

Truth Defended, Being an Answer to an Anonymous Pamphlet

by John Gill

The Supralapsarian scheme holds that God chose his people without considering them as fallen creatures, and this doctrine is defended against the author's objections.

Scripture: Isaiah 8:20, Isaiah 53:6, John 3:16, Romans 5:1, Romans 8:29, Romans 9:11-13, 2 Corinthians 5:21, Ephesians 1:3-4, Titus 3:5, 1 Peter 1:2

Topics: "Atonement", "Election"

Description

John Gill defends the Supralapsarian doctrine against an anonymous pamphlet that critiques its foundational principles. He emphasizes the importance of scripture as the ultimate authority for examining doctrines, arguing that the pamphlet's author misrepresents the Supralapsarian view on election and predestination. Gill contends that God's choice of the elect is not based on their fallen state but rather on His sovereign will, and he critiques the pamphlet's failure to engage with key biblical texts that support the Supralapsarian position. He also addresses misconceptions about eternal justification and the nature of Christ's atonement, asserting that these doctrines align with the glory of God's grace and justice. Ultimately, Gill calls for a deeper understanding of these theological concepts rooted in scripture.

Transcript

TRUTH DEFENDED:

BEING AN

ANSWER TO AN ANONYMOUS PAMPHLET,

ENTITLED,

Some Doctrines in the Supralapsarian Scheme impartially examined by the Word of God.

Lately to my hands an anonymous pamphlet, entitled, Some Doctrines in the Supralapsarian Scheme impartially examined by the Word of God. The author of it is right, in making the word of God the rule and standard by which doctrines and schemes are to be tried and examined. To the law and to the testimony; if men speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. (Isa. 8:20) He sets out with large declarations of his regard to the sacred writings, which to swell the performance are too often

repeated, even ad nauseam; and yet, in his very first paragraph, drops a sentence not very agreeable to them, if any sense can be made of it: "All opinions and maxims, he says; that correspond not with this divine rule, we should either entirely reject, or at least refuse to admit as articles of our faith."

But why not entirely reject them, without any hesitation? why this disjunctive proposition? why this softening clause added? If it can be thought to be so, or to convey a different idea from the former, as it is designed it should; though I should think, to refuse to admit doctrines and maxims as articles of faith, that do not correspond with the divine rule, is the same thing as to reject them as articles of faith. The man seems to write in the midst of hurry and surprise. Since he has met with schemes and opinions so exceedingly shocking and stunning, it would have been advisable for him to have sat down and waited until he was better come to, and more composed, before he put pen to paper, and committed his frightful apprehensions to writing.

And indeed one would have thought he has had time enough to have recovered himself from the surprise he has met with, seeing it is near four years ago, since the more modern pieces he has taken notice of were published to the world. I. The examination begins with the foundation principle of the Supralapsarians, as he calls it, that "God chose his people without considering them as fallen creatures." He does well to begin with their foundation-doctrine; for if he can demolish the foundation, the superstructure must fall; if he can pluck up what he supposes to be the root of many false opinions, the branches which grow from it will die in course.

But though this received opinion of theirs, as our author styles it, is a denomination one, or that from which they are called Supralapsarians, yet it is far from being a foundation principle, or a fundamental article of faith with them; nor do they consider this point, in which they differ from others, as the principal one in the doctrine of election: They and the Supralapsarians are agreed in the main points respecting that doctrine; as, that it is an eternal act of God; that it is of certain particular persons; that it is unconditional, irrespective of faith, holiness, and good works, as causes and conditions of it; and that it entirely springs from the good-will and pleasure of God.

The Contra-Remonstrants were not all of a mind concerning the object of predestination, but did not think it worth their while to divide upon that account. Nay, some of them were of opinion that it was not necessary to be determined, whether God, in choosing men, considered them as fallen, or as not yet fallen provided it was but allowed that God in choosing considered men in an equal state, so as that he that is chosen was not considered by God either of himself, or by his own merit, or by any gracious estimation, more worthy than he who is not chosen.

That famous Supralapsarian, Dr. Twiss, declares that "as for the ordering of God's decrees, upon which only arise the different opinions touching the object of predestination, it is merely apex logicus, a point of logic." The decrees of God may be distinguished into the decree of the end, and the decree of the means, that they may the better be conceived of by our finite understandings; which are not able to consider all things at once, and together, as they lie in the divine mind, but of one thing after another; and that without dividing and separating of God's decrees, or supposing any priority or posteriority in him.

Now the decree of the end must be considered before the decree of the means; and that what is first in intention, is last in execution, and so vice versa. Let then eternal life and glory, or a state of everlasting communion with God, be the end of election, as it is with respect to man, then the creation, permission of Adam's fall, and the recovery out of it, are the means in order to that end. It follows, that in the decree of

the end, man could not be considered as a fallen creature, but as yet not created; because the creation and the permission of the fall belong to the decree of the means, which is an order of nature after the decree of the end.

For if God first decreed to create man, and to permit him to fall, and then decreed to bring him to a state of eternal life and happiness; according to this known rule, that what is first in intention is last in execution, this strange absurdity will follow, that man will be first brought into a state of eternal life and happiness, and then created and permitted to fall. Let the end be the manifestation of God's glory, which certainly is the supreme end of election, then the means are creation, permission of sin, redemption, sanctification, and in a word, complete salvation; which though they are materially many, yet make up but one formal decree, called the decree of the means.

Now according to the former rule, the intention of the end must be first, and then the intention of the means; and, consequently, man cannot be considered in the decree of the end, the manifestation of God's glory, as yet created and fallen; because the creation and permission of sin belong to the decree of the means, which in order of nature is after the decree of the end. But if, on the contrary, God first decreed to create man and permit him to fall, and then decreed to manifest the glory of his grace and mercy, in his eternal salvation; according to the above rule, that what is first in intention is last in execution, and so vice versa, it will follow, that the glory of God's grace and mercy are first manifested in the eternal salvation of man, and then he is created and suffered to fall.

Likewise it is to be observed, that the several things mentioned in the decree of the means, creation, permission of sin, and salvation, are not to be considered as subordinate, but as co-ordinate means, or as making up an entire, complete medium. We are not to suppose that God decreed to create man that he might permit him to fall, or that he decreed to permit him to fall, that he might save him: but that he decreed to create him, permit him to fall, and to save him notwithstanding his fall, that he might glorify his grace and mercy.

Nor are we to conceive of them after this manner, that God first decreed to create man, and then decreed to permit him to fall; for it would follow that man, in the execution of these decrees, is first permitted to fall, and then he is created: Nor thus, that God first decreed to create man, and permit him to fall, and then decreed to save him; for, according to the former rule, man would first be saved, and then created and permitted to fall. These are some of the reasonings of the Supralapsarians; particularly of Dr.

Twiss, as may be seen in his *Vindiciæ*, and in his *Riches of God's love*, against Hord. This poor man, that takes upon him to write against the Supralapsarians, would do well to try his skill in unraveling and destroying this kind of reasoning: But alas his capacity will never reach it. I am afraid the very mention of these things will increase his surprise and fright. However, since he has taken upon him to object to this opinion of the Supralapsarians, it will be proper to hear what he has to say.

And, 1. He proposes to shew, that this doctrine is destitute of support from the scripture, and tells us, he has often wondered what part of sacred writ can be produced to support it; and that he has been searching and trying to know the language of the divine word concerning election; and shall therefore mention, and in a few words, comment upon those scriptures which, says he, I judge, are only necessary to be considered in this dispute; and these are, 1 Peter 1:2, Ephesians 1:3, 4 and Romans 8:29.

If the man is really ignorant, as I am inclined to think he is, and does not know what parts of sacred writ the Supralapsarians have produced to support their doctrine, he has acted a weak part in meddling with the

controversy; if he does know, he has acted a worse in concealing of them. He promises to mention and comment on those scriptures, which he judges are only necessary to be considered in this dispute; but he ought to have mentioned the scriptures, which the men he opposes judge necessary to be considered in this dispute; and to have shewn the misapplication of them, and that they are not pertinent to their purpose; is this impartially to try and examine, by the word of God, the Supralapsarian scheme, as his title promises? every one knows, that knows any thing of this controversy, that the scriptural part of it is about the sense of the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Romans; and the question is, whether the Sublapsarian, or the Supralapsarian scheme, concerning the objects of election and reprobation, is most agreeable to the sense of the apostle in that chapter; particularly, whether the Supralapsarian scheme, of God's choosing some, and leaving others, considered as unfallen, as having done neither good nor evil, does not best agree with the account the apostle gives in verses 11-13 of the election of Jacob, and rejection of Esau; and more especially whether it does not best agree with the same apostle's account in verse 21, of the potter's making of the same lump one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?

This author should have mentioned these scriptures, and commented upon them, and answered the arguments of the Supralapsarians from them; in particular, those of that eminent Supralapsarian, Theodore Beza, in his notes upon the last of these texts, which I shall transcribe for this man's sake; and he may try whether he is capable of answering of them. "Those who, by the mass, or lump, says this great man, understand mankind corrupted, do not satisfy me in the explanation of this place: for first, it seems to me, that the phrase of informed matter, neither sufficiently agrees with mankind, either made or corrupted.

Moreover, if the apostle had considered mankind as corrupted, he would not have said, that some vessels were made to honour, and some to dishonour but rather, that seeing all the vessels would be fit for dishonour, some were left in that dishonour, and others translated from that dishonour to honour. Lastly, if Paul had not rose to the highest degree, he had not satisfied the question objected; for it would always have been queried, whether that corruption came by chance, or whether, indeed, according to the purpose of God, and therefore the same difficulty would recur.

I say, therefore, Paul using this most elegant simile, alludes to the creation of Adam, and rises up to the eternal purpose of God, who, before he created mankind, decreed of his own mere will and pleasure, to manifest his glory, both in saving of some whom he knew, in a way of mercy, and in destroying others, whom he also knew, in righteous judgment. And verily, unless we judge this to be the case, God will be greatly injured; because he will not be sufficiently wise, who first creates men, and looks upon them corrupt, and then appoints to what purpose he has created them: nor sufficiently powerful, if when he has taken up a purpose concerning them, he is hindered by another, so that he obtains not what he willed; nor sufficiently constant, if, willingly and freely he takes up a new purpose, after his workmanship is corrupted."

As for the scriptures mentioned by our author, as opposing the Supralapsarian scheme, I shall not trouble the reader, by observing the mangled work he makes with them, and the low and mean comments he makes upon them; I shall only say, that it will he readily owned, that sanctification, obedience, and conformity to the image of God and Christ, are things included in the decree of election: but do these things necessarily suppose, that the persons whom they concern, were in that decree considered as impure, unholy, disobedient, and in a want of conformity to the image of God and Christ? were not the elect angels chosen to sanctification, obedience, and conformity to the image of God? will any one say, that these things supposed them to be, or that in the decree of election, they were considered as impure, unholy, disobedient, and in a want of conformity to the image of God?

But, admitting that these things, with respect to men, suppose them in such a case; it should be observed that they belong to the decree of the means, and therefore fall short of proving that God, in the decree of the end, or in decreeing men to eternal life and happiness, for the glorifying of himself, considered them in such a state; since the decree of the end, in order of nature, is before the decree of the means; unless we can suppose the all-wise being to act in such manner as no wise man would, namely, first fix upon the means, and then appoint the end.

Now if God first decreed to create man, permit his fall, and then sanctify and conform him to the image of his Son, before he decreed to glorify himself in his salvation, the consequence will be, that God is first glorified in the salvation of man; and after that, man is created, suffered to fall, is sanctified, and conformed to the image of Christ; because what is first in intention, is last in execution. There is one thing more I would observe, and that is, that this author delivers it as the settled opinion of the Supralapsarians, "that we were not elected as holy and obedient beings, but to the end we might be such:" And I am much mistaken if this is not the settled opinion of all Sublapsarians, except such as are in the Arminian scheme.

But what is this mentioned for? why, to shew that the Supralapsarians are inconsistent with themselves, and guilty of so flagrant a contradiction, as is not to be reconciled by any. But where does it lie? "why, whereas they affirm, that we were not the Almighty's choice, because we were holy; but that he did choose us to be made holy, and yet in that choice, beheld us free from all defilements and deformity." But this author must be told, if he does not know it, that the Supralapsarians, in considering men not yet created, and so not fallen, as the objects of election, suppose them neither good nor bad, righteous or wicked, holy or unholy, but in the pure, that is in the mere mass of creature-ship, not yet made, much less corrupted, and as having done neither good nor evil; now is this such a flagrant contradiction, never to be reconciled, that men considered neither as holy or unholy, as obedient or disobedient, should be chosen to holiness and obedience? 2.

This author proceeds to shew, that "the doctrine of the Supralapsarians is repugnant to their own opinion of God's eternal foreknowledge, according to which he was pleased to make his choice." To which I reply; that the Supralapsarians will readily own, that the omniscient Jehovah did, at one view, see, and perfectly behold, whatsoever would come to pass, throughout all ages of time; and that he has an universal prescience of all creatures and things, in their different states and circumstances; but then they will deny that election proceeds upon, or that God has been pleased to make his choice according to this his general and eternal prescience.

It is true, that those who are elected, are elected according to the foreknowledge of God the Father; (1 Peter 1:2; Rom. 8:29) and whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son. But these passages are not to be understood of the universal prescience and foreknowledge of God; for then all men would be elected and predestinated, for whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate; but all men are neither conformed to the image of Christ, nor predestinated to be so; it remains, that the foreknowledge, according to which election and predestination proceed, is God's special foreknowledge of his own people, and which is no other than his everlasting love to them, which is the source and spring of his choice of them; and the meaning is, that whom he foreknew, that is, in his eternal mind knew, owned, approved of, loved with an everlasting love; he chose them to salvation, and predestinated them to be conformed to the image of his Son. 3.

This writer goes on to observe, that "this doctrine of God's choosing his people without considering them as fallen creatures, tends to lessen the infinite grace and mercy of God in their election." I reply; that

though it has been a matter of controversy between the Supralapsarians, and others, whether election is an act of mercy, yet not whether it is an act of grace; they, with the scriptures, (Rom. 11:5, 6) affirm, that election is of grace, springs from the sovereign grace and good pleasure of God, and is not influenced by, or to be ascribed to the works of men; but then they cannot observe, that it is ever said to be of mercy.

Regeneration is ascribed to the mercy of God, 1 Peter 1:3, so is forgiveness of sins, Luke 1:77, yea, our whole salvation, Titus 3:5, but never election, nor that, but salvation is said to be of God, that sheweth, mercy, Rom. 9:15. Their reasons, among many others, too many to mention, why it cannot be an act of mercy, are, because the angels are elected, but not of mercy; the human nature of Christ is elected, but not of mercy. They argue, that supposing it should be admitted, that election is an act of mercy, it must either be *actus elicited*, an actual will of being merciful, or *actus imperatus*, the act of shewing mercy itself; not the latter, because that supposes persons not merely foreknown as miserable, but in actual being, and in real misery, and is a transient act upon them; whereas election puts nothing in the persons chosen: if it is an act of mercy, it must be the former, God's actual will of being merciful; but this does not necessarily presuppose misery, or miserable objects, it being internal, and immanent in God, and the same with his mercy itself; and would have been the same, nor would God have been the less merciful, if the world had not been, and there had never been a miserable object on whom to display it.

The act of election does not presuppose men sinners and in miserable, nor indeed can it; for should it presuppose sin, it would presuppose the decree of the permission of sin; and the permission of sin would be first in God's intention, than man's salvation of God's mercy, and consequently would be last in execution; than which nothing can be thought of more absurd. Besides though election is not an act of mercy, yet it is far from having any tendency to lessen the mercy of God, and does, even according to the Supralapsarian scheme, abundantly provide for the glorifying of it; since, according to that, the decree of the end is, the glorifying of the grace and mercy of God, tempered with justice; The decree of the means provides for the bringing about of this end, which includes creation, the permission of sin, the mission of Christ, sanctification, and complete salvation; so that the elect of God may well be called vessels of mercy; since through such means, they are brought to eternal life and glory; though, in the decree of the end, they are considered as not yet created and fallen, than which nothing can more tend to advance the free grace and mercy of God. 4.

This author urges, that "this way of stating election strikes severely against the justice of God, in passing by the rest of mankind, not included in this decree; for hereby they are rejected as creatures only, and not as sinful creatures." It is very strange, that election should severely strike against the justice of God, when, according to this way of stating it, it is a choice of persons to eternal life and happiness for the glorifying of the grace and mercy of God, mixed with his justice; and so as much provides in end and means, for the honour of divine justice, as for the glory of grace and mercy: and it is stranger still, that election should be a passing by the rest of mankind, not included in this decree: I suppose he means reprobation; for he has an extraordinary hand at putting one thing for another.

Now let it be observed, that though the Supralapsarians do not consider reprobation as an act of justice, but of sovereignty, yet not of injustice; nor does their way of stating it at all strike at the justice of God. They suppose, that God, in the act of preterition, considered the objects of it as not yet created and fallen; and determined, when created, to leave them to their own will, and deny them that grace which he is not obliged to give: and where is the justice of all this?

But then, though they do not premise sin to the consideration of the act or preterition, yet they always premise it to the decree of damnation; which this author, as is generally done, confounds together. They say, that as God damns no man, but for sin, so he decreed to damn no man but for sin: and surely this cannot be thought to strike severely against the justice of God. It is true, they do not look upon sin to be the cause of the decree of reprobation, quoad actum volentis, which can only be the will of God; but quoad res volitas, the cause of the thing willed, damnation.

Besides, this way of stating the decrees of election and reprobation, respecting men, can no more strike at the justice of God, than the way of stating these decrees, respecting angels, does: which can not be done in another way: for the elect angels could never be considered as fallen; and therefore the other angels, who were passed by, and rejected at the same time, must be rejected as creatures only, and not as sinful creatures; unless it can be thought that the angels were not chosen and passed by at the same time, nor then considered in a like state; and that God chose some of them upon their foreseen holiness and obedience, and rejected the rest upon their foreseen rebellion and disobedience: and if so, why may not the election and rejection of men be thought to proceed upon the same foot? which none, that I know of, will come in to, but such that are in the Arminian scheme.

This theme our author says he has been at ways cautious of meddling with, lest he should darken counsel for want of knowledge; and it is pity he meddled with it now, since he discovers so much ignorance of it: who can forbear thinking of the common proverb? Thus having considered what he calls the foundation doctrine of the Supralapsarians, he proceeds, II. To examine some of the doctrines which grow from this root, as the natural offspring of it, and appear with the same complection; and begins, 1.

With their doctrine of eternal justification. What this author says, I am persuaded, will never meet with general credit, "that eternal justification is the natural offspring of the Supralapsarian doctrine, respecting the objects of election, not considered as fallen creatures." He goes all along, I observe, upon a false notion, that whatever is thought, or said to be done in eternity is a Supralapsarian doctrine: whereas the Sublapsarians themselves allow election to be from eternity, before the foundation of the world, and so believe the fall of Adam, though not without the consideration of it; and in this they differ from the Supralapsarians.

I know a reverend Divine, now living in this city of London, who, if I mistake not, reckons himself among the Supralapsarians, and says, that they dig deepest into the gospel; and yet is a strenuous opposer of justification from eternity; and even before faith: on the other hand, there have been some who have thought, that the object of election is man fallen, and yet have been for justification before faith. For my own part, I must confess, I never, considered justification from eternity, any other than a Sublapsarian doctrine, proceeding upon the surety-ship engagements of Christ, and his future satisfaction and righteousness; upon which foot the Old-Testament saints were openly justified, and went to heaven long before the satisfaction was really made, or the justifying righteousness brought in; and, indeed, if the objects of justification are the ungodly, as the scripture represents them to be, they must be considered as fallen creatures; However, if the doctrine of eternal justification is the natural offspring of the former, and appears with the same complection, and is to be maintained with equal force of argument, we have no reason to be ashamed of it: and I am sure we have no reason to be in any pain on the account of the opposition this doughty writer makes unto it: he says, we have exceeded all the bounds of revelation in our inquiries after it, and then barely mentions three or four places of scriptures, which speak of justification by faith; and concludes, that therefore there is no justification before it; an extraordinary way of arguing indeed!

When justification by faith no ways contradicts justification before it; nay, justification perceived, known, enjoyed by faith, supposes justification before it; for how should any have that sense, perception, and comfort of their justification by it, if there was no justification before it? He proceeds to observe the order or chain of salvation, in Romans 8:30, where calling is represented as prior to justification; an objection I have formerly answered in my Doctrine of Justification, to which I refer the reader, and take the opportunity of observing, that neither this author, nor any other, have attempted to answer the arguments there made use of in favour of justification before faith: I will not say they are unanswerable; but I may say, that as yet they are unanswered: this author, if he pleases, may try what he can do with them, and it might have been expected in this his performance; but instead of this, he sets himself, with all his might, against some other doctrines, which he represents as Supralapsarian, as calculated to favour the scheme of eternal justification, and as branches of it; as, 1.

"That God was eternally reconciled to the elect; and that no scripture can be produced to prove that the Lord Jesus did come to procure reconciliation for them; and that wherever Christ is said to make peace by his blood, It is to be understood only of his reconciling the sinner to God." Whether he refers to anything that has been published, or dropped in private conversation, or who the persons are, that affirm this, I know not: I greatly fear he has both misrepresented their words and meaning.

I must own, I never heard of any such thing as an eternal reconciliation of God to the elect. Reconciliation supposes former friendship, a breach of it, and a conciliation of it again; which is inconsistent with the everlasting, invariable, and unchangeable love of God to them. God was indeed from everlasting reconciling, not himself to the world, but the world of his elect to himself; (2 Cor. 5:19) that is drawing the scheme and model of their reconciliation by Christ, or settling the way and manner in which reconciliation, atonement, and satisfaction for their sins, should be made; and accordingly made a covenant of peace with his Son, appointed him to be their peace, and in the fulness of time sent him to make peace by the blood of his cross, and laid upon him the chastisement of their peace; and who has actually made reconciliation for their sins; and so they, even when enemies, were actually reconciled; that is, their sins were actually expiated and atoned for to God, by the death of his Son.

This is the doctrine of reconciliation the scriptures speak of, and which I never knew before was ever reckoned a Supralapsarian doctrine: for surely reconciliation, atonement, or satisfaction for sin, which are synonymous terms, expressive of the same thing, must suppose persons sinners herein concerned. Let it be farther observed, that God from all eternity loved his elect with an invariable love; that he never entertained any hatred of them, or was at enmity with them; that there is no such thing as a change in God from hatred to love, any more than from love to hatred; that our Lord Jesus Christ did not by his atoning sacrifice procure his Father's love to the elect, seeing his being a propitiation for sin was a fruit, effect, and evidence of that love Agreeably, the scriptures never speak of God's being reconciled to his elect either in eternity or in time, but of their being reconciled to him and not so much of the reconciliation of their persons, as of a reconciliation for their sins; whereby their persons are reconciled, not to the love and affections of God, which they always shared in, but to the justice of God, which insisted upon a satisfaction to a broken law; which being given, both love and justice are reconciled together, righteousness and peace kiss each other, in the affair of their salvation.

Now, there is nothing in this doctrine of reconciliation that is opposite, (1.) To the sin-offerings and peace-offerings under the law, since these were made to the God of Israel for the people of Israel, whom God loved above all people that were upon the face of the earth, and were typical of that atoning sacrifice, in which indeed were discovered the severest resentment of justice against sin, and yet the clearest

evidence of strong love and affections to persons then enemies, and destitute of love to God: Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. (1 John 4:10) In this both type and antitype agree, that the reconciliation is not of God to men, but for men to God; though this author says, "it is past all dispute, that the party to be reconciled is God;" when it is the very thing in dispute between us.

It is no where said of the sacrifices of the law, that God was reconciled by them to the people of Israel; and it is no where said of the sacrifice of Christ, the antitype of them, that God is by it reconciled to his elect; though I am content that God should be said to be reconciled to his elect by the death of Christ, provided no more is meant by it than satisfying of his justice, not a conciliating or procuring his love and favour. The author's reasoning on the denial of this, that the reconciliation must be made to the house of Israel, or for the God of Israel, or with the sinner or the sin, is so stupid and senseless, that it deserves no consideration (2.)

Nor does this doctrine, which denies that Christ came to reconcile God to sinners, oppose, as is suggested, what is prophesied of him in the Old Testament, or what is affirmed of his performance in the New; since, though it was prophesied of him, that God should make his soul an offering for sin; (Isa. 53:10) and it is affirmed of him, that he gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God; (Eph. 5:2) yet it is neither said that he should, or that he did do this for the elect, to remove any enmity in the heart of God against them, or to turn any hatred of his into love towards them, or to purchase and procure the love and affections of God for them: so far from this, that because they had a peculiar share in the love and affections both of the Father and the Son, the Father made the soul of his Son an offering for them, and the Son gave himself an offering unto God on their account.

The Old Testament says, that the Lord is well pleased for his righteousness sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honourable; (Isa. 42:21) and the New Testament says, that Christ has so loved his, that he has given himself for them, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savour; (Eph. 5:2) a but neither the one nor the other say, that either God was to be, or that he is, hereby reconciled to his elect, or they hereby ingratiated into his affections. What is written in Colossians 1:20, Corinthians 15:3, Hebrews 2:17, Colossians 2:14, Ephesians 1:7, perfectly agree with the doctrine of reconciliation I am now contending for; nor does this oppose that plain scripture, Romans 5:1, Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus.

We have no need to remove the stop in the text; though how this author dare venture to alter the reading of it, and render the words peace in God, or what is his reason for it, I know not. The peace the text speaks of, does not design the peace, reconciliation, and atonement made by the blood of Christ, but the effect of it; even an inward conscience peace, which believers have with God, or God-ward, through Christ the donor of it, springing and arising from faith's apprehending an interest in the justifying righteousness of the Son of God. (3).

Nor does this doctrine lessen, or tend to frustrate the great and important ends of our Saviour's sufferings and death, as this author attempts to prove. The ends of his sufferings and death were to bring the elect to God to make reconciliation for their sins, to reconcile them to God; and accordingly they were even when enemies, reconciled to God by the death of his Son. (1 Peter 3:18; Dan. 9:24; Heb. 2:17; Rom. 5:10) Where does the scripture ever represent the end of Christ's sufferings and death to be, to reconcile God to his elect; that is, to remove any enmity in his heart against them, or to procure for them his love and favour? but on the contrary, it represents the sufferings and death of Christ as fruits and evidences of his

matchless and surprising love to them.

God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. (Rom. 5:8) The doctrines of reconciliation and justification, thus viewed in the light of scripture can never clash with the satisfaction of Christ, nor tend to lessen and frustrate it; since reconciliation is no other than satisfaction and atonement to the justice of God, and justification proceeds upon the foot of satisfaction, and everlasting righteousness. Nor is there room or reason for that stupid inference and conclusion, that because Christ came to reconcile sinners to God, therefore he became an offering to the sinner, and not to God.

There is a twofold reconciliation the scriptures speak of; the one is obtained by the price of Christ's blood, the other by the power of his grace: you have them both in one text, 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. The meaning of which is; that if, when the elect of God were in a state of nature, and so of enmity to God, atonement was made for their sins by the sacrifice and death of Christ, which is strongly expressive of the amazing love of God to them; then much more being by the Spirit and grace of God reconciled to this way of peace, pardon, atonement, life and salvation, they shall be saved, through the interceding life of their Redeemer. (4).

This doctrine, as it has been stated, does not render the offices of Christ, as mediator, intercessor and high priest, needless, yea, of none effect; unless this author can imagine, according to his own scheme, that it is the sole work of the mediator, intercessor and high priest, to reconcile God to the elect. This we indeed say is no part of his work, in such sense, as to conciliate the love and favour of God to them; but does it follow, from hence, that his office is needless, and of none effect?

Is it not needful, to reconcile the elect to God, to make reconciliation for their sins? Is he not useful, as mediator, to be their advocate and intercessor, their way of access to God, and acceptance with him, and of conveyance of all he blessings of the covenant of grace to them, whence he is called the in mediator of it? I would also ask this author, if he thinks when God is reconciled to the elect by the death of his Son, or rather when they believe; for it seems there is no reconciliation before faith in Christ, the blood, sacrifice and death of Christ will not effect it, according to these men, till faith has given the finishing stroke: I say, I ask this author, whether he thinks that the office of Christ, as mediator, ceases? for, according to his way of reasoning, it should cease, when reconciliation is really made.

Whereas Christ, after believing as well as before, is the mediator between God and man, and ever lives to make intercession for us. (1 Tim. 2:5; Heb. 7:25) We are able to prove that Christ was set up as mediator from everlasting that his mediation was always necessary, and ever will be; that, as he is the medium of all grace now to us, he will be the medium of all glory to all eternity. To conclude this head; our author seems to be convinced that John 3:16, expresses the love of God to his elect, antecedent to his giving and sending of his Son to be the propitiatory sacrifice; since he docs not attempt to offer any thing against the exposition, or to give another sense of it. 2.

"Another branch of their (Supralapsarians) eternal justification, is said g to he their refusing to pray for the pardon of sin, any otherwise than the manifestation of it to their consciences." Strange! that pardon of sin should be a branch of eternal justification, when it is a distant blessing from it; as, I think, I have sufficiently made to appear in my treatise concerning it: stranger still! that refusing to pray for it should be deemed a branch of it: and what is of all most wonderful, is, flint this should he reckoned a Supralapsarian point,

when pardon of sin supposes sin, and sin supposes the fall; anti whether it is to be conceived of as in the divine mind, from eternity, or as passing into successive acts in time, as men sin, or as manifested to their consciences, the objects of it cannot be considered otherwise than as sinners, fallen creatures; and therefore is a Sublapsarian, and not a Supralapsarian doctrine.

Is this man qualified to examine the Supralapsarian scheme? He proceeds to try this practice of refusing to pray for the pardon of sin any otherwise than the manifestation of it to the conscience, by the example of the holy men of God, and by the advice and direction of our blessed Lord and Saviour. He might have spared the pains he has taken in collecting the instances of praying for the pardon of sin, since the question is not, whether the saints, in any sense, should pray for it; for we allow, that they have done it, that they are directed to it, and should do it; but the question is, in what sense they have done it, and should do it?

Now we apprehend, that when believers pray for the pardon of sin, that their sense and meaning is not, nor should it be, as if the blood of Christ should be shed again for the remission of sin, or as if complete pardon was not procured by it, or as though this was to be obtained by their praying, tears, humiliation, and repentance, or that any new act of pardon I should arise in the mind of God, and be afresh passed; but when they pray in this manner, their meaning is, either that God would, in a providential way, deliver them out of present distress, or avert those troubles and sorrows they might justly fear; or, that they might have the sense and manifestation of pardon to their souls, fresh sprinklings of the blood of Jesus, and renewed applications of it to their consciences; and this, we believe, is both their duty and interest to do daily, since they are daily sinning against God, grieving his Spirit, and wounding their own consciences.

The instance of the apostle's advising Simon Magus to pray, is not to pray particularly for the pardon of sin, or that the evil thought of his heart might be forgiven him, as this author suggests; but to repent and pray in general; and this is added by way of encouragement, If perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee. However, I will not contend with him about it, since nothing in this controversy depends upon it. He goes on to observe, that, 3. "The third branch of their eternal justification is, that God loved and delighted in the elect as much while in their sinful state, and in the height of their rebellion against his laws, as when they are converted, and made obedient to his ways."

That God loves his elect, and delights in them, as considered in Christ, and so as justified in him before the foundation of the world, I firmly believe; and which is far from being a licentious way of talking, or from being any contradiction to the holiness of God: but that his love to them, and delight in them as such, should be a branch of their eternal justification, is what I confess I never was acquainted with before; and what is more news still, is, that this spurious tenet, as this author in his great wisdom and modesty calls it, is built upon eternal union with Christ, which he represents as a false and sandy foundation: whereas the persons he opposes, consider the everlasting love of God to his elect as the foundation, yea, the bond of their eternal union.

Of this one would think he could not be ignorant; but really every page, and almost every line, discover such stupidity and ignorance, that it is not at all to be marvelled at. He goes on, in his former way, to consider this tenet of God's loving and delighting in his elect, while in their unconverted state with the rest, as a Supralapsarian point; and which he calls a common maxim of the Supralapsarians. I entreat this author, that he would never more attempt to write about Supralapsarian principles, or to try and examine the Supralapsarian scheme, until some of his friends, patrons, or editors, have better informed him concerning them.

What, is this a Supralapsarian tenet, that God loves and delights in his elect while in their sinful state, and in the height of their rebellion? Surely these persons must be considered as sinners, as fallen creatures; and therefore as this author has stated the point, it must be a Sublapsarian, and not a Supralapsarian one. Had he indeed represented it as our sense, that God loved and delighted in his elect, as in Christ from all eternity, above the fall, and without any consideration of it, he had done us more justice; and this would have bid fair to have been deemed a Supralapsarian point: but this would not have answered his wicked design; I can call it no other, which is to suggest to weak minds "that God loves and delights in the sins and rebellions of his elect, or loves and delights in them considered as sinners, and rebellious persons;" this we abhor, as much as he: for what else can reflect dishonour on the Christian religion, or strike at the doctrine of God's holiness, or stand diametrically opposite to all practical godliness, or oppose those scriptures which speak of God as hating sin, and abhorring the workers of iniquity?

Not the doctrine of God's loving and delighting in his elect, as considered in Christ, in whom they cannot be considered otherwise than as holy and righteous. We know that men in an unconverted state cannot please God, that is, do those things which are well-pleasing to him; and yet their persons may be acceptable in his sight, not as considered in themselves; for so they cannot be, even after conversion, notwithstanding all their humiliations, repentance, tears, prayers, and services; but as considered in Christ, in whom, and in whom alone, they are the objects of God's love and delight.

But it seems we are to hear of this again; and therefore at present I shall take my leave of it, till we know what he has farther to object. 4. He proceeds to prove "that these authors (the Supralapsarians) in order to support their doctrine of eternal justification, have very unjustly affirmed that our blessed Saviour was by imputation a sinner; yea, that he became very sin." I shall content myself in making some general observations upon his long harangue on this head, which will serve to discover his weakness and ignorance. (1.)

I observe, that as his title page promises an examination of some doctrines in the Supralapsarian scheme, and his assurance leads him on; so, according to his usual way, he affirms that the doctrine of Christ's being made sin, or a sinner by imputation, or of the imputation of sin to Christ, is a doctrine in the Supralapsarian scheme, or a Supralapsarian notion; whereas imputation of sin supposes sin, and that supposes the fall; wherefore the persons whose sins were imputed to Christ, and in whose room and stead he bore them, must he considered as sinners and fallen creatures.

And hence it appears to be a Sublapsarian, and not a Supralapsarian doctrine. (2.) I take notice of the unfair and disingenuous dealing of this writer. He first proposes to prove, that it is unjustly affirmed that Christ was by imputation a sinner, and immediately alters the state of the question, and represents it as the notion of the Supralapsarians, that Christ was really the sinner, and made truly and properly sin, and made sin, or a sinner, in a proper sense; whereas though with Dr.

Crisp, we affirm, that there was a real transaction, a real imputation of sin to Christ, and that the really bore the sins of his people in the Protestant sense, as opposed to that of the Papists, who sneeringly call every thing imputed, putative, fantastic and imaginary, with whom our author seems to join: but then we say that Christ is only the sinner by imputation, or was only made sin this way; not that sin was inherently in him, or that it was committed by him; in which sense only he can be truly, properly, and really the sinner.

And this is what Dr Crisp himself says, and that in the very passage this man takes upon him to confute: "Christ, says he, stands a sinner in God's eyes; though not as the actor of transgressions, yet as he was

the surety." This observation alone is sufficient to set aside all the trifling and impertinent reasonings of this writer on this head. We are not afraid, nor ashamed to say, that Christ was made original and actual sin in this sense; that is to say, that original sin, and the actual sins of God's people, were imputed to Christ, and he bore them and made satisfaction to justice for them: Nor can we observe any absurdity in descending to particulars, and saying that the swearing the lying, blasphemy, &c. of God's elect, were laid upon him, imputed to him, and he took them upon him, and bore them away: Nor does this reflect upon the holiness of God, as this man suggests, in making his Son by imputation the worst thing that ever was in the world; since there never was any one thing in the world which so much discovers the holiness of God, and strictness of his justice, than his giving his Son to be the propitiation for our sins; which could not be done without the imputation of them to him: Nor does this act of imputation make God the author of sin, any more than the imputation of the righteousness of Christ makes the Father the author of that righteousness; nor does this reflect dishonour, either on the divine or human nature of Christ, since neither of them can be defiled with sin but, on the other hand, serves much to express the wondrous love, grace, and condescension of Christ, that he who knew no sin, should be made sin for us. (3.)

I observe the rudeness of the man, in representing the doctrine of the imputation of sin to Christ, or his being made sin by imputation, "as vile and ridiculous, and equally as pernicious as Transubstantiation; a scheme not to be freed from inexplicable perplexities, and vile nonsense; calling it ridiculous doctrine, spurious stuff, yea, blasphemy;" when it is the doctrine of our reformers, of all sound Protestant divines, never denied by any but Socinians and Arminians, or such as he inclined to them: Wherefore had he thought fit to have rejected it, yet for the sake of so many valuable men who have espoused it, he ought to have treated it with decency.

Nor can I pass by his rude treatment of Dr. Crisp and Mr. Hussey; the one he represents as guilty of blasphemy, or something like it, and an addle-headed man, that knew not what he wrote; and the other, as a ridiculous writer; when they were both, in their day and generation, men of great piety and learning, of long standing and much usefulness in the Church of Christ; whose name and memory will be dear and precious to the saints, when this writer and his pamphlet will be remembered no more. (4.)

I observe, this author treats the doctrine of Christ's being a sinner by imputation, as a novel doctrine, and embraced by men of a vehement thirst after novelty. I have already hinted, that this was the doctrine of the first reformers, and all sound Protestant divines, that our sins were imputed to Christ, and Christ's righteousness imputed to us. This was the faith of the ancient church, in the first ages of christianity, as appears from a passage of Justin Martyr, one of the most early christian writers extant; "What else," says he, speaking of Christ, "could cover our sins, but his righteousness?"

In whom could we, transgressors and ungodly, be justified, than in the only Son of God? O sweet. change! O unsearchable performance! O unexpected benefits! that the transgression of many should be hid in one righteous person: and the righteousness of one justify many transgressors." Yea, some of the ancient writers have expressed themselves in terms full as exceptionable as what Dr. Crisp has made use of: so Chrysostom; "For he hath made that righteous one a sinner, that he might make sinners righteous: indeed he does not only say so, but what was much more; for he does not express the habit, but the quality; he does not say, he made him a sinner, but sin itself; that we might be made, he does not say righteous, but righteousness, even the righteousness of God."

So Oecumenius; "Christ," says he, "was the great sinner, seeing he took upon him the sins of the whole world, and made them his own." So Austin; "He, that is, Christ, is sin, as we are righteousness; not our

own, but God's; not in ourselves but in him; even as he himself is sin; not his own, but ours: not in himself, but in us." Some of them have been very express, as to Christ's bearing the filth of sin; particularly Gregory of Nyssa; "For," says he; speaking of Christ, "having translated to himself the filth of my sins, he imparted to me his own purity, and made me a partaker of his beauty."

And in another place, says he, "the pure and harmless one took upon him or received the filth of human nature; and passing through all our poverty, came to the trial of death itself." And elsewhere he says, "purity was in our filth; but the filth did not touch that purity;" meaning, that the holy nature of Christ was not defiled by it. I shall not now take notice of some later writers; perhaps I may hereafter: I hope this will be sufficient to clear the doctrine from the charge of novelty. (5.)

I cannot overlook the wretched vanity and ignorance of the man about tropes and figures. Though I cannot but think his learned friend, or friends, who had the supervisal of his performance, have been far from acting the kind, faithful, and friendly part, in suffering him to expose himself as he has done; he tells us that "it is very evident, that all the scriptures that they (Dr. Crisp, and others) depend upon as plain proofs that Christ was made very sin for us, are metonomies, which is a figure frequently to be met with in the Bible;" and then by an asterisk, we are directed to the margin, where, for the sake of the poor, illiterate Supralapsarians, a definition is given of a metonymy, which is this; "a metonymy is a changing, or putting one thing, or more, for another." "and," says he, in the body of his work, "sometimes you have the cause for the effect, and sometimes the effect put for the cause;" and among the instances he produces, this is one, that unbelief is put for faith.

Now, not to take notice that a metonymy is a trope, and not a figure, nor of his miscalling it metonymy, instead of metonymy, which might have been thought to have been an error of the press, but that it is so often repeated; I say, not to take notice of these things; he says, "a metonymy is a changing, or putting one thing, or more, for another;" but surely it is not a changing, or putting any one thing for another; it looks as if he thought so, seeing, among his examples, he makes unbelief to be put for faith.

There is a metonymy of the cause and effect, subject and adjunct, but never of contraries; as grace and sin, vice and virtue, faith and unbelief are: this looks more like the figure antiphrasis, than the trope metonymy. Our author, by his new figure in rhetoric, will be able, in a very beautiful manner, to bring off the vilest of creatures, that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter. (Isa. 5:20) Let me ask this author, since he has put this instance among his examples of a metonymy of the cause for the effect, and of the effect for the cause; let me, I say, ask him, whether he thinks unbelief is the cause faith, or faith the cause of unbelief; and seeing he has got such a good hand at metonymies, we will try what use he can make of them in explaining the scriptures in this controversy. (6.)

The scriptures made use of to prove the imputation of sin to Christ, or that Christ was made sin by imputation, are, 2 Corinthians 5:21, Isaiah 53:6. Now our author "hopes to make it plain, that these scriptures are as truly figurative texts as those are that represent Christ to be a lion, a star, a door, a rock, a vine," &c. and observes that "all the scriptures depended on as plain proofs, that Christ was made very sin for us, are metonomies." But he should have observed, that the scriptures which speak of Christ as a lion, a star, a door, a rock, a vine, &c. are metaphors, and not metonymies; and could he produce any, where Christ is said to be made a lion, a star, a door a rock, a vine, &c. there would appear a greater likeness between them, and such a text which says, he was made sin for us: he fancies the doctrine of transubstantiation is as well supported by scripture as this doctrine; that the constructions we put upon the

texts in dispute about it, are as gross as those the Papists put on such as they produce in favour of theirs; which is not very surprising, since he seems to have an opinion of popish doctrines, and to be verging that way; for in one part of this performance of his, he frankly acknowledges, that he has no high opinion of popish doctrines, which supposes that he has an opinion of them, and begins, at least, to think a little favourably of them, though not highly.

But Jet us attend to time texts in dispute; the first is, 2 Corinthians 5:21. For he hath made him to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him who knew no sin; which, he says, has been notoriously wrested, and observes, that "this text in both parts of it, is metonomically spoken, and is the cause put for the effect; and the native language of it is, that God made his dear Son a sin-offering for us, that we might partake of the promised blessings, or the righteousness of God in him."

Admitting the words are to be taken in a metonymical sense, yea, that the meaning is, that Christ was made an offering for sin; they are not a metonymy of the cause for the effect; for sin is not the cause, though the occasion of a sin-offering; there might have been sin and no offering for it: offering for sin is not an effect necessarily arising from it, but what purely depended on the will and pleasure of God; but taking the words in the sense of a sin-offering, it is, as Piscator observes *Per metonymiam subjecti occupantis in veteri Testamento usitatam*.

Besides, this sense of the words is so far from destroying the doctrine of the imputation of sin to Christ, that it serves to confirm it: For as the typical sin-offerings under the law, had first the sins of the people put upon them by the priest, and typically imputed to them, and were bore by them, Leviticus 10:17, before they could be offered for them; so our Lord Jesus was first made sin, or had the sins of his people imputed to him, or he could never have been made an offering for them.

I deny, that *salva justitia Dei*, consistent with the justice of God, Christ, an innocent person could ever bear even the punishment of our sins, or be made a sacrifice for them, or die for them, as he did, according to the scriptures, if they had not been imputed to him; punishment could never have been inflicted on him, if sin had not been reckoned to him. Though I see no reason why sin, in one and the same sentence here, should have two different meanings, as it must have, according to this sense of them, he hath made him, to be sin for us, who knew no sin: the word sin, last mentioned, cannot be meant of an offering for sin: for it is not true, that Christ knew no sin-offering, when multitudes had been offered up under the law; but the meaning is, that he never was guilty of sin; and yet he who never was guilty of sin, was made so by imputation, that is, had the guilt of our sins imputed to him; which well agrees with, and may be confirmed by the latter part of the text, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

Now in the same way that we are made the righteousness of God, was Christ made sin: we are made the righteousness of God by imputation, that is, the righteousness of Christ, who is both God and man, is imputed to us; so Christ was made sin by imputation, that is, our sins were imputed to him. What this author says concerning our being made the effects of God's righteousness or faithfulness, I own, I cannot, for my life form any idea of; and though he has attempted to explain it, he has left it inexplicable; I choose not to use his own phrase, inexplicable nonsense.

Before I dismiss this text, I would take notice of one very extraordinary observation of this author's; which is, that this way of reasoning to prove Christ a sinner, will prove that all men, that have the righteousness of Christ imputed to them, are their own saviours; his argument is this: "if by the imputation of our condemning sins to Christ he was made a sinner, then, by the imputation of his saving righteousness, we

are made saviours." But, with his leave, this does not follow; but the truth and force of the reasoning stands thus: If by the imputation of our condemning sins to Christ he was made a sinner, and condemned as such, then, by the imputation of his righteousness, we are made righteous, and saved as such; for not sinner and saviour, but sinner and righteous, salvation and condemnation, are the antitheses.

Give me leave to subjoin the sense of two or three of our principal reformers, and sound Protestant divines, of this passage of scripture, who wrote long before Dr. Crisp's time. Calvin upon the text says; "How are we righteous before God? namely, as Christ was a sinner; for, in some respects, he sustained our person, that he might become guilty in our name; and as a sinner, be condemned, not for his own, but the offences of others seeing he was pure, and free from all fault, and underwent punishment due, not to himself, but to us:" which agrees with what he says on Galatians 3:13.

"Because he sustained our person, therefore he was a sinner, and deserving of the curse; not as in himself, but as in us." Beza on the place, has these words; that "the antithesis requires, that rather Christ should be said to be made sin for us, that is, a sinner, not in himself, but on the account of the guilt of all our sins, imputed to him; of which the two goats were a figure, mentioned Leviticus 16." Piscator, as well as Beza, having mentioned the other sense of Christ's being made a sin-offering, adds, "rather sin here, by a metonymy of the adjunct, signifies summum peccatorem," the chief sinner; "inasmuch as all the sins of all the elect were imputed to Christ; which exposition the following antithesis favours, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him; that is, righteous before God; namely, by a righteousness obtained by the sacrifice of Christ; imputed to us by God."

So that though the words may be taken in a metonymical sense; yet they are not a metonymy of the cause for the effect, but a metonymy of the adjunct: so scelus is put for scelestus, by Latin authors, as here sin for the sinner. I now proceed to what our author has to say to Isaiah 54:6. The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. This text he says, Dr Crisp makes the foundation of his several sermons, to prove that our blessed Lord was made a sinner and says, that he very injudiciously affirms, that it is the very fault, or transgression itself, that the Lord laid upon Christ; but he purposes to make it plain, that he is mistaken in his opinion about this text, and that it was not the crime or fault, but the punishment due to us for our sins, that was laid upon Christ, which, he thinks, is evident from verses 3, 7.

To which I reply; that the punishment due to us for sin, could not have been laid upon Christ, nor could he have been wounded for our transgressions, or bruised for our sins, or have been oppressed and afflicted, had he not had our sins laid upon him, that is, imputed to him: nor is it inconsistent with the holiness of God, to take either original sin, or our actual sins and transgressions, even particular sins, and lay them upon Christ; since this was done in order to shew his infinite holiness, his indignation against sin, and the strictness and severity of his justice in the punishment of it; nor is this inconsistent with the nature of sin, nor any rude and extravagant way of thinking of it, which surely may as truly and properly be put, or laid upon Christ, as the iniquities and transgressions of the children of Israel in all their sins, which mean their very crimes, were typically put and laid upon the scapegoat.

This writer goes on to observe, that the prophecy in Isaiah 53:4, Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows, was fulfilled by our Lord's healing the diseases of the people, Matthew 8:16, 17, and argues, that if the text in Isaiah 53:4 is to be construed in the same method as the sixth and eleventh verses are, the consequence will be, that our Lord bore the palsy of the Centurion's servant, and the fever of Peter's wife's mother: this, he thinks, will greatly hamper our scheme, so that we shall not be able to produce any thing consistent with it, free from inexplicable perplexities and vile nonsense.

But what reason can be given, why the expressions in the several places, should be interpreted in the same way? What though our Lord, in his state of incarnation, being a man of sorrows and acquainted with griefs, is said to bear the griefs, and carry the sorrows of men, because he had compassion on them, and sympathized with them in their sickness, which put him upon healing of them; and in such sense, bore them as a parent bears the sicknesses of a child, or a husband bears the infirmities of a wife; for we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; does it therefore follow, that this must be the sense of Christ's bearing our sins when he suffered for them as our surety?

Can it be thought that he sympathized with our sins, or with us on the account of them, which put him upon suffering for them, as he is said to bear or sympathize with men's sicknesses and diseases, or with them upon the account of them which put him upon healing of them? (7.) The imputation of the filth of sin to Christ, and his bearing of it, would come next to be considered; but our author has not thought fit to make use of any arguments against it, and therefore I do not think myself obliged to enlarge upon it; only would observe, that filth and guilt are inseparable from sin; and therefore if sin is laid upon Christ, and imputed to him, guilt and filth must be likewise: nor can I see how we can expect to be cleared of the one and cleansed from the other, unless Christ bore them both, when his soul was made an offering for sin, and his blood was shed to cleanse from it.

This writer would, indeed, be nibbling at it, but knows not how to go about it; and only cavils at, some expressions of Mr. Hussey's concerning it. Whether, in Psalm 110:7, there is any allusion to the brook Cedron, or Kidron, over which our Lord went in to the garden, I will not say; but I see not why that black and unclean brook, or common-sewer, may not be an emblem of the pollutions and defilements of sin; which being laid on Christ when he passed over that brook, made him so heavy and sore amazed in his human nature, as to desire the cup might pass from him. As to what Mr Hussey says of our iniquities b

Source: <https://sermonindex.net/speakers/john-gill/truth-defended-being-an-answer-to-an-anonymous-pamphlet/>

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net