down this as a principle: "Deus potestatem habet infligendi poenam, et non infligendi; justitiae autem divinae nequaquam repugnat peccatori, quem punire jure possit, ignoscere." He is treating in that place about the supreme dominion and free power of God. And hereunto he saith it belongeth to inflict punishment, or to spare and pardon. But he is herein evidently mistaken: for although he who is absolutely supreme over all may punish and spare, yet it belongs not to him as such so to do: for punishing and sparing are the acts of a governor or judge as such; and unto God as such are they constantly ascribed in the Scripture, Jam 4:12; Ps 9:8, 9; Ge 18:25; Ps 50:6, 94:2; He 12:23. Now, it is one thing what may be done by virtue of *absolute sovereignty* and dominion, setting aside the consideration of rule and government, and another what ought to be done by a righteous ruler or judge. And whereas he says it is not contrary to justice to spare one who might *de jure* be punished, if he means by "a ruler may punish him by right," no more but that he may do so and do him no wrong, were there no more in the case it might be true. But it is not thus at any time

with sinners; for not only may God punish them and do them no wrong, but his own holiness and righteousness requires that they should be punished. And therefore the assertion, if accommodated to the cause in hand, must be this, “It is no wrong to justice to spare them who ought to be punished;” which is manifestly false. And Crellius himself grants that there are sins and sinners which not only God may punish *de jure,* but that he ought so to do, and that it would be contrary to his justice not to punish them: Adv. Grot. ad cap. 1 p. 98,

> “Deinde nec illud negamus rectitudinem ac justitiam Dei nonnunquam eum ad peccata punienda movere; eorum nempe quibus veniam non concedere, non modo aequitati per se est admodum consentaneum, verum etiam divinis decretis ut ita loquar debitum, quales sunt homines non resipiscentes, atque in peccatis contumaciter perseverantes; maxime si illud peccati genus in quo persistunt, insignem animi malitiam, aut apertum divinae majestatis contemptum spiret, si enim hujusmodi hominibus venia concederetur, facile supremi rectoris majestas, et legum ab ipso latarum evilesceret, et gloria ipsius, quae praecipuus operum ejus omnium finis est, minueretur.”

What here he grants concerning *some* sins, we contend to be true concerning *all.* Neither do that justice, equity, and rule which require these sins of contumacy and impenitency to be punished, depend on a free decree or act of the will of God only, for then no sin of itself or in its own nature deserves punishment. And it implies a contradiction to say that it doth so, and yet that it depends merely on the will of God. And in that book De Deo he hath other conceptions to this purpose: Cap. 23 p. 180,

> “Est ratio aliqua honestatis, circa quam Deus juste dispensare non potest;”

and p. 186,

> “Deo indignum est contumacium scelera impunita demittere;”

and cap. 28,

> “Nec sanctitas nec majestas Dei usquequaque fert ut impune mandata ejus violentur.”

If it be thus with respect unto some sins, it must not be because of sin, but only of some degrees of sin, if it be not so with all sin whatever. And who can believe that the *nature* of sin is not contrary unto the holiness and majesty of God, but that *some certain degrees* only of it are so? and who shall give in that degree of sin when it becomes so inconsistent with God's holiness and majesty? It is said that this is stubbornness and impenitency. But whoever sins once against God will be impenitent therein, unless relieved by the grace of Jesus Christ, which supposeth his satisfaction. And this is evident in the instance of the angels that sinned.

23. The defense which he makes of his former assertion, containing the substance of what remains of their plea against the necessity of the satisfaction of Christ, I shall particularly examine, and put an end unto this Exercitation. He therefore pleads,

> "Nemini sive puniat sire non puniat facit injuriam; siquidem de jure ipsius tantum agitur; neque enim nocenti debetur poena, sed is eam debet; et debet quidem illi, cui injuria omnis ultimo redundat, qui in nostro negotio Dens est; jus autem suum si rem spectes ut persequi cuique licet, ita et non persequi, ac de eo quantumlibet remittere: haec enim juris proprii, ac dominici natura est."

Ans. "Jus Dei," δικαίωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, "the right of God," in this matter, is neither "jus proprium," which answers the right of every private person, nor "jus dominicum," or the right of absolute dominion, but the right of a ruler or supreme judge, whereunto the things here ascribed unto the right of God in this matter do not belong, as we shall see. For whereas he saith, first, "That whether he punish or do not punish, he doth wrong to none," it is granted that no wrong is done to men; for, by reason of his sovereignty, he can do them none. But where punishment is due unto any sin, it cannot be absolutely spared, without the wrong or impeachment of that justice in whose nature it is to require its punishment. It is not, then, properly said that if God should not punish sin he should wrong any, for that he cannot do, do he what he will; but not to punish sin is contrary to his own holiness and righteousness. And for what he adds, secondly, "That punishment is *not due to the offender*, but that he owes his punishment unto him against whom the injury is done, who in this case is God;" I say, certainly no man ever imagined that punishment is so due to

the offender, or is so far his right, as that he should be injured if he were not punished, or that he might claim it as his right. Few offenders will pursue such a right. And whereas it is said that the injury in sin is done to God, it must be rightly understood; for the injury that is done unto him hath no analogy with that which is done by one private man unto another. Neither doth our goodness add any thing to him, nor our sin take any thing from him: [1816]Job 35:6-8,

> "If thou sinnest, what doest thou against him? or if thy transgressions be multiplied, what doest thou unto him? If thou be righteous, what givest thou him? or what receiveth he of thine hand? Thy wickedness may hurt a man as thou art; and thy righteousness may profit the son of man."

But that which is here called "injury," is the transgression of the law of the righteous Judge of all the world; and shall he not do right? shall he not recompense unto men according to their ways? And therefore that falls to the ground which he adds as the proof of the whole: "For as it is lawful for every one to prosecute his own right, so every one may forego it, remit of it, or not prosecute it, at his pleasure." And this is that which is principally insisted on by them in this cause, namely, that the right of punishing being in God only, he may forego it if he please, seeing every one may recede from or not pursue his own right at his pleasure. But a person may have a double right. First, that which ariseth from a debt, or a personal injury. This every man may pursue, so as that hereby he wrongs not any unconcerned therein, nor transgresses any rule of duty prescribed unto himself; and every one may at his pleasure remit, so as no prejudice redound thereby unto others. But our sins in respect of God have neither the nature of debts properly, nor of personal injuries, though they are metaphorically so called. And there is a right of rule or government, which is either positive or natural. Of the first sort is that which magistrates have over their subjects. Hereunto belongs the fight of exacting punishment according to the law. Now, this is such a right as hath duty inseparably annexed unto it. This, therefore, a righteous magistrate cannot forego without destroying the end of magistracy in the public good. For a magistrate to say, 'I have, indeed, a right to punish offenders in the commonwealth, but I will forego it, seeing all its exercise depends upon my will,' is a rejection of his duty, and an abrenunciation of his authority.

But, lastly, the right of God to rule over all is natural and necessary unto him: so therefore is our obligation unto obedience, or obnoxiousness unto punishment. To say that God may forego this right, or remit of it, is to say that he may at his pleasure cease to be our Lord and God; for the same nature of God which necessarily requireth our obedience doth indispensably require the punishment of our disobedience. And so have we closed our first argument in this cause, with our vindication of it.

A DIGRESSION

Concerning the sufferings of Christ, whether they were of the same kind with what sinners should have suffered, or whether he suffered the same that we should have done.

Unto what we have argued in the foregoing Exercitation it is generally objected, "That if the justice of God did thus indispensably require the punishment of sin, which was the ground of the satisfaction made by Christ, then it was necessary that Christ should undergo the same punishment that the sinners themselves should have done, namely, that which the justice of God did require. But this was impossible," as is pretended. And to overthrow this apprehension, that the Lord Christ underwent the same punishment in kind which we should have done, or as was due unto us, they have thus stated the opinion of them whom they do oppose. "Some," they say, "do maintain that our sins are to be looked on as our debts, or under the notion of debts, and God as the creditor, requiring the payment of them. Wherefore our Lord Jesus Christ, by his death and sufferings, paid this debt; so that his death was 'solutio ejusdem,' or the payment of what was due in the same kind. This, say some learned men, gave great advantage unto Socinus; who easily proved that there was no necessity for a mere creditor to exact his debt, but that he might at his pleasure 'cedere jure suo,' or forego his own right.. And this must needs be supposed of God in this matter, whose love, and grace, and pardoning mercy, are so celebrated therein." And to confirm this argument it is usually added, — which is the main thing pleaded by Socinus and Crellius themselves, — " That the Lord Christ neither did nor could undergo the penalty due unto us, because that was eternal death. And to plead that either Christ should have undergone it, if he could not have delivered himself from it, or that what was wanting unto his

sufferings as to their duration was compensated by the dignity of his person, is to acknowledge that indeed he did not undergo the *same punishment* that we are obnoxious unto."

Learned men, and those sound in the substance of the doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ, being differently minded, either in the thing itself or about the sense of the terms whereby it is expressed, I shall endeavor to state *right conceptions* about it, or at least express my own, without a design to contradict those of any others. And, — First, For the consideration of our sins under the notion of debts, and God as a creditor, it is generally known that before the rising of any heresy, the most learned men had expressed themselves with such a liberty as advantage hath been thence taken by such adversaries of the truth as afterwards arose. Thus the Scripture having called our sins our debts, and made mention of the payment made by Christ, and compared God to a creditor, before Socinus called the whole matter of the satisfaction of Christ into question, it is no wonder if the truth were commonly expressed under these notions, without such distinctions as were necessary to secure them from unforeseen exceptions. He with whom Socinus first disputed on this subject was Covetus; and he doth indeed make use of this argument to prove the satisfaction of Christ, namely, "That our sins being our debts, justice required that there should be payment made of them, or for them." But the truth is, he doth not take his argument from the nature of debts in general, but from the especial nature of these debts, as the Scripture calls them: for he made it appear that these debts are such as are crimes, or transgressions of the law of God; on the account whereof the persons that had contracted these debts, or were guilty of these crimes, became liable and obnoxious unto punishment in the judgment of God, who is the sovereign ruler over all. There is, therefore, a distinction to be put between such debts as are *civil* or pecuniary only, and those which are *criminal* also. And when the Scripture sets out our sins as debts, with such circumstances as allude unto pecuniary debts and their payment, it is to make the thing treated of obvious unto our understandings by a similitude exposed unto the acquaintance of all men; but as our sins are really intended, the expression is metaphorical. And Socinus, in his disputation about the nature of debts, creditors, and payments, had no advantage but what he took by a supposition that the terms which were used by his

adversary metaphorically (his argument being taken from the thing intended) were urged by him in their proper sense; which indeed they were not. And so, whereas all his dispute respects civil or pecuniary debts only, he was far enough from triumphing over his adversary, who intended such as were criminal. Wherefore, as this notion, of debts, creditors, and payments, need not yet be forborne in a popular way of teaching, because it is made use of in the Scripture to give us a sense of our condition upon the account of our sins, especially a declaration being made that these debts will be exacted of us; so in a disputation about the truth, it is necessary to declare of what nature these debts are, as all generally do, asserting them to be criminal.

Secondly, There is much ambiguity in that expression, of "Christ's paying the same which was due from us." For that term, "the *same*," may be variously modified, from divers respects. Consider the punishment suffered, it may be it was the same; consider the person suffering, and it was not the same. And therefore it may be said, as far as it was a penalty it was the same; as it was a payment it was not the same; or it was not the same as it was a satisfaction. For it was only what the law required, and the law required no satisfaction as formally such. Punishment and satisfaction differ formally, though materially they may be the same. I judge, therefore, that Christ was to undergo, and did undergo, that very punishment, in the kind of it, which those for whom he suffered should have undergone, and that, among others, for the reasons ensuing: —

1. *Christ underwent the punishment which, in the justice or judgment of God, was due unto sin.* That the justice of God did require that sin should be punished with a meet and due recompense of reward, we have proved already, and shall afterwards further confirm. To answer and satisfy this justice it was that Christ suffered; and therefore he suffered what that justice required. And this is what is pleaded for, and all. We should have undergone no more but what in the justice of God was due to sin. This Christ underwent, — namely, what in the justice of God was due to sin, and therefore what we should have undergone. Nor can it be supposed that, in the justice of God, there might be two sorts of penalties due to sin, one of one kind, and another of another. If it be said that because it was undergone by another it was not the same, I grant it was payment, which our suffering could never have been; it was satisfaction, which we by

undergoing any penalty could not make; but he yet suffered the same penalty which we should have done. No more is intended but that the Lord Christ underwent that punishment which was due to our sins; which I cannot see how it can well be denied by those who grant that he underwent any punishment at all, seeing the justice of God required no other.

2. That which was due to sin was all of it, whatever it was, contained and comprehended in the *curse of the law;* for in the curse God threatened the breach of the law with that punishment which in his justice was due unto it, and all that was so. I suppose this will not be denied. For the curse of the law is nothing but an *expression of that punishment* which is due unto the breach of it, delivered in a way of threatening. But now Jesus Christ underwent the curse of the law; by which I know not what to understand but that very punishment which the transgressors of the law should have undergone. Hence our apostle says that he was "made a curse for us," Galatians 3:13; because he underwent the penal sentence of the law. And there were not two kinds of punishment contained in the curse of the law, one that the sinner himself should undergo, another that should fall on the Mediator; for neither the law nor its curse had any respect unto a mediator. Only every transgressor was cursed thereby. The interposition of a mediator depends on other principles and reasons than any the law was acquainted withal. It was therefore the same punishment, in the kind of it, which was due to us, that the Lord Christ was to undergo, or it was that which neither the justice nor the law of God required.

3. It is said expressly that *God caused all our iniquities to meet on him,* Isaiah 53:6, or "hath laid on him the iniquity of us all;" that he bare our sins, verse 11, or "bare our sins in his own body on the tree," 1 Peter 2:24; whereby he who knew no sin was made sin for us, 2 Corinthians 5:21; — the sense of all which places I have elsewhere pleaded and vindicated. Now, unless we will betake ourselves unto the metaphorical sense of our adversaries, and grant that all these, and the like expressions in the Scripture innumerable, signify no more but that Christ took away our sins, by declaring and confirming unto us the way of faith and obedience, whereby we may obtain the pardon of them, and have them so taken away, we can assign no sense unto them but that the Lord Christ underwent the punishment due unto our sins in the judgment of God, and

according to the sentence of the law; for how did God make our sins to meet on him, how did he bear them, if he did not suffer the penalty due to them, or if he underwent some other inconvenience, but not the exact demerit of sin? And there is no other sense given of these places by them who plead for the satisfaction of Christ but this, that he bare the punishment due to our sins; which is all that is contended for.

4. Christ *suffered in our stead.* He was our ᾽Αντίψυχος. And it is usual with all learned men to illustrate his being so by the instances of such as have been renowned in the world on that account; which they have clear warranty for from our apostle, Romans 5:7. When one would substitute himself in the room of another who was obnoxious unto punishment, he that was so substituted was always to undergo that very penalty, whether by loss of limb, liberty, or life, that the other should have undergone. And in like manner, if the Lord Christ suffered in our stead, as our ᾽Αντίψυχος, he suffered what we should have done. And to conclude, if a certain punishment of sin be required indispensably, on the account of the holiness and essential righteousness of God, I know not on what ground we can suppose that several sorts or kinds of punishment might be inflicted for it at pleasure.

It remains that we consider the principal objections that are usually leveled against the truth asserted, and either answer them, or show how that which we maintain is not concerned in them nor opposed by them.

First, therefore, it is objected, "That the punishment which we should have undergone was *death eternal*, but this Christ did not, nor could undergo; so that he underwent not the same punishment that we should have done." *Ans.* Death as eternal was in the punishment due unto our sin, not directly, but consequentially; and that "a natura subjecti," not "a natura causae." For, that the punishment of sin should be eternal arose not from the nature and order of all things, namely, of God, the law, and the sinner, but from the nature and *condition of the sinner* only. This was such as that it could no otherwise undergo a punishment proportionable unto the demerit of sin but by an *eternal continuance* under it. This, therefore, was not a necessary consequent of guilt absolutely, but of guilt in or upon such a subject as a sinner is, who is no more but a finite limited creature. But when, by God's appointment, the same punishment fell on Him

whose person, upon another consideration, was infinitely distanced from those of the sinners themselves, eternity was not of the nature of it. But then it may be said, "That the admission of one to pay or suffer for another, who could discharge the debt in much less time than the other or offender could, is not the same that the law required; for the law takes no notice of any other than the person who had offended. And if a mediator could have paid the same, the original law must have been *distinctive*, — that either the offender must suffer or another for him." *Ans.* These things are for the most part true, but not contrary to our assertion, as is pretended, through a misapprehension of it. For the law requires no such thing as one to suffer for another, nor, absolutely considered, doth admit of it. This was from God's gracious dispensation of or with the law, as the supreme Lord and ruler over all. The law itself takes notice *only of offenders*, nor hath any such supposition included in it as that the offenders must suffer or a mediator in their stead. But this the law hath in it, and inseparable from it, namely, that this kind of punishment is due to the transgressor of it. And by God's gracious substitution of Christ in the room of sinners, there was no relaxation made of the law as to the punishment it required; nor is there any word in the Scripture giving countenance unto such an apprehension. That there was a dispensation with the law so far as that one person should undergo the punishment (namely, the Son of God) which others did deserve, he becoming a mediator for them, the Scripture everywhere declares. Upon the supposition of his substitution in the place and stead of sinners, could there be any word of Scripture produced intimating such a relaxation of the law as that it should not require of him the whole punishment due to sin, but only some part of it, or not the punishment which was due to sinners, but somewhat else of another kind that was not in the original sanction and curse of it, there would be an end of this difference. But this appears not, nor is there any thing of sound reason in it, that one should suffer for another, in the stead of another, and thereby answer the law whereby that other was bound over unto punishment, and yet not suffer what he should have done. Nor is it pleaded, in this case, that the *dignity of the person* makes up what was wanting in the kind or degree of punishment; whence it is supposed that it would follow that then he who so suffered, suffered not what others should have done who were not so worthy. It is only said, that from the dignity of the person undergoing the same kind of

punishment that others should have done, that respect of it which consisted in its duration, and arose from the disability of the persons liable unto it otherwise to undergo it, could have here no place.

It is yet further pleaded, "That if the same be paid in a strict sense, then deliverance would have followed *ipso facto,* for the release immediately follows the payment of the same; and it had been injustice to have required any thing further of the offenders when strict and full payment had been made of what was in the obligation." *Ans*. To discuss these things at large would require a larger discourse than I shall now divert unto. But, —

1. It hath been showed already, howsoever we allow of that expression of "paying the same," it is only suffering the same for which we contend. Christ underwent the same punishment that the law required, but that his so doing should be a payment for us depended on God's sovereign dispensation, yet so that, when it was paid, it was the same which was due from us.

2. This payment, therefore, as such, and the deliverance that ensued thereon, depended on a previous compact and agreement, as must all satisfaction of one for another. This compact, as it concerned the person requiring satisfaction and the person making it, we have before described and explained; and as it concerns them who are to be partakers of the benefit of it, it is declared in the covenant of grace. Deliverance, therefore, doth not *naturally* follow on this satisfaction, but *jure foederis;* and therefore was not to ensue *ipso facto,* but in the way and order disposed in that covenant.

3. The actual deliverance of all the persons for whom Christ suffered, to ensue *ipso facto* upon his suffering, was absolutely impossible; for they were not [in being], the most of them, when he suffered. And that the whole of the time, way, and manner of this deliverance dependeth on compact, is evident from them who were delivered actually from the penalty long before the actual sufferings of Christ, merely upon the account of his sufferings which should afterwards ensue.

4. *Deliverance is* no end of punishment, considered merely as such; none is punished properly that he may be delivered; however, the cessation of punishment may be called a deliverance.

5. Mere deliverance was not the whole end of Christ's sufferings for us, but such a deliverance as is attended with a state and condition of superadded blessedness. And the duties of faith, repentance, and obedience, which are prescribed unto us, are not enjoined only or principally with respect unto deliverance from punishment, but with respect unto the attaining of those other ends of the mediation of Christ, in a new spiritual life here and eternal life hereafter. And with respect unto them may they justly be required of us, though Christ suffered and paid the same which we ought.

6. No deliverance *ipso facto,* upon a supposition of suffering or paying of the same, was necessary, but only the *actual discharge* of him who made the payment, and that under the notion and capacity of an undertaker for others: which in this case did ensue; for the Lord Christ immediately on his sufferings was discharged, and that as our surety and representative.

But it may be further objected, "That it is impossible to reconcile the freeness of remission with the full payment of the very same that was in the obligation; for it is impossible that the same debt should be fully paid and freely forgiven." *Ans.* It is well if those who make use of this objection, because they suppose it of force and weight, are satisfied with their own answers unto the Socinians when it is much urged and insisted on by them. For it seems at first view that if the freedom of pardon unto us exclude any kind of satisfaction to be made by another for us, that it excludes all; for as to the freedom of pardon, wherein soever that freedom doth consist, it is asserted in the Scripture to be absolute, without any respects or restrictions. It is not said that God will so freely pardon us that he will not require all that was due, the same that was due, but somewhat he may and will. It is not said that he will not have a suffering of this kind of punishment, but the suffering of another kind of punishment he will. And so to suppose is a thing unworthy of the grace and righteousness of God. To say that God *freely remitted our sins,* abrogating the law and the curse of it, requiring no punishment, no satisfaction for them, neither from ourselves nor from the Mediator, hath, at first view, an appearance of royal grace and clemency, until, being examined, it is found inconsistent with the truth and holiness of God. To say that God required the execution of the sentence and curse of the law, in the undergoing of the punishment due unto sin, but yet, out of his love

and infinite grace, sent his Son to undergo it for us, so to comply with his holiness, to satisfy his justice, and fulfill his truth and law, that he might freely pardon sinners,— this the Scripture everywhere declares, and the so doing is consistent with all the perfections of the divine nature. But to say that he would neither absolutely pardon us without any satisfaction, nor yet have the same penalty undergone by Christ which his justice and law required as due unto sin, but somewhat else, seems to be unworthy of the holiness of God on the one side, which is but partially complied withal, and of his grace on the other, which is not exalted by it, and is a conceit that hath no countenance given unto it in the Scripture. Wherefore, the absolute freedom of pardon unto us is absolutely consistent with Christ suffering the *same penalty* which was due unto our sins.

And whereas it is pleaded, "That satisfaction and remission must respect the same person, for Christ did not pay for himself, but for us, neither could the remission be unto him; so that what was exactly paid by him, it is all one as if it had been paid by us;" unless it be cautiously explained, it hath a disadvantageous aspect towards the whole truth pleaded for. The Scripture is clear that God pardoneth us for Christ's sake; and no less clear that he spared not him for our sakes. And if what Christ did be so accounted as done by ourselves as that payment and remission respect immediately the same person, then be it what it will, more or less, that was so paid or so satisfied for, we are not freely pardoned, but are esteemed to have suffered or paid so much, though not the whole. This is not that which we do believe. But satisfaction was made by Christ, and remission is made unto us. He suffered, the just for the unjust, that we may go free. In brief, Christ's undergoing the punishment due unto our sins, the same that we should have undergone,—or, to speak with respect unto that improper notion, his paying the same debts which we owed,— doth not in the least take off from the freedom of our pardon; yet it much consists therein, or at least depends thereon. I say not that pardon itself doth so, but the freedom of it in God, and with respect unto us, doth so. For God is said to do that freely for us which he doth of grace; and whatever he doth of grace is done for us freely. Thus the love and grace of God in sending Jesus Christ to die for us were free; and therein lay the foundation of free remission unto us. His constitution of his suffering of the same punishment which was due unto our sins, as the surety and

mediator of the new covenant, was free and of mere grace, depending on the compact or covenant between the Father and Son, before explained. The imputation of our sin to him, or the making him to be sin for us, by his own voluntary choice and consent, was in like manner free. The constitution of the new covenant, and therein of the way and law of the participation of the benefits of the sufferings of Christ, was also free and of grace. The communication of the Holy Spirit unto us, enabling us to believe and to fulfill the condition of the covenant, is absolutely free. And other instances of the freedom of God's grace, with respect unto the remission of sin, might be given Unto us it is *every way free*. In our own persons we make no satisfaction, nor pay one farthing of our debt; we did nothing toward the procurement of another to do it; we bring neither money nor price to obtain a pardon; but are absolved by the mere free grace of God by Jesus Christ. And there is nothing here inconsistent with Christ suffering the same that we should have done, or his paying the same debt which we owed, in the sense before explained.

EXERCITATION 30.

THE NECESSITY OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST ON THE SUPPOSITION OF SIN AND GRACE.

1. *The vindictive justice of God confirmed by other arguments.*

2. *The common suffrage of mankind herein;*

3. *Expressed in sacrifices.*

4. *The anger of God, wherein it consists.*

5. *Arguments proving it necessary that sin should be punished.*

6. *Sum of the reasons for the necessity of the priesthood of Christ.*

7. *No necessity nor use of his death on any other supposition.*

8. *Conclusion.*

1. That which is proposed unto confirmation in these Exercitations is, that the justice or righteousness from whence it is that God punisheth sin, and which he exerciseth in so doing, is an *essential property* of his nature. There yet remain some other arguments whereby the truth hereof is confirmed, which I shall only briefly represent, that we be not too long detained on this particular head of our design. Besides, I have both urged and vindicated these arguments already in another way.

2. In the next place, therefore, unto what hath been insisted on, we may plead the *common suffrage of mankind* in this matter: for what all men have a presumption of is not free, but necessary, nor can be otherwise; for it is from a principle which knows only what is, and not what may be or may not be. Of such things there can be no common or innate persuasion among men. Such are all the free acts of the will of God. They are of things that might be or might not be; otherwise were they not free acts. If, therefore, God's punishing of sin were merely an effect of a free act of his will, without respect unto any essential property of his nature, there could never have been any general presumption or apprehension of it in the minds of men. But this there is, namely, that God is righteous with that kind of righteousness which requires that sin be punished; and he therefore doth punish it accordingly. Hence our apostle, speaking of the generality of the heathen, affirms that they knew that it was "the judgment of God that they who committed sin were worthy of death," [401]Romans 1:32.

They are enormous sins indeed, mostly, which he instanceth in; but his inference is from the *nature*, and not the *degree* of any sin. “They who commit sin are worthy or death;” that is, obnoxious unto it on the account of their guilt, and which shall therefore be inflicted on them. And death is the punishment due to sin. And this is “the *judgment* of God,” — that which his justice requireth, which, because he is just, he judgeth meet to be done; or, this is that *right* which God exerciseth in the government of all. And this was known to the Gentiles by the light and instinct of nature, for other instruction herein they had not. And this natural conception of their minds they variously expressed, as hath been elsewhere declared. Thus, when the barbarians saw Paul bound with a chain, whence they supposed him to be a malefactor, they presently concluded, upon the viper’s leaping on his hand, that vengeance from God was fallen on him, which he should not escape notwithstanding the deliverance which he had had at sea; for this δίκη, or “vengeance,’’ they thought to be peculiarly designed to find out sinners that had seemed to have made an escape from punishment justly deserved, Acts 28:4. That such punishment is due to sin they were sufficiently convinced of by the testimony of their own consciences, Romans 2:14, 15; and whereas conscience is nothing but the judgment which a man maketh concerning himself and his actions, with respect unto the superior judgment of God, a sense of the eternal righteousness of God was therein included.

3. And this sense of avenging justice they expressed in all their *sacrifices*, wherein they attempted to make some atonement for the guilt of sin. And this in an especial manner evidenced itself, partly in that horrid custom of sacrificing of other men, and partly in the occasional devoting of themselves unto destruction unto the same end; as also in their more solemn and public lustrations and expiations of cities and countries, in the time of public calamities and judgments. For, what was the voice of nature in those actings, wherein it offered violence to its own inbred principles and inclinations? It was this alone: ‘The Governor over all is just and righteous; we are guilty. He will not suffer us to live, vengeance will overtake us, if some way or other some course be not found out to appease him, to satisfy his justice, and to divert his judgments,’ Micah 6:6, 7. This they thought to be the most probable way to bring about this end, namely, to take another of the same nature with themselves, and it

may be dear unto them, and to bring him unto death, the worst that could be feared or suffered, in their own stead, with an imprecation “quod in ejus caput sit” upon him.

4. Again; what is affirmed in the Scripture concerning the *anger, wrath, and fury of God* against sin, and in the punishment of sinners, confirms what we affirm. See <45 1:18>Romans 1:18; <04 25:4>Numbers 25:4; <05 13:17>Deuteronomy 13:17; <06 7:26>Joshua 7:26; <19 78:49>Psalm 78:49; <23 13:9>Isaiah 13:9; <35 3:8>Habakkuk 3:8. Now, this anger and wrath, especially in the signification of the original words, do denote such commotions and alterations as the divine nature is no way subject unto; for with God there is neither variableness nor shadow of change, <59 1:17>James 1:17. Yet our apostle says that this anger is “revealed from heaven,” — namely, in the acts of divine providence in the world. Nothing, therefore, can be intended hereby but the *effects* of anger; that is, punishment. And so it is declared, <45 3:5>Romans 3:5; <49 5:6>Ephesians 5:6; <45 2:5>Romans 2:5: for the anger or wrath of God is said to come upon men when they are punished by him for their sins. Yet something *in God* is declared hereby; and this can be nothing but a constant and unchangeable will of rendering unto sin a meet recompense of reward, <45 9:22>Romans 9:22. And this is justice, the justice pleaded for, which is inseparable from the nature of God. Hence God is said to judge and punish in his anger, <19 56:7>Psalm 56:7. And if any thing but this vindictive justice be therein intended, that is assigned unto him which ought not to be assigned unto a man that is honest and wise. And this doth God no less manifest in the works of his providence than he doth his goodness and patience; though the instances of it neither are nor ought to be continual, because of the future general judgment, whereunto all things and persons are reserved.

5. It will be granted by some that there is such a natural property in God as that which we contend for; “But it doth not thence follow,” they say, “that it is necessary that God should *punish all sin;* but he doth it, and may do it, by an absolute free act of his will. There is, therefore, no cogent argument to be taken from the consideration hereof for the necessity of the sufferings of Christ.” The heads of some few arguments to the contrary shall put a close to this whole discourse:—

First, *God hateth sin, he hateth every sin;* he cannot otherwise do. Let any man assert the contrary, — namely, that God doth not hate sin, or that it

is not necessary unto him, on the account of his own nature, that he should hate sin, — and the consequence thereof will quickly be discerned. For to say that God may not hate sin, is at once to take away all natural and necessary difference between moral good and evil; for if he may not hate it, he may love it. The mere acts of God's will which are not regulated by any thing in his nature but only wisdom and liberty, are not determined unto this or that object, but he may so will any thing, or the contrary. And then if God may love sin, he may approve it; and if he approve sin, it is not sin, which is a plain contradiction. That God hateth sin, see Psalm 5:4, 5, 11:5, 14:1, 53:1; Leviticus 26:30; Deuteronomy 16:22; 1 Kings 21:26; Proverbs 15:9; Habakkuk 1:13. And this hatred of sin in God can be nothing but the displicency in or contrariety of his nature unto it, with an immutable will of punishing it thence arising; for, to have a natural displicency against sin, and not an immutable will of punishing it, is unworthy of God, for it must arise from impotency. To punish sin, therefore, according to its demerit is necessary unto him.

Secondly, God with respect unto sin and sinners is called "a consuming fire," Hebrews 12:29; Deuteronomy 4:24; Isaiah 33:14, 5:24, 66:15, 16. Something we are taught by the allusion in this expression. This is not the *manner of God's operation.* God worketh freely; the fire burns necessarily. God, I say, always worketh freely, with a freedom accompanying his operation; though in some cases, on some suppositions, it is necessary that he should work as he doth. It is free to him to speak unto us or not; but on the supposition that he will do so, it is necessary that he speak truly, for God cannot lie. Fire, therefore, acts by brute inclination, according to its form and principle. God acts by his understanding and will, with a freedom accompanying all his operations. This, therefore, we are not taught by this allusion. The comparison, therefore, must hold with respect unto the event, or we are deceived, not instructed by it. As, therefore, the fire necessarily burneth and consumeth all combustible things whereunto it is applied, in its way of operation, which is natural; so doth God necessarily punish sin when it lies before him in judgment, in his way of operation, which is free and intellectual.

Thirdly, It is necessary that God should do every thing that is *requisite unto his own glory.* This the perfection of his nature and existence doth require. So he doth all things for himself. It is necessary, therefore, that

nothing fall out in the universe which should absolutely impeach the glory of God, or contradict his design of its manifestation. Now, suppose that God would and should let sin go unpunished, where would be the glory of his righteousness as he is the supreme ruler over all? For, to omit what justice requireth is no less a disparagement unto it than to do what it forbids, <2076>Proverbs 17:15. And where would be the glory of his holiness, supposing the description given of it, <3613>Habakkuk 1:13, — where would be that fear and reverence which is due unto him, where that sense of his terror, where that secret awe of him which ought to be in the hearts and thoughts of men, — if once he were looked on as such a God, as such a Governor, as unto whom it is a matter of mere freedom, choice, and liberty, whether he will punish sin or no, as being not concerned in point of righteousness or holiness so to do? Nothing can tend more than such a persuasion to ingenerate an apprehension in men that God is such an one as themselves, and that he is so little concerned in their sins that they need not themselves be much concerned in them. Such thoughts they are apt to conceive, if he do but hold his peace for a season, and not reprove them for their sins, <1921>Psalm 50:21. And if their hearts are fully set in them to do evil, because in some signal instances judgment is not speedily executed, <2081>Ecclesiastes 8:11, how much more will such pernicious consequents ensue, if they are persuaded that it may be God will never punish them for their sins, seeing it is absolutely at his pleasure whether he will do so or no! — that neither his righteousness, nor his holiness, nor his glory, requires any such thing at his hands! This is not the language of the law; no, nor yet of the consciences of men, unless they are debauched. Is it not, with most Christians, certain that eventually God lets no sinners go unpunished? Do they not believe that all who are not interested by faith in the sufferings of Christ, or at least that are not saved on the account of his undergoing the punishment due to sin, must perish eternally? And if this be the absolute rule of God’s proceeding towards sinners, if he never went out of the way of it in any one instance, whence should it proceed but from what his nature doth require?

Lastly, God is, as we have showed, the *righteous judge* of all the world. What law is unto another judge, who is to proceed by it, that is the infinite rectitude of his own nature unto him. And it is necessary to a judge to punish where the law requires him so to do; and if he do not, he is not just.

And because God is righteous by an essential righteousness, it is necessary for him to punish sin as it is contrary thereunto, and not to acquit the guilty. And what is sin cannot but be sin, neither can God order it otherwise; for what is contrary to his nature cannot by any act of his will be rendered otherwise. And if sin be sin necessarily, because of its contrariety to the nature of God, on the supposition of the order of all things by himself created, the punishment of it is on the same ground necessary also.

6. On the grounds insisted on, argued and proved it is, that on the supposition before also laid down and explained, — namely, that God would glorify himself and his grace in the recovery and salvation of sinners, which proceeded alone from the free counsel of his will, — it was, with respect unto the holiness and righteousness of God, absolutely necessary that the Son of God, in his interposition for them, should be a priest, and offer himself for a sacrifice; seeing therein and thereby he could and did undergo the punishment which, in the judgment of God, was due unto the sins of them that were to be saved by him.

7. Hereon we lay the necessity of the death and suffering of Jesus Christ; as also our apostle doth declare, ◁BIBLEHebrews 2:10, 11. And they who are otherwise minded are not able to assign so much as a sufficient cause or just and peculiar reason for it; which yet to think it had not is highly injurious to the wisdom and grace of God. The reason assigned by the Socinians is, that by his death he might confirm the doctrine that he taught, and our faith in himself, as also to set us an example of patient suffering. But these things were not highly necessary if considered alone, nor peculiar, and such there must be, or no man can satisfy himself why the Son of God should suffer and die; for God sent many before to reveal his will, — Moses, for instance, whose declarations thereof all men were bound to believe, — and yet caused them not to die violent, bloody, and cursed deaths, in the confirmation of them. So the death of Moses was concealed from all the world, only it was known that he died; his doctrine was not confirmed by his death. Besides, our Lord had such a power of working miracles as to give an uncontrollable evidence unto his being sent of God, and of God’s approbation of what he taught. Nor can it be pretended that. it was necessary that he should die that he might rise again, and so confirm his doctrine by his resurrection; for he might have died for

this end any other way, and not by a shameful and cursed death, — not by a death in the view whereof he cried out that he was forsaken of God. Besides, on the supposition that Christ died only to *confirm his doctrine,* his resurrection was not of any more virtue to ingenerate, strengthen, or increase faith in us, than any other miracle that he wrought; for himself tells us that the rising of any one from the dead absolutely is not accompanied with such a peculiar efficacy to that purpose, <263>Luke 16:31. But on supposition that he died for our sins, or underwent the punishment due to them, his resurrection from the dead is the principal foundation of our faith and hope. Neither was his being an *example* unto us indispensably necessary; for God hath given us other examples to the same purpose, which he obligeth us to conform ourselves unto, <591>James 5:10, 11. Whereas, therefore, all acknowledge that Christ was the Son of God, and there must be some peculiar reason why the Son of God should die a shameful and painful death, this cannot be assigned by them by whom the indispensable necessity of punishing is denied.

Others say it was needful the Lord Christ should suffer, for the *declaration of the righteousness of God,* with his hatred of and severity against sin. So indeed the Scripture says, but it says so on the suppositions before laid down and proved. How they can say so, with any congruity unto or consistency with reason, by whom these are denied, I cannot understand; for if there be no such justice in God as necessarily requires that sin be punished, how can it be exalted or manifested in the punishment of it? If the punishment of sin be a mere *free act* of the will of God, which he may exert or the contrary, the pleasure of his will is manifested indeed therein, but how his justice is made known I see not. Suppose, as the men of this persuasion do, that it was easy with God to pardon the sins of men freely, without any satisfaction or compensation; that there was nothing in his nature which required of him to do otherwise; that had he done so, he had done it without the least disadvantage unto his own glory, — that is, he had acted therein as became his holiness and righteousness, as he is the supreme governor over all;—on these suppositions, I say, who can give a reasonable account why he should cast all our sins on his Son, and punish them all in his person, according as if justice had required him so to do? To say that all this was done for the

satisfaction of that *justice* which re*quired no such thing* to be done, is not satisfactory.

8. From what hath been discoursed, both the original and necessity of the priesthood of Christ are evidently demonstrated. There was no respect in the designation of it unto the state of innocency. Upon the supposition and consideration of the fall, the entrance of sin, and the ruin of mankind thereby, there were personal transactions in the holy Trinity with respect unto their recovery, as there had been before in their creation. Herein the Son undertook to be our deliverer, in and by the assumption of our nature, wherein alone it could be wrought, into personal union with himself; because, for this end, the justice and holiness of God required that the penalty due and threatened unto sin should be undergone and suffered. This the Son willingly undertook to do in that nature which he assumed to himself. And because the things themselves to be suffered were not only or so much indeed considered as his will and obedience in suffering, — being an instance of obedience, in compliance with the will and law of God, outbalancing the disobedience of the first, and all our sins in opposition thereunto, — therefore was he, in all his sufferings to offer himself up freely to the will of God; which offering up of himself was his sacrifice: to which end he was called, anointed, ordained of God a high priest; for this office consisteth in a power, right, and faculty, given him of God to offer up himself in sacrifice, in, by, and under his suffering of the penalty due to sin, so as thereby to make expiation of sin and reconciliation for sinners, as we shall prove in our next discourse.

EXERCITATION 31.

THE NATURE OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

1. *The nature of the priesthood of Christ, why proposed to consideration — The opinions of the Socinians concerning the priesthood of Christ; consequents thereof.*

2. *Christ an high priest properly so called — Arguments in the confirmation thereof proposed and vindicated—* Hebrews 5:1, 7:11-16*, explained to that purpose.*

3. *God the immediate object of the sacerdotal actings of Christ, proved from the typical priesthood and the use of sacrifices.*

4. *Further confirmed from the nature of all the offices of Christ;*

5. *From the nature of sacerdotal duties and acts.*

6. *Some particular testimonies pleaded to the same purpose — The conclusion.*

7. *The call of Christ unto his priestly office.*

8. *His inauguration and actual susception of it.*

9. *Things considerable in the priest's offering sacrifices of old.*

10. *Their accomplishment in the Lord Christ discharging his priestly office.*

11. *The truth thereof further explained and confirmed.*

12. *Testimonies of the Scripture to that purpose urged, explained, vindicated — Ephesians 5:2;*

13. *Hebrews 5:6, 7;*

14. *Hebrews 1:3, vindicated.*

15. *Hebrews 9:12, vindicated.*

16. *Christ once offered, and that when he bare our sins.*

17. *The necessity of suffering unto sacrifice,* *Hebrews 9:25, 26, 7:27, 10:11, 12.*

1. That our Lord Jesus Christ is the *true and only high priest* of the church hath been before declared, and it is in words acknowledged by all in some sense or other. The general nature also of that office hath been fully manifested, from what we have discoursed concerning its *original*, with the ends thereof, and his designation thereunto. Without the utter overthrow of those foundations in the first place, all the attempts of men against the true and proper nature of this office as vested in him are weak and impotent. The *sacrifice* that he offered as a priest, the nature, use, and end thereof, must be considered apart afterwards, in its proper place. The *qualifications* of his person, with the love, care, and grace, which he

exerciseth in the discharge of this office, must all be distinctly spoken unto, as they are represented unto us by the apostle in the Epistle itself. Wherefore there would be no necessity of handling the nature of this office here apart, were it not for the opposition that is made unto it, and that depravation of the doctrine of the gospel concerning it which some have attempted; for whereas the principal design of the Socinians in these things is to overthrow the sacrifice that he offered as a priest, they lay the foundation of their attempt in an opposition to the office itself. It is therefore principally with respect unto them that I have here proposed the *nature of that office* unto consideration; and I shall be more conversant in its vindication than in its declaration; which most Christians are acquainted withal. And I shall proceed in this method herein: — First, I shall declare what are in general their conceptions about this office; in opposition whereunto the truth declared in the Scripture shall be taught and vindicated. Secondly, I shall more particularly declare their opinions as to the several concernments of it, and consider as well their explanation of their own sense, with their confirmation of it, as their opposition and exceptions unto the faith of the church of God.

In the first place, they grant that the Lord Christ is our high priest, — that is, that he is so called in the Scripture; but that he is so *really* they deny. For this name, they say, is ascribed unto him not *properly* or directly, to denote what he is or doth, but by reason of some kind of allusion that there is between what he doth for us and what was done by the priests of old amongst the Jews, or under the old testament. He is therefore, in their judgment, improperly and metaphorically called a priest, as believers are said to be kings and priests, though after somewhat a more excellent manner; for he is so termed because of the *good offices* that he doth for the church, and not that he is or ever was a priest indeed. Hereon they say,—

Secondly, That he then entered on this office, or then began to do that work with reference whereunto, — because of its allusion to the work of the priests under the law, — he is called a priest, when, upon his ascension into heaven and appearance in the holy place, he received power from God to help, and relieve, and assist the church, in all its occasions. What he did and suffered before in the world, in his death and blood-shedding, was, by virtue of God’s decree, a necessary preparation unto his

discharge of this office, but belonged not thereunto, nor did he there offer any sacrifice to God. Wherefore they also affirm, —

Thirdly, That this priesthood of Christ is indeed of the same nature with his kingly office, both of them consisting in a power, ability, authority, and readiness, to do good unto the church. Only herein there seems some difference between them, that as a king he is able to help and save us, but as a priest he is willing and ready so to do.

Fourthly, That the object of the acts of the priesthood of Christ is firstly and principally *man,* yea, it is only so, none of them having God for their object, no more than the acts of his kingly power have; for it is his care of the church, his love towards it, with the supply of his grace and mercy which from God he bestows upon it, on the account whereof he is said to be a priest, and his so doing is called the exercise of his priesthood.

This in general is the substance of what they affirm and teach concerning this office of Christ, as we shall more particularly manifest and evince in the ensuing Exercitation. Now, if these things are so, I confess all our exposition of this Epistle, at least the principal parts of it, must fall to the ground, as being built on the sandy foundation of many false suppositions. And not only so, but the faith of the whole church of God in this thing is overthrown; and so are also all the common notions of mankind about the office of the priesthood and its exercise that ever prevailed in the world. And, to lay the whole fabric of truth in all instances level with the earth, the instructive relation or analogy that is between the types of the old testament and the substance of things declared in the new is taken away and destroyed. Wherefore it is necessary that we should diligently assert and confirm the truth in this matter in opposition to all their bold assertions, and vindicate it from their exceptions, whereby we shall fully declare the nature of this blessed office of Christ.

2. Our first difference is about the *name and title,* as to the signification of it when applied unto Jesus Christ. And we affirm that he is *properly* the high priest of the church, and not metaphorically only. When I say he is properly the high priest of the church, my meaning is, that he is so the high priest as he is the king and prophet of the church. And look, by what means or arguments it may be proved that Christ is the true, real king and prophet of the church, and not metaphorically called so only, by the same

may it be proved that he is in like manner the high priest of the church also; for both the name is in a like manner assigned unto him, and the office, and the acts of it, yea, they are so more fully and expressly than the other. And he may as well be said to be metaphorical in his person as in his offices. But I shall distinctly manage these arguments, which I challenge all the Socinians in the world to return a direct answer unto, and not by long digressions and tergiversations; a precedent for which is given them by Crellius in this case, whose sophistical evasions shall be called to a particular account afterwards.

First, He unto whom all things whatever *properly belonging unto a priest* are ascribed, and to whom belongs the description of a priest in all things essential unto him, such ascription and accommodation being made by the Holy Ghost himself, or persons divinely inspired by him, he is a high priest properly so called. And that things are so with reference unto the priesthood of Christ will appear in the ensuing instances: —

(1.) As to the *name* itself, this is so ascribed unto him. No man durst have so called him had he not been first called so by the Holy Ghost. And this he is both in the Old Testament and in the New. He is expressly said to be the כֹּהֵן, ἱερεύς, ἀρχιερεύς, “a priest,” “an high priest,” without the least intimation on any occasion of impropriety or a metaphor in the expression. And as he is thus called frequently, so constantly with respect unto those acts and duties which are proper unto the office of the priesthood. Now, whatever color may be given unto the metaphorical use of a word or a name where it is but once or rarely used, and that with respect unto such things as answer not unto the proper signification, there can be none where it is used frequently, and in the same case invariably, and constantly with respect unto things that suit its proper signification.

(2.) The description of a high priest properly so called is given by our apostle, Hebrews 5:1: Πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμζανόμενος, ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, ἵνα προσφέρῃ δῶρά τε καὶ ζυσίας ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν. A high priest is one who is taken from among other men by the call and appointment of God, and is appointed in the stead, or on the behalf of other men, in things pertaining to God; that is, to offer unto him gifts and sacrifices for sins. See this description explained in our exposition of the place. Now this is

the description of a priest properly so called; for it is the priesthood of Aaron which the apostle intends to express in the first place, as is evident in verse 4. But Aaron was a priest properly so called, — that is, within his own sphere of typicalness; at least he was not so only metaphorically. To say he was, is to destroy the thing itself of the priesthood, and thereby to destroy the metaphor also; for a metaphor cannot be of nothing. But now whatever is contained in this description, and whatever in answer unto it was found in Aaron, as belonging to his office, and not adhering unto him individually from the infirmity of his person, is all ascribed by the apostle unto Jesus Christ; as is undeniably evinced in our exposition of the place, whereunto I refer the reader. In brief, he was taken by the call and appointment of God from amongst men, Deuteronomy 18:18, Hebrews 7:13, 14. He was appointed for men, or to act in their behalf, 1 John 2:1, 2; and that τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, "in things pertaining to God," Hebrews 7:25, 26, 9:14, 15, particularly "to offer gifts and sacrifices" for sin, chap. 8:3. If this were all that was required to constitute Aaron a priest properly so called, then the ascription of these things unto Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost is sufficient to declare him a priest properly so called. And there is strength added unto this argument from what the apostle discourseth concerning the necessity of a call from God unto this office; for he tells us that "no man taketh this honor to himself," — that is, to be a priest, — "but he that is called of God, as was Aaron," chap. 5:4. And thence he shows and proves that Christ did not take this honor unto himself, but in like manner was called of God, verse 5. Now, if not the honor of a real and proper priesthood with respect unto Christ be intended, but somewhat else, metaphorically so called, then is the apostle's way of arguing utterly impertinent, as from an instance of one kind arguing the necessity of a thing of another. And it may be replied unto him, that although a man must be called of God unto a priesthood that is real and proper, such as was that of Aaron, yet it doth not thence follow that such a call is necessary unto that which is so metaphorically only; for so all believers are made priests unto God, but yet none of them have any especial call from God thereunto.

(3.) The discourse of our apostle, chap. 7:11-16, gives further evidence unto the same truth: "If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need

was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood. And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest," etc. For we may observe, —

[1.] That as Aaron was a priest, so there was a necessity, from the prophecy of Psalm 110:4, that there should be another priest. Now, if this other priest were not a priest properly so called, as Aaron was, there is no consequence in the apostle's discourse, it proceeding on terms equivocal.

[2.] The priesthood, according to this prophecy and our apostle's interpretation of it, was only to be changed. But if, after the removal of the law, there was no other proper priesthood to succeed, it was not changed, but abolished. And it is more true that there was none than that there was any; for properly there was none, though metaphorically there was.

[3.] On this supposition all the circumstances insisted on by our apostle as exceedingly observable to his purpose, — namely, that our Lord was of the tribe of Judah, and not of Levi; that he was constituted a priest in an especial way, and not like unto that of old,— are of no use: for there is nothing peculiar in these things, if he intend not a priest properly so called.

[4.] It utterly enervates that invincible argument whereby the apostle proves the necessary cessation of the law and legal or Mosaical institutions; for he builds on this supposition, that the priesthood being changed, the law of divine worship or service must be so also. And this unavoidably follows because of the inseparable relation that was between the Aaronical priesthood and all the worship of the tabernacle. But if this other priest whom he intends was not properly, but only metaphorically so, there might be a thousand of them, and yet no necessity for the change of the law of worship ensue. For two priests, one whereof is proper and the other metaphorically so only, are consistent at the same time, but two that are properly so are not; whence our apostle says that the Lord Christ

could not be a proper priest of the same nature with those of the order of Aaron whilst they continued, ^[3004]Hebrews 8:4.

[5.] He is expressly said to be a priest "after the order of Melchisedec." But this Melchizedek was a priest properly so called. He therefore must be so who is a priest according to the same order; for priests of several sorts and kinds, as real and nominal only, or proper and metaphorical, cannot be said to be after the same order, for no orders can be more different than those whereof one is proper, the other metaphorical. This difference is not in some property and adjunct, but in the whole kind; as real and painted fire differ, or a man and his image. Besides, he is said to be a priest "after the order of Melchisedec," so as that withal he is denied to be a priest "after the order of Aaron." But if he were not properly so called, but only metaphorically, by reason of some allusion unto a proper priesthood in what he did, the direct contrary might much rather be asserted; for there was more allusion between Aaron in his priesthood and him, and our apostle gives more instances of it, than between him and Melchizedek. And if it be false that Christ was a high priest according to the order of Aaron, notwithstanding the great allusion between what he did and what was done by Aaron in that office, and the great representation made of him and his actings thereby, then is it not true that Christ was called a priest "after the order of Melchisedec," by reason of some allusion unto the office of the priesthood.

[6.] This conception would utterly enervate the sense of the general argument that the apostle manageth towards these Hebrews, as well as that especial one about the cessation of the law. For he is pressing them to stability and constancy in the profession of the gospel, that they fall not back unto their old Judaism which they had deserted. To enforce his exhortation to this purpose, the principal argument he insists on is taken from the excellency and glory of the priesthood under the new testament, — incomparably exalted above that of the old, which yet was the most glorious and useful part of their worship. But that which is metaphorical in any kind is evidently less than that which is properly so. It is replied by Crellius, "That what is only metaphorically so may yet be more excellent than that which is properly;" whereof he gives some instances. And it is true it may be so. But it cannot be so in that instance wherein the metaphor consists. Suppose the Lord Christ to be only metaphorically a

priest, yet he may, on many other accounts, be far more excellent and glorious than Aaron. But yet the priesthood of Aaron being properly so, and his only metaphorically so, the priesthood of Aaron was more excellent than his; which is directly contrary to the scope of the apostle. Suppose the Lord Christ were only metaphorically a prophet or a king, he may yet on many other considerations be more excellent than either Moses or David, yet they must, on this supposition, be granted to have had the offices of prophet and king more eminently than he. So also must it be with his priesthood, on this supposition, with respect unto that of Aaron.

[7.] Add unto all these particular instances unto the contrary, that this Socinian fiction of the Lord Christ being not a priest, but only called so, by reason of some similitude between what he doth for the church and what was done by the priests of the law, — which indeed, as by them explained, is none at all, — is directly opposite to the whole design and discourse of the apostle in this Epistle. For, treating of the priesthood of Christ, he constantly calls him a priest in the sense which they had of that expression to whom he wrote, or he spake not to their understandings; he assigns all sorts of sacerdotal actions unto him, in all instances of duties belonging unto a priest as such, and that in competition with, and by way of preference above, the priests of the order of Aaron; nor doth he in any place, either directly or indirectly, give the least intimation that all these expressions of his were only tropical or metaphorical, not indeed signifying those things which those to whom he wrote understood by them. This had not been to instruct the Hebrews, but to deceive them, nor will be granted by those who have a greater reverence for the sacred writings than to wrest them at their pleasure into a compliance with their own preconceived opinions.

And this is the first thing which we are to consider in the investigation and vindication of the true nature of the priesthood of Christ. It was such as that on the account thereof he was a priest properly so called; which as it gives a rule unto the interpretation of the nature of the sacrifice which as a priest he offered, so is the truth of it confirmed by all other things which are ascribed unto him under that qualification, as we shall see afterwards. And what remains for the further confirmation hereof will be added in our

ensuing consideration of the attempt of our adversaries to establish the contrary assertion.

3. "Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle," his actings in that office do in the first place respect God himself,— τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. He did the things that were to be performed with God on the behalf of the people. And this further manifests the nature of his office. He came as a priest εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ, Hebrews 2:17; that is, ἱλάσκεσθαι τὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, as hath been observed by many, "to make reconciliation with God for the sins of the people." For sins cannot be the *immediate object* of reconciliation, but he alone is so who was displeased with them, and by whom, on that reconciliation, they are pardoned and the sinner acquitted. But yet neither can we carry this without control. This also is denied by our adversaries in this cause, although therein they offer violence not only unto all that we are taught in the Scripture about these things, but also unto all the common sentiments of mankind, putting such senses on these expressions as are absolutely contrary unto them and inconsistent with them. What are those senses we shall afterwards examine. For the present, it sufficeth to our purpose to take notice of their denial that the sacerdotal actings of Christ, — that is, his oblation and intercession, — do respect God in the first place; the contrary whereunto we shall now teach and confirm.

The Scripture instructs us, as we have proved, that the Lord Christ was and is our high priest; and, moreover, that as such he offered himself unto God once for all, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people, as a propitiatory, expiatory sacrifice, Isaiah 53:10; Hebrews 1:3, 2:17, 5:5, 7:27, 10:10; Ephesians 5:2; 1 John 2:2. What the Holy Ghost intends hereby, and what is the meaning of these expressions, he had before instructed the church in, by those institutions under the old testament whereby he foresignified and represented what was intended in them and by them. To suppose these expressions to have one signification under the old testament, and another quite of a different nature under the new, whereas the things signified by the one were appointed only to teach and instruct us in the nature of the other, is to take away all certainty from what we are taught in the Scripture. We may therefore positively conclude, that if the actings of the priests under the old testament did

respect God in the first place, then those of Christ did so also, or there is no similitude or analogy between these things; which to affirm is to overthrow both the old testament and the new. This, therefore, we must in the first place confirm.

The principal duty and work of the priests under the law was to offer sacrifices. As the whole law speaks thus, so our apostle expressly confirms it, making that work the great end of the priesthood. Sacrifices had respect unto sin. Priests were appointed to offer θυσίας περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν, "sacrifices for sin." And when God called them to the work, he said it was לְכַהֲנוֹ־לִי, that they should exercise the priesthood towards him, [1280]Exodus 28:1. Had there been no sin, there had been no sacrifices properly so called, as we have proved before. There might have been a dedication of any thing in our power unto God, as an acknowledgment of his sovereignty and bounty. But sacrifices by blood had all respect unto sin, as the nature of them doth declare. Wherefore, God appointing priests to offer sacrifices for sin, and therein to minister unto him, he must be *the first object* of their actings as such.

Sacrifices by blood, to be offered by these priests, and by them only, God appointed of various kinds, with respect unto various occasions, of bulls, goats, sheep, fowls; whose nature and differences I have explained in our former Exercitations, Exerc. 24. The principal end of all these sacrifices, was to make atonement for sin. This is so express in their institution as that it is all one to deny that there were any sacrifices appointed of God as to deny that they were appointed to make atonement. See [3004]Leviticus 1:4, 5:5, 6, 6:7, 16:6, 34, etc. Now, the nature, use, and end of atonement, was to avert the anger of God due to sin, and so to pacify him that the sinner might be pardoned. This is the importance of the word, and this was the end of those sacrifices whereby atonement was made. The word is sometimes used where no sacrifice was implied, but is never used in any other sense than that declared. So Moses spake unto the people upon their making of the calf:

> "Ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto the LORD; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin,"
> [2230]Exodus 32:30.

He hoped that he should by his interposition turn away the wrath of God, and obtain pardon for them; which he calls making an atonement, because of its respect unto the great future sacrifice, by virtue whereof alone we may prevail with God on such occasions. In [3365]Leviticus 5:5, 6, as in many other places, this is appropriated unto sacrifices:

> "When a man shall be guilty in one of these things, he shall confess that he hath sinned in that thing: and he shall bring his trespass-offering unto the LORD for his sin which he hath sinned; ..... and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his sin."

So also verses 17, 18, chap. [3366]6:6, 7, etc. The sin committed was against the Lord; the guilt contracted was confessed to the Lord; the sacrifice or offering was brought unto the Lord; the atonement was made by the priest before the Lord; — all which give it the nature before described, and admit of no other. In some instances the sins committed were to be confessed over the head of the sacrifice wherewith the atonement was to be made; which rendered the whole action more pregnant with representation. A person guilty of sin, convicted in his own conscience, condemned by the sentence of the law, by God's allowance and appointment brought a clean beast, assigned in general for that use, and, bringing it to the altar, confessed over it his sin and guilt, laying them legally upon it, so delivering it up into the hands of the priest, by whom it was slain, and the blood poured out, as suffering under the guilt laid upon it; wherein, with some other ensuing acts, it was offered to God to make atonement for the sin committed and confessed. Thus was blood given unto the people to make atonement for their souls, because the life of the beast was in the blood, which was destroyed in the shedding thereof, [3367]Leviticus 17:11.

Certainly no man can ever arrive unto so much confidence as to question whether the actings of the priests in those sacrifices whereby atonement was made, did not in the first place respect God himself; nor, indeed, do I know that it is by any positively and directly denied: for the sense we plead for depends not on the use of any one single word, or the signification of it in these or other places, but upon the whole nature and express ends of those institutions. And herein all mankind are agreed, namely, that the divine Power was the immediate object of sacerdotal

actings, — that they were done with God on the behalf of men, and not actings towards men on the behalf of God.

By all these terms and expressions doth our apostle describe the *sacerdotal actings of Christ.* For having declared him to be a high priest, he affirms that he offered a sacrifice to God, — a sacrifice to make reconciliation for sin: as also, that therein God made all our sins to meet upon him; which "he bare in his own body on the tree." The question now is, What is intended thereby? Our adversaries say it is the merciful and powerful actings of Christ towards us, giving out help, assistance, grace, and mercy, from God unto us; so delivering us from all evil, the whole punishment due to sin, and eternal death. But why are these things called his offering of himself unto God a sacrifice to make reconciliation for sin? They say it is because of an allusion and similitude that is between what he so doth for us, and what was done by the priests of old in their sacrifices. But it is plain, from what hath been declared concerning the sacerdotal actings of the priests of old in their sacrifices, that there is no allusion nor similitude between these things, nor can they assign wherein it should consist. Their actings were immediately *towards God* on our behalf, his, it is said, are *towards us* on God's behalf; theirs were to make atonement for sin, his to testify love and mercy to sinners; theirs by shedding of blood, wherein was life, his in power and glory. Wherefore I say, if we have any instruction given us in these things, — if the office of the priesthood, or any duties of it, any sacrifices offered by the priests, were instituted to typify, prefigure, and represent Jesus Christ as the great high priest of the church, — it cannot be but that his sacerdotal actings do justly and immediately respect God himself; which shall now be further confirmed.

4. There are (as is out of controversy) three offices which the Lord Christ, as the mediator and surety of the new covenant, beareth and exerciseth towards the church, namely, those of king, prophet, and priest. And these, as they are distinctly assigned unto him, so they are distinct among themselves, and are names of diverse things, as really, so in the common notions and sense of mankind. And in these offices, where there is an affinity between them, or any seeming coincidence, in their powers, duties, and acts, the kingly and prophetical do make a nearer pass unto each other than either of them do unto the sacerdotal, as shall afterwards be more

fully evinced; for the nature of these two offices requireth that the object of their exercise be men. As in general it doth so, so in particular in those of Christ. He acts in them in the name of God, and for God, towards men. For although a king be the name of one who is invested with power absolute and supreme, yet is it so only with respect unto them towards and over whom he is a king. As denoting an infinite, absolute, independent power, of necessity it belongs to God alone essentially considered. This office in Christ is considered as delegated by the Father, and exercised in his name: "The head of every man is Christ;" but "the head of Christ is God." He anoints him king on his holy hill of Zion, Psalm 2:6; and he rules in the name and majesty of his God, Micah 5:4. Wherefore the whole exercise of the power and duty of this office is *from* God, and *for* God towards men. In his name he rules his subjects and subdueth his enemies. None can fancy God to be the object of any of the acts of this office.

It is so in like manner with his prophetical office. God raised him up from among his brethren to be the prophet of his church, to reveal his will; and by him he spake to us. See Exposition on Hebrews 1:1, 2. His whole work as a prophet is to reveal the will of God, and therein to teach and instruct us. *Men*, therefore, are the *immediate object* of the powers, duties, and acts of this office.

And that which we further observe from hence is this, that there is no one thing that the Lord Christ acts immediately towards the church, but that it belongs unto and proceeds from one or the other of these powers or offices. If any one be otherwise minded, let him prove the contrary by instances, if he be able. The Scripture affordeth none to that purpose. It followeth hence, therefore, that *God is the object* of the actings of Christ in his priestly office. For if he be not so, then, —

(1.) There is no room nor place in his whole mediation for any such office, seeing all he performs towards us belongs unto the other. And therefore those by whom this is denied do upon the matter at length contend that indeed he hath no such office. And if this be so, —

(2.) It doth not belong unto Christ as mediator to deal with God in any of the concerns of his people; for he must do so as a priest, or not at all. And then we have no advocate with the Father; which is utterly abhorrent from

the common faith of Christianity. And this absurd supposition shall be afterwards removed by express testimonies to the contrary. Take away this fundamental principle, that Christ as mediator deals with God for us, and you overthrow the faith of all Christians.

(3.) This would render the whole instruction intended for the church in the Aaronical priesthood and sacrifices useless and impertinent, nothing of the like nature being signified thereby; for that, as we have proved, openly *respected God* in the first place. And on this supposition the accommodation of it unto the priesthood of Christ by our apostle would be altogether vain.

(4.) It is contrary to the common notion of the nature of the priesthood amongst mankind; for none yet ever owned such an office in things religious, but apprehended the use of it to be in doing the things with God that were to be done on the behalf of men. And hereby, as was observed, would the faith and consolation of all believers, which are resolved into what the Lord Christ hath done and doth for them with God, be utterly overthrown.

5. Again; the same truth is undeniably evinced from the nature of *sacerdotal acts and duties.* These are, as it is stated by common consent, those two of oblation and intercession. And both these are expressly ascribed unto the Lord Jesus Christ as he is a high priest, and nothing else immediately as he is so. The actual help and aid which he gives us is the fruit and effect of these sacerdotal actings. The sole inquiry, therefore, in this matter is, What or who is the immediate object of oblation and intercession? Is this God, or man? Did Christ offer himself as a sacrifice unto God, or unto us? Doth he intercede with God for us, or with us only? A man would suppose that the absurdity of these imaginations, so expressly contrary to the Scripture and the common sense of mankind, should even shame our adversaries from the defense of them. But they are not so obtuse or so barren in their invention as to want evasions at any time. “Quid si manifesto tenentur? anguilla sicut elabentur.” They therefore tell us, “It is true, if you take oblation and intercession in their proper sense, then God, and none other, must be their immediate object; but as they are ascribed unto Christ they are used only metaphorically,

and do indeed denote such actions of his towards the church as have some allusion unto oblation and intercession properly so called." But I say, —

(1.) There was never such a metaphor heard of before, as that one thing should be called by the name of another, between which there is no peculiar similitude, as there is none between *offering unto God* and *giving grace unto men.*

(2.) Who hath given them this authority to turn what they please into metaphors; by which means they may, when they have a mind to it, make an allegory, and consequently a fable, of the whole Scripture? It is expressly affirmed that the Lord Christ is a high priest. Nothing is in the notion of that office, taken properly, that is unworthy of him, no more than in those of king and prophet. No intimation is given us, directly or indirectly, that this office is ascribed unto him metaphorically. As such he is said to make oblation and intercession to God, — the things wherein the exercise of the priestly office doth consist. What confidence is it, now, to deny that he doth these things properly and immediately with God as a high priest, by an arbitrary introduction of a metaphor which the Scripture giveth not the least countenance unto!

6. We might, moreover, plead the use and end of the sacrifice which he offered as a high priest, which was to make expiation of sin and atonement for it. But because we differ with our adversaries about the sense of these expressions also, I shall not make use of them as the medium of an argument until the precise signification of them be evinced and determined; which shall be done, God willing, in our consideration of the nature of the sacrifice itself. Wherefore I shall close this head of our disputation with some express testimonies confirming the truth in hand.

To this purpose speaks our apostle, Hebrews 8:3,

> "For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer."

The things which the high priests had of old to offer as gifts and sacrifices, they offered unto God. This I presume is unquestionable; for God commanded them that all their gifts and sacrifices should be offered unto him upon his altar, consecrated for that purpose. To have done otherwise

had been the highest idolatry. But Christ, if he be a high priest, must, saith the apostle, of necessity have somewhat to offer, as they did, and after the same manner; that is, unto God. If this he did not, there is nothing of reason or sense in the apostle's inference; for what necessity can there be, because the high priests of old did offer sacrifices to God, that then if Jesus Christ be a high priest he must do something of another kind? They have nothing to say upon these instances, but to confess the words and deny the thing, and then tell us that they agree to the words, but differ about their interpretation, — the interpretation they suggest being a direct denial of the thing itself; whereof more afterwards.

To the same purpose speaks our apostle, chap. 5:1; which place hath been before vindicated, and is so fully in the ensuing Exposition, whereunto the reader is referred. And this consideration discovereth much of the general nature, use, and end, of the priesthood of Christ, which we inquire after; for it is hence evident that it is the power, office, and duty, whereby he makes an interposition between God and us, — that is, with God on our behalf. And there are two general ends of this interposition, as the Scripture testifies, and which the common faith of Christians relies upon. And these are, —

(1.) "Averruncatio mali," the removal of all sorts of evil from us, every thing that did or might befall us in a way of evil, hurt, damage, or punishment, on the account of our sins and apostasy from God.

(2.) "Acquisitio boni," the procuring and obtaining for us every thing that is good, with respect unto our reconciliation to God, peace with him, and the enjoyment of him. And these are intended in the general acts of his office; for, — first, his oblation principally and firstly respects the making atonement for sin, and the turning away of the wrath that was due unto us as sinners; wherein he was Jesus, the deliverer, who saves us from the wrath to come. And this is all that is included in the nature of oblation as absolutely considered: But as the oblation of Christ was founded on the covenant before described, it had a further prospect. For with respect unto the obedience which therein he yielded unto God, according to the terms of that covenant, it was not only *satisfactory,* but *meritorious;* that is, by the sacrifice of himself he did not only turn away the wrath which was due unto us, but also obtained for us "eternal redemption," with all the grace

and glory thereunto belonging. There remains nothing to be done on our behalf, after the once offering of himself, whereby he "perfected for ever them that are sanctified," but only the actual application of these good things unto us, or our actual instating in the possession of them. Hereunto is his intercession, the second duty of his priestly office, designed; the especial nature whereof must be elsewhere declared and vindicated.

7. For the further clearing of the whole subject of our inquiry, we must yet consider both the *call* of Christ unto this office, his *actual inauguration,* and his *discharge* of it, both when and where; for all these belong unto its nature.

The *call* of the Lord Christ unto this office is expressly asserted by our apostle, chap. ⁽ᴴᴮ⁾5:4-6,

> "And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee. As he saith also in another place, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec."

If the reader desire to see the particulars wherein the call of Christ consisted, its comparison with the call of Aaron, preference before it, or exaltation above it, he may consult our Exposition on that place, from whence I shall repeat nothing here. In general I say, that the call of Christ unto the office of the priesthood consisted in that eternal covenant which was between the Father and him concerning his undertaking the work of our recovery and salvation, which I have at large before described. He was not made a priest by virtue of any vocal command, as Aaron was called by a command given unto Moses unto that purpose, ⁽ᴱˣ⁾Exodus 28:1; nor by virtue of any established law, which gave the posterity of Aaron their succession to that office; but he was called by an immediate transaction between him and the Father before the world was. This call of his, therefore, may be considered either with respect unto designation or manifestation. As it intends the designation of Christ unto his office, so it is expressed in these words of God the Father to him, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee;" which what they import in the covenant transactions between the Father and the Son hath been before declared. The manifestation of this call consisted originally in the first promise given

concerning his incarnation and undertaking of the work of our redemption, [1]Genesis 3:15. With respect hereunto he says, [2]Psalm 40:8, 9, אֱלֹהַי אָז אָמַרְתִּי הִנֵּה־בָאתִי בִּמְגִלַּת־סֵפֶר כָּתוּב עָלָי לַעֲשׂוֹת־רְצוֹנֶךָ; — "Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book," — that is, בְּרֹאשׁ מְגִלַּת, "in the beginning of the sacred volume," as our apostle renders it, ἐν κεφαλίδι, "in the head" of it, [3]Hebrews 10:7; that is, in that first promise, recorded in the beginning of the Scripture, wherein his own consent was tacitly included, and the virtue of his office and sacrifice established, whence he became the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." And more need not be added in this place concerning this call of Christ unto the office of the priesthood.

8. His actual *inauguration* into it, and susception of it, is next to be considered. And he was vested with all his offices from his conception and nativity. There was no time wherein he was, as to his human nature, and was not the king, priest, and prophet of his church; for he received all his offices by the unction of the Spirit, when God "anointed him with the oil of gladness above his fellows." And this was done fundamentally in his incarnation, when he was conceived and sanctified by the Holy Spirit, communicated unto him not by measure. And so he was born "Christ the Lord," [4]Luke 2:11. He was born one anointed by the Holy Ghost, Lord, and consequently priest and prophet, — all which offices were communicated by unction. Together with those graces, gifts, and abilities, which were necessary to their discharge, right, title, and authority for their exercise in their proper seasons were conveyed unto him thereby. And in these two doth all office and power consist.

The *actual exercise* of all the offices of Christ was regulated by the will of the Father, his own wisdom and compliance therewithal, with the order and nature of the things themselves about which he was to be conversant therein. He was anointed to be the great prophet of the church from the womb; yet he entered not upon the public discharge of that office until after his baptism, when his commission and call thereunto were proclaimed from heaven, [5]Matthew 3:17. So also was he "Christ the Lord," — that is, the king of the church; yet began he not visibly to exercise that office in his own person until the mission of his apostles with authority from him to preach the gospel, Matthew 10. So had God

disposed of things, and so did the nature of the work which he had to do require. And as to his priestly office, he neither did nor could enter upon the exercise and discharge of it until the end of his prophetical ministry; for he could not do it but by his death, which was to put an end unto that ministry here on the earth, excepting only the instructions which he gave to his apostles after his resurrection, <4401>Acts 1:3.

But to propose the whole matter somewhat more distinctly, there are three things that concurred unto the inauguration of the Lord Christ unto this office, or there were degrees of it: —

(1.) His *real unction* by the Holy Ghost with an all-fullness of gifts and graces, at his incarnation. This whole work of the Spirit, with its effects, I have elsewhere at large discussed, [f4] and shall not further insist upon it.

(2.) His *declarative unction* at his baptism, when the Spirit descended upon him, and filled him with power for the exercise of all the gifts and graces he had received for the discharge of his whole office.

(3.) Unto both these there succeeded an *especial dedication* to the actual performance of the duties of this office. And this was his own act, which he had power for from God. This himself expresseth, <4819>John 17:19, Ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν· — "I sanctify," that is, I consecrate or dedicate, "myself." For of real sanctification, by purification and further infusion of grace, he was not capable: and the communication of real grace to the human nature was the work of the Holy Ghost; he did not so sanctify himself. But he did dedicate, separate, and consecrate himself unto God, in the discharge of this office. It doth also respect the sacrifice which he was to offer: 'I consecrate and give up myself to be a sacrifice.' But he who was to be the sacrifice was also to be the sacrificer. This consecration, therefore, respected his person, and what he was to do as the sacrificer, no less than what he was to suffer as a sacrifice; for this also was necessary, and every high priest was so consecrated.

In that prayer, therefore, of our Savior, John 17, do I place the beginning and entrance of the exercise of his priestly office. Whatever he did after this unto the moment of his death belonged principally thereunto. Sundry things, I confess, fell in occasionally afterwards, wherein he acted his prophetical office in bearing witness unto the truth; but the scope of all his

ensuing actions and passions respect his priestly office only: for although his sacrifice, precisely considered, consisted in his actual offering of himself on the cross, yet his sacerdotal actings with reference unto it are not to be confined thereunto. And what these actings were, without an inquiry into the nature of his sacrifice, which I have designed for the subject of another discourse, I shall briefly recount.

Sundry things were considerable in the sacrifices of old, which, although they did not all belong unto the essence of them, yet they did unto their completeness and perfection, being all types and resemblances of what was afterwards to be done by Christ himself. Some of these we shall call over, to give an illustration thereunto:—

9. First, There was required thereunto the *adduction* of the sacrifice, or of the beast to be sacrificed, unto the priest, or the priest's provision of it, which was incumbent on him with respect to the תָּמִיד, or daily sacrifice in the temple. This belonged unto the sacrifice, and is expressed by a sacred word, Leviticus 1:2, קָרְבָּן אָדָם כִּי־יַקְרִיב. The bringing or adduction of it made it a "corban," a gift brought, sacred, dedicated to God. For there was in it, —

(1.) "Animus offerentis," the mind and intention of the offerer to devote it unto God; which was the foundation, and gave life to the sacrifice. Hence it was a principle even among the heathen that no sacrifice was accepted that proceeded not "a libenti animo," "from a willing mind." And this the apostle seems to allude unto, 2 Corinthians 8:12, Εἰ γὰρ ἡ προθμυία πρόκειται, "If there be a free determination or purpose of mind," namely, in offering any thing to God, καθὸ ἐὰν ἔχη τις, εὐπρόσδεκτος, οὐ καθὸ οὐκ ἔχει, "it is accepted according to what a man hath, and not according to what he hath not." It is the mind, and not the matter; that gives measure and acceptance unto an offering.

(2.) There was in it *loss* and damage in the charge of it. The offerer parted with it "e peculio suo." He gave it up to make expiation for his sin.

(3.) The *care* of providing it according to the law belonged also hereunto. The offerer was to take care that it was of clean beasts, a male or female, as the law required, without blemish. It is true, the priest was also to make judgment hereof after its bringing unto him; but he that brought it was to

use his utmost skill and diligence in the choice of a meat-offering out of his flock, or he fell under the curse of the deceiver, [3013]Malachi 1:13, 14.

(4.) The act of *adduction* itself belonged unto the holy service, with a testification of a desire, in a way of faith and obedience, to have it offered unto God. These things, indeed, were no essential parts of the sacrifice, but they were necessarily antecedent unto it and preparatory for it. And all these things, in some cases, were left unto the people, although they signified what was to be done by Christ in his sacrifice, to manifest the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood, which could not comprise nor answer all that was to be prefigured by sacrifices.

Secondly, There was *mactation*, or the killing of the beast by the priests at the altar. And herein consisted the essence, all that followed being instituted in testification of its direction and dedication unto God. Hence to slay and to sacrifice in this matter are the same.

"Et nigram mactabis ovem, lucumque revises." — Virg. Georg. 4.546.

See our second [f5] Exercitation for the confirmation hereof. And the substance of the sacrifice is to be thought principally to consist herein, though the offering of it was also necessary to its completeness and perfection; for, —

(1.) Herein the intention of the sacrificer and sacrificed, in that solemn *formula* which was understood in all expiatory sacrifices, "Quod in ejus caput sit," was effected or accomplished. And as the common sense of all nations agreed in a commutation in such sacrifices, as I have proved elsewhere, so we are plainly taught it in the Scripture; for besides that this is the open sense and meaning of all institutions about them, so the especial rite of confessing sin over the head of the scape-goat, thereby laying it on him, yea, and the command that he who brought his sin or trespass-offering should therewithal confess his own guilt, do make it evident. Now this, as is manifest, was accomplished only in the mactation and death of the sacrifice.

(2.) It was the *blood* whereby atonement was made, and that as it was the life of the creature; and the reason why it was given to make atonement was, because the life was in it, Wherefore that act whereby the blood of the creature was so taken away as that thereby the life of it was

destroyed, was the principal thing in the sacrifice itself. It is true, atonement on the altar was to be made with the blood after the effusion of it; but it was with it whilst it was yet warm, before the animal spirits were utterly departed from it, and that because its virtue for expiation depended on its being poured out in death. And no blood could have been offered but that which was taken away in the mactation or total destruction of the life of the sacrifice. And the pouring of the blood at the altar, with the sprinkling of it variously, belonged unto the appropriation of the sacrifice to God, unto whose sanctified altar it was brought.

Thirdly, There was the *burning of the sacrifice,* or in some cases the principal parts of it, on the altar. This finished or completed the sacrifice. For whereas, in the great anniversary of expiation, some part of the blood of the sacrifice was carried into the most holy place, it was no part of the sacrifice itself, but a consequent of it, in a holy improvement of what was finished before, as to the duty itself. And this was appointed for no other end but because it was the only way whereby the perpetual efficacy of the blood of Christ in heaven, which was shed on the earth, might be represented.

In these things did the discharge of the priestly office in those of the order of Aaron principally consist. And all these things were exactly answered and fulfilled, in a spiritual and glorious manner, by our Lord Jesus Christ, the great high priest of the church, who was himself to be all and to do all after he had solemnly dedicated and consecrated himself unto this work, as we shall see by a review and application of the particulars recounted.

10. First, There was the *adduction,* or his bringing himself to be an offering or sacrifice to God. And this consisted in all those sacred actions of his which were previously preparatory unto his death; as, —

(1.) His going up to Jerusalem unto the passover. He went on purpose to offer himself unto God. And in his way he acquainted his disciples with what would befall him therein, [Luke 18:31-33]; [Matthew 20:17-19]; which when one of them would have dissuaded him from, he gave him that vehement and severe reproof, “Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offense unto me: for thou savorest not the things that be of God,” [Matthew 16:23]. Peter, considering only the outward part of his sufferings, with the shame and scandal wherewith it was attended, would

have prevailed with him to have avoided it; which he knew was in his power to do. But withal, which he knew not, he dissuaded him from going to offer himself unto God, for which cause principally he came into the world, and so fell under this sacred rebuke; for this great and weighty work of obedience was so fully implanted in the heart of Christ, that he could not bear with any thing that had the appearance of a diversion from it. With such intention, freedom, willingness, and readiness of mind, did he go to offer himself, according to the will of God; which gave life, virtue, and merit, unto his oblation.

(2.) His going into the garden the night before his suffering. What was it but as it were the bringing of himself to the door of the tabernacle to offer himself unto God, or to make his soul an offering for sin, according to the will of God?

(3.) He offered up unto God prayers and supplications; which, because they had respect unto his sacrifice, are reckoned by our apostle as sacerdotal acts, Hebrews 5:7. Principally his prayers in the garden are intended; for his supplications there, with the manner of them, the apostle expresses and declares; see our exposition of the place. For all sacrifices were accompanied with supplications for grace and pardon. And herein did our Savior actually give up himself unto God to be a sacrifice; which was to be done by expressions of his obedience, and supplications for that issue thereof which was promised unto him.

(4.) His propassion or foresuffering in the garden, in the anguish of his soul, the agony of his mind, and bloody sweat, belongs hereunto. Hereon, indeed, succeeded an external shame, which was necessary for the leading and bringing of him "as a lamb to the slaughter," Isaiah 53:7, but his own mind and will it was that brought him to be a sacrifice to God. The offering himself was his own act, from first to last, and is constantly ascribed unto him.

Secondly, There was *mactation* or slaying of the sacrifice, which was in his death as it was bloody. Herein consisted the essence and substance of the sacrifice; herein he offered himself unto God. For although the other acts, of sprinkling the blood and burning the carcass of the sacrifice, or its oblation, were in the typical sacrifices distinct from the slaying of it, yet this was by reason of the imperfection of all persons and things that were

made use of in that sacred service. Hence many distinct acts succeeding one unto another among them were necessary. In the Lord Christ, by reason of the perfection of his person, and that he himself was both priest and sacrifice, things were done at once which were separately by them represented. Wherefore in the very death of Christ, in and by his blood-shedding, he offered himself unto God.

It is fondly excepted, "That if his death was a sacrifice, the Jews and the soldiers who crucified him were the priests." The violence which was offered unto him by all sorts of persons was necessary on other accounts; so also were the assaults which he then conflicted with from the prince and power of darkness: for they belonged to the curse of the law, which was now upon him. But his being a sacrifice depended only on his own will, he offering himself in obedience to the will of God, according to the compact before described. The soldiers were no more but as the cords that bound the sacrifice to the horns of the altar; nor did they so take away his life but that he laid it down of his own mere will, in compliance with the commandment of the Father, <4810>John 10:18.

In the pouring out of his blood, the heavenly altar of his body was sprinkled, and all heavenly things purified, even with this "better sacrifice," <5823>Hebrews 9:23. Thus is he said to "pour out his soul unto death," <2312>Isaiah 53:12. That expression contains the whole nature of a sacrifice: for his soul is said to be poured out unto death with respect unto the pouring out of the blood; for in it was the life poured out, the blood being given to make atonement because the life was in it.

Thirdly, There was the *oblation* itself. This in those sacrifices, the sacred performance whereof was accomplished πολυμερῶς, by many parts and degrees, by reason of the imperfection of the sacrificer and sacrificed, followed after the mactation, with the shedding and sprinkling of blood. In this absolutely perfect sacrifice of Christ it was not so. His oblation was at the same time and in the same action with his blood-shedding; for it was his holy, obediential giving up himself unto the will of God, in undergoing what was due unto our sins, making atonement for them thereby. He "offered himself unto God through the eternal Spirit," <5814>Hebrews 9:14. The holy and eternal Spirit of God dwelling in him in all fullness, supporting his faith, confirming his obedience, kindled in him that fire of

zeal unto the glory of God and the reparation of his honor, from the reflection cast upon it by the sin, apostasy, disobedience, and rebellion of mankind, with that flame of love unto their salvation, which as it were consumed this sacrifice in its oblation to God. Thus in and by his "giving himself for us," — that is, in and by his death, which is constantly intended by that expression, — he made himself "an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor," Ephesians 5:2.

Fourthly, Hereon ensued the representation of the whole, in answer to the high priest's entering into the most holy place with a token, part, representation, and remembrance of the blood that was offered on the altar. This was done by Christ when he entered into the holy place not made with hands, as it were sprinkled with his own blood, or accompanied with the efficacy and merit of his sacerdotal offering, "to appear in the presence of God for us." This was consequential to that offering of himself whereby he made atonement for us; for "he entered into the holy place, αἰωςίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος," Hebrews 9:12, — "having obtained eternal redemption." His obtaining eternal redemption was by the sacrifice of himself in his death; for redemption was by price and exchange, and the Lord Christ paid no other price for sin and sinners but his own blood, 1 Peter 1:18, 19. And this was antecedent unto his entering into the holy place; for he did so "having obtained eternal redemption." And it is in vain to except that sometimes things present are expressed by verbs and participles of a preterit signification, or in those tenses which denote things past, seeing they are not to be construed so unless the matter spoken of do enforce such a construction, whereof here there is no pretense; nor can any one instance be given of the use of εὑρίσκω in that way in the whole New Testament. See Hebrews 9:24.

11. This brief account of the analogy that was between the sacerdotal actings in sacrificing under the law and those of the Lord Christ in offering himself as our high priest unto God, doth fully evince the time, place, and manner of his discharge of this office; whereby the nature of it is also manifested. The sacrifice of Christ, indeed, was not carried on by those distinct, separate steps and degrees which the sacrifices of old were, by reason of the imperfection of the offerer and what was offered, and the necessity of many circumstances in those things which were carnal in themselves and appointed to be carnally visible; yet on the whole, in the

transactions that were invisibly carried on between Christ the high priest and God, unto whom he offered himself, every thing that belonged unto the nature of a true and real sacrifice, or which as such was represented by them of old, was, in its proper place, order, and manner, actually accomplished. And I must needs say, that I look upon it as one of the boldest attempts on religion that ever was made by men pretending unto any sobriety, namely, to deny that the Lord Christ was a priest whilst he was on the earth, or that he offered himself a sacrifice unto God in his death; and those who have the confidence to stand and persist in that opinion, against all that light which the nature of the thing itself and the testimonies of Scripture do give unto the truth in this matter, need not fear that on any occasion they shall be wanting unto themselves therein. But of these things I must treat more fully in our ensuing Exercitation.

12. I have only in this place taught the doctrine concerning the nature of the priesthood of Christ, and his discharge of that office, as my design did necessarily require I should do. The testimonies whereby the truth of it is confirmed I have long since urged and vindicated from the exceptions of our adversaries in another treatise. [f6] Here, therefore, I shall only briefly represent some of them, ⁴⁹Ephesians 5:2:῾῾ Ο Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσφορὰν καὶ ζυσίαν, τῷ Θεῷ εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας. It is unavoidable that those expressions, he "loved us and gave himself for us," should signify nothing but what he did in his death; for they are never used in any other sense. So are they repeated, verse 25 of this chapter,᾽ Ηγάτησε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, — that is, to die for it; for this was that whereby Christ expressed his love unto his church, ⁴³John 10:15; ⁵⁰Philippians 2:6-8. So also speaks our apostle expressly, ⁴⁸Galatians 2:20, "Christ loved me, and gave himself for me;" the same with that of John, "Who loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood," ⁶⁶Revelation 1:5, which he did when he was "delivered for our offenses," ⁴⁵Romans 4:25. Παρεδόθη διὰ τὸ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν is the expression of what was done when παρεδώκεν ἑαυτὸν ἡμῶν. The subject, therefore, spoken of is agreed on, or cannot be questioned. Hereof the apostle says that it was προσφορά καὶ ζυσία, "an offering and a sacrifice;" or that in giving himself for us he offered himself to God an offering and a sacrifice. By these two words our apostle expresseth all

sorts of sacrifices under the law, Hebrews 10:5, from Psalm 40:7, where they are expressed by זֶבַח וּמִנְחָה; for although "mincha" be usually applied unto a peculiar thank-offering of meat and drink, yet where these two are joined together, "zebach and mincha," they denote all sorts of expiatory sacrifices: 1 Samuel 3:14, "The iniquity of Eli's house shall not be purged בְּזֶבַח וּבְמִנְחָה," — by any sort of expiatory sacrifices. And θυσία, or זֶבַח, is such a sacrifice as consisted in mactation or killing, as we have proved before. This Christ offered in his death or when out of his love unto us, in obedience unto the will of God, he gave up himself unto death for us. This love and obedience, the Socinians say, is the sacrifice intended in this place, which is therefore metaphorical; but that Christ offered himself a sacrifice in his death they deny that the apostle here asserts. But, —

(1.) In all other places where there is any mention of the offering of Christ, it is expressly said that he offered "himself," or his "soul," or his "body," Isaiah 53:l0; Hebrews 9:14, 10:10; yea, as here he is said to offer sacrifice in his death, so his suffering therein is affirmed to be necessary to his sacrifice of himself, chap. 9:25, 26. He "gave himself for us a sacrifice,'' is no more but that he suffered when he offered himself, as the apostle expressly affirms.

(2.) Although προσφορά may be used for a metaphorical sacrifice, and so possibly may θυσία also, yet whenever they are conjoined in the Scripture, they denote all sorts of proper sacrifices, as is evident from the place before cited; and therefore they can intend here nothing but that sacrifice which all those proper sacrifices prefigured. Besides, θυσία, unless the metaphor be evident and cogent, doth signify nothing but a sacrifice by immolation or killing. Θύειν, as we have showed, is but σφάττειν, "to kill," only it is to slay in sacred services; with respect whereunto also the other word is used in good authors. So Plutarch affirms of the Gauls, that they believed ζεοὺς εἶναι χαίροντας ἀνθρώπων σφαττωμένων αἵματι, καὶ ταύτην τελειοτάτνη ζυσίαν, — " that the gods delighted in the blood of slain men, and that this was the most perfect sacrifice."'' Ανθρωποσφαγία, if it respect things sacred, is the same with ἀνθρωποζυσία. So, whereas the Lord Christ was ἀμνίον ἐσφαγισμένον, "a Lamb slain," Revelation 5:12, 13:8, — being called

"a Lamb," and "the Lamb of God," as all acknowledge, with respect unto the paschal lamb, — it is said πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐθύθη Χριστὸς, 1 Corinthians 5:7, "Christ our passover," our paschal lamb, "is sacrificed for us." Θυσία, therefore, being used to express the nature of the death of Christ with respect unto God, nothing can be intended thereby but a proper and bloody sacrifice.

(3.) Our adversaries acknowledge that the Lord Christ did offer himself as a complete expiatory sacrifice to God. I ask, then, when he is positively and directly affirmed to offer himself an offering and sacrifice unto God, why is not that the expiatory sacrifice which he offered? They have not any thing to reply, but only that he offered not that sacrifice in his death, but upon his entrance into heaven; which is only in favor of their own hypothesis, to contradict the apostle to his face.

(4.) Προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν are regulated by the same verb with ἑαυτόν, Προσφορὰν ἑαυτὸν προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν: so that there can be no other sense of the words but "Christ offered himself a sacrifice," or "gave himself a sacrifice." And whereas it is objected that παραδίδωμι is not used for sacrificing, or offering sacrifice, besides that it is false, as may be seen in Micah 6:7, [f7] where נָתַן in the original is rendered by παραδίδωμι, so here was a peculiar reason for the use of this word, because the apostle included in the same expression both his giving himself for us and the manner of it, namely, by giving himself a sacrifice unto God for us.

(5.) Whereas it is said that this sacrifice was "a sweet-smelling savor unto God," it doth not advantage our adversaries, as I shall elsewhere manifest, from the rise, nature, and first use of that expression. At present it may suffice that it is used expressly concerning expiatory sacrifices, Leviticus 4:31, and whole burnt-offerings, which were of the same nature, chap. 1:9. And whereas this is the first kind of sacrifice appointed under the law, and is said expressly to "make atonement," verse 4, and therein, to be "an offering of a sweet savor unto the LORD," it plainly declares that all other sacrifices which made atonement were in like manner a sweet savor unto the Lord; on the account whereof that of Christ, wherein God rested and was well pleased, is so called. But of these things we must treat elsewhere more at large.

13. Hebrews 5:6, 7, “As he saith also in another place, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec. Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death,” etc. The reader may consult the exposition of this place, wherein the difficulties of it are removed, and the intention of the Holy Ghost in it is truly explained. At present I shall only observe some few passages in confirmation of the truth under consideration; as, —

(1.) The works, acts, or duties, here assigned unto Christ, are assigned unto him expressly as he was a high priest, as is undeniably manifest in the context; wherefore they are sacerdotal acts, or acts of Christ as a priest.

(2.) He performed them “in the days of his flesh,” and that when he was in great distress, standing in need of aid and assistance from God; that is, at the time of his death.

(3.) It is therefore here plainly affirmed, that our Lord Jesus Christ, as a high priest, did, in his dying for us, offer unto God. If we inquire in other places what he offered, it is expressly said that it was “himself,” his “soul,” his “body,” as we have proved. And that Christ, as a high priest, in the days of his flesh offered himself unto God, is all that we need for the confirmation of what we assert concerning the time, place, and nature, of the exercise of his priesthood. It will be excepted that Christ is not said in this place to offer himself, but only to offer up “prayers and supplications;” which are a metaphorical and not a real sacrifice. But the apostle did not solemnly introduce him as called to the office of a high priest, and acting the powers of that office, merely with respect unto prayers and supplications considered by themselves, and to instance in those only at his death, when he might have mentioned those [which he presented] when, in the course of his life, he continued mighty [nightly?] by himself. What he offered he intended afterwards to declare, and doth so expressly; here he designed only to assert, that, being called to be a high priest, he offered unto God; and that as to the manner of that offering, it was with prayers and supplications, cries and tears, wherein he describes his offering of himself by those adjuncts of it which were also sacerdotal.

14. Hebrews 1:3, Δι᾽ ἑαυτοῦ καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς· — "When he had by himself purged our sins, he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." It is agreed between us and our adversaries that this purging of our sins was the effect of that expiatory sacrifice which the Lord Christ offered unto God as our high priest. The whole question that can remain is *when* he offered it. And the apostle here expressly declares that this was done *before* he sat down at the right hand of God; and this is so plain in the words as that no exception can be invented against it. That alone which they have invented for an evasion is, that Christ indeed offered himself at his first entrance into heaven, and on his appearance in the presence of God for us, before he sat down at the right hand of God. This Crellius insists upon, cap. 10. part. 31 p. 537, 538. But this will yield them no relief, neither according to the truth nor according to their own principles; for, —

(1.) Although we may have *distinct apprehensions* of Christ's entering into heaven and his sitting at the right hand of God, yet it is but one state of Christ that is intended in both, his entrance into heaven being only the means of his sitting down at the right hand of God; and therefore they are never mentioned together, but sometimes the one, sometimes the other, is made use of to express the same state. So his sitting down at the right hand of God is expressed as immediately ensuing his suffering, it being that state whereunto his resurrection, ascension, and entrance into heaven, were subservient:

> "He endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the fight hand of the throne of God," Hebrews 12:2.

The whole is, that he "passed through the heavens," chap. 4:14, and was thereon "made higher than the heavens," chap. 7:26; that is, he "suffered," and so "entered into his glory," Luke 24:26. Nor doth the Scripture anywhere give the least intimation of any mediatorial act of Christ interposing between his entrance into heaven and sitting down at the right hand of God.

(2.) This answer hath no consistency with their own principles in this matter: for they contend that the expiation of our sins consists in the taking of them away, by freeing us from the punishment which is due unto

them. And this must be done by virtue of the power which Christ received of God after his obedience; but this his receiving of power belongs unto his sitting at the right hand of God, so as he can in no sense be said to have purged or expiated our sins before it. And if they will allow that Christ expiated our sins anywhere in heaven or earth antecedently unto our actual freedom in present pardon or future complete deliverance, then doth not the expiation of sins consist in our actual deliverance from them, as they contend that it doth.

15. To the same purpose speaks the apostle, [58]Hebrews 9:12, Διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὸ ἅγια, αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος· — "By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption." This entrance of Christ "into the holy place" was his entrance into heaven. Antecedently hereunto he is said to have "obtained eternal redemption." This "redemption we have through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins," [59]Ephesians 1:7; and this forgiveness, or the putting away of sin, was "by the sacrifice of himself," [60]Hebrews 9:26. Wherefore, the sacrifice of Christ, whereby he obtained redemption, or put away sin, was by his blood-shedding. And this was, as it is here expressed, antecedent unto his entrance into the holy place. Crellius, in answer to this testimony, p. 536, engageth into a long discourse to prove that things present, or not perfectly past, are sometimes expressed by the aorist, or sign of the time past; as if our argument from hence were built merely on that form of the word, on supposition of a general maxim that all words in that tense do necessarily signify the time past. But we proceed on no such supposition. We say, indeed, and contend, that there must be, some cogent reason to interpret that of the time present or to come which is expressed as past and done. For this we say there is none in this place, nor is any pretended but the false hypothesis of our adversaries, that Christ offered not himself until his entrance into heaven, which they judge sufficient to oppose unto the clearest testimonies to the contrary. For whereas the words of the apostle signify directly that the Lord Christ first obtained eternal redemption, and then entered into heaven, or the holy place not made with hands, they will have his intention to be the direct contrary, — that he first entered into heaven, and then obtained eternal redemption; for that offering of himself which they suppose was consequential unto his entrance into the holy

place. But we argue from the scope of the words. It is said that "Christ by his own blood entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption." I desire to know how or by what means he did so obtain, or find, or acquire it. Is it not plain that it was "by his own blood," and that which he shed before he entered into the sanctuary?

16. Moreover, Christ is said to "offer himself once," <3072>Hebrews 7:27, 9:28, 10:10, 12, 14. His offering was one, and once offered. An action once performed, and then ceasing to be performed, however it continues in its virtue and efficacy, is so expressed. The high priest entered into the most holy place once in the year; that is, his so doing was an act that was at once performed, and after that was not for that year. Hence the apostle proves the excellency of this sacrifice of Christ above those of the Aaronical priests, because they, by reason of their weakness and imperfection, were often offered; this of Christ, being every way complete, and of infinite efficacy, was offered but once, and at once, <3001>Hebrews 10:1-4, etc. What sacrifice, therefore, can this be, that was then but once offered? Doth this seem to express the continual appearance of Christ in heaven? which, if a sacrifice, is always offering, and not once offered, and so would be inferior unto them which were offered only once a year. For that which effecteth its design by being performed once a year, is more efficacious than that which must be always effecting. Besides, our apostle says expressly that the Lord Christ was "once offered to bear the sins of many," chap. <3028>9:28. But this he did then, and only then, when he "bare our sins in his own body on the tree," <6024>1 Peter 2:24; which irrefragably proves that then he was offered to God.

17. Add yet hereunto that the offering of Christ, which the apostle insists upon as his great sacerdotal act and duty, was necessarily accompanied with suffering, and therefore was on the earth and not in heaven: <3025>Hebrews 9:25, 26, "Nor yet that he should offer himself often; ..... for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world." The argument of the apostle is built upon a general principle, that all sacrifice was in and by suffering. The sacrificed beast was slain, and had his blood poured out. Without this there could be no sacrifice. Therefore if Christ himself had been to be often offered, he must have often suffered. It is excepted, "That although his offering did not consist in his sufferings, nor did they both concur at the same time, yet his suffering was previously

necessary, as an antecedent condition unto his offering of himself in heaven; and on that account the apostle might well conclude that if he were often to be offered, he must have often suffered." But, —

(1.) There can be no reason given, on the opinion of our adversaries, why the suffering of Christ was antecedently *necessary* unto that offering of himself which they imagine. At best they refer it unto an absolute free act of the will of God, which might have been otherwise, and Christ might have often offered and yet not often suffered.

(2.) Christ is said not only to "offer himself," but to be "offered:" "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many," verse 28. Now, though the offering of himself may be accommodated unto that presentation which he made of himself in heaven, yet his being offered to bear sins plainly includes a suffering in what he did.

(3.) There were many typical sacrifices, which nothing belonging unto went beyond their suffering. Such were all the expiatory sacrifices, or sacrifices to make atonement, whose blood was not carried into the sanctuary. For their slaying, the pouring out of their blood, the consumption on the altar, were all destructive unto their beings. And these sacrifices were types of the sacrifice of Christ, as our apostle testifies, chap. ^{Heb}7:27, "Who needeth not daily" (καθ᾽ ἡμέραν) "to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself." Had he intended only the sacrifice of the high priest, he could not have said that he was to offer it καθ᾽ ἡμέραν, "daily," when he was to do so only κατ᾽ ἐνιαυτόν, "yearly," chap. ^{Heb}10:1. It is therefore תָּמִיד, or "daily sacrifice," that he intends, and this was not carried on beyond suffering.

And this is yet more plainly expressed, chap. ^{Heb}10:11, 12, "And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God." Comparing the sacrifice of Christ with these sacrifices, he declares that they were types and representations thereof, or there would be no foundation for such a comparison, nor for the exaltation of his above them, as to its efficacy and its consequents. But there was nothing of these sacrifices carried into the holy place, nor any representation made of them

therein, but in their suffering and destruction they were consummated; for they were the sacrifices which every priest who ministered at the altar did offer either daily or on all occasions. Wherefore, if the sacrifice of. Christ answered unto them, as the apostle teacheth us that it did, he offered it in his suffering, his death, and blood-shedding only. After this he entered as our high priest into the holy place not made with hands, to appear in the presence of God for us. And as this was signified by the high priest's entering into the most holy place with the blood of the bullock and goat that were offered for a sin-offering, so it was necessary in itself unto the application of the value and efficacy of his sacrifice unto the church, according to the covenant between Father and Son before described.

What hath been pleaded is sufficient unto our present purpose, as to the declaration of the nature of the priesthood of Christ, his entrance upon it, and discharge of it. But there being another opinion concerning it, universally opposite in all particulars unto the truth declared and vindicated, we must, for the security of the faith of the church, call it, with the ways, means, and artifices wherewith it is endeavored to be supported, unto an account; which shall be done in the ensuing Exercitation.

EXERCITATION 32.

THE NATURE OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

1. *The opinion of the Socinians about the priesthood of Christ distinctly stated in eight particulars;*

2. *Expressed by themselves.*

3. *The faith of the church of God in opposition thereunto.*

4. *Vindication of the whole doctrine of the priesthood of Christ from the perversion of it and opposition made unto it by Crellius — Its agreement and disagreement with his kingly office and power.*

5. *How the priestly office of Christ is mentioned by other writers of the New Testament, and why principally handled in this Epistle to the Hebrews.*

6. *Intercession no act of Christ's kingly power —* ◁ROM8◁ *Romans 8:34 vindicated — The mutual respect between the offices of Christ with regard unto the same general end.*

7. ◁1JO2◁ *1 John 2:2 vindicated — Testimonies of the Old and New Testament omitted — Confidence of the Socinians in pretending to own the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ.*

8. *The priesthood of Christ is not comprehended by the holy writers in his kingly office — Attempts to prove it vain — The nature of the expiation of sins vindicated —* ◁HEB4◁ *Hebrews 4:16 explained.*

9. *The words of the Psalmist, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," how and in what sense applied by the apostles with respect unto the offices of Christ.*

10. *Vanity of Crellius in assigning differences between the kingly and priestly offices of Christ.*

11. *The differences assigned by him examined.*

12. *Real difference and distinction between these offices proved.*

13. *The dignity and honor of Christ exposed by denying his real priesthood.*

14. *The boldness of Smalcius in censuring the divine writers — His reason why they ascribed the priestly office to Christ.*

1. THE opinion of the Socinians concerning the priesthood of Christ was expressed in general in our preceding discourse; but for the clearer apprehension and confutation of it, it is necessary that it be more particularly declared in the most important parts of it, as also that its contrariety unto the faith of the church may be the more plainly demonstrated. And the sum of what they pretend to apprehend and believe herein may be reduced unto the ensuing heads: —

(1.) “That the Lord Christ was not, nor is, a high priest properly so called, but only metaphorically, by reason of some allusion between what he doth for the church and what was done by the high priests under the law for the Jews.” And here, if they please, they may rest, as having in design utterly overthrown or rejected this office of Christ. But further to manifest their intentions, they add, —

(2.) “That he was not at all, in any sense, a high priest whilst he was on the earth, or before his ascension into heaven.” And this because he did not any of those things on the earth on the account whereof he is called a high priest; but he is called so in an allusion to the high priests under the law. Hence it follows that in his death he offered no sacrifice unto God, nor made any expiation of our sins thereby; which also that he did not they expressly contend.

(3.) “That therefore he became a high priest when he entered into heaven, and presented himself alive unto God.” Not that then he received any new office which he had not before, but only that then he had power to do those things from the doing whereof he is metaphorically denominated a priest. Wherefore they say, —

(4.) “That it is in heaven where he makes atonement and doth expiate our sins, which is called his offering himself unto God an expiatory oblation or sacrifice; which as it consisted not in his sufferings, death, and bloodshedding, so had it no virtue or efficacy from thence, but only as it was a condition pre-required thereunto.”

(5.) “This expiation of our sins consists principally in two things, —

[1.] Our deliverance from the punishment due unto them, initially in this world by pardon, and completely at the last day, when we shall be saved from the wrath to come.

[2.] In our *deliverance* from the power of sin, by faith in the doctrine he taught and confortuity unto his example, that we should not serve it in this world.” And, —

(6.) “Hence it follows that believers are the first proper objects of the discharge of the duties of this office, or of all the sacerdotal actings of Christ;” for they consist in the help, aid, relief, and deliverance from our

spiritual enemies which we have by him, his gracious and merciful will of relieving us being that on the account whereof he is called a high priest, and wherein that office doth consist. Wherefore, —

(7.) "This priestly office of Christ is upon the matter the same with his kingly office;" or it is the exerting and exercise of his kingly power with love, care, and compassion; so called in the Epistle to the Hebrews, out of an allusion unto what was done by the high priests of old.

(8.) "Whereas his intercession doth belong unto this office of his, and is expressly assigned unto him as a high priest, it is nothing but a note, evidence, or expression, to teach us that the power which the Lord Christ exerciseth and putteth forth mercifully for our relief, he received originally from God, as if he had prayed to him for it."

2. I have so included and expressed the apprehensions of these men concerning the priesthood of Christ in these positions, as that I am persuaded that there is no one who is ingenuous amongst them will except against any particular in the account. But that none may reflect in their thoughts about it, I shall repeat it in the words of one of their principal writers. To this purpose speaks Volkelius, de Vera Relig. lib. 3. cap. 37, p. 144,

> "Jam ut de pontificio Christi munere explicemus; primo loco animadvertendum nobis est, illud ab ejusdem officio regio, si in rem ipsam mentem intendas, non multum differre. Cum divinus Spiritus figurato hoc analogicoque dicendi genere, quo pacto Christus regni sui functionem administret, ante oculos nostros constituere potissimum voluerit, nobisque ostendere illum non solum salutem nostram procurare posse, sed etiam nosjuvare velle, et porro id omnino facere inque eo totum esse ut peccata nostra penitus expiet; hoc est, tum ab ipsis peccatis, rum vero praecipue ab eorum reatu ac poena nos liberet."

Again, p. 146,

> "Ut huic sacerdotis officio rite praeponeretur Christus, non satis erat eum in homines esse misericordem, nisi insuper tanta illius esset potestas, quanta ad homines miseriis oppressos divinissima ope sublevandos, pestemque aeternam ab illorum capitibus

> propulsandum opus est; cumque omnis ad hanc rem in coelo terraque potestas requiratur, consequens est Christum antequam in coelum ascenderet tantumque rerum omnium dominatum consequeretur summum sacerdotem nostrum nondum perfectum fuisse."

So he, and much more to the same purpose.

In like manner,

> Cat. Rac. de Munere Christi Sacerdotali: Quaest. 1, "Munus sacerdotale in eo situm est, quod quemadmodum pro regio munere potest nobis in omnibus nostris necessitatibus subvenire; ira pro munere sacerdotali vult ac porro subvenit. Atque haec illius subveniendi seu opis afferendae ratio, sacrificium ejus appellatur."
>
> "Quare haec ejus afferendae ratio sacrificium vocatur; vocatur ita figurato loquendi modo," etc.
>
> "Quid porro est peccatorum expiatio? Est a poenis quae peccata turn temporariae, tum aeternae comitantur, et ab ipsis etiam peccatis ne eis serviamus, liberatio."
>
> "Cur id sacrificium Christi in coelis peragitur? Ideo quod tale tabernaculum requireret," etc.
>
> "Quid? Annon erat sacerdos antequam in coelos ascenderet et praesertim cruci affixus penderet? Non erat."

To the same purpose the reader may see Socin. de Christo Servat. p. 2, cap. 15; Ostorod. Institut. Relig. Christian. cap. 37; Smalcius de Divinitate Jesu Christi, cap. 23; Woolzogen. Compend. Relig. Christian. sect. 51, p. 11; Brenius in Hebrews 4:16, et cap. 8:4.

3. But the faith of the church of God stands up in direct opposition unto all these imaginations; for it asserteth, —

(1.) That our Lord Jesus Christ was and is *truly and properly the high priest* of the church, and that of him all others vested with that office under the law were only types and representatives. And the description which the apostle gives of a high priest properly so called is accommodated and appropriated by himself unto him, Hebrews 5:1-3;

as also all the acts, duties, or offices of the priesthood are accordingly ascribed unto him, chap. 7:26,27, 10:6,7, 9:24; [GOD]1 John 2:1,2.

(2.) That he was perfectly and completely a high priest *whilst he was on the earth,* although he did not perfectly and completely discharge all the duties of that office in this world, seeing he lives for ever to make intercession for us.

(3.) That he offered himself an *expiatory sacrifice* unto God in his death and bloodshedding, and was not made a priest upon his entrance into heaven, there to offer himself unto God, where only the nature of his bloody sacrifice was represented.

(4.) That the *expiation of our sins* consisteth principally in the charging of the punishment due unto them upon the Lord Christ, who took them on himself, and was made a sin-offering for them, that we may be freed from them and all the evil which follows them by the sentence of the law. And therefore,

(5.) *God is the first proper object* of all the sacerdotal actings of Christ; for to him he offered himself, and with him he made atonement for sin. And thereon,

(6.) This office of Christ is distinct from his *kingly office,* and not in any of its proper acts or adjuncts coincident therewithal. All which assertions have been before declared and proved, and shall now be further vindicated.

4. He who is supposed, and that not unjustly, to have amongst our adversaries handled these things with most diligence and subtilty is Crellius. I shall therefore examine what be on set purpose disputes on this subject, and that not by referring the substance of his discourses unto the distinct heads before mentioned, but taking the whole of it as disposed in his own method and words; and that with a design to give a specimen of those artifices, diversions, ambiguous expressions, and equivocations, which he perpetually maketh use of in this cause and controversy. And where he seems to be defective I shall call in Smalcius, and it may be some others of them, unto his assistance. And I shall only transcribe his words in Latin, without adding any translation of them, as supposing that those who are competently able to judge of these things are not wholly ignorant

of that language, and others may find enough for their satisfaction in our discourses so far as they are concerned.

In this controversy he expressly engageth, in Respon. ad Grotium, cap. 10 part. 56, p. 543:

> **“(1.)** Pontificiam Christi dignitatem a prophetica et regis distinctam agnoscimus, quanquam non pari modo distinctam.
>
> **(2.)** Arctius enim cum regia dignitate cohaeret quam cum prophetica.
>
> **(3.)** Unde duo ista munera, regium nempe et pontificium, in sacris literis aperte a se invicem disjuncta, et ut in scholis loquuntur contradistincta, nuspiam cernas sed potius alterum in altero
>
> **(4.)** quodammedo cemprehensum videas. Nam
>
> **(5.)** D. Auctor Hebrews 3 initio Christi dignitatem quam ratione muneris sibi a Deo mandati habeat, nobis ante oculos ponere volens, et ad ejus considerationem nos cohortans, duo tantum illius officia commemorat propheticum et sacerdotale, quorum illud in terris olim absolvit, hoc in coelis perpetuo administrat, dum inquit, ‘Unde, fratres sancti, vocationis coelestis participes, considerate-apostolum’ (seu ‘legatum’) ‘et pontificem confessionis nostrae, Christum Jesum.’ Apostolum sire legatum confessionis, hoc est, religionis ac fidei nostrae quam profiteri debemus, vocat Christum, quia ad eam nobis annunciandam olim a Deo missus fuit quod est prophetae. Pontificem autem ejusdem confessionis sen religionis appellat.
>
> **(6.)** Quia ad eam perpetuo tuendam et curam ejus gerendam, hoc est, ad omnia ea quae ad illam spectant administranda et ad exitum in nabis perducenda a Dee constitutus est; quasi summum religionis nostrae ac sacrorum praesidem aut administratorem dices, quod infra, cap. 12:2. Illis verbis expressit dum eum ducem et consummatorem fidei appellat; quia non tantum voce et exemplo nobis ad eam praeivit, verum etiam eandem ad Dei dextram nunc collocatus perficit, atque ad optatum finem perducit.”

That the Lord Christ is called a priest on some account or other, and is so, these men cannot deny, and therefore on all occasions they do in words expressly confess it. But their endeavor is, to persuade us that little or

nothing is signified by that appellation as ascribed unto him. At least, they will by no means allow that any such thing is intended in that expression as it signifies in all other authors, sacred and profane, when not applied unto the Lord Christ. They will not have a distinct office to be intended in it. Wherefore Crellius, although he acknowledges, in the entrance of this discourse,

(1.) that the priestly dignity of Christ is distinct from his kingly and prophetical dignities, yet his whole ensuing endeavor is to prove that the priesthood is not a distinct office in him. And he sophistically makes use of the word "dignity," the "priestly dignity," to make an appearance of a distinct office from the kingly, which here he expresseth by "dignity" also. But he nowhere allows that he hath a distinct sacerdotal office. And when he mentions" officium pontificale" as distinct from the "officium propheticum," he expressly intendeth his kingly office. And they do constantly in their other writings call the one "officium regium," the other "munus sacerdotale," supposing the first word to denote an habitual power, and the latter only actual exercise, wherein yet they are mistaken. The priestly dignity, therefore, here intended, and by which word he would impose on the less wary reader, is nothing but the honor that is due unto Christ for and in the discharge of his kingly office and power in a merciful, gracious manner, as the priests did of old. Wherefore he adds,

(2.) that notwithstanding this distinction, yet the sacerdotal dignity comes nearer or closer to the kingly dignity than the prophetical. But this assertion is not built on any general principle taken from the nature of these offices themselves, as though there were a greater agreement between the kingly and priestly offices than between the priestly and prophetical; for the prophetical and sacerdotal offices seem on many accounts to be of a nearer alliance than the sacerdotal and kingly, as we shall see afterwards. But this is only a step towards the main design of a total subverting of the sacerdotal office of Christ. For on this assertion it is added immediately,

(3.) that in the Scripture these two offices, the kingly and priestly, are never disjoined openly, or as contradistinct one to another. But yet his words are ambiguous. If he intend that they are not plainly, and so openly, distinguished in the Scripture one from the other, there is nothing more openly false. They are so in names and things, in the powers, acts, duties,

and effects. If by “A se invicem disjuncta et contradistincta,” he intend such a divulsion and separation as that they should agree in nothing, not in their subject., not in their original, nor in their general ends and effects, so no offices of Him are divided who in them all is the Mediator between God and men. But they are nowhere so conjoined as that one of them should be contained and comprehended in the other

(4.) “quodammodo,” “after a sort,” as he speaks; for this word also is of a large and ambiguous signification, used on purpose to obscure the matter treated of or the sense of the author about it. Is one so comprehended in the other as to be the same with it, to be a part of it, or to be only the exercise of the power of the other in an especial manner? If this be the mind of this author, it can be expressed by “quodammodo” for no other end but because he dares not openly avow his sense and mind. But we deny that one is thus contained in the other, or any way so as to hinder it from being a distinct office of itself, accompanied with its distinct powers, rights, acts, and duties.

The argument from Hebrews 3:1-3, whereby he attempts to prove that one of these offices is contained in the other “quodammodo,” whatever that be,

(5.) is infirm and weak; yea, he himself knew well enough the weakness of it. It consists in this only, that the apostle in that place makes mention of the prophetical and priestly offices of Christ, and not of the kingly; for which Crellius himself gives this reason in his commentary on the place, namely, because, as he supposeth, he had treated fully of the kingly office in the first chapter. In the third, the place here produced by him, as himself observes, he is entering on his comparing Christ with Moses, who was the prophet, apostle, ambassador, or legate of God to the people, and Aaron who was their priest; and with respect hereunto he calls the Hebrews unto a due consideration of him, especially considering that they had a deep and fixed apprehension concerning the kingly power of the Messiah, but of his being the great prophet and high priest of the church they had heard little in their Judaism. It doth not therefore follow hence that the kingly and priestly offices of Christ are comprehended one in another “quodammodo,” but only that the apostle, having distinctly handled the kingly office of Christ before, as he had done both in the first

and second chapters, now proceeding to the consideration of his priestly and prophetical offices, makes no mention thereof, nor indeed would it have been to his purpose so to have done; yea, it was expressly contrary to his design. For what is nextly proposed, concerning the nature of these offices, it is agreed that the Lord Christ is called our "apostle" as he was the prophet of the church, sent of God to reveal and declare his mind and love unto us. But it is not so that he is called

(6.) a "high priest," — that is, principally, firstly, and properly, — because of the care he takes of our religion, and his administration of the affairs of it. Yea, there is nothing more opposite than their notion of the priesthood of Christ, not only to the general nature of that office, with the common sense of mankind concerning it, but also to the whole discourse of the apostle on this subject; for he not only asserts, but proves by sundry arguments, that the Lord Christ was made a priest to offer sacrifice unto God, to make reconciliation for sin and intercession for sinners. It is his being constituted a high priest for ever, and having offered the one sacrifice of himself, whereby all that come unto God are sanctified, — he doth as such a high priest preside over the spiritual worship of the house of God; so that in and by him alone we have access unto the throne of grace, and do enter into the holy place through the blood of his sacrifice, wherein he consecrated for us a new and living way of access to God. Wherefore our author utterly fails in his first attempt for a proof of what he had asserted.

5. His next endeavor towards the same purpose is from the *silence* of the other writers of the New Testament concerning this office of Christ. This he supposeth would not have been, considering the excellency and usefulness of it, had it not been included in his kingly office, for so he expresseth himself, p. 544: — "Caeteri scriptores N. Testamenti

(1.) regium potius et propheticum munus commemorant, nec ullus ex iis Christum

(2.) diserte sacerdotem aut pontificem vocat; facturi id proculdubio *creberrime*, si id in caeteris ipsius muneribus atque imprimis in regio, consideratis certis eorum munerum circumstantiis in quibus sacerdoti legali similis est Christus, intelligi ac facile *comprehendi* non posset, cum ex eo munere,

(3.) salus nostra aeterna pendeat, ⁴⁶⁶Hebrews 5:9,10, 7:24,25. Quandoquidem inde *peccatorum* nostrorum proficiscitur remissio et justificatio in qua beatitas nostra consistit."

Ans. The intelligent reader may easily observe what is the judgment of this man concerning the priesthood of Christ, which is this, that in the exercise of his other offices he is so called, because of some *similitude unto the legal priests of old;* which is plainly to deny and overthrow the office itself, and to leave no such thing in him, substituting a bare metaphorical, allusive denomination in the room of it. And it is but a noise of words which is added concerning the dependence of our salvation on the sacerdotal duty of Christ, because indeed it is denied that he is a priest at all; and all that is intended thereby is but the exercise of his other offices in some kind of likeness unto the high priest under the law. To affirm on this supposition that forgiveness of sin, justification, salvation, blessedness, depend on this office, — that is, on a name given from this allusion, — is only to serve a present occasion, without respect to truth or sobriety. But in particular, I say

(1.) there is more express mention [by the writers of the New Testament] of the distinct office of the priesthood of Christ, both as to its nature and its acts, than of his prophetical. Why

(2.) they do not directly and expressly call him a priest, they are not bound to give an account unto these men. It is enough for the faith of the church that they do really and expressly ascribe unto him the acts and duties of that office, such as could be performed by none but a priest properly so called, and particularly such as in no sense belong either to the prophetical or kingly office, — namely, to offer himself a sacrifice, to be a propitiation, to wash us in his blood, to make intercession for us, yea, to be made sin for us, and the like. But this Epistle also belongeth unto the New Testament, nor is it as yet denied by the Socinians so to do; and herein this office of Christ is so plainly, fully, distinctly treated of and proposed, in its causes, nature, use, and effects, with its necessity and the benefits we receive thereby, as that no other office of his is in any part of the Scripture, nor in the whole of it, so graphically described.

The reason also why the *full revelation of* the nature of this office of Christ was, in the wisdom of the Holy Ghost, reserved for this Epistle to

the Hebrews is so evident that our author need not think so strange of it. It was among them that God of old had instituted the solemn representation of it, in their typical priesthood. The nature of all those institutions they were now to be peculiarly instructed in, both that they might see the faithfulness of God in accomplishing what he designed by them, and the end that he put thereby unto their administration. Now, though these things were of use unto the whole church of God, that all might learn his truth, wisdom, and faithfulness, in the harmony of the Old Testament and the New, yet were the Hebrews peculiarly concerned herein, and therefore the Holy Ghost reserved the full communication of those things unto his treating with them in an especial manner. But

(3.) all those acts of the sacerdotal office of Christ whereon the pardon of sin, justification, and salvation, do depend, are expressly mentioned by other writers of the New Testament; as ◂60121 John 2:2; ◂4902Ephesians 5:2; ◂47052 Corinthians 5:21; ◂4503Romans 8:3,4,34; ◂60071 John 1:7; ◂6105Revelation 1:5; ◂60191 Peter 1:19, with sundry other places.

Let it now be judged whether any thing of the least moment hath as yet been offered in proof of the assertion laid down, — namely, that the priestly office of Christ is contained in the kingly “quodammodo.”

6. But he yet further enlargeth on this consideration: — “Quando autem caeteri scriptores sacri id commemorant quod ad sacerdotium Christi magis proprie pertinet,

(1.) munus hoc ipsum muneri regio, aut functionem functioni revera non opponunt. Interpellationem Christi pro nobis,

(2.) semel nominavit Paulus, ◂4503Romans 8:34, sed in ea

(3.) tacite actum etiam regime ipsius potestatis ad nos a poena liberandos pertinentem, tanquam interpellationis effectum quendam proprium complexus est; ἐνέργεια enim sen operatioa regia Christi potestate manans, atque ad nos a poena liberandos pertinens curae illius pro nobis susceptae quidam veluti effectus est et consequens.

(4.) Regiam quidem potestatem apostolus ibi commemoravit in verbis, ‘qui etiam est in dextra Dei,’ et interpellationem ab ea distinxit; sed potestatis

illius actum expresse non commemoravit, contentus interpellationem nominasse.”

Ans. **(1.)** This condition is imposed on us without warrant, that we should produce testimonies out of the other writers of the New Testament where the priestly office of Christ is opposed unto his kingly; nor do we pretend that any such thing is done in this Epistle. Nor are the offices of Christ anywhere opposed one unto another, nor ought they so to be; nor can any man show wherein there is an opposition made between his kingly and prophetical offices, which these men acknowledge to be distinct. And it sufficeth unto our purpose that the kingly and priestly offices are, in their names, powers, acts, and duties, distinctly proposed and declared. And this author ought to have considered all the testimonies before mentioned, and not to have taken out only one or two of them, which he thought he could best wrest unto his purpose; which is all that he hath attempted, and yet hath failed of his end. It is here said

(2.) that Paul in his other epistles doth but once expressly mention the intercession of Christ in heaven. But he mentioneth his oblation on earth more frequently, as may be seen in the places quoted. And the mentioning of it in one place in words plain, and capable of no other sense, is as effectual as if it had been expressed in a hundred other places.

(3.) It is both false and frivolous, to say that in speaking of Christ’s intercession he doth tacitly include any act of his kingly power whereby he frees us from punishment. First, It is false, because as intercession is certainly no act of kingly power, nor formally hath any respect thereunto, — it denoting the impetration of something from another, whereas all the acts of kingly authority are the exerting of that power which one hath in himself, — so there is nothing in the text or context to give countenance unto any such imagination. For what relates unto the kingly power of Christ, namely, his sitting at the right hand of God, is expressed as a distinct act or adjunct of his mediatorial office, even as his dying and rising again are. And that his intercession is completely distinguished and separated from it is plain from the expression whereby it is introduced: Ὃς καὶ ἔστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν· — “Who also is on the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.” If therefore his being at the right hand of God is distinguished from his

dying and rising again, so as not to be included in them nor they in it, then are his intercession and sitting at the right hand of God so distinguished also. And the truth is, the apostle, for our consolation, here proposeth distinctly all the offices of Christ in their most effectual acts, or the most eminent notations of them, and that in the proper order of their discharge and exercise. And whereas the acts of his sacerdotal office are so distinct as that between them the interposition of the actings of his other offices was necessary, he begins and ends with them, as the order of their exercise did require; for, —

[1.] He died for us as a priest; then

[2.] He rose, giving testimony to the truth as the prophet of the church;

[3.] He possessed actually his kingly power, sitting at the right hand of God; and

[4.] There carrieth on the perpetual exercise of his priesthood by intercession.

Wherefore there is nothing in these words that should tacitly intimate an inclusion of any act of the kingly office, but it is expressed in a clear distinction from it, as an act quite of another nature. And it will, if I mistake not, be a very difficult task for these persons to manifest, in any tolerable, rational manner, how the intercession of Christ doth include in it an act of his kingly, power. Secondly, It is frivolous, if by this “tacitly comprehended” he intend that the intercession of Christ, which is an act of his priestly office, hath its effects towards us by virtue of the interposition of some act or acts of his kingly office; for such a mutual respect there is between the acts of all the offices of Christ and their effects. The oblation of Christ, which is an act of the priestly office, is made effectual towards us by the interposition of the exercise of his prophetical office, [4759]2 Corinthians 5:18-21, [4824]Ephesians 2:14-17; and his teaching us as the prophet of the church is made effectual by those supplies of his Spirit and grace which are effects of his kingly power. Suppose, therefore, that the energy and operation of Christ’s kingly power is put forth to make his intercession effectual towards us in the way mentioned by Crellius, — which yet in his sense is false, — this

proves not in the least that his kingly power, or any act of it, is included in his intercession, which is so distinctly expressed. Wherefore,

(4.) that the apostle should here mention the kingly power of Christ, and name his in, tercession as the act thereof, seeing he nameth no other, is a fond imagination; for both doth intercession in its proper nature long to another office, and also it is peculiarly ascribed unto the Lord Christ by our apostle as a *high priest*, and not as a king, [3072]Hebrews 7:25-27. The intercession of Christ as a priest is ordained of God as a means of making his sacrifice and oblation effectual, by the application of its virtue and efficacy unto us; and the actual communication of the truth of it is committed unto him as our Lord, Head, and King. For whereas all his offices are vested in the same person, belong all unto the same general work of mediation, and have all the same general end, it is impossible but that the acts of them must have mutual respect and relation one to another; but yet the offices themselves are formally distinct.

7. He yet proceeds .on the same argument unto another instance: —

> "Johannes dum Christum advocatum quem apud Patrem habeamus, nominat, et eum simul expiationem pro peccatis nostris vocat,
>
> **(1.)** conseri potest munus sacerdotale nobis descripsisse: ubi
>
> **(2.)** tamen regium munus non opponit. At cure ad
>
> **(3.)** consolationem illam, quam eo loce peccantibus proponit Johannes, plurimum pertinent scire Christum plenissimam habere poenas peccatorum a nobis auferendi potestatem
>
> **(4.)** tacite id in suis verbis inclusisse censendus est, 1 Job. 2:2."

Ans. Seeing he designed not to consider all the testimonies that are usually pleaded for the priestly office of Christ in the New Testament, I cannot but admire how he came to fix on this instance, which he can give no better countenance to his evasion from; for, —

(1.) The apostle *may not* only be thought to describe the priestly office of Christ, but he doth it so expressly as that the contrary cannot be insinuated with any respect to modesty. For the whole of the priestly office consists in oblation and intercession, both which are here distinctly

ascribed unto him; and to describe an office by proper power and its duties is more significant than to do it only by its name.

(2.) It is acknowledged that here is no mention made of Christ's kingly power; and it must also be acknowledged that the things here ascribed unto Christ do no way belong unto his kingly office. Hence it follows undeniably that the writers of the New Testament distinguish these offices, and do not include one of them in the other. Yea, but saith Crellius,

(3.) "The apostle is to be thought tacitly to include the kingly power of Christ;" that is, although he mentions it not, yet he ought to have done so, and therefore is to be thought to have intended what he did not express. That case is very desperate, indeed, which is only capable of such defense as this. But there is good reason to think why the apostle ought so to do, — that is, to do what indeed he did not, — Crellius being judge. For saith he,

(4.) "The full power that Christ hath to deliver us from the punishment due to sin belongs unto that consolation which the apostle intended to give unto sinners."

Ans. **(1.)** I deny that the consideration of the power intended did at all belong unto the consolation that the apostle designs for sinners, and that because neither directly nor indirectly is it mentioned by him. And he knew what belonged unto the consolation which he intended better than Crellius did. This, therefore, is but a direction given the apostle (though coming too late) what he ought to have written, and not an interpretation of what he wrote.

(2.) Proposing the expiatory oblation and intercession of Christ as the ground of our consolation, because they are the reasons, causes, and means of the forgiveness of our sins, the apostle had no occasion to mention the certain consequents thereof, such as is our deliverance from the punishment due to sire

(3.) The power of Christ to take away sins, or to deliver us from the punishment due to sin, fancied by Crellius, is indeed no principle of evangelical consolation, nor doth belong to the kingly office of Christ, nor is consistent with the apostle's present discourse, which lays our consolation on the real propitiation and intercession of Christ, both which

are excluded by this imaginary power of taking away the penalty due to sin absolutely, without respect to price, atonement, or satisfaction.

And these are all the places which he thought meet to consider in pursuance of his assertion, “That all the writers of the New Testament, excepting the author of this Epistle, did in a sort include the kingly and priestly offices of Christ the one in the other;” wherein how he hath acquitted himself is left unto the judgment of the indifferent reader. It was not, I confess, improvidently done of him, to confine himself unto the New Testament, considering that in the Old He is expressly called a priest, <19110>Psalm 110:4, and that in conjunction with, and yet distinction from, his regal power, Zechariah 12,13; he is also said to have his soul made a sin-offering, and that when, in and under his suffering, he bare our iniquities, <23530>Isaiah 53:10,11; whereby, when he was cut off, he made reconciliation for iniquity, and brought in everlasting righteousness, <27024>Daniel 9:24,25. Sundry testimonies also of the New Testament, before quoted, are utterly omitted by him, as those which will not by any means be compelled unto the least appearance of a compliance with his design. But these artifices are wanted to the cause. Only I must add, that I cannot but admire with what confidence our adversaries talk of the priesthood of Christ, of his offering himself an expiatory sacrifice, of his intercession, when all these things, in the proper and only signification of the words, are expressly denied by them.

8. Our author proceeds, in the next place, to give a reason of that which neither is nor ever was, namely, why the holy writers do in some manner comprehend these offices one in the other; for they propose them unto us distinctly, as their nature doth require: — “Neque vero immerito sacri scriptores alterum officium in altero

(1.) quodammodo comprehendunt. Nam quicquid a Christo ut sacerdote

(2,3) expectamus, id ab eo ut rege reipsa proficisci dici potest. Sacerdotis est

(4.) peccata expiate et expurgare. Hoc fit dum

(5.) hostes Christi et nostri, Peccatum nempe ipsum, mors et qui mortis habet imperium Satanas, destruuntur. At Christus hostes suos ac nostros debellat ac destruit ut rex, <461524>1 Corinthians 15:24-26, Philippians 3, ult.

(6.) Sacerdotis est auxilium iis qui ad thronum gratie accedunt opportunum praestare, et affiictis prompte succurrere, [Hebrews 2:17,18, 4:15,16].

(7.) Annon etiam Christi regis est populo suo ad thronum ipsius confugienti succurrere, et afflictis opera ferre?"

Ans. **(1.)** We observed before the looseness and ambiguity of that expression, "quodammodo," or "after a sort;" for if it signify any thing in this case, it is the application of the distinct energies and operations of these distinct offices unto the same end, wherein we own their agreement and concurrence. That which he should prove is, that they are one of them so contained in the other as that they are not two distinct offices,

(2.) If whatever we expect from Christ as a priest do really proceed from him as a king, as here it is affirmed, then is his priesthood οὐδὲν ἄλλο πλὴν ὄνομα, — "a mere empty name," whereby nothing of any use or value is signified.

(3.) His arguments whereby he endeavors to prove that the holy writers did, not without cause, do that which indeed they did not at all, are sophistical, and in conclusion not proving what himself intends. For, what "we do expect from a priest" is sophistical; for it respects our present expectation of what is future, — our hope, faith, and desire of what he will do for us. But this is but one part of the office and duty of a priest, yea, that part which is expressly founded in what is done already; for Christ, our high priest, hath already expiated and purged our sins, and we have no expectation that he should do it again. He did "by himself," — that is, by the sacrifice of himself, — "purge our sins," and that before he sat down at the right hand of God, [Hebrews 1:3]; and this he did once only, by his own sacrifice once offered, as we have proved. Wherefore

(4.) it is true that it belongeth unto a priest to expiate our sins and take them away. This we believe that Christ hath done for us, as our high priest; but we do not expect that he should do it any more, any otherwise but by the application unto us of the virtue and efficacy of what he hath already done.

(5.) The description here given us of the expiation of sin, — namely, that it "consists in the actual subduing of Christ's enemies and ours, sin, death, and the devil," — is absurd, dissonant from the common sense of mankind

in these things, destructive to the whole nature of the types of the old testament, and contrary to the plain doctrine of the Scripture. This is a blessed consequent and fruit, indeed, of the expiation of our sins, when he bare our sins in his own body on the tree, when his soul was made an offering for sin, when he offered himself a sacrifice, a propitiation, price, and ransom, to make atonement and reconciliation for sin; but expiation itself consisteth not therein. These, therefore, we acknowledge that Christ effecteth by various actings of his kingly power; but all on a supposition of the atonement made by him as a priest with respect unto the guilt and demerit of sin. Hereby he obtained for us eternal redemption, and we have redemption in his blood, even the forgiveness of sins. The things intended are therefore so distinct that they prove the offices or powers from whence they proceed to be so also: for neither did Christ as a king expiate and purge our sins, which could be done only by a bloody sacrifice; nor doth he as a priest subdue his enemies and ours, which is the work, and whereunto the power of a king is required.

Nor hath he any better success in the next instance, as to encouragements of coming unto the throne of grace. For

(6,7.) "the throne of grace" mentioned in Hebrews 4:16, is not the throne of Christ as a king, "his own throne," as it is here rendered by Crellius, but the throne of God, where Christ as a high priest maketh intercession for us. So that when he says that it is the office of a priest to "succor them who come to the throne of grace," and the part of Christ to relieve them who come for help unto his throne, it is evident that he sophistically confounds the things that are to be distinguished. We go to the throne of God through the interposition of Christ as our high priest, our propitiation, and advocate; and we go to the throne of Christ as king of the church, on the account of the glorious power committed unto him for our help and relief. Wherefore

(2.) the encouragements we have to approach unto the throne of grace, whereunto is our ultimate address, for help and relief, from the priestly office and actings of Christ, are different and distinct from them which we have from his kingly office, as the actings of Christ with respect unto the one and the other of these offices are different and distinct. We go "with boldness unto the throne of grace," on the account of Christ's being our

high priest; as he who, by the *oblation* of himself, hath procured admittance for us, and consecrated a new and living way for our access thereunto; as he who, by his *intercession,* procures us favorable audience and speeds our requests with God. See our Exposition on the place. Our expectation of relief and aid from the Lord Christ as the king of grace and glory on his throne, ariseth from that all-power in heaven and earth which is given unto him for that end. In brief, as a priest he interposeth with God for us; as a king he acts from God towards us.

9. His last attempt to the same purpose is in the ensuing discourse: — "Idem ex eo quoque apparet quod auctor divinus Epist. ad Hebrews

(1.) locum illum psalmi, 'Filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui re'

(4.) ad

(5.) sacerdotium Christi aperte refert, cap. 5:5,6, et pontificiam ei dignitatem hac ratione a Deo concessam docet. At ea

(6.) de regno aperte loquuntur. Nam

(2,3.) David qui Christi typus fuit explicat in iis verbis decretum Dei, quo rex, post diuturnum exilium reipsa fuit constitutus, et in solio regio collacatus, quemadmodum psalmus inspectus quemvis docebit unde ea Paulus Christo e mortuis resuscitato demure ait impleta, Act. 13:32,33.

(7.) Nam tum demum Deus secundum promissa sua regem dedit populo suo et Jesum constituit Dominum et Christum; seu quod idem est, Filium Dei in potentia, Act. 2:36, ⁴⁵Romans 1:4. Et idem hic D. scriptor ad Hebraeos, cap. 1:5.

(8.) Ex istis verbis demonstrat praestantiam Christi supra angelos quam, ad dextram Majestatis in excelsis collocatus, est adeptus. Quod si sacerdotium Christi a regia dignitate prorsus est distinctum, et Christus reipsa sacerdos fuit cum in cruce pateretur, imo tunc proprie sacerdotii munere functus est, in coelo improprie, quomodo haec verba quae de regia supremaque dignitate Christi loquuntur, ad sacerdotium Christi accommodantur, quod tum revera fuerit peractum, cure Christus se maxime humiliavit, et minor apparuit angelis, ⁵⁰Philippians 2:8, ⁵⁸Hebrews 2:8

Ans. If it were determinately certain what he intends to prove, we might the better judge of the validity of his proofs and arguments. But his limitation of "quodammodo," "videtur," and "aliqua ex pare," leave it altogether uncertain what it is that he designeth to evince. It is enough to our cause and purpose if we manifest that nothing by him produced or insisted on doth prove the kingly and priestly offices of Christ to be the same, or that one of them is so comprehended in the other as that they are not distinct in their powers, energies, and duties. And this is not done; for, —

(1.) The words of the testimony out of the second psalm, which is so variously applied by the apostles, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," do not formally express any one office of Christ, nor are used to that purpose. They only declare the relation and love of the Father unto his person; which were the foundation and reason of committing all that authority unto him which he exercises in all his offices; whereunto, therefore, they are applied. And therefore on several occasions doth God express the same thing in words very little varied, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," <4017>Matthew 3:17, 17:5; <6017>2 Peter 1:17; for the declaration of Christ to be the eternal Son of God is all that is intended in these words.

(2.) That these words were firstly used of David and his exaltation to the throne of Israel after his banishment, is easily said, but not so easily proved. Let our reader consult our Exposition on <5805>Hebrews 1:5.

(3.) The call of Christ unto his offices of king, priest, and prophet, as it respects the authority and love of the Father, was but one and the same. He had not a distinct call unto each office, but was at once called unto them all, as he was the Son of God sent and anointed to be the Mediator between God and men. The offices themselves, the gifts and graces to be exercised in them, their powers, acts, and duties, were distinct, but his call unto them all was the same.

(4.) The writer of this Epistle doth not accommodate these words to the priestly office of Christ, any otherwise but to evince that he was called of God unto that office on the ground of his relation to God and his love of him; for he produceth those words to declare who it was that called him, and why he did so, the call itself being expressed, as respecting the

priesthood, in the other testimony, “Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.” Wherefore there is not in these words any expression of the priesthood of Christ. See the exposition of the place.

(5.) These words are most eminently applied unto the resurrection of Christ, Acts 13:32,33. Now, this principally belonged unto his prophetical office, as that whereby the truth of the doctrine he had taught was invincibly confirmed. And you may by this means as well overthrow the distinction between his kingly and prophetical offices as between his kingly and sacerdotal. But the reassert why it is accommodated unto the Lord Christ with respect unto either of his offices, is because his relation unto God, therein expressed, was the ground of them all.

(6.) What if Crellius cannot prove that these words of the psalmist have any respect unto the kingly office of Christ? I deny at present that he can do so, and refer the reader for his satisfaction herein unto the exposition of them as quoted by the apostle, Hebrews 1:5.

(7.) Those words whereby he enlargeth herein, “That then, when Christ was raised from the dead, God gave unto his people a king according unto his promises, and appointed Jesus to be both Lord and Christ, or, which is the same, the Son of God in power,” for which Acts 2:36, Romans 1:4, are urged, are partly ambiguous and sophistical, and partly false. For, —

[1.] The things mentioned in those places are not the same. In the one it is said that God made him “both Lord and Christ;” in the other, that he was “declared to be the Son of God with power.” And he doth wofully prevaricate when he so repeats the words, as if it were said that he was made or appointed to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection, when he was only publicly determined or declared so to be.

[2.] He insinuates that Jesus was not made Lord and Christ, or the Son of God, until after his resurrection. But this is openly false: for, —

1st. *He* was born both Lord and Christ, Luke 2:11;

2dly. When he came into the world the angels worshipped him as Lord and Christ, Hebrews 1:6;

3dly. Peter confessed him before to be "Christ, the Son of the living God," [4016]Matthew 16:16;

4thly. He often affirmed before that all things were given into his hands, [4017]Matthew 11:27;

5thly. If it were so, the Jews only crucified Jesus, and not Christ the Lord, or only him that was so to be afterwards; which is false and blasphemous. It is true, upon his ascension, not immediately on his resurrection, he was gloriously exalted unto the illustrious exercise of his kingly power; but he was our Lord and King before his death. And therein also, —

(8.) From what hath been spoken, it is easy to know what is to be returned unto the conclusion that he makes of this argument; for the words produced in testimony are not spoken immediately concerning any office of Christ whatever, as expressive of it, much less concerning his *regal dignity* in a peculiar manner. And God was no less the father of Christ, he was no less begotten of him, when he was humbled to death in the sacrifice of himself that he offered as a priest, than when he was exalted in glory at the right hand of the Majesty on high.

10. From this attempt to prove that the *sacerdotal office* of Christ is comprehended in the regal by the divine writers, Crellius proceeds to show what "differences there are indeed between them;" and hereof he giveth sundry instances. But he might have spared that labor. This one would have sufficed, namely, that the Lord Christ is a "king really and properly," — he is a "priest only metaphorically;" that is, he is not so indeed, but is called so improperly, because of some allusion between what he did and what was done by the priests of old, as believers are called kings and priests. A man would think this were difference enough, as amounting to no less but that Christ is a king indeed, but not a priest. There was therefore no need that he should take the pains to find out, indeed to coin, differences between two such offices, whereof one is, and the other is not. And all the differences he fixeth on, the first only excepted, whereunto some pretense may be given, are merely feigned, or drained out of some other false hypotheses of the same author. However, it may not be amiss, seeing we have designed the vindication of this office of Christ from the whole opposition that is made unto it by this sort of men, to examine a

little those differences he assigns between the real and supposed office of Christ, which he makes use of to no other end but to annihilate the latter of them: —

11. "Distinctio autem inter regium et sacerdotale munus primum in eo cernitur quod regium munus latins se porrigit quam sacerdotium; unde illius etiam crebrior fit mentio. Regis enim est etiam punire; sacerdotis vero tantum peccata populi expiare."

Ans. This may be granted as one difference in the exercise of the power of these offices; for the kingly power of Christ is extended unto his enemies, the stubbornest of them and those who are finally so, but Christ is a priest offered and intended only for the elect. But he might also have instanced in sundry other acts the kinky power of Christ, as, namely, his *law-giving*, his *universal protection* of his people, his *rule and government* of the church by his Spirit and word, which belong not at all unto his priestly office. But this was not to his purpose, nor doth he design to evince any real difference between these two offices. For it is true that he opposeth punishing and expiating sin the one to the other, assigning the former unto the *kingly*, the latter unto the *sacerdotal* office; but if to expiate sin be only to remove and take away the punishment of sin, or that which is contrary to punishing, then Crellius maintains that Christ doth this by virtue of his kingly power and office. The sum, therefore, of this difference amounts to no more but this, that the Lord Christ as a king, and by virtue of his regal power, doth both punish sin and take away the punishment of it; only he doth the latter as a priest, — that is, there is an allusion in what he doth unto what was done for the people by the priests of old.

He adds another difference*:* —

"(1.) Deinde cum Christum regem appellamus, eo ipso nisi quid addamus aliud, nec

(2.) exprimimus eum hanc potestatem aliunde accepisse, et, quicquid beneficii ab ipso ut rege nostro proficiscitur,

(3.) id totum Deo qui hanc ei potestatem largitus fuerit, ascribendum esse.

(4.) Regium enim munus et nomen per se nil tale indicat cure Deus etiam rex sit et dicatur, <4053>Matthew 5:85, <5065>1 Timothy 6:15. At cum Christum sacerdotem vocamus, ei,

(5.) oblationem et interpellationem tribuimus, eo ipso indicamus peccatorum nostrorum remissionem non ab ipso ut prima causa sed a Deo proficisci, et eum potestatem Peccata nostra remittendi a seipso non habere,

(6.) nec esse supremum omnium rerum rectorem. Quomodo enim offerret et interpellaret apud alium et sacerdotis munere fungeretur ad remissionem nobis parandam? Quare dum sacerdotis nomine insignitur a Deo altissimo,

(7.) cui alias potestate aequalis est, aperte distinguitur, et Dei prae ipso praerogativa atque eminentia indicatur, quae facile ob tantam Christi praestantiam ac gloriam qua ipsum Dens auxit, obscurari posset, et sic Deo gloria ilia quam in Christo exaltando quaesivit eripi,

Ans. **(1.)** There is neither difference nor pretense of any difference between these offices of Christ assigned in these words, nor doth this discourse seem to be introduced for any other end but only to make way for that sophistical objection against the deity of Christ wherewith it is closed. For whatever notion the first sound of these words, “king” and “priest,” may present unto the minds of any prejudiced persons, in reality Christ doth no less depend on God with respect unto his kingly office than with respect unto his priestly; which Crellius also doth acknowledge.

(2.) When we call Christ Lord and King, we consider both who and what he is, and thereby do conceive and express his being appointed unto that office by God the Father. And of all men the Socinians have least cause to fear that on the naming of Christ as king they should conceive him to be independent of God; for believing him to be a man, and no more, there cannot possibly an imagination thereof befall their minds.

(3.) It is not what we express when we call Christ a king, but what the Scripture declareth concerning that office of his, which we are to consider; and therein it is constantly affirmed and expressed that God made him “both Lord and Christ,” that all his power was given him of God, that he sets him his king on the holy hill of Zion, and gives him to be head over all unto the church. Wherefore, to call and name Christ our king, and not at

the same time to apprehend him as appointed of God so to be, is to renounce that only notion of his being so which is revealed unto us, and is a folly which never any Christian fell into. Wherefore, when we call Christ king, we do acknowledge that he is made so of God, who consequently is the author and principal cause of all the good and blessed effects which we are made partakers of through the administration of the kingly office and power of Christ; nor did ever any sober person fail into an imagination to the contrary, seeing none can do so without an express renunciation of the Scripture.

(4.) When God, absolutely considered, is said to be king, the subject of the proposition limits and determines the sense; for the nature of him which is presented unto us under that name, "God," will not allow that he should be so any otherwise but on the account of his infinite, essentially divine power; which the notion of Christ as mediator doth not present unto us.

(5.) The reasons taken from what is ascribed unto the Lord Christ as a priest to prove that, in our notion and conception of that office, we look on him as *delegated by God,* and acting power for us on that account, are, although true in themselves, yet frivolous as unto his purpose; because all the acts, duties, and powers of his kingly office, do affirm and prove the same. Christ hath all his power, both as king and priest, equally from God the Father, and was equally called of God to act in both these offices; — in his name, majesty, and authority *towards us,* in one of them; and *with or before him* on our behalf, in the other.

(6.) Whereas he adds, and enlargeth thereon, that by the oblation and intercession of Christ, which are ascribed unto him as a priest, it is evident that he hath not power of or from himself to pardon our sins, as also that he is not the *supreme rector,* but is distinguished from the most high God, to whom otherwise he is equal in authority, I ask, —

[1.] Whether Christ as a king hath power, of himself and from himself, to take away sin, as the supreme rector of all, and that power not delegated unto him of God? I know he will not say so, nor any of his party, and therefore the difference between these two offices on that account is merely pretended.

[2.] To make the Lord Christ, whom they will have to be a man only, to be equal in power on any account with God, is a bold assertion. How shall any creature be equal, in any respect, unto God? To whom shall we equal him? How can he who *receiveth power from another* for a certain end be equal in power unto that other from whom he doth receive it? How shall he who acts in the name of another be equal unto him? But these great expressions are used concerning things which are false, only to cover the sacrilege of taking that from him wherein he was truly equal to God, and counted it no robbery so to be.

[3.] It is confessed that the Lord Christ, as the high priest of the church, was *inferior to God*, that his Father was greater than he, that he offered himself unto God, and intercedeth with him; but that he is not *equal with God*, of the same nature with him, under another consideration, this proveth not. And,

(7.) on the other side, there is not the least danger that the *prerogative of God, absolutely considered*, with respect unto Christ as mediator, should be obscured by the glory of the kingly office of Christ, among them who acknowledge that all the glory and power of it are freely given unto him of God.

He yet proceeds: —

"(1.) Accedit quod cure Christus sacerdos dicitur et quidem talks qui seipsum obtulerit, et mors ipsius, sine qua offerre se non potuit, aportius includitur, quam regni mentio hullo pacto complectitur;

(2.) et cura ipsius admodum tenera et solicita quam pro nobis gerit, et qua expiationem peccatorum nostrorum perficit, magis quam regii muneris mentione indicatur. Unde non parum consolationis ex divina Christi potestate nobis accedit

(3.) quae alias magnitudine et sublimitate sua vilitatem nostram absterrere potuisset, quo minus tanta cum animi fiducia ad ipsum confugere, et opem ab ipso expectare auderemus."

Ans. **(1.)** How, according unto the judgment of these men, "the death of Christ is more openly and plainly included in his being called a priest," than in his being a king, I know not; for he was not, if we may believe

them, “a priest in his death,” nor did his death belong unto his discharge of that office, only they say it was “necessarily antecedent” thereunto. But so also was it unto the discharge of his kingly office; for he “ought first to suffer, and then to enter into his glory,” <42246>Luke 24:26. And his exaltation unto his glorious rule was not only consequent unto his humiliation and suffering, or unto his death, but did also depend thereon, <451409>Romans 14:9; <500207>Philippians 2:7-11. Wherefore, with respect unto the *antecedent necessity* of the death of Christ, there is no difference between these offices, it being equal with regard unto them both. Had he placed the difference between these two offices with respect unto the death of Christ herein, that Christ as a priest died and offered himself therein unto God, which no way belonged unto his kingly office, he had spoken the truth, but that which was destructive unto all his pretensions. For what is here asserted, it constitutes no difference at all between them.

(2.) It is acknowledged that the consideration of the priesthood of Christ bespeaks much care and tenderness towards the church, which is a matter of great consolation unto us. But, —

[1.] It is so when this care and tenderness are looked on as the effects and fruits of that love which he manifested and exercised when in his death he offered himself a sacrifice for the expiation of our sins, and continueth to intercede for us, thereby rendering his oblation effectual. Herein doth the Scripture constantly place the love of Christ, and thence instructs us in his tender care and compassion thence arising, <490525>Ephesians 5:25-27; <480220>Galatians 2:20; <660105>Revelation 1:5. Remove this consideration of the priesthood of Christ, which is done by these men, and you take away the foundation and spring of that care and tenderness in him towards us as a priest whereby we should be relieved and refreshed. Wherefore, —

[2.] This consolation is nowhere proposed unto us as that which axiseth absolutely from the office itself, but from what, out of his unspeakable love, he underwent and suffered in the discharge of that office; for being therein exercised with all sorts of temptations, and undergoing all sorts of sufferings, he is merciful and tender in the discharge of the remaining duties of this office. See <580217>Hebrews 2:17, 4:15,16, and 5:7,8, with our Exposition on those places. I do not, therefore, see how they who deny that Christ suffered any thing in being our high priest, can, from the consideration of

the priesthood, draw any other arguments for his care and tenderness than what may be taken from his other offices.

[3.] Christ as a king, absolutely considered, without respect unto his sufferings, is no less tender to, no less careful of his church, than he is as he is a priest, his love and other qualifications for all his offices being the same; only his preparation for the exercise of his care and tenderness, by what he suffered as a priest, makes the difference in this matter; the consideration whereof being removed, there remains none at all. To conceive of Christ as the king of his church, and not to conceive withal that every thing in him as such is suited unto the consolation and encouragement of them that do believe, is highly to dishonor him. He is, as a king, the shepherd of his flock, his pastoral care belonging unto his kingly office, as kings of old were called the shepherds of their people. But in his rule and feeding of the church as a shepherd, he is proposed as acting all manner of care and tenderness, as the nature of the office doth require, [2300]Isaiah 40:10,11.

(3.) It is aloud imagination, that believers should be frighted or deterred from going unto Christ as a king because of their own vileness and his glorious dignity, seeing that glorious dignity was conferred on him on purpose to relieve us from our vileness. There is no office of Christ but containeth its encouragements in it for believers to make use of it and improve it unto their consolation; and that because the ground of all their hopes and comforts is in his person, and that love and care which he acts in them all. But that we should consider any one of them as a means of encouraging us with respect unto another, the Scripture teacheth us not, any otherwise than as the effects of his priestly office, in his oblation and intercession, are the fundamental reasons of the communication of the blessed effects of his kingly power unto us. For all the benefits we are made partakers of by him flow from hence, that he loved us, and gave himself for us, washing us in his own blood. Even the glorious greatness of God himself, — which, absolutely considered, is enough to deter us, as we are sinners, from approaching to him, — as he is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, is a firm foundation of trust, confidence, and consolation; and therefore the glory of Christ in his kingly power must needs be so also.

He closeth his discourse in these words: — “Quare haec quoque fuit causa hujus

(1.) appellationis Christo tribuendae; ut

(2.) omittam multas similitudines quae Christo cure sacerdote legali et Melchisedeco, qui itidem fuit sacerdos Dei altissimi intercedunt; quae huic appellationi causam dederunt; quibus etiam addenda est similitudo multiplex cum victimis legalibus.’

Ans. Here **(1.)** the whole design is plainly expressed. There is the name of a priest, for some certain reasons, attributed unto Christ, whereas truly and really he never had any such office from whence he might be so denominated. And this is that which, in this whole discourse, I principally designed to evince.

(2.) To say that Christ was “called a priest from that likeness which was in sundry things” (not in the office of the priesthood and execution thereof) “unto the legal high priest, and Melchizedek,” and the sacrifices of the law, is only to beg or suppose the thing in question. They were all instituted and made priests, and all their sacrifices were offered, principally to this end, that they might prefigure and represent him as the only true high priest of the church, with that sacrifice of himself which he offered for it; and without this consideration there would never have been any priest in the world of God’s appointment. And this is the whole of what this man pleads, either directly or by sophistical diversions, to confound these two offices of Christ, and thereby utterly to evacuate his sacerdotal office. Wherefore, before I proceed to remove his remaining exceptions unto the truth and reality of this office, I shall confirm the real difference that is between it and the kingly office, in a confounding it wherewithal the strength of their whole endeavor against it doth consist.

12. The offices of king and priest may be considered either absolutely, or as they respect our Lord Jesus Christ. In the first way it will not be denied but that they are distinct. The one of them is founded in nature, the other in grace. The one belongs unto men as creatures capable of political society, the other with respect unto their supernatural end only. It is true that the same person was sometimes vested with both these offices, as

was Melchizedek; and the same usage prevailed among the heathens, as we shall see afterwards more at large.

"Rex Anius, rex idem hominum Phoebique sacerdos." — AEn, 3:80.

But this hinders not but that the offices were then distinct in their powers and duties, as the regal and prophetical were when David was both king and prophet. But at present our inquiry is concerning these offices in Christ only, whether they were both proper and distinct, or one of them comprised in the other, being but a metaphorical expression of the manner of the exercise of its powers and duties. And concerning this we may consider, —

(1.) He is absolutely, and that frequently, called a priest or a high priest, in the Old Testament and the New. This was demonstrated in the entrance of these Exercitations. Now, the notion or nature of a priest, and the office of the priesthood, or what is signified by them, are plainly declared in the Scripture, and that in compliance with the unanimous apprehension of mankind concerning them; for, that the office of the priesthood is that faculty or power whereby some persons do officiate with God in the name and on the behalf of others, by offering sacrifice, all men in general are agreed. And thereon it is consented also that it is, in its entire nature, distinct from the kingly power and office, whose first conception speaks a thing of another kind. Now, whereas the Scripture doth absolutely and frequently declare unto us that Christ is a priest, it doth nowhere intimate that his priesthood was of another kind than what it had in general declared it to be in all others, and what all men generally apprehended of it. If any other thing were intended thereby, men must unavoidably be drawn into errors and mistakes. Nor doth it serve to undeceive us, that some come now and tell us that the Scripture by that name intends no such distinct office, but only the especial qualifications of Christ for the discharge of his kingly power, and the manner of his acting or exercising thereof; for the Scripture itself says no such things, but, as we shall see immediately, gives plain testimony unto the contrary.

(2.) His first solemn type was both a king and a priest, and he was so as to both of these offices properly. He was not a king properly, and a high priest only metaphorically, or so called because of his careful and merciful administration of the kingly power committed unto him; but he had the

office of the priesthood properly and distinctly vested in him, as both Moses and our apostle do declare, ◁0148Genesis 14:18, ◁5807Hebrews 7:1. And he was more peculiarly a type of Christ as he was a priest than as he was a king; for he is said to be "a priest," and not a king, "after the order of Melchisedec." Therefore that consideration of him is reassumed by the psalmist and by our apostle, and not the other. And is it not uncouth, that God, designing to prefigure one that should be a priest metaphorically only, and properly a king, should do it in and by a person who was a priest no less properly than he was a king, and in his so being was peculiarly and principally designed to prefigure him? Who can learn any thing of the mind of God determinately if his declarations thereof may be thus interpreted?

(3.) In the giving of the law God did renew and multiply the instructive types and representations of these offices of Christ. And herein, in the first place, he takes care to teach the church that he (whom all those things which he then did institute did signify) was to be a priest; for of any prefiguration of his kingly power there is very little spoken in the law. I shall at present take it for granted, as having sufficiently proved it elsewhere, and which is not only positively affirmed but proved with many arguments by our apostle, namely, that the principal end of Mosaical institutions was to prefigure, represent, and instruct the church, though darkly, in the nature of the offices, work, and duties, of the promised Messiah. This being so, if the Lord Christ were to be a priest only metaphorically and improperly, and a king properly, his priesthood being included in his kingly office, and signifying no more but the manner of his administration thereof, how comes it to pass that his being a priest should be taught and represented so fully and distinctly in so many ordinances, by so many types and figures, as it is, and his kingly power be scarce intimated at all? for there is no mention of any typical kings in the law, but only in the allowance which God gave the people to choose such a ruler in future times, wherein he made provision for what he purposed to do afterwards, ◁5714Deuteronomy 17:14,15. Moreover, when God would establish a more illustrious typical representation of his kingly office in the family of David, to manifest that these two offices should be absolutely distinct in him, he so ordained in the law that it should be ever afterwards impossible that the same person should be both king and

priest, until He came who was typified by both; for the kingly office and power were confined, by divine institution, to the house and family of David, as that of the priesthood was unto the family of Aaron. If these offices had been to be one and the same in Christ, these institutions had not instructed the church in what was to come.

(4.) A distinct office has a "distinct power or faculty" for the performance of its acts in a due manner with respect unto a certain end. And those things whereby it is constituted are distinct in the kingly and priestly offices of Christ; for, —

[1.] Moral powers and acts are distinguished by their objects. But the object of all the actings of the sacerdotal power of Christ is God; of the regal, men. For every priest, as we have showed, acts in the name and on the behalf of men with God; but a king, in the name and on the behalf of God with and towards men, as to the ends of that rule which God hath ordained. The priest represents men to God, pleading their cause; the king represents God to men, acting his power. Wherefore, these being distinct powers or faculties duties and acts, they prove the offices whereunto they do belong, or from which they proceed, to be distinct also, And this consideration demonstrates a greater difference between these two offices than between the kingly and prophetical, seeing by virtue of them both some men equally act in the name of God towards others. But that the priesthood of Christ is exercised towards God on the behalf of men, and that therein the formal nature of any priesthood doth consist, whereby it is effectually distinguished from all other offices and powers that any men are capable of, we have the common consent of mankind to prove, the institution of God under the old testament, with express testimonies in the new confirming the same.

[2.] As the acts of these offices are distinguished by their objects, so also are they and their ἀποτελέσματα between themselves, or in their own nature. The acts of the sacerdotal office operate morally only, by way of procurement or acquisition; those of the regal office are physical, and really operative of their effects: for all the acts of the priestly office belong unto oblation or intercession. And their effects consist either in,

(1.) "averruncatione mali," or

(2.) “procuratione boni.” These they effect morally only, by procuring and obtaining of them. The acts of the kingly office are legislation, communication of the Spirit, helps, aids, assistances of grace, destruction of enemies, and the like. But these are all physically operative of their effects. Wherefore the offices whence they proceed must be distinct in their natures, as also they are. And what hath been spoken may suffice at present to evince the difference between these two offices of Christ, which those men are the first that ever called into doubt or controversy.

13. I shall close this discourse with the consideration of an tempt of Crellius to vindicate his doctrine concerning the priesthood of Christ from an objection of Grotius against it, namely, that it “diminishes the glory of Christ, in ascribing unto him only a figurative priesthood.” For hereunto he answers, by way of concession,

(1.) “That indeed they allow Christ to be a priest metaphorically only, as believers are said to be kings and priests, and to offer sacrifices.” Now, this is plainly to deny any such real office, which sometimes they would not seem to do, and to substitute an external denomination in the room thereof. What are the consequents hereof, and what a pernicious aspect this hath upon the faith and consolation of all believers, is left unto the judgment of all who concern themselves in these things. He answers,

(2.) “That although they deny the Lord Christ to be a priest properly so called, yet the dignity which they ascribe unto him under that name and title is not metaphorical, but real, and a greater dignity than their adversaries will allow.” For the latter clause, or who they are that ascribe most glory and honor to Jesus Christ, according as that duty is prescribed unto us in the Scripture, both with respect unto his person, his mediation, and all his offices, with the benefits redounding unto the church thereby, — they or we, — is left unto every impartial or unprejudiced judgment in the world. For the former, the question is not about what dignity they assign to Christ, nor about what names or titles they think meet to give him, but about the *real honor of the priesthood*.. That this is an honor in itself, that it was so to Aaron, that it is so to Christ, our apostle expressly declares, ^[3004]Hebrews 5:4,5. If Christ had it not, then had Aaron a *real honor* which he had not, and therein was preferred above him. But, saith he, “Although he is compared with Aaron, and his priesthood opposed

unto his, and preferred above it, yet it is not in things of the same kind, though expressed under the same name, whereby things more perfect and heavenly are compared with things earthly and imperfect." But, —

(1.) This leaves the objection in its full force; for whatever dignity Christ may have in other things above Aaron, yet in the honor of the priesthood Aaron was preferred before him; for it is a real priesthood which the apostle asserts to be so honorable. And although a person who hath it not may have a *dignity of another kind,* which may be more honorable than that of the priesthood, yet if he have not that also, he therein comes behind him that hath it.

(2.) It is true, where things fall under the same appellations, some *properly,* and some *metaphorically* only, those of the latter sort, though they have not so good a title as the other to the common name whereby they are called, yet may they in their own nature be more excellent than they; but this is only when the things properly so called have notable defects and imperfections accompanying of them. But this consideration hath here no place; for the real office of the priesthood includes nothing in it that is weak or impotent, nor are the acts of it in any thing inferior unto what may be fancied as metaphorical. And whereas the dignities of all the mediatory actings of Christ are to be taken from the efficacy of them, and their tendency unto the glory of God and the salvation of the church, it is evident that those which are assigned unto him as the acts of a real priesthood are far more worthy and honorable than what they ascribe unto him under the metaphorical notion of that office.

(3.) If the priesthood of Christ is not opposed, as such, unto the priesthood of Aaron, on what grounds or from what principles doth our apostle argue unto the abolishing of the priesthood of Aaron from the introduction of that of Christ, plainly asserting an inconsistency between them in the church at the same time? for there is no such opposition nor inconsistency, where the offices intended are not both of them properly so, but one of them is' only metaphorically so called. So there is no inconsistency in the continuance of the kingly office of Christ, which is real, and all believers being made kings in a sense only metaphorically.

14. But Valentinus Smalcius will inform us of the original and occasion of all our mistakes about the priesthood of Christ: De Regn. Christ. cap. 23;

“Quo porto figurate loquendi nimio studio factum est ut etiam de Christo dicatur eum apud Deum pro nobis interpellare,” etc.; — “It was out of an excessive desire” (in the Holy Ghost or the apostles) “to speak figuratively, that Christ is said to intercede for us, and consequently to be a priest.” But he afterwards makes an apology for the Holy Spirit of God, why he spake in so low and abject a manner concerning Christ; and this was, the care he took that none should believe him to be God. We have had some among ourselves who have traduced and reproached other men for the use of “fulsome metaphors,” as they call them, in the expression of sacred things, though evidently taken out of the Scripture; but this man alone hath discovered the true fountain of that miscarriage, which was the “excessive desire of the holy writers to speak figuratively,” lest any one should believe Jesus Christ to be God from the things that really belong unto him.

EXERCITATION 33.

OF THE ACTS OF THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST, THEIR OBJECT, WITH THE TIME AND PLACE OF ITS EXERCISE.

1. *The acts and adjuncts of the priesthood of Christ proposed to consideration — The acts of it two in general, oblation and intercession — Vanity of confessions in general, ambiguous words, whilst their sense is undetermined.*

2. *The true nature of the oblation of Christ — Opinion of the Socinians concerning it.*

3. *The nature of his intercession, with their conceptions about it.*

4. *Things proposed unto a further discussion.*

5. *The time and place of Christ's susception and discharge of the office of the priesthood.*

6. *The first argument for the time of the exercise of this office, taken from the concession of the adversaries.*

7. *The second, from the effect of his sacrifice in making atonement, and the prefiguration thereof in the sacrifices of the law.*

8. *Thirdly, From his entrance into heaven as a high priest with respect to the sacrifice he had offered.*

9. *Fourthly, Other priests, who entered not into the sanctuary, types of Christ in their office and sacrificing, vindicated from the exception of Crellius.*

10. *The account given of the priesthood of Christ by Valentinus Smalcius examined,*

11. *The arguings of Woolzogenius to the same purpose.*

12. *The boldness and impiety of Smalcius reproved.*

13. *God the immediate object of all the sacerdotal actings of Christ.*

14-19. *This proved and vindicated from the exceptions of Crellius.*

20. *Reasons for so doing.*

1. HAVING declared and vindicated the nature of the sacerdotal office of our Lord Jesus Christ, it remaineth that we consider the acts of it distinctly, with some of the most important adjuncts of its exercise. And it is not so much the dogmatical declaration of these things that I design, which also hath already been sufficiently discharged, as the vindication of them from the perverse senses put upon them by the Socinians.

The general acts of the Lord Christ as the high priest of the church are two, — namely, *oblation* and *intercession.* These the nature of the office in

general doth require, and these are constantly assigned unto him in the Scripture. But concerning these, their nature, efficacy, season, use or end, there is no agreement between us and the Socinians. And I know not that there is any thing of the like nature fallen out among those who profess themselves to be Christians, wherein persons fully agreeing in the same words and expressions, as they and we do in this matter, should yet really disagree, and that unto the greatest extremity of difference, about every thing signified by them, as we do herein. And this sufficiently discovers the vanity of all attempts to reconcile the differing parties among Christians by a confession of faith, composed in such general words and terms as that each party may safely subscribe and declare its assent unto. Neither is the insufficiency of this design relieved by the additional advice that this confession be composed wholly out of the Scriptures and of expressions therein used; for it is not an agreement in words and the outward sound of them, but the belief and profession of the same truths or things, that is alone to be valued, all that is beyond such an agreement being left at peace in the province of mutual forbearance. An agreement in *words only* parrots may learn; and it will be better amongst them than that which is only so amongst men, because they have no mind to act dissenting and contradicting principles. But for men to declare their assent unto a certain form of words, and in the meantime in their minds and understandings expressly to judge and condemn the faith and apprehensions of one another about these very things, is a matter that no way tends to the union, peace, or edification of the church. For instance, suppose a form of words expressing in general that Christ was a high priest; that, the acts of the priesthood being oblation and intercession, Christ in like manner offered himself to God and maketh intercession for us; that hereby he purgeth, expiateth, and doth away our sins, with many more expressions to the same purpose, should be drawn up and subscribed by the Socinians and their adversaries, as they can safely do on all hands; will this in the least further any agreement or unity between us, whilst we not only disagree about the sense of all these terms and expressions, but believe that things absolutely distinct and inconsistent with one another, yea, destructive of one another, are intended in them? For so really it is between us herein, as the further consideration of particulars will manifest.

2. First, The *oblation* of Christ is that act or duty of his sacerdotal office whereby he offered himself, his soul and body, or his whole human nature, an expiatory sacrifice to God in his death and blood-shedding, to make atonement for the sins of mankind, and to purchase for them eternal redemption. So that, —

(1.) The nature of the oblation of Christ consisted in a bloody expiatory sacrifice, making atonement for sin, by bearing the punishment due thereunto. And,

(2.) As to the efficacy of it, it hath procured for us pardon of sin, freedom from the curse, and eternal redemption.

(3.) The time and place when and wherein Christ, as our high priest, thus offered himself a sacrifice unto God, was in the days of his flesh, whilst he was yet in this world, by his suffering in the garden, but especially on the cross.

For the application of the effects of this oblation of Christ unto the church, and the completing of all that was foresignified as belonging thereunto, it was necessary that, as our high priest, he should enter into the holy place, or the presence of God in the heavens, there to represent himself as having done the will of God, and finished the work committed to him; whereon the actual efficacy of his oblation or the communication of the fruits of it unto the church, according to the covenant between the Father and Son before described, doth depend.

In all these things the Socinians wholly dissent from us. What they conceive about the nature of the office itself hath been already called unto an account. As for this act or duty of it, they apprehend, —

(1.) That the expiatory oblation or sacrifice ascribed unto the Lord Christ, as a high priest, is nothing but his *presenting of himself alive* in the presence of God.

(2.) This, therefore, they say he did after his resurrection, upon his ascension into heaven, when he had revealed the will of God, and testified to the truth of his ministry with his death, which was necessary unto his ensuing oblation.

(3.) That his expiation of our sins consists in the exercise of that power which he is intrusted withal, upon this offering of himself, to free us from the punishment due unto them.

(4.) That this presentation of himself in heaven might be called his offering of himself, or an expiatory sacrifice, it was necessary that, antecedently thereunto, he should die for the ends mentioned; for if he had not so done there would have been no allusion between his care and power in heaven which he exerciseth towards the church, and the actings of the high priests of old in their oblations and sacrifices, and so no ground or reason why what he did and doth should be called the offering of himself. Wherefore this is the substance of what they affirm in this matter: — "The place of Christ's offering himself was in heaven, in the glorious presence of God; the time of it, after his ascension; the nature of it, a presenting himself in the presence of God, as one who, having declared his name and done his will, was gloriously exalted by him; — the whole efficacy hereof being an effect of that power which Christ hath received as exalted to deliver us from sin."

In this imaginary oblation the death of Christ hath no part nor interest. They say, indeed, it was previously necessary thereunto; but this seems but a mere pretense, seeing it is not intelligible, on their principles, how it should so be: for they affirm that Christ did not offer in heaven that very body wherein he suffered on the tree, but a new, spiritual body that was prepared for him unto that end. And what necessity is there that one body should suffer and die that another might be presented in heaven? The principal issues whereunto these differences between them and us may be reduced shall De declared and insisted on.

3. The second duty of the priestly office is *intercession.* How frequently this also is ascribed unto the Lord Christ as a high priest hath been declared before. Now, intercession is of two sorts: —

(1.) *Formal* and *oral;*

(2.) *Virtual* and *real.*

(1.) There is a *formal,* oral intercession, when any one, by words, arguments, supplications, with humble earnestness in their use, prevails with another for any good thing that is in his power to be bestowed on

himself or others. Of this nature was the intercession of Christ whilst he was on the earth. He dealt with God, by prayers, and supplications, sometimes with cries and tears, with respect unto himself in the work he had undertaken, but principally for the church of his elect, Hebrews 5:7; John 17. This was his intercession as a priest whilst he was on the earth, namely, his interposition with God, by prayers and supplications, suited unto the state wherein he was, for the application of the benefits of his mediation unto the church, or the accomplishment of the promises made unto him upon his undertaking the work of redemption.

(2.) *Virtual* or real intercession differs not in the substance or nature of it from that which is oral and formal, but only in the outward manner of its performance, with respect unto the reasons of it as now accomplished. When Christ was upon the earth, his state and condition rendered it necessary that his intercession should be by way of formal supplications; and that, as to the argument of it, it should respect that which was for to come, his oblation, — which is both the procuring cause of all good things interceded for and the argument to be pleaded for their actual communication, — being not yet completed. But now, in heaven, the state and condition of Christ admitting of no oral or formal supplications, and. the ground, reason, or argument of his intercession, being finished and past, his intercession, as the means of the actual impetration of grace and glory, consists in the real presentation of his offering and sacrifice for the procuring of the actual communication of the fruits thereof unto them for whom he so offered himself. The whole matter of words, prayers, and supplications, yea, of internal conceptions of the mind formed into prayers, is but accidental unto intercession, attending the state and condition of him that intercedes. The real entire nature of it consists in the presentation of such things as may prevail in the way of motive or procuring cause with respect unto the things interceded for. And such do we affirm the intercession of Christ as our high priest in heaven to be.

It is no easy matter to apprehend aright what our adversaries judge concerning this duty of the priesthood of Christ. They all say the expression is figurative, and they will not allow any real intercession of Christ, although the Scriptures so expressly lay the weight of our consolation, preservation, and salvation thereon, Romans 8:34; Hebrews 7:25-27; 1 John 2:1. Neither are they agreed what is

signified by it. That which mostly they agree on is, that it is a "word used to declare that the power which Christ exerciseth in heaven was not originally his own, but was granted to him of God; and therefore the good that by virtue thereof he doth to and for the church is so expressed as if he obtained it of God by intercession." But it is, I confess, strange to me, that what the Holy Ghost left the weight of our consolation and salvation on should be no more but a word signifying that the power which Christ exerciseth in heaven for the good of his church was "not originally his own," but was conferred on him by God after his ascension into heaven.

4. From what hath been discoursed it is evident how great and wide the difference is between us about these things, which yet are the things wherein the life of our faith is concerned. And so resolved are they in their own sentiments, that they will not admit such terms of reconciliation as may be tendered unto them, if in any thing they intrench thereon; for whereas Grotius premised unto his discourse on this subject, "Constat nobis ac Socino de voce Christi mortem fuisse sacrificium expiatorium, id ipsum clare testante divina ad Hebraeos Epistola," — "We are agreed with Socinus as to the name, that the death of Christ was an expiatory sacrifice, as is clearly testified in the Epistle to the Hebrews," — Crellius renounceth any such concession in Socinus, and tells Grotius how greatly he is mistaken in that supposition, seeing both he and they do perfectly deny that the death of Christ was the expiatory sacrifice mentioned in that Epistle, cap. 10 part. 1, p. 472. Now, it is evident that these things cannot be handled unto full satisfaction without a complete discussion of the true nature of the sacrifice of Christ. But this is not my present design, nor shall I engage into it in these Exercitations. The proper seat of the doctrine thereof is in the 9th and 10th chapters of this Epistle. If God will, and we live to arrive thereunto, all things concerning them shall be handled at large. Only, there are some things which belong peculiarly to the office itself under consideration. These we shall separate from what concerns the nature of the sacrifice, and vindicate from the exceptions of our adversaries. And they are referred unto the ensuing heads: — First, The *time and place* when and where the Lord Christ entered on and principally discharged the office of his priesthood. Secondly, The *immediate proper object* of all his sacerdotal actings, which having been stated before must now be vindicated and further confirmed. Thirdly, The *especial nature of*

his sacerdotal intercession, which consists in the moral efficacy of his mediation in procuring mercy and grace, and not in a power of conferring them on us.

5. The FIRST thing we are to inquire into is, the *time and place of the exercise of the priesthood of Christ;* and the state of the controversy about them needs only to be touched on in this place, as having been before laid down. Wherefore with reference hereunto we affirm —

(1.) That *the Lord Christ was a high priest in the days of his flesh,* whilst he was in this world, even as he was also the king and prophet of the church.

(2.) That he exercised or discharged this office, as unto the principal acts and duties of it, especially as to the oblation of his great expiatory sacrifice, *upon the earth, in his death,* and the effusion of his blood thereon.

(3.) We say not that the priesthood of Christ was limited or *confined unto this world,* or the time before his resurrection, but grant that it hath a duration in heaven, and shall have so unto the end of his mediation. He abideth, therefore, a priest for ever, as he doth the king of his church. And the continuance of this office is a matter of singular use and consolation to believers, and as such is frequently mentioned. Wherefore, although he ascended not into heaven *to be made a priest, but as a priest,* yet his ascension, exaltation, and glorious immortality, or the "power of an endless life," were antecedently necessary to the actual discharge of some duties belonging unto that office, as his intercession and the continual application of the fruits and benefits of his oblation.

The Socinians, as hath been declared, comply with us in none of these assertions; for whereas they judge that Christ is then and therein only a priest, when and wherein he offereth himself unto God, this they say he did not until his entrance into heaven upon his ascension, and that there he continueth still so to do. Whilst he was in this world, if we may believe them, he was no priest, nor were any of his duties or actings sacerdotal. But yet, to mollify the harshness of this conceit, they grant that, by the appointment of God, his temptations, sufferings, and death, were antecedently necessary unto his heavenly oblation, and so belong unto his

priestly office metonymically. These being the things in difference, how they may be established or invalidated is our next consideration.

6. Our first argument for the time and place of the exercise of the priesthood of Christ shall be taken from the judgment and opinion of our adversaries themselves; for if the Lord Christ whilst he was upon the earth had power to perform, and did actually perform, all those things wherein they affirm that his sacerdotal office doth consist, then was he a priest at that time and in that place; for the denomination of the office is taken from the power and its exercise. And themselves judge that the priesthood of Christ consisteth solely in a right, power, and readiness, to do the things which they ascribe unto him. Neither can any difference be feigned from a distinct manner of the performance of the things so ascribed unto him. In heaven, indeed, he doth them conspicuously and illustriously; in the earth he did them under sundry concealments. But this altereth not the nature of the things themselves. Sacerdotal actions will be so whatever various accidents may attend them in the manner of their performance. Now, that Christ did all things on the earth which they assign as acts of his sacerdotal office will appear in the ensuing instances: —

(1.) On *the earth* he presented himself unto God as one that was ready to do his will, and as one that had done it unto the uttermost, in the last finishing of his work. This presentation they call his offering himself unto God. And this he doth, ⁵⁸Hebrews 10:7, "Lo, come to do thy will, O God." That this was with respect unto the obedience which he performed on the earth is manifest from the place of the psalmist whence the words are taken; for he so presents himself in them unto God as one acting a principle of obedience unto him in suffering and preaching the gospel: "I come to do thy will; thy law is written in my heart," ¹⁹Psalm 40:8-10. Again, he solemnly offered himself unto God on the earth upon the consideration of the accomplishment of the whole work which was committed unto him, when he was in the close and finishing of it. And herewithal he made his request to God that those who believed on him, or should so do to the end of the world, might have all the benefits which God had decreed and purposed to bestow on them through his obedience unto him; — which is the full description of the oblation of Christ, according to these men. See ⁴³John 17:1-6, etc.

(2.) He had and exercised on the earth a most *tender love* and care for his whole church, both his present disciples and all that should believe on him through their word. This they make to be the principal property of this office of Christ, or rather, from hence it is, — namely, his tender *care*, love, and readiness to relieve, which we cannot apprehend in him under the notion of his kingly power alone, — that he is called a high priest, and is so to be looked on. Now, whereas two things may be considered in the love and care of Christ towards his church; first, The *evidencing fruits* of it; and, secondly, Its *effects; — the* former were more conspicuous in what did in this life than in what he doth in heaven, and the latter every way equal thereunto. For,

[1.] The great *evidencing* fruit of the love of Christ and his care of his church was in this, that he *died for it.* This both himself and all the divine writers express and testify to be the greatest fruit and evidence of love, expressly affirming that greater love there cannot be than what is so expressed. See <43004>John 10:14, 15:13; <45506>Romans 5:6; <48020>Galatians 2:20; <49525>Ephesians 5:25; <62306>1 John 3:16; Revelation 1. If, therefore, Christ be denominated a high priest because of his love and care towards his church, as he had them in the highest degree, so he gave the greatest evidence of them possible, whilst he was in this world. This he did in dying for it, in giving his life for it; which, in what sense soever it be affirmed, is the highest fruit of love, and so the highest act of his sacerdotal office.

[2.] The effects of this priestly love and care, they say, consists in the *help* and *aid* which he gives unto those that believe on him, whereby they may be preserved from evil. But that he did this also on the earth, besides those other instances which may be given thereof, himself also expressly affirms, <43712>John 17:12, “While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name; those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost.”

(3.) There belongs nothing more unto the priesthood of Christ, according unto these men, but only a *power* to act what his love and care do incline and dispose him unto. And this consists in the actual collation of grace, mercy, pardon of sin, and spiritual privileges, on believers. But all these things were effected by him whilst he was in this world. For, —

[1.] He had power on the earth to forgive or take away the sins of men; which he put forth and acted accordingly, ⁴⁰Matthew 9:2; ⁴¹Mark 2:5; ⁴²Luke 5:20, 7:48. And the taking away of sin *effectually* is the great sacerdotal act which they ascribe unto him.

[2.] He conferred spiritual privileges upon them who believed on him; for the greatest thing of this kind, and the fountain of all others, is adoption, and unto "as many as received him gave he power to become the sons of God," ⁴³John 1:11,12.

[3.] Whatever also Christ doth for us of this kind may be referred either unto his quickening of us with life spiritual, with the preservation of it, or the giving of us *right* and *title* to eternal life. But for these things he had power whilst he was on the earth, as he himself expressly declares, ⁴⁴John 4:10, ⁴⁵5:21, ⁴⁶11:40, 10:28, ⁴⁷11:25, ⁴⁸14:6, 15:5, ⁴⁹17:22. And with respect unto all these things doth he require that we should believe in him and rely upon him.

Besides these three things, in general, with what belongs unto them, I do not know what the Socinians ascribe more to the sacerdotal dignity or power of Christ or the exercise of it, nor what they require more, but that the name and title of the high priest of the church may be ascribed unto him in their way, — that is, metaphorically; for although they set these things off with the specious titles of expiating or purging our sins, of the offering of himself unto God, of intercession, and the like names, as real sacerdotal acts, yet it is evident that no more is intended by them than we have expressed under these heads. And if they shall say otherwise, let them give an instance of any one thing which they ascribe unto him as a priest, and if we prove not that it is reducible unto one of these heads, we will forego this argument. Wherefore, upon their own principles, they cannot deny but that the Lord Christ was as really and truly a priest whilst he was on the earth as he is now in heaven.

7. Secondly, Let it be further remembered, that we plead only Christ to have been a priest and to have offered sacrifice on the earth quoad ἱλασμόν, as to *propitiation*, or the expiation of sin, granting on the other side that he is still so in heaven *quoad* ἐμφανισμόν, as to *appearance* and representation. Wherefore, whatever our adversaries do or can ascribe unto the Lord Christ as a priest, which in any sense, or by virtue of any

allusion, can be looked on as a sacerdotal act, is by us acknowledged and ascribed unto him. That which is in controversy ariseth from their denial of what he did on the earth, or of his being a high priest before his ascension into heaven; which is now further to be confirmed.

When and where he made reconciliation and atonement for us, or for our sins, then and there he was a priest. I do not know that it is needful to confirm this proposition; for we intend no more by acting of the priest's office but the making atonement for sin by sacrifice. He that hath power and right so to do is a priest by the call and appointment of God. And that herein principally consists the acting of the sacerdotal power, we have the consent of the common sense of mankind. Nor is this expressly denied by the Socinians themselves. For it was the principal if not the sole end why such an office was ordained in the world, Hebrews 5:1. But this was done by the Lord Christ whilst he was on the earth; for' he made atonement for us by his death. Among other testimonies to this purpose, that of our apostle is irrefragable, Romans 5:10,

> "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life."

He distributes the mediatory actings of Christ on our behalf into his death and his life. And the life which he intends is that which ensued after his death. So it is said, "He died, and rose, and revived," Romans 14:9. He was dead and is alive, Revelation 1:18. For he leads in heaven a *mediatory life*, to make intercession for us, whereby we are saved, Hebrews 7:25. Upon this distribution of the mediatorial actings of Christ, our reconciliation unto God is peculiarly assigned unto his death: "When we were enemies we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son." Reconciliation is sometimes the same with atonement, Hebrews 2:17; sometimes it is put for the immediate effect of it. And in this place [Romans 5.] the apostle declares that our being reconciled and receiving the atonement are the same: Καταλλαγέντες, . . . τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάζομεν, verses 10,11. But to make atonement and reconciliation is the work of a priest. Unless this be acknowledged, the whole instructive part of the Old Testament must be rejected; for the end of the priest's office, as we observed, was to make atonement or reconciliation. And that this was

done by the death of Christ, the apostle doth here expressly affirm. He slew the enmity, made peace, reconciled Jews and Gentiles unto God in one body, by the cross, <4902>Ephesians 2:15,16. Our adversaries would have the reconciliation intended to be only on our part, or the reconciling us unto God; not on the part of God, or his reconciliation unto us. But as this is false, so it is also, as to our present argument, impertinent; for we dispute not about the nature of reconciliation, but the cause and time of its making. Whatever be the especial nature of it, it is an effect of a *sacerdotal act*. Nor is this denied by our adversaries, who plead that our conversion to God depends on Christ's offering himself to God in heaven, as the effect on the cause. And this reconciliation, whatever its especial nature be, is directly ascribed to the death of Christ` Therein, therefore, was he a priest and offered sacrifice. Besides, the especial nature of the reconciliation made by the death of Christ is sufficiently declared; for we are so reconciled by Christ as that our sins are not imputed unto us, <470519>2 Corinthians 5:19, 21; and that because they were imputed unto him when he was made a curse for us, <480313>Galatians 3:13, — when he hung on the tree, and bare our sins in his own body thereon, <600224>1 Peter 2:24. And then he gave himself λύτρον, "a ransom," <402028>Matthew 20:28, and ἀντίλυτρον, <540206>1 Timothy 2:6, a price of redemption for us; and his soul was made a sin-offering, <235310>Isaiah 53:10, — that is, "sacrificium pro reatu nostro," "a sacrifice for the expiation of our guilt," And this he did as the *sponsor* or *surety*, or "the mediator of the new covenant," <581515>Hebrews 9:15; and therefore he must do it either as the king, or as the prophet, or as the priest of the church, for within these offices and their actings is his mediation circumscribed. But it is manifest that these things belong unto neither of the former; for in what sense can he be said to pay a price of redemption for us in the shedding his blood, or to make his soul an offering for sin, to make reconciliation by being made sin and a curse for us, as he was a king or a prophet? In like manner and to the same purpose we are said to have "redemption in" (or "by") "his blood, even the forgiveness of sins," <490107>Ephesians 1:7; to be "justified by his blood," <450509>Romans 5:9; <510114>Colossians 1:14; <600118>1 Peter 1:18,19. Now, redemption, forgiveness and justification, consisting, according to our adversaries, in our delivery from the punishment due unto sin, it is an effect, as they also acknowledge, of the sacerdotal actings of Christ. But they are all said to be by his blood, which was shed on the earth. Besides, it is in like manner acknowledged

that the Lord Christ was both priest and sacrifice; for, as it is constantly affirmed, he "offered himself," <3094>Hebrews 9:14, <4902>Ephesians 5:2. And he was a sacrifice when and wherein he was a propitiation; for propitiation is the end and effect of a sacrifice. So the apostle distributes his sacerdotal acts into propitiation and intercession, <6201>1 John 5:1,2. His making oblation and being a propitiation are the same. And wherein God made him a propitiation, therein he was our propitiation. But this was in his death; for God set him forth "To be a propitiation through faith in his blood," <4525>Romans 3:25. Our faith, therefore, respecting Christ as proposed of God to be a propitiation, — that is, making atonement for us by sacrifice, — considers him as shedding his blood unto that end and purpose.

8. Thirdly, The Lord Christ entered into the holy place, that is, heaven itself, *as a high priest*, and that with respect unto what as a high priest he had done before; for when the apostle teacheth the entrance of Christ into heaven by the entrance of the high priest into the sanctuary, as that which was a prefiguration thereof, he instructs us in the manner of it. Now, the high priest was already in office, completely a high priest, before his entrance into the most holy place, and was not admitted into his office thereby, as they pretend the Lord Christ to have been by his entrance into heaven. Yea, had he not been a high priest before that entrance, he would have perished for it; for the law was, that none should so enter but the high priest. And not only so, but he was not, on pain of death, at any time to go into the sanctuary, but with immediate respect unto the preceding solemn discharge of his office; for he was not to enter into it but only after he had, as a priest, slain and offered the expiatory sacrifice, some of the blood whereof he carried into the most holy place, to complete and perfect the atonement. Now, if the Lord Christ was not a priest before his entrance into heaven, if he did not enter thereinto with respect unto, and on the account of, the sacrifice which he had offered before without the holy place, in his death and blood-shedding, all the analogy that is between the type and the antitype, all that is instructive in those old institutions, is utterly destroyed, and the apostle, illustrating these things one by another, doth lead us unavoidably into misapprehension of them. [For whosoever shall read that, as the high priest entered into the most holy place with the blood of bulls and goats, which he had sacrificed without, to appear in the presence of God, in like manner Jesus Christ, the high priest of the church,

called of God unto that office, by the one sacrifice of himself, or by his own blood, entered into the holy place in heaven, to appear in the presence of God for us, will understand that he was a high priest and offered his sacrifice before he so entered into the heavenly sanctuary, or he must offer violence unto the plain, open sense of the instruction given unto him.

9. Fourthly, Other priests, who *never entered into the sanctuary,* were types of Christ in their office and the execution of it; which if he was not a priest on earth, nor thereon offered his sacrifice or executed his office, they could not be; for nothing they did represented the appearance of Christ in heaven. And this is evident in his principal type, Melchizedek; for he did so eminently represent him above Aaron and his successors as that he is peculiarly called a priest after his order. Now, Melchizedek discharged his office entirely, and an end was put unto his priesthood, before there was any sanctuary erected, to be a resemblance of the holy place whereinto Christ, our high priest, was to enter. And whereas our adversaries say that he is called a high priest because of an allusion that was between what he doth for the church and what was done by them, if his priesthood and sacrifice consisted in his entrance into heaven and presenting or offering himself there in glory unto God, there was no allusion at all between it and what was done by him whom the Scripture expresseth as his principal type, namely, this Melchizedek, who had no sanctuary to enter into, whereby there might be any allusion between what he did and what was done by Jesus Christ. Moreover, all the priests according to the law, in all their sacrifices, especially those that were solemn and stated for the whole people, were types of Christ; for whereas the original institution of all expiatory sacrifices, or sacrifices to make atonement for sin, was merely with respect unto, and to prefigure, the sacrifice which Christ was to. offer, without which they would have been of no use nor signification, nor had ever been instituted, as being a kind of worship no way suiting the divine nature without this relation; and whereas the Lord Christ, with respect unto them, is called the “Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world,” and a “Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,” as I have proved elsewhere; the priests that offered these sacrifices must of necessity be types of him in his.

Crellius replies hereunto: “Vult Socinus

(1.) publica et stata sacrificia, atque imprimis anniversarium, figuram fuisse sacrificii Christi; caetera veto sacrificiorum nostrorum spiritualium.

(2.) Nam et nos istiusmodi sacrificia, quibus intervenientibus peccata expiantur, seu remissio peccatorum ex Dei benignitate obtinetur, offerimus:

(3.) saccrdotem etiam summum esse verum Christi summi sacerdotis typum,

(4.) caeteros vulgares sacerdotes nobis qui etiam sacerdotes sumus, censet respondere; qua de re mirum est si quisquam dubitet, cap. 10 ad Grot. part. 21, p. 413."

(1.) It is acknowledged that *other stated* and solemn sacrifices besides the anniversary expiation were types of the sacrifice of Christ. But these were offered by the ordinary priests, as Numbers 28:15,22,30, 29:5,11,16,19,22, and were completed without the most holy place, no entrance into it ensuing thereon; for they consisted entirely in the death and blood-shedding of the sacrifices themselves, with their oblation on the altar. How, then, could they typify Christ and his sacrifice, if that consisted not at all in his death and blood-shedding, which they did represent, but in his entrance into heaven, and presenting himself there unto God, which they did not represent at all? This concession, therefore, that the sacrifice of Christ was typified by any sacrifices whereof no part nor remembrance was carried into the sanctuary, destroys the whole hypothesis of our adversaries.

(2.) Nothing that we do is, in any sense, such a sacrifice as whereby sin is expiated. And although our faith is the means whereby we are interested in the one sacrifice of Christ by which our sins are expiated once and for ever, and we thereby, according unto God's appointment, obtain the forgiveness of our sins, yet no duties of ours are anywhere called sacrifices, but such as are fruits of gratitude for the pardon of sin, received by virtue of that one sacrifice of Christ.

(3.) The high priest was a true, real type of Christ, but not his only type; Melchizedek was so also, and so were all the ordinary priests of the house of Aaron, who served at the altar.

(4.) He is greatly mistaken in his last assertion, whereof he gives no other proof but only “Qua de re mirum eat si quisquam dubitet;” and this is, that the priests under the law were types of all Christians, and their sacrifices of ours, and that “this belongeth unto the economy of the new covenant.” For I do not only doubt of it, but also expressly deny it, and that on such grounds as will leave none for admiration in any sober person; for, —

[1.] All the priests of the house of Aaron were of the very *same office* with the high priest. Aaron and his sons were at the same time called to the same office, and set apart in the same manner, [2]Exodus 28:1 and 29:9. If, therefore, the high priest was in his office the type of Christ, the other priests in their office could not be types of us, unless we have the same office with Christ himself, and are made mediators with him.

[2.] The sacrifices offered by the other priests were of the same nature with that or those which were offered by the high priest himself; for although the entrance once a year into the most holy place was peculiar unto him, yet he had no sacrifice of any especial kind, as burnt-offering, sin-offering, or trespass-offering, peculiar unto him, but the other priests offered the same. If, therefore, the sacrifice of the high priest was a type of the sacrifice of Christ, the sacrifices of the other priests could not be types of ours, unless they are of the same kind with that of Christ, which is not yet affirmed.

[3.] The truth is, the whole people under the law were types of believers under the gospel in the highest of their privileges, and therefore the priests were not so. We are now “kings and priests;” and the apostle Peter expressing this privilege, [3]1 Peter 2:5, doth it in the words spoken of the body of the people or church of old, [4]Exodus 19:6. Nothing, therefore, is more vain than this supposition.

Fifthly, The principal argument whereby we prove that Christ was a priest on the earth, is taken from the nature of the sacrifice which he offered as a priest. But whereas this cannot be duly managed without a full consideration and debate of all the properties, ends, and concernments of that sacrifice, which is not our present subject nor design, it must, as it was intimated before, be transmitted unto its proper place.

10. It remaineth that we consider the pretences and pleas of our adversaries in the defense of their opinion. It is that, I confess, which they have no concernment in for its own sake, being only a necessary consequent of their judgment concerning the office of the priesthood itself. Wherefore, for that the most part they content themselves with a bare denial that he was a priest on the earth, the proof of their negation they mix with the description of the office and its discharge. Wherefore, to show how little they are able to prove what they pretend unto, I shall represent their plea in the words of one of the chief masters of that sect, that the reader may see what is the true state of the controversy between them and us in this matter, which they industriously endeavor to conceal, and then consider their proofs in particular. This is Valentinus Smalcius, in his book De Regno Christ. cap. 23, which is, De Christi Sacerdotio, whose words ensue: —

"Deinde considerandum etiam est

(1.) totam hanc rem, quae per sacerdotii vocabulum in Christo describitur, esse figuratam, qua scilicet explicantur ea qum sub veteri foedere olim extabant. Quemadmodum enim sub veteri fcedere Deus pontifices esse voluit

(2.) qui causam populi apud Deum agerent: sic etiam quia Jesus Christus causam populi divini in coelo agit ideo ipse sacerdos, et hoc opus illius, sacerdotium, appellantur.

(3.) Potest hoc totum ex eo apparere si consideretur in sola, quodammodo, Epistola ad Hebraeos, Christi, quatenus sacerdos est, et sacerdotii ejus mentionem fieri; et tamen impossibile est alios apostolos in suis scriptis rei tam insignis, sine qua Christi dignitas consistere nequit, nullam mentionem facere."

Ans. **(1.)** It is not much that I shall observe on these words, and I shall therein principally respect the perpetual sophistry of these men. It is somewhat plain, indeed, that all things spoken about the priesthood of Christ are figurative, and nothing real or proper; and therefore he speaks of it as a thing utterly of another nature that is intended, only in Christ it is described "per sacerdotii vocabulum," — "by this word, the priesthood." But the sober Christian reader will judge whether there be nothing but a

mere occasional abuse of that word intended by the Holy Ghost in that frill and large description which he hath given us of this office of Christ, its duties, acts, adjuncts, and exercise, with the importance of these things unto our faith and consolation.

(2.) Who would not think these expressions, first concerning the high priest, “Qui causam populi apud Deum ageret,” “Who should deal with God on the behalf of the people,” and then concerning Christ, “Qui causam populi divini in coelo agit,” “Who pleads the holy people’s cause in heaven,” were so far equivalent, especially the one being produced in the illustration of the other, as that the things signified should, though they be not of the same kind, yet at least some way or other agree? But no such matter is intended; for in the first proposition God is expressly asserted as the *immediate object* of the sacerdotal actings of the high priest under the law, according to the Scripture; but in the latter, “causam populi in coelo agit,” which is ascribed unto Christ, nothing is intended but the exercise of his love and power in heaven towards his people for their relief, — which is a thing quite of another nature. By these contrary senses of seeming equivalent expressions, all analogy between the old priesthood and that of Christ is utterly destroyed.

(3.) It is falsely pretended that this office of Christ is not formally mentioned by other divine writers besides the apostle in this Epistle unto the Hebrews. He is expressly called a priest in the Old Testament by the way of prophecy, and all acts of this office are expressly mentioned and declared in sundry other places of the New Testament, which have been before produced. And although it becomes not us to call the Spirit of God to an account, or to expect an express reason to be assigned why he teacheth and revealeth any truth more directly and expressly in one place of the Scripture than in another, — it being an article of our faith that what he doth he doth wisely, and on the most rational motives, — yet we are not altogether in the dark unto the reason why the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ was more openly and plainly taught in this Epistle than in any other place of Scripture. It was the prefiguration of it and preparation for it which the church of the Hebrews had received in their Mosaical institutions which was the occasion hereof; and whereas the whole economy of their priesthood and sacrifices had no other end or use but to prefigure and represent those of the Lord Christ, upon his coming

and the accomplishment of what was typified by them they were to cease and to be removed out of the church. But those Hebrews, by the long use of them, had contracted an inveterate persuasion that they had an excellency, use, and efficacy in the worship of God, upon their own account, and were therefore still to be continued and observed. On this occasion the declaration of the nature and use of the priesthood of Christ in the church was not only opportune and seasonable, but necessary and unavoidable. It was so, that those Hebrews who did sincerely believe the gospel, and yet supposed that the old legal institutions were in force and obligatory, might be delivered from so pernicious an error. And in like manner it was so with respect unto them who, being satisfied in their cessation and removal, were to be instructed in what was the design of God in their institution, and what was their use; whereby they might at once discern that they were not a mere burden of chargeable and unuseful outward observances, and yet how great and excellent a glory was exhibited in their stead now under the gospel. Besides, whereas God was now giving up the whole Scripture unto the use of the church, what better season or occasion could be taken to declare the harmony and relation that is between the old testament and the new, the analogy between the institutions of the one and the other, the preparations that were made in the shadows of the one for the introduction of the substance of the other, and so at once to present a scheme of divine wisdom and grace in both, than this of the instruction of the church of the Hebrews in their translation out of the one state into the other, which was peculiar to them, and wherein the Gentiles had no share? These things, I say (with holy submission to the sovereign will and wisdom of the Holy Ghost), rendered this time and place most convenient for the fixing and stating the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ in a peculiar manner.

But our author adds:

> “Quod igitur ipse Christus, cure adhuc mortalis esset, promisit, ‘se futurum cum suis singulis diebus usque ad consummationem seculi;’ ‘se eos non relicturum orphanos,’ sed ‘eis daturum os et sapientiam, cui nemo possit resistere ‘idem ex mortuis resuscitatus dixit Johanni, ‘Ne metuas, ecco vivo in secula seculorum;’ et dive Paulo, ‘Ne metuas, sed loquere et non tace, quia ego tecum sum;’ quod denique apud apostolos est, Jesum Christum caput esse

> ecclesiae, et ecclesiam esse ejus corpus, ecclesiam ab eo foveri, Christum nos liberate a futura ira, hoc est auctori Epistolae ad Hebraeos Jesum Christum pontificem nostrum esse." Add hereunto what he instructs us in a little afterwards: "Ipse Christus et sacerdos factus estet oblatio; hoc est, absque figuris loquendo; quando Christus in coelum ascendens factus est immortalis et cure Dee habitare coepit in loco illo sanctissimo; coepit nostrae salutis curare talem gerere, qualem se gesturum antea promiserat."

Ans. This is in some measure plain dealing, and needful to the cause wherein these men are engaged; for although no great matter, at first view, seems to be contained herein, yet upon the truth of what he avers depends all the opposition they make unto the *real sacrifice* and satisfaction of Christ. Hence, therefore, it is evident what is the true state of the controversy between these men and us about the priesthood of Christ. It is not, indeed, about the nature of that office, nor about the time and place of its exercise, though they needlessly compel us to treat about them also; but the sole question is, whether Christ *have any such office* or no. For if this be all they grant which this man asserts, as indeed it is, — namely, "That the Lord Christ, upon the account of some actings of his, which are no one of them properly or peculiarly sacerdotal, is only called a high priest figuratively by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews," — then indeed he neither hath nor ever had any such office at all. And this is the true state of our controversy with them, and with all by whom the satisfaction of Christ is denied, namely, whether he be the high priest of the church or no. And herein the Holy Ghost himself must answer for us and our profession.

This, then, is the substance of what they intend: The power, love, and care which the Lord Christ exerciseth in heaven towards his church makes him to be figuratively called our high priest; and in the same manner he is said to offer himself to God. But whence, then, comes it to pass, that whereas, according to the notion and understanding that is given us of the nature of these things (priest and sacrifice) in the Scripture, — suited unto the apprehension of all mankind about them, and which they answer or they are nothing, — there is no similitude or likeness between them and what Christ was and did, they are expressed by these terms, which are apt to lead unto thoughts of things quite of another kind than (as it seems) are

intended? Why this, saith Smalcius, was “ex nimio figurate loquendi studio,” — “out of an excessive desire in the holy writers to speak figuratively;” an account which whether any wise man will, or good man ought to be satisfied withal, I do much question. And yet, according to Smalcius, they much fail in their design. For whereas no wise man doth ever use figurative expressions unless he judge them necessary to set off the things he intends to express, and to greaten the apprehension of them, it is, if we may believe this author, unhappily fallen out otherwise with the writers of the New Testament in this matter; for instead of heightening or enlarging the things which they intended by all their figurative expressions, they do but lessen or diminish them. For so he informs us:

> “Hoc tum ob alias causas, tum ob hanc etiam hic primum annotare voluimus ut sciamus in istis figurate loquendi modis, quantumvis fortasse cuipiam videri possit, Christo summam in eis praestantiam tribui; tamen minus ei tribui quam res est.”

No men, certainly, could ever have steered a more unhappy course. For no doubt they designed to press the excellency of Christ and the usefulness of his mediation in these things unto the church; but in the pursuit of it they wholly omit those plain and proper expressions whereby they might have fully declared it, to the comfort of the church and the establishment of our faith, and betake themselves absolutely unto such figurative expressions as whereby the dignity of Christ is diminished, and less is ascribed unto him than is due. Certainly men have used to make very bold with the Scriptures and their own consciences who can satisfy themselves with such imaginations.

But yet when all is done, all this, as hath been manifested before will not serve the turn, nor disprove our assertion, that the Lord Christ was a priest whilst on the earth; for all the things which they thus ascribe unto him were then discharged by him. Wherefore we shall further consider what direct opposition they make hereunto.

11. It is no matter at all whom we fix upon to call to an account herein. Their wits are barren in a peculiar manner on this subject, so that they all say the same things, one after another, without any considerable variation. The reader, if he please, may satisfy himself herein by consulting Socinus, Volkelius, Ostorodius, Smalcius, Moscorovius, Crellius, and

Schlichtingius, in the places before cited. I shall therefore confine myself to him who hath last appeared in the defense of this cause, and who seems to have put the newest gloss upon it. This is Ludwig Woolzogen., in his Compend. Relig. Christianae, sect. 51, whose words ensue: —

> “Praeterea etiam hoc nobis paucis attingendum est quod sacerdotale Christi munus non bene intelligent illi qui statuunt Christum sacrificium expiatorium pro peccatis nostris in cruce peregisse et absolvisse. Nam in veteri foedere, cujus
>
> **(1.)** sacrificia fuere typi sacrificii Christi, non fuit factum sacrificium
>
> **(2.)** expiatorium in mactatione victimae seu pecudis, sed tantum fuit praeparatio quaedam ad sacrificium. Verum in eo
>
> **(3.)** consistebat sacrificium quando pontirex maximus cure sanguine ingrediebatur in sanctum sanctorum, atque
>
> **(4.)** eum Deo offerebat et sacrificabat. Sacrificare enim proprie non est
>
> **(5.)** mactare, sed offerre et Deo secrete.”

Ans. **(1.)** It is acknowledged that the sacrifices under the old testament were *types of the sacrifice of Christ;* that is, all of them were so which were expiatory or appointed to make atonement. Although, therefore, these men are wary, yet they stand in such an unstable and slippery place as that they often reel and betray themselves; for if all expiatory sacrifices were types of the sacrifice of Christ, most of them being perfect and complete without carrying any of their blood into the sanctuary, that of Christ must be so before his entrance into heaven.

(2.) As for what he affirms of the expiatory sacrifice, — that is, the anniversary sacrifice on the day of expiation, — that it consisted not in the slaying of the sacrifice, which was only a certain preparation thereunto, it is either sophistical or false. It is sophistical, if by “mactatio pecudis” he intend only the single act of slaying the sacrifice: for so it is granted that was not the entire sacrifice, but only a part of it; the oblation of it on the altar was also required unto its perfection. But it is false, if he intend thereby all that was done in the offering of the beast, namely, its adduction to the altar, its mactation, the effusion of its blood, the sprinkling thereof, the laying of the offering on the altar, the consumption of it by fire, — all

which belonged thereunto. All these things, even all that preceded the entrance of the high priest into the most holy place, are distinguished from what was done afterwards, and are to be considered under that head which he calls the slaying of the victim. But then his assertion is false, for the sacrifice consisted therein, as we have proved.

(3.) That the expiatory sacrifice did not consist in the entrance and appearance of the high priest in the most holy place with the blood of the beast offered is manifest from hence, because he was commanded to offer the beast in sacrifice before his entrance into the sanctuary, which was a consequent of the sacrifice itself, and represented the effects of it.

(4.) That the high priest sacrificed the blood unto God in the sanctuary, as he affirms, is an assertion that hath no countenance given unto it in the Scripture, nor hath it so from any common notion concerning the nature of sacrifices; and the atonement that is said to be made for the most holy place by the sprinkling of the blood towards the mercy-seat was effected by the sacrifice as offered before, whereof that ceremony was a sign and token.

(5.) That to sacrifice and to slay are the same in the original, so as that both these actions, — that is, sacred and common slaying, — are expressed ofttimes by the same word, I have before demonstrated. But withal I grant that unto a complete sacrifice the ensuing oblation on the altar was also required. Hence was the sacrifice offered and consecrated unto God.

But he endeavors to confirm his assertion with some testimonies of our apostle: “Et hoc est quod nit auctor Epistolae ad Hebraeos:

(1.) ‘In secundum tabernaculum’ (id est, in sanctissimum sacrarium) ‘semel quotannis solus pontifex, non absque sanguine ingreditur, quem offert pro seipso et pro populi iguorantiis,’ Hob. 9:7, quibus verbis elucet pontificem maximum turn demum sacrificasse, et obtulisse quando sanguinem intulit in sanctissimum sanctuarium, et cure eo coram Deo apparuit. Haec apparitio ac oblatio, demure

(2.) expiatio et redemptio a peccatis consenda est. Ita igitur in Christo quoque qui et pontifex maximus et simul etiam victima esse debuit, mactatio corporis ejus in cruce, nihil aliud quam praeparatio fuit ad verum

sacrificium. Sacrificium autem ipsum peractum est tum, cure in sanctuarium coeleste ingressus est cure proprio sanguine suo, ibique Deo seipsum tanquam victimam obtulit et exhibuit, necnon tanquam aeternus pontifex pro nobis apud Deum intercedit, nostram expiationem procurat."

Ans. **(1.)** I understand not the force of the proof from this testimony unto the purpose of our author. The high priest did enter into the most holy place with the blood of the sacrifice. What will thence ensue? Had it been common blood before, and now first consecrated unto God, something might be collected thence in compliance with his design; but it was the blood of the sacrifice which was dedicated and offered unto God before, the blood of the sacrifice that was slain, which was only carried into the most holy place and sprinkled there, as the representation of its virtue and efficacy. In like manner, Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God that was slain and sacrificed for us, after he had through the eternal Spirit offered himself unto God, procuring thereby redemption for us in his blood, entered into heaven, there in the presence of God to *represent* the virtue of his oblation, and by his intercession (prefigured not by the offering, but by the sprinkling of blood) to make application thereof unto us.

(2.) Redemption did in no sense follow the appearance of the high priest in the most holy place *typically*, nor the entrance of the Lord Christ into heaven *really;* but it is constantly assigned unto his death and blood-shedding, — which invincibly proves that therein alone his oblation of himself did consist. See 1 Peter 1:18,19. Expiation may be considered either in respect of *impetration* or of *application.* In the first regard it did not follow, but precede the entrance of the high priest into the most holy place, for the sacrifice was offered without to make atonement for sin; and the same atonement was made in sundry sacrifices whose blood was never sprinkled in the most holy place. In the latter sense alone it may be said to follow it, which we contend not about.

His next testimony is from Hebrews 9:11, 12, the words whereof he only cites, without attempting any improvement or application of them: "But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own

blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption."

Had he attempted any proof from these words, he would have found himself at a loss where to have fixed the argument. Wherefore, he contents himself with the bare sound of the words, supposing that may seem to favor his pretension. For it is plain from this text, —

(1.) That Christ entered into heaven *as* our high priest, and not *that* he might become so; which is sufficient to scatter all his imaginations about this office of his,

(2.) That he entered into heaven "by his own blood," which was shed and poured out in his sacrifice before that entrance; for really he carried no blood with him, as the high priest did of old, but only was accompanied with the efficacy and virtue of that which was shed before.

(3.) He is said to have "obtained eternal redemption" *before* his entrance into heaven, that being expressed as past upon his entrance; which invincibly proves that his sacrifice was antecedent thereunto.

His last testimony is Hebrews 8:4, which most of them make use of as their shield and buckler in this cause: "For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law." But the plain design and intention of the apostle allows them no relief from these words. He had proved invincibly that the Lord Christ was to be "an high priest," and had showed in some instances the nature of that office of his. Here, to confirm what he had so declared, he lays it down, by the way of concession, that if there were no other priesthood but that which is earthly and carnal, or which belonged unto the Judaical church, he could not have been a priest at all, which yet he had proved that it was necessary he should be. And the reason of this concession he adds, from the possession of that office by the priests of the house of Aaron, and the enclosure of its propriety unto them, as verse 5. Hence it unavoidably ensues that he must have a priesthood of another kind, or different from that of Aaron, which he expressly asserts as his conclusion, verse 6. A priest he must be; a priest after the order of them who offered gifts according to the law he could not be: and therefore he had another, and therefore a more excellent, priesthood.

12. Unto these testimonies, which are commonly pleaded by them all to deprive the Lord Christ of this office, at least whilst he was on the earth, I shall add the consideration of one, with the argument from it, which I find not insisted on by any of them but only Smalcius alone: De Reg. Chr. cap. 23,

> "Hanc Christi oblationem auctor Epistolae ad Hebraeos volens innuere, et aperte demonstrate eam tum demum esse perfectam cum Christus in coelum ascendit, ait, 'Talem decebat nes habere pontificem, sanctum, labe carentem, impollutum, segregatum a peccatoribus, et excelsiorem coelis factum;' et Paulo infra ait, 'Jesum Christum semetipsum Deo immaculatum obtulisse per Spiritum aeternum;' intelligens per ista epithets, 'Sancti, labe carentis, impolluti, segregati a peccatoribus, et innocentis,' non Christi sanctitatem quoad mores, hac enim semper perfecte Christus fuit praeditus, etiam antequam pontifex noster factus est, sed eam sanctitatem quae Christi naturam respicit. Quae Christi natura, quamdiu in terris fuit, qui fratribus per omnia fuit assimilatus infirmitati et mortalitati obnoxia fuit; nunc vero ab ea in omnem aeternitatem libera est,"

Ans. **(1.)** These properties of "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners," which the apostle ascribes unto our Lord Jesus as our high priest, [3]Hebrews 7:26, as also his offering himself "without spot," chap. 9:14, this man ascribes unto Christ as exalted in heaven, in contradistinction unto what he was whilst on the earth; for thence he taketh his argument that he was not a priest whilst he was on the earth, namely, because he was so holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, in heaven. Now, if it do not hence follow that he was impure, defiled, guilty, like other sinners, whilst he was on the earth, yet it doth undeniably, — and that is the matter contended for, — that he was not holy, harmless, and undefiled, in the sense here intended by the apostle. How this can be freed from open blasphemy I am not able to discern.

(2.) He is not secured by his ensuing distinction, that the Lord Christ was before, whilst on the earth, perfectly holy. as to his manners, but that the epithets here used respect his nature: for, not to assign all these properties unto the nature of Christ from the instant of his conception, or to deny

them to belong thereunto, is no less contrary to the Scripture and really blasphemous than to deny him to have been holy with respect unto his life and conversation; for he was the "holy thing" that was born of the Virgin, and as he was born of her, by virtue of the miraculous creation and sanctification of his nature in the womb, whereof I have treated elsewhere at large.

(3.) Here is a supposition included, that all the difference between Christ and us, whilst he was in this world, consisted only in the use of his freedom unto the perfect obedience wherein we fail and come short. That his nature was absolutely holy and impeccable, ours sinful and defiled, is cast out of consideration; and yet to deny this difference between him and us is no less blasphemous than what we before rejected.

(4.) Christ in this world was indeed obnoxious to sufferings and death itself, as having a nature, on that account, like unto his brethren in all things. But to suppose that he was obnoxious to infirmity and mortality because he was not yet holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, is injurious unto his person, and derogatory from his love; for it was not from the necessity of his own condition in human nature that he was exposed unto sufferings or unto death, but he became so by voluntary condescension for our sakes, Philippians 2:5-8. We are obnoxious unto these things on our own account, he only on ours.

(5.) In the death of Christ, when he shed his blood, he was ἀμνὸς ἄμωμος καὶ ἄσπιλος, "a lamb without spot and without blemish," 1 Peter 1:19; and he is said to offer himself ἄμωμον τῷ Θεῷ, "without spot to God," Hebrews 9:14. He was therefore no less so before and in his death than after. And it is a surprisal, to be put, by one professing himself a Christian, to the work of proving the Lord Christ to have been, in his entire nature, in this world holy and harmless.

(6.) He doth not in the least relieve himself from those impieties by his ensuing discourse on Ephesians 5:26, 27,

> "That he might sanctify ,and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

He contends that the making of the church “holy and without blemish” in this place concerns its glorified state, because it is therewithal said to be a “glorious church.” In the same sense, therefore, as he affirmeth, is Christ said to be “holy” when he was “glorified,” and not before. But he adds herein to the weight and number of his preceding enormities: for in what sense soever the church is said to be made holy or to be sanctified, whether it be in grace or as instated in glory, it is so by being washed and cleansed from the spots, stains, and filth which originally it had; but to ascribe such a sanctification or making holy unto the Lord Christ is the highest blasphemy imaginable.

We may therefore firmly conclude, with the whole church of God, according unto the Scripture and the nature of the thing itself, that the Lord Christ was a priest and executed his priestly office whilst he was on the earth, even then when he offered up himself unto God with strong cries and supplications at his death on the cross.

13. SECONDLY, That which yet remains, as belonging unto our present design, is the consideration of the *direct and immediate object of the sacerdotal actings of Christ*, or the exercising his mediatory power by virtue of his priestly office. This we have declared before and proved, namely, that it is *God himself*. Our meaning is, that the Lord Jesus Christ, as the high priest of the church, acts on its behalf with God, doing those things which are to be done with him, according to the covenant before explained. As a king and prophet he acts in the name of God towards us; as a priest he acts towards God on our behalf. This the whole economy of the Aaronical priesthood doth confirm, and the very nature of the great duties of this office, oblation and intercession, do necessarily infer. Doth Christ offer himself in sacrifice unto God, or unto us? Doth he intercede with God, or with us? It is no small evidence of the desperate cause of our adversaries, that they are forced to put uncouth and horrid senses on these sacerdotal duties, to accommodate them unto their sentiments. So after that Smalcius hath told us that these things were thus expressed in Scripture “ex nimio figurate loquendi studio,” so traducing the wisdom and sobriety of the penmen thereof, he adds in the explication of that figurative expression, as he would have it, of Christ’s intercession, “Cum igitur de Christo dicitur eum pro nobis interpellare, aliud nihil dicitur quam eum potentia illa sua sibi data curare nostri gerere.” It is not easily conceivable

how a greater violence can be offered unto a sacred expression. By such interpretations it is possible to put an orthodox sense on all the writings of Smalcius. But in the vindication of his exposition of Christ's intercession he adds, "That the power which Christ exerciseth in his care of the church, and all his actings towards it, he received of God, and therefore in the use of it he is said to make intercession for us;" — that is, he doth one thing, and is said to do another ! What he doth is not said, — namely, that he acts his power towards the church; and what he doth not, that he is said to do, — namely, to make intercession with God for us. The arguments whereby we confirm the truth asserted have been before declared and confirmed. Wherefore, to put a close unto this whole disputation, and to give the reader a specimen of the subtlety and perpetual tergiversation of our adversaries in this cause, wherein also occasion will be administered further to explain sundry things relating unto this office of Christ, I shall examine strictly the whole discourse of Crellius on this subject, and therein give a peculiar instance of the sophistical ability of these men in evading the force of arguments and testimonies from the Scripture.

14. Grotius proves that the first actings of Christ as a priest were towards God, from Hebrews 5:1, and chap. 8:3, whereunto Crellius replies, cap. 10:part. 3, p. 474,

> "Postrema haec verba ita sunt comparata, ut per se Socini sententiae non repugnent, Grotium nil invent. Fatetur enim Socinus quoque et saris clare docet auctor D. Heb. 2:17, actionem Christi qua sacerdos est, et sic ejus sacrificium expiatorium esse ex eorum numero quae pro homine fiant apud Deum; ut alia hic deductione, cum de Christi sacrificio quaeratur, non fuerit opus. De sensu ergo quaeritur, cum de verbis constet."

Ans. **(1.)** The agreement which he pretends between Grotius and himself in this matter, as to the words of the apostle, is enough, with sober men, to put an end unto the whole controversy. The question is, Whether Christ, as a high priest, did act principally towards God, or towards us? 'Towards God,' saith the apostle, and Grotius from him. 'We are agreed,' saith Crellius, 'about these words; all the question is about their sense.' As how? 'Namely, whether they signify that Christ exerciseth this office towards God, or towards us ;' for this is that which, after a long

tergiversation, he comes unto: Pag. 477, “Talem hac in parte Christi actionem esse aperte indicat apostolus quae circa nos primo versetur non vero circa Deum;” — “The apostle intimateth plainly, that such is the (sacerdotal) acting of Christ in this matter that it is first exercised towards us, and not towards God.” Whatever, therefore, is otherwise pretended, the question between him and us is about the words themselves and their truth, and not about their sense and meaning. For if it be true that the Lord Christ καθίσταται ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώτων τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, “is appointed as a priest for men,” (or on their behalf,) “in the things belonging unto God,” or to be done with God, Hebrews 5:1, and that in an especial manner, εἰς τὸ προσφέρειν δῶρὰ τε καὶ θυσίας, chap. 8:3, “to offer gifts and sacrifices unto God,” the whole sense is granted which we plead for. If he is not so appointed, if he doth not do so, — that is, if he was not ordained to act with God in the behalf of men, if he did not offer sacrifice for them or the expiation of their sins, — then are not these words true, and it is in vain to contend about the sense of them.

(2.) I shall only further observe the sophistry of that expression, “Actionem Christi qua sacerdos est,” — “That action of Christ whereby he is a priest;” for he intends that Christ is only denominated a priest from some action he doth perform, whereas in truth he performs those actions by virtue of his priesthood, and could not perform them were he not a priest in office.

Having laid this foundation, Crellius enters upon a large discourse, wherein he doth nothing but perpetually divert from the argument in hand, and by a multitude of words strive to hide himself from the sense of it. Take him when he supposeth himself out of its reach and he speaketh plainly. So he doth, Lib. de Caus. Mort. Christi, pag. 7:

> “Cum consideratur Christus ut sacerdos, etsi similitudinem refert ejus qui Deo aliquid hominum nomine praestet, si tamen rem ipsam penitius spectes, deprehendes eum talem esse sacerdotum qui Dei nomine aliquid nobis praestet;”

— “When Christ is considered as a priest, although he bears the likeness of one that doth something with God on the behalf of men, yet, if you look more narrowly into the matter itself, you will find that he is such a priest who acts towards us in the name of God.” If we may but hold him

to this plain declaration of his mind (which, indeed, he must keep to or lose his cause), the vanity and tergiversation that are in all his other evasions and pretences will be evident.

15. But because we have resolved on a particular examination of all that can be pretended in this matter on the behalf of our adversaries, we may consider his plea at large in his own words:

> **"(1.)** Grotius ita verba ea proculdubio intelligit, ac si dictum esset sacrificiis moveri Deum, ut hominibus benefaciat, et expiatoriis quidem, ut remissionem peccatorum iis concedere velit.
>
> **(2.)** Hoc si in eam sententiam accipiatur in quam alias Grotius hujusmodi verba in nostro negotio sumere solet, ut significet,
>
> **(3.)** Deum iratum ac poenas expetentem, ita tamen ut non aversetur omnes irae deponendae rationes, sacrificiis placari, et ad ignoscendum fiecti.
>
> **(4.)** Non est id de omnibus sacrificiis expiatoriis, etiam proprie dictis admittendum, imo de iis quae proprie ita appellantur,
>
> **(5.)** Minus, quam de aliis ab homine profectis precibus scilicet, poenitentia, animi humilitate sen cordis ac spiritus contritione.
>
> **(6.)** Neque enim sub lege eo pacto Deum movebant sacrificia ab ipso praescripta praesertim semper: sed cum Deus jam antea decrevisset se intervenientibus illis sacrificiis delicta et lapsus velle condonare, iis oblatis,
>
> **(7.)** vi decreti istius effectus ille apud Deum consequebatur, etiamsi is actu non irasceretur, imo ideo petius offerebantur sacrificia, he, si forte negligerentur, irasceretur, quam ut jam iratus placaretur. Quod si vocem movendi, et caeteras ei similes, eo modo hic accipias, quem nos alibi etiam explicuimus, ut significent conditione praestita apud Deum efficere, ut in decreti sui effectum hominibus benefaciat, et reatum peccati deleat poenamque avertat, sive per se, ut sub lege, sive per alium ut novi foederis tempore, id quod Grotius air, tum de sacrificiis legalibus, turn etiam de morte Christi;

(8.) quam sacrificium, et quidem expiatorium esse fatemur, licet per se in hoc genere nondum perfectum, verum est,”

Ans. **(1.)** There was no need at all of this large and ambiguous repetition of the whole state of the controversy about the nature and use of sacrifices in this place, where the argument concerned only the proper object of Christ’s sacerdotal actings. And he knew well enough the mind of Grotius, as to the sense of what he asserted; only it was necessary to retreat into this long diversion, to avoid the force of the testimonies produced against him.

(2.) The sense which we plead for, as to the expiation of our sins by Jesus Christ, is plain and evident. God was the author and giver of the law and the sanction thereof; the supreme, righteous, holy rector, governor, judge of all persons and actions relating thereunto; the dispenser of the rewards and punishments, according to the sense and sentence of it. Man transgressed this law by sin, and did what lay in him thereby to cast off the government of God. This rendered him obnoxious unto the sentence, curse, death, and punishment, threatened in the sanction of the law; which God, as the righteous, holy, supreme governor of all, was, on the account of his righteousness, authority, and veracity, obliged to execute. This respect of God towards the transgressors of his law the Scripture represents under the notion and expression of his anger against sin and sinners; which is nothing but the engagement of his justice to punish offenders. On this account God would not, and without the violation of his justice and veracity could not, forgive sin, or dismiss sinners unpunished, without an atonement made by an expiatory sacrifice; wherein his justice also was to be satisfied and his law to be fulfilled. And this was done by the sacrifice of Christ, according to the tenor and compact between God and him before described.

(3.) The advantage that Crellius seeks from the words of Grotius, in the entrance of his discourse, of God’s being “angry with sinners, yet not so as to depose all thoughts of reconciliation,’’ will stand him in no stead; for he intended no more by them, but that although God was provoked, as the righteous governor of his creatures, yet he determined not absolutely to destroy them, when he had found a ransom: that is, provided his justice were satisfied, his honor repaired, his law fulfilled, — all which his own

holiness and faithfulness required, — he would pardon sin, and take away the punishment from sinners. That whereby this was done was the sacrifice of Christ; whose object, therefore, must be God himself, and consequently he is so of all his sacerdotal actings.

(4.) All expiatory sacrifices did, in their way and kind, procure the remission of sins by the way of atonement, and not otherwise. Nor can Crellius give any one instance to the contrary. Their first and principal design was to atone and pacify anger, or to turn away wrath and punishment as due from the displeasure of God; and, therefore their first effect was towards God himself.

(5.) The means on our part for the obtaining of the actual remission of sin, and a sense thereof in our consciences, as prayer, repentance, humiliation, contrition of heart and spirit, are not means of making atonement, wherein there is always the nature of compensation and satisfaction. If we apply ourselves unto God by them unto any such purpose, or rest upon them unto that end, we render them useless, yea, an abomination. Yea, they are all enjoined unto us on supposition of atonement made for sin in and by the blood of Christ; and so they were from the foundation of the world. From the giving of the first promise, wherein the Lord Christ was a “lamb slain,” as to the efficacy of his future oblation, God forgave sins for his sake, and not otherwise. And the duties enjoined us in order unto actual remission, or a sense of it in our consciences, are all to be founded in the faith of that atonement, which is supposed, and is to be pleaded in them all; for in Christ alone it is that we have “redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.” But all this is a diversion from the present argument and inquiry, which concerns only the proper object of the sacerdotal actings of Christ, and not the nature of his sacrifice, which shall be spoken unto elsewhere. And those very duties whereby we make application for actual remission or pardon, upon the atonement made, have God for their object also; and so must every thing which hath an influence of any kind into the pardon of sin.

(6.) The account he gives concerning the influence of expiatory sacrifices in procuring the pardon of sin is false and sophistical. That God, not being angry with sin, should decree that upon the offering of sacrifices he would pardon it, and would have such sacrifices offered, not because he was

angry, but that he might not be so, is a vain imagination; for all sacrifices were offered for sins that were past, and all application we can make unto God by the sacrifice of Christ for the pardon of sin respects it as past. And therefore were sacrifices instituted to make atonement; that is, to avert and turn away wrath already deserved and due to the offender. To say this was done, not because God was angry at sin, but that he might not be so, when it was already committed, is inconsistent with truth and reason: for God is angry with sin because it is committed; and if he be not so, he is never angry with it. That which we intend hereby is, that he forbids every sin, and hath annexed a threatening of punishment unto that prohibition. This is his anger.

(7.) That expression, "vi decreti," that God pardons sin by virtue of his decree, contains sundry secrets of these men's doctrine. For it is intimated that all that belongs unto the expiation of sin by sacrifices was a mere free constitution; nothing in them, nothing which they had any respect unto, or in the atonement made by them, was any way necessary on the account of the righteousness or holiness of God. For this decree of God is nothing but a voluntary constitution of this order of things, that sacrifices should go before remission, and not contribute any thing thereunto. There is therefore nothing in that discourse, "Conditione praestita spud Deum efficere ut vi decreti sui," etc., but that sacrifices, by God's appointment, were an act of worship antecedent to the remission of sins. It is true, there is nothing done, in the whole matter of the expiation of sin, but it depends on God's decree and appointment; but the things disposed of by virtue of that decree have this relation one to another, that the sacrifice of Christ shall be, and is, the *procuring cause* of the pardon of sin. God may therefore be said to pardon sin "in decreto suo," as the original disposing cause; but he doth it not without respect to the sacrifice of Christ, as the *meritorious procuring cause*. It is not, therefore, merely an antecedent condition, making way for the accomplishment of a voluntary decree; but it is a moral cause, appointed of God in his decree for the effecting of pardon.

(8.) I wonder with what confidence he here affirms that the death of Christ was an expiatory sacrifice, when he knew himself that he did not believe it so to be. That Christ offered but one sacrifice both they and we agree. But that this was not in his death, that it was in heaven, when he presented

himself unto God, — that indeed it consists in the power which he hath, as glorified and exalted, to free us from the punishment due unto sin, — is the sum of what he pleads for in this part of his book. Both here and elsewhere he endeavors to prove that Christ was not a priest whilst he was on the earth, that his death was only a prerequisite condition (and so was his life also) unto the offering of himself. But from all these open contradictions he shelters himself by saying that it was not as yet *perfect* in this kind. But why doth he say that it was not a perfect sacrifice, while he believes that it was none at all? Or if it be not a perfect sacrifice, was it a part of the perfect sacrifice that was afterwards completed in heaven? If it was so, then was Christ a priest whilst he was on the earth, — then did he offer himself unto God in his death, — then was God the object of that sacerdotal act, as we contend and plead for. If these things belong not unto it, then it was neither a perfect sacrifice nor imperfect, neither complete nor incomplete, neither part of a sacrifice nor the whole; which we shall find him granting in his next words: —

16. “Sed si loquaris de

(1.) sacrificio seu oblatione Christi expiatoria perfecta, quam in coelis peragit, quamque D. auctor ad Heb. explicat, et Grotius qui earn *ostensionis* appellat, agnoscit; de ea aliquid amplius dici debet.

(2.) Neque enim ea ad remissionem peccatorum intervenit, tanquam nuda quaedam conditio, aut res ad alterum tantum, qui remissionem reipsa praestet, aliqua ratione impellendum comparata; sod potissimum tanquam vera causa efficiens quae vi sua remissionem peccatorum nobis a Deo decretam praestat; et efficacia sua eorum vim quam ad nos damnandos et divinis suppliciis obnoxios reddendos habent, extinguit ac delet.”

Ans. As the former discourse was a mere diversion from the present question and argument, so this is partly a begging of the question in general, and .partly a concession of what he labors to avoid the inconvenience of. For, —

(1.) It is a plain begging of the main question, to say and suppose that the perfect expiatory sacrifice of Christ consisted only in what he performed in heaven; the contrary whereunto we have sufficiently proved before, and

which they shall never evince whilst the Scripture is owned to be the word of God.

(2.) The latter part of his discourse plainly grants what he would seem to deny, but proves it not. He denies that the sacrifice of Christ respects God so much as a condition pre-required unto the forgiveness of sin. But he will have it to be the efficient cause of pardon; that is, the Lord Christ, being intrusted with power from God unto that end and purpose after his ascension into heaven, doth take away our sin, or free and deliver us from the punishment due unto it. Now, though this be true, yet this is not the oblation or sacrifice of himself. Nor can any man reconcile the notion of a sacrifice with this actual efficiency in delivering us from the punishment of sin, so as that they should be the same. Hereof it is granted that we, and not God, are the first and immediate object; but that the oblation or sacrifice of Christ consists herein is wholly denied, nor doth he here attempt to prove it so to do.

(3.) What account, on this supposition, can be given of the *intercession of Christ*, which is his second great sacerdotal duty? Doth this also consist in *a powerful efficiency* in us of what God hath decreed concerning his pardoning, blotting out, and extinguishing of sin? Is this the nature of it, that whereas God had decreed freely to pardon sin, and to take away the punishment due unto it, this intercession is his powerful taking away of that punishment, and his actual delivery of us from sin? Is it possible that an act and duty of this nature should be expressed by a word of a more opposite signification and importance? For my part, I value not that use of right reason, that these men so much boast of, which is exercised in giving a wrong signification unto words expressive of so weighty truths and duties? Who but they can possibly understand any thing, by Christ's intercession in heaven at the right hand of God, but his procuring from him grace, mercy, and pardon for us, by virtue of his antecedent oblation? And God is the object of his actings herein.

17. But he proceeds to give countenance unto what he hath asserted:

> **"(1.)** Itaque quemadmodum oblationis vox, ut infra clarius patebit, ad hanc Christi actionem

(2.) ob similitudinem cum legalibus sacrificiis transfertur; ira et loquutio haec

(3.) quod peragatur vel fiat, apud Deum pro hominibua

(4.) Similitudo in eo est

(5.) quod quemadmodum legalia sacrificia ideo Deo offerebantur

(6.) et coram ipsius vultu perficiebantur, ut iis peractis

(7.) vi decreti ipsius homines, pro quibus offerebantur, remissionem peccatorum ab ipso obtinerent; ita

(8.) interveniente Christi oblatione, seu apparitione coram Dei vultu

(9.) per sanguinis fusionem facta, et cum summo salutis nostrae perficiendae desiderio conjuncta,

(10.) homines a Deo vi decreti ipsius, ipsiusque virtute, quam eum in finem Christo concessit, liberationem a poenis obtinent.

(11.) Indicate nempe hac locqutione Spiritus Sanctus voluit remissionem peccatorum quam Christus in coelis apud Patrem degens nobis praestet, a Deo ejusque benignitate primo proficisci, et quicquid ad eam in nobis perficiendam sit, id totum ipsius virtute et auctoritate, Christo, qui ut eam adipisceretur, et sic nos a peccatorum poenis reipsa liberate posset, sanguinem suum fuderat, eoque cum desiderio coelum fuerat ingressus, datâ peragi.

(12.) Itaque ut id exprimat non modo Christi in coelos ingressum atque ad Deum accessum, per quem factum est ut ad dextram ipsius consideret, et plenam peccata nobis remittendi potestatem obtineret, sed et perpetuam apud ipsum permansionem, cum salutis nostrae cura conjunctam ita considerat, ac si ea Deus aliqua ratione moveretur ad remissionem peccatorum nobis vi decreti sui concedendam,

(13.) Et sic inter hanc et illam actus quidam ipsius Dei, propitium se nobis exhibentis, et nos a poena liberantis interveniret; cum tamen ipse Christus potestate sibi, a Deo, et olim jam decreta, et in coelum ingresso donata, id totum, quod ad nos a poena liberandos pertinet ejus nomine faciat.”

Ans. **(1.)** The name of oblation and sacrifice is not applied at all unto that action of Christ which this man intends, namely, his appearance in heaven; which, as to its efficacy on our behalf, belongs unto his intercession, [Romans 8:34]; I [John 2:1]. There is more also in the sacrifice of Christ than the transferring the name of oblation unto any action of his which is not so indeed. These little artifices and insinuations, which when discovered are a mere begging of the thing in question, make up the principal parts of Crellius' defense. Wherefore, —

(2.) The name of oblation is not transferred unto that action of Christ wherein his sacrifice did truly and really consist, namely, his death and blood-shedding, merely by an allusion taken from the legal sacrifices; but it is so called by the Holy Ghost because *it is so indeed,* as having the true, proper nature of a sacrifice, so as that it was the pattern or idea in the mind of God of all the other sacrifices which he appointed, and which, therefore, were ordained unto no other end but to prefigure the nature and exhibit the efficacy thereof.

(3.) That expression, of doing things "apud Deum," or doing for men the things that appertain unto God, cannot, on the hypothesis of these men, be ascribed unto Christ out of a similitude unto what was done by the priests of old: for whatever they did, as priests, they did it unto God; but the Lord Christ, according to these men, did nothing as a priest unto God. And how can that which he doth towards us be called by the name of what the priests did of old towards God, because of its likeness thereunto, seeing there is no likeness between these things? for what similitude is there between the offering of a *bloody sacrifice* to God, thereby to make atonement £or the guilt of sin, and the *actual powerful deliverance* of us from the punishment due to sin? What such similitude, I say, is there between these things, as to warrant their being called by the same name, which answers unto one of them properly, and to the other not at all? That, therefore, which is here pretended amounts to no more than this, namely, that whereas he doth nothing in his offering with God, but with men, he is said to offer himself by reason of a similitude in what he did unto what the priests did in their oblations, who did nothing with men therein, but with God! As, therefore, we know that the sacerdotal acting of Christ was not called an oblation, offering, or sacrifice, merely out of the similitude that was between it and the sacrifices of old, — although we

grant that indeed there was more than a mere similitude between them, even a typical relation, the one being designed to represent the nature and exhibit the virtue of the other, whence they are both properly called by the same name, — so, according to the opinion of our adversaries, we deny that there is any such likeness or similitude between what Christ doth in taking away of sin and what was done by the priests of old, as that any denomination could or ought thence to be taken, or any name assigned unto it. As for the death of Christ, Crellius peremptorily denies it to have been Christ's perfect expiatory sacrifice; and for his offering himself in heaven, he affirms, that whatever other appearance may be of it, yet indeed it is wholly conversant about us, and not about God. It is therefore in vain to inquire after reasons and grounds on which Christ may be said to do those things in his sacrifice "quae sunt apud Deum peragenda," when it cannot be truly spoken at all, and is directly denied by them.

(4.) Let it therefore be observed, that the similitude that was between the sacrifices of the law and that of Christ was not a bare natural or moral similitude, whence the one of them-might be called by the name of the other, that name belonging to the one properly, unto the other metaphorically; but whereas there is a generical identity between them, both of them agreeing in the same general nature of being proper sacrifices in their own special kind, the one of them, namely, those of the priests under the law, were instituted and ordained to represent the other, or the sacrifice of Christ, whence arose a similitude between them, as there was a real difference on many other accounts. And the relation that was between them, which these men would have to be a similitude only, arose from these three respects: —

[1.] That the sacrifice of Christ was the pattern in heavenly things according unto the idea whereof all legal sacrifices were appointed to make a representation; that is, God having designed his Son Jesus Christ to be the high priest of his church, and to expiate their sins by the sacrifice of himself, did appoint the legal priesthood and sacrifices, obscurely to delineate that design before its actual accomplishment, And indeed here lies the true difference between us and the Socinians in this matter; for they suppose that God having, for certain ends, instituted the office of priests and duty of sacrificing in the church of old, some things that were done afterwards, and are yet done by Christ, because of their allusion

unto, and some kind of likeness with, what was done in and by those institutions, are called by their names. We judge, on the other hand, that God originally designing the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, that he might represent his purpose therein, to be accomplished in the fullness of time, and grant an outward means or pledge unto the church of an interest in the nature, efficacy, and benefit thereof, and for no other end, appointed the typical priesthood and sacrifice of the old testament, as hath been proved at large before. Wherefore,

[2.] Seeing they were types appointed of God to set out, teach, and prefigure, the sacrifice of Christ, whatever was in them that did not arise from the natural and indispensable imperfections of them by whom they were offered and the nature of the offerings themselves, but was directly of divine institution, was in the mind and will of God instructive beforehand of the nature and use of the sacrifice of Christ. If, therefore, those priests offered sacrifice to God, so did Christ; if they made atonement by blood, so did Christ; if those sacrifices consisted in the slaying, and oblation on the altar, of the victim, so did Christ's in his death and blood-shedding; if God was the principal immediate object of their sacerdotal actings, so he was of Christ's.

[3.] They were, by God's ordinance, *figuratively communicative* of the real virtue of the sacrifice of Christ; that is, God appointed them unto this end, that the church making use of them in the faith of the promise concerning the future sacrifice of Christ, should through them be made partakers of the benefits thereof, they being means of communicating spiritually what they did carnally represent. Crellius thinks that all sacrifices were only conditions required antecedently unto the free pardon of sin, which he calls the "pardoning of sin by virtue of God's decree," but that they had no influence unto the procuring of the remission of sin; which is, in effect, that they did no way make atonement for sin. But then no man living can give an account of their *special nature*, or why God did institute a condition of that kind, when any duties or acts of obedience of any other sort would have served unto the same end. It is plain that all expiatory sacrifices did at least make a representation of commutation, satisfaction, pacification of wroth, turning away of evil, the procurement of mercy, reconciliation, and atonement; and if they did nothing of this nature, it is hard to find any reason for their institution. Wherefore the similitude

invented by Crellius is of no consideration in this matter, but is only found out on purpose to destroy the true analogy that is between the legal sacrifices and that of Christ.

(5.) There is indeed, according to the opinion of these men, no similitude between them; for the legal sacrifices did not consist in the representation of the beast sacrificed, much less in any exaltation and power that it had afterwards, but in the slaying and offering of sin on the altar, whereunto there is not the least resemblance in that which they call the perfect expiatory sacrifice of Christ.

(6.) The offering of sacrifices "coram Dei vultu," "before the face of God," is true, but not in his sense; for he confines it unto the presence of God in the sanctuary only, whereas that which was done at the altar was also said to be done before God, and nowhere else were any sacrifices offered.

(7.) The use of legal sacrifices here granted by him is indeed none at all; for the decree of God, — that is, the free pleasure of God, — is made the only cause of the remission of sin, without respect unto any procuring cause or means whatever. And if propitiatory or expiatory sacrifices had no influence into the remission of sin, if they made not atonement for it., they were of no use at all. Nor is there any thing fond in the application of these things to Christ and his sacrifice; for, —

(8.) The oblation or sacrifice of Christ was not the same with, nor did consist in, his appearance in the presence of God in heaven, but was antecedent thereunto. He "offered himself," and afterwards "appears in the presence of God for *us,*" as is plainly expressed.

(9.) This oblation of Christ is said to be "per sanguinis fusionem," — " by the shedding of his blood ;" but how or in what sense? The words are used to keep unto some seeming compliance with the Scripture, wherein our redemption, forgiveness, freedom from wrath, — all the effects of the sacrifice of Christ, — are frequently and signally ascribed unto his blood-shedding. But is there any intention to intimate that the effusion of his blood had any interest or concern in his oblation? We know it had not, according to these men, but only as an antecedent condition unto his exaltation, as was his whole life and humiliation.

(10.) The manner of the expiation of sin by the sacrifice of Christ, here at large described by Crellius, is absurd, dissonant from reason, and contradictory to the Scripture in itself, and in the manner of its declaration sophistical. The words are to this purpose, "*That* Christ, as a priest, offered himself unto God through the effusion of his blood, to obtain for us mercy, pardon of sin, and deliverance from punishment." But the meaning or sense intended is, that being exalted to heaven, after his death, by the power that he hath received from God he pardons our sins, and delivereth us from the punishment due unto them. But this is such a way of teaching things as becometh neither the holy penmen of the Scripture, nor any man of common sobriety. And to increase the fondness of the story, Christ is said to do these things with God, or towards God, when men are the express objects of what he doth; and this in his ensuing discourse he directly asserts and contends for.

(11.) This is that, it seems, which the Holy Ghost would intimate by these expressions, of Christ's being a priest, of his offering himself to God an expiatory sacrifice, of our redemption thereon by his blood in the forgiveness of our sins, namely, "That whatever Christ doth in heaven towards the pardon of sin, or the pardon Of sin which he affords us, proceedeth in the first place from the kindness and benignity of God, because he hath given power unto him for that end and purpose." But if no more be indeed intended in this expression, if the sacrifice of Christ did in no sense procure our redemption, or pardon of sin, or deliverance from the punishment due unto it, to what end the Holy Ghost should use these expressions, why he should largely and particularly insist upon them and their explanation for our instruction, seeing the only thing intended by them, — namely, that the pardon of our sins proceeds originally from divine benignity and grace, and that the Lord Christ, as mediator, hath received all his power from God the Father, — is taught and expressed a thousand times more plainly and clearly in other places and words, and whereas these things and expressions signify no such things as those intended, no man living can divine. Let him that can, assign a tolerable reason why the exercise of the power of Christ in heaven, because it is given him of God, should be called his feting, sacrifice, or oblation of himself, as the high priest of the church. All men freely acknowledge, that whatever power Christ hath, as mediator, to forgive us our sins, actually

to free us from the punishment deserved by them, he received it of God, who gave all things into his hands, because he laid down his life for his sheep; but that his priesthood consists in the exercise of this power, and that the exercise thereof with love and care is his oblation and sacrifice of himself, being indeed only a consequent thereof, and the means of the administration of its virtue and efficacy, is a fond imagination.

(12.) In the mention of those things whereby God should at least seem to be moved to grant unto us the pardon and remission of sin, Crellius utterly omits the death of Christ, reckoning up only his entrance into heaven, his great desire of our salvation, his access unto God, and sitting at his right hand; wherein he seems not much to aim at a compliance with the Scripture, which everywhere ascribes all these effects directly and immediately to the death and blood-shedding of Christ.

(13.) The sum of what remains of his discourse amounts to this, "*That* although in what Christ did for us there is an appearance as though God, upon the consideration of what was done by him, was moved to pardon sin and free us from punishment" (which yet exclusively unto his death is not true), "yet indeed there is no such thing intended; but only this is so, that Christ doth all this by virtue of the power he received from God, and in his name." The sum of the whole is, that there is an appearance of Christ's being a high priest, an appearance of his offering himself a sacrifice to God for us, an appearance of his acting with God on our behalf, an appearance of his procuring redemption and pardon of sins for us; but in truth and really there is nothing intended but that he hath received power from God, after his humiliation, to pardon our sins and deliver us from punishment, which he exerciseth with love and tenderness. But yet all this while he hath not directly denied that Christ, in his offering himself as a priest, had first respect unto God, — which was the-only thing in question, — and that because he had not long before granted that the Scripture in express terms affirms it; but he would make a show of reasons why though the thing be not so indeed, yet it is mentioned as though it were; which is first to assign a falsehood to the holy writers, and then to excuse it. His ensuing discourse in this place, wherein he designs to prove that God is said to do something for Christ, which yet he doth himself (as the subduing of his enemies, and the like) by virtue of the power he hath received of God, is so exceedingly impertinent unto the

present occasion, as being designed only for a diversion from the cause in hand, as that I shall pass it by, and come to that part of his disputation wherein he begins to speak his mind with more openness and freedom than before.

18. Pag. 477: “Interdum tamen D. ille scriptor ad Hebrews de Christi sacerdotio et oblatione agens, et rem nudam ante oculos nobis volens ponere, neglecta aliquantum allusionis ac comparationis cum ritibus legalibus concinnitate, talem hac in parte Christi actionem esse aperte indicat, quae circa nos primo versetur, non vero circa Deum.”

Ans. **(1.)** This is plain dealing, and to the purpose. To what end have we been led about by all the long discourse which we have examined? Grotius affirmed and proved that the actings of Christ as a priest did in the first place respect God, and not us. This Crellius durst not grant, lest he should prejudice his cause; nor at first deny, until he had endeavored to cast a mist before the eyes of the reader. But now, supposing him sufficiently entangled or engaged, he expressly denies what Grotius affirmed. Be it so, then, that *we*, and not God, are the immediate objects of Christ’s sacerdotal actings: then did he offer himself to us, and not unto God; and maketh intercession with us, and not with God ; — for these are the only general sacerdotal actings of Christ, and if God be not the object of them, he did neither offer himself unto God nor intercede with him. But

(2.) he supposeth that all which seems to be asserted unto that purpose proceeds from the neat fitting of these things by way of allusion unto the legal sacrifices; which when the apostle neglecteth, he declares his intention to be quite otherwise. Let us consider the testimonies he produceth in the confirmation of this bold assertion : —

> “Docet id, ut supra vidimus, locus ipsius sub finem cap. ii., atque imprimis ver. ult., ubi modum explicat, quo Christus, tanquam pon-tifex in iis quae apud Deum, peccata populi expiet. Modus veto iste est, ‘In quo enim ipse passus est cum tentaretur, potest iis qui tentantur auxiliari.’ ‘Potest,’ inquit; hoc est, ad id faciendum pronus est, aut id facere libenter solet. Idem docent verba cap. 4 itidem sub finem quae eandem cum illis sententiam continent.”

Ans. **(1.)** He is mistaken in supposing that the apostle, in the places alleged, doth omit or neglect the consideration of the analogy between the ancient priesthood and sacrifice and those of Christ.

For, in the first place, chap. [Heb 2:17], these words, Πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ, — "A faithful high priest in things pertaining unto God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people," doth respect both the office and whole work of the priests of old, in making atonement for sin by expiatory sacrifices. And in chap. 4:14, the entrance of Christ into heaven asserted in opposition unto the entice of the legal high priest into the carnal sanctuary.

(2.) The help which the Lord Christ unto us, expressed chap. 2:18, is founded on and proceedeth from the reconciliation or atonement which he is affirmed to have in the first place, verse 17.

(3.) The question under consideration is, whether the oblation of Christ doth in the first place respect God or us; and to prove that it respects us, and not God, he cites this testimony of verse 18, wherein there is no mention of his oblation at all, and omits the preceding words, where his oblation is so described by its effects as to prove unavoidably that it respected God in the first place.

(4.) The succor which Christ affords unto them that are tempted is no act of his priestly office; but it is the act of him who is our priest, and who was, as enabled thereunto by virtue of the reconciliation he had made by his oblation as a priest, so the discharge of that office he underwent and suffered those things whereby he is disposed and inclined to put forth his power in our behalf.

(5.) In chap. [Heb 4:15], 4:15, 16, the apostle treats not of the oblation of Christ, but of his personal qualification fitting him for his office. And that which he hath a principal eye unto is his intercession, and the fruits of it; and we shall conclude that this is *with God*, at least until our adversaries can affix some other tolerable sense unto that expression, or make intelligible their new kind of intercession with God for us, by acting his own power and love wards us.

But he yet undertakes to prove that what is here mentioned is the whole of what Christ doth as a priest for us, his discourse whereof, because it compriseth the substance of all that he hath to plead this cause, I shall at large transcribe and examine: —

19. "Ad ea veto confirmanda et illustranda adhibentur a D. auctore ea quae subjiciuntur initio, cap. 5, ut indicat particula 'enim,' quae initium istud cap. 5, cum fine capitis praecedentis connectit. Quare ex illis tonsure potest quid D. auctor sibi velit verbis, quatenus ea ad Christum acommodari debent, quae Grotius hic urget, eaque de causa totum locum adscribemus. Est autem hujusmodi, ' Non habemus pontificem qui non posit compati infirmitatibus nostris; sed tentatum per omnia secundum similitudinem absque cato. Accedamus ergo cum fiducia ad thronum gratis, ut accipiamus misericordiam et gratiam ad opportunum auxilium. Omnis enim pontifex ex hominibus acceptus pro hominibus constituitur in iis qua ad' (vel 'apud') 'Deum, ut offerat dons et victimas pro peccatis: qui possit moderate condolere ignorantibus et errantibus; siquidem etiam ipse circundatus est infirmitate etc. Ubi vides illis cap. 5:verbis, quod 'pontifex constituatur in iis quae ad Deum,' ut 'offerat dons et victimas pro peccatis,' nihil in praecedentibus respondere procter illa, quod a Christo accepturi simus 'misericordiam et gratiam ad opportunum auxilium;' quod sit cum nobis tentatis, ac vehementer trepidantibus succurrat, et ne malorum pondere pressi tentationi succumbamus, ac peccatorum nostrorum poenas luamus, efficit; aut tunc, cum impii suorum scelerum dant poenas, ipse nos tuetur, et ne cum illis una pernicie involvamur, potestate sua divina intercedit. Quod idem, ut vidimus, cap. 2 indicatur in verbis illis, ubi expiationis, quam Christus spud Deum peragit, modus explicatur. At hujusmodi actio circa nos primo versatur, non vero circa Deum, nisi improprie loquamur."

Ans. **(1.)** I have at large transcribed this whole passage, that we may see what; is the only foundation which he builds upon, or argument he hath to prove that the sacerdotal acts of Christ respect us in the first place, and not God. The whole of what he pleads issues from this single supposition, that the apostle in the beginning of the fifth chapter intends nothing but the confirmation of what he had delivered in the end of the fourth; and therefore, that the offering of "gifts and sacrifices for sins" unto God is only his giving help and succor unto us in our temptations, — which is the

most uncouth expression and explication of one thing by another that ever was in the world. Now, this supposition is evidently false, and the connection of the discourse, which he feigneth at pleasure, every way insufficient to enforce us unto such a fond and brainless exposition of the words. That which alone he pleads in justification of his assertion, is the introduction of this near discourse by the causal particle γάρ, *"for;" as* though it intimated that the apostle designed no more but to give a reason of what he had before laid down concerning the help and succor which we have in all our temptations and sufferings from our high priest. This, indeed, he doth also, in the description he gives us of the nature and duties of this office; wherein he doth not merely explain what he had before delivered, but adds other considerations also of the nature and acts of that office confirming our faith and expectation therein. But his principal regard is to the whole subject-matter treated of, as being now to give his reasons why he doth so industriously instruct them in the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ. And this use of the same particle in his transitions from one thing to another, — wherein it respects not so much what immediately went before in particular, as the relation of what ensues unto his whole design, and is also sometimes redundant, — we have manifested by sundry instances in our Exposition. Wherefore, the apostle having occasionally digressed from the priesthood of Christ, which he had proposed unto consideration in the end of the second chapter, through the third and unto the 14th verse of the fourth, he there returns again unto his first design. And this he doth by declaring in general the glow of Christ as a priest, his eminency above those of the order of Aaron, and the spiritual advantage which we receive, not from his being a priest, but from his being such a person, so qualified for the discharge of his office, as he is there by him described. Having expressed this in the last verses of the fourth chapter, and thereby stirred up the Hebrews to a diligent attention unto what he had to instruct them in with respect hereunto, in the beginning of the fifth he lays the foundation of all his subsequent discourses about the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, in a general description of that office and the duties thereof, with what belongs essentially thereunto in all that are partakers thereof, adding some particular instances of the imperfections that attended it in the priests under the law, making application of the former unto Jesus Christ, and discarding the consideration of the latter. As, therefore, in the. end of the fourth chapter,

he prepares his way unto his intended declaration of the nature and duties of the sacerdotal office of Christ, by declaring in general the advantage we have by his susception of that office who was the Son of God incarnate; so here, in the beginning of the fifth, he adds a description of the power, acts, and duties of that office, whence our benefits by it do originally arise. There is therefore no such coherence between these passages as should warrant us to look on Christ's helping and assisting of them that are tempted to be the same with his offering gifts and sacrifices to God. Yea, suppose that the apostle in these words doth only give the reason of what he had before asserted, — which is all that is pleaded by Crellius to impose this nonsensical sense upon us, — yet thereby also his pretension would be everted; for the *reason* of any thing differs from the *thing* itself. And if he proves only that we may have help and succor from Christ, as our high priest, on this ground, that every priest doth offer gifts and sacrifices for sin, it doth not follow that his helping of us and his offering of sacrifice are the same, yea, it doth that they are distinct and different, the latter being given in as a reason and cause of the former.

(2.) What is here further discoursed concerning our deliverance by the power and care of Christ from sin and destruction, even then when wicked and impenitent persons shall be utterly destroyed, is true; but yet it is not his offering of sacrifice unto God for sin, but it is a consequent thereof. The consideration of it is indeed a matter of great consolation and encouragement unto believers, but it is not to be asserted unto the exclusion of that which is the fountain of all the benefits which we receive by his mediation. And now it may be considered whether any thing be here offered by this author, either to prove that we are the first object of all the sacerdotal actings of Christ, or in answer unto the testimonies alleged that God alone is so. But he hath yet somewhat more to add, and therefore proceeds : —

> "Animadvertendum autem est in loco utroque, sed apertius in posteriori ob
>
> **(1.)** allusionem ad sacerdotium legale et similitudinem quandam quae Christo cum pontificibus Aaronicis intercedat,

(2.) ad Christum etiam accommodari infirmitatem, quae in pontificibus istis exstiterit, quaque ii impelli debuerint ad aliorum infirmitates tanto promptius expiandas; cum tamen in Christo

(3.) quippiam alterius generis infirmitatibus illis, quae nihil aliud erant quam lapsus et ignorantiae seu delicta ex infirmitate profecta, opponatur, nempe tentationes seu afflictiones ipsius, quarum memor, nobis tentatis atque affiictis succurrere tanto promptius soleat."

Ans. **(1.)** This man seems to aim at nothing but how he may evade the force of truth, and therefore lays hold of every appearing advantage, though indeed contradicting himself therein; for in the entrance of his production of these testimonies, he tells us, "That they are such places as wherein the apostle, neglecting the allusion unto the priesthood of old, doth plainly and openly declare the nature of that of Christ." But here, in the pressing of those testimonies, he pleads the *express mention of that allusion as the principal reason of his exposition.*

(2.) It is not true that those infirmities of the priests of old which consisted in their sins and ignorances are any way accommodated unto Christ. The things here spoken of the nature of the priest's office, and the discharge of it by them with whom it was intrusted, are distributed unto the subjects intended, according to their capacity. In the priests of old there were such infirmities as that they had need to offer for their own sins also; in Christ there was no such thing, nor any thing that answered thereunto. But in all priests there were infirmities, such as inseparably attend our human nature in this mortal life; and these our high priest, Christ Jesus, was subject unto, whence he was liable to be tempted and to suffer. These the apostle doth not accommodate to Christ, but really ascribes unto him. See verses 7, 8, with our exposition.

(3.) This one concession of Crellius, that Christ our high priest, that is, as our high priest, was subject unto temptations and sufferings, — which he must be, or there is no similitude between him and the high priests of old in this matter of infirmities, — utterly overthrows his whole cause; for he was no way subject unto them but as and whilst he was in this world. His glorified nature in heaven is liable neither to temptations nor sufferings. If therefore any of these infirmities were found in him as our high priest,

which the apostle expressly affirms, and Crellius acknowledgeth, he was our high priest whilst he was on the earth. But he adds : —

> **“(1.)** Ex quo apparet peccatis etiam illorum quos pontifices Aaronici expiare debebant, tentationes atque afflictiones nostras his locis respondere, quarum vis,
>
> **(2.)** quam ad nos perdendos habent alum toliitur et ab iis nos auxilio Christi eripimur, peccata nostra expiari dicuntur.
>
> **(3.)** Itaque non mirum est caetera quoque quae de Aaronicis sacerdotibus dicuntur, alio sensu ad Christum accommodari, et quaedam de illis proprie, de Christo improprie, praestantiori tamen sensu accipi.”

Ans. **(1.)** Where there is any mention made of the offering of Christ for us, it is constantly with respect unto our sins, and not unto our temptations and sufferings, at least not in the first place. What he is affirmed to do with respect unto them, as to the aid, relief, and deliverance which he gives us, is all consequential unto his once offering of himself to take away sin.

(2.) The foundation of the inference which is here made we have already taken away, namely, that the *sinful infirmities* of the priests of old were accommodated unto Christ with respect unto natural infirmities, or obnoxiousness unto temptations and sufferings; which we have showed to be false. Yet hence he would infer that the sins of the people of old, for which the priests offered sacrifice, do correspond in this matter with our temptations and sufferings ; — that as they offered sacrifices for real sins, so Christ’s sacrifice is our relief from temptations and sufferings. The force of the reason pretended lies in this, that because the priests of the order of Aaron had sins themselves, therefore they offered sacrifices for the sins of the people, those which were truly and really so; but whereas the Lord Christ had no sins of his own, but only temptations and sufferings, therefore the sins offered for were temptations and sufferings. Nothing can be. more absurdly imagined; for both those qualifications, that he “had no sin,” and that he “was tempted,” were necessary unto his offering for us and for our sins. Being “made sin for us, and sent in the likeness of sinful flesh, yet without sin, he condemned sin in the flesh, bearing our sins in his own body on the tree.” Is this all, therefore, that the

great discourses of Crellius concerning “the expiatory sacrifice of Christ, his being a propitiation for our sins, his offering himself unto God for us,” with the like magnificent expressions of sacerdotal actings, do amount unto, — namely, that he frees us by his power from temptations and afflictions, with all the efficacy they have to destroy us? Is this, I say, to offer himself to God a true, perfect, complete expiatory sacrifice? Were it not much better wholly to deny that Christ was a high priest, or that he ever offered himself to God, than to put such strained and futilous senses on these expressions.

(3.) And because these men will have it so, all things must be spoken properly of the Aaronical priests, though they were umbratile, typical, figurative, temporary, and liable to such infirmities as exceedingly eclipsed the glory of the office itself; but all things spoken of the Lord Christ to the same purpose must be improper and metaphorical, and denote things of another nature, only called by the names of priesthood and sacrifice in allusion unto them and those things, who and which .were appointed and ordained of God for no other end or purpose but that they might prefigure him in the discharge of his office. And then, to salve the matter, the things so improperly assigned unto Christ must be said to be more excellent than the things that are properly ascribed unto the Aaronical priests, when indeed they are not, nor to be compared unto them; and if they were, yet would not that prove but that Aaron, though not absolutely, yet as unto the office of the priesthood, was more excellent than Christ, as being properly a priest, whereas the Lord Christ was so only metaphorically, which is a diminution as to that particular.

He closeth his discourse: “Istud adhuc antequam hinc abeamus notare libet, Paulum, [657]Romans 15:17, licet de munere suo apostolico loquatur, cujus vis circa homines primo versabatur, et quod, ut cum Grotio loquamur, erat pro Deo aut Christo apud homines, tamen quia ad sacrificia sacerdotiumque alludit dicere, se habere gloriationem, seu quod glorietur in Christo Jesu τὰ πρὸς Θεόν, ‘ in iis quae apud Deum.’”

Ans. This observation doth no way impeach the force of the testimony produced by Grotius. He intended no more by that expression, Τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, but to declare in the words of the apostle that *God was the object* of what was so performed; which certainly, unless some great

reason be produced unto the contrary, must be acknowledged to be the sense of the words. But Grotius proves his intention from the matter treated of, which is sacrifices; and if they are not offered unto God, and that for men, they are not at all what they are called. And in compliance with this sense the apostle respects the discharge of his conscience towards God in the work of his ministry, wherein he had immediately to do with him; for although men were the object of his ministry, yet he received it from God, and to him he was to give an account thereof. Wherefore he only declares how he had acquitted himself sincerely in that whole work, which was in an especial manner committed unto him of God, and whereof he was to give unto him a peculiar account.

20. I had sundry reasons why I chose to insist on a particular examination of these discourses of Crellius; for it is confessed that none among our adversaries have handled those things with more diligence and subtilty than he hath made use of. It was necessary, therefore, to give a specimen, as of his strength, so of his way and method, whereby he seeks to defend his opinions. And every impartial reader may see, in the discussion of what he allegeth or pleadeth, that the whole of his defense is made up of tergiversations, equivocations, and plausible diversions from the cause under debate. Besides, I have had sundry opportunities hereby to declare many things belonging to the nature and discharge of the priesthood of Christ which could not conveniently be reduced unto other heads. And I was willing, also, to cast these things into this place by themselves, to avoid all controversies as much as possible in the Exposition itself, though I constantly detect the falsehood of this man’s interpretations, as those of others who either follow him or comply with him. And hereby also, perhaps, some who are less exercised in the sophistry of these men may learn somewhat how they are to be dealt withal.

EXERCITATION 34.

PREFIGURATIONS OF THE PRIESTHOOD AND SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

1. *Prefigurations of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ.*

2. *The original, use, and practice of sacrifices before the law — Rabbinical conceits on* Psalm 69:32 *— Instances of the sacrifices of the patriarchs — Occasional, not stated.*

3. *No office of priesthood from the beginning — Men bound to offer sacrifices every one for himself.*

4. *Sacrifices in families, before the law and afterwards, among the heathen and in the church.*

5. *By whom those sacrifices were offered.*

6. *This further inquired into.*

7. *The rights of primogenitors — What Jacob took from Reuben,* Genesis 49:3, 4.

8. *Jews' apprehension of the rights of the first-born.*

9. *The right of sacrificing continued unto particular persons before the law, and to fathers of families.*

10. *The first rise of the priesthood in greater communities by lot or suffrage.*

11. *How far annexed to the kingly office.*

12. *Inquiry into the original of the priesthood among the Egyptians.*

13. *The story of the Hyksos in Manetho applicable to the Hebrews only.*

14. *Who were the priests of Egypt. 15, 16. The wise men, sorcerers, magicians of Egypt, and of the Chaldeans.*

1. SUNDRY things concerning the priesthood of Christ, and those the most material that relate thereunto, we have now passed through. But we know withal that although the foundations hereof were laid in the eternal counsels of God, and a revelation was made of them in the first promise, immediately upon the entrance of sin, yet the Son of God was not actually "manifested in the flesh," for the execution of those counsels and discharge of this office, until "the fullness of time" came, after the expiration of a multitude of ages In the meantime, there were certain prefigurations of it instituted of God in the church, to keep up and direct the faith of mankind unto what was to come, in sacrifices and a certain typical priesthood, with emanations from them into the practice of the nations of the world. Now,

what is worth our inquiry into, with reference unto these prefigurations of the priesthood of Christ, may be referred unto these four heads : —

(1.) The state of things in general, with respect unto priesthood and sacrifices in the church, before the giving of the law.

(2.) The peculiar priesthood of Melchizedek, which fell within that period of time.

(3.) The institution of the Aaronical priesthood at Mount Sinai, with the nature and duration of that office, the garments, sacrifices, laws, and succession, of the high priests in particular.

(4.) The rise, occasion, and usage, of a priesthood among the nations of the world. From all these we may learn both what God thought meet previously to instruct the church in concerning the future glories of the priesthood of Christ, and what presumptions there were in the light of nature concerning the substance of that work which he was to accomplish.

2. Our first inquiry will be as unto what monuments remain of either sacrifices or the order of priesthood, from and after the first promise and the institution of expiatory oblations, unto the solemn giving of the law in the wilderness, when all things were reduced into a methodical, instructive order.

The first institution of sacrifices, and revelation of an acceptable worship of God in and by them, I have declared before, and elsewhere discussed and proved at large. Hereupon, as is evident from many particular instances recorded in the Scripture, sacrifices were offered before the law: It is highly probable that Adam himself, after he had received the promise, which gave life and efficacy unto that kind of sacred service, did offer sacrifices unto God. And this some do suppose, and that not unwarrantably, that he did with the beasts with whose skins he was clothed, and that by the immediate direction of God himself. Hereby the whole of those creatures were returned to God, and their carcasses not left to putrefy on the earth. And so the whole was an illustrious exemplification of the promise newly given, or a type and representation of Christ and his righteousness; for as he was to be our real sacrifice of atonement to expiate Our sins, so are we said to put him on, or to be clothed with his righteousness. So typically was our first father, after his

receiving the promise, clothed with the skins of the beasts which were offered in sacrifice to make atonement; and therein was Christ a “lamb slain from the foundation of the world.” And those beasts seem rather to have been sheep or goats than the greater cattle of the herd, their skins being more meet for clothing. The Jews suppose that Adam sacrificed an ox or a bullock. So in the Targum on <19632>Psalm 69:32, אדם קדמי דקדימו לטלפוהו ותשפר צלותי קדם יי מן חור פטים ובחיר דקריב קרנוי; — “My prayer shall please God more than the fat and choice bullock, which Adam, the first man, offered, whose horns went before the dividing of the hoofs.” To the same purpose Rashi comments on the place: משור פד הוא שור שהקריב אדם הראשו שנברא בקומתו etc.; — “This is the ox which Adam, the first man, offered, which was created in his full stature; and they called him שור, an ox or bullock, in the day wherein he was brought; and he was like a bullock of three years old. And his horns went before his hoofs; for his head came first out of the earth when he was made, and his horns were seen before his hoofs.” It may be there is no more intended in this fable but an account of the order of these words, מַקְרִין מַפְרִיס, wherein the order of nature, the bringing forth of horns being placed before dividing of the hoofs, seems to be inverted, though nothing indeed be intended but the description of a bullock fit for sacrifice. But the authors of the fable may yet have had a further reach. The psalmist in that place prefers the moral and spiritual duties of obedience before sacrificing. This they will not allow to be spoken with reference unto the sacrifices of the law, and therefore put it off unto that of Adam, which they make their conjectures about. After this example Cain and Abel offered sacrifices, <01043>Genesis 4:3, 4; and Noah, <01820>Genesis 8:20; and Melchizedek, as we have showed, <01420>Genesis 14:20 and Abraham, <01509>Genesis 15:9, 10, <01223>Genesis 22:13; and Isaac, <01625>Genesis 26:25; and Jacob, <01828>Genesis 28:18, 35:3,7; and <18005>Job 1:5, <18408>Job 42:8. Express mention of more before the giving of the law I do not remember. Not that I think these were all the sacrifices which were offered according to the mind of God in that space of time. I doubt not but all the persons mentioned and multitudes besides did in those days offer sacrifices to God, thereby testifying their faith in the promise and expectation of the great expiatory sacrifice that was to come. Oblations were not yet, indeed, fixed unto times and seasons, as the most of them, especially the most

solemn, were afterwards under the law; and therefore I suppose their offering was occasional. Upon some appearance of God to them, on great mercies received, in times of great dangers, troubles, or perils, to themselves or families, when they were in doubts and perplexities about their affairs, and would inquire of God for direction, they betook themselves unto this solemn service, as the instances on record do manifest. And the only solemn sacrifices we read of among the heathen, traduced by imitation from the patriarchs, were for a long season such as were offered in the times of approaching wars, after victories, and upon the solemn covenanting of nations or rulers; who yet in process of time also made use of stated solemn sacrifices, and of those that were confined to the interests of private families.

3. It doth not appear that there was as yet any peculiar office of priesthood erected or instituted. But the persons who enjoyed the revelation of the promise and the institution of sacrifices may be considered two ways: —

(1.) *Personally*;

(2.) As *members of some society*, natural or political.

Families are natural societies, Greater voluntary combinations, for the preservation of human conversation unto all the ends of it, we may call political societies. Consider men in the first way, and every one was his own priest, or offered his own sacrifices unto God. Not that every one was instated in that office: for, to, make an office common to *all is* to destroy it; as it includes an especial privilege, faculty, power, and duty, which being made common, their being ceaseth. But every one was to perform that duty for himself, which upon the erection of the priesthood was confined and limited thereunto. It doth not, therefore, follow that because every one was to offer sacrifice, therefore every one was a priest in office. God giving out the prefigurations of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ πολυμερῶς, by distinct parts and degrees, he ordained the duty of sacrificing before he erected an office for the peculiar discharge of it. Thus Cain and Abel, as we have before observed, offered their own sacrifices, but could not both of them be priests; nor indeed was either of them so: nor was Adam, nor was it possible he should be so, before the increase and multiplication of his family; for a priest is not of one, but

must act in the name of others. Wherefore, sacrifice being a worship prescribed unto believing sinners, every one in his own person was to attend unto it, and did so at stated times or on solemn occasions, according as they apprehended the mind of God required it of them.

4. Secondly, As persons were united into any community, natural or political, this worship was required of them in that community; for this is a prescription of the law of nature, that every society, wherein men do coalesce according to the mind of God, should own their dependence on him with some worship common unto them, and to be performed in the name of the society. Especially is it so with respect to that which is the foundation of all others, in a household or family. So God gives unto Abraham the testimony of sincerity, that he would order and take care of his worship in his family, ◁0189Genesis 18:19. Hence there were sacrifices peculiar unto families before the law, wherein it cannot be doubted but the father of the family was the sacred administrator. So Job offered burnt-offerings for himself and his family, chap. 1:5; and Jacob for his, ◁0189Genesis 35:3, 7. Yet are they not hereon to be esteemed priests by office, seeing they had their warrant for what they did from the light and law of nature, but the office of the priesthood depends on institution. And such family sacrifices were famous among the heathens. An eminent instance hereof the Roman historian gives us in C. Fabius, who, when Rome was sacked by the Gauls, and the Capitol besieged, upon the stated time of the solemn worship and sacrifices of the family of the Fabii, passed through the enemy's camp to the Quirinal Hill, and discharged the accustomed "sacra," returning to the Capitol without disturbance or affront from the enemy, Liv. lib. 5:And the family ceremonies, in the sacrifice of an ox unto Hercules, by the Potitii and Pinarii, were adopted by Romulus and Numa into the use of the whole people, the posterity of those families being made as it were their public priests thereby. And after they had confirmed the administration of their "sacra" in public solemnities for the whole community, yet they left it free to single persons and families to sacrifice for themselves as they saw good; for as they took up the former course probably from the form and example of Mosaical institutions, so they retained the latter from the original practice and tradition of the world. Even the meanest of the people continued their family libations. "Sacrima" they called the wine which their countrymen

offered to Bacchus, as Festus testifies; and “carpur” the vessel out of which they drew the wine whereof they made a libation to Jupiter. “Struferta” and “suovetaurilia” were the sacrifices of poor families. And something in resemblance of this original practice continued among the people of God after the giving of the law. So the family of Jesse had an yearly sacrifice, which was a free-will offering, and a feast thereon, 1 Samuel 20:6. But it may be by the זֶבַח הַיָּמִים there was intended only a feast at which there was a slaughter of beasts. If a sacrifice be intended, the time and place were irregular. Or if the whole was pretended by David, yet is it hence evident that such things were in common use at that time, or no pretense could have been made of it. And if it was a sacrifice, it was offered by a legal priest, or the whole of it was an abomination. Philo, lib. in. de Vita Mosis, admits all the people afresh to this duty at the passover: Νόμου προστάξει σύμπαν τὸ ἔθνος ἱερâται, τοῦ κατὰ μέρος ἑκάστου τὰς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ζυσίας ἀναγόντος τότε καὶ ἱερουργοῦντος· — “By the appointment of the law the whole nation sacrificeth” (or “is employed in sacred duties”), “whilst every one brings his own sacrifice and slays it.” But this saying of his is not without its difficulties, and deserves further inquiry.

5. Persons united into *greater societies* for the ends of human conversation had, as we observed, the use of sacrifices among them as such, and which they were by the light of nature directed unto. So was it among the Israelites when the twelve original families, being multiplied into so many numerous tribes, were, by common consent, united into one people or nation, without any polity, rule, or order peculiarly accommodated unto the whole community. This was the condition of that people before the giving, of the law, the bonds of this union being consanguinity, agreement in design, outward state in the world with respect unto other, nations, all under the conduct of divine Providence unto a certain designed end. In this state there were some that offered sacrifice for the whole people: Exodus 24:4, 5,

> “Moses builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel. And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the LORD).”

It is probable these young men were the same with those who are called "the priests," chap. ^{Exod}19:22, 24, when as yet the office of the priesthood was not erected.

6. There hath been great inquiry who those priests were, or who they were who thus offered sacrifices for families or greater associations, and by what means they were invested with that privilege. By most it is concluded that they were the first-born of the families and tribes, and that the right of the priesthood before the giving of the law was a branch of the primogeniture. But whatever similitude there may be in what the light of nature-directed to and what was after sacredly appointed, yet this opinion will not easily be admitted by them who judge it necessary to resolve the original of the priesthood into a voluntary institution, as that which was to be *typical* and *representative* of the priesthood of Christ, which must be an immediate effect and emanation of divine wisdom and grace. Yet some suppose this opinion may be confirmed by the example of Melchizedek, who was the first called a priest of God in the world, being [according to them] Shem, the eldest son of Noah. But the whole of this argument is composed of most uncertain conjectures. It is uncertain whether Shem was the eldest son of Noah, and most probable that he was not so; more uncertain whether Melchizedek was Shem or no; yea, it is at the next door to the highest certainty that he was not so. And it is absolutely certain that he *was not a priest* on any account common to him with others, but by the immediate call or appointment of God; for had it been otherwise, when the Lord Christ was made a priest according to the order of Melchizedek, he must have been so according to that common order whereof his priesthood was, which is contrary unto his singular call to that office. And if an extraordinary instance may contribute any thing unto satisfaction in this inquiry, that of Moses is express to the contrary. He was a priest unto God: ^{Psalm}Psalm 119:6, "Moses and Aaron among his priests." And there is not any thing peculiar unto a priest but he discharged it in his own person. Yet was not he the eldest son of Amram his father, but younger than Aaron by three years, who was alive all the while he executed his priesthood. But from these extraordinary instances nothing certain in this case can be concluded. Micah afterwards, when he fell off from the law of institution in setting up teraphim and graven images, consecrated מִבָּנָיו אַחַד, one of his sons from amongst them,

which he thought meet, without regarding the primogeniture, (07)Judges 17:5. I have formerly thought that the הַכֹּהֲנִים הַנִּגָּשִׁים אֶל־יְהוָה, (02)Exodus 19:22, 24, “The priests which drew nigh to the LORD,” — which, as was now said, I still suppose and judge to be the same with the young men employed by Moses in the first solemn sacrifice in the wilderness, chap. (02)24:5, — were the first-born of the families: but I now rather judge that they were persons delegated by common consent, or immediate divine designation, which in that extraordinary dispensation supplied the room thereof, to act representatively in the name of the people; for the other opinion is attended with many difficulties, and exposed unto sundry exceptions not to be evaded.

7. The rise of this opinion concerning the office of the priesthood, or peculiar right of sacrificing for themselves and others, being annexed unto the primogeniture, is usually taken from the words and fact of Jacob with respect unto Reuben his eldest son: (01)Genesis 49:3, “Reuben, thou art, my first-born, my might, and the beginning of my strength, the excellency of dignity, and the excellency of power: unstable as water, thou shalt not excel.” The Targums make jointly this interpretation of the words, “Thou hast a threefold right above thy brethren, — בכראותא; the primogeniture, the priesthood, and the rule. But seeing thou hast sinned, the primogeniture shall be given to Joseph, the priesthood to Levi, and the rule or dominion to Judah.” But their authority, without further evidence, is not sufficient to determine this case. The privileges of the first-born were certainly great from the beginning. There was מִשְׁפַּט בְּכוֹרָה, a right of primogeniture, founded in the law of nature, determined in the judicial law unto Israel, and generally owned in some degree or other among all nations in the world. The foundation of it is expressed in these words of Jacob, כֹּחִי וְרֵאשִׁית אוֹנִי, — “ My might, and the beginning of my strength ;” that is, the spring unto all power and excellency that was to arise out of his posterity. In him it began, and in him was the foundation of it laid. And the same reason is repeated in the establishment of the law: הוּא רֵאשִׁית אֹנוֹ לוֹ מִשְׁפַּט הַבְּכֹרָה; — “ He is the beginning of his strength; his is the right of primogeniture,” (05)Deuteronomy 21:17. Hence this right was confined unto the firstborn of the father only, and not to the first-born of the mother, if her husband had had a son by another wife before. And if a man had more wives at the same time, he that was the

first-born of any of them was to have the privilege of the birthright, against all disadvantages on the mother's part, as if she were hated in comparison of the others; which manifests that it was a law of nature not to be transgressed, nor the right to be forfeited but by *personal sin and disobedience*, as it was with Esau and Reuben, <05215>Deuteronomy 21:15-17. There was, indeed, a privilege that belonged unto the first-born of every mother, by virtue of the especial law about פֶּטֶר רֶחֶם, him that opened the womb; for every such an one was to be "sanctified" or separated unto the Lord, <02132>Exodus 13:2; which among men was restrained unto the male: chap. <02229>22:29, "The first-born of thy sons shalt thou give unto me." And therefore we have added, in way of exposition of this law, in our translation, chap. <02319>34:19, "All that openeth the matrix is mine" (that is, the males). And it was instead of the first-born males only that the Levites were taken in exchange, <04040>Numbers 3:40-42. But this was a peculiar ceremonial law and privilege. There were two things that eminently belonged unto the πρωτοτοκεία, or right of primogeniture, before the law, the one whereof was confirmed also under it; and this was the privilege in "familia herciscunda," or distribution of the estate and inheritance of the family. For whereas every son was to have שְׁכֶם אֶחָד <01422>Genesis 48:22, "one part" or "shoulder," to bear the charge of his own especial family, so the first-born was to have פִּי שְׁנַיִם, <05217>Deuteronomy 21:17, that is, διπλᾶ, or μέρος διπλοῦν, "a double portion" of the inheritance. And this evidently Jacob took from Reuben and gave to Joseph, when he adopted his two sons, and gave each of them the inheritance of a tribe, Genesis 48. And there also belonged hereunto civil pre-eminence and right unto rule. The first-born had a principal honor among his brethren, and when rule and dominion was erected, without especial cause and alteration made by God himself, it belonged unto him. So do the words of God to Cain plainly signify: "Unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shelf rule over him," <01007>Genesis 4:7. And when God transferred in prophecy the birthright from Esau to Jacob, he did it in these words, "The elder shall serve the younger," chap. <01523>25:23; which Isaac also in the confirmation of it so expresseth,

> "Be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee," chap. <01729>27:29.

And so he tells Esau afterwards, “Behold, I have made him thy lord, and all his brethren have I given to him for servants,” verse 37. And this was by Jacob taken from Reuben and given unto Judah- Both these are expressly mentioned, <1 Chronicles 5:1, 2>

> “Reuben was the first-born; but, forasmuch as he defiled his father’s bed, his birthright was given unto the sons of Joseph: and the genealogy is not to be reckoned after the birthright. For Judah prevailed above his brethren, and of him came the chief ruler; but the birthright was Joseph’s.”

I confess the birthright here seems to be confined unto the double portion only, and is therefore proposed as totally transferred to Joseph, and to have comprised all that was lost by Reuben. The matter of rule is introduced so as that when God would erect it, he gave it to Judah without depriving any other of a right unto it. I will not therefore be positive that, by the law of nature, or any previous constitution of God, right unto rule belonged unto the primogeniture, but suppose it might be disposed unto the most worthy, as the Roman epitomator [f8] affirms it was at the beginning of all governments. However, here is no mention of the priesthood, which we inquire after.

8. The Mishnical Jews, in Masseceth Becaroth Peresh. 8, divide the rights of the primogeniture in נחלה and כהנה, “the inheritance” and “the priesthood,” and thereon *make* many distinctions *concerning* them, who may be the first-born, or have the right of primogeniture, as unto the one, but not unto the other. But by “the priesthood” they intend only the *dedication of the first-born* unto God upon the law of opening the womb. Now, this had no relation unto the priesthood properly so called. As far as it had its foundation in the law of nature, it was an offering unto God of the first-fruits of the family, all *primitiae* being due unto him; and hereby was the whole family made sacred and dedicated unto God: for “If the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy,” <Romans 11:16>. The place, therefore, mentioned in Becaroth intends not the priesthood. But in Bereshith Rabba, fol. 71, some of them do plainly ascribe the priesthood unto the primogeniture; and so doth Jerome from them, on <Genesis 17:27>, Epist. ad Evagr., and elsewhere, as do others also of the ancients. But in the whole law and order of the primogeniture, it is plain that God

designed to shadow out the Lord Christ in his offices, when, by his incarnation, he became the first-born of the creation, as to rule, ^{Col}Colossians 1:15, 18, ^{Rev}Revelation 1:5, ^{Heb}Hebrews 1:6; as to inheritance, ^{Heb}Hebrews 1:3, 4, ^{Eph}Ephesians 1:20; and as to sanctifying the whole family, ^{Heb}Hebrews 2:11.

9. Yet all that hath been spoken, or that may further be pleaded to the same purpose, doth not necessarily conclude that the right unto sacrificing by way of office was enclosed to the first-born before the giving of the law; and afterwards we know how it was disposed of by divine institution. There was, therefore, in that state of the church, no office of priesthood, but every one performed this duty and worship of sacrifice, "ex communi jure," with respect unto himself. As all were obliged to attend unto this worship of God, and express their faith in the promise thereby, so every one who was "sui juris," or had the free disposal of himself in all his moral actions, did in his own person attend unto his own duty herein. As persons were united into families, and made up one body naturally-political by God's appointment, the "pater familias" had the duty of sacrificing for the whole committed unto him. Herein it is probable he had the especial assistance of the first-born of the family, whereby he might be initiated into his future duty. Yet was it not afterwards confined to him; for Abel, who was the youngest son of his father, offered sacrifices for himself in his own person, his father and elder brother being yet alive. I no way doubt but that all the persons on the patriarchal line before the flood offered sacrifices to God; yet is it most uncertain whether they were all of them the first born of their respective parents. Abraham after the flood offered sacrifice whilst the eldest son of Noah was yet alive, neither was he himself the first-born of his immediate parents. Afterwards it is probable that the order and solemnity of public sacrificing went along in a peculiar manner with the birthright; not that it was a privilege thereof, but that the privilege of the birthright made what they did more extensive and illustrious. But this was continued only whilst a family continued by consent. When it divided, all things returned to their primitive right and practice. So was it when the younger sons of Noah were separated from the elder; they lost not the right of solemnizing the worship of God thereby. And in case the firstborn was incapable, through sin, idolatry, or apostasy from God, the right of the remainder was not prejudiced thereby,

but every one might personally attend unto the discharge of his duty herein; which after the giving of the law was not provided for. But this respected men only. Women were afterwards, among the heathen, admitted into the office of the priesthood, especially in the idolatries of Juno. But there was no induction towards any such practice in the light of nature or original tradition; for “the head of the woman is the man.” And the whole sex generally being supposed under the power of their parents or husbands, nothing remains on record of their solemnizing sacred worship in their own persons, though some conjectures have been made about Rebekah’s inquiry of God upon her conception of twins.

10. When greater *political societies,* being the products of the light, of nature acting by choice, and on necessity, were established, it was judged needful, or at least useful, not only that every one should offer sacrifice for himself that would, nor only that the head of each family should discharge that duty in the name of the whole family, — which expresses the first two directions of the law of nature, — but also that some one or more should offer sacrifice for the *whole community,* which had the solemn representation of a sacerdotal office. How these persons came originally in the world to be designed unto this work and office is a matter left much in the dark and obscure. The ways whereby God erected this office, and constituted any in the possession and enjoyment of it, are plain and evident: for he did it either by an *immediate call* from himself, as it was with Melchizedek in one manner, and Aaron in another, or by the constitution of a *legal succession* of priests, as it was with all the posterity of Aaron; concerning both which we shall treat afterwards distinctly. Our present inquiry is, how this order of things came to pass in the world, or when, — that some certain persons, under the name of priests, should have the administration of things sacred in the behalf of political communities committed unto them. And these are the ways that may be pleaded with good probability to this purpose: The first is, that the people or communities judging the duty of public sacrificing and religious administrations to be their duty, and necessary for them as a community, did choose out from among themselves, either by lot or suffrage, — the two original ways of all elections, — such as they judged meet for that purpose. So Virgil would have Laocoon designed to be a priest to Neptune by lot: —

“Laocoon, ductus Neptune sorte sacerdos.”
AEn. 2:201.

And in Statius it was by the choice of the people that Theodamas was made the priest of Apollo in the room of Amphiaraus. So he speaks to them, Thebaid. lib. 10:189: —

——”Non hae nostro de pectate voces:
Ille canit, cui me famulari, et sumere vittas
Vestra tides, ipse non discordante, subegit.”

And when, among the Romans, the care of sacred things had been devolved on their kings, upon their removal the people created priests by suffrage among themselves, and one under the name of “rex sacrorum,” that by the continuance of the name therein the office might not in any thing be missed, the civil power being fully transferred unto the consuls. See Dion. Halicarnass, lib. 5. So Livy: “Rerum deinde divinarum habita cura: et quia, quaedam publica sacra per ipses reges factitata erant, ne ubiubi regum desiderium esset, regem sacrificulum creant,” lib. 2. cap. 2. And the king of the “sacra” at Athens had the same original, as is manifest in Demosthenes. The Dacians so far improved this power as that, having at first made priests unto their gods, they at length made one of their priests to be their god.

And this I take to be one of the principal ways whereby, in the first coalescences of human society, the order of priesthood came to be erected among them. Possibly in their elections they might suppose themselves to have received guidance by some supernatural indication, of which afterwards; but it was consent and choice that gave them their authority and office.

11. Secondly, Those who had by any means obtained the rule of the community, knowing that with their power over it they had an obligation on them to seek its good, did take upon themselves the care of sacrificing for it, and performed it in their own persons. And there seems to be a natural traduction of the power and right of this kind of priesthood from the fathers of families unto the heads of political societies, which have a resemblance unto them. And thence the heathen writers do generally grant that the care of the administration of sacred things accompanied the supreme power, so that the kingdom and the priesthood amongst them for

a season went together. So Aristotle informs us of the kings in the heroical times, — that is, such as they had tradition but no history of: Κύριοι ἦσαν τῆς δὲ κατὰ πόλεμον ἡγεμονίας, καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ὅσαι μὴ ἱεροτικαί· — "They were rulers of things belonging unto the conduct of war, and had the ordering of sacrifices that were not in an especial manner reserved to the priesthood;" of the reason of which exception I shall afterwards give an account. And again: Στρατηγὸς ἦν καὶ δικαστὴς ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς κύριος, Aristot. Polit. lib3. — "The king was general, judge, and lord of things sacred." And Cicero: "Apud veteres, qui rerum potiebantur iidem auguria tenebant; ut enim sapere, sic divinare regale ducebant:" De Divin. lib. 1. cap. 40 The truth is, the use of sacrificing among the Gentiles, by the time we meet with any probable records of things among them, was much restrained, and principally attended unto in and with respect unto war, or an apprehension of the approach of public calamities. Hence it came to pass that they who had the chief command in war had power of sacrificing also. But if it was so that not only a right of sacrificing for the community occasionally, in the times of danger, belonged unto him who presided therein, but that the supreme power and priesthood went together in any greater societies, as traduced from the practice of families, it is evident that they were very quickly separated again, and vested in diverse persons, yet so as still to reserve unto kings and generals the privilege of sacrificing expiatory oblations in war; which they did sometimes by the death of beasts, sometimes of persons, and sometimes of themselves: for the first mention we have of priests in the world is distinct from kings in the same place. This was in Egypt, where we find the "cohanim," or priests, an order of men by themselves, under the power and care of their kings, How they came by that office originally, if we shall suppose that the right of sacrificing for the community went along with regal power and rule, I know not. It may be said that kings grew weary of that employment, as their greatness, wealth, and empire increased, and so suffered others to be chosen unto it, or designed them thereunto by their own power; or, that ambition and luxury rendering them unfit for the discharge of that office and negligent in it, the people provided for themselves as they could. Or it may be thought that some such things fell out in those early days of the world as did in later ages among the caliphs of the Saracens; for the world in all its varieties varieth not from itself. These caliphs, being originally the

successors of Mohammed, had all power civil and sacred in their hands; but through the sloth of some of them, military men, who had the power and charge of armies in their hands and disposal, took the civil power from them, and, making themselves emperors, left only the pontificate unto the caliphs, the principal dignity remaining unto them being an allowance to wear those garments and colors which they did as successors to Mohammed, when they had all the power. See Elmacin. Histor. Saracen. lib. 3. cap. 2. It might have so fallen out with those priests of Egypt. Being originally both princes and priests, they were confined to the sacerdotal function by some of more heroic spirits, who deprived them of rule and government; which alteration might constitute one of those changes in their dynasties which are so much spoken of. And thence, it may be (which Athenaeus observes), the priests of Egypt did always wear kingly garments. But these things are only conjectures, and that about matters wrapped up in the greatest obscurity. I rather judge that there was never an ordinary concurrence of both these offices in the same persons, though it sometimes so fell out on extraordinary occasions; as, —

Rex Anius, rex idem hominum Phoebique sacerdos."

And the most ancient reports among the heathen, both in the Eastern and Grecian traditions, mention these offices as distinctly exorcised by diverse persons. Homer hath his priests as well as his kings, though that which then was peculiar to them was divination, and not sacrificing.

Thirdly, Priests among the heathen might have their original from some extraordinary *afflatus*, real or pretended. It was with respect unto their gods that men had thoughts of sacrificing, or of the way of it. And the world was generally now become utterly at a loss both as to the nature and manner of religious worship, though the light of nature kept them up to a persuasion that the Deity was to be worshipped, and some small remainders of original tradition that sacrificing was an acceptable mode of religious worship still continued with them. But how to exert these notions in practice, or how to express their impressions from tradition, they knew not. But yet they still had an apprehension that the knowledge hereof dwelt with the gods themselves, and that from them they were to expect and receive direction. In this posture of the minds of men and their consciences, it is no wonder if some quickly pretended themselves to be

divinely inspired, and were as easily believed; for men who are utterly destitute of all means of divine and supernatural direction are given up unto as great an excess in facile credulity, as they are unto an obstinate unbelief of the most evident truths by whom such light and direction hath been rejected. And as this latter frame at this day discourageth men wise and sober in the proposal of sacred truths, upon the highest and most evident warranty, unto the sceptical atheism of rebels against the light; so the former encouraged crafty impostors to impose their pretended inspirations on the credulous multitude, as that they easily gave up unto them the entire conduct of their religious affairs. And Satan himself was sure not to be wanting to so great an occasion of promoting his interest in the world; and therefore, as he had diverted the minds of men before from the true and only object of all religious worship, entangling them in an endless maze of abominable idolatries, so, to secure them unto himself in. those tormenting, disquieting uncertainties whereinto he had cast them, he did actually intermix himself and all his power in the minds and imaginations of some persons, whom he had designed for the guides of others in their superstitions. And an appearance of his power and presence with them was that which instated and fixed them in a peculiar office of managing things esteemed sacred and religious. This was the certain and undoubted original of the stated solemn priesthood among the heathen, as will yet further appear.

12. To return, therefore, whence we have digressed, next to him who was the first priest in office in the .world, and that by virtue of divine appointment, — of whom I must treat afterwards distinctly and by himself, — those first mentioned under that name are the priests of Egypt, [1]Genesis 41:45, 47:22, 26. Concerning them, therefore, in the first place, our inquiry shall be.

It is very probable that the Egyptians began to have their stated “sacra” very early in the world; for they were the posterity of him who unquestionably made the first defection from true religion after the flood, and therefore most likely they first improved that superstition which they embraced in the room thereof. And hence it came to pass that having chosen both their deities and the manner of their veneration in the times of barbarity and darkness, before mankind had leisure to improve the remaining light of nature by contemplation, arts, and sciences, they fixed

on, and tenaciously adhered unto, such observances in their superstition as were ridiculous and contemptible unto all the world besides. In process of time they received many customs and usages in sacred things from Abraham and his posterity whilst they dwelt amongst them; much, it may be, particularly under the rule of Joseph, and more upon the fame and renown of their glorious law and divine order in religious worship. These customs and usages being observed among them by some Grecian writers long afterwards, divers of late are inclined to believe that the Israelites took them from the Egyptians, and not on the contrary. I mean not any of those superstitious and idolatrous customs which that people learned from the Egyptians, as weeping for Tammuz, even as they borrowed idolatries and superstitions from all their neighbors round about them, as I have elsewhere declared, but those institutions themselves which Moses gave them in the wilderness, and some that God had peculiarly given unto Abraham. Whether a due reverence unto divine revelations and institutions hath been observed herein, I shall elsewhere, God willing, make inquiry. In brief, the plainest state of the difference is this: God gives a law of divine worship unto his people in the wilderness, declares all the parts and observances of it to be of his own immediate appointment And in the declaration of his mind he allowed not Moses the interposition of any one word or conception of his own, but made him a mere internuncius, to make known his express commands and will to the people; nor did he allow him to do any thing but what he expressly and immediately ordained. In the meantime, making known to the people that all they were enjoined was from himself, he straitly forbids them to do any thing in his service after the manner whereby other nations served their idol gods. Yet notwithstanding it appears afterwards that sundry of the things which were so instituted and observed amongst them were observed also by the Egyptians. Hereupon it is inquired whether the Egyptians learned those things and took up the practice of them from the Israelites, or whether Moses (who, indeed, had no more to do with the intruding or appointing of those sacred institutions than hath the present reader, whoever he be) did not learn them in Egypt and prescribe them in the wilderness unto the people. But whereas the inquiry ought to be, not what Moses might learn of and receive from the Egyptians, but what God himself did so (for if we believe the Scripture at all, they were all of his own immediate appointment, without the interposition of the wit, invention, or memory

of Moses), so I shall say, that if any learned man can produce any one evident testimony, or but such an one as whose pretence unto a probability of truth I cannot make manifest to be vain, of the observation of any one sacred institution belonging peculiarly unto the system of Mosaical ordinances among the Egyptians before the giving of the law, I will pass on among the captives in their triumph for so great an achievement. But certain it is that men are exceedingly apt to take up with learned conjectures out of heathen writers, though pressing hard on the reputation of sacred truth.

13. An instance hereof, if I mistake not, may be taken from that space of time, and what sets out therein what we have now under consideration. Josephus in his Discourses against Apion, lib. 1. reports somewhat of the history of the Egyptians out of Manetho, a priest of Heliopolis, who wrote his story in the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus, about sixteen hundred years after Abraham's being in Egypt. Out of this man's writing, and in his own words, he gives an account of a nation that was called Hyksos, which in the Egyptian language signifieth "kingly shepherds." This nation, as he says, entered Egypt and subdued it, holding it for about five hundred years, erecting an especial dynasty therein. By these shepherds and their king, with Josephus, Manetho intended the Israelites and their abode in Egypt, although he mixed the story of it with many fabulous traditions; for under that name and character were they known to the Egyptians, and on the account of that profession of life whence they were so denominated lived separately from them. This story, with allowances for the fabulous tradition and invention of the reporter, is for the substance of it fairly reconcilable unto our sacred writings; yea, no other interpretation of it is consistent with them, as we shall manifest. But our late learned chronologers are generally of another mind. They will have a nation called by the Egyptians Hyksos, leaving no memorial of any name of their own, nor ground of any tolerable conjecture from whence they came, nor what became of them in the issue, nor why the Egyptians gave them that name, being a composition of what they most adored and most abhorred, to have entered Egypt presently after the death of Joseph, and conquering the whole kingdom, or at least all the lower and principal parts of it, to have erected a kingdom of their own therein. These, they say, were they who oppressed the Israelites, as is related in Exodus; and under

their rule was the people delivered, as in the same story, in the reign of Apophis, leaving them to rule in Egypt two or three hundred years after. Concerning this people, the principal things observed out of Manetho are, —

(1.) That they invaded the country in the reign of one Timaus, God being angry with the nation; and that they had no king of their own at their first entrance.

(2.) That after their entrance they made one from among themselves a king, whom they called Salatis.

(3.) That this Salatis took care about corn and its measures, with the stipends of soldiers.

(4.) That he and his successors endeavored to root out all the Egyptians.

(5.) That they kept Abatis (that. is, Pelusium) with a garrison of 240,000 soldiers, building of some other cities. Now, leaving unto others the liberty of their judgment, I cannot but declare that to me either this whole story is a mere coined fable, or it is the Hebrews alone that are intended in it, or that credit is not to be given unto our sacred story, as I shall evidently demonstrate. For, —

(1.) If the Hebrews and their abode in Egypt be not intended in this story, what credit is to be given unto the writings of this Manetho, and the skill he pretended in the antiquities of his country, or the sacred records from whence he boasteth to have transcribed his commentaries? For if the state of the Israelites be not here expressed, it is apparent that he had not any notice of it; for Josephus, searching of him no doubt with diligence, to find what he could discover concerning the antiquity and affairs of his own nation, could find nothing in his book concerning their coming into and departure from Egypt but this passage only. For what he mentions afterwards about the lepers and mixed people hath no consistency with the story of the Hebrews, but was a mere figment of the Egyptians, designing their reproach. And if this Manetho was utterly ignorant, and had no tradition of what befell his country in that terrible desolation and ruin, the like whereof never befell any nation under heaven, what reason have we to give the least credit unto any of his reports? A man may soberly judge, on such a supposition, that all his dynasties and kings, and

what fell out under them in ancient times, were mere figments of his own brain, like the story of Geoffrey of Monmouth concerning the succession of kings in this island from the coming of Brutus, which in like manner is pretended to be taken from sacred monastical archives.

(2.) The Israelites were at that time known by the name of shepherds, professing themselves to follow that course of life whence they were so denominated; and as such they were "an abomination unto the Egyptians." These things concurring with the ruin that befell Egypt at their departure, issued in such a fame and tradition as might easily be fabled upon by Manetho, an idolatrous priest, so long after. But that there should be two sorts of persons, two nations, at the same time in Egypt, both strangers, both called shepherds, the one oppressing the other, the Egyptians as it were unconcerned in both, seems rather to be a dream than to have any thing of real tradition or story in it. Besides, who the one sort of shepherds at that time were is known unto all; but as to the other sort, none can imagine whence they came, nor what was the end they were brought unto.

(3.) They are said by this Manetho to come into Egypt without a king, but afterwards made one of themselves so, who "in time of harvest ordered the measures of corn, and paid men their allowances" (ἐνθά τε κατὰ ζέρειαν ἤρχετο τὰ μὲν σιτομετρῶν καὶ μισθοφορίαν παρεχόμενος); which things have so plain a respect to Joseph as that he must shut his eyes who sees him not therein, especially since the times agree well enough.

(4.) Joseph had the exercise of all regal power committed unto him, who was one of the shepherds, and made laws and statutes, yea, changed the whole political interest of Egypt and the tenure of their lands, making the king the sole proprietor of the whole soil, leaving the people to hold it of him in a way of tenancy at a certain rate, by the way of acknowledgment and rent. This might well raise a fame of his being a king amongst them. And there is that herein which overthrows the whole fabulous supposition of the invasion and conquest of Egypt at that time by another nation. For Moses affirms that those laws of Joseph were in force and observed in Egypt unto the day of his writing that story, [1]Genesis 47:20-26. Now, this story supposeth that immediately after the death of Joseph came in a new nation, who utterly dispossessed the Egyptians of their country and

whole interest therein, taking it into their own power, possession, and use. And can any man think it probable that the laws made by Joseph about the rights of the king and the people should be in force and be observed by this new nation, who had conquered the whole, and at first, no man knows for how long, had no king at all? For they were these Hyksos, and not the Egyptians, who, according to Manetho, as interpreted by our chronologers, ruled in Egypt in the days of Moses. This, in my judgment, so long as men will acknowledge the divine authority of the writings of Moses, is sufficient to discard the whole story; for it is most certain that things could not be at the same time as Moses and Manetho report, if the Hebrews be not intended by him. And setting aside such considerations, certainly he who was a person renowned for wisdom and righteousness in the world, the ruler and conductor o£ a mighty nation, the first and most famous lawgiver on the earth, writing of things done in his own days and under his own eyes, is to be believed before an obscure, fabulous priest, who lived at least sixteen hundred years after the things fell out which he undertakes to relate.

(5.) The nation or people unto whom Abraham went down was to afflict him and his posterity four hundred years, and afterwards to be judged of God for their oppression, [OCR]Genesis 15:13, 14. Now, this cannot be affirmed, if they first went down unto one nation, and then were afflicted by another, as this story imports.

(6.) The people with whom the Israelites had to do from first to last, in a way of kindness and oppression, are called Mizraimites or Egyptians constantly; and although these Hyksos should have been in Mizraim, or Egypt, yet if they were not of the posterity of Mizraim, it could not be said in what they did that it was done by the Mizraimites. They were Egyptians who first received them and kindly entertained them; Egyptians they were who oppressed them and were their taskmasters; an Egyptian it was that Moses slew for his cruelty; Egyptians they were whom the people spoiled at their departure; and so in all other instances: whereas, if this story be rightly applied unto another nation, they received nothing but kindness from the Egyptians, and were oppressed wholly by another people.

(7.) The places which Manetho reports these Hyksos to have held peculiarly in garrison were most probably those built by the Israelites whilst oppressed by the Egyptians. It is generally agreed that Pithom, which was built by them, Exodus 1:11, was the same with Pelusium, and this the same with Abaris, which the Hyksos are said to maintain with 240,000 men; which great number are said afterwards to have been driven out of Egypt, and to have entered into Syria. He that shall reflect on the truth of the story in Moses, and withal consider the nature of the reports concerning the Hebrews leaving Egypt, in Trogus, Tacitus, and others, will not easily think that any but they are intended.

(8.) It is evident that whoever ruled Egypt at the departure of the Israelites, both himself, his whole host, and all the strength of the kingdom, were utterly destroyed. If it be supposed that those were the Hyksos, and not the Egyptians, and withal as it is said that the Egyptians in Thebais always waged war with these Hyksos, and expected an opportunity to recover their liberty, can it be imagined that they would have let go the advantage now put into their hands, when there was no strength left to oppose them? But this, according to the story, they did no way make use of; but after their destruction and desolation, the Hyksos continued to rule in Egypt two or three hundred years. Wherefore, this story, as it is framed by Manetho, and applied by some late learned chronologers, is inconsistent with the writings of Moses; and therefore, with those by whom their sacred authority is acknowledged, it can be no otherwise esteemed but as a fabulous declaration of that obscure tradition which the Egyptians had so long after of the Hebrews being in their country, and of the desolation which befell it thereby. “Malum habitat in aliendo fundo.” Had there not been somewhat of real truth in the business, there had been no occasion for this fabulous superstructure. The like account I shall give in its proper place of that other bold, and to speak plainly, false hypothesis, that many of the Mosaical religious institutions were taken from the usages and customs of the Egyptians in their sacred rites.

14. But to return. The כֹּהֲנִים, or “priests,” mentioned among the Egyptians, were probably princes of the people at the first. And translators are yet dubious whether they should render the word in its places “priests” or “princes.” At first they were designed by common

consent to take care of the “sacra” which belonged unto the community, which grew into an hereditary office; nor can I give any other probable conjecture concerning them. Appointed they seem to have been to comply with the catholic tradition of sacrificing, or. doing something in lieu of it, for the good of the community. And their function continued in principal reputation in after ages, increasing in popular veneration and esteem as superstition increased among them, which was fast enough, until it had even tired itself with its own extravagancies and excess.

15. Besides these “cohanim,” there were in Egypt at the same time other sorts of men, whom we call “magicians and sorcerers,” whose arts or delusions were afterwards generally followed by the priests of other nations; or, it may be, upon some neglect of the service of their gods, these men, pretending unto a familiarity and acquaintance with them, took the office upon themselves, promising supernatural effects in the execution of it. There seem to be three sorts of them expressed, Exodus 7:11. There are the חַכָמִים, “chacamim, and מְכַשְּׁפִים mecashshephim, and חַרְטֻמִים, “chartummim.” The “chacamim,” which we render “wise men,” are here distinguished from the “mecashshephim,” or “sorcerers;” but the “chartummim,” or “magicians,” seem to comprise both the other sorts, the “chacamim” and “mecashshephim: Then Pharaoh called the wise men and the sorcerers: now the magicians of Egypt, they also did in like manner with their enchantments.” But Genesis 41:8, the “chacamim,” or “wise men,” are distinguished from the “chartummim,” or “magicians,” as they are here from the “mecashshephim,” or “sorcerers;” and therefore we shall consider them distinctly.

The חַכָמִים are constantly rendered by the LXX. σοφοί, and all other translations are compliant, the word being of a known obvious signification, and commonly taken in a good sense, “wise men ;” for they were they who afterwards, when the contemplation of things secret and hidden first found acceptance and then applause in Greece, were called σοφοί and then φιλόσοφοι. But the original of their studies seem to have been in things magical, curious, and diabolical; in which arts philosophy made its last attempt in the world under Apollonius and some other Pythagoreans, — so, like an “ignis fatuus,” expiring as it began. Wherefore these “chacamim,” now of such reputation in Egypt, were such as had separated themselves unto the study of curious arts and the speculation of

hidden things; into whose contemplations Satan variously insinuated himself, giving them an esteem and honor among the common people on the account of their skill in things unto them unknown; they gratifying him, on the other hand, in promoting his design for superstition and idolatry. This gave them the title of “wise men;” which yet possibly, in the judgment of those who really were so, was confined unto their trade and profession, for we hear not of their use on any other occasion. <0207b>Exodus 7:11, the *LXX*. render חַכָמִים by σοφισταί, “Men subtle to deceive.” Hence, probably, in the expression of what was done by their counsel, Luke useth κατασοφισάμενος, “dealt subtilly,” <4479>Acts 7:19.

Those joined in one place with these wise men are the מְכַשְּׁפִים The name is originally Hebrew, from כָּשַׁף, “praestigias exercuit.” The LXX. render it by φαρμακοί, “venefici;” and the Targum by חרש, “praestigiator,” “jugglers, impostors,” and also “conjurers.” They seem to have pretended unto the revelation or discovery of things secret and hidden; whence the Arabic כשף signifies “to cover,” “to reveal,” “to make known.” Such a sort of impostors the world was always pestered withal, which were of old in great reputation, though now the scorn of the multitude. Probably they had an access unto the administration of things sacred, whence the word in the Syriac denotes “to pray,” “to administer in things holy,” and “to sacrifice.” The “chartummim” are those unto whom all magical effects are peculiarly assigned. It doth not appear whether they were a peculiar sect distinct from the other two, or some of them more eminently skilled in magical operations than the rest. The name is foreign to the sacred language, probably Egyptian, though in use also among the Chaldeans, unto whom this diabolical skill and practice were traduced from Egypt. The LXX. render them, <0408>Genesis 41:8, ἐξηγηταί, “interpreters,” according to the matter in hand, it being the interpretation of the dreams of Pharaoh which was inquired after, wherein also they boasted their skill. <0207b>Exodus 7:11, they render it ἐπαοιδοί, “incantatores, enchanters.’’ The Vulgar Latin omits the name, and to supply that omission renders בְּלַהֲטֵיהֶם, “per incantationes Egyptiacus, “by their Egyptian enchantments.” Some render it by “genethliaci,” which Aben Ezra gives countenance unto on <2702>Daniel 2:2, calling them התלדות חכמי, “men skilled in casting nativities;” others by “malefici, arioli, magi,

necromantici," "witches, conjurers, magicians;' Targum, חרשׁים; in the common translation, Genesis 41:8, "magistri," without any reason. It is plain and evident that they were a sort of persons who pretended unto a power of miraculous operation, and made use of their skill and reputation in opposition unto Moses. Their chiefs at that time were Jannes and Jambres, mentioned by our apostle, 2 Timothy 3:8, as they are likewise spoken of in the Talmud, and are joined with Moses by Pliny, as persons famous in arts magical. It is not unlikely but that this sort of men might have been cast under some disgrace by failing in the interpretation of the dreams of Pharaoh, the knowledge whereof was of so great importance unto the whole nation. This being done by Joseph, whose eminent exaltation ensued thereon, it is not improbable but that they bore a peculiar malice towards all the Israelites, being, moreover, instigated and provoked by the knowledge and worship of the true God that was among them. This made them vigorously engage in an opposition unto Moses, not only in compliance with the king, but, as our apostle speaks, ἀντέστησαν, — " they set themselves against him;" which includes more than a mere production of *magical effects* upon. the command of Pharaoh, whereby they attempted to obscure the lustre of his miracles, — even a sedulous, active, industrious opposition to his whole design. And besides, whereas they knew that Moses was skilled in all the learning of the Egyptians, and not perceiving at first any peculiar presence of divine power with him, they thought themselves sufficient for the contest, until they were forced, by the evidence of his miraculous operations, to acknowledge the energy of a divine power above what they could imitate or counterfeit. The name, as was said, is Egyptian, as was the art they professed. And it is not unlikely but that those which Moses calls כֹּהֲנִים, "cohanim," were in the Egyptian language called חַשְׁמַנִּים, "chashmannim," who are mentioned Psalm 68:32, which we render "princes," who are said to come out of Egypt in the profession of subjection unto the kingdom of Christ; for the word is Egyptian, and nowhere else used.

16. Unto these Egyptian artists two other sorts were added among the Babylonians, Daniel 2:2. Besides the "chartummim" and "mecashshephim," which managed these arts in Egypt, whence their skill and names were traduced unto the Chaldeans, there were among their wise

men אַשָּׁפִים, “ashshaphim,” and כַּשְׂדִּים, “casdim” also. How these two sorts were distinguished between themselves, or from the others named with them, is altogether unknown. Strabo tells us that the astrologers, magicians, and philosophers, among the Chaldeans, were called by various names: Καὶ γὰρ ᾽Ορχηνοί τινες προσαγορεύονται, καὶ Βορσιππηνοί, καὶ ἄλλοι πλείους, lib. 16, cap. 1. — “ Some were called Orcheni, and some Borsippeni; as also there were other sorts of them.” “Ashshaphim” are rendered “philosophers, astronomers, astrologers, physicians,” merely on conjecture, and not from any signification of the name, which is unknown. The “casdim,” or Chaldeans, seem to have been a sort of people that claimed their pedigree in an especial manner from the first inhabitants of those parts, being the posterity of Chesed, the son of Nahor. These, probably, being overpowered by a confluence of other sects of men, betook themselves unto those curious arts which afterwards were famous, or [rather] infamous, throughout the world under their name; for the prognostication of future events, which they pretended unto, is a thing that the world always despised and yet inquired after. So Strabo describes them: ᾽Αφώριστο δ᾽ ἐν τῇ Βαζυλωνίᾳ κατοικία τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις φιλοσόφοις, τοῖς Χωλδαίοις προσαγορευομένοις, [ubi supra;] — “There is in Babylonia a peculiar place of habitation assigned unto philosophers born in or deriving their race from the country, called Chaldeans.” We may take a brief view of them all in their order, expressed in Daniel 2:2. The first are the “chartummim.” They were they to whom all the magical operations in Egypt are ascribed; and the name itself is Egyptian, though some would have it of a Hebrew extract R. Saadias would derive it from חוּר, “a hole;” and אָטוּם, “shut,” or “closed;” supposing they gave their answers from a hole in the earth, as the oracle at Dodona out of an oak. Some deduce it from חָרַט, as Avenarius and Manasseh Ben Israel, judging them a sort of persons who used a style or graving tool to cut characters and pictures to work their enchantments by. See Fuller. Miscellan., lib. 5:cap. 11. Hottinger, with most probability, conjectures the name to be token from חרד, which in the Persian language still signifies “to know,” ד being changed into ט, as is usual. For all such impostors do always represent themselves as persons endued with excellent skill and knowledge; and as such are they by the common people

esteemed. A sort of people they were pretending to supernatural operations by virtue of a hidden power present with them, — that is, diabolical. The next mentioned are the “ashshaphim,” distinguished from the “chartummim,” as another sort and sect, by vau copulative. Aben Ezra renders them by הרופאים, “physicians.” Some would have the name the same with the Greek σοφοί, and so a general name for all professors of secret knowledge, and of the causes of things natural. In the Concordance of Rabbi Nathan, אשף is חוזה, “*a* seer, a prophet, a prognosticator.’ The third sort are the “mecashshephim,” from כְּשַׁף, “to divine.” See 14336 2 Chronicles 33:6; 05304 Deuteronomy 18:10; 02274 Exodus 22:17. Maimonides, and many that follow him among the Jews, suppose these to have been such as, framing images and pictures of things above, included such powers in them by incantation as could intercept the influences of the heavenly bodies, and thereby produce rare and wonderful effects, but always hurtful and noxious. Of the “casdim” we have spoken before. He that would further satisfy himself in the nature of the arts they professed may consult Maimonides in More Nebuchim, lib. 3 cap. 37; Polydor. Virgil de Rerum Incantor. p. 85; Rhodigni. Var. Lec., lib. 9:cap. 23; Sixtus Senensis, Biblioth. Tit. Curio Sacrarum Artium libri; Danaeus de Praestigiatoribus; Kircher. OEd. tom. 2, part. 2, fol. 456; Bantus Coelum Orientale; Pictures of Witchcraft; Delrio, Disqusit. Rerum Magicarum, lib. 1, cap. 2, lib. 2; Pelan. in 27012 Daniel 2:2; Geierus Daniel; Agrippa de Occults Philosophia, etc. Strabo informs us that in his time they had lost all their skill and arts, and that the remainders of them were only a kind of priest that attended unto sacrificing, lib. 17; and he says that one Chaeremon, who went along with AElius Gallus, the governor of Egypt, undertaking still to practice their arts, was ridiculous unto all for his ignorance and arrogance.

I have diverted unto the consideration of these sorts of men, as finding some of them in this space of time, before the giving of the law, looked on as those who had more acquaintance and intimacy with the deities in common veneration than ordinary, and were thereon esteemed as priests and sacred. But it is plain that they were such as the devil excited, acted, and after a sort inspired, to draw off the minds of men from the knowledge and fear of the only true God and his worship. Wherefore, notwithstanding their pretense of interposing between men and a divine

power, which Satan made use of, to discover things hidden, and to effect marvellous operations, as also that at length they became public sacrificers, yet are they to be utterly excluded from all consideration in those prelibations and prefigurations of the priesthood of Christ which derived themselves from divine institution through the catholic tradition of mankind.

AN ADVERTISEMENT UNTO THE READER.

HAVING made this entrance into what I had designed concerning the prefigurations of the priesthood of Christ in the church and in the world, I find the full discussion of all things thereunto belonging will require larger discourses than either my present indisposition as unto health will allow me to engage into, or the printer's haste admit of a stay for. Wherefore, having despatched the whole doctrinal part of the sacerdotal office of Christ, which was my principal design in these Exercitations, I do crave the reader's pardon to transmit the remainder of our historical observations unto the publication of another part of our Exposition of the Epistle, if God shall be pleased to afford that occasion and opportunity.

EXERCITATIONS

CONCERNING

THE NAME, ORIGINAL, NATURE, USE, AND CONTINUANCE OF A DAY OF SACRED REST:

WHEREIN

THE ORIGINAL OF THE SABBATH FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD, THE MORALITY OF THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT, WITH THE CHANGE OF THE SEVENTH DAY, ARE INQUIRED INTO;

TOGETHER WITH

AN ASSERTION OF THE DIVINE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S DAY, AND PRACTICAL DIRECTIONS FOR ITS DUE OBSERVATION.

Διὰ δυσφημίας καὶ εὐφημίας.— ***2 Corinthians 6:8.***

Search the Scriptures, — John 5:39.

TO THE READER.

CHRISTIAN READER,

THERE are two great concerns of that religion whose name thou bearest, — the *profession* of its truth, and the *practice* or exercise of its power. And these are mutually assistant unto each other. Without the profession of faith in its truth, no man can express its power in obedience; and without obedience profession is little worth. Whatever, therefore, doth contribute help and assistance unto us in either of these, according to the mind of God, is to be highly prized and valued. Especially it is so in such a season as this, wherein the former of them is greatly questioned, and the latter greatly neglected, if not despised. But if there be any thing which doth equally confirm and strengthen them both, it is certainly of great necessity in and unto religion, and will be so esteemed by them who place their principal concerns in these things. Now, such is the solemn observation of a sacred weekly day of rest unto God; for amongst all the outward means of conveying to the present generation that religion which was at first taught and delivered unto men by Jesus Christ and his apostles, there hath been none more effectual than the catholic, uninterrupted observation of such a day for the celebration of the religious worship appointed in the gospel. And many material parts of it were unquestionably preserved by the successively-continued agreement of Christians in this practice. So far, then, the profession of our Christian religion in the world at this day doth depend upon it. How much it tends to the exercise and expression of the power of religion cannot but be evident unto all, unless they be such as hate it, — who are not a few. With others it will quickly appear unto a sober and unprejudicated consideration; for no small part hereof doth consist in the constant payment of that homage of spiritual worship which we owe unto God in Jesus Christ. And the duties designed thereunto are the means which he hath appointed for the communication of grace and spiritual strength unto the due performance of the remainder of our obedience. In these things consist the services of this day; and the end of its observation is their duo performance, unto the glory of God and the advantage of our own souls. Whereas, therefore, Christian religion may be considered two ways ; — first, as it is publicly and solemnly professed in

the world, whereon the glory of God and the honor of Jesus Christ do greatly depend; and, secondly, as it prevails and rules in the minds and lives of private men, — neither of them can be maintained without a due observance of a stated day of sacred rest. Take this away, neglect and confusion will quickly cast out all regard unto solemn worship. Neither did it ever thrive or flourish in the world from the foundation of it, nor will do so unto its end, without a due religious attendance unto such a day. Any man may easily foresee the disorder and profaneness which would ensue upon the taking away of that whereby our solemn assemblies are guided and preserved. Wherefore, by God's own appointment, it had its beginning and will have its end with his public worship in this world. And take this off from the basis whereon God hath fixed it, and all human substitutions of any thing in the like kind to the same purposes will quickly discover their own vanity. Nor without the advantage which it affords, as it is the sacred repository of all sanctifying ordinances, will religion long prevail in the minds and lives of private men; for it would be just with God to leave them to their own weaknesses and decays, — which are sufficient to ruin them, — who despise the assistance which he hath provided for them, and which he tenders unto them. Thus, also, we have known it to have fallen out with many in our days, whose apostasies from God have hence taken their rise and occasion. This being the ease of a weekly sacred day of rest unto the Lord, it must needs be our duty to inquire and discern aright, both what warrant we have for the religious observance of such a day, as also what day it is in the hebdomadal revolution that ought so to be observed. About these things there is an inquiry made in the ensuing discourses, and some determinations on that inquiry. My design in them was to discover the fundamental principles of this duty, and what ground conscience had to stand upon in its attendance thereunto; for what is from God in these things is assuredly accepted with him. The discovery hereof I have endeavored to make, and therewithal a safe rule for Christians to walk by in this matter, so that for want thereof they may not lose the things which they have wrought. What I have attained unto of light and truth herein is submitted to the judgment of men learned and judicious. The censures of persons heady, ignorant, and proud, who speak evil of those things which they know not, and in what they naturally know corrupt themselves, I neither fear nor value. If any discourses seem somewhat dark or obscure unto ordinary readers, I desire

they would consider that the foundations of the things discoursed of lie deep, and that no expression will render them more familiar and obvious unto all understandings than their nature will allow. Nor must we in any ease quit the strengths of truth because the minds of some cannot easily possess themselves of them. However, I hope nothing will occur but what an attentive reader, though otherwise but of an ordinary capacity, may receive and digest. And they to whom the argument seems hard may find those directions which will make the practice of the duty insisted on easy and beneficial. The especial occasion of my present handling this subject is declared afterwards. I shall only add, that here is no design of contending with any, of opposing or contradicting any, of censuring or reflecting on those whose thoughts and judgments in these things differ from ours, begun or carried on. Even those by whom a holy day of rest under the gospel and its services are laughed to scorn are by me left unto God and themselves. My whole endeavor is to find out what is agreeable unto truth about the observance of such a day unto the Lord; what is the mind and will of God concerning it; on what foundation we may attend unto the services of it, as that God may be glorified in us and by us, and the interest of religion, in purity, holiness, and righteousness, be promoted amongst men.

J.O.
January 11, 1671.

EXERCITATION 1.

DIFFERENCES CONCERNING A DAY OF SACRED REST — PRINCIPLES DIRECTING TO THE OBSERVANCE OF IT — THE NAME OF THE DAY CONSIDERED.

Ἄρα ἀποκειπεται σαββατυσμος τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ.—*Hebrews 4:9.*

1. *Trouble and confusion from men's inventions;*

2. *Instanced in doctrines and practices of a sabbatical rest.*

3. *Reason of their present consideration.*

4. *Extent of the controversies about such a rest.*

5. *A particular enumeration of them.*

6. *Special instances of particular differences, upon an agreement in more general principles.*

7. *Evil consequences of these controversies in Christian practice.*

8. *Principles and rules proposed, for the right investigation of the truth in this matter.*

9. *Names of a sacred day of rest,* יוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי, Ἡ εβδόμη, ἱερὰ εβδόμη, Genesis 2:3, Hebrews 4:4.

10. יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת שַׁבָּת מְשֻׁבָּת מִשְׁבָּת שַׁבָּתוֹן, Genesis 2:2; Exodus 16:23, 35:2; Lamentations 1:7 — *Saturn called* שבתי *and* שבתאי *by the Jews, and why — The word doubled —* שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן *— Reason of it.*

11. *Translation of this word into the Greek and Latin languages —* Μία σαββάτων.

12. *All Judaical feasts called sabbata by the heathen — Suetonius, Horace, Juvenal, cited to this purpose.*

13. Ἡμέρα ἡλίου, *Sunday — Used by Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Eusebius — Blamed by Austin, Jerome, and Philastrius.*

14. *Use of the names of the days of the week derived from the heathen of old — Custom of the Roman church.*

15. *First day of the week — Lord's day — Lord's-day Sabbath.*

1. SOLOMON tells us that in his disquisition after the nature and state of things in the world, this alone he had found out, that is, absolutely and unto his satisfaction, namely, that "God made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions," Ecclesiastes 7:29. And the truth hereof we also find by woful experience, not only in sundry particular instances,

but in the whole course of men in this world, and in all their concerns with respect unto God and themselves. There is not any thing wherein and whereabout they have not found out many inventions, to the disturbance and perverting of that state of peace and quietness wherein all things were made of God. Yea, with the fruits and effects of this perverse apostasy, and relinquishment of that universally harmonious state of things wherein we were created, not only is the whole world as it lies in evil filled, and as it were overwhelmed, but we have the relics of it to conflict withal, in that reparation of our condition which in this life, by grace, we are made partakers of. In all our ways, actions, and duties, some of these inventions are ready to immix themselves, unto our own disturbance, and the perverting of the right ways of God.

2. An evident instance we have hereof in the business of a day of sacred rest, and the worship of God therein required. God originally, out of his infinite goodness, when suitably thereunto, by his own eternal wisdom and power, he had made all things good, gave unto men a day of *rest*, as to express unto them his own rest, satisfaction, and complacency in the works of his hands, so to be a day of rest and composure to themselves, and a means of their entrance into and enjoyment of that rest with himself, here and for ever, which he had ordained for them. Hence it became unto them a principle and pledge, a cause and means, of quietness and rest, and that in and with God himself. So might it be still unto the sons of men, but that they are in all things continually finding out new inventions, or immixing themselves in various questions and accounts; for so saith the wise man, חֻמָּה בִקְּשׁוּ חִשְׁבֹּנוֹת רַבִּים, — "Themselves have sought out many computations."

And hence it is that whereas there are two general concernments of such a day, — the doctrine and the practice of it, or the duties to be performed unto God thereon, — they are both of them solicited by such various questions, through the many inventions which men have found out, as have rendered this *day of rest* a matter of *endless strife,* disquietment, and contention. And whereas all doctrines of truth do tend unto practice, as their immediate use and end, the whole Scripture being ἀλήθεια ἥ κατ᾽ εὐσέζειαν, Tit. 1:1, "the truth which is after godliness," the contentions which have been raised about the doctrine of the holy day of rest have greatly influenced the minds of men, and weakened them in that practice of

godliness which all men confess to be necessary in the observation of such a day of rest unto the Lord, if such a day of rest there be, on what foundation soever it is to be observed. For Christians in general, under one notion or other, do agree that a day of rest should be observed, in and for the celebration of the worship of God. But whereas many controversies have been raised about the grounds of this observance, and the nature of the obligation thereunto, advantage hath been taken thereby to introduce a great neglect of the duties themselves for whose sakes the day is to be observed, whilst one questions the reasons and grounds of another for its observation, and finds his own by others despised. And this hath been no small nor ineffectual means of promoting that general profaneness and apostasy from strict and holy walking before God which at this day are everywhere so justly complained of.

3. It is far from my thoughts and hopes that I should be able to contribute much unto the composing of these differences and controversies, as agitated amongst men of all sorts. The known pertinacy of inveterate opinions, the many prejudices that the minds of most in this matter are already possessed withal, and the particular engagements that not a few are under to defend the pretensions and persuasions which they have published and contended for, will not allow any great expectation of a change in the minds of many from what I have to offer. Besides, there are almost innumerable critical discourses on this subject in the hands of many, to whom perhaps the report of our endeavors will not arrive. But yet these and the like considerations, of the darkness, prejudices, and interests of many, ought not to discourage any man from the discharge of that duty which he owes to the truths of God, nor cause him to cry with the sluggard, “There is a lion without, I shall be slain in the streets.” Should they do so, no truth should evermore be taught or contended for; for the declaration of them all is attended with the same difficulties, and liable to the same kind of opposition. Wherefore, an inquiry into this matter being unavoidably cast upon me, from the work wherein I am engaged, in the exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, I could not on any such accounts waive the pursuit of it; for this discourse, though upon the desires of many now published by itself, is but a part of our remaining Exercitations on that Epistle. Nor am I without all hopes but that what shall be declared and proved on this subject may be blessed to an

usefulness unto them who would willingly learn, or be established in the truth. An attempt also will be made herein for the conviction of others, who have been seduced into paths inconsistent with the communion of saints, the peace of the churches of Christ, or opinions hurtful to the practice of godliness; and left unto the blessing of Him who, when he hath supplied seed to the sower, doth himself also give the increase. And these considerations have prevailed with me to cast my mite into this sanctuary, and to endeavor the right stating and confirmation of that doctrine whereon so important a part of our duty towards God doth depend, as is generally confessed, and will be found by experience, that there doth on this concerning a day of sacred rest.

4. The controversies about the Sabbath (as we call it at present for distinction's sake, and to determine a subject of our discourse), which have been publicly agitated, are universal; as unto all its concerns. Neither name nor thing is by all agreed on. For whereas most Christians acknowledge (we may say all, for those by whom it is denied are of no weight, nor scarce of any number) that a day on one account or other, in a hebdomadal revolution of time, is to be set apart for the public worship of God, yet how that day is to be called is not agreed amongst them. Neither is it granted that it hath any name affixed unto it, by any such means that should cause it justly to be preferred unto any other, that men should arbitrarily consent to call it by. The names which have been, and amongst some .are still, in use for its denotation and distinction, are, the *seventh day,* the *Sabbath,* the *Lord's day*, the *first day of the week, Sunday.* So was the day now commonly observed called o£ old by the Grecians and Romans, before the introduction of religion into its observation; and this name some still retain, as a thing indifferent; others suppose it were better left unto utter disuse.

5. Those about the thing itself are various, and respect all the concerns of the day inquired after. Nothing that relates unto it, no part of its respect to the worship of God, is admitted by all uncontended about. For it is debated amongst all sorts of persons, —

(1.) Whether *any part of time* be naturally and morally to be separated and set apart to the solemn worship of God; or, which is the same, whether it be natural and moral duty to separate any part of time, in any revolution

of it, unto divine service, — I mean, so as it should be stated and fixed in a periodical revolution. Otherwise, to say that God is solemnly to be worshipped, and yet that no time is required thereunto, is an open contradiction.

(2.) Whether such a time supposed be *absolutely and originally moral*, or made so by positive command, suited unto general principles and intimations of nature. And under this consideration also a part of time is called *moral* metonymically from the duty of its observance.

(3.) Whether, on supposition of some part of time so designed, the space or quantity of it have its determination or limitation *morally*, or merely by law positive or arbitrary; for the observation of some part of time may be moral, and the "quota pars" arbitrary.

(4.) Whether every law positive of the old testament was absolutely *ceremonial*, or whether there may not be a law *moral-positive*, as given to and obligatory on all mankind, though not absolutely written in the heart of man by nature; that is, whether there be no morality in any law but what is a part of the law of creation.

(5.) Whether the institution of the seventh-day Sabbath was *from the beginning of the world*, and before the fall of man, or whether it was first appointed when the Israelites came into the wilderness. This in itself is only a matter of fact, yet such as whereon the determination of the point of right, as to the universal obligation unto the observation of such a day, doth much depend; and therefore hath the investigation and true stating of it been much labored in and after by learned men.

(6.) Upon a supposition of the institution of the Sabbath from the beginning, whether the additions made and observances annexed unto it at the giving of the law on mount Sinai, with the ends whereunto it was then designed, and the uses whereunto it was employed, gave unto the seventh day a *new state*, *distinct from what it had before*, although naturally the same day was continued as before; for if they did so, that new state of the day seems only to be taken away under the new testament. If not, the day itself seems to be abolished; for that some change is made therein from what was fixed under the Judaical economy cannot modestly be denied.

(7.) Whether in the fourth commandment there be a foundation of a distinction between a *seventh day in general*, or *one day in seven*, and that *seventh day* which was the same numerically and precisely from the foundation of the world. For whereas an obligation unto the strict observation of that day precisely is, as we shall prove, plainly taken away in the gospel, if the distinction intimated be not allowed there can be nothing remaining obligatory unto us in that command, whilst it is supposed that that day is at all required therein.

(8.) Hence it is especially inquired, whether a seventh day, or one day in seven, or in the hebdomadal cycle, be to be observed holy unto the Lord, on the account of the *fourth commandment.*

(9.) Whether, under the new testament, all *religious observation of days* be so taken away as that there is no divine obligation remaining for the observance of any one day at all, but that as all days are alike in themselves, so are they equally free to be disposed of and used by us, as occasion shall require; for if the observation of one day in seven be not founded in the law of nature, expressed in the original positive command concerning it, and if it be not seated morally in the fourth commandment, it is certain that the necessary observance of it is now taken away.

(10.) On the other extreme, whether the seventh day from the creation of the world, or the last day of the week, be to be observed *precisely* under the new testament, by virtue of the fourth commandment, and no other. The assertion hereof supposeth that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath, hath neither changed nor reformed any thing in or about the religious observation of a holy day of rest unto the Lord; whence it follows that such an observation can be no part or act of evangelical worship properly so called, but only a moral duty of the law.

(11.) Whether on the supposition of a non-obligation in the law unto the observance of the seventh day precisely, and of a new day to be observed weekly under the new testament, as the Sabbath of the Lord, on *what ground* it is so to be observed.

(12.) Whether of the fourth commandment as unto one day in seven, or only as unto some part or portion of time, or whether without any respect unto that command, as purely ceremonial: for granting, as most do, the

necessity of the observation of such a day, yet some say that it hath no respect at all to the fourth decalogical precept, which was totally and absolutely abolished with the residue of Mosaical institutions; others, that there is yet remaining in it an obligation unto the sacred separation of some portion of our time unto the solemn service of God, but undetermined; and some, that it yet precisely requires the sanctification of one day in seven.

(13.) If a day be so to be observed, it is inquired *on what ground*, or *by what authority*, there is an alteration made from the day observed under the old testament unto that nosy in use, — that is, from the last to the first day of the week; whether was this translation of the solemn worship of God made by Christ and his apostles, or by the primitive church; for the same day might have been still continued, though the duty of its observation might have been fixed on a new reason and foundation. For although our Lord Jesus Christ totally abolished the *old solemn worship* required by the "law of commandments contained in ordinances," and by his own authority introduced a new law of worship, according unto institutions of his own, yet might obedience unto it in a solemn manner have been fixed unto the former day

(14.) If this was done by the authority of Christ and his apostles, or be supposed so to be, then it is inquired whether it was done by the *express institution of a new day*, or by a *directive example* sufficient to design a particular day, no institution of a new day being needful: for if we shall suppose that there is no obligation unto the observance of one day in seven indispensably abiding on us from the morality of the fourth commandment, we must have an express institution of a new day, or the authority of it is not divine; but on the supposition that that is so, no such institution is necessary, or can be properly made, as to the whole nature of it.

(15.) If this alteration of the day were introduced by the primitive church, then whether the continuance of the observation of one day in seven be *necessary* or no; for what was appointed thereby seems to be no further obligatory unto the churches of succeeding ages than their concernment lies in the occasions and reasons of their determinations.

(16.) If the continuance of one day in seven for the solemn worship of God be esteemed necessary in the present state of the church, then,

whether the continuance of that now in general use, namely, the first day in the week, be necessary or no, or whether it may not be lawfully changed to some other day. And sundry other the like inquiries are made about the original, institution, nature, use, and continuance, of a day of sacred rest unto the Lord.

6. Moreover, amongst those who do grant that it is necessary, and that indispensably so, as to the present church-state, which is under an obligation, from whencesoever it arise, neither to alter nor omit the observation of a day weekly for the public worship of God, wherein a cessation from labor and a joint attendance unto the most solemn duties of religion are required of us, it is not agreed whether the *day itself,* or the *separation of it* to its proper use and end, be any part in itself of divine worship, or be so merely relatively, with respect unto the duties to be performed therein. And as to those duties themselves, they are not only variously represented, but great contention hath been about them and the manner of their performance, as likewise concerning the causes and occasions which may dispense with our attendance unto them. Indeed, herein lies secretly the μῆλον ἔριδος and principal cause of all the strife that hath been and is in the world about this matter. Men may teach the doctrine of a sabbatical rest on what principles they please, de-dace it from what original they think good, if they plead not for an *exactness of duty* in its observance, if they bind not a *religious, careful attendance* on the worship of God, in public and private, on the consciences of other men, if they require not a watchfulness against all diversions and avocations from the duties of the day, they may do it without much fear of opposition; for all the concern-meats of doctrines and opinions which tend unto practice are regulated thereby, and embraced or rejected as the practice pleaseth or displeaseth that they lead unto.

Lastly, On a precise supposition that the observation of such a day is necessary upon divine precept or institution, yet there is a controversy remaining about fixing its proper bounds as to its beginning and ending. For some would have this day of rest measured by the first constitution and limitation of time unto a day from the creation, namely, from the evening of the day preceding unto its own, as the evening and morning were said to be יוֹם אֶחָד, "one day," Genesis 1:5. Others admit only of that proportion of time which is ordinarily assigned to our labor on the six

days of the week; that is, from its own morning to its own evening, with the interposition of such diversions as our labor on other days doth admit and require.

7. And thus is it come to pass, that although God made man upright, and gave him the Sabbath, or day of rest, as a token of that condition, and pledge of a future eternal rest with himself, yet, through his finding out many inventions, that very day is become amongst us an occasion and means of much disquietment and many contentions. And that which is the worst consequent in things of this nature, that belong unto religion and the worship of God, these differences, and the way of their agitation, whilst the several parties litigant have sought to weaken and invalidate their adversaries' principles, have apparently influenced the minds of all sorts of men unto a neglect in the practice of those duties which they severally acknowledged to be incumbent on them, upon those principles and reasons for the observation of such a day which themselves allow. For whilst some have hotly disputed that there is now no *especial day of rest* to be observed unto the Lord, by virtue of any divine precept or institution, and others have granted that if it be to be observed only by virtue of ecclesiastical constitution, men may have various pretences for dispensations from the duties of it, the whole due observation of it is much lost among Christians.

Neither is it a small evil amongst us, that the disputes of some against the divine warranty of one day in seven to be separated unto sacred uses, and the pretense of others to an equal regard unto all days from their Christian liberty, together with an open, visible neglect in the most of any conscientious care in the observance of it, have cast not a few unwary and unadvised persons to take up with the Judaical Sabbath, both as to its institution and manner of its observation. Now, whereas the solemn worship of God is the spring, rule, and measure of all our obedience unto him, it may justly be thought that the neglect thereof, so brought about as hath been declared, hath been a great, if not a principal, occasion of that sad degeneracy from the power, purity, and glory of Christian religion, which all men may see, and many do complain of at this day in the world. The truth is, most of the different apprehensions recounted have been entertained and contended for by persons learned and godly, all equally pretending to a love unto truth, and care for the preservation and

promotion of holiness and godliness amongst men. And it were to be wished that this were the only instance whereby we might evince that the best of men in this world do “know but in part, and prophesy but in part.” But they are too many to be recounted, although most men act in themselves and towards others as if they were themselves liable to no mistakes, and that it is an inexpiable crime in others to be in any thing mistaken. But as this should make us jealous over ourselves and our own apprehensions in this matter, so ought the consideration of it to affect us with tenderness and forbearance towards those who dissent from us, and whom we therefore judge to err and be mistaken.

But that which principally we are to learn from this consideration is, with what care and diligence we ought to inquire into the *certain rule of truth* in this matter. For whatever we do determine, we shall be sure to find men learned and godly otherwise minded. And yet in our determinations are the consciences of the disciples of Christ greatly concerned, which ought not by us to be causelessly burdened, nor yet countenanced in the neglect of any duty that God doth require. Slight and perfunctory disquisitions will be of little use in this matter; nor are men to think that their opinions are firm and established when they have obtained a seeming countenance unto them from two or three doubtful texts of Scripture. The principles and foundations of truth in this matter lie deep, and require a diligent investigation. And this is the design wherein we are now engaged. Whether we shall contribute any thing to the declaration or vindication of the truth depends wholly on the assistance which God is pleased to give or withhold. Our part it is to use what diligence we are able; neither ought we to avoid any thing more than the assuming or ascribing of any thing unto ourselves. It is enough for us if in any thing, or by any means, God will use us, not as “lords over the faith of men, but as helpers of their joy.”

Now, for the particular controversies before mentioned, I shall not insist upon them all, for that were endless, but shall reduce them unto those general heads under which they may be comprehended, and by the right stating whereof they will be determined. Nor shall I enter into any especial contest, unless it be occasionally only, with any particular persons who of old or of late have critically handled this subject. Some of them have, I confess, given great provocations thereunto, especially of the Belgic divines, whose late writings are full of reflections on the learned writers of

this nation. Our only design is προτιμᾷν τῆν ἀλήθειαν. And herein I shall lay down the general regulating principles of the doctrine of the Scriptures in this matter, confirming them with such arguments as occur to my mind, and vindicating them from such exceptions as they either seem liable unto or have met withal; all with respect unto the declaration given of the doctrine and practice of the Sabbath in the different ages of the church by our apostle, chap. iv, of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

8. The principles that I shall proceed upon, or the rules that I shall proceed by, are,—

(1.) *Express testimonies* of Scripture, which are not wanting in this cause. Where this light doth not go before us, our best course is to sit still; and where the word of God doth not speak in the things of God, it is our wisdom to be silent. Nothing, I confess, is more nauseous to me than magisterial dictates in sacred things, without an evident deduction and confirmation of assertions from Scripture testimonies. Some men write as if they were inspired, or dreamed that they had obtained to themselves Pythagorean reverence. Their writings are full of strong, authoritative assertions, arguing the good opinion they have of themselves, which I wish did not include an equal contempt of others. But any thing may be easily affirmed, and as easily rejected.

(2.) The *analogy of faith* in the interpretation, exposition, and application, of such testimonies as are pleadable in this cause. “Hic labor, hoc opus.” Herein the writer’s diligence and the reader’s judgment are principally to be exercised. I have of late been much surprised with the plea of some for the *use of reason* in religion and sacred things; not at all that such a plea is insisted on, but that it is by them built expressly on a supposition that it is by others, whom they reflect upon, denied; whereas some probably intended in those reflections have pleaded for it against the Papists (to speak within the bounds of sobriety) with as much reason and no less effectually than any amongst themselves. I cannot but suppose their mistake to arise from what they have heard, but not well considered, that some do teach about the darkness of the mind of man by nature with respect unto spiritual things, with his disability, by the utmost use of his rational faculties, as corrupted or unrenewed, *spiritually* and *savingly* to apprehend the things of God, without the especial assistance of the Holy

Ghost. Now, as no truth is more plainly or evidently confirmed in the Scripture than this, so to suppose that those by whom it is believed and asserted do therefore deny the use of reason in religion, is a most fond imagination. No doubt but whatever we do or have to do towards God, or in the things of God, we do it all as rational creatures; that is, in and by the use of our reason. And not to make use of it in its utmost improvement, in all that we have to do in religion or the worship of God, is to reject it, as to the principal end for which it is bestowed upon us. In particular, in the pursuit of the rule now laid down is the utmost exercise of our reason required of us. To understand aright the sense and importance of the words in Scripture testimonies, the nature of the propositions and assertions contained in them, the lawful deduction of inferences from them, to judge and determine aright of what is proposed or deduced by just consequence from direct propositions, to compare what in one place seems to be affirmed with what in others seems to be asserted to the same purpose or denied, with other instances innumerable of the exercise of our minds about the interpretation of Scripture, are all of them acts of our reason, and as such are managed by us. But I must not here further divert unto the consideration of these things. Only I fear that some men *write* books about them because, they *read* none. This I know, that they miserably mistake what is in controversy, and set up to themselves men of straw as their adversaries, and then cast stones at them.

(3.) The *dictates of general and uncorrupted reason,* suitable unto and explained by Scripture light, is another principle that we shall in our progress have a due regard unto; for whereas it is confessed that the separation of some portion of time to the worship of God is a part of the law of our creation, the light of nature doth and must still, on that supposition, continue to give testimony unto our duty therein. And although this light is exceedingly weakened and impaired by sin in the things of the greatest importance, and as to many things truly belonging unto it in our original constitution so overwhelmed with prejudices and contrary usages that of itself it owns them not at oil, yet let it be excited, quickened, rectified, by Scripture light, it will return to perform its office of testifying unto that duty, a sense whereof and a direction whereunto were concreated with it. We shall therefore inquire what intimations the light of nature hath continued to give concerning a day of sacred rest to be

observed unto God; and what uncontrollable testimonies we have of those intimations, in the knowledge, confessions, and expressions of them, in and by those who had no other way to come to an acquaintance with them. And where there is a common or prevailing suffrage given amongst mankind unto any truth, and that, to free us from entanglements about it, declared to be such in the Scripture, it must be acknowledged to proceed from that light of nature which is common unto all, though the actings of it be stifled in many.

(4.) *The custom and practice of the church of God* in all ages is to be inquired into. I intend not merely the church of Christ under the gospel, but the whole church from the beginning of the world, in the various dispensations of the will and grace of God unto it, before the giving of the law, under the yoke of it, and since the promulgation of the gospel. And great weight may' certainly be laid upon its harmonious consent in any practice relating to the worship of God. Nay, what may be so confirmed will thence appear not to be an institution peculiar to any especial mode of worship, that may belong unto one season and not unto another, but to have an everlasting obligation in it, on all that worship God, as such never to be altered or dispensed withal. And if every particular church be the pillar and ground of truth, whose testimony thereunto is much to be esteemed, how much more is the universal church of all ages so to be accounted! And it is a brutish apprehension, to suppose that God would permit a persuasion to befall the church in all ages, with respect unto his worship, which was not from himself, and the expression of its practice accepted with him. This, therefore, is diligently to be inquired into, as far as we may have certain light into things involved in so much darkness, as are all things of so great antiquity.

(5.) A due consideration of *the spirit and liberty of the gospel,* with the nature of its worship, the reasons of it, and the manner of its performance, is to be had in this matter. No particular instance of worship is to be introduced or admitted contrary to the nature, genius, and reason of the whole. If, therefore, such a sabbatical rest, or such an observation of it, be urged, as is inconsistent with the principles and reasons of evangelical worship, as is built upon motives not taken from the gospel, and in the manner of its observance interferes with the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, it discovers itself not to belong unto the present state of the

worshippers of God in Christ. Nor is any thing to commend itself unto us under the mere notion of *strictness* or *preciseness,* or the appearance of more than ordinary severity in religion. It is only walking according unto rule that will please God, justify us unto others, and give us peace in ourselves. Other seeming duties that may be recommended, because they have λόγου σοφίας ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ, καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος, "a pretense of wisdom in doing even more than is required of us, through humility and mortification," are of no price with God, nor useful unto men. And commonly those who are most ready to *overdo in one thing* are prone also to *underdo* in others. And this rule we shall find plainly rejecting the rigid observation of the seventh day as a Sabbath out of the verge of gospel order and worship.

(6.) The *tendency of principles, doctrines, and practices,* to the promotion or hinderance of piety, godliness, and universal holy obedience unto God, is to be inquired into. This is the end of all religious worship, and of all the institutions thereof. And a due observation of the regular tendency of things unto this end will give a great discovery of their nature and acceptance with God. Let things be urged under never so specious pretences, if they be found by experience not to promote gospel holiness in the hearts and lives of men, they discover themselves not to be of God. Much more when principles and practices conformable unto them shall be evidenced to obstruct and hinder it, to introduce profaneness, and countenance licentiousness of life, to prejudice the due reverence of God and his worship, do they manifest themselves to be of the tares sowed by the evil one. And by this rule we may try the opinion which denies all divine institution unto a day of holy rest under the new testament.

These are the principal rules which, in this disquisition after a sabbatical rest, we shall attend unto. And they are such as will not fail to direct us aright in our course, if through negligence or prejudice we miss not of a due regard unto them. These the reader is desired to have respect unto in his perusal of the ensuing discourses; and if what is proposed or concluded be not found suitable unto them, let it be rejected: for I can assure him that no self-assuming, no contempt of others, no prejudicing adherence to any way or party, no pretense of certainty above evidence produced, have had any influence into those inquiries after the truth in this matter, which, σὺν Θεῷ, we now address ourselves unto.

9. In the first place, it will be necessary to premise something about the *name* whereby this day may be called; for that also among some hath been controverted. Under the old testament it had a double appellation; the one taken from the natural order of the day, then separated with respect unto other days; the other from its nature and use. On the first account it was called יוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי, "the seventh day:" Genesis 2:3, אֶת־יוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי וַיְבָרֶךְ אֱלֹהִים; — " And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." So also Exodus 20:11. Upon its first institution, and on the re-introduction of its observation, it is so called. But it is a mere description of the day from its relation to the six precedent days of the creation that is herein intended; absolutely it is not so called anywhere. Yet hence by the Hellenists it was termed ἡ εβδὸμη, "the seventh;" and ἱερα ἑβδόμη, "the sacred seventh day." So is mention made of it by Philo, Josephus, and others. And our apostle maketh use of this name as that which was commonly in use to denote the Sabbath of the Jews: Chap. 4:4, Εἴρηκε γὰρ που περὶ τῆς ἑζδὸμης· — " For he speaketh" (or, "it is spoken") "somewhere concerning the seventh" ʿ Ημέρας is not added, because ἑβδόμη was used technically to denote that day. And he educes the reason of this denomination from Genesis 2:2. Being, as was said, the day that ensued immediately after the six distinct days wherein the world was created, and putting a period unto a measure of time by a numeration of days, always to return in its cycle, it was called "the seventh day." And from that course of time completed in seven days, thence recurring to its beginning, is the name of ἑβδομάς, "hebdomas," "a week," which the Hebrews call only שָׁבוּעַ, "a seven." And the same word sometimes signifieth the seventh day, or one day in seven.῎Αγειν τὴν ἑβδομάδα is "septimum diem celebrare," "to celebrate the" (or "a") "seventh day." And the Latins used the word in the same manner for *seven days*, or *one day* in seven. But this appellation, as we shall see, the apostle casts out of consideration and use, as to the day to be observed under the new testament: for that which was first so is passed away, and another instituted in the room thereof; which although it be also ἑβδὸμη, or a "seventh day" absolutely, or one in the revolution of seven, yet not being the seventh in their natural order, that name is now of no use, but antiquated.

10. From its occasion, sanctification, and use, it was called שַׁבָּת, and יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת, "the Sabbath," and "the Sabbath-day." The occasion of this name is expressed, Genesis 2:3, "God blessed the seventh day, בּוֹ שָׁבַת כִּי," — "because he rested" ("shabath") "that day." It is called rest, the rest because on that day God rested. And in the decalogue, it is יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת אֵת, "the day of the Sabbath," or of God's rest and ours. And absolutely שַׁבָּת, "the Sabbath," Isaiah 56:2; where also God, from his institution of it, calls it "my Sabbath," verse 4.

This being a thing so plain and evident, it were mere loss of time to insist upon the feigned etymologies of this name, afar it came to be taken notice of in the world; I shall only name them. Apion the Alexandrian would have it derived from the Egyptian word "sabbo," as Josephus informs us, cont. Ap. lib. ii.; and what the signification of that word is the reader may see in the same place. Plutarch derives it from "sabboi" a word that was used to be howled in the furious services of Bacchus; for his priests and devotees used in their bacchanals to cry out, "Evoi, Sabboi," Sympos. lib. vii. cap. xiv; which things are ridiculous. Lactantius, with sundry others of the ancients, fell into no less, though a 1ess offensive mistake. "Hic," saith he, "est dies Sabbati, qui lingua Hebræorum à numero nomen accepit; unde septenarius numerus legitimus et plenus est," Insitut. lib. vii. cap. xiv. Procopius Gazæus on the Pentateuch hath a singular conceit. Speaking of the tenth of the month Tizri, termed sabbaton sabbat, he calls it,

> Συλλήψιν τοῦ προδρόμου, διὸ καὶ σάββατα σαββάτων ἑορτὴ, καθ᾽ ἣν ἔμελλεν ὁ τῆς ἀφέΣεως καὶ τῆς μετανοίας καιρὸς ἄρχεσθαι, ἀπὸ τῆς συλλήψεως τοῦ προδρόμου; ὅθεν ἐστὶν ὑπολαβεῖν καὶ τὴν ἐπυμολογίαν τοῦ Σαββάτου; ὅτι σαβαχθὰ καλεῖται ἡ ἄφεσις· ἀφιᾶσι δὲ᾽ αὗτὴν ἱερὰν τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅτι ἑβδὸμη ἐστὶν ὅ ἐστι Σαβαά.

He would have it to be the day of the conception of John Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, when the remission and repentance that he preached began; and thence conjectures the etymology of the Sabbath to be from "sabachta" (that is, the Syriac שבקתא), which signifies "remission," that day being remitted holy unto the Lord, being the seventh day, which is

Sabaa, that is שְׁבַע; the vanity of which conjectures is apparent to all. The reason and rise of this appellation are manifest.

Hence this was the proper and usual name of this day under the old testament, being expressive of its occasion, nature, and end. The word hath also other forms; as שַׁבָּתוֹן, <02162>Exodus 16:23, 35:2, “sabbaton;” and מִשְׁבָּת, <25107>Lamentations 1:7, “mishbat;” the signification of the word being still retained. Neither yet is this word peculiarly sacred as to what it denotes, but is used to express things common or profane, even any cessation, resting, or giving over. The first time it occurs, <01002>Genesis 2:2, it is rendered in Targum by נח, a common word signifying to rest. See <23140>Isaiah 14:4, 24:8, and many other places. It is also applied to signify a week, because every week, or seven days, had a Sabbath or day of rest necessarily included in it: <03315>Leviticus 23:15, “Ye shall count to yourselves שֶׁבַע שַׁבָּתוֹת תְּמִימֹת “seven complete sabbaths;” that is, weeks, each having a Sabbath in it for its close: for the reckoning was to expire on the end of the seventh Sabbath, verse 16. And this place being expounded by Onkelos, in his Targum, of a week, Nachmanides says upon it, that if it be so (which he also grants and pleads), then יהיו שתי לשונות בפסוק אחד, “there will be two tongues in one verse,” or the same word used twice in the same verse with different significations, — namely, that the word שַׁבָּת should denote both the holy day of rest and also a week of days. And he gives another instance to the same purpose in the word עֲיָרִים, <07004>Judges 10:4, “Jair the Gileadite had thirty sons,” עֲיָרִים לָהֶם וְרֹכְבִים עַל־שְׁלֹשִׁים עֲיָרִים וּשְׁלֹשִׁים; where the word עֲיָרִים signifies in the former place “colts of asses,” and in the latter “cities.” And the common number of seven is expressed by it, <03348>Leviticus 25:8, “Thou shalt number unto thee שֶׁבַע שַׁבְּתֹת שָׁנִים,” “seven sabbaths of years ;” that is, as it is expounded in the next words, פְּעָמִים שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים שֶׁבַע, seven times seven years;” seven years being called a sabbath of years, because of the land’s resting every seventh year, in answer to the rest of the church every seventh day. See the Tar-gum on <23813>Isaiah 58:13; Esth. 2:9. Moreover, because of the rest that was common to the weekly Sabbath, with all other sacred feasts of Moses’ institution in their stated monthly or annual revolution, they were also called sabbaths, as shall be proved afterwards. And as the Greeks and Latins made use of this word,

borrowed from the Hebrew, so the Jews, observing that their Sabbath day had amongst them its name from Saturn, “dies Saturni,” as amongst us it is still thence called “Saturday,” they called him, or the planet of that name, שבטי, “Shibti,” and שבתאי, “Shabbetai.” And even from hence some of the Jews take advantage to please themselves with vain imaginations. So R. Isaac Caro, commending the excellency of the seventh day, says, “that Saturn is the planet of that -day, the whole being nominated from the first hour;” whereof afterwards. “He therefore,” saith he, “hath power on that day to renew the strength of our bodies, as also to influence our minds to understand the mysteries of God. He is the planet of Israel, as the astrologers acknowledge,” (doubtless!); “and in his portion is the rational soul; and in the parts of the earth, the house of the sanctuary; and among tongues, the Hebrew tongue; and among laws, the law of Israel” So far he; but whether he can make good his claim to the relation of the Jews unto Saturn, or their pretended advantage on supposition thereof, I leave to our astrologers to determine, seeing I know nothing of these things. And on the same account, of their rest falling on the day under that planetary denomination, many of the heathen thought they dedicated the day and the religion of it unto Saturn. So Tacitus, Hist., lib. v.: “Alii honorem eum Saturno haberi. Seu principia religionis tradentibus idæis quos cum Saturno pulsos et conditores gentis accepimus; seu quod e septem sideribus queis mortales reguntur, altissimo orbe et præcipua potentia stella Saturni feratur; ac pleraque cœlestium vim suam et cursum septimos per numeros conficiant.” Such fables did the most diligent of the heathen suffer themselves to be deluded withal, whereby a prejudice was kept up in their minds against the only true God and his worship. The word is also sometimes doubled, by a pure Hebraism: 1 Chronicles 9:32, שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּת , “Shabbath, Shabbath,” — that is, “every Sabbath ;” and is somewhat variously used in the conjunction of another form: שַׁבָּתוֹן שַׁבָּת, Exodus 16:23, 35:2; and שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן, Exodus 31:15; Leviticus 25:4. We render שַׁבָּתוֹן, by “rest,” “the rest of the Sabbath,” and “a Sabbath of rest.” Where “sabbaton” is preposed at least, it seems to be as much as “sabbatulum,” and to denote the entrance into the Sabbath or the preparation for it, such as was more solemn, when הגדול שבת, “a great Sabbath,” a high (lay ensued. Such was the Sabbath before the passover,

for the miracle, as the Jews say, which befell their forefathers that day in Egypt. The time between the two evenings was the “sabbatulum.”

This, then, was the name of the day of rest under the old testament; yet was not the word appropriated to the denotation of that day only, but is used sometimes naturally to express any rest or cessation, sometimes as it were artificially in numeration for a week, or any other season whose composition was by, and resolution into seven, though this was merely occasional, from the first limitation of a periodical revolution of time by a Sabbath of rest; of which before.

11. And this various use of the word was taken up among the Grecians and Latins also. As they borrowed the word from the Jews, so they did its use. The Greek σάββατον is merely the Hebrew שַׁבָּתוֹן, or perhaps formed by the addition of their usual termination from שַׁבָּת; whence also our apostle frames his σαββατισμός. The Latin “sabbatum” is the same. And they use this word, though rarely, to express the last day of the week. So Suetonius in Tiber., “Diogenes grammaticus sabbatis disputare Rhodi solitus.” And the LXX. always so express the seventh-day Sabbath; and frequently they use it for a week also. And so in the New Testament, Νηστεύω δὶς τοῦ σαββάτου, <4212 8>Luke 18:12; — “I fast twice in the sabbath;” that is, two days in the week. And ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν Σαββάτων <4413 4>Acts 13:14, “the day of the Sabbath,” is that day of the week which was set apart for a sabbatical rest. Hence μία σαββάτων, “one day of the sabbaths,” which frequently occurs, is the same with πρώτη ἑζδομάδος, “the first day of the week,” εἷς or μία being often put for πρῶτος, πρώτη, the ordinal for the cardinal.

12. About the time of the writing of the books of the New Testament, both the Jews themselves and all the heathen that took notice of them called all their feasts and solemn assemblies their sabbaths, because they did no servile work in them They had the general nature of the weekly Sabbath, in a cessation from labor. So the first day of the feast of trumpets, which was to be on the first day of the second month, what day soever of the week it happened to be on, was called a sabbath, <0232 4>Leviticus 23:24. This Scaliger well observes and well proves, Emendat, Tempor. lib. iii., Canon. Isagog. lib. iii. p. 213:

> “Omnem festivitatem Judaicam, non solum Judæi sed et Gentiles sabbatum vocant; Judi quidem cure dicunt Tizri. nunquam incipere a feria prima, quarta, sexta, ne duo sabbata continuentur; Gentiles autem non alio nomine omnes eorum solennitates vocabant.”

And this is evident from the frequent mention of the sabbatical fasts of the Jews, when they did not, nor was it lawful for them to fast on the weekly Sabbath. So speaks Augustus to Tiberius in Suetonius, Octav. August. cap. lxxvi.:

> “Ne Judæus quidem, mi Tiberi, tam diligenter sabbatis jejunium servat, quam ego hodie servavi.”

And Juvenal, Sat. iv:158, —

“Observant ubi festa mero perle sabbata reges.”

And Martial, —

“Et non jejuna sabbata lege premet;”

speaking in contradiction, as he thought, unto them. And so Horace mentions their “tricesima sabbata;” which were no other but their new moons. And to this usual manner of speaking in those days doth our apostle accommodate his expressions, ⁵¹⁰²⁶Colossians 2:16, “Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in part of an holy day” (any part of it, or respect unto it), “or of the new moon, or of the sabbath ;” that is, any of the Judaical feasts whatever, then commonly called sabbaths. So Maimonides, Tract. De Sabb. cap. xxix., speaking of their ימים טובים, “good days” or “feasts,” says expressly, שבתות דיי שכולם, — “They are all sabbaths to the Lord.”

And from this usage some think to expound that vexed expression,

> Σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον· ἐπειδὴ δεύτερον μὲν ἦν τοῦ πάσχα, πρῶτον δὲ τῶν ἀζύμων· εἰ οὖν σάββατον εἴρηται, μὴ θαυμάσης· σάββατον γὰρ πᾶσαν ἑσρτὴν ἐκάλουν,

— ⁴²⁰⁶¹Luke 6:1; which we render, “The second Sabbath after the first.” So Suidas,

> Σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον· ἐπειδὴ δεύτερον μὲν ἦν τοῦ πάσχα, πρῶτον δὲ τῶν ἀζύμων· εἰ οὖν σάββατον εἴρηται, μὴ ζαυμάσης· σάββατον γὰρ πᾶσαν ἑορτὴν ἐκάλουν

— " It was the second day of the passover, and the first of unleavened bread. And wonder not that it is called a sabbath, for they called every feast day a sabbath." Theophylact gives us another day, but on the same reason. Saith he,

> Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πᾶσαν ἑορτὴν σάββατον ὠνόμαζον· ἀνάπαυσις γὰρ τὸ σὰββατον. Πολλάκις οὖν ἀπήντα ἡ ἑορτὴ ἐν τῇ παρασκευῇ, καὶ ἐκάλουν τὴν παρασκευὴν Σάββατον διὰ τὴν ἑορτήν· εἶτα τὸ κυρίως Σάββατον ὠνόμαζον δευτερόπρωτον, ὡς δεύτερον ὅν, προηγησαμένης ἄλλης καὶ Σαββάτου

—"The Jews call every feast a sabbath, for sabbath is as much as rest. Ofttimes, therefore, there fell out a feast on the day before the weekly Sabbath; and they called it a sabbath bemuse it was a feast. And therefore that which was the proper Sabbath at that time was called ' the second Sabbath after the first,' being the second from that which went before." Chrysostom allows of the same reason, Hom. XXXix. in Matt. Isidore of Pelusium fixeth on another day, but still for the same reason: Epist. cx. Lib.iii., Δευτερόπρωτον εἴρηται, ἐπειδὴ δεύτερον μὲν ἦν τοῦ πάσχα, πρῶτον δὲ τῶν ἀζύμων·—"It is called the deuteroproton, because it was the second day from the sacrificing of the passover, and the flint day of unleavened bread;" which he shows was called a sabbath upon the general account of all the Jewish feasts being so called: for so he saith, Εἰ δὲ σάββατον εἴρηται μὴ ζαυμάσης· σάββατον γὰρ πᾶσαν ἑορτὴν καλοῦσι. By the way, this is expressly contrary to the Scripture, which makes the day spoken of to be the proper weekly Sabbath, as it is called without any addition, Matthew 12:11, whereon depended the questions that ensued about its observation. But we are beholden to Scaliger for the tree meaning of this expression, which so puzzled the ancients, and concerning which Gregory Nazianzen turned off Jerome with a scoff scarce becoming his gravity, when he inquired of him what might be the meaning of it. Scaliger, therefore, conjectures that it is called Σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον, because it was the first Sabbath ἀπὸ τῆς δευτέρας τῶν ἀζύμων, "from the second day of unleavened bread." For on that day they offered the handful or sheaf of new fruits; and from that day they

counted seven weeks unto Pentecost. And the Sabbaths of thee weeks were reckoned ἀπὸ τῆς δευτέρας τῶν ἀζύμων and the first that followed was called δευτερόπρωτον. So he, both in his Emendat. Tempor. lib. vi, and Isagog. Canon. p. 218. And this is subscribed unto by his mortal adversary, Dionysius Petavius, Animad. in Epiphan. n. 31, p. 64, who will not allow him ever to have spoken rightly, but in what the wit of man can find no tolerable objection against. But this calling of their feasts "sabbaths," with the reason of it, is given us by all their principal anthem So Lib. Tseror. Hammor. on Levit. p. 102: שהמועדים נקראים הם קרואים מן השבת שנקרא קרא קדש ולכן השבת ולפי נקראו בשמו שבת שבתון מקראי קדש שפירושו שכל המועדים הוא ראש המועדים כולם וכולם —"Because all solemn days are called holy convocations, they are all called so the Sabbath, which is called holy; wherefore the Sabbath is the head of all solemn feasts, and they are all of them called by the name thereof, sabbaths of rest ;" whereof he gives instances.

13. Some of the ancient Christians, dealing with the heathens, called that day which the Christians then observed in the room of the Jewish seventh day, ἡμέραν ἡλίον, or "diem sells," "Sunday;" as those who treat and deal with others must express things by the names that are current amongst them, unless they intend to be barbarians unto them. So speaks Justin Martyr, Apol. ii., Τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέραν, κοινῇ πάντες τὴν συνέλευσιν ποιοῦμεθα· — "We meet" (for the worship of God) "in common on Sunday." Had he said" the Sabbath," the Gentiles would have concluded it to have been the Judaical Sabbath. To have called it to them "the Lord's day," had been to design no determinate day; they would not have known what day he meant. And the name of "the first day of the week," taken up signally by Christians upon the resurrection of Christ, was not in use amongst them. Wherefore he called the day he intended to determine, as was necessary for him, by the name in use amongst them to whom he spake, "Sunday." In like manner, Tertullian, treating with the same sort of men, calls it "diem solis," Apol. cap. xvi. And Eusebius, reporting the edicts of Constantine for the obviation of the Lord's day, as it is termed in them, adds that is the day which we call ἡμέραν ἡλίου, or "Sunday."

But yet among Christians themselves this name was not in common use, but by some was rejected, as were also all the rest of the names of the days used among the Pagans. So speaks Austin in Psalm xcii.: “Quarta sabbatorum, quarta feria, quæ Mercurii dies dicitur a Paganis, et a mullets Christians. Sed noluimus ut dicant, et utinam corrigantur ut non dicant.” And Jerome, Epist ad Algas.

> “Una sabbati, dies dominica intelligenda est; quia hebdomada in sabbatum, ut in primam, et secundam, et tertiam, et quartam, et quintam, et sextam sabbati dividitur; quam ethnici idolorum et planetarum nominibus appellant.” He rejects the use of the ordinary names unto the heathens. And Philastrius makes the usage of them amongst Christians almost heretical, Num.

14. All the eastern nations also, amongst whom the planetary nomination of the days of the week first began, have, since their casting off that kind of idolatry, rejected the use of those names; being therein more religious or more superstitious, than the most of Christians. So is it done by the Arabians and Persians, and those that are joined unto them in religious observances. The day of their worship, which is our Friday, the Arabians call “Giuma,” the Persians “Adina.” The rest of the days of the week they discriminate by their natural order within their hebdomadal revolution, — the first, the second, the third, etc.; only some of them in some places have some special name occasionally imposed on them. The church of Rome, from a decree, as they suppose or pretend, of Pope Sylvester, reckons all the days of the week by “Feria prima, secunda,” and so onwards; only their writers for the most part retain the name of “sabbatum,” and use “dies dominica” for the first day. And the Rhemists, on Revelation 1:10, condemn the name of Sunday as heathenish. And Polydore Virgil before them says,

> “Profecto pudendum est, simulque dolendum, quod non antehac data sunt istis diebus Christiana nomina; ne dii gentium tam memorabile, inter nos, monumentum haberent,” De Invent. Rer. lib. vi. cap. v.

And indeed, among sundry of thee ancients, there do many severe expressions occur against the use of the common planetary names. And at the first relinquishment of Gentilism, it had no doubt been well if those

names of Baalim had been taken away out of the mouths of men, especially considering that the retaining of them hath been of no use nor advantage. As they are now rivetted into custom and usage, claiming their station on such a prescription as in some measure takes away the corruption of their use, I judge that they are not to be contended about; for as they are vulgarly used, these names are mere notes of distinction, of no more signification than first, second, and third, the original and occasioned imposition of them being amongst the many utterly unknown. Only I must add, that the severe reflections and contemptuous reproaches which I have heard made upon and poured out against them who, it may be out of weakness, it may be out of a better judgment than our own, do abstain from the using of them, argue a want of due charity and that condescension in love which become those who judge themselves strong; for the truth is, they have a plea sufficient at least to vindicate them from the contempt of any. For there are some places of Scripture which seem so far to give countenance unto them, that if they mistake in their application, it is a mistake of no other nature but what others are liable unto in things of greater importance; for it is given as the will of God, ⁂Exodus 23:13,

> "In all things," saith he, "that I have said unto you be circumspect: and make no mention of the name of other gods, neither let it be heard out of thy mouth."

And it cannot be denied but that the names of the days of the week were the names of gods among the heathen. The prohibition is renewed, ⁂Joshua 23:7, "Neither make mention of the name of their gods:" which is yet. extended further, ⁂Deuteronomy 12:3, to a command "to destroy and blot out the names of the gods of the people ;" which by this means are retained. Accordingly, the children of-Reuben, building the cities formerly called Nebo and Baal-meon, changed their names, because they were the names of heathen idols, ⁂Numbers 32:38. And David mentioneth it as a part of his integrity, that he would not take up the names of idols into his lips, ⁂Psalm 16:4. And some of the ancients, as hath been observed, confirm what by some at present is concluded from these places. Saith Jerome, "Absit ab ore Christiano dicere, Jupiter omnipotens, Mehercule, et Mecastor, et cætera magis portenta quam nomina," Epist. ad Damas. Now, be it granted that the objections against the use of the planetary names of the days of the week from these places

may be answered from consideration of the change of times and the circumstances of things, .yet certainly there is an appearance of warranty in them sufficient to secure them from contempt and reproach who are prevailed on by them to another use.

15. But of a *day of rest* there is a peculiar reason. If there be a name given in the Scripture unto such a day, by that name it is to be called, and not otherwise. So it was unquestionably under the old testament. God himself had assigned a name unto the day of sacred rest then enjoined the church unto observation, and it was not lawful for the Jews to call it by any other name given unto it or in use among the heathen. It was and was to be called "the Sabbath day," "the Sabbath of the LORD." In the new testament there is, as we shall see afterwards, a signal note put on "the first day of the week." So thence do some call their day of rest or solemn worship, and contend that so it *ought* to be called. But this only respects the order and relation of such a day to the other days of the week, which is natural, and hath no respect unto any thing that is sacred. It may be allowed, then, for the indigitation of such a day, and the discrimination of it from the other days of the week, but it is no proper name for a day of sacred rest. And the first use of it, upon the resurrection of our Lord, was only peculiarly to denote the time. There is a day mentioned by John, in the Revelation, (which we shall afterwards consider,) that he calleth ἡμέραν κυριακήν, "diem dominicam," "the Lord's day." This appellation, what day soever is designed, is neither natural nor civil, nor doth it relate unto any thing in nature or in the common usage of men. It must therefore be sacred; and it is, or may be, very comprehensive of various respects. It is "the Lord's day," the day that he hath taken to be his lot or especial portion among the days of the week; as he took, as it were, possession of it in his resurrection. So his people are his lot and portion in the world, therefore called his people. It is also, or may be, his day subjectively, or the day whereon his businesses and affairs are principally transacted. So the poet, Statius, Theb. viii:664, —

"Tydeos illa dies;"

that was Tydeus' day, because he was principally concerned in the affairs of it. This is the day wherein the affairs of the Lord Jesus Christ are transacted, his person and mediation being the principal subjects and

objects of its work and worship. And it is, or may be, called his, “the Lord’s day,” because enjoined and appointed to be observed by him or his authority over the church. So the ordinance of the supper is called “the supper of the Lord” on the same account. On supposition, therefore, that such a day of rest there is to be observed under the new testament, the name whereby it ought to be called is “the Lord’s day ;” which is peculiarly expressive of its relation unto our Lord Jesus Christ, the sole author and immediate object of all gospel worship. But whereas the general notion of a sabbatical rest is still included in such a day, a super-addition of its relation to the Lord Christ will entitle it unto the appellation of “the Lord’s-day Sabbath ;” that is, the day of sacred rest appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ. And thus, most probably, in the continuation of the old testament phraseology, it is called “the Sabbath day,” [4240]Matthew 24:20, and in our Epistle comes under the general notion of a sabbatism, chap. 4:9.

EXERCITATION 2.

OF THE ORIGINAL OF THE SABBATH.

1. *Of the original of the Sabbath — The importance of this disquisition.*

2. *Opinion of some of the Jewish masters about the original of the Sabbath, that it began in Marah.*

3. *The station in Marah, and the occurrences thereof — Tacitus noted — Exodus 15:25, 26; Jews' exposition of it.*

4. *These opinions refuted by testimonies and reasons.*

5. *Another opinion of the ancient Jews about the original of the Sabbath, and of the Mohammedans.*

6. *Opinions of Christians about the original of the Sabbath proposed.*

7. *That of its original from the foundation of the world asserted — The first testimony given unto it, Genesis 2:1-3, vindicated — Exceptions of Heidegger answered.*

8. *What intended by "sanctifying" and "blessing the seventh day."*

9. *Other exceptions removed — Series and dependence of the discourse in Moses cleared — The whole testimony vindicated.*

10. *Hebrews 4:3, 4, vindicated.*

11. *Observation of the Sabbath by the patriarchs before the giving of the law — Instances hereof collected by Manasseh Ben Israel — Further confirmation of it.*

12. *Tradition among the Gentiles concerning it — Sacredness of the septenary number.*

13. *Testimonies of the heathen, collected by Aristobulus, Clemens, Eusebius.*

14. *Importance of these testimonies examined and vindicated.*

15. *Ground of the hebdomadal revolution of time — Its observation catholic.*

16. *Planetary denominations of the days of the week, whence.*

17. *The contrary opinion, of the original of the Sabbath in the wilderness, proposed and examined.*

18-26. *Arguments against this original of the Sabbath answered, etc.*

1. HAVING fixed the name, the *thing* itself falls nextly under consideration. And the order of our investigation shall be, to inquire first into its original, and then into its causes. And the true stating of the former will give great light into the latter, as also into its duration. For if it began with the world, probably it had a cause cognate to the existence of the world and the ends of it, and so must in duration be commensurate unto it. If it owed its rise

to succeeding generations, amongst some peculiar sort of men, its cause was arbitrary and occasional, and its continuance uncertain; for every thing which had such a beginning in the worship of God was limited to some seasons only, and had a time determined for its expiration. This, therefore, is first to be stated. And, indeed, no concern of this day hath fallen under more diligent, severe, and learned dissertations, Very learned men have here engaged into contrary opinions, and defended them with much learning and variety of reading. “Summa sequar fastigia rerum,” and I shall briefly call the different apprehensions both of Jews and Christians in this matter unto a just examination. Neither shall I omit the consideration of any opinion whose antiquity or the authority of its defenders did ever give it reputation, though now generally exploded, as not knowing, in that revolution of opinions which we are under, how soon it may have a revival.

2. The Jews (that we may begin with them with whom some think the Sabbath began) are divided among themselves about the original of the Sabbath no less than Christians; yea, to speak the truth, their divisions and different apprehensions about this matter of fact have been the occasion of ours, and their authority is pleaded to countenance the mistakes of others. Many, therefore, of them assign the original or first revelation of the Sabbath unto the wilderness station of the people in Marah; others of them make it coeval with the world.

The first opinion hath countenance given unto it in the Talmud. Gemar. Babyon. Tit. Sab. cap. ix., and Tit. Sanhed. cap. vii. And the tradition of it is embraced by so many of their masters and commentators that our learned Seedless, de Jur. Gen. apud Heb. lib. iii. cap. xii.-xiv., contends for it as the common and prevailing opinion amongst them, and endeavors an answer unto all instances or testimonies that are or may be urged to the contrary. And, indeed, there is scarce any thing of moment to be observed in all antiquity, as to matter of fact about the Sabbath, whether it be Jewish, Christian, or heathen, but what he hath heaped together, or rather treasured up, in the learned discourses of that third book of his, Jus Gentium aped Hebraeos. Whether the questions of right belonging thereunto have been duly determined by him is yet left unto further inquiry. That which at present we are in the consideration of, is the opinion of the Jews about the *original of the Sabbath* at the station of

Marah, which he so largely confirms with testimonies out of all sorts of their authors, and those duly alleged, according to their own sense and conceptions.

3. Marah was the first station that the children of Israel fixed in the wilderness of Shut, five days after their coming up out of the Red sea. Before their coming hither, they had wandered three days in the wilderness without finding any water, until they were ready to faint. The report of this their thirst and wandering was famous amongst the heathen, and mixed by them with vain and monstrous fables. One of the wisest amongst them puts as many lies together about it as so few words can well contain. "Effigiem," saith he, "animalis, quo monstrante errorem sitimque depulerant, penetrali sacravere," Tacit. Hist., lib. v. cap. iv. He feigns that by following some wild asses they were led to waters, and so made an end of their thirst and wandering; on the account whereof they afterwards consecrated in their temple the image of an ass. Others of them besides him say that they wandered six days, and finding water on the seventh, that was the occasion and reason of their perpetual observation of the seventh day's rest. In their journey from the Red sea to Marah, they were particularly pressed with wandering and thirst, ‹0252›Exodus 15:22; but this was only for three days, not seven: "They went three days in the wilderness, and found no water." The story of the ass's image or head consecrated amongst them was taken from what fell out afterwards about the golden calf. This made them vile among the nations, and exposed them to their obloquy and reproaches. Upon the third day, therefore, after their coming from the Red sea, they came to Marah; that is, the place so called afterwards from what there befell them, for the waters which there they found being מָרִים, "bitter," they called the name of the place מָרָה, or "bitterness." Hither they came on the third day; for although it is said that "they went three days in the wilderness, and found no water," ‹0252›Exodus 15:22, after which mention is made of their coming to Marah, verse 23, yet it was in the evening of the third day, for they pitched that night in Marah, ‹0433›Numbers 33:8. There, after their murmuring for the bitterness of the waters, and the miraculous cure of them, it is added in the story,

> "There the LORD made for them a statute and an ordinance, and there he proved them, and said, If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the LORD thy God, and wilt do that which is right in

his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians: for I am the LORD that healeth thee," Exodus 15:25, 26.

It is said that he gave them חֹק וּמִשְׁפָּט, the words whereby sacred ordinances and institutions are expressed. What this "statute and ordinance" were in particular is not declared. These, therefore, are suggested by the Talmudical masters. One of them, they say, was the ordinance concerning the Sabbath. About the other they are not so well agreed. Some refer it to the fifth commandment, of honoring father and mother; others to the ceremonies of the red heifer, with whose ashes the water of sprinkling was to be mingled: for which conjectures they want not such reasons as are usual amongst them. The two first they confirm from the repetition of the law, Deuteronomy 5:12, 15; for there these words, "As the LORD thy God hath commanded thee," are distinctly added to those two precepts, the fourth and fifth, and to no other. And this could arise from no other cause but because God had before given them unto the people in Marah, where he said he had given them וּמִשְׁפָּט חֹק; that is, the ordinance and law of the Sabbath, and the judgment of obedience to parents and superiors! This is one of the principal ways whereby they confirm their imaginations. And fully to establish the truth hereof, Baal Hatturim, or the small gematrical annotations on the Masoretical Bibles, adds, that in these words, כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוְּךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ, the final numeral letters make up the same number with מָרָה, the name of the place where these laws were given. And this is the sum of what is pleaded in this case.

4. But every one may easily seethe vanity of these pretences, and how easy it is for any one to frame a thousand of them who knows not how better to spend his time. Aben Ezra and Abarbanel both confess that the words used in the repetition of the law, Deuteronomy 5, do refer to the giving of it on mount Sinai. And if we must seek for especial reasons for the inserting of those words, besides the sovereign pleasure of God, they are not wanting which are far more probable than these of the masters.

(1.) The one of these commandments closing up the first table, concerning the worship of God, and the other heading the second table, concerning our

duties amongst ourselves and towards others, this memorial, “As the LORD thy God hath commanded thee,” is on that account expressly annexed unto them, being to be distinctly applied unto all the rest.

(2.) The fourth commandment is, as it were, “custos primæ tabulæ,” the keeper-of the whole first table, seeing our owning of God to be our God, and our worship of him according to his mind, were solemnly to be expressed on the day of rest commanded to be observed for that purpose, and in the neglect whereof they will be sure enough neglected; whence also a remembrance to observe this day is so strictly enjoined. And the fifth commandment is apparently “custos secundæ tabulæ,” as appointed of God to contain the means of exacting the observation of all the duties of the second table, or of punishing the neglect of them and disobedience unto them. And therefore it may be the memorial is not peculiarly annexed unto them on their own distinct account, but equally upon that of the other commandments whereunto they do refer.

(3.) There is yet an especial reason for the peculiar appropriation of these two precepts by that memorial unto this people; for they had now given unto them an especial typical concern in them, which did not at all belong unto the rest of mankind, who were otherwise equally concerned in the decalogue with themselves. For in the fourth commandment, whereas no more was before required but that one day in seven should be observed as a sacred rest, they were now precisely confined to the seventh day in order from the finishing of the creation, or the establishing of the law and covenant of works, or a day answering thereunto; for the determination of the day in the hebdomadal revolution was added in the law decalogical to the law of nature. And this was with respect unto and in the confirmation of that ordinance which gave them the seventh-day Sabbath in a peculiar manner, — that is, the seventh day after six days’ raining of manna, Exodus 16:And in the other, the promise annexed unto it of prolonging their days had peculiar respect unto the land of Canaan. There is neither of these but is a far more probable reason of the annexing these words, “As the LORD thy God commanded thee,” unto those two commandments, than that fixed on by the Talmudical masters. Herein only I agree with them that both those commands were given alike in Marah; and one of them I suppose none will deny to be a. principal dictate of the law of nature. For the words mentioned, חֹק וּמִשְׁפָּט, “a statute and an

ordinance," the meaning of them is plainly expounded, (0256)Exodus 15:26. God then declared this unto them as his unchangeable ordinance and institution, that he would bless them on their obedience, and punish them upon their unbelief and rebellion; wherein they had experience of his faithfulness to their cost. The reader may see this fiction further disproved in Tostatus on the place., though I confess some of his reasons are inconstringent and frivolous.

Moreover, this station at Marah was reached on or about the twenty-fourth day of Nisan, or April; and the first solemn observation of the Sabbath in the wilderness was upon the twenty-second of Iyar, the month following, as may easily be evinced from Moses' journal. There were therefore twenty-seven days between this fictitious institution of the Sabbath and the first solemn observation of it, which was at their station in Alush, as is generally supposed, certainly in the wilderness of Sin, after they had left Marah and Elim, and the coast of the Red sea, whereunto they returned from Elim, (0261)Exodus 16:1; (0433)Numbers 33:8-14. For they first began their journey out of Egypt on the fifteenth day of Nisan, or the first month, (0237)Exodus 12:37, (0433)Numbers 33:3; and they passed through the sea into the wilderness about the nineteenth day of the month, as is evident from their journeyings, (0433)Numbers 33:5-8. On the twenty-fourth of that month they pitched in Marah; and it was the fifteenth day of Iyar, or the second month, before they entered the wilderness of Sin, where is the first mention of their solemn observation of the Sabbath, upon the occasion of the gathering of manna, Between these two seasons three Sabbaths must needs intervene, and those immediately upon its first institution, if this fancy may be admitted. And yet the rulers of the congregation looked upon the people's preparation for its observation as an unusual thing, (0262)Exodus 16:22, which could not have fallen out had it received so fresh an institution.

Besides, these masters themselves, and Rashi in particular, who in his comment on the place promotes this fancy, grants that Abraham observed the Sabbath. But the law and ordinance hereof, they say, he received on peculiar favor and by especial revelation. But be it so; it was the great commendation of Abraham, and that given him by God himself, that he would "command his children and his household after him" to "keep the way of the LORD," (0189)Genesis 18:19. Whatever ordinance, therefore, he

received from God of any thing to be observed in his worship, it was a part of his fidelity to communicate the knowledge of it unto his posterity, and to teach them its observance. They must, therefore, of necessity, on those men's principles, be instructed in the doctrine and observation of the Sabbath before this pretended institution of it. Should we, then, allow that the generality of the Jewish masters and Talmudical rabbis do assert that the law of the Sabbath was first given in Marsh, yet the whole of what they assert being a mere curious, groundless conjecture, it may and ought to be rejected. Not what these men *say,* but what they *prove,* is to be admitted. And he who, with much diligence, hath collected testimonies out of them unto this purpose, hath only proved what they thought, but not what is the truth. And upon this fond imagination is built their general opinion, that the Sabbath was given only unto Israel, is the "spouse of the synagogue,'' and that it belongs not to the rest of mankind. Such dreams they may be permitted to please themselves withal; but that these things should be pleaded by Christians against the true original and use of the Sabbath is somewhat strange. If any think their assertions in this matter to be of any weight, they ought to admit what they add thereunto, namely, that all the Gentiles shall once a week keep a Sabbath in hell.

5. Neither is this opinion amongst them universal. Some of their most famous masters are otherwise minded; for they both judge that the Sabbath was instituted in paradise, and that the law of it was equally obligatory unto all nations in the world. Of this mind are Maimonides, Aben Ezra, Abarbanel, and others; for they expressly refer the revelation of the Sabbath unto the sanctification and benediction of the first seventh day, Genesis 2:3. The Targum on the title of Psalm xcii. ascribes that psalm to Adam, as spoken by him on the Sabbath day; whence Austin esteemed this rather the general opinion of the Jews, Tractat. 20 in Johan. And Manasseh Ben Israel, lib. de Creat. Problem. 8, proves out of sundry of their own authors that the Sabbath was given unto and observed by the patriarchs, before the coming of the people into the wilderness. In particular, that it was so by Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph, he confirms by testimonies out of the Scripture not to be despised. Philo Judæus and Josephus, both of them more ancient and more learned than any of the Talmudical doctors, expressly assign the original of the Sabbath unto that of the world. Philo calls it, Τοῦ κόσμου γενέσιον, "The day of the

world's nativity;" and ῾Εορτὴν οὐ μιᾶς πόλεως ἤ χώρας ἀλλὰ τοῦ παντός, "A feast not of one city or country, but of the whole world," De Opificio Mundi, et de Vita Mos lib. 2. To the same purpose speaks Josephus, lib. 2. cont. Apion. And the words of Abarbanel are sufficiently express in this matter: שבהכנסתו נשלמה ונגמרה מלאכת קדש משתה ויום סוג והבדיל לכבוד ולתפארת את יום השביעי בעבור וארץ כמו האדם בעשותו מלאכה יקרה יעשה אהד גמירתה שמים;—"He sanctified and separated the seventh day unto glory and honor, because on its approach the work of heaven and earth was perfected and finished,..., even as a man when he hath performed an honorable work and perfected it maketh a banquet and a day of feasting." And yet more evident is that of Maimon. Tract. Kiddush Hakkodesh cap. i.; הירח מסורה לכל אדם כמו שבת בראשית שכל אחד מונה ששה הדבר מסור עד שיקדשוהו בית דין וזקבעי אותו היום אין ראית ראש חדש הוא שיהיה ראש חדש ושובת בשביעי אלא לבית דיין;

— "The vision or sight of the moon is not delivered to all men, as was the Sabbath bereschith" (or "in the beginning"). "For every man can number six [days] and rest on the seventh: but it is committed to the house of judgment" (the sanhedrin), that is, to observe the appearances of the moon; "and when the sanhedrin declareth and pronounceth that it is the new moon, or the beginning of the month, then it is to be taken so to be." He distinguisheth their sacred feasts into the weekly Sabbath and the new moons, or those that depended ἀπὸ τῆς φάσεως τῆς σελήνης "upon the appearing of the new moon." The first he calls בראשית שבת, "Sabbath bereschith," the Sabbath instituted at the creation; for so, from the first of Genesis, they often express technically the work of the creation. This, he says, was given *to every man;* for there is no more required to the due observation of it, in point of time, but that a man be able to reckon six days, and so rest on the seventh. But now for the observation of the new moons, for all feasts that depended on the variations of her appearances, this was peculiar to themselves, and the determination of it left unto the sanhedrin. For they trusted not unto astrological computations merely as to the changes of the moon, but sent persons unto sundry high places to watch and observe her first appearances; which if they answered the general established rules, then they proclaimed the beginning of the feast to be. So Maimon. Kiddush Hakkodesh, cap. ii.

And Philippus Guadagnolus, Apol. pro Christiana Relig., part. 1:cap. viii., shows that Ahmed Ben Zin, a Persian Mohammedan, whom he confutes, affirmed that the institution of the Sabbath was from the creation of the world. This, indeed, he reflects upon in his adversary with a saying out of the Koran, Azoar. 3, where those that sabbatize are cursed: which yet will not serve his purpose; for in the Koran respect is had to the Jewish Sabbath, or the seventh day of the week precisely, while one day of seven only is pleaded by Ahmed to have been appointed from the foundation of the world. I know some learned men have endeavored to elude most of the testimonies which are produced to manifest the opinion of the most ancient Jews in this matter; but I know also that their exceptions might be easily removed, would the nature of our present design admit of a contest to that purpose.

6. We come now to the consideration of those different opinions concerning the original of the Sabbath which are embraced and contended about amongst learned men, yea, and unlearned also, of the present age and church. And rejecting the conceit of the Jews about the station in Marah, which very few think to have any probability attending it, there are two opinions in this matter that are yet pleaded for. The first is, that the Sabbath had its institution, precept, or warranty for its observation, in paradise, before the fall of man, immediately upon the finishing of the works of creation. This is thought by many to be plainly and positively asserted, <010203>Genesis 2:3; and our apostle seems directly to confirm it, by placing the blessing of the seventh day as the immediate consequent of the finishing of the works of God from the foundation of the world, <580403>Hebrews 4:3, 4. Others refer the institution of the Sabbath to the precept given about its observation in the wilderness of Sin, <021622>Exodus 16:22-26; for those who deny its original from the beginning, or a morality in its law, cannot assert that it was first given on Sinai, or had its spring in the decalogue, nor can give any peculiar reason why it should be inserted therein, seeing express mention is made of its observation some while before the giving of the law there. These, therefore, make it a mere typical institution, given, and that without the solemnity of the giving of other solemn institutions, to the church of the Hebrews only. And those of this judgment, some of them, contend that in these words of Moses, <010203>Genesis 2:3, “And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it

he had rested .from all his work," a prolepsis is to be admitted; that is, that what is there occasionally inserted in the narrative, and to be read in a parenthesis, came not to pass indeed until above two thousand years after, namely, in the wilderness of Sin, where and which God first blessed the seventh day and sanctified it. And the reason given for the supposed intersertion of the words in the story of Moses is, because when it came to pass indeed that God so blessed the seventh day, he did it on the account of what he was then relating of the works that he made, and the rest that ensued thereon. Others give such an interpretation of the words as that they should contain no appointment of a day of rest, as we shall see. Those who assert the former opinion deny that the precept, or rather directions, about the observation of the Sabbath given unto the people of Israel in the wilderness of Sin, Exodus 16, was its first original institution; but affirm that it was either a new declaration of the law and usage of it unto them, who in their long bondage had lost both its doctrine and practice, with a renewed re-enforcement of it, by an especial circumstance of the manna not falling on that day, or rather a particular application of a catholic moral command unto the economy of that church unto whose state the people were then under a preludium, in the occasional institution of sundry particular ordinances, as hath been declared in our former Exercitations. This is the plain state of the present controversy about the original of the Sabbath as to time and place, wherein what is according unto truth is now to be inquired after.

7. The opinion of the *institution of the Sabbath from the beginning of the world* is founded principally on a double testimony, one in the Old Testament, and the other in the New. And both of them seem to me of so uncontrollable an evidence that I have often wondered how ever any sober and learned persons undertook evade their force or efficacy in this cause. The first is that of [illegible]Genesis 2:1-3,

> "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all host of them, And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made."

There is, indeed, somewhat in this text which hath given difficulty unto the Jews, and somewhat that the heathen took offense at. That which troubles the Jews is, that God is said to have finished his work on the seventh day; for they fear that somewhat might be, hence drawn to the prejudice of their absolute rest on the seventh day, whereon it seems God himself wrought in the finishing of his work. And Jerome judged that they might be justly charged with this consideration.

> "Arctabimus," saith he, "Judos, qui de otio sabbati gloriantur, quod jam tunc in principio Sabbatum dissolutum sit; dun Deus operatur in Sabbato complens opera sua in eo, et benedicens ipsi diei, quia in illo universa complevit;"

— " We will urge the Jews with this, who glory of their sabbatical rest, in that the Sabbath was broken" (or "dissolved ")" from the beginning, whilst God wrought in it, finishing his work, and blessing the day, because in it he finished all things" Hence the LXX. read the words, by an open corruption, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ, "on the sixth day ;" wherein they are followed by the Syriac and Samaritan versions. And the rabbins grant that this was done on purpose that it might not be thought that God made any thing on the seventh day. But this scruple was every way needless; for, do but suppose that וַיְכַל, which expresseth the time past, doth intend the preterpluperfect tense, — as the preterperfect in the Hebrew must do where occasion requires, seeing they have no other to express that which at any time is past by, — and it is plain that God had perfected his work before the beginning of the seventh-day's rest. And so are the words well rendered by Junius, "Quum autem perfecisset Deus die septimo, opus suum quod fecerat." Or we may say, "Compleverat die septimo."

That which the heathen took offense at, was the rest here ascribed unto God, as though he boa been wearied with his work. Hence was that of Rutilius in his Itinerary: —

"Septima, quæque dies turpi damnata veterne,
Ut delassati mollis imago Dei."

The sense of this expression we shall afterwards explain. In the meantime, it is certain that the word here used doth often signify only to cease, or give over, without respect either to weariness or rest, as Job 32:1; 1

Samuel 25:9: so that no just cause of offense was given in the application of it to God himself. However, Philo, lib. de Opific. Mund., refers this of God's rest to his contemplation of the works of his hands, and that not unmeetly, as we shall see. But set aside prejudices and preconceived opinions, and any man would think that the institution of the Sabbath is here as plainly expressed as in the fourth commandment. The words are the continuation of a plain historical narration. Having finished the account of the creation of the world in the first chapter, and given a recapitulation of it in the first-verse of this, Moses declares what immediately ensued thereon, — namely, the rest of God on the seventh day, and his blessing and sanctifying that day whereon he so rested. That day on which he rested he blessed and sanctified, even that individual day in the first place, and a day in the revolution of the same space of time for succeeding generations. This is plain in the words, or nothing can be thought to be plainly expressed. And if there be any appearance of difficulty in these words, "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it," it is wholly taken away in the explication given of them by himself afterwards in the fourth commandment, where they are plainly declared to intend its setting apart and consecration to be a day of sacred rest. But yet exceptions are put in to this plain, open sense of the words. Thus it is lately pleaded by Heidegger, Theol. Patriarch. Exerc. iii. sect. 58,

> "Deus die septimo cessaverat facere opus novum, quia sex diebus omnia consummata erant. Ei dici benedixit eo ipso quod cessans ab opere suo, ostendit, quod homo in cujus creatione quievit, factus sit propter nominis sui glorificationem; quod cure mains fuerit cæteris quæ hactenus creata sunt, vocatur benedictio; eundem diem cui sic benedixit sanctificavit, quia et illo die, et reliquo toto tempore constituerat se in homine sanctificare tanquam in corona et gloria sui operis. Sanctificare enim est, eum qui sanctus est, sanctum dicere et testari. Dies igitur et tempus sanctum erat et agnoscebatur, non per se, sed per sanctitatem hominis, qui in tempore se sanctificat, et cogitationes, et studia, et actiones suas Deo, qui sanctus est, vindicat et consecrate"

I understand not how God can be said to bless the seventh day because man, who was created on the sixth day, was made for the glory of his name; for all things, as well as man, were made for the glory of God. He

"made all things for himself," [Proverbs 16:4] Proverbs 16:4; and they all "declare his glory," [Psalm 19:1] Psalm 19:1. Nor is it said that God rested on the seventh day from making' of man, but "from all his work which he had made." Granting man, who was last made, to have been the most eminent part of the visible creation, and most capable of immediate giving of glory to God, yet it is plainly said that the rest of God respected "all his work which he had made," which is twice repeated; besides that the works themselves are summed up into the making of "the heavens and the earth, and all the host of them." And wherein doth this include the blessing of the seventh day? It may he better applied to the sixth, wherein man was made; for on the seventh God did no more make man than he did the sun and moon, which were made on the fourth. Nor is there here any distinction supposed between God's resting on the seventh day and his blessing of it, which yet are plainly distinguished in the text. To say he blessed and sanctified it merely by resting on it, is evidently to confound the things that are not only distinctly proposed in the text, but so proposed as that one is laid down as the cause of the other; for because God rested on the seventh day, therefore he blessed it. Nor is the sanctification of the day any better expressed. "God," saith he, "had appointed on that day, and always, to sanctify himself in man, as the crown and glory of his work." I wish this learned man had more clearly expressed himself. What act of God is it that can be here intended? It must be the purpose of his will. This, therefore, is given us as the sense of this place: God sanctified the seventh day; that is, God purposed from eternity to sanctify himself always in man, whom on the sixth day he would create for his glory. These things are so forced as that they scarcely afford a tolerable sense.

8. Neither is the sense given by this author and some others of that expression, "to sanctify,' — that is, to declare or testify any person or thing to be holy, — being spoken by God, and not of him objectively, usual, or to be justified. In reference unto God, our sanctifying him, or his name, is indeed to testify or declare his holiness, by our giving honor and glory to him in our holy obedience. But as to men and things, to sanctify them, is either really to sanctify them, by making them internally holy, or to separate and dedicate them unto holy uses; the former peculiar to persons, the latter common to them with other things made sacred, by an authoritative separation from profane or common uses, unto a peculiar,

sacred, or holy use in the worship of God. Nor are the following words in our author, that “the day is sanctified and made holy, not in itself, but by the holiness of man,” any more to the purpose; for as man was no more created on that day than the beasts of the field, — so that from his holiness no color can be taken to ascribe holiness unto the day, — so it is not consistent with what was before asserted, that the sanctification intended is the holiness of God himself as declared in his works, for now it is made the holiness of man.

The sense of the words is plain, and is but darkened by these circumlocutions: וַיְבָרֶךְ אֱלֹהִים אֶת־יוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי וַיְקַדֵּשׁ אֹתוֹ. The Jews do well express the general sense of the words, when they say of the day, that נבדל מעסקי העולם, “It was divided” (or “distinguished) “from the common nature of things in the world,” namely, by having a new, sacred relation added unto it; for that the day itself is the subject spoken of, as the object of God’s blessing and sanctification, nothing but unallowable prejudice will deny. And this to be the sense of the expressions both the words used to declare the acts of God about it do declare.

(1.) וַיְבָרֶךְ, “He blessed it.” God’s blessing, as the Jews say, and they say well therein, is תוספת טובת, — “an addition of good.” It relates to some thing that hath a real present existence, to which it makes an addition of some further good than it was before partaker of. Hereof, as we said, the day in this place was the *direct and immediate object:* “God blessed it.” Some peculiar good was added unto it. Let this be inquired into, what it was and wherein it did consist, and the meaning of the words will be evident. It must be somewhat whereby it was preferred unto or exalted above other days. When any thing of that nature is assigned, besides a relation given unto it to the worship of God, it shall be considered. That this was it, is plain from the nature of the thing itself, and from the actual separation and use of it to that purpose which did ensue.

(2.) The other word, וַיְקַדֵּשׁ, “And sanctified it,” is further instructive in the intention of God, and is also exegetical of the former. Suppose still, as the text will not allow us to do otherwise, that the day is the object of this sanctification, and it is not possible to assign any other sense of the words but that God set apart, by his institution, that day to be the day of his

worship, to be spent in a sacred rest unto himself. And this is declared to be the intendment of the word in the decalogue, where it is used again to the same purpose; for none ever doubted that the meaning of וַיְקַדֵּשׁ, "And he sanctified it," therein, is any other but that by his institution and command he set it apart for a day of holy rest. And this signification of that word is not only most common, but solely to be admitted in the Old Testament, if cogent reason be not given to the contrary; as where it denotes a dedication and separation to civil uses, and not to sacred, as it sometimes doth, still retaining its general nature of separation. And therefore I will not deny but that these two words may signify the same thing, the one being merely exegetical of the other. He blessed it by sanctifying of it; as Numbers 7:1, וַיִּמְשָׁחֵם וַיְקַדֵּשׁ אֹתָם, "And he anointed them and sanctified them ;" that is, he sanctified them by anointing them, or by their unction set them apart unto a holy use: which is the instance of Abarbanel on this place. This, then, is that which is affirmed by Moses: On the seventh day, after he had .finished his work, God rested, or ceased from working, and thereon blessed and sanctified the seventh day, or set it apart unto holy uses, for their observance by whom he was to be worshipped in this world, and whom he had newly made for that purpose. God then sanctified this day: not that he *kept it holy* himself, which in no sense the divine nature is capable of; nor that he purified it, and made it *inherently* holy, which the nature of the day is incapable of; nor that he *celebrated* that which in itself was holy, as we sanctify his name, which is the act of an inferior towards a superior; but that he *set it apart* to sacred use *authoritatively*, requiring us to sanctify it in that use *obedientially*. And if you allow not this original sanctification of the seventh day, the first instance of its solemn, joint, national observation is introduced with a strange abruptness. It is said, Exodus 16, where this instance is given, that "on the sixth day the people gathered twice as much bread" as on any other day, namely, "two omers for one man ;" which the rulers taking notice of acquainted Moses with it, verse 22. And Moses, in answer to the rulers of the congregation, who had made the information, gives the reason of it: "To-morrow," saith he, "is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the LORD," verse 23. Many of the Jews can give some color to this manner of expression; for they assign, as we have showed, the revelation and institution of the Sabbath unto the station in Marah, Exodus 15, which was almost a month before. So they think that no more is here

intended but a direction for the solemn observance of that day which was before instituted, with particular respect unto the gathering of manna; which the people being commanded in general before to gather every day according to their eating, and not to keep any of it until the next day, the rulers might well doubt whether they ought not to have gathered it on the Sabbath also, not being able to reconcile a seeming contradiction between those two commands, of gathering manna every day, and of resting on the seventh- But those by whom the fancy about the station in Marah is rejected, as it is rejected by most Christians, and who will not admit of its original institution from the beginning, can scarce give a tolerable account of this manner of expression. Without the least intimation of institution and command, it is only said, "To-morrow is the Sabbath holy to the LORD ;" that is, ' for you to keep holy.' Bat on the supposition contended for, the discourse in that place, with the reason of it, is plain and evident; for there being a previous institution of the seventh day's rest, the observation whereof was partly gone into disuse, and the day itself being then to receive a new, peculiar application to the church-state of that people, the reason both of the people's act, and the rulers' doubt, and Moses' resolution, is plain and obvious.

9. Wherefore, granting the sense of the words contended for, there is yet another exception put in to invalidate this testimony as to the original of a seventh day's sabbatical rest from the foundation of the world. And this is taken, not from the signification of the words, but the connection and disposition of them in the discourse of Moses. For suppose that by God's blessing and sanctifying the seventh day, the separation of it unto sacred uses is intended, yet this doth not prove that it was so sanctified immediately upon the finishing of the work of creation. For, say some learned men, these words of [illegible]Genesis 2:3,

> "And God blessed the seventh, day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made,"

are inserted occasionally into the discourse of Moses, from what afterwards came to pass, They are not therefore, as they suppose, a continued part of the historical narration there insisted on, but are inserted into it by way of prolepsis or anticipation, and are to be read as it were in a parenthesis. For supposing that Moses wrote not the book of Genesis

until after the giving of the law (which I will not contend about, though it be assumed gratis in this discourse), there being a respect had unto the rest of God when his works were finished in the institution of the Sabbath, upon the historical relation of that rest Moses interserts what so long after was done and appointed on the account thereof. And so the sense of the words must be, that "God rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made ;" that is, the next day after the finishing of the works of creation: wherefore, two thousand four hundred years after, "God blessed the seventh day, and 'sanctified it," — not that seventh day where, on he rested, with them that succeeded in the like revolution of time, but a seventh day that felt out so long after, which was not blessed nor sanctified before ! I know not well how men learned and sober can offer more hardship unto a text than is put upon this before us by this interpretation. The connection of the words is plain and equal: "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." You may as well break off the order and continuation of the words and discourse in any other place as in that pretended. And it may be as well feigned that God finished his work on the seventh day, and afterwards rested another seventh day, as that he rested the seventh day, and afterwards blessed and sanctified another. It is true, there may be sundry instances given out of the Scripture of sundry things inserted in historical narrations by way of anticipation, which fell not out until after the time wherein mention is made of them; but they are mostly such as fell out in the same age or generation, the matter of the whole narration being entire within the memory of men. But of so monstrous and uncouth a prolepsis as this would be, which is supposed, no instance can be given in the Scripture or any sober author, especially without the least notice given that such it is And such schemes of writing are not to be imagined, unless necessity from the things, themselves spoken of compel us to admit them, much less where the matter treated of and the coherence of the words do necessarily exclude such an imagination, as it is in this. place; for without the introduction of the words mentioned, neither is the discourse complete nor the matter of tract absolved. And what lieth against our construction and interpretation of these words, from

the arguments insisted on to prove the institution of the Sabbath in the wilderness, shall be afterwards considered.

10. The testimony, to the same purpose with the former, taken out of the New Testament, is that of our apostle: [3403]Hebrews 4:3, 4,

> "For we which have believed do enter into rest, as he said, As I sware in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest: although the works were finished from the foundation of the world. For he speaketh somewhere concerning the seventh day on this wise, And God rested on the seventh day from all his works."

having insisted at large on this place, with the whole ensuing discourse, in our exposition of the chapter itself, I shall here but briefly reflect upon it, refereeing the reader for its full vindication unto its proper place. The present design is to convince the Hebrews of their concernment in the promise of entering into the rest of God, namely, that promised rest which yet remained, and was prophesied of, Psalm 95. To this purpose he manifests, that notwithstanding any other rest of God that was mentioned in the Scripture, there yet remained *another rest,* for them that did or would believe in Christ through the gospel. In the proof and confirmation hereof he takes into consideration the several rests of God, under the several states of the church which were now past and gone. And first he fixeth upon the sabbatical rest of the seventh day, as that which was the first in order, first instituted, first enjoyed or observed. And this, he says, ensued upon the finishing of the works of creation. This the order of the words and coherence of them require: "Although the works were finished from the foundation of the world. For he speaketh concerning the seventh day on this wise." The works and the finishing of them did not at all belong to the apostle's discourse or purpose, but only as they denoted the *beginning of the seventh day's sabbatical rest;* for it is the several rests of God alone that he is inquiring after. ' The first rest mentioned,' saith he, ' cannot be that intended in the psalm; because that rest began from the foundation of .the world, but this mentioned by David is promised,' as he speaketh, 'so long a time after.' And what was this rest? Was it merely God's ceasing from his own works? This the apostle had no concernment in; for he treateth of no rest of God absolutely, but of such a rest as men by faith and obedience might enter into, — such as was that afterwards in

the land of Canaan, and that also which he now proposed to them in the promise of the gospel, both which God calleth his rests, and inviteth others unto an entrance into them. Such, therefore, must be the rest of God here intended; for concerning his rest *absolutely*, or his mere cessation from working, he had no reason to treat: for his design was only to show that notwithstanding the other rests that were proposed unto men for to obtain an entrance into them, there yet remained another rest, to be entered into and enjoyed under the gospel Such a rest, therefore, there was instituted and appointed of God from the foundation of the world immediately upon the finishing of the works of creation; which fixeth immovably the beginning of the sabbatical rest. The full vindication of this testimony the reader may find in the Exposition itself, whither he is referred. And I do suppose that no cause can be confirmed with more clear and undeniable testimonies. The observation and tradition of this institution, whereby it will be further confirmed, are next to be inquired after.

11. That this divine original institution of the seventh-day Sabbath was piously observed by the patriarchs, who retained a due remembrance of divine revelations, is out of controversy amongst all that acknowledge the institution itself; by others it is denied, that they may not be forced to acknowledge such an institution. And indeed it is so fallen out with the two great ordinances of divine worship before the giving of the law, the one instituted before the fall, the other immediately upon it, that they should have contrary lots in this matter, — namely, the *Sabbath*, and *sacrifices*. The Sabbath we find expressly instituted; and therefore do and may justly conclude that it was constantly observed, although that observation be not directly and in terms mentioned. Sacrifices we find constantly observed by holy men of old, although we read not of their express institution; but from their observation we do and may conclude that they were instituted, although that institution be not expressly recorded. But yet as there is such light into the institution of sacrifices as may enable us to justify them by whom they were used, that they acted therein according to the mind of God and in obedience unto his will, as we have elsewhere demonstrated; so there want not such instances of the observation of the Sabbath as may confirm the original divine institution of it pleaded for. This, therefore, I shall a little inquire into.

Many of the Jewish masters, as we observed before, ascribe the original of the Sabbath unto the statute given them in Marah, Exodus 15:And yet the same persons grant that it was observed by the religious patriarchs before, especially by Abraham, unto whom the knowledge of it was granted by peculiar privilege. But these things are mutually destructive of each other. For they have .nothing to prove the institution of the Sabbath in Marah but these words of verse 25, שָׁם שָׂם לוֹ חֹק וּמִשְׁפָּט, — "There he made for them a statute and an ordinance." And it is said of Abraham that he "commanded his children and his household after him" to "keep the way of the LORD, to do justice and judgment," [Genesis 18:19]. If, then, the observation of the Sabbath be a "statute" or "ordinance," and. was made known to Abraham, it is certain that he instructed his household and children, all his posterity, in their duty with respect thereunto. And if so, it could not be first revealed unto them at Marah. Others, therefore, of their masters do grant, as we observed also, the original of the Sabbath from the creation, and do assert the patriarchal observation of it upon that foundation. The instances, I confess, which they make use of are not absolutely cogent; but yet, considered with other circumstances wherewith they are strengthened, they may be allowed to conclude unto a high probability. Some of them are collected by Manasseh Ben Israel, Lib. de Creat. Problem. 8. Saith he, "Dico quemadmodum traditio creationis mundi penes Abrahamum et ejus posteros tantum fuit; ita etiam ex dictamine legis naturalis Sabbatum ab iis solis culture fuisse. De Abrahamo dicit sacra Scriptura, 'Observavit cultum meum' (מִשְׁמַרְתִּי), [Genesis 26:5]; quo loco custodia Sabbati intelligitur. De Jacobo idem affirmant veteres, ex eo loco quo dicitur venisse ad Salem, et castra posuisse e regione vel ad conspectum civitatis (אֶת־פְּנֵי הָעִיר), [Genesis 33:18]. Quia enim Sabbatum, inquiunt, instabat, non licebat ei ulterius proficisci, sed subsistebat ante urbem. Idem asserunt de Josepho, quando dicitur jussisse servis suis ut mactarent et præpararent, id propter Sabbatum factum fuisse. Ad hoc refertur in fera et Rabba Mosem petiisse a Pharaone in Ægypto, ut afflicto populo suo permitteret uno die cessare à laboribus; eoque impetrato, ex traditione elegisse Sabbatum; ex his omnibus colligitur Sabbatum ante datam legem observatum fuisse." So far he. Of the observation of the Sabbath by the light of nature we shall treat afterwards. As to the instances mentioned by him, that concerning Abraham is not

destitute of good probability. That expression, וַיִּשְׁמֹר מִשְׁמַרְתִּי, "And kept my charge," seems to have peculiar respect unto the Sabbath, called elsewhere "The charge of the LORD." Hence some of those amongst Christians who contend for the wilderness original of the Sabbath, yet grant that probably there was a free observation of it among the patriarchs, from the tradition they had of the rest of God upon the creation of the world. So Tornellius, Annal. Vet. Test.; Suarez de Religione, lib. ii. cap. i. sect. 3; Prideaux Orat. de Sabbat. For as there is no doubt but that the creation of the world was one of the principal articles of their faith, as our apostle also asserts, Hebrews 11:3, so it is fond to imagine that they had utterly lost the tradition of the rest of God upon the finishing of his works; and it may easily be conceived what that would influence them unto, should you suppose that they had lost the remembrance of its express institution, which will not be granted. What, therefore, may be certainly judged or determined of their practice in this matter shall be briefly declared.

That all the ancient patriarchs before the giving of the law diligently observed the solemn worship of God in and with their families, and those under their rule or any way belonging to their care and disposal, both their own piety forbids us to question, and the testimony given them that they walked with God, and by faith therein obtained a good report, gives us the highest assurance. Now, of all obedience unto God faith is the principle and foundation, without which it is impossible to please him, Hebrews 11:6. This faith doth always (and must always so do) respect the command and promise of God, which gives it its formal nature; for no other principle, though it may produce the like actions with it, is divine faith but what respects the command and promise of God, so as to be steered, directed, guided, and bounded by them. Unto this solemn worship of God, which in faith they thus attended unto, some stated time is indispensably necessary; and therefore that *some portion* of time should be set apart to that purpose is acknowledged almost by all to be a dictate of the law of nature, and we shall afterwards prove it so to be. What ground have we now to imagine that the "holy men of old" were left without divine direction in this matter? That a designation and limitation of this time was, or would have been, of great use and advantage unto them, none can deny. Considering, therefore, the dealings of God with

them, and how frequently he renewed-unto them the knowledge of his will by occasional revelations, it cannot be supposed that divine grace was wanting unto them herein. Besides, in what-they did in this kind, they are expressly said to "keep the way of the LORD," [189]Genesis 18:19; and in particular, "his charge, his commandments, his statutes, and his laws," chap. 26:5, — which comprise all the institutions and ordinances of divine worship. That they did any thing of themselves, from their own wisdom and invention, in the worship of God, is nowhere intimated, nor are they anywhere commended on the account thereof; yea, to do a thing in faith, as they did whatever of this kind they did, and that as a part of the worship of God, is to do it upon the command of God. And the institution mentioned, upon the reason of God's rest joined with it, is so express as that none can doubt a practice conformable unto it by all that truly feared the Lord, although the particulars of it should not be recorded.

12. It was from no other original that the tradition of the sacredness of the septenary number, and the fixing of the first period of time (next unto that which is absolutely natural, and appearing so to the senses, of night and day, with the composition of the night and day into one measure of time, which was also from the original creation and Conjunction of evening and morning into one day) unto a septenary revolution of days, was so catholic in the world, and that both amongst nations in general, and particularly amongst individual persons that were inquiring and contemplative. Not only that sort of philosophers who expressed their apprehensions mystically by numbers, as the Pythagoreans. and some of the Platonics, who from hence took the occasion of that way of teaching and instruction, esteemed the septenary number sacred, but those also did so who resolved their observations into things natural or physical; for in all their notions and speculations about the Pleiades and Triones in heaven, lunar changes, sounds of instruments, variations in the age of man, critical days in bodily distempers, and transaction of affairs private and public, they found a respect thereunto. It must therefore be granted, that there is a great impression left on the whole creation of a regard to this number, whereof instances might be multiplied. The ground hereof was no other but an emanation from the old tradition of the creation of the world, and the rest that ensued on the seventh day. So say the ancient verses, which some ascribe to Linus, others to Callimachus: —

῾Επτὰ δὲ πάντα τέτυκται ἐν οὐρανῷ ἀστερόεντι
῾Εν κυκλοῖς φανέντ᾽ ἐπιτελλομένοις ἐνιαυτοῖς· —

"In seven all things were perfected in the starry heavens, which appear in their orbs or circles, in the rolling or voluble years."

This was the true original of their notions concerning the sacredness of the number seven. But when this was obscured or lost amongst them, as were the greatest and most important sacred truths communicated unto man in his creation, they, many of them, retaining the principle of the sacred number, invented other reasons for it of no importance. Some of these were arithmetical, some harmonical or musical notions. But were their reasons for it never so infirm, the thing itself they still retained. Hence were their notations of this number. It was termed by them the Virgin, and Pallas, and Καρός, which sacredly is, saith Hesychius, ὁ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀριθμός, "the number of seven." It is hard to give any-other account whence all these conceptions should arise besides that insisted on. From the original impression made on the minds of men by the instruction of the *law of creation,* which they were made under, and the tradition of the creation of the world in six days, dosed with an additional day of sacred rest, did these notions and obscure remembrances of the specialty of that number arise. And although we have not yet inquired what influence into the law of creation, as instructive and directive of our actions, the six days' work had, with its consequential day of rest, yet all will grant that whatever it was, it was far more clear and cogent unto man in innocency, directly obliged by that law, and able to understand its voice in all things, than it could be to them who, by the effects of it, made some dark inquiries after it; who were yet able to conclude that there was somewhat sacred in the number of seven, though they knew not well what.

13. Neither was the number of seven only in general sacred amongst them, but there are testimonies produced out of the most ancient writers amongst the heathen expressing a notion of a seventh day's sacred feast and rest. Many of these were of old collected by Clemens Alexandrinus and by Eusebius out of Aristobulus, a learned Jew. They have by many been insisted on, and yet I think it not amiss here once more to report them. The words of Aristobulus, wherewith he prefaceth his allegation of them, are in Eusebius, Præpar. Evangel., lib. xiii. cap. xii., speaking of the seventh day, Διασάφει ῞Ομηρος καὶ ῾ησίοδος μετειληφότες ἐκ τῶν

ἡμετέρων βιζλίων ἱερὰν εἶναι·— " Homer and Hesiod, taking it out of our books, do openly affirm that it is sacred." That what they affirm herein was taken from the Jewish books I much question, nor do I think that in their time, when the Law only was written, the nations of the world had any the least acquaintance with their writing, nor much until after the Babylonish captivity, when they began to be taken notice of; which [knowledge of them] was principally diffused under the Persian empire, by their commerce with the Grecians, who inquired into all things of that nature, and that had an appearance of secret wisdom. But these apprehensions, whatever they were, they seem rather to have taken up from the secret insinuations of the law of creation, and the tradition that was in the world of the matter of fact. Out of Hesiod, therefore, he cites the following testimonies,

᾽᾽ Εργ. καὶ ᾽ Ημ. 770: —

Πρῶτον ἔνη, τετράς τε, καὶ ἑζδόμη, ἱερὸν ἦμαρ·—

"The first, the fourth and the seventh day, is sacred."

Again, —

῾ Εζδομάτη δ᾽ αὖτις λαμπρὸν φάος ἠελίοιο·—

"The seventh again the sacred or illustrious light of the sun."

And out of Homer, —

῾ Εζδομάτη δ᾽ ἤπειτα κατήλυθεν ἱερὸν ἦμαρ·—

"Then came the seventh day, that is sacred."

Again, —

῞Εζδομάτῃ δὴ οἱ λίπομεν ῥόον ἐξ ᾽ Αχέροντος·—

"It was the seventh day, wherein al1 things were finished, or perfected."

Again, —

῾ ΕζδομάΤῃ δὴ οἱ λίπομεν ῥόον ἐξ᾽ Αχέροντος· —

"We left the flood of Acheron on the seventh day."

Whereunto he subjoins an ingenious exposition about the relinquishment of the oblivion of error, by virtue of the sacredness of the number seven.

He adds also out of Linus: —

ἑ Εζδομάτῃ δὴ οἱ τετελέσμενα πάντα τέτυκται· —

"The seventh day, wherein all things were finished."

Again,—

ἑ Εζδόμη εἶν ἀγαθοῖς, καὶ ἑζδὸμη ἐστί γενέθλη,
Εζδόμη ἐν πρωτοῖσι, καὶ ἑζδόμη ἐστὶ τελείς·—

"The seventh day among the best things, the seventh is the nativity of all things
The seventh is among the chiefest, and is the perfect day."

Again, —

ἑ Επτὰ δὲ παντα τέτυκται ἐν οὐρανῷ ἀστερόεντι
ἑ Εν κυκλοῖσι φανέντ᾽ ἐπιτελλομένοις ἐνιαυτοῖς·

of which before.

The same testimonies he repeats again in his next chapter out of Clemens, with an alteration of some few words not of any importance; and the verses ascribed to Linus in Aristobulus are said to be the work of Callimachus in Clemens, — which is not of our concernment. Testimonies to the same purpose may be taken out of some of the Roman writers. So Tibullus, giving an account of the excuses he made for his unwillingness to leave Rome, —

"Aut ego sum causatus aves, aut omina, dira
Saturni sacra me tenuisse die;" —

"Either I laid it on the birds" (he had no encouraging augury), "or that bad omens had detained me on the sacred day of Saturn," lib. 1:eleg. iii.

14. I shall not, from these and the like testimonies, contend that the heathens did generally allow and observe themselves one day sacred in the week. Nor can I grant, on the other hand, that those ancient assertions of Hesiod, Homer, and Linus, are to be measured by the late Roman writers, poets or others, who ascribe the seventh day's sacred feast to the Jews in way of reproach; as Ovid,—

——"Nec to peregrina morentur
Sabbata," Remed. Amoris v. 219; —
"Stay not" (thy journey) "for foreign Sabbaths."

And Artis Amator lib. 1. 416, —

"Culta Palæstino septima festa Syro;" —
"The seventh day feast observed by the Jew."

Nor shall I plead the testimony of Lampridius, concerning the Emperor Alexander Severus going into the Capitol and the temples on the seventh day, seeing in those times he might learn that observance from the Jews, whose customs he had occasion to be acquainted with; for all ancient traditions were before this time utterly worn out or inextricably corrupted. And when the Jews by their conversation with the Romans, after the wars of Pompey, began to present them unto them again, the generality despised them all, out of their hatred and contempt of that people. And I do know that sundry learned men, especially two of late, Gomarus and Selden, have endeavored to show that the testimonies usually produced in this case do not prove what they are urged for. Great pains they have taken to refer them all to the sacredness of the septenary number before mentioned, or to the seventh day of the month, sacred, as is pretended, on the account of the birth of Apollo; whereunto, indeed, it is evident that Hesiod hath respect in his ἕζδομον ἱερὸν ἦμαρ. But the authority of Aristobulus and Clemens is not to be despised. Something they knew, undoubtedly, of the state of things in the world in their own days and those that went before; and they do not only instance in the testimonies before rehearsed, but also assert that the sacredness of one of the seven days was generally admitted by all. And the testimonies of Philo and Josephus are so express to that purpose as that their force cannot be waived without offering violence unto their words. The words of Philo we expressed before. And Josephus, in his second book against Apion, chap. XXXix., says positively, Οὐδ᾽ ἔστιν οὐ πόλις ῾Ελλήνων, οὐδετισοῦν οὐδὲ βαρζαρος, οὐδὲ ἔν ἔθνος, ἔνθα μὴ τὸ τῆς ἑζδομάδος ἥν ἀργοῦμεν ἡμεῖς, τὸ ἔθος οὐ διαπεφοίτηκε· — "There is neither any city of the Greeks, nor barbarians, nor any nation whatever, to whom our custom of resting on the seventh day is not come." And this, in the words foregoing, he affirmeth to have been ἐκ μακροῦ, from a long time before, as not taken up by an occasional acquaintance with them. And Lucian his

Pseudologista tells us that children at school were exempted from studying ἐν ταῖς ἑζδὸαις, “on the seventh days;” and Tertullian his Apology, cap. xvi., tells the Gentiles of their sabbaths or on Saturday. But yet, as was intimated, I shall grant that the observation of a weekly sacred feast is not proved by the testimonies produced; which is all that those who oppose them do labor to disprove. But I desire to know from what original these traditions were derived, and whether any can be assigned unto them but that of the original institution of the sabbatical rest. It is known that this was common amongst them, that when they had a general notion or tradition of any thing, whose true cause, reason, and beginning, they knew not, they would feign a reason or occasion of accommodated to their present apprehensions and practices, as I have elsewhere evinced and cleared. Having, therefore, amongst them the tradition of a seventh day’s sacred rest, which was originally catholic, and having long lost the practice and observance of it, well as its cause and reason, they laid hold on any thing to affix it unto which might have any resemblance unto what was vulgarly received amongst them, or what they could divine in their more curious speculations.

15. The hebdomadal revolution of time, generally admitted in the world, is also a great testimony unto the original institution of the Sabbath. Of old it was catholic, and is at present received among those nations whose converse was not begun until of late with any of those parts of the world where there is a light gone forth in these things from the Scripture. All nations, I say, in all ages, have from time immemorial made the revolution of seven days to be the second stated period of time. And this observation is still continued throughout the world, unless amongst them who in other things are openly degenerated from the law of nature; as those barbarous Indians who have no computation of times, but by sleeps, moons, and winters. The measure of time by a day and night is directed unto sense by the diurnal course of the sun: lunar months and solar years are of an unavoidable observation unto all rational creatures. Whence, therefore, all men have reckoned time by days, months, and years, is obvious unto all But whence the hebdomadal revolution, or weekly period of time, should make its entrance and obtain a catholic admittance, no man can give an account, but with respect to some impressions on the minds of men from the constitution and law of our nature, with the tradition of a sabbatical

rest instituted from the foundation of the world. Other original, whether artificial and arbitrary or occasional, it could not have. Nothing of any such thing hath left the least footsteps of its ever being in any of the memorials of times past. Neither could any thing of so low an original or spring be elevated to such a height as to diffuse itself through the whole world. A derivation of this observation from the Chaldeans and Egyptians, who retained the deepest tincture of original traditions, hath been manifested by others. And so fixed was this computation of time on their minds, who knew not the reason of it, that when they made a disposition of the days of the year into any other period, on accounts civil or sacred, yet they still retained this also. So the Romans, as appears by the fragments of their old kalendars, had their nundinæ, which were days of vacation from labor, on the eighth, or, as some think, the ninth day's recurring; but yet still made use of the stated weekly period. It is of some consideration in this cause, and is usually urged to this purpose, that Noah observed the septenary revolution of days in sending forth the dove out of the ark, Genesis 8:10, 12. That this was done casually is not to be imagined. Nor can any reason be given why, notwithstanding the disappointment he met with the first and second time, he should still abide seven days before he sent again, if' you consider only the natural condition of the flood, or the waters in their abatement. A revolution of days, and that upon a sacred account, was doubtless attended unto by him. And I should suppose that he still sent out the dove the next day after the Sabbath, to see, as it were, whether God had returned again to rest in the works of his hands. And, Genesis 29:27, a week is spoken of as a known account of days or time: "Fulfil her week;" that is, not a week of years, as he had done for Rachel, but fulfill a week of days in the festival of his marriage with Leah; for שְׁבַע זֹאת can have no other sense, seeing זֹאת, of the feminine gender, relates unto Leah, whose nuptials were to be celebrated, and not to שְׁבַע, "a week," which is of the masculine. And it was the custom, in those ancient times of the world, to continue the celebration of a marriage feast for seven days, or a week; as Judges 14:12, 15, 17. "The seven days of the feast" is spoken of as a thing commonly known and in vulgar use.

16. Let us, therefore, consider what is offered to weaken the force of this observation. It is pretended that the ancient heathen, or the contemplative persons amongst them, observing the unfixed, various motions of the

seven planetary luminaries, as they used and abused it to other ends, so they applied their number and names unto so many days, which were thereby as it were dedicated unto them, which shut them up in that septenary number. But that the observation of the weekly revolution of time was from the philosophers, and not the common consent of the people, doth not appear; for those observed also the twelve signs of the zodiac, and yet made that no rule to reckon time or days by. Besides, the observation of the site and posture of the seven planets, as to their height or elevation with respect unto one another, is as ancient as the observation of their peculiar and various motions. And upon the first discovery thereof, all granted this to be their order, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Sol, Venus, Mercury, Luna. What alteration is made herein by the late hypothesis, fixing the sun as in the center of the world, built on fallible phenomena, and advanced by many arbitrary presumptions, against evident testimonies of Scripture and reasons as probable as any that are produced in its confirmation, is here of no consideration: for it is certain that all the world in former ages was otherwise minded; and our argument is not taken, in this matter, from what really *was true*, but from what was universally apprehended *so to be*. Now, whence should it be, that, if this limiting the first revolution of time unto seven days proceeded from the planetary denominations fixed to the days of the year arbitrarily, the order among the planets should be so changed as every one sees it to be? For in the assignation of the names of the planets to the days of the week, the midst is taken out first, and so the fourth in order inclusive falls to be next, until the whole cycle be finished. Some would take the reason hereof from the proportion of harmony, some from the diurnal ascension of the planets; which is ridiculous. So Dio Cassius, in the thirty-seventh book of his History (the third of them that remain), treating of the taking of Jerusalem by Pompey on the seventh day of the week, when the people, out of their superstition, made not their wonted resistance, inquires on that occasion of the reason of the assignation of the planetary names to the days of the week; which he affirms to have had its original from the Egyptians. And two reasons he tells us that he had heard of the especial assignation of their several names unto the several days, in the order wherein they are commonly used. The first is, that it was taken from the harmony δαὶ τεσσάρων, or the musical note of diatessaron. For beginning, saith he, with Saturn in the highest sphere, and so passing unto the fourth in order,

it is the Sun, and so throughout in the whole revolution. His other reason is, that taking the day and night, beginning with the first hour, and assigning the name of a planet to each hour, beginning with Saturn for the reason before mentioned, and the succeeding hours to the other planets in their order, so renewing the numerations to the end of the four and twenty hours, the first hour of the next day falls to the Sun, and so of the day following to the moon, and the remainder to the other planets in the order commonly ascribed unto them. What there is in these conjectures I know not; but both of them give the precedency of the first day, as they are fixed, unto that which, in the true and natural order of the days, is the last. There is a good account given us of this matter by Johannes Philoponus, περὶ κοσμοποιΐας, or de Creation. Mund. Lib. vii. cap. xiv.:

> ’’ Εκεῖνο γε μὴν συμπεφώνηται πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἑππὰ μόνος εἶναι ἡμέρας, αἵτινες εἰς ἑαυτὰς ἀνακυκλουμέναι πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἑπτὰ μόνας εἶναι ἡμέρας, αἵτινες εἰς ἑαυτὰς ἀνακυκλουμέναι τὸν ὅλον ποιοῦσι χρόνον.

“This,” saith he, “is consented unto amongst all men, that there are only seven days, which, by a revolution into themselves, compose the whole of time; whereof we can assign no other reason but that only which is given by Moses. The Grecians, indeed, ascribe the seven days to the seven planets, — the first to the Sun, the second to the Moon, the third to Mars, the fourth to Mercury, the fifth to Jupiter, the sixth to Venus, the seventh to Saturn; and hereby they first acknowledge that there are but seven days, whereof al1 time consisteth: but further they can give no reason why the days are so dished of unto the planets; for why did they not rather constitute twelve days, from the twelve parts of the zodiac, through which the sun passing perfecteth the year? Nor can any reason be assigned from the motions of the planets why any one of the days is inscribed to any of them. It is most likely, therefore, that the Gentiles, as they without just reason or cause dedicated the planets by the names of demons and heroes, so when they observed that there were seven days acknowledged by all, and that the planets were so many in number, they did according to their pleasure, in the two equal numbers, assigning one day to one planet, another to another.” To which he adds truly, Μόνος ἄρα τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ ἑζδομαδικοῦ τῶν ἡμέρων ἀριθμοῦ ζεόθεν ἐμπνευσθεὶς ὁ μέγας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀποδέδωκε Μωυσῆς· — “ Only the great Moses,

being divinely inspired, hath delivered unto men the true reason of the septenary number of the days." So far he. There seems to be some reason for assigning the conduct of time to the sun, or calling the first day by his name, as also of adjoining the moon unto him in the next place; for the succession of the sun, though created the fourth day, in point of use, unto that diffused light which was created the first day, with its being the instrumental cause and measure of every day, with the tradition of the appointment of sun and moon to rule and distinguish times and seasons, with the sensible effects and operations of them, might easily give them the pre-eminence by common consent in giving names unto the days of the week. The other names were added and applied according to some prevailing fictions concerning the planets, and their respect unto men and their actions. But the hebdomadal period of time was fixed long before the imposition of those names prevailed among the Grecians and the Romans; which perhaps is not very anciently, as Dio thinks, though they derived them from the Chaldeans and Egyptians. And that the acknowledgment of seven days gave occasion to fix unto them the names of the seven planets, and not that the observation of the seven planets gave occasion to compute the days of the world by sevens, is manifest from hence, in that many nations admitting of the hebdomadal revolution of time gave the days in it quite other names, as various reasons or occasions did suggest them unto them. In the ancient Celtic or German tongue, and all languages thence deriving, the sun and moon only, on the reasons before mentioned, giving name to the leading days of the week, the rest of the days are distinguished and signalized with the names of the conductors of their first great colonies in the north-western parts of the world; for to fancy that Tuisco is the same with Mars, Woden with Mercury, Thor with Jupiter, and Frea with Venus, is to fancy what we please, without the least ground of probability. Nor did the Celtic ever call the planets by those names. So that if there be any allusion in those names unto those of the Grecians and Romans, it was not taken .from their natural speculation about the planets, but from their pleasing fictions about deified heroes, wherein they were imitated by most nations of the world. The English and Dutch have taken in Saturday from Saturn; other nations of the same extract retain their own occasional names. The observation, therefore, of the seven planets gave neither rise, reason, cause, nor occasion, to this original period of time in a hebdomadal revolution of days. And hence Theophilus Antiochenus, lib.

ii. ad Antolychum, affirms that "all mortal men agreed in the appellation of the seventh day;" whose testimony is of good force, though himself mistake the original of that appellation. For he tells us that παρ᾽ ῾Εβραίοις καλεῖται σάββατον, ῾Ελληνιστί ἑρμηνεύεται ἑβδομάς, by an error common to many of the ancients, who could not distinguish between שַׁבָּת and שֶׁבַע. It is also to this purpose observed by Rivet and Selden, from Salmasius, out of Georgius Syncellus, in his Chronology, that the patriarchs reckoned the times or distinguished them καθ᾽ ἑζδομάδας, by weeks only. This, therefore, is to me no small evidence of the institution and observation of the Sabbath from the foundation of the world; for hence did this periodical revolution of time prevail amongst the nations, even those which had not the least converse with or knowledge of the Jews or their customs, after the command and observation of it was renewed amongst them. Not that this evidence is of itself a sufficient testimony unto its original institution, nor that going before, but that the *piety of the patriarchs* and *traditions of the apostate Gentiles* do confirm the time of that institution, which is so expressly recorded.

17. It remaineth that we take a view of the opinion advanced by many learned men in opposition unto what we have been pleading for; and this is, that the command concerning the Sabbath was peculiar to the Jews alone, and that it was given unto them in the wilderness, and not at all before. Many of the Jews, as was declared, are of this judgment, and thence call the Sabbath the "bride of their nation," that which, God gave to them, as he did Eve to Adam, and to no other. Abulensis contends for this opinion in his comment on Exodus 16; who is followed by some expositors of the Roman church, and opposed by others, as Cornelius à Lapide, etc. The same difference in judgment is found amongst the protestant divines. The dissertations of Rivet and Gomarus on this subject are well known. The controversy being of late renewed, especially among some of the Belgic divines, I shall take under consideration the arguments of one of them, who hath last of all defended this cause, and weigh of what importance they are, separating as much as we can between the matter of our present dispute, which is the *original of the Sabbath,* and that of the *causes* of it, which we shall nextly inquire into.

18. The design is to prove that the Sabbath was first given to the Jews, and that in the wilderness. And to this purpose, after having repeated the words of the fourth commandment, he adds:

> "Quis vero dicere audebit, verba hæc convenire in hominem ab initio creationis, sicut hic statuitur?" (that is, by his adversary) "an illi incumbebat opus et quidem servile, idque per sex dies? an ipsi erant servi et ancillae? an jumenta requietis indigentia? an peregrini inter portas ejus? quis non videt ad solum Israelitarum statum in toto illo præcepto respici? Ita Calvinus in Genesis 2 Postea in lege novum de Sabbato præceptum datum est, quod Judæis et quidem ad tempus peculiare foret; fuit enim legalis ceremonia, spiritualem quietem adumbrans, cujus in Christe apparuit veritas. Quo nihil efficacius dici poterat. Hanc vero præcepti mentem esse patet ex aliis testimoniis Scripturæ apertissime, in quibus Judæis tantum datum esse Sabbatum constanter docetur: ◁1269Exodus 16:29, 'Videte, quod Jehovah dedit vobis illud Sabbatum, idcirco dat vobis cibum bidui.' Et Ezech. 20:12, 'Sabbata dedi eis, ut essent signum inter me et ipsos, ad sciendum me Jehovam sanctificare ipsos.' Denique ◁1694Nehemiah 9:14, 'Sabbatum quoque sanctum notum fecisti eis; quum præcepta, statutaque, et leges, præciperes eis per Mosem servum tuum.' In quibus locis uniformiter docetur tanta cum emphasi, per Mosem Deum dedisse Judæis Sabbatum, non ergo aliis gentibus datum fuit; ant ipsis etiam per majores ipsorum ante illud tempus ab origine mundi," Disquisit. cap. ii. p. 50.

Ans. **(1.)** It is by all confessed that the command of the Sabbath, in the renewal of it in the wilderness, was accommodated unto the pedagogical state of the church of the Israelites. There were also such additions made unto it, in the *manner of its observance* and the *sanction of it*, as might adapt its observation unto their civil and political estate, or that theocratical government which was then erected amongst them. So was it to bear a part in that ceremonial instruction which God in all his dealings with them intended. To this end also the manner of the delivery of the whole law and the preservation of its tables in the ark were designed. And divers expressions in the explicatory parts of the decalogue have the same reason and foundation. For there is mention of fathers and children to the third and fourth generation, and of their sins, in the second commandment;

of the land given to the people of God, in the fifth; of servants and handmaids, in the tenth. Shall we therefore say that the moral law was not before given unto mankind, because it had a *peculiar delivery*, for special ends and purposes, unto the Jews? It is no argument, therefore, that this command was not, for the substance of it, given before to mankind in general, because it hath some modifications added in the decalogue, to accommodate it to the present church and civil state of the Hebrews, as likewise had the fifth commandment in particular.

(2.) For those expressions insisted on, of "work," "servile work," "work for six days," of "servants and handmaids," of "the stranger within the gates," they were necessary explications of the command in its application unto that people, and yet such as had a just proportion unto what was enjoined at the first giving of this command, occasioned from the *outward change* of the state of things amongst men from what it was in innocency. For in that state God signed man to work, and that in the tilling of the ground, whilst he abode in it: Genesis 2:15, "He put the man in the garden לְעָבְדָהּ," "to work in it;" the same word whereby work is enjoined in the decalogue. And whereas God had sanctified the seventh day to be a day of rest, and thereon put man into the garden לְעָבְדָהּ, "to till it," by work and labor, he did virtually say unto him, as in the command, שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲבֹד וְעָשִׂיתָ כָּל־מְלַאכְתֶּךָ; — "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work." Neither was this in the least inconsistent with the condition wherein he was created; for man being constituted and composed partly of an immortal soul, of a divine extract and heavenly original, and partly of a body made out of the earth, he was a middle creature between those which were *purely spiritual*, as the angels, and those which were *purely terrestrial*, as the beasts of the field. Hence when God had made man עָפָר מִן־הָאֲדָמָה, "of dust from out of the earth," as all the beasts of the field were made, and had given him distinctly נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים, "a breath of life," in a distinct substance, answerable to that of the angels above, whose creation was not out of any pre-existing matter, but they were the product of an immediate emanation of divine power, as was the soul of man, there was no meet help to be associated unto him in the whole creation of God. For the angels were not meet for his help and individual converse, on the account of what was terrene and mortal in him; and the beasts were much more unsuited unto him, as having nothing in them to answer his divine

and more noble part. And as his nature was thus constituted, that he should converse, as it were amphibiously, between the upper and inferior sort of creatures, so he was divided in his works and operations, suitably unto the principles of his nature and peculiar constitution; for they were partly to be divine and spiritual, partly terrene and earthly, though under the government of the sovereign divine principle in him. Hence it was required that in this condition, being not absolutely fitted, as the angels, for constant contemplation, he should work and labor in the earth whilst; he continued in it, and his terrene part not refined or made spiritual and heavenly. This made a certain time of rest necessary unto him, and that upon a double account, flowing from the principles of his own nature. For his earthly constitution could not always hold out to labor with its own satisfaction, and his intellectual and divine part was not to be always diverted, but to be furthered in and unto its own peculiar operations. This made a sacred rest necessary to him And in that addition of sweat and travail which befell him in his labor afterwards, there was not a new course of life enjoined him, but a curse was mixed with that course and labor which was originally allotted unto him. So, then, although there is a different manner of working more necessary, and supposed in the giving of the law, than was at the first institution of a sabbatical rest, yet the change is not in the law or command for labor, but in the state or condition of man himself.

The same may be spoken concerning the addition about servants and handmaids; for in the state of innocency there would have been a superiority of some over others, in that government which is economical or paternal. Hence all duties of persons in subordination are built on the *law of nature;* and what is not resolved thereinto is force and violence. And herein lies the foundation of what is ordained with reference unto servants and strangers, which is expressed in the fourth commandment, with an especial application to the state of the Judaical church and people. Wherefore, although there should have been no such servants or strangers as are intended in the decalogue in the ‘state of innocency, when we plead that the law of the Sabbath was first given, yet this proves no more but that this precept, in the renovation and repetition of it unto the Jews, was accommodated to the present state of things amongst them, that state being such as had its foundation in the law of creation itself.

The places adjoined of [2]Exodus 16:29, 31:17, [3]Ezekiel 20:12, do prove sufficiently and undeniably that in the Mosaical pedagogy, the observation of the seventh day being precisely enjoined, there were additions of signification given unto it, that is, to the seventh day precisely, by divine institution, as amongst them it was to be observed. And therefore unto the utmost extent of the *determination of the day of rest* unto the seventh day precisely, and *all the significancy annexed unto it,* to that people, we acknowledge that the Sabbath was absolutely commensurate to the church-state of the Jews, beginning and ending with it. But the argument hence educed, namely, that "God gave the Sabbath, that is, the law of it, in a peculiar manner unto the Jews, therefore he had not given the same law for the substance of it before unto all mankind," is infirm: for God gave the whole law to the Jews in an especial manner, and enforced the observation of it with a reason or motive peculiar to them, namely, "I am the LORD thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage ;" and yet this law was before given unto them who never were in Egypt, nor never thence delivered. And upon the account of this peculiar appropriation of the law unto the Jews, it is spoken of in the Scripture in places innumerable as if it had been given unto them only, and to no others at all. So speaks the psalmist, Psalm 147:19, מַגִּיד דְּבָרָו לְיַעֲקֹב חֻקָּיו וּמִשְׁפָּטָיו לְיִשְׂרָאֵל; — "Declaring his words unto Jacob, his statutes and judgments unto Israel;" where as by חֻקִּים and מִשְׁפָּטִים, the ceremonial and judicial laws are intended, so by דְּבָרָו, "his words," are the עֲשֶׂרֶת הַדְּבָרִים "the ten words," as Moses calls the decalogue. And of them all the psalmist adds, verse 20, לֹא־עָשָׂה כֵּן לְכָל גּוֹי, — "He hath not done so unto any nation," namely, not in the same manner; for none will deny hut that nine precepts at least were given unto all mankind in Adam.

19. It is added by the same learned author,

> "Præterea (p. 51) si quies septimi diei omnibus ab origine mundi hominibus injuncta fuisset, non autem solis Israelitis a tempore Mosis, Deus non solum Israelitas ob neglectum illius præcepti sed et Gentiles, semel saltem eadem de causa reprehendisset. Cum vero Israelitas ea de causa reprehendat sæpissime, Gentiles tamen nuspiam reprehendere hoc nomine legitur, qui propter peccata in

> legem naturalem commissa toties et tam arciter à Deo reprehenduntur. Luculentum ejus rei exemplum est, Nehemiah 13. Tyrii asserunt Hierosolymas et omnes res venales quas vendebant ipso Sabbato Judæis, et quidem Hierosolymis, ver. 16. Non tamen Nehemias peccati violati Sabbati reos arguit Tyrios sed Judæos, ver. 17. Tyrios autem clausis portis pridie Sabbati à vespera usque urbem excludit, et ita compescit, et tandem à muris urbis abigit, ver. 19-21. Si vero Tyrii hi una cure Judæis lege Sabbati communi præcepto fuissent obstricti; nonne à viro sanctissimo ejus peccati nomine quoque reprehensi fuissent? quod tamen factum non apparet. Quum præterea Scriptura impia Gentilium festa graviter reprehendat, an sancti Sabbati neglectum, si id quoque ipsis observandum fuisset, tam constanti silentio dissimulasset?"

The force of this argument consists in this assertion, that whatever we find God did not reprove in the Gentiles, therein they did not sin, nor had they any law given unto them concerning it, no, not even in Adam: which will by no means be granted. For, —

(1.) The times are spoken of wherein God "suffered them to walk in their own ways, and winked at their ignorance?' Hence, as he gave them no reproofs for their sins by his revealed word, so those which he gave them by his providence are not recorded. We may not therefore say, they sinned in nothing but what we find them reproved for in particular.

(2.) Other instances may be given of sins against the light of nature among the Gentiles, and that in things belonging to the second table, wherein that light hath a greater evidence accompanying it than in those of the first, the first precept only excepted, which yet we find them not rebuked for. Such were the sins of concubinacy and fornication.

(3.) After the renovation or giving of this command unto the Jews, it was the duty of the nations to whom the knowledge thereof did come to take up the observation of it. For it was doubtless their duty to join themselves to God and his people, and with them to observe his statutes and judgments; and their not so doing was their sin; which, as is pretended, they were not reproved for, or God was not displeased with them on that account.

(4.) The publication of God's commands is to be stated from *giving* of them, and not from the instances of *men's transgressing* of them. Nor is it any rule, that a law is then first given when men's sins against it are first reproved. For the instance insisted on of Nehemiah and the Tyrians, with his different dealing with them and the Jews about the breach of the law of the Sabbath, chap. xiii., it is of no force in this matter; for when the Tyrians knew the command of the Sabbath among the Jews, — which was a sufficient revelation of the will of God concerning his worship, — it was their duty to observe it. I do not say that it was their duty *immediately,* and abiding in their *Gentilism,* to observe the Sabbath according to the institution it had among the Jews; but it was their duty to know, own, and obey the true God, and to join themselves to his people, — to do and observe all his commands If this was not their duty, upon that discovery and revelation which those had of the will God who came up to Jerusalem, as they did concerning whom we speak, then was it not their sin to abide in their Gentilism; which I suppose will not be asserted. It was therefore, on one account or other, a sin in the Tyrians to profane the Sabbath. It will be said, Why then did not Nehemiah reprove them as well as he did the Jews? The answer is easy. He was the head and governor of the state and polity of the Jews, unto whom it belonged to see that things amongst them were observed and done according to God's law and appointment; and this he was to do with authority, having the warrant of God for it. With the Tyrians he had nothing to do; no care of them, no jurisdiction over them, no intercourse with them, but according to the law of nations. On these accounts he charged not them with sin or a moral evil, which they would not have regarded, having no regard to the true God, much less to his worship but he threatened them with war and punishment for disturbing his government of the people according to the law of God.

It is well observed, that God *reproved the profane feasts of the heathen,* and therein unquestionably the neglect of them that were of his own appointment. For this is the nature and method of negative precepts and condemnatory sentences in divine things, that they assert what is contrary to that which is forbidden, and recommend that which is opposite unto what is condemned. Thus, the worship of God according to his own institution is commanded in the prohibition of making to ourselves or finding out ways of religious worship and honor of our own. For whereas

it is a *prime dictate* of the law of nature, that God is to be worshipped according to his own appointment, — which was from the light of it acknowledged among the heathen themselves, —it is not anywhere asserted or intimated in the decalogical compendium of it, unless it be in that prohibition. It sufficeth, then, that even among the Gentiles God vindicated the authority of his own Sabbaths, by condemning their impious feasts and abominable practices in them.

20. By the same learned writer (p. 52), the testimony of the Jews in this case is pleaded. They generally affirm that the Sabbath was given unto them only, and not to the rest of the nations, Hence it is by them called the "bride of the synagogue." Nor do they reckon the command of it amongst the Noachical precepts, which they esteem all men obliged unto, and whose observation they imposed on the proselytes of the gate, or the uncircumcised strangers that lived amongst them. Nay, they say that others were liable to punishment if they did observe it. For that part of the command, "Nor the stranger that is within thy gates," they say, it intends no more but that no Israelite should compel him to work, or make any advantage of his labor; but for himself, he was not bound to abstain from labor, but might exercise himself therein at his own discretion for his advantage. These things are pleaded at large, and confirmed with many testimonies and instances, by the learned Selden; and from him are they again by others insisted on. But the truth is, there is not any thing of force in the conceits of these Talmudical Jews in the least to weaken the principle we have laid down and established; for, —

(1.) As hath been showed, this opinion is not indeed catholic amongst them; but many, and those of the most learned of the masters, do oppose it, as we have proved already. And others may be added to them, whose opinion, although it be peculiar, yet it wanteth not a fair probability of truth; for they say that the first part of the precept, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy," hath respect to the glorifying of God on the account of his original work and rest. This, therefore, belongs unto all mankind. But as for that which follows, about the six days' labor, and the seventh day's cessation or quiet, it had respect unto the bondage of the Israelites in Egypt, and their deliverance thence, and was therefore peculiar unto them. So R. Ephraim in Keli Jacar. And hence, it may be, the word "remember" hath respect unto the command of the Sabbath from the

foundation of the world. And therefore when the command is repeated again, with peculiar respect to the church of Israel, as the motive from the Egyptian bondage and deliverance is expressed, so the caution of remembering is omitted, [KJV]Deuteronomy 5:12, and transferred to this other occasion, “Remember that thou wast a servant,” verse 15.

(2.) The sole foundation of it is laid in a corrupt and false tradition or conceit of the giving of the law of the Sabbath in Marsh; which we have before disproved, and which is despised as vain and foolish by most learned men.

(3.) The assertors of this opinion do wofully contradict themselves, in that they generally acknowledge that the Sabbath was observed by Abraham and other patriarchs, as it should seem, at least four hundred years before its institution.

(4.) It is none of the seven called “Noachical precepts,” for they contain not the whole law of nature, or precepts of the decalogue, and one of them is ceremonial in their sense; so that nothing can hence be concluded against the original or nature of this law.

(5.) That an uncircumcised stranger was liable to punishment if he observed the Sabbath is a foolish imagination, not inferior unto that of some others of them, who affirm that “all the Gentiles shall keep the Sabbath one day in seven in hell.”

(6.) For the distinction which they have invented, that a proselyte of the gate might work for himself, but not for his master, it is one of the many whereby they make void the law of God through their traditions. Those who of old amongst them feared God, knowing their duty to instruct their households and families, — that is, their children and servants, — in the ways and worship of God, walked by another rule.

21. It is further pleaded by the same author (p. 53), “That the Gentiles knew nothing of this sabbatical feast, but that when it came to their knowledge they derided and exploded it as a particular superstition of the Jews.” To this purpose many instances out of the historians and poets who wrote in the time of the first Roman emperors are collected by Selden, which we are again directed unto. “Now it could not be, if it had been originally appointed unto all mankind, that they should have been

such strangers unto it." But this matter hath been discoursed before. And we have showed that sundry of the first writers of the Christian church were otherwise minded: for they judged and proved that there was a notion at least of the "seventh day's sacred rest" diffused throughout the world; and they lived nearer the times of the Gentiles' practice than those by whom their judgment and testimony are so peremptorily rejected. It is not unlikely but that they might be mistaken in some of the testimonies whereby they confirm their observation; yet this hinders not but that the observation itself may be true, and sufficiently confirmed by other instances which they make use of.

For my part, as I have said, I will not, nor, for the security of the principle laid down, need I to contend that the seventh day was observed as a sacred feast amongst them. It is enough that there were such notices of it in the world as could proceed from no other original but that pleaded for, which was common unto all. The Roman writers, poets and others, do speak of and contemn the Judaical sabbaths; under which name they comprehended all their sacred feasts and solemn abstinences. Hence they reproached them with their sabbatical fasts; of which number the seventh-day, hebdomadal Sabbath was not. But they never endeavored to come to any real acquaintance with their religious rites, but took up vulgar reports concerning them; as did their historians also, who in the affairs of other nations are supposed to have been curious and diligent.

22. Indeed, after the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey, when the people of the Jews began to be known among the Romans, and to disperse themselves throughout their provinces, they began every day more and more to hate them, and to east all manner of reproaches on them, without regard to truth or honesty. And it may not be amiss here a little, by the way, to inquire into the reasons of it. The principal cause hereof, no doubt, was from the God they worshipped, and the manner of his worship observed amongst them; for finding them to acknowledge and adore *one only* (the true) God, and that without the use of any kind of images, they perceived their own idolatry and superstition to be condemned thereby. And this had been the condition of that people under the former empires, of the Chaldeans, Persians, and Grecians. God had appointed them to be his witnesses in the world that he was God, and that there was none other: [2340] Isaiah 44:8,

> "Ye are even my witnesses. Is there a God beside me? yea, there is no God; I know not any."

As also chap. [23810]43:10-12,

> "Ye are my witnesses," that "before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am the LORD; and beside me there is no savior. ..... Therefore ye are my witnesses, saith the LORD, that I am God."

This greatly provoked, as other nations of old, so at length the Romans, as bidding defiance to all their gods and their worship of them, wherein they greatly boasted; for they thought that it was merely by the help of their gods, and on the account of their religion, that they conquered all other nations. So Cicero, Orat. de Harusp. Respon., cap. ix.: "Quam volumus licet ipsi nos amemus, tamen nec numero Hispanos, nec robore Gallos, nee calliditate Pœnos, nec artibus Græcos; sed pietate ac religione, atque hae una sapientia, quod deorum immortalium numine omnia regi, gubernarique perspeximus, omnes gentes nationesque superavimus;" — "Let us love and please ourselves as we think meet, yet we outgo neither the Spaniards in number, nor the Gauls in strength, nor the Africans in craft, nor the Grecians in arts; but it is by our piety and religion, and this only wisdom, that we refer all to the government of the immortal gods, that we have overcome all countries and nations." And Dionysius Halicarnassæus, Antiq. Romans lib. ii., having given an account of their sacred rites and worship, adds that he did it

> ἵνα τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι τῶν Ῥωμαίων εὐσέθειαν, ἣν οἱ ἄνδρες ἐπετήδευον, μὴ παράδοξον φανῇ τὸ πάντας αὐτοῖς τὸ κάλλιστον λαζεῖν τοὺς πολὲμους τέλος,

— "that those who knew not before the piety or religion of the Romans might not now think it strange that they should have such success in all their wars." To be judged and condemned those things, by the contrary witness of the Jews, they could not bear. This made them reflect on God himself, as the God which they worshipped. They called him *incertum* and *ignotum*, affirming the rites of his worship to be absurd, and contrary to the common consent of mankind, as Tacitus expressly, Hist. lib. v. cap. iv. The best they could afford when they spake of him was, Ὃς τίς ποτε

οἷτος ἐστίν, "Whoever he be." And Tully will not allow that it was any respect to their God or their religion which caused Pompey to forbear spoiling the temple when he took it by force.

> "Non credo," saith he, "religionem et Judæorum, et hostium, impedimento præstantissimo imperatori fuisse (quod victor ex illo fano nihil attigerit)," Orat. pro Flacc., cap. xxviii.; whereunto he adds as high a reproach of them and their religion as he could devise: "Stantibus Hiero-solymis, pacatisque Judæis, tamen istorum religio sacrorum a splendore hujus imperii, gravitate nominis nostri majorum institutis, ahorrebat: nunc vero hoc magis, quod illa gens, quid de nostro imperio sentiret ostendit armis: quam cara diis immortalibus esset docuit, quod victa est, quod elocata, quod servata."

— "Whilst Jerusalem stood" (that is, in its own power), "and the Jews were peaceable, yet their religion was unworthy the splendor of this empire, the gravity of our name, and abhorrent from the ordinances of our ancestor. How much more now, when that nation hath showed what esteem it hath of our empire by its arms, and how dear it is to the immoral gods, that it is conquered, and set out under tribute!" The like reflections yea worse, may be seen in Trogus, Tacitus, Plutarch, Strabo, and Democritus in Suidas, with others.

23. Another ground of their hatred was, that the Jews, whilst the temple stood, gathered great sums of money out of all their provinces, which they sent unto the sacred treasury. So the same person informs us in the same place:

> "Cum aurum Judæorum nomine, quotas ex Italia, et ex omnibus vestris provinciis Hierosolymam exportari soleret;"

— " Out of Italy, and all other provinces of the empire, there was gold wont to be sent by the Jews to Jerusalem;" as now the European Jews do contribute to the maintenance of their synagogues in the same place. And this is acknowledged by Philo, Legat. ad Caium, and Josephus, Antiq. lib. xiv. cap. xi., to have been yearly a very great sum. But by his "Judæorum nomine," he seems not only to express that the returns of the gold mentioned were in the name of the Jews, but also to intimate that it might

be raised by others also, who had taken on them the profession of their religion; for this was the third and principal cause of their hatred and animosity, namely, that they drew over multitudes of all sorts of persons to the profession of the law of Moses. And a good work this was, though vitiated by the wickedness and corrupt ends of them who employed themselves therein, as our Savior declares, [4023]Matthew 23:15. This greatly provoked the Romans in those days, and on every occasion they severely complain of it. So Die Cassius speaking of them adds, Καὶ ἐστὶ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς᾽ Ρωμαίοις τὸ γένος τοῦτο, κολασθὲν μὲν πολλάκις, αὐξηθὲν δὲ ἐπὶ πλεῖστόν, ὥστε καὶ ἐς παῤῥησίαν τῆς νομίσεως νικῆσαι· — "And this kind of men" (that is, men of this profession, not natural Jews) "is found also among the Romans; which though they have been frequently punished, yet have for the most part increased, so as to take the liberty of making laws to themselves." As for their punishments, an account is given, in Suetonius in Domit., and others, of the inquisition and search made after such as were circumcised. And as to their making of laws unto themselves, he respects their feasts, Sabbaths, abstinences, and such like observances as the Jews obliged their proselytes unto. In like manner complaineth Juvenal, Sat. xiv. 100, —

'Romanas autem soliti contemnere leges,
Judaicum ediscunt, et servant, ac metuunt jus,
Tradidit arcano quodcunque volumine Moses;"—

> "Contemning the Roman laws, they learn the rites and customs of the Jews, observing and learning the whole right or law delivered in the secret writing of Moses."

Seneca is yet more severe: "Cum interim usque eo sceleratissima gentis consuetudo convaluit, ut per omnes jam terras recepta sit; victi victoribus leges dederunt;" — "The custom of this wicked nation hath so far prevailed that it is now received among all. nations; the conquered have given laws to the conquerors." And Tacitus, Hist. lib. v. cap. v.: "Pessimus quisque, spretis religionibus patriis, tributa et stipes illuc" (that is, to Jerusalem) "gerebant." The like revengeful spirit appears in those verses of Rutilius, lib. 1. Itinerar., though he lived afterwards, under the Christian emperors : —

“O utinam nunquam Judæa victa fuisset
Pompeii bellis imperioque Titi;
Lætius excisæ pestis contagia serpunt
Victoresque suos natio victa premit.”

But it is not unlikely that he reflects on Christians also.

24. We may add hereunto, that for the most part the conversation of the Jews amongst them was wicked and provoking. They were a people that had, for many generations, been harassed and oppressed by all the principal empires in the world; this caused them to hate them, and to have their minds always possessed with revengeful thoughts. When our apostle affirmed of them, “that they pleased not God, and were contrary to all men,” <52215>1 Thess. 2:15, he intended not their opposition to the gospel and the preachers of it, which he had before expressed, hut that envious contrariety unto mankind in general which they were possessed with. And this evil frame the nations ascribed’ to their law itself. “Moses novos ritus contrariosque cæteris mortalibus indidit,” saith Tacitus, Hist., lib. v. cap. iv. But this most falsely. No law of men ever taught such benignity, kindness, and general usefulness in the world, as theirs did. The people themselves being grown wicked and corrupt, “pleased not God, and were contrary to all men.” Hence they were looked on as such who observed not so much as the law of nature towards any but themselves, as resolving

“Quæsitum ad fontem solos diducere verpes,” Juv., xiv. 104; —

“Not to direct a thirsty person to a common spring if uncircumcised.”

Whence was that censure of Tacitus, “Apud ipsos tides obstinata, misericordia in promptu, adversus omnes alios hostile odium;” — “Faithful and merciful among themselves, towards all others they were acted with irreconcilable hatred:” which well expresseth what our Savior charged them with, as a corrupt principle among them, <40543>Matthew 5:43, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy ;” into which two sorts they distributed all mankind, — that is, in their sense, their own countrymen and strangers.

Their corrupt and wicked conversation also made them a reproach, and their religion contemned. So was it with them from their first dispersion, as God declares: <263620>Ezekiel 36:20,

> "When they entered unto the heathen, whither they went, they profaned my holy name, when they said to them, These are the people of the LORD."

And their wickedness increased with their time; for they still learned the corrupt and evil arts, with all ways of deceit, used in the nations where they lived, until, for the crimes of many, the whole nation became the common hatred of mankind. And, that we may return from this digression, this being the state of things then in the world, we may not wonder if the writers of those days were very supinely negligent or maliciously envious in reporting their ways, customs, and religious observances. And it is acknowledged that, before those times, the long course of idolatry and impiety wherein the whole world had been engaged had utterly corrupted and lost the tradition of a sabbatical rest. What notices of it continued in former ages hath been before declared.

25. But it is further pleaded (p. 54), "That indeed the Gentiles could be no way obliged to the observation of the fourth commandment, seeing they had no indication of it, nor any means to free them from their ignorance of the being of any such law. That they had once had, and had lost the knowledge of it, in and by their progenitors, is rejected as a vain pretence." And so much weight is laid on this consideration, that a demand is made of somewhat to be returned in answer that may give any satisfaction unto conscience. But I understand not the force of this pretended argument. Those who had absolutely lost the knowledge of the true God (in and by their progenitors), as the Gentiles had done, might 'well also lose the knowledge of all the concernments of his worship. And so they had done, excepting only that they had traduced some of his institutions, as sacrifices, into their own superstition; and so had they corrupted the use of his sabbaths into that of their idolatrous feasts. But when the *true God* had no other acknowledgment amongst them but what answered the title of "The *unknown God,*" is it any wonder that his ways and worship might be unknown amongst them also? And it is but pretended that they had no indication of a sabbatical rest, nor any means to free them from their ignorance. Man's duty is both to be learned and observed in order. It is in vain to expect that any should have indications of a holy rest unto God before they are brought to the knowledge of God himself. When this is obtained, — when the true God upon just grounds is owned and

acknowledged, — then that some time be set apart for his solemn worship is of moral and natural right. That this is included in the very first notion of the true God and our dependence upon him, all men do confess. And this principle was abused among the heathen to be the foundation of all their stated annual and monthly sacred solemnities, after they had nefariously lost the only object of all religious worship. Where this progress is made, as it might have been, by attending to the directive light of nature, and the impressions of the law of it left upon the souls of men, there will not be wanting sufficient indicatives of the meetest season for that worship. However, these things were and are to be considered and admitted in their order; and with respect unto that order is their obligation. The heathen were bound first to know and own the true God, and him alone; then to worship him solemnly; and after that, in order of nature, to have some solemn time separated unto the observance of that worship. Without an admission of these, all which were neglected and rejected by them, there is no place to inquire after the obligation of a hebdomadal rest. And their nonobservance of it was their sin, not firstly, directly, and immediately, but *consequentially*, as all others are that arise from an ignorance or rejection of those greater principles whereon they do depend.

26. The trivial exception from the difference of the meridians is yet pleaded also; for hence it is pretended to be impossible that all men should precisely observe the same day. For if a man should sail round the world by the east, he will at his return home have gotten a day by his continual approach towards the rising sun; and if he steer his course westward, he will lose a day in the annual revolution, as it is gotten the other way: so did the Hollanders, anno 1615. And hence the posterity of Noah, gradually spreading themselves over the world, must have gradually come to the observation of different seasons, if we shall suppose a day of sacred rest required of them or appointed to them. “Apage, nugas.” If men might sail eastward or westward, and not continually have seven days succeeding one another, there would be some force in this trifle. On our hypothesis, wherever men are, a seventh part of their time, or a seventh day, is to be separated to the remembrance of the rest of God, and the other ends of the Sabbath. That the observance of this portion of time shall in all places begin and end at the same instants, the law and order of God’s creation will not permit. It is enough that amongst all who can assemble for the worship of God there is no difference in general, but that they all observe the

same proportion of time. And he who, by circumnavigation of the world, (such rare and extraordinary instances being not to be provided for in a general law,) getteth or loseth a day, may at his return, with a good conscience, give up again what he hath not, or retrieve what he hath lost, with those with whom he fixeth; for all such occasional accidents are to. be reduced unto the common standard. All the difficulty, therefore, in this objection relates to the precise observation of the seventh day from the creation, and not in the least unto one day in seven. And although the seventh day was appointed principally for the land of Palestine, the seat of the church of old, wherein there was no such alteration of meridians, yet I doubt not but that a *wandering Jew* might have observed the foregoing rule, and reduced his time to order upon his return home. What other exceptions of the like nature occur in this cause, they shall be removed and satisfied in our next inquiry, which is after the causes of the Sabbath, and the morality of the observation of one day in seven.

EXERCITATION 3.

OF THE CAUSES OF THE SABBATH.

1. *Of the causes of the Sabbath.*

2. *God the absolute original cause of it — Distinction of divine laws into moral and positive.*

3. *Divine laws of a mixed nature; partly moral, partly positive.*

4. *Opinion of some that the law of the Sabbath was purely positive — Difficulties of that opinion.*

5. *Opinion of them who maintain the observation of one day in seven to be moral.*

6. *Opinion of them who make the observation of the seventh day precisely to be a moral duty.*

7. *The second opinion asserted.*

8. *The common notion of the Sabbath explained. 9, The true notion of it further inquired into.*

10. *Continuation of the same disquisition.*

11. *The law of nature, wherein it consists – Opinion of the philosophers.*

12. *Not comprised in the dictates of reason – No obliging authority in them formally considered.*

13. *Uncertainty and disagreement about the dictates of reason – Opinions of the Magi. Zeno, Chrysippus, Plato, Archelaus, Aristippus, Carneades, Brennus, etc.*

14. *Things may belong to the law of nature not discoverable to the common reason of the most.*

15. *The law of nature, wherein it does really consist.*

16. *Light given unto a septenary. sacred rest in the law of nature.*

17. *Further instances thereof.*

18. *The observation of the Sabbath on the same foundation with monogamy.*

19. *The seventh day an appendage of the covenant of works.*

20. *How far the whole notion of a weekly sacred rest was of the law of nature.*

21. *Natural light obscured by the entrance of sin.*

22. *The sum of what is proposed.*

23. *The inquiry about the causes of the Sabbath renewed.*

24. *The command of it, in what sense a Iaw moral, and how evidenced so to be.*

25. *To worship God in associations and assemblies of moral duty.*

26. *0ne day in seven required unto solemn worship by the law of our creation*

27. *What is necessary to warrant the. ascription of any duty to the law of creation.*

28. *(1.) That it be congruous to the known principles of it.*

29. *(2.) That it have a general principle in the light of nature.*

30. *(3.) That it be taught by the works of creation.*

31. *(4.) Direction for its observance, by superadded revelation, no impeachment of it.*

32. *How far the same duty may be required by a law moral and by a law positive.*

33. *Vindication of the truths laid down from an objection.*

34. *Other evidences of the morality of this duty.*

35. *Required in all states of the church.*

36. *These varied states.*

37. *Command for the Sabbath before the fall.*

38. *Before and at the giving of the law, and under the gospel.*

39. *Whether appointed by the church.*

40. *Of the fourth commandment in the decalogue.*

41. *The proper subject of it.*

42. *The seventh day precisely not primarily required therein.*

43. *Somewhat moral in the granted by all.*

44. *The matter of this command a moral duty by the law of creation.*

45. *The morality of the precept itself proved from its interest in the decalogue, in various instances.*

46. *The law of the Sabbath only preferred above all ceremonial and judicial laws.*

47. *The words of our Savior,* <4420> *Matthew 24:20, considered.*

48. *The whole law of the decalogue established by Christ.*

49. *Objections proposed.*

50. *The first answered,*

51. *The second answered.*

52. *The third answered.*

53. *One day in seven, not the seventh day precisely, required in the decalogue.*

54. *An objection from the sense of the law.*

55. *Answered.*

56, 57. *Other objections answered.*

58, 59. <5102216> *Colossians 2:16, 17, considered.*

1. WE have fixed the *original* of the sabbatical rest, according to the best light we have received into these things, and confirmed the reasons of it

with the consent of mankind. The next step in our progress must be an inquiry into *its causes.* And here also we fall immediately into those difficulties and entanglements which the various apprehensions of learned men, promoted and defended with much diligence have occasioned. I have no design to oppose or contend with any, although a modest examination of the reasons of some will be indispensably necessary unto me. All that I crave is the liberty of proposing my own thoughts and judgement in this matter, with the reasons and grounds of them. When that is done, I shall humbly submit the whole to the examination and judgment of all that call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, their Lord and ours.

2. First, it is agreed by all that God alone is the *supreme, original,* and *absolute cause* of the Sabbath. Whenever it began, whenever it ends, be it expired or still in force, of what kind soever were its institution, the law of it was from God. It was from heaven, and not of men; and the will of God is the sole rule and mea-sure of our observation of it, and obedience to him therein. What may or may not be done, in reference unto the observation of a day of holy rest, by any inferior authority comes not here under consideration. But whereas there are two sorts of laws whereby God requires the obedience of his rational creatures, which are commonly called moral and positive, it is greatly questioned and disputed to whether of these sorts does belong the command of a sabbatical rest. *Positive laws* are taken to be such as have no reason for them in themselves,–nothing of the matter of them is taken from the things themselves commanded,— but do depend merely and solely on the sovereign will and pleasure of God. Such were the laws and institutions of the sacrifices of old; and such are those which concern the sacraments and other things of the like nature under the new testament *Moral laws* are such as have the reasons of them taken from the nature of the things themselves required in them; for they are good from their respect to the nature of God himself, and from that nature and order of all things which he has placed in the creation. So that this sort of laws is but declarative of the absolute goodness of what they do require; the other is constitutive of it, as unto some certain ends. Laws positive, as they are occasionally given, so they are esteemed alterable at pleasure. Being fixed by mere will and prerogative, without respect to any thing that should make them necessary antecedent to their giving, they may by the same authority at any time be taken away and abolished. Such, I say, are

they in their own nature, and as to any firmitude that they have from their own subject-matter. But with respect unto God's determination, positive divine laws may become eventually unalterable. And this difference is there between legal and evangelical institutions. The laws of both are positive only, equally proceeding from sovereign will and pleasure, and in their own natures equally alterable; but to the former God had in his purpose fixed a determinate time and season wherein they should expire or be altered by his authority; the latter he has fixed a perpetuity and unchangeableness unto, during the state and condition of his church in this world. The other sort of laws are perpetual and un-alterable in themselves, so far as they are of that sort, —that is, moral. For although a law of that kind may have an especial injunction, with such circumstances as may be changed and varied (as had the whole decalogue in the commonwealth of Israel), yet so far as it is moral, —that is, as its commands or prohibitions are necessary emergencies, or expressions of the good or evil of the things it commands or forbids, —it is invariable. And in these things there is an agreement, unless sometimes, through mutual oppositions, men are chafed into some exceptions or distinctions

3. Unto these two sorts do all divine laws belong, and unto these heads they may be all reduced. And it is pleaded by some that these kinds of laws are contradistinct, so that a law of one kind can in no sense be a law of the other. And this doubtless is true reduplicatively, because they have especial formal reasons. As far and wherein any laws are positive, they are not moral; and as far as they are purely moral, they are not formally positive, though given after the manner of positive commands. Howbeit this hinders not but that some do judge that there may be and are divine laws of a mixed nature; for there may be in a divine law a foundation in and respect unto somewhat that is moral, which yet may stand in need of the superaddition of a positive command for its due observation unto its proper end. Yea, the *moral reason* of things commanded, which arises out of a due natural respect unto God and the order of the universe, may be so deep and hidden, as that God, who would make the way of his creatures plain and easy, gives out express *positive commands* for the observance of what is antecedently necessary by the law of our creation. Hence a law may partake of both these considerations, and both of them have an equal influence into its obligatory power. And by this means sundry duties,

some moral, some positive, are as it were compounded in one observance; as may be instanced in the great duty of prayer. Hence the whole law of that observance becomes of a mixed nature; which yet God can separate at his pleasure, and taking away that which is positive, leave only that which is absolutely moral in force. And this kind of laws, which have their foundation in the nature of things themselves, which yet stand in need of further direction for their due observation, which is added unto them by positive institution, some call moral-positive.

4. According to these distinctions of the nature of the laws which God expresses his will in and by, are men's apprehensions different about the *immediate* and *instrumental cause* of the sabbatical rest. That God was the author of it is, as was said, by all agreed But, say some, the law whereby he appointed it was purely positive, them matter of it being arbitrary, stated and determined only in the command itself; and so the whole nature of the law and that commanded in it are changeable. And because positive laws did, and always do, respect some other things besides and beyond themselves, it is pleaded that this law was *ceremonial* and *typical;* that is, it was an institution of an outward, present religious observation, to signify and represent something not present nor yet come. Such were all the particulars of the whole system of Mosaical worship, whereof this law of the Sabbath was a part and an instance. In brief, some say that the *whole law of the Sabbath* was, as to its general nature, positive and arbitrary, and so changeable; and in particular, ceremonial and typical, and so actually changed and abolished. But yet it is so fallen out, that those who are most positive in these assertions cannot but acknowledge that this law is so ingrafted into, and so closed up with somewhat that is moral and unalterable, that it is no easy thing to hit the joint aright, and make a separation of the one from the other. But concerning any other law expressly and confessedly ceremonial, no such thing can be observed. They were all evidently and entirely arbitrary institutions, without any such near relation to what is moral as might trouble any one to make a distinction between them. For instance, the law of sacrifices has indeed an answerableness in it to a great *principle of the law of nature*, namely, that we must *honor God with our substance* and the best of our increase; yet that this might be done many other ways, and riot by sacrifice, if God had pleased so to ordain, every one is able to apprehend. It is otherwise in this

matter; for none will deny but that it is required of us, in and by the law of nature, that some time be set apart and dedicated unto God, for the observation of his solemn worship in the world; and it is plain to every one that this natural dictate is inseparably included in the law of the Sabbath. It will therefore surely he difficult to make it absolutely and universally positive. I know some begin to whisper things inconsistent with this concession. But we have as yet the *universal consent* of all divines, ancient and modern, fathers, schoolmen, and casuists, concurring in this matter; for they all unanimously affirm, that the *separation of some part of our time to sacred uses*, and the solemn honoring of God, is required of us in the light and by the law of nature. And herein lies the fundamental notion of the law now inquired after. This also may be further added, that whereas this natural dictate for the observation of some time in the solemn worship of God has been accompanied with a declaration of his will from the foundation of the world, that this time should be one day in seven, it will be a matter of no small difficulty to find out what is purely positive therein.

5. Others building on this foundation, that the dedication of some part of our time to the worship of God is a duty natural or moral, as required by the law of our creation (not that time in itself, which is but a circumstance of other things, can be esteemed moral, but that our observation of time may be a moral duty), do add that the determination of one day in seven to be that portion of time so to be dedicated is inseparable from the same foundation, and is of the same nature with it; that is, that the sabbatical observation of one day's holy rest in seven has a moral precept for its warranty, or that which has the nature of a moral precept in it: so that although the revolution of time in seven days, and the confining of the day to that determined season, do depend on revelation and a positive command of God for its observance, yet on supposition thereof the moral precept prevails in the whole, and is everlastingly obligatory. And there are some divines of great piety and learning who do judge that a command of God given unto all men, and equally obligatory unto all respecting their manner of living unto God, is to be esteemed a moral command, and that indispensable and unchangeable, although we should not be able to discover the reason of it in the light and law of nature. Nor can such a command be reckoned amongst them that are *merely positive*, arbitrary,

and changeable; all which depend on sundry other things, and do not firstly affect men as men in general. And it is probable that God would not give out any such catholic command, which comprised not somewhat naturally good and right in it And this is the best measure and determination of what is moral, and not our ability of discovering by reason what is so and what is not, as we shall see afterwards.

6. Moreover, there are some who stay not here, but contend that the *precise observation of the seventh day* in the hebdomadal revelation lies under a command moral and indispensable for God, they say, who is the sovereign Lord of us and our times, has taken, by an *everlasting law,* this day unto himself, for his honor and service; and he has therein obliged all men to a holy rest, not merely on some certain fixed and stated time, not on one day in seven originally, as the first intention of his command, but on the seventh day precisely, whereunto those other considerations of some stated and fixed time and of one day in seven are consequential, and far from previous foundations of it The seventh day, as the seventh day, is, they say, the first proper object of the command; the other things mentioned, of a stated time and of one day in seven, do only follow thereon, and by virtue thereof belong to the command of the Sabbath, and no otherwise. Herein great honor indeed is done unto the seventh day, above all other ordinances of worship whatever, even of the gospel itself, but whether with sufficient warranty we must afterwards inquire. At present I shall only observe, that this *observation of the seventh day precisely* is resolved into the sovereignty of God over us and our times, and into an occasion respecting purely the covenant of works; on which bottoms it is hard to fix it in an absolute, unvariable station.

7. It is the second opinion, for the substance of it, which I shall endeavor to explain and confirm; and therein prove a sacred sabbatical rest unto God, of *one day in seven,* to be enjoined unto all that fear him, by a law perpetual and indispensable, upon the account of what is moral therein. The reason, I say, of the obligation of the law of the Sabbath is moral, and thence the obligation itself universal; however,. the determination and declaration of the day itself depend on arbitrary revelation and a law merely positive. These things being explained and confirmed, the other opinions proposed will fall under our consideration.

To obtain a distinct light into the truth in this matter, we must consider both the true notion of the sacred rest, as also of the law of our creation, whereby we affirm that fundamentally and virtually it is required.

8. The general notion of the Sabbath is, "a portion of time set apart, by divine appointment, for the observance and performance of the solemn worship of God." The worship of God is that which we are made for, as to our station in this world, and is the means and condition of our enjoyment of him in glory, wherein consists the ultimate end, as unto us, of our creation. This worship, therefore, is required of us by the law of our creation; and it is upon the matter all that is required of us thereby, seeing we are obliged by it to do all things to the glory of God. And therefore is the solemn expression of that worship required of us in the same manner; for the end of it being our glorifying him as God, and the nature of it consisting in the profession of our universal subjection unto him and dependence upon him, the solemn expression of it is as necessary as the worship itself which we are to perform. No man, therefore, ever doubted but that by the *law of nature* we were bound to worship God, and *solemnly to express* that worship; for else wherefore were we brought forth in this world? These things are inseparable from our nature; and where this order is disturbed by sin we fall into another, which the properties of God, on the supposition of transgressing our first natural order, do render no less necessary unto his glory than the other, namely, that of punishment.

Moreover, in this worship it is required, by the same law of our being, that we should serve God with all that we do receive from him. No man can think otherwise. For is there any thing that we have received from God that shall yield him no revenue of glory, whereof we ought to make no acknowledgment unto him? Who dare once so to imagine? Among the things thus given us of God is our time. And this falls under a double consideration in this matter: —First, As it is an inseparable *moral circumstance* of the worship required of us; so it is necessarily included in the command of worship itself, not directly, but consequentially. Secondly, It is *in itself* a part of our vouchsafements from God, for our own use and purposes in this world. So upon its own account, firstly and directly, a separation of a part of it unto God and his solemn worship is required of us. It remains only to inquire what part of time it is that is and

will be accepted with God. This is declared and determined in the fourth commandment to be the seventh part of it, or one day in seven. And this is that which is positive in the command; which yet, as to the foundation, formal reason, and main substance of it, is moral. And these things are *true,* but yet do not express the *whole nature* of the Sabbath, which we must further inquire into.

9. And, first, it must be observed, that wherever there is mention of a sabbatical rest, as enjoined unto men for their observation there is still respect unto a *rest of God* that preceded it, and the cause and foundation of it. In its first mention, God's rest is given as the reason of his sanctifying and blessing a day of rest for us, whence also it has its name: Genesis 2:3, "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, בּוֹ שָׁבַת כִּי,"—" because he sabbatized thereon himself." And so it is expressed, and the same reason is given of it, in the fourth commandment. God wrought six days, and rested the seventh; therefore must we rest, Exodus 20:11. The same is observed in the new creation, as we shall see afterwards and more fully in our exposition of Hebrews 4. Now, that God may he said to rest, it is necessary that some signal work of his do go before; for rest, in the first notion of it, includes a respect to an antecedent work or labor. And so it is everywhere declared. God *wrought his works* and finished them, and then *rested;* he made all things in six days; and rested on the seventh. And he that is entered into rest ceases from his work. And both these, the work of God and the rest of God, must in this matter be considered. For the work of God, it is that of the old and whole creation, as is directly expressed, Genesis 2:1-3, Exodus 20:11, which I desire may be borne in mind.

And this work of God may he considered two *ways:—First, Naturally* or physically, as it consisted in the mere production of the effects of his power, wisdom, and goodness. So all things are the work of God. *Secondly, Morally, as* God ordered and designed all his works to be a means of glorifying himself, in and by the obedience of his rational creatures. This consideration, both the nature of it, and the order and end of the whole creation, do make necessary. For God first made all the inanimate, then animate and sensitive creatures, in their glory, order, and beauty. In and on all these he implanted a teaching and instructive power: for "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament shows his

handiwork,” [19001]Psalm 19:1; and all creatures are frequently called on to give praise and glory to him. And this expresses that in their nature and order which reveals and manifests him and the glorious excellencies of his nature, which man is to contemplate in their effects in them, and give glory unto him; for after them all was man made, to consider and use them all for the end for which they were made, and was a kind of mediator between God and the rest of the creatures, by and through whom he would receive all his glory from them. This is that which our apostle discourses about, [45019]Romans 1:19, 20. The design of God, as he declares, was to manifest and show himself in his works to man. Man learning from them “the invisible things of God,” was to “glorify him as God,” as he disputes. The ordering and disposal of things to this purpose is principally to be considered in the works of God, as his rest did ensue upon them.

Secondly, The rest of God is to be considered as that which completes the foundation of the sabbatical rest inquired after; for it is built on God’s working and entering into his rest. Now, this is not a mere *cessation from working.* It is not absolutely so; for “ God works hitherto.” And the expression of God’s rest is of a moral and not a natural signification; for it consists in the satisfaction and complacency that he took in his works, as effects of his goodness, power, and wisdom, disposed in the order and unto the ends mentioned. Hence, as it is said that upon the finishing of them, he looked on “every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good” [01003]Genesis 1:31, —that is, he was satisfied in his works and their disposal, and pronounced concerning them that they became his infinite wisdom and power; so it is added that he not only “ rested on the seventh day,” but also that he was “refreshed,” [02317]Exodus 31:17, —that is, be took great complacency in what he had done, as that which was suited unto the end aimed at namely, the expression of his greatness, goodness, and wisdom, unto his rational creatures, and his glory through their obedience thereon, as on the like occasion he is said to “rest in his love,” arrd to “rejoice with singing,” [36107]Zephaniah 3:17.

Now, in the work and rest of God thus stated did the whole rule of the obedience of man originally consist; and therein was he to seek also his own rest, as his happiness and blessedness; for God had not declared any other way for his instruction in the ends of his creation, —that is, his obedience unto him and blessedness in him, —but in and by his own

works and rest, This, then, is the first end of this holy rest And it must always be born in mind, as that without which we can give no glory to God as rational creatures, made under a moral law in a dependence on him; for this he indispensably requires of us, and this is the sum of what be requires of us, namely, that we glorify him according to the revelation that he makes of himself unto us, whether by his works of nature or of grace. To the solemnity hereof the day inquired after is necessary. To express these things is the general end of the sabbatical rest prescribed unto us and our observation; for so it is said God wrought and rested, and then requires us so to do.

And it has sundry particular ends or reasons: —First, That we might learn the satisfaction and *complacency* that God has in his own works, <0202>Genesis 2:2, 3; that is, to consider the impressions of his excellencies upon them, and to glorify him as God on that account, <4501>Romans 1:19-21. For hence was man originally taught to fear, love, trust, obey, and honor him absolutely, even from the manifestation that he had made of himself in his works, wherein he rested And had not God thus rested in them, and been refreshed upon their completing and finishing, they would not have been a sufficient means to instruct man in those duties. And our observation of the evangelical Sabbath has the same respect unto the works of Christ and his rest thereon, when he saw of the travail of his soul and was satisfied, as shall afterwards be declared.

Secondly, Another end of the original sabbatical rest was, that it might be a *pledge* unto man of his rest in and with God; for in and by the law of his creation, man had an end of rest proposed unto him, and that in God. This he was to be directed unto and encouraged to look after. Herein God by his works and rest had instructed him. And by giving him the Sabbath, as he gave him a pledge thereof, so he required of him his approbation of the covenant way of attaining it; whereof afterwards. Hence Psalm 92, whose title is, מִזְמוֹר שִׁיר לְיוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת, “A psalm or song for the Sabbath day,” —which some of the Jews ascribe unto Adam, —as it principally consists in contemplations of ‘the works of God, with holy admiration of his greatness and power manifested in them, with praises unto him on their account, so it expresses the destruction of ungodly sinners and the salvation of the righteous, whereof in that day’s rest they had a pledge. And this belonged unto that state of man wherein he was created, namely,

that he should have a pledge of eternal rest. Neither could his duty and capacity be otherwise answered or esteemed reasonable. His duty, which was working in moral obedience, had a natural relation unto a reward; and his capacity was such as could not be satisfied, nor himself attain absolute rest, but in the enjoyment of God. A pledge hereof therefore, belonged unto his condition.

Thirdly, Consideration was had of the *way* and *means* whereby man might enter into the rest of God proposed unto him. And this was by that obedience and worship of God which the covenant wherein he was created required of him. The solemn expression of this obedience and exercise of this worship were indispensably required of him and his posterity, in all their societies and communion with one another. This cannot be denied, unless we shall say that God making man to be a sociable creature, and capable of sundry relations, did not require of him to honor him in the societies and relations whereof he was capable; which would certainly overthrow the whole Jaw of his creation with respect unto the end for which he was made, and render all societies sinful and rebellious against God. Hereunto the sabbatical rest was absolutely necessary; (or without some such rest, fixed or variable, those things could not be. This is a time or season for man to express and solemnly pay that homage which he owes to his *Creator;* and this is by most esteemed the great, if not the only end of the Sabbath. But it is evident that it falls under sundry precedent considerations.

10. These being the proper ends and reasons of the original sabbatical rest, which contain the true notion of it, we may next inquire after the law whereby it was prescribed and commanded. To this purpose we must first consider the state wherein man was created, and then the law of his creation. And for the state and condition wherein man was created, it falls under a threefold consideration: for man may be considered either, —

(1.) Absolutely as a *rational creature;* or,

(2.) As made under a *covenant of rewards and punishments;* or,

(3.) With respect unto the *special nature* of that covenant.

First, He was made a rational creature, and thereby necessarily in a moral dependence on God for being endowed with *intellectual faculties,* in an

immortal soul, capable of eternal blessedness or misery, able to know God, and to regard him as the first cause and last end of all, as the author of his being and object of his blessedness, it was naturally and necessarily incumbent on him, without any further considerations, to love, fear, and obey him, and to trust in him as a preserver and rewarder. And this the order of his nature, called "the image of God," inclined and enabled him unto. For it was not possible that such a creature should be produced, and lie under an obligation unto all those duties which the nature of God and his own, and the relation of the one to the other, made necessary. Under this consideration alone, it was required, by the *law of man's creation,* that some time should be separated unto the solemn expression of his obedience, and due performance of the worship that God required of him; for in vain was he endued with intellectual faculties and appointed unto society, if he were not to honor God by them in all his relations, and openly express the homage which he owed him. And this could not be done but in a *time* appointed for that purpose; the neglect whereof must be a deviation from the law of the creation. And as this is generally acknowledged, so no man can fancy the contrary. Here, then, do we fix the necessity of the separation of some time to the ends of a sabbatical rest, even on the nature of God and man, with the relation of one to the other; for who can say no part of our time is due to God, or so to be disposed?

Secondly, Man in his creation, with respect unto the ends of God therein, was *constituted under* a covenant. That is the law of his obedience was attended with promises and threatenings, rewards and punishments, suited unto the goodness and holiness of God; for every law with rewards and recompenses annexed has the nature of a covenant. And in this case, although the promise wherewith man was encouraged unto obedience, which was that of eternal life with God, did in strict justice exceed the worth of the obedience required, and so was a superadded effect of goodness and grace, yet was it suited unto the constitution of a covenant meet for man to serve God in unto his glory; and, on the other side, the punishment threatened unto disobedience, in death and an everlasting separation from God, was such as the righteousness and holiness of God, as his supreme governor, and Lord of him and the covenant, did require. Now, this covenant belonged unto the law of creation; for although God might have dealt with man in a way of *absolute sovereignty,* requiring

obedience of him without a covenant of a reward infinitely exceeding it yet having done so in his creation, it belongs unto and is inseparable from the law thereof. And under this consideration, the time required in general for a rest unto God, under the first general notion of the nature and being of man, is determined unto one day in seven; for as we shall find that in the various dispensations of the covenant with man and the change of its nature, so long as God is pleased to establish any covenant with man, he has and does invariably require one day in seven to be set apart unto the assignation of praise and glory to himself; so we shall see afterwards that there are indications of his mind to this purpose in the covenant itself.

Thirdly, Man is to be considered with special respect unto that covenant under which he was created, which was a covenant of works; for herein rest with God was proposed unto him as the end or reward of his own works, or of his personal obedience unto God, by absolute strict righteousness and holiness. And the peculiar form of this covenant, as relating unto the way of God's entering into it upon the finishing of his own works, designed the seventh day from the beginning of the creation to be the day precisely for the observation of a holy rest.

As men, then, are always rational creatures, so some portion of time is by them necessarily to be set apart to the solemn worship of God. As they are under a covenant, so this time was originally limited unto one day in seven. And as the covenant may be varied, so may this day also; which under the covenant of works was precisely limited unto the seventh day. And these things must be further illustrated and proved.

11. This was the state and condition wherein man was originally created. Our next inquiry is after the law of his creation, commonly called the *law of nature,* with what belongs thereunto, or what is required of us by virtue thereof. Now, by the *law of nature* most understand the dictates of right reason, which all men, or men generally, consent in and agree about; for we exclude wholly from this consideration the instinct of brute creatures, which has some appearance of a rule unto them. So Hesiod of old determined this matter speaking of them, Ἔργ. καὶ Ἡμ. 278, —

"They devour one another,
because they have no right or law amongst them."

Hence the prophet complaining of force and violence amongst men, with a neglect of right, justice, and equity, says, “Men are as the fishes of the sea, as the creeping things, that have no ruler over them,” Hab. 1:14. They devour one another, without regard to rule or fight; as he in Varro,—

“Natura humanis omnia sunt paria.
Qui pote plus, urget; pisces ut sæpe minutos
Magnu’ comest, ut aves enecat accipiter.”

Most learned men, therefore, conclude that there is no such thing as “jus,” or “lex naturæ,” among irrational creature; and consequently nothing of good or evil in their actions. But the consent of men in the dictates of reason is esteemed the law of nature. So Cicero, Tusc. 1:cap. xiii, “Omni in re consensio omnium gentium lex naturæ putanda est;”—”The common consent of all nations in any thing is to be thought the law of nature.” And Aristotle also, Rhet lib. 1:cap. xiv., calls it νόμου κοινόν “a common law, unwritten,” pertaining unto all, whose description he adds: Κοινὸν δὲ, τὸ κατὰ φύσιν· ἔστι γὰρ ὅ μαντεύονταί τι πάντες φύσει κοινὸν δίκαιον ἥ ἀδικὸν καὶ μηδεμία κοινωνία πρὸς ἀλλήλους, κἂν ἦ, μήδε συνθήκη· —That which is common is according to nature; for there is somewhat which all men think, and this is common right or injustice by nature, although there should be neither society nor compact between them.” And this he confirms out of Empedocles, that it is that οὗ τισὶ μὲν δίκαιον, τισὶ δὲ οὐ δίκαιον,— “not which is just to some, and unjust to others.”

῾Αλλὰ τὸ μὲν πάντων νόμιμον, διὰ εὐρυμέδοντος
Αἰθέρος ἠνεκέως τέταται διὰ τῆς ἀπλέτου αὐγῆς·—

“But it in right amongst all, spread out with immense
right by the broad ruling sky”

The like he affirms in his Ethics, lib. 5:cap. vii., defining it to be that which πανταχοῦ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει δύναμιν, καὶ οὐ τῷ δόκειν ἥ μή,— “that which has always, or everywhere, the same force or power, and does not seem or not seem so to be” [and not because it has been so decreed or not]. This his expositors affirm to be παρὰ τοῖς πλείστοις, καὶ ἀδιαφόροις καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ἔχουσιν,—”amongst the most of men who live according to the light of nature, with the principles of it uncorrupted.” This κατὰ φύσιν is the same with μετὰ λόγου, “according to the dictates

of reason." So λόγος ὁ ὀρθός, "right reason, is the same with many as "jus naturæ," or "naturale." Tully in his first de Legib., cam xii., pursues this at large. "Est unum jus," says he, "quo devincta est hominum societas, et quod lex constituit una Quæ lex est recta ratio imperandi atque prohibendi;" —"There is one common right, which is the bond of human society, and which depends on one law. And this law is the right reason of forbidding and commanding." This, then, is generally received,— namely, that the law of nature consists in the dictates of reason, which men sober, and otherwise uncorrupted, do assent unto and agree in. But there are sundry things which will not allow us to acquiesce in this description of it; for,—

12. First, the law of nature is a constant and perfect law. It must be so, because it is the fountain and rule of all other laws whatever; for they are but deductions from it and applications of it. Now, unto a complete law it is required, not only that it be instructive, but also that it have a *binding* force, or be coactive; that is, it does not only teach, guide, and direct what is to be done, persuading by the reason of the things themselves which it requires, but also it must have authority to exact obedience, so far as that those who are under the power of it can give themselves no dispensation from its observance. But thus it is not with these dictates of reason. They go no further than direction and persuasion; and these always have, and always will have, a respect unto occasions, emergencies, and circumstances. When these fall under any alterations, they will put reason on new considerations of what it ought to determine with respect unto them; and this the nature of a universal law will not admit. Whatever, then, men determine by reason, they may alter on new considerations, such as occasioned their original determination. I do not extend this unto all instances of natural light, but to some only; which suffices to demonstrate that the unalterable law of nature does not consist in these dictates of reason only. Suppose men do coalesce into any civil society on the mere dictates of reason that it is meet and best for them so to do, if this be the *supreme reason* thereof, no obligation arises from thence to preserve the society so entered into but what is liable unto a dissolution from contrary considerations. If it be said that reason dictates and commands in the name of God, whence an indissoluble obligation attends it, it will be answered, that this introduces a new respect, which is not formally included in the

nature of reason itself. Let a man indeed use and improve his own reason without prejudice, — let him collect what resolutions, determinations, instructions, laws, have proceeded from the reason of other men,— it will both exceedingly advance his understanding, and enable him to judge of many things that are congruous to the light and law of nature; but to suppose the law of nature to consist in a system or collection of such instances and observations is altogether unwarrantable.

13. The event of things, in the disagreement of the wisest men about the dictates of reason, utterly everts this opinion. The law of nature, whatever it be, must in itself be *one,* uniform, unalterable, the same in and unto all; for by these properties it differs from all other laws. But if it have no higher nor more noble original to be resolved into but mere human reason, it will be found, if not in all things, yet in most, fluctuating and uncertain. For about what is agreeable to reason in things moral, and what is not there have been differences innumerable from time immemorial, and that amongst them who searched most diligently after them, and boasted themselves to be wise upon their self-pleasing discoveries. This gave the greatest occasion unto the two hundred and eighty-eight sects of philosophers, as Austin reports them out of Varro, who was "disertissimus nepotum Romuli," lib. 19:de Civit. Dei. Yea, and some of the most learned and contemplative authors did not only mistake in many instances what natural light required, but also asserted things in direct opposition unto what is judged so to be. The saying produced out of Empedocles by Aristotle, before mentioned, is to prove that the killing of any living creature is openly against the universally prevailing law of nature. Others maintained such things to be natural as the most did abominate. Incest in the nearest instances, with sodomy, were asserted lawful by the Magi, and some of the most learned Greeks, as Zeno and Chrysippus. And it was the judgment of Theodorus that a wise man ought καὶ κλέψειν τε καὶ μοιχεύειν, καὶ ἱεροσυλήσειν ἐν καιρῷ, μηδὲν τούτων φύσει αἰσχρὸν εἶναι, as Hesychius Illustrius reports in his life. He thought that neither theft, nor adultery, nor sacrilege, had any thing evil or filthy in them in their own nature, so that a wise man ought to have respect unto them, according to circumstances and occasions. Plato's promiscuous use of wives was confirmed by law at Sparta. And Archelaus at once determined καὶ τὸ δίκαιον εἶναι, καὶ τὸ αἰσχρὸν οὐ φυσει

ἀλλὰ νόμῳ, as Diogenes in his life, who likewise reports the same of Aristippus and Carneades. Naturally they thought nothing just or unjust, good or evil, but by virtue of some arbitrary law. And there are yet those in the world, partakers of human nature in common with us all, who know no other rule of their actions towards others but power, as the cannibals, and those Indians who suppose they may justly spoil all that are afraid of them. Yea some, who of late have pretended a severe inquisition into these things, seem to incline unto an opinion that power and self-advantage are the rule of men's conversation among themselves in this world. So it was the principle of Brennus, in his time the terror of Europe, that there was no other law of nature but that the weaker should obey the stronger." And the commander of the Gauls who besieged the Roman Capitol, when he was on a composition to depart upon the giving to him such a weight of gold, threw his sword and helmet into the scale against it, giving no other reason for what he did but "Væ victis." Neither will another rule which they had of assigning things to the law of nature hold firm, namely, a general usage of mankind from time immemorial. This Antigone pleads in Sophocles for her burying of Polynices,'' Αντιγ.—

Οὐ γάρ τι νῦν γε κἀχθὲς ἀλλ᾽ ἀεί ποτε
Ζῇ παῦτα κὀυδεὶς οἰδεν ἐξ ὅτον ᾽ φάνη·—

"This (right) arose not today nor yesterday,
but was in force ever of old, nor does any man know
from whence it arose."

For all nations, from beyond the records of the original of things, had consented unto practices directly contrary to the light of nature, as is now acknowledged. And hence were all the disputes of old about the nature, bounds, and ends of good and evil, duty and vice, honest and filthy, just and unjust,. that could never be determined. This Plato observing, affirms in his Phædo, "That if any one name either silver or iron, presently all men agree what it is that is intended; but if they speak of that which is just and good, presently we are at variance with others and among ourselves." So great uncertainty is there in human reason, under its best natural improvements, in its judgment of what does or does not belong to the principles and condition of our nature, so far is it from being comprehensive of the whole law thereof.

14. When, therefore, we plead any thing to belong unto or to proceed from the law of nature, it is no impeachment of our assertion to say that it does not appear so to the common reason of mankind, or that right reason has not found it out or discovered it, provided it contain nothing repugnant thereunto; for it will never be universally agreed what does so appear to the common reason of all, nor what is, has been, or may be discovered thereby. And although it should be true, which some say, that moral and natural duties depend on and have their formal reason from the nature of God and man, yet it does not thence follow that we do, or may, by the sole light of nature, know what does so arise, with the due bounds and just consequences of it. But there is, as we shall. see, something yet further required in and unto the law of nature, which is the adequate rule of all such duties. I shall not, therefore, endeavor to prove that the mere dictates of reason do evince a sacred hebdomadal rest as knowing that the law of nature, unto which we say it does belong, does not absolutely consist in them; nor did they ever since the fall, steadily and universally, as acted in men possessed of reason, either comprehend or express all that belongs thereunto.

15. By the law of nature, then, I intend, not a law which *our nature gives unto all our actions*, but a *law given unto our nature*, as a rule and measure unto our moral actions. It is “lex naturæ naturantis,” and not “naturæ naturæ” It respects the efficient cause of nature, and not the effects of it. And this respect alone can give it the nature of a law,— that is, an obliging force and power; for this must be always from the act of a superior, seeing “par in parem jus non habet,”— “equals have no right one over another.” This law, therefore, is that rule which God has given unto human nature, in all the individual partakers of it, for all its moral actions, in the state and condition wherein it was by him created and placed, with respect unto his own government of it and judgment concerning it; which rule is made known in them and to them by their inward constitution and outward condition wherein they were placed of God. And the very heathens acknowledged that the *common law of mankind* was God’s prescription unto them. So Tully, lib. 2:de Legibe. cap. iv., “Hanc video sapientissimorum fuisse sententiam, legem neque hominum ingenus excogitatam, nec scitum aliquod esse populoruim, sed æternuni quiddam, quod universum mundum regeret, imperandi prohibendique sapientia. Ita

principem legem illam et ultimam, mentem esse dicebant, omnia ratione aut cogentis, aut vetantis Dei." Take this law, therefore, *actively*, and it is the will of God commanding; take it *passively*, and it is the conscience of man complying with it; take it *instrumentally*, and it is the inbred notions of our minds, with other documents from the works of God, proposed unto us. The supreme original of it, as of all authority, law, and obligation, is the will of God, constituting, appointing, and ordering the nature of things; the means of its revelation, is the effect of the will, wisdom, and power of God, creating man and all other things wherein he is concerned, in their order, place, and condition; and the observation of it, as far as individual persons are therein concerned, is committed to the care of the conscience of every man, which naturally is the mind's acting itself towards God as the author of this law.

16. These things being premised, we shall consider what light is given unto this sacred duty from the law of our creation. The first end of any law is to instruct, direct, and guide them in their duty unto whom it is given. A law which is not in its own nature instructive and directive, is no way meet to he prescribed unto rational creatures. What has an influence upon any creature of any other kind, if it be internal, is *instinct,* and not properly a law; if it be external, it is *force* and compulsion. The law of creation, therefore, comprised every thing whereby God instructed man, in the creation of himself and of the universe, unto his works or obedience, and his rest or reward. And whatever tended unto that end belonged unto that law. It is, then, as has been proved, unduly confined unto the ingrafted notions of his mind concerning God and his duty towards him, though they are a *principal part* thereof. Whatever was designed to give improvement unto those notions and his natural light, to excite or direct them,— I mean in the works of nature, not superadded positive institutions,— does also belong thereunto. Wherefore the whole instruction that God intended to give unto man by the works of creation, with their order and end, is, as was said, included herein. What he might learn from them, or what God taught him by them, was no less his duty than what his own inbred light directed him unto, [Romans 1:18-20]. Thus the framing of the world in *six days*, in six days of *work*, was intended to be instructive unto man, as well as the consideration of the things materially that were made. God could have immediately produced

all out of nothing, ἐν ἀτόμῳ ἐν ῥιπῇ ὀφθαλμοῦ,— in the shortest measure of time conceivable; but he not only made all things for himself, or his glory, but disposed also the order of their production unto the same end. And herein consisted part of that covenant instruction which he gave unto man in that condition wherein he was made, that through him he might have glory ascribed unto him on the account of his works themselves, as also of the order and manner of their creation; for it is vain to imagine that the world was made in six days, and those closed with a day of rest, without an especial respect unto the obedience of rational creatures, seeing absolutely with respect unto God himself neither of them was necessary. And what he intended to teach them thereby, it was their duty to inquire and know. Hereby, then, man in general was taught obedience and working before be entered into rest; for being created in the image of God, he was to conform himself unto God. As God wrought before he rested, so was he to work before his rest, his condition rendering that working in him obedience, as it was in God an effect of sovereignty. And by the rest of God, or his satisfaction and complacency in what he had made and done, he was instructed to seek rest with God, or to enter into that rest of God, by his compliance with the ends intended.

17. And whereas the innate light and principles of his own mind informed him that some time was to be set apart to the solemn worship of God, as he was a rational creature made to give glory unto him, so the instruction he received by the works and rest of God, as made under a covenant, taught him that one day in seven was required unto that purpose, as also to be a pledge of his resting with God. It may be, it will be said that man could not know that the world was made in six days, and that the rest of God ensued on the seventh, without some especial revelation. I answer,—

(1.) That I know not. He that knew the nature of all the creatures, and could give them names suited thereunto upon his first sight and view of them, might know more of the order of their creation than we can well imagine; for we know no more, in our lapsed condition, what the light of nature directed man unto as walking before God in a covenant, than men merely natural do know of the guidance and conduct of the light and law of grace in them who are taken into the new covenant.

(2.) However, what God instructed him in, even by revelation, as to the due consideration and improvement of the things that belonged unto the law of his creation, that is to be esteemed as a part thereof. Institutions of things by special revelation, that had no foundation in the law or light of nature, were merely positive; such were the commands concerning the trees of life and of the knowledge of good and evil. But such as were directive of natural light and of the order of the creation were moral, and belonged unto the general law of obedience; such was the especial command given unto man to till and keep the garden, Genesis 2:15, or to dress and improve the place of his habitation, for this in general the law of his creation required. Now this God did, both as to his works and his rest. Neither do I know any one as yet that questions whether Adam and the patriarchs that ensued before the giving of the law knew that the world was created in six days. Though some seem to speak doubtfully hereof, and some by direct consequent deny it, yet I suppose that hitherto it passes as granted. Nor have they who dispute that the Sabbath was neither instituted, known, nor observed, before the people of Israel were in the wilderness, once attempted to confirm their opinion with this supposition, that the patriarchs from the foundation of the world knew not that the world was made in six days, which yet alone would be effectual unto their purpose. Nor, on the other side, can it be once rationally imagined that if they had knowledge hereof, and therewithal of the rest which ensued thereon, they had no regard unto it in the worship of God.

18. And thus was the Sabbath, or the observation of one day in seven as a sacred rest, fixed on the same moral grounds with *monogamy*, or the marriage of one man to one woman only at the same time; which, from the very fact and order of the creation, our Savior proves to have been an unchangeable part of the law of it. For because God made them two single persons, male and female, fit for individual conjunction, he concludes that this course of life they were everlastingly obliged not to alter nor transgress. As, therefore, men may dispute that polygamy is not against the law of nature, because it was allowed and practiced by many, by most of those who of old observed and improved the light and rule thereof to the uttermost, when yet the very “factum” and order of the creation is sufficient to evince the contrary; so although men should dispute that the

observation of one day's sacred rest in seven is not of the light or law of nature,— all whose rules and dictates, they say, are of an easy discovery, and prone to the observation of all men, which this is not,— yet the order of the creation, and the rest of God that ensued thereon, are sufficient to evince the contrary. And in the renewing of the law upon mount Sinai, God taught the people not only by the words that he spake, but also by the works that he wrought Yea, he instructed them in a moral duty, not only by what he did, but by what he did not; for he declares that they ought to make no images of or unto him, because he made no representation of himself unto them.

> "They saw no manner of similitude on the day that the LORD spoke unto them in Horeb out of the midst of the fire," Deuteronomy 4:15, 16.

19. But now, to shut up this discourse, whereas the covenant which man originally was taken into was a covenant of works, wherein his obtaining rest with God depended absolutely on his doing all the work he had to do in a way of legal obedience, he was during the dispensation of that covenant tied up precisely to the observation of the seventh day, or that which followed the whole work of creation. And the seventh day, as such, is a pledge and token of the rest promised in the covenant of works, and no other. And those who would advance that day again into a necessary observation do consequentially introduce the whole covenant of works, and are become debtors into the whole law; for the. works of God which preceded the seventh day precisely were those whereby man was initiated into and instructed in the covenant of works, and the day itself was a token and pledge of the righteousness thereof, or a moral and natural sign of it, and of the rest of God therein, and the rest of man with God thereby. And it is no service to the church of God, nor has any tendency into the honor of Christ in the gospel, to endeavor a reduction of us unto the covenant of nature.

20. Thus was man instructed in the whole notion of a weekly sacred rest, by all the ways and means which God was pleased to use in giving him an acquaintance with his will, and that obedience unto his glory which he expected from him: for this knowledge he had partly by the law of his creation, as *innate* unto him or con-created with the principles of his

nature, being the necessary exsurgency of his rational constitution; and partly by the *works and rest of God*, thereon proposed unto his consideration; both firmed by God's declaration of his sanctification of the seventh day. Hence did he know that it was his duty to express and celebrate the rest of God, or the complacency that he had in the works of his hands, in reference unto their great and proper end, or his glory, in the honor, praise, and obedience of them unto whose contemplation they were proposed for those ends. This followed immediately from the *time spent in the creation*, and the rest that ensued thereon, which were so ordered for his instruction, and not from any other cause or reason, taken either from the nature of God or of the things themselves, which required neither six days to make the world in, nor any rest to follow thereon; for that rest was not a cessation from working absolutely, much less merely so. Hence did he learn the nature of the covenant that he was taken into, namely, how he was first to work in obedience, and then to enter into God's rest in blessedness; for so had God appointed, and so did he understand his will, from his own present state and condition. Hence was he instructed to dedicate to God, and to his own more immediate communion with him, one day in a weekly revolution, wherein the whole law of his creation was consummated, as a pledge and means of entering eternally into God's rest, which from hence he understood to be his end and happiness. And for the sanctification of the *seventh day of the week precisely*, he had it by revelation, or God's sanctification of it; which had unto him the nature of a positive law, being a determination of the day suited unto the nature and tenor of that covenant wherein he walked with God.

21. And by this superadded command or institution, the mind of man was confirmed in the meaning and intention of his innate principles, and other instructions to the same purpose in general. All these things, I say, the last only excepted, was he directed unto in and by the *innate principles* of light and obedience wherewith the faculties of his soul were furnished, every way suited to guide him in the whole of the duty required of him, and by the further instruction he had from the other works of God, and his rest upon the whole. And although, it may be, we cannot now discern how in particular his natural light might conduct and guide him to the observance of all these things, yet ought we not therefore to deny that so it did, seeing there is evidence in the things themselves, and we know not well what that

light was which was in him; for although we may have some due apprehensions of the substance of it, from its remaining ruins and materials in our lapsed condition, yet we have no acquaintance with that light and glorious luster, that extent of its directive beams, which it was accompanied withal, when it was in him as he came immediately from the hand of God, created in his image. We have lost more by the fall than the best and wisest in the world can apprehend whilst they are in it,— much more than most will acknowledge, whose principal design seems to be to extenuate the sin and misery of man; which issues necessarily in an undervaluation of the love and grace of Jesus Christ. But if a natural or carnal man cannot discern how the Spirit or grace of the new covenant, which succeeds into the room of our first innate light, as unto the end of our living unto God's glory in a new way, directs and guides those in whom it is unto the observance of all the duties of it, let us not wonder if we cannot easily and readily comprehend the brightness, and extent, and conduct of that light which was suited unto an estate of things that never was in the world since the fall, but only in the man Christ Jesus; whose wisdom and knowledge in the mind and will of God even thereby, without his superadded peculiar assistance, we may rather admire than think to understand.

22. Thus, then, were the foundations of the old world laid, and the covenant of man's obedience established, when all the sons of God sang for joy, even in the first rest of God, and in the expression of it by the sanctification of a sacred rest, made to return unto him a revenue of glory in man's observance of it. And on these grounds I do affirm that the weekly observation of a day to God for sabbath ends is a duty *natural* and *moral*, which we are under a perpetual and indispensable obligation unto,— namely, from that command of God, which, being a part of the law of our creation, is moral, indispensable, and perpetual. And these things, with the different apprehensions of others about them, and oppositions unto them, must now be further explained and considered; and that we now enter·upon,— namely, the consideration of the judgment and opinions of others about these things, with the confirmation of our own.

23. In the inquiry after the causes of the Sabbath, the first question usually insisted on is concerning the nature of the law whereby its observation is commanded. This some affirm to be moral, some only positive, as we have

showed before. And many disputes there have been about the true notion and distinction of laws moral and positive. But whereas these terms are invented to express the conceptions of men's minds, and that of moral, at least, includes not any absolute determinate sense in the meaning of the word, those at variance about them cannot impose their sense and understanding of them upon one another; for seeing this denomination of moral, applied unto a law, is taken from the subject-matter of it, which is the manners or duties of them to whom the law is given, if any one will assert that every command of God which respects the manners of men, that is, of all men absolutely as men, is moral, I know not how any one can compel him to speak or think otherwise, for he has his liberty to use the word in that sense which he judges most proper. And if it can be proved that there is a law, and ever was, binding all men universally to the observation of a hebdomadal sacred rest, I shall not contend with any how that law ought to be called, whether moral or positive. This contest, therefore, I shall not engage into, though I have used, and shall yet further use, those terms in their common sense and acceptation. My way shall be plainly to inquire what force there is in the law of our creation unto the observation of a weekly Sabbath, and what is superadded there-unto by the vocal declaration of the will of God concerning it.

24. And here, in the first place, it is generally agreed,— so that the opposition unto it is not considerable, nor any way deserving our notice,— that in and by the light of nature, or the law of our creation, some time ought to be separated unto the observance of the solemn worship of God; for be that worship what it will, merely natural, or any thing superadded by voluntary and arbitrary institutions, the law for its observance is natural, and requires that time be set apart for its celebration, seeing in time it is to be performed. When there was but one man and woman, this was their duty; and so it continued to be the duty of their whole race and posterity, in all the societies, associations, and assemblies whereof they were capable. But the first object of this law or command is the *worship of God itself*; *time* falls under it only consequentially and reductively. Wherefore the law of nature does also distinctly respect time itself; for we are bound thereby to serve God with all that is ours, and with "the first fruits of our substance" in every kind. Somewhat of whatever God has given unto us is to be set apart from our own use, and

given up absolutely to him, as a homage due unto him, and a necessary acknowledgment of him. To deny this, is to contradict one of the principal dictates of the law of nature; for God has given us nothing ultimately for ourselves, seeing we and all that we have are wholly his. And to have any thing whereof no part as such is to be spent in his service, is to have it with his displeasure. Let any one endeavor to assert and prove this position, 'No part of our time is to be set apart to the worship of God and his service in a holy and peculiar manner,' and he will quickly find himself setting up in a full contradiction to the law of nature, and the whole light of the knowledge of God in his mind and conscience. Those who have attempted any such thing have done it under this deceitful pretense, that all our time is to he spent unto God, and every day is to be a Sabbath. But whereas, notwithstanding this pretense, they spend most of their time directly and immediately to themselves and their own occasions, it is evident that they do but make use of it to rob God of that which is his due directly and immediately; for unto the holy separation of any thing unto God, it is required as well that it be taken from ourselves as that it be given unto him. This, therefore, the law of our creation requires as unto the separation of some part of our time unto God. And if this does not at first consideration discover itself in its *directive power*, it will quickly do so in its condemning power, upon a contradiction of it. Thus far, then, we have attained.

25. Moreover, men are to worship God in assemblies and societies, such as he appoints, or such as by his providence they are cast into. This will not be denied, seeing it stands upon as good, yea, better evidence, than the associations of mankind for ends political unto their own good by government and order, which all men confess to be a direction of the law of nature. For what concerns our living to God naturally is as clear in that light and conduct as what concerns our living among ourselves. Now, a part of this worship it is that we honor him with what by his gift is made ours. Such is our *time* in this world. Nor can the worship itself be performed and celebrated in a due manner without the designation and separation of *some time* unto that purpose. And thereby, secondly, this *separation of time* becomes a branch of the law of nature, by an immediate, natural, and unavoidable consequence. And what is so is no less to he reckoned among the rules of it than the very first notions or impressions

that it gives us concerning the nature of any thing, good or evil; for whatever reason can educe from the principles of reason, is no less reason than those principles themselves from whence it is educed. And we aim at no more from this discourse but that the separation of some time to the worship of God, according to the ends before insisted on, is reasonable; so that the contrary in its first conception is unreasonable and foolish. And this, I suppose, is evident to all; I am sure by most men it is granted. Could men hereupon acquiesce in the authority and wisdom of God indigitating and measuring out that portion of time in all seasons and ages of the church, there might be a natural rest from these contentions about a rest sacred and holy. However, I cannot but admire at the liberty which some men take, positively to affirm and contend that the command for the observation of the Sabbath, when or however it was given, was wholly umbratile and ceremonial; for there is that in it confessedly, as its foundation, and that which all its concernments are educed from, which is as direct an impression on the mind of man from the law of creation as any other instance that can be given thereof

26. Upon this foundation, therefore, we may proceed. And I say, in the next place, that the stated time directed unto for the ends of a sacred rest unto God by the light and law of nature,— that is, God's command impressed on the mind of man in and by his own creation, and that of the rest of the works of God, intended for his direction in obedience,— is, that it be *one day in seven.* For the confirmation hereof; what we have discoursed concerning the law of creation and the covenant ratified with man therein is to be remembered. On the supposition thereof; the advancement or constitution of any other portion of time, in the stead and to the exclusion thereof; as a determination and limitation of the time required in general in the first instance of that law, is and would appear a contradiction unto it God having finished his works in six days, and rested on the seventh, giving man thereby and therein the rule and law of his obedience and rewards, for him to assign any other measure or portion of time for his rest unto God in his solemn worship, is to decline the authority of God for the sake of his own inventions; and to assign no portion at all unto that end, is openly to transgress a principal dictate of the law of nature, as has been proved. Neither this direction nor transgression, I confess, will evidently manifest themselves in the mere

light of nature, as now depraved and corrupted; no more will sundry instances of its authority, unless its voice be diligently attended unto, and its light cultivated and improved in the minds of men, by the advantage of consequential revelations, given unto us for that purpose. For, that by the assistance of Scripture light, and rational considerations thence arising, we may discover many things to be dictates of, and to be directed unto by, the law of nature, which those who are left unto the mere guidance and conduct of it could not discover so to be, may be easily proved, from the open transgression of it in sundry instances, which they lived and approved themselves in, who seemed most to have lived according unto it, and professed themselves to be wise in following the light and conduct of reason in all things, as was before at large discoursed. The polytheism that prevailed amongst the best of the heathens, their open profession of living unto themselves, and seeking after their happiness in themselves, with many other instances, make this evident. And if revelation, or Scripture light, contributed no more to the discovery of the postulata of the law of nature, but by a removal of those prejudices which the manner and fashion of the world amongst men, and a corrupt conversation received by tradition from one generation to another, had fixed on and possessed their minds withal, yet were the advantages we had by it unto this end unspeakable. Let, then, this help be supposed, and let a judgment be made of the injunctions of the law of nature rather by its condemning right and power than by its directive light (for that, in our lapsed estate, is a better κριτήριον of its commands than the other), and we shall find it manifesting itself in this matter. For on this supposition, let those who will not acknowledge that the separation of one day in seven is to be observed unto God for the ends declared, allowing the assertion before laid down of the necessity of the separation of some stated time to that purpose, fix to themselves any other time in a certain revolution of days, and they will undoubtedly find themselves pressed with so many considerations from the law of their creation to the contrary, as will give them little rest or satisfaction in their minds in what they do.

27. Further to manifest this, we may inquire what is necessary unto any duty of obedience towards God, to evince it to be a requisite of the law of our creation. And here our diligence is required; for it must be said again expressly, what was before intimated, that it is a childish mistake to

imagine that whatever is required by the law of nature is easily discernible, and always known to all. Some of its directions it may be are so, especially such as are inculcated on the minds of men by their common interest and advantage. Such are “neminem lædere,” and “jus suum cuique tribuera.” But it is far from being true that all the dictates of the law of nature and requisites of right reason are evident and incapable of controversy, as they would have been unto man had he continued in his integrity. Many things there are between men themselves, concerning which, after all helps and advantages, and a continued observation of the course of the world unto this day, it is still disputed what is the sense of the law of nature about them, and wherein or how far they belong unto it. The *law of nations* among themselves with respect unto one another, on which is founded the peace and order of mankind, is nothing but the law of nature, as it has been expressed in instances, by the customs and usages of them who are supposed to have most diligently attended unto its directions. And how many differences, never to be determined by common consent, there are in and about these things, is known; for there are degrees of evidence in the things that are of natural light. And many things that are so are yet in practice accompanied with the consideration of positive laws, as also of civil usages and customs amongst men. And it is not easy to distinguish in many observances what is of the law of nature, and what of law positive, or of useful custom. But of these things we have discoursed before in general. We are now to inquire what is requisite to warrant the ascription of any thing unto this law.

28. And,

(1.) It is required that it be *congruous unto the law of nature*, and all the other known principles of it. Unto us it may be enjoined by law positive, or be otherwise made necessary for us to observe; but it must in itself; or materially, hold a good correspondency with all the known instances of the law of our creation, and this manifested with satisfying evidence, before its assignation thereunto. It is of natural light that we should obey God in all his commands; but this does not cause every command of God to belong to the law of nature. It is, as was said, moreover required thereunto, that it be in itself; and the subject-matter of it, congruous unto the principles of that law, whereof there is nothing in things merely arbitrary and positive, setting aside that general notion that God is to be

obeyed in all his laws, which belongs not to this question. Now, when this congruity unto the law of nature or right reason, in the matter of any law or command, is discovered and made evident, it will greatly direct the mind in its inquiry after its whole nature, and manifest what is superadded unto it by positive command. And this will not be denied unto the Sabbath, its command and observation. Let the ends of it before laid down be considered, and let them be compared with any other guidances or directions which we have by natural light concerning our living to God, and there will not only a harmony appear amongst them, but also that they contribute help and assistance to one another towards the same ultimate end.

29. (2.) It is required that it have a general principle in the light of nature and dictates of right reason, from whence it may be educed, or which it will necessarily follow upon, supposing that principle rightly and duly improved. It is not enough that it be at agreement, that it no way interfere with other principles; it must also have one of its own, from whence it does naturally arise. So does the second commandment of the decalogue belong to the law of nature. Its principle lies in that acknowledgment of the being of God which is required in the first; for therein is God manifested to be of that nature, to be such a being, that it is, and must be, an absurd, unreasonable, foolish, and impious thing in itself, implying a renunciation of the former acknowledgment, to make any images or limited representations of his being, or to adore him any way otherwise than himself has declared. So is it here also. The separation of a stated time unto the solemn worship of God is so fixed on the mind of man, by its own inbred light, as that it cannot be omitted without open sin against it in those who have not utterly sinned away all the efficacy of that light itself. However, that this is required of us by the law of our creation may be proved against all contradiction. Hence, whatever guiding, directing, determining, positive law may ensue or be superadded, about the limitation of this time so to be separated, it being only the application of this natural and moral principle, as to some circumstance of it, it hinders not but that the law itself concerning it is of the law of nature, and moral; for the original power unto obligation of such a superadded law lies in the natural principle before mentioned.

30. (3.) What all men are taught by the *works of creation themselves*, their order, harmony, and mutual respect to each other, with reference unto their duty towards God and among themselves, is of the law of nature, although there be not an absolute distinct notion of it inbred in the mind discoverable. It is enough that the mind of man is so disposed as to be ready and fit to receive the discovery and revelation of it. For the very creation itself is a law unto us, and speaks out that duty that God requires of us towards himself; for he has not only so ordered all the works of it that they should be meet to instruct us, or contain an instructive power towards rational creatures, made in that state and condition wherein man was created, which was before described, which has in it the first notion of a law; but it was the will of God that we should learn our duty thereby, which gives it its complement as a law obliging unto obedience. And it is not only thus in general, with respect unto the whole work of creation in itself, but the ordering and disposal of the parts of it is alike directive and instructive to the nature of man, and has the force of a law morally and everlastingly obligatory. Thus, the pre-eminence of the man above the woman, which is moral, ensues upon the order of the creation, in that the man was first made, and "the woman for the man," as the apostle argues, ⁴⁶¹⁰1 Corinthians 11:8, 9, ⁵⁰⁰²1 Timothy 2:12, 13. And all nations ought to be obliged hereby, though many of them, through their apostasy from natural light knew not that either man or woman was created, but, it may be, supposed them to have grown out of the earth like mushrooms; and yet an effect of the secret original impression hereof influenced their minds and practices. So the creation of one man and one woman gave the natural law of marriage, whence polygamy and fornication became transgressions of the law of nature. It will be hard to prove that about these and the like things there is a clear and undoubted principle of directive light in the mind of man, separate from the consideration of the order of creation; but therein a law, and that moral, is given unto us, not to be referred unto any other head of laws but that of nature. And here, as was before pleaded, the creation of the world in six days, with the rest of God on the seventh, and that declared, gives unto all men an everlasting law of separating one day in seven unto a sacred rest; for he that was made in the image of God was made to imitate him and conform himself unto him, God in this order of things saying as it were unto him, 'What I have done, in your station do ye likewise.' Especially was this made effectual by his innate apprehension

that his happiness consisted in entering into the rest of God, the pledge whereof it was his unquestionable duty to embrace.

31. (4.) In this state of things, a direction by a revelation, in the way of a precept, for the due and just exercise of the principles, rules, and documents before mentioned, is so far from impeaching the morality of any command or duty, as that it completes the law of it, with the addition of a formal obligatory power and efficacy. The light and law of creation, so far as it was innate, or concreated with the faculties of our souls, and completing our state of dependence on God, has only the general nature of a principle, inclining unto actions suitable unto it, and directing us therein. The documents also that were originally given unto that light from without, by the other works and order of the creation, had only in their own nature the force of an instruction. The will of God, and an act of sovereignty therein, formally constituted them a law. But now, man being made to live unto God, and under his conduct and guidance in all things, that he might come to the enjoyment of him, no prejudice arises unto, nor alteration is made in the dictates of, the law of creation, by the superadding any *positive commands* for the performance of the duties that it does require, and regulating of them, as to the especial manner and ends of their performance. And where such a positive law is interposed or superadded, it is the highest folly. to imagine that the whole obligation unto the duty depends on that command, as though the authority of the law of nature were superseded thereby, or that the whole command about it were now grown positive and arbitrary; for although the same law cannot be moral and positive in the same respect, yet the same duty may be required by a law moral and a law positive. It is thus with many observances of the gospel. We may, for example, instance in excommunication, according to the common received notion of it. There is a *positive command* in the gospel for the exercise of the sentence of it in the churches of Christ But this hinders not but that it is natural for *all societies* of men to exclude from their societies those that refractorily refuse to observe the laws and orders of the society, that it may be preserved unto its proper end. And according to the rule of this natural equity, that it should be so, have all rational societies amongst men, that knew nothing of the gospel, proceeded, for their own good and preservation. Neither does the superadded institution in the gospel

derogate from the general reason hereof, or change the nature of the duty, but only direct its practice, and make application of it to the uses and ends of the gospel itself.

32. I do not plead that every law that God prescribes unto me is *moral* because my obedience unto it is a moral duty; for the morality of this obedience does not arise from, nor depend upon, the especial command of it, which, it may he, is positive and arbitrary, but from the respect that it has unto our dependence, in all things which we have to do, absolutely and universally on God. To obey God in all things is unquestionably our moral duty. But when the substance of the command itself, that is, the duty required, is moral, the addition of a positive command does no way impeach its morality, nor suspend the influence of that law whereon its morality does depend. It is, therefore, unduly pretended by some, that because there is a positive command for the observation of the Sabbath,— supposing there should be such a command for the whole of it, which is nothing else but an explanation and enforcement or the original moral precept of it (as in every state of the church something relating unto it, namely, the precise determination of the day itself in the hebdomadal revolution, depended on a law positive),— therefore the law of it is not moral. It is not so, indeed, so far and in that respect wherein it is positive; but it is so from itself, for the substance of it and antecedently unto that positive command. The whole law, therefore, of the Sabbath and its observation may be said to be *moral-positive*; which expression has been used by some learned divines in this case, and that not unduly. For a law may be said to be so on a double account:— First, When the *positive part* of the law is declarative, and accumulative with respect unto a precedent law of nature, as when some additions are made to the duties therein required, as to the manner of their performance. Secondly, When the *foundation* of a duty only is laid in the law of nature, but its entire practice is regulated by a positive law. From all the instances insisted on, it is manifest that the law of the sabbatical observation is moral, a branch of the law of nature, however it be enforced, directed, and the especial day in seven be limited and determined, by positive command.

33. These things by many are denied. They will not grant that there is any rule or direction in the law of creation for a sacred rest unto God on one day in seven; for they say that no such [rule] can be made to appear with

that evidence which the common anticipations of the minds of men are accompanied withal. But this objection has been sufficiently obviated by a due stating of the law of nature, which is not to be confined unto inbred natural anticipations only. And it is certain also that some say the very same concerning the being of God himself, and of the difference between good and evil, namely, that there are no manifest and steadfast presumptions of them in the mind of man; which yet hinders not but that the acknowledgment of a Divine Being, as also the difference that is between good and evil, is natural, and inseparable from the faculties of our souls. Hence Julian in Cyril. lib. 5:con. Jul. joins the first and fourth precept together. Saith he, Ποῖον ἔθνος ἐστὶ, πρὸς τῶν ζεῶν, ἔξω τοῦ οὐ προσκυνήσεις θεοῖς ἑτέροις, καὶ τοῦ μνήσθητι τῶν Σαββάτων, ὃ μὴ τὰς ἄλλας οἴεται χρῆναι φυλάττειν ἐντολάς· — " He says" (and swears) "that all nations judged that the commandments" (of the decalogue) "ought to be kept excepting the first, forbidding other gods, and the other of remembering the Sabbath to keep it." The one may be rejected as well as the other.

Besides, the law of nature, as to an obligatory indication of our duty, is not, no, not in the extent insisted on, as comprising the objective documents that are in the works and order of the creation, to be considered alone by itself in this matter, but in conjunction with the covenant that it was the rule of; for whatever was required of man by virtue of that covenant was part of the moral law of God, or belonged unto the law of his creation. From all which the rest pleaded for to be moral does arise. And considering the nature of this duty, with the divine positive direction whereby its first practice was regulated, and stood in need so to be, when "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it," it is marvelous that the remaining light of nature about it should put forth itself by so many intimations as it does, and in so many instances, to express the first impression that it had from God in this matter; for I think we have manifested that they are many, and those pleadable against any probability of contradiction. In a word, we may in all ages find the generality of mankind feeling, and as it were groping in the dark, after a stated sacred rest to be observed unto God. And however the most of men destitute of divine revelation missed the season, the ends, and the object of this rest, yet they were plainly influenced unto all their stated sacred or

religious solemnities, both feasts and abstinences, by the remainders of an innate persuasion that such a rest was to be observed. Besides, we know that the present indications of nature, as corrupt, are no just rule and measure of its original abilities, with respect unto living to God. And they do but woefully bewray their ignorance and impudence, who begin to plead that our minds or understandings were no way impaired or worsted by the fall, but that the principles or abilities in them, in reference unto God and ourselves, are the same as originally, and that unimpaired. Either such men design to overthrow the gospel and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, or they know not what they say, nor whereof they do affirm. But hereof we shall treat elsewhere, by God's assistance. At present we know that the light of nature is so defective, or so impotent in giving indications of itself, that many nations left destitute of divine revelation, or wilfully rejecting it, have lived and approved themselves in open transgression of the law of it, as has been showed. The apostle gives sundry instances of that kind amongst them who most boasted themselves to attend to the dictates of right reason, Romans 1. All idolaters, polygamists, fornicators, and those who constantly lived on spoil and rapine, approving themselves, or not condemning themselves in what they did, are testimonies hereof. That alone, then, is not to be pretended to be of the law of nature which all men acknowledge to be a part of it; nor is every thing to be rejected from having a place therein which some have lived in a secure transgression of, and others say that it gives no indications of itself; but that is to be understood to belong thereunto which, by the diligent consideration of all means and advantages of knowledge, may be found to be congruous to all the other known and allowed principles and maxims of it, and to have its foundation in it, being what originally God by any means instructed our nature in, as that which belonged unto our living unto him. And, it may be, a man may sooner learn what is natural duty to God, in and from corrupted nature, by the opposition that it will make unto its practice, as it is corrupted, than by the light and guidance it will give unto it as nature. It is also, as we have. observed, more discernible in its judging and condemning what is done contrary unto it, than in directing unto what it did originally require.

34. Having given evidence unto the morality of the Sabbath from the indications of it and directions unto it in the light and law of nature,—

which will be found to be such as not to be by any modest or sober man contemned,— we proceed to add those other consequential confirmations of the same truth, which God has given us in the following revelations of his will about it. And, first, this gives no small countenance unto an apprehension of an unchangeable morality in the law of the Sabbath, that in all estates of the church, from the foundation of the world, under the several covenants wherein it has walked with God, and the various dispensations of them, there is a full evidence that in them all God has still required of his people the observation of a sacred rest unto himself in a hebdomadal revolution of time or days. A full confirmation hereof; with its proofs and illustrations, the reader will find at large in our exposition of the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, so soon as God shall give an opportunity to have it communicated unto him. At present I shall touch only on the heads of things.

35. That any religious observance has been required through all estates of the church, having no foundation but only in arbitrary institution, cannot be proved by any one single instance. The institutions of the state of innocency, in the matters of the garden, with the trees of life and of the knowledge of good and evil, ceased, as all men confess, with that estate. And although God did not immediately upon the sin of man destroy that garden, — no, nor it may be until the flood, leaving it as a testimony against the wickedness of that apostate generation for whose sins the world was destroyed,— yet was neither it nor the trees of it of any use, or lawful to be used, as to any significancy in the worship of God. And the reason is, because all institutions are appendixes, and things annexed unto a covenant; and when that covenant ceases, or is broken, they are of no use or signification at all.

36. There was a new state of the church erected presently after the fall, and this also attended with sundry new institutions, especially with that concerning sacrifices. In this church-state some alterations were made, and sundry additional institutions given unto it upon the erection of the peculiar church-state of the Israelites in the wilderness; which yet hindered not but that it was in general the same church-state, and the same dispensation of the covenant, that the people of God before and after the giving of the law enjoyed and lived under. Hence it was that sundry institutions of worship were equally in force both before and after the

giving of the law on mount Sinai; as is evident in sacrifices, and some other instances may be given. But now, when the state of the church and the dispensation of the covenant came to be wholly altered, as they were by the gospel, not any one of the old institutions was continued, or to be continued, but they were all abolished and taken away. Nothing at all was traduced over from the old church-states, neither from that in innocency nor from that which ensued on the fall in all its variations, with any obligatory power, but what was founded in the law of nature, and had its force from thence. We may then confidently assert, that what God requires equally in all estates of the church, that is moral, and of an everlasting obligation unto us and all men. And this is the state of matters with the Sabbath and the law thereof.

37. Of the command of the Sabbath in the state of innocency we have before treated, and vindicated the testimony given unto it, [OIC02]Genesis 2:2,3. It will, God assisting, be further discoursed and confirmed in our exposition of the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The observation of it by virtue of its original law and command, before the promulgation of the decalogue in Sinai, or the first wilderness observation of the Sabbath, recorded on the occasion of giving manna, has also been before confirmed. Many exceptions, I acknowledge, are laid in against the testimonies insisted on for the proof of these things; but those such as, I suppose, are not able to invalidate them in the minds of men void of prejudice. And the pretense of the obscurity that is in the command will be easily removed, by the consideration of another instance of the same antiquity. All men acknowledge that a promise of Christ, for the object and guide of the faith of the ancient patriarchs, was given in those words of God immediately spoken unto the serpent, [OIC05]Genesis 3:15,

> "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

The words in themselves seem obscure unto any such end or purpose. But yet there is such light given into them; and the mind of God in them, from the circumstances of time, place, persons, occasion, from the nature of the things treated of; from the whole ensuing economy, or dealing of God with men, revealed in the Scripture, as that no sober man doubts of the

promissory nature of those words, nor of the intention of them in general, nor of the proper subject of the promise, nor of the grace intended in it. This promise, therefore, was the immediate object of the faith of the patriarchs of old, the great motive and encouragement unto and of their obedience. But yet it will be hard, from the records of Scripture, to prove that any particular patriarch did believe in, trust, or plead that promise, which yet we know that they did all and every one; nor was there any need, for our instruction, that any such practice of theirs should be recorded, seeing it is a general rule that those holy men of God did observe and do whatever he did command them. Wherefore, from the record of a command, we may conclude unto a suitable practice, though it be not recorded; and from a recorded approved practice, on the other side, we may conclude unto the command or institution of the thing practiced, though it be nowhere plainly recorded. Let unprejudiced men consider those words, Genesis 2:2, 3, and they will find the command and institution of the Sabbath as clear and conspicuous in them, as the promise of grace in Christ is in those before considered, especially as they are attended with the interpretation given of them in God's following dealings with his church. And therefore, although particular instances of the obedience of the old patriarchs in this part of it, or the observation of the Sabbath, could not be given and evinced, yet we ought no more on that account to deny that they did observe it, than we ought to deny their faith in the promised Seed, because it is nowhere expressly recorded in the story of their lives.

38. Under the law,— that is, after the giving of it in the wilderness,— it is granted that the *portion of time* insisted on was precisely required to be dedicated unto God, although, it may be, for some ages, it will be hard to meet with a recorded instance of its observation; but yet none dares take any countenance from thence to question whether it was so observed or no.

All, therefore, is secure unto the great alteration that was made in instituted worship under the gospel. And to proceed unto that season, there is no practice in any part of God's public worship that appears earlier in the records of the New Testament, as to what was peculiar thereunto, than the observation of one day in seven for the celebration of it. Hereof more must be spoken afterwards. Some say, indeed, that the

appointment of one day in seven, and that the first day of the week, for the worship of God, was only a voluntary agreement, or a matter consented unto by the apostolical or first churches, merely εὐταξίας *gratia*, or to keep good order and decorum amongst them, without respect unto any moral command of God to that purpose. This they say directly with respect to the first day of the week, or the Lord's day, and its religious observation. But those who appoint the first day of every week to be so observed, do without doubt appoint that that should be the condition of one day in seven. Now, I could incline to this apprehension, if; besides sundry other invincible reasons that lie against it, I did not find that God had always before, in all states of the church from the foundation of the world, invariably required the observation of one day in seven; and I know no reason why what had been observed all along so far upon his own authority, he would have observed still, but no longer on his command, but on the invention and consent of men. Had the. religious observance of one day in seven been utterly laid aside and abolished, it would and ought to have been concluded that the law of it was expired in the cross of Christ., as were those of circumcision, the sacrifices, and the whole temple-worship; but to have this observation continued by the whole church, in and under the approbation of God, whereof none ever doubted, by a reassumption of it through the authority of the church, after God had taken off his own from it is a most vain imagination.

39. I dispute not of what the church may appoint, for good order's sake, to be observed in religions assemblies; but this I dare say confidently, that no church nor churches, not all the churches in the world, have power by common consent to ordain any thing in the worship of God, as a part of it, which God had once ordained, commanded, and required, but now under the gospel ceases so to do, as circumcision and sacrifices. But this is the state of the religious observance of one day in seven! None can deny but that formerly it was ordained and appointed of God. And it should seem, according to this opinion, that he took off the authority of his own command, that the same observance might be continued upon the *authority of the church*. "Credat Apella!" Neither do the footsteps of the occasion of any such ecclesiastical institution appear anywhere on record in the Scripture, where all things of an absolute new and arbitrary institution, whether occasional or durable, are taken notice of. There is, indeed,

mention made, and that frequently, of the first day of the week being set apart for the assembling of believers for the worship of God, and a solid reason is insinuated why that especial day in particular ought so to be; but why one day in seven should be constantly observed to the purpose mentioned, no reason, no account is given in the New Testament, other than why men should not lie or steal. Nor has any man a ground to imagine that there was an intercision of a sabbatical observance, by the interposition of any time, between the observation of the seventh day and of the first of the week, for the same ends and purposes, though not absolutely in the same manner. If there be any indications, proofs, evidences, that the first churches continued without the observation of one day in seven, after they desisted from having a religious respect unto the seventh day, before they had the same regard to the first of the week unto this purpose, I wish they might be produced, for they would be of good weight in this matter; but as yet no such thing is made to appear. For if the obligation of the precept for observing one day in seven, as a sacred rest to God, may be suspended in any change of the outward state and condition of the church, it cannot be esteemed to be moral. I speak not of the actual observance of the thing commanded,— which, for many causes, may occasionally and temporarily be superseded,— but of the obliging force and power in the *command itself, which, if it be moral, is perpetual*, and not capable of interruption. Now, testimonies we have that sundry persons, not sufficiently instructed in the liberty of the gospel and the law of its obedience, observed both the days, the seventh and the first,— yea, it may be that for a while some observed the one day, and some the other; but that any Christians of old thought themselves *de facto* set at liberty from the religious observation of one day in seven, this neither is nor can be proved. This practice, then, was universal, and that approved of God, as we shall see afterwards and further in another discourse, now more than once directed unto. Now, what can any man conceive to be the ground of this unvariableness in the commanded and approved observation of one day in seven, in all states, conditions, and alterations, in and of the church, but that the command for it is part of the moral,. unchangeable law? Hereby, therefore, it is confirmed unto us so to be. And, indeed, if every state of the church be founded in an especial work of God, and his rest thereon and complacency therein, as a pledge or testimony of giving his church rest in himself, as elsewhere shall be fully confirmed, a sabbatical

rest must be necessary unto the church in every state and condition. And although absolutely another day might have been fixed on under the new testament, and not one in a hebdomadal revolution, because its peculiar works were not precisely finished in six days, yet that season being before fixed and determined by the law of creation, no innovation nor alteration would be allowed therein.

40. There is yet remaining that which is principally to be pleaded in this cause, and which of itself is sufficient to bear the weight of the whole. Now, this is the place which the command for the observation of a Sabbath unto God holds in the decalogue. Concerning this we have no more to inquire, but whether it have obtained a station therein in its own right, or were on some other occasion advanced to that privilege: for if it be free of that society in its own right, or on the account of its origin and birth, the morality of it can never be impeached; if it had only an occasional interest therein, and held it by a lease of time, it may ere this be long since disseized of it Now, we do not yet dispute whether the seventh day precisely be ordained in the fourth commandment, and do take up the whole nature of it, as the only subject of it, and only required in it. Only, I take it for granted that the observation of one day in seven is required in the command; which is so, because the seventh day, or a seventh day in a septenary revolution, is expressly commanded.

41. It is, indeed, by many pretended that the command firstly and directly respects the seventh day precisely, and one day in seven no otherwise than as it necessarily follows thereon; for where the seventh day is required, one in seven is so consequentially. And they who thus pretend have a double design, the one absolutely contradictory to the other: for those do so who from thence conclude that the *seventh day precisely* comprising the whole nature of the Sabbath, that day is indispensably and everlastingly to be observed; and those do so who, with equal confidence, draw their conclusion to the utter abolition of the whole Sabbath and the law of it, in the taking away of the seventh day itself. Such different apprehensions have men of the use and improvement that may be made of the same principles and concessions. For those of the latter sort hope that if they can prove the observation of the *seventh day precisely*, and not *one of seven* but only consequentially, to be the whole of what is intended in the fourth commandment, by virtue of the apostle's rule, Col 2:16 Colossians

2:16 (to which purpose he often elsewhere expresses himself), they shall be able to prove that it is utterly abolished. Those of the other sort suppose that, if they can make this to be the sense of the commandment, they shall prevail to fix a perpetual obligation on all men from thence unto the observation of the seventh day precisely, although the words of the apostle seem to lie expressly against it.

42. But the supposition itself that both parties proceed upon is not only uncertain, but certainly false; for the very order of nature itself disposes these things into that series and mutual respect which can never be interrupted. The command is about the *separation of time* unto the service of God. This he tacitly grants, nor will deny, if he be pressed, who contends for the seventh day. Here, therefore, it is natural and necessary that time be indefinitely considered and required, antecedently unto the designation and limitation of the portion of time that is required. This the order of nature requires; for if it be time indefinitely that is limited in the command unto the seventh day, time indefinitely is the first object of that limitation. And the case is the same with reference unto one day in seven. This also has, and must have, a natural priority unto the seventh day; for the seventh day is one day of the seven. And these things are separable. Some part of time may be separated unto religious worship, and yet not one day in seven, but any other portion, in a certain revolution of days, weeks, months, or years, if there be not a distinct reason for it. And one day in seven may be so separated, wherein the seventh day precisely may have no interest. And these things the very nature of them does assert, distinguish, and determine. Whatever morality, therefore, or obligation unto a perpetual observance, can be fancied by any to be in the command as to the seventh day, it is but consequential unto, dependent upon, and separable from, the command and duty for the observance of one day in seven. And this suffices as to our present purpose; for I do not yet treat with them who contend for the precise observation of the seventh day now under the gospel. It Is enough that here we prove that the *fourth commandment requires the sacred observation of one day in seven*, and that so far as it does so it is moral and unchangeable.

43. All men, as we have often observed, do allow that there is something moral in the fourth commandment, namely, that either some part of it or the general nature of it is so, I do not, therefore, well understand them and

him of late who have pleaded that the seventh day only is required in that command, and yet that this seventh day was absolutely ceremonial and typical, being accordingly abolished. The consistency of these assertions does not yet appear unto me; for if the whole matter of the command be ceremonial, the command itself must needs be so also. For a relief against this contradiction, it is said that the morality of this command consists in this, that we should look after and take up our spiritual rest in God. But this will not allow that it should be a distinct commandment of itself, distinguished from all the rest of the decalogue, nor indeed scarcely from any one of them; for the primitive end of all the commandments was to direct us and bring us into rest with God,— of the first table immediately, and of the second in and by the performance of the duties of it among ourselves. And of the first precept this is the sum; so that it is unduly assigned to be the peculiar morality of the fourth, instead of the solemn expression of that rest as our end and happiness. Neither is there any way possible to manifest an especial intention in and of any law, that is not found in this. The words and letter of it, in their proper and only sense, require a day, or an especial season, to be appointed for a sacred rest; and so does the nature of religious worship, which undoubtedly is directed therein; the rest of God, proposed in the command as the reason of it, which was on the seventh day, after six of working, requires the same intention in the words; so does also the exact limitation of time mentioned in it: all in compliance with the order and place that it holds in the decalogue, wherein nothing in general is left unrequired in the natural and instituted worship of God, but only the setting apart, with the determination and limitation, of some time unto the solemn observation of it. Few, therefore, have ever denied but that the morality of this command, if it be moral, does extend itself unto the separation of some part of our time to the solemn recognizing of God and our subjection unto him; and this in the letter of the law is limited, on the reasons before insisted on, unto one day in seven, in their perpetual revolution. The sole inquiry, therefore, remaining is, whether this precept be moral or no, and so continue to he possessed of a power perpetually obligatory to all the sons of men. And this is that which we are now inquiring into.

44. Here, therefore, we must have respect unto what has been discoursed concerning the subject-matter of the precept itself; for if that be not only

congruous to the law of nature, but that also which, by the creation of ourselves and all other things, we are taught and obliged unto the observation of; the law whereby it is required must be moral. For the descriptive or distinctive term, “moral,” does first belong unto the things themselves required by any law, and thence to the law whereby they are commanded. If; then, we have proved that the thing itself required in the fourth commandment, or the religious observation of a sacred rest unto God, for the ends mentioned, in the periodical revolution of seven days, is natural and moral, from the relation that it has unto the law of creation, then there can be no question of the morality of that command. What has been performed therein is left unto the judgment of the sober and judicious readers; for no man can be more remote from a pertinacious adherence to his own sentiments, or a magisterial imposition of his judgment and apprehensions upon the minds, thoughts, or practice of other men, than I desire to be. For however we may please ourselves in our light, knowledge, learning, and sincerity; yet, when we have done all, they are not constituted of God to be the rule or measure of other men’s faith, persuasions, apprehensions, and conversations. And others, whom, for some defects,— at least so supposed by us,— we may be apt to despise, may be yet taught the truth of God in things wherein we may be out of the way. That, then, which we have to do in these cases, is first to endeavor after a full persuasion in our own minds; then to communicate the principles of reason and Scripture testimony which we ground our persuasion upon unto others; laboring with meekness and gentleness to instruct them whom we apprehend to be out of the way; so submitting the whole to the judgment of all that fear the Lord, and shall take notice of such things. And these rules have I, and shall I attend unto, as abhorring nothing more than a proud, magisterial imposing of our apprehensions and inclinations on the minds and practices of other men; which I judge far more intolerable in particular persons than in churches and societies,— in both contrary to that royal law of love and liberty which all believers ought to walk by. And therefore, as we said, what has been spoken on this subject, or shall yet further be added, I humbly submit to the judgment of the sober and indifferent readers; only assuring them that I teach as I have learned, speak because I believe, and declare nothing but whereof I am fully persuaded in my own mind.

45. The nature of the decalogue, and the distinction of its precepts from all commands, ceremonial or political, comes now under consideration. The whole decalogue, I acknowledge, as given on mount Sinai to the Israelites, had a political use, as being made the principal instrument or rule of the polity and government of their nation, as peculiarly under the rule of God. It had a place also in that economy or dispensation of the covenant which that church was then brought under; wherein, by God's dealing with them and instructing of them; they were taught to look out after a further and greater good in the promise than they were. yet come to the enjoyment of. Hence the decalogue itself, in that dispensation of it, was a schoolmaster unto Christ. But in itself, and materially considered, it was wholly, and in all the preceptive. parts of it, absolutely moral. Some, indeed, of the precepts of it, as the first, fourth, and fifth, have either prefaces, enlargements, or additions, which belonged peculiarly to the then present and future state of that church in the land of Canaan; but these especial applications of it unto them change not the nature of its commands or precepts, which are all moral, and, as far as they are esteemed to belong to the decalogue, are unquestionably acknowledged so to be. Let us, therefore, consider the pleas for morality in the fourth command upon the account of its interest in the decalogue, and the manifest evidences of that interest. As, therefore, the giving, writing, use, and disposal of the decalogue, were peculiar and distinct from the whole system of the rest of the laws and statutes, which, being with it given to the church of Israel, were either ceremonial or judicial; so the precept concerning the Sabbath, or the sacred observance of one day in seven, has an equal share with the other nine in all the privileges of the whole; as, —

(1.) It was spoken *immediately by the voice of God*, in the hearing of all the people, [2201]Exodus 20:1, whereas all the other laws, whether ceremonial or judicial, were given peculiarly to Moses, and by him declared unto the rest of the people. What weight is laid hereon, see [2190]Exodus 19:10,11,17,18; [5043]Deuteronomy 4:33,34, 33:2: in the former whereof the. work itself is declared; in the latter, a distinguishing greatness and glory, above all other legislations, is ascribed unto it. And it is worth the inquiry what might be the cause of this difference. No other appears to me but that God thereby declared that the law of the decalogue belonged immediately and personally unto them all and every one, upon the original light of the law

of nature, which it did represent and express; whereas all the other laws and statutes given unto them by the mediation of Moses belonged unto that peculiar church-state and economy of the covenant which they were then initiated into, and which was to abide unto the time of the reformation of all things by Jesus Christ. And here it may be remembered, and so in all the ensuing instances, that we have proved the matter of this command to be, first, the separation of some time indefinitely to the worship of God, and then the limitation of that time unto one day in seven; for this it requires, or nothing at all which should be peculiar unto a distinct precept is required in it, as we have before manifested. And this one consideration alone is sufficient to evince its morality.

(2.) This command, as all the rest of the decalogue, was written *twice by the finger of God in tables of stone.* And hereof there was a double reason: — First, That it was a stable renovation and objective representation of that law, which being implanted on the heart of man, and communicated unto him in his creation, was variously defaced; — partly by the corruption and loss of that light, through the entrance of sin, which should have guided us in the right apprehension and understanding of its dictates, and of the obedience that it required; partly through a long course of a corrupt conversation, which the world had, in the pursuit of the first apostasy, and according to the principles of it, plunged itself into. God now again fixed that law objectively, in a way of durable preservation, which in its primitive seat and subject was so impaired and defaced. And hereof the additions mentioned, with peculiar respect unto the application of the whole, or any part of it, unto that people, were no impeachment, as is acknowledged in the preface given unto them all containing a motive unto their dutiful observance of the whole. And hence this law must necessarily be esteemed a part of the antecedent law of nature; neither can any otter reason he given why God wrote it himself with those and only those that are so, in tables of stone Secondly, This was done as an emblem that the whole decalogue was a representation of that law which, by his Spirit, he would write in the fleshy tables of the hearts of his elect. And this is well observed by the church of England, which, after the reading of the whole decalogue, the fourth command among the rest, directs the people to pray that God would write all these laws in their hearts. Now, this concerns only the moral law; for although obedience unto all God’s

ceremonial and typical institutions, while they were in force, was moral, and a part of the law written in the heart, or required in general in the precepts of the first table of the decalogue, yet those laws themselves had no place in the promise of the covenant that they should be written in our hearts; for if it should be so, especial grace would lie yet administered for the observation of those laws now they are abolished, which would not only be vain and useless, but contradictory to the whole design of the grace bestowed upon us, which is to be improved in a due and genuine exercise of it. Neither does God bestow any grace upon men but withal he requires the exercise of it at their hands. If, then, this law was written in tables of stone together with the other nine, that we might pray and endeavor to have it *written in our hearts*, according to the promise of the covenant, it is, and must be, of the nature of the rest,— that is, moral, and everlastingly obligatory.

(3.) As all the rest of the moral precepts, it was *preserved in the ark*, whereas the law of ceremonial ordinances, written by Moses, was placed in a book by the side of the ark, separable from it, or whence it might be removed. The ark on many accounts was called "the ark of the covenant;" whereof, God assisting, I shall treat elsewhere. One of them was, that it contained in it nothing but that moral law which was the rule of the covenant. And this was placed therein to manifest that it was to have its accomplishment in Him who was "the end of the law," Romans 10:3, 4; for the ark with the propitiatory was a type of Jesus Christ, chap. 3:25. And the reason of the different disposal, of the moral law in the ark, and of the ceremonial in a book by the side of it, was to manifest, as the inseparableness of the law from the covenant, so the establishing, accomplishment, and answering of the one law in Christ, with the removal and abolishing of the other by him. As for the law kept in the ark, the type of him, he was to fulfill it in obedience, to answer its curse, and to restore it unto its proper use in the new covenant,— not that which it had originally, when it was itself the whole of the covenant, but that which the nature of it requires, in the moral obedience of rational creatures, whereof it is a complete and adequate rule,— when the other law was utterly removed and taken away. And if that had been the end whereunto the law of the Sabbath had been designed, had it been absolutely capable of abolition in this world, it had not been safeguarded in the ark with the

other nine, which are inseparable from man's covenant obedience unto God, but had been left with other ceremonial ordinances at the side of the ark, in a readiness to be removed, when the appointed time should come.

(4.) God himself separates this command from them which were ceremonial in their principal intention and whole subject-matter, when he calls the whole system of precepts in the two tables by the name of the ten words or commandments: [5104]Deuteronomy 10:4, הַקָּהָל אֵת עֲשֶׂרֶת הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֲלֵיכֶם בָּהָר מִתּוֹךְ הָאֵשׁ בְּיוֹם; —

> "Those ten words, which the LORD spoke unto you in the mount out of the midst of the fire in the day of the assembly."

No considering person can read these words, but he will find a most signal emphasis in the several parts of them. "The day of the assembly," הַקָּהָל יוֹם is that which the Jews so celebrate under the name of "the station in Sinai;" the day that was the foundation of their church-state, when they solemnly covenanted with God about the observation of the law, [5105]Deuteronomy 5:24-27. And the Lord himself spoke these words, —that is, in an immediate and especial manner; which is still observed where any mention is made of them, as [2001]Exodus 20:1, [5106]Deut 5:22, and 10:4, And saith Moses, "He spoke them unto you, "— that is, immediately unto "all the assembly," [5107]Deuteronomy 5:22; where it is added, that he spoke them out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud and of the thick darkness, with a great voice," (that every individual person might hear it:) "and he added no more." He spake not one word more, gave not one precept more immediately unto the whole people, but the whole solemnity, of fire, thunder; lightning, earthquake, and sound of trumpet, immediately ceased and disappeared; whereon God entered on his treaty with Moses, wherein he revealed unto him and instructed him in the ceremonial and judicial laws, for the use of the people, who had now taken upon themselves the religious observance of what he should so reveal and appoint. Now, as the whole decalogue was hereby signalized, and sufficiently distinguished from the other laws and institutions which were of another nature, so, in particular, this precept concerning the Sabbath is distinguished from all those which were of the Mosaical pedagogy, in whose declaration Moses was the mediator between God and the people. And this was only upon the account of its participation in the same nature with the rest of the

commands, however it may and do contain something in it that was peculiar to that people, as shall be showed afterwards.

(5.) Whereas there is a frequent opposition made in the Old Testament between moral obedience and the outward observance of ordinances of a mere arbitrary institution, there is no mention made of the weekly Sabbath in that case, though all ceremonial institutions are in one place or other enumerated. It is true, <2013>Isaiah 1:13, the Sabbath is joined with the new moons, and its observation rejected in comparison of holiness and righteousness; but as this is expounded in the next verse to be intended principally of the appointed annual feasts or sabbaths, so we do grant that the Sabbath, as relating unto temple-worship, there intended and described, had that accompanying it which was peculiar to the Jews and ceremonial, as we shall show hereafter. But absolutely the observation of the Sabbath is not opposed unto, nor rejected in comparison of; other or any moral duties.

(6.) The observation of the Sabbath is pressed on the church on the same grounds and with the same promises as the greatest and most indispensable moral duties, and together with them opposed unto those fasts which belonged unto ceremonial institutions. To this purpose is the nature and use of it at large discoursed, <2306>Isaiah 58:6-1.4.

46. Now, it is assuredly worth our inquiry what are the just reasons of the preference of the Sabbath above all positive institutions, both by the place given unto it in the decalogue, as also on the account of the other especial instances insisted on. Suppose the command of it to be ceremonial, and one of these two reasons, or both of them, must be alleged as the cause hereof For this exaltation of it must arise either from the excellency of it in itself and service, or excellency of its signification, or from both of them jointly. But these things cannot he pleaded or made use of unto the purpose intended. For the service of it, as it was observed among the Jews, it is now earnestly pleaded that it consisted in *mere bodily rest*; which is scarcely to be reckoned as any part of divine service at all. What is further in it is said to be only a mere circumstance of time, not in any thing better than that of place, which had an arbitrary determination also for a season. It cannot, therefore, be thus exalted and preferred above all other ordinances of worship upon the account of its service, seeing it is

apprehended to be only a mere adjunct of other services; which were therefore more worthy than it, as every thing which is for itself is more worthy than that which is only for another. And take it absolutely, *place* is a more noble circumstance than *time* in this case, considering that place, being determined by an arbitrary institution in the building of the temple, became the most glorious and significant part of divine worship; yet had it no place in the decalogue, but only in the Samaritan corruption added unto it. It must therefore be upon the account of its signification that it was thus peculiarly exalted and honored; for the dignity, worth, and use of all ceremonial institutions depended on their significancy, or their fitness and aptness to represent the things whereof they were types, with the especial worth of what they did peculiarly typify. And herein the Sabbath, even with the application it had unto the Judaical church-state, came short of many other divine services, especially the solemn sacrifices, wherein the Lord Christ, with all the benefits of his death, was, as it were, evidently set forth crucified before their eyes. Neither, therefore, of these reasons, nor both of them in conjunction, can be pleaded as the cause of the manifold preference of the Sabbath above all ceremonial institutions. It remains, therefore, that it is solely upon the account of its morality, and the invariable obligation thence arising unto its observation, that it is so joined with the precepts of the same nature; and such we have now, as I suppose, sufficiently confirmed it to be.

47. I cannot but judge yet further, that in the caution given by our Savior unto his disciples, about praying that their flight should not be on the Sabbath day, ◁Matthew 24:20▷, he does declare the continued obligation of the law of the Sabbath, as a moral precept, upon all. It is answered by some, that it is the Judaical Sabbath alone that is intended, which he knew that some of his own disciples would be kept for a season in bondage unto. For the ease, therefore, of their consciences in that matter, he gives them this direction. But many things on the other side are certain and indubitable, which render this conjecture altogether improbable: for,—

(1.) All real obligation unto Judaical institutions was then absolutely taken away; and it is not to be supposed that our Lord Jesus Christ would before-hand lay-in provision for the edification of any of his disciples in error.

(2.) Before that time came they were sufficiently instructed doctrinally in the dissolution of all obligation in ceremonial institutions. This was done principally by St Paul, in all his epistles, especially in that unto the Hebrews themselves at Jerusalem.

(3.) Those who may be supposed to have continued a conscientious respect unto the Judaical Sabbath could be no otherwise persuaded of it than were the Jews themselves in those days. But they all accounted themselves absolved in conscience from the law of the Sabbath upon imminent danger in time of war, so that they might lawfully either fight or flee, as their safety did require. This is evident from the decree made by them under the Asmonæans. And such imminent danger is now supposed by our Savior; for he instructs them to forego all consideration of their enjoyments, and to shift merely for their lives. There was not, therefore, any danger, in *point of conscience* with respect unto the Judaical Sabbath, to be then feared or prevented. But, in general, those in whose hearts are the ways of God do know what an addition it is to the greatest of their earthly troubles, if they befall them in such seasons as to deprive them of the opportunity of the sacred ordinances of God's worship, and indispensably engage them in ways and works quite of another nature, then when they stand in most need of them. There is therefore another answer invented,— namely, that our Lord Jesus in these words respected not the consciences of the disciples, but their trouble, and therefore joins the Sabbath day and the winter together, in directing them to pray for an ease and accommodation of that flight which was inevitable; for as the winter is unseasonable for such an occasion, so the law concerning the Sabbath was such as that if any one traveled on that day above a commonly-allowed Sabbath day's journey he was to be put to death. But neither is there any more appearance of truth in this pretense: for,—

(1.) The power of capital punishments was before this time utterly taken away from the Jews, and all their remaining courts interdicted from proceeding in any cause wherein the lives of men were concerned.

(2.) The times intended were such as wherein there was no course of law, justice, or equity amongst them, but all things were filled with rapine, confusion, and hostility; so that it is a vain imagination, that any cognizance was taken about such cases as journeying on the Sabbath.

(3.) The dangers they were in had made it free to them as to legal punishments, upon their own principles, as was declared; so that these cannot be the reasons of the caution here given. It is at least, therefore, most probable that our Savior speaks to his disciples upon a supposition of the perpetual obligation of the law of the Sabbath; that they should pray to be delivered from the necessity of a flight on the day whereon the duties of it were to be observed, lest it falling out otherwise should prove a great aggravation of their distress.

48. From these particular instances we may return to the consideration of the law of the decalogue in general, and the perpetual power of exacting obedience wherewith it is accompanied. That in the Old Testament it is frequently declared to be universally obligatory, and has the same efficacy ascribed unto it, without putting in any exceptions to any of its commands or limitations of its number, I suppose will be granted. The authority of it is no less fully asserted in the New Testament, and that also absolutely without distinction, or the least intimation of excepting the fourth command from what is affirmed concerning the whole. It is of the law of the decalogue that our Savior treats, [40]Matthew 5:17-19. This he affirms that he came not to dissolve, as he did the ceremonial law, but to fulfill it; and then affirms that not one jot or tittle of it shall pass away. And making thereon a distribution of the whole into its several commands, he declares his disapprobation of them who shall break, or teach men to break, any one of them. And men make bold with him, when they so confidently assert that they may break one of them, and teach others so to do, without offense. That this reaches not to the confirmation of the seventh day precisely, we shall after-wards abundantly demonstrate. In like manner St James treats concerning “the whole law” and all the commands of it, chap. [59]2:10, 11. And the argument he insists on for the observance of the whole,-namely, the giving of it by the same authority,-is confined to the decalogue, and the way of God’s giving the law thereof or else it may be extended to all Mosaical institutions, expressly contrary to his intention.

49. It is known that many things are usually objected against the truth we have been pleading for, namely, the morality of a sacred rest to God on one day in seven, from its relation to the law of creation, and the command for it in the decalogue; and it is known, also, that what is so objected has

been by others solidly answered and removed: but because those objections or arguments have been lately renewed and pressed by a person of good learning and reputation, and a new re-enforcement endeavored to be given unto them, I shall give them a new examination, and remove them out of our way.

50. It is then objected, in the first place, Disquisit de Moralitate Sabbati, [f9] p.7, "That the command for the observation of the Sabbath is a command of time, or concerning time only, namely, that some certain and determinate time be assigned to the worship of God, and this may be granted to be moral; but time is no part of moral worship, but only a circumstance of it, even as place is also: therefore the command that requires them in particular cannot be moral, for these and the like circumstances must necessarily be of a positive determination."

Ans. **(1.)** The whole force of this argument consists in this, that time is but a help, instrument, or circumstance of worship, and therefore is not moral worship itself, nor a part of moral worship, nor can so be. But this argument is not valid; for whatever God requires by his command to be religiously observed, with immediate respect unto himself; is a part of his worship. And this worship, as to the kind of it, follows the nature of the law whereby it is commanded. If that law be merely positive, so is the worship commanded, however it be a duty required by the law of nature that we duly observe it when it is commanded; for by the law of nature God is to be obeyed in all his commands, of what sort soever they are. If that law be moral, so is the duty required by it, and so is our obedience unto it. The only way, then, to prove that the observation of time is no part of moral worship is this, namely, to manifest that the law whereby it is required is positive, and not moral; for that it is required by divine command, of the one sort or the other, is now supposed. And, on the other side, from the consideration of the thing itself naturally, as that it is an adjunct or circumstance of other things, no consequence arises to the determination of the nature of the law whereby it is required.

(2.) Time abstractedly, or one day in seven absolutely, is not the *adequate object* of the precept, or the fourth commandment, but it is a holy rest to be observed unto God in his worship on such a day; and this not a holy rest unto God in general, as the tendency and end of all our obedience and

living unto him, but as an especial remembrance and representation of the rest of God himself, with his complacency and satisfaction in his works, as establishing a covenant between himself and us. This is the principal subject of the command, or a stated day of a holy rest unto God in ‘such a revolution of days or time. This we have proved to be moral from the foundation and reason of it laid and given in the law of nature, revived and represented in the fourth command of the decalogue. Now, though place be an inseparable circumstance of all actions, and so capable of being made a circumstance of divine worship by divine positive command, as it was of old in the instance of the temple, yet no especial or particular place had the least guidance or direction unto it in the law of nature, by any works or acts of God whose instructive virtue belonged thereunto; and therefore all places were alike free by nature, and every place wherein the worship of God was celebrated was a natural circumstance of the action performed, and not a religious circumstance of worship, until a particular place was assigned and determined by positive command for that purpose. It is otherwise with time, as has been showed at large. And therefore, although any place, notwithstanding any thing in the law of nature, might have been separated by positive institution unto the solemn worship of God, it does not thence follow, as is pretended, that any time, a day in a monthly or annual revolution, might have been separated unto the like purpose, seeing God had given us indication of another limitation of it in the law of creation.

51. It is further objected, Disquisit. p. 8, “That in the fourth commandment not one in seven, but the seventh day precisely, is enjoined. The day was before made known unto the Israelites in the station at Marah, or afterwards at Alush, namely, the seventh day from the foundation of the world. This in the command they are required to observe. Hence the words of it are, that they should remember הַשַּׁבָּת אֶת־יוֹם, that same Sabbath day, or that day of the Sabbath, which was newly revealed unto them This command, therefore, cannot be moral, as to the limitation of time specified therein, seeing it only confirms the observation of the seventh-day Sabbath, which was before given unto the Hebrews in a temporary institution.” And this is insisted on as the principal strength against the morality of the command. I shall first give

you in my answer in general, and then consider the especial improvements that are made of it

(1.) Instances may be given, and have been given by all writers concerning the Hebrew tongue, wherein the prefixed letters, sometimes answering the Greek prepositive articles, are redundant; and if at all emphatical, yet they do not at all limit, specify, or determine. See <19A104>Psalm 1:4; <21A214>Ecclesiastes 2:14; <03B305>Leviticus 18:5. The observation, therefore, of prefixing הַ to שַׁבָּת,— which may possibly denote an excellency in the thing itself, but tends nothing to the determination of a certain day, but as it is afterwards declared to be one of seven,— is too weak to bear the weight of the inference intended. Nor will this be denied by any who ever aright considered the various use and frequent redundancy of that prefix.

(2.) The Sabbath, or rest of a seventh day, was known and observed from the foundation of the world, as has been proved. And therefore if from the prefix we are to conclude a limitation or do-termination to be intended in the words, "Remember the Sabbath day," yet it respects only the original Sabbath, or the Sabbath in respect of its original, and not any new institution of it; for supposing the observation of the Sabbath to have been before in use, whether that use were only of late, or a few days before, or of more ancient times, even from the beginning of the world, the command concerning it may be well expressed by זָכוֹר אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת;— "Remember the Sabbath day."

(3.) Suppose that the Sabbath had received a limitation to the seventh day precisely, in the ordinance given unto that people in the first raining of manna, then does the observation of that day precisely, by virtue of this command, necessarily take place. And yet the command, which is but the revival of what was required from the foundation of the world, cannot be said to intend that day precisely in the first place: for the reason of and in the original command for a sabbatical rest, was God's making the world in six days, and resting on the seventh; which requires no more but that in the continual revolution of seven days, six being allowed unto work, one should be observed a sacred rest to God. These words, therefore, "Remember the Sabbath day," referring unto the primitive command and reason of it as is afterwards declared in the body of the law, require no more but a weekly day of rest, whereunto the seventh day is reduced, as

added by an especial ordinance. And the reason of this commandment from the works of God and the order of them, is repeated in the decalogue, because the instruction given us by them being a part of the law of our creation more subject unto a neglect, disregard, and forgetfulness, than those other parts of it which were wholly innate to the principles of our own nature, it was necessary that the remembrance of it should be so expressly revived, when in the other precepts there is only a tacit excitation of our own inbred light and principles.

(4.) The emphatical expression insisted on, "Remember the Sabbath day," has respect unto the singular necessity, use, and benefit of this holy observance, as also to that neglect and decay in its observation which, partly through their own sin, partly through the hardships that it met withal in the world, the church of former ages had fallen into. And what it had lately received of a new institution, with reference unto the Israelites, falls also under this command, or is reduced unto it, as a ceremonial branch under its proper moral head, whereunto it is annexed. And whereas it is greatly urged, "That the command of the seventh day precisely is not the command of one day in seven, and that what God has determined, as in this matter the day is, ought not to be indefinitely by us considered," it may be all granted without the least prejudice unto the cause wherein we are engaged; for although the institution of the seventh day precisely be somewhat distinct from one day in seven, as containing a determinate limitation of that which is the other notion is left indefinite, yet this hinders not but that God may appoint the one and the other, the one in the *moral reason* of the law, the other by an *especial determination* and institution. And this especial institution is to continue, unless it be abrogated or changed by his own authority; which it may be without the least impeachment of the moral reason of the whole law, and a new day be limited by the same authority, which has been done accordingly, as we shall afterwards declare.

52. It is yet further pleaded, Disquisit, p.9-12, "That no distinction can be made between a weekly Sabbath and the seventh day precisely. And if any such difference be asserted, then if one of them be appointed in the fourth commandment, the other is not; for there are not two Sabbaths enjoined in it, but one. And it is evident that there never was of old but one Sabbath. The Sabbath observed under the old testament was that required and

prescribed in the fourth commandment; and so, on the other side, the Sabbath required in the decalogue was that which was observed under the old testament, and that only. Two Sabbaths, one of one day in seven, and the other of the seventh day precisely, are not to be fancied. The seventh day, and that only, was the Sabbath of the old testament and of the decalogue." These things, I say, are at large pleaded by the forementioned author.

Ans. **(1.)** These objections are framed against a distinction used by another learned person, about the Sabbath as absolutely commanded in the; decalogue, and as enjoined to practice under the old testament. But neither he nor any other sober person ever fancied that there were two Sabbaths of old, one enjoined unto the church of the Israelites, the other required in the decalogue. But any man may, nay, every prudent man ought to distinguish between the Sabbath as enjoined absolutely, in words expressive of the law of our creation and rule of our moral dependence on God, in the fourth command, and the same Sabbath as it had a temporary, occasional determination to the seventh day in the church of the Jews, by virtue of an especial intimation of the will of God, suited unto that administration of the covenant which that church and people were then admitted into. I see, therefore, no difficulty in these things. The fourth commandment does not contain only the moral equity that some time should always be set apart unto the celebration of the worship of God, nor only the original instruction given us by the law of creation, and the covenant obedience required of us thereon, wherein the substance of the command does consist; but it expresses, moreover, the peculiar application of this command, by the will of God, to the state of the church then erected by him, with respect unto the seventh day precisely, as before instituted and commanded, Exodus 16. Nor is here the least appearance of two Sabbaths, but one only is absolutely commanded unto all, and determined unto a certain day for the use of some for a season.

53. (2.) That one day in seven only, and not the seventh day precisely, is directly and immediately enjoined in the decalogue, and the seventh only with respect unto an antecedent Mosaical institution, with the nature of that administration of the covenant which the people of Israel were then taken into, has been evinced in our preceding investigation of the causes and ends of the Sabbath, and been cleared by many. And it seems evident

to an impartial consideration. For the observation of one day in seven belongs unto every covenant of God with man. And the decalogue is the invariable rule of man's walking before God and living unto him, of what nature soever, on other reasons, the covenant be between them, whether that of works, or that of grace by Jesus Christ The seventh day precisely belonging unto the covenant of works, cannot therefore be firstly, but only occasionally intended in the decalogue Nor does it, nor can it, invariably belong unto our absolute obedience unto God, because it is not of the substance of it, but is only an occasional determination of a duty, such as all other positive laws do give us. And hence there is in the command itself a difference put between a Sabbath day, and the arbitrary limitation of the seventh day to be that day; for we are commanded to "remember the Sabbath day," not the seventh day; and the reason given (as is elsewhere observed) is, because "the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it" (in the close of the command, where the formal reason of our obedience is expressed), not the seventh day. Nor is, indeed, the joint observation of the seventh day precisely unto all to whom this command is given,-that is, to all who take the Lord to be their God,— possible, though it was to the Jews in the land of Palestine, who were obliged to keep that day; for the difference of the climate in the world will not allow it. Nor did the Jews ever know whether the day they observed was the seventh from the creation; only they knew it was so from the day whereon manna was first given unto them. And the whole revolution and computation of time by days was sufficiently interrupted in the days of Joshua and Hezekiah, from allowing us to think the observation of the seventh day to be moral. And it is a rule to judge of the intention of all laws, divine and human, that the meaning of the preceptive part of them is to be collected from the reasons annexed to them or inserted in them. Now, the reasons for a sacred rest that are intimated and stated in this command do no more respect the seventh day than any other in seven. Six days are granted to labor, that is in number, and not more, in septenary revolution. Nor does the command say any thing whether these six days shall be the first or the last in the order of them. And any day is as meet for the performance of the duties of the Sabbath as the seventh, if in an alike manner designed thereunto; which things are at large pleaded by others.

54. It has hitherto been allowed generally that the fourth commandment does at least include something in it that is moral, or else, indeed, no color can be given unto its association with them that are absolutely so in the decalogue. This is commonly said to be, that some part of our time be dedicated to the public worship of God. But as this would overthrow the pretension before mentioned, that there can be no moral command about time, which is but a circumstance of moral duties, so the limitation of that time unto one day in seven is so evidently a perpetually binding law, that it will not be hard to prove the unchangeable obligation that is upon all men unto the observance of it; which is all, for the substance, that is contended for. To avoid this it is now affirmed, Disquisit., p.14, that

> "Morale quarti præcepti est, non unum diem sed totum tempus vitæ nostræ quantum id fieri potest, impendendum esse cultui Dei, quærendo regnum Dei et justitiam ejus, atque inserviendo ædificationi proximi: quo pertinet ut Deo serviamus, ejus beneficia agnoscamus et celebremus, eum invocemus spiritu, fidem nostram testemur confessione ens," etc.;

— "This is that which is moral in the fourth commandment, namely, that not one day, but as much as may be our whole lives, be spent in the worship of God, seeking his kingdom and the righteousness thereof, and furthering the edification of our neighbor. Hereunto it belongs that we should serve God, acknowledge and celebrate his benefits, pray unto him in spirit, and testify our faith by our confession."

55. *Ans*. It is hard to discover how any of these things have the least respect to the fourth commandment, much more how the morality of it should consist in them; for all the instances mentioned are indeed required in the first precept of the decalogue, that only excepted of taking care to promote the edification of our neighbor, which is the sum and substance of the second table, expressed by our Savior by loving our neighbor as ourselves. To live unto God, to believe and trust in him, to acknowledge his benefits, to make confession of him in the world, are all especial moral duties of the first commandment. It cannot therefore be apprehended how the morality of the fourth commandment should consist in them. And if there be nothing else moral in it, there is certainly nothing moral in it at all; for these things and the like are claimed from it, and taken out of its

possession by the first precept. And thereunto does the general consideration of time with respect unto these duties belong, namely, that we should live unto God while we live in this world; for we live in time, and that is the measure of our duration and continuance. Something else, therefore, must be found out to be moral in the fourth commandment, or it must be denied plainly to have any thing moral in it.

56. It is further yet pleaded, 'That the Sabbath was a type of our spiritual rest in Christ, both that which we have in him at present by grace, and that which remains for us in heaven. Hence it was a shadow of good things to come, as were all other ceremonial institutions. But that the same thing should be moral and a shadow is a contradiction. That which is a shadow can in no sense be said to be moral, nor on the contrary. The Sabbath, therefore, was merely ceremonial."

Ans. It does not appear, it cannot be proved, that the Sabbath, either as to its first original, or as to the substance of the command of it in the decalogue, was typical, or instituted to prefigure any thing that was future: yea, the contrary is evident; for the law of it was given before the first promise of Christ, as we have proved, and that in the state of innocency, and under the covenant of works in perfect force, wherein there was no respect unto the mediation of Christ. I do acknowledge that God did so order all his works in the first creation and under the law of nature as that they might he suitable morally to represent his works under the new creation, which from the analogy of our redemption to the creation of all things is so called. And hence, according to the eternal counsel of God, were all things meet to be gathered unto a head in Christ Jesus. On this account there is an *instructive resemblance* between the works of the one sort and of the other. So the rest of God after the works of the old creation is answered by the rest of the Son of God upon his laying the foundation of the new heavens and new earth in his resurrection. But that the Sabbath originally, and in its whole nature, should be a free institution, to prefigure and as in a shadow to represent any thing spiritual or mystical, afterwards to be introduced, is not nor can be proved. It was, indeed, originally a moral pledge of God's rest and of our interest therein, according to the tenor of the covenant of works; which things belong unto our relation unto God by virtue of the law of our creation. It continues to retain the same nature with respect unto the covenant of grace. What it had annexed unto

it, what applications it received unto the state of the Mosaical pedagogy, which were temporary and umbratile, shall be declared afterwards.

57. But it is yet pleaded, from an enumeration of the parts of the fourth commandment, that there can be nothing moral as to our purpose in it. And these are said to be three:— First, The *determination of the seventh day* to be a day of rest. Secondly, The *rest itself* commanded on that day. Thirdly, The *sanctification of that rest unto holy worship*. "Now neither of these can be said to be moral Not the first, for it is confessedly ceremonial. The second is a thing in its own nature indifferent, having nothing of morality in it, antecedent unto a positive command. Neither is the third moral, being only the means or manner of performing that worship which is moral."

Ans. **(1.)** It will not be granted that this is a sufficient analysis or distribution of the parts of this command. The principal subject-matter of it is omitted, namely, the observation of one day in seven unto the ends of a sacred rest; for we are required in it to sanctify the Sabbath of the Lord our God, which was a seventh day in a hebdomadal revolution of days. Supply this in the first place, in the room of the determination of the seventh day to be that day, which evidently follows it in the order of nature, and this argument vanishes.. Now, it is here only tacitly supposed, not at all proved, that one day in seven is not required.

(2.) Rest in itself, absolutely considered, is no part of divine worship, antecedently unto a divine positive command. But a rest from our own works, which might be of use and advantage unto us, which by the law of our creation we are to attend unto in this world, that we may attend and apply ourselves to the worship of God, and solemnly express our universal dependence upon him in all things; a rest representing the rest of God in his covenant with us, and observed as a pledge of our entering into his rest by virtue of that covenant, and according to the law of it, such as is the rest here enjoined, is a part of the worship of God. This is the rest which we are directed unto by the law of our creation, and which by the moral reason of this command is enjoined unto us on one day in seven; and in these things consists the morality of this precept, on whose account it has a place in the decalogue, which, on all the considerations before

mentioned, could not admit of an association with one that was purely ceremonial.

(3.) Granting the dedication of some time or part of time unto the solemn worship of God to be required in this command, as is by all generally acknowledged, and let a position be practically advanced against this we insist on, namely, that one day in seven is the time determined an limited for that purpose, and we shall quickly perceive the mischievous consequents of it; for when men have taken out of the hand of God the division between the time that is allowed unto us for our own occasions and what is to be spent in his service, and have cast off all influencing direction from his example of work mg six days and resting the seventh, and all guidance from that seemingly perpetual direction that is given us of employing ordinarily six days in the necessary affairs of this life, they will find themselves at no small loss what to fix upon or wherein to acquiesce in this matter. It must either be left to every individual man to do herein as seems good unto him, or there must an umpirage of it be committed unto others, either the church or the magistrate. And hence we may expect as many different determinations and limitations of time as there are distinct ecclesiastical or political powers amongst Christians. What variety and changeableness would hence ensue, what confusion this would cast all the disciples of Christ into, according to the prevalence of superstition or profaneness in the minds of those who claim this power of determining and limiting the time of public worship, is evident unto all. The instance of "holy days," as they are commonly called, will further manifest what of itself lies naked under every rational eye. The institution and observation of them was ever resolved into the moral part of this command for the dedicating of some part of our time unto God: but the determination hereof being not of God, but left unto the church, as it is said, one church multiplies them without end, until they grow an insupportable yoke unto the people; another reduces this number into a narrower compass; a third rejects them all; and no two churches, that are independent ecclesiastically and politically one on the other, do agree about them. And so will and must the matter fall out as to the especial day whereof we discourse, when once the determination of it by divine authority is practically rejected. As yet men deceive themselves in this matter, and pretend that they believe otherwise than indeed they do. Let them come once soberly to join their

opinion of their liberty and their practice together, actually rejecting the divine limitation of one day in seven, and they will find their own consciences under more disorder than yet they are aware of.

Again, if there be no day determined in the fourth command but only the seventh precisely, which is ceremonial, with a general rule that some time is to be dedicated to the service of God, there is no more of morality in this command than in any of those for the observation of new moons and annual feasts, with jubilees, and the like; in all which the same general equity is supposed, and a ceremonial day limited and determined. And if it be so, as far as I can understand, we may as lawfully observe new moons and jubilees as a weekly day of rest, according to the custom of all churches.

58. The words of the apostle Paul Colossians 2:16, 17, are at large insisted on to prove that the Sabbath was only typical and a shadow of things future: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon" (ἢ σαββάτων), "or of the sabbaths" (or, "sabbath days"), "which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ" For hence, they say, it will follow that there is nothing moral in the observation of the Sabbath, seeing it was a mere type and shadow, as were other Mosaical institutions, as also that it was absolutely abolished and taken away in Christ

Ans. This place must be afterwards considered; I shall here only briefly speak unto it And,

(1.) It is known and confessed, that at that time all Judaical observations of days, or the days which they religiously observed, whether feasts or fasts, weekly, monthly, or annual, were by themselves and all others called their sabbaths, as we have before evinced. And that kind of speech which was then in common use is here observed by our apostle. It must, therefore, necessarily be allowed that there were two sorts of sabbaths among them. The first and principal was the weekly Sabbath, so called from the rest of God upon the finishing of his works. This being designed for sacred and religious uses, other days separated unto the same ends in general came, from their analogy thereunto, to be called sabbaths also, yea, were so called by God himself, as has been declared. But the distinction and difference between these sabbaths was great The one of them was

ordained from the foundation of the world, before the entrance of sin, or giving of the promises, and so belonged unto all mankind in general; the others were appointed in the wilderness as a part of the peculiar church worship of the Israelites, and so belonged unto them only. The one of them was directly commanded in the decalogue, wherein the law of our creation was revived and expressed; the others have their institution expressly among the residue of ceremonial, temporary ordinances. Hence they cannot be both comprised under the same denomination, unless upon some reason that is common to both sorts alike. So when God saith of them all, "Ye shall observe my sabbaths," it is upon a reason common to them all namely, that they were all commanded of God which is the formal reason of our obedience, of what nature soever his commands are, whether moral or positive. Nor can both these sorts be here understood under the same name, unless it be with respect unto something that is common unto both. Allow therefore, the distinctions between them before mentioned, which cannot soberly be denied, and as to what they agree in, namely, what is or was in the weekly primary Sabbath of the same nature with those days of rest which were so called in allusion there-unto, and they may be allowed to have the same sentence given concerning them; that is, so far the weekly Sabbath may be said to be a shadow, and to he abolished.

(2.). It is evident that the apostle in this place deals with them who endeavored to introduce Judaism absolutely, or the whole system of Mosaical ceremonies, into the observation of the Christian church. Circumcision, their feasts and new moons, their distinctions of meats and drinks he mentions directly in this place. And therefore he deals about these things so far as they were Judaical, or belonged unto the economy of Moses, and no otherwise. If any of them fell under any other consideration, so far as they did so he designs not to speak of them. Now, those things only were Mosaical, which being instituted by Moses, were figurative of good things to come; or the things which, being of the same nature with the residue of his ceremonies, were before appointed, but accommodated by him to the use of the church which he built, such as sacrifices and circumcision: for they were all of them nothing else but an obscure adumbration of the things whereof Christ was the body. So far, then, as the weekly Sabbath had any additions made unto it or limitation

given of it, or directions for the manner of its observance, or respected the services then to be performed in it, and by all accommodated unto that dispensation of the covenant which the posterity of Abraham were then brought into, it was a shadow, and is taken away by Christ Therewith falls its limitation to the seventh day, its rigorous observation, its penal sanction, its being a sign between God and that people,— in a word, every thing in it and about it that belonged unto the then present administration of the covenant, or was accommodated to the Judaical church or state, But now, if it be proved that a *septenary sacred rest* was appointed in paradise, that it has its foundation in the law of creation, that thereon it was observed antecedently unto the institution of Mosaical ceremonies, and that God renewed the command concerning it in his system of moral precepts, manifoldly distinguished from all ceremonial ordinances, so far and in these respects it has no concern in these words of the apostle.

(3.) It cannot be said that the religious observance of one day in seven, as a holy rest unto God, is. abolished by Christ, without casting a great reflection of presumption on all the churches of Christ in the world,— I mean that now are, or ever were so; for they all have observed and do still observe such a day. I shall not now dispute about the authority of the church to appoint days unto holy or religious uses, to make "holy days,"— let it be granted to be whatever any yet has pretended or pleaded that it is; but this I say, that when God by his authority had commanded the observation of a day to himself and the Lord Christ by the same authority has taken off that command, and abolished that institution, it is not in the power of all the churches in the world to take up the religions observance of that day to the same ends and purposes. It is certain that God did appoint that a Sabbath of rest should be observed unto him, and for the celebration of his solemn worship, on one day in seven. The whole command of God hereof is now pleaded to be dissolved, and all obligation from thence unto its observation to be abolished, in and by Christ. Then say I, it is unlawful for any church or churches in the world to resume this practice, and to impose the observance of it on the disciples of Christ. Be it that the church may appoint holy days of its own, that have no foundation in nor relation to the law of Moses, yet doubtless it ought not to dig any of his ceremonies out of their grave, and impose them on the necks of the disciples of Christ; yet so must it be thought to do on this

hypothesis, that the religious observance of one day in seven]s absolutely abolished by Christ, as a mere part of the law of commandments contained in ordinances, which was nailed to his cross and buried with him, by the constant practice and injunction thereof.

(4.) Herewith fall the arguments taken from the apostle's calling the Sabbath in this place "a *shadow;"* for it is said that "nothing which is moral can be a shadow." It is true, that which is moral, so far as it is moral, cannot be a shadow. We therefore say, that the weekly observation of a day of rest from the foundation of the world, whereunto a general obligation was laid on all men unto its observation, the command whereof was a part of the moral law of God, was no shadow, nor is so called by the apostle, nor did typify good things to come. But that which is in its own nature moral, may, in respect of some peculiar manner of its observance, in such' a time or season, and some adjuncts annexed unto it, in respect whereof it becomes a part of ceremonial worship, be so far and in those respects esteemed a shadow, and as such pass away. In brief the command itself, of observing one day in seven as a holy rest unto God, has nothing Aaronical or typical in it but has its foundation in the light of nature, as directed by the works of God and his rest thereon. [As] for its limitation precisely to the last day of the week, with other directions and injunctions for and in the manner of its observance, they were Mosaical, and as a shadow are departed, as we shall manifest in our ensuing Exercitation.

59. But yet neither can it be absolutely proved, if we would insist thereon, that the weekly Sabbath is in any sense intended in these words of the apostle; for he may design the sabbatical years which were instituted among that people, and probably now pressed by the Judaizing teachers on the Gentile proselytes. Nor will the exception put in from some of the rabbins, that the sabbatical years were not to be observed out of the land of Canaan, from which Colosse was far enough distant, re-enforce the argument to this purpose: for as men in one place may have their consciences exercised and bound with the opinion of what is to be done in another, though they cannot engage in the practice of it whilst they are absent, so our apostle chargeth the Galatians, — as far distant from Canaan as the Colossians, — that when they began to Judaize, they observed years, as well as days, and months, and times; which could respect only the sabbatical years that were instituted by the law of Mosea

EXERCITATION 4.

OF THE JUDAICAL SABBATH,

1. *The Sabbath, how required by the law of nature as a covenant.*

2. *Explanation of the law of the Sabbath in the fourth precept of the decalogue.*

3. *The law of creation and covenant of works renewed in the church of Israel; with what alterations.*

4. *The Sabbath, why said to be given peculiarly to the Israelites.*

5. *Change in the covenant introduceth a change in the Sabbath.*

6. *The whole nature of the Judaical Sabbath, and how it is abolished.*

7. *Jews' sense of the original of the Sabbath rejected.*

8. *The first appropriation of the law of the Sabbath to that people,* ◁02169▷ *Exodus 16*

9. *Their mistakes about its observation.*

10. *The giving of the law on mount Sinai, with the ends of it.*

11. *Nature of the fourth commandment thereon; what Mosaical in it.*

12. *Renovation of the command of the Sabbath,* ◁02312▷ *Exodus 31:12-17.*

13. *Occasion hereof.*

14. *Appropriations made of the Sabbath to the church of Israel in this renovation.*

15. *The commandment renewed again,* ◁02342▷ *Exodus 34:21 — New additions made to it.*

16. *So also* ◁02352▷ *Exodus 35:2,3.*

17. *The whole matter stated,* ◁05155▷ *Deuteronomy 5:15,18,19. The conclusion.*

1. WE have declared how the observation of a *septenary sacred rest* is required by the moral law, or the law of our creation. Now, this is not absolutely and merely as it is a *law*, but as it contained a *covenant* between God and man. A law it might have been, and yet not have had the nature of a covenant, which doth not necessarily follow upon either its instructive or preceptive power. Yet it was originally given in the counsel of God to that end, and accompanied with promises and threatenings; whence it had the nature of a covenant. By virtue of this law as a covenant was the observation of a Sabbath prescribed and required, as a token and pledge of God's rest in that covenant, in the performance of the works whereon it was constituted, and of the interest of man in that rest, as also to be a

means of entrance into it. On this ground it should have been observed in the state of innocency, wherein the law of it was given and declared; for it was nb less necessary unto that state and condition than unto any other wherein God requireth covenant obedience of men; nor, considering the nature and ends of a holy rest or Sabbath, can any reason be given why it should be thought accommodated only to the administration of the covenant under the old testament after the giving of the law, whereunto by some it is appropriated.

2. It is true, indeed, that in the fourth commandment there is an explanation of the rest of the Sabbath, so far as it consisteth in a cessation from our own works that are of use and advantage to the outward man in this life, suited as unto the state and condition of mankind in general since the fall, so unto the especial state of the Jews at that time when the law was given; as there was also in the additional appendix of the first commandment. But, for the substance of it, the same kind of rest was to be observed in the state of innocency, and was necessary thereunto, on the grounds before insisted on. Servile labor, with trouble, sweat, and vexation, was occasioned by the curse, <0103>Genesis 3:17-19. The state also of servants and handmaids, such as was then and is still in use, followed on the entrance of sin; though merely to serve be no part of the curse, <4720>1 Corinthians 7:20,21, as having its foundation in that subordination which is natural; and the government of servants ought not to be despotical, but paternal, <0118>Genesis 18:19. In these things there was some variation supposed in the giving of the decalogue, as to their outward manner, from the original state of things amongst mankind. But there was also work required of man, or labor in the earth, with reference unto his natural life and subsistence in this world, in the state of innocency; for it is said expressly, that God put man into the garden, לְעָבְדָהּ וּלְשָׁמְרָהּ <0215>Genesis 2:15, — to labor in it, and to preserve it by labor for his use. A cessation, therefore, from bodily labor was consistent with, and useful unto, that condition, that men thereby might be enabled to give themselves (in the season they were directed unto by the works and example of God) wholly unto the especial end of living unto him, according to the covenant made with them.

There is nothing, therefore, in the fourth commandment, directing unto six days of labor, and requiring a seventh unto rest, that is inconsistent or not

compliant with the law of our creation, and the state of living unto God constituted thereby, although the manner of that work and labor be varied from what originally it was. Likewise in that state of mankind there was to be a superiority of some over others. This the natural relation of parents and children makes manifest. And these latter were in the worship of God to be under the government and direction of the others. And unto this natural equity is all subjection to magistrates in subjects, and to masters in servants, reduced in the fifth commandment. So, then, the outward variations which are in these things supposed in the fourth commandment do not in the least impeach its morality, or hinder but that, for the substance of it, it may be judged a law natural and moral, and a true representation of a part of the law of our creation.

3. Seeing, therefore, that the moral law, as a covenant between God and man, required this sacred rest, as we have proved, we must inquire what place, as such, it had in the Mosaical economy, whereon the true reason and notion of the Sabbath as peculiarly Judaical doth depend; for the Sabbath being originally annexed to the covenant between God and man, the renovation of the covenant doth necessarily require an especial renovation of the Sabbath, and the change of the covenant as to the nature of it must in like manner introduce a change of the Sabbath. And we shall find that the covenant of the law, or of works, had a twofold renovation in the church of Israel, in the framing and constitution of it. These rendered it their especial covenant, although it was not absolutely a new covenant, nor is it so called, but is everywhere called the old, and hence the Sabbath became peculiarly theirs.

First, It was renewed unto them *materially.* It was originally written in the heart of man, or co-created with the faculties of his soul; where its light and principles, being excited, guided, and variously affected with the consideration of the works of God (proposed unto him with an instructive ability for that end, whose directions concurred to the making up of the entire law of creation), were evidently directive unto all the duties which God in the first covenant required at our hands. By the entrance of sin, with the corruption and debasing of the faculties of our souls which ensued thereon, — whereby the alteration in our nature, the principal seat and subject of this law, was so great as that we lost the image of God, or that light and knowledge unto our duty with respect unto him which was

necessary for us in that covenant, — the law itself became insufficient, a lame and imperfect guide unto the ends of the covenant. Besides, the aspectable creation, — the outward medium of instructing man in the knowledge of the goodness, power, and wisdom of God, — being for our sin brought under the curse, and the creature into bondage, the contemplation of it would not so clearly, distinctly, and perfectly represent him unto us as formerly. Let men fancy what they please, and please themselves whilst they will with their fancies, all things both within and without, in the whole creation, were brought into such disorder and confusion by the entrance of sin, as that the law of nature was utterly insufficient to enable us unto, or to guide us in, our living unto God according to the tenor of the first covenant.

There were and are, indeed, general notions of good and evil indelibly planted on the faculties of our souls, with a power of judging concerning our actions and moral practices, whether they are conformable unto those notions with respect unto the superior judgment of God. But besides the impairing of the principles of these notions, before mentioned, they were of old variously obscured, perverted, and stifled, by customs, prejudices, and the power of sin in the world, so as that they were of little use as unto a due performance of covenant duties, indeed of none at all in reference unto any acceptation with God.

Wherefore, God erecting his church, and renewing the knowledge of himself and man's duty towards him, in the posterity of Abraham, he gave unto them afresh, in the first place, the precepts of the law and covenant of nature, for the guide and rule of their obedience. And that this might now be permanent, he reduced the substance of the whole law unto "ten words," or commands, writing them in tables of stone, which he appointed to be sacredly kept amongst them. The law thus declared and written by him was the same, I say, materially, and for the substance of it, with the law of our creation, or the original rule of our covenant obedience unto God. Yet in it, as thus transcribed, there was an innovation both in its form and principle of obligation. For as to its form or directive power, it was now made external and objective unto the mind of man, which before was principally internal and subjective. And the immediate obligation unto its observation among that people was now from the promulgation of it on Mount Sinai, and the delivery of it unto them thereon. Hence it was

prefaced with motives peculiar to their state and condition, and its observation continually pressed on them afterwards with arguments taken from their peculiar relation unto God, with his love and benefits unto them. This gave it a new respect, because there was nothing originally in it nor belonging unto it but what was equally common unto all mankind. Now, this alteration in the law and covenant of creation, as applied unto the church of the Israelites, did also affect the law of the Sabbath, which was a part of it, It was now no more to them a mere moral command only, equally regarding all mankind; but had a temporary respect given unto it, which was afterwards to be abolished and taken away. So was it with the whole law, and so was it with the Sabbath in particular. To take up, therefore, the observation of it, as appointed in the decalogue, not as a material transcript of the law of nature merely, but as under its renovation to the church of Israel, is a groundless and unwarrantable going over into a part of abolished Judaism; for, —

Secondly, The law was renewed as an ingredient into that economy under which God was pleased to bring his church at that time, before the exhibition of the promise, or the accomplishment of it. And sundry things are to be observed herein: —

(1.) That God did not absolutely bring that people under the *covenant of works* in all the rigor of it, according to its whole law and tenor, to stand or fall absolutely by its promises or threatenings; for although the law contained the whole rule of the covenant, and on the considerations to be afterwards mentioned it is often called the “covenant of God” with that people, yet were they not absolutely tied up unto it and concluded by it, as to the eternal issue of living unto God. This arose from the interposition of the promise; for the promise of grace in Christ being given upon the first entrance of sin, for the relief and salvation of the elect, and being solemnly renewed unto Abraham and his seed four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law unto his posterity, there was a blessed relief provided therein against the curse and threatenings annexed to the first covenant for all them that betook themselves unto it and made use of it. Notwithstanding, I say, this renovation of the first covenant materially unto them, they were so far freed from its covenant terms as that they had a relief provided against what they could not answer in it, with the consequences thereof.

(2.) From the nature and tenor of the covenant of works, so renewed amongst that people, there was begotten in their minds such *a respect unto the rigor of its commands*, the manner of their observance, or of obedience unto them, with the dread of its curse, awfully denounced amongst them, as brought a servile and bondage frame of spirit upon them in all wherein they had to do with God, by virtue of the law and rule of that covenant. This frame of spirit, as that which stands in direct opposition unto the freedom and liberty purchased for us by Jesus Christ, to serve God in righteousness and holiness without fear all our days, is much insisted on by the apostle Paul, especially in his epistles to the Romans and Galatians. And in their observation of the Sabbath in particular they were under this bondage, filling them with many scrupulous anxieties, which arose, not from the law of the Sabbath itself, as originally given unto man in the state of innocency, but from the accommodation of the law thereof unto them after the entrance of sin. And hereby their Sabbath rest became unto them a great part of their wearying, burdensome yoke, which is taken off in Christ.

(3.) This law was yet proposed to that church and people in the *manner and form of a covenant*, and not only materially as a law or rule. This it had from the promises and threatenings which it was attended withal. There was adjoined unto it, "Do this, and live;" and, "The man that doeth these things shall live in them;" as also, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the law, to do them." Not that it was hereby absolutely constituted a covenant, which eventually and finally they were to live or die by (for, as we showed before, there was a relief provided against that condition in the promise), but God gave the old covenant an especial revival, though with respect unto other ends than were originally intended in it. Hence the covenant form given unto it tendered the obedience of that people in a great measure servile, for it gendered unto bondage.

(4.) The law, being attended with various explanations and many ordinances of judgment, deduced from the principles of moral right and equity contained in it, was made the *rule of the polity* and government of that people, as a holy nation under the rule of God himself, who was their king; for their polity, for the kind of it, was a theocracy, over which God in an especial manner presided, as their governor and king. And hence he

affirms, that when they would choose another king over them, after the manner of the nations, they rejected him from reigning over them, though they resolved to adhere to his laws and the manner of government prescribed to them. And this was peculiar to that people. Hence the Sabbath amongst them came to have an absolute necessity accompanying it of an outward, carnal observance, the neglect whereof, or acting any thing against the law of it, was to be punished with death.

(5.) Unto this renovation of the covenant, in the manner and for the ends expressed, there was added a *typical church-state*, with a great number of religious laws and ordinances, in themselves carnal and weak, but mystically significant of spiritual and heavenly things, and instructive how to use the promise, that was before given, for their relief from the rigor and curse of the law or covenant now proposed unto them. And in all these things did the covenant of God, made with that people in the wilderness, consist. The foundation, matter, manner of administration, promises, and threatenings of it, were the same with the covenant of works; but they were all accommodated to their ecclesiastical and political estate, with especial respect unto their approaching condition in the land of Canaan: only there was, in the promise, new ends and a new use given unto it, with a relief against its rigor and curse.

4. On the account of the accessions that were thus made to the law, and especially unto the observation of the Sabbath, it is often mentioned in the Scripture as that which God had in a peculiar manner given unto the Israelites, in whose especial worship it had so great a place, many of their principal ordinances having a great respect unto it, it being also the only means of keeping up the solemnity of national worship in their synagogues among the people, <44152>Acts 15:21. Thus God says concerning them, that he gave them his Sabbaths in the wilderness, to be a sign between him and them, <26010>Ezekiel 20:10-12; and it is said of the same time, <16914>Nehemiah 9:14, that he “made known unto them his holy Sabbath,” — that is, in the manner and for the ends expressed. Nor is there any need why we should say that “He gave them” intends no more but that he restored the knowledge of the Sabbath amongst them, the memory whereof they had almost lost, although that interpretation of the expression might be justified; for he says nowhere that he then *gave his Sabbaths,* but that he then peculiarly *gave them unto that people,* and that for the ends

mentioned. For the Sabbath was originally a moral pledge and expression of God's covenant rest, and of our rest in God; and now was it appointed of God to be a sign of the especial administration of the covenant which was then enacted. Hence it is said that he gave it them as "a perpetual covenant," Exodus 31:16, "that they might know him to be the LORD that sanctified them," verse 13, — that is, their God according to the tenor of that covenant, which was to continue throughout their generations; that is, until the new covenant should be brought in and established by Christ. Thus was it peculiarly given unto them; and so far as it was so, as it was a sign of their covenant, as it was then first given, so it is now abolished: for, —

5. The renovation and change of the covenant must and did introduce a change in the rest annexed unto it; for a Sabbath, or a holy rest, belongs unto every covenant between God and man. But as for the kind and nature of it, as to its ends, use, and manner of observation, it follows the especial kind or nature of that covenant wherein we at any season walk before God. Now, the original covenant of works being, in this representation of it on Sinai, not absolutely changed or abolished, but afresh presented unto the people, only with a relief provided for the covenanters against its curse and severity, with a direction how to use it to another end than was first given unto it, it follows that the day of the sabbatical rest could not be changed. And therefore was the observation of the *seventh day precisely* continued, because it was a moral pledge of the rest of God in the first covenant; for this the instructive part of the law of our creation, from God's making the world in six days, and resting on the seventh, did require. The observation of this day, therefore, was still continued among the Israelites, because the first covenant was again presented unto them. But when that covenant was absolutely, and in all respects as a covenant, taken away and disannulled, and that not only as to its formal efficacy, but also as to the manner of the administration of God's covenant with men, as it is under the gospel, there was a necessity that the day of rest should also be changed, as I have more fully showed elsewhere. I say, then, that the precise observation of the seventh day enjoined unto the Israelites had respect unto the covenant of works, wherein the foundation of it was laid, as hath been demonstrated. And the whole controversy about what day is

to be observed now as a day of holy rest unto the Lord, is resolved fully into this inquiry, namely, what covenant we do walk before God in.

6. And that we may understand the whole nature of the Judaical Sabbath, it must moreover be considered, that the law in general, and all the precepts of it, were the instrument of the polity of the people under the government of God, as we before observed; for all the judgments relating unto civil things were but an application of the moral law to their state and condition. Hence was the sanction of the transgression of it to be punished with death. So was it in particular with respect unto the Sabbath, <04152>Numbers 15:32-36, partly that it might represent unto them the original sanction of the whole law as a covenant of works, and partly to keep that stubborn people by this severity within due bounds of government. Nor was any thing punished by death judicially in the law but the transgression of some moral command. יד השמים, "the hand of heaven," is threatened against their presumptuous transgression of the ceremonial law, where no sacrifice was allowed: "I the LORD will set my face against that man, and cut him off." This also made the Sabbath a yoke and a burden, that wherein their consciences could never find perfect rest. And in this sense also it is abolished and taken away.

Again, it was made a part of their law for religious worship in their typical church-state; in which and whereby the whole dispensation of the covenant which they were under was directed unto other ends. And so it had the nature of a shadow, representing the good things to come, whereby the people were to be relieved from the rigor and curse of the whole law as a covenant. And on these reasons new commands were given for the observation of the Sabbath, and new motives, ends, and uses were added thereunto, every way to accommodate it to the dispensation of the covenant then in force, which was afterwards to be removed and taken away, and therewithal the Sabbath itself, so far as it had relation thereunto; for the continuation of the seventh day precisely belonged unto the new representation that was made of the covenant of works. The representation of that covenant, with the sanction given unto it amongst the judgments of righteousness in the government of the people in the land of Canaan, which was the Lord's, and not theirs, made it a yoke and burden; and the use it was put unto amongst ceremonial observances made it a shadow: in all which respects it is abolished by Christ. To say that the

Sabbath as given unto the Jews is not abolished, is to introduce the whole system of Mosaical ordinances, which stand on the same bottom with it. And particularly, the observation of the seventh day precisely lieth as it were in the heart of the economy. And these things will the more clearly appear if we consider the dealing of God with that people about the Sabbath from first to last.

7. The Jews, some of them at least, as was before discoursed, would have not only the first revelation of the Sabbath unto them, or the renovation of its command, but its first institution absolutely, to have been in their station at Marah, Exodus 15. The vanity of this pretense we have before sufficiently discovered. And whereas this was the opinion of the Talmudical masters of the middle ages since Christ, they seem to have embraced it on the same account whereon they have invented many other fancies; for observing that a Sabbath was in esteem amongst the Christians, in opposition unto them they began to contend that the Sabbath was, as they called it, "the *bride of the synagogue*," and belonged to themselves alone, being given *secretly* to them only. The vanity of this pretense we have before laid open, and so shall not again insist upon it.

8. The first peculiar dealing of God with them about the Sabbath was evidently in their first station at Alush, Exodus 16. The occasion of the whole is laid down, verses 4,5, "Then said the LORD unto Moses, Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law, or no. And it shall come to pass, that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily." Here is no mention of the Sabbath, nor any reason given why they should gather a double portion on the sixth day. This command, therefore, must needs have seemed somewhat strange unto them, if they had before no notion at all of a seventh day's sacred rest. They must otherwise have been at a great loss in themselves why they must double their measure on the sixth day. However, it is apparent that either they had lost the true day they were to observe, through their long bondage in Egypt, or knew not what belonged to the due observation and sanctification of it; for when the people had observed this command, and gathered a double portion of manna, to keep one part of it for the next day, — although they had experience that if at another season it were kept

above one day it would putrefy and stink, verse 20, — the rulers of the congregation, fearing some mistake in the matter, go and acquaint Moses with what was done amongst them, verse 22. Hereon Moses replieth unto them, verse 23, "This is that which the LORD hath said, Tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the LORD: bake that which ye will bake," etc.

This is the first express mention of the Sabbath unto and amongst that people; and it sufficiently declares that this was not the absolute original of a sabbatical rest. It is only an appropriation and application of the old command unto them; for the words are not *preceptive*, but *directive*. They do not institute any thing new, but direct in the practice of what was before. Hence it is affirmed, verse 29, that God gave them the Sabbath, — namely, in this new confirmation of it, and accommodation of it to their present condition; for this new confirmation of it, by withholding of manna on that day, belonged merely and solely unto them, and was the especial limitation of the seventh day precisely, wherein we are not concerned who do live on the "true bread" that came down from heaven. In these words, therefore, "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the LORD," there is a certain limitation of the day, a direction for its sanctification, as confirmed by the new sign of withholding manna, all which belonged to them peculiarly; for this was the first time that, *as a people*, they observed the Sabbath, which in Egypt they could not do. And into this institution and the authority of it must they resolve their practice who adhere unto the observation of the seventh day precisely; for that day is no otherwise confirmed in the decalogue but as it had relation hereunto.

9. The Jews in this place fall into a double mistake about the practical observation of their Sabbath; for from these words, "Bake that which ye will bake, and seethe that which ye will seethe, and that which remaineth lay up for you to be kept until the morning," verse 23, they conclude it to be unlawful to bake or seethe any thing on the Sabbath day, whereas the words have respect only to the manna that was to be preserved. And from the words of verse 29, "See, for that the LORD hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days, abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day," they have made a rule, yea, many rules, about what motions or removals are lawful on the Sabbath day, and what not. And hence they have bound themselves with many anxious and scrupulous observances, though the

injunction itself do purely and solely respect the people in the wilderness, that they should not go out into the fields to look for manna on that day; which some of them having done, verse 27, an occasion was taken irom thence for this injunction. And hereunto do some of the heathen writers ascribe the original of the sabbatical rest among the Jews, supposing that the seventh day after their departure out of Egypt they came to a place of rest, in remembrance whereof they consecrated one day in seven to rest and idleness ever after; whereunto they add other fictions of a like nature. See Tacit. Hist. lib. 5.

10. Not long after ensued the giving of the law on Sinai, Exodus 20. That the decalogue is a summary of the law of nature, or the moral law, is by all Christians acknowledged, nor could the heathens of old deny it. And it is so perfectly. Nothing belongs unto the law which is not comprised therein; nor can any one instance be given to the contrary. Nor is there any thing directly and immediately in it but what belongs unto that law. Only God now made in it an especial accommodation of the law of their creation unto that people, whom he was in a second work now forming for himself, Isaiah 43:19-21, 51:15,16. And this he did, as every part of it was capable of being so accommodated. To this purpose he prefaceth the whole with an intimation of his particular covenant with them, "I am the LORD thy God;" and addeth thereunto the remembrance of an especial benefit, that they, and they alone, were made partakers of, "that brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage," — which he did in the pursuit of his especial covenant with Abraham and his seed. This made the obligation to obedience unto the law, as promulgated on mount Sinai, to belong unto them peculiarly. To us it is only an everlasting rule, as declarative of the will of God and the law of our creation. The obligation, I say, that arose unto obedience from the promulgation of the law on mount Sinai was peculiar unto the Israelites; and sundry things were then and there mixed with it that belonged unto them alone. And whereas the mercy, the consideration whereof he proposeth as the great motive unto obedience, — which was his bringing them out of Egypt, with reference unto his settling of them in the land of Canaan, — was a typical mercy, it gave the whole law a station in the typical church-state which they were now bringing into. It altered not the nature of the things commanded, which, for the substance of them, were all moral; but it gave

their obedience unto it a new and typical respect, even as it was the tenor of the covenant made with them in Sinai, with respect unto the promised land of Canaan, and their typical state therein.

11. This in an especial manner was the condition of the fourth commandment. Three things are distinctly proposed in it: —

(1.) The command for an observance of a Sabbath day: [2208]Exodus 20:8, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." This contains the whole substance of the command; the formal reason whereof is contained in the last clause of it: "Wherefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." And upon the neglect of the observance of the Sabbath in former generations, with a prospect of the many difficulties that would arise among the people in the observation of it for the future; as also because the foundation and reason of it in the law of creation, being principally external, in the works and rest of God that ensued thereon, were not so absolutely ingrafted in the minds of men as continually to evidence and manifest themselves, as do those of the other precepts, there is an especial note put upon it for remembrance. And whereas it is a positive precept, as is that which follows it, all the rest being negatives, it stood more in need than they of a particular charge and special motives; of which motives one is added also to the next command, being in like manner a positive enunciation.

(2.) There is an express determination of this Sabbath to the seventh day, without which it was only included in the original reason of it: Verses 9,10, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the LORD thy God." And herein the day originally fixed in the covenant of works is again limited unto this people, to continue unto the time of the full introduction and establishment of the new covenant. And this limitation of the seventh day was but the renovation of the command when given unto them in the way of an especial ordinance, Exodus 16, and belongs not to the substance of the command itself. Yea, take the command itself without respect unto its explications elsewhere, and it expresseth no such limitation, though virtually, because of the precedent institution, Exodus 16, it be contained in it. Hence,

(3.) There is a prescription for the manner of its observance, accommodated unto the state and condition of that people; and that two ways, —

[1.] In comprehending things *spiritual* under things *carnal*, when yet the carnal are of no consideration in the worship of God, but as they necessarily attend upon things spiritual. Hence that part of the command which concerns the manner of the observation of the Sabbath, to be kept holy, is given out in a prohibition of bodily labor and work, or a command of bodily rest. But it is the expression of the rest of God and his complacency in his works and covenant, with the sanctification of the day in obedience to his command, in and by the holy duties of his worship, that is principally intended in it. And this he further intimates afterwards unto them, by his institution of a double sacrifice, to be offered morning and evening on that day.

[2.] In the distribution of the people into the *capital persons*, with their relations, servants, and strangers, that God would have to live amongst them and join themselves unto them on the whole, it appears that the Sabbath is not now commanded to be observed because it is the seventh day, as though the seventh day were firstly and principally intended in the command, which, as we have showed, neither the substance of the command nor the reason of it, with which the whole of the precept is begun and ended, will admit of; but the seventh day is commanded to be observed, because by an antecedent institution it was made to be the Sabbath unto that people, Exodus 16 (whence it came to fall under the command, not primarily, but reductively), as it had been on another account from the foundation of the world. The Sabbath, therefore, is originally commanded as one day in seven to be dedicated unto a holy rest; and the seventh day, if we respect the order of the days, is added as that especial day which God had declared that he would have at that time his Sabbath to be observed on.

Now, all these things in the law of the Sabbath are Mosaical, — namely, the obligation that arose unto its observation from the promulgation of the law unto that people on Sinai; the limitation of the day unto the seventh or last of the week, which was necessary unto that administration of the covenant which God then made use of, and had a respect unto a previous

institution; the manner of its observance, suited unto that servile and bondage frame of mind which the giving of the law on mount Sinai did ingenerate in them, as being designed of God so to do; the ingrafting it into the system and series of religious worship then in force, by the double sacrifice annexed unto it, with the various uses in and accommodations it had unto the rule of government in the commonwealth of Israel; — in all which respects it is abolished and taken away.

12. God having disposed and settled the Sabbath, as to the seventh day, and the manner of its observation, as a part of the covenant then made with that people, he hereon makes use of it in the same manner and unto the same ends with the residue of the institutions and ordinances which he had then prescribed unto them. This he doth, Exodus 31:12-17,

> "And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak thou unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily, my sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the LORD that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you: every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death: for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from amongst his people. Six days may work be done; but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the LORD: whosoever doeth any work in the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death. Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever: for in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed."

This is the next mention of the Sabbath amongst that people, wherein all that we have before laid down is fully confirmed. God had now by Moses appointed other sabbaths, that is, monthly and annual sacred rests, to be observed unto himself. With these he now joins the weekly Sabbath, in allusion whereunto they have that name also given unto them. He had sufficiently manifested a difference between them before: for the one he pronounced himself on mount Sinai, as part of his universal and eternal law; the others he instituted by revelation unto Moses, as that which

peculiarly belonged unto them. The one was grounded on a reason wherein they had no more concern or interest than all the rest of mankind, — namely, God's rest in his works, and being refreshed thereon, upon the creation of the world, and the establishment of his covenant with man; the others all built on reasons peculiar unto themselves and that church-state whereinto they were admitted. But here the sabbaths of both these kinds are brought under the same command, and designed unto the same ends and purposes. Now, the sole reason hereof lies in those temporary and ceremonial additions which we have manifested to have been made unto the original law of the Sabbath, in its accommodation to their church-state, with the place which it held therein, as we shall see yet further in particular.

13. The occasion of this renovation of the command was the building of the tabernacle, which was now designed, and forthwith to be undertaken. And with respect hereunto there was a double reason for the repetition of this command: — First, Because that work was for a holy end, and so upon the matter a holy work, and whereon the people were very intent Hence they might have supposed that it would have been lawful for them to have attended unto it on the Sabbath days, This, therefore, God expressly forbids, that they might have no pretense for the transgression of his command; and therefore is the penalty annexed unto it so expressly here appointed and mentioned. Secondly, As the tabernacle now to be built was the *only seat* of that solemn instituted worship which God was now setting up amongst them, so the Sabbath being the great means of its continuance and performance, this they were now to be severely minded of, lest by their neglect and forgetfulness thereof they might come to a neglect and contempt of all that worship which was as it were built upon it. And, as we have observed before more than once, the weekly Sabbath being inserted into the economy of their laws, as to the matter of works and rest, it is comprised in the general with other feasts, called sabbaths also: "Verily, my sabbaths ye shall keep." And in this regard they are all cast together by our apostle, Colossians 2:16: "The sabbath days." And they who, by virtue of this and the like commands, would bind us up to the Judaical Sabbath, do certainly lose both that and all other ground for the observance of any sabbath at all; for look in what respects it is joined

with the other sabbaths by Moses, in the same it is taken away with them by the apostle.

14. There is a treble appropriation of the weekly Sabbath in this place made unto the church of the Israelites: —

(1.) In that the observation of it is required of them *in their generations*, — that is, during the continuance of that church-state, which was to abide to the coming of Christ; for what was required of them in their generations, as it was required, was then to expire and be abolished.

(2.) That they were to observe it as a *perpetual covenant*, or as a part of that covenant which God then made with them, which is called everlasting, because it was to be so unto them, seeing God would never make any other peculiar covenant with them. And whereas all the statutes and ordinances that God then gave them belonged unto and altogether entirely made up that covenant, some of these, as this especial command for the Sabbath, and that for circumcision, are distinctly called the covenant, and ceased with it.

(3.) It was given unto them as an especial pledge of the covenant that God then made with them, wherein he rested in his worship, and brought them to rest therein in the land of Canaan, whereby they *entered into God's rest.* Hence it is called "a sign" between them, Exodus 31:13,17; which is repeated and explained, Ezekiel 20:12. A sign it was, or an evident expression of the present covenant of God between him and them; not a sacramental or typical sign of future grace in particular, any otherwise than as their whole church constitution and their worship in general, whereof by these means it was made a part, were so, — that is, not in itself or its own nature, but as prescribed unto them.

And a present sign between God and them it was upon a double account: —

[1.] On the part of the people. Their assembling on that day for the celebration of the worship of God, and the avowing him alone therein to be their God, was a sign, or an evident express acknowledgment that they were the people of the Lord. And this doth not in the least impeach its original morality, seeing there is no moral duty but in its exercise or actual performance may be so made a sign.

[2.] On the part of God, — namely, that it was he who sanctified them; for by this observance they had a visible pledge that God had separated them unto and for himself, and therefore bad given them his word and ordinances as the outward means of their further sanctification, to be peculiarly attended to on that day. And on these grounds it is that God is elsewhere said to give them his Sabbaths, to reveal them unto them, as their peculiar privilege and advantage. And their privilege it was; for although, in comparison of the substance and glory of things to be brought in by Christ, with the liberty and spirituality of gospel worship, all their ordinances and institutions were a yoke of bondage, yet considering their use, with their end and tendency, compared with the rest of the world at that time, they were an unspeakable privilege, <19E719>Psalm 147:19,20. However, therefore, the Sabbath was originally given before unto all mankind, yet God now, by the addition of his institutions to be observed on that day, whereby he sanctified the people, made an enclosure of it so far unto them alone.

Lastly, Here is added a peculiar sanction under the penalty of death: "Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death," <021314>Exodus 31:14. God sometimes threateneth cutting off or extermination unto persons, concerning whom yet the people had no warranty to proceed capitally against them; only he took it upon himself, as the supreme legislator and rector of that people, to destroy them and cut them off, as they speak, "by the hand of heaven." But wherever this expression is used, "He shall surely be put to death," מוֹת יוּמָת, "Dying he shall die," there the people, or the judges among them, are not only warranted but commanded to proceed judicially against such an offender. And in this respect it belonged unto that severe government which that people stood in need of, as also to mind them of the sanction of the whole law of creation as a covenant of works, with the same commination of death unto all transgressions. In all these regards the Sabbath was Judaical, and is absolutely abolished and taken away.

15. The command is renewed again, <023421>Exodus 34:21,

> "Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest; in earing time and in harvest thou shalt rest."

Earing time and harvest are the seasons wherein those who till the ground are most intent upon their occasions, and do most hardly bear with intermissions, because they may be greatly to their damage. Wherefore they are insisted on or specified, to manifest that no avocation nor pretense can justify men in working or labor on that day; for by expressing earing and harvest, all those intervenings also are intended in those seasons whereon damage and loss might redound unto men by omitting the gathering in of their corn. And it should seem, on this ground, that on that day they might not labor, neither to take it away before a flood, nor remove it from an approaching fire. So some of the masters think, although our Savior convinces them, from their own practice, in relieving cattle fallen into pits on that day, <scripRef type="bible" osis="Luke.14.5">Luke 14:5</scripRef>, and by loosing them that were tied, to lead them to watering, chapter 13:15, that they did not conceive this universally to be the intendment of that law, that in no case any work was to be done. And it seems they were wiser for their asses in those days than the poor wretch was for himself in a later age, who, falling into the jakes at Tewkesbury on that day, would not suffer himself to be drawn out, — if the story be truly reported in our chronicles. In general, I doubt not but that this additional explanation in a way of severity is in its proper sense purely Judaical, and contains something more of rigidness than is required by the law of the Sabbath as purely moral.

16. Mentioned it is again, with a new addition, <scripRef type="bible" osis="Exod.35.2-Exod.35.3">Exodus 35:2,3</scripRef>, “Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a Sabbath of rest to the LORD: whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations on the Sabbath day.” Here again the penalty and the prohibition of kindling fire are Mosaical, and so on their account is the whole command as here renewed, though there be that in it which, for the substance of it, is moral. And here the seventh day precisely is made קֹדֶשׁ, “holiness,” unto them (or, מִקְרָאֵי קֹדֶשׁ, “a convocation of holiness,” “an holy convocation,’’ as it is expressed, <scripRef type="bible" osis="Lev.23.2">Leviticus 23:2</scripRef>, where these words are again repeated); whose profanation was to be avenged with death. The prohibition also added about kindling of fire in their habitations hath been the occasion of many anxious observances among the Jews. They all agree that the kindling of fire for profit and advantage in kilns and oasts, [f10] for the making of brick, or drying of corn, or for founding or melting metals, is

here forbidden. But what need was there that so it should be, seeing all these things are expressly forbidden in the command in general, "Thou shalt do no manner of work?" Somewhat more is intended. They say, therefore, that it is the kindling of fire for the dressing of victuals; and this indeed seems to be the intendment of this especial law, as the manna that was to be eaten on the Sabbath was to be prepared on the *parascune.* But withal I say, this is a new additional law, and purely Mosaical, the original law of the Sabbath making no intrenchment on the ordinary duties of human life, as we shall see afterwards. Whether it forbade the kindling of fire for light and heat, I much question. The present Jews in most places employ Christian servants about such works; for the poor wretches care not what is done to their advantage, so they do it not themselves. But these and the like precepts belonged unquestionably unto their pedagogy, and were separable from the original law of the Sabbath.

17. Lastly, The whole matter is stated, Deuteronomy 5:15; where, after the repetition of the commandment, it is added, "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the LORD thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: therefore the LORD thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." The mercy and benefit they had received in their deliverance from Egypt is given as the reason, not why *they should keep the Sabbath*, as it was proposed as a motive unto the observation of the whole law in the preface of the decalogue, but wherefore *God gave them the law of it*, to keep and observe: "Therefore the LORD thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath." Now, the reason of the command of a sabbatical rest absolutely, God had everywhere declared to be his making the world in six days, and resting on the seventh; the mention whereof in this place is wholly omitted, because an especial application of the law unto that people is intended. So that it is evident that the Mosaical Sabbath was, on many accounts and in many things, distinguished from that of the decalogue, which is a moral duty. For the deliverance of the people out of Egypt, which was a benefit peculiar unto themselves, and typical of spiritual mercies unto others, was the reason of the institution of the Sabbath as it was Mosaical, which it was not, nor could be, of the Sabbath absolutely, although it might be pressed on that people as a considerable motive why they ought to endeavor the keeping of the whole law.

18. From all that hath been discoursed, it appears that the observation of the seventh day precisely from the beginning of the world belonged unto the covenant of works, not as a covenant, but as a covenant of works, founded in the law of creation; and that in the administration of that covenant, which was revived, and unto certain ends re-enforced unto the church of Israel in the wilderness, it was bound on them by an especial ordinance, to be observed throughout their generations, or during the continuance of their church-state. Moreover, that as to the manner of its observance required by the law, as delivered on mount Sinai, it was a yoke and burden to the people, because that dispensation of the law gendered unto bondage, ◁Galatians 4:24▷; for it begot a spirit of fear and bondage in all that were its children and subject unto its power. In this condition of things it was applied unto sundry ends in their typical state; in which regard it was "a shadow of good things to come." And so also was it in respect of those other additional institutions and prohibitions which were inseparable from its observation amongst them, whereof we have spoken. On all these accounts I doubt not but that the Mosaical Sabbath, and the manner of its observation, are under the gospel utterly taken away. But as for the weekly Sabbath, as required by the law of our creation, and re-enforced in the decalogue, the summary representation of that great original law, the observation of it is a moral duty, which by divine authority is translated unto another day.

19. The ancient Jews have a saying, which by the later masters is abused, but a truth is contained in it, השבת נתן קיום וחוזק לכל דברי העולם; — "The Sabbath gives firmitude and strength to all the affairs of this world;" for it may be understood of the blessing of God on the due observation of his worship on that day. Hence it was, they say, that any young clean beast that was to be offered in sacrifice must continue seven days with the dam, and not be offered until the eighth, ◁Leviticus 22:27▷, and that a child was not to be circumcised until the eighth day, that there might be an interposition of a Sabbath for their benediction. And it is not unlikely that the eighth day was also signalized hereby, as that which was to succeed in the room of the seventh, as shall be manifested in our next discourse.

EXERCITATION 5.

OF THE LORD'S DAY.

1. *A summary of what hath been proved — A progress to the Lord's day.*

2. *The new creation of all things in Christ the foundation of gospel obedience and worship.*

3. *The old and new creation compared.*

4. *The old and new covenant.*

5. *Distinct ends of these covenants.*

6. *Supposition of the heads of things before confirmed.*

7. *Foundation of the Lord's day on those suppositions.*

8. *Christ the author of the new creation; his works therein.*

9. *His rest from his works the indication of a new day of rest.*

10. *Observed by the apostles.*

11. *Proof of the Lord's day from Hebrews 4 proposed.*

12. *The words of the text.*

13. *Design of the apostle in general.*

14. *His answer unto an objection, with his general argument.*

15. *The nature of the rests treated of by him.*

16. *The church under the law of nature, and its rest.*

17. *The church under the law of institutions, and its rest.*

18. *The church under the gospel, and its rest.*

19. *The foundation of it.*

20. *Christ, his works and his rest, intended* Hebrews 4:10.

21. *This further proved by sundry arguments.*

22. *What were his works whereby the church was founded.*

23. *His entrance into his rest, not in his death, but in his resurrection.*

24. *The day of rest limited and determined hereby.*

25. *The sabbatism that remains for the people of God.*

26. *The sending of the Holy Ghost.*

27. *Church assemblies on the first day of the week.*

28. *The Lord's day,* Revelation 1:10.

29. *The sum of the preceding discourse.*

30. *Necessity of the religions observation of one day in seven.*

31. *Blessing of God on the church-worship on the first day.*

32. *Of the seventh-day Sabbath — Judaism restored in it — Of the Ebionites.*

33. *Schisms perpetuated by the opinion of the seventh-day Sabbath.*

34. *Penalty of the law re-enforced with it.*

35. *The whole legal.*

1. HOW the creation of all things was finished, and how the rest of God and man ensued thereon, hath been declared. It hath also in part, and sufficiently as unto our present purpose, been evidenced how the great ends of the creation of all, in the glory of God, and the blessedness of man in him, with the pledge thereof in a sabbatical rest, were for a season as it were defeated and disappointed, by the entrance of sin, which brake the covenant that was founded in the law of creation, and rendered it useless unto those ends; for the law became weak through sin and the flesh, or the corruption of our nature that ensued thereon, Romans 8:3. Hence it could no more bring man to rest in God. But yet a continuation of the obligatory force of that law and covenant, with the direction of it unto other ends and purposes than at first given unto them, was under the old testament designed of God, and hath been declared also. Hence was the continuation of the original sabbatical rest in the church of Israel, with the especial application of its command unto that people, insisted on in the preceding discourse. In this state of things God had of old determined the renovation of all by a new creation, a new law of that creation, a new covenant, and a new sabbatical rest, unto his own glory, by Jesus Christ; and these things are now to be discussed.

2. The renovation of all things by Jesus Christ is prophesied of and foretold as a new creation of all, even of the heavens and the earth, and all things contained in them, Isaiah 65:17, 18, 66:22; 2 Peter 3:13. Hence the state of things to be introduced thereby was under the old testament called "The world to come," Hebrews 2:5. So it is still called by the Jewish masters, עולם הנא, and עתיד עולם. So Kimchi, among other expositions of the title of Psalm 92, "A psalm or song for the Sabbath day," adds this, as that which the most ancient rabbins fixed on והם ימי המשיח על העתיד לבא לעולם שכולו שבת ומנוחה;" — "They interpreted it of the world to come, which shall be wholly sabbath or rest; and these are the days of the Messiah." A spiritual rest it is they intend, and not a cessation of a Sabbath day in particular, seeing in the prophecy

of the new temple, or church-state, in those days there is especial direction given for the service of the Sabbath day, <2604>Ezekiel 46:4.

And this renovation of all things is said, accordingly, to be accomplished in Christ: <4057>2 Corinthians 5:17, 18, “Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.” The old law, old covenant, old worship, old Sabbath, all that was peculiar unto the covenant of works as such, in the first institution of it and its renewed declaration on mount Sinai, are all antiquated and gone. What now remains of them, as to any usefulness in our living to God, does not abide on the old foundation, but on a new disposition of them, by the renovation of all things in Christ; for “in the dispensation of the fullness of times,” God gathered unto a head “all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him,” <4910>Ephesians 1:10. The whole old creation, as far as it had any thing in itself or its order that belonged unto or contributed anything towards our living unto God and his glory, is disposed anew in Christ Jesus unto that end.

But this renovation of all, which is the foundation of all our acceptable obedience unto God and of his present worship, consists principally in the regeneration of the elect, making them new creatures, and the erection of a new church-state thereby, to the glory of God. Now, this new creation of all must answer unto all the ends of the old, in reference unto the glory of God and the good of them who are partakers of it; otherwise it would not be so rightly called, nor answer the declared end of it, which was to gather all things to a head in Christ Jesus; for what was lost by sin, as to the glory of God in the old creation, in this was to be repaired and recovered.

3. We may, then, as the foundation of our present discourse, consider how these things answer unto one another : — First, The old creation comprised in it the *law of the obedience* of all creatures unto God. This was therein and thereby implanted on their natures, with inclinations natural or moral unto the observation of it. And thus must it be also in the new creation, as unto the subject of it, which is the church. The law of the old creation unto man consisted principally in the image of God in him and concreated with him; for hereby did he both know his duty and was enabled to perform it, and was acquainted with his relation unto God and dependence upon him, which rendered it necessary and indispensable. But

this law in the state of creation fell under a double consideration, or had a double use, — first as a *rule*, and then as a *principle*. As a rule, the light that was in the mind of man, which was a principal part of the image of God in him, acquainted him with his whole duty, and directed him in the right performance of it. As a principle, it respected the ability that the whole man was endowed withal to live to God according to his duty. This law, as to its first use, being much impaired, weakened, and in a great measure made useless by sin, God was pleased to restore it in the vocal revelation of his will, especially in the decalogue, which with his own finger he wrote in tables of stone. In answer hereunto a new law of obedience is introduced by the new creation in Christ Jesus. And this principally consisteth in the *renovation of the image of God* in the new creatures, which was lost by sin; for they are "renewed in the spirit of their mind," and do "put on that new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness," [402]Ephesians 4:23, 24. And this fully answers the first law, as it was a principle of light and power unto obedience. And in a great measure it supplies the loss of it as it was a rule also; for there is a great renovation thereof, in God's writing his law in our hearts, not here to be insisted on. But in this new creation God designed to gather up all that was past in the old, and in the law thereof, and in the continuation of it by writing under the old testament, unto one head in Christ. Wherefore he brings over into this state the use of the first law, as renewed and represented in tables of stone, for a directive rule of obedience unto the new creature, whereby the first original law is wholly supplied. Hereunto he makes an addition of what positive laws he thinks meet, as he did also under the old law of creation, for the trial of our obedience and our furtherance in it. So the moral law of our obedience is in each condition, the old and the new, *materially* the same; nor is it possible that it should be otherwise. But yet this old law, as brought over into this new estate, is new also; for "all things are become new." And it is now the rule of our obedience, not merely and absolutely unto God as the creator, the first cause and last end of all, but as unto God in Christ bringing us into a new relation unto himself. In the renovation, then, of the image of God in our souls, and the transferring over of the moral law as a rule, accompanied with new distinct principles, motives, and ends, does the law of the new creation consist, and fully answer the law of the first, as it was

a principle and a rule, each of them having their peculiar positive laws annexed unto them.

4. Secondly, The law of creation had a *covenant* included in it, or inseparably annexed unto it. This also we have before declared, and what belonged thereunto or ensued necessarily thereon. Thus, therefore, must it be also in the new creation and the law thereof. Yea, because the covenant is that which as it were gathers all things together, both in the works and law of God, and in our obedience, disposing them into that order which tends to the glory of God and the blessedness of the creatures in him, this is that which in both creations is principally to be considered; for without this, no end of God in his works or law could be attained, nor man be made blessed in a way of righteousness and goodness unto his glory. And the law of creation no otherwise failed, or became useless as to its first end by sin, but that the covenant of it was thereby broken, and rendered useless as to the bringing of man unto the enjoyment of God. This, therefore, was principally regarded in the new creation, — namely, the making, confirming, and ratifying, of a new covenant. And the doing hereof was the great promise under the old testament, Jeremiah 31:31-34, whereby the believers who then lived were made partakers of the benefits of it. And the confirming of this covenant in and by Christ is expressed as a part of the new creation, Hebrews 8:8-13, and it is indeed comprehensive of the whole work of it.

5. Thirdly, The *immediate end* of the old covenant was to bring man by due obedience unto the rest of God. This God declared in and unto his inbred, native light, by his works and his rest that ensued thereon; and also by the day of rest which he instituted as a pledge thereof, and as a means of attaining it, by that obedience which was required in the covenant. This we have before declared, and this was the true original and end of the first sabbatical rest. All these things, therefore, must have place also in the new covenant, belonging unto the new creation. The immediate end of it is our entering into the rest of God, as the apostle proves at large, Hebrews 4. But herein we are not absolutely to enter into God’s rest as a creator and rewarder, but into the rest of God in Christ, the nature whereof will be fully explained in our exposition of that chapter; for obedience is now to be yielded unto God, not absolutely, but to God in Christ, and with that respect, therefore, are we to enter into rest. The foundation hereof must lie

in the works of God in the new creation, and the complacency with rest which he took therein; for all *our* rest in God is founded in his *own* rest in his works. For a pledge hereof, a day of rest must be given and observed, the reasons and necessity whereof we have explained and confirmed in our preceding discourses. This, as has been showed, was originally the seventh day of the week; but, as the apostle tells us in another case, "The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law," so the covenant being changed, and the rest which was the end of it being changed, and the way of entering into the rest of God being changed, a *change of the day of rest* must of necessity thereon ensue. And no man can assert the same day of rest precisely to abide as of old, but he must likewise assert the same law, the same covenant, the same rest of God, the same way of entering into it; which yet, as all acknowledge, are changed. The day first annexed unto the covenant of works, — that is, the seventh day, — was continued under the old testament, because the outward administration of that covenant was continued. A relief, indeed, was provided against the curse and penalty of it; but in the administration of it, the nature, promises, and threatenings of that covenant, though with other ends and purposes, were represented unto the people. But now that covenant being absolutely abolished, both as to its nature, use, efficacy, and power, no more to be represented or proposed unto believers, the whole of it and its renewed administration under the old testament being removed, taken away, and disappearing, [488]Hebrews 8:13, the precise day of rest belonging unto it was to be changed also; and so it is come to pass.

6. We must here suppose what has been before proved and confirmed, — that there was a day of holy rest unto God necessary to be observed, by the law, and by the covenant of nature or works; neither was nor could either of them be complete without it, looking on them as the rule and means of man's living unto God, and of his coming to the enjoyment of him: and that this day was, in the innate light of nature, as directed by the works of God, designed and proposed unto it for that purpose, to be one day in seven. This was it to learn, and this it did learn, from God's creating the world in six days, and resting on the seventh; for God affirms everywhere that because he did so, therefore it was the duty of man to labor on six days, as his occasions do require, and to rest on the seventh. This, therefore, they were taught by those works and rest of God, or it

could not be proposed as the reason of their suitable practice; and for this end did God so work and rest. The law, therefore, of this holy rest he reneweth in the decalogue, amongst those other laws, which being of the same nature and original, — namely, branches of the law of our creation, — were to be unto us moral and eternal; for God would no longer intrust his mind and will in that law unto the depraved nature of man, — wherein if he had not, in the best, often guided and directed it by fresh extraordinary revelations, it would have been of little use to his glory, — but committed it, by vocal revelation, to the minds of the people, as the doctrinal object of their consideration, and recorded it in tables of stone. Moreover, the nature of the first covenant, and the way of God's instructing man in the condition of it, by his works and rest, had limited this holy day unto the seventh day, the observation whereof was to be commensurate unto that covenant and its administration, however the outward forms thereof might be varied.

7. On these suppositions we lay, and ought to lay, the observation of the Lord's day under the new testament, according to the institution of it, or declaration of the mind of Christ, who is our Lord and Lawgiver, concerning it.

(1.) A new work of creation, or a work of a new creation, is undertaken and completed, <2657>Isaiah 65:17, 18, 66:22; <6803>2 Peter 3:13; <6201>Revelation 21:1; <4809>Romans 8:19, 20; <4705>2 Corinthians 5:17; Gal-vi.

15.

(2.) This new creation is accompanied with a new law and a new covenant, or the law of faith and the covenant of grace, <4827>Romans 3:27, 8:2-4; <2831>Jeremiah 31:31-34; <5801>Hebrews 8:8-13.

(3.) Unto this law and covenant a day of holy rest unto the Lord does belong; which cannot be the same day with the former, no more than it is the same law or the same covenant which were originally given unto us, <5809>Hebrews 4:9; <6010>Revelation 1:10.

(4.) That this day was limited and determined to the first day of the week by our Lord Jesus Christ, is that which shall now further be confirmed. Only I must desire the reader to consider, that whereas the topical arguments whereby this truth is confirmed have been pleaded, improved,

and vindicated, by many of late, I shall but briefly mention them, and insist principally on the declaration of the proper grounds and foundations of it.

8. As our Lord Jesus Christ, as the eternal Son and Wisdom of the Father, was the immediate cause and author of the old creation, ^[4801]John 1:3, ^[5116]Colossians 1:16, ^[5802]Hebrews 1:2, 10, so as Mediator he was the author of this new creation, ^[5803]Hebrews 3:3-4. He built the house of God; he built all these things, and is God. Herein he wrought, and in the accomplishment of it "saw of the travail of his soul, and was satisfied," ^[2911]Isaiah 53:11; that is, "he rested, and was refreshed." Herein he gave a new law of life, faith, and obedience unto God, ^[2904]Isaiah 42:4; not by an addition of new precepts to the moral law of God not virtually comprised therein, and distinct from his own positive institutions of worship, but in his revelation of that new way of obedience unto God in and by himself, with the especial causes, means, and ends of it, — which supplies the use and end whereunto the moral law was at first designed, ^[4501]Romans 8:2-3, 10:3-4, — whereby he becomes "the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him," ^[5809]Hebrews 5:9. This law of life and obedience he writes by his Spirit in the hearts of his people, that they may be "willing in the day of his power," ^[1910]Psalm 110:3, ^[4703]2 Corinthians 3:3, 6, ^[5810]Hebrews 8:10; not at once and in the foundation of his work actually, but only in the causes of it. For as the law of nature should have been implanted in the hearts of men in their conception and natural nativity, had that dispensation of righteousness continued, so in the new birth of them that believe in him is this law written in their hearts in all generations, ^[4006]John 3:6. Hereon was the covenant established and all the promises thereof, of which he was the mediator, ^[5806]Hebrews 8:6. And for a holy day of rest, for the ends before declared, and on the suppositions before laid down evincing the necessity of such a day, he determined the observation of the first day of the week; for, —

9. First, on this day he rested from his works, *in and by his resurrection;* for then had he laid the foundation of the new heavens and new earth, and finished the works of the new creation, "when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." On this day he rested from his works, and was refreshed, as God did and was from his. For although he "worketh hitherto," in the communication of his Spirit and

graces, as the Father continued to do in his works of providence, after the finishing of the works of the old creation, though these works belonged thereunto, yet he ceased absolutely from that kind of work whereby he laid the foundation of the new creation. Henceforth he dieth no more. And on this day was he refreshed in the view of his work; for he saw that it was exceeding good. Now, as God's rest, and his being refreshed in his work, on the seventh day of old, was a sufficient indication of the precise day of rest which he would have observed under the administration of that original law and covenant, so the rest of our Lord Jesus Christ, and his being refreshed in and from his works, on the first day, is a sufficient indication of the precise day of rest to be observed under the dispensation of the new covenant, now confirmed and established.

And the church of Christ could not pass one week under the new testament, or in a gospel state of worship, without this indication; for the Judaical Sabbath, as sure as it was so, and as sure as it was annexed unto the Mosaical administration of the covenant, was so far abolished as not really to oblige the disciples of Christ in conscience unto the observation of it, whatever any of them might for a season apprehend. And if a new day was not now determined, there was no day or season appointed for the observance of a holy rest unto the Lord, nor any pledge given us of our entering into the rest of Christ. And those who say that it is required that some time be set apart unto the ends of a sabbatical rest, but that there is no divine indication of that time, when nor what it is or shall be, if we consider what are the ends of such a rest, as before declared, must allow us to expect firmer proofs of their uncouth assertion than any as yet we have met withal.

10. Accordingly: this indication of the gospel day of rest and worship was embraced by the apostles, who were to be as the chief cornerstones, the foundation of the Christian church; for immediately hereon they assembled themselves on that day, and were confirmed in their obedience by the grace of our Lord, in meeting with them thereon, [809]John 20:19, 26. And it seems that on this day only he appeared unto them when they were assembled together, although occasionally he showed himself to sundry of them at other seasons Hence he left Thomas under his doubts a whole week before he gave him his gracious conviction, that he might do it in the assembly of his disciples on the first day of the week; from which time forward this

day was never without its solemn assemblies, as shall further be cleared afterwards.

11. Now, because I am persuaded that the substance of all that we have laid down and pleaded for in all the preceding discourses, especially in what we have proposed concerning the foundation and causes of the Lord's day, is taught by the apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. 4, I shall present unto the reader the sum of his design and scope in that place, from verse 3 to verse 10, with an application of it unto our present purpose, referring him yet, for further satisfaction, unto our full exposition of the chapter itself; for this place is touched on by all who have contended about the original and duration of the sabbatical rest, but has not yet, that I know of, been diligently examined by any. I shall not fear to lay much of the weight of the cause wherein I am engaged upon it, and therefore shall take a view of the whole context and the design of the apostle therein.

12. The words of the apostle are: "For we which have believed do enter into rest, as he said, As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest: although the works were finished from the foundation of the world. For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works. And in this place again, If they shall enter into my rest. Seeing therefore it remaineth that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached entered not in because of unbelief: (again, he limiteth a certain day, saying in David, Today, after so long a time; as it is said, Today if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts. For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day. There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his,") [HOD]Hebrews 4:3-10.

13. The design of the apostle in this discourse, is to confirm what he had laid down and positively asserted in the beginning of the chapter. Now this is, that there is yet, under the gospel, a promise of entering into the rest of God left or remaining unto believers; and that they do enter into that rest by mixing the promise of it with faith. This he declares; and the declaration of it was useful unto, and necessary for the Hebrews. For he lets them know, that notwithstanding their present and ancient enjoyment

of the land of Canaan, with the worship and rest of God therein, which their forefathers fell short of by their unbelief, they were under a new trial, a new rest being proposed unto them in the promise. This he proves by a testimony out of the 95th Psalm, the words whereof he had insisted on at large chap. 3, and does so again in this. But the application of that testimony unto his purpose is obnoxious to a great objection; for the rest mentioned in that psalm seems to be a rest long since past and enjoyed, either by themselves or others. They, therefore, could have no new or fresh concernment in it, nor be in danger of coming short of it. And if this were so, all the arguments and exhortations of the apostle in this place must needs be weak and incogent, as drawn from a mistaken and misapplied testimony.

14. To remove this objection, and thereby confirm his former assertions and exhortations thereon, is the design of the apostle in this discourse.

To this end he proceeds unto the exposition and vindication of the testimony itself which he had cited out of the Psalms. And herein he shows, from the proper signification of the words, from the time when they were spoken, and the persons to whom, that no other rest was intended in them but what was now by him proposed unto them as the rest of God and his people in the gospel.

The general argument which to this purpose he insists upon, consists in an enumeration of all the several rests of God and his people which are mentioned in the Scriptures; for from the consideration of them all he proves that no other rest could be intended in the words of David but only the rest of the gospel, whereinto they enter who do believe.

Moreover, from that respect which the words of the psalmist have unto the other foregoing rests of God and his people, he manifests that they also were appointed of God to be representations of that spiritual rest which was now brought in and established. This is the general design of this discourse.

In pursuit hereof he declares in particular, —

(1.) That the rest mentioned in the psalm is not that which ensued immediately on the creation of all things. This he evinceth, because it was

spoken of afterwards, a long time after, and that to another purpose, [3004]Hebrews 4:4-5.

(2.) That it was not the rest of the land of Canaan, because that was not entered into by them unto whom it was first proposed and promised, for they came short of it by their unbelief, and perished in the wilderness; but this rest, which is now afresh proposed, is such as the people of God must and will enter into, verses 6, 7.

(3.) Whereas it may be objected, that although the wilderness generation entered not in, yet their posterity did so, under the conduct of Joshua, verse 8; he answers, that this rest in the psalm being proposed and promised in David so long a time (above four hundred years) after the people had quietly possessed the land whereinto they were conducted by Joshua, it must needs be that another rest, then yet to come, was intended in those words of the psalmist, verse 9. And,

(4.) to conclude his argument, he declareth that this new rest had a new, peculiar foundation, which the other had no interest or concernment in, — namely, his ceasing from his works and entering into his rest who is the author of it, verse 10. This is his way and manner of arguing for the proof of what he had before laid down, and which he issueth in that conclusion, verse 9, "There remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God."

15. But we must yet further consider the nature of the several rests here discoursed of by the apostle, which will give light and confirmation unto what we have before discoursed. To this purpose will the ensuing propositions, taken from the words, conduce; as,—

(1.) The *rest of God* is the foundation and principal cause of our rest. Hence in general it is still called "God's rest:" "If they shall enter into my rest." It is, on some account or other, God's rest before it is ours; not the rest only which he hath appointed, commanded, and promised unto us, but the rest wherewith himself rested, as is plainly declared on every head of the rests here treated of. And this confirms that foundation and reason of a sabbatical rest which we have laid down in our third Exercitation.

(2.) God's rest is not spoken of absolutely with respect unto himself only, but with reference unto an *appointed rest* that ensued thereon, for the church to rest with him in. Hence it follows that the rests here mentioned

are as it were double, — namely, the rest of God himself, and the rest that ensued thereon for us to enter into. For instance, at the finishing of the works of creation, which is first proposed, God ceased from his works, and rested. This was his own rest, the nature whereof hath been before declared. “He rested on the seventh day.” But this was not all: “he blessed it” for the rest of man, a rest for us ensuing on his rest, — an expressive representation of it, and a pledge of our entering into, or being taken into a participation of the rest of God.

(3.) The apostle proposeth the threefold state of the church unto consideration: —

[1.] The state of it under the *law of nature* or creation;

[2.] The state of it under the *law of institutions* and carnal ordinances;

[3.] That then introducing under the gospel. Accordingly have we distinguished our discourses concerning a sabbatical rest, in our third, and fourth, and this present Exercitation. To each of these he assigns a distinct rest of God, a rest of the church, entering into God’s rest, and a day of rest, as the means and pledge thereof. And withal he manifests that the two former were ordered to be previous representations of the latter, though not equally nor on the same account.

16. FIRST, He considers the church and the state of it under *the law of nature*, before the entrance of sin. And herein he shows first that there was a rest of God in it; for saith he, “The works were finished from the foundation of the world .... And God did rest the seventh day from all his works,” verses 3, 4. As the foundation of all, he layeth down first the works of God; for the church, and every peculiar state of the church, is founded in the work, some especial work of God, and not merely in a law or command. “The works,” saith he, “were finished from the foundation of the world.” Τὰ ἔργα, “the works,” מַעֲשֵׂה, “the work,” that is, of God, the effect of his creating power, “was finished,” or completed, ἀπὸ καταζολῆς κόσμου, “from the foundation of the world;” a periphrasis for the six original days, wherein time and all things measured by it and existent with it had their beginning. This work of God, as has been proved, Exerc. 3, was the foundation of the church in the state of nature, and gave unto it the entire law of its obedience.

On this work and the completing of it ensued the rest of God himself: Verse 4, “God did rest the seventh day from all his works.” This rest of God, and the refreshment he took in his works, as comprising the law and covenant of our obedience, have been explained already.

But this alone does not confirm, nor indeed come near, the purpose or argument of the apostle: for he is to speak of such a rest of God as men might enter into, as was a foundation of rest unto them, or otherwise his discourse is not concerned in it; whereupon, by a citation of the words of Moses from Genesis 2:2, he tells us that this rest of God was on the seventh day, which God accordingly blessed and sanctified to be a day of rest unto man. So that in this state of the church there were three things considerable : —

(1.) The rest of God himself in his works, wherein the foundation of the church was laid;

(2.) A rest proposed unto man to enter into with God, wherein lay the duty of the church; and,

(3.) A day of rest, the seventh day, as a remembrance of the one and a means and pledge of the other. And herewith we principally confirm our judgment on the Sabbath’s beginning with the world; for without this supposition the mentioning of God’s work and his rest no way belonged to the purpose of our apostle. For he discourseth only of such rests as men might enter into and have a pledge of; and there was no such thing from the foundation of the world, unless the Sabbath was then revealed. Nor is it absolutely the work and rest of God, but the obedience of men and their duty with respect unto them, which he considers; and this could not. be, unless the rest of God was proposed unto men to enter into from the foundation of the world.

17. SECONDLY, The apostle considers the church under the law of institutions; and herein he presenteth the rest of the land of Canaan, wherein also the three distinct rests before mentioned do occur : —

(1.) There was in it a rest of God. This gives denomination to the whole. He still calls it his rest: “If they shall enter into my rest.” And the prayer about it was, “Arise, O LORD, into thy rest, thou and the ark of thy strength,” or the pledge of his presence and power. And this rest also

ensued upon his work; for God wrought about it works great and mighty, and only ceased from them when they were finished. And this work of his answered in its greatness unto the work of creation, whereunto it is compared by himself: <25515>Isaiah 51:15, 16,

> "I am the LORD thy God, that divided the sea, whose waves roared: The LORD of hosts is his name. And I have put my words in thy mouth, and I have covered thee in the shadow of mine hand, that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Zion, Thou art my people."

The dividing of the sea, whose waves roared, is put by a synecdoche for the whole work of God in preparing a way for the church-state of that people in the land of Canaan. And this he compares to the work of creation, in planting the heavens, and laying the foundations of the earth; for although these words are but a metaphorical expression of the political and church state of that people, yet there is an evident allusion in them unto the original creation of all things. This was the work of God, upon the finishing whereof he entered into his rest, in the satisfaction and complacency that he had therein; for after the erection of his worship in the land of Canaan, he says of it, "This is my rest, and here will I dwell."

God being thus entered into his rest, in like manner as formerly two things ensue thereon: —

(2.) That the people are invited and encouraged to enter into the rest of God. This the apostle treats concerning in this and the foregoing chapter. And this their entrance into rest, was their coming by faith and obedience into a participation of the worship of God wherein he rested, as a means and pledge of their everlasting rest in him. And although some of them came short hereof, by reason of their unbelief, yet others entered into it under the conduct of Joshua.

(3.) Both these, his own rest and the rest of the people, God expressed by appointing a day of rest. This he did, that it might be a token, sign, and pledge, not now, as given to this people absolutely, of his first rest at the creation, but of his present rest in his instituted worship, and to be a means, in the solemn observation of that worship, to further their entrance into his rest eternally. Hence had the seventh day a peculiar institution

among that people, whereby it was made to them a sign and token that he was their God, and that they were his people. And here lies the foundation of all that we have before discoursed concerning the Judaical Sabbath in our fourth Exercitation.

It is true, this day was the same in order of the days with that before observed, namely, the seventh day of the week; but it was now re-established upon new considerations, and unto new ends and purposes. The time of the change of the day was not yet come; for this work was but preparatory for a greater. And the covenant whereunto the seventh day was originally annexed being not yet to be abolished, that day was not to be yet changed, nor another to be substituted in the room of it. Hence this day came now to fall under a double consideration, — first, As it was such a *proportion of time* as was requisite unto the worship of God, and appointed as a pledge of his rest in his covenant; secondly, As it received a new institution, with superadded ends and significations, as a *token and pledge of God's rest* in the law of institutions, and the worship erected therein.

So both these states of the church had these three things distinctly; — a rest of God in his works, for their foundation; a rest in obedience and worship, for man to enter into; and a day of rest, as a pledge and token of both the others.

18. THIRDLY, The apostle proves, from the words of the psalmist, that there was yet to be a third state of the church, an especial state under the Messiah, which he now proposed unto the Hebrews, and exhorted them to enter into. And in this church-state there is to be also a peculiar state of rest, distinct from them which went before. To the constitution hereof there are three things required :— First, That there be some signal *work of God* completed and finished, whereon he enters into his rest. This was to be the foundation of the whole new church-state, and of the rest to be obtained therein. Secondly, That there be a *spiritual rest* ensuing thereon and arising thence, for them that believe to enter into. Thirdly, That there be a new or renewed *day of rest,* to express that rest of God, and to be a pledge of our entering into it. If any of these, or either of them, be wanting, the whole structure of the apostle's discourse will be dissolved, neither

will there be any color remaining for his mentioning the seventh day and the rest thereof. These things, therefore, we must further inquire into.

19. First, the apostle showeth that there was a great work of God, and that finished, for the foundation of the whole. This he had made way for, chap. 3:4-5, where he both expressly asserts the Son to be God, and shows the analogy that is between the creation of all things and the building of the church, — that is, the works of the old and new creation. As, then, God wrought in the creation of all, so Christ, who is God, wrought in the setting up of this new church-state. And upon his finishing of it he entered into his rest, as God did into his, whereby he limited a certain day of rest unto his people. So he speaks, "There remaineth therefore a sabbatism for the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest, he also has ceased from his works, as God did from his own." A new day of rest, accommodated unto this new church-state, arises from the rest that the Lord Christ entered into upon his ceasing from his works. And as to this day, we may observe, —

(1.) That it has this in common with the former days, that it is a sabbatism, or *one day in seven*, which that name in the whole Scripture use is limited unto; for this portion of time to be dedicated unto sacred rest, having its foundation in the light and law of nature, was equally to be observed in every state of the church.

(2.) That although both the former states of the church had *one and the same day*, though varied in some ends of it, now the day itself is changed, as belonging to another covenant, and having its foundation in a work of another nature than what they had respect unto.

(3.) That the observation of it is suited unto the *spiritual state* of the church under the gospel, delivered from the bondage frame of spirit wherewith it was observed under the law. And these things must be further confirmed from the context.

20. The foundation of the whole is laid down, verse 10, "For he that has entered into his rest, is ceased from his works, as God from his own." Expositors generally apply these words unto believers, and their entering into the rest of God; whether satisfactorily to themselves and others, as to their design, coherence, scope, or signification of particular expressions, I

know not. The contrary appears with good evidence to me; for what are the works that believers should be said here to rest from? Their sins, say some; their labors, sorrows, and sufferings, say others. But how can they be said to rest from these works as God rested from his own? for God so rested from his as to take the greatest delight and satisfaction in them, — to be "refreshed" by them:

> "In six days the LORD made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed," <02317>Exodus 31:17.

He so rested from them as that he rested in them and blessed them, and blessed and sanctified the time wherein they were finished. We have showed before that the rest of God was not only a cessation from working, nor principally so, but the satisfaction and complacency that he had in his works. But now if those mentioned be the works here intended, men cannot so rest from them as God did from his; but they cease from them with a detestation of them so far as they are sinful, and joy for their deliverance from them so far as they are sorrowful. This is not to rest as God rested. Again; when are believers supposed to rest from these works? It cannot be in this world: for here we rest not at all from temptations, sufferings, and sorrows; and in that mortification of sin which we attain unto, yet the conflict is still continued, and that with severity, unto death, <450724>Romans 7:24. It must therefore be in heaven that they thus rest; and so it is affirmed accordingly. But this excludes the rest in and of the gospel from the apostle's discourse, which renders it altogether unsuitable to his purpose. This I have so fully demonstrated in the exposition of the chapter, as that I hope it will not be gainsaid. Thirdly, There is no comparison in the whole discourse between the *works of God* and the *works of men,* but between the works of God in the creation and under the law on the one side, and those in and under the gospel on the other; and the whole comparison is summed up and closed in this verse.

21. It appears, therefore, that the subject of the apostle's proposition in this place hath been mistaken. It is another who is intended, even Christ himself, the Son of God, and his rest from his works, which is here compared with the rest of God from his at the foundation of the world, to which end alone the mention of them was introduced, <580403>Hebrews 4:3-4; for, —

(1.) The conjunction γὰρ, "for," whereby he brings in his assertion, manifests that the apostle in these words gives an account whence it is that there is a new sabbatism remaining for the people of God: "There remaineth a Sabbath-keeping for the people of God; for he that is entered into his rest is ceased from his works." Had there not been a work laying the foundation of the gospel church-state, and a rest of God in it and ensuing thereon, there could have been no such sabbatism for believers, for these things are required unto a Sabbath. He had proved before that there could be no such rest but what was founded in the works of God, and his rest that ensued thereon; such a foundation, therefore, he saith, this new rest must have, and it has it. This must be, and is, in the works and rest of him by whom the church was built; that is Christ, who is God, as it is expressly argued, chap. 3:3-4. For as that rest which all the world was to observe was founded in his works and rest who made the world and all things in it, so the rest of the church under the gospel is to be founded in his works and rest by whom the church was built, — that is Jesus Christ; for he, on the account of his works and rest, is also "Lord of the Sabbath," to abrogate one day of rest,, and to institute another.

(2.) The apostle here changeth the manner of his expression from the plural absolutely, "We who believe," or virtually in the name of a multitude, "The people of God," into that which is absolutely singular, ὁ εἰσελθὼν, "He that is entered." A single person is here expressed, with respect unto whom the things mentioned are asserted; and of this change of phrase there can be no other reason given.

(3.) The rest which this person is said to enter into is called *"his rest"* absolutely. As God, speaking of the former rest, calls it "My rest," so this is the "My rest" of another, — namely, the rest of Christ: whereas when the entering of believers into rest is spoken of, it is called either God's rest, "They shall enter into my rest," or rest absolutely, "We that believe do enter into rest," but not their rest, or our rest; for it is not our own absolutely, but God's rest whereinto we enter and wherein we rest. But the rest here is the rest of him whose it is, and who is the author of ours

(4.) There is a direct parallel in the words between the works of the old creation and those of the new, which are compared by the apostle; for, —

[1.] There are the *authors* of them; which on the one side is said to be God, "As God did from his own," — that is, God the Creator, or God as Creator; on the other, "He," αὐτὸς, the same with οὗτος, chap. 3:3, — that is, he of whom we speak, as the apostle declares himself, chap. 4:13, for in these words a transition is made unto his treating of the person of Christ.

[2.] The *works* of the one and the other are expressed. The works of the Creator are ἴδια ἔργα, "his proper works," "his own works," — the works of the old creation, ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων ὁ Θεὸς. And there are the works of him of whom he speaks, τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, "his works," those which he wrought in like manner as God did his own at the beginning; that is, the work of building the church: for these works must answer each other, and have the same respect unto their authors. They must be good and complete in their kind, and such as rest and refreshment may be taken in and on them. To compare the sins and sufferings of men with the works of God, our apostle did not intend.

[3.] There is the *rest* of the one and the other; and these also have their mutual proportion. Now, God rested from his own works of creation, —

1st. By ceasing from creating, only continuing all things by his power in their order, and propagating them unto his glory.

2dly. By his respect unto them and refreshment in them, as those which expressed his excellencies and set forth his praise, and so satisfied his glorious design. So also must he rest who is spoken of.

> **1st**. He must cease from working in the like kind of works. He must suffer no more, die no more, but only continue the work of his grace and power in the preservation of the new creature, and the orderly increase and propagation of it by his Spirit.
>
> **2dly**. He takes delight and satisfaction in the works that he hath wrought; for he sees of the travail of his soul, and is satisfied, and is in the possession of that glory which was set before him while he was engaged in this work.

And these things sufficiently clear the subject here spoken of, namely, that it is Jesus Christ, the mediator.

22. The works that the rest mentioned respects have been sufficiently intimated, and I have so fully insisted on them in the exposition of the third and fourth verses of the third chapter of this Epistle, that I shall not here again repeat them. In brief, all that he did and suffered, in and from his incarnation to his resurrection, as the mediator of the covenant, with all the fruits, effects, and consequences of what he so did and suffered, whereby the church was built and the new creation finished, belongs unto these works, His rest that ensued on these works has two parts; —

(1.) A *cessation* from his works, which was eminent, and answered God's rest from his own;

(2.) *Satisfaction* in his works, and the glorious product of them, as those which had an impression on them of his love and grace, <19167>Psalm 16:7.

23. It remains only that we inquire into his entrance into his rest, both how and when he did so, even as God entered into his on the seventh day; for this must limit and determine a day of rest to the gospel church. Now, this was not his lying down in the grave. His body, indeed, there rested for a while, but that was no part of his mediatory rest, as he was the founder and builder of the church: for, —

(1.) It was a part of his *humiliation.* Not only his death, but his abode and continuance in the state of death, was so, and that a principal part of it; for after the whole human nature was personally united unto the Son of God, to have it brought into a state of dissolution, to have the body and soul separated from each other, was a great humiliation. And every thing of this nature belonged unto his works, and not his rest.

(2.) This separation of body and soul under the power of death was *penal,* a part of the sentence of the law which he underwent; and therefore Peter declares that the pains of death were not loosed but in his resurrection: <441024>Acts 2:24, "Whom God," saith he, "hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." While he was held of it, he was under it penally. This, therefore, could not be his rest, nor any part of it; nor did he in it enter into his rest, but continued in his work. Nor, secondly, did he first enter into his rest at his ascension. Then, indeed, he took actual possession of his glory, as to the full, public manifestation of it. But to enter into rest is one thing, and to

take possession of glory another; and it is placed by our apostle as a consequent of his being "justified in the Spirit" when he entered into rest, I Timothy 3:16. But this his entrance into rest was in, by, and at his resurrection from the dead; for, —

(1.) Then and therein was he freed from the sentence, power, and stroke of the law, being discharged of all the debts of our sins, which he had undertaken to make satisfaction for, ◂4102424Acts 2:24.

(2.) Then and therein were all types, all predictions and prophecies fulfilled, which concern the work of our redemption.

(3.) Then, therefore, his work was done, — I mean that which answereth God's creating work; though he still continues that which answers his work of preservation. Then was the law fulfilled and satisfied, Satan subdued, peace with God made, the price of our redemption paid, the promise of the Spirit received, and the whole foundation of the church of God gloriously laid on his person, in his works and rest.

(4.) Then and therein was he "declared to be the Son of God with power," ◂4501004Romans 1:4; God manifesting unto all that this was he concerning and unto whom he said, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," ◂4413333Acts 13:33.

24. Thus did the author of the new creation, the Son of God, the builder of the church, having finished his works, enter into his rest. And this was, as all know, on the *morning of the first day of the week.* And hereby did he limit and determine the day for a sacred sabbatical rest under the new testament; for now was the old covenant utterly abolished, and therefore the day which was the pledge of God and man's rest therein was to be taken away, and was so accordingly, as we have showed. As the rest from the beginning of the world had its foundation from the works of God, and his rest which ensued thereon, which was determined unto the seventh day, because that was the day wherein God ceased from those works, which day was continued under the *legal administration* of the covenant by Moses; so the rest of the Lord Christ, the Son of God, is the foundation of our rest; which, changing the old covenant and the day annexed unto it, he hath limited unto the first day of the week, whereon he ceased from his works and entered into his rest. And hereby the apostle

completes the due analogy that is between the several rests of God and his people, which he hath discoursed of in this chapter. For as in the beginning of the world, there was, first, the work of God and his rest thereon; which made way unto a rest for his people in himself and in his worship, by the contemplation of his works that he had made, on whose finishing he rested; and a day designed, determined, blessed, and sanctified, to express that rest of God, — whence mention is made of those works in the command for the observation of that day, seeing the worship of God in and on it consisted principally in the glorifying of him by and for those works of his, as also to be a means to further men in their entrance into eternal rest, whereunto all these things do tend: and as at the giving of the law there was a great work of God, and his rest thereon, in his establishing his worship in the land of Canaan; which made way for the people's entering into his rest in that worship and country; who had a day of rest enjoined unto them, to express the one and the other, as also to help them to enter finally into the rest of God: so now, under the gospel, there is a rest answering all these, in and by the instances which we have given.

25. And this is that which the apostle affirms, as the substance of all which he has evinced, namely, that there is a sabbatism for the people of God, Hebrews 4:9, σαββατισμός. The word is framed by our apostle from a Hebrew original, with a Greek termination. And he uses it as that which is comprehensive of his whole sense, which no other word could be; for he would show that there is a sabbatical rest, founded in the rest of God, remaining for the church, and therefore makes use of that word whereby God expressed his own rest when he sanctified the seventh day for a day of rest thereon. That day of rest being removed, and another on a new foundation, namely, the rest of Christ upon his works, introduced, he calls it a "sabbatism," or a "sabbath-keeping." He does not do this only and separately, averring the necessity of a Sabbath observation in the first place, distinctly from a spiritual rest in Christ, with an eternal rest ensuing thereon, but in the manner and order before laid down, wherein the necessity of such a day is included. And besides the evidence that ariseth from the consideration of the whole context, there are two things which make it undeniably evident that our apostle asserts an evangelical Sabbath, or day of rest, to be constantly observed in and for the worship of God under the gospel. For, first, without this design there can be no tolerable

reason assigned why he should mention the works of God from the foundation of the world, with his rest that ensued thereon, and refer us to the seventh day, which, without respect unto another day to be introduced, doth greatly involve his whole discourse. Again, his use of this word, σαββατισμός, "a sabbatism," — which is framed, and as it were coined on purpose, that it might both comprise the *spiritual rest* aimed at, and also a *sabbath-keeping,* or observation of a sabbath rest, — manifests his purpose. When he speaks of our rest in general, he still does it by σαββατισμός, adding that there was an especial day for its enjoyment. Here he introduces σαββατισμός, "a sabbatism;" which his way of arguing would not have allowed had he not designed to express the Christian Sabbath. Add hereunto that he subjoins the especial reason of such a day's observation in the next verse, as we have declared. And here do we fix the foundation and reason of the Lord's day, or the holy observation of the first day of the week, the obligation of the fourth commandment unto a weekly sacred rest being put off from the seventh day to the first, on the same ground and reason whereon the state of the church is altered from what it was under the law unto what it is now under the gospel. And the covenant itself also is changed; whence the seventh day is now of no more force than the old covenant and the old law of institutions contained in ordinances, because the Lord Christ hath ceased from his works and entered into his rest on the first day.

26. Here we have fixed the foundation of the observation of the Lord's day, on the supposition of what has been proved concerning our duty in the holy observance of one day in seven from the law of our creation, as renewed in the decalogue. The remaining arguments, evincing the change of the day from the seventh unto the first by divine authority, shall be but briefly touched on by me, because they have been lately copiously handled and fully vindicated by others. Wherefore, first, when the Lord Christ intended conspicuously to *build his church* upon the foundation of his works and rest, by sending the Holy Ghost with his miraculous gifts upon the apostles, he did it on *this day,* which was then among the Jews the feast of Pentecost or of weeks. Then were the disciples gathered together "with one accord," in the observance of the day signalized to them by his resurrection, ⁴⁰Acts 2:1. And by this does their obedience receive a blessed confirmation, as well as their persons a glorious

endowment, with abilities for the work which they were immediately to apply themselves unto. And hereon did they set out unto the whole work of building the church on that foundation, and promoting the worship of it, which on that day was especially to be celebrated.

27. The *practice of the apostles and the apostolical churches* owned the authority of Christ in this change of the day of sacred rest; for henceforward, whatever apprehensions any of them might have of the continuance of the Judaical Sabbath, as some of them judged that the whole service of it was still to be continued, yet they observed this day of the Lord as the time of their assemblies and solemn worship. One or two instances hereof may be called over: ◂4206Acts 20:6-7,

> "We came to Troas in five days; where we abode seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight."

I doubt not but in the seven days that the apostle abode there, he taught and preached as he had occasion in the houses of the believers; but it was the first day of the week when they used, according to their duty, to assemble the whole body of them for the celebration of the solemn ordinances of the church, synecdochically expressed by breaking of bread. This they did without an extraordinary warning or calling together; for in answer to their duty they were accustomed so to do. Such is the account that Justin Martyr gives of the practice of all churches in the next age: Τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται. "On the day called Sunday, there is an assembly of all Christians, whether living in the city or country." And because of their constant breaking of bread on this day, it was called "dies panis," August. Epist. cxviii. And Athanasius proved that he brake not a chalice at such a time, because it was not the first day of the week, when it was to be used, Socrat. lib. 5:cap. 22: And whosoever reads this passage without prejudice will grant that it is a marvelously abrupt and uncouth expression, if it do not signify that which was in common observance amongst all the disciples of Christ; which could have no other foundation but only that before laid down, of the authority of the Lord Christ requiring it of them. And I doubt not but that Paul preached his

farewell sermon unto them, which continued until midnight, after all the ordinary service of the church was performed. And all the objections which I have met withal against this instance amount to no more but this, that although the Scripture says that the disciples met for their worship on the first day of the week, yet indeed they did not so do.

In 1 Corinthians 16:2 the same practice is exemplified: "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God has prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." The constant day of the churches' solemn assemblies being fixed he here takes it for granted, and directs them unto the observance of an especial duty on that day. What some except, that here is no mention of any such assembly, but only that every one on that day should lay by himself what he would give, which every one might do at home or where they pleased, is exceeding weak, and unsuitable unto the mind of the apostle; for to what end should they be limited unto a day, and that the first day of the week, for the doing of that which might be as well, to as good purpose and advantage, performed at any other time, on any other day of the week whatever? Besides, it was to be such a laying aside, such a treasuring of it in a common stock, as that there should be no need of any collection when the apostle came. But if this was done only privately, it would not of itself come together at his advent, but must be collected. But all exceptions against these testimonies have been so lately removed by others, that I shall not insist further on them.

28. That from those times downwards the first day of the week had a solemn observation in all the churches of Christ, whereby they owned its substitution in the room of the seventh, day, applying the duties and services of the Sabbath unto it, hath also been demonstrated. And that this was owned from the authority of the Lord, is declared by John in the Revelation, who calls it "The Lord's day," Revelation 1:10; whereby he did not surprise the churches with a new name, but denoted to them the time of his visions by the name of the day, which was well known unto them. And there is no solid reason why it should be so called, but that it owes its pre-eminence and observation unto his institution and authority. And no man who shall deny these things can give any tolerable account how, when, or from whence, this day came to be so observed and so called. It is ἡμέρα κυριακή, "the Lord's day," "the day of the Lord," as

the holy supper is δεῖπνον κυριακόν, 461120 1 Corinthians 11:20, "the Lord's supper," by reason of his institution, יוֹם יְהוָה, "the day of the LORD," in the Old Testament, which the LXX. render ἡμέρα Κυρίου, nowhere ἡμέρα κυριακή, signifies indeed some illustrious appearance of God, in a way of judgment or mercy. And so also in the person of Christ, this was the day of his appearance, 411609 Mark 16:9. So was it still called by the ancient writers of the church, Ignatius in Epist. ad Trall., ad Magnes., etc.; Dionysius of Corinth. Epist. ad Romans in Euseb. Hist. lib. 4:cap. xxi.; Theophilus Antioch. lib. 1:in 4:Evangel.; Clemens Alex., Stromat. lib. 7:cap. vii.; Origen, lib. 8:con. Cels.; Tertul. de Coron. Milit. cap. iii. As for those who assign the institution of this day to the apostles, although the supposition be false, yet it weakens not the *divine original* of it; for an obligation lying on all believers to observe a Sabbath unto the Lord, and the day observed under the law of Moses being removed, it is not to be imagined that the apostles fixed on another day without immediate direction from the Lord Christ; for indeed they delivered nothing to be constantly observed in the worship of God but what they had his authority for, 461123 1 Corinthians 11:23. In all things of this nature, as they had the infallible guidance of the Holy Ghost, so they acted immediately in the name and authority of Christ, where what they ordained was no less of *divine institution* than if it had been appointed by Christ in his own person. It is true, they themselves did for a season, while their ministry was to have a peculiar regard to the Jews, for the calling and conversion of the remnant that was amongst them according to the election of grace, go frequently into their synagogues on the seventh day to preach the gospel, 441314 Acts 13:14, 16:13, 17:2, 18:4; but it is evident that they did so only to take the opportunity of their assemblies, that they might preach unto the greater numbers of them, and that at such a season wherein they were prepared to attend unto sacred things. Upon the same ground Paul labored if it were possible to be at Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost, 442016 Acts 20:16. But that they at any time assembled the disciples of Christ on that day for the worship of God, that we read not.

29. We may now look back, and take a view of what we have passed through. That *one day in seven* is, by virtue of a divine law, to be observed holy unto the Lord, the original of such an observation, 010202 Genesis 2:2, the letter of the fourth commandment, with the nature of the covenant

between God and man, do prove and evince. And hereunto is there a considerable suffrage given by learned men of all parties. The doctrine of the reformed divines hereabout hath been largely represented by others. They also of the church of Rome, that is many of them, agree herein. It is asserted in the canon law itself, Tit. de Feriis, cap. Licet., where the words of Alexander the Third are, "Tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti pagina sep-timum diem ad humanam quietem specialiter deputavit;" where by "septimus dies" he understands one day in seven, as Suarez showeth, de Relig., lib. 2:cap. 2. And it is so by sundry canonists, reckoned up by Covarruvias. The schoolmen also give in their consent, as Bannes in 2a 2ae, g. 44, a.1. Bellarmine contends expressly, de Cult. Sanct., lib. in. cap. xi., that "Jus divinum requirebat ut unus dies hebdomadae dicaretur cultui divino." So doth Suarez, de Dieb. Sac., cap. i., and others might be added. We have the like common consent, that whatever, in the institution and observation of the Sabbath under the old testament, was peculiar unto that state of the church, either in its own nature or in its use and signification, or in its manner of observance, is taken away, by virtue of those rules, Romans 14:5; Galatians 4:10; Colossians 2:16-17. Nor can it be denied but that sundry things annexed unto the sabbatical rest, peculiar to that church-state which was to be removed, were wholly inconsistent with the spirit, grace, and liberty of the gospel I have also proved that the observation of the *seventh day precisely* was a pledge of God's rest in the covenant of works, and of our rest in him and with him thereby; so that it cannot be retained without a re-introduction of that covenant and the righteousness thereof. And therefore, although the command for the observation of a Sabbath to the Lord, so far as it is moral, is put over into the rule of the new covenant, wherein grace is administered for the duty it requires, yet take the *seventh day precisely as the seventh day*, and it is an old testament arbitrary institution, which falls under no promise of spiritual assistance in or unto the observation of it Under the new testament we have found a new creation, a new law of creation, a new covenant: the rest of Christ in that work, law, and covenant: the limiting of a day of rest unto us, on the day wherein he entered into his rest; a new name given unto this day, with respect unto his authority by whom it was appointed; and an observation of it by all the churches; so that we may say of it, "This is the day which the LORD hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it," as Psalm 118:24.

30. These foundations being laid, I shall yet, by some important considerations, if I mistake not, give some further evidence unto the necessity of the religious observation of *the first day of the week,* in opposition unto the *day of the law,* by some contended for. It is, therefore, first acknowledged, that the observation of some *certain day,* in and for the solemn public worship of God, is of indispensable necessity. They are beneath our consideration by whom this is denied. Most acknowledge it to be a dictate of the law of nature, and the nature of these things does require it. We have proved, also, that there is such a determination of this time unto *one day in seven,* as it must needs be the highest impudence in any person, persons, or churches, to attempt any alteration herein. And notwithstanding the pretences of some about their liberty, none yet have been so hardy, from the foundation of the world, as practically to determine a day for the worship of God in any other revolution of days or times, to the neglect and exclusion of one day in seven. Yea, the light hereof is such, and the use of it is so great, that those who have taken up with the worst of superstitions instead of religion, as the Mohammedans, yet, complying in general with the performance of a solemn worship to God, have found it necessary to fix on one certain day in the hebdomadal revolution for that purpose. And, indeed, partly from the appointment of God, partly from the nature of the thing itself, the religious observation of such a day is the great preservative of all solemn profession of religion in the world. This the law of nature, this the written word directs unto, and this experience makes manifest unto all. Take away from amongst men a conscience of observing *a fixed, stated day of sacred rest* to God, and for the celebration of his worship in assemblies, and all religion will quickly decay, if not come to nothing in this world. And it may be observed, though it be not evident whether it be the cause or the effect, that where and amongst whom religion flourishes in its power, there and amongst them is conscience the most exercised, and the most diligence used in the observation of such a day. I will not say absolutely whether it is religion or other principles that teach men exactness in the observation of this day; nor on the other hand, that a conscience made of this observation does procure a universal strictness in other duties of religion; but this is evident, that they are mutually helpful unto one another. And therefore, though some have labored to divest this observation of any *immediate divine authority,* yet they are forced to supply such a constitution for the

observation of one day in seven, as that they affirm that none can omit its observation without sin in ordinary cases. Whether they have done well to remove from it the command of God, and to substitute their own in the room of it, they may do well to consider.

31. Let, then, the state of things in reference unto the first day of the week, with the presence of God in, and his blessing upon, the worship of the church thereon, be considered. And this is a consideration, as I think, by no means to be despised. It is manifest to all unprejudiced persons, that the apostles and apostolical churches did religiously observe this day; and no man can with any modesty question the celebration of the worship of God therein in the next succeeding generations. In the possession of this practice are all the disciples of Christ at this day in the world, some very few only excepted, who sabbatize with the Jews, or please themselves with a vain pretense that every day is unto them a Sabbath. Nor is it simply the catholicism of this practice which I insist upon, though that be such, and hath such weight in things of this nature, as that for my part I shall not dissent from any practice that is so attested; but it is the blessing of God upon it, and the worship on this day performed, which is pleaded, as that which ought to be of a high esteem with all humble Christians. On this day, throughout all ages, has the edification of the churches been carried on, and that public revenue of glory been rendered unto God which is his due. On this day hath God given his presence unto all his solemn ordinances, for all the ends for which he hath appointed them: nor hath he, by any means, given the least intimation of his displeasure against his churches for their continuance in the observation of it. On the other side, not only have the wisest and holiest men, who have complained of the sins of their several times and ages wherein they lived, which procured the pouring out of the judgments of God upon them, constantly reckoned the *neglect and profanation of the Lord's day* among them, but such instances have been given of particular severities against them who have openly profaned this day, and that upon unquestionable testimonies, as may well affect the minds and consciences of those who profess a reverence of God in the holy dispensations of his providence.

Nor can any of these things be pleaded to give countenance unto any other day, that should be set up in competition with the Lord's day, or the first day of the week. What of this nature can be spoken concerning the seventh

day, now by some contended for, and that (which is grievous) by some persons holy and learned? Of what use has it ever been to the church of God, setting aside the occasional advantage taken from it by the apostles, of preaching the gospel in the synagogues of the Jews? What testimonies have we of the presence of God with any churches, in the administration of gospel ordinances and worship on that day? And if any lesser assemblies do at present pretend to give such a testimony, wherein is it to be compared with that of all the holy churches of Christ throughout the world in all ages, especially in those last past?

Let men in whose hearts are the ways of God seriously consider the use that hath been made, under the blessing of God, of the conscientious observation of the Lord's day, in the past and present ages, unto the promotion of holiness, righteousness, and religion universally, in the power of it; and if they are not under invincible prejudices, it will be very difficult for them to judge that it is a plant which our heavenly Father hath not planted. For my part, I must not only say, but plead while I live in this world, and leave this testimony to the present and future ages, if these papers see the light and do survive, that if I have ever seen anything in the ways and worship of God wherein the power of religion or godliness hath been expressed, anything that has represented the holiness of the gospel and the Author of it, anything that has looked like a preludium unto the everlasting sabbath and rest with God, which we aim through grace to come unto, it hath been there and with them where and amongst whom the Lord's day hath been had in highest esteem, and a strict observation of it attended unto, as an ordinance of our Lord Jesus Christ. The remembrance of their ministry, their walking and conversation, their faith and love, who in this nation have most zealously pleaded for, and have been, in their persons, families, and churches or parishes, the most strict observers of this day, will be precious with them that fear the Lord while the sun and moon endure. Their doctrine also in this matter, with the blessing that attended it, was that which multitudes now at rest do bless God for, and many that are yet alive do greatly rejoice in. Let these things be despised by those who are otherwise minded; to me they are of great weight and importance.

32. Let us now a little consider the day that by some is set up, not only in competition with this, but to its utter exclusion. This is the seventh day of

the week, or the *old Judaical Sabbath,* which some contend that we are perpetually obliged to the observation of, by virtue of the fourth commandment. The grounds whereon they proceed in their assertion have been already disproved, so far as the nature of our present undertaking will admit, and such evidences given unto the change of the day as will not easily be everted nor removed. The consequences of the observation of the seventh day, should the practice of it be resumed amongst Christians, is that which at present I shall a little inquire into, when we have summed up somewhat of what has been spoken: —

(1.) It was not directly nor absolutely required in the decalogue, but consequentially only, by way of appropriation to the Mosaical economy, whereunto it was then annexed. The command is to observe the Sabbath day, and the blessing is upon the Sabbath day. "The LORD blessed the Sabbath day." And the mention of the seventh day in the body of the command fixes the number of the days in whose revolution a sabbatical rest returns, but determines not an everlasting order in them, seeing the order relating to the old creation is inconsistent with the law, reason, and worship of the new. And if the seventh day and the Sabbath, as some pretend, are the same, the sense of the command in the enforcing part of it is, "But the seventh day is the seventh day of the LORD thy God," — which is none at all.

(2.) The state of the church and the administration of the covenant, whereunto the observation of this day was annexed, are removed; so that it cannot continue, no more than a house can stand without a foundation.

(3.) The Lord Christ, who is the "Lord of the Sabbath," and by assuming that title to himself manifested his authority as to the disposal of the day whereon a sabbatical rest was to be observed, has, in his own rest from his works, limited unto us another day of sacred rest, called, from his appointment of it, "The Lord's day," — his day who is the Lord of the Sabbath.

(4.) The day so introduced by his authority hath from the day of his rest been observed without interruption, or any such difference about it as fell out among the churches of God about other feast days, whose observation was introduced among them they knew not well how, as of the Pascha, and the like. And whereas the due observation of it has been enjoined by

councils, edicts of emperors, kings, and princes, laws of all sorts, advised and pressed by the ancient writers among Christians, and the practice of its observance taken notice of by all who from the beginning have committed the affairs of Christianity unto posterity, yet none of any sort pretend to give it any original, but all refer it unto Christ himself, mediately or immediately. The observation, then, of this day first, is an evident Judaizing, and a returnal unto those "rudiments of the world" which the apostle so severely cautioned us against. I know not how it is come to pass, but so it is fallen out, that the nearer Judaism is unto an absolute abolition and disappearance, the more some seem inclinable to its revival and continuance, or at least to fall back themselves into its antiquated observances. An end it had put to it morally and legally long ago, in the coming, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. And we may say of it what the apostle said of idols when the world was full of idolatry, "We know that Judaism is nothing in the world," — no such thing as by some it is esteemed. The actual abolition of it in the profession of the present Jews, by the removing of the veil from their hearts and eyes, and their turning unto God, we hope, is on its approach. And yet, as was said, there seems in many an inclination unto their rites and servile observances.

It is apparent in the Acts and Epistles of the apostles, especially that to the Hebrews, that at the first preaching of the gospel there were very many Jews who came over to the faith and profession of it. Many of these continued "zealous of the law," and would bring along with them all their Mosaical institutions, which they thought were to abide in force for ever. In this weakness and misapprehension they were forborne in the patience of God and wisdom of the Holy Ghost, guiding the apostles and disciples of Jesus Christ. In this state things continued unto the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, when the chiefest cause of their contests was taken away. In the meantime they carried themselves very variously, according to the various tempers of their minds; for it is apparent that some of them were not content themselves to be indulged in their opinions and practices, but they endeavored by all means to impose the observance of the whole Mosaical law on the churches of the Gentiles. Their circumcision, their sabbaths, their feasts and fasts, their abstinences from this or that kind of meats, they were contending about, and thereby

perverting the minds of the disciples. Some stop was put to the evil consequences hereof in the synod at Jerusalem, Acts 15; which yet determined nothing concerning the Jews' own practice, but only concerning the liberty of the Gentile believers. After the destruction of Jerusalem, city and temple, these professing Jews fell into several distinct ways. Some of them, who, as is probable, had despised the heavenly warning of leaving the place, took up their lot amongst their unbelieving brethren, relinquishing the profession of the gospel which they had made; not, it may be, with any express renunciation of Christ, but with a disregard of the gospel, which brought them not those good things they looked for: of which mind Josephus the historian seems to be one. These in time became a part of that apostate brood which have since continued in their enmity to the gospel, and into whose new and old superstitions they introduced sundry customs which they had learned among the Christians. Some absolutely relinquished their old Judaism, and completely incorporated with the new Gentile churches, unto whom the promise and covenant of Abraham was transferred and made over. These were the genuine disciples of our great apostle. Others continued their profession of the gospel, but yet still thought themselves obliged unto the observation of the law of Moses and all its institutions. Hereupon they continued in a distinct and separate state from the believers and churches of the Gentiles, and that for some ages, as some say to the days of Adrian. These, it may be, were they whom Eusebius out of Hegesippus calls Μασζωθαῖοι, "Masbothaei," whom he reckons as a sect of the Jews, Histor. lib. 4:22. The Jews call them משבותאי, — that is, "Sabbatarians;" which must be from some observation of the Sabbath in a distinct manner or for different reasons from themselves. Buxtorf and our late learned lexicographer [f11] render משבותאי, by "Sabbatarii," adding this explanation, "Qui secundum Christi doctrinam Sabbatum observabant," by a mistake; for as they are reckoned unto the Jews by Hegesippus, so those who followed the doctrine of Christ did not sabbatize with the Jews, nor were ever called Sabbatarians by them. There was, indeed, a sort of persons among the Samaritans who are called Sabuaei, whom Epiphanius makes the third sect of them; but these were so called without any respect unto a sabbatical observation. שבועאי the Jews call them, — that is, "Septenarii," from שבוע; unless we shall think, with Drusius, that they were so denominated

from Sebaia, who came along with Dosthai to settle the new inhabitants of Samaria. Epiphanius says no more of them but that they observed the feast of Pentecost in autumn, and the feast of Tabernacles in the spring, at the time of the Jews' Passover; but this gives no account why they should be so called. But perhaps they got this appellation from their observation of every day in the week between the Passover and the Pentecost, (that is for seven weeks, which began with the second day in the week of unleavened bread,) whereon the omer or sheaf of first-fruits was to be offered. But to return. After this many of them coalesced, and we hear no more of them. In the meantime, as there were great disputes and heats between the differing parties while the occasion of their difference continued, so the Gentile believers did in many things either condescend unto those of the Circumcision, or fell themselves in liking with their observances, and received them into practice. Hence it was that they embraced the paschal solemnity, with some other festivals, and also in many places admitted the sacredness of the seventh-day Sabbath, though still observing, according to the institution of Christ and his apostles, the Lord's day also. And it is not improbable that they might be induced the rather to continue these observations, that they might thereby give a public testimony of their faith against the Marcionites, who began early to blaspheme the Old Testament and the God thereof; which blasphemy they thought to condemn by this practice. And hence in those writings which are falsely ascribed to the apostles, but suited to those times, Can. 66, and Constitut. lib. 7: cap. xxiv., the observation both of the Saturday and the Lord's day is enjoined.

Others of these Jews about the same season constituted a sect by themselves, compounding a religion out of the law and gospel, with additions and interpretations of their own. These the ancients call Ebionites. Circumcision, with all the sabbaths, feasts, and rites of Moses, they retained from the law. That the Messiah was come, and that Jesus Christ was he, they admitted from the gospel; that he was only a mere man, not God and man in one person, they added of their own, yet in compliance with the sense and expectation of the corrupt and carnal part of the church of the Jews, whereof originally they were. And this sect is that which in a long tract of time has brought forth Mohammedanism in the east; for the religion of the Mohammedans is nothing but that of the

Ebionites, with a superaddition of the interests and fanatical brain-sick notions of the impostor himself.

And yet so it is that some begin now to plead that these Ebionites were the only true and genuine believers of the Circumcision in those days. These, they say, and these alone, retained the doctrine preached by the apostles to the Jews, for they were the same and no other with those which were also called Nazarenes. Thus do the Socinians plead expressly, and have contended for it in sundry treatises published to that purpose. This they do, hoping to obtain from thence some countenance unto their impious doctrine about the person of Christ, wherein they agree with the Ebionites. But as to their sabbatizing with the Jews, and the rest of their ceremonial observances, they will have nothing to do with them, as not finding those things suited unto their interest and design. But herein do they now begin to be followed by some among ourselves, who apparently fall in with them in sundry things condemned by our apostle, and on the account whereof they declined him and rejected his authority; as others seem almost prepared to do, on other reasons not here to be mentioned. In particular, some begin to sabbatize with them, yea, to outgo them; for Ebion and his followers, although they observed the seventh-day Sabbath with the Jews, yet they observed also the Lord's day with the Christians, in honor of Jesus Christ, as both Eusebius and Epiphanius testify: Ταῖς Κυριακαῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῖν τὰ παραπλήσια εἰς μνήμην τοῦ σωτηρίου ἀναστάσεως ἐτέλουν τέλουν·— "They in like manner with us observe the Lord's day, in remembrance of the saving resurrection." How great a scandal these things are to Christian religion, how evidently tending to harden the Jews in their infidelity, is apparent unto all; for the introduction of any part of the old Mosaical system of ordinances is a tacit denial of Christ's being come in the flesh, at least of his being the King, Lord, and Lawgiver of his church. And to lay the foundation of all religious, solemn gospel worship in the observation of a day which, as such, as the seventh day precisely, hath no relation unto any natural or moral precept, not instituted, not approved by Jesus Christ, cannot but be unpleasing to them who desire to have their consciences immediately influenced by his authority in all their approaches unto God. But Christ is herein supposed to have built the whole fabric of his worship on the

foundation of Moses, and to have grafted all his institutions into a stock that was not of his own planting.

33. Moreover, it is evident that this opinion concerning the necessary observation of the seventh-day Sabbath tends to the increasing and perpetuating of schisms and differences amongst the disciples of Christ, — things in their own nature evil, and to be avoided by all lawful ways and means. It is known how many different opinions and practices there are amongst the professors of the gospel. That they should all be perfectly healed, or taken away, perhaps in this world is not to be expected; for the best know but in part, and prophesy but in part. That every good man and genuine disciple of Christ ought to endeavor his utmost for their removal, none will deny; for if it be our duty, so far as it is possible, and as much as in us lieth, to live peaceably with all men, in that peace which is the life of civil society, doubtless it is so much more to live so with all believers, in a peaceable agreement in the worship of God. And therefor, of all differences in judgment which lead unto practice, those are the worst and most pernicious which occasion or draw after them anything whereby men are hindered from joining together in the same public solemn worship, whereby they yield unto God that revenue of glory which is due unto him in this world. And that many of these are found at this day, is not so much from the nature of the things themselves about which men differ, as from the weakness, prejudices, and corrupt affections, of them who are possessed with different apprehensions about them. But now, upon a supposition of an adherence by any unto the seventh-day Sabbath, all communion amongst professors in solemn gospel ordinances is rendered impossible; for if those of that persuasion do expect that others will be brought unto a relinquishment of an *evangelical observance of the Lord's-day Sabbath,* they will find themselves mistaken. The evidence which they have of its appointment, and the experience they have had of the presence of God with them in its religious observation, will secure their faith and practice in this matter. Themselves, on the other hand, supposing that they are obliged to meet for all solemn worship on the seventh day (which the others account unwarrantable for them to do on the pretense of any binding law to that purpose), and esteeming it unlawful to assemble religiously with others on the first day on the plea of an evangelical warranty, they absolutely cut off themselves from all possibility of

communion, in the administration of gospel ordinances, with all other churches of Christ. And whereas most other breaches as to such communion are in their own nature capable of healing, without a renunciation of those principles in the minds of men which seem to give countenance unto them, the difference is here made absolutely irreparable, while the opinion mentioned is owned by any. I will press this no further but only by affirming, that persons truly fearing the Lord ought to be very careful and jealous over their own understandings, before they embrace an opinion and practice which will shut them out from all visible communion with the generality of the saints of God in this world.

34. We have seen the least part of the inconveniences that attend this persuasion and its practice, nor do I intend to mention all of them, which readily offer themselves to consideration. One or two more may yet be touched on. For those by whom it is owned do not only affirm that the law of the seventh-day Sabbath is absotutely and universally in force, but also that the sanction of it, in its penalty against transgressors, is yet continued! This was, as is known, the *death of the offender by stoning.* So did God himself determine the application of the curse of the law unto the breach of this command, in the instance of the man that gathered wood on that day, who was stoned by his direction, Numbers 15:35. Now, the consideration of this penalty, as expressive of the curse of the law, influenced the minds of the Jews into that bondage frame wherein they observed the Sabbath; and this always put them upon many anxious arguings, how they might satisfy the law in keeping the day, so as not to incur the penalty of its transgression. Hence are the questions among the Jews no less endless than those about their genealogies of old, about what work may be done and what not, and how far they might journey on that day; which when they had with some indifferent consent reduced unto two thousand cubits, which they called “a Sabbath day’s journey,” yet where to begin their measure, from what part of the city, where a man dwelt, from his own house, or the synagogue, or the walls, or suburbs of it, they are not agreed. And the dread hereof was such among them of old, from the rigorous justice wherewith such laws with such penalties were imposed on them, that until they had by common consent, in the beginning of the rule of the Asmonaeans, agreed to defend themselves from their enemies on that day, they sat still in a neglect of the law of nature,

requiring all men to look to their preservation against open violence, and suffered themselves to be slain, to their satiety who chose to assault them thereon. And certainly it is the greatest madness in the world, for a people to engage in war that do not think it at least lawful at all times to defend themselves. And yet they lost their city afterwards by some influence from this superstition. And do men know what they do, when they endeavor to introduce such a bondage into the observance of gospel worship, a yoke and bondage upon the persons and spirits of men which those before us were not able to bear? Is it according to the mind of Christ, that the worship of God, which ought to be "in spirit and in truth," now under the gospel, should be enforced on men by capital penalties? And let men thus state their principles, 'The seventh day is to be kept precisely a Sabbath unto the Lord, by virtue of the fourth commandment: for not one day in seven, but the seventh day itself, is rigorously and indispensably enjoined unto observation: and the transgression of this law, not as to the spiritual worship to be observed on it, but as to every outward transgression, by journeying or other bodily labor, is to be avenged with death :' — undoubtedly, in the practice of these principles, besides that *open contradiction* which they will fall into unto the spirit, rule, and word of the gospel, they will find themselves in the same entanglements wherein the Jews were and are. And as the cases that may occur about what may be done and what not, what cases of necessity may interpose for relief, are not to be determined by private persons according to their own light and understanding, because they have respect unto the public law, but by them unto whom power is committed to judge upon it and to execute its penalty; so there will so many cases, and those almost inexplicable, emerge hereon, as will render the whole law an intolerable burden unto Christians. And what, then, is become of "the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free?" and wherein is the pre-eminence of the spiritual worship of the gospel above the carnal ordinances of the law ?

35. And this introduceth an evil of no less heinous importance than any of those before enumerated. The precise observation of the seventh day, as such, is undoubtedly no part of the law naturally moral. This we have sufficiently proved before, as I suppose. That law is written in the hearts of believers by virtue of the covenant of grace, and strength is administered thereby unto them for the due performance of the duties that it doth

require. Nor is it an institution of the gospel; none ever pretended it so to be. If there be not much against it in the New Testament, yet surely there is nothing for it. In the things that are so, we have ground to expect the assistance of the Spirit of Christ to enable us for their right observation, to the glory of God, and our own edification or increase in grace. But it is a mere precept of the old law as such; and "what the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law." In all its precepts, κατακυριεύει, it exercises a severe dominion over the souls and consciences of them that are under it. And we have no way to extricate ourselves from under that dominion, but by our being dead unto its power and authority as such through the death of Christ; or by an interest by faith in the benefits which, through his fulfilling and satisfying the law, do redound to the church. But what is required of any one, under the notion of the formal and absolute power of the law, is to be performed in and by that spirit which is administered by the law, and the strength which the law affords; and this indeed is great as to conviction of sin, nothing at all as unto obedience and righteousness. Do men in these things appeal unto the law? unto the law they must go; for I know not anything that we can expect assistance of gospel grace in or about, but only those things which are originally moral, or things superadded unto them in the gospel itself, to neither of which heads this observation of the seventh day as such can be referred. It is therefore a mere legal duty, properly so called; and in a bondage frame of spirit, without any especial assistance of grace, it must be performed. And how little we are beholden unto those who would, in any one instance, reduce us from the liberty of the gospel unto bondage under the law, our apostle hath so fully declared that it is altogether needless farther to attempt the manifestation of it.

EXERCITATION 6.

THE PRACTICAL OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

1. *Practice the end of instruction and learning.*

2. *Practical observation of the Sabbath handled by many.*

3. *Complaints concerning too much rigor and strictness in directions for the observation of the Sabbath.*

4. *Extremes to be avoided in directions of sacred duties — Extreme of the Pharisees.*

5. *The worse extreme of others, in giving liberty to sin.*

6. *Mistakes in directions about the observation of the Lord's day.*

7. *General directions to that purpose proposed.*

8. *Of the beginning and ending of the Sabbath — The first rule about time.*

9. *The frame of spirit required under the gospel in the observation of the Lord's day.*

10. *Rules and principles for its due observation.*

11. *Duties required thereunto of two sorts.*

12. *Preparatory duties, their necessity and nature.*

13. *Particular account of them.*

14. *Meditation.*

15. *Supplication.*

16. *Instruction.*

17. *Duties of the day itself.*

18. *Of public duties.*

19. *What refreshments and labor consistent with them.*

20. *Of private duties.*

1. IT remains that something be briefly offered which may direct a practice suitable unto the principles laid down and pleaded; for this is the end of all sacred truth and all instruction therein. This that great rule of our blessed Savior both teaches us and obliges us to an answerable duty, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them," John 13:17; — words so filled with his wisdom, that happy are they in whose hearts they are always abiding. The end, then, of our learning Scripture truths, is to obtain such an idea of them in our minds as may direct us unto a suitable practice. Without this they are to us of no use, or of none that is good. Ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ. Knowledge without practice puffs up, not builds up. For, as

Austin speaks with reference to these words, Con. Faust. Man. lib. xv:cap. viii., “Multa quibusdam sunt noxia, quamvis non sint mala.” Things not evil, yea, good in themselves, may be hurtful unto others. And nothing is useful but as it is directed to its proper end. This practice is unto sacred truth.

2. I confess our endeavors herein may seem less necessary than in the foregoing discourses; for there are many treatises on this part of our present subject extant in our own language, and in the hands of those who esteem themselves concerned in these things. With some they meet, indeed, with no other entertainment than the posts did that were sent by Hezekiah through Ephraim, Manasseh, and Zebulun, to invite them to the passover; — they are laughed to scorn and mocked at, [1480]2 Chronicles 30:10. “But Wisdom is justified of her children.” To some they are of great use, and in great esteem; and, for the most part, in the main of their design they do agree. So that the truth in them is established in the mouths of many witnesses, without danger of dividing the minds of men about it, But yet I cannot take myself to be discharged hereby from the consideration of this concern also of a sacred rest under the gospel, the nature of our design requiring it. And there are yet important directions for the right sanctifying of the name of God, in and by the due observance of a day of sacred rest, which I have not taken notice to have been insisted on by others; and whereas a due improvement may be expected of the peculiar principles before discussed, I shall go through this part of the work also.

3. Besides, there are not a few complaints, and those managed, at least some of them, by persons of sobriety and learning, pretending also a real care for the preservation and due observance of all duties of piety and religion, that there has been some excess in the directions of many given about the due sanctification of the Lord’s day. And there is no small danger of mistakes on this hand, while therein is a pretense of zeal and devotion to give them countenance. Of this nature some men do judge some rigorous prescriptions to be which have been given in this matter. And they say that a great disadvantage to religion has ensued hereon: for it is pretended that they are such as are beyond the constitution of human nature to comply withal; of which kind God certainly requires nothing at our hands. Hence it is pleaded, that men finding themselves no way able to come to a satisfaction, in answer to the severe directions for duties and the

manner of their performance which by some are rigorously prescribed, have taken occasion to seek for relief by rejecting the whole command; which, if duly interpreted in such a condescension as they were capable of a compliance withal, they would have adhered to. On this account men have found out various inventions, to color their weariness of that strict course of duty which they were bound to. Hence have some taken up a plea that every day is to them a Sabbath, that so they might not keep any; some, that there is no such thing as a sacred rest on any day required of us by the authority of Christ, and therefore that all directions for the manner of the observance of such a day are to no purpose. And many by degrees have declined from that strictness which they could not come up to a delight in, until they have utterly lost all sense of duty towards God in this matter. And these things are true; only the reasons of them are not agreed on.

4. And in things of this nature those who are called to the instruction of others are careful to avoid extremes; for "he that justifies the wicked, and he that condemns the just, even they both are abomination to the LORD." And several instances there are of the miscarriages of men on the one hand and the other. On the one lay the sin of the Pharisees of old. When they had gotten the pretense of a command, they would burden it with so many rigid observances, in the manner of its performance, as should make it a yoke intolerable to their disciples, getting themselves the reputation of strict observers of the law. But, in truth, they were not so wanting to their own ease and interest as not to provide a secret dispensation for themselves. They would scarcely put a finger to the burdens which they bound and laid on the shoulders of others. And this is the condition of almost all that have an appearance of religion or devotion in the Papacy. And a fault of the same nature, though not of so signal a provocation, others may fall into unadvisedly, who are free from their hypocrisy. They may charge and press both their own consciences and other men's above and beyond what God has appointed. And this they may do with a sincere intention to promote religion and holiness amongst men, by engaging them into the strictest ways of the profession of it. Now, in the direction of the consciences of men about their duties to God, this is carefully to be avoided; for peace is only to be obtained in keeping steady and even to the

rule. To transgress on the right hand, whatever the pretense be, is to lie for God; which will not be accepted with him.

5. On the other hand there lies a rock of far greater danger; and this consists in the accommodation of the laws, precepts, and institutions of God, unto the lusts, and the present courses and practices of men. This evil we have had exemplified in some of late, no less conspicuously than the aforementioned was in them of old. A mystery of iniquity to this purpose has been discovered not long since and brought forth to light, tending to the utter debauchery of the consciences and lives of men. And in it lies the great contrivance whereby the famous sect of the Jesuits have prevailed on the minds of many, especially of potentates and great men in the earth, so as to get into their hands the conduct of the most important affairs of Europe. And this abomination, as it is known, has lately been laid open by the diligence of some; in which at once concurred a commendable care of Christian morality and a high provocation in other things by them who endeavored to corrupt it. A search has been made into the writings which that sort of men have published, for the direction of the consciences of men in the practice of moral duties, or unto their disciples, for their guidance upon confessions. And a man may say of the discovery what the poet said upon the opening of the house of Cacus, Æn., 8:262; 243 : —

"Panditur extemplo foribus domus atra revulsis:
Abstractaeque boves, abjurataeque rapinae
Coelo ostenduntur.
Non secus ac si qua penitus vi terra dehiscens,
Infernas reseret sedes, et regna recludat
Pallida"

Such a loathsome appearance of vizards and pretenses for the extenuating of sin, and countenancing of men in the practice of it, was never before presented to the eyes of men. The main of their design, as is now manifest, has been so to interpret Scripture laws, rules, and precepts, as to accommodate them all to that course of corrupt conversation which prevails generally in the world, even among them who are called Christians, —

"Gratum opus agricolis;" —

a work exceedingly acceptable and obliging to all sorts of men, who, if not given up to open atheism, would rejoice in nothing more than in a reconciliation between the rule of their consciences and their lusts, that they might sin freely, without trouble or remorse. To this end, having learned the inclinations and temptations of men from their private confessions, and finding it a thing neither possible in itself, nor at all conducive to their own interest, to endeavor their reformation by and recovery to the fixed, stable rule of truth and duty, they have, by their false glosses, subtle distinctions, and refined imaginations, made it to justify and countenance them in the highest abominations, and in ways leading constantly to the practice of them. And there is nothing, in their whole course, which faithful interpreters of the mind of God ought more carefully to avoid, than a falling in any instance into that evil which these men have made it their design to promote and pursue. The world, indeed, seems to be weary of the just, righteous, holy ways of God, and of that exactness in walking according to his institutions and commands which it will be one day known that he does require. But the way to put a stop to this declension, is not by accommodating the commands of God to the corrupt courses and ways of men. The truths of God and the holiness of his precepts must be pleaded and defended, though the world dislike them here and perish hereafter. His law must not be made to lackey after the wills of men, nor be dissolved by vain interpretations, because they complain they cannot, indeed because they will not, comply with it. Our Lord Jesus Christ came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them, and to supply men with spiritual strength to fulfill them also. It is evil to break the least commandment; but there is a great aggravation of that evil in them that shall teach men so to do. And this cannot be done but by giving such expositions of them as by virtue whereof men may think themselves freed from an obligation to that obedience which indeed they do require. Wherefore, though some should say now, as they did of old, concerning any command of God, “Behold, what a weariness it is! and what profit is it to keep his ordinances?” yet the law of God is not to be changed to give them relief. We are therefore, in this matter, to have no consideration of the present course of the world, nor of the weariness of professors in the ways of strict obedience. The sacred truth and will of God in all his commands is singly and sincerely to be inquired after.

6. And yet I will not deny but that there have been and are mistakes in this matter leaning towards the other extreme. Directions have been given, and that not by a few, for the observation of a day of holy rest, which, either for the matter of them or the manner prescribed, have had no sufficient warrant or foundation in the Scripture. For whereas some have made no distinction between the Sabbath as *moral* and as *Mosaical*, unless it be merely in the change of the day, they have endeavored to introduce the whole practice required on the latter into the Lord's day. But we have already showed that there were sundry additions made to the command, as to the manner of its observance, in its accommodation to the Mosaical pedagogy, besides that the whole required a frame of spirit suited thereunto. Others, again, have collected whatever they could think of that is good, pious, and useful in the practice of religion, and prescribed it all, in a multitude of instances, as necessary to the sanctification of this day; so that a man can scarcely in six days read over all the duties that are proposed to be observed on the seventh. And it has been also no small mistake, that men have labored more to multiply directions about external duties, giving them out as it were by number or tale, than to direct the mind or inward man in and to a due performance of the whole duty of the sanctification of the day, according to the spirit and genius of gospel obedience. And, lastly, it cannot be denied but that some, it may be measuring others by themselves and their own abilities, have been apt to tie them up to such long, tiresome duties, and rigid abstinences from refreshments, as have clogged their minds, and turned the whole service of the day into a wearisome bodily exercise, that profits little.

7. It is not in my design to insist upon any thing that is in controversy amongst persons learned and sober; nor will I now extend this discourse to a particular consideration of the *especial duties* required in the sanctification or services of this day. But whereas all sorts of men who wish well to the furtherance and promotion of piety and religion in the world, on what reasons or foundations soever they judge that this day ought to be observed a holy rest to the Lord, do agree that there is a great and sinful neglect of the due observation of it, — as may be seen in the writings of some of the principal of those who cannot grant to it an immediate divine institution, — I shall give such rules and general

directions about it as due application whereof will give sufficient guidance in the whole of our duty herein.

8. It may seem to some necessary that something should be premised concerning the measure or *continuance* of the day to be set apart to a holy rest to the Lord; but it being a matter of controversy, and to me, on the reasons to be mentioned afterwards, of no great importance, I shall not insist upon the examination of it, but only give my judgment in a word concerning it. Some contend that it is a natural day, consisting of twenty-four hours, beginning with the evening of the preceding day, and ending with the same of its own. And accordingly so was the church of Israel directed, <0232>Leviticus 23:32, "From even unto even shall ye celebrate your Sabbath ;" although that does not seem to be a general direction for the observation of the weekly Sabbath, but to regard only that particular extraordinary Sabbath which was then instituted, namely, the day of atonement, on the tenth day of the seventh month, verse 27. However, suppose it to belong also to the weekly Sabbath, it is evidently an addition to the command, particularly suited to the Mosaical pedagogy, that the day might comprise the sacrifice of the preceding evening in the services of it; from an obedience whereunto we are freed by the gospel. Neither can I subscribe to this opinion; and that because, —

(1.) In the description and limitation of the first original seven days, it is said of each of the six that it was constituted of an evening and a morning, but of the day of rest there is no such description; it is only called "the seventh day," without any assignation of the preceding evening unto it.

(2.) A day of rest, according to rules of natural equity, ought to be proportioned to a day of work or labor, which God has granted to us for our own use. Now, this is to be reckoned from morning to evening: <1940>Psalm 104:20-23.

> "Thou makest darkness, and it is night: wherein all the beasts of the forest do creep" (from whose yelling the night has its name in the Hebrew tongue.) "The young lions roar after their prey, and seek their meat from God. The sun arises, they gather themselves together, and lay them down in their dens. Man goes forth unto his work and to his labor until the evening."

The day of labor is from the removal of darkness and the night, by the light of the sun, until the return of them again; which, allowing for the alterations of the day in the several seasons of the year, seems to be the just measure of our day of rest.

(3.) Our Lord Jesus Christ, who in his resurrection gave beginning and being to the especial day of holy rest under the gospel, rose not until "the morning of the first day of the week," when the beamings of the light of the sun began to dispel the darkness of the night, or "when it dawned toward day," as it is variously expressed by the evangelists. This, with me, determines this whole matter.

(4.) Mere cessation from labor in the night seems to have no place in the spiritual rest of the gospel to be expressed on this day, nor to be by any thing distinguished from the nights of other days of the week.

(5.) Supposing Christians under the obligation of the direction given by Moses before mentioned, and it may entangle them in the anxious, scrupulous intrigues which the Jews are subject to about the beginning of the evening itself, about which their greatest masters are at variance; which things belong not to the economy of the gospel. Upon the whole matter, I am inclined to judge, and do so, that the observation of the day is to be commensurate to the use of *our natural strength* on any other day, from morning to night And nothing is hereby lost that is needful to the due sanctification of it; for what is by some required as a *part* of its sanctification, is necessary and required as a due *preparation* thereunto. This, therefore, is our first rule or direction : —

I. The first day of the week, or the Lord's day, is to be set apart to the ends of a holy rest unto God, by every one, according as his natural strength will enable him to employ himself in his lawful occasions any other day of the week.

There is no such certain standard or measure for the observance of the duties of this day, as that every one who *exceeds it* should by it be cut short, or that those who, on important reasons, *come short of it* should be stretched out thereunto. As God provided, in his services of old, that he who was not able to offer a bullock might offer a dove, with respect to their outward condition in the world; so here there is an allowance also for

the natural temperaments and abilities of men. Only, whereas if persons of old had pretended poverty, to save their charge in the procuring of an offering, it would not have been acceptable, yea, they would themselves have fallen under the curse of the deceiver; so no more will now a pretense of weakness or natural inability be any excuse to any for neglect or profaneness Otherwise, God requires of us, and accepts from us, "according to what we have, and not according to what we have not," And we see it by experience, that some men's natural spirits will carry them out to a continuance in the outward observance of duties much beyond, nay, double perhaps to what others are able, who yet may observe a holy Sabbath unto the Lord with acceptation. And herein lies the spring of the accommodation of these duties to the sick, the aged, the young, the weak, or persons any way distempered. "God knows our frame, and remembers that we are dust ;" as also that that dust is more discomposed and weakly compacted in some than in others. As thus the people gathered manna of old, some more, some less, אִישׁ לְפִי־אָכְלוֹ, "every man according to his appetite," yet "he that gathered much had nothing over, and he that gathered little had no lack," Exodus 16:17, 18; so is every one in sincerity, according to his own ability, to endeavor the sanctifying of the name of God in the duties of this day, not being obliged by the examples or prescriptions of others, according to their own measures.

9. II. Labour to observe this day, and to perform the duties required in it, with a frame of mind becoming and answering the spirit, freedom, and liberty of the gospel.

We are now to serve God in all things "in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter," Romans 7:6, — with a spirit of peace, delight, joy, liberty, and a sound mind. There were three reasons of the bondage, servile frame of spirit which was in the Judaical church, in their observance of the duties of the law, and consequently of the Sabbath : —

(1.) The *dreadful giving* and promulgation of it on mount Sinai; which was not intended merely to strike a terror into that generation in the wilderness, but through all ages during that dispensation, to influence and awe the hearts of the people into a dread and terror of it. Hence the apostle tells us that "mount Sinai gendered unto bondage," Galatians 4:24; — that is, the law, as given thereon, brought the people into a

spiritually servile state; wherein, although secretly, on the account of the ends of the covenant, they were children and heirs, yet they differed nothing from servants, chap. 4:1-3.

(2.) The renovation and re-enforcement of the *old covenant,* with the promises and threatenings of it, which was to be upon them during the continuance of that state and condition. And although the law had a new use and end now given unto it, yet they were so in the dark, and the proposal of them attended with so great an obscurity, that they could not clearly look into the comfort and liberty finally intended therein; for "the law made nothing perfect," and what was of grace in the administration of it was so veiled with types, ceremonies, and shadows, that they could not see to the end of the things that were to be done away, ◁2 Corinthians 3:13.

(3.) The sanction of the law *by death* increased their bondage; for as this in itself was a terror to them in their services, so it was expressive and a representation of the original curse of the whole law, ◁Galatians 3:13. And hereby were they greatly awed and terrified, although some of them, by especial grace, were enabled to delight themselves in God and his ordinances.

And in these things was administered "a spirit of bondage unto fear," which by the apostle is opposed to "the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father," ◁Romans 8:15; which where it is, there is liberty.

> "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty,"
> ◁2 Corinthians 3:17,

and there only. And therefore, although they boasted that they were the children of Abraham, and on that reason free and never in bondage, yet our Savior lets them know, that whatever they pretended, they were not free until the Son should make them so. And from these things arose those innumerable anxious scrupulosities which were upon them in the observation of this day, accompanied with the severe nature of those additions in its observation which were made unto the law of it, as appropriated to them for a season.

Now, all these things we are freed from under the gospel; for, —

(1.) We are not now brought to receive the law from *mount Sinai,* but are come unto *mount Zion.* So the apostle at large, Hebrews 12:18-24,

> "For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched" (that is, which naturally might be so by men's hands, though morally the touching of it was forbidden), "and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which they that heard entreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more; for they could not endure that which was commanded, And if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart: and so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake;"

which it seems were the words he used, where it is on this occasion said of him, "And Moses spake," but nothing is added of what he said, Exodus 19:19. Which things are insisted on by him, to show the grounds of that bondage which the people were in under the law. Whereunto he adds, "But ye are come unto mount Zion, unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem;" — "Jerusalem which is above, which is free, which is the mother of us all," Galatians 4:26. That is, we receive the law of our obedience from Jesus Christ, who speaks from heaven, to be observed with a spirit of liberty.

(2.) The old covenant is now absolutely abolished, nor is the remembrance of it any way revived, Hebrews 8:13. It has no influence into or upon the minds of believers. They are taken into a covenant full of grace, joy, and peace: for "the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," John 1:17.

(3.) In this covenant they receive the Spirit of Christ, or adoption, to serve God without legal fear, Luke 1:74; Romans 8:15; Galatians 4:6. And there is not any thing more insisted on in the gospel, as the principal privilege thereof. It is, indeed, nothing to have liberty in the word and rule, unless we have it in the spirit and principle. And hereby are we delivered from that anxious solicitude about particular instances in outward duties, which was a great part of the yoke of the people of old; for, —

[1.] Hence we may in all our duties look on God as a father. By the Spirit of his Son, we may in them all cry, “Abba, Father;” for “through Christ we have access by one Spirit unto the Father,” Ephesians 2:18, — to God as a father; as one that “will not always chide,” that does not watch our steps for our hurt, but “remembers that we are dust;” one who ties us not up to rigid exactness in outward things, while we act in a holy spirit of filial obedience, as his sons or children. And there is a great difference between the duties of servants and children, neither has a father the same measure of them. The consideration hereof, regulated by the general rules of the Scripture, will resolve a thousand of such scruples as the Jews of old, while servants, were perplexed withal.

[2.] Hence we come to know that he will be worshiped “in spirit and in truth” Therefore he more minds the inward frame of our hearts, wherewith we serve him, than the mere performance of outward duties; which are only so far accepted with him as they are expressions and demonstrations thereof. If, then, in the observation of this day, our hearts are single and sincere in our aims at his glory with delight, it is of more price with him than the most rigid observation of outward duties by number and measure.

[3.] Therefore, the minds of believers are no more influenced to this duty by the curse of the law and the terror thereof, as represented in the threatened penalty of death. The authority and love of Jesus Christ are the principal causes of our obedience. Hence our main duty lies in an endeavor to get spiritual joy and delight in the services of this day, which are the especial effects of spiritual liberty. So the prophet requires that we should “call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the LORD, honorable;” as also, on the other side, that we should “not do our own ways, nor find our own pleasure, nor speak our own words,” Isaiah 58:13. And these cautions seem to regard the Sabbath absolutely, and not as Judaical. But I much question whether they have not, in the interpretation of some, been extended beyond their original intention; for the true meaning of them is no more but this, that we should so delight ourselves in the Lord on his holy day, as that, being expressly forbidden our usual labor, we should not need, for want of satisfaction in our duties, to turn aside unto our own pleasures and vain ways, which are only our own, to spend our time and pass over the Sabbath, — a thing complained of by many; whence sin and Satan have been more served on this day than on all the days of the week

beside. But I no way think that here is a restraint laid on us from such words, ways, and works, as neither hinder the performance of any religious duties belonging to the due celebration of the worship of God on this day, nor are apt in themselves to unframe our spirits, or divert our affections from them. And those whose minds are fixed in a spirit of liberty to glorify God in and by this day of rest, seeking after communion with him in the ways of his worship, will be unto themselves a better rule for their words and actions than those who may aim to reckon over all they do or say; which may be done in such a manner as to become the Judaical Sabbath much more than the Lord's day.

10. III. Be sure to bring good and right principles to the performance of the duty of keeping a day of rest holy unto the Lord. Some of these I shall name, as confirmed expressly *in,* or drawn evidently *from,* the preceding discourses : —

(1.) *Remember that there is a weekly rest, or a holy rest of one day in the week, due to the solemn work of glorifying God as God.* "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." We have *had a week* unto our own occasions, or we have a *prospect of a week* in the patience of God for them. Let us remember that God puts in for *some time* with us. All is not our own. We are not our own lords. Some time God will have to himself, from all that own him in the world; and this is that time, season, or day. He esteems not himself acknowledged, nor his sovereignty owned in the world, without it. And therefore this day of rest he required the first day as it were that the world stood upon its legs, has done so all along, and will do so to the last day of its duration. When he had made all things, and saw that they were good, and was refreshed in them, he required that we should own and acknowledge his goodness and power therein. This duty we owe to God as God.

(2.) *Remember that God appointed this day to teach us that as he rested therein, so we should seek after rest in him here, and look on this day as a pledge of eternal rest with him hereafter.* So was it from the beginning. This was the end of the appointment of this day. Now, our rest in God in general consists in two things: —

[1.] In *our approbation* of the works of God and the law of our obedience, with the covenant of God thereon. These things are expressive of and do

represent unto us the goodness, righteousness, holiness, faithfulness, and power of God. For these, and with respect to them, are we to give glory to him. What God rests in, he requires that through it we should seek for our rest in him. As this was the duty of man in innocency, and under the law, so it is ours now much more; for God has now more eminently and gloriously unveiled and displayed the excellencies of his nature and the counsels of his wisdom, in and by Jesus Christ, than he had done under the first covenant. And this should work us to a greater and more holy admiration of them; for if we are to acknowledge that "the law is holy, just, and good," as our apostle speaks, although it is now useless as to the bringing of us to rest in God, how much more ought we to own and subscribe to the gospel, and the declaration that God has made of himself therein, that so it is?

[2.] In an *actual solemn compliance* with his will, expressed in his works, law, and covenant. This brings us to *present satisfaction* in him, and leads us to the *full enjoyment* of him. This is a day of rest, but we cannot rest in a day, nor in any thing that a day can afford; only it is a help and means of bringing us to rest in God. Without this design, all our observation of a Sabbath is of no use or advantage. Nothing will thence redound to the glory of God nor to the benefit of our own souls. And this they may do well to consider who plead for the observation of the seventh day precisely; for they do profess thereby that they seek for rest in God according to the tenor of the first covenant. That they approve of, and that they look (by that profession) to be brought to rest by; though really, and on other principles, they do otherwise. Whatever, then, be the covenant wherein we walk with God, the great principle which is to guide us in the holy observation of this day is, that we celebrate the rest of God in that covenant, approve of it, rejoice in it, and labor to be partakers of it, whereof the day itself is given us as a pledge. We must therefore, —

(3.) *Remember that we have lost our original rest in God by sin.* God made us upright in his own image, meet to take our rest, satisfaction, and reward in himself, according to the tenor of the law of our creation, and the covenant of works established thereon. Hereof the seventh day was a token and pledge. All this we must consider that we have lost by sin. God might justly have left us in a wandering condition, without either rest or any pledge of it. Our reparation, indeed, is excellent and glorious; yet so as

to mind us that on our part the loss of our former estate was shameful, and in the remembrance whereof we ought to be humbled. And hence we may know that it is in vain for us to lay hold of the seventh day again, which is but an attempt to return into the garden after we are shut out and kept out by a flaming sword; for although it was made use of as a type and shadow under the law, yet to us who must live on the substance of things, or not at all, it cannot be possessed without robbery, and it is of no use when attained. For we are to remember, —

(4.) *That the rest in God and with God, which we now seek after, enter into, and celebrate the pledge of, using the means for the further enjoyment of it in the observation of this day, is a rest by a recovery, by a reparation in Jesus Christ.* There is now a new rest of God, and a new rest for us in God. God now rests and is refreshed in Christ, in his person, in his works, in his law, in the covenant of grace in him; in all these things is his soul well pleased. He is "the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person," making a far more glorious representation of him than did the works of creation of old; which yet he had left such impressions of his goodness, power, and wisdom upon, as that he rested in them, was refreshed with them, and appointed a day for man to rest in his approbation of them, and giving glory to him for them. How much more is it so with him, with respect unto this glorious image of the invisible God! This he now deals with us in. For as of old he commanded light to shine out of darkness, whereby we might see and behold his glory, which he had implanted and was implanting on the work of his hands; so now he

> "shines in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of his glory in the face of Jesus Christ," 2 Corinthians 4:6

— that is, enables us to behold all the excellencies of his nature, made manifest in the person and works of Jesus Christ. The way, also, of bringing them to him, through Christ, who had by sin come short of his glory, is that which he approves of, is delighted with, and rests in, giving us a pledge thereof in this day of rest. Herein lies the principal duty of this day's observances, — namely, to admire this retrieval of a rest with God, and of a rest for God in us. This is the fruit of eternal wisdom, grace, and goodness, love, and bounty. This, I say, belongs to the sanctification of this day, and this ought to be our principal design therein, — namely, in it

to give glory unto God for the wonderful recovery of a rest for us with himself, and to endeavor to enter by faith and obedience into that rest. And for these ends and purposes are we to make use of all the sacred ordinances of worship wherein and whereby this day is sanctified unto the Lord.

(5.) *That in the observation of the Lord's day, which is the first day of the week, we subject our consciences immediately to the authority of Jesus Christ, the mediator, whose day of rest originally it was, and which thereby and for that reason is made ours.* And hereby, in the observation of this day, have we fellowship with the Father and his Son Jesus Christ. Of old there was nothing appeared in the day, whilst the seventh day was in force, but the rest of God the creator, and his sovereign authority, intimated unto us thereby, for the observing of a holy rest unto him, according to the tenor of the first covenant. But now the immediate foundation of our rest on the Lord's day is the Lord's rest, the rest of Christ, when, upon his resurrection, he ceased from his works, as God did from his own. This gives great direction and encouragement in the duty of observing this day aright. Faith truly exercised in bringing the soul into an actual subjection unto the authority of Christ in the observance of this day, and directing the thoughts unto a contemplation of the rest that he entered into after his works, with the rest that he has procured for us to enter into with him, does more thereby towards the true sanctification of this day than all outward duties can do, performed with a legal spirit, when men are in bondage to the command as taught to them, and dare not do otherwise. God in several places instructs the Israelites what account they shall give unto their children concerning their observation of sundry rites and ceremonies that he had instituted in his worship: Exodus 13:14,

> "And it shall be when thy son asks thee in time to come, saying, What is this? that thou shalt say unto him, By strength of hand the LORD brought us out from Egypt," etc.

It was in remembrance of such works of God amongst them, whereof those rites were a token and representation. And we have here a special observance in the worship of God. What account can we give to ourselves and our children concerning our observation of this day holy unto the

Lord? Must we not say, nay, may we not do so with joy and rejoicing, that whereas we were lost and undone by sin, excluded out of the rest of God, so far as that the law of the observation of the outward pledge of it, being attended with the curse, was a burden, and no relief to us, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, undertook a great work to make peace for us, to redeem and save us; and when he had so done, and finished his work, even the erecting of the "new heavens and new earth, wherein dwells righteousness,'' he entered into his rest, and thereby made known to us that we should keep this day as a day of holy rest unto him, and as a pledge that we have again given to us an entrance into rest with God?

(6.) We are then to remember, *that this day is a pledge of our eternal rest with God.* This is that whereunto these things do tend; for therein will God glorify himself in the full accomplishment of his great design in all his works of power and grace. And this is that which ultimately we aim at We do at best in this world but enter into the rest of God; the full enjoyment of it is reserved for eternity. Hence that is usually called our everlasting Sabbath, as that state wherein we shall always rest with God and always give glory unto him. And this day is a pledge hereof on sundry accounts; —

[1.] Because thereon God as it were *calls us aside out of the world,* to an immediate converse with himself. Israel never had a more dreadful day than when they were called out of their tents, from their occasions and all worldly concerns, לִקְרַאת הָאֱלֹהִים, "in occursum Jehovae," — to "a meeting with God," Exodus 19:17. God called them aside, to meet and converse with them. But it was to mount Sinai that he called them; which was "altogether on a smoke, because the LORD descended upon it in fire," verse 18. Hence, although they had been preparing themselves for it sundry days, they were not able to bear the terror of God's approach unto them But under the gospel we are this day called out of the world and off from our occasions, to converse with God, to meet him at mount Zion, Hebrews 12. Here he does not give us a *fiery law,* but a *gracious gospel;* does not converse with us by thunder and lightning, but with the sweet, still voice of mercy in Jesus Christ. And as this requires due thoughts of heart in us, to prepare us for it, so it is in itself a great and unspeakable privilege, purchased for us by Christ. And herein have we a pledge of rest with God above, when he shall call us off from all relations, all occasions

of life, all our interests and concerns in this world, and eternally set us apart unto himself. And, undoubtedly, that it may be such a pledge unto us, it is our duty to take off our minds and souls, as far as we are able, from all occasions of life and businesses of this world, that we may walk with God alone on this day. Some, indeed, do think this a great bondage; but so far as they do so, and so far as they find it so, they have no interest in this matter. We do acknowledge that there are weaknesses attending the outward man, through the frailty and imbecility of our nature, and therefore have before rejected all rigid, tiresome services; and I do acknowledge that there will be repining and rebelling in the flesh against this duty: but he who really judges in his mind, and whose practice is influenced and regulated by that judgment, that the segregation of a day from the world and the occasions of it, and a secession unto communion with God thereon, is grievous and burdensome, and that which God does not require, nor is useful to us, must be looked on as a stranger to these things. He to whom the worship of God in Christ is a burden or a bondage, — who says, "Behold, what a weariness it is!" — who thinks a day in a week to be too much and too long to be with God in his especial service, — is much to seek, I think, of his duty. Alas! what would such persons do if they should ever come to heaven, to be taken aside to all eternity to be with God alone, who think it a great bondage to be here diverted unto him for a day? They will say, it may be, 'Heaven is one thing, and the observation of the Lord's day is another.' Were they in heaven, they doubt not but they should do well enough; but for this observation of the Lord's day, they know not what to say to it. I confess they are so, they are distinct things, or else one could not be the pledge of the other; but yet they both agree in this, that they are a separation and secession from all other things unto God. And if men have not a principle to like that in the Lord's day, neither would they like it in heaven, should they ever come there. Let us, then, be ready to attend in this matter to the call of God, and go out to meet him; for where he places his name, as he does on all his solemn ordinances, there he has promised to meet us. And so is this day unto us a pledge of heaven.

[2.] It is so in respect of the duties of the day, wherein the sanctification of the name of God in it does consist. All duties proper and peculiar to this day are duties of communion with God. Everlasting, uninterrupted,

immediate communion with God is heaven. Carnal persons had rather have Mohammed's paradise than Christ's heaven. But this is that which believers aim at, — eternal communion with God. Hereof are the duties of this day, in a right, holy performance, an assured pledge; for this is that which in them all we aim at, and express according to the measure of our light and grace. Hereon we hear him speak to us in his word; and we speak to him in prayers, supplications, praises, thanksgivings, in and by Jesus Christ, In all, our aim is to give glory to him, which is the end of heaven; and to be brought nearer to him, which is its enjoyment. In what God is pleased hereby to communicate to our souls, and in what, by the secret and invisible supplies of his grace and Spirit, he carries out our hearts, unto, lie and consist those first-fruits of glory which we may be made partakers of in this world. And the first-fruits are a pledge of a full harvest; God gives them to us for that end that they may be so. This, then, are we principally to seek after in the celebration of the ordinances of God, whereby we sanctify his name on this day. Without this, bodily labor, in the outward performance of a multitude of duties, will profit little. Men may rise early, and go to bed late, and eat the bread of care and diligence all the day long, yet if they are not thus in the Spirit, and carried out unto spiritual communion with God in the services of the day, it will not avail them. Whatever there be, either in the service itself performed, or in the manner of its performance, or the duration of it, which is apt to divert or take off the mind from being intent hereon, it tends to the profanation rather than the sanctification of this day.

[3.] The rest of the day is also a pledge of our rest with God. But then this rest is not to be taken for a mere bodily cessation from labor, but in that extent wherein it has before been at large described.

These are some of the rules which we are to have a respect unto in our observation of this day. A due application of them to particular occasions and emergencies will guide us through the difficulties of them. Therefore did I choose rather to lay them thus down in general than to insist on the determination of particular cases; which, when we have done all, must he resolved into them, according to the light and understanding of them who are particularly concerned.

11. It remains that we offer some directions as to the duties themselves wherein the sanctification of this day does consist. And this I shall do briefly. It has been done already at large by others, so as that from thence they have taken occasion to handle the nature of all the religious duties, with the whole manner of their performance, which belong to the service of this day; which does not properly appertain unto this place. I shall therefore only name the duties themselves which have a respect unto the sanctification of the day, supposing the nature of them and the due manner of their performance to be otherwise known.

Now these duties are of two sorts; —

I. -*Preparatory* for the day; and,

II. Such as are *actually to be attended unto in it.*

12. I. There are duties preparatory for it; for although, as I have declared, I do not judge that the preceding evening is to be reckoned unto this holy rest as a part of it, yet doubtless it ought to be improved unto a due preparation for the day ensuing. And hereby the opinion of the beginning of the sabbatical rest with the morning is put into as good a condition, for the furtherance of the duties of piety and religion, as the other about its beginning in the evening preceding. Now, preparation in general is necessary, —

(1.) On the account of *the greatness and holiness of God, with whom in an especial manner we have to do.* The day is his; the duties of the day are his prescriptions; the privileges of the day are his gracious concessions ; — he is the beginning and ending of it. And as we observed before, on this day he calls us aside unto a converse with himself; and certainly some special preparation of our hearts and minds is necessary hereunto. This belongs to the keeping of our foot when we go to the house of God, [Ecclesiastes 5:1], — namely, to consider what we are to do, whither we are going, to whom we make our approaches, in the solemn worship of God. The rule which he gives, [Leviticus 10:3], is moral and perpetual or everlasting:

> "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people I will be glorified."

He loves not a rude, careless rushing of poor sinners upon him, without a sense of his greatness and a due reverence of his holiness. Hence is that advice of our apostle, ⁵⁸Hebrews 12:28, 29, “Let us have grace,” be graciously prepared in our hearts and minds, “whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear: for our God is a consuming fire.” And this will not be answered by mere bodily postures of veneration. Hence there is a due preparation necessary

(2.) It is so *from our own distractions and entanglements in the businesses and occasions of life.* I speak not of such who spend the whole week in the pursuit of their lusts and pleasures, whose Sabbath rest hath an equal share in profaneness with all other parts of their lives; but we treat of those who in general make it their design to live unto God. The greatest part of these I do suppose to be engaged industriously in some calling or course of life; and these things are apt to fill their minds, as well as to take up their time, and much to conform them to their own likeness. Much converse with the world is apt to beget a worldly frame in men, and earthly things will taint the mind with earthliness. And although it is our duty in all our secular occasions also to live to God, and whether we eat or drink to do all things to his glory, yet they are apt to unframe the mind, so as to make it unready unto spiritual things and heavenly contemplations. There is a command, indeed, that we should pray always, which at least requires of us a readiness of mind to lay hold of all occasions and opportunities for prayer; yet none will deny but that there is great advantage in a due preparation for that and all other duties of religion. To empty, therefore, and purge our minds of secular, earthly businesses, designs, projections, accounts, dependences of things one on another, with reasonings about them, as far as in us lies, is a duty required of us in all our solemn approaches unto God. And if this be not done, but men go full of their occasions into religious services, they will by one means or other return upon them, and prevail upon them, to their disturbance. Great care is to be taken in this matter; and those who constantly exercise themselves to a good conscience herein, will find themselves fitted for the duties of the day to a good success.

13. For these preparatory duties themselves, I should refer them to three heads, if the reader will take along with him these advertisements **:** —

(1.) That I am not *binding burdens on men or their consciences,* nor tying them up unto strict observances, under the consideration of sin if not precisely attended unto. Only I desire to give direction, such as may be helpful to the faith and obedience of those who in all things desire to please God. But if they apply themselves to those ways in other instances which they find more to their own edification, all is done that I aim at.

(2.) That I propose not these duties as *those which fall under an especial command* with reference to this season, but only as such which, being commanded in themselves, may with good spiritual advantage be applied to this season. Whence it follows, —

(3.) That if we are, by *necessary occasions,* at any time diverted from attending to them, we may conclude that we have lost an opportunity or advantage, not that we have contracted the guilt of sin, unless it be from the occasion itself or some of its circumstances.

14. These things premised, I shall recommend to the godly reader a threefold preparatory duty, to the right observation of a day of holy rest unto the Lord : —

(1.) Of meditation;

(2.) Of supplication;

(3.) Of instruction, unto such as have others depending on them.

(1.) Of *meditation.* And this answers particularly the reasons we have given for the necessity of these preparatory duties; for herein are the minds of believers to exercise themselves unto such thoughts of the majesty, holiness, and greatness of God, as may prepare them to serve him "with reverence and godly fear." The nature of the duty requires that this meditation should first respect God himself; and then the day and its services in its causes and ends. God himself, I say, not absolutely, but as the cause and author of our sabbatical rest. God is to be meditated on with respect unto his majesty, greatness, and holiness, in all our addresses unto him in his ordinances; but a peculiar consideration is to be had of him as the especial author of that ordinance which we address ourselves to the celebration of, and so to make our access unto him therein. His rest, therefore, in Jesus Christ, his satisfaction and complacency in the way and

covenant of rest for us through him, are the subjects of a suitable meditation in our preparation for the observance of this day of rest. But especially the person of the Son, whose works and rest thereon are the foundation of our evangelical rest on this holy day, is to be considered. It were easy to supply the reader with proper meditations on these blessed subjects, for him to exercise himself in as he finds occasion; but I intend only directions in general, leaving others to make application of them according to their ability. Again, the *day itself* and its sacred services are to be thought upon. The *privileges* that we are made partakers of thereby, the *advantages* that are in the duties of it, and the *duties* themselves required of us, should be well digested in our minds. And where we have an habitual apprehension of them, yet it will need to be called over and excited. To this end those who think meet to make use of these directions may do well to acquaint themselves with the true nature of a sabbatical rest, from what has been before discoursed. It will afford them other work for faith and thankfulness than is usually taken notice of by them who have no other notion of it than merely a portion of time set apart unto the solemn worship of God. There are other mysteries of God and his love, other directions for our obedience unto God in it, than are commonly taken notice of. By these means the ends of preparatory duties above mentioned will be effected; the mind will be filled with due reverential apprehensions of God on the one hand, and disentangled on the other from those cares of the world and other cumbersome thoughts wherewith the occasions of life may have possessed it.

15. (2.) *Supplication*; that is, prayer with especial respect unto the duties of the day. This is the life of all preparation for every duty. It is the principal means whereby we express our universal dependence on God in Christ, as also work our own hearts to a sense of our indigent estate in this world, with all our especial wants, and the means whereby we obtain that supply of grace, mercy, and spiritual strength, which we stand in need of, with respect unto the glory of God, and the increase of holiness and peace in our own souls Special directions need not be given about the performance of this known duty. Only I say, some season for it, by way of preparation, will be an eminent means to further us in the due sanctification of the name of God on this day. And it must be founded on thanksgiving for the day itself, with the ends of it, as an advantage for our

converse with God in this world. His goodness and grace in this condescension and care are to be acknowledged and celebrated. And in the petitory part of preparatory prayer, two things are principally to be regarded : —

[1.] A supply of grace from God, the God and Fountain of it. And herein respect must be had, — *First.* Unto that grace or those graces which in their own nature are most immediately serviceable to the sanctification of the name of God in this ordinance. Such are reverence of his authority and delight in his worship. *Secondly.* Such graces, in particular, as we have found advantage by in the exercise of holy duties; as, it may be, contriteness of spirit, love, joy, peace. *Thirdly.* Such as we have experienced the want of, or a defect in ourselves as to the exercise of them on such occasions; as, it may be, diligence, steadfastness, and evenness of mind.

[2.] A removal of evils, or that God would "lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." And herein a regard is to be had, — *First.* Unto the *temptations of Satan.* He will be casting his fiery darts in such a season. He is seldom busier than upon our engagement into solemn duties *Secondly.* To the inconstancy, wavering, and distraction of our own minds These are, indeed, a matter of unspeakable abasement, when we consider aright the majesty of God with whom we have to do. *Thirdly.* To undue and unjust offenses against persons and things, that we may lift up "holy hands" to God, "without wrath and doubting." Sundry things of the like nature might be instanced in, but that I leave all to the great direction, Romans 8:26, 27.

16. (3.) *Instruction.* This in such cases was peculiarly incumbent on the people of old, — namely, that they should instruct their children and their families in the nature of the ordinances whereby they worshiped God. This is that which God so commended in Abraham, Genesis 18:19, "I know Abraham," saith he, "that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the LORD, to do justice and judgment ;" in which expression the nature and observance of all ordinances is required.

Thus is it incumbent on them who have others under their charge to instruct them in the nature of this service which we observe unto the Lord.

It may be this is not, this will not be necessary upon every return of this day; but that it should be so done at some appointed season, no man that endeavors to walk uprightly before God can deny. And the omission of it has probably caused the whole service, amongst many, to be built on custom and example only. Hereon has that great neglect of it which we see ensued; for the power of their influence will not long abide.

17. We have done with preparatory duties.

II. Come we now to the day itself, the duties whereof I shall pass through with an equal brevity. And they are of two sorts: —

(1.) *Public;*

(2.) *Private:* whereof the former are the principal, and the latter subordinate unto them; and those of the latter sort are either personal or domestic.

18. The *public duties* of the day are principally to be regarded. By public duties, I intend *the due attendance unto and the due performance of all those parts of his solemn worship which God has appointed to be observed in the assemblies of his people, and in the manner wherein he has appointed them to be observed.* One end of this day is, to give glory to God in the celebration of his solemn worship. That this may be done aright and unto his glory, he himself has appointed the ways and means, or the ordinances and duties wherein it does consist. Without this, we had been at an utter loss how we might sanctify his name, or ascribe glory to him. Most probably we should have set up the calves of our own imaginations, to his greater provocation But he has relieved us herein, himself appointing the worship which he will accept. Would we, therefore, give full direction in particular for the right sanctifying of the name of God on this day, we ought to go over all the ordinances of worship which the church is bound to attend unto in its assemblies. But this is not my present purpose. Besides, somewhat of that kind has been formerly done in another way. I shall therefore here content myself to give some general rules, for the guidance of men in the whole; as, —

(1.) *That the public and solemn worship of God is to be preferred above that which is private.* They may be so prudently managed as not to interfere nor ordinarily to intrench on one another; but wherever on any

occasion they seem so to do, the private are to give place to the public: for one chief end of the sacred setting apart of this day, is the solemn acknowledgment of God, and the performance of his worship in assemblies. It is therefore a marvelous undue custom, on the pretense of private duties, whether personal or domestic, to abate any part of the duties of solemn assemblies; for there is in it a setting up of our own choice and inclinations against the wisdom and authority of God. The end of the day is the solemn worship of God, and the end is not to give way to the most specious helps and means.

(2.) *Choice is to be made of those assemblies for the celebration of public worship where we may be most advantaged as unto the ends of them, in the sanctification of this day, so far as it may be done without breach of any order appointed of God:* for in our joining in any concurrent acts of religious worship, we are to have regard unto helps suited to the furtherance of our own faith and obedience. And also, because God has appointed some parts of his worship, as in their own nature and by virtue of his appointment are means of conveying light, knowledge, grace, in spiritual supplies to our souls, it is certainly our duty to make choice and use of them which are most meet so to do.

(3.) For the manner of our attendance on the public worship of God, with *reverence, gravity, order, diligence, attention,* though it be a matter of great use and moment, yet not for this place to handle; nor does it here belong to us to insist on those ways whereby we may excite particular graces unto due acts of themselves, as the nature of the duties wherein we are engaged do require.

19. (4.) Although the day is wholly to be dedicated to the ends of a sacred rest, before insisted on, yet, —

[1.] *Duties in their performance drawn out to such a length as to beget wearisomeness and satiety, tend not unto edification, nor do any way promote the sanctification of the name of God in the worship itself,* Regard, therefore, in all such performances, is to be had, — *First.* Unto the *weakness of the natural constitution of some,* the infirmities and indispositions of others, who are not able to abide in the outward part of duties as others can. And there is no wise shepherd but will rather suffer the stronger sheep of his flock to lose somewhat of what they might reach

unto in his guidance of them, than compel the weaker to keep pace with them to their hurt, and it may be their ruin. Better a great number should complain of the shortness of some duties, who have strength and desires for a longer continuance in them, than that a few who are sincere should be really discouraged by being overburdened, and have the service thereby made useless to them. I always loved, in sacred duties, that of Seneca concerning the orations of Cassius Severus, when they heard him, "Timebamus ne desineret;" — "We were afraid that he would end." *Secondly.* To the *spiritual edge of the affections of men,* which ought to be whetted, and not, through tediousness in duties, abated and taken off. Other things of a like nature might be added, which for some considerations I shall forbear.

[2.] *Refreshments helpful to nature, so far as to refresh it, that it may have a supply of spirits to go on cheerfully in the duties of holy worship, are lawful and useful.* To macerate the body with abstinences on this day is required of none, and to turn it into a fast, or to fast upon it, is generally condemned by the ancients. Wherefore to forbear provision of necessary food for families on this day is Mosaical; and the enforcement of the particular precepts about not kindling fire in our houses on this day, baking and preparing the food of it the day before, cannot be insisted on without a re-introduction of the seventh day precisely, to whose observation they were annexed, and thereby of the law and spirit of the old covenant. Provided always that these refreshments be, —

First. *Seasonable for the time* of them, and not when public duties require our attendance on them;

Secondly. *Accompanied* with a singular regard to the rules of temperance; as,

(First.) That there be no *appearance of evil;*

(Secondly.) That nature be not charged with any kind of *excess,* so far as to be hindered rather than assisted in the duties of the day;

(Thirdly.) That they be accompanied with *gravity,* and *sobriety,* and *purity* of conversation. Now, whereas these things are, in the substance of them, required of us in the whole course of our lives, as we intend to please God, and to come to the enjoyment of him, none ought to think

an especial regard unto them on this day to be a bondage or troublesome unto them.

[3.] *Labour or pains for the enjoyment of the benefit and advantage of the solemn assemblies of the church, and in them of the appointed worship of God, is so far from intrenching on the rest of this day that it belongs to its due observation.* A mere bodily rest is no part of religious worship in itself, nor does it belong to the sanctification of this day any further than as it is a means for the due performance of the other duties belonging to it. We have no bounds under the gospel for a Sabbath-day's journey, provided it is for Sabbath ends In brief, all pains or labors that our station and condition in this world, that our troubles which may befall us, or any thing else, make necessary, as that without which we cannot enjoy the solemn ends and uses of this holy day of rest, are no way inconsistent with the due observation of it. It may be the lot of one man to take so much pains, and to travel so far, for and in the due celebration of the Lord's day, as if another should do the like without his occasions and circumstances, it would be a profanation of it.

[4.] *Labour in works of charity and necessity,* such as to visit the sick, to relieve the poor, to help the distressed, to relieve or assist creatures ready to perish, to supply cattle with necessary food, is allowed by all, and have been by many spoken unto.

[5.] For sports and such like recreations, and their use on this day, I refer the reader to laws of sundry emperors and nations concerning them. See of Constant. Leg. Omnes cap. de Feriis; Theodosius and Arcadius ibid.; and of Leo and Authemius, in the same place of the Code; of Charles the Great, Capitular., lib. 1:cap. 81, lib. 5:cap. 188. The sum of them all is contained in that exhortation which Ephraim Syrus expresses in his Serm. de Diebus Festis:

"Festivitates dominicas honorare studiose contendite, celebrantes eas non panegyrice, sed divine; non mundane, sed spiritualiter; non instar gentilium, sed Christianorum. Quare non portarum frontes coronemus; non choreas ducamus, non chorum exornemus; non tibiis et citharis auditum effeminemus, non mollibus vestibus induamur, nec cingulis undique auro radiantibus cingamur; non comessationibus et ebrietatibus dediti simus, verum ista

relinquamus eis quorum Deus venter est, et gloria in confusione ipsorum.”

20. For *private duties,* both personal and domestic, they are either antecedent or consequent to the solemn public worship, as usually for time it is celebrated amongst us. These consisting in the known religious exercises of prayer, reading the Scripture, meditation, family instructions from the advantage of the public ordinances, they are to be recommended to every one’s conscience, ability, and opportunity, as they shall find strength and assistance for them.

Μόνῳ τῷ Θεῷ δόξα.

SUMMARY

OF DOCTRINAL AND PRACTICAL OBSERVATIONS, DRAWN FROM THE EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE.[F12]

CHAPTERS 1, 2.

PRE-EMINENT DIGNITY OF CHRIST, BOTH ABSOLUTELY AND COMPARATIVELY—HIS SUPERIORITY TO ANGELS.

Chapter 1. Verse. 1,2.—

1. The revelation of the will of God, as to all things which concern his worship and our faith and obedience, is peculiarly, and in a way of eminence, from the Father.

2. The authority of God, speaking in and by the penmen of the Scriptures, is the sole bottom and foundation of our assenting to them, and to what is contained in them, with faith divine and supernatural.

3. God's gradual revelation of himself, and of his mind and will unto the church, was a fruit of infinite wisdom and care towards his elect.

4. We may see hence the absolute perfection of the revelation of the will of God by Christ and his apostles, as to every end and purpose whatever for which God by Christ and his apostles, as to every end and purpose whatever for which God ever did or ever will in this world reveal himself or his mind and will.

5. That the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the great prophet of his church under the new testament, the only revealer of the will of the Father, as the Son and Wisdom of God, made the worlds, and all things contained in them.

Verse 3.—

1. Our Lord Jesus Christ, as the Son of God, hath the weight of the whole creation upon his hand, and disposeth of it by his power and wisdom.

2. Such is the nature and condition of the universe, that it could not subsist a moment, nor could any thing in it act regularly unto its appointed end, without the continual support, guidance, influence, and disposal, of the Son of God.

3. So great was the work of freeing us from sin, that it could no otherwise be effected but by the sacrifice of the Son of God himself.

4. That there is nothing more vain, foolish, and fruitless, than the opposition which Satan and his agents yet make unto the Lord Christ and his kingdom.

5. That the service of the Lord Christ is both safe and honorable.

6. Great is the spiritual and eternal security of them that truly believe in Christ.

Verse 4. All pre-eminence and exaltation of one above others depends on the supreme counsel and will of God.

Verse 5.—

1. Every thing in Scripture is instructive.

2. It is lawful to draw consequence from the assertions of Scripture; and such consequences, rightly deduced, are infallibly true and *de fide*.

3. The declaration of Christ to be the Son of God is the care and work of the Father.

Verse 6.—

1. That the authority of God speaking in the Scripture is that alone which divine faith rests upon, and is to be resolved into.

2. That for the begetting, increasing, and strengthening of faith, it is useful to have important fundamental truths confirmed by many testimonies of Scripture.

3. The whole creation of God hath a great concern in God's bringing forth Christ into the world, and in his exaltation in his kingdom.

4. The command of God is the ground and reason of all religious worship.

5. That the Mediator of the new covenant is in his own person God, blessed for ever, to whom divine or religious worship is due from the angels themselves.

6. The Father, upon the account of the work of Christ in the world, and his kingdom that ensued on it, gives new commandment unto the angels to worship him, his glory being greatly concerned therein.

7. Great is the church's security and honor, when the Head of it is worshipped by all the angels in heaven.

8. It can be no duty of the saints of the new testament to worship angels, who are their fellow-servants in the worship of Jesus Christ.

Verse 7.—

1. Our conception of the angels, their nature, office, and work, is to be regulated by the Scripture.

2. That the glory, honor, and exaltation of the angels, lie in their subserviency to the providence of God.

Verse 8,9.—

1. The conferring and comparing of Scriptures is an excellent means of coming to an acquaintance with the mind and will of God in them.

2. It is the duty of all believers to rejoice in the glory, honor, and dominion of Jesus Christ.

3. It is the divine nature of the Lord Christ that gives eternity, stability, and unchangeableness to his throne and kingdom: "Thy throne, O God, is for ever."

4. All the laws, and the whole administration of the kingdom of Christ by his word and Spirit, are equal, righteous, and holy: "His scepter is a scepter of righteousness."

5. The righteous administrations of the Lord Christ in his government proceed all from his own habitual righteousness and love thereunto.

6. God is a God in especial covenant with the Lord Christ, as he is the mediator: “God, thy God.”

7. The collation of the Spirit on the Lord Christ, and his glorious exaltation, are the peculiar works of God the Father: “God, thy God, hath anointed thee.”

8. The Lord Jesus Christ is singular in this unction.

9. All that serve God in the work of building the church, according to his appointment, are anointed by his Spirit, and shall be rewarded by his power, Daniel 12:3.

10. The disciples of Christ, especially those who serve him in his church faithfully, are his companions in all his grace and glory.

Verse 10-12.—

1. All the properties of God, considered in the person of his Son, the head of the church, are suited to give relief, consolation, and support unto believers in all their distresses.

(1.) The properties of God are those whereby God makes known himself to us.

(2.) God oftentimes declares and proposeth these properties of his nature to us, for our support, consolation, and relief in our troubles, etc.

(3.) That since the entrance of sin, these properties of God, absolutely considered, will not yield that relief and satisfaction unto the souls of men which they would have done, and did, whilst man continued obedient unto God, according to the law of his creation.

(4.) These properties of the divine nature are in every person of the Trinity entirely.

(5.) The person of the Word, or the eternal Son of God, may be considered either absolutely as such, or as designed in the counsel, wisdom, and will of the Father.

2. The whole old creation, even the most glorious parts of it, hastening to its period, at least of our present interest in it and use of it, calls upon us not to fix our hearts on the small perishing shares which we have therein, especially since we have Him who is omnipotent and eternal for our inheritance.

3. The Lord Christ, the mediator, the head and spouse of the church, is infinitely exalted above all creatures whatever, in that he is God over all, omnipotent and eternal.

4. The whole world, the heavens and earth, being made by the Lord Christ, and being to be dissolved by him, is wholly at his disposal, to be ordered for the good of them that do believe.

5. There is no just cause of fear unto believer from any thing in heaven or earth, seeing they are all of the making and at the disposal of Jesus Christ.

6. Whatever our changes may be, inward or outward, yet, Christ changing not, our eternal condition is secured, and relief provided against all present troubles and miseries.

7. Such is the frailty of the nature of man, and such the perishing nature of all created things, that none can ever obtain the least stable consolation but what ariseth from an interest in the omnipotency, sovereignty, and eternity of the Lord Christ.

Verse 13.—

1. The authority of God the Father in the exaltation of Jesus Christ as the head and mediator of the church, is greatly to be regarded by believers.

2. The exaltation of Christ is the great pledge of the acceptance of the work of mediation performed in the behalf of the church.

3. Christ hath many enemies to his kingdom.

4. The kingdom and rule of Christ is perpetual and abiding, notwithstanding all the opposition that is made against it.

5. The end whereunto the Lord Jesus Christ will assuredly bring all his enemies, let them bluster whilst they please, shall be unto them miserable and shameful, to the saints joyful, to himself victorious and triumphant.

Verse 14.—

1. The highest honor of the most glorious spirits in heaven, is to minister unto the Lord in the service whereunto he appoints them.

2. Unto what ends and purposes doth God make use of the ministry of angels, for the good of them that do believer.

3. The Socratical fancy of one single guardian angel attending every one, as it is, if admitted, a real impeachment unto superstition and idolatry.

4. Believers obtain heaven by inheritance and free gifts of their Father, and not by merit of their own.

Chapter 2. Verse 1.—

1. Diligent attendance unto the word of the gospel is indispensably necessary unto perseverance in the profession of it.

2. There are sundry times and seasons wherein, and several ways and means whereby, men are in danger to lose the word that they have heard, if they attend not diligently unto its preservation.

3. The word heard is not lost without the great sin as well as the inevitable ruins of the souls of men.

4. It is the nature of the word of the gospel to water barren hearts, and to make them fruitful unto God.

5. The consideration of the revelation of the gospel by the Son of God is a powerful motive unto diligent attendance unto it.

6. The true and only way of honoring the Lord Christ as the Son of God, is by diligent attendance and obedience unto his word.

Verse 2-4.—

1. Motives unto a due valuation of the gospel, and perseverance in the profession of it, taken from the penalties annexed unto the neglect of it, are evangelical, and of singular use in the preaching of the word.

2. All punishments annexed unto the transgression either of the law or gospel are effects of God's vindictive justice, and consequently just and equal.

3. Every concern of the law and gospel, both as to their nature and promulgation, is to be weighed and considered by believers, to beget in their hearts a right and due valuation of them.

4. What means soever God is pleased to use in the revelation of his will, he gives it a certainty, steadfastness, assurance, and evidence, which our faith may rest in, and which cannot be neglected without the greatest sin.

5. Every transaction between God and man is always confirmed and ratified by promises and threatenings, rewards, and punishments: "Every trespass."

6. The most glorious administrators of the law do stoop to look into the mysteries of the gospel.

7. Covenant transgressions are attended with unavoidable penalties.

8. The gospel is a word of salvation to them that do believe.

9. The salvation tendered in the gospel is great salvation.

10. Men are apt to entertain thoughts of escaping the wrath of God, though they live in a neglect of the gospel.

11. The neglecters of the gospel shall unavoidably perish under the wrath of God.

> **Verse 5.** This is the great privilege of the church of the gospel, that, in the things of the worship of God, it is made subject unto and immediately depends upon the Lord Jesus Christ, and not any other, angels or men.

1. That the Lord Christ is our head.

2. That he is our only head.

Verse 6-9. The consideration of the infinitely glorious excellencies of the nature of God, manifesting themselves in his works, doth greatly set out his condescension and grace in his regard and respect to mankind.

1. The respect, care, love, and grace of God unto mankind, expressed in the person and mediation of Jesus Christ, is a matter of singular and eternal admiration.

2. That such was the inconceivable love of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, unto the souls of men, that he was free and willing to condescend unto any condition for their good and salvation.

3. The blessed issue of the abasement of Jesus Christ, in his exaltation unto glory and honor, is an assured pledge of the final glory and blessedness of all that believe in him, whatever difficulties and dangers they may be exercised withal in the way.

4. Jesus Christ, as the mediator of the new covenant, hath absolute and supreme authority given unto him over all the works of God in heaven and earth.

5. The Lord Jesus Christ is the only Lord of the gospel state of the church, called under the old testament "The world to come."

6. The Lord Jesus Christ in his death did undergo the penal sentence of the law, in the room and stead of them for whom he died.

Verse 10.—

1. That the whole work of saving the sons of God, from first to last, their guidance and conduct through sins and sufferings unto glory, is committed unto the Lord Jesus.

2. That the Lord Jesus Christ being priest, sacrifice, and altar himself, the offering whereby he was consecrated unto the perfection and complement of his office was of necessity to be part of that work which, as our priests and mediator, he was to undergo and perform.

3. The Lord Christ, being consecrated and perfected through sufferings, hath consecrated the way of sufferings, for all that follow him to pass through unto glory.

4. Such is the desert of sin, and such is the immutability of the justice of God, that there was no way possible to bring sinners unto glory but by the sufferings and death of the Son of God, who undertook to be the captain of their salvation.

Verse 11-13.—

1. That all the children which are to be brought unto glory, antecedently unto their relation unto the Lord Christ, are polluted, defiled, separate from God.

2. That the Lord Christ is the great sanctifier of the church. He, as the captain of salvation, sanctifies every son whom he brings to glory.

3. The agreement of Christ and the elect in one common nature is the foundation of his fitness to be an undertaker on their behalf, and of the equity of their being made partners of the benefits of his mediation.

4. That notwithstanding the union of nature which is between the Son of God incarnate, the sanctifier, and the children that are to be sanctified, there is, in respect of their persons, an inconceivable distance between them, so that it is a marvelous condescension in him to call them brethren.

5. That which was principally upon the heart of Christ in his sufferings, was to declare and manifest the love, grace, and good-will of God unto men, that they might come to an acquaintance with him and acceptance before him.

6. That the Lord Christ, as the captain of our salvation, was exposed in the days of his flesh unto great difficulties, anxieties of mind, dangers, and troubles.

7. The Lord Christ, in all his perplexities and troubles, betook himself unto the protection of God, trusting in him.

8. He both suffered and trusted as our head and precedent.

Verse 14,15.—

1. That all sinners are subject unto death as it is penal.

2. Fear of death as it is penal is inseparable from sin, before the sinner is delivered by the death of Christ.

3. Fear of death as penal renders the minds of men obnoxious unto bondage.

4. That the Lord Christ, out of his inexpressible love, willingly submitted himself unto every condition of the children to be saved by him, and to every thing in every condition of them, sin only excepted.

5. It was only in flesh and blood, the substance and essence of human nature, and not in our personal infirmities, that the Lord Christ was made like unto us.

6. That the Son of God should take part in human nature with the children, is the greatest and most admirable effect of divine love, wisdom, and grace.

7. That the first and principal end of the Lord Christ's assuming human nature, was not to reign in it, but to suffer and die in it.

8. All the power of Satan in the world over any of the sons of men is founded in sin, and the guilt of death attending it.

9. All sinners out of Christ are under the power of Satan.

10. The death of Christ, through the wise and righteous disposal of God, is victorious, all-conquering, and prevalent.

11. One principal end of the death of Christ was to destroy the power of Satan.

Verse 16.—

1. The Lord Jesus Christ is truly God and man in one person.

2. The redemption of mankind, by the taking of our nature, was a work of mere sovereign grace.

Verse 17,18.—

1. The promised Messiah was to be the great high priest of the people of God.

2. The assumption of our nature, and his conformity unto us therein, was principally necessary unto the Lord Jesus on the account of his being a priest for us.

3. Such was the unspeakable love of Christ unto the brethren, that he would refuse nothing, no condition that was needful to fit him for the discharge of the work which he had undertaken for them.

4. The principal work of the Lord Christ as our high priest, and from which all other actings of his in that office do flow, was to make reconciliation or atonement for sin.

5. The Lord Christ suffered under all his temptations, sinned in none.

6. Temptations cast souls into danger.

7. The great duty of tempted souls is to cry out unto the Lord Christ for help and relief.

CHAPTER 3., 4:1-13

CHRIST'S SUPERIORITY TO MOSES, THE AGENT IN FOUNDING THE OLD DISPENSATION.

Chapter 3. Verses 1,2.—

1. All the doctrines of the gospel, especially those concerning the person and offices of Christ, are to be improved unto practice in faith and obedience.

2. Dispensers of the gospel ought to use holy prudence in winning upon the minds and affections of those whom they are to instruct.

3. Believers are all related unto one another in the nearest and strictest bond of an equal relation.

4. All true and real professors of the gospel are sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and made truly and really holy.

5. No man comes to a useful, saving knowledge of Jesus Christ in the gospel, but by virtue of an effectual heavenly calling.

6. The effectual heavenly vocation of believers is their great privilege, wherein they have cause to rejoice, and which always ought to mind them of their duty unto him that hath called them.

7. The spiritual mysteries of the gospel, especially those which concern the person and offices of Christ, require deep, diligent, and attentive consideration.

8. The business of God with sinners could be no way transacted but by the negotiation and embassy of the Son.

9. Especial privileges will not advantage men, without especial grace.

10. The Lord Christ is all in all and unto his church, the king, priest, and apostle or prophet of it, all in one.

11. A diligent, attentive consideration of the person, offices, and work of Jesus Christ, is the most effectual means to free the souls of men from all entanglements of errors and darkness, and to keep them constant in the profession of the truth.

12. The union of believers lies in their joint of faith in the person and offices of Christ, upon a participation in the same heavenly calling.

13. The ordering of all things in the church depends on the sovereign appointment of the Father.

14. The faithfulness of the Lord Christ in the discharge of the trust committed unto him is the great ground of faith and assurance unto believers, in the worship of the gospel.

15. All things concerning the worship of God in the whole church or house, now under the gospel, are no less completely and perfectly ordered and ordained by the Lord Jesus Christ than they were by Moses under the law.

Verse 3-6.—

1. Every one who is employed in the service of God in his house, and is faithful in the discharge of his work and trust therein, is worthy of honor. So was Moses.

2. That the Lord Christ is worthy of all glory and honor upon the account of his thus building his church, the house of God.

3. The honor and glory of all that ever were, or all that ever shall be, employed in the work and service of the house of God, jointly and severally considered, is inferior, subordinate, and subservient to the glory and honor of Jesus Christ, the chief builder of the house.

4. The building of the church is so great and glorious a work as that it could not be effected by any but him who is God.

5. The greatest and most honorable of the sons of men, that are employed in the work of God in his house, are but servants and part of the house itself.

6. The great end of all Mosaic institutions, was to present, or prefigure, and give testimony unto the grace of the gospel by Jesus Christ.

7. It is an eminent privilege to be of the house of Christ, or a part of that house: “Whose house are we.”

8. The greatness of this privilege requires an answerableness of duty.

9. In times of trial and persecution, freedom, boldness, and constancy in profession, are a good evidence unto ourselves that we are living stones in the house of God, and are duties acceptable unto him.

10. Interest in the gospel gives sufficient cause of confidence and rejoicing in every condition.

11. So many and great are the interveniences and temptations that lie in the way of profession, so great is the number of them that decay in it or apostatize from it, that as unto the glory of God, and the principal discovery of its truth and sincerity, it is to be taken from its permanency unto the end.

Verse 7-11.—

1. No divine truth ought in its delivery to be passed by, without manifesting its use, and endeavoring its improvement unto holiness and obedience.

2. In times of temptations and trials, arguments and exhortations unto watchfulness against sin, and constancy in obedience, are to be multiplied in number, and pressed with wisdom, earnestness, and diligence.

3. Exhortations unto duty ought to be built on a stable foundation, and to be resolved into an authority which may influence the consciences of them to whom they do belong.

4. What was given by inspiration from the Holy Ghost, and is recorded in the Scripture for the use of the church, is of all our obedience consists in its relation to the voice or authority of God.

6. Every thing in the commands of God, relating unto the manner of their giving out and communicating unto us, is to be retained in our minds, and considered as present unto us.

7. Consideration and choice are a stable and permanent foundation of obedience.

8. Such is the nature, efficacy, and power of the voice or word of God, that men cannot withstand or resist it without a sinful hardening of themselves against it.

9. Many previous sins make way for the great sin of finally rejecting the voice or word of God.

10. Old Testament examples are New Testament instructions.

11. Especial seasons of grace and obedience are in an especial manner to be observed and improved.

12. That the examples of our forefathers are of use unto us, and objects of our deepest consideration.

13. It is a dangerous condition, for children to boast of the privileges of their fathers, and to imitate their sins.

14. A multitude joining in any sin gives it thereby a great aggravation.

15. The sinful actings of men against those who deal with them in the name of God, and about the works or will of God, are principally against God himself.

16. Unbelief manifesting itself in a time of trial is a most provoking sin.

17. There is commonly a day, a time, wherein unbelief riseth to its height in provocation.

18. To distrust God, to disbelieve his promises, whilst a way of duty lies before us, after we have had experience of his goodness, power, and wisdom, in his dealing with us, is a tempting of God, and a great, provoking sin.

19. No place, no retiredness, no solitary wilderness, will secure men from sin or suffering, provocation or punishment.

20. Great works of providence are a great means of instruction; and neglect of them, as to their instructive end, is a great aggravation of the sin of those who live when and where they are performed.

(1.) To profit by these, it is required that we consider and be well acquainted with our own condition.

(2.) That we consider what peculiar impressions of his will God puts upon any of his works.

21. The greater evidence that God gives of his power and goodness in any of his works, the louder is his voice in them, and the greater is the sin of them that neglect them.

22. The end of all God's works, of his mighty works of providence, towards a person, a church, or a nation, is to bring to faith and dependence.

23. God is pleased ofttimes to grant great outward means to those in whom he will not work effectually by his grace.

24. No privilege, no outward means of grace, no other advantages whatever, will secure men in a course of sinning from the wrath and justice of God.

25. There are determinate bounds fixed unto God's patience and forbearance towards obstinate sinners.

26. The heart of God is greatly concerned in the sins of men, especially of those who on any account are his people, and so esteemed.

27. In all the sins of men, God principally regards the principle, that is the heart.

28. The error of the heart in preferring the ways of sin before obedience, with its promises and rewards, is the root of all great provoking sins and rebellions against God.

29. A constant persisting in a course of sin, is the utmost, highest, and last aggravation of sin.

30. None despise or desert the ways of God but those that know them not.

31. When God expresseth great indignation in himself against sin, it is to teach men the greatness of sin in themselves.

32. God gives the same firmitude and stability unto his threatenings that he doth unto his promises.

33. When men have provoked God by their impenitency to decree their punishment irrevocably, they will find severity in the execution.

34. It is the presence of God alone that renders any place or condition good or desirable.

Verse 12.—

1. There is a need of great care, heedfulness, watchfulness, and circumspection, for a due continuance in our profession, to the glory of God and advantage of our own souls.

2. Godly jealousy concerning, and watchfulness over the whole body, that no beginnings of backslidings from Christ and the gospel be found amongst them, is the duty of all churches, of all believers.

3. It is the duty of every individual believer to be intent on all occasions, lest at any time, or by any means, there should be found in him an evil heart of unbelief. Unbelief rejects the peculiar doctrines of the gospel; such as,

(1.) That Jesus of Nazareth, poor and despised as he was in the world, was the Son of God, the Savior of the world, and is both Lord and Christ.

(2.) That by the obedience, death, and blood-shedding of this same Jesus, who was crucified and slain, are redemption, forgiveness of sins, deliverance from the wrath to come, righteousness, and acceptation with God, to be obtained, and by him only.

(3.) That the way and means whereby forgiveness of sin, righteousness, and acceptance with God for sinners, is obtained by this Jesus Christ, is, that by the sacrifice of himself, his death, and blood-shedding, with the punishment for sin which he voluntarily underwent, God was atoned, his justice satisfied, and his law fulfilled; and that because he had ordered, in his infinite wisdom and sovereignty, with the will and consent of Christ himself, to charge all the sin of the all the elect upon him, and to accept of his obedience for them, he undertaking to be their Surety and Redeemer.

4. The root of all backsliding, of all apostasy, whether it be notional or practical, partial or total, lies in unbelief.

5. The malignity and venom of sin is apt to hide itself under many, under any shades and pretences.

6. The best way to antidote the soul against sin, is to represent it unto the mind in its true nature and tendency.

7. Whoever departs from the observance of the gospel and the insitutions thereof, doth in so doing depart from the living God.

8. When a heart is made evil by unbelief, it is engaged in a course of sinful defection, of revolt from the living God.

Verse 13.—

1. Sedulous mutual exhortation is an eminent means to obviate and prevent the design of the deceitfulness of sin.

2. Gospel duties have an effectual efficacy attending them in their special seasons.

3. We have but an uncertain season for the due performance of most certain duties.

4. The deceit which is in sin, and which is inseparable from it, tends continually to the hardening of the heart.

Verse 14.—

1. Union with Christ is the principle and measure of all spiritual enjoyments and expectations.

2. Constancy and steadfastness in believing is the great touchstone, trial, and evidence of union with Christ, or a participation of him.

(1.) There are many appearing evidences of union with Christ that may and do fail.

(2.) There may be certain and undeceiving evidences of a present participation of Christ.

(3.) No grace, no sign or mark, will any longer or any further be an evidence or testimony in this matter, but only as the soul is effectually influenced unto perseverance thereby.

(4.) Perseverance is an evidence of union in that it is an effect of it.

(5.) Whatever profession hath been made by any, whatever fruits of it have been brought forth, whatever continuance in it there hath been, if it fail totally, it is sufficient evidence that those who have made it were never partakers of Christ.

3. Persistency in our subsistence in Christ unto the end is a matter of great endeavor and diligence, and that unto all believers.

4. Not only our profession and existence in Christ, but the gracious beginnings of it also, are to be secured with great spiritual care and industry.

Verse 15.—

1. That every circumstance of the Scripture is instructive.

2. God hath filled the Scripture with truth.

Verse 16.—

1. Many hear the word or voice of God to no advantage, but only to aggravate their sin.

2. In the most general and visible apostasies of the church, God still preserves a remnant unto himself, to bear witness unto him and for him by their faith and obedience.

3. God lays a few, ofttimes a very few, of his secret ones in the balance against the greatest multitude of rebels and transgressors.

Verse 17.—

1. God is not displeased with any thing in his people but sin.

2. Public sins, sins in societies, are great provocations of God.

3. God sometimes will make men who have been wickedly exemplary in sin righteously examplary in their punishment.

4. Great destructions in a way of judgment and vengeance are institute representations of the judgment and vengeance to come.

Verse 18.—

1. All unbelief is accompanied with contumacy and rebellion.

2. Unbelief not only justifies but glorifies the greatest severities of God against them in whom it prevails.

3. The oath of God is engaged against no sins but unbelief.

Verse 19.—

1. Whatever we consider in sin, God principally considers the root and spring of it in unbelief, as that which maketh the most direct and immediate opposition unto himself.

2. Unbelief is the most direct and immediate root and cause of all provoking sins.

3. To disbelieve God with respect unto any special design of glorifying himself, is the greatest and highest provocation.

4. Unbelief deprives men of all interest in or right unto the promises of God.

5. No unbeliever shall ever enter into the rest of God.

Chapter 4. Verse 1.—

1. The gospel, in the dispensation thereof, is not only attended with promises and rewards, but also with threatenings and punishments.

2. Gospel comminations ought to be managed towards all sorts of professors promiscuously, be they true believers, temporary, or hypocrites.

3. Fear is the proper object of gospel comminations, which ought to be answerable to our several conditions and grounds of obnoxiousness unto those threatenings.

4. It is a matter of great and tremendous consequence, to have the promises of God left and proposed unto us.

5. The failing of men through unbelief doth no way cause the promises of God to fail or cease.

6. The gospel state of believers is a state of assured rest and peace.

7. Many to whom the promise of the gospel is proposed and preached do or may, through their own sins, come short of the enjoyment of the things promised.

8. Not only backsliding through unbelief, but all appearance of tergiversation in profession, and occasions of them in times of difficulty and trials, ought to be carefully avoided by professors.

9. They who mix not the promises of the gospel with faith shall utterly come of entering into the rest of God.

Verse 2.—

1. It is a signal privilege to have the gospel preached unto us.

2. Barely to be evangelized, to have the gospel preached unto any, is a privilege of a dubious issue and event.

3. The gospel is no new doctrine, no new law.

4. God hath graciously ordered the word of the gospel to be preached unto men, wheron depends their welfare or their ruin.

5. The sole cause of the promise being ineffectual unto salvation, in and towards them to whom it is preached, is in themselves and their own unbelief.

6. There is a failing, temporary faith with respect unto the promises of God, which will not advantage them in whom it is.

7. The great mystery of useful and profitable believing consists in the mixing and incorporating of truth and faith in the souls and minds of believers.

Verse 3.—

1. The state of believers under the gospel is a state of blessed rest.

2. It is faith alone which is the only way and means of entering into this blessed state of rest.

3. There is a mutual inbeing of the promises and threatenings of the covenant, so that in our faith and consideration of them they ought not utterly to be separated.

4. God hath shown us in his own example that work and labor is to precede our rest.

5. All the works of God are perfect.

6. All the works of God in the creation were wrought and ordered in a subserviency unto his worship and glory whereby.

Verse 4.—

1. Whatever the Scripture saith in any place, being rightly understood and applied, is a firm foundation for faith to rest upon, and for arguments or proofs in matters of God’s worship to be deduced from.

2. It is to no purpose to press any thing in the worship of God, without producing the authority of God for it in his word.

3. What the Scripture puts an especial mark upon is especially by us to be regarded and inquired into.

Verse 5.—Many important truths are not clearly delivered in any one single testimony or proposition in the Scripture, but the mind of God concerning them is to be gathered and learned by comparing of several Scriptures, in order and respect to one another.

Verse 6.—

1. The faithfulness of God in his promises is not to be measured by faith or obedience of men at any one season, in any one generation; nor by their sins whereby they come short of them, nor by any providential dispensations towards them.

2. The promises of God are such as belong only to the grace of the covenant, or such as respect also the outward administration of it in this world.

3. Some, yea, many promises of God, may have a full accomplishment, when very few, or it may be none at all, know or take notice that so they are accomplished.

4. Some promises of God, as to their season, although they may have, and indeed have, their use and benefit in all seasons; and until this come there can be no failure charged, though they be not fulfilled.

5. There are many promises whose signal accomplishment God that not limited to any especial season, but keeps it in his own will to act according to them towards his church as is best suited to his wisdom and love.

6. Some concerns of the glory of God in the world may suspend the full and outward accomplishment of some promises for a season.

7. When the accomplishment of promises seemeth to be deferred, we are not to faint in our duty.

Verse 7.—

1. In reading and hearing the Scripture, we ought to consider God speaking in it and by it unto us.

2. Divine inspiration, or the authority of God speaking in and by the penmen of the Scripture, is the ground and foundation of our faith, and is that which gives them authority over our consciences and efficacy in them.

3. The holy Scripture is an inexhaustible treasury or repository of spiritual mysteries and sacred truths.

4. Many important truths lie deep and secret in the Scripture, and stand in need of a very diligent search and hard digging in their investigation, and for their finding out.

5. For searching the Scriptures aright there is required a peculiar humble and teachable frame of spirit;

6. Earnest prayer for the guidance, direction, assistance, and illumination, of the Holy Ghost, to enable us to find out, discern, and understand the deep things of God;

7. Endeavor, in all inquirings into the word, to mind and aim at the same ends which God hath in the giving and granting of it unto us.

8. They that would search the Scriptures, to find out the sacred truths that lie hid in them, ought to take care that they entertain no corrupt lusts in their hearts and minds.

9. Sedulity and constancy in this duty are a great help to a profitable discharge of it.

10. In our search after truth, our minds are greatly to be influence and guided by the analogy of faith;

11. A due consideration of the nature of the discourse wherein any words are used.

12. The proper grammatical sense of the words themselves is duly to be inquired into and pondered.

Verse 8.—

1. There is not true rest for the souls of men but only in Jesus Christ by the gospel.

2. Other things will not give rest to the souls of men.

3. The gospel church-state is a state of spiritual rest in Christ.

4. It is a great mercy and privilege to have a day of rest and worship given unto us.

Verse 9.—

1. Believers under the new testament have lost nothing, no privilege that was enjoyed by them under the old.

2. It is the people of God alone who have a right unto all the privileges of the gospel, and who in a due manner can perform the duties of it.

3. The people of God, as such, have work to do, and labor incumbent on them.

4. God hath graciously given his people an entrance into rest during their state of work and labor, to sweeten it unto them, and to enable them for it.

5. Believers may and do find assured rest in the due attendance unto and performance of the duties of the gospel.

6. There is a weekly sacred rest appointed for believers under the gospel.

Verse 10.—

1. The whole church, all the duties, worship, and privileges of it, are founded in the person, authority, and actions of Jesus Christ.

2. The first day of the week, the day of the resurrection of Christ, when he rested from his work, is appointed and determined for a day of rest or Sabbath unto the church, to be constantly observed in the room of the seventh day, appointed and observed from the foundation of the world under the old testament.

Verse 11.—

1. That great oppositions will and do arise against men in the work of entering into God’s rest.

2. That as the utmost of our labors and endeavors are required to our obtaining an entrance into the rest of Christ, so it doth very well deserve that they should be laid out therin.

3. There is a present excellency in and a present reward attending gospel faith and obedience.

4. Precedent judgments on others are monitory ordinances to us.

5. It is better to have an example than to be made an example of divine vengeance under the guilt of those sins which others, in a like manner guilty of, have not escaped.

Verse12,13.—

1. It is the way of the Spirit of God, to excite us unto especial duties, by proposing unto us and reminding us of such properties of God as the consideration whereof may in an especial manner incline us unto them.

2. The life and power of Christ are continually exercised about the concerns of the souls of professors.

3. The power of Christ in his word is irresistible, as to whatever effects he doth design in it.

4. Though men may close and hide things from themselves and others, yet they cannot exclude the power of Christ in his word from piercing into them.

5. The Lord Christ discerneth all inward and spiritual things, in order to his present and future judgment of those things, and the persons in whom they are.

6. It is no trouble or labor to the Word of God to discern all creatures, and all that is of them and in them, seeing that there is nothing but is evidently apparent, open, and naked, under his all-seeing eye.

7. It is a great and difficult matter really and practically to convince professors of the practical judging omniscience of Jesus Christ in the word of God.

8. That the beginnings or entrances into declensions in profession, or backslidings from Christ and the gospel, are secret, deep, and hardly discoverable.

9. A due and holy consideration at all times of the all-seeing eye of Jesus Christ is a great preservative against blackslidings or declensions in profession.

10. A due and holy consideration of the omnisciency of Christ is a great encouragement unto the meanest and weakest believers, who are upright and sincere in their faith and obedience.

CHAPTER 4:14-16, 5.-8.

SUPERIORITY OF CHRIST AS PRIEST TO THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD, FROM THE ANALOGY OF HIS OFFICE WITH THAT OF MELCHISEDEC, AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.

Chapter 4. Verse 14.—

1. That great opposition is, and always will be, made unto the permanency of believers in their profession.

2. It is our duty, in the midst of all oppositions, to hold our profession firm and steadfast unto the end.

3. Believers have great encouragement unto and assistance in the constancy of their profession, by and from the priesthood of Jesus Christ.

Verse 15.—The church of God hath a standing, perpetual advantage, in the union of our nature to the person of the Son of God, as he is our high priest.

Verse 16.—

1. There is, there will be a season, many a season, in the course of our profession or walking before God, wherein we do or shall stand in need of especial aid and assistance.

2. That there is with God in Christ, God on his throne of grace, a spring of suitable and seasonable help for all times and occasions of difficulty.

3. All help, succor, or spiritual assistance in our straits and difficulties, proceeds from mere mercy and grace.

4. When we have, through Christ, obtained mercy for our persons, we need not fear but that we shall have suitable and seasonable help for our duties.

5. The way to obtain help from God, is by a due gospel application of our souls for it to the throne of grace.

6. Great discouragements are used to interpose themselves in our minds and against their faith, when we stand in need of especial help from God, and would make an application unto him for relief.

7. Faith's consideration of the interposition of Christ in our behalf, as our high priest, is the only way to remove discouragements, and to give us boldness in our access unto God.

8. That in all our approaches unto God, we are to consider him as on a throne.

Chapter 5. Verse 1.—

1. Christ's participation of our nature, as necessary unto him for the bearing and discharge of the office of a high priest on our behalf, is a great ground of consolation unto believers, a manifest evidence that he is and will be tender and compassionate towards them.

2. It was the entrance of sin that made the office of the priesthood necessary.

3. It was of infinite grace that such an appointment was made.

4. The priest is described by the especial discharge of his duty or exercise of his office, which is his "offering both gifts and sacrifice for sins." 5. Where there is no proper propitiatory sacrifice, there is no proper priest.

6. Jesus Christ alone is the high priest of his people.

7. It was a great privilege which the church enjoyed of old, in the representation which it had, by God's appointment, of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ in their own typical priests and sacrifices.

8. Much more glorious is our privilege under the gospel, since our Lord Jesus hath taken upon him, and actually discharged, this part of his office, in offering an absolutely perfect and complete sacrifice for sin.

9. What is to be done with God on the account of sin, that it may be expiated and pardoned, and that the people of God who have sinned may be accepted with him and blessed, is all actually done for them by Jesus Christ, their high priest, in the sacrifice for sin which he offered on their behalf.

Verse 2.—

1. Compassion and forbearance with meekness in those from whom we expect help and relief, is the great motive and encouragement unto faith, affiance, and expectation of them.

2. We live, the life of our souls is principally maintained, upon this compassionateness of our High Priest.

3. Though every sin hath in it the whole nature of sin, rendering sinners obnoxious unto the curse of the law, yet as there are several kinds of sins so there are several degrees of sin, some being accompanied with a greater guilt than others.

4. Our ignorance is both our calamity, our sin, and an occasion of many sins unto us.

5. Sin is a wandering from the way.

6. No sort of sinners is excluded from an interest in the care and love of our compassionate High Priest, but only those who exclude themselves by their unbelief.

7. It is well for us, and enough for us, that the Lord Christ was encompassed with the sinless infirmities of our nature.

8. God can teach a sanctified use of sinful infirmities, as he did in it and unto the priests under the law.

Verse 3.—

1. The absolute holiness and spotless innocence of the Lord Christ in his offering of himself had a signal influence into the efficacy of his sacrifice, and is a great encouragement unto our faith and consolation.

2. Whosoever dealeth with God or man about the sins of others should look well, in the first place, unto his own.

3. No dignity of person or place, no duty, no merit, can deliver sinners from standing in need of a sacrifice for sin.

4. It was a part of the darkness and bondage of the church under the old testament, that their high priests had need to offer sacrifices for themselves and for their own sins.

Verse 4.—

1. It is an act of sovereignty in God to call whom he pleaseth unto his work and especial service, and eminently so when it is unto any place of honor and dignity in his house.

2. The highest excellency and utmost necessity of any work to be done for God in this world, will not warrant our undertaking of it or engaging in it, unless we are called thereunto.

3. The more excellent any work of God is, the more express ought our call unto it to be.

4. It is a great dignity and honor to be duly called unto any work, service, or office, in the house of God.

Verse 5.—

1. The office of the high priesthood over the church of God was an honor and glory to Jesus Christ.

2. Relation and love are the fountain and cause of God’s committing all authority in and over the church to Jesus Christ.

Verse 6.—That in all things wherein God hath to do with mankind, Jesus Christ should have an absolute pre-eminence.

Verse 7.—

1. The Lord Jesus Christ himself had a time of infirmity in this world.

2. A life of glory may ensue after a life of infirmity.

3. The Lord Christ is no more now in a state of weakness and temptation.

4. The Lord Christ filled up every season with duty, with the proper duty of it.

5. The Lord Christ, in his offering up himself for us, labored and travailed in soul to bring the work unto a good and holy issue.

6. The Lord Christ, in the time of his offering and suffering, considering God, with whom he had to do, as the sovereign Lord of life and death, as the supreme Rector and Judge of all, cast himself before him, with most fervent prayers for deliverance from the sentence of death and the curse of the law.

7. In all the pressures that were on the Lord Jesus Christ, in all the distresses he had to conflict withal in his sufferings, his faith for deliverance and success was firm and unconquerable.

8. The success of our Lord Jesus Christ in his trials, as our head and surety, is a pledge and assurance of success unto us in all our spiritual conflicts.

Verse 8.—

1. Infinite love prevailed with the Son of God to lay aside the privilege of his infinite dignity, that he might suffer for us and our redemption.

2. In his sufferings, and notwithstanding them all, the Lord Christ was the Son still, the Son of God.

3. A practical experience of obedience to God in some cases will cost us dear.

4. Sufferings undergone according to the will of God are highly instructive.

5. In all these things, both as to suffering and learning, or profiting thereby, we have a great example in our Lord Jesus Christ.

6. The love of God towards any, the relation of any unto God, hinders not but that they may undergo great sufferings and trials.

Verse 9.—

1. All that befell the Lord Christ, all that he did or suffered, was necessary to this end, that he might be the cause of eternal salvation to believers.

2. The Lord Christ was consecrated himself in and by the sacrifice that he offered for us, and what he suffered in so doing.

3. The Lord Christ alone is the only principal cause of our eternal salvation, and that in every kind.

4. Salvation is confined to believers.

Verse 10.—

1. God was pleased to put a signal honor upon the person and office of Melchisedec, that in them there should be an early and excellent representation made of the person and priesthood of Jesus Christ.

2. As the Lord Christ received all his honor, as mediator, from God the Father, so the ground and measure of our glory and honor unto him as such depend on the revelation and declaration of it unto us.

3. It is an evidence and testimony that the Lord Christ was able to be, and is, the author of eternal salvation unto all that do obey him, because he is a priest after the order of Melchisedec; that is, that his priesthood is eternal.

Verse 11.—

1. There are revealed in the Scripture sundry deep and mysterious truths, which require a peculiar diligence in our attendance unto their declaration, that we rightly understand them or receive them in a due manner.

2. It is necessary for the ministers of the gospel sometimes to insist on the most abstruse and difficult truths that are revealed for our edification.

3. There is a glorious light and evidence in all divine truths, but by reason of our darkness and weakness, we are not always able to comprehend them.

4. Many who receive the word at first with some readiness, do yet afterwards make but slow progress either in knowledge or grace.

5. It is men's slothfulness in hearing that is the sole cause of their not improving the means of grace, or not thriving under the dispensation of the word.

6. It is a grievous matter to the dispersers of the gospel, to find their hearers unapt to learn and thrive under their ministry, through their negligence and sloth.

Verse 12.—

1. The time wherein we enjoy the great mercy and privilege of the dispensation of the gospel, is a matter which must in particular be accounted for.

2. Churches are the schools of Christ, wherein his disciples are trained up unto perfection, every one according to the measure appointed for him, and usefulness in the body.

3. It is the duty of ministers of the gospel to endeavor to promote the increase of their hearers in knowledge, until they also are able to instruct others, according to their calls and opportunities.

4. The holy Scriptures are to be looked on, consulted, and submitted unto, as the oracles of God.

5. God hath, in infinite love and wisdom, so disposed of his word as that there are first principles, plain and necessary, laid down in it, to facilitate the instruction he intends thereby.

6. They who live under the preaching of the gospel are obnoxious to great and provoking sins, if they diligently watch not against them.

7. There will be a time when false and unprofitable professors will be made manifest and discovered, either to their present conviction or their eternal confusion.

8. Men do ofttimes secretly wax worse and worse under profession and means of grace.

9. There are provisions of truth in the Scripture, suitable to the spiritual instruction and edification of all sorts of persons that belong to Jesus Christ.

Verse 13.—

1. The gospel is the only word of righteousness, in itself and to us.

2. It is a great aggravation of the negligence of persons under the dispensation of the gospel, that it is a word of righteousness.

3. That God requires, of all those who live under the dispensation of the gospel, that they should be skilful in the word of righteousness.

Verse 14.—

1. The word of the gospel, in the dispensation of it, is food provided for the souls of men.

2. Whereas the word is food, it is evident that it will not profit our souls until it be eaten and digested.

3. It is an evidence of a thriving and healthy state of soul, to have an appetite unto the deepest mysteries of the gospel, its most solid doctrines of truth, and to be able profitably to digest them.

4. The assiduous exercise of our minds about spiritual things, in a spiritual manner, is the only means to make us profit in the hearing of the word.

5. The spiritual sense of believers, well exercised in the word, is the best and most undeceiving help in judging of what is good or evil, what is true or false, that is proposed unto them.

Chapter 6. Verse. 1.—

1. It is the duty of ministers of the gospel to take care, not only that the doctrine which they preach be true, but also that it be seasonable with respect to the state and condition of their hearers.

2. Some important doctrines of truth may, in the preaching of the gospel, be omitted for a season, but none must ever be forgotten or neglected.

3. It is a necessary duty of the dispensers of the gospel to excite their hearers, by all pressing considerations, to make a progress in the knowledge of the truth.

4. The case of that people is deplorable and dangerous whose teachers are not able to carry them on in the knowledge of the mysteries of the gospel.

5. In our progress towards an increase in knowledge, we ought to go on with diligence and the full bent of our wills and affections.

Verse 1,2.—

1. There is no full interest in Christ or Christian religious to be obtained without repentance from dead works, nor any orderly entrance into a gospel church-state without a credible profession thereof.

2. Faith in God, as to the accomplishing of the great promise in sending his Son Jesus Christ to save us from our sins, is the great fundamental principle of our interest in and profession of the gospel.

3. The consideration of the accomplishment of this promise is a great encouragement and support to faith with respect to all other promises of God.

4. The doctrine of the resurrection is a fundamental principle of the gospel, the faith whereof is indispensably necessary unto the obedience and consolation of all that profess it.

5. Ministers of the gospel ought to dwell greatly on the consideration of this principle, as it is represented in its terror and glory, that they may be excited and stirred up to deal effectually with the souls of men, that they fall not under the vengeance of that day.

6. Persons to be admitted into the church, and unto a participation of all the holy ordinances thereof, had need to be well instructed in the important principles of the gospel.

7. It is not the outward sign, but the inward grace, that is principally to be considered in those ordinances or observances of the church which visibly consist in rites and ceremonies, or have them accompanying them.

Verse 3.—

1. No discouragements should deter the ministers of the gospel, to whom the dispensation of the mysteries of Christ is committed, from proceeding in the declaration of these, when they are called thereunto.

2. As it is our duty to submit ourselves in all our undertakings unto the will of God, so especially in those wherein his glory is immediately concerned.

3. Let them who are intrusted with means of light, knowledge, and grace, improve them with diligence, lest, upon their knowledge, God suffer not his ministers further to instruct them.

Verse 4-6.—

1. It is a great mercy, a great privilege, to be enlightened with the doctrine of the gospel, by the effectual working of the Holy Ghost.

2. It is such a privilege as may be lost, and end in the aggravation of the sin and condemnation of those who were made partakers of it.

3. Where there is a total neglect of the due improvement of this privilege and mercy, the condition of such persons is hazardous, as inclining towards apostasy.

4. All the gifts of God under the gospel are peculiarly heavenly, ◁4812John 3:12; ◁4903Ephesians 1:3. 5. The Holy Ghost, for the revelation of the mysteries of the gospel, and the institution of the ordinances of spiritual worship, is the great gift of God under the new testament.

6. There is a goodness and excellency in this heavenly gift, which may be tasted or experienced in some measure by such as never receive him in his life, power, and efficacy.

7. A rejection of the gospel, its truth and worship, after some experience had of their worth and excellency, is a high aggravation of sin, and a certain presage of destruction.

8. The Holy Ghost is present with many as to powerful operations, with whom he is not present as to gracious inhabitation.

9. There is a goodness and excellency in the word of God, able to attract and affect the minds of men, who yet never arrive at sincere obedience to it.

10. There is an especial goodness in the word of the promise concerning Jesus Christ, and the declaration of its accomplishment.

Verse 7.—

1. The minds of all men by nature are universally and equally barren with respect to fruits of righteousness and holiness, meet for and acceptable unto God.

2. The dispensation of the word of the gospel unto men is an effect of the sovereign power and pleasure of God, as is the giving of rain unto the earth.

3. God so ordereth things in his sovereign, unsearchable providence, that the gospel shall be sent unto, and in the administration of it shall find admittance into what places, and at what times, seem good unto himself, even as he orders the rain to fall on one place, and not on another.

4. It is the duty of those unto whom the dispensation of the word is committed of God, to be diligent, watchful, instant in their work, that their doctrine may, as it were, continually drop and distil upon their hearers, that the rain may fall often on the earth.

5. Attendance unto the word preached, hearing of it with some diligence, and giving of it some kind of reception, make no great difference among men; for this is common unto them who never become fruitful.

6. God is pleased to exercise much patience towards those to whom he once grants the mercy and the privilege of his word.

7. Where God grants means, there he expects fruit.

8. Duties of gospel obedience are fruits meet for God, things that have a proper and especial tendency unto his glory.

9. Wherever there are any sincere fruits of faith and obedience found in the hearts and lives of professors, God graciously accepts and blesseth them.

Verse 8.—

1. Whilst the gospel is preached unto men, they are under their great trial for eternity.

2. Barrenness under the dispensation of the gospel is always accompanied with an increase of sin.

3. Ordinarily God proceeds to the rejection and destruction of barren professors by degrees, although they are seldom sensible of it until they fall irrecoverably into ruin.

Verse 9.—

1. It is the duty of the dispensers of the gospel to satisfy their hearers in and of their love in Jesus Christ to their souls and persons.

2. It is our duty to come into the best satisfaction we may in the spiritual condition of them with whom we are to have spiritual communion.

3. We may, as occasions require, publicly testify that good persuasion which we have concerning the spiritual condition of others, and that unto themselves.

4. The best persuasion we can arrive unto concerning the spiritual condition of any leaves yet room, yea, makes way for gospel threatenings, warnings, exhortations, and encouragements.

5. Among professors of the gospel some are partakers of better things than others.

6. There are, according to the tenor of the covenant of grace, such things bestowed on some persons as salvation doth infallibly accompany and ensue upon.

7. It is the duty of all professors strictly to examine themselves concerning their participation of those better things which accompany salvation.

Verse 10.—

1. Faith, if it be a living faith, will be a working faith.

2. We ought to look on obedience as our work, which will admit neither of sloth nor negligence.

3. It is a due regard unto the name of God that gives life, spirituality, and acceptance, unto all the duties of love which we perform towards others.

4. It is the will and pleasure of God that many of his saints be in a condition, in this world, wherein they stand in need of being ministered unto.

5. The great trial of our love consists in our regard to the saints that are in distress.

6. It is the glory and honor of a church, the principal evidence of its spiritual life, when it is diligent and abounds in those duties of faith and love which are attended with the greatest difficulties.

7. Our perseverance in faith and obedience, though it requires our duty and constancy therein, yet it depends not on them absolutely, but on the righteousness of God in his promises.

8. Nothing shall be lost that is done for God, or in obedience unto him.

9. The certainty of our future reward, depending on the righteousness of God, is a great encouragement unto present obedience.

Verse 11.—

1. Our profession will not be preserved, nor the work of faith and love carried on, unto the glory of God and our own salvation, without a constant studious diligence in the preservation of the one and the exercise of the other.

2. Ministerial exhortation unto duty is needful even unto them who are sincere in the practice of it, that they may abide and continue therein.

3. Whereas there are degrees in spiritual saving graces and their operations, we ought continually to press towards the most perfect of them.

4. Hope, being improved by the due exercise of faith and love, will grow up into such an assurance of rest, life, immortality, and glory, as shall

outweigh all the troubles and persecutions that in this world may befall us on the account of our profession or otherwise.

Verse 12.—

1. Spiritual sloth is ruinous of any profession, though otherwise never so hopeful.

2. Faith and patient long-suffering are the only way whereby professors of the gospel may attain rest with God, in the accomplishment of the promises.

3. All the children of God have a right unto an inheritance.

4. The providing of examples for us in the Scripture, which we ought to imitate and follow, is an effectual way of teaching, and a great fruit of the cure and kindness of God towards us.

Verse 13-16.—

1. We have need of every thing that any way evidenceth the stability of God's promises to be represented unto us, for the encouragement and confirmation of our faith.

2. The grant and communications of spiritual privileges is a mere act or effect of sovereign grace.

3. Where the promise of God is absolutely engaged, it will break through all difficulties to a perfect accomplishment.

4. Although there may be privileges attending some promises that may be peculiarly appropriated to some certain persons, yet the grace of all promises is equal to all believers.

5. Whatever difficulty and opposition may lie in the way, patient endurance in faith and obedience will infallibly bring us unto the full enjoyment of the promises.

6. Faith gives such an interest unto believers in all the promises of God, as that they obtain even those promises,—that is the benefit and comfort of them,—whose actual accomplishment in this world they do not behold.

7. There is, as we are in a state of nature, a strife and difference between God and us.

8. The promises of God are gracious proposals of the only way and means for the ending of that strife.

9. The oath of God, interposed for the confirmation of these promises, is every way sufficient to secure believers against all objections and temptations, in all straits and trials, about peace with God through Jesus Christ.

10. That the custom of using oaths, swearing, cursing, or imprecation, in common communication, is not only an open transgression of the third commandment, which God hath threatened to revenge, but it is a practical renunciation also of all the authority of Jesus Christ, who hath so expressly interdicted it.

11. Whereas swearing by the name of God in truth, righteousness, and judgment, is an ordinance of God for the end of strife among men, perjury is justly reckoned amongst the worst and highest of sins, and is that which reflects the greatest dishonor on God, and tendeth to the ruin of human society.

12. Readiness in some to swear on slight occasions, and the ordinary impositions of oaths on all sorts of persons, without a due consideration on either hand of the nature, ends, and properties of lawful swearing, are evils greatly to be lamented, and in God's good time, among Christians will be reformed.

Verse 17-20.—

1. The purpose of God for the saving of the elect by Jesus Christ is an act of infinite wisdom, as well as sovereign grace.

2. The life and assurance of our present comforts and future glory depends on the immutability of God's counsel.

3. The purpose of God concerning the salvation of the elect by Jesus Christ became immutable from hence, that the determination of his will was accompanied with infinite wisdom.

4. Infinite goodness, as acting itself in Christ, was not satisfied in providing and preparing good things for believers, but it would also show and declare it unto them, for their present consolation.

5. It is not all mankind universally, but a certain number of persons, under certain qualifications, to whom God designs to manifest the immutability of his counsel, and to communicate the effects thereof.

6. God alone knows the due measures of divine condescension, or what becomes the divine nature therein.

7. So unspeakable is the weakness of our faith, that we stand in need of inconceivable divine condescension for its confirmation.

8. Fallen, sinful man stands in need of the utmost encouragement that divine condescension can extend unto, to prevail with him to receive the promise of grace and mercy by Jesus Christ.

9. Sense of danger and ruin from sin is the first thing which occasions a soul to look out after Christ in the promise.

10. A full conviction of sin is a great and shaking surprisal unto a guilty soul.

11. The revelation or discovery of the promise, or of Christ in the promise, is that alone which directs convinced sinners into their proper course and way.

12. Where there is the least of saving faith, upon the first discovery of Christ in the promise, it will stir up the whole soul to make out towards him and a participation of him.

13. It is the duty and wisdom of all those unto whom Christ in the promise is once discovered, by an gospel means or ordinance once set before them, to admit of no delay of a thorough closing with him.

14. There is a spiritual strength and vigor required unto the securing of our interest in the promise, κρατῆσαι, “to lay fast and firm hold upon it.”

15. The promise is an assured refuge unto all sin-distressed souls who betake themselves thereunto.

16. Where any souls, convinced of sin by the charge of the law, and of their own lost condition theron, do betake themselves unto the promise for relief, God is abundantly willing that they should receive strong consolation.

17. All true believers are exposed to storms and tempests in this world.

18. These storms would prove ruinous unto the souls of believers, were they not indefeasibly interested by faith and hope in the promise of the gospel.

19. No distance of place, no interposition of difficulties, can hinder the hope of believers from entering into the presence of and fixing itself on God in Christ.

20. The strength and assurance of the faith and hope of believers is invisible unto the world.

21. Hope firmly fixed on God in Christ by the promise will hold steady, and preserve the soul in all the storms and trials that may befall it.

22. It is our wisdom at all times, but especially in times of trial, to be sure that our anchor have a good hold-fast in heaven.

23. After the most sincere performance of the best of our duties, our comforts and securities are centered in Christ alone.

24. As the minds of men are greatly to be prepared for the communication of spiritual mysteries unto them, so the best preparation is by the cure of their sinful and corrupt affections, with theremoval of their barrenness under what they have before learned and beend instructed in.

25. This same Jesus is our Savior in every state and condition,—the same on the cross, and the same at the right hand of the Majesty on high.

26. The Lord Jesus having entered into heaven as our forerunner, gives us manifold security of our entrance thither also in the appointed season.

27. If the Lord Christ be entered into heaven as our forerunner, it is our duty to be following him with all speed we can.

28. We may see whereon the security of the church doth depend, as to the trials and storms which it undergoes in the world.

29. What will he not do for us, who, in the height of his glory, is not ashamed to be esteemed our forerunner? 30. When our hope and trust enter within the veil, it is Christ as our forerunner that in a peculiar manner they are to fix and fasten themselves upon.

Chapter 7. Verse 1-3.—

1. When truths in themselves mysterious, and of great importance unto the church, are asserted or declared, it is very necessary that clear evidence and demonstration be given unto them, that the minds of men be left neither in the dark about their meaning, nor in suspense about their truth.

2. God can raise the greatest light in the midst of the greatest darkness, as [4006]Matthew 4:16. 3. He can raise up instruments for his service and unto his glory, when, where, and how he pleaseth.

4. The signal prefiguration of Christ in the nations of the world, at the same time when Abraham received the promises for himself and his posterity, gave a pledge, and assurance of the certain future call of the Gentiles.

5. The Lord Christ, as king of the church, is plentifully stored with all spiritual provisions, for the relief, support, and refreshment of all believers in and under their duties, and will give it out unto them as their occasions do require.

6. Those who go to Christ merely on the account of his priestly office and the benefits thereof, shall also receive the blessings of his kingly power, in abundant supplies of mercy and grace.

7. God in his sovereign pleasure gives various intervals unto places, as to the enjoyment of his worship and ordinances.

8. Acts of munificence and bounty are memorable and praiseworthy, though they no way belong unto things sacred by virtue of divine institution.

9. It is acceptable with God, that those who have labored in any work or service of his should receive refreshments and encouragements from men.

10. Every one is that in the church, and nothing else, which God is pleased to make him so to be.

11. Where God calleth any one unto a singular honor and office in his church, it is in him a mere act of his sovereign grace.

12. A divine call is a sufficient warrant for the acting of them according unto it who are so called, and for the obedience of others unto them in their work or office.

13. The first personal instituted type of Christ was a priest.

14. To keep up and preserve a due reverence of God in our minds and words, we should think of and use those holy titles which are given to him and whereby he is described in the Scripture.

15. It is good at all times to fix our faith on that in God which is meet to encourage our obedience and dependence upon him in our present circumstances.

16. It is a matter of inestimable satisfaction that he whom we serve is the most high God, the sovereign possessor of heaven and earth.

17. Public profession in all ages is to be suited and pointed against the opposition that is made unto the truth, or apostasy from it.

18. All the commotions and concussions that are among the nations of the world do lie in, or shall be brought into, a subserviency unto the interest of Christ and his church.

19. Whatever be the interest, duty, and office of any to act in the name of others toward God, in any sacred administrations, the same proportionately is their interest, power, and duty to act towards them in the name of God in the blessing of them.

20. He who hath received the greatest mercies and privileges in this world may yet need their ministerial confirmation.

21. In the blessing of Abraham by Melchisedec, all believers are virtually blessed by Jesus Christ.

22. It is God's institution that makes all our administrations effectual.

23. Whatsoever we receive signally from God in a way of mercy, we ought to return a portion of it unto him in a way of duty.

24. The church never did in any age, nor ever shall, want that instruction by divine revelation which is needful to its edification in faith and obedience.

25. It is a great honor to serve in the church, by doing or suffering, for the use and service of future generations.

26. The Scripture is so absolutely the rule, measure, and boundary of our faith and knowledge in spiritual things, as that what it conceals is instructive, as well as what it expresseth.

27. When any were of old designed to be types of Christ, there was a necessity that things more excellent and glorious should be spoken of them than did properly belong unto them.

28. All that might be spoken, so as to have any probable application in any sense unto things and persons typically, coming short of what was to be fulfilled in Christ, the Holy Ghost in his infinite wisdom supplied that defect, by ordering the account which he gives of them so as more might be apprehended and learned from them than could be expressed.

29. That Christ abiding a priest for ever, hath no more a vicar, or successor, or substitute in his office, or any deriving a real priesthood from him, than had Melchisedec.

30. The whole mystery of divine wisdom, expressing all inconceivable perfections, centered in the person of Christ, to make him a meet, glorious, and most excellent priest unto God in the behalf of the church.

Verse 4,5.—

1. It will be fruitless, and to no advantage, to propose or declare the most important truths of the gospel, if those to whom they are proposed do not diligently inquire into them.

2. The sovereign will, pleasure, and grace of God, is that alone which puts a difference among men, especially in the church.

3. Whereas even Abraham himself gave the tenth of all to Melchisedec, the highest privilege exempts not any from the obligation unto and performance of the meanest duty.

4. Opportunities for duty which render it beautiful ought diligently to be embraced.

5. When the instituted use of consecrated things ceaseth, the things themselves cease to be sacred or of esteem.

6. Rule, institution, and command, without regard to unrequired humility, or pleas of greater zeal and self-denial, unless in evident and cogent circumstances, are the best preservatives of order and duty in the church.

7. It is the duty of those who are employed in sacred ministrations to receive what the Lord Christ hath appointed for their supportment, and in the way of his appointment.

8. It is God's prerogative to give dignity and pre-eminence in the church among them which are otherwise equal, and this must be acquiesced in.

9. No privilege can exampt persons from subjection unto any of God's institutions, though they were of the loins of Abraham.

Verse 6-8.—

1. We can be made partakers of no such grace, mercy, or privilege in this world, but that God can, when he pleaseth, make an addition thereunto.

2. It is the blessing of Christ, typified in and by that of Melchisedec, that makes promises and mercies effectual unto us.

3. Free and sovereign grace is the only foundation of all privileges.

4. It is a great mercy and privilege, when God will make use of any in the blessing of others with spiritual mercies.

5. Those who are appointed to bless others in the name of God, and thereby exalted unto a pre-eminence above those that are blessed by his

appointment, ought to be accordingly regarded by all that are so blessed by them.

6. Let those who are so appointed take heed that, by their miscarriage, they prove not a curse to them whom they ought to bless.

7. In the outward administration of his worship, God is pleased to make use of poor, frail, mortal, dying men.

8. The life of the church depends on the everlasting life of Jesus Christ.

9. They who receives tithes of others, for their work in holy administrations, are thereby proved to be superior to them of whom they do receive them.

10. It is of great concern to us what covenant we do belong to, as being esteemed to do therein what is done by our representative in our name.

Verse 11.—

1. An interest in the gospel consisteth not in an outward profession of it, but in a real participation of those things wherein the perfection of its state doth consist.

2. The pre-eminence of the gospel state above the legal is spiritual and indiscernible unto a carnal eye.

3. To look for glory in evangelical worship from outward ceremonies and carnal ordinances, is to prefer the Levitical priesthood before that of Christ.

4. Put all advantages and privileges whatever together, and they will bring nothing to perfection without Jesus Christ.

Verse 12.—

1. Notwithstanding the great and many provocations of them by whom the priesthood was exercised, yet God took it not away until it had accomplished the end whereto it was designed.

2. The efficacy of all ordinances or institutions of worship depends on the will of God alone.

3. Divine institutions cease not without an express divine abrogation.

4. God will never abrogate or take away an institution or ordinance of worship, unto the loss or disadvantage of the church.

5. God in his wisdom so ordered all things, that the taking away of the priesthood of the law gave it its greatest glory.

6. How it is a fruit of the manifold wisdom of God that it was a great mercy to give the law, and a greater to take it away.

7. If under the law the whole worship of God did so depend on the priesthood, that that failing or being taken away, the whole worship of itself was to cease, as being no more acceptable before God; how much more is all worship under the new testament rejected by him, if there be not a due regard therein unto the Lord Christ, as the only high priest of the church, and to the efficacy of his discharge of that office.

8. It is the highest vanity to pretend use or continuance in the church from possession or prescription, or pretended benefit, beauty, order, or advantage, when once the mind of God is declared against it.

Verse 13.—

1. It is our duty, in studying the Scripture, to inquire diligently after the things which are spoken concerning Jesus Christ, and what is taught of him in them.

2. All men’s rights, duties, and privileges, in sacred things, are fixed and limited by divine institution.

3. Seeing Christ himself had no right to minister at the material altar, the re-introduction of such altars is inconsistent with the perpetual continuance of his priesthood.

Verse 14.—

1. It pleaseth God to give sufficient evidence unto the accomplishmnet of his promise.

2. Divine regulation gives bounds, postively and negatively, unto the worship of god.

Verses 15-17. —

1. Present truths are earnestly to be pleaded and contended for.

2. Important truths should be strongly confirmed.

3. Arguments that are equally true may yet, on the account of evidence, not be equally cogent.

4. In the confirmation of the truth we may use ever help that is true and seasonable, though some of them may be more effectual unto our end than others.

5. What seemed to be wanting unto Christ, in his entrance into any of his offices, or in the discharge of them, was on the account of a greater glory.

6. The eternal continuance of Christ's person gives eternal continuance and efficacy into his office.

7. To make new priests in the church, is virtually to renounce the faith of his living for ever as our priest, or to suppose that he is not sufficient to the discharge of his office.

8. The alteration that God made in the church, by the introduction of the priesthood of Christ, was progressive towards its perfection.

Verses 18,19.—

1. It is a matter of the highest nature and importance, to set up, take away, or remove any thing from or change any thing in the worship of god.

2. The revelation of the will of God, in things relating unto his worship, is very difficultly received where the minds of men are prepossessed with prejudices and traditions.

3. The only securing principle, in all things of this nature, is to preserve our souls in an entire subjection unto the authority of Christ, and unto his alone.

4. The introduction into the church of what is better and more full of grace, in the same kind with what went before, doth disannul what so preceded; but the bringing in of that which is not better, which doth not communicate more grace, doth not do so.

5. If God would disannul every thing that was weak and unprofitable in his service, though originally of his own appointment, because it did not exhibit the grace he intended, he will much more condemn any thing of the same kind that is invented by men.

6. It is in vain for any man to look for that from the law, now it is abolished, which it could not effect in its best estate.

7. When God hath designed any gracious end towards the church, it shall not fail nor his work cease for want of effectual means to accomplish it.

8. Believers of old, who lived under the law, did not live upon the law, but upon the hope of Christ, or Christ hoped for.

9. The Lord Christ, by his priesthood and sacrifice, makes the church perfect, and all things belonging thereunto.

10. Out of Christ, or without him, all mankind are at an inconceivable distance from God.

11. It is an effect of infinite condescension and grace, that God would appoint a way of recovery for those who had willfully cast themselves into this woeful distance from him.

12. All our approximation unto God in any kind, all our approaches unto him in holy worship, are by him alone who was the blessed hope of the saints under the old testament, and is the life of them under the new.

Verses 20-22.—

1. The faith, comfort, honor, and safety, of the church, depend much on every particular mark that God hath put upon any of the offices of Christ, or whatever belongs thereto.

2. Nothing was wanting on the part of God, that might give eminency, stability, glory, and efficacy, to the priesthood of Christ.

3. Although the decrees and purposes of God were always firm and immutable, yet there was no fixed state of outward dispensations, none confirmed with an oath, until Christ came.

4. Although God granted great privileges unto the church under the old testament, yet still in ever instance he withheld that which was the principal, and should have given perfection to what he did grant. He made them priests, but without an oath.

5. God by his oath declares the determination of his sovereign pleasure unto the subject of it.

6. Christ's being made a priest by the oath of God for ever, is a solid foundation of peace and consolation to the church.

7. All the transactions between the Father and the Son, concerning his offices, undertakings, and the work of our redemption, have respect unto the faith of the church, and are declared for our consolation.

8. How good and glorious soever any thing may appear to be, or really be, in the worship of God, or as a way of our coming to him, or walking before him, if it be not ratified in and by the immediate suretiship of Christ, it must give way unto that which is better; it could be neither durable in itself, nor make any thing perfect in them that made use of it.

9. All the privileges, benefits, and advantages, of the offices and mediation of Christ, will not avail us, unless we reduce them all unto faith in his person.

10. The whole undertaking of Christ, and the whole efficacy of the discharge of his office, depend on the appointment of God.

11. The stability of the new covenant depends on the suretiship of Christ, and is secured to believers nearby.

12. The Lord Christ's undertaking to be our surety gives the highest obligation to all duties of obedience according to the covenant.

Verses 23-25.—

1. God will not fail to provide instruments for his work that he hath to accomplish.

2. There is such a necessity of the continual administration of the sacerdotal office in behalf of the church, that the interruption of it by the death of the priests was an argument of the weakness of that priesthood.

3. The perpetuity of the priesthood of Christ depends on his own perpetual life.

4. The perpetuity of the priesthood of Christ, as unchangeably exercised in his own person, is a principal part of the glory of that office.

5. The addition of sacrificing priests as vicars of, or substitutes unto Christ, in the discharge of his office, destroys his priesthood as to the principal eminency of it above that of the Levitical priesthood.

6. Consideration of the person and offices of Christ ought to be improved unto the strengthening of the faith and increase of the consolation of the church.

7. The consideration of the office-power of Christ is of great use unto the faith of the church.

8. It is good to secure this first ground of evangelical faith, that the Lord Christ, as vested with his offices, and in the exercise of them, is able to save us.

9. Whatever hindrances and difficulties lie in the way of salvation of believers, whatever oppositions do rise against it, the Lord Christ is able, by virtue of his sacerdotal office, and in the exercise of it, to carry the work through them all to eternal perfection.

10. The salvation of all sincere gospel worshippers is secured by the actings of Christ in the discharge of his priestly office.

11. Attendance unto the service, the worship of God in the gospel, is required to interest us in the saving care and power of our high priest.

12. Those who endeavor to come unto God in any other way but by Christ, as by saints and angels, may do well to consider whether they have any such office in heaven as by virtue whereof they are able to save them to the uttermost.

13. It is a matter of strong consolation to the church that Christ lives in heaven for us.

14. So great and glorious is the work of saving believers unto the utmost, that it is necessary that the Lord Christ should lead a mediatory life in heaven to make intercession for us.

15. The most glorious prospect that we can take into the things that are within the veil, into the remaining transactions of the work of our salvation in the most holy place, is in the representation that is made unto us of the intercession of Christ.

16. The intercession of Christ is the great evidence of the continuance of his love and care, his pity and compassion towards his church.

Verse 26.—

1. God, in his infinite wisdom, love and grace, gave us such a high priest as, in the qualifications of his person, the glory of his condition, and the discharge of his office, was every way suited to deliver us from the state of apostasy, sin, and misery, and to bring us unto himself through a perfect salvation.

2. Although these properties of our high priest are principally to be considered, as rendering him meet to be our high priest, yet are they also to be considered as an examplar and idea of that holiness and innocency which we ought to be comfortable to.

3. Seeing all these properties were required unto Christ and in him, that he might be our high priest, he was all that he is here said to be for us and for our sakes, and benefit from them doth redound unto us.

4. The infinite grace and wisdom of God are always to be admired by us in providing such a great high priest as was every way meet for us, with respect unto the great end of his office as was every way meet for us, with respect unto the great end of his office, namely, the bringing of us unto himself.

5. The dignity, duty, and safety of the gospel church, depend solely on the nature, the qualifications, and the exaltation, of our high priest.

6. If such a high priest became us, was needful to us, for the establishment of the new covenant and the communication of the grace thereof to the

church, then all persons, Christ alone excepted, are absolutely excluded from all interest in this priesthood.

7. If we consider aright what it is that we stand in need of, and what God hath provided for us that we may be brought unto him in his glory, we shall find it our wisdom to forego all other expectations, and to betake ourselves unto Christ alone.

Verses 27,28.—

1. No sinful man was meet to offer the great expiatory sacrifice for the church; much less is any sinful man fit to offer Christ himself.

2. The excellency of Christ's person and priesthood freed him in his offering from many things that the Levitical priesthood was obliged unto.

3. No sacrifice could bring us to God, and save the church to the utmost, but that wherein the Son of God himself was both priest and offering.

4. It was burdensome and heavy work to attain relief against sin, and settled peace of conscience, under the old priesthood, attended with so many weaknesses and infirmities.

5. There never was, nor ever can be, any more than two sorts of priests in the church, the one made by the law, the other by the oath of God.

6. As the bringing in of the priesthood of Christ after the law, and the priesthood constituted thereby, did abrogate and disannul it; so the bringing in of another priesthood after his will abrogate and disannul that also.

7. Plurality of priests under the gospel overthrows the whole argument of the apostle in this place, and if we have yet priests that have infirmities, they are made by the law, and not by the gospel.

8. The sum of the difference between the law and the gospel is issued in the difference between the priests of the one and the other state, which is inconceivably great.

9. The great foundation of our faith, and the hinge whereon all our consolation depends, is this, that our high priest is the Son of God.

10. The everlasting continuance of the Lord Christ in his office is secured by the oath of God.

Chapter 8. Verse 1.—

1. When the nature and weight of the matter treated of, or the variety of arguments wherein it is concerned, do require that our discourse of it should be drawn forth to a length more than ordinary, it is useful to refresh the minds and relieve the memories of our hearers by a brief recapitulation of the things insisted on.

2. When doctrines are important, and such as the eternal welfare of the souls of men are immediately concerned in, we are by all means to endeavor an impression of them on the minds of our hearers.

3. The principal glory of the priestly office of Christ depends on the glorious exaltation of his person.

Verse 2.—

1. The Lord Christ, in the height of his glory, condescends to discharge the office of a public minister in the behalf of the church.

2. All spiritually sacred and holy things are laid up in Christ.

3. He hath the ministrations of all these holy things committed to him.

4. The human nature of Christ is the only true tabernacle wherein God would dwell personally and substantially.

5. The church hath lost nothing by the removal of the old tabernacle and temple, all being supplied by the sanctuary, true tabernacle, and minister thereof.

6. We are to look for the gracious presence of God in Christ only.

7. It is by Christ alone that we can make our approach unto God in his worship.

8. It was an institution of God, that the people in all their distresses should look into, and make their supplications towards, the tabernacle or holy temple.

9. If any one else can offer the body of Christ, he also is the minister of the true tabernacle.

Verse 3.—

1. God's ordination or appointment gives rules, measures, and ends, unto all sacred offices and employments.

2. There is no approach unto God without continual respect unto sacrifice and atonement.

3. There was no salvation to be had for us, no, not by Jesus Christ himself, without his sacrifice and oblation.

4. As God designed unto the Lord Christ the work which he had to do, so he provided for him, and furnished him with whatever was necessary thereunto.

5. The Lord Christ being to save the church in the way of office, he was not to be spared in any thing necessary thereunto.

6. Whatever state or condition we are called unto, what is necessary unto that state is indispensably required of us.

Verse 4.—

1. God's institution, rightly stated, do never interfere.

2. The discharge of all the parts and duties of the priestly office of Christ, in their proper order, was needful unto the salvation of the church.

Verse 5.—

1. God alone limits the signification and use of all his own institutions.

2. It is an honor to be employed in any sacred service that belongs unto the worship of God, though it be of an inferior nature unto other parts of it.

3. So great was the glory of the heavenly ministration in the mediation of Jesus Christ, that God would not at once bring it forth in the church, until he had prepared the minds of men, by types, shadows, examples, and representations of it.

4. Our utmost care and diligence in the consideration of the mind of God is required in all that we do about his worship.

Verse 6.—

1. God, in his infinite wisdom, give proper times and seasons to all his dispensations to and towards the church.

2. The whole office of Christ was designed to the accomplishment of the will and dispensation of the grace of God.

3. The condescension of the Son of God to undertake the office of the ministry on our behalf is unspeakable, and for ever to be admired.

4. The Lord Christ, by undertaking this office of the ministry, hath consecrated and made honorable that office unto all that are rightly called unto it, and do rightly discharge it.

5. The exaltation of the human nature of Christ unto the office of this glorious ministry depended solely on the sovereign wisdom, grace, and love of God.

6. It is our duty and our safety to acquiesce universally and absolutely in the ministry of Jesus Christ.

7. The provision of a mediator between God and man was an effect of infinite wisdom and grace.

8. There is infinite grace in every divine covenant, inasmuch as it is established on promises.

9. The promises of the covenant of grace are better than those of any other covenant.

10. Although one state of the church hath had great advantages and privileges above another, yet no state had whereof to complain, while they observed the terms prescribed unto them.

11. The state of the gospel, or of the church under the new testament, is accompanied with the highest spiritual privileges and advantages that it is capable of in this world.

Verse 7.—

1. Whatever God had done before for the church, yet he ceased not, in his wisdom and grace until he had made it partaker of the best and most blessed condition whereof in this world it is capable.

2. Let those unto whom the terms of the new covenant are proposed in the gospel take heed to themselves that they sincerely embrace and improve them, for there is neither promise nor hope of any further or fuller administration of grace.

Verse 8.—

1. God hath ofttimes just cause to complain of his people, when yet he will not utterly cast them off.

2. It is the duty of the church to take deep notice of God's complaints of them.

3. God often surpriseth the church with promises of grace and mercy.

4. "He saith," that is, נְאֻם־יְהוָה, "saith the Lord," is the formal object of our faith and obedience.

5. Where God placeth a note of observation and attention, we should carefully fix our faith and consideration.

6. The things and concerns of the new covenant are all of them objects of the best of our consideration.

7. There is a time limited and fixed for the accomplishment of all the promises of God, and all the purpose of his grace towards the church.

8. The new covenant, as collecting into one all the promises of grace given from the foundation of the world, accomplished in the actual exhibition of Christ, and confirmed in his death and by the shedding of his blood, and thereby becoming the sole rule of new spiritual ordinances of worship suited thereunto, was the great object of the faith of the saints in the old Testament, and is the great foundation of all our present mercies.

9. All the efficacy and glory of the new covenant do originally rise from, and are resolved into, the author and supreme cause of it, which is God himself.

10. The covenant of grace in Christ is made only with the Israel of God, the church of the elect.

11. Those who are first and most advanced as to outward privileges are oftentimes last and least advantaged by the grace and mercy of them.

Verse 9.—

1. The grace and glory of the new covenant are much set off and manifested by the comparing of it with the old.

2. All God's works are equally good and holy in themselves, but as unto the use and advantage of the church, he is pleased to make some of them means of communicating more grace than others.

3. Though God makes an alteration in any of his works, ordinances of worship, or institutions, yet he never changeth his intention or the purpose of his will.

4. The disposal of mercies and privileges, as unto times, persons, seasons, is wholly in the hand and power of God.

5. Sins have their aggravations from mercies received.

6. Nothing but effectual grace will secure our covenant-obedience one moment.

7. No covenant between God and man ever was or ever could be stable and effectual, as unto the ends of it, that was not made and confirmed in Christ.

8. No external administration of a covenant of God's own making, no obligation of mercy on the minds of men, can enable them unto steadfastness in covenant-obedience, without an effectual influence of grace from and by Jesus Christ.

9. God, in making a covenant with any, in proposing the terms of it, retains his right and authority to deal with persons according to their deportment in and towards that covenant.

10. God's casting men out of his special care, upon the breach of his covenant, is the highest judgment that in this world can fall on any persons.

Verses 10-12.—

1. The covenant of grace, as reduced into the form of a testament, confirmed by the blood of Christ, doth not depend on any condition or qualification in our persons, but on a free grant and donation to God, and so do all the good things prepared in it.

2. The precepts of the old covenant are all turned into promises under the new.

3. All things in the new covenant being proposed unto us by the way of promise, it is by faith alone that we may attain a participation of them.

4. Sense of the loss of an interest in and participation of the benefits of the old covenant, is the best preparation for receiving the mercies of the new.

5. God himself, in and by his own sovereign wisdom, grace, goodness, all sufficiency, and power, is to be considered as the only cause and author of the new covenant.

6. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ in the new covenant, in its being, existence, and healing efficacy, is as large and extensive to repair our natures, as sin is in its residence and power to deprave them.

7. All the beginnings and entrances into the saving knowledge of God, and thereon of obedience unto him, are effects of the grace of the covenant.

8. The work of grace in the new covenant passeth on the whole soul, in all its faculties, powers, and affections, unto their change and renovation.

9. To take away the necessity and efficacy of renewing, changing, sanctifying grace, consisting in an internal, efficacious operation of the principles, habits, and acts of internal grace and obedience, is plainly to overthrow and reject the new covenant.

10. We bring nothing to the new covenant but our hearts, as tables to be written on, with the sense of the insufficiency of the precepts and promises of the law, with respect to our own ability to comply with them.

11. The Lord Christ, God and man, undertaking to be the mediator between God and man and a surety on our behalf, is the spring and head of the new covenant, which is made and established with us in him.

12. As nothing less than God becoming our God could relieve, help, and save us, so nothing more can be required thereunto.

13. The efficacy, security, and glory of this covenant, depend originally on the nature of God, immediately and actually on the mediation of Christ.

14. It is from the engagement of the properties of the divine nature that this covenant is ordered in all things and sure.

15. As the grace of this covenant is inexpressible, so are the obligations it puts upon us unto obedience.

16. God doth as well undertake for our being his people as he doth for his being our God.

17. Those whom God makes a covenant withal are his in a peculiar manner.

18. The instructive ministry of the old testament, as it was such, and as it had respect to the carnal rites thereof, was a ministry of the letter, and not of the spirit, which did not really effect in the hearts of men the things which it taught.

19. There is a duty incumbent on every man to instruct others, according to his ability and opportunity, in the knowledge of God.

20. It is the Spirit of grace alone, as promised in the new covenant, which frees the church from a laborious but ineffectual way of teaching.

21. There was a hidden treasure of divine wisdom, of the knowledge of God, laid up in the mystical revelations and institutions of the old testament, which the people were not then able to look into nor to comprehend.

22. The whole knowledge of God in Christ is both plainly revealed and savingly commnicated, by virtue of the new covenant, unto them who do believe.

23. There are, and ever were, different degrees of persons in the church, as unto the saving knowledge of God.

24. Where there is not some degree of saving knowledge, there no interest in the new covenant can be pretended.

25. The full and clear declaration of God, as he is to be known of us in this life, is a privilege reserved for and belonging unto the days of the new testament.

26. To know God as he is revealed in Christ, is the highest privilege whereof in this life we can be made partakers.

27. Persons destitute of this saving knowledge are utter strangers unto the covenant of grace.

28. Free, sovereign, and undeserved grace in the pardon of sin, is the original spring and foundation of all covenant mercies and blessings.

29. The new covenant is made only with them who effectually and eventually are made partakers of the grace of it.

30. The aggravations of sin are great and many, which the consciences of convinced sinners ought to have regard unto 31. There is grace and mercy in the new covenant provided for all sorts of sins and all aggravations of them, if this grace and mercy be received in a due manner.

32. Aggravations of sin do glorify grace in pardon.

33. We cannot understand aright the glory and excellency of pardoning mercy, unless we are convinced of the greatness and vileness of our sins in all their aggravations.

CHAPTERS 9., 10:1-18.

SUPERIORITY OF CHRIST'S PRIESTHOOD FROM THE SUPERIOR VALUE OF HIS SACRIFICE.

Chapter 9. Verse 1.—

1. Every covenant of God had its proper privileges and advantages.

2. There was never any covenant between God and man but it had some ordinances or arbitrary institutions of external divine worship annexed unto it.

3. It is a hard and rare thing to have the minds of men kept upright with God in the observance of the institutions of divine worship.

4. Divine institution alone is that which renders any thing acceptable unto God.

5. God can animate outward, carnal things with a hidden, invisible spring of glory and efficacy.

6. All divine service or worship must be resolved into divine ordination or institution.

7. A worldly sanctuary is enough for them whose service is worldly.

Verse 2.—

1. Every part of God's house and the place wherein he will dwell is filled and adorned with pledge of his presence and means of communicating his grace.

2. The communication of sacred light from Christ, in the gifts of the Spirit, is absolutely necessary unto the due and acceptable performance of all holy offices and duties of worship in the church.

3. No man, by his utmost endeavors in the use of outward means, can obtain the least beam of saving light, unless it be communicated unto him by Christ, who is the only fountain and cause of it.

Verses 3-5.—

1. The more of Christ, by the way of representation or exhibition, any institutions of divine worship do contain or express, the more sacred and holy are they in their use and exercise.

2. It is Christ alone who in himself is really the Most Holy, the spring and fountain of all holiness unto the church.

3. The time of the burning of the incense was after the sacrifice of the sin-offering.

4. The incense was kindled with fire taken from the altar when the blood of the sacrifices was newly offered.

5. The mediatory intercession of Jesus Christ was a sweet savor unto God, and efficacious for the salvation of the church.

6. The efficacy of Christ's intercession dependeth on his oblation.

7. The glory of these types did no way answer the glory of the antitype, or that which was represented by them.

8. We are always to reckon that the efficacy and prevalency of all our prayers depends on the incense which is in the hand of our merciful high priest.

9. Although the sovereign will and pleasure of God be the only reason and original cause of all institute worship, yet there is, and ever was, in all his institutions, such an evidence of divine wisdom and goodness as gives them beauty, desirableness, and usefulness unto their proper end.

10. All the counsels of God concerning his worship in this world, and his eternal glory in the salvation of the church, do center in the person and mediation of Christ.

Verse. 6, 7. — A continual application unto God by Christ, and a continual application of the benefits of the mediation of Christ by faith, are the springs of the light, life, and comfort of the church.

Verse. 7. —

1. A spiritual illumination of the mind is indispensably necessary unto our walking with God.

2. Those who would be preserved from sin must take care that spiritual light do always bear sway in their minds.

3. They ought constantly to watch against the prevalency of corrupt prejudices and affections in their mind.

4. When the light of the mind is solicited by temptations to suspend its conduct and determination on present circumstances, to know that sin lies at the door, this is its last address for admission.

5. If error grow strong in the heart through the love of sin, truth will grow weak in the mind as to the preservation of the soul from it.

6. Nothing ought to influence the soul more unto repentance, sorrow, and humiliation for sin, than a due apprehension of the shameful error and mistake that is in it.

Verse. 8. —

1. The divine ordinances and institutions of worship are filled with wisdom sufficient for the instruction of the church in all the mysteries of faith and obedience.

2. It is our duty, with all humble diligence, to inquire into the mind of the Holy Ghost in all ordinances and institutions of divine worship.

3. Although the Lord Christ was not actually exhibited in the flesh under the old testament, nor had actually offered himself unto God for us, yet had believers then an actual access into the grace and favor of God, though the way, the cause, and means of it were not manifestly declared unto them.

4. The design of the Holy Ghost in the tabernacle, and in all its ordinances and institutions of worship, was to direct the faith of believers unto what was signified by them.

5. Typical institutions, attended diligently unto, were sufficient to direct the faith of the church unto the expectation of the real expiation of sin, and acceptance with God thereon.

6. Though the standing of the first tabernacle was a great mercy and privilege, yet the removal of it was a greater.

7. The divine wisdom in the economy and disposal of the revelation of the way into the holiest, or of grace and acceptance with himself, is a blessed object of our contemplation.

8. The clear manifestation of the way of redemption, of the expiation of sin, and peace with God thereon, is the great privilege of the gospel.

9. There is no access into the gracious presence of God but by the sacrifice of Christ alone.

Verse. 9. —

1. There is a state of perfect peace with God to be attained under imperfect obedience.

2. Nothing can give perfect peace of conscience with God but what can make atonement for sin.

Verse. 10. —

1. There is nothing in its own nature so mean and abject but the will and authority of God can render it of sacred use and sacred efficacy, when he is pleased to ordain and appoint it.

2. The fixing of times and seasons for the state of things in the church is solely in the hand of God, and at his sovereign disposal.

3. It is a great part of the blessed liberty which the Lord Christ brought into the church, — namely, its freedom and liberty from legal impositions, and every thing of the like nature in the worship of God.

4. The time of the coming of Christ was the time of the final general reformation of the worship of God, wherein all things were unchangeably directed unto their proper use.

Verse. 11. —

1. The bringing forth and accomplishing the glorious effects of the hidden wisdom of God, were the true and real good things intended for and promised to the church from the beginning of the world.

2. These things alone are absolutely good to the church, all other things are good or evil as they are used or abused.

3. So excellent are these good things, that the performance and procuring of them were the cause of the coming of the Son of God, with his susception and discharge of his sacerdotal office.

4. Such a price and value did God put on these things, so good are they in his eyes, that he made them the subject of his promises to the church from the foundation of the world.

5. The human nature of Christ, wherein he discharged the duties of his sacerdotal office, in making atonement for sin, is the greatest, the most perfect, and excellent ordinance of God, far excelling those that were most excellent under the old testament.

6. The Son of God undertaking to be the high priest of the church, it was of necessity that he should come by or have a tabernacle wherein to discharge that office.

7. God is so far from being obliged unto any means tot the effecting of the holy counsels of his will, that he can when he pleaseth exceed the whole order and course of the first creation of all things, and his providence in the rule thereof.

Verse. 12. —

1. The entrance of our Lord Jesus Christ as our high priest into heaven, to appear in the presence of God for us, and to save us thereby to the uttermost, was a thing so great and glorious as could not be accomplished but by his own blood.

2. Whatever difficulties lay in the way of Christ, as unto the accomplishment and perfection of the work of our redemption, he would not decline them, nor desist from his undertaking, whatever it cost him.

3. There was a holy place meet to receive the Lord Christ after the sacrifice of himself, and a suitable reception for such a person after so glorious a performance.

4. If the Lord Christ entered not into the holy place until he had finished his work, we may not expect an entrance thereinto until we have fnished ours.

Verse. 13, 14. —

1. There is such an evidence of wisdom and righteousness, unto a spiritual eye, in the whole mystery of our redemption, sanctification, and salvation by Christ, as gives an immovable foundation unto faith to rest upon in its receiving of it.

2. The efficacy of all the offices of Christ towards the church depends on the dignity of his person.

3. There is nothing more destructive to the whole faith of the gospel than by any means to evacuate the immediate efficacy of the blood of Christ.

4. Christ's offering himself was the greatest expression of his inexpressible love.

5. It is evident how vain and insufficient are all other ways of the expiation of sin with the purging of our consciences before God.

6. Faith hath ground of triumph in the certain efficacy of the blood of Christ for the expiation of sin.

7. Nothing could expiate sin and free conscience from dead works but the blood of Christ alone, and that in the offering himself to God through the eternal Spirit.

8. It was God, as the supreme ruler and lawgiver, with whom atonement for sin was to be made.

9. The souls and consciences of men are wholly polluted before they are purged by the blood of Christ.

10. Even the best works of men, antecedently to the purging of their consciences by the blood of Christ, are but dead works.

11. Justification and sanctification are inseparably conjoined in the design of God's grace by the blood of Christ.

12. Gospel worship is such, in its spirituality and holiness, as becometh the living God.

Verse. 15. —

1. It is an act of mere sovereign grace in God, to provide such a blessed inheritance for any of them who had sinfully cast away what they were before intrusted withal.

2. All our interest in the gospel inheritance depends on our receiving the promise by faith.

3. The conveyance and actual communication of the eternal inheritance by promise, to be received by faith alone, tends exceedingly unto the exaltation of the glory of God, and the security of the salvation of them that do believe.

4. Effectual vocation is the only way of entrance into the eternal inheritance.

5. Though God will give grace and glory unto his elect, yet he will do it in such a way as wherein and whereby he may be glorified also himself.

6. Such is the malignant nature of sin, of all transgression of the law, that unless it be removed, unless it be taken out of the way, no person can enjoy the promise of the eternal inheritance.

7. It was the work of God alone to contrive, and it was the effect of infinite wisdom and grace to provide, a way for the removal of sin, that it might not be an everlasting obstacle against the communication of an eternal inheritance unto them that are called.

8. A new testament providing an eternal inheritance in sovereign grace; the constitution of a mediator, such a mediator, for that testament, in infinite wisdom and love; the death of that testator for the redemption of transgressions, to fulfill the law and satisfy the justice of God; with the communication of that inheritance by promise, to be received by faith in all them that are called, are the substance of the mystery of the gospel.

9. The efficacy of the mediation and death of Christ extending itself to all the called under the old testament, is an evident demonstration of his

divine nature, his pre-existence to all these things, and the eternal covenant between the Father and him about them.

10. The first covenant did only forbid and condemn transgressions; redemption from them is by the new testament alone.

11. The glory and efficacy of the new covenant, and the assurance of the communication of an eternal inheritance by virtue of it, depend hereon, that it was made a testament by the death of the mediator, which is further proved in the following verses.

Verse. 16, 17. —

1. It is a great and gracious condescension in the Holy Spirit to give encouragement and confirmation unto our faith, by a representation of the truth and reality of spiritual things in those which are temporal, and agreeing with them in their general nature, whereby they are represented unto the common understandings of men.

2. There is an irrevocable grant of the whole inheritance of grace and glory made unto the elect in the new covenant.

3. As the grant of these things is free and absolute, so the enjoyment of them is secured from all interveniences by the death of the testator.

Verse. 18. —

1. The foundation of a church-state among any people, wherein God is to be honored in ordinances of instituted worship, is laid in a solemn covenant between him and them.

2. Approbation of the terms of the covenant, consent unto them, and solemn acceptance of them, are required on our part unto the establishment of any covenant between God and us, and our participation of the benefits of it.

3. It was the way of God from the beginning, to take children of covenanters into the same covenant with their parents.

4. It is by the authority of God alone that any thing can be effectually and unchangeably dedicated unto sacred use, so as to have force and efficacy given unto it thereby.

Verse. 19. —

1. There can be no covenant between God and men, but in the hand or by virtue of a mediator.

2. A mediator may be either only an internuncius, a messenger, a day's-man, or also a surety and an undertaker.

3. None can interpose between God and a people in any sacred office, unless he be called of God and approved of the people, as was Moses.

4. A covenant that consisted in mere precepts, without an exhibition of spiritual strength to enable unto obedience, could never save sinners.

5. In all our dealings with God, respect must be had unto every one of his precepts.

6. The first eminent use of the writing of the book of the law, that is, of any part of the Scripture (for this book was the first that was written), was that it might be read unto the people.

7. This book was both written and read in the language which the people understood and commonly spake.

8. God never required the observance of any rites or duties of worship without a previous warrant from his word.

9. The writing of this book was an eminent privilege, now first granted unto the church, leading unto a more perfect and stable condition than formerly it had enjoyed.

10. The blood of the covenant will not benefit or advantage us, without an especial and particular application of it unto our own souls and consciences.

Verse. 20. — The condescension of God in making a covenant with men, especially in the ways of the confirmation of it, is a blessed object of all holy admiration.

Verse. 21, 22. —

1. In all things wherein we have to do with God, whereby we approach unto him, it is the blood of Christ, and the application of it unto our consciences, that gives us a gracious acceptance with him.

2. Even holy things and institutions, that are in themselves clean and unpolluted, are relatively defiled, by the unholiness of them that use them.

3. There was a great variety of legal purifications.

4. This variety argues that in ourselves we are ready to be polluted on all occasions.

5. This variety of institutions was a great part of the bondage state of the church under the old testament.

6. The great mystery wherein God instructed the church from the foundation of the world, especially by and under legal institutions, was that all purging of sin was to be by blood.

7. This is the great demonstration of the demerit of sin, and of the holiness, righteousness, and grace of God.

Verse. 23. —

1. The glory and efficacy of all ordinances of divine worship which consist in outward observances (as it is with the sacraments of the gospel) consist in this, that they represent and exhibit heavenly things unto us.

2. We ought to have a due consideration to the holiness of God in his worship and service.

3. The one sacrifice of Christ, with what ensued thereon, was the only means to render effectual all the counsels of God concerning the redemption and salvation of the church.

4. Neither could heavenly things have been made meet for us or our use, nor we have been meet for their enjoyment, had they not been dedicated and we been purged by the sacrifice of Christ.

5. Every eternal mercy, every spiritual privilege, is both purchased for us and sprinkled unto us by the blood of Christ.

6. There is such an uncleanness in our natures, our persons, our duties and worship, that unless they and we are all sprinkled with the blood of Christ, neither we nor they can have any acceptance with God.

7. The sacrifice of Christ is the one only everlasting fountain and spring of all sanctification and sacred dedication.

Verse. 24. —

1. The distinct offices of Christ give direction and encouragement to faith.

2. Christ accepted of God on our behalf, is the spring of all spiritual consolation.

Verse. 25. —

1. Such is the absolute perfection of the one offering of Christ, that it stands in need of, that it will admit of, no repetition in any kind.

2. This one offering of Christ is always effectual unto all the ends of it, even no less than it was in the day and hour when it was actually offered.

3. The great call and direction of the gospel is to guide faith, and keep it up unto this one offering of Christ, as the spring of all grace and mercy.

4. Whatever had the greatest glory in the old legal institutions carried along with it the evidence of its own imperfection, compared with the thing signified in Christ and his office.

Verse. 26. —

1. It was inconsistent with the wisdom, goodness, grace, and love of God, that Christ should often suffer in that way which was necessary to the offering of himself, namely, by his death and blood-shedding.

2. It was impossible, from the dignity of his person.

3. It was altogether needless, and would have been useless.

4. As the sufferings of Christ were necessary unto the expiation of sin, so he suffered neither more nor oftener than was necessary.

5. The assured salvation of the church of old, from the foundation of the world, by virtue of the one offering of Christ, is a strong confirmation of

the faith of the church at present to look for and expect everlasting salvation thereby.

6. It is the prerogative of God, and the effect of his wisdom, to determine the times and seasons of the dispensation of himself and his grace to the church.

7. God had a design of infinite wisdom and grace in his sending of Christ, and his appearance in the world thereon, which could not be frustrated.

8. Sin had erected a dominion, a tyranny over all men, as by a law.

9. No power of man, of any mere creature, was able to evacuate, disannul, or abolish this law of sin.

10. The destruction and dissolution of this law and power of sin was the great end of the coming of Christ for the discharge of his priestly office in the sacrifice of himself.

11. It is the glory of Christ, it is the safety of the church, that by his one offering, by the sacrifice of himself once for all, he hath abolished sin as to the law and condemning power of it.

Verse. 27, 28. —

1. God hath eminently suited our relief, the means and causes of our spiritual deliverance, to our misery, the means and causes of it, as that his own wisdom and grace may be exalted and our faith established.

2. Death in the first constitution of it was penal.

3. It is still penal, eternally penal, to all unbelievers.

4. The death of all is equally determined and certain in God’s constitution.

5. The ground of the expiation of sin by the offering of Christ is this, that therein he bare the guilt and punishment due unto it.

6. It is the great exercise of faith, to live on the invisible actings of Christ on the behalf of the church.

7. Christ’s appearance the second time, his return from heaven to complete the salvation of the church, is the great fundamental principle of

our faith and hope, the great testimony we have to give against all his and our adversaries.

8. Faith concerning the second coming of Christ is sufficient to support the souls of believers, and to give them satisfactory consolation in all difficulties, trials, and distresses.

9. All true believers do live in a waiting, longing expectation of the coming of Christ.

10. To such alone as look for him will the Lord Christ appear unto salvation.

11. Then will be the great distinction among mankind, when Christ shall appear, unto the everlasting confusion of some, and the eternal salvation of others.

12. At the second appearance of Christ there will be an end of all the business about sin, both on his part and ours.

13. The communication of actual salvation unto all believers, unto the glory of God, is the final end of the office of Christ.

Chapter 10. Verse. 1. —

1. Whatever there may be in any religious institutions and the diligent observance of them, if they come short of exhibiting Christ himself unto believers, with the benefits of his mediation, they cannot make us perfect, nor give us acceptance with God.

2. Whatever hath the least representation of Christ or relation unto him, the obscurest way of teaching the things concerning his person and grace, whilst it is in force, hath a glory in it,

3. Christ and his grace were the only good things that were absolutely so from the foundation of the world, or the giving of the first promise.

4. There is a great difference between the shadow of good things to come and the good things themselves, actually exhibited and granted unto the church.

5. The principal interest and design of them that come to God, is to have assured evidence of the perfect expiation of sin.

6. What cannot be effected for the expiation of sin at once, by any duty or sacrifice, cannot be effected by its reiteration or repetition.

7. The repetition of the same sacrifices doth of itself demonstrate their insufficiency to the ends sought after.

8. God alone limiteth the ends and efficacy of his own institutions.

Verse. 2, 3. —

1. The discharge of conscience from its condemning right and power, by virtue of the sacrifice of Christ, is the foundation of all the other privileges which we receive by the gospel.

2. All peace with God is resolved into a purging atonement made for sin.

3. It is by a principle of gospel light alone that conscience is directed to condemn all sin, and yet to acquit all sinners that are purged.

4. An obligation unto such ordinances of worship as could not expiate sin, nor testify that it was perfectly expiated, was part of the bondage of the church under the old testament.

5. It belongs unto the light and wisdom of faith so to remember sin and make confession of it as not therein or thereby to seek after a new atonement for it, which is made once for all.

Verse. 4. —

1. It is possible that things may usefully represent what it is impossible that, in and by themselves, they should effect.

2. There may be great and eminent uses of divine ordinances and institutions, although it be impossible that by themselves, in their most exact and diligent use, they should work out our acceptance with God.

3. It was utterly impossible that sin should be taken away before God, and from the conscience of the sinner, but by the blood of Christ.

4. The declaration of the insufficiency of all other ways for the expiation of sin, is an evidence of the holiness, righteousness, and severity of God against sin, with the unavoidable ruin of all unbelievers.

5. Herein also consists the great demonstration of the love, grace, and mercy of God, with an encouragement to faith, in that, when the old sacrifices neither would nor could perfectly expiate sin, he would not suffer the work itself to fail, but provided a way that should be infallibly effective of it.

Verse. 5-10. —

1. We have the solemn word of Christ, in the declaration he made of his readiness and willingness to undertake the work of the expiation of sin, proposed unto our faith, and engaged as a sure anchor of our souls.

2. The Lord Christ had an infinite prospect of all that he was to do and suffer in the world in the discharge of his office and undertaking.

3. No sacrifices of the law, not all of them together, were a means for the expiation of sin, suited to the glory of God or necessities of the souls of men.

4. Our utmost diligence, with the most sedulous improvement of the light and wisdom of faith, is necessary in our search into and inquiry after the mind and will of God in the revelation he makes of them.

5. The constant use of sacrifices, to signify those things which they could not effect or really exhibit to the worshippers, was a great part of the bondage that the church was kept in under the old testament.

6. God may, in his wisdom, appoint and accept of ordinances and duties to one end which he will refuse and reject when they are applied to another.

7. The supreme contrivance of the salvation of the church is in a peculiar manner ascribed unto the person of the Father.

8. The furniture of the Lord Christ (though he was the Son, and in his divine person the Lord of all) for the discharge of his work of mediation, was the peculiar act of the Father.

9. Whatever God designs, appoints, and calls any unto, he will provide for them all that is needful unto the duties of obedience whereunto they are so appointed and called.

10. Not only the love and grace of God in sending his Son are continually to be admired and glorified, but the acting of this infinite wisdom, in fitting and preparing his human nature, so as to render it every way meet unto the work which it was designed for, ought to be the especial object of our holy contemplation.

11. The ineffable but yet distinct operation of the Father, Son, and Spirit, in, about, and towards the human nature assumed by the Son, are, as an uncontrollable evidence of their distinct subsistence in the same individual divine essence, so a guidance unto faith as unto all their distinct actings towards us in the application of the work of redemption unto our souls.

12. It is the will of God that the church should take especial notice of this sacred truth, that nothing can expiate or take away sin but the blood of Christ alone.

13. Whatever may be the use or efficacy of any ordinances of worship, yet if they are employed or trusted unto for such ends as God hath not designed them unto, he accepts not of our persons in them, nor approves of the things themselves.

14. The foundation of the whole glorious work of the salvation of the church was laid in the sovereign will, pleasure, and grace of God, even the Father.

15. The coming of Christ in the flesh was, in the wisdom, righteousness, and holiness of God, necessary for to fulfill his will, that we might be saved unto his glory.

16. The fundamental motive unto the Lord Christ, in his undertaking the work of mediation, was the will and glory of God.

17. God’s records in the roll of his book are the foundation and warrant of the faith of the church, in the head and members.

18. The Lord Christ, in all that he did and suffered, had continual respect unto what was written of him.

19. In the record of these words, “Lo, I come,” etc., —

(1.) God was glorified in his truth and faithfulness;

(2.) Christ was secured in his work and the undertaking of it;

(3.) A testimony was given unto his person and office;

(4.) Direction is given unto the church, in all wherein they have to do with God, what they should attend unto, namely, what is written;

(5.) The things which concern Christ the mediator are the head of what is contained in the same records.

20. Whereas the apostle doth plainly distinguish and distribute all sacrifices and offerings, into those on the one side which were offered by the law, and that one offering of the body of Christ on the other side, the pretended sacrifice of the mass is utterly rejected from any place in the worship of God.

21. God, as the sovereign lawgiver, had always power and authority to make what alteration he pleased in the orders and institutions of his worship.

22. Sovereign authority is that alone which our faith and obedience respect in all ordinances of worship.

23. As all things from the beginning made way for the coming of Christ in the minds of them that did believe, so every thing was to be removed out of the way that would hinder his coming and the discharge of the work he had undertaken: law, temple, sacrifices, must all be removed, to give way unto his coming.

24. Truth is never so effectually declared as when it is confirmed by the experience of its power in them that believe it and make profession of it.

25. It is a holy glorying in God, and no unlawful boasting, for men openly to profess what they are made partakers of by the grace of God and blood of Christ.

26. It is the best security, in differences in and about religion (such as these wherein the apostle is engaged, the greatest and highest that ever

were), when men have an internal experience of the truth which they do profess.

27. The sovereign will and pleasure of God, acting itself in infinite wisdom and grace, is the sole, supreme, original cause of the salvation of the church.

Verse. 11-14. —

1. If all those divine institutions, in the diligent observance of them, could not take away sin, how much less can any thing do so that we can betake ourselves unto for that end!

2. Faith in Christ doth jointly respect both his oblation of himself by death and the glorious exaltation that ensued thereon.

3. Christ in this order of things is the great exemplar of the church.

4. It was the entrance of sin which raised up all our enemies against us.

5. The Lord Christ, in his ineffable love and grace, put himself between us and all our enemies.

6. The Lord Christ, by the offering of himself making peace with God, ruined all the enmity against the church and all the enemies of it.

7. It is the foundation of all consolation to the church, that the Lord Christ, even now in heaven, takes all our enemies to be his, in whose destruction he is infinitely more concerned than we are.

8. Let us never esteem any thing or any person to be our enemy, but only so far and in what they are the enemies of Christ,

9. It is our duty to conform ourselves to the Lord Christ in a quiet expectancy of the ruin of all our spiritual adversaries.

10. Envy not the condition of the most proud and cruel adversaries of the church.

11. There was a glorious efficacy in the one offering of Christ.

12. The end of it must be effectually accomplished towards all for whom it was offered.

13. The sanctification and perfection of the church being that end designed in the death and sacrifice of Christ, all things necessary unto that end must be included therein, that it be not frustrated.

Verse. 15-18. —

1. It is the authority of the Holy Ghost alone, speaking to us in the Scripture, whereinto all our faith is to be resolved.

2. We are to propose nothing, in the preaching and worship of the gospel, but what is testified unto by the Holy Ghost.

3. When an important truth consonant unto the Scripture is declared, it is useful and expedient to confirm it with some express testimony of Scripture.

CHAPTERS 10:19-39, 11.

THE OBLIGATION, ADVANTAGE, AND NECESSITY, OF STEADFAST ADHERENCE TO THE GOSPEL INFERRED AND URGED FROM THE PRECEDING DOCTRINES, AND FROM THE TRIUMPHS OF FAITH AS EXEMPLIFIED BY THE SAINTS.

Chapter 10. Verse. 19-23. —

1. It is not every mistake, every error, though it be in things of great importance, while it overthrows not the foundation, that can divest men of a fraternal interest with others in the heavenly calling.

2. This is the great fundamental privilege of the gospel, that believers, in all their holy worship, have liberty, boldness, and confidence, to enter with it and by it into the gracious presence of God.

3. Nothing but the blood of Jesus could have given this boldness, nothing that stood in the way of it could otherwise have been removed, nothing else could have set our souls at liberty from that bondage that was come upon them by sin.

4. Rightly esteem and duly improve the blessed privilege which was purchased for us at so dear a rate.

5. Confidence in an access unto God not built on, not resolved into the blood of Christ, is but a daring presumption, which God abhors.

6. The way of our entrance into the holiest is solemnly dedicated and consecrated for us, so as that with boldness we may make use of it.

7. All the privileges we have by Christ are great, glorious, and efficacious, all tending and leading unto life.

8. The Lord Christ doth peculiarly preside over all the persons, duties, and worship, of believers in the church of God.

9. The heart is that which God principally respects in our access unto him.

10. Universal, internal sincerity of heart is required of all those that draw nigh unto God in his holy worship.

11. The actual exercise of faith is required in all our approaches unto God, in every particular duty of his worship.

12. It is faith in Christ alone that gives us boldness of access unto God.

13. The person and office of Christ are to be rested in with full assurance in all our accesses to the throne of grace.

14. Although that worship whereby we draw nigh unto God be wrought with respect to institution and rule, yet without internal sanctification of heart we are not accepted in it.

15. Due preparation, by fresh applications of our souls unto the efficacy of the blood of Christ for the purification of our hearts, that we may be meet to draw nigh to God, is required of us.

16. Universal sanctification upon our whole persons, and the mortification in an especial manner of outward sins, are required of us in our drawing nigh unto God.

17. These are the ornaments wherewith we are to prepare our souls for it, and not the gaiety of outward apparel.

18. It is a great work, to draw nigh unto God so as to worship him in spirit and in truth.

19. There is an internal principle of saving faith required unto our profession of the doctrine of the gospel, without which it will not avail.

20. All that believe ought solemnly to give themselves up unto Christ and his rule, in an express profession of the faith that is in them and required of them.

21. There will great difficulties arise in, and opposition be made unto, a sincere profession of the faith.

22. Firmness and constancy of mind, with our utmost diligent endeavors, are required unto an acceptable continuance in the profession of the faith.

23. Uncertainty and wavering of mind as to the truth and doctrine we profess, or neglect of the duties wherein it doth consist, or compliance with errors for fear of persecution and sufferings, do overthrow our profession and render it useless.

25. As we ought not on any account to decline our profession, so to abate of the degrees of fervency of spirits therein is dangerous unto our souls.

25. The faithfulness of God in his promises is the great encouragement and supportment, under our continual profession of our faith, against all oppositions.

Verse. 24. —

1. The mutual watch of Christians, in the particular societies whereof they are members, is a duty necessary unto the preservation of the profession of the faith.

2. A due consideration of the circumstances, abilities, temptations, and opportunities for duties in one another, is required hereunto.

3. Diligence, or mutual exhortation unto gospel duties, that men on all grounds of reason and example may be provoked unto them, is required of us, and is a most excellent duty, which in an especial manner we ought to attend unto.

Verse. 25. —

1. Great diligence is required of us in a due attendance unto the assemblies of the church, for the ends of them, as they are instituted and appointed by Jesus Christ.

2. The neglect of the authority and love of Christ in the appointment of the means of our edification, will always tend to great and ruinous evils.

3. No church order, no outward profession, can secure men from apostasy.

4. Perfection, freedom from offense, scandal, and ruinous evils, are not to be expected in any church in this world.

5. Men that begin to decline from their duty in church relations ought to be marked, and their ways avoided.

6. Forsaking of church assemblies is usually an entrance into apostasy.

7. When especial warnings do not excite us unto renewed diligence in known duties, our condition is dangerous as unto the continuance of the presence of Christ amongst us.

8. Approaching judgments ought to influence unto especial diligence in all evangelical duties.

9. If men will shut their eyes against evident signs and tokens of approaching judgments, they will never stir up themselves nor engage into the due performance of present duties.

10. In the approach of great and final judgments, God, by his word and providence, gives such intimations of their coming as that wise men may discern them.

11. To see evidently such a day approaching, and not to be sedulous and diligent in the duties of divine worship, is a token of a backsliding frame, tending unto final apostasy.

Verse. 26, 27. —

1. If a voluntary relinquishment of the profession of the gospel and the duties of it be the highest sin, and be attended with the height of wrath and

punishment, we ought earnestly to watch against every thing that inclineth or disposeth us thereunto.

2. Every declension in or from the profession of the gospel hath a proportion of the guilt of this great sin, according unto the proportion that it bears unto the sin itself.

3. There are sins and times wherein God doth absolutely refuse to hear any more from men in order unto their salvation.

4. The loss of an interest in the sacrifice of Christ, on what account or by what means soever it fall out, is absolutely ruinous unto the souls of men.

5. There is an inseparable concatenation between apostasy and eternal ruin.

6. God oftentimes visits the minds of cursed apostates with dreadful expectations of approaching wrath.

7. When men have hardened themselves in sin, no fear of punishment will either rouse or stir them up to seek after relief.

8. A dreadful expectation of future wrath, without hope of relief, is an open entrance into hell itself.

9. The expectation of future judgment in guilty persons is, and will be at one time or another, dreadful and tremendous.

10. There is a determinate time for the accomplishment of all divine threatenings and the infliction of the severest judgments, which no man can abide or avoid.

11. The certain determination of divine vengeance on the enemies of the gospel is a motive unto holiness, a supportment under sufferings in them that believe.

12. The highest aggravation of the greatest sins, is when men, out of a contrary principle of superstition and error, do set themselves maliciously to oppose the doctrine and truth of the gospel, with respect unto themselves and others.

13. There is a time when God will make demonstrations of his wrath and displeasure against all such adversaries of the gospel as shall be pledges of his eternal indignation.

14. The dread and terror of God's final judgments against the enemies of the gospel is in itself inconceivable, and only shadowed out by things of the greatest dread and terror in the world.

Verse. 28, 29. —

1. It is the contempt of God and his authority in his law that is the gall and poison of sin.

2. When the God of mercies will have men show no mercy as to the temporal punishment, he can and will, upon repentance, show mercy as to eternal punishment.

3. Though there may be sometimes an appearance of great severity in God's judgments against sinners, yet when the nature of their sins and the aggravation of them shall be discovered, they will be manifested to have been righteous and within due measure.

4. We ought to take heed of every neglect of the person of Christ or of his authority, lest we enter into some degree or other of the guilt of this great offense.

5. The sins of men can really reach neither the person nor authority of Christ.

6. Every thing that takes off from a high and glorious esteem of the blood of Christ as the blood of the covenant, is a dangerous entrance into apostasy.

7. However men may esteem of any of the mediatory actings of Christ, yet are they in themselves glorious and excellent.

8. There are no such cursed pernicious enemies unto religion as apostates.

9. The inevitable certainty of the eternal punishment of gospel despisers depends on the essential holiness and righteousness of God, as the ruler and judge of all.

10. It is a righteous thing with God thus to deal with men.

11. God hath allotted different degrees of punishment unto the different degrees and aggravations of sin.

12. The apostasy from the gospel here described, being the absolute height of all sin and impiety that the nature of man is capable of, renders them unto eternity obnoxious unto all punishment that the same nature is capable of.

13. It is our duty diligently to inquire into the nature of sin, lest we be overtaken in the great offense.

14. Sinning against the testimony given by the Holy Ghost unto the truth and power of the gospel, whereof men have had experience, is the most dangerous symptom of a perishing condition.

15. Threatenings of future eternal judgments unto gospel despisers belong unto the preaching and declaration of the gospel.

16. The equity and righteousness of the most severe judgments of God, in eternal punishments against gospel despisers, is so evident that it may be referred to the judgment of men not obstinate in their blindness.

17. It is our duty to justify and bear witness unto God in the righteousness of his judgments against gospel despisers.

Verse. 30, 31. —

1. There can be no right judgment made of the nature and demerit of sin, without a due consideration of the nature and holiness of God, against whom it is committed.

2. Nothing will state our thoughts aright concerning the guilt and demerit of sin, but a deep consideration of the infinite greatness, holiness, righteousness, and power of God, against whom it is committed.

3. Under apprehensions of great severities of divine judgments, the consideration of God, the author of them, will both relieve our faith and quiet our hearts.

4. A due consideration of the nature of God, his office, that he is the Judge of all, especially of his people, and that enclosure he hath made of vengeance unto himself, under an irrevocable purpose for its execution, gives indubitable assurance of the certain, unavoidable destruction of all wilful apostates.

5. Although those who are the people of God do stand in many relations unto him that are full of refreshment and comfort, yet it is their duty constantly to remember that he is the holy and righteous Judge, even towards his own people.

6. The knowledge of God in some good measure, both what he is in himself and what he hath taken on himself to do, is necessary, to render either his promises or threatenings effectual unto the minds of men.

7. The name of the living God is full of terror or comfort unto the souls of men.

8. There is an apprehension of the terror of the Lord in the final judgment, which is of great use to the souls of men.

9. When there is nothing left but judgment, nothing remains but the expectation of it, its fore-appre-hension will be filled with dread and terror.

10. The dread of the final judgment, where there shall be no mixture of ease, is altogether inexpressible.

11. That man is lost for ever who hath nothing in God that he can appeal unto.

12. Those properties of God which are the principal delight of believers, the chief object of their faith, hope, and trust, are an eternal spring of dread and terror unto all impenitent sinners.

13. The glory and horror of the future state of blessedness and misery are inconceivable, either to believers or sin-nero 14. The fear and dread of God, in the description of his wrath, ought continually to be in the hearts of all who profess the gospel.

Verse. 32-34. —

1. A wise management of former experiences is a great direction and encouragement unto future obedience.

2. All men by nature are darkness and in darkness.

3. Saving illumination is the first-fruit of effectual vocation.

4. Spiritual light, in its first communication, puts the soul on the diligent exercise of all graces.

5. It is suited unto the wisdom and goodness of God to suffer persons, on their first conversion, to fall into manifold trials and temptations.

6. All temporary sufferings, in all their aggravating circumstances, in their most dreadful preparation, dress, and appearance, are but light things in comparison of the gospel and the promises thereof.

7. There is not any thing in the whole nature of temporary sufferings, or any circumstance of them, that we can claim an exemption from, after we have undertaken the profession of the gospel.

8. It is reserved unto the sovereign pleasure of God to measure out unto all professors of the gospel their especial lot and portion as unto trials and sufferings, so as that none ought to complain, none to envy one another.

9. Of what sort or kind the sufferings of any that God employs in the ministry of the gospel shall be, is in his sovereign disposal alone.

10. Faith, giving an experience of the excellency of the love of God in Christ, and the grace received thereby, with its incomparable preference above all outward, perishing things, will give joy and satisfaction in the loss of all our substance, upon the account of an interest in these better things.

11. It is the glory of the gospel that it will, on a just account, from a sense of and interest in it, give satisfaction and joy unto the souls of men in the worst of sufferings for it.

12. It is our duty to take care that we be not surprised with outward sufferings when we are in the dark as unto our interest in these things.

13. Internal evidences of the beginnings of glory in grace, a sense of God's love, and assured pledges of our adoption, will give insuperable joy to the minds of men under the greatest outward sufferings.

14. It is our interest in this world, as well as with respect unto eternity, to preserve our evidences for heaven clear and unstained.

15. There is a substance in spiritual and eternal things whereunto faith gives a subsistence in the souls of believers.

16. There is no rule of proportion between eternal and temporal things.

Verse. 35, 36. —

1. In the times of suffering, and in the approaches of them, it is the duty of believers to look on the glory of heaven under the notion of a refreshing, all-sufficient reward.

2. He that would abide faithful in difficult seasons, must fortify his soul with an unconquerable patience.

3. The glory of heaven is an abundant recompense for all we shall undergo in our way towards it.

4. Believers ought to sustain themselves in their sufferings with the promise of future glory.

5. The future blessedness is given unto us by the promise, and is therefore free and undeserved.

6. The consideration of eternal life as the free effect of the grace of God in Christ, and as proposed in a gracious promise, is a thousand times more full of spiritual refreshment unto a believer than if he should conceive of it or look upon it merely as a reward proposed unto our own doings or merits.

Verse. 37-39. —

1. The delay of the accomplishment of promises is a great exercise of faith and patience.

2. It is essential unto faith to be acted on the promised coming of Christ, to all that look for his appearance.

3. There is a promise of the coming of Christ suited unto the state and condition of the church in all ages.

4. The apparent delay of the accomplishment of any of these promises requires an exercise of the faith and patience, of the saints.

5. Every such coming of Christ hath its appointed season, beyond which it shall not tarry.

6. This divine disposition of things gives a necessity unto the continual exercise of faith, prayer, and patience, about the coming of Christ.

7. Although we may not know the especial dispensations and moments of time that are passing over us, yet all believers may know the state in general of the church under which they are, and what coming of Christ they are to look for and expect.

8. Faith in any church satisfies the souls of men with what is the good and deliverance of that state, although a man do know and is persuaded that personally he shall not see it himself nor enjoy it.

9. Under despondencies as to peculiar appearances or comings of Christ, it is the duty of believers to fix and exercise their faith on his illustrious appearance at the last day.

10. Every particular coming of Christ, in a way suited unto the present deliverance of the church, is an infallible pledge of his coming at the last unto judgment.

11. Every promised coming of Christ is certain, and shall not be delayed beyond its appointed season, when no difficulties shall be able to stand before it.

12. There are especial qualifications of grace required unto steadfastness in profession in times of persecution and long-con-tinued trials.

13. Many things are required to secure the success of our profession in times of difficulties and trials.

14. The continuance of the spiritual life and eternal salvation of true believers is secured from all oppositions whatever.

15. No persons whatever ought to be, on any consideration, secure against those sins which present circumstances give an efficacy unto.

16. It is an effect of spiritual wisdom to discern what is the dangerous and prevailing temptation of any season, and vigorously to set ourselves in opposition unto it.

17. It is much to be feared that in great trials some will draw back from that profession of the gospel wherein they are engaged.

18. This defection is commonly durable, continued by various pretences.

19. It is our great duty to look diligently that we are of that holy frame of mind, and attend to that due exercise of faith, that the soul of God may take pleasure in us.

20. Though there appear as yet no outward tokens or evidences of the anger and displeasure of God against our ways, yet if we are in that state wherein God hath no pleasure in us, we are entering into certain ruin.

21. Backsliders from the gospel are in a peculiar manner the abhorrence of the soul of God.

22. When the soul of God is not delighted in any, nothing can preserve them from utter destruction.

23. The Scripture everywhere testifieth that in the visible church there is a certain number of false hypocrites.

24. It is our duty to evidence unto our own consciences, and give evidence unto others, that we are not of this sort of number.

25. Nothing can free apostates from eternal ruin.

26. Sincere faith will carry men through all difficulties, hazards, and troubles, unto the certain enjoyment of eternal blessedness.

Chapter 11. Verse. 1. —

1. No faith will carry us through the difficulties of our profession from oppositions within and without, giving us constancy and perseverance therein unto the end, but that only which gives the good things hoped for a real subsistence in our minds and souls.

2. The peculiar specifical nature of faith, whereby it is differenced from all other powers, acts, and graces in the mind, lies in this, that it makes a life on things invisible.

3. The glory of our religion is, that it depends on and is resolved into invisible things.

4. Great objections are apt to lie against invisible things when they are externally revealed.

5. It is faith alone that takes believers out of this world while they are in it, that exalts them above it while they are under its rage, and enables them to live upon things future and invisible.

Verse. 2. —

1. Instances or examples are the most powerful confirmations of practical truths.

2. They who have a good testimony from God shall never want reproaches from the world.

3. It is faith alone which, from the beginning of the world (or from the giving of the first promise), was the means and way of obtaining acceptance with God.

4. The faith of true believers from the beginning of the world was fixed on things future, hoped for, and invisible.

5. That faith whereby men please God acts itself in a fixed contemplation on things future and invisible, from whence it derives encouragement and strength to endure and abide firm in profession against all oppositions and persecutions.

6. However men may be despised, vilified, and reproached in the world, yet if they have faith, if they are true believers, they are accepted with God, and he will give them a good report.

Verse. 3. —

1. They who firmly assent unto divine revelation do understand the creation of the world, as to its truth, its season, its cause, its manner, and end.

2. Faith puts forth its power in our minds in a due manner, when it gives us clear and distinct apprehensions of the things we do believe.

3. As God's first work was perfect, so all his works shall be perfect.

4. The aid of reason, with the due consideration of the nature, use, and end of all things, ought to be admitted of, to confirm our minds in the persuasion of the original creation of all things.

Verse. 4. —

1. Every circumstance in suffering shall add to the glory of the sufferer.

2. We are to serve God with the best that we have, the best that is in our power, with the best of our spiritual abilities.

3. God gives no consequential approbation of any duties of believers, but where the principle of a living faith goes previously in their performance.

4. Our persons must be first justified, before our works of obedience can be accepted with God.

5. They whom God approves must expect that the world will disapprove them, and ruin them if it can.

6. Where there is a difference within, in the hearts of men, on the account of faith or the want of it, there will for the most part be unavoidable differences about outward worship.

7. God's approbation is an abundant recompense for the loss of our lives
8. There is a voice in all innocent blood shed by violence.

9. Whatever troubles faith may engage us into in the profession of it, with obedience according to the mind of God, it will bring us safely off from them all at last (yea, though we should die in the cause), unto our eternal salvation and honor.

Verse. 5. —

1. Whatever be the outward different events of faith in believers in this world, they are all alike accepted with God, approved by him, and shall all equally enjoy the eternal inheritance.

2. God can and doth put a great difference, as unto outward things, between such as are equally accepted before him.

3. There is no such acceptable service unto God, none that he hath set such signal pledges of his favor upon, as zealously to contend against the world in giving witness to his ways, his worship, and his kingdom, or the rule of Christ over all.

4. It is a part of our testimony to declare and witness that vengeance is prepared for ungodly persecutors, and all sorts of impenitent sinners, however they are and may be provoked thereby.

5. The principal part of this testimony consists in our own personal obedience, or visible walking with God in holy obedience, according to the tenor of the covenant.

6. As it is an effect of the wisdom of God to dispose the works of his providence and the accomplishment of his promises according to an ordinary established rule, declared in his word, which is the only guide of faith, so sometimes it pleases him to give extraordinary instances in each kind, both in a way of judgment and in a way of grace and favor.

7. Faith in God through Christ hath an efficacy in the procuring of such grace, mercy, and favor in particular, as it hath no ground in particular to believe.

8. They must walk with God here who design to live with him hereafter.

9. That faith which can translate a man out of this world, can carry him through the difficulties which he may meet withal in the profession of faith and obedience in this world.

Verse. 6. —

1. Where God hath put an impossibility upon any thing, it is in vain for men to attempt it.

2. It is of the highest importance to examine well into the sincerity of our faith, whether it be of the true kind or not.

3. God himself in his self-sufficiency and his all-sufficiency, meet to act towards poor sinners in a way of bounty, is the first motive or encouragement unto, and the last object of faith.

4. They who seek God only according to the light of nature do but feel after him in the dark, and they shall never find him as a rewarder.

5. They who seek him according to the law of works, and by the best of their obedience thereunto, shall never find him as a rewarder, nor attain that which they seek after.

6. It is the most proper act of faith to come and cleave to God as a rewarder in the way of grace and bounty, as proposing himself for our reward.

7. That faith is vain which doth not put men on a diligent inquiry after God.

8. The whole issue of our finding of God when we seek him depends on the way and rule which we take and use in our so doing.

Verse. 7. —

1. It is a high commendation to faith, to believe things on the word of God that in themselves and all second causes are invisible, and seem impossible.

2. No obstacle can stand in the way of faith, when it fixeth itself on the almighty power of God and his infinite veracity.

3. It is a great encouragement and strengthening unto faith, when the things which it believes as promised or threatened are suitable unto the properties of the divine nature, his righteousness, holiness, goodness, and the like.

4. The destruction of the world, when it was filled with wickedness and violence, is a pledge of the certain accomplishment of all divine threatenings against ungodly sinners and enemies of the church, though the time of it may be yet far distant, and the means of it may not be evident.

5. A reverential fear of God, as threatening vengeance unto impenitent sinners, is a fruit of saving faith and acceptable unto God.

6. It is one thing to fear God as threatening, with a holy reverence, another to be afraid of the evil threatened, merely as it is penal and destructive.

7. Faith produceth various effects in the minds of believers, according to the variety of objects that it is fixed on; sometimes joy and confidence, sometimes fear and reverence.

8. Then is fear a fruit of faith, when it engageth us into diligence in our duty.

9. Many things tend to the commendation of the faith of Noah.

10. In the destruction of the old world we have an eminent figure of the state of impenitent sinners, and of God's dealing with them, in all ages, 11. The visible professing church shall never fall into such an apostasy, nor be so totally destroyed, but that God will preserve a remnant for a seed to future generations.

12. Those whom God calleth unto, fitteth for, and employeth in any work, are therein συνεργοί θεοῦ, — "co-workers with God."

13. Let those that are employed in the declaration of God's promises and threatenings take heed unto themselves to answer the will of him by whom they are employed, whose work it is wherein they are engaged.

14. It ought to be a motive unto diligence in exemplary obedience, that therein we bear testimony for God against the impenitent world, which he will judge and punish.

15. All right unto spiritual privileges and mercies is by gratuitous adoption.

16. The righteousness of faith is the best inheritance, for thereby we become heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ.

Verse. 8. —

1. It becomes the infinite greatness and all-satisfactory goodness of God, at the very first revelation of himself unto any of his creatures, to require

of them a renunciation of all other things, and of their interest in them, in compliance with his commands.

2. In the call of Abraham we see the power of sovereign grace in calling men to God, and the mighty efficacy of faith in complying therewith.

3. It is the call of God alone that makes a distinction amongst mankind, as unto faith and obedience, with all the effects of them.

4. The church of believers consists of those that are called out of the world.

5. Self-denial in fact or resolution is the foundation of all sincere profession.

6. There is no right, title, or possession, that can prescribe against the righteousness of God in the disposal of all inheritances here below at his pleasure.

7. God's grant of things unto any is the best of titles, and most sure against all pretences or impeachments.

8. Possession belongs unto an inheritance enjoyed.

9. An inheritance may be given only for a limited season.

10. It is faith alone that gives the soul satisfaction in future rewards, in the midst of present difficulties and distresses.

11. The assurance given us by divine promises is sufficient to encourage us to advance in the most difficult course of obedience.

Verse. 9. —

1. Where faith enables men to live unto God as unto their eternal concerns, it will enable them to trust unto him in all the difficulties, dangers, and hazards of this life.

2. If we design to have an interest in the blessing of Abraham, we must walk in the steps of the faith of Abraham.

3. Where faith is once duly fixed on the promises, it will wait patiently under trials, afflictions, and temptations for their full accomplishment.

4. Faith discerning aright the glory of spiritual promises, will make the soul of a believer contented and well satisfied with the smallest portion of earthly enjoyments.

Verse. 10. —

1. A certain expectation of the heavenly reward, grounded on the promises and covenant of God, is sufficient to support and encourage the souls of believers under all their trials, in the whole course of their obedience.

2. Heaven is a settled, quiet habitation.

3. All stability, all perpetuity in every state, here and hereafter, ariseth from the purpose of God, and is resolved thereinto.

4. This is that which recommends to us the city of God, the heavenly state, that it is, as the work of God alone, so the principal effect of his wisdom and power.

5. A constant expectation of an eternal reward argues a vigorous exercise of faith, and a sedulous attendance to all duties of obedience.

Verse. 11. —

1. Faith may be sorely shaken and tossed at the first appearance of difficulties lying in the way of the promise, which yet at last it shall overcome.

2. Although God ordinarily worketh by his concurring blessing on the course of nature, yet is he not obliged thereunto.

3. It is no defect in faith not to expect events and blessings absolutely above the use of means, unless we have a particular warrant for it.

4. The duty and use of faith about temporal mercies are to be regulated by the general rules of the word, where no especial providence doth make application of a promise.

5. The mercy concerning a son unto Abraham by Sarah his wife was absolutely decreed and absolutely promised, yet God indispensably requires faith in them for the fulfilling of that decree and the accomplishment of that promise.

6. The formal object of faith in the divine promises is not the things promised in the first place, but God himself in his essential excellencies of truth, or faithfulness, and power.

7. Every promise of God hath this consideration tacitly annexed to it, "Is any thing too hard for the LORD?"

8. Although the truth, veracity, or faithfulness of God, be in a peculiar manner the immediate object of our faith, yet it takes in the consideration of all other divine excellencies for its encouragement and corroboration.

Verse. 12. —

1. When God is pleased to increase his church in number, it is on various accounts a matter of rejoicing unto all believers.

2. An ungodly, carnal multitude, combined together in secular interests for their advantage, unto the ends of superstition and sin, calling themselves "The church," like that of Rome, is set up by the craft of Satan to evade the truth, and debase the glory of these promises.

3. God oftentimes by nature works things above the power of nature in its ordinary efficacy and operations.

4. Whatever difficulties and oppositions lie in the way of the accomplishment of the promises under the new testament, made unto Jesus Christ concerning the increase and stability of his church and kingdom, these promises shall have an assured accomplishment.

Verse. 13. —

1. It is the glory of true faith that it will not leave them in whom it is, that it will not cease its actings for their support and comfort in their dying, when the hope of the hypocrite doth perish.

2. The life of faith doth eminently manifest itself in death, when all other reliefs and supports do fail.

3. That is the crowning act of faith, the great trial of its vigor and wisdom, namely, in what it doth in our dying.

4. Hence it is that many of the saints, both of old and of late, have evidenced the most triumphant actings of faith in the approach of death.

5. The due understanding of the whole old testament, with the nature of the faith and obedience of all the saints under it, depends on this one truth, that they believed things that were not yet actually exhibited nor enjoyed.

6. God would have the church, from the beginning of the world, to live on promises not actually accomplished.

7. We may receive the promises, as to the comfort and benefit of them, when we do not actually receive the things promised.

8. As our privileges in the enjoyment of the promises are above theirs under the old testament, so our faith, thankfulness, and obedience, ought to excel theirs also.

9. No distance of time or place can weaken faith as unto the accomplishment of divine promises.

10. Quiet waiting for the accomplishment of promises at a great distance, and which most probably will not be in our days, is an eminent fruit of faith.

11. This firm persuasion of the truth of God in the accomplishment of his promises unto us, upon a discovery of their worth and excellency, is the second act of faith, wherein the life of it doth principally consist.

12. This avowed renunciation of all other things beside Christ in the promise, and the good-will of God in him, as to the repose of any trust or confidence in them for our rest and satisfaction, is an eminent act of that faith whereby we walk with God.

Verse. 14. —

This is the genuine and proper way of interpreting the Scripture, when from the words themselves, considered with relation unto the persons speaking them, and to all their circumstances, we declare what was their determinate mind and sense.

Verse. 15. —

1. It is in the nature of faith to mortify not only corrupt and sinful lusts, but our natural affections, and their most vehement inclinations, though in themselves innocent, if they are any way uncompliant with duty of obedience to the commands of God.

2. When the hearts and minds of believers are fixed on things spiritual and heavenly, it will take them off from inordinate cleaving to things otherwise greatly desirable.

Verse. 16. —

1. To avow openly in the world, by our ways, walking, and living, with a constant public profession, that our portion and inheritance is not in it, but in things invisible, in heaven above, is an illustrious act and fruit of faith.

2. Faith looks on heaven as the country of believers, a glorious country, an eternal rest and habitation.

3. In all the groans of burdened souls under their present trials, there is included a fervent desire after heaven, and the enjoyment of God therein.

4. This is the greatest privilege, honor, advantage, and security that any can be made partakers of, that God will bear the name and title of their God.

5. God’s owning of believers as his, and of himself to be their God, is an abundant recompense for all the hardships which they undergo in their pilgrimage.

6. Divine wisdom hath so ordered the relation between God and the church, that that which is in itself an infinite condescension in God, and a reproach unto him in the wicked, idolatrous world, should also be his glory and honor, wherein he is well pleased.

7. Where God, in a way of sovereign grace, so infinitely condescends as to take any into covenant with himself, so as that he may be justly styled their God, he will make them to be such as shall be a glory to himself.

8. We may see the woful condition of them who are ashamed to be called his people, and make that name a term of reproach unto others.

9. Eternal rest and glory are made sure for all believers in the eternal purpose of the will of God, and his actual preparation of them by grace.

Verse. 17. —

1. God alone knows how to ascribe work and duty proportionate unto the strength of grace received.

2. Ofttimes God reserves great trials for a well-exercised faith.

3. Faith must be tried, and of all graces it is most suited unto trial.

4. God proportions trials for the most part unto the strength of faith.

5. Great trials in believers are an evidence of great faith in them, though not understood either by themselves or others before such trials.

6. Trials are the only touchstone of faith, without which men must want the best evidence of its sincerity and efficacy, and the best way of testifying it unto others.

7. We ought not to be afraid of trials, because of the admirable advantages of faith in and by them.

8. Let them be jealous over themselves who have had no especial instances of the trial of their faith.

9. True faith being tried will in the issue be victorious.

10. Where there is a divine command, evidencing itself to our consciences so to be, it is the wisdom and duty of faith to close its eyes against whatsoever seems insuperable in difficulties or inextricable in consequents.

11. Divine revelations did give such an evidence of their being immediately from God to those who received them, that though in all things they contradicted their reason and interest, yet they received them without any hesitation.

12. The great glory and commendation of the faith of Abraham consisted in this, that without all dispute, hesitation, or rational consideration of

objections to the contrary, by a pure act of his will he complied with the authority of God.

13. It is a privilege and advantage to have an offering of price to offer to God if he call for it.

14. Obedience begun in faith, without any reserves, but with a sincere intention to fulfill the whole work of it, is accepted with God as if it were absolutely complete.

15. The power of faith in its conflict with and conquest over natural affections, when their unavoidable bent and inclinations are contrary to the will of God, whereby they are exposed to receive impressions from temptations, is an eminent part of its glory, and a blessed evidence of its sincerity.

Verse. 18. —

1. In great and inextricable difficulties, it is the duty, wisdom, and nature of faith, to fix itself on the immense properties of the divine nature, whereby it can effect things inconceivable and incomprehensible.

2. God may justly require the assent and confidence of faith unto all things which infinite power and wisdom can effect, though we can neither see, nor understand, nor comprehend the way whereby it may be accomplished.

3. God's dealings with his church sometimes are such as that, unless we shut our eyes and stop our ears unto all objections and temptations against his promises, opening them only unto divine sovereignty, wisdom, and veracity, we can never abide in a comfortable course of obedience.

4. This is the glory of faith, that it can spiritually compose the soul in the midst of all storms and temptations, under darkness as unto events.

5. In any surprisal with seemingly insuperable difficulties, it is our duty immediately to set faith at work.

6. There may sometimes, through God's providential disposal of all things, be an appearance of such an opposition and inconsistency between his commands and promises as nothing but faith bowing the soul unto divine sovereignty can reconcile.

Verse. 19. —

1. It is good for us to have our faith firmly built on the fundamental articles of religion.

2. We ought to remember the privileges and advantages that Abraham obtained on the trial, exercise, and victory of his faith.

3. Faith obtaining the victory in great trials (as suffering for the truth), and carrying us through difficult duties of obedience, shall have a reward even in this life in many unspeakable spiritual privileges and advantages.

4. The example of Abraham was peculiarly cogent unto the Hebrews, who gloried in being the children of Abraham, from whom they derived all their privileges and advantages.

5. If we are children of Abraham, we have no reason to expect an exemption from the greatest trials.

Verse. 20. —

1. The failure, error, or mistake, of any one leading person, with respect unto divine promises and their accomplishment, may be of dangerous consequence unto others.

Verse. 21. —

1. It is an eminent mercy when faith not only holds out to the end, but waxeth strong towards the last conflict with death.

2. It is so also to be able by faith, in the close of our pilgrimage, to recapitulate all the passages of our lives in mercies, trials, afflictions, so as to give glory to God with respect to them all.

3. That which enlivens and encourageth faith as to all other things is a peculiar respect to the Angel, the Redeemer, by whom all grace and mercy is communicated to us.

4. It is our duty so to live in the constant exercise of faith, as that we may be ready and strong in it when we are dying.

5. Though we should die daily, yet there is a peculiar dying season, when death is in its near approach, which requires peculiar actings of faith.

6. In all acts of divine worship, whether solemn or occasional, it is our duty to dispose our bodies into such a posture of reverence as may represent the inward frame of our minds.

7. There is an allowance for the infirmities of age and sickness in our outward deportment in divine worship, so as that there be no indulgence to sloth or custom, but that an evidence of a due reverence of God and holy things be preserved.

Verse. 22.

1. It is of great use unto the edification of the church, that such believers as have been eminent in profession should at their dying testify their faith in the promises of God.

2. Joseph, after his trial of all that this world could afford, when he was dying, chose the promise for his lot and portion.

3. No interposition of difficulties ought to weaken our faith as unto the accomplishment of the promises of God.

Verse. 23. —

1. Where there is an agreement between husband and wife in faith and the fear of the Lord, it makes way unto a blessed success in all their duties; when it is otherwise, nothing succeeds unto their comfort.

2. When difficult duties befall persons in that relation, it is their wisdom each to apply themselves unto that part and share of it which they are best suited for.

3. This is the height of persecution, when private houses are searched by bloody officers to execute tyrannical laws.

4. It is well when any thing of eminence in our children doth so engage our affections unto them as to make them useful and subservient unto diligence in disposing of them unto the glory of God.

5. The rage of men and the faith of the church shall work out the accomplishment of God’s counsels and promises unto his glory, from under all perplexities and difficulties that may arise in opposition unto it.

Verse. 24. —

1. Whatever be the privileges of any, whatever be their work or office, it is by faith alone that they must live to God, and obtain acceptance with him.

2. It is good to fill up every age and season with the duties which are proper thereunto.

3. It is a blessed thing to have the principles of true religion fixed in the minds of children, and their affections engaged to them, before they are exposed to temptations, from learning, wisdom, wealth, or preferment.

4. The token of God's covenant received in infancy, being duly considered, is the most effectual means to preserve persons in the profession of true religion against apostasy by outward temptations.

5. The work of faith in all ages of the church, as to its nature, efficacy, and the method of its actings, is uniform and the same.

Verse. 25. —

1. Let no man be offended at the low, mean, persecuted condition of the church at any time.

2. The sovereign wisdom of God, in disposing the outward state and condition of his people in this world, is to be submitted to.

3. It is certain there is somewhat contained in this title and privilege of being "the people of God" that is infinitely above all outward things that may be enjoyed in this world, and which doth inexpressibly outbalance all the evils that are in it.

4. The church, in all its distresses, is ten thousand times more honorable than any other society of men in the world; they are "the people of God."

5. In a time of great temptations, especially from furious persecutors, a sedate consideration of the true nature of all things wherein we are concerned, and their circumstances on every hand, is necessary, to enable us unto a fight choice of our lot and a due performance of our duty.

6. No profession will endure the trial in a time of persecution but such as proceeds from a determinate choice of adhering unto Christ and the gospel,

with a refusal and rejection of whatever stands in competition with them, on a due consideration of the respective natures and ends of the things proposed unto us on the one hand and on the other.

7. Moses chose to be afflicted with the people of God, and so must every one do who will be of them unto his advantage.

8. Men fearfully delude themselves in the choice they make about profession in times of persecution.

Verse. 26. —

1. Reproach hath, in all ages, from the beginning of the world, attended Christ and all the sincere professors of faith in him; which in God's esteem is upon his account.

2. Let the things of this world be increased and multiplied into the greatest measures and degrees imaginable, it alters not their kind.

3. There is an all-satisfactory fullness in spiritual things, even when the enjoyment of them is under reproach and persecution, unto all the true ends of the blessedness of men.

4. Such signal exemplifications of the nature and efficacy of faith in others, especially when victorious against mighty oppositions, as they were in Moses, are high encouragements unto us unto the like exercise of it in the like circumstances.

5. It is our duty, in the whole course of our faith and obedience, to have respect unto the future recompense of reward.

6. It is faith only that can carry us through the difficulties, trials, and persecutions which we may be called unto for the sake and name of Christ.

7. Faith in exercise will carry us safely and securely through all the trials which we have to undergo for Christ and the gospel.

8. Faith is highly rational in all its acts of obedience towards God.

Verse. 27. —

1. In all duties, especially such as are attended with great difficulties and dangers, it is the wisdom of believers to take care, not only that the works

of them be good in themselves, but that they have a just and due call to their performance.

2. Even the wrath of the greatest kings is to be disregarded if it lie against our duty towards God.

3. There is a heroic frame of mind and spiritual fortitude required to the due discharge of our callings in times of danger, which faith in exercise will produce.

4. There is nothing insuperable to faith, while it can keep a clear view of the power of God and his faithfulness in his promises.

Verse. 28. —

1. There is always an especial exercise of faith required unto the due observance of a sacramental ordinance.

2. Whatever is not sprinkled with the blood of Christ, the Lamb of God, who was slain and sacrificed for us, is exposed unto destruction from the anger and displeasure of God.

3. It is the blood of Christ alone which gives us security from him that hath the power of death.

4. God hath always instruments in readiness to execute the severest of his judgments on sinners in their greatest security.

5. Such is the great power and activity of these fiery ministering spirits, as that, in the shortest space of time imaginable, they can execute the judgments of God on whole nations as well and as easily as on private persons.

6. Unless we are sprinkled with the blood of Christ, our paschal Lamb, no other privilege can secure us from eternal destruction.

Verse. 29. —

1. Where God engageth his word and promise, there is nothing so difficult, nothing so remote from the rational apprehensions of men, but he may righteously require our faith and trust in him therein.

2. Faith will find a way through a sea of difficulties under the call of God.

3. There is no trial, no difficulty, that the church can be called unto, but that there are examples on record of the power of faith in working out its deliverance.

4. God knows how to secure impenitent sinners unto their appointed destruction, by giving them up unto hardness of heart and an obstinate continuance in their sins against all warnings and means of repentance.

5. God doth not give up any in a judiciary way unto sin, but it is a punishment for preceding sins, and as a means to bring on them total ruin and destruction.

6. Let us not wonder that we see men in the world obstinate in foolish counsels and undertakings, tending unto their own inevitable ruin, seeing probably they are under judiciary hardness from God.

7. There is no such blinding, hardening lust in the minds or hearts of men, as hatred of the people of God and desire of their ruin.

8. When the oppressors of the church are nearest unto their ruin, they commonly rage most, and are most obstinate in their bloody persecutions.

Verse. 30. —

1. Faith will embrace and make use of means divinely prescribed, though it be not able to discern the effective influence of them unto the end aimed at.

2. Faith will cast down walls and strong towers that lie in the way of the work of God.

Verse. 31. —

1. Although unbelief be not the only destroying sin (for the wages of every sin is death, and many are accompanied with peculiar provocations), yet it is the only sin which makes eternal destruction inevitable and remediless.

2. Where there are means granted of the revelation of God and his will, it is unbelief that is the greatest and most provoking sin, and from whence God is glorified in his severest judgments.

3. Where this revelation of the mind and will of God is most open, full, and evident, and the means of it are most express and suited unto the

communication of the knowledge of it, there is the highest aggravation of unbelief.

4. Every thing which God designs as an ordinance to bring men unto repentance ought to be diligently attended to and complied withal, seeing the neglect of it or of the call of God therein shall be severely revenged.

5. It is in the nature of true, real, saving faith immediately, or at its first opportunity, to declare and protest itself in confession before men.

6. Separation from the cause and interest of the world is required in all believers, and will accompany true faith wherever it is.

Verse. 32. —

1. It is requisite prudence, in the confirmation of important truths, to give them a full proof and demonstration, and yet not to multiply arguments and testimonies beyond what is necessary, which serves only to divert the mind from attending unto the truth itself to be confirmed.

2. It is not the dignity of the person that gives efficacy unto faith, but it is faith that makes the person accepted.

3. Neither the guilt of sin nor the sense of it should hinder us from acting faith on God in Christ when we are called thereunto.

4. True faith will save great sinners.

5. There is nothing so great or difficult, or seemingly insuperable, no discouragement so great from a sense of our own unworthiness by sin, nor opposition arising against us from both of them in conjunction, that should hinder us from believing and from the exercise of faith in all things when we are called thereunto.

Verse. 33. —

1. There is nothing that can lie in the way of the accomplishment of any of God’s promises but it is conquerable by faith.

2. That faith that hath stopped the mouths of lions can restrain, disappoint, and stop the rage of the most savage oppressors and persecutors of the church.

Verse. 34, 35. —

1. It is the wisdom and duty of faith to apply itself to all lawful ways and means of deliverance from danger.

2. We ought to exercise faith about temporal mercies, as they are ofttimes received by it and given in on the account of it.

Verse. 35-37. —

1. It belongs unto the sovereign pleasure of God to dispose of the outward state and condition of the church, as unto its seasons of prosperity and persecution.

2. Those whose lot falleth in the times of greatest distress or sufferings, are no less accepted with him than those who enjoy the highest terrene felicity and success.

3. Sufferings will stir us up unto the exercise of faith on the most difficult objects of it, and bring in the comforts of them into our souls.

Verse. 36. — There may be sufferings sufficient for the trial of the faith of the church when the world is restrained from blood and death.

Verse. 37. —

1. No instruments of cruelty, no inventions of the devil or the world, no terrible preparations of death, — that is, no endeavours of the gates of hell, — shall ever prevail against the faith of God's elect.

2. It is no small degree of suffering, for men by law or violence to be driven from those places of their own habitation which the providence of God, and all just right among men, have allotted unto them.

3. He will be deceived who at any time, under a sincere profession of the gospel, looks for any other, any better treatment or entertainment in the world than reproaches, defamations, revilings, threatenings, contempt.

Verse. 38. —

1. Let the world think as well, as highly, as proudly of itself as it pleaseth, when it persecutes it is base and unworthy of the society of true believers and of the mercies wherewith it is accompanied.

2. God's esteem of his people is never the less for their outward sufferings and calamities, whatever the world judgeth of them.

3. Ofttimes it is better and more safe for the saints of God to be in the wilderness among the beasts of the field than in a savage world, inflamed by the devil into rage and persecution.

4. Though the world may prevail to drive the church into the wilderness, to the ruin of all public profession in their own apprehension, yet it shall be there preserved unto the appointed season of its deliverance.

5. It becomes us to be filled with thoughts of and affections unto spiritual things, to labor for an anticipation of glory, that we faint not in the consideration of the evils that may befall us on the account of the gospel.

Verse. 39, 40. — It is our duty not only to believe, that we may be justified before God, but so to evidence our faith by the fruits of it, as that we may obtain a good report, or be justified before men.

Verse. 40. —

1. The disposal of the states and times of the church, as unto the communication of light, grace, and privileges, depends merely on the sovereign pleasure and will of God, and not on any merit or preparation in man.

2. Though God gives more light and grace unto the church in one season than in another, yet in every season he gives that which is sufficient to guide believers in their faith and obedience unto eternal life.

3. It is the duty of believers, in every state of the church, to make use of and improve the spiritual provision that God hath made for them, always remembering that unto whom much is given of them much is required.

4. God measures out unto all his people their portion in service, sufferings, privileges, and rewards, according to his own good pleasure.

5. It is Christ alone who was to give, and who alone could give, perfection or consummation unto the church.

6. All the outward glorious worship of the old testament had no perfection in it, and so no glory, comparatively, unto that which is brought in by the gospel.

7. All perfection, all consummation, is in Christ alone.

CHAPTERS 12., 13.

EXHORTATIONS TO PERSEVERANCE IN ALL CHRISTIAN DUTY.

Chapter 12. Verse. 1. —

1. In all examples set before us in Scripture, we are diligently to consider our own concern in them, and what we are instructed by them.

2. God hath not only made provision, but plentiful provision, in the Scripture for the strengthening of our faith, and for our encouragement unto duty.

3. It is an honor that God puts on his saints departed, especially such as suffered and died for the truth, that even after their death they shall be witnesses unto faith and obedience in all generations.

4. To faint in our profession whilst we are encompassed with such a cloud of witnesses is a great aggravation of our sin.

5. Universal mortification of sin is the best preparative, preservative, and security for constancy in profession in a time of trial and persecution.

6. Whereas the nature of indwelling sin at such seasons is to work by unbelief towards a departure from the living God, or to the relinquishment of the gospel and the profession of it, we ought to be continually on our watch against all its arguings and actings towards that end.

7. The way whereby this sin principally manifests itself, is by the clogs and hinderances which it puts upon us in the constant course of our obedience.

8. The reward that is proposed at the end of this race is every way worthy of all the pains, diligence, and patience that are to be taken and exercised in the attainment of it

Verse. 2. —

1. The foundation of our stability in the faith and profession of the gospel in times of trial and suffering, is a constant looking unto Christ with expectation of aid and assistance.

2. It is a mighty encouragement unto constancy and perseverance in believing, that he in whom we do believe is the author and finisher of our faith.

3. The exercise of faith on Christ, to enable us unto perseverance under difficulties and persecutions, respects him as a Savior and a sufferer, as the author and finisher of faith itself.

4. Herein is the Lord Christ our great example, in that he was influenced and acted, in all that he did and suffered, by a continual respect unto the glory of God and the salvation of the church.

5. If we duly propose these things unto ourselves in all our sufferings, as they are set before us in the Scripture, we shall not faint under them, nor be weary of them.

6. This blessed frame of mind in our Lord Jesus in all his sufferings is that which the apostle proposeth for our encouragement and unto our imitation.

7. If he went so through his sufferings, and was victorious in the issue, we also may do so in ours, through his assistance who is the author and finisher of our faith.

8. We have in this instance the highest proof that faith can conquer both pain and shame.

9. We should neither think strange of them, nor fear them, on the account of our profession of the gospel, seeing the Lord Jesus hath gone before in the conflict with them and conquest of them.

Verse. 3. —

1. Such things may befall us in the way of our profession of the gospel as are in themselves apt to weary and burden us, so as to solicit our minds to a relinquishment of it.

2. When we begin to be heartless, desponding, and weary of our sufferings, it is a dangerous disposition of mind, tending towards a defection from the gospel.

3. We ought to watch against nothing more diligently than the insensible, gradual prevailing of such a frame in us, if we intend to be faithful to the end.

4. If we design perseverance in a time of trouble and persecution, it is both our wisdom and our duty to keep up faith to a vigorous exercise, the want whereof is the fainting in our minds.

5. The malicious contradiction of wicked priests, scribes, and pharisees, against the truth, and those that profess it on the account thereof, is suited to make them faint, if not opposed by vigorous acting of faith on Christ, and a due consideration of his sufferings in the same kind.

6. Whoever they are who, by their contradictions unto the truth and them that do profess it, do stir up persecution against them, let them pretend what they will of righteousness, they are sinners, and that in such a degree as to be obnoxious to eternal death.

7. If our minds grow weak, through a remission of the vigorous acting of faith, in a time of great contradiction unto our profession, they will quickly grow weary, so as to give over if not timely recovered.

8. The constant consideration of Christ in his sufferings is the best means to keep up faith unto its due exercise in all times of trial.

Verse. 4. —

1. The proportioning the degrees of sufferings, and the disposal of them as unto times and seasons, is in the hand of God.

2. It is highly dishonorable to faint in the cause of Christ and the gospel under lesser sufferings, when we know there are greater to be undergone by ourselves and others on the same account.

3. Signal diligence and watchfulness is required in our profession of the gospel, considering what enemy we have to conflict withal.

4. It is an honorable warfare, to be engaged against such an enemy as sin is.

5. Though the world cannot, or will not, yet Christians can distinguish between resisting the authority of men, whereof they are unjustly accused, and the resistance of sin, under a pretense of that authority, by refusing a compliance with it.

6. There is no room for sloth or negligence in this conflict.

7. They do but deceive themselves who hope to preserve their faith, in times of trial, without the utmost watchful diligence against the assaults and impressions of sin.

8. The vigor of our minds, in the constant exercise of spiritual strength, is required hereunto.

9. Without this we shall be surprised, wounded, and at last destroyed by our enemy.

10. They that would abide faithful in their profession in times of trial ought constantly to bear in mind and be armed against the worst of evils that they may be called unto on the account thereof.

Verse. 5. —

1. This is a blessed effect of divine wisdom, that the sufferings which we undergo from men for the profession of the gospel shall be also chastisements of love from God, to our spiritual advantage.

2. The gospel never requires our suffering, but if we examine ourselves we shall find that we stand in need of the divine chastisement in it.

3. When, by the wisdom of God, we can discern that what we suffer on the one hand is for the glory of God and the gospel, and on the other is

necessary to our own sanctification, we shall be prevailed with to patience and perseverance.

4. Where there is sincerity in faith and obedience, let not men despond if they find themselves called to suffer for the gospel when they seem to be unfit and unprepared for it, seeing it is the design of God by those sufferings, whereunto they are called on a public account, to purify and cleanse them from their present evil frames.

5. The want of a diligent consideration of the provision that God hath made in the Scripture for our encouragement to duty and comfort under difficulties is a sinful forgetfulness, and is of dangerous consequence to our souls.

6. Usually God gives to believers the most evident pledges of their adoption when they are in their sufferings and under their afflictions.

7. It is a tender case to be under troubles and afflictions, which requires our utmost diligence, watchfulness, and care about it.

8. When God's chastisements in our troubles and afflictions are reproofs also, when he gives us a sense in them of his displeasure against our sins, and we are reproved by him, yet even then he requires of us that we should not faint nor despond, but cheerfully apply ourselves unto his mind and calls.

9. A sense of God's displeasure against our sins, and of his reproving us for them, is consistent with an evidence of our adoption, yea, may be an evidence of it.

10. A due consideration of this sacred truth, namely, that all our troubles, persecutions, and afflictions, are divine chastisements and reproofs, whereby God evidenceth unto us our adoption, and that he instructs us for our advantage, is an effectual means to preserve us in patience and perseverance unto the end of our trials.

Verse. 6. —

1. In all our afflictions, the resignation of ourselves unto the sovereign pleasure, infinite wisdom, and goodness of God, is the only means or way of preserving us from fainting, weariness, or neglect of duty.

2. Love is antecedent unto chastening.

3. Chastising is an effect of his love.

4. Unto chastisement is required that the person chastised be in a state wherein there is sin, or that he be a sinner.

5. Divine love and chastening are inseparable.

6. Where chastisement evidenceth itself (as it cloth many ways, with respect unto God the author of it, and those that are chastised) not to be penal, it is a broad seal set to the patent of our adoption.

7. This being the way and manner of God's dealing with his children, there is all the reason in the world why we should acquiesce in his sovereign wisdom therein, and not faint under his chastisement.

8. No particular person hath any reason to complain of his portion in chastisement, seeing this is the way of God's dealing with all his children.

Verse. 7. —

1. Afflictions or chastisements are no pledges of our adoption, but when and where they are endured with patience.

2. It is the internal frame of heart and mind under chastisements that lets in and receives a sense of God's design and intention towards us in them.

3. This way of dealing becomes the relation between God and believers, as father and children, — namely, that he should chastise, and they should bear it patiently.

Verse. 8. —

1. There are no sons of God, no real partakers of adoption, that are without some crosses or chastisements in this world.

2. It is an act of spiritual wisdom, in all our troubles to find out and discern divine paternal chastisements; without which we shall never behave ourselves well under them, nor obtain any advantage by them.

3. There are in the visible church, or among professors, some that have no right unto the heavenly inheritance.

4. The joyous state of freedom from affliction is such as we ought always to watch over with great jealousy, lest it should be a leaving of us out of the discipline of the family of God.

Verse. 9, 10. —

1. It is the duty of parents to chastise their children, if need be, and of children to submit thereto.

2. It is good for us to have had the experience of a reverential submission unto paternal chastisements, as from thence we may be convinced of the equity and necessity of submission unto God in all our afflictions.

3. No man can understand the benefit of divine chastisement who understands not the excellency of a participation of God's holiness.

4. If under chastisements we find not an increase of holiness in some especial instances or degrees, they are utterly lost; we have nothing but the trouble and sorrow of them.

5. There can be no greater pledge nor evidence of divine love in afflictions than this, that God designs by them to make us partakers of his holiness, to bring us nearer to him, and make us more like him.

Verse. 11. —

1. When God designeth any thing as a chastisement, it is in vain to endeavor to keep off a sense of it; it shall be a matter of sorrow to us.

2. Not to take in a sense of sorrow in affliction is, through stout-heartedness, to despise the chastening of the Lord.

3. The sorrow which accompanies chastisement is that which the apostle terms κατὰ λύπη, 2 Corinthians 7:9, 10.

4. The nature and end of afflictions are not to be measured by our present sense of them.

5. All the trouble of afflictions is but for the present, at most but for the little while which we are to continue in this world.

6. Those who cannot see an excellency in the abounding of the fruits of righteousness can never apprehend that there is either good or benefit in chastisements.

7. We can never find any benefit in chastisements unless we are exercised by them; that is, unless all our graces are stirred up by them to a constant holy exercise.

8. It is the fruit of righteousness alone that will bring in peace to us, that will give us a sense of peace with God, peace in ourselves and with others, so far as is possible.

9. Grace in afflictions will at length prevail quietly to compose the mind under the storm raised by them, and give rest with peace to the soul.

10. Herein lies the wisdom of faith in this matter, not to pass a judgment on chastisements from the present sense we have of what is evil and dolorous in them, but from their end and use, which are blessed and glorious.

Verse. 12, 13. —

1. It is the duty of all faithful ministers of the gospel to consider diligently what failures or temptations their flocks are liable or exposed to, so as to apply suitable means for their preservation.

2. Despondency is the great evil which, in all our sufferings and afflictions, we are with all intension of mind to watch against.

3. We do well to pity men who are weary and fainting in their courage and under their burdens; but we are to be no way gentle towards ourselves in our spiritual weariness and decays, because we have continued supplies of strength ready for us, if we use them in a due manner.

4. This exhortation is given us in a peculiar manner, namely, that we ought to confirm our minds against all discouragements and despondencies under our sufferings and afflictions by the consideration of God’s design in them, and the blessed success which he will give to them.

5. The recovery of this frame, or the restoration of our spiritual hands and knees to their former vigor, is by stirring up all grace to its due exercise, which is torpid and desponding under sloth in this frame.

Verse. 13. —

1. It is our duty not only to be found in the ways of God in general, but to take care that we walk carefully, circumspectly, uprightly, and diligently in them.

2. To make halts or baulks in our way of profession, or crooked paths, in neglect of duty, or by compliances with the world in times of trial and persecution, is an evidence of an evil frame of heart, and of a dangerous state or condition.

3. A hesitation or doubtfulness in or about important doctrines of truth will make men lame, weak, and infirm in their profession.

4. Those who are so are disposed to a total defection from the truth, and are ready on all occasions to go out of the way.

5. Every vicious habit of mind, every defect in light or neglect of duty, every want of stirring up grace unto exercise, will make men lame and halt in profession, and easy to be turned aside with difficulties and oppositions.

6. When we see persons in such a state, it is our duty to be very careful so to behave ourselves as not to give any occasion to their further miscarriages, but rather to endeavor their healing.

7. The best way whereby this may be done, is by making visible and plain to them our own faith, resolution, courage, and constancy, in a way of obedience becoming the gospel.

8. The negligent walking of those professors who are sound in the faith, their weakness and pusillanimity in times of trial, their want of making straight paths to their feet in visible holiness, is a great means of turning aside those that are lame, weak, and halting.

9. It is good to deal with and endeavor the healing of such lame halters, whilst they are yet in the way.

Verse. 14. —

1. A frame and disposition of seeking peace with all men is eminently suited unto the doctrine and grace of the gospel.

2. They are much mistaken in the Lord Christ, who hope to see him hereafter in glory, and who yet live and die here in an unholy state.

3. If this doctrine be true, that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord," the case will be hard at last with a multitude of popes, cardinals, and prelates, who pretend that they have the opening of the door into his presence committed unto them.

4. We may follow peace with men, and not attain it; but if we follow holiness, we shall as assuredly see the Lord as without it we shall come short of this enjoyment.

5. The same means is to be used for the securing of our present perseverance and of our future blessedness, namely, holiness.

Verse. 15. —

1. The grace, love, and good-will of God, in the adoption, justification, sanctification, and glorification of believers, is proposed unto all in the gospel, as that which may infallibly be attained in the due use of the means thereunto appointed, namely, sincere faith in Christ Jesus.

2. The outward profession of the gospel, with the performance of the duties and enjoyment of the privileges thereunto belonging, will not of themselves instate any man in the grace of God, or in an assured interest therein.

3. There is no man who, under the profession of the gospel, comes short of obtaining the grace and favor of God, but it is by reason of himself and his own sin.

4. Negligence and sloth, missing of opportunities, and love of sin, all proceeding from unbelief, are the only causes why men, under the profession of the gospel, do fail of the grace of God.

5. The root of apostasy from God and the profession of the gospel may abide invisibly in professing churches.

6. Spiritual evils in churches are progressive.

7. It is the duty of churches, what in them lies, to prevent their own trouble as well as the ruin of others.

8. There is a latent disposition in negligent professors to receive infection by spiritual defilements, if they are not watched against.

9. Church inspection is a blessed ordinance and duty, which is designed by Christ himself as a means to prevent these contagious evils in churches.

Verse. 16, 17. —

1. That church which tolerates in its communion men living in such gross sins as fornication has utterly, as unto its discipline, departed from the rule of the gospel.

2. Apostatizing professors are prone to sins of uncleanness.

3. Evil examples proposed in Scripture light, divested of all colors and pretences, laid open in their roots and causes, are efficacious warnings unto believers to abstain from all occasions leading unto the like evils, and much more from the evils themselves.

4. Where there is in any a latent predominant principle of profaneness, a sudden temptation or trial will let it out unto the greatest evils.

5. This principle of profaneness, in preferring the morsels of this world before the birthright privileges of the church, is that which at this day threatens the present ruin of religion.

Verse. 17. —

1. The example of Esau cuts off all hopes from outward privileges, where there is an inward profaneness of heart.

2. Profane apostates have a limited season only wherein the recovery of the blessing is possible.

3. The severity of God in dealing with apostates is a blessed ordinance for the preservation of them that believe, and the edification of the whole church.

4. Sin may be the occasion of great sorrow, where there is no sorrow for sin, as it was with Esau.

5. No man knows whereunto a deliberate sin may lead him, nor what will be the event of it.

6. Profaneness and despising spiritual privileges is a sin that God at one time or other will testify his severity against.

7. Steadfastness in faith, with submission unto the will of God, will establish the soul in those duties which are most irksome unto flesh and blood.

Verse. 18, 19. —

1. A view of God as a judge, represented in fire and blackness, will fill the souls of convinced sinners with dread and terror.

2. Where God calls sinners to answer the law, there is no avoiding of an appearance; the terrible summons and citation will draw them out whether they will or not.

3. It is a blessed change, to be removed from the summons of the law to answer for the guilt of sin, unto the invitation of the gospel to come and accept of mercy and pardon.

4. Let no man ever think or hope to appear before God with confidence or peace, unless he have an answer in readiness unto all the words of this law, all that it requires of us.

5. No outward privilege, such as this was, to hear the voice of God, is sufficient of itself to preserve men from such sins and rebellions as shall render them obnoxious to divine displeasure.

6. Then is the sinner utterly overwhelmed, when he hath a sense of the voice of God himself in the law.

7. The speaking of the law doth immediately discover the invincible necessity of a mediator between God and sinners.

8. If the giving of the law was so full of terror that the people could not bear it, but apprehended that they must die if God continued to speak it to them, what will be the execution of its curse in a way of vengeance at the last day?

Verse. 22-24. —

1. All pleas about church order, power, rights, and privileges, are useless, where men are not interested in this Sion state.

2. It is our duty well to consider what sort of persons they ought to be who are meet to be denizens of this city of God.

3. The church is the safest society in the world.

4. The church is the most honorable society in the world, for all the angels in heaven belong to it.

5. We may hence see the folly of that voluntary humility in worshipping of angels which the apostle condemns, and which is openly practiced in the church of Rome.

6. It is the highest madness for any one to pretend himself to be the head of the church, as the pope doth, unless he assume also to himself to be the head of all the angels in heaven; for they all belong to the same church with the saints here below.

7. The revelation of the glorious mystery of this general assembly is one of the most excellent pre-eminences of the gospel above the law.

8. Jesus Christ alone is absolutely the first-born and heir of all.

9. Under the old testament the promises of Christ, and that he was to proceed from that people according to the flesh, gave the title of sonship unto the church of Israel.

10. All the right and title of believers under the old testament unto sonship, or the right of the first-born, arises merely from their interest in him and participation of him who is absolutely so.

11. It is a glorious privilege to be brought unto this blessed society, this general assembly of the first-born.

12. If we are come unto this assembly, it is our duty carefully to behave ourselves as becometh the members of this society.

13. All contests about church order, state, interest, power, with whom the church is, are vain, empty, fruitless, unprofitable, among those who cannot evidence that they belong unto this general assembly.

14. Eternal election is the rule of the dispensation of effectual grace, to call and collect an assembly of first-born unto God.

15. In Jesus Christ believers are delivered from all discouraging dread and terror in the consideration of God as a judge.

16. Such is the pre-eminence of the gospel state above that of the law, that whereas they of old were severely forbidden to make any approach unto the outward signs of the presence of God, we have now an access with boldness unto his throne.

17. As the greatest misery of unbelievers is to be brought into the presence of this Judge, so it is one of the greatest privileges of believers that they may come unto him.

18. Believers have an access to God, as the judge of all, with all their causes and complaints.

19. However dangerous and dreadful the outward state of the church may be at any time in the world, it may secure itself of final success; because therein God is judge alone, unto whom they have free access.

20. The prospect of an eternal reward from God as the righteous judge is the greatest support of faith in all present distresses.

21. A prospect by faith into the state of the souls of believers departed is both a comfort against the fears of death, and a support under all the troubles and distresses of this present life.

22. This is the blessedness and safety of the catholic church, that it is taken into such a covenant, and hath an interest in such a mediator of it, as are able to save it unto the utmost.

23. The true notion of faith for life and salvation, is a coming unto Jesus as the mediator of the new testament,

24. It is the wisdom of faith to make use of this mediator continually, in all wherein we have to do with God.

25. The glory, the safety, the pre-eminence of the state of believers under the gospel consists in this, that they come therein to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant.

26. The miserable, woful condition of poor convinced sinners under the law, and obnoxious unto the curse thereof, is here set before us.

27. The blessed state of believers is also represented unto us herein, and that not only in their deliverance from the law, but also in the glorious privileges which they obtain by the gospel.

28. We have here a representation of the glory, beauty, and order of the invisible world, of the new creation, of the spiritual catholic church.

Verse. 25-27. —

1. Unbelief under the preaching of the gospel is the great, and in some respect the only damning sin, as being accompanied with, yea, consisting in, the last and utmost contempt of the authority of God.

2. There is in all sins and disobedience a rejection of the authority of God in giving of the law.

3. No sinner can escape divine vengeance if he be tried and judged according to the law.

4. It is the duty of the ministers of the gospel diligently and effectively to declare the nature of unbelief, with the heinousness of its guilt above all other sins whatsoever.

5. It is the duty of ministers to declare the nature of unbelief, not only with respect to them who are open and avowed unbelievers, to convince them of the danger wherein they are, but also to all professors whatever, and to maintain an especial sense of it on their own minds and consciences.

6. This is the issue whereunto things are brought between God and sinners wherever the gospel is preached, namely, whether they will hear the Lord Christ or turn away from him.

7. The grace, goodness, and mercy of God, will not be more illustrious and glorious to all eternity in the salvation of believers by Jesus Christ, than

his justice, holiness, and severity will be in the condemnation of unbelievers.

8. The sovereign authority and mighty power of Christ are gloriously manifested in that signal change and alteration which he made in the heavens and earth of the church, in its state and worship, by the promulgation of the gospel.

9. God was pleased to give testimony to the greatness and glory of this work, by the great commotions in heaven and earth wherewith it was accompanied.

10. It was a mighty work, to introduce the gospel among the nations of the earth, seeing their gods and heavens were to be shaken and removed thereby.

Verse. 28, 29. —

1. Such is the nature and use of all divine or theological truths, that the teaching of them ought constantly to be applied and improved to practice.

2. The privileges which believers receive by the gospel are inconceivable.

3. Believers are not to be measured by their outward state and appearance of things in the world, but by the interest they have in that kingdom which it is their Father’s pleasure to give them.

4. It is assuredly their duty in all things to behave themselves as becomes those who receive such privileges and dignity from God himself.

5. The obligation from hence unto the duty of serving God is evident and unavoidable.

6. Spiritual things and mercies do constitute the most glorious kingdom that is in the world, even the kingdom of God.

7. This is the only kingdom that never shall and never can be moved, however hell and the world do rage against it.

8. Without grace we cannot serve God at all.

9. Without grace in actual exercise we cannot serve God acceptably.

10. To have an increase in grace, as unto its degrees and measures, and to keep it in exercise in all duties of the service of God, is a duty required of believers by virtue of all the gospel privileges which they receive from God.

11. This is the great apostolical canon for the due performance of divine worship, namely, “Let us have grace to do it;” all others are needless and superfluous.

12. However God takes us near unto himself in covenant, whereby he is our God, yet he requires that we always retain due apprehensions of the holiness of his nature, the severity of his justice against sinners, and his ardent jealousy concerning his worship.

13. The consideration of these things, and the dread of being by guilt obnoxious unto their terrible consuming effects, ought to influence our minds unto reverence and godly fear, in all acts and parts of divine worship.

14. We may learn how great our care and diligence about the serving of God ought to be.

15. The holiness and jealousy of God, which are a cause of insupportable terror unto convinced sinners, driving them from him, have towards believers only a gracious influence unto that fear and reverence which causes them to cleave more firmly unto him.

Chapter 13. Verse. 1. —

1. The power and glory of Christian religion is exceedingly decayed and debased in the world.

2. Where the pretense of mutual love is continued in any measure, yet its nature is unknown, and its effects are generally neglected.

3. We are especially to watch unto the preservation of those graces, and the performance of those duties, which in our circumstances are most exposed to opposition.

4. Brotherly love is very apt to be impaired and decay if we do not endeavor continually to preserve and revive it.

5. It is a part of the wisdom of faith to consider aright the ways and occasions of the decay of mutual love, with the means of its preservation.

Verse. 2. —

1. Especial seasons are directions and constraining motives unto especial duties.

2. Our hearts are not to be trusted unto in occasional duties if we preserve them not in a continual disposition towards them.

3. The mind ought continually to be on its watch, and in a gracious disposition towards such duties as are attended with difficulties and charge.

4. Examples of privileges annexed to duties, whereof the Scripture is full, are great motives and incentives to the same or the like duties 5. Faith will make use of the highest privileges that ever were enjoyed on the performance of duties, to encourage unto obedience, though it expects not any thing of the same kind on the performance of the same duties 6. When men designing that which is good do more good than they intended, they shall or may reap more benefit thereby than they expected.

Verse. 3. —

1. If we be called unto suffering for the profession of the gospel, let us not think strange of it; it is no new thing in the world.

2. Bonds and imprisonment for the truth were consecrated to God and made honorable by the bonds and imprisonment of Christ himself, and commended unto the church in all ages by the bonds and imprisonment of the apostles and primitive witnesses of the truth.

3. It is better, more safe and honorable, to be in bonds with and for Christ, than to be at liberty with a brutish, raging, persecuting world.

4. God is pleased to give grace and courage unto some to suffer for the gospel unto bonds.

5. When some are tried as unto their constancy in bonds, others are tried as unto their sincerity in the duties required of them.

6. Usually more fail in neglect of their duty towards sufferers, and so fall from their profession, than do so fail under and on the account of their sufferings.

7. Although there are peculiar duties required of us towards those who suffer for the gospel in an eminent manner, as unto bonds, yet are we not thereon discharged from the same kind of duties towards those who suffer in lesser degrees and in other things.

8. Not only those who are in bonds for the gospel, or suffer to a high degree in their persons, are under the especial care of Christ, but those also who suffer in any other kind whatever, though the world may take little notice of them.

9. Professors of the gospel are exempted from no sorts of adversity, from nothing that is evil and grievous unto the outward man in this world, and therefore ought we not to think it strange when we fall into them.

10. We have no security of freedom from any sort of suffering for the gospel whilst we are in this body, or during the continuance of our natural lives.

11. We are not only exposed unto afflictions during this life, but we ought to live in the continual expectation of them, so long as there are any in the world who do actually suffer for the gospel.

12. The knowledge that we ourselves are continually obnoxious unto sufferings, no less than they who actually suffer, ought to incline our minds unto a diligent consideration of them in their sufferings, so as to discharge all duties of love and helpfulness towards them.

13. Unless it do so we can have no evidence of our present interest in the same mystical body with them, nor just expectation of any compassion or relief from others when we ourselves are called unto sufferings.

Verse. 4. —

1. Divine institution is sufficient to render any state or condition of life honorable.

2. The more useful any state of life is, the more honorable it is.

3. That which is honorable by divine institution, and useful in its own nature, may be abused and rendered vile by the miscarriages of men, as marriage may be.

4. It is a bold usurpation of authority over the consciences of men, and a contempt of the authority of God, to forbid that state unto any which God hath declared honorable among all 5. Means for purity and chastity not ordained, blessed, or sanctified unto that end, will prove furtherances of impurity and uncleanness, or worse evils.

6. The state of marriage being honorable in the sight of God himself, it is the duty of them that enter thereinto duly to consider how they may approve their consciences unto God in what they do.

7. In the state of marriage there is required of men a due consideration of their call unto it and of their ends in it, that they are those of God's appointment.

8. Conjugal duties, regulated by the bounds assigned unto them by natural light, with the general rules of Scripture, and subservient unto the due ends of marriage, are honorable, giving no cause of pollution or shame.

9. Whatever light thoughts men may have of sin, of any sin, the judgment of God concerning all sin, which is according to truth, must stand for ever.

10. Fornication and adultery are sins in their own nature deserving eternal damnation.

11. Men living and dying impenitently in these sins shall eternally perish.

12. The especial aggravation of these sins doth in a peculiar manner expose men unto a sore condemnation.

13. All occasions of, all temptations leading unto, these sins are to be avoided as we take care of our souls.

14. Although the state of men may be changed, and divine wrath due to those sins be finally escaped by repentance, yet it may be observed, that of all sorts of sinners those who are habitually given up unto those lusts of the flesh are of all others the most rarely called and brought to effectual repentance.

15. Many of those persons, by reason of their convictions, received in the light of a natural conscience, do live in a kind of seeming repentance, whereby they relieve themselves after some acts of uncleanness, until, by the power of their lust, they are hurried again into them.

Verse. 5, 6. —

1. All covetousness is inconsistent with a Christian conversation according to the gospel.

2. Covetousness in any degree is highly dangerous in a time of persecution or suffering for the gospel

3. All the efficacy, power, and comfort of divine promises, arise from and are resolved into the excellencies of the divine nature.

4. The vehemency of the expression, by the multiplication of the negative particles, is an effect of divine condescension, to give the utmost security to the faith of believers in all their trials.

5. Divine presence and divine assistance, which are inseparable, are the spring and cause of suitable and sufficient relief and supplies to believers in every condition.

6. Especially the due consideration of them is abundantly sufficient to rebuke all covetous inclinations and desires, which without it will be prevalent in us in a time of straits and trials.

7. The cheerful profession of confidence in God, against all opposition and in the midst of all distresses, is that which believers have a warrant for in the promises that are made to them.

8. As the use of this confidence is our duty, so it is a duty highly honorable to the profession of the gospel.

9. Believers may use the same confidence that David used, seeing they have the same grounds of it that David had.

10. All believers, in their sufferings and under their persecutions, have a refreshing, supporting interest in divine aid and assistance.

11. It is their duty to express with confidence and boldness, at all times, their assurance of the divine assistance declared in the promises, to their own encouragement, the edification of the church, and the terror of their adversaries.

12. Faith duly fixed on the power of God, as engaged for the assistance of believers in their sufferings, will give them a contempt of all that men can do to them.

13. The most effectual means to encourage our souls in all our sufferings, is to compare the power of God who will assist us, and that of man who doth oppress us.

14. That which in our sufferings delivereth us from the fear of men takes out all that is evil in them, and secures our success.

Verse. 7. —

1. This is our best, this is our only way of remembering them who have been our guides, leaders, and rulers in the church, whether they have been apostles, or evangelists, or ordinary pastors, — namely, to follow them in their faith and conversation.

2. This ought to be the care of the guides of the church, namely, to leave such an example of faith and holiness as that it may be the duty of the church to remember them and follow their example.

3. The word of God is the sole object of the faith of the church, the only outward means of communicating the mind and grace of God unto it.

4. A due consideration of the faith of those who have been before us, especially of such who were constant in sufferings, and above all, of those who were constant to death, as the holy martyrs in former and latter ages, is an effectual means to stir us up to the same exercise of faith when we are called to it.

Verse. 8. —

1. The due consideration of Jesus Christ, especially in his eternity, immutability, and indeficiency in his power, as he is always the same, is the great encouragement of believers in their whole profession of the faith, and in all the difficulties they may meet withal upon the account thereof.

2. As no changes formerly made in the institution of divine worship altered any thing in the faith of the church with respect unto Christ, for he was and is still the same; so no necessitudes we may meet withal in our profession, by oppression or persecution, ought in the least to shake us, for Christ is still the same to protect, relieve, and deliver us.

3. He that can in the way of his duty on all occasions retreat to Jesus Christ, and unto the due consideration of his person in the discharge of his office, will not fail of relief, support, and consolation.

4. A steadfast cleaving unto the truth concerning the person and office of Christ will preserve us from hearkening to various and strange doctrines, perverting our souls.

5. Jesus Christ from the beginning of the world, that is, from the giving of the first promise, was the object of the faith of the church.

6. It is the immutability and eternity of Jesus Christ in his divine person, that renders him a meet object of the faith of the church in the discharge of his office.

Verse. 9. —

1. There is a revelation of truth given to the church in the word of God, which is its only doctrinal foundation and rule of faith.

2. This doctrine is cognate and every way suited to the promotion of the grace of God in believers, and the attainment of their own salvation.

3. Doctrines unsuited to this first revelation by Christ and his apostles, as recorded in the Scripture, did soon spring up, unto the trouble of the church.

4. Usually such doctrines as are empty of truth and substance, useless and foreign to the nature and genius of evangelical grace and truth, are imposed by their authors and abettors with a great noise and vehemence on those who have been instructed in the truth.

5. Where such doctrines are entertained, they make men double-minded, unstable, turning them from the truth, and drawing them at length into perdition.

6. The ruin of the church in after ages arose from the neglect of this apostolical caution, in giving heed to various and strange doctrines, which at length overthrew and excluded the fundamental doctrines of the gospel.

7. Herein lies the safety of all believers and of all churches, namely, to keep themselves precisely unto the first complete revelation of divine truth in the word of God.

8. They who decline in any thing from grace, as the only means to establish their hearts in peace with God, shall labor and exercise themselves in other things to the same end, whereby they shall receive no advantage.

Verse. 10. —

1. The Lord Christ in the one sacrifice of himself is the only altar of the church of the new testament.

2. This altar is every way sufficient in itself for the ends of an altar, namely, the sanctification of the people.

3. The erection of any other altar in the church, or the introduction of any other sacrifice requiring a material altar, is derogatory to the sacrifice of Christ, and exclusive of him from being our altar.

4. Whereas the design of the apostle, in the whole of his discourse, is to declare the glory of the gospel and its worship above that of the law, of our priest above theirs, of our sacrifice above theirs, of our altar above theirs, it is fond to think that by “our altar” he intends such a material fabric as is every way inferior to that of old.

5. When God appointed a material altar for his service, he himself enjoined the making of it, prescribed its form and use, with all its utensils, services, and ceremonies, allowing of nothing in it or about it but what was by himself appointed.

6. Sinners under a sense of guilt have in the gospel an altar of atonement, whereunto they may have continual access for the expiation of their sins.

7. All privileges, of what nature soever, without a participation of Christ, as the altar and sacrifice of the church, are of no advantage to them that enjoy them.

Verse 11, 12. —

1. The complete answering and fulfilling of all types in the person and office of Christ testifieth the sameness and immutability of the counsel of God in the whole work of the redemption and salvation of the church, notwithstanding all the outward changes that have been in the institutions of divine worship.

2. The church could no otherwise be sanctified but by the blood of Jesus, the Son of God.

3. The Lord Jesus, out of his incomprehensible love to his people, would spare nothing, avoid nothing, deny nothing, that was needful to their sanctification, their reconciliation, and dedication to God.

4. There was, by divine constitution, a concurrence in the same work of suffering and offering, that satisfaction unto the law and its curse might be made by it, as penal in a way of suffering and atonement, or reconciliation with God by the way of a sacrifice or offering.

5. The whole church is perfectly sanctified by the offering of the blood of Christ as to impetration; and it shall be so actually, by virtue of the same blood in its application.

6. When the Lord Jesus carried all the sins of his own people in his own body unto the tree, he left the city, as a type of all unbelievers, under the wrath and curse of God.

7. Going out of the city as a malefactor, he bore all the reproach that was due to the sins of the church, which was a part of the curse.

Verse. 13, 14. —

1. All privileges and advantages whatever are to be foregone, parted withal, and renounced, which are inconsistent with an interest in Christ and a participation of him.

2. If it were the duty of the Hebrews to forsake those ways of worship which were originally of divine institution, that they might wholly give up themselves unto Christ in all things pertaining unto God, much more is it ours to forego all such pretences unto religious worship as are of human invention.

3. Whereas the camp contained not only ecclesiastical but also political privileges, we ought to be ready to forego all civil accommodations also, in houses, lands, possessions, converse with men of the same nation, when we are called thereunto on the account of Christ and the gospel.

4. If we will go forth to Christ as without the camp, or separated from all the concerns of this world, we shall assuredly meet with all sorts of reproaches.

5. Believers are not like to meet with any such encouraging entertainment in this world as to make them unready or unwilling to desert it, and go forth after Christ, bearing his reproach.

6. This world never did nor ever will give a state of rest and satisfaction to believers.

7. In the destitution of a present satisfactory rest, God hath not left believers without a prospect of that which shall afford them rest and satisfaction to eternity.

8. As God hath prepared a city of rest for us, so it is our duty continually to endeavor the attainment of it in the ways of his appointment.

9. The main business of believers in this world is diligently to seek after the city of God, or the attainment of eternal rest with him; and this is the character whereby they may be known.

Verse. 15. —

1. Every act of grace in God or love in Christ towards us is in its own nature obligatory to thankful obedience.

2. The religious worship of any creature, under what pretense soever, hath no place in our Christian profession.

3. Every act and duty of faith hath in it the nature of a sacrifice to God, wherewith he is well pleased.

4. The great, yea, the only encouragement which we have to bring our sacrifices to God with expectation of acceptance lieth herein, that we are to offer them by him who can and will make them acceptable in his sight.

5. Whatever we tender to God, and not by Christ, it hath no other acceptance with him than the sacrifice of Cain.

6. To abide and abound in solemn praise to God for Jesus Christ, and for his mediation and sacrifice, is the constant duty of the church, and the best character of sincere believers.

7. A constant solemn acknowledgment of the glory of God, and of the holy excellencies of his nature (that is, his name) in the work of the redemption of the church by the suffering and offering of Christ, is the principal duty of it, and the animating soul and principle of all other duties whatever.

Verse. 16. —

1. It is dangerous unto the souls of men, when an attention unto one duty is abused to countenance the neglect of another.

2. The world itself, even in those that believe not, doth receive great advantage by the grace administered from the death of Christ and its fruits, whereof the apostle treats.

3. That religion hath no relation unto the cross of Christ which doth not incline and dispose men unto benignity and the exercise of loving-kindness towards all.

4. Much less hath that religion any relation to the cross of Christ which guides and disposeth its professors unto rage, cruelty, and oppression of others, on the account of an interest of its own.

5. We ought always to admire the glory of divine wisdom, which hath so disposed the state of the church in this world, that there should be continual occasion for the exercise of every grace mutually among ourselves.

6. Beneficence and communication are the only outward evidences and demonstrations of the renovation of the image of God in us.

7. God hath laid up provision for the poor in the grace and duty of the rich, not in their coffers and their barns, wherein they have no interest.

8. The will of God revealed concerning his acceptance of any duties, is the most effectual motive unto our diligence in them.

9. The works and duties which are peculiarly useful unto men are peculiarly acceptable to God.

Verse. 17. —

1. The due obedience of the church in all its members unto the rulers of it, in the discharge of their office and duty, is the best means of its edification, and the chief cause of order and peace in the whole body.

2. An assumption of right and power by any to rule over the church, without evidencing their design and work to be a watching for the good of their souls, is pernicious unto themselves and ruinous unto the church itself.

3. They who do attend with conscience and diligence unto the discharge of the work of the ministry towards their flocks, committed in an especial manner unto their charge, have no greater joy or sorrow in this world than what accompanies the daily account which they give unto Christ of the discharge of their duty amongst them, as their success falls out to be.

4. Much of the life of the ministry and benefit of the church depend on the continual account given unto Christ, by prayer and thanksgiving, of the state of the church and success of the word therein.

Verse. 20, 21. —

1. When we make application to God for any especial grace or mercy, it is our duty to direct and fix our faith on such names, titles, or properties of God, as whereunto that grace doth particularly relate, and from whence it doth immediately proceed.

2. If this be the title of God, if this be his glory, that he is the God of peace, how excellent and glorious is that peace from whence he is so denominated, — which is principally the peace which we have with himself by Jesus Christ!

3. As every thing that is evil to mankind, within them and amongst them, both with reference to things temporal and eternal, proceeds from our original loss of peace with God by sin, and by the enmity which ensued

thereon; so peace, on the other side, is comprehensive of all kinds of good, both here and hereafter: and God being styled the God of peace declares him to be the only fountain and cause of all that is good to us in every kind.

4. All the work of God towards Jesus Christ respected him as the head of the church, as our Lord and Savior.

5. The safety, security, and consolation of the church much depend on this greatness of its Shepherd.

6. On this relation of Christ to the church it lives and is preserved in the world.

7. The bringing back of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the Shepherd of the sheep, from the state of the dead, through the blood of the covenant, is the great pledge and assurance of peace with God, or the effecting of that peace which the God of peace had designed for the church.

8. The reduction of Christ from the dead by the God of peace, is the spring and foundation of all dispensations and communications of grace to the church, or of all the effects of the atonement and purchase made by his blood.

9. All legal sacrifices issued in blood and death; there was no recovery of any of them from that state.

10. There is, then, a blessed foundation laid of the communication of grace and mercy to the church, to the eternal glory of God.

> **Verse. 22.** — When ministers take care that the word which they deliver is a word tending unto the edification and consolation of the church, they may with confidence press the entertainment of it by the people, though it should contain things some way grievous to them, by reason of their weakness or prejudices.

FOOTNOTES

[ft1] See vol. 1 p. 141 of this edition of the Exposition.

[ft2] See Vindiciae Evangelicae, vol. xii. p. 169, and also vol. iii. p. 377. — Ed.

[ft3] Vol. 12 of works, p. 240.

[ft4] Vols. 3, 4 of this edition of works.

[ft5] He refers to the second Exercitation of this volume, the 26th in order, p. 14. — ED.

[ft6] See vol. 12 Vindiciae Evangelicae.

[ft7] It is in verse 16 that the translation occurs, but it has no reference to sacrifice. — ED.

[ft8] Justin. — ED.

[ft9] Our author refers to a work by a learned Dutch divine, Andrew Essenius. It appeared in 1665.—ED.

[ft10] In the Kentish dialect, “A kiln for malt or oats.” — Halllwell’s Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words. — ED.

[ft11] By a peculiar use of the word “late,” our author here refers to Edmund Castell, the learned author of the “Lexicon Heptaglotton,” which was published only two years before this work on the Sabbath appeared. Castell survived Owen, and the word “late” refers, therefore, not to the decease of the former, but to the recent appearance of his book. — E.D.

[ft12] Among the preliminary Exercitations which Dr. Owen affixed to his Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, there is nothing corresponding to what we usually find in such matter,—a full analysis of the scope and contents of the Epistle. The only thing approaching to it is this Summary, which receives various titles in the different volumes of the original edition,—sometimes “Practical Observations,” sometimes “Doctrinal Observations,” sometimes “Contents,” and sometimes “Doctrine.” We give it entire, only adding a few words to mark the leading divisions of the Epistle.—ED.