

SALUS ELECTORUM, SANGUIS JESU;

OR,

**THE DEATH OF DEATH
IN THE DEATH OF CHRIST:**

by John Owen

1647

A TREATISE OF THE REDEMPTION AND
RECONCILIATION THAT IS IN THE BLOOD OF CHRIST;
THE MERIT OF IT, AND THE SATISFACTION WORKED BY IT:
IN WHICH

*THE PROPER END OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST IS ASSERTED; THE
IMMEDIATE EFFECTS AND FRUITS OF IT ARE ASSIGNED,
WITH THEIR EXTENT IN RESPECT TO ITS OBJECT;*

And The

Whole Controversy About Universal Redemption Fully Discussed.

IN FOUR PARTS.

from

THE WORKS OF JOHN OWEN

EDITED BY

WILLIAM H. GOOLD

VOLUME 10

This Edition of

THE WORKS OF JOHN OWEN

first published by Johnstone & Hunter, 1850-53

Original editor notes by Wm. Goold are (in black)

Modernized, formatted, and annotated (in blue)

by William H. Gross www.onthewing.org © Jan 2004

Last updated 10/20/2021

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	XI
PREFATORY NOTE	1
NOTE TO THE EARL OF WARWICK.....	4
TO THE READER.	5
BOOK I.....	13
CHAPTER 1 - THE PURPOSE OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST	13
I. THE INTENT IN THE DEATH OF CHRIST	13
II. THE EFFECT OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST	13
<i>First, Reconciliation with God.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Secondly, Justification.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Thirdly, Sanctification.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Fourthly, Adoption</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Fifthly, Glorification</i>	<i>14</i>
III. THE INTENT AND EFFECT IS LIMITED	14
CHAPTER II – THE GENERAL NATURE OF ANY PURPOSE.....	15
I. THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN END AND MEANS	15
II. THE RELATION OF END TO MEANS.....	15
III. THE ENDS ARE EITHER OF THE WORK, OR OF THE WORKER.....	16
IV. THE END IS EITHER THE BENEFIT, OR THE BENEFICIARY	17
V. MEANS ARE EITHER INNATELY GOOD, OR THEY ARE CONDUCTIVE TO THE END.....	17
VI. APPLYING THE PROPOSITIONS	17
CHAPTER III - THE AUTHORITY OF THE FATHER	17
I. THE JOINT EFFORT OF THE TRINITY.....	17
II. THE ROLE OF THE FATHER	18
1. <i>The Father Sends the Son.....</i>	<i>18</i>
(1.) The Father imposes the Office of Mediator	19
(2.) The Father Furnishes the Son for his Office	20
(3.) The Father establishes a Covenant with the Son	22
The Father promises to protect and assist the Son.....	22
The Father promises success	23
2. <i>The Father Punishes the Son.....</i>	<i>24</i>
CHAPTER IV – THE REDEEMING WORK OF THE SON.....	26
FIRST, HIS INCARNATION	26
SECONDLY, HIS OBLATION.....	27
THIRDLY, HIS INTERCESSION.....	28
CHAPTER V – THE ACTIONS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT	29
FIRST, THE INCARNATION OF THE SON.....	29
SECONDLY, IN THE SON’S OBLATION	29
THIRDLY, IN THE SON’S RESURRECTION	30

CHAPTER VI – THE MEANS USED 30

I. CHRIST’S DISPENSATION AS MEDIATOR 30

First, His Oblation 30

Second, His Intercession 30

II. OBLATION AND INTERCESSION AS A SINGLE MEANS 31

First, they both have the same end 31

Secondly, they both have the same object 31

Thirdly, His Oblation is the Foundation of His Intercession 32

CHAPTER VII –PROOFS FOR A SINGLE MEANS 32

I. SCRIPTURE JOINS THEM..... 32

II. THEY ARE BOTH ACTS OF THE PRIESTLY OFFICE..... 33

III. THE NATURE OF INTERCESSION REQUIRES IT 34

IV. THE COVENANT SPECIFIES IT..... 34

V. CHRIST UNITED THEM 35

VI. OUR CONSOLATION DEPENDS ON IT 35

CHAPTER VIII – OBJECTIONS TO A SINGLE MEANS 36

GENERAL ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF UNIVERSAL REDEMPTION. 36

II. Christ died for all, that some Sinners may be Persuaded 40

 First, the proposed universal intercession is unclear. 41

 First, is this intercession accidental or intentional? 41

 Secondly, is it by his oblation or not? 41

 Thirdly, is it to instill belief?..... 41

 Fourthly, is his intercession for the world, or only the church?..... 42

 Fifthly, is it absolute or conditional?..... 42

 Secondly, His Intercession is Limited and Conditional 42

 First, he intercedes only for some transgressors 43

 Secondly, he prays only for his crucifiers 43

 Thirdly, his prayer is only for forgiveness, not belief..... 43

 Fourthly, he prays only for those at his death..... 44

 Fifthly, it is unlikely he prayed for the impenitent 44

 Sixthly, his prayer was effectual – but not all believed 44

 Seventhly, he prays for his enemies as a duty, not as a Mediator..... 44

 John 17 confirms his intercession is limited, not universal..... 45

 First, he did not grant means of grace to all 45

 Secondly, John 17:9 precludes a larger object..... 45

 Thirdly, “world” does not mean all men 45

 Fourthly, believing here only means acknowledgement..... 45

 Matthew 5:15-16 addresses witnessing, not intercession..... 46

 John 1:9 only speaks of illumination, not intercession 46

III. As Priest, his sacrifice is for one end, and all men 46

 First, the language of the proposition is unclear 47

 Secondly, if Christ is Priest for all, it can only be for some ends 48

BOOK II 49

CHAPTER I – PURPOSE AND EFFECT OF CHRIST’S DEATH..... 49

 1. IT IS SUPREME AND ULTIMATE WITH REGARD TO GOD’S GLORY..... 49

 2. IT IS INTERMEDIATE AND SUBSERVIENT WITH REGARD TO US 50

CHAPTER II – REFUTING MISTAKEN PURPOSES OF CHRIST’S DEATH 51

 I. IT WAS NOT FOR CHRIST’S OWN GOOD..... 51

II. IT WAS NOT FOR HIS FATHER’S GOOD	52
<i>First, God was not restricted to this solution</i>	52
<i>Secondly, it would be wishing, not willing</i>	53
<i>Thirdly, it would liberate the Father, not us</i>	53
<i>Fourthly, despite his sacrifice, some would not be saved</i>	54
CHAPTER III – SCRIPTURES ASSERTING THE IMMEDIATE END OF CHRIST’S DEATH	55
I. THOSE WHICH SHOW THE INTENT OF GOD	55
<i>First, the parable of the lost sheep</i>	55
<i>Secondly, the angel’s declaration of Christ’s purpose</i>	55
<i>Thirdly, Paul’s declaration of his purpose</i>	56
<i>Fourthly, the declaration in Hebrews</i>	56
<i>Fifthly, the declaration in Ephesians</i>	56
<i>Sixthly, Christ’s own declaration recorded in John</i>	57
<i>Seventhly, the declaration in Galatians</i>	57
<i>Eighthly, the declaration in 2Corinthians</i>	57
II. THOSE WHICH LAY DOWN THE ACTUAL EFFECT OF HIS OBLATION	57
<i>First, sanctification</i>	58
<i>Secondly, freedom from punishment</i>	58
<i>Thirdly, peace and reconciliation with God</i>	59
<i>Fourthly, life and eternal glory for his sheep</i>	59
III. THOSE WHICH SHOW FOR WHOM CHRIST DIED: THE ELECT	60
<i>Moore’s Objections:</i>	61
The word “many” means all men.....	61
Christ’s death is for more ends than propitiation	61
Scripture does not say the ransom is paid only for his sheep	62
CHAPTER IV – DISTINCTION BETWEEN IMPETRATION AND APPLICATION.....	66
FIRST, UNIVERSALISTS INSIST THAT IMPETRATION AND APPLICATION ARE SEPARATE.....	67
I. IMPETRATION IS FOR ALL, APPLICATION IS FOR BELIEVERS	67
<i>First, Christ reconciled all, but only believers benefit</i>	67
<i>Secondly, Christ died for all, but only believers are reconciled.</i>	67
<i>Thirdly, Reconciliation is twofold: paid for all, but worked in some</i>	67
II. THE TRUE NATURE OF THE DISTINCTION	68
<i>First, impetration is purchase, application is enjoyment.</i>	68
First, The distinction regards what is procured, not Christ’s intent.	68
Secondly, what is purchased is not purchased conditionally.	68
Thirdly, what is purchased is not bestowed conditionally.	68
Fourthly, impetration and application have the same objects.	68
<i>Secondly, what is obtained is applied by nature.</i>	69
<i>Thirdly, Christ intercedes for those for whom he died</i>	69
SECONDLY, UNIVERSALISTS SAY RECONCILIATION IS ONLY APPLIED TO SOME.....	70
<i>First, Because of God’s universal love, He desires all to be saved.</i>	70
<i>Secondly, God’s love has no effect unless satisfaction is made for all.</i>	71
<i>Thirdly, He sent Christ to fulfill his universal love, and satisfy his justice.</i>	71
<i>Fourthly, the purpose of Christ’s death was to obtain the power to save.</i>	72
<i>Fifthly, Christ satisfied God’s justice, allowing conditional salvation.</i>	72

III. SUMMATION 73
First, God sent his Son for the elect alone. 74
Secondly, the ransom was sufficient for all those intended. 74
Thirdly, those intended were the elect...... 74
Fourthly, what was purchased is necessarily bestowed...... 75

CHAPTER V – FURTHER DISTINCTIONS 75

IMPETRATION AND APPLICATION MAY BE DISTINCT, BUT THEY CANNOT BE SEPARATE. 75
First, what is obtained is certainly possessed. 75
Secondly, if Christ died for them, the benefit belongs to them...... 76
Thirdly, if a ransom is paid for them, the captives must be freed. 76
Fourthly, Scripture ties Application to Impetration...... 76

WHAT IS OBTAINED IS NOT OBTAINED CONDITIONALLY 76
First, such a condition ought to be revealed...... 76
Secondly, such a condition must be within our power to perform. 76
Thirdly, the condition of faith is procured by Christ...... 77
Fourthly, if it were conditional, then Christ would only be half a mediator. 77

BOOK III..... 79

CHAPTER I – ARGUMENTS AGAINST UNIVERSAL REDEMPTION 79

ARGUMENT I. THE COVENANT IS NOT UNIVERSAL BUT PARTICULAR. 79
 ARGUMENT II. IF THE INTENT WAS UNIVERSAL, IT MUST BE KNOWN UNIVERSALLY. 80

CHAPTER II – THREE MORE ARGUMENTS 82

ARGUMENT III. IF THE RANSOM IS UNIVERSAL, ANY CONDITION IS PAID FOR TOO. 82
First, such a condition must be made known to all (Arg. II)...... 83
Secondly, all men must be able to believe. 83
That is contrary to the Scriptures...... 83

ARGUMENT IV. MEN ARE TWO SORTS; CHRIST DIED FOR ONE, NOT FOR BOTH. 85
First, Scripture identifies two sorts of men. 85
Second, Christ died only for the one sort. 86

ARGUMENT V. SCRIPTURE NOWHERE SAYS THAT CHRIST DIED FOR ALL MEN. 86

CHAPTER III – TWO OTHER ARGUMENTS FROM THE PERSON OF CHRIST 87

ARGUMENT VI. CHRIST DIED AS A SURETY FOR THOSE HE REPRESENTED. 87
First, He endured the penalty due others to free each from it. 87
Secondly, satisfaction was made for each person Christ died for. 88

CHRIST DID NOT MAKE SATISFACTION FOR ALL MEN..... 88
First, if he satisfied for all, then all are saved. 88
Secondly, he did not intend to satisfy for more than could be saved. 88

THE EXCEPTION THAT ITS APPLICATION WAS CONDITIONAL HAS NO FORCE 89
First, the condition was unknown by all. 89
Secondly, Christ knew whoever failed the condition would be lost. 89
Thirdly, conditional redemption is rejected. 89

ASSERTING THAT CHRIST SATISFIED FOR BOTH DAMNED AND SAVED IS VALUELESS. 89
First, Christ was required to die for those who would be saved...... 89
Secondly, Christ’s intent was to free those for whom he died...... 89
Thirdly, if Christ satisfied for all sin, the sin of unbelief was paid for. 90

ARGUMENT VII. CHRIST DIED AS A MEDIATOR, A PRIEST FOR HIS OWN PEOPLE.....	90
CHAPTER IV – PROCUREMENT OF SANCTIFICATION AND FAITH.....	90
ARGUMENT VIII. CHRIST’S BLOOD IS EFFECTUAL TO WASH, PURGE, AND SANCTIFY.....	90
<i>First, the Scriptural type of sacrifice legally sanctifies.</i>	91
<i>Secondly, Scripture says blood sacrifices are intended to sanctify.</i>	91
<i>Scripture Proofs</i>	91
<i>The Death of Christ is the sole cause of Redemption</i>	92
First, the paid ransom is the sole cause of redemption.....	92
Secondly, faith itself is procured by Christ’s death	93
ARGUMENT IX. FAITH IS PROCURED BY CHRIST’S DEATH.....	93
<i>Premises:</i>	93
1. <i>Nothing is bestowed on us that was not purchased by Christ’s Death</i>	93
2. <i>Faith is indispensable to our salvation</i>	93
3. <i>The question is whether faith is a fruit and effect of Christ’s death?</i>	94
First, if it is, then was it absolute or conditional?	94
If absolutely, then surely, if he died for all, they must all believe.	94
If conditionally, and the condition is our faith, then this faith is of ourselves and not of Christ.	94
Secondly, if it is not, then it is an act of will and we save ourselves	94
1. It must be an act of our own will	94
2. We are the cause of our salvation and Christ’s death has no value	95
<i>Proofs:</i>	95
1. <i>Faith is part of our sanctification and holiness purchased by Christ</i>	95
2. <i>All the fruits of election are purchased by Christ</i>	95
3. <i>All the blessings of the Covenant are purchased by Christ</i>	96
4. <i>Everything necessary to be saved must be purchased by Christ</i>	96
5. <i>Faith is a gift, a blessing, procured for us by Christ</i>	97
<i>Conclusion: If what he procured is not common to all, he did not die for all</i>	97
ARGUMENT X. THE ANTITYPE OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL AS GOD’S ELECT.....	97
CHAPTER V – THE NATURE OF REDEMPTION.....	98
ARGUMENT XI. FIRST: BY ITS NATURE, REDEMPTION IS NOT UNIVERSAL.	98
<i>Spiritual Redemption differs from temporal redemption.</i>	99
First, the one who receives the ransom also gives it.	99
Secondly, we are not freed from God, but brought near to Him.	99
Thirdly, the Jailer was conquered to satisfy the Judge.....	99
<i>Redemption means to free a person by paying a ransom for him</i>	100
<i>Conclusion: If there is a universal redemption, all men are redeemed.</i>	100
CHAPTER VI – THE NATURE OF RECONCILIATION	101
ARGUMENT XII. SECOND: BY ITS NATURE, RECONCILIATION IS NOT UNIVERSAL.	101
<i>Reconciliation is ascribed to the Death of Christ</i>	101
<i>Both parties must be reconciled, not just one.</i>	101
<i>If reconciliation was purchased by the Death of Christ, all are reconciled.</i>	102
1. Christ turned away God’s wrath towards us	102
2. Christ turns us away from our enmity towards God	102
<i>If both parties are reconciled, how can one remain under God’s wrath?</i>	103
<i>Conclusion: Christ died only for those who are reconciled</i>	103
CHAPTER VII – THE SATISFACTION OF CHRIST.....	104

ARGUMENT XIII. THIRD: CHRIST’S SATISFACTION WAS NOT UNIVERSAL.....	104
<i>The Nature of Legal Satisfaction</i>	104
First, satisfaction may be made by paying exactly what is owed.....	104
Secondly, satisfaction may be made by substituting an acceptable value.....	104
<i>The Nature of Christ’s Satisfaction</i>	104
First, the debtor is man;.....	104
Secondly, The debt is sin;.....	105
Thirdly, what will satisfy is death;.....	105
Fourthly, the obligation is obedience to the law;.....	105
Fifthly, the creditor is God;.....	105
Sixthly, what intervenes is the ransom paid by Christ’s Death;.....	105
<i>Two things must be cleared:</i>	105
First, that Christ made the required satisfaction.....	105
Was the satisfaction of Christ <i>solutio ejusdem</i> , or <i>solutio tantidem</i> ?.....	106
Arguments against <i>solutio ejusdem</i> , by Grotius.....	106
Arguments for <i>solutio ejusdem</i> , refuting Grotius:.....	107
Conclusion: Christ’s satisfaction was <i>solutio ejusdem</i> for those he represented.....	108
Secondly, what response God ought to have to this satisfaction.....	108
First, with regard to us, he is considered a creditor;.....	109
Secondly, with regard to Christ, he is considered supreme Lord and Lawgiver;.....	109
Therefore, two acts are eminent in God’s response to Christ’s Death:.....	109
1. An Act of Justice – Challenges and Answers.....	109
2. An act of Supreme Sovereignty.....	111
A Comparison of these inferences with Universal Redemption.....	112
CHAPTER VIII – THE SUBSTANCE OF THE SATISFACTION OF CHRIST.....	113
FIRST, ANY OBJECTION TO CHRIST’S SATISFACTION IS PELAGIAN OR ARMINIAN HERESY.....	114
SECONDLY, THE ELECT AND THE REPROBATES ARE SEPARATE CAMPS BY NATURE.....	114
THIRDLY, THE ETERNAL LOVE OF GOD IS AN ACT OF WILL, NOT PASSION.....	115
<i>First, God willfully chooses to act in behalf of His elect.</i>	115
<i>Secondly, no act of God changes the nature its object.</i>	115
<i>Thirdly, the wrath of God is also not passionate, but willful.</i>	115
<i>Fourthly, God’s love does not remove any conditions for His elect.</i>	115
1. ACKNOWLEDGING GOD’S ELECTION DOES NOT JUSTIFY OR RECONCILE US.....	116
2. ALL MEN REMAIN UNDER THE WRATH OF GOD UNTIL THEY ARE RECONCILED.....	116
3. THE ELECT ARE UNDER GOD’S WRATH IN THE SAME WAY AS REPROBATES.....	117
4. THE ELECT ARE NOT RECONCILED TO GOD UNTIL THEY BELIEVE THE SON.....	118
CONCLUSION: ELECTION DOES NOT REMOVE THE NEED FOR CHRIST’S SATISFACTION.....	118
CHAPTER IX – ARGUMENTS PROVING THE SATISFACTION OF CHRIST.....	118
I. FROM CHRIST BEARING OUR SIN, AND THE PUNISHMENT FOR IT.....	118
<i>First, he took and bore our sins.</i>	119
<i>Secondly, he underwent the punishment for our sins</i>	119
<i>Thirdly, he did this in our stead</i>	119
II. FROM CHRIST PAYING THE RANSOM FOR OUR SINS AS OUR SURETY.....	119
<i>First, Christ paid the price and ransom for our sins.</i>	120
<i>Secondly, He paid this price into the hands of his Father.</i>	120
<i>Thirdly, he did this as our surety.</i>	120
<i>Fourthly, he did this for our freedom.</i>	120
III. FROM CHRIST MAKING AN ATONEMENT AND RECONCILIATION.....	120
IV. FROM THE NATURE OF HIS PRIESTLY OFFICE.....	121
<i>First, The punishment due to sin is the wrath of God:</i>	121

Secondly, The curse of the law is the wrath of God taken passively,..... 121
Thirdly, The death that sinners are to undergo is the wrath of God..... 121
V. FROM THE NECESSITY OF HIS SATISFACTION TO OUR FAITH AND CONSOLATION..... 122
VI. FROM HIS BEING MADE SIN FOR US, AND BRUISED FOR OUR INIQUITIES..... 122
Objection 1: The Son is punished despite pleasing the Father. 123
Objection 2: The Elect are not punished for their sin..... 123
CHAPTER X – THE MERIT OF CHRIST 124
ARGUMENT XIV. FOURTH: THE MERIT ASCRIBED TO CHRIST IS NOT UNIVERSAL..... 124
ARGUMENT XV. FIFTH: SPECIFIC PHRASES PRECLUDE UNIVERSAL REDEMPTION..... 126
CHAPTER XI – LAST GENERAL ARGUMENT..... 127
ARGUMENT XVI. SIXTH: SCRIPTURES THAT PRECLUDE UNIVERSAL REDEMPTION. 127
1. *Genesis 3:15 – There are two Seeds.* 127
 First, the seed of the woman..... 127
 Secondly, the seed of the serpent..... 128
2. *Matt. 7:23 – There are those who are known and unknown by Christ.* 128
3. *Matt. 11:25, 26 – There are those who know, and do not know.* 129
4. *John 10:11-29 – There are the sheep and the goats.* 129
 First, all men are not the sheep of Christ, 129
 Secondly, the sheep that are his elect are called by God..... 129
 Thirdly, Christ says that he laid down his life for his sheep, 129
5. *Rom. 8:31-34 – Christ’s love, sacrifice, and intercession is for the Elect.* 130
 First, if Christ died for all out of love, then God loves those who perish..... 130
 Secondly, God freely gives all good things to those he loves, including faith..... 130
 Thirdly, those he died for are freely justified..... 130
6. *Eph. 1:7 – Christ’s blood brings forgiveness only to Abraham’s seed.....* 131
7. *2Cor. 5:21 – Those for whom he died are considered righteous.....* 131
8. *John 17:9, 19 – Christ prayed for and sanctified himself for the Elect.* 131
9. *Eph. 5:25 – The object of Christ’s love is his bride alone, not another.* 131
BOOK IV 132
CHAPTER I –CONSIDERATIONS PRIOR TO ANSWERING OBJECTIONS 132
1. THE DIGNITY, WORTH, AND VALUE OF THE BLOOD OF CHRIST 132
 First, the dignity of the person that offered it, and was offered..... 133
 Secondly, the greatness of the pain he endured, 133
 The worth of the Death of Christ is undervalued by Universal Redemption. 133
2. THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE NEW COVENANT UNDER THE GOSPEL..... 135
3. THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN MAN’S DUTY AND GOD’S PURPOSE. 136
4. THE ERROR OF THE JEWS CONCERNING THE EXTENT OF REDEMPTION..... 136
5. THE MEANING OF THE WORDS CONCERNING THE EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT. 138
 First, is the word “world.” 138
 Second, is the word “all”..... 142
6. THE APPEARANCE OF PERSONS AND THINGS IN THE SCRIPTURE..... 144
7. THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A JUDGMENT OF CHARITY, AND ONE OF FACT..... 144
8. THE CONNECTION BETWEEN FAITH AND SALVATION. 145
9. THE MIXTURE OF ELECT AND REPROBATES IN THE WORLD..... 147
10. THE DIFFERENT ACTS AND DEGREES OF FAITH. 147

<i>First, we cannot save ourselves.....</i>	148
<i>Secondly, Salvation is found in the promised seed only.....</i>	148
<i>Thirdly, Jesus was this promised seed, the Savior.....</i>	148
<i>Fourthly, the Gospel requires us to rely on Christ as the Redeemer.....</i>	148
<i>Fifthly, we must individually believe in the efficacy of Christ’s blood.....</i>	149
CHAPTER II – ANSWER TO OBJECTIONS FROM SCRIPTURE	149
I. PASSAGES THAT AFFIRM CHRIST DIED FOR THE “WORLD”- JOHN 3:16.....	150
<i>First, alleged proof by reason.....</i>	150
<i>Second, consideration of specific Scriptural passages</i>	151
1. John 3:16.....	152
FIRST , the cause for sending Christ is Love.....	154
SECOND , the object of this love is the “world”.....	157
THIRD , the intent of God in sending his Son is to save believers.....	160
CHAPTER III – OTHER TEXTS PRODUCED BY UNIVERSALISTS	161
2. 1Jn. 2:1-2.....	161
(1.) To whom the Apostle writes.....	162
(2.) The aim and intention of the apostle.....	164
(3.) The meaning of the words “propitiation” and “whole world”.....	164
First, the meaning of the word “propitiation”.....	164
Secondly, the meaning of the phrase “of the whole world”.....	166
3. John 6:51.....	169
4. 2Cor 5:19.....	169
5. John 1:9.....	171
6. John 1:29.....	172
7. John 3:17.....	172
8. John 4:42; 1Jn. 4:14; John 6:51.....	173
9. John 12:46.....	173
CHAPTER IV – ANSWER TO SECOND ARGUMENT FOR UNIVERSALISM.....	173
II. PASSAGES THAT SIGNIFY CHRIST DIED FOR ALL, OR GOD WILLS SALVATION FOR ALL.....	173
1. <i>1Tim. 2:4,6.....</i>	174
2. <i>2Pet. 3:9,.....</i>	177
3. <i>Heb. 2:9,.....</i>	178
4. <i>2Cor. 5:14-15.....</i>	179
5. <i>1Cor. 15:22.....</i>	180
6. <i>Rom. 5:18.....</i>	181
CHAPTER V - ANSWER TO LAST ARGUMENT FOR UNIVERSALISM.....	187
III. PASSAGES WHICH AFFIRM CHRIST BOUGHT, OR DIED FOR, THOSE WHO PERISH.....	187
1. <i>Rom. 14:15.....</i>	188
2. <i>1Cor. 8:11.....</i>	189
3. <i>2Pet. 2:1.....</i>	190
4. <i>Heb. 10:29.....</i>	192
CHAPTER VI – ANSWER TO CHAP. 20 OF UNIVERSALITY OF GRACE.....	196
ARGUMENTS MADE BY THOMAS MOORE:.....	196
I. <i>Scripture declares that Christ gave himself a ransom for every man.....</i>	196
II. <i>Christ came to save all sinners, not just some of them.....</i>	198
III. <i>The purpose of Christ’s death and exaltation is to be Lord of all.....</i>	200

IV. *Christ is the Savior of the whole world, but only believers receive life.* 202

V. *Christ gave himself for all, to gain the right of Lordship over all.*..... 203

VI. *The plain meaning of Scripture is that Christ died for all men.*..... 204

 Proof 1 of argument 6 – God gave his Son to be Savior of the world..... 205

 Proof 2. Christ came to take away the sins of the world, a propitiation for all. 207

 Proof 3. Christ invites all to repent and believe through his Spirit. 208

 Proof 4. The Holy Ghost will judge all as to the sin of not believing in Christ. 209

 Proof 5. God testifies that he wants his Son to redeem all men. 212

 Proof 6. The very words and phrases of Scripture imply no less than all men..... 213

 Proof 7. The unique privileges of believers do not exclude ransom for all. 215

 Proof 8. As in Adam all fell, in Christ all are redeemed. 216

 Proof 9. The gospel is to be preached to all, therefore all are capable of belief. 217

 Proof 10. Believers are to pray for all, therefore all may be saved. 218

 Proof 11. Christ will always be with his people, preaching to and praying for all. 219

 Proof 12. Christ made good his word to all, that none would exclude themselves. 219

 Proof 13. The blessing of life extends to all mankind, overcoming God’s chosen. 220

 Proof 14. Those who reject the gospel “choose” darkness and destruction. 221

 Proof 15. God’s good intentions in pleading with all men requires that Christ saved all men. 224

 Proof 16. Scripture says it is sin to refuse grace, indicating it belongs to all. 226

 Proof 17. If some are judged to a second death, Christ first died for them. 227

 Proof 18. Believers may contend for, and lose, a common salvation..... 227

CHAPTER VII – REMOVING REMAINING OBJECTIONS..... **228**

OBJECTION I. EACH MUST BELIEVE JESUS DIED FOR HIM; ERGO HE DIED FOR ALL...... **228**

Assumptions of this Objection:..... **229**

 first, “believing”, both as to its obligation and the truth, means the same. 229

 secondly, “believing” means Christ is savingly applied to the soul. 229

 thirdly, “believing” refers to the purpose of the Father and the intent of Jesus..... 229

 fourthly, the condition of everyone for whom Christ died is the same 229

Minor Proposition: Everyone is bound to believe that Jesus Christ died for him...... **229**

 First, if it were so, then some must be bound to believe what is false. 229

 Secondly, men would be bound to believe what is not revealed. 230

 Thirdly, the objects of faith are God’s commands, promises, and threats..... 230

 Fourthly, any command to believe cannot be interpreted by God’s intent..... 230

 Fifthly, unless he hears, how can anyone be bound to believe?..... 230

OBJECTION II. PARTICULAR REDEMPTION CAUSES DOUBT WHETHER ONE IS SAVED. **233**

OBJECTION III. UNIVERSAL REDEMPTION BETTER REPRESENTS THE LOVE OF GOD...... **235**

OBJECTION IV. UNIVERSAL REDEMPTION BETTER EXALTS THE MERIT OF CHRIST. **238**

OBJECTION V. UNIVERSAL REDEMPTION OFFERS GREATER CONSOLATION. **239**

ANSWER: **240**

 1. Universal Redemption is no cause for Consolation. 240

 2. Universal Redemption undermines the true cause of Consolation..... 241

 3. Particular Redemption does not abridge any part of a believer’s Consolation..... 243

 4. Particular Redemption is the solid foundation of all enduring Consolation..... 245

CONCLUSION -..... **245**

A FEW TESTIMONIES OF THE ANCIENTS...... **246**

 I. CHURCH OF SMYRNA,..... 246

 II. THE WITNESS OF HOLY IGNATIUS, 246

 III. CLEMENS,..... 246

 IV. CYPRIAN,..... 246

 V. CYRIL..... 247

 VI. ATHANASIUS,..... 247

 VII. AMBROSE..... 247

Table of Contents

VIII. AUGUSTINE,..... 248
IX. PROSPER..... 248
X. CONCIL. VALENTINUS, CAN. 4: 249
APPENDIX..... 250
A REPLY TO MR. JOSHUA SPRIGGE..... 250

Introduction

This is a restatement and simplification of Owen's original work. It should be used for teaching purposes only. You may reproduce the text so long as you do not change it and you do not sell it to anyone. This restriction is placed on it so that the propagation of any errors in the updated language is limited. If someone rephrases my updated language, the treatise will quickly degenerate into a misstatement rather than a restatement of Owen's work. That would be lamentable. So what are the changes that have been made?

The old English wording has been updated, so that "thee" and "thou" are now "you" and "yours." American spelling has been employed. Scripture references with Roman numerals have been updated to Arabic and corrected where needed. The difficult structure and syntax have been simplified. Little-used words have been replaced with simpler ones as well. Some exceptions to this simplification include the words "*oblation*" (p.27) which is an act of offering; and "*impetration*" (p.66) which is obtaining something by petition or beseeching. Because of their context, extensive use, and the wider connotations of these words, they have been left alone. Gould's 1850-53 editor notes are followed by "- Ed."

Sentences have been shortened, and in many cases split into several sentences for clarity. Parallelism has been employed to maintain rhythm and clarity. Unreferenced pronouns have been made explicit. The passive voice has been changed to active in most places. Duplicated texts, digressions that do not affect the content, and alternate phrasings within the same sentence, have been removed for easier comprehension. Ad hominem attacks, however, have been kept as an expression of Owen's outrage, and his acidic humor. Because Latin is no longer a required course in public education, Latin passages have been excised except where they are core to his argument; those remaining have been crudely translated to help the reader. Hence, this must be called an abridgment. However, the full argument and supporting text are maintained. This is not a synopsis, but the entire treatise presented in the original work. As a result, the expository style remains. If it seems stilted, it is because it is stilted in the original.

The old King James passages of Scripture, and Owen's direct translations, have been restated in many cases for readability as well. Where this was done, the original Hebrew and Greek meanings were used to preserve his intent. Passages in Owen's original work that had no reference are now marked to help the reader find them more easily. Where Owen cites the original Greek or Hebrew, a bracket containing [NT:xxxx] or [OT:xxxx] has been inserted with the Anglicized Greek/Hebrew word and Strong's numbers. Referenced but unquoted scriptures have been footnoted for your convenience.

A table of contents has been created to make it easier to locate particular passages and to serve as a general outline of the argument. Therefore, additional sub-headings have been added. I make no apologies for altering the text. My purpose is not to preserve Owen's original text as if it were Scripture, but to preserve his teaching and wisdom, organized and annotated. It would be a shame if the modern audience did not benefit from his labors because the language was too complex or arcane to comprehend.

And so I hope the restatement of this important work makes it more accessible to you, and that it brings home the importance of the doctrine he articulates from Scripture. We are seekers of Godly truth, not logic or human wisdom. These doctrines don't result from logic and reason alone, nor are they imposed on scripture by some system of theology. They are derived from the truth of God's word. Only the truth will enable us to see God as He is, and thereby come to know him (John 17:3).

William H. Gross

www.onthewing.org

© Jan 2004

PREFATORY NOTE

In the testimonies from the ancient fathers, which Owen appends to the following treatise, he quotes Augustine and Prosper as authorities in support of his own view of a definite and effectual atonement. Though these fathers held this view in opposition to the Pelagians and semi-Pelagians of their day, the point did not emerge into commanding prominence in the controversy with which their names are chiefly and honorably associated. It was by no means a subject of special controversy, or the key of their position in the field on which their polemical laurels were won. It was otherwise in the dispute which prevailed between Hincmar and Gottschalc, exactly four centuries later. The discussion on the extent of the atonement then assumed a distinct and positive shape. The decisions of the different councils which sat in judgment upon their conflicting principles will be found in the appendix to this treatise. The same controversy was renewed in Holland between the Gomarists and the Arminians, when the Synod of Dort, in one of its articles, condemned the Remonstrant doctrine of a universal atonement. Cameron, the accomplished professor of divinity at Saumur, originated the last important discussion on this point before Owen wrote his treatise on it. The views of Cameron were adopted and urged with great ability by two of his scholars, Amyraut and Testard; and in the year 1634 a controversy arose, which agitated the French Church for many years. Amyraut had the support of Daillé and Blondell. He was ably opposed by Rivet, Spanheim, and Des Marets.

In the last two instances in which discussion on the extent of the atonement revived in the Reformed Churches, there was an essential distinction, very commonly overlooked, between the special points upon which the controversies respectively turned. The object of the article on the death of Christ, emitted by the Synod of Dort, was to counteract the tenet that Christ by the atonement only acquired for the Father a plenary right and freedom to institute a new procedure with all men by which they might be saved on condition of their own obedience. The divines of Saumur would not have accepted this tenet as a correct representation of their sentiments. Admitting that the elect are infallibly secured in the enjoyment of salvation by the purpose of God and through the death of Christ, they contended for an antecedent decree by which God is free to give salvation to all men through Christ on the *condition* that they believe on him. Hence their system was termed *hypothetic universalism*. The vital difference between it and the strict Arminian theory, lies in the absolute security asserted in the former for the spiritual recovery of the elect. They agree, however, in attributing some kind of universality to the atonement, and in maintaining that, on a certain *condition*, within the reach of fulfilment by all men – generally obedience according to the Arminians, and faith according to the divines of Saumur – all men have access to the benefits of Christ's death. To impart consistency to the theory of Amyraut, faith must in some sense be competent to all men; and he held, accordingly, the doctrine of *universal grace*. In this respect, his theory differs essentially from the doctrine of universal atonement, as embraced by eminent Calvinistic divines, who held the necessity of the *special operation* of grace in order to exercise faith. The readers of Owen will understand, from this cursory explanation, why he dwells with peculiar keenness and reiteration of statements to refute the conditional system, or the system of *universal grace*, according to the name it bore in subsequent discussions. It was plausible; it had many learned men for its advocates; it had obtained currency in the foreign churches; and it seems to have been embraced by More, or

Moore, to whose work on “The Universality of God’s Free Grace,” our author replies at great length.

Thomas Moore is described by Edwards, in his “Gangraena,” part II. p. 86, as “a great sectarian, who did much harm in Lincolnshire, Norfolk, and Cambridgeshire; who was famous also in Boston, Lynn, and even in Holland, and was followed from place to place by many.” His work, in a quarto volume, was published in 1643; and in the same year a reply to it appeared from the pen of Thomas Whitefield, “Minister of the Gospel at Great Yarmouth.” Mr Orme remarks, “He takes care to inform us on the title-page that ‘Thomas Moore was of late a weaver at Wills, near Wisbitch.’” And he adds, in regard to Moore’s production, “Without approving of the argument of the work, I have no hesitation in saying that it is creditable to the talents of the weaver, and not discreditable to his piety.” The weaver, it should be added, was the author of some other works: “Discovery of Seducers that Creep into Houses,” “On Baptism,” “A Discourse about the Precious Blood and Sacrifice of Christ,” etc.

In 1650, Mr Horne, minister at Lynn in Norfolk, a man “of exemplary and primitive piety,” according to Palmer (Nonconf. Mem, III pp. 6, 7), and author of several works, published a reply to Owen’s work under the title, “The Open Door for Man’s Approach to God; or, a vindication of the record of God concerning the extent of the death of Christ, in answer to a treatise on that subject by Mr John Owen.” Horne had considerable reputation for skill in the oriental languages, and “some of his remarks and interpretations of Scripture,” in the judgment of Mr Orme, “were not unworthy of Owen’s attention.” Owen, however, in his epistle prefixed to his “Vindiciae Evangelicae,” expresses his opinion that the work of Horne did not deserve a reply.

Two years after the following work had been published, its author had to defend some of the views he had maintained in it against a more formidable and celebrated adversary. Richard Baxter, in an appendix to his “Aphorisms on Justification,” took exception to some of the views of Owen on redemption. Owen answered him in a treatise which may be regarded as an appendix to his “Death of Death.” In the discussions between them, so much of scholastic subtilty appears on both sides that little interest is likely to be felt in that department of the general question on which they were at variance.

It may be necessary to state precisely what opinion Owen really held on the subject of the extent of the atonement. All opinions on this point may, in general terms, be reduced to four. There are a few who hold that Christ died so as ultimately to secure the salvation of all men. There are others who maintain the view condemned by the Synod of Dort, that by the death of Christ God is enabled to save all or any, on condition of their obedience. There is a third party, who, while they believe that Christ died so as to infallibly secure the salvation of the elect, hold that inasmuch as Christ, in his obedience and sufferings, did what all men were under obligation to do, and suffered what all men deserved to suffer, his atonement has a general as well as a special aspect and reference, in virtue of which the offer of the gospel may be freely tendered to them. Lastly, there are those, and Owen amongst the number, who advocate a limited or definite atonement, such an atonement as implies a necessary connection between the death of Christ and the salvation of those for whom he died, while the actual bearing of the atonement on the lost is left among the things unrevealed, save only that their guilt and punishment are enhanced by the rejection of that mercy offered in the gospel. Hagenbach, in his “History of Doctrines,” vol. II. p. 255, strangely asserts, that “as regards the extent of the atonement, all denominations, with the exception of the Calvinists, hold that salvation was offered to all.” It would be difficult to specify any Calvinists worthy of the name who hold that salvation should not be offered to all; and it

seems needful to state that Owen at least, a very Calvinist of Calvinists, held no such view. On the contrary, among Calvinists that adhere to the doctrine of a definite atonement, it has been a matter of debate, not whether the gospel should be universally offered, but on what basis the universal offer of the gospel proceeds: the simple command and warrant of the Word, or the intrinsic and infinite sufficiency of the atonement. Perhaps this point was never formally before the mind of our author, but he intimates that the “innate sufficiency of the death of Christ is the foundation of its promiscuous proposal to the elect and reprobate.”

Among the editions of this valuable work, the one printed in Edinburgh in 1755 under the superintendence of the Rev. Adam Gib deserves honorable mention. It is printed with some care; considerable attention is paid to the numeration; and a valuable analysis of the whole work is prefixed to it. We have not felt at liberty to adopt the numeration in all respects, as rather more freedom is used with the original than is consistent with the principles on which this edition of Owen’s works has been issued. We acknowledge our obligations to it in the preparation of the subjoined analysis, which is mostly taken from it.

Editor - William H. Goold

c.1850-1853

Note to the Earl of Warwick
TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE
ROBERT, EARL OF WARWICK,¹ ETC.

MY LORD,

It is not to protect the ensuing treatise, nor to take advantage of your personal worth and honor, that prevailed upon me to boldly prefix your honored name to this ensuing treatise. Let the treatise stand or fall as it may by the judgments of men. And your character is what has truly ennobled your lordship, and made a way to deliver your family to posterity, with an eminent luster added to the roll of your worthy progenitors. If I desired to produce this treatise by myself, my unfitness to perform would necessarily render the performance unacceptable. Nor do I desire at all to attempt to further gain your lordship's favor by it. It would be far below what I have already received from you. And I am fully resolved to own no other esteem among the sons of men than what will be accounted by discharging my duty to my master, Jesus Christ. I would be wholly his.

I do not prefix your name for all or any one of these reasons, nor for anything like them, nor for the usual subjects and ends of dedications, real or pretended. It is only that I might take the opportunity to testify to all the world the response of my heart to the obligation that your lordship was pleased to place on me. You have bestowed the undeserved, undesired favor of opening the door you are entrusted with, to give me an entrance to that place where I was directed by the providence of the Most High to preach the gospel, and where I was sought by his people. I dare say, by the grace of God, that such a stock of prayers and thankfulness is tendered to and for your lordship as your heart will not despise, a heart which has learned to value the least of Christ, whomever it may *be*. And it is tendered on behalf of one who is less than the least of all the saints of God, and unworthy of the name which he still boldly subscribes to – Your honor's most obliged servant in the service of Jesus Christ,

JOHN OWEN.

¹ This nobleman is represented by Neal as having been “the greatest patron of the Puritans.” He was admiral of the parliamentary fleet. He seized on the ships belonging to the king, and during the whole course of the war made use of them against the royal interest. Owen had received the presentation to Coggeshall from this nobleman, whose upright and amiable character was celebrated long after his death under the designation of *The Good Earl Of Warwick*. – ED.

TO THE READER.

READER,

If you intend to go any further, I would entreat you to stay here a little. If you are, like many in this pretending age, *a sign or a title gazer*, and you come into challenges like Cato into the theater, only to go out again, then you have had your entertainment; farewell! But if you are someone resolved to take a serious view of the following discourse, and who really desires satisfaction from the word and Christian reason about the great things it contains, then I desire a few words in the doorway. There are various things affecting the business we have in hand, which I am persuaded you cannot be unacquainted with. Therefore I will not trouble you by needlessly repeating them.

I only crave your permission to preface this undertaking with the results of some of my thoughts after more than seven years of serious inquiry into the mind of God about these things. I hope, on Christ's strength, that they are grounded and guided by his Spirit. I will include a serious perusal of all I could attain that the wit of man, in former or latter days, has published in opposition to the truth. I would like the reader to observe some things concerning the main point.

First, the assertion of *universal redemption*, or general ransom, cannot reach its intended end alone. If it is accepted, then the election of free grace must also be removed. That is because election is the source of all resulting dispensations, and all selective purposes of the Almighty that depend on his own good pleasure and will. There are those who desire to retain the notion of eternally selective free grace, for the moment. But if they do, then they raze the whole imaginary fabric of general redemption that they erected, in respect to its fruit or profitable issue.

Some say there is a decree of election "prior to the death of Christ." What they frame, then, is a twofold election of some to be sons, and others to be servants. Yet, electing some to be servants is what the Scripture calls reprobation. It speaks of it as the consequence of hatred or rejection, Romans 9:11-13.¹ To be a servant, as opposed to having the liberty of children, is as high a curse as can be expressed (Genesis 9:25).² Is this Scriptural election? Besides, if Christ died to bring those for whom he died into the adoption and inheritance of children, then what good could possibly redound to those who were predestined only to be servants?

Others say there is a general conditional decree of redemption that precedes election. They assert that this is the first selective purpose concerning the sons of men, and that it depends on the good pleasure of God alone. They deny that anyone other than the elect will partake of the death of Christ or its fruits, whether grace or glory. Now, to what end? What purpose does a general ransom serve, except to assert that Almighty God would have the precious blood of his dear Son poured out for countless souls whom he will not allow to benefit from a single drop of it? And

¹ Rom 9:11-13: (For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calls;) It was said to her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, 'Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated.'

² Gen 9:25: And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be to his brothers.

so, in respect to them, his blood is spilt in vain, or it is shed for them only to damn them more deeply.

This fountain, then, of free grace, this foundation of the new covenant, this bottom of all gospel dispensations, this fruitful womb of all eternally selective mercies, this purpose of God according to election, must be opposed, slighted, and *blasphemed*, so that a figment of men may not appear to be nonsense. And all the thoughts of the Most High, which differentiate between man and man, must accommodate their holy, self-spiritual endeavors. This is a savory sacrifice to the Roman Belus,¹ a sacred orgy to the long-bewailed manes of St. Pelagius.

Secondly, free-will (which is corrupted nature's deformed darling, the Pallas,² or the beloved self-conception of darkened minds) finds open hearts and arms for its adulterous embraces. The die is cast and the Rubicon has been passed over.³ Free-will advances itself by opposing the free selective grace of God as its sole sworn enemy. It presents itself as an inbred native ability in everyone to take a portion of general mercy, under the name of free grace. This, *this*, is the universalists' free grace, which the Scripture calls our cursed, corrupted nature. It cannot be otherwise. A general ransom without free-will is only "a burdensome fancy." The merit of the death of Christ to them is like ointment in a box. It has no value or power to apply itself to anyone in particular. It is placed in everyone's view by the gospel, so that those who lay hold of it, and apply it to themselves by their own strength, may be healed. That is why this old idol named *free-will* has attained so dear an esteem and high valuation these days. The theory of a general ransom cannot live without it.

If what the Scripture affirms is true, that by nature we are "dead in trespasses and sins," then not a shred would be left of general ransom to take fire from the hearth. Like the wood of the vine, it would not yield a pin to hang a garment on.⁴ You will find all of this fully declared in the ensuing treatise. But here, it is as though all the efforts and Babylonian attempts of the old Pelagians, along with the late Arminians (their varnished offspring), were mild and easy. I will show you greater abominations than these, and further revelations of the imagery that exists in the hearts of men.

In supporting universal redemption, a number have come to deny the satisfaction and merit of Christ, as the theory naturally leads them to do. Witness P – H –, who being unable to untie it from free-will, boldly cut this Gordian knot, only to make both ends of the chain useless. To the question whether Christ died for all men or not, he answers, "He died neither for all nor any, so as to purchase life and salvation for them." If you ask for proofs of this assertion, you might justly expect Achillean arguments. Indeed, what you will hear are great swelling words of vanity, drum-like expressions, and noise from the emptiness. This is the usual language of men who do not know what they speak of, nor what they affirm. These are poor creatures, whose souls are merchandised by the painted faces of novelty and vanity. While these Joabs salute you with kisses of free grace, you do not see the sword that is in their hands, and with which they stab you under the fifth rib, in the very heartblood of faith and all Christian consolation.

¹ The Latin name for the Semitic god Baal – also Bacchus.

² Pallas Athena: Greek Goddess of wisdom

³ A limit that when passed over or exceeded, allows no return. When Julius Caesar defied the civil authority and crossed the River Rubicon with his army in 49 B.C, it began a civil war.

⁴ Ezek. 15:3.

Our blessed Redeemer's deep humiliation consists in a number of things: in bearing the chastisement of our peace and the punishment of our transgressions; being made a curse and sin; deserted under wrath and the power of death; procuring redemption and the remission of sins through the spilling of his blood; offering himself up as a sacrifice to God to make reconciliation, and to purchase an atonement; and pursuing this undertaking with continued intercession in the holy of holies, with all the benefits that flow from his mediation. It seems, according to the universalists, that all of this did not in any way procure life and salvation or remission of sins for us. It only served to declare that we are not what his word actually affirms we are – namely, cursed, guilty, defiled, and not yet cast into hell. “Judas, do you betray the Son of man with a kiss?” See this confuted at large, lib. 3.

Now, this last assertion that we are not cursed and corrupt, thoroughly fancied, has opened a door to all those pretended attainments of the human soul which have metamorphosed the person and mediation of Christ. His work has become an imaginary all-inclusive goodness and love, communicated from the Creator to the new creation. Cerdon's fables could not be more absurd. The Platonic numbers, and the Valentinian Eons were more intelligible than this. The corrosion of the Scriptures by that Pontic vermin Marcion could not equal the contempt and scorn that are cast on them by these impotent impostors. They exempt their whispered discoveries from their trial, and exalt their revelations beyond their authority. Nor do some stop here. Heaven itself is broken open for all to enter. From universal redemption, and through universal justification in a general covenant, they have arrived at universal salvation, whose purchased inheritance cannot be forfeited.

*“March on, brave youths, in the praise of such free grace,
Surround your locks with bays; and full cups place
In your right hands: drink freely on, then call
On the common hope, the ransom general.”¹*

I am not opposed to what motivates the pursuit of these and similar persuasions. They are wholly new to the men of this generation. Every age is engaged in the discovery of truth. We have not come to the end of vice or virtue. The whole world has practiced iniquity five thousand years and more, and yet “aspice hoc novum,” *behold this novelty*, may be set on many crimes. It is no wonder, then, that we hear such debates, if all truth is not yet discovered. Still, something may be revealed to those who have not made up their minds. Do not be shocked to find Saul among the prophets, for who is their father? Is God not free in his dispensations? Are all the depths of Scripture, where the elephants may swim, fathomed to their bottom? If anyone were to observe the progress of the last century in unfolding the truths of God, he would hardly claim that no more is left to be discovered.

I only desire to oppose the itching of corrupted fancies, the boldness of darkened minds, the lascivious and wanton wits, that invent newly created nothings that are insignificant vanities, mixed with a dash of blasphemy. And I especially oppose them considering the penchant among us these days, by one means or another, to be distracted by novelty. “Some are credulous, some negligent, some fall into errors, some seek them.” A great suspicion grows in me every day that pride of spirit, with a Herostratus-like design to ensure their fame,² has prompted many to

¹ Virg. Aen. 8:273, et seq.

² They say that in 356 B.C., **Herostratus**, in order to insure his immortal fame, burned down the great temple of Diana (Artemision) at Ephesus, one of the seven wonders of the ancient world.

conceive and publish some easily invented false opinions. And I might also think that this is the reason they strive to outdo their companions in framing some unique and clever device. To be a follower of others is too lowly an undertaking for them, and so we hear these desperate engagements.

What attracts the eyes of poor deluded souls must of course be glorious attainments, beyond the understanding of men, and above the wisdom of the world. May the great shepherd of the sheep, our Lord Jesus Christ, restore his poor wanderers to his own fold! This theory is a fatal Helena:¹ a useless, barren, fruitless fancy, whose enthronement has caused such irksome, tedious contentions to the churches of God. It is a mere Rome: a desolate, dirty place of cottages, until all the world is robbed and spoiled to adorn it.

Let us suppose that Christ died for all. If God in his free purpose has chosen some to obtain life and salvation, and has passed by others, will it profit only the *chosen*, or *all*? Surely the purpose of God must stand, and he will do what he wants. Therefore, either election, as Huberus says² with wild contradiction, must be universal, or the thoughts of the Most High depend on the free-will of man. If the free grace of God works effectually in some, but not in others, then can those others, whom this powerful grace has passed over, have any benefit by universal redemption? No more than the Egyptians had when the angel passed over those houses whose doors were not sprinkled with blood, leaving them dead behind him. Almighty, powerful, free grace, then, must drop its sail, so that free-will, like the Alexandrian ships coming into the Roman harbors, may come in with top sail unfurled and gallant. Without free-will, the whole territory of universal redemption will certainly be famished. But let these doctrines of God's eternal election, the free grace of conversion, perseverance, and their necessary consequences be asserted, and free-will becomes laughable. The only profit or consolation that free-will has is what it robs from the sovereignty and grace of God. But more about these things later.

Some pretences are usually made by those who advocate *general ransom*. With your patience, courteous reader, we will examine them a little at the start, to remove any prejudice that may lie in the way of truth:

First, they say that the glory of God is exalted by a general ransom; his *good will and kindness towards men are abundantly shown by enlarging the extent of the ransom*. And his free grace, which is restrained by others, is presented as a powerful endearment. They say, in effect, "All things will be well when God is content with that portion of glory which we ourselves assign." The princes of the earth consider it their greatest wisdom to make their favors sound better than they are, to describe with a full mouth what they have done with half a hand. Is it acceptable to lie for God by extending his bounty beyond the marks and eternal bounds assigned to it in his word? Change a hair on your own head, or add a cubit to your own stature, before you add some glory to the Almighty that he does not claim. But, for the most part, this is how the corrupted nature treats all such mysterious things, revealing its own baseness and vileness.

They say that if God's grace extends to all offenders, though his grace is free, and he does what he wills with his own, then all shall be well – he is gracious, merciful, etc. But if the Scripture is

¹ [Helen of Troy](#) whose beauty seduced Paris and led to the Trojan war.

² Origen taught that even the devils who have been chosen will be saved. In the 16th century Puccius and [Huberus](#) repeated his teachings.

once found to present his sovereignty and free selective grace according to election, then he is monstrous, mean, evil, and dreadful. Such pride is inbred; it is a part of our corruption to want to defend it. If we seek to uphold the glory of God, then let us speak in his own language, or be forever silent. What is glorious in him is what he ascribes to himself. Our inventions, as splendid as they may be in our own eyes, are an abomination to him, an attempt to pull him down from his eternal excellence, and to make him completely like us. God would never allow the will of the creature to be the measure of his honor. The obedience of paradise was a regulated obedience. God's prescription has been the basis for accepting any duty ever since he had a creature to worship him. Even the heathen knew that the only service welcome to God was what he himself required, and the only glory he would accept was what he himself revealed, so that he would appear glorious in it. Hence, Epimenides advised the Athenians in a time of danger to sacrifice "to him to whom it was acceptable and due."¹ This resulted in the altar which Paul saw bearing the inscription, "To the unknown God." Socrates tells us in Plato,² that every god will be worshipped "in that way which pleases best his own mind." And in Christianity, Jerome³ sets it down as a rule that God is dishonored by any honor which is ascribed to him beyond his own prescription. It is based wittily on the second commandment. Assigning anything to God that is not assigned by him is *making to ourselves an idol*; we are deifying our own imaginations. Men should cease squaring the glory of God by their own corrupted principles and more corrupted persuasions. The word alone is the arbitrator in the things of God. I hope that the following treatise will present nothing contrary to those natural notions of God and his goodness that have been retained in the sad ruins of our innocence. On these grounds, we affirm that any of that glory of God which a general ransom pretends to assert, however glorious it may seem to our purblind nature, is indeed a sinful flourish; for it obscures that glory in which God is delighted.

Secondly, it is pretended that the worth and value of the satisfaction of Christ are magnified by extending them to all. I can only desire the reader's sincere consideration of what was said before, as this matter is of no small importance. Besides extending the things of God beyond the bounds which he himself set for them, the merit of the death of Christ is robbed of its strength and overthrown by it. It is made meaningless, as if it never produced the least good to anyone. The merit of Christ consists of its own internal worth and sufficiency, along with that obligation which, because of his obedience unto death, calls upon the justice of God for its application to those for whom he died. This is fully manifested in the following treatise.

Thirdly, There is a seeming warrant for universal redemption by many texts of Scripture. The words of these texts are ambiguous. Although they are figurative or indefinite, they still seem to indicate a universal extent. This makes the supporters of universalism rejoice. Now, concerning this apparent Scriptural foundation, I only desire that the reader not be startled at the many passages which have been gathered by some lately (especially Thomas Moore, in his "Universality of Free Grace"), as though they prove the point. Rather, prepare to admire the confidence of men like Mr. Moore, who make such a flourish with their colors and drums, but have no soldiers at all. For, notwithstanding all their pretences, it will become apparent that they hang the whole weight of their building on three or four texts of Scripture (1Tim. 2:5, 6; John 3:16, 17; Heb. 2:9; and 1Jn. 2:2). And the use of those hangs on the ambiguity of two or three

¹ Laert. in Vit. Epimen.

² Plato de Legib., lib. 7.

³ "Hierome" in Owen's original text.

words, which they must agree are variously understood. Not one passage has been presented by our adversaries, in their own defense, that can show the least grounds for opposing the effectual redemption of the elect only. Thomas Moore's book will be fully addressed, and robbed of all its own strength.

Fourthly, some men have been persuaded that the opinion of the universalists serves to present the love and free grace of God. They make that glorious expression, "free grace," the only thing that is being couched in universalism: "God loves all alike, gave Christ to die for all, and is ready to save all, if they will lay hold on him." We experience daily how greedily the hook and bait of this notion is swallowed by many. The truth is, universalism completely destroys the free selective grace of God in all its dispensations and workings. It obviously opposes God's free grace of election, as declared, and so too the very love from which God sent his Son. The free grace of God's *Effectual calling* must also give way to nature's darling, freewill. Indeed, the whole covenant of grace is voided by universalism's general removal of the wrath due to the breach of the covenant of works. What else could they imagine is granted to those "all" with whom they assert this covenant was made? They certainly have not imagined John 3:36.¹ Notwithstanding their flourish of free grace, they are forced to grant that despite all that Christ's death effected, it is still possible that no one will be saved. So I hope I have clearly proved that if he accomplished no more by his death than what they ascribe to it, then it is utterly impossible for anyone to be saved.

Fifthly, the opinion of universal redemption has an advantage by presenting a ready way for convinced men to extricate themselves from all their doubts and anxieties. It gives them all the comfort that the death of Christ can afford before they actually feel the power of that death working within them. They do not need free grace to effectually draw their hearts to embrace Christ in the promise, nor do they need to obtain a particular interest in him. These are tedious things for flesh and blood to confront and await. Some boast that, by using this approach in evangelism, they have effected in an hour what they formerly waited seven years for without success. To dispel this empty flourish, I will show that this opinion is apt to deceive multitudes with a plausible delusion. But in reality, it undermines the very foundations of that strong unflinching consolation that God has abundantly shown he wants the heirs of the promise to receive.

These and similar falsehoods are the general pretences with which the promoters of general ransom commend themselves and their opinion to the emotions of credulous people. They use them to make an open and easy passage into their belief, to have them swallow and digest that bitter potion which lurks in the bottom of their cup. I thought it appropriate to give the reader a brief view of them in the introduction, to get beyond empty generalities, so that he might be better prepared to weigh all these things carefully in an equal balance. Later, the reader will come to consider those things in which the great strength of our adversaries lies. It only remains for me to give the Christian reader a brief account of why I have undertaken this work, and thus close this preface.

First, may I assure you that it was not my desire to drink the waters of Meribah,² or share in Ishmael's portion,¹ to put my hand against others, or to have theirs placed against me, that put

¹ John 3:36: He that believes on the Son has everlasting life: and he that believes not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abides on him.

² That is, to be contentious.

me on this task. I never like myself worse than when I am faced with the role of disputing in controversies. The complexion of my soul is much more pleasant to me in the waters of Shiloah:²

Eccl 2:25, "For who can eat, or hasten more to this than I?"

I do not know what attraction there can be to visit, much less stay, in this quarrelsome, struggling territory, where, as Tertullian says of Pontus, "no wind blows but what is sharp and keen."³ There is little pleasure in taking walks beside dangerous precipices with unpleasant difficulties on every side:

NO quiet nor peace in these things and ways, but continual brawls and dissensions: 4

The strongest bonds of our nearest relations are too commonly broken by such quarrels. I could willingly resolve to flee all wordy battles and paper combats for the remainder of my days except for two things: the precept of Jude 3 to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," and the soundings from my depths for the loss of poor seduced souls.

It is not, then, any salamandrian complexion⁵ that motivated this undertaking. Nor was it any conceit of my own abilities for this work, as though I were the best qualified to undertake it. I know that, as in all things, I am "less than the least of all saints."⁶

Abler pens⁷ in the last few years have discussed and aired out some of these questions in our own language. Some of these writings have come to my hands, but none of any weight before I had nearly finished this heap of my own. That was some twelve months ago or more. I was fully satisfied that they all answered parts of the controversy, especially objections, but none encompassed the whole. I discerned the things underlying the debate, such as satisfaction, reconciliation, and redemption, were left in the dark; the strong foundation of the whole was missing. It was always my desire that someone would undertake the main part of the debate, and unfold from the word the foundation of the whole dispensation of the love of God to his elect in Jesus Christ. I hoped they would include its conveyance through the promises of the gospel, which are all the fruits of that love, purchased and procured by the oblation and intercession of Jesus Christ. From this, the great design of the blessed Trinity in this great work of redemption would become apparent. It would also become clear how vain and fruitless it is to extend this love and its fruits beyond the bounds assigned to it by the principal agents involved. I very much wished that arguments might also be produced to confirm the truth we assert, and oppose the errors, thus establishing the weak and convincing the dissenters. The doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ, his merit, and the reconciliation which results, are correctly understood by few, and lately opposed by some. Because these things are closely related to redemption, I also desired to see them clarified, unfolded, and vindicated by an able pen. After waiting a long time, I have found none to answer my expectations.

¹ To create divisions and become an outcast.

² What flows gently and soothes the soul.

³ Ad.Mar.

⁴ Ovid. Met. 2:79

⁵ A reference to a mythical lizard-like monster that lived in fire to quench its body's chill.

⁶ Eph. 3:8

⁷ *Vindication of Redemption*, by my reverend and learned brother, Mr. John Stalham; Mr. Rutherford, *Christ Drawing Sinners*.

Looking to Him who supplies seed to the sower, and does all our works for us, I suffered myself to undertake the work I expected of another. "I would rather it be done by any than myself, but rather myself than none." This is especially true considering the industrious diligence of those who oppose truth these days.

Add to these considerations the frequent conferences I have been invited to about these things, the daily spreading near my home of the opinions that I oppose here, an increasing noise as they prevail in other places, the advantage they have gained through some military supporters, and the agitation of various eminent and learned friends, and you have the reasons for my undertaking this task. What the Lord has enabled me to do in this endeavor must be left to the judgment of others. I am not entirely hopeless of success, but I am fully resolved that I will not live to see a solid answer given to it.

If anyone tries to pluck some of the branches, torn from the roots and principles of the whole discourse, I freely give them leave to enjoy their own wisdom and imaginary conquest. If anyone seriously undertakes to debate the whole cause, if I live to see it effected, I will engage myself, by the Lord's assistance, to be their humble convert, or their fair antagonist. In what has already been accomplished by the good hand of the Lord, I hope the learned may find something for their contentment, and the weak for their strengthening and satisfaction. In all of this, may some glory redound to the One who owns it, and whose truth is unfolded here by the unworthiest laborer in his vineyard.

J.O.

BOOK I

CHAPTER 1 - The Purpose of the Death of Christ

By the purpose of the death of Christ, we generally mean first, what his Father and he intended in it; and, secondly, what was effectually fulfilled and accomplished by it. Concerning either, we may take a brief view of the expressions used by the Holy Ghost.

I. The intent in the death of Christ

FIRST, do you want to know the purpose for and intent with which Christ came into the world? Let us ask the One who knew his mind and all the secrets of his Father's heart. He will tell us that the "Son of man came to save what was lost," Matt. 18:11, to recover and save poor lost sinners. That was his intent and his design, as it is again asserted in Luke 19:10. Ask also his apostles, who know his mind, and they will tell you the same. So Paul says in 1Tim. 1:15, "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." Now, if you ask who these sinners are towards whom he has this gracious intent and purpose, Christ himself tells you in Matt. 20:28, that he came to "give his life a ransom for many."

In other places, these sinners are called believers, as distinguished from the world. For he "gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father," Gal. 1:4. That was the will and intention of God, that Christ would give himself for us, that we might be saved, being separated from the world. They are his church: Eph. 5:25-27, "He loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it would be holy and without blemish." These last words also express the very aim and end of Christ in giving himself for anyone. He did it so that they may be made fit for God, and brought near to him. A like assertion is made in Tit. 2:14: "He gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a special people, zealous of good works." Thus the intention and design of Christ and his Father in this great work are clear and apparent. We know what it was, and towards whom it was directed, namely, to save us. It was to deliver us from the evil world, to purge and wash us, to make us holy, zealous, fruitful in good works, to render us acceptable, and to bring us to God. For through him "we have access into the grace in which we stand." Rom. 5:2.

II. The Effect of the Death of Christ

The effect and actual product of the work itself is no less clearly manifested than its intent. What is accomplished and fulfilled by the death, blood-shedding, or oblation of Jesus Christ, is just as fully expressed, and very often more distinctly.

First, Reconciliation with God

God reconciles us to himself by removing and slaying the enmity that was between him and us. For "when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son," Rom. 5:10. "God was in him reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses to them," 2Cor. 5:19. He has "reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ," verse 18. If you want to know how this reconstruction was effected, the apostle will tell you that "he abolished in his flesh the enmity, the law of commandments consisting in ordinances, to make one new man in himself from two,

so making peace; and that he might reconcile both to God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby," Eph. 2:15, 16: so that "he is our peace," verse 14.

Secondly, Justification

Christ justifies us by taking away the guilt of our sins, procuring remission and pardon for them. He redeems us from their power, along with the curse and wrath that are due to us for them. For "by his own blood he entered into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us," Heb. 9:12. "He redeemed us from the curse, being made a curse for us," Gal. 3:13; "his own self bearing our sins in his own body on the tree," 1Pet. 2:24. We have "all sinned, and come short of the glory of God;" but are "justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God has set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins," Rom. 3:23-25. For "in him we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins," Col. 1:14.

Thirdly, Sanctification

The Holy Spirit sanctifies us by purging away the uncleanness and pollution of our sins, renewing in us the image of God, and supplying us with the graces of the Spirit of holiness. For "the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself to God, purges our consciences from dead works that we may serve the living God," Heb. 9:14. In fact, "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin," 1Jn. 1:7. "By himself he purged our sins," Heb. 1:3. To "sanctify the people with his own blood, he suffered outside the gate," Heb. 13:12. "He gave himself for the church to sanctify and cleanse it, so that it would be holy and without blemish," Eph.5:25-27. Uniquely among the graces of the Spirit, "it is given to us, for Christ's sake, to believe on him," Phil 1:29; God "blessing us in him with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places," Eph. 1:3.

Fourthly, Adoption

We are adopted, with that evangelical liberty and all those glorious privileges pertaining to the sons of God. For "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons," Gal 4:4, 5.

Fifthly, Glorification

Nor do the effects of the death of Christ rest here. They do not leave us until we are settled in heaven, in glory and immortality forever. Our inheritance is a "purchased possession," Eph 1:14. "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, those who are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance," Heb. 9:15. The sum of all this is that the death and blood-shedding of Jesus Christ has wrought, and effectually procures, for all those who are concerned, eternal redemption. That consists in grace here, and glory hereafter.

III. The Intent and Effect is Limited

Thus the expressions in the Scripture concerning the ends and effects of the death of Christ are so full, clear, and evident, that a man would think everyone might run and read it. But we must pause: among all things in Christian religion, scarcely anything is more questioned than this seemingly fundamental principle. There is a spreading persuasion that a general ransom was paid by Christ for all; that he died to redeem *everyone*. He did not die only for his church, the elect of God, but for *all* of Adam's posterity. Now, the masters of this opinion see full well that if that is

the end of the death of Christ, and the effects mentioned are the immediate fruits and products of that death, then one of two things will necessarily follow:

Either, first, that God and Christ failed to accomplish what they intended; the death of Christ was not a fit means to attain that end. To assert such a thing seems blasphemously injurious to the wisdom, power, and perfection of God. And it is likewise derogatory to the worth and value of the death of Christ;

Or else, second, that all men, the entire posterity of Adam, must be saved, purged, sanctified, and glorified. Surely these advocates of universal redemption will not maintain that, because the Scripture and the woeful experience of millions will not allow it. Therefore, to cast a tolerable color on their persuasion, they must deny that God or his Son had any such absolute aim or end in the death or blood-shedding of Jesus Christ. They must deny that any such thing was immediately procured and purchased by his death, as we recounted before. Instead, they assert that God intended nothing, nor was anything effected by Christ. No immediate benefit arises to anyone by his death except what is common to all and every soul, no matter how cursedly unbelieving here and eternally damned hereafter. No benefit arises until an act of faith, not procured for them by Christ, distinguishes them from others. For if it were procured for them by Christ, why would they all not have it alike?

Now, this seems to me to enervate the virtue, value, fruits and effects of the satisfaction and death of Christ. Besides that, it serves as a basis and foundation for a dangerous, uncomfortable, and erroneous persuasion. Therefore, by the Lord's assistance, I will declare what the Scripture holds out related to both the assertion they make, and what they present to prove it. I desire the Lord to lead us into all truth by his Spirit, to give us understanding in all things, and if anyone thinks otherwise, to reveal that to him also.

CHAPTER II – The General Nature of any Purpose

Of the nature of an end in general, and some distinctions about it.

I. The Distinction between End and Means

The end of anything is what the agent intends to accomplish by an operation that is proper to the nature of that end, and that is applied to it. It is what anyone aims at and designs to attain. It is a thing that is good and desirable to that person in his state and condition. So Noah's end in building the ark was to preserve himself and others. According to the will of God, he made an ark to preserve himself and his family from the flood: "He did it according to all that God commanded him," Gen. 6:22. What the agent does or applies himself to within the scope of his proposed end is called the means. In free intellectual agents, these two things, end and means, complete the whole reason for working. I speak only of those who work according to choice or election. So Absalom, intending a revolt against his father, and to procure the crown and kingdom for himself, "prepared horses and chariots, and fifty men to run before him," 2Sam. 15:1. Further, by attractive words and misleading acquiescence, "he stole the hearts of the men of Israel" verse 6. He then pretends a sacrifice at Hebron, where he establishes a strong conspiracy, verse 12. All of which were the means he used to attain his end.

II. The Relation of End to Means

There is a such a relationship between end and means that (in various ways) they are mutual causes of one another. The end is the first, principal, moving cause of the whole. That is, the

whole work is for the sake of the end. No agent applies himself to action without an end in mind; and were he not determined to produce some certain effect, he would not choose to do one thing more than another. The inhabitants of the old world, intending to produce unity and a common habitat, and perhaps to provide for their safety against a second storm, cry, "Go to, let us build us a city, and a tower whose top may reach to heaven; and let us make a name for ourselves, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth," Gen. 9:4. First, they lay out their aim and design, and then they determine the means that are conducive to attaining it. It is manifest, then, that the reasoning and method a wise worker or agent uses, and executes according to a plan of action, is taken from the end that he aims at. That is, the beginning of that work, in his intention and methodology, is its end.

Now, the means are all those things which are used to attain the end proposed, such as meat to preserve life, sailing in a ship to pass over the sea, or laws to quietly continue human society. They are the procuring cause of the end, in one kind or another. They exist for the end's sake, and the end is motivated by them. The end follows them either morally as their desert, or naturally as their fruit and product.

First, in a moral sense. When the action and the end are to be measured or considered in reference to a moral rule, or a law that is prescribed to the agent, then the means are the deserving or meritorious cause of the end. If Adam had continued in his innocence, and done all things according to the law given to him, then the end procured by his obedience would have been a blessed life to eternity, just as now the end of any sinful act is death, the curse of the law.

Secondly, when the means are considered only in their natural relation, then they are the efficient instrumental cause of the end. So Joab, intending the death of Abner, "smote him with his spear under the fifth rib, so that he died," 2Sam. 3:27. And when Benaiah, by the command of Solomon, fell on Shimei, the wounds he gave him were the efficient and instrumental cause of his death, 1Kings 2:46. In this regard, there is no difference between murdering an innocent man and executing an offender. But under a moral consideration, their ends will only follow what they deserve with regard to their conformity to the rule. And so there is *chasma megas* [a large gap] between them.

III. The Ends are either of the Work, or of the Worker

Considering what has been said, and the defect and perverseness of some agents, there is a twofold end of things. First, there is what the work itself produces (the act), and, secondly, there is the intent of the workman (the actor). When the means chosen are not fit to attain the end, according to the rule that the agent is to work by, then it is inevitable that he will aim at one thing and attain another (with regard to the morality of the work). So it was when Adam was enticed by his desire to be like God. He made that his aim. To effect it, he ate the forbidden fruit. That contracted a guilt that he did not aim at. But when the agent acts rightly, as he should, and he aims at a proper end according to his condition, and he works by means that are fit and suitable to the end proposed, *then the end of the work and the intent of the workman are one and the same*. When Abel intended to worship the Lord, he offered a sacrifice through faith, which was acceptable to the Lord. A man desiring salvation through Christ, applies himself to gain an interest in him. Now, the sole reason for this diversity between the act and the actor is that secondary agents, which men are, have an end assigned to their actions by God. It gives them an external rule or law to work by. This rule always attends their work, whether they want it to or not. God's will and good pleasure is the sole rule of all those works which outwardly belong to

him. Therefore, *only God can never deviate in his actions, nor have any end accompany or follow his acts that he does not precisely intend.*

IV. The End is either the Benefit, or the Beneficiary

Again, the end of every free agent is either what he effects, or for whose sake he effects it. When an agent builds a house to sell or rent, what he effects is the house; what moves him to do it is his love of gain. The physician cures the patient, and is moved to do it by his reward. The end which Judas Iscariot aimed at by going to the priests, bargaining with them, conducting the soldiers to the garden, and kissing Christ, was to betray his Master; but the end that motivated the whole undertaking was obtaining thirty pieces of silver for himself: "What will you give me if I deliver him?" (Matt. 26:15). The end which God effected by the death of Christ was to satisfy his justice: the end for whose sake he did it was either primarily his own glory, or subordinately our glory with him.

V. Means are either innately good, or they are conducive to the end

Means are of two sorts:

First, there are means which are truly good in themselves, without reference to any further purpose; though we do not consider them so when we use them only as a means to an end. No means, as a means, is considered good in itself. It is good only as it is conducive to a further end. It is repugnant to the nature of means to consider them as good in themselves. Study is the most noble employment of the soul; but if we are aiming at wisdom or knowledge, we consider it good only if it conducts us to that end. Otherwise, it merely "wearies the flesh," Eccl. 12:12.

Secondly, there are means which have no good at all, considered in themselves. They are good merely only as they are conducive to the end which they are fit to attain. They receive all their goodness (which is a relative assessment) from what they are appointed to do, though in themselves they are not desirable in any way. For example: cutting off a leg or an arm to preserve life, taking a bitter potion for health's sake, or throwing corn and cargo into the sea to prevent a shipwreck. This is the nature of the death of Christ, as we will declare afterward.

VI. Applying the Propositions

These things being generally proposed, our next task must be to accommodate them to the present business in hand. We will do this in order by presenting the agent working, the means employed, and the end effected in the great work of our redemption. These three must be considered distinctly and in order, so that we may rightly apprehend the whole. Concerning the first of these, *sun theo* [with God], we introduce the third chapter.

CHAPTER III - The Authority of the Father

This chapter concerns the agent or chief author of the work of our redemption, agency being distinctly ascribed to the person of the Father.

I. The Joint Effort of the Trinity

The agent and chief author of this great work of our redemption, is the whole blessed Trinity. This is because all the works which outwardly belong to the Deity are undivided. They belong to each person of the godhead equally, observing their distinct manner of subsistence and order. It is true, there were various other instrumental causes in the oblation (or passion) of Christ, but the

work cannot in any sense be ascribed to them [i.e. to Judas, the Jews, the Roman guards, etc.]. With regard to God the Father, the result of their endeavors was contrary to their own intentions. In the end, they did nothing but what the "hand and counsel of God had before determined should be done," Acts 4:28. And with regard to Christ, they were incapable of accomplishing what they aimed at, for he laid down his own life and no one was able to take it from him, John 10:17, 18. So they are to be excluded from this consideration. The Scripture proposes distinct and various acts or operations uniquely assigned to each of the several persons of the holy Trinity, the joint author of the whole work. And, according to our weak way of understanding, we are to consider them severally and apart. We will do so, beginning with those ascribed to the Father.

II. The Role of the Father

There are two specific acts in this work of our redemption by the blood of Jesus that may be properly assigned to the person of the *Father*. First, sending his Son into the world for this employment. Secondly, laying on him the punishment due to our sin.

1. The Father Sends the Son

The Father loves the world, and sent his Son to die: He "sent his Son into the world that the world might be saved through him," John 3:16, 17. "Sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, He condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us," Rom. 8:3,4. He "set him forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood," Rom. 3:25. For "when the fullness of the time had come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive the adoption of sons," Gal. 4:4, 5.

More than twenty times, the Gospel of John mentions this sending of the Son. Our Savior describes himself as, "Him whom the Father has sent," John 10:36; and he describes the Father as, "He who sent me," chap. 5:37. So this action of sending is appropriate to the Father, according to his promise that he would "send us a Savior, a great one, to deliver us," Isa. 19:20; and according to the profession of our Savior, "I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I: and now the Lord God, and his Spirit, has sent me," Isa. 48:16. Hence, the Father himself is sometimes called our Savior: 1Tim. 1:1, "According to the commandment of God our Savior." Some copies, indeed, read, "of God and our Savior." But the interposition of that particle "*kai*" arose, doubtless, from a misapprehension that Christ alone is called Savior. The phrase is the same one found in the direct parallel passage of Titus 1:3, "According to the commandment of God our Savior." Here, there is no interposition of the conjunctive particle "*kai*." The same title is also ascribed to him in other places, such as Luke 1:47, "My spirit has rejoiced in God my Savior." Also, 1Tim. 4:10, "We trust in the living God, who is the Savior of all men, specially of those who believe." Though, in this last place, it is not ascribed to him with reference to redeeming us by Christ. Instead, it is ascribed to him by saving and preserving us all by his providence. See also Tit. 2:10, 3:4; Deut. 32:15; 1Sam 10:19; Ps. 24:5, 25:5; Isa. 12:2, 40:10, 45:15; Jer. 14:8; Micah 7:7; and Hab. 3:18. Most of these places refer to his sending Christ. This is divided into three separate acts, which we must lay down in order:

(1.) The Father imposes the Office of Mediator

There is an authoritative imposition of the office of Mediator. Christ embraced it by his voluntarily acceptance. He willingly underwent the office in which the Father exercised a kind of superiority by his dispensation. The Son, though "in the form of God," humbled himself to it, Phil 2:6-8. This commissioning may be conceived as having two parts:

[1.] There is a purposed imposition of the Father's eternal counsel for setting apart his Son incarnate to this office. He said to him, "You are my Son; this day I have begotten you. Ask of me, and I will give you the nations for your inheritance, and the furthest parts of the earth for your possession," Ps. 2:7, 8. He also said to him, "Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool," for "the Lord swore, and will not repent, you are a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek," Ps. 110:1, 4. He appointed him to be "heir of all things," Heb. 1:2, having "ordained him to be Judge of the quick and the dead," Acts 10:42. To this, he was "ordained before the foundation of the world," 1Pet. 1:20, and "determined, (NT:3724, *horizo*), to be the Son of God with power," Rom. 1:4, "so that he might be the first-born among many brethren," chap. 8:29.

I know that this imposition of the office of Mediator is an act eternally established in the mind and will of God. And so it is not to be arranged in order with the other acts, which are all temporary, and had their beginning in the fullness of time. This is the spring and fountain of all those others according to James in Acts 15:18, "All his works from the beginning of the world are known to God." Yet, aiming at truth and not exactness, we present it in this arrangement. It is not unusual to say that the purpose is understood in what brings its accomplishment.

[2.] Then there is the actual inauguration of Christ into his office. This involves "committing all judgment unto the Son," John 5:22; "making him to be both Lord and Christ," Acts 2:36; "appointing him over his whole house," Heb. 3:1-6. This is the "anointing of the most Holy," Dan. 9:24; God "anointing him with the oil of gladness above his fellows" Ps. 45:7. The actual setting apart of Christ to his office is by anointing because all of those holy things which were types of him, such as the ark, the altar, etc., were set apart and consecrated by anointing, Exod. 30:25-28, etc. To this inauguration also belongs the public testimony by countless angels from heaven at his nativity, and declared by one of them to the shepherds. "Behold," he says, "I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people; for a Savior is born to you this day in the city of David, which is Christ the Lord," Luke 2:10, 11. This message was closed with that triumphant exultation of the host of heaven, "Glory be to God on high, on earth peace, towards men good will," verse 14. Afterward, it was repeated by that voice which came from the excellent glory, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well-pleased," Matt. 3:7, 17:5; 2Pet. 1:7. If these things ought to be distinguished, and placed in order, then they may be considered in these three separate acts:

First, the Father made the glorious proclamation at Christ's nativity, when he "prepared him a body," Heb. 10:5. He brought his First-begotten into the world saying, "Let all the angels of God worship him" chap. 1:6, sending them to proclaim the message that we recounted before.

Secondly, he visibly sent the Spirit, in the form of a dove, to light upon him at the time of his baptism, Matt. 3:16. This is when he was endowed with a fullness of the Spirit to accomplish the work and discharge the office he was designed for. It was attended with that voice by which he owned him from heaven as his only-beloved.

Thirdly, He “crowned him with glory and honor” in his resurrection, ascension, and sitting down “at the right hand of the Majesty on high.” Heb. 1:3. He set “him as his king upon his holy hill of Zion,” Ps. 2:6, when “all power was given unto him in heaven and in earth,” Matt. 28:18, and “all things were put under his feet” Heb. 2:7, 8. He was highly exalted, and “given a name above every name,” Phil. 2:9-11. It pleased him to appoint witnesses of all sorts: angels from heaven, Luke 24:4, Acts 1:10; the dead out of the graves, Matt. 27:52; the apostles among the living, Acts 2:32; and along with those, more than five hundred brethren, to whom he appeared at once, 1Cor. 15:6.

Thus he was gloriously inaugurated into his office, God saying to him, “It is a light thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give you for a light to the Gentiles that you may be my salvation to the ends of the earth,” Isa. 49:6.

Between these two acts, a twofold promise of God intercedes:

One is *giving a Savior* to his people, a Mediator, according to his former purpose as revealed in Gen. 3:15, “The seed of the woman shall break the serpent’s head;” and, “The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, till Shiloh come; and to him shall be the gathering of the people,” Gen. 49:10. He also foreshadowed this with many sacrifices and other types, and with prophetic predictions: “the prophets have inquired and searched diligently concerning this salvation. They prophesied of the grace that would come to you, searching for the time or manner that the Spirit of Christ in them signified. It testified beforehand about the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that would follow. To them it was revealed that they ministered, not to themselves but to us, the things now reported to you by those who have preached the gospel to you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; these are things the angels desire to look into,” 1Pet 1:10-12.

The other is a promise to *apply the benefits* purchased by this Savior, so designed for those who would believe on him. They are to be given in the fullness of time, according to the former promises. The Father told Abraham that “in his seed all the families of the earth would be blessed,” and he justified himself by this same faith in the promise, Gen. 12:3, 15:6. But these blessings belong entirely to the application, which was equal both before and after his actual mission.

(2.) *The Father Furnishes the Son for his Office*

The second act of the Father in sending the Son, is furnishing him with a fullness of all the gifts and graces that might in any way be requisite to,

1. the office he was to undertake,
2. the work he was to undergo, and
3. the charge he had over the house of God.

Indeed, in Christ there was a twofold fullness and perfection of all spiritual excellences:

First, there was the natural all-sufficient perfection of his Deity. He was as one with his Father with regard to his divine nature, for his glory was “the glory of the only-begotten of the Father,” John 1:14. He was “in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God,” Phil. 2:6, being the “fellow of the LORD of hosts,” Zech. 13:7. From which we have that glorious appearance in Isaiah 6:3, 4, when the seraphims cried one to another saying, “Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory. And the posts of the door moved at the

voice of the one who cried, and the house was filled with smoke." And the prophet cried, "My eyes have seen the King, the LORD of hosts," 6:5. Concerning this vision, the apostle says, "Isaiah saw him, and spoke of his glory," John 12:41. As it were, he emptied himself of this glory for a season when he was "found in the form" or condition "of a servant, humbling himself unto death," Phil. 2:7, 8. He laid aside the glory that attended his Deity, outwardly appearing to have "neither form, nor beauty, nor comeliness, that he should be desired," Isa. 53:2 But we do not treat of this fullness. It was not communicated to him, but essentially belonged to his person, which is eternally begotten of the person of his Father.

The second fullness in Christ was a communicated fullness. It was in him by dispensation from his Father, bestowed on him to fit him for his work and office. He was and is the "Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus," 1Tim. 2:5. This fullness is in him, not as he is the "LORD of hosts," but as he is "Emmanuel, God with us," Matt. 1:23. It is in him as he was a "son given to us, called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace, with the government upon his shoulders," Isa. 9:6. It is a fullness of grace. It is not that essential nature of the Deity, but what is habitual and infused into his humanity, as personally united to his other nature. Though it is not absolutely infinite, as his other nature is, yet it extends itself to all perfections of grace, with regard to both its parts and degrees. There is no grace that is not in Christ. Every grace is in him, and in the highest degree. So whatever the perfection of grace requires, either for the several kinds or respective advancements of that grace, is in him habitually. It is in him by his Father's arrangement for this very purpose, and to accomplish the work designed for him. This work, though not properly infinite, is boundless and endless. It is in him as the light is in the beams of the sun, and as water is in a living fountain which can never fail.

He is the "candlestick" from where the "golden pipes empty the golden oil out of themselves" (Zech. 4:12) and into all that are his. For he is "the beginning, the first-born from the dead, in all things having the pre-eminence; for it pleased the Father that in him all fullness should dwell;" Col.1:18, 19. In him God caused to be "hid all the treasurer of wisdom and knowledge," Col. 2:3; and "in him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily (NT:4985, *somatikos*)," that is, substantially or personally, verse 9. And this, so that "of his fullness we might all receive grace for grace" (John 1:16), in a continual supply. And so, setting upon the work of redemption, he first looks at this. "The Spirit of the Lord God," he says, "is upon me; because the LORD has anointed me to preach good tidings to the meek; he has sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to those who are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the LORD, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn," Isa. 61:1, 2.

This was the "anointing with the oil of gladness" which he had "above his fellows," Ps. 45:7; "it was upon his head, and ran down to his beard, indeed, down to the skirts of his garments," Ps. 133:2, so that everyone covered with the garment of his righteousness might be made partaker of it. "The Spirit of the LORD rested on him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD," Isa. 11:2. And this spirit was not granted in parcels and beginnings, as it is in us, proportioned to our measure and our degrees of sanctification. Instead, it was granted in fullness, for "he received not the Spirit by measure," John 3:34. That is, it was not limited in him when he came of age, as in Eph. 4:13. For until that point it was in fact manifested and amassed in him by degrees, for he "increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man," Luke 2:51. To this was added "all power

in heaven and earth, which was given to him," Matt. 28:18; and "power over all flesh, to give eternal life to as many as he would," John 17:2. We might branch out into many particulars, but this much will suffice to affirm the second act of God in sending his Son.

(3.) *The Father establishes a Covenant with the Son*

The third act in this sending is entering into covenant and compact with his Son. It concerns the work to be undertaken, and the result or event of that work. There are two parts to this covenant:

The Father promises to protect and assist the Son

First, *the Father promises to protect and assist* the Son in accomplishing and perfectly fulfilling the whole dispensation in which he was employed, or which he was about to undertake. Upon undertaking this great work of redemption, the Father engaged himself that the Son would not lack any assistance in his trials. He would not lack strength against opposition, encouragement against temptations, nor strong consolation in the midst of terrors. He would not lack whatever might be necessary or requisite in any way to carry him on through all difficulties to the end of so great an employment. Upon this promise, the Son undertakes this heavy burden which is so full of misery and trouble.

For the Father, before this engagement, requires no less of him than that he "become a Savior, and be afflicted in all the affliction of his people," Isa. 63:8, 9. Although he is "the fellow of the LORD of hosts," he would endure the "sword" that was drawn against him as the "shepherd" of the sheep, Zech. 13:7; "treading the winepress alone, until he became red in his apparel," Isa. 63:2, 3. He would be "stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted; wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities; to be bruised and put to grief; to make his soul an offering for sin, and to bear the iniquity of many," Isa 53. He is to be destitute of comfort so far as to cry, "my God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" Ps. 22:1.

It is no wonder that, upon the Son's undertaking, the Father promised to make "his mouth like a sharp sword, to hide him in the shadow of his hand, to make him a polished shaft, and to hide him in his quiver, to make him his servant in whom he would be glorified," Isa. 49:2, 3. Though "the kings of the earth set themselves against him, and the rulers take counsel together, yet he would laugh them to scorn, and set him as king upon his holy hill of Zion," Ps. 2:2, 4, 6. Though the "builders rejected him," yet he would "become the head of the comer," to the amazement and astonishment of all the world, Ps. 118:22, 23; Matt. 21:42, Mark 12:10, Luke 20:17, Acts 4:11, 12, 1Pet 2:4. Indeed, he would "lay him for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation," Isa. 28:16, so that "whoever fell upon him would be broken, and upon whomever he fell he would grind him to powder," Matt. 21:44.

From this arose our Savior's confidence during his greatest trials. He was assured by his Father's engagement in this covenant and treaty about the redemption of man, that the Father would never leave him nor forsake him. "I gave," he says, "my back to those who struck me, and my cheeks to those who plucked off the hair: I did not hide my face from shame and spitting," Isa. 50:6. With what confidence, blessed Savior, you underwent all this shame and sorrow! Why, "The Lord GOD will help me; therefore I shall not be confounded: therefore I have set my face like a flint, and I know that I shall not be ashamed. He who justifies me is near; who will contend with me? Let us stand together: who is my adversary? Let him come near to me. Behold, the Lord GOD will help me; who is the one who condemns me? Behold! They shall all wear out like a garment; the moth will eat them up," verses 7-9. With this assurance, he was brought as a "lamb

to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is silent; he did not open his mouth," Isa. 53:7. For "when he was reviled, he did not revile back; when he suffered, he did not threaten; but he committed himself to the one who judges righteously," 1Pet. 2:23. So the ground of our Savior's confidence and assurance in this great undertaking, and a strong motive to exercise the graces that he received in his greatest endurements, was the engagement of his Father in this compact of assistance and protection.

The Father promises success

The *Second Part* of this covenant is *the Father's promise of success*, or a good result from all his sufferings. He promises a happy attainment of the purpose of his great undertaking. Now, of all, this is the primary consideration. It is directly conducive to the business proposed, but would not have been so clear without the former considerations. For whatever God promised his Son would be fulfilled and attained by him, it was certainly this at which the Son aimed in the whole undertaking. He designed it as the end of the work that was committed to him, and which he alone could and did claim upon accomplishing his Father's will. In Isa. 49, you have what this was, and the promises surrounding it:

"You shall be my servant," says the Lord, "to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give you for a light to the Gentiles, that you may be my salvation to the end of the earth. Kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, because of the LORD that is faithful."

And he will certainly accomplish this engagement:

"I will preserve you, and give you for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages; that you may say to the prisoners, Go forth; to those who are in darkness, Show yourselves. They shall feed in the ways, and their pastures shall be in all high places. They shall not hunger nor thirst; neither shall the heat nor sun strike them: for the one who has mercy on them shall lead them, even by the springs of water shall he guide them. And I will make all my mountains a way, and my highways shall be exalted. Behold, these shall come from far: and, lo, these from the north and from the west; and these from the land of Sinim," Isa.49:6-12.

By all these expressions, the Lord evidently and clearly engages himself to his Son, that he would gather to himself a glorious church of believers. He would gather them from among Jews and Gentiles, from throughout the world. They would be brought to him and certainly fed in full pasture. They would be refreshed by springs of water, all the spiritual springs of living water which flow from God in Christ for their everlasting salvation. This, then, is what our Savior certainly aimed at as the promise upon which he undertook the work. It is gathering together the sons of God, bringing them to God, and passing them on to eternal salvation. This being well considered, it will completely overthrow any theory of general ransom or universal redemption, as will become apparent later.

In the 53rd chapter of the same prophecy, the Lord is more express and punctual in these promises to his Son. He assures him that when he "made his soul an offering for sin, he would see his seed and prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD would prosper in his hand. He would see the travail of his soul and be satisfied. By his knowledge, he would justify many. He would divide a portion with the great, and the spoil with the strong," verses 10-12. He was to see his seed by this covenant, and raise up a spiritual seed to God; they would be a faithful people, to

be prolonged and preserved throughout all generations. I cannot see how this is consistent with the persuasion of those who affirm “that the death of Christ might have had its full and utmost effect, and yet none be saved.” Still, some have boldly affirmed it. All those who assert universal redemption tacitly grant it in the proper ends and effects of the death of Christ that they propose.

“The pleasure of the LORD” was to “prosper in his hand.” This is what is declared in Heb. 2:10 as “bringing many sons unto glory.” For “God sent his only-begotten Son into the world that we might live through him,” 1Jn. 4:9. The promises of God that were made to him in their agreement, and so consequently, his own aim and intention, is manifested most clearly in the request our Savior makes upon accomplishing the work for which he was sent. This certainly was neither more nor less than what God engaged him for. “I have,” he says, “glorified you on earth, I have finished the work which you gave me to do,” John 17:4. And now, what does he require after manifesting his eternal glory, which he emptied himself of for a season, verse 5? Clearly, he requires a full joining of the love of God and the fruits of that love upon all his elect, in faith, sanctification, and glory. God gave them to him, and he sanctified himself to be a sacrifice for their sake, praying for their sanctification in John 17:17-19. He requires their preservation in peace, their communion with one another, and their union with God. Verses 20 and 21: “I pray not for these alone” (that is, his apostles), “but for those also who shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as you, Father, are in me, and I in you, that they may also be one in us.” And lastly, he requires their glory, verse 24: “Father, I will that those whom you have given me also be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which you have given me.”

These several postulates are no doubt grounded on the previously cited promises made to him by his Father. In all this, there is not one word concerning everyone. Instead, the contrary is expressly stated: “I do not pray for the world, but for those you have given me,” John 17:9. Let it be diligently observed that the *promise* of God to his Son, and the *request* of the Son to his Father, are directed to this unique end of *bringing sons to God*.

This has been the first act of the Father, consisting of these three particulars.

2. The Father Punishes the Son

The second act is laying upon the Son the punishment for sins. This is ascribed to the Father throughout the Scripture: “Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, against the man that is my fellow, says the LORD of hosts: strike the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered,” Zech. 13:7. What is set down here imperatively, as a command, is indicatively expounded in the gospel. “I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad,” Matt. 26:31. “He was stricken by God, and afflicted... The LORD laid upon him the iniquity of us all... It pleased the LORD to bruise him, and to grieve him,” Isa. 53:4, 6, 10. “He made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him,” 2Cor. 5:21. The adjunct in both passages is made the subject, as the opposition between his being made sin and our being made righteousness declares. “Him who knew no sin,” that is, who deserved no punishment, “him has he made to be sin,” or laid the punishment due to sin upon him. Or perhaps, in the latter place, sin may be taken to mean an offering or sacrifice for the expiation¹ of sin, (NT:266, *hamartia*). This corresponds to the word *chattath* in the Old Testament [OT:2403], which signifies both sin and the sacrifice for it.

¹ That is, *atonement*.

And the Lord God did this. For Herod, Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, did nothing but “what his hand and counsel had determined before to be done,” Acts 4:27, 28. This is the source of the great shakings of our savior in his close conflict with his Father's wrath, and of that burden which the Father directly imposed on him. When there was no hand or instrument outwardly appearing to cause him any suffering or cruciating torment, he “began to be sorrowful, even to death” Matt. 26:37, 38. When he was in the garden with his three best apostles, before the traitor or any of his accomplices appeared, he was “confounded, and very heavy,” Mark 14:33. That was the time, “in the days of his flesh, when he offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears to the one who was able to save him from death,” Heb. 5:7. His state is described by the evangelist in Luke 22:43, 44: “An angel from heaven appeared to him, strengthening him. But being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was like great drops of blood falling to the ground.” Surely it was a close and strong trial that he now underwent, coming directly from his Father. For how meekly and cheerfully he submits to all the cruelty of men, and the violence done to his body, without any regret or troubled spirit, until this conflict with his Father is renewed. He cries, “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?”

This, by the way, will be worth our observation, so that we may know with whom our Savior chiefly had to deal, and what he underwent for sinners. It will also give some light to the grand query concerning for whom he undertook all this. His sufferings did not consist in mere corporal punishments and afflictions, or their effects alone on his soul and spirit. It was no less than the curse of the law of God that he underwent for us. For he freed us from the curse “by being made a curse,” Gal 3:13. This curse contained all the punishment that was due to sin, either in the severity of God's justice, or according to the demands of that law which required obedience. It is true that the curse of the law would only be temporal death. This is because the law was considered the instrument of Jewish polity, and it served that economy or dispensation. But it is a foolish dream that it is no more than that, because it is the universal rule of obedience, and the bond of the covenant between God and man. In dying for us, Christ not only aimed at our good, but he also directly died in our stead. The punishment due to our sin and the chastisement of our peace was upon him. The punishment was the pains of hell, in their nature and being, and in their weight and pressure, but not in their tendency and continuance (for it is impossible for him to be detained by death). Who can deny this and not injure the justice of God, which will inevitably inflict those pains upon sinners to eternity? It is true, indeed, that the law is relaxed with regard to those who are suffering. God allows commutation, as he did in the carnal sacrifices that were made under the old law. The life of a beast was accepted instead of the life of a man. This is fully revealed, and we believe it. But where is any alteration in the nature of the punishment intimated?

We conclude with the prophet, then, that there is a second act of God in laying the punishment on him for us. He says, “All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone to his own way; and the LORD has laid on him the iniquity of us all,” Isa. 53:6. It seems strange to me that Christ would undergo the pains of hell in the stead of those who lay in the pains of hell before he underwent those pains, and who will continue in those pains until eternity; for “their worm does not die, nor is their fire quenched,” Isa. 66:24. To which I may add this dilemma to our universalists: God imposed his wrath, and Christ underwent the pains of hell, either for all the sins of all men, or for all the sins of some men, or for some of the sins of all men.

If it was the last, for some of the sins of all men, then all men have some sins to answer for; and so no man will be saved. For if God enters into judgment with us, even though it is with all

mankind for one sin, no flesh will be justified in his sight: "If the LORD should mark iniquities, who would stand?" Ps.130:3. We all might as well cast all we have "to the moles and to the bats, to go into the clefts of the rocks, and into the tops of the ragged rocks, for fear of the LORD, and for the glory of his majesty," Isa. 2:20, 21.

If it was for the second, which is what we affirm, that Christ in their stead suffered for all the sins of all the *elect* in the world.

If it was the first, then why are not all freed from the punishment of all their sins? You will say, "Because of their unbelief; they will not believe." But this unbelief, is it a sin or not? If not, why should they be punished for it? If it is, then Christ either underwent the punishment for it, or he did not. If he did, then why should that sin keep them from partaking of the fruit of his death more than their other sins for which he died? If he did not undergo the punishment for it, then he did not die for all their sins. Let the universalists choose which part they prefer.

CHAPTER IV – The Redeeming Work of the Son

Of those things which are uniquely ascribed to the person of the Son in the work of redemption.

SECONDLY, The Son was an agent in this great work. He concurred in it by a voluntary or willing undertaking of the office imposed on him. For when the Lord said, "Sacrifice and offering he would not accept: he had no pleasure in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin," then Christ said, "Behold, I come – in the volume of the book it is written of me – to do your will, O God," Heb. 10:6, 7. All other ways being rejected as insufficient, Christ undertakes the task, "in whom alone the Father was well pleased," Matt. 3:17. Hence, he professes that "he did not come to do his own will, but the will of the one who sent him," John 4:38. He professes that it was his meat and drink to do his Father's will, and to finish his work, John 4:34. The first words that we find recorded of him in the Scripture are the same, "Do you not know that I must be about my Father's business?" Luke 2:49. And at the close of all he says, "I have glorified you on the earth; I have finished the work which you gave me to do," John 17:4. Everywhere he calls what he did his Father's work, or his Father's will which he came to accomplish, referring to the imposition which we treated before.

Now, this undertaking of the Son may be considered in three parts. The first is a common foundation for the others. It is the means, where the others are the end. And yet in some way being a distinct action, with a goodness in itself in reference to the main end, we will consider it apart; and that is,

First, His incarnation

His incarnation, as it is usually called, is his taking on flesh and pitching his tent among us, John 1:14. It is "being made of a woman," Gal 4:4. For this was "the mystery of godliness, that God should be manifested in the flesh," 1Tim. 3:16. Thereby he did not assume any singular person, but took our human nature itself into personal union with himself. "For as much as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he likewise took part of the same himself; that through death he might destroy the one who had the power of death, that is, the devil," Heb. 2:14. It was the children that he considered, the "children whom the Lord gave him," Heb. 2:13. Their participation in flesh and blood moved him to partake of the same. He did so not because all the world, all the posterity of Adam, were in that condition, but because the *children* were in that condition; he sanctified himself for their sakes. Now, this emptying of the Deity, this humbling

of himself, this dwelling among us, was the sole act of the second person, or the divine nature in the second person. The Father and the Spirit had no involvement in it except by their liking, approval, and eternal counsel.

Secondly, His Oblation

His oblation is “offering himself up to God for us without spot, to purge our consciences from dead works,” Heb. 9:14. “For he loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood,” Rev. 1:5. “He loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it,” Eph. 5:25, 26. He took the cup of wrath, due to us, from his Father’s hands, and drank it all, “but not for himself,” Dan. 9:26. “For our sakes he sanctified himself,” John 17:19, to be an offering, an oblation for sin. For “when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly,” Rom. 5:6. This is what was typified by all the institutions, ordinances, and sacrifices of old. When they were at an end, Christ said, “Behold, I come to do your will.” Now, the perfecting or consummating of this oblation is set out in the Scripture chiefly with regard to what Christ suffered, and not so much with regard to what he did. This is because it is considered chiefly as the means used by these three blessed agents to attain a further end. Yet without voluntarily giving himself up to be an oblation and sacrifice, it would not have had any value. For if the will of Christ had not been in it, it could never have purged our sins. Therefore, in regard to his oblation, I refer to his actions.

He was the “Lamb of God, which takes away the sin of the world,” John 1:29. He was the Lamb of God that he himself had provided for a sacrifice. And how did this Lamb behave himself? With unwillingness and struggle? No. He did not open his mouth: “He was brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is silent, so he did not open his mouth,” Isa. 53:7. He says of this, “I lay down my life. No man takes it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again,” John 10:17, 18. He might have been cruciated on the part of God, but his death could not have been an oblation and offering had not his will concurred in it. “He loved me,” says the apostle, “and gave himself for me,” Gal. 2:20. Now, that alone deserves the name of a gift which comes from a free and willing mind, as Christ’s was when “he loved us, and gave himself for us; an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour,” Eph. 5:2. He does it cheerfully: “Behold, I come to do your will, O God,” Heb. 10:9. And so “he bore our sins in his own body on the tree,” 1Pet 2:24.

Now, I would not tie this oblation or offering of Christ to any one thing, whether action, passion, performance, or suffering. Instead, it comprises the whole economy and dispensation of God manifested in the life lived among us. It includes all those things that he performed in the days of his flesh, when he offered up prayers and supplications, with strong cries and tears. He continued in this way until he had fully “by himself purged our sins, and sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high,” Heb. 1:3. He waited “until his enemies were made his footstool,” Heb. 10:13. He waited to complete the whole dispensation of his coming and ministering, until he had given his soul as the price of redemption for many, Matt. 26:28.

His entering into the holy of holies, sprinkled with his own blood, and appearing for us before the majesty of God, considered by some as the continuation of his oblation, we may assign to his intercession instead.

Thirdly, His Intercession

His intercession is for everyone of those for whom he gave himself as an oblation. He did not suffer for them, and then refuse to intercede for them. He did not do the greater, and omit the lesser. The price of our redemption is more precious in the eyes of God and his Son than to throw it away on perishing souls, ignoring what becomes of them afterward. This care is imposed on Christ, with a promise annexed: "Ask of me," says the Lord, "and I will give you the nations for your inheritance, and the furthest parts of the earth for your possession," Ps. 2:8. Accordingly, Christ tells his disciples that he has more work to do for them in heaven. "I go," he says, "to prepare a place for you, that I may come again and receive you to myself," John 14:2, 3. Just as "the high priest went into the holy of holies alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and the errors of the people," Heb. 9:7; so "Christ having become a high priest of good things to come, by his own blood entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us," Heb. 9:11,12.

Now, what was this holy place into which he entered, sprinkled with the blood of the covenant? And for what purpose did he enter it? "He has not entered the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but heaven itself, to appear now in the presence of God for us," Heb. 9:24. And what does he appear there for? To be our advocate, to plead our cause with God, to apply the good things procured by his oblation to all those for whom he was an offering. As the apostle tells us, "If any man sins, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous," 1Jn. 2:1. How does that come to pass? "He is the propitiation for our sins," 1Jn. 2:2. Being a propitiatory sacrifice for our sins is the foundation of his intercession. Therefore, both propitiation and intercession belong to the same person.

Now, by the way, we know that Christ refused to pray for the world, in opposition to his elect. "I pray for them," he says: "I do not pray for the world, but for those you have given me," John 17:9. Thus there was no foundation for interceding for others, because he was not a propitiation for them. Again, we know the Father always hears the Son ("I knew," he says, "that you hear me always," John 11:42). And he hears in order to grant his request, according to the fore-mentioned engagement, Ps. 2:8. Therefore, if Christ interceded for all, then all would undoubtedly be saved. For "he is able to completely save those who come to God by him, seeing he ever lives to make intercession for them," Heb. 7:25. Hence, the apostle is confident in that intercession of Christ. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God who justifies. Who is the one who condemns? It is Christ who died, rather, who is risen again, that is at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us," Rom. 8:33, 34.

We cannot help but observe that those for whom he died may assuredly conclude that he makes intercession for them, and that none will lay anything to their charge. This breaks the neck of any theory of a general ransom. For, according to that theory, he died for millions who have no interest in his intercession. They will have their sins laid to their charge, and they will perish under them. This may be further cleared up by the very nature of this intercession. It is not a humble, dejected supplication, which does not befit the glorious state of someone who sits at the right hand of the Majesty on high. Instead, Christ authoritatively presents himself before the throne of his Father, sprinkled with his own blood, to make out to his people all the spiritual things that are procured by his oblation. He says, "Father, I will that those whom you have given me be with me where I am," John 17:24. He appears in heaven on behalf of whomever he suffered for, with his satisfaction and merit. Here we must call to mind what the Father promised his Son upon undertaking this employment. There is no doubt that this alone is what Christ

intercedes with him about: in sum it is that he might be the captain of salvation to all who believe on him, and effectually bring many sons to glory.

Hence, having such a high priest over the house of God, we may draw near with the full assurance of faith. For by one offering he has perfected forever those who are sanctified, Heb. 10:14. But more of this must be said later.

CHAPTER V – The Actions of the Holy Spirit

The unique actions of the Holy Spirit in this business.

THIRDLY, in a few words we may consider the actions of the agent who is the third in order in that blessed One, whose all is the whole: the *Holy Spirit*. In his own distinct operation, he evidently concurs with the several chief or grand parts of this work. We will refer to three of these parts:

First, The incarnation of the Son

The Holy Spirit concurs with his plenary assistance in the course of the Son's life while he dwelt among us. For his mother was found with child, "to have conceived in her womb of the Holy Ghost," Matt. 1:18. If we ask, along with Mary, how that could be, the angel resolves it for both us and her in Luke 1:35 (as far as it is lawful to be acquainted with these mysterious things): "The Holy Ghost will come upon you, and the power of the Highest will overshadow you: therefore also that holy thing [NT:40, *hagion*] which shall be born of you shall be called the Son of God." It was an over-shadowing power in the Spirit, an allusion to fowls that cover their eggs so that their young may be hatched by the warmth. This conception was by the sole power of the Spirit, who brooded over the fetus "*incubare foetui*," as in the beginning of the world. Now, in process, as this child was conceived by the power of the Spirit, so he was filled with the Spirit, and he "waxed strong" in it, Luke 1:80. Having received a fullness of the Spirit in its gifts and graces, without any limited measure, he was thoroughly furnished and fitted for his great undertaking.

Secondly, In the Son's oblation

His oblation (offering), or passion, is by the Eternal Spirit. They are both the same with respect to what he suffered, and what he did through those sufferings. "By the Eternal Spirit he offered himself without spot to God," Heb. 9:14. This may refer to offering himself as a bloody sacrifice on the cross, or presenting himself continually before his Father. Willingly offering himself through that Spirit was the eternal fire that burned under this sacrifice, and what made it acceptable to God. I see no great ground for what some contend, that the "eternal Spirit" meant our Savior's own Deity. Some Greek and Latin copies read *pneuma hagios* [NT:4151, 40], not as we commonly have it, *pneuma aionios* [NT:4151, 166], and so the doubt is quite removed in those copies. I see no reason why he may not be said to offer himself through the Holy Spirit, if he is elsewhere "declared to be the Son of God, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead," as in Rom. 1:4; or "quickened by the Spirit," as in 1Pet. 3:18. The working of the Spirit was as required in his oblation as in his resurrection, in his dying as in his quickening.

Thirdly, In the Son's resurrection

His resurrection is spoken of by the apostle in Rom. 8:11: "If the Spirit of the one who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwells in you."

And thus we have discovered the blessed agents and undertakers in this work, their several actions, and the orderly concurrence to the whole. Though they may be distinguished, they are not so divided as to preclude every one from being ascribed to the whole nature, of which each person is a partaker "*in solidum*." And as they begin it, so they will jointly carry along the application of it to its ultimate result and accomplishment. For we must "give thanks to the Father, which has made us meet" (that is, by his Spirit) "to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: who has delivered us from the power of darkness, and has translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins," Col. 1:12, 13.

CHAPTER VI – The Means Used

The means used by the fore-recounted agents in this work.

I. Christ's Dispensation as Mediator

Our next task, in order of execution rather than intention, will be to discover the means in this work. These are the same several actions recounted before. But they will now be considered in another respect: as means ordained for obtaining a proposed end. Now, because the several actions of the Father and the Spirit were all exercised towards Christ, and terminated in him as God and man, only Christ and his performances are to be considered as the means in this work. The several concurrences of both the other persons are presupposed as necessarily antecedent or concomitant to the means.

The means that are used or ordained by these agents for the proposed end, is that whole economy or dispensation carried along to the end. From this our Savior Jesus Christ is called a Mediator. This office, as I mentioned before, is usually distinguished into two parts: First, his *oblation*; Secondly, his *intercession*.

First, His Oblation

By his oblation we do not only mean the particular offering of himself upon the cross as an offering to his Father. As such, he was the Lamb of God without spot or blemish. He bore our sins, or carried them up with him, in his own body on the tree. This was the sum and complement of his oblation, and what it chiefly consisted of. But his oblation was also his whole humiliation, or state of emptying himself. This humiliation was manifested by his yielding voluntary obedience to the law, being made under it, so that he might be the end of the law to those who believe, Rom. 10:4. It is also manifested by his subjection to the curse of the law; in the antecedent misery and suffering of his life, as well as by his submitting to death, even the death of the cross, Phil. 2:8. For no action of his as mediator is to be excluded from what makes up the whole means in this work.

Second, His Intercession

Nor by his intercession do I mean only his heavenly appearance in the most holy place, to apply to us all the good things purchased and procured by his oblation. I also mean every act of his

exaltation that is conducive to that end, from his resurrection to his "sitting down at the right hand of the Majesty on high, angels and principalities and powers being made subject to him," 1Pet. 3:22.

In all of this, his *resurrection* is the basis and the foundation of the rest. "For if he is not risen, then is our faith in vain," 1Cor. 15:13, 14; and we are "yet in our sins," verse 17; and "of all men most miserable," verse 19. His resurrection should be especially considered as that to which a great part of the effect is often ascribed. For "he was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification," Rom. 4:25. Thus the whole dispensation and perpetual intercession of Christ for us in heaven follows from his resurrection. For "God raised up his son Jesus to bless us, in turning every one of us from our iniquities," Acts 3:26.

II. Oblation and Intercession as a Single Means

Now, this whole dispensation, with a special regard to the death and blood-shedding of Christ, is the means we speak of. This agrees with what was said in general before; for it is not a thing that is desirable in itself, nor for its own sake. The death of Christ had nothing in it that was good (speaking of his suffering, not his obedience), except as it was conducive to a further end, such as manifesting God's glorious grace. What good was it that Herod and Pontius Pilate, along with the Gentiles and people of Israel, would join together with such horrid villany and cruelty against God's holy child whom he anointed? Acts 4:27. Or what good was it that the Son of God would be made sin and a curse, to be bruised, afflicted, and undergo such wrath that the whole frame of nature trembled to behold it? What good, what beauty and form is in all this, that it should be desired in itself and for itself? Doubtless, none at all. It must, then, be looked upon as a means conducive to an end; the glory and luster of that must take away all the darkness and confusion in the thing itself. Even so, it was intended by the blessed agents in it, by "whose determinate counsel and foreknowledge he was delivered and slain," Acts 2:23. What was done to him was "whatever his hand and counsel had determined," Acts 4:28. What it was must be declared later.

Now, concerning the whole, some things are to be observed:

Though the oblation and intercession of Jesus Christ are distinct acts in themselves, and they have distinct immediate products and results assigned to them, they are not in any respect or regard to be divided or separated. Whatever respect the one would have to any persons or things, the other would equally have in its kind. There is this manifold union between them:

First, they both have the same end

They are both intended to obtain and accomplish the same entire and complete end that is proposed. To wit: to effectually bring many sons to glory, for the praise of God's grace.

Secondly, they both have the same object

Whatever persons the one respects in the good things it obtains for them, the other respects in applying the good things so obtained to the same persons. For "he was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification," Rom., 4:25. In brief, this means that the object of the one has no larger extent than the object of the other. Or to say it another way, those for whom Christ offered himself, for all and only those, does he intercede. This is according to his own word: "For their sake I sanctify myself" (to be an oblation), "that they might also be sanctified through the truth," John 17:19.

Thirdly, His Oblation is the Foundation of His Intercession

The oblation of Christ is the foundation of his intercession. By the oblation he procured everything that is bestowed on us by virtue of his intercession. And that is because the sole reason why Christ procured anything by his death was that it might be applied to those for whom it was procured.

The sum is, that the oblation and intercession of Jesus Christ are one entire means to produce the same effect. The very purpose of his oblation is to have all those things that are procured accordingly bestowed by his intercession. Without their application, his oblation would certainly fail in its proposed end. So, it cannot be affirmed that the death or offering of Christ procured any good for one more person than his intercession applied it to. Interceding for all the good that was purchased, and prevailing in all his intercessions (for the Father always hears his Son), it is evident that everyone for whom Christ died must actually have all the good things purchased by Christ's death applied to him. Because this is evidently destructive to the adverse cause, we must stay a little on the subject to confirm it. I will now only propose those reasons which may be handled apart from the main proof. A subsequent proposal will assign the proper end intended and effected by the death of Christ. The main proof must be deferred until then.

CHAPTER VII –Proofs for a Single Means

Containing reasons to prove that the oblation and intercession of Christ is one entire means to accomplish the same proposed end, and both have the same personal object.

I. Scripture Joins Them

Our first reason is taken from the perpetual union which the Scripture makes of both of these, almost always joining them together. It presents those things that are considered the distinct fruits and effects of each as most inseparable: "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities," Isa. 53:11. The actual justification of sinners, which is the immediate fruit of his intercession, certainly follows his act of bearing their iniquities. And in the next verse they are put together by God in a way that surely none should put asunder: "He bore the sins of many" (behold his oblation!) "and made intercession for the transgressors." He intercedes for those transgressors whose sin he bears. And there is one expression in 53:5 that makes it evident that the immediate effect of his passion is the complete application of all good things for which he intercedes: "With his stripes we are healed." Our total healing is the fruit and procurement of his stripes; the oblation is consummated by it. So also in Rom. 4:25: "He was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification." He rose to justify those for whose offenses he died. Therefore, if he died for all, all must be justified. Otherwise, the Lord failed in his aim and design, in both the death and the resurrection of his Son. Though some have boldly affirmed this, for my part I abhor accepting so blasphemous a fancy.

Rather, let us embrace that doctrine of the apostle which grounds the assurance of our eternal glory, and our freedom from all accusations, upon the death of Christ. This is so because his intercession for us inseparably and necessarily follows his death. "Who," he asks, "shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" It seems that Christ died only for the elect. "It is God that justifies. Who is the one who condemns? It is Christ that died." Will no one be condemned for whom Christ died? What, then, becomes of this proposed general ransom? "Rather, it is him who is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us," Rom.

8:33, 34. Here is the equal extent of the one and the other; those who are concerned in the one are the same ones concerned in the other. That he died for all, and intercedes only for some, can scarcely be squared with this text. This is especially true considering the foundation of all this, which is found in verse 32. "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" The love of God moved him to give up Christ to death for us all. From this, the apostle infers a kind of impossibility in not giving us all good things in him. How can this be reconciled with the opinion of those who assert that he gave his Son for millions to whom he will give neither grace nor glory? I cannot see it. But we rest in the assertion of the apostle: "When we were still without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly," so that, "being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him," Rom. 5:6, 9. This same inseparable bond between the oblation and the intercession of Christ, with their fruits and effects, is intimated in many other places.

II. They are both Acts of the Priestly Office

To offer and to intercede, to sacrifice and to pray, are both acts of the same sacerdotal office. They are both required in anyone who is a priest. If he omits either of these, he cannot be a faithful priest for those he represents. If he either does not make an offering for them, or he does not intercede for the success of his oblation on their behalf, then he is lacking in the discharge of the office. But we find both of these united in Jesus Christ (as I said before): 1Jn. 2:1, 2, "If any man sins, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins." If he is to be such a merciful high priest over the house of God, that the children are encouraged to go to God by him, then he must be an advocate both to intercede, and to offer a propitiatory sacrifice.

The apostle makes this exceedingly clear, and he evidently proves this in the Epistle to the Hebrews. There he describes the priesthood of Christ. The execution of that office consists of these two acts: offering up himself in and by the shedding of his blood, and interceding for us completely. Upon performing both, he exhorts us to draw near with confidence to the throne of grace, for he "came a high priest of good things to come, not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us," Heb. 9:11, 12. His bloody oblation gave him entrance into the holy place not made with hands. There he accomplished the remaining part of his office. The apostle compares his entrance into heaven for us with the entrance of the high priest into the holy place, with the blood of bulls and goats upon him, verses 12, 13. Doubtless, this was to pray for those in whose behalf he had made the offering, verse 7. He so presented himself before his Father that his former oblation might be efficacious. Hence he is said to have "an unchangeable priesthood," because he continues forever, Heb. 7:24. He is "able to completely save those who come to God by him," verse 25. Therefore, we have "boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus," Heb. 10:19-22.

So, then, it is evident that both of these are acts of the same priestly office in Christ. If he performs either of them for anyone, then he must of necessity perform the other one for them also. For he will not exercise any act or duty of his priestly function in behalf for anyone for whom he is not a priest. And for whom he is a priest, he must perform both, because he is faithful in the discharge of his function in the behalf of the sinners for whom he undertakes that office. These two, then, oblation and intercession, must be of equal extent with regard to their objects. They can by no means be separated. And here, by the way, I must ask those who oppose us about the death of Christ, whether they will agree that he intercedes for all or not. If not, then they make him only half a priest. If they will, then they must either defend their error that all will

be saved, or they must own the blasphemy that Christ is not heard by his Father. Nor can Christ prevail in his intercession, which even the saints on earth are sure to do when they make their supplications according to the will of God, Rom. 8:27; 1Jn. 5:14. Besides that, it is expressly said that the Father always hears him, John 11:42. That was true when he was still in the flesh, and had not finished the great work he was sent to do. How much more is that true now, having done the will and finished the work of God? He now sits at the right hand of the Majesty on high! He desires and he requests that the promises that were made to him upon undertaking this work be accomplished.

III. The Nature of Intercession requires it

The nature of the intercession of Christ will prove no less than what we assert. It requires an inseparable conjunction between itself and its oblation. For as it is now perfected in heaven, it is not a humble dejection of himself, with cries, tears, and supplications. No! It cannot be conceived as a mere vocal entreaty. It is *real*. He presents himself, sprinkled with the blood of the covenant, before the throne of grace in our behalf. "For Christ," says the apostle, "has not entered into the holy places made with hands, but into heaven itself, now appearing in the presence of God for us," Heb. 9:24. His intercession there is an appearance for us in heaven in the presence of God. It is a demonstration of his sacred body, in which he suffered for us. For in Hebrews (as we said before), the apostle compares his entrance into heaven for us to the entrance of the high priest into the holy place, with the blood of bulls and goats upon him, Heb. 9:12, 13. Our Savior is there with his own blood. He is presenting himself so that his former oblation might have its perpetual efficacy, until the many sons given to him are brought to glory. His intercession consists in this: it is nothing more than a continuation of his oblation, as it were. He was a "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," Rev. 13:8.

Now, before his actual oblation was completed, his intercession was simply an engagement for the work that would be accomplished in due time. And so, certainly what follows his oblation is nothing more than presenting what was fulfilled according to that engagement. That is, his intercession continues his oblation by laying claim to those things that were procured by his oblation, by a remembrance and declaration of it. How, then, is it possible for his oblation to have a larger compass and extent than his intercession? Can he be said to make an offering for those for whom he does not intercede, when his intercession is nothing more than presenting that offering in behalf of those for whom he suffered? His intercession bestows those good things that were purchased by his oblation.

IV. The Covenant Specifies it

Again: if the oblation and death of Christ procured and obtained every good thing so that it would be bestowed, and if Christ's intercession actually bestowed every good thing, then both the oblation and the intercession have the same aim. They are both means leading to one and the same end. Now, for the proof of this supposition, we must remember what was said earlier concerning the agreement between the Father and the Son. Upon voluntarily engaging himself in this great work of redemption, the Lord promised the Son as the end of his sufferings, the reward of his labors, and the fruit of his merit, everything that he afterward intercedes for. There must be a foundation for our Savior's intercession. It is an entreaty, whether virtual or formal, real or oral, that is made to obtain something. Must it not rest on some promise that was made to him? Is there any good bestowed that is not promised? Is it not apparent that the intercession of Christ

rests on a promise such as the one in Ps. 2:8, "Ask of me, and I will give you the heathen for your inheritance," etc?

Now, why was this promise and engagement made to our savior? Was it not for undergoing what "the kings set themselves, and the rulers took counsel together, against him," Ps. 2:2? The apostles interpret this to refer to Herod, Pontius Pilate, and the people of the Jews, who persecuted him to death, and did to him "whatever the hand and counsel of God had before determined to be done," Acts 4:27, 28. The intercession of Christ, then, is founded on promises made to him. And these promises are nothing but an engagement to actually bestow on those for whom he suffered, all the good things which his death and oblation merited and purchased. It can only be that he intercedes for all those for whom he died. His death procured all and every thing that his intercession bestows; and until they are bestowed, his oblation does not have its full fruits and effects. As for whether the death of Christ procures what is never granted, we will see later whether that contradicts Scriptures, and common sense.

V. Christ united them

Further: what Christ has put together let no man put asunder. We may distinguish between them, but we may not separate them. Now, Christ united the oblation and intercession himself in John 17. For there and then he both offered and interceded. He offered himself as perfectly, with regard to his own will and intention (verse 4), as he did on the cross; and he interceded as perfectly as he now intercedes in heaven. Who, then, can divide these things, or put them asunder? Consider especially that the Scripture affirms that one without the other would be unprofitable. "If Christ is not risen, then your faith is futile; you are still in your sins!" 1Cor. 15:17. Complete remission and redemption could not be obtained without our high priest entering into the most holy place to intercede for us, Heb. 9:12.

VI. Our Consolation Depends on it

Lastly, separating and dividing the death and intercession of Christ, in respect to their objects, cuts off whatever consolation anyone might have from the assurance that Christ died for him. The doctrine of general ransom is not a comforting doctrine. It cuts all the nerves and sinews of that strong consolation which God so abundantly wants us to receive. I will say more about that later. For the present, I will only show how it severs our comfort in one particular aspect. The main foundation of all the confidence and assurance we have in this life, "joy unspeakable, and full of glory" 1Pet. 1:8, arises from this strict connection of the oblation and intercession of Jesus Christ. By the one he has procured all good things for us, and by the other he will actually bestow them. He never leaves our sins, but follows them into every court, until they are fully pardoned and clearly expiated, Heb. 9:26. He will never leave us until he has completely saved those who come to God by him. His death without his resurrection would have profited nothing for us; all our faith in him would have been in vain, 1Cor. 15:17.

So if separated, it yields little consolation. But if connected, it is a sure foundation for a soul to build upon, Heb. 7:25: "What good will it do me to be persuaded that Christ died for my sins, if, notwithstanding that, my sins may appear against me for my condemnation, where and when Christ will not appear for my justification?" If you ask, along with the apostle, "Who is the one who condemns?" it may easily be answered. Rom. 8:34, "Why, God by his law may condemn me, notwithstanding that Christ died for me!" Indeed, says the apostle, but "He is risen again, and sits at the right hand of God, making intercession for us." He does not rest in his death. He will certainly make intercession for those for whom he died, and this alone is what gives firm

consolation. Our sins dare not appear, nor any of our accusers against us, where he appears for us. Quibbling objections against this text will be considered afterward. I hope I have sufficiently confirmed and proved what I proposed in the beginning of this chapter, about the identity of the object of the oblation and intercession of Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER VIII – Objections to a Single Means

Objections to the former proposal are answered.¹

By what was said in the last chapter, it clearly appears that the oblation and intercession of Christ have equal compass and extent with regard to their objects. And their shared objects are the persons for whom he offered himself once, and continually intercedes for. And so, his oblation and intercession are to be looked on as one joint means to attain a certain proposed end. What that end is will be considered next. But because I find there are some who object to the former truth, I must remove their objections before I proceed. I will do that “as a man removes dung until it is all gone,” 1 Kgs. 14:10.

The sum of one of our former arguments was this: sacrifice and intercession both belong to the same person, as high priest. Our Savior is the most absolute, and indeed, the only true high priest. In him are found all those perfections which others received only as a weak and typical representation. And he performs both sacrifice and intercession on behalf of those for whom he is high priest.

General Arguments in favor of Universal Redemption.

I. He died for all, but only intercedes for the church.

I find that some propose an objection to universalism not unlike this: “The ransom and mediation of Christ is no larger than his office of priest, prophet, and king; but these offices pertain to his church and chosen ones. Therefore his ransom only pertains to them.”

The intent and meaning of this argument is the same as what we proposed: Christ offered nothing for those for whom he is not a priest, and he is a priest only for those for whom he also intercedes. If I have occasion to use this argument later, then I will give more weight and strength to it than it seems to have as stated. The interest of those who make this argument is to present their case as inoffensively as possible, so they may seem to have dispensed with it fairly. But let us look at the evasion, such as it is.

One who answered this argument², said “This is a sober objection.” At first I imagined this friendly reply was because he found the argument kind, and easy to be satisfied. But in reading the answer, I found that, far from what was pretended, it only served to vent some new, weak, and false conceptions. Usually what I hear from him in response to other arguments is, “This is horrid, that is blasphemy, detestable, abominable, and false,” phrases which can neither be endured nor avoided from those of his persuasion. After awhile, I realized that the reason for his

¹ In this chapter, Owen presents three arguments made by universalists: first, that he died for all, but only intercedes for the church; second, that Christ died for all so that some sinners may be persuaded; and third, that as Priest, his sacrifice is for one purpose and all men. All three arguments assume Christ's sacrifice can be separated from his intercession. Owen rejects such a separation of his offices of Mediator and Priest.

² Thomas Moore. See Prefatory remark and Chap. VIII, Sec. II. [Note](#).

friendly reply was intimated in its first words. What he meant was that “this objection does not deny the death of Christ for all men, but only his ransom and mediation for all men.”

Now, truly, if this is so, then I disagree with his judgment. It is not a “sober objection,” and I cannot be persuaded that any man in his right wits would propose it. That Christ would die for all, and yet not be a ransom for all, despite affirming that he came to “give his life a ransom for many,” Matt. 20:28, is to me a plain contradiction. The first and most widespread understanding of the death of Christ is that it is a ransom. Indeed, do not this man and those of the same persuasion make the ransom as extensive as the death of Christ? Or do they further distinguish and divide the ends of the death of Christ? As we have already heard from them: “He does not intercede for all for whom he paid a ransom.” Would they also say that he did not pay a ransom for all for whom he died? Who, then, were those others for whom he died, if the very purpose of his death was to pay a ransom? Those others must be beyond all and every man, for they indeed contend that Christ paid a ransom for all.¹ But let us see what he says further. In so easy a cause as this, it is a shame to take advantage.

“The answer to this objection,” he says, “is easy and plain in the Scripture, for the mediation of Christ is both more general and more special. It is more general, because he is the ‘one mediator between God and men,’ 1Tim. 2:5; and it is more special, because he is ‘the mediator of the New Testament, so that those who are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance’ Heb. 9:15. According to that, it is said, ‘He is the Savior of all men, specially of those who believe,’ 1Tim 4:10.² So in all the offices of Christ, the priest, prophet, and king, there is something that is more general, and more special, and unique.”

And this is what he calls a clear and plain answer from the Scripture. He leaves how it applies to the argument to our conjecture. As far as I can conceive, this must be its application: it is true that Christ paid a ransom only for those for whom he is a mediator and priest; but Christ should be considered in two ways: first, as a general mediator and priest for all; and secondly, as a special mediator and priest for some. He pays the ransom as a general mediator, and intercedes as a special mediator.

I assume this is some part of his meaning. In itself, the explanation is so barbarous and remote from common sense, and its substance is such a wild, unChristian madness, that contempt would far better suit it than a reply. The truth is, why should we expect sense and clear expression from

¹ Owen's line of reasoning up to here is a bit difficult to follow. Some Arminians assert that Christ died for all, and that he paid a ransom for all, but he does not intercede for all. Here Owen is saying that if he died for a person, then he paid a ransom for that person. That is because the point of his death was in fact to pay a ransom. Everyone agrees to this. Owen goes on to say that the point of paying a ransom is to apply the benefit of that payment (freedom from condemnation) to the person for whom it was paid. Applying the benefit begins with his intercession. Therefore, Christ is bound to intercede for all those for whom he died, because he paid a ransom for each one of them. Owen's point of contention with the Arminians is this: if Christ died for all, and a general ransom was paid for all, and yet all are not saved, then some for whom a ransom was paid were not freed from their debt of sin –how could Christ's intercession for them fail? Owen's underlying assumption is that Christ successfully intercedes for anyone for whom he paid a ransom. Arminians who argue for a general ransom reject that assumption. But Owen argues that by doing so they are also rejecting the very idea of a ransom. And so some Arminians might say that Christ died for all, but did not pay a ransom for all. Owen argues here that this would reject the very purpose of Christ's dying for them. Hence his incredulity that anyone would make such a claim.

² The word ‘specially’ [NT:3122 *malista*] can also be rendered ‘in particular’ or ‘specifically’

those who leap from their manual trades to the office of preaching and writing?¹ It is impossible to lament too much that madness in such tattered rags is entertained, while sober truth is shut out of doors. What, I pray you, is the meaning of this distinction that, "Christ is either a general mediator between God and man, or a special mediator of the new testament?" Was it ever heard before that Christ was a mediator of something other than the new testament? A mediator does not mediate for one. All mediation concerns an agreement between several parties. Every mediator is the mediator of a covenant. Now, if Christ is a mediator of some covenant beyond the new covenant, then, I ask you, what covenant was that? The covenant of works? Would not such an assertion defeat the whole gospel? Would it not be derogatory to the honor of Jesus Christ to be the mediator of a canceled covenant? Is it not contrary to Scripture to affirm "him a surety" of the first, instead "of a better testament?" Heb. 7:22.

Those who make such bold assertions are better fitted to be catechized than to preach. But we must not let it pass. The man harps upon something that he has heard from some Arminian doctor, though he has laid out his conceptions poorly. Therefore, being somewhat acquainted with how they color those texts of Scripture that are used here, I will briefly remove the poor shift, so that our former argument may stand unshaken.

I have already declared the poverty of the answer. Some have distinguished the fruits of Christ's mediation into those which are more general, and those which are more specific. In some sense, this may be tolerable. But saying the same of the offices of Christ, and Christ himself in relation to them, is a gross misrepresentation. We deny that there is any such general mediation, or general function of Christ's office, that would extend beyond his church or chosen ones.

It was his "church" which he "redeemed with his own blood," Acts 20:28. It was his "church" that "he loved and gave himself for, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, so that he might present it to himself a glorious church," Eph. 5:25-27. They were his "sheep" that he "laid down his life for," John 10:15, and that he "appears in heaven for," Heb. 9:24. There is not one word in the Scripture about mediating for anyone else.

- Look at his *incarnation*. It was "because the *children* were partakers of flesh and blood," Heb. 2:14, not because everyone in the world was a partaker.
- Look at his *oblation*: "For *their* sakes," he says, ("those whom you have given me,") "I sanctify myself," John 17:19; that is, he sanctifies himself to be an oblation for them. That was the work he then had in hand.
- Look at his *resurrection*: "He was delivered for *our* offenses, and was raised again for *our* justification," Rom. 4:25.
- Look at his *ascension*: "I go," says he, "to my Father and *your* Father, and that to prepare a place for you," John 14:2.
- Look at his perpetual *intercession*. Is it not to "completely save those who come to God by him?" Heb. 7:25.

There is not one word of this general mediation for all. If you will hear him, Christ denies in plain terms that he mediates for all: "I do not pray for the world, but for those whom you have given me," John 17:9.

¹ This tradesman who answers the argument against Universalism is Thomas Moore. See the Prefatory Note and Chap. VIII, sec. II. [Note](#)..

Let us see what is presented to confirm such a general mediation. 1Tim. 2:5 is quoted: "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." What conclusion is this supposed to lead us to? Is it impossible for Christ to be a mediator between God and men, without being a mediator for all men? Are not the elect men? Do not the children partake of flesh and blood? Does not his church consist of men? Why should some vague proposition lead us to this universal conclusion? Christ was a mediator for men. This would have been true even if he been a mediator only for his apostles. Will we conclude therefore that he was a mediator for all men? "Apage nugas!"¹

Let us look at another proof. Perhaps it will strengthen the uncouth distinction we oppose. It is 1Tim. 4:10, "Who is the Savior of all men, specially of those who believe." Had it been, "Who is the *Mediator* of all men, specially of those who believe," it would have been more likely. What are these men thinking? Is there any word here spoken of Christ as mediator? The words preceding this phrase indicate that it is the "living God" in whom we trust. He is the Savior mentioned here. And is Christ ever called our Savior with regard to his mediation? I showed before that God the Father is often called Savior. And it is the Father who is intended here, as all sound interpreters agree. That is clear from the context, which speaks of the protecting providence of God. It is general towards all, and special, or specific, towards his church. Thus he is said to "save man and beast," Ps. 36:6. The Hebrew for save, *Yasha* [OT:3467], is rendered *Soter* in the Greek [NT:4990, from 4982 *sozo*], "You shall save or preserve." It is God, then, who is called the "Savior of all" here. He is the Savior by his deliverance and protection in danger, which is his *providence*. This providence is specific towards believers. What proof this offers for universal mediation I do not know.

The context of this passage will not allow any other interpretation. The words offer a reason why believers should cheerfully go forward, running the race that is set before them with joy, despite all the injury and reproaches with which the people of God are continually assaulted. It is because God preserves all (for "in him we live, and move, and have our being," Acts 17:28; Ps. 145:14-16). He will not allow any of them to be injured or unrevenged, Gen. 9:5. And so he is especially the preserver of those who believe. For they are the apple of his eye, Zech. 2:8; Deut. 32:10. If he allows them to be pressed for a season, the apostle encourages them not to let go of their hope and confidence, nor be weary of well-doing, but still rest on and trust in him. What motive would he have to tell believers that God would save those who will never believe? To say nothing of how strange it would seem to have Christ be the Savior of those who are never saved, to whom he never gives grace to believe, and for whom he refuses to intercede, John 17:9. Yet this intercession is no small part of his mediation by which he saves sinners. Neither the subject nor the context of the phrase "He is the Savior of all men," is rightly apprehended by those who twist it in support of universal redemption. For the subject, "He," is God the Father, not Christ the mediator; and the context is a providential preservation, not a purchased salvation. That is, the providence of God protects and governs all. But God is watching in a special way for the good of those who are his, so that they will not always be unjustly and cruelly slandered and reviled, among other pressures. The apostle also shows that it was God's course to do so, 2Cor. 1:9, 10. "But we had the sentence of death in ourselves, so that we would not trust in ourselves, but in God who raises the dead: who delivered us from so great a death, and does deliver us: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us;" for "he is the Savior of all men, specially of those who believe." Paul reveals the basis for his confidence in going through his labors and afflictions

¹ It means, "scram" (or begone) "you babblers!" Obviously, Owen will suffer no fools.

in these words: "Because we hope in the living God," 1Tim. 4:10. If anyone thinks instead that these words express the sum of the doctrine for which he was so turmoiled and afflicted, I will not oppose it. For then it would only be an assertion of the true God and Paul's dependence on him. And this dependence is in opposition to all the idols of the Gentiles, and any other vain conceits by which they exalted themselves into the throne of the Most High. But instead, they are saying,

1. that Christ would be a Savior of those who will never be saved from their sins, in the same way that he saves his people, Matt. 1:21; or
2. that he is a Savior of those who never heard one word about saving, or about a Savior; or,
3. that he would be a Savior in a two senses – first for all, and then secondly for believers; or,
4. that believing is the condition by which Christ becomes a Savior in a special way to someone – and that condition was not procured or purchased by Christ.

If that is the sense of this passage, then I say, "credat Judaeus Apella:"¹

To me, nothing is more certain than that Christ completely saves those to whom he is in any sense a Savior in the work of redemption. He saves them from all their sins of infidelity and disobedience, with saving grace here, and glory after.

II. Christ died for all, that some Sinners may be Persuaded

There are also further attempts to give strength to this evasion, and invalidate our former argument. I must also remove them.

"Christ," they say, (Sir Thomas Moore's *Universality of Grace*)² "in some sort intercedes for transgressors, the sons of men who are still in and of the world. He does this so that the Spirit will unite and bless those who believe on Christ, and so invest himself in their confessions, lives, and ministrations of the gospel, that those among whom his servants dwell might be convinced by these things, and brought to believe the report of the gospel, Isa. 53:12; Luke 23:34. This is the pattern that Christ himself left for us, John 27:21-23. Christ intercedes so that the men of the world might be convinced, and the convinced allured to him, and to God in him, Matt. 5:14-16. In this way, he enlightens every man that comes into the world to some degree, John 1:9. But in a more special way, he intercedes for believers," etc.

Here we find a twofold intercession of Christ as mediator:

1. He intercedes for all sinners, so that they may believe (that is what is intended by these vague expressions).
2. He intercedes for all believers, so that they may be saved.

It is the first distinction that we oppose; and therefore we must address it.

¹ Literally, "Let the Jew Apella believe it," from the Satires of Horace. He could have said, "Tell that to the Marines," the final authority on tall tales. It refers to an obvious absurdity. See Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase and Fable.

² This is not the Thomas More who was Lord Chancellor under King Henry VIII (1478-1535). See the Prefatory Note for more information about this Thomas Moore.

First, the proposed universal intercession is unclear.

Our author says, "Christ in some sort intercedes." I ask, in what sort? Is it directly, or indirectly? Is it by virtue of his blood shed for them, or otherwise? Is it with an intention and desire to obtain for them the good things that he interceded for, or with the purpose that they will go without them? Is it for all and every man, or only for those who live in the outward pale of the church? Is faith the thing required of them, or is it something else? Is that requirement desired absolutely, or is it conditional? All of these questions must be clearly answered before this general intercession can be made intelligible.

First, is this intercession accidental or intentional?

Whether this intercession is direct or indirect, it is not represented as the immediate result or aim of the prayer of Christ. It is represented as a response to a blessing obtained by others. The prayer set down is that God would so bless believers, that those among whom they dwell may believe the report of the gospel. Believers are the direct object of this intercession; others are only glanced at through them. The good desired for those others is either dependent on the flourishing of believers, or else it is an end that Christ's intercession intends to accomplish.

If it is the first, then their good is no more intended than their evil.¹ If it is the latter, then why is it not effected? Why is the intent of our Savior not accomplished? Is it for lack of wisdom in choosing suitable and proportionate means to the proposed end? Or is it for lack of power to effect what he intends?

Secondly, is it by his oblation or not?

Does this intercession come by virtue of his blood that was shed for them, or otherwise? If it is by his blood, then Christ intercedes for them so that they may enjoy those things which he procured for them by his oblation. For that would make his death and blood-shedding the foundation of his intercession. If so, then it follows that Christ procured faith for all by his death, because he intercedes so that all may believe; thus his intercession is grounded on the merit of his death. First, this is more than the asserters of universal redemption will sustain. According to them, effectually and infallibly bestowing faith on those for whom he died is not one of the ends of the death of Christ. Secondly, if he has purchased faith for all by his death, and he entreats for it by his intercession, then why is it not actually bestowed on them? Are his oblation and intercession insufficient to yield that one spiritual blessing? If his intercession is not founded on his death and blood-shedding, then we desire the universalists to describe to us their version of the intercession of Christ. It must differ from his appearing for us in heaven sprinkled with his own blood.

Thirdly, is it to instill belief?

Does he intercede for them intending or desiring that they believe, or not? If not, it is only a mock intercession; he entreats for what he would not grant. If it is his intent, then why is it not accomplished? Why do not all believe? Indeed, if he died for all, and prayed for all, so that they might believe, then why are they all not saved? For Christ is always heard by his Father, John 11:42.

¹ That is, they must choose their salvation, dependent on the persuasiveness of believers. They are no different than Adam who chose to sin, succumbing to the persuasiveness of the serpent. Their good, like Adam's curse, will follow from their choice. Owen is really asking what changed in all this when Christ went to the cross?

Fourthly, is his intercession for the world, or only the church?

Does Christ intercede for everyone in the world, or only for those who live within the pale of the church? If he intercedes only for the church, then if he leaves out anyone in the world, the present hypothesis falls to the ground.¹ If he intercedes for all, then how will all be persuaded? He intercedes “that the Spirit would so lead, guide, and bless believers, and so invest himself in the ministration of the gospel by his servants, that others (that is, everyone in the world) may be convinced and brought to believe?” How can this be said of those millions of souls who will never see a believer, nor hear a report of the gospel?²

Fifthly, is it absolute or conditional?

If his intercession is for faith, then either Christ intercedes for it absolutely, ensuring they certainly have it, or conditionally on the part of God or man. If absolutely, then all will actually believe or else it is not true that the Father always hears him, John 11:42. If conditionally on the part of God, it depends on whether he wills or is pleased to bestow it. Now, adding this condition may denote two things in our Savior:

1. Ignorance of his Father's will in what he intercedes for. That would be inconsistent with the unity of his person as now in glory. And it cannot be, because he is promised to be heard in whatever he asks, Ps. 2:8.³
2. Or else he advances his Father's will by submitting to it as the prime cause of the good to be bestowed. This may well be consistent with absolute intercession, in which case all must believe.

Secondly, His Intercession is Limited and Conditional

Is it a condition on the part of those for whom he intercedes? Now, tell me, what condition is that? Where is it found in the Scripture? Where is it said that Christ intercedes for men so that they may have faith, if they do such and such? What condition can rationally be assigned to this desire? “Some intimate the condition is that they allow the Spirit to work on their hearts, and obey the grace of God.” Now, what is it to obey the grace of God? Is it not to believe? Therefore, it seems that Christ intercedes for them so that they may believe, on condition that they believe. Others, more cautiously, assert the condition of receiving the benefit of this intercession is the good use of the means of grace that they enjoy. But again,

1. What does “good use of the means of grace” mean but submitting to them, which is believing? And so we have the same tautology as before.
2. All do not have the means of grace to use, whether well or badly.

¹ The hypothesis is that he intercedes for all so that some might be persuaded by believers. If Christ intercedes only for the church, then others cannot be persuaded because he has not interceded for them. The hypothesis fails because universal intercession is its premise.

² There is a larger unstated proposition here. If Christ's universal intercession is true, then everyone in the world, in each generation, must have the opportunity to hear and be persuaded by the gospel. Their salvation would no longer be dependent on their own response, or on the sovereign election of God, or on Christ's work on the cross, but on the actions of believers. In essence, Christ would be pushing his responsibility for their salvation onto the church.

³ That is, if his intercession is universal, then either he would be interceding or entreating for what his Father does not will, or his Father would be breaking his promise to hear him.

3. Christ either prays that they may use the means of grace well, or he does not. If not, then how can he pray that they may believe, since using them well, by yielding obedience to them, is indeed what it means to believe? If he does, then he either does it absolutely, or conditionally, and so the argument is repeated.

Many more reasons might be produced to show the madness of this assertion, but these may suffice. Still, we must refute its proof and confirmations offered by the universalists.

First, he intercedes only for some transgressors

The words of the prophet Isaiah 53:12 are used to support their assertion of universal intercession. "*He made intercession for the transgressors,*" which they take to mean *all* transgressors.

ANSWER: The transgressors here, for whom our Savior is said to make intercession, are all the transgressors for whom he suffered. This is the most likely conclusion from the description we have of them in verse 6. Or as some suppose, they are only the transgressors by whom he suffered, that is, who acted in his sufferings. If the first, then this passage proves that Christ intercedes for all those for whom he suffered. This is what we argue for. If the second, then we may consider it accomplished. How he interceded for them only is found in the next passage. They urge it in support of their assertion, namely,

Luke 23:34, "*Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.*"

ANSWER: The conclusion being inferred from these words is that, "Therefore there is a general intercession for all, so that they may believe," I might well leave this to the silent judgment of men. But because the ablest of that side have usually insisted on this passage as proof for a general successful intercession, I will briefly consider their inference, and see whether it has any strength. To that end, we must observe,

Secondly, he prays only for his crucifiers

This prayer is not for all men, but only for that handful of Jews by whom he was crucified. Now, it is a wild deduction to infer from a prayer for them, that he prayed for all men that ever were, are, or will be.

It does not appear that he prayed for all his crucifiers either, but only for those who did it out of ignorance. This is apparent from the reason annexed to his supplication: "For they know not what they do." And though it is said that the rulers also acted ignorantly (Acts 3:17), it is not apparent that all of them did. It is certain from the passage in Acts that some did; and it is just as certain that some of them were converted, as indicated there. Indefinite propositions must not be made universal in such things. Does it follow that because Christ prayed to pardon the sins of those who crucified him out of ignorance, as some did, that he therefore intercedes for all so that they may believe? Can it refer to those who were not his crucifiers and never heard of his crucifixion?

Thirdly, his prayer is only for forgiveness, not belief

Christ does not pray for those men that they might believe, but only that their sin in crucifying him might be forgiven, and not laid to their charge. Hence, it is strange to conclude that he intercedes for all men, just because he prayed that the sin of those who crucified him might be forgiven.

Fourthly, he prays only for those at his death

There is another evident limitation in this business, for among his crucifiers he prays only for those who were present at his death. Many of these doubtless came out of curiosity more than malice and despite, to see and observe, as is usual in such cases. Some urge that notwithstanding this prayer, the chief priests continued in their unbelief. That does not apply here, for it cannot be proved that they were present at his crucifying.¹

Fifthly, it is unlikely he prayed for the impenitent

It cannot be affirmed with any probability that our Savior would pray for every one of them, assuming some of them would be finally impenitent. He knew full well "what was in man," John 2:25; Indeed, he "knew from the beginning who they were that would not believe," John 6:64. We have a rule in 1Jn. 5:16, "There is a sin unto death," etc. It would be contrary to that rule to pray for those whom we know to be finally impenitent, and who sin unto death.

Sixthly, his prayer was effectual – but not all believed

It seems to me that this supplication was effectual and successful, and that the Son was heard in this request. Faith and forgiveness were granted to those for whom he prayed. Yet this proves nothing for a general, ineffectual intercession, for it is both special and effectual. In Acts 3:14-15, Peter tells the crowd that they "denied the Holy One, and desired a murderer," "and killed the Prince of Life." Of those to whom he spoke, five thousand believed, Acts 4:4. "Many of those who heard the word believed, and their number was about five thousand." And similarly, if any others were among those whom our Savior prayed for, they might have been converted afterward. Even the rulers were not outside the compass of the fruits of this prayer, for "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith," Acts 6:7. So nothing can be inferred from this concerning the purpose intended.

Seventhly, he prays for his enemies as a duty, not as a Mediator

We may, no we must, grant a twofold basis for our Savior's prayers. One is by virtue of his office as Mediator; the other is in answer to his duty, as he was subject to the law. It is true that the one who was Mediator was made subject to the law, but those things he did in obedience to the law as a private person were not acts of mediation, nor works of the Mediator. Now, because he was subject to the law, our Savior was bound to forgive offenses and wrongs done to him, and to pray for his enemies. This is what he taught us to do, and which he gave us an example of in Matt. 5:44. "I say to you, love your enemies, bless those who curse you, do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who despitefully use you, and persecute you." He doubtless infers this from the law given in Lev. 19:18, "You shall not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of your people, but you shall love your neighbor as yourself." This is quite contrary to the wicked gloss put on it by the Pharisees. And in this sense, as a private person to whom revenge was forbidden, our Savior here enjoined pardon, commanded prayer, and prays for his enemies and crucifiers. This does not concern his interceding for us as

¹ Universalists urge that he interceded for all by his prayer, but all are not saved, such as the chief priests. This is said to support their claim that Christ died for all, but successfully intercedes only for believers. Owen rightly limits the objects of Christ's prayer to his crucifiers who were present, and as to them, Christ prays only that this sin of theirs be forgiven, not all of their sins. Even if all of their sins were forgiven, and they were saved, it still would not apply to all men.

mediator at all. In mediation, he was always heard, and so this says nothing concerning the purpose in hand.

John 17 confirms his intercession is limited, not universal

Again, John 17:21-23¹ is urged to confirm this general intercession, which we already disproved. Our Savior prays that, by the unity, concord, and the flourishing of his servants, the world might believe and know that God has sent him. Though some embellish this passage, the universalism they contend for is not confirmed by these words in any way.

First, he did not grant means of grace to all

If Christ really intended and desired that the whole world would believe, then no doubt he would also have prayed that more effectual means of grace would be granted to them than just beholding his blessed condition. Even that is granted to only a small part of the world. He would at least have asked for the preaching of the word to them all, as the only ordinary means by which they might come to know him. But we do not find that he ever prayed for this, or that God granted it. No, he blessed his Father that it was not so, because it seemed good in his sight, Matt. 11:25, 26.

Secondly, John 17:9 precludes a larger object

No gloss or interpretation should be put on the passage that would run contrary to the express words of our Savior in verse 9, "I do not pray for the world." For if he prayed here that the world would have true, holy, saving faith, then he prayed for as great a blessing and privilege for the world as what he procured or interceded for his own. Therefore,

Thirdly, "world" does not mean all men

Some say the world here refers to the world of the elect, the world to be saved, God's people throughout the world. Certainly the world is not properly *pro mundo continente*, the world containing, but figuratively *pro mundo contento*, the world contained, or men in the world. Nor must it be taken universally, as referring to all the men in the world. It is seldom taken that way in the Scripture, which we will make apparent later. Instead, it may be understood indefinitely, as men in the world, whether few or many, as the elect are found in their several generations. But, though this interpretation is held by great authors, I cannot absolutely adhere to it. That is because, throughout this chapter of John, the word "world" either refers to the world of reprobates, as opposed to those who are given *to* Christ *by* his Father; or it refers to the world of unbelievers, as opposed to those who are committed *by* Christ *to* his Father. Both are the same group taken from different vantage points.

Fourthly, believing here only means acknowledgement

Believing, verse 21, and knowing, verse 23, do not mean believing in a strict sense of having faith in him, nor having a saving comprehension of Jesus Christ that leads to receiving him.² If

¹ John 17:21-23: That they all may be one; as you, Father, are in me, and I in you, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that you have sent me. And the glory which you gave me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and you in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that you have sent me, and have loved them, as you have loved me.

² Christ prays that the whole world might be convinced of who he is by the testimony of the church, not that the whole world might be saved by believing in him. Even devils believe, in the sense of knowing who he is, and they tremble, but they are not saved, Jms. 2:19.

those he prayed for did, they would become the sons of God. This never was, nor ever will be, fulfilled in every man in the world. Nor was it ever prayed for. The only thing prayed for was a conviction and acknowledgment that the Lord Christ is not a seducer and false prophet, which is what they took him to be. Instead, he prayed that they might believe and know that he was one who came from God, able to protect and do good for and to his own, as he said. This is the kind of conviction and acknowledgment that is often termed "believing" in the Scripture. It is too evident to need proving. Expositors of all sorts agree that this is what is meant here. Now, this is not for the good of the world. It is for the vindication of his people, and the exaltation of his own glory. And so it does not prove the thing in question at all. But more about this word "world" will be discussed later.

Matthew 5:15-16 addresses witnessing, not intercession

"Nor do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick, and it gives light to all who are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father in heaven."

This passage contains some instructions given by our Savior to his apostles to improve their knowledge and light of him. They were to receive further instruction in the preaching of the word and in holiness of life, so that they might be a means to draw men to glorify God. This passage is included by the author simply to make a show of numbers, as many other passages are. He does not once consider what they prove, nor what their purposes are. Therefore, without further inquiry, it may well be laid aside. It does not belong to the business in hand at all, nor by all the strength and skill of Mr. Moore can it be dragged within many leagues of his conclusion.

John 1:9 only speaks of illumination, not intercession

This Scripture says that "*Christ is the true Light, that lights every man who comes into the world.*" This does not apply to the query either. It is wretchedly glossed and rendered as, "In some measure enlightening everyone who comes into the world." "*In some measure,*" says Mr. Moore. Now, I ask you, in what measure is this? How far, to what degree, in what measure, does this illumination come from Christ? By whom or by what means, apart from him, independent of him, is the rest of men's illumination comprised? Who supplies what is missing from Christ? I know your aim is to cherish your illumination by the light of nature. I do not know what common helps you dream of for those who are utterly deprived of all gospel means of grace. Such means not only bring the knowledge of God as Creator, but also knowledge of God as the Redeemer in Christ. I hope one day you will be convinced that you are making sacrifices to your own golden calves, with your twisting and perverting the word of God, and undervaluing the grace of Christ.

It is sufficient that Christ is said to enlighten everyone, because he is the only true light. Everyone who is enlightened receives his light from him, who is the sum and the source of that light. And so the general defense of this ineffectual intercession ends. But there is a further, particular reply to be made concerning the priesthood of Christ.

III. As Priest, his sacrifice is for one end, and all men

"As a priest, he offered sacrifice with regard to one end, which is propitiation for all men, Heb. 2:9, 9:26; John 1:29; 1Jn. 2:2. With regard to all the ends, he offered it for propitiation, for sealing the new testament, and as a testimony to the truth. And with regard to the ultimate end in

all, he offered it for his called and chosen ones, Heb. 9:14-15; Matt. 26:28.” (What follows from another passage has already been answered.)

ANSWER:

First, the language of the proposition is unclear

These words, as placed here, make no tolerable sense, nor is it easy to gather the mind of the author from them. They do little to provide the clear answer to the argument that they pretended to have. Words of Scripture are used, but they are twisted and corrupted. Not only do they countenance error, but they are made part of expressions that defy reason. What, I pray, is the meaning of these words: “He offered sacrifice with regard to one end, then to all ends, and then to the ultimate end in all?” To take them in reverse order:

1. What is this “ultimate end in all?” Does “in all” refer to one out of all the proposed and accomplished ends? Does it mean in all those persons for whom he offered sacrifice? Is it the ultimate end proposed by God and Christ in his oblation? If it is the last, then it is the glory of God. No such thing is intimated in the passages of Scripture cited (Heb. 9:14, 15;¹ Matt. 26:28²).

2. Do those passages demonstrate an ultimate end of the death of Christ that is subordinate to God's glory? Why is the end in one to obtain redemption, and in the other it is for the remission of sins? You say that all this is the first end of the death of Christ, calling it “propitiation,” an atonement for the remission of sins. And yet remission of sins and redemption are one and the same in substance. Both of them are the immediate fruits and the first end of the death of Christ, as is apparent from Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14.³ So here you have confused the first and the final end of the death of Christ. Indeed, you have spoiled and torn down the whole frame and building of your argument erected on this foundation (as you may lawfully do, for it is your own). You offer several purposes for the death of Christ, directed towards several persons, so that some of them belong to all, and all of them belong only to some. This is the “protos pseudos” [primary falseness] of the whole book.

3. Christ offering himself to put away sin, from Heb. 9:26,⁴ is said to be the passage showing the first end of the death of Christ, and shedding his blood for the remission of sins, from Matt. 26:28, is said to be the last! Pray, when you write next time, give us the difference between these two.

4. You say, “He offered sacrifice with regard to one end, propitiation for all men.” Now, truly, if you know the meaning of sacrifice and propitiation, this will hardly make sense to you on review.

¹ Heb 9:14-15: How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? For this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, those who are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

² Matt 26:28: This is my blood of the new testament, shed for many for the remission of sins.

³ Eph 1:7; Col 1:14: In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;

⁴ Heb 9:26: For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world he has appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

Secondly, if Christ is Priest for all, it can only be for some ends

Let me leave your words and try to surmise your meaning. You seem to say that, with regard to one end of Christ's sacrifice, he is a priest for all, and he aimed to attain and accomplish that end for them. But with regard to other ends, he is a priest only for his chosen and called. Now, truly, this is an easy way to answer. You disappoint your adversaries by setting aside their arguments, and then saying your own opinion is different. The very thing given for an answer here is what we are debating. We absolutely deny that the good things procured by Christ's death are variously distributed with regard to their objects. To give a reason for our denial that these things are divided, we point to the argument above concerning the priesthood of Christ.

You will say that various passages of Scripture are quoted to confirm your answer. But, as I told you before, these are presented only for pomp and show. Nothing at all is found in them that applies to the business in hand, for example, Heb. 9:26 and John 1:29. How can we conclude from an indefinite affirmation that Christ bore or took away sin, that he is a priest for everyone with regard to propitiation? Besides, in John 1:9 there is a manifest allusion to the paschal lamb, by which there was a typical, ceremonial purification and cleansing of sin. This applied only to the people of Israel, the type of the elect of God, and not to all the world. Those other two passages, Heb. 2:9 and 1Jn. 2:2, will be considered separately, because they seem to have some strength concerning the main part of the argument. But there is obviously no word in them that can be twisted to give the least support to the rude distinction that we oppose. And so our argument is confirmed and vindicated. The objects of Christ's oblation and intercession are of equal extent. With that, the means used by the blessed Trinity to accomplish the proposed end have been unfolded. The end of those means will be considered next.

BOOK II

CHAPTER I – Purpose and Effect of Christ's Death

A more specific inquiry into the proper end and effect of the death of Christ.

The main thing on which the whole controversy about the death of Christ turns, and on which the great weight of the business depends, is next for our consideration. It is what we have prepared the way for by what has been said already. It is about the proper end of the death of Christ. Whoever can rightly and clearly demonstrate this issue may well be made an umpire in this contest. For if the end of Christ's death is what most of our adversaries assign to it, then we will not deny that Christ died for everyone. And if it is what we maintain, then our adversaries must not extend it beyond the elect, beyond believers. This, then, must be fully clarified and solidly confirmed by those who hope for success in this undertaking.

A brief summary up to this point:

In the beginning of our discourse, we asserted that the purpose of Christ's death is to draw near to God. That is a general expression for everything involved in the recovery of sinners from their state of alienation, misery, and wrath, into grace, peace, and eternal communion with God. There is a twofold end in these things. One end is for the worker (what he intends), and the other is for the work that is wrought (what is accomplished). The worker (or agent) may lack wisdom and certitude in choosing suitable means to attain the proposed end. Or he may lack skill and power in rightly using appropriate means to his best advantage. And so, we showed how these things are always coincident: the work effects what the workman intends by his selection and use of means.

In the business in hand, the agent is the blessed Three in One. And the oblation and intercession of Jesus Christ were the means by which they aligned with and aimed at their proposed end. Oblation and intercession are united. They intend the same object, as was established. Now, unless we blasphemously ascribe lack of wisdom, power, perfection, and sufficiency to the agent, or we assert that the death and intercession of Christ was inappropriate to attain the proposed end, we must grant that the worker and the work have the same end. Whatever the blessed Trinity intended by them was effected; and whatever we find in the result ascribed to them is what the blessed Trinity intended. So we have no reason to consider these separately, unless to argue from one to the other. That is, where we find anything ascribed to Christ's death (as its fruit), we may conclude that God intended to effect that fruit by his death, and vice versa.

Now, the end of the death of Christ is either supreme and ultimate, or it is intermediate and subservient to that ultimate end.

1. It is Supreme and Ultimate with regard to God's glory

The first end is the glory of God, or the manifestation of his glorious attributes, especially his justice, and his mercy toward us that is tempered with his justice. The Lord necessarily aims at himself in the first place, as the highest good, indeed, what alone is good. That is absolutely and inherently so, not deriving his goodness from anything else. Therefore, in all his works, especially the one in hand which is the highest of all, he first intends to manifest his own glory. And he fully accomplishes this in its close, to every point and degree he intended from the start. He "makes all things for himself," Prov. 16:4. Everything in the end must "redound to the glory

of God," 2Cor. 4:15. In this, Christ himself is said to be "God's," 1Cor. 3:23, serving to his glory in that whole administration committed to him. In Eph. 1:6, we find that the whole end of this dispensation, in choosing us from eternity, redeeming us by Christ, and blessing us with all spiritual blessings in him, is "to the praise of the glory of his grace," and "That we should be to the praise of his glory." Eph. 1:12.

This is the end of all the benefits we receive by the death of Christ. For "we are filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ, to the glory and praise of God," Phil. 1:11. This is also fully asserted in Phil. 2:11, "That every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." The apostle fully establishes this in Romans 9, where he asserts the supreme dominion and independence of God in all his actions, and his absolute freedom from making his purposes depend on anything from the sons of men. He does all things for his own sake, and aims only at his own glory. And this is what will be accomplished at the close of all, when every creature will say, "Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto the one who sits upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever," Rev. 5:13.

2. It is Intermediate and Subservient with regard to us

There is an end of the death of Christ which is intermediate and subservient to the end of God's glory. It is the last and most supreme end with regard to us. That is what we now address. It is *bringing us to God*. Now, in reference to the oblation and intercession of Christ, both aim at this same end. Yet, bringing us to God has two distinct parts: the end, and the means to attain that end. With regard to us, both the end (bringing us to God) and the means used (Christ's oblation and intercession), are the ultimate end of the mediation of Christ. The cause is the Lord's appointment of a coherent connection between the acts and the things purchased for us by Jesus Christ. The one should be a means to attain the other. The one is the condition, and the other is the thing promised upon that condition. Both have been equally and alike procured for us by Jesus Christ. For if either is omitted in his purchase, the other would be in vain and fruitless.

Now, both of these consist in a communication of God and his goodness to us. This is for purposes of grace or glory, holiness or blessedness, faith or salvation. Using this last one as an example, faith is the means, and salvation the end; faith is the condition, and salvation is the promised inheritance. Under the name of faith is included all the saving grace that accompanies it; and under the name of salvation is included the whole "glory to be revealed," the liberty of the glory of the children of God, Rom. 8:18,21, and all the blessedness of an eternal enjoyment of the blessed God. With faith go all the effectual means of that faith, both external and internal: the word and the almighty sanctifying Spirit. It includes all the advances in our condition, such as justification, reconciliation, and adoption into the family of God. It includes all the fruits that flow from it in our sanctification and universal holiness. And it includes all the other privileges and enjoyments of believers here, which result from the redemption and reconciliation purchased for them by the oblation of Christ.

We maintain that the end proposed and effected by the blood-shedding of Jesus Christ is a real, effectual, and infallible. It bestows and applies all these things to everyone for whom he died. It includes the means as well as the ends, the condition as well as the result, faith and grace as well as salvation and glory. And it includes those other acts of his mediation which are inseparably joined. Thus, everyone for whom he died and offered himself, by virtue of his death or oblation, has a right to all these things that were purchased for him. In due time, he will certainly and infallibly enjoy them. In the same way, the purpose of Christ's obtaining grace and glory with his

Father was so that all these things would certainly be bestowed on all those for whom he died. Some of them would be bestowed on condition that they believe, but faith itself is absolutely bestowed without any condition. We will further illustrate and confirm this after we remove some false ends that have been assigned to his death.

CHAPTER II – Refuting Mistaken Purposes of Christ's Death

Some mistakes and false ends that have been assigned to the death of Christ.

The death, oblation, and blood-shedding of Jesus Christ are means to an appointed end; and such means are not inherently desirable except to attain that end. Now, because the end of anything must be good or desirable (for it is the agent's intent to accomplish it), the proposed end must be his Father's good, his own good, or our good.

I. It was not for Christ's own good

It is very apparent that the end was not merely his own good. For in his divine nature, he eternally and essentially partakes of all the glory that belongs to the Deity. With regard to us, that glory is variously manifested, but in itself it is always eternally and absolutely perfect. At the close of all, he desires and requests no other glory than what he had with his Father "before the world was," John 17:5. With regard to his human nature, he was eternally predestined to be personally united with the second person of the Trinity. There was no foresight of doing or suffering anything from the instant of his conception. Therefore, while he was in his humanity, he did not merit anything for himself by his death and oblation. He did not need to suffer for himself, because he was perfectly and legally righteous. The glory he aimed at by "enduring the cross, and despising the shame," was not so much to exalt his own glory, as it was to bring many children to glory. This was in the promise made to him, as we declared before. His own exaltation, his power over all flesh, and his appointment to be Judge of the quick and the dead, was a consequence of his deep humiliation and suffering. But we deny that it was the effect and product of his death, that it was procured meritoriously by it, or that it was the end aimed at in his making satisfaction for sin.

Christ has power and dominion over all, but the foundation of this dominion is not his death for all. He has dominion over all things, because he has been appointed "heir of all things, ... upholding them all by the word of his power," Heb. 1:2, 3. "He is set over the works of God's hands, and all things are put in subjection under him," Heb. 2:7, 8. And what "all things" are, or include, may be found in Ps. 8:5-8,¹ the passage cited by the apostle. And did he die for all these things? No. Does he not have power over the angels? Are not principalities and powers made subject to him? Will he not judge the angels at the last day? Even the saints will do it with him, by attesting to his righteous judgments, 1. Cor. 6:2, 3. And yet, it is expressly said that the angels have no share in the whole dispensation of God demonstrated by Christ's dying for the saints to redeem them from their sins. The angels had no need, and any others are eternally excluded: "He did not help angels; but the seed of Abraham," Heb. 2:16. God made him "king upon his holy hill of Zion," to spite his enemies, to bruise them, and to rule them "with a rod of iron," Ps. 2:6, 9. Yet these things are not the immediate effect of his death for them. Rather, all things are given

¹ Ps 8:5-8: You have given him dominion over the works of your hands; you have put all things under his feet, all sheep and oxen – even the beasts of the field, the birds of the air, and the fish of the sea that pass through the paths of the seas.

into his hand because of the immediate love of the Father for his Son, John 3:35; Matt. 11:27.¹ This is the foundation of the sovereignty and dominion he has been given over all creatures, and his power to judge.

Besides, even if it were granted that Christ procured this power to judge by his death (which cannot be proved), would anything follow from that to prove a general ransom for all? Undoubtedly not. This dominion and power to judge is a power to condemn as well as to save. "All judgment" is committed to him, John 5:22. "He has authority given to him to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man." He will execute it at that hour "when all who are in their graves hear his voice and come out; those who have done good, to resurrection of life; and those who have done evil, to resurrection of condemnation," Jn. 5:27-29; 2Cor. 5:10. Now, can it be reasonably asserted that Christ died for men to redeem them, so that he might gain the power to condemn? No. These two things defeat one another. If he redeemed you by his death, then his intent was not to obtain the power to condemn you. If it was, then your redemption was not his intent.

II. It was not for his Father's good.

Secondly, the purpose of Christ's death was not for his Father's good. I am speaking of the immediate end of Christ's death, not its ultimate end. The ultimate end of Christ's oblation (with all the benefits that it purchased and procured) was "to the praise of his glorious grace."² But as to its immediate end, it does not directly obtain anything for God. Instead, it obtains all good things from God for *us*. Arminius and his followers, along with the other universalists of our day, assert that the end is so that God *might* save sinners. His justice has been satisfied, and the hinderance to his saving sinners has been removed by the satisfaction of Christ. By his death, they say, Christ obtained a right and liberty to pardon sin on whatever condition he pleased. Once the satisfaction of Christ was yielded, and considered "*integrum Deo fuit*"³ (as Arminius put it), it was wholly up to God whether to save any or not, and on what condition – whether a condition of faith or works. "God," they say, "had a good mind and will to do good to human kind, but could not because of sin. His justice lay in the way. Therefore he sent Christ to remove that obstacle, that so he might have mercy on them once they fulfilled whatever condition he was pleased to prescribe." Now, because the Arminians consider this the primary, if not the only, end of Christ's oblation, I must show the falseness and folly of it. This may be done plainly by the following reasons:

First, God was not restricted to this solution

The foundation of this whole assertion seems to me to be false and erroneous. They claim that God could not have mercy on mankind unless satisfaction was made by his Son. Assuming it was God's decree, purpose, and constitution to manifest his glory through vindicative justice, it was impossible to be otherwise; for with the Lord there is "no variableness, nor shadow of turning," James 1:17; 1Sam. 15:29. But to assert that, prior to his decree, he absolutely could not have done it, is to me an unwritten tradition. The Scripture affirms no such thing, nor can it

¹ John 3:35 - The Father loves the Son, and has given all things into His hand.

Matt 11:27 - All things are delivered to me by my Father: and no man knows the Son, but the Father; nor does any man know the Father, save the Son, and whomever the Son reveals him to.

² Eph. 1:6

³ "entirely God's work"

be justifiably inferred from there. If anyone denies this, we will see what the Lord has for us to say about it. In the meantime, we rest contented in what Augustine had to say: "Though his infinite wisdom did not lack other ways to save us, certainly the way in which he proceeded was the most convenient, because he proceeded in it."¹

Secondly, it would be wishing, not willing

This would make the cause of God sending his Son to die a common love. It would be *wishing* that he might do good, or show mercy to all, instead of being entirely an act of his *will* or purpose, an act of knowing, redeeming, and saving his elect. Later we will disprove that it was merely a wish.

Thirdly, it would liberate the Father, not us

If the purpose of Christ's death was to acquire a right for his Father so that, notwithstanding his justice, he might save sinners, then he died to redeem a liberty for God to save, rather than a liberty for us to be free from evil. He would have died to gain his Father a greater estate than the one in which it was impossible for him to do what he desired, and toward which his nature was inclined. Christ would not have died to free us from an estate and condition in which we must perish without his purchase of our freedom. If what they say were true, then I see no reason why Christ would be said to come to redeem his people from their sins. Rather, he would plainly have purchased this right and liberty for his Father. Now, where is there any such assertion, or anything of this nature, in the Scripture? Does the Lord say that he sent his Son out of love toward himself, or toward us? Is God, or are *men*, the immediate subject of the good attained by this oblation?

Reply by the universalists: Although this right did arise to God immediately by Christ's death, it also tended to our good. Christ obtained that right, so that the Lord might now bestow mercy on us, if we fulfilled the condition that he would propose.

But I answer, that this would utterly defeat all the merit of the death of Christ towards us. Not even the nature of merit would be left. If something is truly meritorious, then it deserves that the thing which is merited *will* be done, or that it ought to be bestowed, and not only that it may *possibly* be done. There is such a relation between merit and the thing obtained by it, whether it is absolute or contractual, that there arises a real right to the thing procured. When the laborer has worked all day, we do not say, "Now his wages may or may not be paid;" rather we say, "Now his wages *must* be paid" Does he not have a right to his wages? Have we ever heard of the kind of merit in which the thing procured by what was done *might* be bestowed, and not that it *ought* to be?

And did Christ's meritorious oblation purchase only the possibility that he might bestow and apply the fruits of his death by his Father's hand to some or all? "To the one who works," the apostle says, "the reward is not reckoned to be of grace, but of debt," Rom. 4:4. The fruits of Christ's death are as truly procured for us as if they had been obtained by our own hand. With

¹ The reader may be referred to the treatise by the author at the end of this volume, "De Divinâ Justitiâ," for the full and mature expression of his views on the necessity of the atonement. In the statements above, it is implied that salvation might have been accomplished without the absolute necessity of such a satisfaction to the claims of justice as the death of Christ afforded. Dr Owen, it will be found in the treatise referred to, latterly changed his views on this point, and held the necessity for the satisfaction of divine justice by an atonement, in order to salvation, to be absolute. — Ed.

regard to the persons on whom they are bestowed, these fruits are applied as a matter of free grace. Yet, with regard to the purchase, their application is a matter of debt.

Fourthly, despite his sacrifice, some would not be saved

It cannot be said that the ultimate purpose of Christ's death was to create a situation in which it is not only possible that no one would be saved, but indeed impossible for any sinner to be saved by virtue of Christ's death alone. The Scripture fully declares that through Christ we have remission of sins, grace, and glory. But now, notwithstanding this, it might very well be that none of us will enjoy eternal life: for suppose the Father would not bestow it. After all, he is not obligated to bestow it according to this persuasion. He may have a right to do it, but he may exercise this right or not, at his discretion.

Again, suppose God prescribed works as the subsequent condition, and it was impossible for anyone to fulfill it. Then the death of Christ might have accomplished its full purpose, and yet no one would be saved. Was this what was meant by his coming to "save what was lost?" Or could he, by such a limited accomplishment as this, pray as he did, "Father, I will that those whom you have given me be with me where I am; so that they may behold my glory?" John 17:24.

Various other reasons might be given to affirm what this fancy turns on its head. They would make the purchase of Christ not for the actual remission of sins, but only for its possibility; not for salvation, but only salvability; not to achieve reconciliation and peace with God, but only to open a door towards it. But I will use such reasons to assign the right end to the death of Christ.

Ask these universalists what the Father will do upon the death of Christ to satisfy the justice which previously hindered his good will towards men. They will tell you he enters into a new covenant of grace with them. And upon the performance of some condition, they will have all the benefits of Christ's death applied to them. But it seems to us that Christ himself, with his death and passion, is the chief promise of the new covenant as it is found in Gen. 3:15.¹ And so the covenant cannot be said to be procured by his death. Besides, the nature of the covenant defeats this proposal. They say that those with whom the covenant is made will have such and such good things if they fulfill the condition. It is as though it all depended on this obedience, when that obedience itself, and its whole condition, is a promise of the covenant, Jer. 31:33,² a covenant which is confirmed and sealed by the blood of Christ.

We deny that the death of Christ has any proper end with regard to God other than to manifest his glory. That is the reason God calls him "his servant, in whom he will be glorified," Isa. 49:3. Bringing many sons to glory, a duty with which he was entrusted, was to the manifestation and praise of his glorious grace.³ And that was so his love for his elect might gloriously appear, his salvation being borne out by Christ to the ends of the earth. This full declaration of his glory, made evident by his mercy tempered with his justice,⁴ is all that accrued to the Lord by the death

¹ Gen 3:15 - And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; it shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel.

² Jer 31:33, 34 - But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, says the LORD, I will place my law in their core, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people... for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.

³ Eph. 1:6

⁴ For "he set forth Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, that he might be just, and the justifier of the one who believes in Jesus," Rom. 3:25, 26

of his Son. He gained no right or liberty to do what his justice allegedly prevented him from doing before. With regard to us, the end of the oblation and blood-shedding of Jesus Christ was not so that God might pardon us if he would, but that he should pardon us by virtue of the covenant that was the foundation of Christ's merit. He agreed to bestow on us all the good things which Christ intended to purchase and procure by offering himself to God for us.

CHAPTER III – Scriptures Asserting the Immediate End of Christ's Death

The immediate end of the death of Christ, with the several ways it is designed.

The introduction to this whole discourse laid down what the Scripture affirms to be the immediate end of Christ's death. Now, having clarified our sense and meaning in that regard more fully, the end must be more specifically asserted by applying particular passages to our thesis. This is the sum of our thesis: "Jesus Christ, according to the counsel and will of his Father, offered himself on the cross, to procure those things recounted before. He makes continual intercession with the intent and purpose that all the good things procured by his death would be actually and infallibly bestowed on and applied to everyone for whom he died, according to the will and counsel of God." Let us now see what the Scripture says about this. We will arrange the various passages under these groupings:

First, Those which show the intention and counsel of God, with our Savior's own mind, which was one with his Father's in this business.

Secondly, Those which lay down the actual effect of his oblation, what it really procured, effected, and produced.

Thirdly, Those which point out the persons for whom Christ died, the special objects of this work of redemption, as the end and purpose of God.

I. Those which show the intent of God

In the first group, showing the counsel, purpose, mind, intention, and will of God and our Savior in this work, we have Matt. 18:11, "The Son of man is come to save what was lost." He repeats these words again in Luke 19:10.

First, the parable of the lost sheep

In the first passage, they are in the front of the parable about seeking the lost sheep. In the other passage, they are in the close of the recovery of lost Zaccheus. And both passages present the purpose of Christ's coming, which was to do the will of his Father by recovering lost sinners. Zaccheus was recovered by conversion, by bringing him into the free covenant, and making him a son of Abraham. The lost sheep he lays upon his shoulder and brings it home. So, unless he finds what he seeks, unless he recovers what he comes to save, he fails in his purpose.

Secondly, the angel's declaration of Christ's purpose

Matt. 1:21 is the same. The angel declares the purpose of Christ's coming in the flesh, and consequently of all his sufferings in the flesh. He was to "save his people from their sins." Whatever is required to completely and perfectly save his special people from their sins was what he intended by his coming. To say that he only effected the work of salvation in part or in some aspect, is an unfavorable report to Christian ears.

Thirdly, Paul's declaration of his purpose

Paul gives a similar expression in 1Tim. 1:15. He clearly declares the purpose of our Savior's coming, according to the will and counsel of his Father. It is to "save sinners." It is not to open a door for them to come in if they choose to. It is not to make a way possible, so that they may be saved. It is not to purchase reconciliation and pardon from his Father, which perhaps they will never enjoy. It is to actually save them from all the guilt and power of sin, and from the wrath of God for sin. If he does not accomplish this, then he fails in the purpose for which he came. But if that alarm is false and he has not failed, then surely he came only for those who are actually saved. The Father made a compact with his son. He made a promise to him of "seeing his seed, and carrying along the pleasure of the LORD prosperously," Isa. 53:10-12. From this, it is apparent that the decree and the purpose of actually giving a believing generation to Christ, whom he calls "The children that God gave him," Heb. 2:13, is inseparably attached to the decree of Christ's "making his soul an offering for sin." And therefore, saving those who the Father gave him is the end and the aim of that decree.

Fourthly, the declaration in Hebrews

As the apostle further declares in Heb. 2:14,15, "Just as the children are flesh and blood, he likewise became flesh and blood; that through death he might destroy the one who had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver those who through fear of death," etc. Nothing can more clearly state the purpose of that whole dispensation of the incarnation and offering of Jesus Christ than those words. It is to deliver the children whom God gave him from the power of death, hell, and the devil, thus bringing them near to God. There is nothing at all mentioned of purchasing a possible deliverance for everyone. No, *all* are not those children which God gave him. *All* are not delivered from death and the one with the power of death. And therefore it was not *all* for whom he took on flesh and blood.

Fifthly, the declaration in Ephesians

We have the same purpose and intent in Eph. 5:25-27: "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, so that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, and that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having a spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." And again in Tit. 2:14, "He gave himself for us, so that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify a special people for himself, zealous of good works." I think nothing can be clearer than these two passages. Nor is it possible for the wit of man to as fully and lively express our argument, as it is expressed in both these passages by the Holy Ghost. What did Christ do? "He gave himself," say both these passages alike: "For his church," says one; "For us," says the other. Both words have equal extent and force, as all men know. For what purpose did he do this? "To sanctify and cleanse it, to present it to himself a glorious church, not having a spot or wrinkle," he says to the Ephesians. "To redeem us from all iniquity, and to purify a special people for himself, zealous of good works," he says to Titus. I ask now, do all men belong to this church? Do all belong to that group of men among whom Paul places himself and Titus? Are all purged, purified, sanctified, made glorious, and brought near to Christ? Or does Christ fail in his aim towards a great part of mankind? I dare not embrace any of these.

Sixthly, Christ's own declaration recorded in John

Our Savior Christ himself expresses this more evidently. He restricts the object of his sacrifice, declaring his whole design and purpose, and affirming the purpose of his death. In John 17:19 we read, "For their sakes I sanctify myself, so that they also might be sanctified through the truth." "For their sakes," he says. For whose sake, I ask? "The men whom you have given me out of the world," John 17:6. It is not the whole world; for he did not pray for the whole world, verse 9. "I sanctify myself." For what? "For the work I am now engaged in, to be an oblation." And to what end? "That they also may be truly sanctified." The phrase signifies the intent and purpose of Christ. It describes the end he aimed at, and which we hope he has accomplished for it is the hope of the gospel as well. "For the Deliverer that comes out of Zion turns away ungodliness from Jacob," Rom. 11:26. And in this he concurred with the will of his Father, for his purpose was to do and to fulfill the will of his Father.¹

Seventhly, the declaration in Galatians

It is apparent from Gal. 1:4 that this was his Father's counsel, for our Lord Jesus "gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father." His will and purpose is further declared in Gal. 4:4-6, "God sent his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive the adoption of sons." Because we are sons, we are delivered from the law, and thereby freed from the guilt of sin. Being adopted as sons, receiving the Spirit, and drawing near to God, are all part of the Father's purpose in giving his only Son for us.

Eighthly, the declaration in 2Corinthians

I will add only one more passage of the many that might be cited, and that is 2Cor. 5:21, "He has made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, so that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." The purpose of God, in making his Son to be sin, is so that those for whom he was made sin might become his righteousness. That was God's purpose for sending Christ to be made sin, and the reason Christ was willing to become so. Now, if it was the Lord's purpose that universal salvation not be fulfilled, and he knew it would never be fulfilled, and he would not work to fulfill it, then he must have made Christ to be sin only for those who would actually become righteousness in him as an effect of his death. So it is apparent from these passages that Christ's purpose and intention was to fulfill the counsel and will of God, by his own oblation and blood-shedding.

From all of this we draw this conclusion: What the Father and the Son intended to accomplish for all those for whom Christ died, was most certainly effected by his death. And what was effected was this: they are all redeemed, purged, sanctified, purified, delivered from death, from Satan, from the curse of the law, released from the guilt of sin, made righteousness in Christ, and brought near to God. Therefore, Christ died for all those, but only those, in whom all these things are effected. Whether they are all effected in everyone for whom he died, I leave for others to judge who know of these things.

II. Those which lay down the actual effect of his oblation

The second group contains those passages which lay down the actual accomplishment and effect of this oblation, what it really produces and effects in those for whom it is made. It includes Heb.

¹ John 4:34 - My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work.

9:12, 14: "By his own blood he entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us...., The blood of Christ, who offered himself without spot to God through the eternal Spirit, shall purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God." Two things are ascribed to the blood of Christ here. One refers to God: "It obtains eternal redemption." The other refers to us: "It purges our consciences from dead works." So justification with God is the immediate product of that blood by which he entered the holy place, and of that oblation which he presented to God. He procured for us an eternal redemption from the guilt of our sins and his Father's wrath caused by our sins. It includes sanctification in ourselves ("purging our sins," Heb. 1:3). Indeed, this meritorious purging of our sins is specifically ascribed to his offering, performed before his ascension: Heb. 1:3, "When he had purged our sins, he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." And it is expressly mentioned again in Heb. 9:26: "He has appeared to put away sin by sacrificing himself." This expiation (putting away sin by a sacrifice) necessarily and actually sanctifies those for whom Christ was a sacrifice. It does so just as "the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifies for purifying the flesh," Heb. 9:13. Such earthly sacrifices were a "shadow of good things to come."¹ It is certain that whoever was either polluted or guilty because of sin, and for whom an expiation and sacrifice was allowed by such physical ordinances, truly acquired the following:

First, sanctification

This is a legal cleansing and sanctifying; a purifying of the flesh.

Secondly, freedom from punishment

They had freedom from the punishment that was due for breaching the law. This is because the law was the rule of life for God's people. The sacrifice physically accomplished this freedom from punishment for the one who was permitted such an expiation.

Now, because they were only "shadows of good things to come," Christ's sacrifice certainly effected spiritually what these earthly sacrifices typified; and it did so for all those for whom the sacrifice was made. It effected spiritual cleansing by sanctification, and it effected freedom from the guilt of sin. These passages evidently prove it. Whether this is accomplished in all, and for all, let those who are able judge.

Again, by his death, Christ is said to "bear our sins," 1Pet. 2:24. In this passage we have both what he did, "bore our sins" (he carried them up with him upon the cross); and what he intended, "That we being dead to sins, should live to righteousness." And what was the effect? "By his stripes we are healed." This effect of healing is taken from the same passage where our Savior is affirmed to "bear our iniquities, and to have them laid upon him" (Isa. 53:5, 6, 10-12). So it is expository of 1Pet.2:24, and will tell us what Christ did by "bearing our sins." This phrase is used more than once in the Scripture for this purpose. Christ bore our iniquities by his death in such a way that, by virtue of the stripes and afflictions he underwent in offering himself for us, he certainly procured and effected our freedom so that we would not suffer any of those things that he underwent for us. You may also refer to all those passages which evidently show a commutation of suffering between Christ and us. For example, Gal. 3:13: "He delivered us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us."

¹ Heb. 10:1

Thirdly, peace and reconciliation with God

That is, actual peace, achieved by the removal of all enmity on both sides, along with all its causes, is fully ascribed to this oblation: Col. 1:21, 22, "And you, who were sometimes alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, he has now reconciled in his fleshly body through death, to present you holy, unblamable, and unaccused in his sight." Also Eph. 2:13-16, "You who sometimes were far off are made near by the blood of Christ: for he is our peace; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, caused by the law of commandments, so that he might reconcile both to God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby."

Add to these all those passages which likewise assert, as the fruit of his death, complete deliverance from anger, wrath, death, and the one who had the power of death. In Rom. 5:8-10, we see that the immediate effect of Christ's death is peace and reconciliation, deliverance from wrath, enmity, and whatever lies against us to keep us from enjoying the love and favor of God. Christ effected a redemption from all these things for his church "with his own blood," Acts 20:28. And thus, everyone for whom he died may truly say, "Who shall lay anything to our charge? It is God that justifies. Who is the one who condemns? It is Christ that died, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, and who also makes intercession for us," Rom. 8:33, 34. It cannot be shown that these things are procured for every one of the sons of Adam, nor that they all may rejoice in full assurance of it. And yet it is evident that they were procured for all those for whom he died, and that they are the effects of his death for them. For by being slain "he redeemed them to God by his blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and made them kings and priests to our God," Rev. 5:9, 10. "He made an end of their sins, he made reconciliation for their iniquity, and he brought in everlasting righteousness," Dan. 9:24.

Fourthly, life and eternal glory for his sheep

We may also include those other passages where our life is ascribed to the death of Christ, such as John 6:33: He "came down from heaven to give life to the world." Sure enough, he gives life to that world for which he gave his life. It is the world of "his sheep, for which he lays down his life," John 10:15, so that he might "give eternal life to them, that they might never perish," 10:28. He appeared "to abolish death, and to bring life and immortality to light," 2Tim. 1:10. See also Rom. 5:6-10.¹

Now, none of these passages in itself is sufficient against the assertion of a general ransom, or the universality of the merit of Christ. But I will take from the whole of them this general argument: The death and oblation of Jesus Christ (as a sacrifice to his Father) sanctifies all those for whom it was intended as a sacrifice. It purges their sin. It redeems them from wrath, curse, and guilt. It produces peace and reconciliation with God for them. It procures life and immortality for them. It bears their iniquities, and heals all their diseases. If all of these are the actual effects upon those for whom he died, then Christ died only for those who are actually sanctified by his death, who are in fact purged, redeemed, justified, freed from wrath and death, quickened, saved, etc. But it is obvious that all are not sanctified, freed, etc. Therefore, all cannot be the proper object of the death of Christ. This supposition was confirmed before. The inference is plain from Scripture and experience. And (if I am not mistaken) the whole argument is solid.

¹ Rom 5:9-11 - having now been justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him. For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, how much more, having been reconciled, shall we be saved by His life.

III. Those which show for whom Christ died: the elect

There are many passages that point out the persons for whom Christ died, who are specifically designed to be the object of this work of redemption, according to the aim and purpose of God. In some passages these persons are called "many." "The blood of the new testament is shed for many, for the remission of sins," Matt. 26:28. "By his knowledge my righteous servant shall justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities," Isa. 53:11. "The Son of man came not to be ministered to, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many," Mark 10:45; Matt. 20:28. He was to "bring many sons into glory;" and so he was to be the "captain of their salvation, through sufferings," Heb. 2:10. The mere use of the word *many* is not sufficient to restrict the object of Christ's death to some rather than all, because sometimes it does mean *all*, as Rom. 5:19.¹ Yet the word *many* is used in other passages in a way that certainly does not mean *all*. These *many* are the "sheep" of Christ, John 10:15; the "children of God that were scattered abroad," John 11:52; those whom our Savior calls "brethren," Heb. 2:11; "the children that God gave him," which were "partakers of flesh and blood," verses 13, 14. And frequently, the *many* are "those who were given unto him of his Father," John 17:2, 6, 9, 11, who will certainly be preserved. They are the "sheep" of which he was the "Shepherd, through the blood of the everlasting covenant," Heb. 13:20; his "elect," Rom. 8:33; and his "people," Matt. 1:21, who are further explained to be his "visited and redeemed people," Luke 1:68. They are the people which he "foreknew," Rom. 11:2; those who he is said to have had at Corinth before their conversion; his people by election, Acts 18:10; the people that he "suffered for outside the gate, that he might sanctify them," Heb. 13:12. They are his "church, which he redeemed by his own blood," Acts 20:28, which "he loved and gave himself for," Eph. 5:25; the "many" whose sins he took away, Heb. 9:28, and with whom he made a covenant, Dan. 9:27.

The *many* being thus described, are qualified in a way that cannot be common to all. The word can only refer properly to the elect in these passages. It most clearly appears to refer to all and only those who are chosen of God to obtain eternal life through the offering and blood-shedding of Jesus Christ. Many claim with confidence and clamor to have objections. They are easily removed. And so you see the end of the death of Christ, as presented in Scripture.

To gain a clearer understanding, we must remove the objections that are used to escape the force of the argument drawn from the Scripture. Some reply that our "reason," as it is called, is "weak and of no force, equivocal, subtle, fraudulent, false, ungodly, deceitful, and erroneous." These epithets are used as an adornment in "Universality of Free Grace," by Thomas Moore, page 16. Now, this weaving of such a variety of terms (as I see it) only serves to reveal the unlearned eloquence of the author. The use of such terrible names is a strong indicator of a weak cause. When the Pharisees were not able to resist the spirit by which our Savior spoke, they called him "devil and Samaritan." Waters that make noise are usually shallow. It is a proverb among the Scythians, that the "dogs which bark most bite least." But let us hear him speak in his own language.

¹ Rom 5:19 - For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so also by one Man's obedience many will be made righteous.

Moore's Objections:

The word "many" means all men.

He says, "First, this reason [that many does not mean all] is weak and of no force; for the word 'many' is often used to signify all and every man. It also amplifies or indicates the greatness of that number; as in Dan. 12:2, Rom. 5:19, and other passages, where *many* cannot be understood by any Christian to mean less than all men."

Reply:

1. If the proof were taken merely from the word *many*, and not from the context in which it is used, and assuming that all men are distinguished into several sorts by God's purpose, then this exception would bear some color. If some person were to divide the inhabitants of a place like London into poor and rich, those who want and those who abound, and that person said he would bestow his bounty on many in London who are poor, he will easily be understood to bestow it only on the poor.

2. Neither of the quoted passages proves that *many* must necessarily mean all. In Dan. 12:2,¹ the word applies to several parts of the affirmation. It is not to be applied to the whole. And so the sense is that the dead will arise, many to life, and many to shame, as it would have been expressed in another language. Such Hebraisms are not unusual. Besides, it is not improbable that many are said to awake to life, because, as the apostle, says, "All shall not die." The same may be said of Rom. 5:19.² Although *many* seems to mean *all* there, it cannot be intended to "amplify" the number, as Moore puts it. That is, the number of those who died by Adam's disobedience are not compared to the number of those who were made alive by Christ's righteousness. The comparison is between the effects of Adam's sin and the effects of Christ's righteousness. It compares the way death is communicated by the one, and life is communicated by the other. The number of participants in these effects is not considered.

3. I am confident that our author cannot produce the other passages he claims to have in abundance to confirm his case. These are the ones that are commonly urged by Arminians in support of their argument. But if he could produce them, they would not be material to our argument, as was said before.

Christ's death is for more ends than propitiation

"Secondly, this reason," Moore adds, "is equivocal, subtle, and fraudulent. It affirms that the death of Christ, which is for all men and every man, is assumed only as the ransom and propitiation for them, along with their fruits. But where the word *many* is used in any passage on this subject, there are more ends of the death of Christ intended than this one."

Reply:

1. It is denied that any passage of Scripture says the death of Christ is for "all men" or "every man," despite his confident supposition that it is an acknowledged thing.

¹ Dan 12:2 - And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

² Rom 5:19 - For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

2. It is utterly false that there is any other end of the death of Christ besides the fruit of his ransom and propitiation, whether it is directly or indirectly intended. Indeed, what other end can the ransom paid by Christ and the atonement made by him have besides their fruits? The end or outcome of any work is the same as its fruit, effect, or product.¹ So the wild distinction Moore makes by asserting that the ransom and propitiation of Christ, along with their fruits, are for all, while the other ends of his death are only for many, is neither equivocal, subtle, nor fraudulent? But I speak to what I think Moore means, for his words themselves make no sense.

3. He observes that where the word "many" is used, many ends are intended; but it would seem that where the word "all" is used, only the ransom is intimated.

(1.) This is disadvantageous to the author's whole argument. He is saying that where *many* are mentioned, *all* cannot be understood as the meaning, because more ends of the death of Christ are intimated than belong to *all*. And so he must confess that all the other answers he gives to prove that the word *many* means *all*, are contrary to this particular one.

(2.) It is frivolous. It cannot be proved that there are more ends of the death of Christ than the fruit of his ransom.

(3.) It is false. Where the death of Christ is spoken of as being for *many*, he is said to "give his life a ransom" for them, Matt. 20:28. These are the very words used where he is said to die for *all*, 1Tim. 2:6. What difference is there between these two phrases? What ground does Moore have for his observation? This is similar to his other observations. His whole tenth chapter is spent proving that, wherever the redemption purchased by Christ's oblation is mentioned, the ones for whom it is purchased are always spoken of in the third person, using words like "all the world." Yet in chapter 1 of his book, he produces many passages to prove general redemption, where the persons for whom Christ suffers are spoken of in the first or second person, 1Pet. 2:24, 3:18; Isa. 53:6, 6; 1Cor. 15:3; Gal. 3:13, etc.

Scripture does not say the ransom is paid only for his sheep

Thirdly, Moore proceeds, "This reason is false and ungodly. Nowhere in Scripture is it said that Christ died or gave himself a ransom only for many, or only for his sheep; and it is ungodliness to add to or diminish from the word of God in Scripture."

Reply: Ignoring the loving terms of the author, and allowing a grain of what he says to make sense, I say,

First, Christ affirms that he gave his life for "many," for his "sheep."² He is said to die for his "church."³ And countless passages of Scripture witness that all men are not his sheep, nor of his church.⁴ And by just and undeniable consequence of these facts, we argue and conclude that he did not die for those who are not his sheep or of his church. This is only an exposition and unfolding of God's mind in his word. If this is adding to his word, then who can speak from the word of God and be guiltless?

¹ See Owen's presupposition concerning ends and means, Chap. II. sec. II.

² Matt. 20:28; John 10:15, 27-28;

³ Eph. 5:25;

⁴ Matt. 7:23; 13:24-25 ; 25:32; John 8:19, 42-47; 10:14, 26;

Secondly, observe that in the very place where our Savior says he “gave his life for his sheep,” he presently adds that some are not his sheep, John 10:26. If that is not equivalent to giving his life for his sheep only, I do not know what is.

Thirdly, it is an easy thing to recriminate.

Fourthly, he says, “The reason is deceitful and erroneous, for the Scripture nowhere says, ‘The *many* he died for are his sheep’ (much less his elect, as the reason intends it). As for John 10:15, the place usually cited to support this assertion, it is abused. Our Savior, in John 10, did not present the difference between those he did and those he did not die for, or for so and so, but between those who do and those who do not believe on him, verses 4, 5, 14, 26, 27. One hears his voice and follows him, the other does not. Nor did our Savior list here the privileges of all he died for, but only of those who believe on him through the ministration of the gospel. Through the gospel and believing on him, they know him, and approach God, and enter the kingdom by him, verses 8, 4, 9, 27. Nor was our Savior presenting the excellence of those for whom he died, as being preferred above others. He was presenting the excellence of his own love, with the fruits of that love for those not only that he died for, but also that are brought in by his ministration to believe on him, verses 11, 27. Nor was our Savior speaking so much about his ransom-giving and propitiation-making, as he was about his love and faithfulness through the ministration of the gospel. For this reason, he laid down his life for those who are ministered to. In doing so, he gave us an example of testifying to love in suffering, not making a propitiation for sin.”

Reply: It can only the need of our times that keeps the reader from censuring me for considering and transcribing such canting lines as these. But because they are all we have, we must be content, despite their incongruous expressions, incoherent structure, and cloudy phrasing. They tend to raise such a fog that the business in hand may not be perceived, becoming lost in smoke and vapor.

The argument Moore has undertaken to answer is that Christ died for “many,” and those *many* are described as his “sheep,” John 10. What answer, I pray, can be plucked from this confused heap of words that we recited? So that I might safely bypass his whole evasion without letting any of his points stick, I will give a few annotations to answer his remarks.

First, John 10 is not at all abused. It is evident that our Savior differentiates between those for whom he died and those for whom he did not. He calls the first his “sheep,” 10:15. They are those to whom he would “give eternal life,” verse 28. They are the ones “given him by his Father,” 17:9. Evidently he distinguishes them from others who were not his sheep, who would not receive eternal life, and who were not given to him by his Father. It is immaterial what his primary intention was in this passage, and we do not argue it. But from the intent and aim of the words that he uses, and the truth he reveals to advance it, his purpose was to console believers.

Secondly, as for the difference between those he did and those he did not die “for so and so,” we confess there is none. This “so and so” does not express or intimate anything suitable to any purpose of God, nor to any intent of our Savior in this business. To those for whom he died, he died in the same manner, and for the same purpose.

Thirdly, we deny that the primary difference made by our Savior here is between believers and non-believers. It is between the elect and non-elect, those who are his sheep and those who are not. The difference is that the one is enabled to believe, called “hearing his voice and knowing

him,” and the other is not.¹ Believing and not believing is based on their different conditions with regard to God's purpose and Christ's love. This is apparent from the antithesis we are given in verses 26 and 27, “You do not believe, because you are not my sheep,” and, “My sheep hear my voice.” A distinction is made between believing and hearing. And the foundation of this distinction is their condition. The one condition is being his sheep, who hear and believe. They are the ones whom he loved, and gave his life for. And the other condition is not being his sheep. Consequently, they do not hear or believe. They are the ones whom he did not love, and did not give his life for.

Fourthly, It is not relevant to the issue what privileges our Savior expresses here. The only question is for whom he says he would give his life. Second, the frequent repetition of that useless phrase “so and so” serves only to puzzle the reader. Third, we deny that Christ died for anyone except those who will certainly be brought to him by the ministration of the gospel. There are not two groups of saved persons, those for whom he died, and those who are brought in to him. He died for his sheep, and his sheep hear his voice. Those for whom he died, and those who come in to him, may receive different qualifications, but they are not separate groups.

Fifthly, the question is not why our Savior makes mention of his death here, but for whom he died. He expressly says he died for his “sheep,” which all are not.² Second, his intention is to declare giving his life for a ransom, and that is done according to the “commandment received of his Father,” John 10:18.³

Sixthly, Jesus Christ's “love and faithfulness in the ministration of the gospel,” that is, performing the office of the mediator of the new covenant, are only seen in giving his life for a ransom, John 15:13.⁴ Second, There is not one word here about giving us an “example.” Although in laying down his life he also did that, the text is not a proof for that purpose. From these brief annotations, it should be apparent that Moore's discourse is nothing but a miserable mistaking of the text and the question. As a result, he adds various other evasions, which follow.

“Besides,” he says, “the opposition here appears to be not so much between elect and not elect, as between Jews called and Gentiles uncalled.”

Reply: The comparison is between sheep and not-sheep, and that refers to their election, not to their vocation.⁵ Whom would Moore signify by “not sheep”? He says it is the Gentiles who were not called. That is against the text that says it is the sheep, though not yet called, John 10:16.⁶ And who are called? He says it is the Jews. It is true that they were outwardly called at that point; yet many of them were not sheep, 10:26.⁷ This argument is an evasion from the force of

¹ See John 12:39,40 – The word “enabled” has been added to the text to clarify Owen's thought. This is the logic: if Christ's sheep believe, and those who are not his sheep do not believe, then it must be that those who are not his sheep *cannot* believe, or else they would be his sheep. It is not a matter of volition and choice. The condition of being his sheep is what enables the elect to believe; and by extension, those who are not his sheep do not believe because their condition will not permit it.

² John 10:15 - As the Father knows me, so know I the Father: and I lay down my life for the sheep.

³ John 10:18 - This commandment have I received of my Father.

⁴ John 15:13 - Greater love has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

⁵ Owen is referring to their external calling (*vocation* as in “vocalization”), not their employment.

⁶ John 10:16 - And I have other sheep, which are not of this fold: I must also bring them, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd.

⁷ John 10:26 - But you believe not, because you are not of my sheep.

truth, supported by a foul corrupting of the word of God. As such, it is no small provocation to the eye of God's glory. But Moore adds,

“Besides, in Scripture there is a great difference between sheep, and the sheep of his flock and pasture, which he speaks of here, verses 4, 5, 11, 15, 16.”

Reply:

1. This false distinction would no doubt shed a great deal of light on the business in hand, if anyone knew how to explain it well enough.
2. If there is a distinction, it can only be that the “sheep” are those who are only sheep to Christ by his Father's donation; and the “sheep of his pasture” are those who are actually brought home to Christ by the effectual working of the Spirit.

If that is the distinction, then we would find both sorts of sheep mentioned in this chapter: verse 16 (“I have other sheep” given to me) and verse 27 (“My sheep hear my voice, and ... follow me” in response to the Spirit). Together, they comprise those sheep for whom he gave his life, and those to whom he gives life. But Moore proceeds:

“The sheep in verses 4, 5, 11, 15, are not mentioned as all those for whom he died, but as those who, by his ministration, are brought in to believe and enjoy the benefit of his death, and to whom he ministers and communicates the Spirit.”

Reply:

1. The substance of this and other exceptions is that “sheep” means believers. This is contrary to verse 16 which calls those who are not yet gathered into his fold “sheep” (“I have other sheep...”).¹
2. Saying that his sheep are not mentioned as those for whom he died is a contradiction of verse 15 which says, “I lay down my life for my sheep.”
3. There is no more difference between those for whom he died, and those whom he brings in by the ministration of his Spirit, than there is between Peter, James, and John, and the three apostles who attended our Savior's transfiguration. This is childish sophistry.² It begs the question, substituting an opposing opinion for an actual answer.
4. If we accept what is mentioned here, then “to believe and enjoy the benefit of Christ's death” is a special fruit of that death.³ Either it will most certainly be conferred on all those for whom he died, or his death will do them no good at all.

Once more from Mr. Moore, and we are done:

¹ Owen argues that the act of believing is not what makes a person one of Christ's sheep. If that were so, then they could not be referred to as his sheep prior to their act of believing, as this text does. The conclusion is that they are already his sheep before they believe. And so being one of his sheep is the result of God's election, Owen says, rather than self-selection, as Moore says.

² A plausible but false argument (it sounds good, but it has no validity)

³ Actually, according to Moore, to believe is the fruit of Christ's *ministration of the gospel*. The missing step of logic, which Owen employs, is that Christ ministers the gospel through the Spirit who is given to Christ's sheep as a result of his death. Hence, it is the fruit of his *death*.

“Besides, there are more purposes for his death mentioned here than just ransom or propitiation, and yet it does not say, ‘only for his sheep.’ But when ransom or propitiation only is mentioned, it does say, ‘for all men.’ So this reason that it is only for his sheep appears weak, fraudulent, ungodly, and erroneous.”

Reply:

1. There are no more purposes intimated for the death of Christ here, than what was accomplished by his being a propitiation, and being made a ransom for us, with the fruits which certainly and infallibly spring from that.

2. If more ends than that one are mentioned here, and they do not belong to all, then why does Mr. Moore deny that Christ speaks here only of his sheep?

3. I do not know where it says his ransom is “for all men.” But I am sure it says that Christ did “give his life a ransom,” and that is only mentioned where it is *not* said to be for all, but for “many,” as in Matt. 20:28 and Mark 10:45.

And so, from these brief annotations, I hope any unbiased reader will be able to judge whether the reason that Mr. Moore opposes should be considered “weak, fraudulent, ungodly, and erroneous” based on the exceptions devised against it.

Although I fear that I have already encroached on the reader's patience, I cannot let pass another of Mr. Moore's discourses without marking it and making an observation. It immediately follows the exceptions we just removed. He has a great ability to set up a straw man by which to manifest his skill in directing it. In addition to the preceding discourse he adds another exception to universal redemption. It is made against the general understanding of the Scriptural text, in the way and sense in which he conceives them instead. And his exception is this,

“Those words were fit for the time of Christ and his apostles, and had another meaning than they now seem to have.”

Having set up and gaily trimmed this man of straw, an effigy of something that I dare say no one ever argued, he charges it with numerous errors, blasphemies, and lies, exclaimed in vehement outcries, until his straw man tumbles to the ground. If he had not sometimes answered an argument, he would have been thought a most unhappy disputant. Now, to make sure he could do it, I believe he was very careful to frame the objections in a way that would not be too strong for him to obliterate. How blind are those who admire him as a combatant, when he is skillful only at fencing with his own shadow! A great part of Mr. Moore's book is stuffed with such empty janglings as these, proving what no one denies, and answering what no one objects.

CHAPTER IV – Distinction between Impetration and Application

The distinction between impetration and application, the use and abuse of the terms. This chapter includes the opinion of the adversaries in this controversy, and it states the question on both sides.

I will defer giving further reasons for our opposition to the general ransom. For the present, I will remove the usual response to the passages of Scripture I have produced, which is to waive their

meaning. This seems to be *pharmianon pansophon*¹ to our adversaries. They assume it can withstand the weight of all that is urged against them in this case.

They say two things are to be considered in Christ's oblation and in the good things procured by it: first, the impetration or obtaining of those things; and second, the application of those things to particular persons.

FIRST, universalists insist that impetration and application are separate.

I. impetration is for all, application is for believers

"The impetration," they say, "is general. It respects all men. By his death, Christ obtained and procured all good things from his Father: reconciliation, redemption, and forgiveness of sins. And he obtained these for all and every man in the world, if they will believe and lay hold of him. But second, with regard to their application, these things are actually bestowed on only a few, because only a few believe; and belief is the condition on which these things are bestowed. The second is the sense in which the Scriptural texts that we have argued should be understood – all of them. They do not impeach the universality of *merit* one whit, which they assert. What they impeach is the universality of *application*, which they deny."

Now, they offer this answer in various forms and dresses, according to what seems best to those who use it, and what is most subservient to their several opinions. For example,

First, Christ reconciled all, but only believers benefit.

Some of them say that Christ, by his death and passion, absolutely purchased for all and every man, according to the intention of God, remission of sins and reconciliation with God, or restitution into a state of grace and favor with God. All of these are actual benefits to them provided they believe. This is the opinion of the Arminians.

Secondly, Christ died for all, but only believers are reconciled.

Some say² that Christ died for all, but conditionally for some if they believe, or will believe (which he knows they cannot do of themselves). He died absolutely for his own, on whom his purpose is to bestow faith and grace. In this way, they will actually possess the good things purchased by him. This is the teaching of Camero and the divines of France, who follow a new method devised by him.

Thirdly, Reconciliation is twofold: paid for all, but worked in some.

Some believe there is a twofold reconciliation and redemption. One is worked by Christ with God *for* man, which, they say, is general for all and every man. The second is a reconciliation worked by Christ *in* man to God, bringing them actual peace with God.

There are various other ways by which men express their conceptions in this business. The sum of what they say is the same distinction we recounted before: with regard to impetration, Christ obtained redemption and reconciliation for all; with regard to application, it is bestowed only on those who believe and continue in that belief.

¹ an all-wise covering

² Camero, Testardus, Amyraldus.

II. The True Nature of the Distinction

The arguments by which they prove the generality of the ransom and universality of reconciliation must be considered later. For the present, we handle only the distinction itself, its meaning and misapplication.

First, impetration is purchase, application is enjoyment.

We acknowledge that this distinction may be used in a sound sense and with a right meaning, whether expressed as impetration and application, or as procuring reconciliation with God and working reconciliation in us. For by impetration we mean the meritorious purchase of all good things by Christ, for us, with and from his Father. By application we mean the actual enjoyment of those good things upon our believing. It is as if a man paid a price to free captives: paying the price is the impetration we speak of, and freeing the captives is its application. Yet, we must observe these things:

First, The distinction regards what is procured, not Christ's intent.

This distinction has no place in the intention and purpose of Christ, but only with regard to the things that were procured by him. For in his purpose, they are both united. His purpose was both to deliver us from all evil, and to procure all the good that would actually be bestowed on us.¹ But with regard to what was procured, those things may be considered separately either as procured by Christ, or as bestowed on us.

Secondly, what is purchased is not purchased conditionally.

The will of God is not at all conditional in this business. He did not give us Christ to obtain peace, reconciliation, and forgiveness of sins, only on the condition that we believe. There is a condition involved, but not in the will of God. It is absolute that such things should be procured and bestowed.

Thirdly, what is purchased is not bestowed conditionally.

The things which Christ obtained for us are not all conditionally bestowed. Some are absolutely bestowed. And as for those which are conditionally bestowed, the condition is actually purchased and procured for us unconditionally by virtue of the purchase itself. To explain: Christ has purchased remission of sins and eternal life for us. This is enjoyed by us upon our believing, or on the condition of faith. But he has absolutely procured faith itself for us, which is the condition. And he has procured it for us on no condition at all. Whatever condition might be proposed in order to obtain faith, I will later show it to be vain, and to run in a circle.

Fourthly, impetration and application have the same objects.

Both impetration and application have the same individual persons for their objects. Whomever Christ obtained any good thing for by his death, that good thing will certainly be applied to them. He did not obtain anything for anyone, that they will not enjoy in due time. If he worked reconciliation with God for them, then he works reconciliation in them unto God. The one is not extended to some to whom the other does not reach. Now, this being established, the opposite interpretation and misapplication of this distinction vanishes. I will briefly confirm it with two reasons:

¹ That is, one without the other would have defeated his purpose. They are inseparable.

First, if applying the good things that were procured is the purpose for Christ's procuring them, then they must be applied to all for whom they are obtained. Otherwise, Christ fails in his purpose to apply them, which cannot be granted. But applying them was indeed the purpose for obtaining all good things for us. If Christ aimed only at obtaining but not applying them, then his death would have achieved its desired result without applying redemption and salvation to anyone. And so, despite all that he did for us, everyone in the world might have perished eternally. Judge for yourself whether that can be reconciled with the dignity and sufficiency of Christ's oblation, the purpose of his Father, and his own intention. And that intention was that he "came into the world to save sinners"¹, "to save what was lost,"² and to "bring many sons to glory."³

Secondly, we would have to affirm that God was completely uncertain what the outcome would be of sending his Son, laying the weight of our iniquity on him, and giving him up to an accursed death. Did he intend for us to be saved by it? Then he must have aimed at applying the benefit of Christ's death to us, as we assert. Saying he was uncertain what the outcome would be is blasphemy, and contrary to Scripture and right reason. Did he appoint a Savior without thinking of those who were to be saved? Did he appoint a Redeemer without determining who should be redeemed? Did he resolve what means to use without determining their end? It is an assertion that opposes all God's glorious properties.

Secondly, what is obtained is applied by nature.

Say someone obtains something for another person in such a way that it becomes that other person's by right. Then properly, what was obtained must be given or applied to that other person. It is their right to have it. In the same way, anything obtained by Christ, for whomever he obtained it, must be given or applied to them. What is theirs by charge must be made theirs in fact. All that he purchased for them must be applied to them, for it is by virtue of that purchase that they are saved, verses 33, 34.⁴

Thirdly, Christ intercedes for those for whom he died.

Christ makes intercession for those for whom he died. His intercession is to apply those things purchased by his death, and he is always heard in this. Those to whom the one belongs (impetration), the other also belongs (application). So in John 10:10, Christ comes that his sheep "might have life, and have it abundantly;" also 1Jn. 4:9.⁵ In Heb. 10:10 we read, "By God's will we are sanctified" – this is the end, the application – "through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ" – this is the means, the impetration. "For by one offering he has perfected forever those who are sanctified," Heb. 10:14. In brief, all these passages prove what we rightly assign as purpose of Christ's death. As I see it, this may be depended on as firm and immovable: the impetration of good things by Christ, and the application of those things, are done for the same individual persons.

¹ 1Tim. 1:15

² Ezek. 34:16; Matt. 18:11; Lk. 19:10.

³ Heb. 2:10

⁴ Some editors assume this is John 10:33, 34. I disagree. If the verse numbers are correct, then Owen more likely cites Romans 8:33,34 - *Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? ... It is Christ that died, rather, that is risen again, who at the right hand of God makes intercession for us.* As Owen said earlier, and repeats below, the purpose of Christ's intercession is to apply the benefits of his death to the elect.

⁵ 1Jn. 4:9 - God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him.

SECONDLY, universalists say Reconciliation is only Applied to Some.

Here we consider what those who maintain universal redemption mean by the following distinction, and how they apply it. "Christ," they say, "died for all men, and by his death purchased reconciliation with God and forgiveness of sins for them. These benefits, however, are applied only to some, who actually become reconciled to God, and have their sins forgiven them. It is not applied to others, who therefore perish unreconciled and at enmity with God under the guilt of their sins. This application to some," they say, "is not procured or purchased by Christ. For if it was, then he died for all, and all must actually be reconciled, and their sins forgiven them – all would be saved. Instead, the application is made on the fulfillment of the condition God prescribes, which is believing." Some say they can believe by their own strength, if not directly, then by direct consequence. Others say they cannot believe by their own strength; God must give it.

So when it is said in the Scripture that Christ reconciled us to God, redeemed us, saved us by his blood, underwent the punishment of our sins, and made satisfaction for us, they say it only means that Christ provided what will follow upon fulfilling the condition required of us. They assign many glorious things to the death of Christ, but what they give on the one hand they take away with the other. They suspend the enjoyment of these things on a condition that is to be fulfilled by us, and not procured by him. They assert that the proper and full end of the death of Christ was to satisfy God's justice so that God might save sinners if he chose to, based on whatever condition pleased him. He died so that a door of grace might be opened to all who would enter. He did not actually procure justification, remission of sins, life, and immortality for anyone, but only a possibility of these things.

Now, that all the venom underlying the exposition and abuse of this distinction is more apparent, I will list in a few assertions the whole mind of those who use it. Then it may be clearly seen what we oppose.

First, Because of God's universal love, He desires all to be saved.

"God," they say, "considers all mankind fallen from that grace and favor in which Adam was created. They are completely excluded from attaining salvation by the covenant of works that was made with Adam at the beginning. Yet, by his infinite goodness, God was inclined to desire their happiness, every one, so that they might be delivered from misery, and be brought to himself." They call this inclination his "universal love and antecedent will," by which he desires them all to be saved, and out of which love he sends Christ.

Observation 1. We deny that God has any natural or necessary inclination to do good to us or to any of his creatures, whether by his goodness or any other property. Everything concerning us is an act of his free will and good pleasure. It is not a natural, necessary act of his Deity, as will be declared.

Observation 2. Ascribing an antecedent conditional will to God means that fulfilling and accomplishing his will would depend on some free, contingent act or work of ours. That slanders his wisdom, power, and sovereignty, and cannot be excused from blasphemy. It is also contrary to Rom. 9:10, "Who has resisted his will?"

Observation 3. Saying that God has ordinary affections, and is inclined to do good to all, does not seem to support the freedom, fullness, and extent of that most intense love of God which Scripture says caused him to send his Son. John 3:16, "God so loved the world, that he gave his

only-begotten Son.” Eph. 1:9, “Having made known to us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he has purposed in himself.” Col. 1:19, “It pleased the Father that in him all fullness should dwell.” Rom. 5:8, “God commends his love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.”¹

Observation 4. We deny that all mankind is the object of that love of God which moved him to send his Son to die. God “made some for the day of evil,” Prov. 16:4. He “hated [them] before they were born,” Rom. 9:11, 13. They were “before of old ordained to condemnation,” Jude 4, being “fitted to destruction,” Rom. 9:22, “made to be taken and destroyed,” 2Pet. 2:12, “appointed to wrath,” 1Thes. 5:9, to “go to [their] own place,”² Acts 1:25.

Secondly, God's love has no effect unless satisfaction is made for all.

They say that “God's justice is injured by sin. Unless something is done to satisfy it, the love of God (by which he desires to do good to all sinners) could not be acted out. Instead, it would reside eternally in his heart without producing any effect.”³

Observation 1. Neither Scripture nor right reason will enforce or prove that there is an utter and absolute lack of power in God to save sinners by his own absolute will, without satisfying his justice. Certainly he could have effected our salvation without considering it. That would not imply a violation of his holy nature.⁴

Observation 2. It would be opposite to God's eternal blessedness and all-sufficiency to *wish* to do anything (such as doing good to all) which cannot possibly be accomplished without some work that is outwardly fulfilled by him (such as satisfying his justice for all).⁵

Thirdly, He sent Christ to fulfill his universal love, and satisfy his justice.

“Therefore, God sent his Son into the world to die, to fulfill his general love and good will towards all, to show his love in a way that seemed good to him, and to satisfy his justice which stood in the way as its only hindrance.”

We will show the failure of this assertion when we declare the kind of love in which sending Christ was its proper result.

¹ See book iv., chap. ii. and chap. iv., where John 3.16, and Rom. 5.8, are very fully considered. — Ed.

² “His own place” could also be rendered “a separate place for him.”

³ The logic of their argument is that God's justice is injured by *any* sin. And, it would seem, God's love is conditioned on his justice being completely satisfied. His love cannot be exercised unless satisfaction is first made for every sin, of every sinner. Either all sins are satisfied, or no one can be loved and thus saved. If satisfaction is made for everyone, then Christ died for everyone.

⁴ That is a dubious claim. The universalists do not argue directly that our salvation depends on God's justice being satisfied, but on his love being exercised. They assume a universal rather than a particular satisfaction, because they assume a universal rather than a particular love. Their assumption is wrong: “Certainly he could have effected our salvation without loving everyone.”

⁵ What Owen objects to here, is the attempt to separate God's love from his justice. He is saying that God would never want to love all unless he satisfied his justice for all. The implication, based on what he has already said, is that God does not love all mankind, and therefore Christ did not die for all mankind. “Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated.” Mal. 1:2,3

Fourthly, the purpose of Christ's death was to obtain the power to save.

Arminius says, "The proper and immediate end of sending his Son to die for all men was so that God might save sinners in whatever way it pleased him, his justice which hindered [that salvation] being satisfied [by Christ's death]." Or as Corvinus puts it, "He sent his son so that he might will to save sinners. Christ's intention was to so satisfy the justice of God that he might obtain for himself the power to save, on whatever conditions seemed good to his Father to prescribe."

Observation 1. Something was said before based on an examination of those passages of Scripture which describe his purpose in sending his Son. Let those determine whether God intended to procure for himself the freedom to save us if he would, or he instead intended to obtain certain salvation for his elect.

Observation 2. The thought that there could only be a possibility of salvation, or at best a wish or a willingness for it, that is based on some uncertain condition to be fulfilled by us, and that this would be the full, proper, and only immediate end of Christ's death, is something hard to swallow even with a fine wine.

Observation 3. The statement that he procured for himself the ability to save, upon a condition to be prescribed, does not seem to reflect that sure and certain purpose which the Scripture gives for our Savior laying down his life. That purpose was to "save his sheep," and to "bring many sons to glory." There is no basis in Scripture for such an assertion.

Fifthly, Christ satisfied God's justice, allowing conditional salvation.

"Christ, therefore, obtained reconciliation with God, remission of sins, life and salvation, for everyone. It is not that they would actually partake of these things, but that God (his justice now unhindered) might and would prescribe a condition to be fulfilled by them. Upon their fulfilling the condition, he would actually apply to them all those good things purchased by Christ."

And here is their distinction between impetration and application, which we intimated before. They are wondrously divided as to what it means:

Some, like Bormus and Corvinus, say it means that all men are received into a new covenant. Adam is personally redeemed in this new covenant, and we are all restored in him, just as we fell with him under the old covenant. None will be damned who do not actually sin against the condition by which they are born. If they do, then they fall from the saved state into which all men are assumed through Christ's death. In plain terms, Moore says that all are reconciled, redeemed, saved, and justified in Christ, though he could not understand how (Moore, p. 10).

Those who assert the efficacy of grace, as in France, are more wary. They deny this. They assert that by nature we are all children of wrath. Until we come to Christ, the wrath of God abides on all. It is not actually removed from anyone.

Again, some say that, by this satisfaction, Christ removed *original sin* in all. As a consequence, all infants dying before the age of reason must undoubtedly be saved, even though born of Turks and Pagans, or outside of the covenant. And all those beyond the age of reason may be saved from the calamity, guilt, and alienation contracted by our first fall, upon satisfying a new condition.

Others, like Corvinus are more wary. They observe that the blood of Christ is said to "cleanse from all sin," (1Jn. 1:7; 1Pet. 1:18, 19; Isa. 53:6). And so they say that he died for all sinners

alike; absolutely for none, but conditionally for all. Further, some of them say that after the satisfaction of Christ, and before God's consideration of his satisfaction, no condition was yet determined or prescribed. Being undetermined, the Lord might have placed us all under the law and covenant of works again. Still others, like Moore (p. 35), say that procuring a new way of salvation by faith was part of the fruit of the death of Christ.

Some of them say that the condition prescribed can be met by our own strength, with the help of such means as God will afford to all generally. Others deny this. They assert that effectual grace, flowing specifically from election, is necessary to believe. The first group establishes an idol of free-will to maintain their own assertion. The others defeat their own assertion by establishing grace. This is true of Amyraldus, Camero, et al.

Moreover, some say that the love of God in sending Christ is equal for all. Others maintain an inequality in the love of God, although he sent his Son to die for all. There cannot be greater love than that by which the Lord sent his Son to die for us, Rom. 8:32. And so they say that Christ purchased a greater good for some, and a lesser good for others. Here they create a number of awkward distinctions for themselves, or rather (as one calls them), extinctions. They blot out all sense, reason, and true meaning in the Scripture. Witness Testardus, Amyraldus, and, as anyone who can read English, T. Moore. Hence we see a multiplicity of ends in the death of Christ. Some are the fruits of his ransom and satisfaction, and others are I know not what. It is a most difficult thing to know what they mean, and harder to discover their mind than it is to answer their reasons.

In one particular, they agree well enough. They all deny that faith is procured or merited for us by the death of Christ. For once they grant that, it would overturn the whole fabric of universal redemption. But, in assigning the cause of faith, they fall apart again.

Some say that God sent Christ to die for all men, but only on the condition that they believe. It is as though, if they believed, then Christ died for them; but if not, then he did not. And so, they make the act the cause of its own object. Some others hold that he died absolutely for all, to procure all good things for them. But they will not enjoy those things until they fulfill the prescribed condition. Yet they all conclude that, in his death, Christ had no more consideration for the elect than he did for the others. He did not bear them, or take their place. Instead, he was a public person in the place of all mankind.

III. Summation

Regarding the event and the immediate product of the death of Christ, various people have expressed themselves differently. Some place salvation in the power, some in the will, of God; some in the opening of a door of grace; some in a right purchased for himself to save whomever he pleased; some that he had no end at all with regard to us, but that all mankind might have perished even after Christ had done everything. Others vary the ends according to the diversity of the persons for whom he died, granting that these persons are distinguished by a foregoing decree. But I cannot see what purpose the Lord would have to send his Son to die for those he was determined not to save, or at least to bypass, leaving them in ruin for their sins, and without a remedy. Nor can I see the meaning of the twofold destination some have invented.

Such is the powerful force and evidence of truth that scatters all its opposers, and makes them fly to several hiding-corners. If they are not willing to yield and submit themselves to the truth, then they will surely lie down in darkness and error. The truth has no need for their types of

arguments, nor such intricate and involved distinctions about hindrances. It does not oblige its supporters to use flimsy shifts and devices, nor any twists and turns to create a defensible posture. And it is not susceptible to contradictions in its own fundamentals. The whole of the truth in this matter may be summed up thus:

“God, out of his infinite love for his elect, sent his dear Son in the fullness of time, whom he had promised us in the beginning of the world,¹ and whom he had made effectual by that promise, to die and pay a ransom of infinite value and dignity, in order to purchase eternal redemption, and bring to himself every one of those whom he had before ordained to eternal life, all to the praise of his own glory.”

So the proper results and effects of the death of Christ (the meritorious cause of them all) are these: delivery from all evil, freedom from wrath, and an enjoyment of all the good things that are bestowed on us in our transport from death to life, from hell and wrath to heaven and glory. This may be made clear in all its parts by these few assertions:

First, God sent his Son for the elect alone.

The source and cause of God's sending Christ is his eternal love for his elect, and for them alone. I will not further confirm that now. I reserve it for the second general topic of this controversy.

Secondly, the ransom was sufficient for all those intended.

The value, worth, and dignity of the ransom which Christ paid, was infinite and immeasurable. It was fit to accomplish any end, and procure any good, for everyone for whom it was intended, and for as many as God ordained (more of this later). Acts 20:28, “God purchased his church with his own blood.” 1Pet. 1:18, 19, They “were not redeemed with silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.” That redemption was in response to the mind and intention of Almighty God, John 14:13, “As the Father commanded me, that is what I do.” God wanted a price paid that would become the foundation of the intended dispensation of his love and grace, and of the way by which he would dispense it. Acts 13:38, 39, “Through this man is preached to you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which you could not be justified by the law of Moses.” 2Cor. 5:20, 21, “We are ambassadors for Christ, as though God urged you by us: we ask you in Christ's place, be reconciled to God. For he has made him sin for us, who knew no sin, so that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.”

Thirdly, those intended were the elect.

The intention and aim of the Father in this great work was to bring many sons to glory. They are, namely, his elect, whom he had chosen by his free grace from among all men, sorts, nations, and conditions, to be taken into a new covenant of grace with himself. The former covenant was null and abolished with regard to them. Jesus Christ is the first and chief promise of this new covenant, the one who was to procure for the elect all the other good things promised in that covenant, as will be proved.

¹ Gen. 3:15.

Fourthly, what was purchased is necessarily bestowed.

The things purchased or procured, the proper effects of the death and ransom of Christ, the elect must certainly come to possess and enjoy in due time. *What he purchased for them was the remission of sin, freedom from the wrath of God and the curse of the law, justification, sanctification, reconciliation with God, and eternal life.*

It was the will of his Father to send him for these. It was his own intention to lay down his life for them. The truth and fact of his purchase is the foundation of his intercession, begun on earth and continued in heaven. Christ, whom his Father always hears, desires and demands through his intercession that the good things he procured actually be bestowed on everyone for whom they were procured. So the whole of what we assert in this great business is exceedingly clear and apparent, without any intricacy or difficulty at all. It is not clouded with strange expressions. It does not unnecessarily tear one thing from another, as the opposite opinion does. But because the whole strength of demonstrating this point lies in that one distinction we spoke of before, we will consider that a little further, and then come to our arguments.

CHAPTER V – Further Distinctions

Of application and impetration.

We intimated and declared the correct use and sound understanding of this distinction before. Now, seeing that this is the primary falsehood of the opposite opinion, I will give it one more blow, and leave it dying, I hope.

Impetration and Application may be distinct, but they cannot be separate.

I will briefly declare that, although these two things may be distinct, they cannot be separate. For whomever Christ obtained good, that good must be applied to them; for whomever he worked reconciliation with God, they must actually be reconciled to God. So the blood of Christ, and the virtue of his death, cannot be looked on as medicine in a box, available for any who will take it. It is not *applied* to one or another without any difference, as though it was *intended* no more for one than another. He did not obtain all that good only to be indifferent and uncertain whether it would ever be ours. The Arminians say that, notwithstanding the fact that Christ purchased these glorious things for all by his death, those for whom the purchase was made may still be damned, as the great part of them certainly will be. Now to show why these two things should not be separated.

First, what is obtained is certainly possessed.

Separating the *impetration* of a benefit from the *application* of that benefit is contrary to common sense and our usual form of speaking. Its meaning must be twisted to force our understanding of it. When a man has obtained an office, or someone else has obtained it for him, can it be said that it is uncertain whether he will have that office or not? If it is obtained for him, does it not belong to him by right, even if it is not actually in his possession yet? What is impetrated or obtained by petition belongs to the one it was obtained for. It violates common sense to say that something may not belong to a man when it is obtained for him. In saying that we obtained it for him, we are saying that it is his. The same is true of the purchase made by Jesus Christ, and the good things that were obtained by him for all those for whom he died.

Secondly, if Christ died for them, the benefit belongs to them.

It is contrary to reason to think that God intended the *death* of Christ to be applied to anyone who would not share in the *merits* of that death. God's will that Christ should die for someone, means he intended that someone to have a share in the death of Christ, to derive the benefit of it. He intended it to belong to him, to be applied to him. In this case, it is applied to anyone who is his according to the will of God. But the death of Christ, according to the opinion we oppose, is applied to all, and yet the fruits of his death are never made known to the great part of them.

Thirdly, if a ransom is paid for them, the captives must be freed.

It is contrary to reason to think that a compact would be made to deliver captives on payment of their ransom, and yet those captives would not be freed once the payment was made. The death of Christ is a ransom (Matt. 20:28). He paid that ransom under a compact with his Father providing for the deliverance of the captives for whom it was a ransom. His Father promised their deliverance when Christ engaged himself to be a Savior. Having performed what was required, it seems strange and improbable that a great number of these captives would never be released.

Fourthly, Scripture ties Application to Impetration.

It is contrary to Scripture, as declared before. See Book III, chapter 10.

What is obtained is not obtained conditionally.

But our adversaries think they will wipe all this away with one slight distinction, which is this: "It is true," say they, "that all things absolutely procured and obtained for someone do presently become theirs in right; but things that are obtained conditionally do not become theirs until the condition is fulfilled. Now, Christ has purchased all good things by his death for all men conditionally, not absolutely; and until that condition is fulfilled, unless they perform what is required, they have neither part nor portion, neither right to them nor possession of them." They variously describe what this condition is. Some call it not resisting this redemption which is offered to them. Some call it yielding to the invitation of the gospel. Some simply call it faith. Now, if it is true that Christ purchases all things for us, to be bestowed on this condition of believing, then I assert that,

First, such a condition ought to be revealed.

Certainly this condition ought to be revealed to everyone for whom this purchase was made, if it is earnestly intended for them. All for whom he died must have the means to know that his death will do them good if they believe. This is especially so considering that it is in his power alone to grant them these means. Let us say that I entreat a physician who can cure a disease, to cure all that come to him. And then I let many remain ignorant of this opportunity to be cured, knowing that I am the only one who can tell them about it. Do I really intend the healing of those people whom I see but fail to tell? Undoubtedly not. The application is too easy for me not to tell them if that was my intent.

Secondly, such a condition must be within our power to perform.

This required condition is either in their power to perform, or it is not. If it is, then all men have the power to believe, which is false. If it is not, then the Lord will grant them the grace to believe, or he will not. If he will, then why do not all believe? Why are not all saved? If he will

not, then this impetration, obtaining salvation and redemption for all by his blood, comes down to this: God would have intended Christ to die for all to procure a remission of sins for them, reconciliation with himself, and eternal redemption and glory. And yet they will never realize these glorious things unless they do what he knows they cannot do, and which no one besides him can enable them to do. He would be resolved not to enable the great part of them to enjoy the benefits that are theirs. Is this what God intended when he sent Christ to die for them for their good? Did he intend Christ to die for them, only to expose them to shame and misery? It is like promising a blind man a thousand dollars on the condition that he see.

Thirdly, the condition of faith is procured by Christ.

Either this condition of faith is procured for us by the death of Christ, or it is not. If universalists say it is not, then the primary grace of believing, without which redemption itself has no value, is not caused by Christ's meritorious death on the cross. First, this is insulting to our blessed Savior, and serves only to diminish the honor and love due to him. Secondly, it is contrary to Scripture: Tit. 3:5, 6; 2Cor. 5:21, "He became sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." How we could become the righteousness of God except by believing, I do not know. The apostle expressly says, "It is given to us for Christ's sake, on the behalf of Christ, to believe in him," Phil. 1:29; "God blessing us with every spiritual blessing in him," Eph. 1:3; surely faith is not the least of these blessings. If it is a fruit of the death of Christ, then why is it not bestowed on all, since he died for all? The whole impetration of redemption is worthless without it. If the universalists invent a condition on which this redemption is bestowed, the vanity of it will be discovered later. For the present, if this condition is that we do not refuse or resist the means of grace, then let me ask something. Will the fruit of the death of Christ be applied to all that fulfill this condition of not refusing or resisting the means of grace? If not, then why is that fruit produced? If so, then all who do not resist the means of grace must be saved. That includes all pagans, infidels, and those infants to whom the gospel was never preached.¹

Fourthly, if it were conditional, then Christ would only be half a mediator.

This whole assertion tends to make Christ only a half mediator. He would procure the end, but not the means to obtain it.

So, notwithstanding this new distinction, our assertion stands firm. The fruits of the death of Christ, with regard to impetration of good and its application to us, should not be divided. Our arguments to confirm it are unshaken.

In summation, Christ did not die for anyone on the condition that they believe. Instead, he died for all God's elect, so that they *would* believe, and by believing have eternal life. Faith itself is among the principal effects and fruits of the death of Christ, as will be declared. Nowhere does Scripture say that if we believe, then Christ died for us. It would be as though our believing created what otherwise did not exist, an act creating the object toward which it acts. Christ died for us so that we would believe. Salvation is indeed bestowed conditionally; but faith, which is the condition, is absolutely procured by Christ's death.

¹ In other words, according to some universalists, Christ died for all, but only those who meet the condition of not resisting his grace will be saved. The Scriptures say we are given every grace by his death. Therefore, if he died for all, then all have that grace, and all must be saved. Impetration and application would remain linked, despite this supposed exception by the universalists.

The question being stated, we next proceed to make some of those arguments, demonstrations, testimonies, and proofs, by which the truth we maintain is established. We only desire the reader to keep in mind some of the fundamentals laid down in general before. They are so related to the arguments which we will use, that I am confident not one of them can be thoroughly answered without turning them inside out.

BOOK III

CHAPTER I – Arguments against Universal Redemption

Arguments against the universality of redemption - The first two from the nature of the new covenant, and its dispensation.

ARGUMENT 1. The Covenant is not universal but particular.

The first argument may be taken from the nature of the covenant of grace, which was established, ratified, and confirmed in the death of Christ. It was the testament of which Christ was the testator. That is why his blood is called “The blood of the new testament,” Matt. 26:28. No effects of that covenant can be extended beyond its scope. And this covenant was not made universally with all, but particularly with some. Therefore only those with whom it was made were intended to benefit from the death of Christ.

This assumption appears from the nature of the covenant itself, described clearly in Jer. 31:31, 32, “I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; for they broke my covenant, though I was a husband to them, says the LORD.” We find this repeated in Heb. 8:9-11, “Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they did not continue in my covenant, and I did not consider them, says the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord; I will put my laws in their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be a God to them, and they shall be a people to me: and every man shall not need to teach his neighbor and his brother saying, ‘Know the Lord’: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest.”

For this reason, the condition of the covenant is not said to be required, but is absolutely promised: “I will put my fear in their hearts.”¹ This is the main difference between the old covenant of works and the now one of grace. The Lord not only requires the fulfilling of the prescribed condition, but he promises to effect it in those with whom the covenant is made. Without this spiritual efficacy, the truth is, the new covenant would be as weak and unprofitable as the old one. The purpose of the covenant is to bring us to God and bind us to him. The weakness and unprofitableness of the old covenant, and the reason why God in his mercy abolished it, was because our sin made us unable to fulfill its condition that we, “do this, and live.”² Otherwise the connection is still true, that “the one who does these things shall live.”³ Are we any more able to fulfill the condition of the new covenant by ourselves? Is it not as easy for a man by his own strength to fulfill the whole law, as to repent and savingly believe the promise of the gospel? This, then, is one main difference of these two covenants: in the old one, the Lord only required the condition; now, in the new one, he also effects it in all those to whom the covenant is extended. If the Lord only exacted the obedience required of us in the covenant, and he did not also work and effect it in us, then the new covenant would only be for show,

¹ Jer. 32:40

² Lev. 18:5; Lk. 10:28; Rom. 8:8

³ Lev. 18:5

increasing our misery. It would not seriously impart and communicate grace and mercy to us. If this is the nature of the new testament, as it appears to be from its very words, and the condition of the covenant will certainly be worked in all those who are included in the covenant by free grace, then only those who are included this covenant will have its conditions effected in them.

It is apparent that the covenant is not made with all, for “all men do not have faith.”¹ It is the “faith of the elect of God.”² Therefore, the covenant is not made with all, nor is its scope extended beyond the remnant of the elect. Indeed, every blessing of the new covenant is certainly common, and is to be communicated to all the covenantees.³ If the covenant is general, then either faith is not one of the blessings, or all must have it. Some may say that, while it is true that God promises to write his law in our hearts and put his fear in us, it is on condition. Give me that condition, and I will yield. Is it if they believe? Nothing else can be imagined. That is, if they have the law written in their hearts (as everyone who believes has), then God promises to write his law in their hearts! Is this probable, friends? Is it likely? I cannot be persuaded that God has made a covenant of grace with all, especially those who never heard a word of covenant, grace, or its condition, nor have received the grace to fulfill that condition. Without that grace, the whole thing is useless.

The covenant is made with Adam, and he is acquainted with it, Gen. 3:15. It was renewed with Noah and not hidden from him.⁴ It was again established with Abraham, accompanied with a full and rich declaration of its chief promises, Gen. 12. It is most certainly not effected towards all, as will afterwards be apparent. That first distinction, between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent, is enough to overthrow the pretended universality of the covenant of grace. Who dares affirm that God entered into a covenant of grace with the seed of the serpent?

It is most apparent, then, that the new covenant of grace, and its promises, are distinguished in their mercy, restricted to the people whom God foreknew, and so they are not universally extended to all. The blood of Jesus Christ is the blood of this covenant. His oblation is intended to procure the good things the covenant promised, for he was the surety of the covenant, Heb. 7:22. It is inconceivable that his oblation was made for anyone but those intended in this covenant.

ARGUMENT II. If the intent was universal, it must be known universally.

If the Lord intended to procure pardon of sin and reconciliation with God for everyone, to be enjoyed on the condition that they believe, then this good will of God ought to be made known to all by the word so that they might believe. “For faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God,” Rom. 10:17. If these things are not made known to those for whom the Lord has procured so great a good, then one of these things will follow: either they may be saved without faith in or knowledge of Christ, or else this purchase by Jesus Christ and the good will of God is plainly in vain.

The first is false, and proved so. Those for whom he died cannot have knowledge of Christ unless he is revealed to them. The second will only frustrate them; in fact, it plainly mocks them.

¹ 2Thes. 3:2

² Tit. 1:1

³ Eph. 1:3 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ.

⁴ Gen. 8, 9

For his purchase will not help them out of misery, nor will it serve the justice of God to leave them inexcusable. What blame can be put on them for not embracing and using a benefit which they never heard of?

Does it become the wisdom of God to send Christ to die for men so that they might be saved, declaring that unless they hear and believe they *cannot* be saved, and then not cause them to hear about it? What wise man would pay a ransom to deliver captives, upon their acknowledgement of his payment, when he is sure they will never know the payment was made, and so will never be freed? Does this reflect the goodness of God, to deal with his poor creatures in this way? Would he demonstrate the most intense love imaginable for them by sending his Son, a love beyond all compare and illustration, and yet never let them know of it? And then, in the end, damn them for not believing it? Does it reflect the love and kindness of Christ, to assign to him at his death this resolution: "By this oblation, I will obtain for everyone peace and reconciliation with God, redemption and everlasting salvation, and eternal glory in the high heavens. I will do so even for all those poor, miserable, wretched worms, those condemned prisoners, who should expect the sentence of condemnation every hour. All of this will be bestowed on them, if they will only believe. Yet, I will arrange things in such a way that countless souls will never hear one word of all that I have done for them. They will never be persuaded to believe. They will never learn of me as the object of their faith, that by believing in me they might indeed partake of these things." Was this the mind and will, the design and purpose, of our merciful high priest? God forbid.

It is like a prince proclaiming that there are a number of captives held in bondage below, and having an immense treasure, he is resolved to redeem every one of them. And so, every one of them who comes out of prison will thank him for his good will. In the meantime, he never takes care to let these poor captives know his mind and pleasure; yet, unless he effects it himself, it will never be done. Would this not be thought a vain and ostentatious flourish, without any good intent towards the captives?

Or it would be like a physician saying that he has a medicine that will cure all diseases. He says that he intends to cure the diseases of everyone, but he lets only a few know his mind, or anything of his medicine. And yet, without relating this information, it will be known to very few. Will he be thought to desire, intend, or aim at, the recovery of everyone?

Now, it is clear from the Scripture, and from our experience in all ages, under both old and new covenants, that countless men and whole nations have been passed by in the declaration of this mystery. The Lord does not effect that it will, by any means, or in the least measure, be revealed to all. They do not hear so much as a rumour or a report of any such thing.

Under the Old Testament, "In Judah God was known, and his name was great in Israel; his tabernacle was in Salem, and his dwelling-place in Zion," Ps. 76:1, 2. "He showed his word to Jacob, and his statutes and his judgments to Israel. He has not dealt so with any nation: and as for his judgments, they have not known them," Ps. 147:19, 20. There are also those passages naming and cursing the heathen, such as Jer. 10:25, "Pour out your fury on the heathen who do not know you, and on the families who do not call on your name." You have a full description of them in Eph.2:12. They are those "without Christ, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world."

Under the New Testament, the church has indeed “lengthened her cords, and strengthened her stakes.”¹ “Many nations have come up to the mountain of the Lord.”² In fact, there are so many as to be called “all people,”³ “all nations,”⁴ indeed, the “world,”⁵ and the “whole world,”⁶ at least by comparison to the small precinct of the church of the Jews. Yet the Scripture and our own experience make it clear that many are passed by, millions of souls, who have never heard a word of Christ, nor of reconciliation by him. For this, we can give no other reason but this: “Even so, Father, it seemed good in your sight,” Matt. 11:26. The Holy Ghost expressly forbids the apostles to go to various places, sending them another way, Acts 16:6, 7, 9, 10. This is a reflection of the former dispensation in some respects. God “in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways,” Acts 14:16. And as for our experience, not to be specific, ask any of our brothers who have spent any time in the Indies, and they will easily convince you of the truth of that.

The exceptions made against this argument are poor and frivolous, and we reserve a full reply for later. In brief, how is it to be revealed to the thousands of offspring of infidels, whom the Lord cuts off in their infancy, so that they may not pester the world, persecute his church, nor disturb human society? How is it revealed to their parents? Paul affirms that they may be led to the knowledge of God’s eternal power and Godhead by his works, but it is utterly impossible for them to know anything of redemption or a Redeemer.⁷

CHAPTER II – Three More Arguments

ARGUMENT III. If the ransom is universal, any condition is paid for too.

If Jesus Christ died for all men, that is, if he purchased and procured all those things we named for them, according to the mind and will of God, and the Scripture says the effects and fruits of his death are summed up in “eternal redemption,” then he did this according to the purpose of God, either absolutely or subject to some condition to be fulfilled by them. If he did this absolutely, then everyone ought to absolutely and infallibly partake of that eternal redemption. What, I ask, would hinder the enjoyment of that redemption by anyone whom God absolutely intended it for, and Christ absolutely purchased it for?

If the purpose was conditional, then he either procured this condition for them, or he did not. If he procured it for them, then either he did it absolutely, or on condition. If he absolutely procured the condition, then it is the same as before. If he procures something for another, which will be conferred on him if he meets a condition, and that condition is also procured which will absolutely bestow it on him, then it is equivalent to absolutely procuring the thing itself.

That is what we affirm in this very business: Christ procured salvation for us, to be bestowed on the condition that we believe; but he has absolutely procured faith itself, belief, without prescribing any additional condition. Thus we affirm that purchasing salvation for us

¹ Isa. 54:2 – it means that the church has grown, its tent has expanded to contain them.

² Mic. 4:2 – that is, the church has spread to many nations, as promised.

³ Lk. 2:10

⁴ Rev. 7:9

⁵ 2Cor. 5:19

⁶ 1Jn. 2:2

⁷ Rom. 1:20-21; 1Cor. 2:7-12

conditionally is equivalent to absolutely purchasing and bestowing it on us, with regard to the event and result. Thus all must be absolutely saved. But if this condition is procured on another condition, whatever it is, we will begin our query as to whether it is absolute or conditional all over again. And so we would run in a circle until the conditions end somewhere.

On the other side, if this condition is *not* procured by him, then,

First, such a condition must be made known to all (Arg. II).

Secondly, all men must be able to believe.

If all men are able to meet this condition themselves, and that condition is faith in the promises, as all concede it is, then all men in themselves, by the power of their own free-will, are able to believe.

That is contrary to the Scriptures.

By the Lord's assistance, this contradiction will be declared. If they cannot believe,¹ and faith must be bestowed on them and worked within them by the free grace of God,² then when God gave his Son to die for them, to procure eternal redemption for them all, on the condition that they believe, he either purposed to work faith in all of them by his grace so that they might believe, or he did not. If he did, then why does he not actually do it? "He is of one mind, who can turn him?"³ Why do all men not believe? Why do all men not have faith? Or does he fail in his purpose? If he did not purpose to bestow faith on all of them, then it comes to this: God gave Christ to die for all men, but on the condition that they perform what they cannot perform without him, and he purposed not to accomplish that in them.

Now, this is extreme madness. It assigns to God a will to do what he knows and orders will never be done, of granting something on a condition which cannot be fulfilled without his help, and choosing not to grant that help. Does this do anything besides delude poor creatures? Is it possible for any good to come to anyone by a purpose such as this, or by giving such a Redeemer? Is it consistent with the *goodness* of God to intend so great a good as the redemption purchased by Christ, and to pretend that it will profit men, when he knows that they can no more fulfill the condition he requires than Lazarus could come out of the grave by himself? Does it befit the *wisdom* of God, to purpose what he knows will never be fulfilled?

If a man promised a thousand dollars to a blind man on the condition that he open his eyes and see, which he knows he cannot do, does that promise come from a heartfelt pity for the blind man's poverty, or from a mind to mock his misery? If the king promised to pay a ransom for the captives at Algiers on the condition that they conquer their tyrants, which he knows they cannot do, would this be a kingly act? It is like a man paying to redeem captives, but not removing the chains that bind them to their prison walls; or promising dead men great rewards on the condition that they live again.

These are as fruitless to their ends as obtaining salvation for men on the condition that they believe without obtaining that condition for them. It assigns to the will and purpose of Jesus Christ something like this: "I will obtain eternal life, which will be bestowed on men and become

¹ Jn. 12:39,40 Therefore they could not believe

² Eph. 2:8 For you are saved by grace through faith; ... it is the gift of God

³ Job 23:13

theirs by applying the benefits of my death to them. But it will become theirs only on the condition that they believe. However, I will not reveal to countless numbers of them my mind and will in this matter, nor this condition. I know they are completely unable in themselves to perform the condition that I require. They are no more able than Lazarus was to rise, or a blind man to see. And yet, without performing this condition, none of the good things intended for them can ever become theirs. Nor will I procure that condition so that it can be fulfilled in them. That is, it is my will to have something done which I know will never be done, and cannot be done, because I will not do what is needed to accomplish it.” Now, whether such a will and purpose as this befits the wisdom and goodness of our Savior, let the reader judge.

In brief, intending to do anyone good on their performance of a condition that the intender knows is absolutely beyond their strength, especially knowing that it cannot be done without him, and being resolved not to assist, is a vain and fruitless flourish. It would be unworthy of Christ (and useless to those for whom it is meant) to obtain eternal redemption from his Father, when the Lord intends that they will never partake of it because they cannot perform the condition which will actually make it theirs. That is a hard saying indeed. Again, if through Christ God purposes to save everyone, because Christ died for all, but they will only be saved if they believe, and this faith is not purchased by Christ, and men are not able to believe by themselves, then how can any be saved?

“*God bestows faith on some, but not on others,*” is my reply. Is this selective grace purchased for some by comparison to those who are bypassed? If it is, then did not Christ die equally for all. He would have died so that some might have faith, but not others. Indeed, in comparing them, he cannot be said to die for those others at all. He did not die to give them the faith he knew they needed to obtain everything else he purchased. But if faith is not purchased for them by Christ, then would those who are saved have no more to thank Christ for than those who are damned? That would be strange, and contrary to Rev.1:5-6, “To the one who loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and has made us kings and priests to God and his Father, to him be glory and dominion forever and ever.”

For my part, I do not think that Christ obtained salvation for men on the condition that they receive it; instead, he has so fully and perfectly obtained it that they must certainly receive it. He purchased salvation, which is to be bestowed on those who believe; but he also purchased faith along with it, so that they can believe.

Nor can it be objected that, according to our doctrine, God requires anything of men that they cannot do, for example, faith to believe in Christ. Commands do not indicate what God intends should be done, but only what it is our duty to do. They may be made known to us whether we are able to perform those duties or not. They do not signify any intent or purpose of God. As for the promises linked to the command to believe:

First, it is not God’s intent and purpose that Christ only died for us if we believe. It would be absurd for the act to constitute its own object.¹

¹ See Book II, Chap. VI, Sec. II, fifthly, last [paragraph](#): A ball’s presence in my hand does not mean that it created my intent to pick it up. Instead, because I intended to pick up a ball, I first ensured one was accessible to me. In the same way, Christ cannot intend in the past to save someone who may or may not believe in him at some point in the future, outside of his control. Nor can someone create an intent in Christ in the past, that was not there before, simply by believing in him in the present. And so, if it was Christ’s intention to save me, then he had to ensure that

Secondly, it is God's purpose that the death of Christ is profitable to us only if we do believe; which we argued before.

Thirdly, faith is the only way to salvation which God has appointed, so that all who believe will undoubtedly be saved. These two things, faith and salvation, are inseparably linked together, as will be declared.

ARGUMENT IV. Men are two sorts; Christ died for one, not for both.

If by God's eternal purpose, all of mankind is divided into two sorts or conditions, separately portrayed in the Scripture, and Christ is specifically said to die for one and not the other, then did he not die for all. For if he died for all, then he died for everyone of the one sort, and no one of the other.

First, Scripture identifies two sorts of men.

There is such a discriminating distinction between men, by the eternal purpose of God. There are those whom he "loves" and those whom he "hates," Rom. 9:13; whom he "knows," and whom he "knows not," John 10:14; "I know my sheep;" 2Tim. 2:19, "The Lord knows those who are his;" Rom. 8:29, "Whom he foreknew;" Rom. 11:2, "His people which he foreknew;" "I know you not," Matt. 25:12; "I do not speak of you all; I know whom I have chosen," John 13:18.

There are those who are appointed to life and glory, and those appointed to destruction, the "elect" and the "reprobate." There are those who were "ordained to eternal life," Acts 13:48, and those "of old ordained to condemnation," Jude 4. "He has chosen us in him," Eph. 1:4; "whom he predestined, he also called: and whom he called, he also justified: and whom he justified, he also glorified." Rom. 8:30. "God has not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation," 1 Thess. 5:9. "He has mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will, he hardens. Will you say then to me, 'Why does he still find fault? For who has resisted his will?' No but, O man, who are you to reply against God? Shall the thing formed say to the one who formed it, 'Why have you made me this way?' Does the potter not have power over the clay, to make of the same lump a vessel of honor, and another of dishonor?" Rom. 9:18-21. "Made to be taken and destroyed;" 2Pet. 2:12; "Sheep and goats," Matt 25:32; John 10 throughout.

There are those on whom he has "mercy," and those whom he "hardens," Rom. 9:18. There are those who are his "special people," Tit 2:14; "the children of promise," Gal. 4:28; who are "not of the world," John 15:19; his "church," Col. 1:24. And then there are those who, in opposition to them, are "the world," Jn. 17:14; "not prayed for," John 17:9; and "not his people," Heb. 10:30; Rom. 8:9.

This distinction between men is ascribed everywhere in the Scripture to the purpose, will, and good pleasure of God. Prov. 16:4, "The Lord has made all things for himself, even the wicked for the day of evil." Matt. 9:25, 26, "I thank you, O Father, because you have hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and have revealed them to babes... for it seemed good in your sight." Rom. 9:11, 12, "The children not yet being born, having done neither good nor evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of the one who calls; it was said to her, 'The elder shall serve the younger.'" Rom. 9:16, 17, "So then it is not of the one who wills, or the one who runs, but of God who shows mercy. For the scripture says to Pharaoh, 'for

everything I needed to be saved would be present and effectual in me. If faith was needed, he had to ensure I had it, or his intent would fail. It is not my belief that caused Christ's intent, but his intent that caused my belief.

this purpose I have raised you up, that I might show my power in you, and my name might be declared throughout all the earth.” Rom. 9:28-30,” Who are the called according to his purpose. For whom he foreknew, he predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, so that he might be the first-born among many brothers. Moreover, whom he predestined, he also called: and whom he called, he also justified: and whom he justified, he also glorified.” So the first part of the proposition is clear from the Scripture: men are of two sorts.

Second, Christ died only for the one sort.

Now, Christ is said to expressly die for those of the one sort: for his “people,” Matt. 1:21; his “sheep,” John 10:11, 14; his “church,” Acts 20:28, Eph 5:25. This sort is distinguished from the world, Rom. 5:8, 9,¹ John 11:51, 52.² He died for his “elect,” Rom. 8:32-34; his “children,” Heb. 2:12, 13, as declared before. From this we may surely conclude that Christ did not die for everyone. He did not die for those he “never knew,”³ whom he “hates,”⁴ whom he “hardens,”⁵ on whom he “will not show mercy,”⁶ who were “ordained to condemnation;”⁷ in a word, he did not die for a reprobate. He did not die for the world he would not pray for.

What some except is that, although Christ is said to die for his “sheep,” for his “elect,” his “chosen,” he is not said to die *only* for them. Saying that the term is nowhere expressed is an argument that has no value. It does not require any forced interpretation to produce the same conclusion. Common sense and use of speech shows that if men are distinguished into two opposite conditions, such as elect and reprobate, or sheep and goats, then affirming that Christ died for his elect is equivalent to saying that he died for his elect *only*. The meaning is as clear as if the term “only” had been added. Where our Savior says, “I am the way, the truth, and the life,” John 14:6, he does not say that he is the *only* way, and yet that is how it must necessarily be understood. In Col. 1:19, “It pleased the Father that all fullness should dwell in him;” Paul does not say “*only* in him,” and yet it would be blasphemy to say that of any other.

So this exception is unanswerable, as far as I can see. The response might be furthered by a larger explication of God’s purpose in election and reprobation. It could be shown how the death of Christ was a means set apart and appointed for saving his elect. It was not at all undergone and suffered for those whom God, in his eternal counsel, determined would perish for their sins, and so never partake of its benefits. But this must be addressed in the other part of this controversy, concerning the cause for sending Christ.

ARGUMENT V. Scripture nowhere says that Christ died for all men.

We should not assert or affirm anything that the Scripture does not address. And the Scripture nowhere says that Christ died for all men, much less for all and every man (there is a wide

¹ Rom 5:8-9 But God demonstrates His own love toward us, in that while we were still sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, having now been justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him.

² John 11:51-52 Now this he did not say on his own authority; but being high priest that year he prophesied that Jesus would die for the nation, and not for that nation only, but also that He would gather together in one the children of God who were scattered abroad.

³ Matt. 7:23

⁴ Rom. 9:13

⁵ Rom. 9:18

⁶ Jam. 2:13

⁷ Jude 4

difference between the two, as will be declared). Therefore, this is not to be asserted. It is true that Christ is said to give his life “a ransom for all,” but nowhere does it say “for all men.” It is expressly affirmed in other passages that he died for many, for his church, for those who believe, for the children that God gave him, for us, or for some of all sorts.¹ Because of that, it must be clearly proved that where “all” is mentioned, it cannot mean these limited groups, before we can conclude that it does mean *universal*. If men will just consider the particular passages, and contain themselves until they have done what is required, I am persuaded we will be at rest in this business.

CHAPTER III – Two Other Arguments from the Person of Christ

ARGUMENT VI. Christ died as a Surety for those he represented.

For whom Christ died, he died as a sponsor. He died in their stead, as apparent from Romans 5:6-8, “For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. One would scarcely die for a righteous man, though perhaps for a good man *some* would dare to die. But God commends his love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” Galatians 3:13, “He was made a curse for us.” 2Corinthians 5:21, “He has made him sin for us.” All of these passages plainly indicate an exchange of persons, one being accepted in the place of the other. Now, if he died as the surety of those for whom he died, and in their stead, then these two things at least will follow:

First, He endured the penalty due others to free each from it.

He freed them from that anger, wrath, and guilt of death he underwent for them, so that they would all be reconciled in him, and be freed from the bondage they are in because of death. No other reason can be given for Christ undergoing anything in another’s stead, but that the other might be freed from undergoing what he underwent for him. Justice requires that it should be so. This is intimated when our Savior is said to be *enguos*,² “a surety of a better testament,” Hebrews 7:22. He does so by being our priest, by undergoing the “chastisement of our peace,” and by assuming the burden of our “iniquities,” Isaiah 53:5, 6. He was “made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him,” 2Corinthians 5:21.

But all are not freed from wrath and the guilt of death, nor are all actually reconciled to God, which is being justified through imputing righteousness, and not imputing iniquities. For until men come to Christ, “the wrath of God abides on them,” John 3:36. This intimates that his wrath is not removed because they do not believe. It does not say that his wrath comes on them, as though by Christ’s death they would be freed from the state of wrath we are all in by nature, Ephesians 2:3; Instead, it uses *menei*,³ “it remains,” or abides: it was never removed. To those who are not freed, the gospel is a savor of death unto death,⁴ – despising the gospel brings a new death, and a painful condemnation to them. This is the same death whose guilt they lay under before.⁵

¹ Rev 5:9 You... have redeemed us to God by Your blood, Out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation;

² *Enguos* (NT:1450)

³ *Menei* (NT:3306)

⁴ 2Cor. 2:16

⁵ Owen’s point here is that, if Christ’s death brought universal redemption, then God’s wrath would no longer abide for anyone. There would have to be some new condemnation, some new sentence of death that comes to them. But

Some have asserted that all men are redeemed, restored, justified, and made righteous in Christ by his death. But truly, this is so wretched, it perverts the Scriptures which give no support to any such assertion. It is so directly opposed to them, that I judge it fruitless, and a waste of labor, to remove such exceptions (Moore, p. 45).

Secondly, satisfaction was made for each person Christ died for.

If Christ died for all and every man, it follows that he made satisfaction for the sins of all of them. That is because the reason he underwent death for us as a surety was to satisfy God's justice for our sins, thereby redeeming us for himself. No other reason can be given for what he did.

Christ did not make satisfaction for all men.

But Christ has not satisfied the justice of God for all the sins of all and every man. This is evident for a number of reasons.

First, if he satisfied for all, then all are saved.

If Christ made satisfaction to God's justice for someone's sins, then justice is satisfied for their sins, or his satisfaction was rejected as insufficient. No other reason can be given for such a fruitless attempt; and to say it was is blasphemy in the highest degree. But God's justice is not satisfied for all the sins of all and every man. This is as obvious as the former. Some must undergo eternal punishment for their sins themselves, so that the justice of God may be satisfied. The justice of God was not satisfied by the punishment of Christ, because they are not healed by his stripes. I hope, with Christians, this does not need proving. Countless souls will undergo eternal punishment for their own sins. Now, how can the justice of God require satisfaction for their sins, if satisfaction was made for them in Christ? The Lord will require "the last penny" of some, as Matthew 5:26 makes clear.¹

Secondly, he did not intend to satisfy for more than could be saved.

Christ, by undergoing death for us as our surety, satisfied for no more than he intended. Satisfaction for the sins of men is so great a thing that it could not happen accidentally, apart from his intention, will, and purpose. This is especially so considering that sanctifying himself to be an oblation was absolutely necessary to make his death an acceptable offering. But Christ did not intend to make satisfaction for the sins of all and every man. For countless souls were in hell, under the punishment and weight of their own sins, where there was no redemption before or after our Savior made himself an oblation for sin. Now, shall we suppose that Christ would make himself an offering for their sins when he knew they were past recovery, and that it was utterly impossible for them to have any fruit or benefit by his offering? Should we think that the blood of the covenant was wasted on those for whom our Savior intended no good at all? He could not intend good for them, without directly opposing the eternal decree of his

Scripture does not describe it that way. The phrase "death to death," Owen says, is referring to the very same "guilt of death" that all of us were under prior to Christ's death on the cross. It remains for these reprobates. Christ's death, instead of freeing them as it does the elect, only brings home more poignantly the guilt of death under which they suffer. Because they despise the gospel, they are not relieved of their guilt.

¹ Matt 5:25-26 Agree with your adversary quickly ... lest your adversary deliver you to the judge, ...and you be thrown into prison... You will not get out of there until you pay the last penny.

Father, and thus his own eternal Deity. Did God send his Son, and did Christ come, to die for Cain and Pharaoh, damned so many ages before his suffering? Is that a credible appeal? ¹

The exception that its application was conditional has no force

The exception that Christ died for them, and his death would have been available to them if they had believed and fulfilled the required condition, has no force at all, in my judgment.

First, the condition was unknown by all.

For the most part, they never heard of any such condition.

Secondly, Christ knew whoever failed the condition would be lost.

Christ at his death knew full well that they had not fulfilled the condition, and were actually cut off from any possibility of ever doing so. Any intent to do them good by his death would necessarily be in vain and frustrated. Such a fruitless sacrifice must not be assigned to the Son of God.

Thirdly, conditional redemption is rejected.

We shall reject this assertion that redemption is applied if they will believe, shortly.

Asserting that Christ satisfied for both damned and saved is valueless.

To say that Christ might as well satisfy for those who were eternally damned as for those who were actually saved, has no more value than the other exception.

First, Christ was required to die for those who would be saved.

Those who were saved were saved on the ground that Christ would certainly suffer for them in due time. His suffering was as effectual in its purpose and promise as it was in its execution and accomplishment. In the mind of God, it was accounted to them as accomplished, the compact and covenant with Christ being surely ratified upon mutual, unchangeable promises. Our Savior had to perform it, because it was necessary for those who were actually saved. But for those who were actually damned, there was no such inducement to perform it, no ground for it, and no result to be expected from it.

Secondly, Christ's intent was to free those for whom he died.

A simile should clear up the matter. Say a man sends word to a place where captives are in prison, that he will pay the price and ransom that is required to deliver those he appoints, and that he desires these prisoners to come out in expectation of his payment. The one who detains these captives accepts his offer according to his promise. When the man comes, he finds that some have come out as proposed, while others continued obstinate in their dungeon. Those who have come out have heard what he has done, the others have not and are now long since dead, each according to his appointment. In paying his promised ransom, does he intend it for those who died stubbornly and obstinately in the prison, or only for those who came out? Doubtless, only for those who came out.

¹ This argument may easily be misunderstood. Abraham was not burning in the flames of hell until Christ died for him. Owen's point here is that Christ did not die for the convinced damned, but only for the convinced elect. He was covenantally obliged to die for them as their surety. We often say that God "looked forward" to Christ's sacrifice that redeemed Abraham (Lk. 16:23). But Owen shortly points out that God set free those in the past whom Christ promised to pay for in due time.

In the same way, Christ's suffering cannot be thought to be a price paid for those who died in the prison of sin and corruption before his ransom was paid. But it might full well be the price paid for those who were delivered by virtue of his engagement and promise to pay such a ransom.

Thirdly, if Christ satisfied for all sin, the sin of unbelief was paid for.

If Christ died in the stead of all men, and made satisfaction for their sins, then either he died for all of their sins, or only for some of their sins. If he died for only some, then who can be saved? If he died for all, then why are all not saved? They say it is because of their unbelief; they will not believe, and therefore they are not saved. Is unbelief a sin, or not? If it is not, then how can it be a cause of damnation? If it is, then Christ died for it, or he did not. If he did not, then he did not die for all the sins of all men. If he did, then why is this an obstacle to their salvation? Is there any new slant to this? Is this not the same old condition, that they are not saved because they do not believe? That is, either Christ did not die for their unbelief because they would not believe, or else he did die for their unbelief but conditionally, and that condition was that they were believers.

These do not seem to me to be sober assertions.

ARGUMENT VII. Christ died as a Mediator, a Priest for his own people.

For whom Christ died, he is a mediator. This is apparent because his oblation, shedding his blood, was one of the primary acts of his mediation. But he is not a mediator for all and every one. This is just as apparent. As a mediator, he is the priest for those for whom he is a mediator. Now, a priest's role, as was declared before, is to sacrifice and intercede, to procure good things, and to apply them to those for whom they are procured. This is evident from Hebrews 9. Confessedly, Christ does not do this for all. The assertion that Christ is not a mediator for every one needs no proof. Experience proves it, besides countless passages of Scripture. I confess, it is replied by some that Christ is a mediator in respect to some acts, but not in respect to others. I judge this to be a dishonest subterfuge that has no basis in Scripture. It would make our Savior half a mediator in respect to some, which is an offensive expression. But this argument was settled before.¹

CHAPTER IV – Procurement of Sanctification and Faith

On sanctification, the cause of faith, and its procurement by the death of Christ.

ARGUMENT VIII. Christ's blood is effectual to wash, purge, and sanctify.

Another argument may be taken from the effect and fruit of the death of Christ in our sanctification. If the blood of Jesus Christ does wash, purge, cleanse, and sanctify those for whom it was shed, or for whom he was a sacrifice, then certainly he died, shed his blood, or was a sacrifice, only for those who are washed, purged, cleansed, and sanctified through the event. This should all be quite apparent. Faith is the first principle of the heart's purification, Acts 15:9,² and "all men do not have faith," 2Thes.3:2. Faith is "of the elect of God," Tit. 1:1. The consequence, I think, is undeniable, and not to be avoided with any distinctions. But we will now make it evident that the blood of Christ is effectual for all those ends of washing, purging, and

¹ See Book I, Chap. VIII, [Gen. Arg.](#), Moore's argument that Christ died for all but intercedes only for some.

² Acts 15:9 purifying their hearts by faith

sanctifying, which we recounted before. And we will do this first, from its types, and second, by plain expressions concerning the shedding of blood itself:

First, the Scriptural type of sacrifice legally sanctifies.

For the type, we will now consider the sacrifice of atonement, which the apostle so expressly compares with the sacrifice and oblation of Christ. He affirms, in Heb. 9:13, that it legally sanctified those for whom it was a sacrifice. “The blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of a heifer, sprinkled on the unclean, sanctifies to purify the flesh.” Now, what was done physically and legally, typified by that bloody sacrifice of beasts, must be spiritually effected in the antitype, which is the sacrifice of Christ. The apostle asserts this in the verse following. “How much more,” he says, “shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?” If I know anything, the answer that Arminius and some others will give to this, is that the sacrifice did sanctify – not as offered but as sprinkled. And the blood of Christ, did not sanctify with regard to the oblation, with regard to its application. This is weak and unsatisfactory; for it only asserts a separation between his oblation and the application of his blood. While we admit they may be distinguished, such a separation is what we are now disproving. We grant that the blood of Christ sanctifies with regard to the application of the good things it procured. But it must still be proved that it is applied to all for whom it was an oblation. That is because it is said to sanctify and purge, and so Christ’s blood must correspond to the type, which was said to sanctify to purify the flesh.

Secondly, Scripture says blood sacrifices are intended to sanctify.

It is expressly affirmed in various passages concerning blood-shedding and the death of our Savior, that it does effect these things, and that it was intended for that purpose. Many passages were given before. I will now repeat a number of them to strengthen the argument in hand, considering only those passages which point out the purpose of the death of Christ to establish the truth of this argument.

Scripture Proofs

Rom. 6:5, 6, “For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall also be raised in the likeness of his resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, so that the body of sin might be destroyed, and that here forward we should not serve sin.” The words in the latter verse give a reason for the assertion in verse 5 that participating in the death of Christ will certainly be accompanied by conformity to him in his resurrection. That is, it refers to both the spiritual life, and the eternal life: “our old man is crucified with him, so that the body of sin might be destroyed.” That is, our sinful corruption and depraved nature are effectually and meritoriously slain by his death and crucifixion. They are disabled from such a rule and dominion over us that we will no longer be servants to them. This is apparently the sense of the passage, seeing that it is laid as a foundation to drive home all the decrees of sanctification and freedom from the power of sin that we have.

The same apostle¹ also tells us in 2Cor. 1:20, that “all the promises of God are in him indeed, and in him Amen, to the glory of God by us.” “Indeed, and Amen,” means the promises are confirmed, ratified, unchangeably established, and irrevocably made over to us. Now, this was

¹ Owen assumes that Paul is the writer of Hebrews – a minority view today.

done “in him,” that is, in his death and blood-shedding, which confirm the testament in which these promises convey the legacies to us. They are confirmed by the “death of him, the testator,” Heb. 9:16: for he was “the surety of this better testament,” Heb. 7:22. This testament or “covenant he confirmed with many,” by his being “cut off” for them, Dan. 9:26, 27.

Now, what are the promises that are confirmed to us, and established by the blood of Christ? You have a summary of them in Jer. 31:33,34,¹ which is repeated by the apostle in Heb. 8:10-12. It sets out the nature of the covenant that was ratified in the blood of Jesus. You have a summary description of all the free grace there is towards us, both in sanctification (verses 10-11), and in justification (verse 12). Among these promises is the famous one of circumcising our hearts, and putting new hearts and spirits into us, Deut. 30:6; Ezek. 36:26. Our sanctification, holiness, justification, and reconciliation with God are procured by, and established with, unchangeable promises in the death and blood-shedding of Christ. The heavenly or spiritual things are purified with his sacrifice, Heb. 9:23. “For we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins,” Col 1:14; “By death, he destroyed the one who had the power of death, that is, the devil,” that he might “deliver those who, through fear of death, were subject to bondage all their lives,” Heb. 2:14, 15.

Just take notice of these two clearest passages, Tit. 2:14,² Eph. 5:25, 26.³ In both, our cleansing and sanctification is assigned to the purpose and intent of Christ, who was the worker. Therefore the certain effect of his death and oblation was the work, as proved before.⁴ And I will add only one place more to prove that the blood of Christ purges us from all our sin, and it is, 1Cor. 1:30, “Who by God is made wisdom to us, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.” Because it is clear enough, I need not spend time to prove that he was made these things to us by God. God sent him to be “a propitiation through faith in his blood;” Rom. 3:25. Our sanctification, along with all the other effects of free grace, are immediately procured by the death of Christ.

The sum of what has been said is this: sanctification and holiness are the certain fruit and effect of the death of Christ in all those for whom he died; but not everyone is made a partaker of this sanctification and holiness. Therefore, Christ did not die for everyone.

The Death of Christ is the sole cause of Redemption

It is altogether in vain to make the exception, as some do, that the death of Christ is not the sole cause of these things. They cannot actually be worked in anyone unless the Spirit works them, and faith apprehends the death of Christ:

First, the paid ransom is the sole cause of redemption.

The Spirit of God is the cause of sanctification and holiness; but what kind of cause? One that immediately, really, and efficiently produces the effect. Faith is the cause for pardoning sin; but what kind of cause? It is merely an instrumental cause. It apprehends the

¹ I will put My law in their minds, and write it on their hearts; I will be their God, and they shall be My people. No more will every man teach his neighbor, and his brother, saying, ‘Know the LORD,’ for they shall all know Me, from the least to the greatest, says the LORD. For I will forgive their iniquity, and remember their sin no more.

² Titus 2:14 who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from every lawless deed and purify for Himself His own special people, zealous for good works.

³ Eph 5:25-26 just as Christ loved the church and gave Himself for her, so that He might sanctify and cleanse her with the washing of water by the word

⁴ See Book I, Chap. II, Sec. II, [Relaton of End to Means](#).

righteousness of Christ. Now, do these causes, efficient and instrumental, hinder the fact that the blood of Christ not only coincides with them, but is the sole cause of these things, morally and meritoriously? Doubtless, they do not, or else they would be neither instrumental nor efficient. His blood is the sole foundation of the Spirit's operation and efficiency, and the sole cause of faith's existence.

Say a man is held captive by his enemy. Someone goes to the one who holds him, and makes an agreement to pay a ransom for his delivery. The one who holds the captive grants a warrant to the keepers of the prison to knock off his shackles, take away his rags, and let him have new clothes, according to the agreement. He says, "Deliver him, for I have found a ransom." Because the jailer knocks off his shackles, and the warrant of the judge is brought for his discharge, would we deny that the ransom which was paid was the sole cause of his delivery? If the ransom had not been paid, then the issue of the warrant, and the removal of the shackles, would never have happened. They are no less the effect of that ransom than the captive's own delivery.

In our delivery from the bondage of sin, it is true that there are other kinds of things involved besides the death of Christ. There is the operation of the Spirit, and the grace of God. But these are no less the fruit and effect of the death of Christ than our deliverance. It is clear that his death is the only cause of our redemption.

Secondly, faith itself is procured by Christ's death

We affirm that faith itself was procured by Christ's death. It is a proper and immediate fruit of his death in all those for whom he died. If this is true, it utterly overthrows the general ransom, or universal redemption. And if it is not true, then I will willingly concede. Whichever way it goes, free will must be established. I will prove the procurement of faith in the next argument.

ARGUMENT IX. Faith is procured by Christ's Death

Before I press the argument, I must establish a few premises.

Premises:

1. Nothing is bestowed on us that was not purchased by Christ's Death

Whatever is freely bestowed on us through Christ, is completely procured and merited by the death of Christ. Nothing is bestowed on his people that he has not purchased. The price he paid for this purchase is his own blood, 1Pet. 1:18,19. For the covenant between his Father and him, of bestowing all spiritual blessings on those who were given to him, was expressly founded on the condition that, "he would make his soul an offering for sin," Isa. 53:10.

2. Faith is indispensable to our salvation

Everyone agrees that faith is an absolutely indispensable necessity for salvation. There is no acceptable sacrifice to replace it under the new covenant. Whatever God has done in his love by sending his Son, and whatever Christ has done in his oblation, or does in his intercession (whether for all or some), has no value, worth, or profit to us without our faith. These things would only serve to increase and aggravate our condemnation. Whatever else may be accomplished apart from faith, it remains true that "The one who does not believe shall be

damned,” Mark 16:16.¹ Faith is so absolutely necessary, it seems to me that whatever causes our faith, must be the primary and principal cause of our salvation. Without faith, none of this would happen, and with it, all of it is effectual.

3. The question is whether faith is a fruit and effect of Christ’s death?

I will give those who are contrary-minded a clear choice, so that they may answer directly, categorically, and without vague distinctions. “Did our savior merit or procure faith for us by his death and intercession?” Or, to ask it another way, “Is faith a fruit and effect of the death of Christ?”

First, if it is, then was it absolute or conditional?

If Christ did procure our faith by his death, then I demand to know whether Christ procured faith for all for whom he died absolutely, or on some condition to be fulfilled on their part?

If absolutely, then surely, if he died for all, they must all believe.

For what is absolutely procured for someone is absolutely his. If someone has absolutely procured an inheritance, by whatever means, who can say that it is not his? But the apostle denies that all men have faith, “All men do not have faith,” 2 Thess 3:2; and, “Faith is of the elect of God,” Tit. 1:1.

If conditionally, and the condition is our faith, then this faith is of ourselves and not of Christ.

If they say that he procured it for them, that is, to be bestowed on them conditionally, then I desire an unequivocal answer, without distinctions. Give us that condition, so that we may know what it is. It is of infinite concern to all of us. Let me know this condition, and the cause is yours. Is it, as some say, that they not resist the grace of God? What does it mean to not resist the grace of God? Is it not to obey it? And what is it to obey the grace of God? Is it not to believe? And so the condition of faith is faith itself. Christ procured faith so that they would believe, on the condition that they believe! Are these things so?

Can they assign a condition of faith, required on our part, that is not faith itself? Let us hear it, then, and we will renew our inquiry whether that condition is procured by Christ or not. If it is not, then the cause of faith is still found in ourselves. Christ would not be the author and finisher of it.² If it is procured by him, then we are right where we were before. We must follow with our queries whether that condition was procured absolutely or on some condition.

Secondly, if it is not, then it is an act of will and we save ourselves

If our faith is not procured by Christ’s death, then,

1. It must be an act of our own will

Our adversaries must maintain that it is an act of our own wills, to ensure it is not worked in us by grace; and that it is completely within our power to perform. To support their argument, nothing could be bestowed on us by free grace through Christ except what was procured by him in his death and oblation. This is contrary to the following things:

(1.) It contradicts express Scripture in a number of places, which I will not recount.

¹ Also Heb. 11:6 – Without faith, it is impossible to please God.

² Heb. 12:2

(2.) It contradicts the very nature of the new covenant, which does not require a condition, but effectually works its promises in all the covenantees, Jer. 31:33, 34; Ezek. 36:26; Heb. 8:10, 11:

(3.) It contradicts the advancement of the free grace of God by setting up the power of free-will in our corrupted nature, slighting and undervaluing God's grace.¹

(4.) It contradicts the received doctrine of our natural depravity and inability to do anything good; indeed, it will lead to overthrowing the fundamental article of original sin.

(5.) It is contrary to right reason, which will never grant that this natural faculty is capable of producing a purely spiritual act without some kind of spiritual elevation; see 1Cor. 2:14.²

2. We are the cause of our salvation and Christ's death has no value

The cause of our salvation will ultimately resolve into ourselves. It would be in our own power to make what God and Christ have done effectual, or to frustrate their endeavors. For all that is done will not profit us unless we believe; and if Christ has not effected or procured that belief by his death, then the Lord cannot work salvation in us. The deciding vote, whether we will believe or not, is left to ourselves. Now, judge for yourself whether this makes us the cause of our own happiness, and the main builders of our own glory.

These things having been premised, I will briefly prove what others deny, namely, that faith is procured for us by the death of Christ. And consequently, if he procured it for us, and "all men do not have faith," then he did not die for everyone. This is proved by the following reasons:

Proofs:

1. Faith is part of our sanctification and holiness purchased by Christ

The death of Jesus Christ purchased holiness and sanctification for us. This was proved at large in Arg. VIII. But faith, because it is a grace of the Spirit inherent in us, is a formal part of our sanctification and holiness. Therefore, he procured faith for us as well. The assumption is certain and undeniable; the proposition was sufficiently confirmed in Argument VIII, and I cannot see what exception may be taken against the truth of it. If anyone does object, and says that Christ might have procured only part but not all of holiness for us, the parts being hope, love, meekness, and the like,³ then I ask,

First, what warrant do we have to make such a distinction between the graces of the Spirit, so that some are purchased by Christ, while others come from our own store?

Secondly, are we more prone or able to believe on our own, than we are to love and to hope? And what basis do we have for that distinction?

2. All the fruits of election are purchased by Christ

All the fruits of election are purchased for us by Jesus Christ. For "we are chosen in him," Eph. 1:4, and that is the only cause and source of all those good things which the Lord chooses us to.

¹ That is, it suggests we have free will prior to our salvation. That would essentially deny our corrupted nature, and thus our need for God's free grace. See Rom. 7:15.

² 1Cor 2:14-15 But the natural man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him; nor can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.

³ Gal. 5:22; Eph. 5:9

This is for the praise of his glorious grace, that in all things he might have the preeminence. I hope I need not prove that the Lord Jesus is the only means by which, and for whom, the Lord will certainly and actually bestow on his elect all the fruits and effects of the love he intended for them, and for which he chose them.

Now, faith is a fruit, a principal fruit, of our election. For the apostle says, “We are chosen in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy,” Eph. 1:4. And so holiness, faith, purifying the heart, is a principal share of our election. “Moreover, those he predestined, he also called,” Rom. 8:30. That is, having called us according to his purpose, he effectually works faith in us by the mighty operation of his Spirit, “according to the exceeding greatness of his power,” Eph. 1:9. And so those who “were ordained to eternal life believed,” Acts 13:48. God has made them differ from others in the enjoyment of the means of grace, 1Cor. 4:7.¹ Being ordained to eternal life was the fountain from which their faith flowed. And so the elect obtained it, and the rest were blinded, Rom. 11:7.²

3. All the blessings of the Covenant are purchased by Christ

All the blessings of the new covenant are procured and purchased by the one in whom the promises of that covenant are ratified, and to whom the promises are made. For all the good things of that covenant are contained in and exhibited by those promises, through the working of the Spirit of God. It was declared before what the promises of the covenant are, that they are confirmed in Christ, and they are made to his seed, Gal. 3:16. Therefore, all the good things of the covenant are the effects, fruits, and purchase of the death of Christ. Furthermore, faith is part of the good things of the new covenant. This is apparent from the description of them in Jer. 31:33, 34; Heb. 8:10-12; Ezek. 36:25-27, and various other passages.³

4. Everything necessary to be saved must be purchased by Christ

If it is utterly impossible to be saved without faith, then faith must be procured by the one who fully and effectually saves us. How can Christ fully and effectually save us, without purchasing what is indispensable to our salvation? Without faith it is utterly impossible to attain salvation, Heb. 11:6,⁴ Mark 16:16;⁵ and yet Jesus Christ, according to his name, does perfectly save us, Matt. 1:21.⁶ He procures “eternal redemption” for us, Heb. 9:12. He is “able to completely save those who come to God by him,” Heb. 7:25. Therefore, faith must be included in the things that he procured.

¹ 1Cor 4:7 For who makes you differ from another, and what do you have that you did not receive?

² Rom 11:7 Israel has not obtained what it seeks; but the elect have obtained it, and the rest were blinded.

³ Owen has already established a link between faith and holiness, just as James linked faith to works. The promise in these passages is that God shall write his law on our hearts so that we may be holy, and he will put his Spirit in us to enable us to be so. Because faith is part of our sanctification, which is our actual holiness, it must be an inherent promise in these passages, and an implicit component of the covenant.

⁴ Heb 11:6 But without faith it is impossible to please Him, for he who comes to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of those who diligently seek Him.

⁵ Mark 16:16 He who believes and is baptized will be saved; but he who does not believe will be condemned.

⁶ Matt 1:21 And she will bring forth a Son, and you shall call His name *Jesus*, for He will save His people from their sins.

5. Faith is a gift, a blessing, procured for us by Christ

The Scripture is clear that faith, or belief, is the gift and Christ is its procurer. Take for example, “It is given to us on the behalf of Christ (*huper christos* NT:5228), for Christ’s sake, to believe on him,” Phil. 1:29. “God has blessed us with all spiritual blessings in him in heavenly places,” Eph. 1:3. If faith is a spiritual blessing, then it is bestowed on us “in him,” and for his sake. If it is not, then it is not worth arguing about what that means, or in what way it is procured. So look at it however you will, I desire to look to Jesus as the “author and finisher of our faith,” Heb. 12:2. Various other reasons, arguments, and passages of Scripture might be added to confirm this truth, but I hope I have said enough.

Conclusion: If what he procured is not common to all, he did not die for all

The sum of what has been said is this: if the fruit and effect of the death of Christ is not common to all, and it is absolutely procured for us rather than conditioned on some act to be fulfilled by us, then Christ did not die for all. It is evident that the grace of faith is not common to all. It is absolutely procured by the death of Christ. And it is bestowed on those for whom he died. Therefore, our Savior did not die for all.

ARGUMENT X. The Antitype of the People of Israel as God’s Elect

We argue from the type to the antitype, from what stands for something to what it stands for. This will clearly restrict the oblation of Christ to God’s elect. The people of Israel were certainly typical of the church of God in all the remarkable things that happened to them, as declared in 1Cor. 10:11.¹ Their institutions and ordinances were especially representative of the spiritual things of the gospel. Their priests, altar, and sacrifices, were all shadows of the good things to come in Jesus Christ. Their Canaan was a type of heaven, Heb. 4:3, 9,² as was Jerusalem or Zion, Gal. 4:26,³ Heb. 12:22.⁴ The people of Israel as a whole were a type of God’s church, his elect, his chosen and called people. That is why believers are called a “holy people, a royal priesthood,” alluding to the people of Israel, 1Pet. 2:5, 9.⁵ In fact, God’s people are called his “Israel” in countless places, as further expounded in Heb. 8:8.⁶ A true Israelite is the same as a true believer, John 1:47;⁷ One is a Jew who is so in his heart. I hope it does not need not be proved that the people delivered from bondage, preserved, taken near to God, and brought into Canaan, are typical of God’s spiritual church, of elect believers. From this type of Israel, we argue the following for the church:

¹ 1Cor 10:11 Now all these things happened to them for examples, and they are written for our admonition, on whom the ends of the world have come.

² They entered Caanan as their place of rest, and we enter the kingdom as our place of rest.

³ Gal 4:26 But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.

⁴ Heb 12:22 But you have come to mount Zion, and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem

⁵ 1Pet.2:9, You are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation

⁶ Heb 8:8 Behold, the days come, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah – This passage seemingly speaks against Owen’s proposition by naming the house of Israel in contradistinction to the house of Judah. However, Jewish writing is poetic. It repeats phrases not for contrast but for emphasis. Here it combines the two houses that man had separated. And so, “What God has put together...” Matt. 19:6.

⁷ John 1:47 Jesus saw Nathanael coming to him, and said of him, ‘Behold an Israelite indeed,’

Only those who are really and spiritually redeemed by Jesus Christ are typified by the physical redemption of the people of Israel. Only the elect, the church of God, was typified by the Jewish people being delivered from Egypt and brought into Canaan with their ordinances and institutions. It is senseless to imagine that the Jews were a type for the whole world, or for any but God's chosen ones, as proven in Heb. 9,10.¹ Were the Jews and their ordinances types for the seven nations whom they destroyed and supplanted in Canaan? Were they types for the Egyptians, or for those who were infidels and haters of God and his Christ? We conclude, then, from the types and the things which they typify, that only the elect of God, his church and chosen ones, are redeemed by Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER V – The Nature of Redemption

A continuation of arguments from the nature and description of redemption.

ARGUMENT XI. First: by its nature, Redemption is not Universal.

The doctrine of *universal redemption* cannot possibly be sound and sincere, unlike the milk of the word. It will not by any means suit or conform to what it signifies; and the expressions in Scripture by which it is presented to us, both literal and deductive, only imply evident contradictions between them. But now, such is this persuasion of universal redemption. Saying redemption is universal, and yet admitting that many will die in captivity, is a contradiction irreconcilable in itself.

To demonstrate this, let us consider some of the primary words and phrases by which this matter is delivered in the Scripture. These would include redemption, reconciliation, satisfaction, merit, dying for us, bearing our sins, suretyship, being God, a common person, a Jesus [meaning he will save his people], saving completely, a sacrifice putting away sin, and the like. To these we may add the importance of some prepositions and other words used in the original about this business. Have no doubt that we will easily find the general ransom, or universal redemption, will hardly suit any of them. It is too long for the bed, and must be cropped at the head or heels.

We begin with the word *redemption* itself, considered as to both its name and what it points to. The Greek for redemption in the Scripture is sometimes (NT:3085 *lutrosis*), but most frequently (NT:629 *apolutrosis*), which is the delivery of someone from captivity and misery by paying a price or ransom (NT:3083 *lutron*). It is evident that this ransom, or price of our deliverance, was the blood of Christ. He calls it *lutron* in Matt. 20:28;² and (NT:487 *antilutron*) in 1Tim. 2:6.³ That is, it is the price of such a redemption, or what was received as a valuable consideration for our dismissal. Now, what is aimed at in the payment of this price, is the deliverance of those for whom the price is paid, from the evil with which they were oppressed. This spiritual redemption is virtually the same as corporal and civil redemption, with some notable exceptions. The Holy Spirit shows this by comparing the “blood of Christ” in this work of redemption with “silver and gold,” and other things used to pay the ransom in civil redemption, 1Pet. 1:18,19. The evil we were oppressed with was the punishment we deserved; that is, it was the satisfaction required when our debt results from sin. And that is also what we are delivered from by the payment of

¹ The cite in the original text was Heb. 9:10. That was an obvious error. The entirety of both chapters is needed to support his statement, not just verse 10.

² “to give his life a ransom for many.”

³ “who gave himself a ransom *in exchange* for all;”

this price. “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law,” Gal. 3:13. We are “justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,” Rom. 3:24; “in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins,” Eph. 1:7; Col 1:14. The effect of the redemption that is procured by the payment of the price we mentioned, is free justification from the guilt of sin, and pardon from sin itself; we have been delivered from the punishment that is due. It is as if a man had his friend in bondage, and he put up his estate to pay the price of his freedom, a price set by the one who detains him; and by doing so, he sets his friend free. Only, as intimated before, this spiritual redemption has some things in it that are not found in other deliverances, as follows.

Spiritual Redemption differs from temporal redemption.

First, the one who receives the ransom also gives it.

Christ is a propitiation to appease and atone the Lord, but the Lord himself offered him as such, Rom. 3:24, 25;¹ and so the Lord himself is often said to redeem us. His love is the reason the price is procured, and his justice accepts the price because of its merit. For Christ “came down from heaven to do the will of the one who sent him,” John 6:3 8; Heb. 10:9,10. It is different in redemption among men, where the one who receives the ransom has no hand in providing it.

Secondly, we are not freed from God, but brought near to Him.

The captive or prisoner is not so much freed from the power of the one who detains him as he is brought into his favor. When a captive among men is redeemed by the payment of a ransom, he is instantly set free from the power and authority of the one who detained him. But in spiritual redemption, upon paying the ransom for us, which is the blood of Jesus, we are not removed from God. Instead, we are “brought near” to him, Eph. 2:13. We are not delivered from his power, but restored to his favor. Our misery, and punishment, was in banishment from God as much as bondage to sin.

Thirdly, the Jailer was conquered to satisfy the Judge

Just as the judge was to be satisfied, so the jailer was to be conquered. God, the judge, gave the jailer permission to fight for his dominion. Even though it had been wrongfully usurped by him, the cause of his dominion was justly inflicted by the Lord, and our subjection rightly deserved, Heb. 2:14;² Col. 2:15.³ Yet, as strong as he was, he lost his power because he strived to grasp more than he could hold. The foundation of his kingdom being sin, and assaulting Christ who did no sin, he lost his power over those who Christ came to redeem, having no part in him. And thus the strong man was bound, and his house spoiled.

In these and a few other circumstances, our spiritual redemption is distinguished from civil redemption; but for the most part it describes the word in its proper use among men.

Now, this is expressed in the Scripture two ways. Our Savior is either said to die for our redemption, or to die for the redemption of our transgressions; both tend to mean the same thing, I think. The *redemption of our transgressions* is only found in Heb. 9:15. He died *eis apolutrosis parabasis*. Some say this is a figure of speech, transgressions (NT:3847 *parabasis*) being

¹ being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth *to be* a propitiation through faith in his blood...

² that through death he might bring to nothing him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.

³ having spoiled the principalities and powers, he made a show of them...

substituted for transgressors (NT:3848 *parabates*). Others say it is a proper expression of paying a price to deliver us from the evil of our transgressions.¹ The other expression, dying for our redemption, is found in Eph. 1:7 and various other places. Here, the words *lutron* and *apolutrosis* agree, as they also do in Matt. 20:28, and Mark 10:45. Now, these words, especially *antilutron* (1Tim. 2:6), should not be twisted from their genuine meaning. They always denote the payment of a price, or an equal compensation, in lieu of something to be done or a grant to be made by the one to whom that price is paid. Having given these few ideas concerning redemption in general, let us now see how applicable it is to general redemption.

Redemption means to free a person by paying a ransom for him

Redemption is the freeing of a man from misery by paying a ransom. Now, when a ransom is paid for the liberty of a prisoner, is it not completely just that he should have and enjoy the liberty that was purchased for him by that valuable consideration? If I paid a thousand dollars to deliver a man from bondage, and I paid it to the one who detains him, who has the power to set him free, and who is content with the price I paid, would it not be injurious to me, and to the poor prisoner, should his deliverance not be accomplished? Is it conceivable to have redemption for someone and yet not have them redeemed? Is it conceivable that a price would be paid, and the purchase not consummated? Yet all this would be true, with countless other absurdities, if universal redemption were so: a price is paid for all, yet few are delivered; the redemption of all is consummated, yet few of them are redeemed; the judge is satisfied, the jailer is conquered, and yet the prisoner remains imprisoned! Doubtless, putting “universal” and “redemption” together, where the great part of men perish, is as irreconcilable as “Roman” and “Catholic”.

Conclusion: If there is a universal redemption, all men are redeemed.

If someone is redeemed, then he is virtually or actually delivered from all the misery in which he is imprisoned. And this is accomplished by the payment of a ransom. Why, then, are all not saved? The redemption wrought by Christ is the full deliverance of those who are redeemed by the price of his blood. They are redeemed from all the misery in which they were wrapped. Such redemption cannot possibly be universal unless all are saved. All are not saved. Thus, universalism is unsuited to redemption.²

¹ If I cause injury to someone, I incur a debt. I am obligated by the law to make the injured party “whole” again. I am also obligated to pay a price to the state for my *transgression* of the law – it is not enough to return the money, or to pay the medical bills. I am liable to punishment as well as restitution. If someone steps forward and offers to pay the damages, then they have paid for my transgressions. And if they take my punishment, then they have paid for *me*, the transgressor. To redeem is to exchange one thing for another, a price for its object. My offense has given rise to two debts, two objects, which are both paid for by the blood of Christ. And so I am redeemed from both. Thus Owen says that, whether dying for our redemption, or dying for the redemption of our transgressions, it is the same.

² This is the logic: Scripture clearly says that Christ died to redeem us, or to redeem our transgressions. If we are redeemed, then we are freed from the debt of our sin. If we are freed from the debt of our sin, then we are freed from all the misery of our bondage, and from Satan’s domain. Thus, if Christ died for all, then all are freed, or else redemption has no meaning. All are not freed, as all agree. Therefore, Christ could not have died to redeem all, and redemption cannot be universal.

CHAPTER VI – The Nature of Reconciliation

Of the nature of reconciliation, and the argument taken from reconciliation.

ARGUMENT XII. Second: by its nature, Reconciliation is not Universal.

Reconciliation is ascribed to the Death of Christ

Another thing ascribed to the death of Christ is *reconciliation*. Everyone consents that it extends to all for whom he died. In the Scripture, this is clearly proposed in two ways: first, God is reconciled to us; secondly, we are reconciled to God. Both of these are usually ascribed to the death and blood-shedding of Jesus Christ. For those who were “enemies he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death,” Col 1:21, 22. Doubtless these things exactly correspond to one another, for unless both are effected, it cannot be said to be a perfect reconciliation. How can peace be made on only one side? Indeed, it is utterly impossible to rationally apprehend how these two can be divided. For if God is reconciled, and not man, then why does God not reconcile man? Admittedly, it is in his power to do so. And if man is reconciled, but not God, then how can God be ready to receive all who come to him?¹ Now, I hope it will not be asserted that God is actually reconciled to everyone in the world, and everyone is made at peace in Jesus Christ. But to clarify this, we must briefly consider the nature of reconciliation, as it is proposed to us in the gospel. Some light may also be shed from the nature of reconciliation itself, and from the use of the word in civil matters.

Both parties must be reconciled, not just one.

Reconciliation is the renewing of friendship between parties who were at variance before, between both the one who gave offense, and the one who was offended. God and man were set at a distance, at enmity, and at variance with one another, by sin. Man was the offending party, God was the one offended, and the alienation was mutual. Yet there was this difference: man was alienated with regard to his affections, the basis and the cause of God’s anger and enmity. God was alienated with regard to the effects and result of that anger and enmity. The word in the New Testament is *katallage* (NT:2643) reconciliation, and the verb *katallasso* (NT:2644) to reconcile. Both derive from *allasso* (NT:236), to change, or to turn from one thing or one mind to another. From this idea comes the first native meaning of the Latin words *permutatio* and *permutare*, because most commonly those who are reconciled are changed with regard to their affections. This change is always with regard to the distance and variance between them, and with regard to the effects of the offense; and from that, turning means reconciliation, and to reconcile. The word does not apply until both parties are actually reconciled, and until all differences are removed with regard to their former grudge and ill-will. If one is well pleased with the other person, while that other person continues unappeased and implacable, then there is no reconciliation.

Our Savior gives the command that if someone brings his gift to the altar, and there remembers that his brother was offended by him for any reason, then he should go and be reconciled to him.² By this, he fully intends a mutual turning of their minds to one another, especially with regard to appeasing and atoning the one who was offended. These words are not used in any other sense. They always denote, even in common speech, a full reintegration of friendship between dissenting parties, with reference most times to some compensation made to the offended party.

¹ 2Cor. 6:17-18.

² Matt. 5:23

The reconciling by the one party and the reconciliation of the other may be distinguished, but both are required to make up an entire reconciliation.

If reconciliation was purchased by the Death of Christ, all are reconciled.

Thus the folly of Socinus and his sect is remarkable. They would have the reconciliation mentioned in the Scripture be nothing but our conversion to God, without appeasing his anger and turning away his wrath from us. This is a reconciliation hopping on one leg. The distinction that some make between the universal reconciliation of God to all men, and the reconciliation of only of a small number men to God, is no less a monstrous figment. Mutual alienation must have mutual reconciliation; they correlate. The state that existed between God and man before the reconciliation made by Christ, was a state of enmity. Man was at enmity with God, Rom. 8:7; we were his “enemies,” Col. 1:21; Rom. 5:10. We hated him and opposed him, in the highest rebellion, and to the utmost of our power. God was also an enemy to us, in that his “wrath” was on us, Eph. 2:3, and it remains on us until we believe, John 3:36. To be perfectly reconciled (which many passages say Christ effects) two things are required. First, the wrath of God must be turned away, and his anger removed with all the effects of his enmity towards us. Secondly, we must be turned away from our opposition to him, and brought into voluntary obedience. Until both these are effected, reconciliation is not perfected. Now, in the Scripture both these are assigned to our Savior as the effects of his death and sacrifice.

1. Christ turned away God’s wrath towards us

He turned away the wrath of God from us and appeased him, thus reconciling God toward us by his death. For “when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son,” Rom. 5:10. It is apparent here that reconciling means turning away God’s wrath from us, because this is the means by which God chiefly commends his love to us. It is certainly in the forgiveness of sin, and in the aversion of his anger caused by it. And, in the latter end of the verse, this reconciliation is distinguished from our being saved from the wrath to come. That salvation comprises our conversion and our entire reconciliation to God. Besides, in verse 11, we are said to *receive* this “reconciliation” (I don’t know how we translated it “atonement”),¹ which cannot mean our reconciliation to God, nor our conversion. We cannot properly be said to accept or receive these things. Instead, the reconciliation is of God to us, which we *receive* when this reconciliation is apprehended by faith.²

2. Christ turns us away from our enmity towards God

He redeems us, and reconciles us to God by “the blood of his cross,” Col. 1:20. He does so meritoriously, satisfactorily, by acquisition and purchase. He accomplishes it in due time, actually and efficiently by his Spirit. You have both of these mentioned jointly in 2Cor. 5:18-20.³ First, we see God being reconciled to us in Christ. This consists in not imputing our iniquities to

¹ In verse 11, the KJV translates *katallage* as atonement instead of reconciliation.

² In other words, Christ’s atoning sacrifice reconciles God toward us. It does not reconcile us toward God. By faith, we understand that God’s wrath has been averted, and thus we accept the reconciliation that has been attained for us by Christ’s death. This in turn is what reconciles us to God and completes or perfects the reconciliation, yielding peace.

³ 2Cor. 5:18-20 – But all things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave the ministry of reconciliation to us; namely, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not reckoning their trespasses to them, and committed to us the word of reconciliation. Therefore, we are ambassadors on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating through us: we beseech *you* on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God.

us, which is the subject-matter of the ministry, verses 18,19. Secondly, we see ourselves being reconciled to God, by accepting the pardon of our sins, which is the end of the ministry, verse 20. This same thing is declared at large in Eph. 2:13-15. The actual and effectual accomplishment of both things, “simul et semel,”¹ make up that reconciliation which is the effect of the death of Christ. And so it is in many passages: “We are reconciled to God by the death of his Son,” Rom. 5:10; “And you, who were once alienated, he has reconciled in the body of his flesh through death,” Col. 1:21, 22. This is so evident in the Scripture, that none can possibly deny reconciliation is the immediate effect and product of the death of Christ.

If both parties are reconciled, how can one remain under God’s wrath?

Now, how this reconciliation can possibly be reconciled with universal redemption, I am unable to discern. For if reconciliation is the proper effect of the death of Christ, as all admit, and if he died for all, then I ask how it comes to pass,

First, that God is not reconciled to all? And he is not, for his wrath abides on some, John 3:36, and reconciliation is the aversion of wrath.

Secondly, that all are not reconciled to God? And they are not, for “by nature [others] are the children of wrath,” Eph. 2:3; and some, all their lives, do nothing but “treasure up wrath against the day of wrath,” Rom. 2:5.

Thirdly, how can it be that reconciliation is effected between God and all men, and yet God is not reconciled to all, nor are all reconciled to God?

Fourthly, if God is reconciled to all, when does he begin to be unreconciled towards those who perish? What alteration in his will or nature allows it?

Fifthly, if all are reconciled by the death of Christ, when do those who perish begin to be unreconciled, being born children of wrath?

Sixthly, reconciliation on the part of God consists in the turning away his wrath and not imputing iniquity, 2Cor. 5:18, 19. This is justification, which renders us blessed, Rom. 4:6-8. Why then, if God is reconciled to all, are all not justified and made blessed by not imputing their sin?

Conclusion: Christ died only for those who are reconciled.

Those who have discovered a redemption where none are redeemed, and a reconciliation where none are reconciled, can easily answer these and other such questions. I leave them to do so at their leisure, and in the meantime I conclude this part of our argument. Reconciliation is the renewing of lost friendship, the slaying of enmity, the making up of peace, the appeasing of God, the turning away of his wrath, attended by not imputing iniquities. On our part, it is the conversion to God by faith and repentance. This, I say, is the reconciliation that is the effect of the death and blood of Christ. It cannot be asserted that such a reconciliation refers to anyone else, nor can Christ be said to die for any other, than those for whom all its properties and acts may be truly affirmed. Whether this may be said of all men or not, let all men judge.

¹ together and at the same time.

CHAPTER VII – The Satisfaction of Christ

Of the nature of the satisfaction of Christ, with related arguments.

ARGUMENT XIII. Third: Christ's Satisfaction was not Universal.

A third way by which the death of Christ for sinners is expressed is *satisfaction*, namely, that by his death he satisfied the justice of God for the sins of those for whom he died, so that they might go free. It is true that the word satisfaction is not found in the Latin or English Bible as applied to the death of Christ. In the New Testament it is not found at all, and in the Old it is found but twice, in Num. 35:31, 32. But what is intended by that word is everywhere ascribed to the death of our Savior. There are also other words in the original languages that are equivalent to what we mean by satisfaction. Now as far as I know, all who outwardly call themselves Christians confess that Christ thus made satisfaction for the sins of all those for whom he died, except the wretched Socinians, whom we will not address at this time. Let us, then, first see what this satisfaction is, and then how inconsistent it is with universal redemption.

The Nature of Legal Satisfaction

Satisfaction is a term borrowed from the law. It is properly applied to things, and from there it is translated to persons. It is a full compensation of the creditor from the debtor. The one to whom anything is due from someone else is that man's creditor; and the one owing is his debtor. The debtor has an obligation to pay or restore what is due from him, until he is freed by a lawful breaking of that obligation, making the debt null and void. This must be done by satisfying what his creditor can require by virtue of that obligation. For example, if I owe a man a hundred pounds, I am his debtor by virtue of the bond by which I am bound. I remain so until something is done to recompense him, and moves him to cancel the bond. This is called *satisfaction*. Thus, from real things, it is translated to personal things. Personal debts are injuries and faults which, when committed, makes a man liable to punishment. The one who inflicts that punishment, or who sees that it is done, is the creditor. He must do so unless satisfaction is made. Now, there may be a twofold satisfaction:

First, satisfaction may be made by paying exactly what is owed

By a just solution, or by paying the very thing that is in the obligation. It is paid either by the party who is bound, or by another in his stead. If I owe a man twenty pounds, and my friend pays it, then my creditor is fully satisfied. **This is *solutio ejusdem*.**

Secondly, satisfaction may be made by substituting an acceptable value

By a tantamount solution, or by paying the extent of it in another kind, not the kind that is in the obligation. By the creditor's acceptance, it stands in lieu of it. And upon presentation, freedom from the obligation also follows, not necessarily, but by virtue of an act of favor. **This is *solutio tantidem*.**

The Nature of Christ's Satisfaction

In the business in hand,

First, the debtor is man;

he owes the ten thousand talents, Matt. 28:24.

Secondly, The debt is sin;

“Forgive us our debts,” Matt. 6:12.

Thirdly, what will satisfy is death;

What is required in lieu of that, to make satisfaction for it, is death: “In the day that you eat of it, you shall surely die,” Gen. 2:17; “The wages of sin is death,” Rom. 6:23.

Fourthly, the obligation is obedience to the law;

The obligation by which the debtor is tied and bound is the law, “Cursed is every one,” etc., Gal. 3:10; Deut. 27:26; the justice of God, Rom. 1:32; and the truth of God, Gen. 3:3.

Fifthly, the creditor is God;

The creditor that requires this of us is God, considered as the offended party, severe Judge, and supreme Lord of all things.

Sixthly, what intervenes is the ransom paid by Christ’s Death;

What intervenes to destroy the obligation is the ransom paid by Christ: Rom. 3:25, “God set him forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood.”

I will not go into any long discourse on the satisfaction made by Christ, but only so far as necessary to give light to the matter in hand. To this end,

Two things must be cleared:

First, that Christ made the required satisfaction.

Second, that an act of God ought to follow that satisfaction.

First, that Christ made the required satisfaction.

For the *first*, I told you that the word “satisfaction” does not occur in the Scripture, but the thing most frequently signified by it does. This is a compensation made to God by Christ for our debts. To make satisfaction to God for our sins, it is required only that he undergo the punishment due to those sins, for that is the satisfaction required where sin is the debt. Now, Christ has certainly effected this satisfaction, for he “himself bore our sins in his body on the tree,” 1Pet, 2:24. “By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall *bear* their iniquities,” Isa. 53:11. The Hebrew word for “bear” is *nasa* (OT:5375), also in verse 12. It argues that the punishment of sin is taken from us and transferred to him. It signifies all that we mean by the word “satisfaction.” So does *anaphero* (NT:399), used by Peter in place of that word.¹ For to bear iniquity, in the Scripture language, is to undergo the punishment that is due because of it, Lev. 5:1. And this is what we call “making satisfaction” for it. This is further illustrated by a declaration of how he bore our sins by being “wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities,” Isa. 53:5. At the end of that verse, this is added: “the chastisement of our peace was upon him.” Every chastisement is either for instruction, or for punishment and correction. The first can have no place with regard to our Savior. The Son of God had no need to be taught with such thorns and briars. It must therefore be for punishment and correction; and that was because our sins were then upon him. By his punishment, our peace or freedom from punishment was procured.

Moreover, in the New Testament there are various words and expressions concerning the death of our Savior which represent what we mean by satisfaction. For example, it is termed *prophora*

¹ 1Pet. 2:24, “Who himself bore our sins...”

in Eph. 5:2 (NT:4376 - offering). He gave himself up as an offering and a sacrifice, or a sacrifice of expiation, as it would appear by the type of sacrifice with which it is compared (Heb. 9:13, 14). The same can be applied to the Hebrew word *'asham*, Isa. 53:10; Lev. 7:2 (OT:0817 - offering). "He made his soul an offering for sin," – an atoning sacrifice to remove the sin. The apostle abundantly clarifies this in saying that Christ was made sin itself, 2Cor. 5:21. Sin is put there as the adjunct for punishment, i.e. the punishment due to sin. He is also termed "propitiation" in 1John 2:2. This reflects the Hebrew *chata'* (OT:2398), used in Gen. 31:39, "I bear the debt," which is to undergo the debt, and to make compensation for it. This was the office of the one who was to be Job's "redeemer" (OT:1350 *ga'al*), Job 19:25.¹ All of these and various other words, which will be considered in part later, declare the very same thing that we mean by satisfaction. Specifically, it means taking upon himself the whole punishment due to sin. In offering himself, he was doing what God (the one offended) was more delighted and pleased by, than what he himself was displeased and offended by, which was the sins of all those for whom he suffered, and for whom he offered himself. And there can be no more complete satisfaction made to anyone than by doing what he is more contented with, rather than by relieving what discontents and troubles him and for which he must be satisfied. God was more pleased with the obedience, offering, and sacrifice of his Son, than he was displeased with the sins and rebellions of all the elect.

It is as if a good king has a group of his subjects rebel against him. He is thereby moved to destroy them because they will not have him reign over them. But the only son of that king puts in for their pardon. He tenders to his father some excellent conquest recently achieved by him, begging him to accept it, and to be pleased with his poor subjects, and to receive them into favor again. Or, what is nearer, it is as if he offered himself to undergo the punishment which his father's justice has allotted for the rebels, and he accordingly suffered that punishment. He properly makes satisfaction for their offense, and in strict justice, they ought to be pardoned. This was Christ, acting as the sent-away goat² that bore all the sins of the people of God, and carried them away. He fell under them himself, though with assurance to break all the bonds of death, and to live forever.

Was the satisfaction of Christ *solutio ejusdem*, or *solutio tantidem*?

Now, I said that there is a twofold satisfaction by which the debtor is freed from the obligation that is upon him. The one is *solutio ejusdem*, which is paying the same thing that is in the obligation. The other is *solutio tantidem*, which is paying what is not the same, nor equivalent to what is due, but is graciously accepted by the creditor anyway. It is worth inquiring as to which of these our Savior performed.

Arguments against *solutio ejusdem*, by Grotius

Grotius,³ who is esteemed by many to have handled this argument with most exactness, denies that the payment made for us by Christ was *solutio ejusdem*. That is, he denies that the

¹ "For I know that my redeemer lives..."

² Lev. 16:10, the scapegoat.

³ Owen refers to Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), a man distinguished in legal science. He was a child prodigy, like Owen, and considered the Father of International Law. Grotius was a pioneer in natural rights theory, defining natural law as a perceptive judgement in which things are good or bad by their own nature. This conflicted with Calvinism for two reasons. First, because God was no longer the only source of ethics. Second, because Grotius

payment of the debt of sin is the same as undergoing the punishment due to that sin. He gives these reasons:

First, because if it were the same, then such a solution, satisfaction, or payment, would be accompanied by actual freedom from the obligation.

Secondly, where such a solution is made, and there is freedom from the obligation, there is no room left for remission or pardon.

“It is true,” he says, “deliverance follows it; but this deliverance cannot be by gracious pardon, for no such interceding act of grace is needed. But if satisfaction is made by offering something other than what was in the obligation, then it may be accepted or refused as the creditor pleases. And if it is accepted by the creditor, then it is accepted by an act of grace. Such was the satisfaction made by Christ.”¹

Truly, neither of these reasons seems persuasive to me.

Arguments for *solutio ejusdem*, refuting Grotius:

First, the reason rests upon something that cannot be granted, namely, that actual freedom from the obligation does not follow the satisfaction made by Christ.² By death, Christ did actually deliver us from death, as the elect are said to die and rise with him.³ By death, he did actually deliver us from the curse by being made a curse for us.⁴ And the whole written obligation that was against us, was taken out of the way and nailed to his cross.⁵ It is true that all those for whom he did this do not instantly actually apprehend and perceive it. That is impossible. Yet that does not keep them from having all the fruits of his death in actual right, even though not in actual possession. They cannot have that until it is at least made known to them. It is as if a man paid a ransom for a prisoner detained in a foreign country. From the very day of the payment and its acceptance, the prisoner has a right to his liberty. However, he cannot enjoy that liberty until tidings of it are brought to him, and a warrant is produced for his delivery.

Secondly, The satisfaction of Christ, by the payment of the same thing that was required in the obligation, is no way prejudicial to that free, gracious forgiveness of sin so often mentioned. God’s gracious pardoning of sin comprises the whole dispensation of grace towards us in Christ, of which there are two parts:

First, The laying of our sin on Christ, or making him to be sin for us; which was merely and purely an act of free grace, which he did for his own sake.

considered ethics inherently good, and products of the nature of man. These ideas were precursors to some of John Locke’s theories.

¹ Grotius says that in offering his life to pay our debt, Christ offered something different than what we were obligated to pay. If God accepts Christ’s sacrifice on our behalf, he may be gracious in doing so, but he is not legally obligated to accept it. In fact, accepting it would be no more gracious than simply pardoning our debt to begin with. Moreover, by accepting Christ’s sacrifice on our behalf, God would be clearing our debt, and so there would be no need to pardon us as well. “Defensio Fidei Catholicæ de Satisfactione Christi, contra F. Socinum.”

² In rejecting that what Christ paid was what we owed, Grotius is asserting that the debt is not cleared.

³ Rom. 6:4-8; Col. 2:12-13

⁴ Gal. 3:13

⁵ Col. 2:14

Secondly, The gracious imputation of the righteousness of Christ to us, or making us the righteousness of God in him. This is no less of grace and mercy, and that is because the very merit of Christ himself has its foundation in a free compact and covenant. However, that remission, grace, and pardon, which is in God for sinners, is not opposed to Christ's merits, but to our merits. He pardons everything for us, but he did not spare his only Son; he did not subtract one penny from him.

The freedom of pardon, then, does not have its foundation in any defect of the merit or satisfaction of Christ, but in three other things:

First, the will of God in freely appointing this satisfaction by Christ, John 3:16; Rom. 5:8; 1Jn. 4:9.

Secondly, in graciously accepting that decreed satisfaction in our steads, for just so many, and no more.

Thirdly, in freely applying the death of Christ to us.

Remission, then, does not exclude a full satisfaction by the very thing in the obligation, but only the satisfaction by the one to whom pardon and remission are granted. So that, notwithstanding anything said to the contrary, the death of Christ made satisfaction in the very thing that was required in the obligation. He took away the curse, by "being made a curse," Gal. 3:13, He delivered us from sin, being "made sin," 2Cor. 5:21. He underwent death that we might be delivered from death. All our debt was in the curse of the law which he wholly underwent. Nor do we read of any relaxation of the punishment in the Scripture, but only a commutation of the person. This being done, "God condemned sin in the flesh of his Son," Rom. 8:3. Christ stood in our stead, and so reparation was made to God, and satisfaction was given for all the detriment that might accrue to him by the sin and rebellion of those for whom this satisfaction was made. His justice was violated, and he "provides Christ to be a propitiation" for our sins, "that he might be just, and the justifier of the one who believes in Jesus," Rom. 3:25, 26. Never was his justice more clearly demonstrated than in causing "the iniquity of us all to meet upon him." His law was broken. Therefore Christ comes to be "the end of the law for righteousness," Rom. 10:4. Our offense and disobedience was distasteful to him; but in the obedience of Christ he took full pleasure, Rom. 5:17; Matt. 3:16.

Conclusion: Christ's satisfaction was *solutio ejusdem* for those he represented.

Now, to clear up the nature of the satisfaction made by Christ. This much appears to be evident: it was a full, valuable compensation, made to satisfy the justice of God for all the sins of all those for whom he made that satisfaction. He satisfied it by undergoing the same punishment that they themselves were bound to undergo because of the obligation that was placed upon them. When I say that, I mean it was essentially the same in weight and pressure, though not in all the accidents of duration and the like. For it was impossible to detain him by death. Now, we will inquire whether the justice of God would permit anyone to perish eternally if Jesus Christ made so full, perfect, and complete a satisfaction for him. This is the first thing that we are to consider.

Secondly, what response God ought to have to this satisfaction.

We must look at what act of God is exercised either towards us or towards our Savior in this business. Everyone admits that God in the whole is the party who is offended by our sins. It is his law that is broken, his glory that is impaired, and his honor that is abased by our sin: "If I am a father," he says, "where is my Honor?" Malachi 1:6. Now, the law of nature and universal right

requires that the party offended be recompensed in whatever he is injured by the fault of another. Being offended, God is considered in two ways:

First, with regard to us, he is considered a creditor;

We are all miserable debtors; we owe him “ten thousand talents,” Matt. 18:24. And our Savior has taught us to call our sins our “debts,” Matt. 6:12; the Lord requires and exacts of us the payment of this debt.

Secondly, with regard to Christ, he is considered supreme Lord and Lawgiver;

God was pleased to lay the punishment of us all on Christ, to make our iniquity be settled upon him. He did not spare him, but required the debt at his hands to the last penny. And so, God is considered the supreme Lord and Governor of all, the only Lawgiver. He alone had the power to relax his own law so far as to have the name of a surety put into the obligation, which was not there before, and then to require the whole debt of that surety. For he alone has the power of life and death, James 4:12.

Therefore, two acts are eminent in God’s response to Christ’s Death:

First, an act of Justice – This is an act of severe justice, like a creditor exacting the payment of the debt at the hands of the debtor. Where sin is the debt, the payment is punishment, as was declared earlier: the justice of God is thereby repaired in whatever it was previously violated.

Secondly, an act of Sovereignty – This is an act of sovereignty or supreme dominion, in translating the punishment from the principal debtor to the surety whom he had given and bestowed on the debtor by his free grace: “He spared not his own Son, but delivered him up to death for us all” (Rom. 8:32).

Hence, observe these two things:

1. An Act of Justice – Challenges and Answers

God accepts the punishment of Christ just as a creditor accepts his due debt. He does not spare the debtor, but requires the last penny (Matt. 5:26). When the debt is punishment, it is true that there is no creditor. For, “*Delicta puniri publice interest*” [the offense is punished for the public good]. But because this punishment is also considered as a price, as in 1Cor. 6:20, it must be paid into the hands of some creditor, just as it was paid into the hands of God. From this, Christ is said to come to do God’s will, Heb. 10:9, and to satisfy him, as in John 6:38.

And the arguments that some have used to prove that God cannot inflict punishment as a creditor, nor by virtue of his supreme dominion, do not seem to me to have any great weight.

Arguments against this Act of Justice, by Grotius:

I find various arguments urged by Grotius. His great skill in the law, and use of terms, might well give him sanctuary from such weak examiners as myself, if this was an issue of law. But the one who has so foully betrayed the truth of God in other things, and corrupted his word,¹ does

¹ Grotius was from Holland, an Arminian stronghold in the Netherlands. He tried to work a reconciliation between Arminianism and Calvinism, but failed (naively thinking that theological issues could be settled by political and contractual agreements). His opposition to the Calvinist government led to his arrest and imprisonment. He was later charged with treason and placed under permanent house arrest.

not deserve our assent in anything except what is extorted by evidence of reason. Let us, then, see what there is of reason in this which we now have in hand:

First, Punishment is not the right of a Creditor.

Grotius tells us that “The right of punishing that exists in the rector or lawgiver can neither be a right of absolute dominion, nor a right of a creditor. That is because these rights of dominion and crediting belong to the one who has them, and are exercised for his own sake; but the right of punishing is for the good of community.”

ANSWER:

When we refer to God as the creditor in this argument, which is what Grotius intends, his reasoning has no value. For we deny that there is anything in him, or that is done by him, which is primarily for the good of anyone but himself. His AUTARKEIA, or self-sufficiency, will not allow for doing anything with an ultimate respect to anything but himself.¹ And where Grotius says that the right of punishing is for the good of community, we answer, that “bonum universi,” the good of community, is the glory of God, and only the glory of God. So these things cannot be distinguished in him.

Secondly, Punishment is not desirable in and of itself.

Grotius adds, “Punishment is not desirable in and for itself, but only for the community’s sake. Now, the right of dominion and the right of a creditor are things that are worthy and desirable in themselves, without considering any public aim.”

ANSWER:

First, The comparison ought not to be between punishment and the right of dominion, but between the *right* of punishment and the right of dominion; the fact of one is not to be compared with the right of the other.²

Secondly, God desires nothing unless it is for himself. To suppose that there is a good which is desirable to God for its own sake is intolerable.

Thirdly, There are some acts of supreme dominion, in themselves and for their own sake, that are as little desirable as any act of punishment: for example, the annihilation of an innocent creature. Grotius will not deny that God may do this nonetheless.

Thirdly, God cannot omit punishing the impenitent.

He proceeds, “Anyone may, without any wrong, waive the right of supreme dominion or creditorship. But the Lord cannot omit punishment for some sins, such as those of the impenitent.”

ANSWER:

First, God, by virtue of his supreme dominion, may omit punishment without any wrong or prejudice to his justice. It is as great a thing to impute sin where it is *not* found, and to inflict

¹ In other words, while it may be true in the world of men that the right to punish is reserved to the state, such a notion has no meaning when God is the lawgiver or creditor. There is no higher authority like the state to which we may reserve punishment. God’s kingdom is an absolute autocracy.

² That is, God has the right to punish, and it exists independently of his status as our creditor or as one holding dominion over us. Thus Grotius’ initial proposition of dependency is incorrect.

punishment as a result of that imputation, as it is not to impute sin where it *is* found, and to omit punishment because it has *not* been imputed. Now, God did the first of these things to Christ. Therefore, he may do the latter to us.¹

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

Fourthly, Exercising a right to punish is not the same as being just.

He adds, "No one can be called just for exercising his own right or lordship; but God is called just for punishing or for not forgiving sin," Rev. 16:5.²

ANSWER:

First, However it may be in other causes, in this cause God may certainly be said to be just in exacting his debt or using his dominion. That is because his own will is the only rule of justice.

Secondly, We do not say that punishing is an act of dominion, but an act of exacting a due debt. Requiring this of Christ in our stead presupposes an intervening act of supreme dominion.

Fifthly, Punishment is not an act of exacting a debt.

His last reason is, "Because the virtue by which one waives his dominion or remits a debt is liberality; but that virtue by which a man abstains from punishing someone is clemency. Thus punishment cannot be an act of exacting a debt or exercising dominion."³

ANSWER:

The virtue by which a man waives the exacting of what is due, universally considered, is not always liberality. For, as Grotius himself confesses, a debt may arise and accrue to someone by the injury of his fame, credit, or name, by a lie, slander, or otherwise. Now, the virtue which moves a man not to exact payment by way of reparation, is not in this case liberality. It is either clemency, or that grace of the gospel for which moralists have no name. And so it is with every offended party that has a right of requiring punishment from his offender, yet does not exercise it. Notwithstanding these exceptions, what is notably seen in this business of satisfaction is that God, as a creditor, requires payment of the debt by punishment.

2. An act of Supreme Sovereignty.

The second notable thing in this is an act of supreme sovereignty and dominion, requiring the punishment of Christ. For a complete answer to the obligation and fulfilling of the law, we have Rom. 8:3, 10:4.

¹ Isa. 53:5; Rom. 5:19

² "You are just, Lord – who is, and has been, and will continue being the Holy One – because you judged these things."

³ This is a straw man argument which establishes a false dichotomy. Are his definitions of liberality and clemency valid propositions, and if valid, is the supposition that they are mutually exclusive valid? Owen refutes the propositions and the conclusion in one blow, using Grotius' own words.

“For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God did by sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, on account of sin: He condemned sin in the flesh, so that the righteous requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us who do not walk according to the flesh but according to the Spirit.”

“For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone who believes.”

These things are unfolded at large. We may see, in brief, some natural inferences that accompany them as they are laid down:

First, the debt was paid in full.

The full and due debt of all those for whom Jesus Christ was responsible was fully paid to God, and to the furthest extent of the obligation.

Secondly, having been paid, the debt should be cancelled by the creditor.

The Lord, who is a just creditor, in all equity ought to cancel the bond, to stop all suits, actions, and punishments against the debtors, because full payment has been made to him for the debt.

Thirdly, the debt was all the sins of those for whom the payment was made.

The debt was not paid for this or that sin, but for all the sins of all those for whom this payment was made, 1Jn. 1:7, as demonstrated before.

Fourthly, a second payment is not required.

Requiring a second payment of a debt that is already paid, is not in accordance with the justice which God demonstrated in sending Christ to be a propitiation for our sins, Rom. 3:25.

Fifthly, the debt having been paid, the Judge should discharge it.

Receiving a discharge from further trouble is what is equitably due to a debtor who has his debt paid. The Lord has accepted payment from Christ in the stead of all those for whom he died. In justice, and according to that obligation which he undertook in free grace, the Judge ought to grant them a discharge.

Sixthly, Christ's satisfaction is the same as if the debtors had paid it.

There was a relaxation of the law effected by the supreme power of the lawgiver in regard to the persons who were to suffer the required punishment. The actual satisfaction of that punishment has been made. Therefore, it can no more be laid to the charge of those for whom Christ died than if they had actually fulfilled the obedience it required, Rom. 8:32-34.¹

A Comparison of these inferences with Universal Redemption

Now it is easily discernible whether these things are consistent with universal redemption or not, because they are evident in themselves. We can clearly follow the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction, as declared before. For,

¹ He that did not spare his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how will he not also with him freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifies; who is the one that condemns?

First, if the debt is fully paid, why do some still owe it?

If the full debt of all is paid to the furthest extent of the obligation, how can it be that so many are imprisoned till eternity, never freed from their debts?

Secondly, if the debt ought to be cancelled, why is God's wrath on some?

If the Lord, as a just creditor, ought to cancel all obligations and cease all suits against those who have their debts paid, why is it that his wrath smokes against some to all eternity? Let no one tell me it is because they do not walk worthy of the benefit bestowed; for not walking worthy is part of the debt which is fully paid, and the debt fully paid is all our sins.

Thirdly, if the debt is fully paid, why is a second payment needed?

Is it probable that God calls any to a second payment, and requires satisfaction of those for whom, by his own acknowledgment, Christ has made what is full and sufficient? Has he an after-reckoning that he did not think of? He did not spare his own Son for what was before him, Rom. 8:32.

Fourthly, if the debt is paid, why is it not discharged for so many?

How can it be that God never gives a discharge to countless souls, though their debts are paid?

Fifthly, if the debt is fully satisfied, why is anyone still condemned?

Why is it that anyone lives and dies under the condemning power of the law, never being released, if that debt is fully satisfied in his behalf as if he himself had done whatever was required?

Let those who can, reconcile these things. I am no Oedipus for them.¹ I have already discussed the poor beggarly distinctions by which it is attempted. And so much for satisfaction.

CHAPTER VIII – The Substance of the Satisfaction of Christ

A digression containing the substance of a conference concerning the satisfaction of Christ.

About the time I was composing that part of the last argument which is taken from the satisfaction of Christ, someone came to the place where I live (whose name and everything else concerning him will be concealed out of respect for his modesty). To those who heard him in a private exercise about the sufferings of Christ, he seemed to enervate, indeed to overthrow, the satisfaction of Christ. Apprehending that to be a dangerous consequence, and to prevent further difficulty, I set myself briefly and plainly to oppose it. A little after, I willingly entertained a conference and debate (desired by the gentleman) about the point in question. Being carried along with that quietness and sobriety of spirit which befitted lovers of and searchers after truth, I easily perceived not only what his persuasion was in the thing in hand, but also the ground and sole cause of his misapprehension. It was briefly this:

The eternal, unchangeable love of God for his elect actually instated them in such a condition that they were incapable of having any satisfaction made for them. The result of that was to

¹ In Greek mythology, Oedipus solved the unsolvable riddle of the Oracle. The Arminian answer, of course, is that Christ's universal atonement was indeed paid in full, but its application is conditional. Owen already dispensed with that argument in Books I and II, proving that it is not conditional. Therefore it must be limited in scope.

remove the wrath they were due, and to make atonement for their sins. Because it was an eternal pre-existing love, they only lacked a clear manifestation of it to their souls. By such a manifestation they might be delivered from all that dread, darkness, guilt, and fear which was in and upon their consciences by reason of not understanding this love. That misapprehension came upon them through the fall of Adam.

Now, to remove this misapprehension, Jesus Christ was sent to manifest and declare the eternal good will of God towards them. Thus he bore and took away their sins by removing from their consciences this misapprehension of God and their own condition which they had by reason of sin. He did not satisfy the justice of God for their sins, for God was eternally well-pleased with them. The sum is this: election is asserted here to the overthrow of redemption.

What followed in our conference with whatever success it obtained by God's blessing will, for my part, rest in the minds and judgments of those who heard it; it was intended for their sake alone. The things themselves are first, of great weight and importance and of singular concern to all Christians. Secondly, they contain a mixture of undoubted truth and no less undoubted errors, true propositions and false inferences, and assertions of necessary verities to the exclusion of others which are no less necessary. And thirdly, they directly belong to the business in hand. I will briefly declare and confirm the whole truth in this business so far as opportunity was given by the exercise and debate before mentioned. I will begin with the first part of it concerning the eternal love of God for his elect, along with the state and condition they are placed in by it. Concerning this, you may observe,

First, any objection to Christ's satisfaction is Pelagian or Arminian heresy.

What is now made by some to be a new doctrine of free Grace is indeed an old objection against it. The substance of it is that satisfaction by Christ is unnecessary as a consequence of eternal election. This was more than once objected to Austin [Augustine] by the old Pelagian heretics upon his clearing and vindicating that doctrine. The same objection, renewed by others, is also answered by Calvin in his Institutes lib. 2, cap. 16.¹ A number of schoolmen had also answered it before in their own way, as in Thom. 3.q.49, a.4.² Yet, despite its obvious senselessness, and the many solid answers which long before removed the objection, the Arminians, at the Synod of Dort, greedily snatched it up again. They placed it in the very front of their arguments against the effectual redemption of the elect by Jesus Christ. Now, what was only an objection in their arguments, is taken up by some among us as a truth. The absurd consequence of it is owned as just and good, and its conclusion is deemed necessary, from the granting of election to the denial of satisfaction.

Secondly, the Elect and the Reprobates are separate camps by nature.

Observe that where things are so opposed, it must be that they are separate: "Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated," Rom. 9:13. By the one, men are "ordained to eternal life," Acts 23:48; by the other, men "were long ago ordained unto condemnation," Jude 4. Now if the elect are justified, and sanctified, and saved, merely because of God's decree that they will be so, and by which they need nothing but the manifestation of that truth, then it must be likewise for the reprobates. As soon as they are finally impenitent, damned, and burned, surely they lack nothing

¹ Calvin, John, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Vol. 2, Chap. 16, Christ the Redeemer.

² Aquinas, Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, Third Part, Question 49, Article 4.

but a manifestation of that truth. Whether it is true or not, consult the whole dispensation of God towards them.

Thirdly, the Eternal Love of God is an act of will, not passion.

Consider the eternal love of God. Is it an affection in his eternal nature, as love is in ours? Once it was no less than blasphemy to conceive of it that way. His pure and holy nature, in which there is neither change nor shadow of turning, is not subject to any such passion. It must, then, be an eternal act of his will and that alone. In the Scripture, it is called his “good pleasure,” Matt. 11:26; his “purpose according to election,” Rom. 9:11; the “foundation of God,” 2Tim. 2:19. Now, every eternal act of God’s will is immanent in himself, and is not really distinguished from himself; whatever is so in God, is God. Hence, it puts nothing into the creature concerning whom it is directed, nor does it alter its condition at all. Indeed, it produces no effect until some external act of God’s power makes it out.

For instance, God decreed from eternity that he would make the world. Yet we know the world was not made until about five thousand five hundred years ago.¹ But you will say, “It was made in God’s purpose.” That is, he purposed to make it. In the same way, he purposes there will be a day of judgment. Is there, therefore, actually a universal day of judgment already? God purposes that he will justify and save certain persons in and through Christ. Are they therefore justified because God purposes it? It is true, they *will* be justified, because he has purposed it; but it is denied that they are so. The consequence is inevitable from the divine purpose to the fruition of anything. This refers to the certainty of its event, not its actual existence. When the Lord went to actually make the world in the beginning, there was no world; so when he comes to bestow faith and actually justify a man, until he has done so, the man is not justified. The sum is this,

First, God willfully chooses to act in behalf of His elect.

The eternal love of God towards his elect is nothing but his purpose, his good pleasure. It is a pure act of his will by which he determines to do such and such things for them in his own time and way.

Secondly, no act of God changes the nature its object.

No purpose of God, no immanent eternal act of his will, produces any outward effect, or changes anything in the nature and condition of that thing concerning which his purpose is exercised. It only makes the event and its success necessary with regard to that purpose.

Thirdly, the wrath of God is also not passionate, but willful.

The wrath and anger of God that sinners lie under is not any passion in God, but only the outward effects of anger, such as guilt, bondage, etc.

Fourthly, God’s love does not remove any conditions for His elect.

An act of God’s eternal love, which is immanent in himself, does not exempt the creature from the condition in which he is under God’s anger and wrath, until some temporal act of free grace really changes its state and condition.

¹ This is an interesting insight into Owen’s strictly literal interpretation of Genesis. The same year, Bishop Ussher published his *Annals of the Old Testament* (1647) in which he dated creation to October 26, 4004 BC. Owen’s argument here is that God is eternal, and he eternally decreed to make the world, but the world did not come into being until a desired point in time.

For example: God holding the lump of mankind in his own power, like clay in the hand of the potter, determines to make some vessels for honor, to the praise of his glorious grace. Others he makes for dishonor, for the manifestation of his revenging justice. To this end, he suffers them all to fall into sin and the guilt of condemnation, by which they all become liable to his wrath and curse. His purpose to save some of these does not at all exempt or free them from the common condition of the rest with regard to themselves and the truth of their estate; not until some actual thing is accomplished to bring them near to him. So that notwithstanding his eternal purpose, his wrath with regard to the effects of their sin and guilt abides on them until that eternal purpose makes itself out in some distinguishing act of free grace. This may be further manifested by these ensuing arguments:

1. Acknowledging God's election does not justify or reconcile us.

If the sinner wants nothing toward acceptance and peace with God except a manifestation of his eternal love, then evangelical justification is nothing but an apprehension of God's eternal decree and purpose. But this cannot be made out from the Scripture. God's justifying of a person is not making known to him God's decree of election; nor is man's justification an apprehension of that decree, purpose, or love. Where is any such thing in the book of God? It is true, there is a revelation of it made to justified believers, and therefore it is attainable by the saints. "God shedding abroad his love in their hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given to them," Rom. 5:5. But it is after they are "justified by faith," and have "peace with God," verse 1. Believers are to give "all diligence to make their calling and election sure." But saying that justification should consist in this is a strange notion. Justification in the Scripture is an act of God. It is pronouncing an ungodly person, upon believing, to be absolved from the guilt of sin, and to gain an interest in the all-sufficient righteousness of Christ. This is how God "justifies the ungodly," Rom. 4:5, "by the righteousness of God which comes to believers through faith in Jesus Christ," Rom. 3:22. Christ becomes righteousness for those who were sinful in themselves. But in this manifestation of eternal love, there is not the least foundation for a form of justification, though justification is not without a sense and perception of the love of God.

2. All men remain under the wrath of God until they are reconciled.

Before actual reconciliation, the Scripture is exceedingly clear that all men are in a like state and condition, without any real difference at all. The Lord reserves to himself his distinguishing purpose of the alteration that he will effect afterward by his free grace: "There is none that does good, no, not one," Rom. 3:12; for "we have proved that both Jews and Gentiles are all under sin," verse 9. All mankind is in the same condition, with regard to themselves and their own real state. This truth is not at all prejudiced by their relation to the eternal decrees; for "every mouth is stopped, and all the world has become guilty before God," Rom. 3:19. The word is *hupodikos*, (NT:5267) meaning liable to his judgment. "Who makes you differ from another? And what have you that you did not receive?" 1Cor. 4:7. All distinguishment with regard to state and condition is by God's actual grace. For even believers are "by nature children of wrath, even as others," Eph. 2:3. The condition, then, of all men during their unregeneracy is one and the same. The purpose of God concerning the difference that will be effected in the elect is referred to himself. Now, I ask whether reprobates in that condition lie under the effects of God's wrath or not? If you say "No," who will believe you? If so, then why not the elect also? The same condition has the same qualifications. We have proved there is not an actual distinguishment. Produce some difference that has a real existence, or the cause is lost.

3. *The Elect are under God's wrath in the same way as Reprobates.*

Consider what it means to lie under the effects of God's wrath according to the declaration of the Scripture. Then see whether the elect are delivered from it before their actual calling. Now, this consists in a number of things:

- (1.) To be in such a state of alienation from God that none of their services are acceptable to him: "The prayer of the wicked is an abomination to the LORD," Prov. 28:9.
- (2.) To have no outward enjoyment sanctified, but all things are unclean, Tit. 1:15.
- (3.) To be under the power of Satan who rules at his pleasure in the children of disobedience, Eph. 2:2.
- (4.) To be in bondage to death, Heb. 2:15.
- (5.) To be under the curse and condemning power of the law, Gal. 3:13.
- (6.) To be liable to the judgment of God, and to be guilty of eternal death and damnation, Rom. 3:19.
- (7.) To be under the power and dominion of sin reigning in them, Rom. 6:19.

These and similar things are what we call the effects of God's anger.

Let anyone now tell me what the reprobates in this life lie under more than these? And do not all the elect, until their actual reconciliation in and by Christ, lie under the very same things?

- (1.) Are not their prayers an abomination to the Lord? Can they please God without faith? Heb. 9:6. And we suppose them not to have faith, for if they have it, they are actually reconciled.
- (2.) Are their enjoyments sanctified to them? Does anything have a sanctified relation without faith? See 1Cor. 7:14.
- (3.) Are they not under the power of Satan? If not, then how does Christ come in and for them to destroy the works of the devil? Did not he not come to deliver his own from the one who had the power of death, that is, the devil? Heb. 2:14; Eph. 2:2,
- (4.) Are they not under bondage to death? The apostle plainly affirms that they are, all their lives, until they are actually freed by Jesus Christ, Heb. 2:14, 15.
- (5.) Are they not under the curse of the law? How are they freed from it? By Christ being made a curse for them, Gal. 3:13.
- (6.) Are they not liable to judgment and guilty of eternal death? How is it, then, that Paul says that there is no difference, that all are subject to the judgment of God and are guilty before him? Rom. 3:9; and that Christ saves them from this wrath which was to come upon them with regard to merit? Rom 5:9; 1Thes. 1:10.
- (7.) Are they not under the dominion of sin? "God be thanked," says Paul, "that you were the servants of sin, but you have obeyed," etc., Rom. 6:17.

In brief, the Scripture is more plentiful in nothing else than in laying and charging all this misery and wrath upon the elect of God, due to an unreconciled condition, until they actually partake in the deliverance by Christ.

But now some men think to wipe away all that has been said in a word. They tell us that all this is only in their own apprehension, that these things are not so in themselves. But if these things are so only in the apprehension of the elect, why are they otherwise to the rest of the world? The Scripture makes no difference or distinction between them. And if it is so with all, then let all get this apprehension as fast as they can, and all will be well with the whole world, which is now miserably captivated under a misapprehension of their own condition. That is, let them say the Scripture is a fable, and the terror of the Almighty is only a scarecrow to frighten children, that sin is only in conceit, and so square their life to their blasphemous fancies. Some men's words eat like a canker.

4. The Elect are not reconciled to God until they believe the Son.

Of particular passages of Scripture which might abundantly be produced to our purpose, I will content myself to name only one: John 3:36, "The one who does not believe the Son shall not see life; the wrath of God abides on him." It abides: there it was and there it will remain if unbelief is continued; but upon believing it is removed. "But is it not God's love by which we shall be freed from his wrath?" Who denies it? But is an apprentice free because he will be free at the end of seven years? Because God has purposed to free his people in his own time, and will do it, are they therefore free before he does it? "But are we not in Christ from all eternity?" Yes, we are *chosen* in him. Therefore, in some sense we are in him. But how? Just as we are. Actually, a man cannot be in Christ until he exists. Now, how can we be from eternity? Are we eternal? No. It is only that God from eternity has purposed that we *will be* eternal. Does this give us an eternal being? Alas! We are of yesterday. Being in Christ only respects God's purpose, and therefore from that we can only infer that we are not eternal until we believe.

Conclusion: Election does not remove the need for Christ's satisfaction.

This then being cleared, I hope it is apparent to all how miserable a strained consequence it is to argue from God's decree of election to the overthrow of Christ's merit and satisfaction. The redemption wrought by Jesus Christ is indeed the chief means of carrying along that purpose of election to its execution, the pleasure of the Lord prospering in Christ's hand. The argument is undeniable from the purpose of God to save sinners, that the satisfaction of Christ for those sinners is the evident consequence of that purpose. The same act of God's will which sets us apart from eternity for the enjoyment of all spiritual blessings in heavenly places, also sets apart Jesus Christ to be the purchaser and procurer of all those spiritual blessings by making satisfaction for all their sins. We will prove by these ensuing arguments that Christ did so, which is the main thing opposed in this digression.

CHAPTER IX – Arguments proving the Satisfaction of Christ

The second part of the former digression – Arguments to prove the satisfaction of Christ.

I. From Christ bearing our sin, and the punishment for it

If Christ took our sins on himself, and God laid them on him in such a way that he was punished for them in our stead, then he satisfied the justice of God for them so that sinners might go free. The consequence of the proposition is apparent, and was proved before. There are three parts to this assumption, to be confirmed severally:

First, Christ took and bore our sins and God laid them on him.

Secondly, he underwent the punishment that was due for them.

Thirdly, he did this in our stead.

First, he took and bore our sins.

You have it in John 1:29, “Who takes away the sin of the world;” 1Pet. 2:24, “Who himself bore our sins in his own body;” Isa. 53:11, “He shall bear their iniquities;” and verse 12, “He bore the sin of many.” That God also laid or imposed our sins on him is no less apparent: Isa, 53:6, “The LORD, laid on him the iniquity of us all;” 2Cor. 5:21, “He has made him to be sin for us.”

Secondly, he underwent the punishment for our sins

In thus doing, our Savior underwent the punishment due to the sins which he bore, and which were laid upon him. Death and the curse of the law contain the whole of the punishment due to sin. Gen. 2:17, “Dying you shall die,” is what was threatened. Death was what entered by sin, Rom. 5:12: the word in these passages comprehends all misery due to our transgressions. It is also what is held out in the curse of the law. Deut. 27:26, “Cursed is the one who does not confirm all the words of this law by doing them.” It is unquestionably evident that all evils of punishment are comprised in these two things. Now, in bearing our sins, Jesus Christ underwent both. For “by the grace of God he tasted death,” Heb. 2:9; by death he delivered from death, verse 14. He was not “spared, but given up to death for us all,” Rom. 8:32. So also he bore the curse of the law: Gal. 3:13, he “was made a curse for us;” and “cursed.” And this was done by undergoing the punishment that was in death and curse: for by these “it pleased the LORD to bruise him, and put him to grief,” Isa. 53:10. Indeed, “he spared him not,” Rom. 8:32, but “condemned sin in his flesh,” Rom. 8:3.

Thirdly, he did this in our stead

It remains only to show that he did this in our stead, and the whole argument is confirmed.

Now, our Savior himself makes this apparent in Matt. 20:28. He came “to give himself as a ransom for many.” The word “for” is the Greek *anti* (NT:473). It always supposes a commutation, and a change of one person or thing instead of another, as will be declared afterward. This is so in Matt 2:22 and 1Tim. 2:6. In 1Pet 3:18, “He suffered *for* us, the just for the unjust;” and Ps. 69:4, “I restored” (or paid) “what I did not take,” namely, our debt. In so far as he did that, we are thereby discharged, as in Rom. 8:34 where it is asserted, upon this very ground, that he died in our stead. And so the several parts of this first argument are confirmed.

II. From Christ paying the ransom for our sins as our surety

If Jesus Christ paid into his Father’s hands a valuable price and ransom for our sins, as our surety, thus discharging the debt that we lay under so that we might go free, then he bore the punishment due to our sins and made satisfaction to the justice of God for them (to pay such a ransom is to make such satisfaction). There are four things to be proved in this assumption, or second proposition:

First, That Christ paid such a price and ransom.

Secondly, That he paid it into the hands of his Father.

Thirdly, That he did it as our surety.

Fourthly, That we might go free.

All which we will prove in order:

First, Christ paid the price and ransom for our sins.

For the first, our Savior himself affirms it in Matt. 20:28. He “came to give his life *lutron*” (NT:3083) a ransom or price of redemption “for many,” also Mark 10:45. The apostle terms it *antilutron* (NT:487) in 1Tim. 2:6, a ransom to be accepted in the stead of others. From this we are said to have deliverance “by the ransom-paying of Christ Jesus,” Rom. 3:24. “He bought us with a price,” 1Cor. 6:20; that price was his own blood, Acts 20:28. It is compared to and exalted above silver and gold in this work of redemption, 1Pet. 1:18. So this first part is most clear and evident.

Secondly, He paid this price into the hands of his Father.

A price must be paid to somebody to deliver someone from captivity. It must be paid to the judge or the jailer, that is, to God or the devil. To say the latter would be the highest blasphemy; Satan was to be conquered, not satisfied. For the former, the Scripture is clear: It was his “wrath” that was on us, John 3:36. It was God who had “shut us all up under sin,” Gal. 3:22. He is the great king to whom the debt is owed, Matt. 28:23-34. He is the only “law-giver, who is able to save and to destroy,” James 4:12. No, the ways by which this ransom-paying is expressed in the Scripture abundantly enforces its payment into the hands of his Father. For his death and bloodshedding is said to be *prospora* (NT:4376) and *thusia* (NT:2378), “an oblation and sacrifice,” Eph. 5:2; and his soul is said to be a sacrifice or “offering for sin,” Isa. 53:10. Now, certainly offerings and sacrifices are to be directed to God alone.

Thirdly, he did this as our surety.

We are assured of this in Heb. 7:22. He was made *egguos* (NT:1450), a “surety of a better testament;” and, in performance of the duty which lay upon him as such, “he paid what he did not take,” Ps. 69:4.

Fourthly, he did this for our freedom.

All of this could not possibly have any other end but that we might go free.

III. From Christ making an atonement and reconciliation

To make an atonement for sin, and to reconcile God to sinners, is in effect to make satisfaction to the justice of God for sin, and all that we understand thereby. But Jesus Christ, by his death and oblation, did make an atonement for sin, and did reconcile God to sinners: ergo,

The first proposition is evident in itself; the assumption is confirmed in Rom. 3:24, 25. We are justified freely by the ransom-paying that is in Christ, whom God has set forth to be *hilasterion*, a propitiation, an atonement, a mercy-seat, a covering of iniquity. And that was done to manifest his justice, declared in going forth and accomplishing that atonement. So likewise in Heb. 2:17 he is said to be a “merciful high priest ... to make reconciliation for the sins of the people,” to reconcile God to the people. The meaning of the words is to reconcile God, who was offended with the sins of the people. We are said to “receive” that reconciliation, Rom. 5:11 (the word *katallage* is rendered “atonement” in the KJV; in other passages, the same word is rendered “reconciliation,” being indeed, the only word used for it in the New Testament). And all this is said to be accomplished by one righteousness or satisfaction, that is of Christ, (the words will not bear that sense in which they are usually rendered, “By the righteousness of one”). And hereby

we were delivered from that condemnation from which it was impossible to be delivered otherwise, Rom. 8:3.

IV. From the Nature of his Priestly Office

What the exercise of the priestly office of Jesus Christ while he was on earth consisted of cannot be rejected nor denied without damnable error. It consisted in this: to bear the punishment due to our sins, to make atonement with God by undergoing his wrath, and reconciling him to sinners by the satisfaction of his justice.

It is most apparent that the exercise of Christ's priestly office consisted in these things. First, from all the types and sacrifices by which it was prefigured; their chief end was propitiation and atonement. Secondly, from the very nature of the sacerdotal office; it was appointed for sacrificing, and Christ had nothing to offer but his own blood through the eternal Spirit. Thirdly, from diverse, indeed, countless texts of Scripture which affirm the same. It would be too long a work to prosecute these things severally and at large. Therefore I will content myself with one or two places in which all those testimonies are comprised, such as Heb. 9:13, 14, "If the blood of bulls and of goats," etc., "how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God?" etc.

Here the death of Christ is compared to, exalted above, and in the antitype answers the sacrifices of expiation which were made by the blood of bulls and goats. And so it must at least spiritually effect what they carnally accomplished and typically prefigured: namely, deliverance from the guilt of sin by expiation and atonement. For as the life and blood of the sacrifice was accepted in the stead of the offerer who was to die for the breach of the law according to its rigor, so in this sacrifice of Christ his blood was accepted as an atonement and propitiation for us, he being priest, altar, and sacrifice. In Heb. 10:10-12, he is expressly said, in the place of all the old, insufficient, carnal sacrifices which could not make their offerors perfect, to offer up his own body as a sacrifice for sins. He did so for the remission and pardon of sins through that offering of himself, as we see in verse 19. And in the performance of that sacrifice, we also affirm that our Savior underwent the wrath of God which was due to us. I will briefly confirm this because it is questioned by some, and I will confirm it with these following reasons:

First, The punishment due to sin is the wrath of God:

Rom. 1:18, "The wrath of God is revealed against all ungodliness;" chap. 2:5, "The day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God;" Eph. 2:3, "Children of wrath;" John 3:36. But Jesus Christ underwent the punishment due to sin: 2Cor. 5:21, "Made sin for us;" Isa. 53:6, "Iniquity was laid upon him;" 1Pet. 2:24, "He bore our sins in his own body on the tree." Therefore he underwent the wrath of God.

Secondly, The curse of the law is the wrath of God taken passively,

Deut 24:20, 21. But Jesus Christ underwent the curse of the law: Gal. 3:13, "Made a curse for us," the curse that those who are out of Christ lie under, who are "of the works of the law," verse, 10. Therefore he underwent the wrath of God.

Thirdly, The death that sinners are to undergo is the wrath of God.

Jesus Christ tasted of that death which sinners were to undergo for themselves; for he died as "our surety," Heb. 7:22, and in our stead, Matt. 20:28. Hence his fear, Heb. 5:7; agony, Luke

22:44; astonishment and amazement, Mark 14:33; abandonment, Matt. 27:46; sorrow, heaviness, and inexpressible pressures, Matt. 26:37-39.

V. From the necessity of his satisfaction to our faith and consolation

No doctrine can be true or agreeable to the gospel which strikes at the root of gospel faith, and plucks away the foundation of all that strong consolation which God is so abundantly willing that we should receive. But such is that which denies the satisfaction made by Christ, which denies his answering the justice and undergoing the wrath of his Father. It makes the poor soul like Noah's dove in its distress, not knowing where to rest the soles of her feet. When a soul is turned out of its self-righteousness, it begins to look abroad, and view the heaven and earth for a resting place. It perceives an ocean, a flood, an inundation of wrath, to cover all the world. This is the wrath of God revealing itself from heaven against all ungodliness, so that the soul can obtain no rest or abiding. It cannot reach heaven by its own flight, and it is unwilling to fall to hell. If now the Lord Jesus Christ does not appear as an ark in the midst of the waters, upon whom the floods have fallen, and yet has gotten above them all as a refuge, then alas! What will the soul do? When the flood fell there were many mountains glorious in the eye, far higher than the ark. But yet those mountains were all drowned, while the ark still kept on top of the waters. Many hills and mountains of self-righteousness and general mercy, appearing at the first view, seem to the soul much higher than Jesus Christ. But when the flood of wrath once comes and spreads itself, all those mountains are quickly covered. Only the ark, the Lord Jesus Christ, though the flood falls on him also, yet he gets quite above it, and gives safety to those who rest upon him.

Let me now ask any of those poor souls who have been wandering and tossed with the fear of the wrath to come, whether they ever found a resting-place until they came to this: God did not spare his only Son, but gave him up to death for us all; that he made him to be sin for us; that he put all the sins of all the elect into that cup of which he was to drink; that the wrath and flood which they feared fell upon Jesus Christ (though now, as the ark, he is above it), so that if they could get into him they should be safe. The storm has been his, and the safety will be theirs. As all the waters which would have fallen upon those who were in the ark fell upon the ark while they remained dry and safe, so all the wrath that should have fallen upon them fell on Christ. What alone causes their souls to dwell in safety? Has this not been your bottom, your foundation, your resting-place? If not, I fear you have only rotten bottoms. Now, what would you say if a man should come and pull this ark from under you, and give you an old rotten post to swim on in the flood of wrath? It is too late to tell you that no wrath is due to you; the word of truth and your own consciences have given you other information. You know the "wages of sin is death;" in whomever it is found, he must die. So the soul may well say, "Deprive me of the satisfaction of Christ, and I am bereaved. If he did not fulfill justice, I must; if he did not undergo wrath, I must undergo it to eternity. O rob me not of my only pearl!" Denying the satisfaction of Christ destroys the foundation of faith and comfort.

VI. From his being made sin for us, and bruised for our iniquities

Another argument we may take from a few particular passages of Scripture which I will produce:

First, 2Cor. 5:21, "He made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin." "He made him to be sin for us." How could that be? Are not the next words, "He knew no sin?" Was he not a Lamb without blemish and without spot? Doubtless "he did no sin, nor was guile found in his mouth." What then is this, "God made him to be sin?" It cannot be that God made him sinful, or a sinner by any inherent sin. That will not stand with the justice of God nor with the holiness of the person of our

Redeemer. What is it, then? “He made him to be sin who knew no sin?” Why clearly, by dispensation and consent, he laid to his charge what he was not guilty of. He charged upon him and imputed to him all the sins of all the elect, and proceeded against him accordingly. He stood as our surety, really charged with the whole debt, and he was to pay the last penny, as a surety is to do if it is required of him. Though he did not borrow the money, nor owe one penny of what is in the obligation, yet if he is sued to an execution, he must pay it all. The Lord Christ (if I may so say) was sued by his Father’s justice to an execution, in answer to which he underwent all that was due to sin, which we proved before is death, wrath, and curse.

Objection 1: The Son is punished despite pleasing the Father.

Exception is taken, “That God was always well pleased with his Son; he testified it again and again from heaven. How then could he lay his wrath upon him?”

ANSWER: It is true he was always well pleased with him; yet it “pleased him to bruise him and put him to grief.” He was always well pleased with the holiness of his person, the excellence and perfectness of his righteousness, and the sweetness of his obedience. But he was displeased with the sins that were charged on him, and therefore it pleased him to bruise and put to grief the one with whom he was always well pleased.

Objection 2: The Elect are not punished for their sin.

Nor does this exception have any more value: “That Christ underwent no more than the elect lay under; but they did not lay under wrath and the punishment due to sin.”

ANSWER: This proposition is most false, and there is no truth in the assumption; for

First, Christ underwent not only that wrath (taking it passively) which the elect were under, but also that wrath which they should have undergone had he not borne it for them: he “delivered them from the wrath to come.”

Secondly, The elect, in their several generations, lie under all the wrath of God with regard to merit and procurement, though not with regard to actual endurance; and they lie under his wrath with regard to guilt, but not present punishment. So that, notwithstanding these exceptions, it stands firm that “he was made sin for us, who knew no sin.”

Isa. 53:5, “He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.” This passage was mentioned before. I will add some small enlargements that help to reveal the meaning of the words. “The chastisement of our peace was upon him;” that is, he was chastised or punished so that we might have peace, so that we might go free. Our sins were the cause of his wounding, and our iniquities were the cause of his being bruised. All our sins were laid upon him, as in verse 6. That is, he “bore our sins,” in Peter’s interpretation.¹ He bore our sins not, as some think, by declaring that we were never truly sinful, but by being wounded for them, bruised for them, undergoing the chastisement due to them. This burden consisted in death, wrath, and curse, thus making his soul an offering for sin. “He bore our sins.” Some say this means he declared that we have an eternal righteousness in God because of his eternal purpose to do us good. But is this to interpret Scripture, or to corrupt the word of God? Ask the word what it means by Christ’s bearing of sin. It will tell you it means his being “stricken” for our transgressions, Isa. 53:8, his

¹ 1Pet. 2:24

being “cut off” for our sins, Dan. 9:26. Nor does the expression “bearing sins” have any other meaning in the Word: Lev. 5:1, “If anyone hears an oath, and does not testify concerning it, then he will bear his iniquity.” What is that? Does it mean he will declare himself or others to be free from sin? No, undoubtedly not. It means he will undergo the punishment due to sin, as our Savior did in bearing our iniquities. The one who would cheat a believer of this foundation must be a cunning gamester indeed.

I will not urge or produce more arguments or texts on this subject, though the cause itself will sustain many. I have proceeded as far as the nature of a digression will bear. Neither will I undertake, at this time, to answer objections to the contrary. I do not intend a full discussion of the satisfaction of Christ, which would cause me to search for, draw out, and confute all objections to the contrary. And for those which gave rise to this discourse, I dare not produce them. Otherwise I would be unable to restrain the conjectures of men that I purposely framed such weak objections so that I might obtain an easy conquest over a man of straw of my own erection. They were so weak and have so little force to slash as fundamental a truth as what we maintain that I will end this argument here.

CHAPTER X – The Merit of Christ

Of the merit of Christ, with arguments from there.

ARGUMENT XIV. Fourth: the Merit ascribed to Christ is not Universal.

A fourth thing¹ ascribed to the death of Christ is *merit*, or that worth and value of his death by which he purchased and procured for us all those good things which we find in the Scripture for his death, to be bestowed upon us., I will not speak much of this, having considered it under the notion of impetration already. I will only add a few observations proper to that particular of the controversy which we have in hand. The word “merit” is not found at all in the New Testament, nor in any translation of the original that I have seen. The vulgar Latin reads *promeretur* once, in Heb. 13:16; and the Rheimists, to preserve the sound, have rendered it “promerited.” But these words in both languages are uncouth and barbarous. Besides that, they do not in any way correspond to *euaresteo* (NT:2100), which is the word in the original. It gives no color to merit, whether by name or aspect.² No, I suppose it will prove a difficult thing to find any one word, in either of the languages in which the holy Scripture was written, that properly and immediately signifies merit in its first native importance.

So we will not trouble ourselves about the name if what is intended by it is made apparent. And it is apparent in both the Old and New Testaments, such as Isa. 53:5, “The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.” The procurement of our peace and healing was the “merit” of his chastisement and stripes. So too in Heb. 9:12: “Obtaining eternal redemption by his blood.” This is as much as we intend to signify by the merit of Christ. The word which comes nearest in meaning is found in Acts 20:28, *peripoieo* (NT:4046), “Purchased with his own blood;” purchase and impetration, merit and acquisition, which are equivalent terms in this business. *Peripoieo* is used in a number of other passages, such as 1Thes. 5:9; Eph. 1:14; and 1Pet 2:9. Now, what we understand by this word is performing an action by which the

¹ The first three were arguments XI, XII, and XIII in chapters V, VI, and VII of Book III.

² That is, what is translated from the Latin as “merit” actually refers to *pleasing* someone, not earning or obtaining something.

thing aimed at by the agent is due him, according to the equity and equality required in justice. For example, “To the one who works, the reward is not reckoned of grace, but of debt,” Rom. 4:4. From what was said before, it is apparent that such a merit attends the death of Christ. The weight of laboriously proving it is not imposed on us by our adversaries, who seem to acknowledge it no less themselves. So we may take it for granted (until our adversaries close ranks with the Socinians in this as well).

Christ then, by his death, merited and purchased for all those for whom he died, all those things which the Scripture assigns to the fruits and effects of his death. These are the things purchased and merited by his blood-shedding and death. These may be grouped in two parts:

First, those which are privative¹ such as,

1. Deliverance from the hand of our enemies, Luke 1:74; from the wrath to come, 1Thes. 1:10.
2. The destruction and abolition of death in his power, Heb. 2:14;
3. Of the works of the devil, 1Jn. 3:8.
4. Deliverance from the curse of the law, Gal. 3:13;
5. From our vain life, 1Pet. 1:18;
6. From the present evil world, Gal. 1:4;
7. From the earth, and from among men, Rev. 14:3,4.
8. Purging of our sins, Heb. 1:3,

Secondly, positive, such as,

1. Reconciliation with God, Rom. 5:10; Eph. 2:16; Col. 1:20.
2. Appeasing or atoning of God by propitiation, Rom. 3:25; 1Jn. 2:2.
3. Peacemaking, Eph. 2:14.
4. Salvation, Matt. 1:21.

By his death, our Savior has merited and purchased all these for all those for whom he died. That is, he has so procured them from his Father that, with regard to that merit, and according to the equity of justice, they ought to be bestowed on those for whom they were purchased and procured. It was absolutely of free grace that God would send Jesus Christ to die for anyone; it was of free grace for whom he would send him to die; it is of free grace that the good things procured by his death should be bestowed on any person. But considering his own appointment and constitution, it is of debt with regard to Jesus Christ that by his death he should merit and procure grace and glory for those for whom he died, and that these things be communicated to them. Now, what is thus merited, is to be bestowed out of debt. We do not say that it may be bestowed, but that it ought to be bestowed, and it is injustice if it is not.

Having said this little of the nature of merit, and of the merit of Christ, and of what his death procured for those in whose stead he died, it will quickly be apparent how irreconcilable general ransom is with these things. To demonstration this, we need only propose this one question, namely, “If Christ has merited grace and glory for all those for whom he died, and if he died for

¹ That is, dealing with the removal or loss of something.

all, then how can it come to pass that these things are not communicated to and bestowed upon all?" Is the defect in the merit of Christ, or in the justice of God? How vain it is to say that these things are not bestowed upon us absolutely, but only upon condition. The very condition itself is also merited and procured, as Eph. 1:3-4,¹ and Phil. 1:29,² which has been already declared.

ARGUMENT XV. Fifth: Specific phrases preclude Universal Redemption.

The very phrases "dying for us," "bearing our sins," being our "surety," and the like, by which the death of Christ for us is expressed, cannot be reconciled with the payment of a ransom for all. To die for another is, in Scripture, to die in that other's stead so that he might go free. Judah begged his brother Joseph to accept him for a bondman instead of Benjamin so that Benjamin might be set free, Gen. 44:33. That was to make good the engagement in which he stood bound to his father to be a surety for Benjamin (Gen. 43:9). The one who is surety for another (as Christ was for us, Heb. 7:22), undergoes the danger so that the other may be delivered from it. So David, wishing that he had died for his son Absalom, 2Sam. 18:33, doubtless intended a commutation, substituting his life for Absalom's so that he might have lived. Also in Rom. 5:7, Paul intimates the same thing, supposing that such a thing might be found among men, that one person should die for another. He was no doubt alluding to the Decii, Menoeceus, Euryalus, and such others, whom we find mentioned in the stories of the heathen. They voluntarily cast themselves into death to deliver their country or friends, thus allowing others to continue their liberty and life, which they were due to lose. Instead, they took the loss upon themselves, to whom it was not directly due. And this plainly is the meaning of that phrase, "Christ died for us." That is, in undergoing death there was a subrogation of his person in the place and stead of ours.

Some, indeed, object that where the word *hyper* (NT:5228 "for") is used in this phrase, as in Heb. 2:9, "That by the grace of God he should taste death *for* every man," only the good and profit of those for whom he died is intended. It does not require any commutation. But I see no reason why this exception should prevail, for the same preposition is used in the same way in other cases where it does confessedly intimate a commutation, such as Rom. 9:3. There Paul affirms that he "could wish himself accursed from Christ, *for* his brethren," that is, in their stead so that they might be united to him. So also, 2Cor. 5:20, "We are ambassadors *for* Christ... in Christ's stead." In 1Cor. 1:13 he asks and strongly denies, "Was Paul crucified *for* you?" plainly showing that the word *hyper* does argue a commutation or change. It refers to crucifying Christ for his church. Paul does not mean the good of those for whom he died, for plainly Paul might have been crucified for the good of the church. But instead of that, he abhors the least thought of it. But concerning the word *anti*, which is also used, there is no doubt or exception. It always signifies a commutation and change, whether it is applied to things or persons. Luke 11:11, "A serpent instead of a fish;" Matt. 5:38, "An eye for an eye;" Heb. 12:16, "for a morsel of meat"; and for persons, Archelaus is said to reign "instead of his father," Matt. 2:22.

Now, this word is used of the death of our Savior, Matt. 20:28, "The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many." These words are repeated in Mark 10:45. That is, he gave his life a ransom in the stead of the lives of many. Plainly, Christ is dying for us as a surety (Heb. 7:22),

¹ Eph. 1:3-4 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has *blessed us in Christ with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places*, even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and blameless before him.

² For it has been granted to you that *for the sake of Christ* you should not only believe in him but also suffer for his sake;

and thereby he is “bearing our sins in his own body,” 1Pet. 2:24. He was being made a curse for us, and was undergoing death, punishment, curse, and wrath not only for our good, but directly in our stead. It is a commutation and subrogation of his person in our place, being allowed and accepted by God.

This being cleared, I demand,

First, did Christ die thus for all? That is, did he die in the stead of all so that his person was substituted in place of theirs? Did he die for Cain and Pharaoh and the rest who long before his death were under the power of the second death, never to be delivered?

Secondly, is it justice that any of those in whose stead Christ died, bearing their iniquities, should themselves also die and bear their own sins to eternity?

Thirdly, what rule or example of equity is there, when the surety has answered and made complete satisfaction of what was required in the obligation in which he was a surety, that those for whom he was a surety would afterwards be proceeded against?

Fourthly, did Christ hang upon the cross in the place of reprobates?

Fifthly, did he undergo all that was due to those for whom he died? If not, how could he be said to die in their stead? If so, why are they not all delivered?

I will only add this: to assert that Christ died for all men is the readiest way to prove that he died for no man, in the sense that Christians have believed he died for men till now. It rushes poor souls into the pit of Socinian blasphemies.¹

CHAPTER XI – Last General Argument

The last general argument.

ARGUMENT XVI. Sixth: Scriptures that preclude Universal Redemption.

Our next argument is taken from some particular passages of Scripture that clearly and distinctly hold out the truth we affirm. Out of the great number of them, I will take a few with which to close our arguments.

1. Genesis 3:15 – There are two Seeds.

First, the seed of the woman.

I will begin with the first mention of Jesus Christ, and the first revelation of the mind of God concerning a discrimination between the people of Christ and his enemies: Gen. 3:15, “I will put enmity between you” (the serpent) “and the woman, and between your seed and her seed.” The seed of the woman means the whole body of the elect. Christ is their head, and all the rest are his members. The seed of the serpent (the devil) with the whole multitude of reprobates, make up the malignant state, in opposition to the kingdom and body of Jesus Christ.

¹ Socinians were antitrinitarian, denying the distinction of persons in the Godhead. Christ was the Logos, but Socinus denied His pre-existence; He was the Word of God only in being His interpreter. Christ was miraculously begotten as a perfect man, and as the appointed mediator, but He was not God (he was a deified man). He was not conceived of the Holy Spirit, but begotten by Joseph. His death did not bring about our redemption. Adam was free from sin only as a fact (i.e. his nature did not change at the Fall). Socinus denied the doctrine of original sin entirely. There was no hell; instead, the wicked were annihilated.

It is most apparent that the seed of the woman means Christ with all the elect, for all the things foretold of the seed of the woman concur in them (the properties of a thing prove the thing itself). In the elect, who are believers in and through Christ, are found all the properties of the seed of the woman. The head of the serpent is broken in them and by them. Satan is trodden down under their feet. The devil is disappointed in his temptations, and the devil's agents are frustrated in their undertakings. Principally and especially this is spoken of Christ himself, of his whole body collectively, which bears a continual hatred toward the serpent and his seed.

Secondly, the seed of the serpent.

The seed of the serpent means all the reprobate men of the world, impenitent unbelievers. For,

First, the enmity of the serpent lives and exercises itself in them. They hate and oppose the seed of the woman; they have a perpetual enmity toward it; and everything that is said of the seed of the serpent properly belongs to them.

Secondly, they are often called his seed in the Scripture: Matt. 3:7, "O generation of vipers," or seed of the serpent; also Matt. 23:33. Christ tells the reprobate Pharisees, "You are of your father the devil, and you will do the lusts of your father," John 8:44. So again, "Child of the devil," Acts 13:10, that is, the seed of the serpent; for "the one who commits sin is of the devil," 1Jn. 3:8.

These things being undeniable, we proceed thus: Christ died for no more than God promised he should die for. God did not promise that he should die for all; for he did not promise the seed of the woman to the seed of the serpent. He did not promise Christ to reprobates. Instead, in the first mention of him in Gen. 3:15, God promises enmity against the seed of the serpent. In sum, the seed of the woman did not die for the seed of the serpent.

2. Matt. 7:23 – There are those who are known and unknown by Christ.

"I will say to them, I never knew you." At the last day, Christ says to some that he never knew them. Christ says directly that he knows his own, those for whom he lays down his life, John 10:14-17. And surely he knows whom and what he has bought. Is it not strange that Christ would die for and buy those whom he will not own, saying he never knew them? If they are "bought with a price," surely they are his own, 1Cor. 6:20. If Christ did buy them, and laid out the price of his precious blood for them, but then at the last day deny that he ever knew them, might they not well reply, "Ah, Lord! Was not your soul heavy unto death for our sakes? Did you not undergo for us that wrath which made you sweat drops of blood? Did you not bathe yourself in your own blood, that our blood might be spared? Did you not sanctify yourself to be an offering for us as well as for any of your apostles? Was not your precious blood by stripes, by sweat, by nails, by thorns, by spear, poured out for us? Did you not remember us when you hung upon the cross? And now you say you never knew us? Good Lord, though we be unworthy sinners, yet your own blood does not deserve to be despised. Why is it that none can lay anything to the charge of God's elect? Is it not because you died for them? And did you not do the same for us? Why, then, are we thus charged, and thus rejected? Could your blood not satisfy your Father, so that we ourselves must be punished? Could justice not content itself with that sacrifice, yet we must now hear, "Depart, I never knew you?" I do not know what can be replied to this plea if the general ransom is granted.

3. Matt. 11:25, 26 – There are those who know, and do not know.

“I thank you, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and have revealed them to babes. Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in your sight.” God in his sovereignty, as Lord of heaven and earth, of his own good pleasure, hides the gospel from some, either with regard to its outward preaching, or with regard to the inward revelation of its power in their hearts. Christ certainly did not die for them. To what end would the Father send his only Son to die for the redemption of those whom, for his own good pleasure, he had determined would be everlasting strangers to it, and never so much as hear of it in the power of that gospel revealed to them? Our Savior affirms here that there are such people; and he thanks his Father for that dispensation of which so many complain today.

4. John 10:11-29 – There are the sheep and the goats.

This clear passage,¹ which is sufficient of itself to gut the general ransom, has been considered before, and therefore I will only review it briefly.

First, all men are not the sheep of Christ,

First, He says so himself, verse 26, “You are not my sheep.”

Secondly, the distinction will be made evident at the last day when the sheep and the goats will be separated.

Thirdly, the properties of the sheep are not found in all: that they hear the voice of Christ, that they know him, and the like.

Secondly, the sheep that are his elect are called by God

This refers as much to those who were to be called as to those who were then already called (verse 16). Some were not yet of his fold of called ones. They are sheep by election, and not by believing.²

Thirdly, Christ says that he laid down his life for his sheep,

Plainly he excludes all others; for,

First, he lays down his life for them as sheep. What belongs to them as sheep belongs only to sheep. If he lays down his life for sheep, as sheep, certainly he does not lay it down for goats, wolves, and dogs.

Secondly, he lays down his life as a shepherd, verse 11. Therefore, he lays it down for them as sheep. What has the shepherd to do with wolves, unless it is to destroy them?

Thirdly, dividing all men into sheep and others, verse 26, he says he lays down his life for his sheep; which is the same as saying he did it for them only.

¹ The good shepherd gives his life for the sheep. I know my sheep and they know me... I lay down my life for the sheep... I have other sheep that are not of this fold. I must bring them also, and they will hear my voice... you do not believe because you are not from my fold. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me... I give them eternal life. My Father... has given them to me.

² This is a little confusing. The Arminian view is that all are called, and then some become elect by believing. The reformed view is that only some are elect, and all of them will be called and believe. Whether called now or later, only sheep can come, because only sheep are elect. Goats, wolves, and dogs (non-elect) cannot become sheep. Owen is rejecting self-election here.

Fourthly, He describes those for whom he died by this: “My Father gave them to me,” verse 29; also Jn. 17:6, “They were yours, and you gave them to me.” This is not all men, for “all that the Father gives him shall come to him,” Jn. 6:37, and he “gives them eternal life, and they shall never perish,” Jn. 10:28.

Let the sheep of Christ hold this evidence close, and all the world shall never deprive them of their inheritance. To further confirm this passage, add Matt. 20:28;¹ John 11:52.²

5. Rom. 8:31-34 – Christ’s love, sacrifice, and intercession is for the Elect.

The intention of the apostle in this passage³ is to offer consolation to believers in affliction or under distress. He does this generally in verse 31, by giving the assurance of the presence of God with them, and his assistance at all times. These are enough to conquer all opposition, and to make all difficulty indeed contemptible, by the assurance of his loving kindness which is better than life itself. “If God is for us, who can be against us?” To manifest this presence and kindness, the apostle reminds them of that most excellent, transcendent, and singular act of love towards them, in sending his Son to die for them. He did not spare him, but required their debt be paid from his hand. He then argues from the greater to the lesser: that if he has done that for us, surely he will do everything else that will be required. If he did the greater, will he not do the lesser? If he gives his Son to death, will he not also freely give us all things? From which we may observe,

First, if Christ died for all out of love, then God loves those who perish.

The greatest and most excellent expression of the love of God towards believers is in sending his Son to die for them, not sparing him for their sake. This is made the chief of all expressions. Now, if God sent his Son to die for all, then he has shown as great an act of love, and as great a manifestation of it, to those who perish as to those who are saved.

Secondly, God freely gives all good things to those he loves, including faith.

God will freely give all things to whomever he has given and not spared his Son. But he does not give all things that are good to everyone, such as faith, grace, and glory. From this, we conclude that Christ did not die for all. Again, verse 33, he gives us a description of those who have a share in the consolation intended: for whom God gave his Son, to whom he freely gives all things. That is, they are his “elect.” It does not refer to all, but only to those whom he has chosen before the foundation of the world, that they should be holy. This gives another confirmation of the restraint of the death of Christ to them alone. He further confirms this in verse 34, by declaring that those of whom he speaks will be freely justified and freed from condemnation. And so,

Thirdly, those he died for are freely justified.

He gives two reasons for this: First, because Christ died for them. Secondly, because he is risen, and makes intercession for those for whom he died.

¹ the Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many.

² to gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad.

³ If God *is* for us, who *is* against us? He that did not spare his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not also with him freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect? Who is the one that condemns? It is Christ Jesus that died, rather, that was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us.

This affords us two invincible arguments for the business in hand.

The first is taken from the infallible effects of the death of Christ: Who will lay anything to their charge? Who will condemn them? Why are they, what reason is given? “It is Christ that died.” His death infallibly frees all those for whom he died from condemnation.

The second is taken from the connection that the apostle makes here between the death of Jesus Christ, and his intercession: he makes intercession for those for whom he died; but it is also true that he completely saves those for whom he intercedes, Heb. 7:25.

From all of this, it is undeniably apparent that the death of Christ, along with its fruits and benefits, belongs only to the elect of God.

6. Eph. 1:7 – Christ’s blood brings forgiveness only to Abraham’s seed.

“In whom we have redemption.” If his blood was shed for all, then all must have a share in those things that are to be had in his blood. Now, among these things is the redemption which consists in the forgiveness of sins. This certainly all do not have, for those who have it are “blessed,” Rom. 4:7, and they will be blessed forevermore. This blessing does not come to all, but only to the seed of righteous Abraham, Rom. 4:16.

7. 2Cor. 5:21 – Those for whom he died are considered righteous.

“He has made him sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” It was in his death that Christ was made sin, or made an offering for it. Now, for whomever he was made sin, they are made the righteousness of God in him: “By his stripes we are healed,” Isa 53:5. John 15:13, “Greater love has no man than this: that he lays down his life for his friends.” So then, interceding is not a greater love than dying, nor is anything else that he does for his elect. If he laid down his life for all, which is the greater love, then why does he not also save the rest of them completely?

8. John 17:9, 19 – Christ prayed for and sanctified himself for the Elect.

“I pray for them: I do not pray for the world, but for those whom you have given me; for they are yours.” And verse 19, “For their sakes I sanctify myself.”

9. Eph. 5:25 – The object of Christ’s love is his bride alone, not another.

“Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;” also Acts 20:28.¹ The object of Christ’s love and his death is asserted to be his bride, his church. The church is as properly the object of Christ’s affection as a man’s own wife is the only permissible object of his conjugal affections. If Christ had such a love for others as to die for them, then there is latitude for men to have conjugal affections for women other than their wives.

I thought to add other arguments, intending a clear discussion of the whole controversy. But upon reviewing what has been said, I confidently conclude that those arguments which have already been urged will be enough to satisfy those who will be satisfied with anything. And those who are obstinate will not be satisfied with more. So here will be an end of our arguments.

¹ Take heed ... to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood.

BOOK IV

CHAPTER I – Considerations prior to Answering Objections

Things to be considered prior to the solution of objections.

THERE are various passages in Holy Scripture in which the ransom and propitiation made by the blood of Christ are set forth as general and indefinite expressions. There is seemingly intimated a fruitlessness or lack of success with regard to some for whom he died, through their own default. There are general offers, promises, and exhortations made to embrace the fruits of the death of Christ, even to those who never actually do it. From these passages, some have taken the opportunity to maintain that there is universal redemption, respecting everyone equally. They do so with great confidence, affirming that the contrary opinion cannot possibly be reconciled with those places of Scripture in which these things are proposed. These three parts are the only fountains from which are drawn (but with violence) all the arguments that oppose the particular effectual redemption of the elect only. Before I answer objections which arise from a twisted interpretation of particular passages, I will lay down some fundamental principles that are in conformity to the word, and widely presented in it. These passages which have given rise to the general and indefinite affirmations laid down in the word, and upon which they are founded, in no way disagree with our judgment in this matter. Rather, they contain the truth of it, and that truth is not a universal ransom for everyone. I will make some distinctions to further clarify the thing in question, and dispense with many false imputations of things and consequences that are erroneously or maliciously imposed on us.

1. The dignity, worth, and value of the blood of Christ

The first thing that we will lay down concerns the dignity, worth, preciousness, and infinite value of the blood and death of Jesus Christ. Maintaining and declaring this is especially considered. Every opinion that seemingly clashes against it is exceedingly prejudiced, or at least is deservedly suspect. Indeed, it is to be rejected by Christians if upon examination it is found to be injurious and derogatory to the merit and honor of Jesus Christ. To this purpose, the Scripture is exceedingly full and frequent in setting forth the excellence and dignity of his death and sacrifice. By reason of the unity of his person with the godhead, it calls Christ's blood, "God's own blood," Acts, 20:28. It exalts it infinitely above the blood of all other sacrifices, having for its character "the eternal Spirit," and being "without spot," Heb. 9:14. It is transcendently more precious than silver, or gold, or corruptible things, 1Pet. 1:18. It is able to give justification from all things, from which men could not be justified by the law, Acts 13:39.

Now, the sacrifice and offering of Christ was as it was intended to be by his Father. It was, then, the purpose and intention of God that his Son should offer a sacrifice of infinite worth, value, and dignity, sufficient in itself to redeem all and every man, if it had pleased the Lord to employ it to that purpose. Indeed, it was sufficient to redeem other worlds as well, if the Lord had freely made them, and wanted to redeem them. We say, then, that the sacrifice of Christ was sufficient to redeem the whole world, and to expiate all the sins of each and every man in the world. This sufficiency of his sacrifice has a twofold basis:

First, the dignity of the person that offered it, and was offered.

Secondly, the greatness of the pain he endured,

By this pain he was able to bear, and he underwent, the whole curse of the law and the wrath of God that was due to sin.

And this presents the innate, real, true, worth and value of the blood-shedding of Jesus Christ. This is its own true internal perfection and sufficiency. Its application to anyone, as a price for them and as a benefit to them according to its worth, is external to the blood itself. It does not arise from it, but merely depends on the intention and will of God. It was in itself of infinite value and sufficiency to have been made a price to purchase each and every man in the world. That it formally became a price for anyone is solely ascribed to the purpose of God, to his intention to purchase and redeem them by it. The intention of the offerer and acceptor, that it should be paid for someone or anyone, is what gives the formality to the price; this is external.

But the value and fitness of it to be made a price, arises from its own internal sufficiency. Hence we find that old distinction of the schoolmen, embraced and used by diverse protestant divines (though rejected by others), namely, "That Christ died for all with regard to the sufficiency of the ransom he paid, but not with regard to the efficacy of its application;" or, "The blood of Christ was a sufficient price for the sins of all the world;" This last expression is corrected by some and reasserted this way: "The blood of Christ was sufficient to have been made a price for all." This is most true, as declared before. For being a price for some or all does not arise from its own sufficiency, worth, or dignity, but from the intention of God and Christ to use it to that purpose. Therefore, it is denied that the blood of Christ was a sufficient price and ransom for everyone, not because it was not sufficient, but because it was not a ransom.

And so the distinction between them, which was expressed earlier, easily appears. If it means only that the blood of our Savior was of sufficient value to redeem everyone, and that Christ intended to lay down a price which should be sufficient for their redemption, then it is acknowledged as most true. But the truth is, the expression "to die for them," shows that the intention of our Savior in laying down the price was their redemption; we deny the price was laid down for all. If it was, then all must be made actual partakers of the eternal redemption purchased for them. Otherwise, God failed in his design through the defect of the ransom paid by Christ, or because his justice refused to dismiss the charges upon the delivery of the ransom.

The worth of the Death of Christ is undervalued by Universal Redemption.

We conceive that the infinite value and worth of the death of Christ is exceedingly undervalued by those who assert universal redemption. We showed before that it is extrinsic to its value whether it is extended to this or that object, fewer or more. Its true worth consists in its immediate effects, products, and results, with what it is fit and able to do in its own nature. This, they openly and obviously undervalue, almost annihilate. Hence these expressions concerning it:

First, that a door of grace was opened for sinners by his death; I suppose they know not where; but they deny that anyone was effectually carried in at the door by grace.

Secondly, that God might save those for whom Christ died if he wanted to, on whatever condition he pleased; but they deny that Christ purchased a right of salvation for anyone.

Hence they grant that after the death of Christ,

First, God might have dealt with man upon a legal condition again;

Secondly, that each and every man might have been damned, and yet the death of Christ had its full effect; moreover, that faith and sanctification are not purchased by his death, indeed, no more than what he may go to hell with.

In these and other various ways they express their low thoughts and slight imaginations concerning the innate value and sufficiency of the death and blood-shedding of Jesus Christ. To the honor, then, of Jesus Christ our Mediator, God and man, our all-sufficient Redeemer, we affirm that his death and blood-shedding was of so great a dignity and worth, of so precious a value, of such an infinite fullness and sufficiency, that this oblation of himself was in every way able and perfectly sufficient to redeem, justify, reconcile, and save all the sinners in the world. It was fully able and sufficient to satisfy the justice of God for all the sins of all mankind, and to bring every one of them to everlasting glory.

Now, this fullness and sufficiency of the merit of the death of Christ is a foundation for two things:

First, it is the ground for generally publishing the gospel to “all nations,” with the right to be preached to “every creature” (Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:15). This is because the way of salvation which the gospel declares is wide enough for all to walk in. There is enough in the remedy that it brings to light, to heal all their diseases and to deliver them from all their evils. If there were a thousand worlds, the gospel of Christ might, upon this ground, be preached to them all, because there is enough in Christ for the salvation of them all, if they would derive virtue from him by touching him in faith, the only way to draw refreshment from this fountain of salvation.

Some object in vain that the preaching of the gospel to all is needless and useless if Christ did not die for all. Indeed, doing so would make God call upon men to believe what is not true, namely, that Christ died for them:

First, there are some to be saved among those nations where the gospel is sent (“I have many people”). But they cannot be saved in God’s appointed way, unless the gospel is preached to others as well as to themselves.¹

Secondly, in the economy and dispensation of the new covenant, all external differences and privileges of people, tongues, and nations have been abolished. The word of grace is to be preached without distinction to all, and all men everywhere are called to repent.

Thirdly, when God calls upon men to believe, he does not call upon them to believe that Christ died for them, but that there is no name under heaven given to men by which they may be saved; only the name of Jesus Christ, through whom salvation is preached.

Besides these certain truths, I say the sufficiency of Christ’s blood, which we have described, is a sufficient basis and ground for all those general precepts for preaching the gospel to all men.

Secondly, those who preach the gospel in particular congregations, being utterly unacquainted with the purpose and secret counsel of God, and also being forbidden to pry or search into it (Deut. 29:29), may on this ground justifiably call upon every man to believe, giving an assurance of salvation to everyone in particular upon his believing. They may know, and be fully persuaded of this: that there is enough in the death of Christ to save everyone who will believe. They may

¹ That is, we preach to non-elect as well as to elect, because we cannot know which is which until they respond.

leave the purpose and counsel of God to himself as to whom he will bestow faith, and for whom Christ died in particular (as they are commanded).

This one thing, being well observed, will crush many of the vain flourishes of our adversaries; as will what follows below.

2. The Administration of the New Covenant under the Gospel.

A second thing to be considered is the economy or administration of the new covenant in the times of the gospel. The kingdom and dominion of Christ are amplified and enlarged after his appearance in the flesh. All external differences are taken away, the name of Gentiles removed, the partition wall broken down, the promise to Abraham that he should be heir of the world, as he was father of the faithful, was now to be fully accomplished. Now, this administration is opposite to that dispensation which was restrained to one people and family, which was uniquely God's. All the rest of the world had been excluded, and it did not comprehend all individuals. But the new covenant denotes a removal of all those restraining exceptions that were in force before. So considering the end to which these general expressions are used in Scripture, and what they aim at, will clearly manifest their nature, how they are to be understood, and who is intended and comprehended in them. For if what is meant by them is only this enlargement of the visible kingdom of Christ to all nations with regard to right, and to many with regard to fact, then it is evident that they refer only to a collection of men without any differences, and not a universal collection of everyone; the thing meant by them requires the one and not the other. God has elect in all those nations, produced in several generations, in which the means of grace are employed.

Hence, those objections that are made against the particularity of the ransom of Christ and restricting it only to the elect, and which are based on the terms "all", "all men", "all nations", "the world", "the whole world", and the like, are all exceedingly weak and invalid. They twist the general expressions of the Scripture beyond their aim and intent. That is because these terms are being used by the Holy Ghost only to evidence the removal of all personal and national distinctions, breaking up all the narrow bounds of the Old Testament, enlarging the kingdom of Christ beyond the bounds of Jewry and Salem, abolishing all old restrictions, and opening a way for the elect among all people to come in (called "the fullness of the Gentiles"). There is now "neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all, and in all," Col. 3:11.

Hence the Lord promises to "pour out his Spirit upon all flesh," Joel 2:28. Peter interprets this to be accomplished by filling the apostles with the gifts of the Spirit, that they might be enabled to preach to several nations, Acts 2:17, "having received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations" Rom. 1:5. This is not the Jews only, but some among all nations, "the gospel being the power of God unto salvation for everyone that believes, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek," verse 16. As to salvation, it intends only those specifically bought by Christ, which he "redeemed out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation," Rev. 5:9. There you have a specific distribution of what is generally set down in other passages; the gospel is commanded to be preached to all these nations, Matt. 28:19, so that those bought and redeemed among them all might be brought home to God, John 11:52. And this is what the apostle so largely sets forth in Eph. 2:14-17.

Now, this is the sense, and no other, in which those many passages usually urged for universal grace and redemption are to be taken, as we have explained.

3. The distinction between man's duty and God's purpose.

There being no connection between man's duty and God's purpose, we must exactly distinguish between them. The purpose and decree of God is not the rule of our duty; nor is the performance of our duty to do what we are commanded, any declaration of what God's purpose is, nor his decree as to what should be done. This is especially seen and considered in the duty of the ministers of the gospel to dispense the word, exhort, invite, give precepts and warnings, all of which has been committed to them. All of these are perpetual declarations of our duty, and they manifest the approval of the things exhorted and invited to, along with the truth of the connection between one thing and another. But these are not from the counsel and purpose of God with regard to individual persons in the ministry of the word. A minister is not to inquire after nor trouble himself about those secrets of the eternal mind of God; namely, whom he purposes to save, and whom in particular he has sent Christ to die for. It is enough for them to search out his revealed will, and from there take their directions, from which they have their commissions.

Therefore, there is no sequel between the universal precepts from the word concerning the things to be done, to God's purpose in himself concerning specific persons. They command and invite all to repent and believe. But they do not know in particular on whom God will bestow repentance unto salvation, nor in whom he will effect the work of faith with power. And when they make proffers and tenders in the name of God to all, they do not say to all, "It is the purpose and intention of God that you should believe." Who gave them any such power? It is his command that makes it their duty to do what is required of them. But they do not declare his mind, that is, what he will do in particular. The external offer is one from which every man may conclude his own duty; none may conclude God's purpose, which yet may be known upon performing his duty. It is in vain to say that God has given Christ for all to whom he offers Christ in the preaching of the gospel. For his offer in the preaching of the gospel is not a declaration to anyone in particular either of what God has done for him, or will do in reference to him, but of what that individual ought to do if he wants to be approved by God, and obtain the good things that are promised. From this, it follows,

First, God always intends to save some among those to whom he sends the gospel in its power. Ministers of the gospel are unacquainted with God's particular purpose; they are bound to seek the good of everyone; and they are to hope and judge well of all, as befits them. Thus, they may offer Jesus Christ to all, with the life and salvation that is in him, notwithstanding the fact that the Lord has given his Son only to his elect.

Secondly, this offer is neither vain nor fruitless. If it is performed as it ought to be, and as it is required, then it declares their duty, and what is acceptable to God. If anyone asks, "What is declared and made known of God's mind and will when men for whom Christ did not die are commanded to believe?" I answer, first, they are commanding what ought to be done if someone would be acceptable to God; secondly, they are declaring the sufficiency of salvation that is in Jesus Christ for all who believe on him; thirdly, they are declaring the certain, infallible, inviolable connection between faith and salvation, so that whoever performs the one will surely enjoy the other; for whoever comes to Christ he will in no way cast out (Jn. 6:37).

4. The Error of the Jews concerning the extent of Redemption.

There was an ingrafted and erroneous persuasion of the Jews that restricted salvation and deliverance by the Messiah (or promised seed) to themselves alone. For awhile it had a strong influence on the apostles themselves, who were the offspring of Abraham according to the flesh.

This must be considered the basis for many of the general expressions and expansions of the objects of redemption in Scripture. Yet, their presence gives no plausibility to unlimited universality. It is very apparent that the Jews were generally infected with this proud opinion, and that all the promises belonged only to them and theirs. These were universally theirs, exclusive of all those others whom they called “dogs, uncircumcised,” and on whom they poured out curses. Hence, when they saw the multitudes of Gentiles coming to the preaching of Paul, they were “filled with envy, contradicting, blaspheming, and stirring up persecution against them,” Acts 13:45-50. The apostle again speaks of these proud Jews in 1Thes. 2:15, 16. “They do not please God,” he says, “and are opposed to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved.” What most enraged them in the preaching of our Savior was his prediction of letting out his vineyard to others (Matt. 21:41).

It is apparent that the apostles themselves had deeply drunk in this opinion, learned by tradition from their fathers, not only in their questioning about the restoration of the kingdom to Israel, Acts 1:6, but it is also evident in their understanding of the Great Commission. They had received their commission to teach and baptize all nations, Matt. 28:19, and every creature, Mark 16:15, and they were endowed with power from above to do it, Acts 1:8. Yet they seem to have understood their commission to extend only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, for they went about preaching only to the Jews, Acts 11:19. When the contrary was evidenced and demonstrated to them, they glorified God, saying, “Then God has also granted repentance unto life to the Gentiles” Acts 11:18. They admired it as something they were not acquainted with before. And it is no wonder that men were not easily or soon persuaded of this, because it was the great mystery which was not made known in former ages. It was then revealed to God’s holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit: “That the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel,” Eph. 3:5, 6.

Now, this being made known to them by the Spirit, and the time having come in which the little sister was to be considered (So 8:8), the prodigal brought home (Lk. 15:11+), and Japheth persuaded to dwell in the tents of Shem (Gen. 9:27), they labored by all means to root it out of the minds of their brethren according to the flesh,¹ those for whom they especially cared. They also labored to leave no thought in the mind of the eunuch that he was a dry tree, nor in the mind of the Gentile that he was cut off from the people of God. To this end, they used various general expressions to directly rebut that former error which was absolutely destructive to the kingdom of Jesus Christ. Hence we find the terms “the world”, “all men”, “all nations”, “every creature”, and the like, used in the business of redemption and preaching the gospel. These things were not restricted to one certain nation and family (as was supposed), but they extended universally to God’s people scattered abroad in every region under heaven. This is especially true of those expressions used by John. He lived to see the first coming of the Lord in that fearful judgment and vengeance which he executed upon the Jewish nation some forty years after his death.² He frequently asserts that Christ benefits the world in contrast to the Jewish nation, as I said before. He gives us a rule for understanding such phrases and locutions. John 11:51-52: “He signified that Jesus should die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but that he should also gather together into one the children of God that were scattered abroad.” To this end, he tells the believing Jews that Christ is not a propitiation for them only, “but for the sins of the whole

¹ That is, of their fellow believers who were Jews.

² The expected return of Christ during the lifetime of some of his disciples (Matt. 16:28; Mk. 9:1; Lk. 9:27) is here interpreted to be the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in 70AD, followed by the great diaspora.

world,” 1Jn. 2:2, or the people of God scattered throughout the whole world. It is not tied to any one nation, as they sometimes vainly imagined. And this shines much light on the sense and meaning of those passages where the words “world” and “all” are used in the business of redemption. They do not show a collective universality, but a general distribution to men of all sorts, in opposition to the erroneous persuasion recounted before.

5. The Meaning of the Words concerning the extent of the Atonement.

We must seriously weigh the extent, nature, and meaning of the general terms which are frequently used in an indefinite way in the Scripture to identify the object of Christ’s redemption. The whole weight of the argument for universal redemption hangs on these expressions. The chief if not the only argument for it is taken from words which seem to have a latitude in their meaning, such as “the world”, “the whole world”, “all”, and the like. These terms, once the universalists fasten onto them, cause them to run with “Io triumphe,” as though the victory were surely theirs. The world, the whole world, all, all men! – who can oppose it? Call their attention to the context of the several passages where the words appear, appeal to rules of interpretation, remind them of the circumstances and scope of the passage, the sense of the same words in other passages, and use other helps and assistance which the Lord has acquainted us with to discover his mind and will in his word, and they shortly cry out to use the bare letter of the word, its literal meaning independent of its context:

“Away with the gloss and interpretation; allow us to believe what the word expressly says.”

Being deluded by the love of their own darling, they little imagine (I hope) that if this assertion were generally applied, and they will not allow us the gift of interpretation in proportion to our faith, then at one clap they would confirm the cursed madness of the Anthropomorphites, who assign a human body, form and shape, to God, who has none. Likewise they would confirm the cursed figment of transubstantiation, destroying the body of Christ who actually has one, along with numerous other pernicious errors. Let them continue such empty clamors as long as they please. They are fit only to terrify and shake weak and unstable men; we will not be silent for the truth’s sake. And I hope we will very easily make it apparent that the general terms that are used in this matter will indeed give no credence to any argument for universal redemption, whether absolute or conditional.

Two words are badly stumbled over: “the world,” and “all”. We will consider later the particular passages in which these are found, and which drive the arguments of our adversaries. For the present, we will only show that the words themselves, according to their use in Scripture, do not necessarily show a universal collection of those toward whom they are directed. Instead, being words with various meanings, they must be interpreted according to the scope and the subject-matter of the place where they are used in Scripture.

First, is the word “world.”

In the New Testament, this is called *kosmos* (NT:2889). There is another word, *aion* (NT:165) that is sometimes translated “world,” but it is not involved in this matter. It denotes duration of time rather than the scope or extent of something. I will briefly give you enough of the various meanings of *kosmos* to make it apparent that no argument can be made based on the bare usage of a word which is so equivocal. Its meaning will need to be distinguished in each passage from which the argument is taken.

THE SCHEME

The World is taken,

- I. Subjectively
 - A. Universally
 - B. Partially; for
 1. The visible heaven.
 2. The habitable earth.
- II. Adjunctively,¹ with regard to,
 - A. The inhabitants,
 1. Collectively for the whole.
 2. Distributively for,
 - (1.) Any.
 - (2.) Many.
 3. Signally,
 - (1.) The good, or elect.
 - (2.) The wicked, or reprobate.
 4. Indifferently, or in common.
 5. Restrictively, or synecdochically;² for,
 - (1.) The chief.
 - (2.) The Romans.
 - B. The accidents;
 1. Of corruption.
 - (1.) Corruption itself.
 - (2.) The seat of corruption.
 - (3.) The earthly condition.
 2. Of the curse.

All these distinctions of the use of the word are made out in the following observations:

The word “world” in the Scripture is in general taken five ways:

First, *Pro mundo continente*;³

First, generally – *holos* for the whole fabric of heaven and earth, with all things contained in them, which were created by God in the beginning: Job 34:13; Acts 17:24; Eph. 1:4; and many other passages.

Secondly, distinctively,

First, for the heavens, and all things belonging to them, distinguished from the earth, Ps. 90:2;

¹ **Adjunct:** Something attached to or related to something else in a dependent or subordinate position. “The king and his army.”

² **Synecdoche:** A figure of speech in which a part or a component of something is used to refer to the whole (“all hands on deck” for *sailors*), the whole of something to refer to a part (such as *the law* meaning a *police officer*), the specific for the general (such as referring to an *assassin* as a *cutthroat*, which is only one way to assassinate), the general for the specific (such as *thief* for *pickpocket*), or the material for the thing which is made from it (referring to a *sword* as *steel*).

³ For the world as a whole.

Secondly, The habitable earth, and this very frequently, as Ps. 24:1, 98:7; Matt. 13:38; John 1:9, 3:17, 19, 4:14, 17:11; 1Tim. 1:15, 6:7.

Secondly, For the world contained, especially men in the world; and that either,

First, universally for everyone, Rom. 3:6, 19, 5:12.

Secondly, indefinitely for men, without restriction or enlargement, John 7:4; Isa. 13:11.

Thirdly, exegetically, for many, which is the most usual acceptance of the word, Matt. 18:7; John 4:42, 12:19, 16:8, 17:21; 1Cor. 4:9; Rev. 13:3.

Fourthly, comparatively, for a great part of the world, Rom. 1:8; Matt. 24:14, 26:13; Rom. 10:18.

Fifthly, restrictively, for the inhabitants of the Roman empire, Luke 2:1.

Sixthly, for men distinguished by their various qualifications,

1st, For the good of God's people, referring either to their designation or their possession of something, Ps. 22:27; John 3:16, 6:33, 51; Rom. 4:13, 11:12, 15; 2Cor. 5:19; Col. 1:6; 1Jn. 2:2.

2dly, For the evil, wicked, rejected men of the world, Isa. 53:11; John 7:7, 14:17, 22, 15:19, 17:25; 1Cor. 6:2, 11:32; Heb. 9:38; 2Pet. 2:5; 1Jn.5:19; Rev. 13:3.

Thirdly, For the corrupted world, or that universal corruption which is in all things in the world: Gal 1:4,6:14; Eph. 2:2; James 1:27, 4:4; 1Jn. 2:15-17; 1Cor. 7:31, 33; Col 2:8; 2Tim. 4:10; Rom 12:2; 1Cor. 1:20, 21, 3:18, 19.

Fourthly, For a worldly estate or the condition of men or things, Ps. 73:12; Luke 16:8; John 18:36; 1Jn. 4:5; and many other passages.

Fifthly, For the accursed world, as under the power of Satan, John 7:7, 14:30, 16:11, 33; 1Cor. 2:12; 2Cor. 4:4; Eph. 6:12.

This word has various other meanings in Holy Scripture, which it is unnecessary to recount further. I have reviewed these various meanings to show the emptiness of the clamor with which some men fill their mouths, who frighten unstable souls with those scriptures mentioning "world" so often in the business of redemption, as though some strength might be taken from that to uphold the general ransom. "Parvas habet spes Troja, si tales habet."¹ If their great strength is only sophistical craft,² taken from the ambiguity of an equivocal word, their whole endeavor is likely to prove fruitless. I have declared that the word has various other uses in the Scripture. So when I come to consider the objections which use the word "world" to mean universal redemption, I hope by God's assistance to show that in no place in which the word is used in redemption, can it be taken for all and every man in the world. Indeed, it is used in very few passages besides those to mean all and every man. Concerning this word, our way will be clear if you add these observations to what has been said,

First, as in other words, so it is with these: the same word is repeated in a different sense and understanding. Matt. 8:22, "Let the dead bury their dead;" – dead in the first instance denotes

¹ The least thing might have held the hope of Troy, if only it could be held itself.

² The skill of making plausible but misleading arguments.

those who are spiritually dead in sin; in the next instance, it refers to those who are naturally dead by a dissolution of soul and body. John 1:11, He “came to his own,” *eis idios*, to all the things that he had made; “and his own,” *kai idios*, that is, the great part of the people, “did not receive him.” Again, John 3:6, “What is born of the Spirit is spirit.” Spirit in the first instance is the almighty Spirit of God; in the latter instance, it is a spiritual life of grace received from him. Now, in such passages as these, to argue that the meaning of the word is such in one place, therefore it is the same in the other, would violently pervert the mind of the Holy Ghost. So too, the word “world” usually changes in its meaning. John 1:10, “He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and yet the world did not know him!” The one who would force the same meaning on the word “world” in its triple mention here would make an egregious gloss. In the first, it plainly signifies some part of the habitable earth; it is taken subjective “partially” in the second, as the whole frame of heaven and earth; and then it is taken subjective “universally” in the third, for some men living in the earth, namely, unbelievers, who may be said to be “the world” adjunctively. Again, John 3:17, “God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world might be saved through him;” the word “world” in the first instance is necessarily understood as that part of the habitable world in which our Savior lived; in the second instance, it refers to all men in the world, just as some suppose (there is a truth in this: for our Savior did not come to condemn all men in the world; condemnation was not the prime aim of his coming, and he came to save his own people, thus not condemning all); in the third instance, it refers to God’s elect, or believers living in the world in their several generations; these were the ones he intended to save and no one else; otherwise Christ fails in his purpose, and his endeavor is insufficient to accomplish that for which it is designed.

Secondly, no argument can be taken from a phrase in a particular Scripture passage if, in other passages where it is used, the meaning there is obviously denied (unless the scope of the passage or its subject-matter compels it). For instance: God is said to love the world, and to have sent his Son to reconcile the world to himself in Christ; and Christ is said to be a propitiation for the sins of the whole world. If the scope of the passages where these assertions are found, or the subject-matter which they address, compels the word “world” to mean all persons universally, then let it be so without restriction. But if such an interpretation is not compelled from the passages themselves, then why should “world” there signify everyone more than it does in John 1:10: “The world did not know him.” If there it means all without exception, then no one believed in Christ. That would be contrary to verse 12. Or in Luke 2:1, “That all the world should be taxed,” it can only be understood to mean the chief inhabitants of the Roman empire; or in John 8:26, “I say to the world those things which I have heard” is understood to mean the Jews to whom he spoke, those who then lived in the world, and not those to whom he was not sent; or in John 12:19, “Behold, the world has gone after him!” That world was nothing but a great multitude of one small nation. Or in 1Jn. 5:19, “The whole world lies in wickedness,” from which it is understood that all believers are exempted; or in Rev. 13:3, “All the world wondered after the beast;” judge for yourself whether it affirms the whole universe of individuals in the world wondered after the beast. In the same way, it is understood that “all nations” is equal in extent to “the world.” This is apparent in Rom. 1:5; Rev. 18:3, 23; Ps. 118:10; 1Chron. 14:17; Jer. 27:7.

It is evident that the words “world”, “all the world”, and “the whole world”, where taken adjunctively for men-in-the-world, almost always denote only some or many men in the world. They are separated into good or bad, believers or unbelievers, and elect or reprobate. This is

understood from from what is immediately affirmed about them in the passages cited. I see no reason in the world¹ why they should be bent to mean anything else in the passages cited in the controversy between us and our opponents. We will consider the particular passages later.

Second, is the word “all”

Now, what we have said of the word “world”, we may say of the word “all.” Much reliance is placed on it, and many boasts are made from it – without cause. We declared before that nowhere is it affirmed in the Scripture that Christ died for all men, or gave himself a ransom for all men, much less for all and every man. It is expressly affirmed that he “gave himself a ransom for all,” 1Tim. 2:6. But what is now in debate is who this “all” should be, whether all believers, or all the elect, or some of all sorts, or all of every sort. Our adversaries affirm it is all of every sort. The main reason for their interpretation is the importance of the word itself. We will show, when we come to the particular passages they urge, that the circumstances of the passage, the analogy of faith, and other helps for exposition, do not favor their gloss at all. For the present let us look at the word in its usual acceptance in the Scripture, and see whether it always requires such an interpretation.

It is too apparent to require any illustration that the word “all” is to be taken either collectively for all in general, without exception, or distributively for some of all sorts, excluding none. It is used in this second sense by all sorts of people, whether speaking, writing, or expressing themselves in another way; but this is especially so in holy writ. It is granted that the word is sometimes taken in the first sense (for all collectively) and I need not prove it. Those whom we oppose affirm that this is the only sense of the word – though I dare boldly say it is not to be understood in that sense once in ten times through the whole book of God. Instead, it is commonly and indeed properly used in the latter sense (for some of all sorts) concerning whatever is affirmed. A few instances from the many that might be urged will make it clear.

Thus then, you have it in John 12:32, “And if I am lifted up from the earth, I will draw all unto me” I cannot approve that we translate it “all men” as in other places. Though I know the sense is the same, yet the word “men” is not in the original, only the word “all.” But who, I ask, are these all? Are they everyone? Then is everyone drawn to Christ, made believers, truly converted, and certainly saved? For those who come to him by his and his Father’s drawing, “he will in no way cast out,” John 6:37.

Here then, “all” can have no other meaning than many, some of all sorts, no sort excluded. Accordingly the word is interpreted this way in Rev. 5:9, “You have redeemed us out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.” These are the “all” he draws to him. This particular exposition of this phrase is to me of more value and esteem than a thousand glosses of the sons of men. Translators are to keep close to the propriety and native meaning of every word. Thus in Luke 11:42, our translators have made the word “all” properly signify what we assert is the right interpretation of it; for they render *rhetos* (which expressly is “every herb”), “all manner of herbs,” taking the word distributively (as it must be taken). It signifies herbs of all sorts, and not any individual herb, for which the Pharisees did not and could not tithe. And in the very same sense the word is used again in Luke 18:12, “I give tithes of all that I possess;” where it cannot signify every individual thing, as is apparent.² Most evident, also, is this restrained meaning of

¹ Note Owen’s dry humor in using this phrase to denote the entire world.

² He does not tithe his cloak, or his land, or his children for example.

the word in Acts 2:17, “I will pour out of my Spirit, upon all flesh.” Whether or not it comprises every man or rather men of several and various sorts, let every man judge for himself.

The same course of interpretation as before is followed by our translators in Acts 10:12. They render what is literally “all beasts or four-footed creatures,” as “all manner of beasts;” or beasts of various sorts. It must also be understood in the same sense in Rom. 14:2, “One believes that he may eat all things;” that is, what he pleases of things to be eaten. See, moreover, 1Cor. 1:5.¹ Indeed, in 1Tim. 2:4 where it is said that “God will have all men to be saved,” where men so eagerly contend that the word “all” is to be taken for everyone (though fruitlessly and falsely, as will be demonstrated), – in that very chapter the word “all” must confessedly be expounded according to the sense we give it. In verse 8 of that chapter, it says, “I will, therefore, that men pray in every place.” It cannot signify every individual place in heaven, earth, and hell. This is confessed by all,² and it needs no proof; no more than when our Savior is said to cure “every disease,” in Matt. 9:35. There is no need to prove that he did not cure every disease of every man, but only all sorts of diseases.

Various other instances might be given to show that this is the most usual and frequent meaning of the word “all” in the Holy Scripture. Therefore, nothing can be inferred from the base word that would compel us to conclude that an absolute unlimited universality of all individuals is intimated by it. We will consider the particular passages insisted on afterward. I will conclude what has been said concerning these general expressions in Scripture with these observations:

First, the word “all” is certainly and unquestionably restrained sometimes, and it ought to be restrained, to “all of some sorts,” even though the qualification which is the bond of the limitation is not expressed, namely “all believers,” (see 1Cor. 15:22; Eph. 4:6) In Rom. 5:18 we read, “The free gift came upon all men to justification of life.” “All men” are those that are actually justified. They are no more or less than those who are Christ’s, that is, believers; for certainly justification is not possible without faith (Heb. 11:6).

Secondly, the word “all” is sometimes used for “some of all sorts,” as in Jer. 31:34.³ The Hebrew word there is *kowl* (OT:3635). It is rendered “all” by Paul in Heb. 8:11; so too in John 12:32 and 1Tim. 2:1-3. This is apparent by the mention of “kings” as one sort of people intended there. And I have no doubt but it will appear to all that the word must be taken in one of these senses in every place where it is used in the business of redemption; as will be proved.

Thirdly, if a diligent comparison is made between the general expressions of the New Testament and the predictions of the Old, they will be found to answer and explain one another. The Lord affirms in the New what the Old foretold should be done. Now, there are predictions and prophecies of the Old Testament that all nations, all flesh, all people, all the ends, families, or kindreds of the earth, the world, the whole earth, and the isles, will be converted, and look up to Christ, and come to the mountain of the Lord. No one doubts that only the elect of God in all nations are signified, knowing that in them alone those predictions have their accomplishment. Why should the same expressions used in the Gospel, many of

¹ That in everything you are enriched by him, in all utterance, and *in* all knowledge;

² There goes that dry humor again in which “confessed by all” means it ought to be universally confessed, but is certainly not.

³ And no longer shall each one teach his neighbor and each his brother, saying, ‘Know the LORD,’ for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, declares the LORD. For I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.”

them directly aiming to declare the fulfilling of these prophecies, be to a large extent wire-drawn so contrary to the mind of the Holy Ghost?

In closing, as when the Lord is said to wipe the tears from all faces,¹ it does not hinder its meaning to say that the reprobates will be cast out to eternity where there is weeping and wailing, etc. So when Christ is said to die for all, it does not hinder its meaning to say that those reprobates may perish to eternity for their sins, without any effectual remedy intended for them, though that remedy may be occasionally proposed to some of them in the gospel.

6. *The Appearance of Persons and Things in the Scripture.*

Observe that the Scripture often speaks of things and persons according to the appearance they have, and their account or esteem among men. Frequently it speaks of men's condition according to their outward appearance (on which human judgment is based), and not what they are indeed. Thus, many are called *wise*, *just*, and *righteous* according to how they are esteemed by men, though the Lord knows they are foolish sinners. Jerusalem is called "The holy city," Matt. 27:53, because it was holy in esteem and appearance; but indeed it was a "den of thieves" (Matt. 21:13). In 2Chron. 28:23, it is said of Ahaz, that wicked king of Judah, that "he sacrificed to the gods of Damascus that struck him." It was the Lord alone that struck him. Those idols to which he sacrificed were but sticks and stones, the work of mens hands. They could in no way help themselves much less strike their enemies. Yet the Holy Ghost uses an expression that addresses his idolatrous persuasion and says, "They struck him." Is it not said of Christ in John 5:18, that he had broken the Sabbath? Yet he only did that in the corrupt opinion of the blinded Pharisees.

Moreover, add to what has been said what is no less an undeniable truth, namely, that many things which are proper and specific to the children of God are often and frequently assigned to those who live only in *outward* communion with them, and who have partaken of the same *external* privileges, though indeed they are aliens with regard to their participation in the grace of the promise. Put these two things which are most evident together, and it will easily appear that those passages which seem to express a possibility that those who are said to be redeemed by the blood of Christ will perish and suffer eternal destruction, are in no way advantageous to the adversaries of the effectual redemption of God's elect by the blood of Christ. This is because they may be said to be redeemed *κατὰ τὴν δόξαν*, not *κατὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν*,² — *κατὰ τὸ φαίνεσθαι*, not *κατὰ τὸ εἶναι*,³ — it is in respect to appearance, not reality, as used in Scripture in various other things.

7. *The Difference between a Judgment of Charity, and one of Fact.*

What is spoken about someone as a charitable judgment on our part must not always be exactly squared to what is actually true in their regard. For the rightness of our judgment, it suffices that we proceed according to the rules of judging that are given us. For what is outside of our cognizance does not belong to us, whether it addresses our judgments or not. Thus the apostles in the Scriptures often write to men addressing them as "holy," "saints," even "elected." But from there is no warrant to positively conclude that they were all indeed holy, saints, or elect. This is so in 1Pet. 1:1, 2, where he calls all the strangers to whom he wrote, scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the

¹ Rev. 21:4

² According to glory, not according to truth.

³ According to appearance, not according to being.

Father,” etc. And yet no one would dare affirm that I have any warrant to conclude, that in truth all were such. So Paul tells the Thessalonians, the whole church to whom he wrote, that he “knew their election of God,” 1Thes. 1:4. In 2Thes. 2:13, he blesses God “who had chosen them to salvation.” Now, did not Paul make this judgment of them by the rule of charity? Accordingly, he affirms in another place, “It is fitting for me to think so of you all,” Phil. 1:7. Can it be, should it be, infallibly concluded that they were all elected? If some of these should be found to fall away from the gospel and to have perished, would it be valid to conclude that the elect might perish? Would we not answer that they were *said* to be elected according to the judgment of charity, but that they were not so *in fact*? And why is this answer not as sufficient and satisfying when it is given in response to the objection that some are perishing who were charitably said to be redeemed, as when they were charitably said to be elected?

8. *The Connection between Faith and Salvation.*

The infallible connection of faith and salvation according to God’s purpose and will must be considered. It is frequently the thing intended in gospel proposals. The Lord has established it in his counsel, and revealed it in his word, that there is an indissoluble bond between these two things, so that “the one who believes shall be saved,” Mark 16:16. This, indeed, is the substance of the gospel in its outward promulgation. This is the testimony of God, that eternal life is in his Son. Whoever believes this sets his seal to it that God is true. Whoever does not believe it makes God out to be a liar, 1Jn. 5:9-11. Now, this connection between the means and the end, faith and life, is the only thing which is meant and what is offered to countless people to whom the gospel is preached. All the commands, proffers, and promises that are made to them intimate no more than this will of God: that believers shall certainly be saved. This is an unquestionable divine truth, and it is a sufficient object for supernatural faith to rest upon. If it not accepted as true, it is a sufficient cause for damnation. John 8:24, “If you do not believe that I am he,” (that is, “the way, the truth, and the life”) “you shall die in your sins.”

It is a vain imagination of some that, when the command to believe and the promise of life are presented to someone, even if he is one of those who will certainly perish, yet somehow the Lord’s will is conditional as to this man’s salvation. They imagine the Lord intends this man will be saved on condition that he will believe, when that condition does not at all lie in the will of God, which is always absolute. The condition exists only between the things proposed to these people, as declared before.¹ And those poor deluded things, who stand on their own legs before they are able to crawl, who might justly be persuaded to hold onto men of more strength, greatly betray their own conceited ignorance by this assertion. With great pomp, they show the broken pieces of an old Arminian sophism with acclamations of grace to this new discovery (for that is how they think of all that is new to them). They say, “As is God’s proffer, so is his intention; if he calls all to believe and be saved, then he intends all to believe and be saved.”

First, God does not proffer life to all upon the condition of faith, passing by a great part of mankind without any such proffer being made to them at all.

Secondly, if by God’s proffer they understand his command and promise, who told them that these things declared his will and purpose, or intention? He commands Pharaoh to let his people go; but did he intend Pharaoh to do so according to his command? Had he not foretold

¹ That is, faith is the instrument required to receive grace. It is not the cause of that grace, nor the condition of salvation.

that he would so order things that Pharaoh would *not* let them go? I thought that God's commands and promises always revealed our duty, and not his purpose; they revealed what God would have us do, and not what he will do. Indeed, his promises as particularly applied reveal his mind to the persons to whom they are applied; but when they are indefinitely proposed, they reveal no other intention of God but what we discovered before: they concern things, not persons; they concern his determinate purpose to infallibly connect faith and salvation.

Thirdly, if the proffer is universal (as they say), and the intention of God is bound to the offer – that is, he intends the salvation of those to whom the tender offer is made, upon their profession of faith – then,

First, what becomes of election and reprobation? Neither of them, certainly, is consistent with this universal purpose of saving us all.

Secondly, if he intends it, then why is it not accomplished? Does his purpose fail? “*Dum vitant stulti vitia, in contraria currunt.*”¹ Is this certain Scylla not worse than the feared Charybdis?²

They say, “He intends salvation only on condition. The condition not being fulfilled, he does not fail in his purpose, though the thing is not conferred.” But did the Lord foreknow whether the condition would be fulfilled by those to whom the proposal was made, or not? If not, where is his prescience, his omniscience? If he did, then how can he be said to intend their salvation when he certainly knew that they would never fulfill the condition on which it was to be attained? Moreover, he knew that the condition was not to be attained without his bestowing it, and he had determined not to bestow it.

Would they ascribe such a will and purpose to a wise man as they ignorantly and presumptuously ascribe to the only wise God? Would a wise man intend to have a thing done upon the performance of a condition that he knew full well could never be performed without him, and that he had fully resolved not to effect? For instance, would he intend to give his daughter in marriage to a man upon condition that this man would give him a jewel he does not have, nor can obtain, unless the father bestows it on him, but which he is resolved never to bestow? Where will blindness and ignorance, thought to be light and knowledge, carry such poor deluded souls?

This, then is the main thing demonstrated and held out in the promulgation of the gospel: the strict connection between the duty of faith assigned to them, and the benefit of life promised to them. This has a truth of universal extent, grounded upon the complete sufficiency of the death of Christ towards all who will believe. And I see no reason why this should be termed part of the mystery of the universalists, that the gospel could not be preached to all unless Christ died for all. With what was mentioned before concerning another part of it, this is an old, rotten, carnal, and long-since-confuted sophism, arising out of the ignorance of the word and right reason, which are no way contrary to one another.

¹ As we evade the foolish flaw, we hasten the opposite.

² From Homer's *Iliad and the Odyssey*, a Greek myth about Odysseus who must sail between the two: Scylla is a twelve-headed monster snatching unsuspecting travelers from her lair, while Charybdis is a consuming vortex only an arrow-shot away.

9. The mixture of Elect and Reprobates in the world.

Another ground for holding out a tender of the blood of Jesus Christ to those for whom it was never shed, is the mixed distribution of the elect and reprobates, believers and unbelievers, according to the purpose and mind of God, through-out the whole world and in its several places, in all or most of the single congregations. The ineffectualness of the proposal that we cannot preach to all unless Christ died for all is apparent in this mixed distribution. The ministers of the gospel, who are stewards of the mysteries of Christ, and to whom the word of reconciliation is committed, are bound to admonish and warn all men to whom they are sent. That is because they are acquainted only with revealed things. The Lord lodges his purposes and intentions towards particular persons in the secret ark of his own heart, which is not to be pried into. Ministers give the same commands, propose the same promises, make tenders of Jesus Christ in the same manner, to all. This is done so that the elect, whom they do not know but by the event of their conversion, may obtain the promises, while the rest are hardened.

Now, these things are thus ordered by Him who is supreme over all. Namely, that there should be such a mixture of elect and reprobate, of tares and wheat, to the end of the world; and, secondly, that Christ, and reconciliation through him, should be preached by men ignorant of his eternal discriminating purposes. As such, there is an absolute necessity for two other things. First, the promises must have a kind of unrestrained generality in order to be suitable to this dispensation that was recounted before. Secondly, they must be proposed to those towards whom the Lord never intended the good things of the promises; they have a share in this proposal only by their mixture in this world with the elect of God. So from the general proposition of Christ in the promises, nothing can be concluded concerning his death for all those to whom it is proposed; it has another reason and occasion.

The sum is this: the word of reconciliation is committed to men unacquainted with God's distinguishing counsels. It is to be preached to men of a varied and mixed condition with regard to his purpose. The way by which he has determined to bring his own home to himself is by exhortations, entreaties, promises, and like means, accommodated to the reasonable nature of which all to whom the word is sent are partakers. These means are also suited to the accomplishment of other ends towards the rest, such as conviction, restraint, hardening, inexcusableness. It can only be that the proposal and offer must necessarily be made to some upon condition, who intentionally, and with regard to the purpose of God, have no right to it in the just aim and intent of it. To close, observe two things. First, the proffer itself neither is, nor ever was, absolutely universal to all; it is only indefinite, without respect to outward differences. Secondly, Christ is not to be received without faith, and God gives faith to whom he pleases; it is therefore clear that he never intends Christ for those on whom he will not bestow faith.

10. The Different Acts and Degrees of Faith.

The faith which is enjoined and commanded in the gospel has several diverse acts and different degrees. It proceeds orderly in its exercise according to the natural method by which the objects to be believed are proposed. The consideration of this is very useful in the business in hand. Our adversaries pretend that if Christ did not die for all, then those for whom he did not die are exhorted in vain to believe. Indeed, there is no proper object for the faith of countless people because Christ did not die for them. It is as though the gospel presented this doctrine at the start, that Christ died for everyone, elect and reprobate; or as though the first thing which anyone living under the means of grace is exhorted to believe is that Christ died for him in particular;

both of which are notoriously false, as I hope will be made manifest to all in the close of our undertaking. For the present I will only intimate something of what I said before concerning the order of exercising the several acts of faith. It will become clear that no one in the world is commanded or invited to believe unless he is enjoined to have a sufficient object on which to fix the act of faith, truth enough for its foundation, and latitude enough for its utmost exercise.

First, we cannot save ourselves.

The first thing which the gospel enjoins sinners, and which it persuades and commands them to believe, is that salvation is not to be had in themselves. For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God (Rom 3:23). Nor is salvation to be had by the works of the law, by which no living flesh can be justified (Rom 3:20). Here is a saving gospel truth for sinners to believe, which the apostle dwells upon completely in Romans chapters 1-3 preparing a way for justification by Christ. Now, there are countless people to whom the gospel is preached who never come as far as to believe even this! Among these you may count almost the whole nation of the Jews, as is apparent in Rom. 9; 10:3-4. Now, before going any further, a contempt of this object of faith is the sin of infidelity.

Secondly, Salvation is found in the promised seed only.

The gospel requires faith that there is salvation to be had in the promised seed, in Him who was before ordained to be a captain of salvation for those who believe. And here also at this trial of true divine faith, some millions of the great army of men, outwardly called, drop off and never believe that God has provided a way to save sinners.

Thirdly, Jesus was this promised seed, the Savior.

Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified by the Jews, was this Savior who was before promised. There is no other name given under heaven by which men may be saved besides his (Ac 4:12). And this was the main point upon which the Jews broke off, refusing to accept Christ as the Savior of men. Rather, they prosecuted him as an enemy of God. Thereupon they are so often charged with infidelity and damnable unbelief. The question was not, as between Christ and them, whether he died for them all or not, but whether he was the promised Messiah. They denied that he was, and perished in their unbelief. Now, before these three acts of faith are even performed, the soul is exhorted in vain to climb the uppermost steps [to resolve the extent of the atonement], and miss all the bottom foundation ones [of placing its faith in Christ alone].

Fourthly, the Gospel requires us to rely on Christ as the Redeemer.

Having discovered and believed on Jesus being the promised Redeemer, the gospel requires resting upon this Christ as an all-sufficient Savior. With him there is plenteous redemption. He is able to save to the utmost those who come to God by him, and to bear the burden of all weary laboring souls that come by faith to him. In this proposal there is a certain infallible truth, grounded upon the superabundant sufficiency of the oblation of Christ in itself for whomever it is intended (fewer or more). Now, to exercise this act of faith requires much self-knowledge, much conviction, much sense of sin, God's justice, and free grace. Good Lord! How many thousand poor souls within the pale of the church can never be brought to it! The truth is, without the help of God's Spirit, none of those three before can be performed, much less this last one. He works freely, when, how, and in whom he pleases (Jn. 3:8).

Fifthly, we must individually believe in the efficacy of Christ's blood.

Once these things are firmly seated in the soul (and not before), every one of us is particularly called to believe the efficacy of the redemption that is in the blood of Jesus with regard to our own particular soul. Every one in whom the free grace of God has worked the former acts of faith may assuredly do this act, for God works this as well. If they should do so, they may believe without either doubt or fear that they lack a right object in which to believe; for certainly Christ died for every one in whose heart the Lord, by his almighty power, effectually works faith to lay hold on him, and assent to him, according to that orderly proposal presented in the gospel.

Now, according to this order (as it is observed by some) are the articles of our faith, as proposed in the Apostles' Creed (that ancient summary of Christian religion), the remission of our sins, and life eternal, which is the last thing proposed to believe in, For before we can attain anything further, these must be firmly rooted. There is to be an absolute truth in everything to which we are called to assent, and we assent according to the order of the gospel. If Christ did not die for all, it would be senseless and vain to cry out that this object to be believed is a nullity.¹

And so I have proposed the general foundations of these answers which we will give to the ensuing objections. Making particular application of them will be an easy task, as I hope will be made apparent to all.

CHAPTER II – Answer to Objections from Scripture

An introduction to the answer to particular arguments.

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

The first is that, for my own part, I would rather they were all buried than brought to light. They are in opposition to the truth of God, which they seem to deface. Therefore, were it left to my choice, I would not produce any of them. It is not that there is any difficulty or weight in them which would make their removal laborious or burdensome. It is only that I am not willing to be instrumental in giving any breath or light to what opposes the truth of God. But because, in these times of liberty and error, I suppose the reader has already heard or is likely to hear most of them from men lying in wait to deceive, I will therefore show you the poison. Thus I may furnish you with an antidote against the venom of such self-seekers who abound in our days.

Secondly, I must desire that when you hear an objection, you would not be carried away with the sound of its words, nor allow it to make an impression on your spirits. Remember how many demonstrations and countless passages of Scripture have confirmed the truth opposed by them. Rest yourselves until the passages are well-weighed, the arguments pondered, and the answers set down. Then the Lord direct you to “prove all things, and hold fast what is good” 1Thes. 5:21.

¹ It might be said that if we make this issue a component of the gospel, then it must be believed one way or the other if we are to be justified. But if indeed the doctrine of particular atonement is true, then it would be “senseless and vain” to ask anyone to believe the opposite, for that would be a falsehood; everything in the gospel must be true. Therefore, as important as it is, there are prior essentials of the Gospel to which we must assent before considering this issue of the extent of the atonement, and they are sufficient to justify us without it.

Thirdly, I ask that you diligently observe what comes near the crux of the controversy, the thing in which the difference lies. Leave behind all other flourishes and swelling words of vanity as of no weight, and no importance.

Now, the objections laid against the truth maintained are of two sorts. The first sort is taken from scripture that is perverted; the other is taken from reason that is abused.

We begin with the first, the OBJECTIONS TAKEN FROM SCRIPTURE; all the passages which may in any way seem to contradict our assertion are offered by our strongest adversaries in their great strength (Remon. Scripta Synod).¹ They are referred to in three parts:

First, those passages that affirm that Christ died for the world, or that otherwise make mention of the word “world” in redemption.

Secondly, those which mention all and every man, either in the work of Christ’s dying for them, or where God is said to will their salvation.

Thirdly, those which affirm Christ bought, or died for, those who perish.

Hence they draw out three principal arguments or sophisms on which they greatly insist. All of which we will, by the Lord’s assistance, consider in their respective order, with the passages of Scripture brought to confirm and strengthen them.

I. Passages that affirm Christ died for the “world”- John 3:16

The first of these passages is taken from the “world,” passages to whom our poor pretenders are indeed like children. It is thus proposed by them:

“The one who is given out of the love with which God loved the world, such as John 3:16; that gave for the life of the world, such as John 6:51; and was a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, as 1Jn. 2:2” (to which add, John 1:29, 4:42; 2Cor. 5:19, cited by Arminius pp. 530, 531, and Corv. ad Molin. p. 442, chap. 29); “he was given and died for every man in the world; but the first is true of Christ, as appears by the passages before alleged: therefore he died for everyone,” Remon. Act. Synod. p. 300.

To this they say their adversaries have no color of an answer. But granting them the liberty of boasting, and without seeking for colors, we flatly deny the consequence of the first proposition. We will at any time, by the Lord’s help, put it to the test whether we have a just cause to deny it. There are two ways by which they go about proving this consequence from “the world” to everyone; first, by the reason and the sense of the word; secondly, from considering the particular passages of Scripture they have urged. We will test them in both.

First, alleged proof by reason

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

The whole world contains all and every man in the world; Christ died for the whole world: therefore Christ died for all and every man in the world.

¹ Acta et Scripta Synodalia Dordracena *ministorum* Remonstrantium in *fæderato Belgio*. 2Cor. xiii. 8. Harderwiici, 1620. This volume (a copy of which is in the Union Theol. Seminary Library) contains the official acts and dogmatic writings of the Remonstrants in explanation and defense of their five articles against the decisions of the Synod of Dort, including a lengthy exposition of the ninth chapter of Romans and other Scripture passages quoted against them. (Philip Schaff, *Creeds*, I.ix.iii.iv).

ANSWER: Here are four terms manifested in this syllogism¹ which arise from the ambiguity of the word “world;” and so there is no true medium on which the weight of the conclusion should hang. In the first proposition, “the world” is taken for the world containing; in the second, it is taken for the world contained, or men in the world; this is too apparent to need proving. So that unless you render the conclusion, “*Therefore Christ died for that which contains all the men in the world,*” and assert in the assumption that “*Christ died for the world containing,*” or the fabric of the habitable earth (which is madness), this syllogism is sophistically false. If then, you will take any proof from the word “world,” it must not be from the thing itself, but from the meaning of the word in the Scripture; as thus:

This word “world” in the Scripture signifies all and every man in the world; but Christ is said to die for the world: ergo, etc.

ANSWER: The first proposition, concerning the significance and meaning of the word “world”, is either universal, comprehending all passages where it is used, or it is particular, intending only some passages. If the proposition is universal, it is apparently false, as was manifested before; if it is particular, then the argument must be formed thus:

In some passages in Scripture the word “world” signifies all and every man in the world, of all ages, times, and conditions; but Christ is said to die for the world: ergo, etc.

ANSWER: This syllogism is no better than the former, as is evident; a universal conclusion cannot be inferred from a particular proposition.

Second, consideration of specific Scriptural passages

But now that the first proposition is correctly formed, I have one question to demand concerning the second, or the assumption: namely, is Christ said to have died for the world in every place where his death is mentioned, or only in some places? If you say in every place, that is apparently false, as already revealed by those many texts of Scripture produced before. They restrain the death of Christ to his elect, his sheep, his church, in comparison to which these general passages are only a few. If it is the second, then the argument must run thus:

In some few passages of Scripture the word “world” does signify all and every man in the world; but in some few passages Christ is said to die for the world (though not in express words, yet in equivalent words): ergo, etc.

ANSWER: This argument is so weak, ridiculous, and sophistically false, that it must be evident to anyone. And yet clearly, from the word “world” itself, the argument will not be made any better, and none desires it to be worse. It is again a universal conclusion based on particular affirmatives. Besides that, it apparently has four terms in the syllogism, unless the same passages in the first can be proved to be the very same passages in the assumption; yet, this is the very thing in question.² So if any strength is to be taken from this word, it must be an argument made in this form:

¹ In logic, this is a form of deductive reasoning consisting of a major premise, a minor premise, and a conclusion; for example, *All humans are mortal* (the major premise); *I am a human* (the minor premise), *therefore, I am mortal* (the conclusion).

² To put that in logical form, there is a set of passages in which the word “world” refers to all men; there is a separate set of passages in which Christ is said to die for the world; it cannot be concluded that these sets are identical. Hence it proves nothing.

If the word “world” does signify all and every man that ever were or will be, in those passages where Christ is said to die for the world, “then Christ died for all and every man”; the word “world” in all those passages where Christ is said to die for the world does signify all and every man in the world: therefore Christ died for them.

ANSWER: First, There is only one place where it is said that Christ gave his life for the world, or died for it, which holds out the intention of our Savior. All the other passages only seem to show the sufficiency of his oblation for all, which we also maintain. Secondly, we absolutely deny the assumption that the word “world” means all and every man in the world in that passage. We appeal for a test to consider all those particular passages in which such mention is made.

Thus have I called this argument to rule and measure, so that it might be evident where its great strength lies (which is indeed its very weakness). Those who, having caught hold of the word “world”, presently run away with the bait, as though all were clear in support of universal redemption. Yet, if you desire them to lay out and manifest the strength of their reason, they do not know what to say. Instead, the world, and indeed the whole world, understands neither what they say nor what they affirm. And now, *quid dignum tanto?*¹ What is the cause of the great boast mentioned in the introduction? I dare say, a weaker argument was never produced by rational men in so weighty a cause. This will be further manifested by considering the several particular passages produced to give it countenance, which we will do in order:

1. John 3:16

The first place we camp upon is what is first propounded by our adversaries, and on which they substantially rest. Yet, notwithstanding their clamorous claim, there are a number who think this very text is as fit and ready to overturn their entire opinion as Goliath’s sword was ready to cut off his own head. There are many unanswerable arguments against the universality of redemption that are easily deduced from the words of that text. May the great peaceable King of his church guide us to make good the interest of truth in the passage at issue. We will attempt this through him by opening the word and secondly, by balancing reasonings and arguments from them. This place is John 3:16, “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whomever believes in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.”

The universalists exceedingly boast in this passage for which we are persuaded they have so little cause. We do not doubt that, with the Lord’s assistance, we can demonstrate that it destroys their whole defense. To this end, I will briefly give you a double paraphrase of the words, the first containing their sense, and the latter our own. This then, is how our adversaries explain these words:

“‘God so loved,’ means that God had such a natural inclination, wish, and propensity toward the good of ‘the world,’ toward Adam, along with every one of his posterity, of all ages, times, and conditions (of which some were in heaven, and some long before in hell), ‘that he gave his only-begotten Son,’ causing him in the fullness of time to be incarnated and to die. He did this not with a purpose and resolve to save anyone, but ‘that whoever’ (meaning whatever persons of those toward whom he had a propensity) ‘believes in him should not perish, but have everlasting life;’ that is, they should have this fruit and result: that they should escape death and hell, and live eternally.”

¹ A latin quote from Horace’s *The Epistle to the Pisones*: “What is so worthy?”

To explicate the sense of the passage, these things are to be observed:

First, what is the love that caused Christ to be sent or given, which they suggest is a natural propensity toward the good of all?

Secondly, who are the objects of this love? Are they all and every man of all generations?

Thirdly, what does this giving consist in? I cannot find whether they mean the appointment of Christ to be a recoverer, or his actual exhibition in the flesh to accomplish his ministering.

Fourthly, by “whoever” they refer to all the persons in the world; it is not restricted in its intent toward some.

Fifthly, they suggest that life eternal is the fruit obtained by believers, but somehow it is not the end intended by God [“not with a purpose and resolve to save anyone”].

Now, in the second place, look a little at what we conceive to be the mind of God in those words. We take his aim to be the advancement and presentation of the free love of God to lost sinners in sending Christ to procure for them eternal redemption. This may be apparent in the following paraphrase:

“‘God’ the Father ‘so loved,’ means that he had such a special, transcendent love towards ‘the world’ which he specially loved (meaning miserable, sinful, lost men of all sorts, not only Jews but Gentiles also) ‘that’ this love was an unchangeable purpose and act of his will concerning their salvation. Intending their salvation for the praise of his glorious grace, ‘he gave,’ meaning he prepared a way to prevent their everlasting destruction by appointing and sending ‘his only-begotten Son’ to be an all-sufficient Savior to all who look up to him, ‘that whoever believes in him,’ (referring to all believers whatever – and only them) ‘should not perish, but have everlasting life,’ and thus effectually obtain those glorious things through him which the Lord in his free love had designed for them.”

In enlarging upon these words to set forth what we conceive to be the mind of the Holy Ghost in them, these things are to be observed:

First, we understand the “love” of God to mean that act of his will which causes him to send his Son Jesus Christ, which is the most eminent act of love and favor to the creature; for love is *velle alicui bonum*, “to will good to any.” And God never willed greater good to the creature than in appointing his Son for their redemption. Notwithstanding, I would have it observed that I do not make the purpose of sending or giving Christ to be absolutely subordinate to God’s love to his elect, as though that were the absolute end of the other. Rather, they are both co-ordinate to the same supreme end. They both manifest God’s glory by the way of mercy tempered with justice; but with regard to our apprehension of it, that is the relation in which they stand one to another. And so we say there is no greater love than this.

Secondly, we understand “the world” to refer to the elect of God only, not considered as it is used in this place as such, but under the notion of what serves to further exalt God’s love towards them, which is the end intended here. And this notion is that they are poor, miserable, lost creatures in the world, of the world, scattered abroad in all places of the world, not tied just to Jews or Greeks, but dispersed in every nation, kindred, and language under heaven.

Thirdly, that “every believer,” declares God’s intent in sending or giving his Son, not distributed to the world as the thing beloved, but directed to the persons whose good was intended, that love being an unchangeable intention of their greatest good.

Fourthly, “Should not perish, but have life everlasting” contains an expression of the particular aim and intention of God in this business, which is the certain salvation of believers by Christ. And this in general, is the interpretation of the words which we adhere to, and which will yield various arguments, each sufficient to gut the idea of a general ransom. That they may be better bottomed and more dearly convincing, we will lay down and compare the several words and expressions of this passage whose interpretation we differ about, for the purpose of rejecting the one sense of it and embracing the other:

- The first difference in the interpretation of this place is about the cause of sending Christ; here it is called “love. “
- The second is about the object of this love; here it is called “the world.”
- The third concerns the intention of God in sending his Son; it is said to be that believers might be saved.

FIRST, the cause for sending Christ is Love.

For the **FIRST**, by “love” – all our adversaries agree that what is intended here is a natural affection and propensity in God toward the good of the creature that is generally lost under sin. This moved him to take some way by which the condition might possibly be remedied. We, on the contrary, say that love here does not mean an inclination or propensity of God’s nature, but an act of his will (which is where we conceive his love to be seated), and an eternal purpose to do good to man, which is the most transcendent and eminent act of God’s love to the creature.

That both these may be weighed, to see which is most agreeable to the mind of the Holy Ghost, I will give you, first, some of the reasons by which we oppose the former interpretation; and, secondly, those by which we confirm our own.

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

First, nothing that includes any imperfection is to be assigned to Almighty God: he is God all-sufficient; he is our rock, and his work is perfect. But a natural affection in God toward the good and salvation of all, never being completed nor perfected, carries with it a great deal of imperfection and weakness; not only that, but by necessity it is exceedingly prejudicial to the absolute blessedness and happiness of Almighty God. Look, however much we want to see our desires fulfilled, whether our desires are natural or voluntary, is how much we want of blessedness and happiness. Thus, no natural affection for anything *which is* never to be accomplished can be ascribed to him, such as this general love for all is supposed to be, without impairing the infinite blessedness of the ever-blessed God.

Secondly, if the Lord has such a natural affection for all, loving them enough to send his Son to die for them, then why is it that this affection of his is not accomplished? Why is it that it is hindered and does not produce its effects? Why does the Lord not engage his power to fulfill his desire? “It does not seem good to his infinite wisdom to do so,” they say. Then there is an affection in God which, in his wisdom, he cannot prosecute. Among the sons of men, the worms of the earth, this would be called a brutish affection.

Thirdly, No affection or natural propensity toward good is to be ascribed to God which the Scripture nowhere assigns to him, and which is contrary to what the Scripture does assign to him. Now, the Scripture nowhere assigns to God any natural affection by which he should be naturally inclined toward the good of the creature; the place to prove it clearly is yet to be produced. And it is apparent that it is contrary to what the Scripture does assign to him; for it describes him as being free in showing mercy, every act of it being performed freely by him, even as he pleases, for “he has mercy on whom he will have mercy.” Now, if every act of mercy shown toward anyone proceeds from the free distinguishing will of God (as is apparent), certainly there can be no such natural affection in him.¹ And the truth is, if the Lord were not to show mercy, and this mercy were not extended to the creature merely upon his own distinguishing will, but instead the Lord were naturally moved to show mercy to the miserable, then he should, first, be no more merciful to men than to devils, and secondly, he should be no more merciful to those who are saved than to those who are damned:² for what is natural must be equal in all its operations; and what is natural to God must be eternal. Many more effectual reasons are produced by our divines to deny this natural affection in God, as in the resolution of the Arminian distinction between God’s antecedent and consequent will (I call it so, as now abused by them). The learned reader may repair to them for satisfaction. So that the love mentioned in this passage is not that natural affection toward all in general. But,

Secondly, It is the special love of God for his elect, as we affirm, and so, consequently, it is not any such thing as our adversaries suppose to be intended by it, namely, a velleity³ or natural inclination toward the good of all. For,

First, the love intimated here is absolutely the most eminent and transcendent love that God ever showed or bore towards any miserable creature; indeed, the intention of our Savior is to set it forth in just this way, as is apparent by its emphatic expression in this passage. The particles “so,” “that,” declare no less, pointing out an eximiousness⁴ that is specifically remarkable in the thing of which the affirmation is made, above any other thing of the same kind. Expositors usually lay weight upon almost every particular word of the verse, for the exaltation and demonstration of the love mentioned here.

- “So,” that is, in such a degree, to such a remarkable and astonishing height:
- “God,” the glorious, all-sufficient God, who could have manifested his justice to eternity in the condemnation of all sinners, and in no way wanted them to partake of his blessedness:
- “loved,” with such an earnest intense affection, consisting in an eternal unchangeable act and purpose of his will to bestow the chiefest good (the choicest effectual love):

¹ Owen’s argument is that an act of mercy denies a natural affection for the object of his mercy. Mercy is required so as not to punish the individual for his sin – punishment is the natural inclination, and mercy is the remedy for that inclination.

² Owen’s logic here may seem questionable. If God extended mercy to all, then there are none who are damned. And that’s his point. It suggests that hell must be empty, and hell clearly is not empty. Therefore God cannot “naturally” extend mercy to all.

³ That is, a mere wish or inclination; volition at its lowest level.

⁴ A choice selection; something extraordinary and excellent.

- “the world,” men in the world, of the world, subject to the iniquities and miseries of the world, lying in their blood, having nothing to render them commendable in his eyes, or before him:
- “that he gave;” he did not, as he at first made all the world, speak the word and it was done, but he proceeded higher, to perform a great deal more and longer work, in which he was to do more than exercise an act of his almighty power, as before; and therefore he gave
- “his Son;” not any favorite or other well-pleasing creature; not sun, moon, or stars; not the rich treasure of his creation (all too mean, and coming short of expressing this love); but his *Son*:
- “begotten Son,” and that not so called by reason of some near approaches to him, and filial, obediencial reverence of him, as the angels are called the sons of God; for it was not an angel that he gave, though that would have been an expression of most intense love; nor was it any son by adoption, as believers are the sons of God; but it was his begotten Son, begotten of his own person from eternity; and that son was
- “his only-begotten Son;” it was not any one of his sons, for he had or has but one only-begotten Son, always in his heart, his Isaac, and he gave him: beside this gift, how could the infinite wisdom of God make or give any higher testimony of his love? especially if you will add what is evidently included here, though the time was not as yet come that it should be openly expressed, namely the purpose for which he gave his Son, his only one; not to be a king, and worshipped in the first place, but he “did not spare him, but delivered him up” to death “for us all,” Rom. 8:32.
- To which end, for a close of all, cast your eyes upon his design and purpose in this whole business, and you will find it was that *believers*, those whom he thus loved, “might not perish,” – that is, they might not undergo the utmost misery and wrath unto eternity, which they deserved;
- “but have everlasting life,” eternal glory with himself, which of themselves they could in no way attain; and you will easily grant that “greater love has no man than this.” Jn 15:13

Now, if the love here mentioned is the greatest, highest, and chiefest of all, certainly it cannot be that common affection towards all that we discussed before; for the love by which men are actually and eternally saved is greater than what may consist with the perishing of men unto eternity.

Secondly, the Scripture positively asserts this very love is the chiefest act of the love of God, and what he would have us take notice of in the first place: Rom. 5:8, “God commends his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us;” and fully, 1Jn. 4:9-10, “In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because God sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. In this is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins:” In both passages, the eminency of this love is set forth exceedingly and emphatically toward believers, with such expressions that in no way accommodate a natural velleity toward the good of all.

Thirdly, seeing that all love in God is but *velle alicui bonum*, to will good to those who are beloved, then those to whom he intends the good which is the result and the effect of that

love, are certainly the object of his love; but now the result of this love or the intended good (i.e. not perishing and obtaining eternal life through Christ) only happens to and is only bestowed upon elect believers: therefore, they are certainly the object of this love and they alone; which was the thing we had to declare.

Fourthly, that love which is the cause of giving Christ is always the cause of bestowing all other good things: Rom. 8:32, “The one who spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?” Therefore, if the love mentioned there is the cause of sending Christ, as it is, it must also cause all other things to be given with him, and so it can be directed towards none but those who have those things bestowed on them; which are the elect only, believers only. Who else has grace here or glory hereafter?

Fifthly, the word here, which is *agape*, signifies, in its native importance, *valde dilexit*,¹ to love so as to rest in that love; how it can co-exist with hatred and an eternal purpose not to bestow effectual grace, which is in the Lord towards some, will not easily be made apparent. And now let the Christian reader judge whether the love of God in this passage mentioned is to be understood as a natural velleity or inclination in God toward the good of all, both elect and reprobate, or whether the special love of God toward his elect alone is the fountain of the chiefest good that was ever bestowed on the sons of men. This is the first difference about the interpretation of these words.

SECOND, the object of this love is the “world”

The second thing controverted is the object of this love, pressed by the word “world,” which our adversaries would have mean all and every man. We, the elect of God scattered abroad in the world, with the tacit exception of the Jewish nation before the actual exhibition of Christ in the flesh, and excluding all other nations (some few proselytes excepted), had all the benefits of the promises appropriated to them – Rom. 9:4.² Now all nations have an equal share in those privileges. To confirm the exposition of the word as used by the universalists, I have yet to see anything of weight presented except the word itself; for neither the love mentioned in the beginning, nor the design pointed to at the end of the verse, will possibly agree with the sense which they impose on that word in the middle. Besides, we have declared at large before how weak and infirm an inference they make from the word “world” by reason of its ambiguous and wonderfully various acceptances.

I find three poor shifts in the great champions of this course to prove that the word “world” does not signify the elect. We might have justly expected some reasons to prove that it signified or implied all and every man in the world, which was their own assertion; but instead we have a deep silence from them, being conscious, no doubt, of their inability to offer any such proof. Only, as I said, they bring three pretended arguments to disprove what no one set about to prove, namely, that “the world” means the elect as such; for though we conceive that the men in and of the world who are directly designed here are all God’s elect, and only God’s elect, yet we do not say that they are considered so here. Rather they are considered as men scattered over all the world, who in themselves are subject to misery and sin. So whoever would oppose our

¹ Strongly esteemed or valued.

² Rom 9:4 Who are Israelites; to whom *pertain* the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises;

exposition of this passage must either prove first, that “the world” here must necessarily mean all and every man in the world; or secondly, that it cannot be taken indefinitely for men in the world who materially are elect, though not considered under that formal term. Thus, all those vain flourishes which some men make with these words by putting the word *elect* in place of the word *world*, and then coining absurd consequences, are quite beside the business in hand.

Yet, further, we deny that by placing the word *elect* into the text, any absurdity or untruth will justly follow. Indeed, that flourish which is usually made is just a bugbear to frighten weak ones; for, suppose we should read it thus, “God so loved the *elect*, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish;” what inconvenience will now follow? “Why,” they say, “some of the elect whom God so loved as to send his Son for them, may perish.” Why, I pray? Is it because he sent his Son that they might not perish? Or what other cause? “Because it is said that *whoever* of them believes on him should not perish; which intimates that some of them might not believe.” Very good! But where is there any such intimation? In express words, God designs the salvation of all those for whom he sends his Son; and certainly all who believe shall be saved. But it is the word “whoever”, they say, which divides the world into those who believe and those who do not.

ANSWER:

First, if this word “whoever” divides men, then it restricts the love of God to some and not to others, to one group and not another. And if it does not restrict the love of God, intending the salvation of only some, then it does not divide the afore-mentioned object of his love; and if it *does* restrict it, then all are not intended in the love which moved God to give his Son.¹

Secondly, I deny that the word “whoever” divides the object of God’s love. It only declares his end and aim in giving Christ in the pursuit of that love, namely, that all *believers* might be saved. So the sense is, “God so loved his elect throughout the world, that he gave his Son with this intention: that *believers* might be saved by him.” And this is all that anyone objects to from this passage to disprove our interpretation (besides a few worthless quibblings); which we will now confirm both positively and negatively:

First, our first reason is taken from what was proved before concerning the nature of that love which is here said to have “the world” for its object. This cannot be extended to everyone in the world, as will be confessed by all. Now, such is “the world” here, that it is beloved with that love which we described here, and proved is intended here; it is such a love as is, first, the most transcendent and remarkable; secondly, an eternal act of the will of God; thirdly, the cause of sending Christ; fourthly, an act of giving all good things in and with him; fifthly, an assured fountain and spring of salvation to all those beloved. So that the world beloved with this love cannot possibly be everyone in the world.

Secondly, the word “world” in the next verse, which carries along the sense of this and is a continuation of the same matter, reveals God’s intention in giving his Son. The word must therefore signify the elect and believers, or at least only those who are saved. It is true, the word “world” is used three times in that verse in a dissonant sense, by an inversion which is not unusual in the Scripture, as was declared before. It is the latter passage that this refers to, and has the some meaning as “the world” in verse 16, “That the world might be saved through

¹ i.e., whether there are two groups or not, those who do not believe are not the objects of God’s love or they would be saved.

him,” – *hina sozo* [NT:2443 4982], “that it should be saved!”¹ It reveals the aim, purpose, and intention of God towards the world that he so loved, which is its salvation. Now, if this is understood to speak of any but believers, God fails in his aim and intention, which we dare not grant as yet.

Thirdly, It is not unusual with the Scripture to call God’s chosen people by the name of “the world”, just as it calls them all flesh, all nations, all families of the earth, and similar general expressions. Therefore it is not surprising if they are referred to as *the world* here. The intention of the passage is to exalt and magnify the love of God towards them, which receives no small advancement from their being in every way a world. They are termed this way where Christ is said to be their Savior, John 4:42² which certainly he is, but only of those who are saved. A Savior of men who are not saved is strange. Also John 6:51,³ when he is said to give himself for their life. Clearly, verse 33⁴ of the same chapter, he “gives life to the world:” whether it is any but his elect let all men judge; for Christ himself affirms that he gives life only to his “sheep,” and those to whom he gives life “shall never perish,” chap. 10:27, 28. So Rom. 4:13, Abraham is said by faith to be “heir of the world;” in verse 11 he is called the father of the faithful. And Rom. 11:12, the fall of the Jews is said to be “the riches of the world;” that world is comprised only of believers of all sorts in the world, as when the apostle affirmed that the Gospel word bore fruit “in all the world,” Col. 1:6. This is that “world” which “God reconciles to himself, not imputing their trespasses to them,” 2Cor. 5:19; it is attended with blessedness in all those to whom that non-imputation belongs, Rom. 4:8. And it is for various and evident reasons that they have this appellation; such as,

First, to distinguish the object of this love of God from the angelic nature, which utterly perished in all the fallen individuals, as the Scripture carefully and expressly distinguishes in Heb. 2:16,⁵ and by calling this love of God *philanthropia*, Titus 3:4.⁶

Secondly, to evert and reject the boasting of the Jews, as though all the means of grace and all the benefits intended were appropriated by them.

Thirdly, to denote that great difference and distinction between the old administration of the covenant, when it was tied to one people, family, and nation, and the new, when all boundaries being broken up, the fullness of the Gentiles and the corners of the world were to be made obedient to the scepter of Christ.

Fourthly, To manifest the condition of the elect themselves, who are thus beloved, to declare the free grace of God towards them, since they are divested of all qualifications except those which qualify them as terrene, earthly, lost, miserable, and corrupted.

This much at least may easily be obtained, that nothing can be justly opposed to our exposition of this passage from the word “world” itself, as has been declared already, and which will further be made manifest.

¹ Actually it’s aorist passive subjunctive: “that it *might* be saved” – only the sovereignty of God makes it “should.”

² Jn 4:42 – “...this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.”

³ Jn 6:51 – “...the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.”

⁴ Jn 6:33 – “For the bread of God is he which comes down from heaven, and gives life to the world.”

⁵ Heb 2:16 For surely he did not take on *him* the nature of angels {or lay hold of}, but he took on *him* the seed of Abraham.

⁶ Tit 3:4 But after that the kindness and love {*philanthropia*} of God our Saviour toward man appeared, ...

Fourthly, if everyone in the world is intended, why does the Lord not, in the pursuit of this love, reveal Jesus Christ to everyone whom he so loved? *Strange* that the Lord should so love men as to give his only-begotten Son for them, and yet not once by any means indicate his love to them, as he does not indicate it to countless people! – that he should love them, and yet order things in such a way, in his wise dispensation, that this love should be altogether vain and fruitless! – love them, and yet determine that they will receive no good by his love, though his love indeed wills the great good to them!

Fifthly, unless you will grant,

First, some are beloved and also hated from eternity;

Secondly, the love of God towards countless people is vain and fruitless;

Thirdly, The Son of God is given for those who never hear a word of him and have no power granted to them to believe in him;

Fourthly, that God is mutable in his love, or else he still loves those in hell;

Fifthly, that he does not give all things to those to whom he gives his Son, contrary to Rom. 8:32;¹

Sixthly, that he does not certainly know beforehand who will believe and be saved;

Unless, I say, all these blasphemies and absurdities are granted, it cannot be maintained that “the world” here means every one of mankind, but it means only men in common scattered throughout the world, who are the elect.

THIRD, the intent of God in sending his Son is to save believers

The **THIRD** difference about these words concerns the means by which this love of the Father, whose object is said to be the world, is made out to them. Now, this love of the Father is made out to them by *believing*: “that whoever believes,” or “that every believer.” We take the intention of these words to be the designing or manifesting of the way by which the elect of God come to partake of the fruits of the love set forth here. That way is by faith in Christ, God having appointed that as the only way by which he will communicate to us the life that is in his Son. To this something was said before, having proved that the term “whoever” does not divide the object of the love of God; to which, also, we may add these following reasons:

First, if the object is restricted here, so that only some of those for whose sake Christ is sent will believe and be saved, then this restriction and the determination of the fruits of this love depends either on the will of God, or on the persons themselves. If it depends on the persons themselves, then they are the ones who make themselves differ from others, contrary to 1Cor. 4:7.² If it depends on the will of God, then you make the sense of the passage to be, “God so loved all in a such a way that only some of them should partake of the fruits of his Love.” To what end, then, I pray, did he love those others? Is it not this: “Out with the sword, and run the dragon through with the spear?”

¹ Rom 8:32 He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?

² 1Cor 4:7 For who makes you to differ *from another*? and what do you have that you did not receive?

Secondly, seeing that these words, “that whoever believes”, specifically point out the aim and intention of God in this business, if it restricts the object that is beloved, then the salvation of believers is confessedly the aim of God in this business, and that salvation distinguishes believers from others; and if this is so, then the general ransom is an empty sound, because it has no dependence on the purpose of God. His intention is carried out in giving his Son only for the salvation of believers, and that is done determinately, unless you think God is ignorant of those who will believe.

These words, then, “whoever believes”, designate the means by which the Lord will bring us to participate in life through his Son whom he gave for us; and the following words about having life everlasting, make out the whole counsel of God in this matter, subordinate to his own glory; it follows from these,

That God did not give his Son,

1. for those who never believe;
2. much less for those who never hear of him, and so evidently lack the means of faith;¹
3. for those on whom he has determined not to bestow effectual grace so that they might believe.

Now, let the reader take up the several parts of these opposite expositions, weigh them all, try all things, with a special consideration of the love of God, and inquire seriously whether a general affection and a natural velleity toward the good of all is consistent with the perishing of anyone who is so beloved. Or is it rather the special, transcendent love of the Father toward his elect, as asserted before, that is consistent with the salvation of every one of his beloved; and then determine whether it is a general ransom, fruitless with regard to most for whom it was paid, or the effectual redemption of the elect only, which has the firmest and strongest foundation in these words of our Savior. Remember that these passages are produced as the strongest support of the adverse cause. And yet it is most apparent that both the cause of sending Christ and the end intended by the Lord in doing so, as expressed in these very passages, are altogether inconsistent with a general ransom or a general affection toward all men.

CHAPTER III – Other texts produced by Universalists

Unfolding the remaining texts of Scripture produced for the confirmation of the first general argument for universal redemption.

NEXT to the passage considered before, what is urged with the most confidence and pressed with the most importunity for the defense of the general ransom is,

2. *1Jn. 2:1-2*

“If any man sins, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.” Now, these words, and the deductions from them, have been set out in various dresses with a great variety of observations to make them appear advantageous to the cause in hand. The weight of

¹ This is an interesting proposition, and one not very well supported by Scripture. Faith comes by hearing, but not salvation. Salvation comes by grace, and that grace is eternally decreed – it is not triggered or activated by faith but by the will of God. It is not dependent on the action or inaction of men, but on the action of God. This doesn't relieve us of our responsibilities, however.

the whole hangs upon this, that the apostle affirms that Christ is the “propitiation for the sins of the whole world.” They say it “manifestly appears to be everyone in the world,”

First, “From the words themselves without any wresting; for what can be meant by the whole world, but all men in the world?”

Secondly, “From the contrast that is made between *world* and *believers*. All believers comprise the first part of the apostle’s assertion that Christ is a propitiation for *our* sins; and therefore, in contrast to all believers, *the world* is understood to be all *others*.”

If anything else of import is taken in exception, we will address it in our opening of the passage which follows. Before I further clear the mind of the Holy Ghost in these words, I must tell you that I might answer the objection from this passage very briefly, and yet so solidly as to quite cut off all the quibbling exceptions of our adversaries. Namely, that “the world” used in other passages denotes men living in the world. So by “the whole world” in this passage, nothing more is meant than men living throughout the whole world, that is, in all the parts and regions of that world (in opposition to the inhabitants of any one nation, place, or country). This is what the redeemed of Christ are said to be in Rev. 5:9.¹ But because our opponents boast of this passage, I will, by God’s assistance, open the sense and meaning of it in such a way that it will appear to all how little reason they have to place any confidence in their wrested interpretation of it.

To make out the meaning of this passage, three things are to be considered:

- (1.) To whom the apostle writes.
- (2.) What is his purpose and aim in this particular passage.
- (3.) The meaning of these two expressions:

- [1.] Christ being a “propitiation;” and
- [2.] “The whole world.”

Having done this according to the analogy of faith, the scope of this and other parallel passages, and with reference to the use of the words themselves, we will easily manifest by undeniable reasons that the text cannot be understood as it is urged and wrested for universal redemption.

- (1.) To whom the Apostle writes

Discovering those to whom the epistle was specifically directed will give some light into the meaning of the apostle. This is one of those things which is very valuable in the investigation of the right meaning of any passage. For although this and an other parts of divine Scripture were given for the use, benefit, and direction of the whole church, yet many parts of it were directed to specific churches and particular persons, and some distinct sorts of persons. They so immediately aim at some things to be taught, reprov'd, removed, or established, with direct reference to those specific persons and churches, that it takes no labor to prove it. We have nothing written that expressly denotes those to whom this epistle was primarily directed and would enable us to make an assertion that is infallibly true and *de fide*. Yet, by clear and evident deduction, it may be made more than probable that it was intended for the Jews, or believers of the circumcision:

First, John was in a special manner a minister and an apostle to the Jews, and therefore they were the most immediate and proper objects of his care: “James, Cephas, and John gave to

¹ Rev 5:9 You are worthy to take the book, and to open its seals: for you were slain, and have redeemed us to God by your blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;

Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that they should go unto the heathen, and themselves unto the circumcision,” Gal. 2:9. It was James whom Paul refers to there who wrote the epistle of James, because James the brother of John was slain earlier. Now, Peter and James, in the prosecution of their apostleship towards the Jews, wrote epistles to them in their dispersion, James 1:1, 1Pet. 1:1, just as Paul did to all the chief churches planted by him among the Gentiles. So it is more than probable that John, writing the epistle, directed it primarily to those who were the chief objects of his care and apostleship.

Secondly, he frequently intimates that those to whom he wrote were those who heard and received the word from the beginning; so it says twice in this chapter in verse 7, “I write an old commandment, which you had from the beginning, ...which you heard from the beginning.” Now, the promulgation of the gospel had its beginnings among the Jews, and its first introduction with the Jews before the conversion of any of the Gentiles, which was a mystery for a season. This is apparent from the story of the Acts of the Apostles. chap. 1-5, 10, 11. “To the Jew first, and also to the Greek,” was the divinely appointed order, Rom. 1:16.

Thirdly, the contrast that the apostle makes between us and the world in this very passage is sufficient to make apparent the ones to whom he wrote. As a Jew, he reckons himself with and among the believing Jews to whom he wrote. He sets himself with them in contrast to the residue of believers in the world; and this is usual with this apostle, and how he is to be understood as he declares in his Gospel, chap. 11:51-52.¹

Fourthly, the frequent mention and cautions that he gives about false teachers, seducers, and antichrists evidently declare that this epistle was especially directed to those who were more open and susceptible to the seductions of their countrymen than others. In those first days they were mostly, if not all, men of the Circumcision; this is clear from Scripture and ecclesiastical story. It was these of whom the apostle said, “they went out from them,” 1Jn. 2:19.

Now this being thus cleared up, if you will also remember what was said before concerning the inveterate hatred of that people towards the Gentiles, and the ingrafted opinion they had concerning their own sole interest in the redemption procured and purchased by their Messiah, it will be no difficult thing for anyone to discern the aim of the apostle in this passage, in the expression at which we are stuck. “He,” says he, “is the propitiation for our sins,” – that is, *our* sins, those who are believers among the Jews; and lest by this assertion they should take the opportunity to confirm themselves in their former error,² he adds, “And not, for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world,” or, “The children of God scattered abroad,” as in John 11:51- 52, of whatever nation, kindred, tongue, or language they were.³ So we do not have here a contrast between the effectual salvation of all believers and the ineffectual redemption of all others, but an extension of the same effectual redemption which belonged to the Jewish believers, to all other believers or children of God throughout the whole world.

¹ Jn 11:51-52 And this he did not speak of himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; And not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad.

² That is, the error that the Gospel is only for the Jews, and not for Gentiles.

³ Rev 5:9; 14:6

(2.) The aim and intention of the apostle

These words give consolation to *believers* against their sins and failings: “If any man sins, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins.” The very order and series of the words, without further enlargement, proves this to be so. He intended this consolation for believers only, so that they would not despair or utterly faint under their infirmities, because a sufficient, indeed, an effectual remedy is provided. This is evident because:

First, they alone have an advocate; it is confessed that believers alone have an interest in Christ’s advocacy.

Secondly, in such a case, comfort belongs only to believers; to others who are in a state and condition of alienation, wrath denounces them, John 3:36.¹

Thirdly, they are the “little children” to whom he writes, 1Jn. 2:1; they are the ones whom he describes in verses 12-13² that have “their sins forgiven them for his name’s sake,” and who “know the Father.”

So the aim of the apostle is to offer consolation to believers in their failings; he can only speak of them. And if he should extend to everyone the consolation of which he speaks, namely, that Christ was their propitiation, I cannot conceive how this can possibly serve its purpose, or console believers; for what comfort can arise by telling them that Christ died for countless people who will be damned? Will that be any refreshment to me when I hold it in common with those who perish eternally? Is this not more a pumice-stone than a breast of consolation? If you ask, “how can comfort be given to everyone, unless Christ died for them?” I say, “If by everyone you mean all *believers*, Christ is, as asserted in the text, a propitiation and an advocate for them *all*. If by everyone, you mean all *others*, reprobates and unbelievers, I say that there is neither in the death of Christ nor in the word of God any solid spiritual consolation prepared for them; the children’s bread must not be cast to dogs.”

(3.) The meaning of the words “propitiation” and “whole world”

Next to be considered is the meaning and purpose of the word “propitiation,” which Christ is said to be for “us,” and “the whole world.”

First, the meaning of the word “propitiation”

The word in the original is *hilasmos* [NT:2434], only used twice in the New Testament: here, and chap. 4:10 of this same epistle. The verb also, *hilaskomai* [NT:2433], is only used twice; namely, Heb. 2:17, translated there (and properly, considering the construction it is in) “to make reconciliation;” in Luke 18:13, it is the word of the publican, “Be merciful to me.” There is also another word of the same root with a like meaning; it is also twice used, namely, *hilasterion* [NT:2435]; in Rom. 3:25, it is translated “a propitiation;” and in Heb. 9:5, it is rendered “the mercy-seat.” This will give some light into the meaning of the word. What Exodus 25:17 calls *capporeth* [OT:3727], from *caphar* [OT:3722], properly to cover, is here called *hilasterion*; it is

¹ Jn 3:36 - He that believes on the Son has everlasting life: and he that does not believe on the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abides on him.

² 1Jn 2:12-13 I write to you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name’s sake. I write to you, fathers, because you have known him *that is* from the beginning. I write to you, young men, because you have overcome the wicked one. I write to you, little children, because you have known the Father.

what Christ is said to be in Rom. 3:25. Now, this mercy-seat was a plate of pure gold, two cubits and a half long, and a cubit and a half broad, like the uppermost plate or board of a table; that was laid upon the ark and shadowed over with the wings of the cherubim. Now, this word *kapporeth* comes as was said, from *kaphar*, whose first native and genuine sense is “to cover,” (though most commonly rendered “to expiate.”) This plate or mercy-seat was so called because it was placed upon the ark and covered it, as the wings of the cherubim hovered over it; the mystical use of it is to hide, as it were, the law or rigid tenor of the covenant of works which was in the ark. God thereby declares himself to be pacified or reconciled, the cause of anger and enmity being hidden. Hence the word comes to have its second acceptance, what the apostle renders *hilasterion*, “placamen” or “placamentum” – that by which God is appeased.

This that cover plainly signified, being shadowed with the wings of the cherubim denoting God’s presence in power and goodness; the cherubim were made crouching over it, as the wings of a hen over her chickens. Hence that prayer of David, to be “hid under the shadow of God’s wings,” Ps. 36:7, 57:1, 61:4, 63:7, 91:4 (and perhaps that allusion of our Savior in Matt. 23:37), intimating the favorable protection of God in mercy, denoted by the winds of the cherubim covering the propitiatory, embracing what covered the bill of accusation; this, typically, was that table or golden plate or covering described before; it truly and really is Jesus Christ, as is expressly affirmed in Rom. 3:25.

Now, all this will give us some light into the meaning of the word, and so, consequently, into the sense of this place, with the mind of the Holy Ghost therein. *hilasmos* and *hilasterion*, both translated “a propitiation,” with the verb of the same original do signify what was done or typically effected by the mercy seat, namely, to appease, pacify, and reconcile God with regard to aversation for sin. Hence that phrase, Heb. 2:17, “*hilaskomai* for the sins of the people,” which the Latinists render “*Expiare peccata populi*,” “To expiate the sins of the people.” (“*expiare*” is, in this business, to turn away anger by an atonement. So the historian writes, “*Solere reges ostenta coelestia caede aliqua illustri expiare, atque a semet in capita procerum depellere*,” Suet. in Neron. 36.) We render it, “To make reconciliation for the sins of the people.” The word will bear both, the meaning being to appease, or pacify, or satisfy God for sin, that it might not be imputed to them towards whom he was so appeased. “Propitiation for the sins of the people,” is as much as “To pacify God concerning sin.” Hence the word receives another meaning, that in which it is used by the publican in Luke 18:13, ““Be merciful to me;” that is, “Let me enjoy that mercy from which flows the pardon of sin, by being appeased towards me, and reconciled to me.” From all which it appears that the meaning of the word *hilasmos*, or “propitiation,” which Christ is said to be, is that by which the law is covered, God is appeased and reconciled, sin is expiated, and the sinner is pardoned; from this image, pardon and remission of sin is so often portrayed as the product and fruit of his blood-shedding, by which he was a “propitiation,” Matt. 26:28; Eph. 1:7; Col 1:14; Heb. 9:22; Rom. 3:25, 5:9; 1Jn. 1:7; 1Pet. 1:2; Rev. 1:5.

From what has been said, the evident sense of the passage is that Christ has so expiated sin, and reconciled us to God, that the sinner is pardoned and receives mercy for Christ’s sake, and the law will never be produced or presented to condemn him. Now, whether this can be tolerably applied to the whole world (taking it for all and every man in the world), let all the men in the world who are able judge: Are the sins of everyone expiated? Is God reconciled to everyone? Is every sinner pardoned? Will no one have the transgression of the law charged to him? If so, then why is everyone not saved? Doubtless, all these things are true of every believer, but of no one else in the whole world. For them alone, the apostle affirmed that Christ is a propitiation; it is

where his advocacy arises from that he promises as the fountain of their consolation, and he affirms what it consists of, which is a presentation of the atonement made by Christ's blood. Christ is also a propitiation only by faith, Rom. 3:25. Surely none but believers have faith. And therefore it is certainly believers alone, throughout the world, for whom Christ is a propitiation. To them alone God says, "I will be propitious," – the great word of the new covenant, Heb. 8:12-13,¹ and they alone are the covenanters.

Secondly, the meaning of the phrase "of the whole world"

Let us consider the phrase "of the whole world." I will not declare how the word "world" has diverse meanings in the Scripture, partly because I have in some measure already done that; partly because it is not in itself so much insisted on here, but only with reference to its general adjunct, *whole*, "the whole world." And therefore, we must speak to the whole phrase together. Now, concerning this expression, I say,

First, since this phrase and what is equivalent to it, "all the world", are used seven or eight times in the New Testament, it cannot be made apparent, clearly and undeniably, that in any of these places it comprises all and every man in the world (save perhaps one, where it is used in *re necessaria*). Unless some circumstance in this passage enforces that sense (which it does not), it will be a plain wresting of the words to force that interpretation on them. Let us, then, briefly look at the passages, beginning with the last, and ascending forward. Now, that is Rev. 3:10, "I will keep you from the hour of temptation, which will come "upon all the world," (the word "world" is different in the original here than it is in the place we have before us. That is because there are various words to express the same thing, but they are considered under several conceptions); In this passage it cannot signify everyone. That is evident because some are promised to be preserved from what is said to come upon it. Passing over this passage then, the next one is Col 1:6, "Which is come to you as in all the world." Where,

1. All and every man cannot be understood to be the meaning of the phrase, for they had not all then received the gospel.
2. Only believers are signified here, living abroad in the world, because the gospel is said to "bring forth fruit" in those to whom it comes, and there is no true gospel fruit without faith and repentance.

Another passage is Rom. 1:8, "Your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world." Did everyone in the world hear and speak of the Roman faith? You have this phrase also in Luke 2:1, "There went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed;" yet this was only the Roman empire, short enough of comprising all singular persons in the world. It is needless to repeat the rest of the passages because they are all of the same indefinite importance and meaning.

If, then, the expression itself does not show any such universality as is pretended, unless the matter in which it is used and the circumstances of the passage require it (neither of which apply in John 3:16), there is no basis to fasten such an acceptance on it. Rather we may conclude that since "all the world" and "the whole world", as used in other passages, are taken indefinitely for men of all sorts throughout the world, the same words are not to be understood differently here.

¹ Heb 8:12-13 For I will be merciful [NT:2436 *hileos*, propitious] to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities I will remember no more. In that he says, a new *covenant*; he has made the first old...

Secondly, “the whole world” can signify no more than all nations, all the families of the earth, all flesh, all men, or all the ends of the world. These surely are expressions equivalent to and as comprehensive in their particulars as “the whole world.” But we frequently find all these expressions refer to believers only, of all sorts, as situated throughout the world. Why should this phrase not also be affirmed to be, in the same matter, of the same and no other importance? We may give some instances in other passages: “All the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God,” Ps. 98:3; “All the ends of the world shall remember and turn to the LORD, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before you,” Ps. 22:27; “All nations shall serve you,” Ps. 72:11. These general expressions denote no more than the believers of all the various nations of the world who alone see the salvation of God, remember, and turn to him and serve him. So it is in Joel 2:28, “I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh;” these words are repeated on the accomplishment of that promise in Acts 2:17. Luke uses the same expression as part of a sermon of John Baptist, “All flesh shall see the salvation of God.”¹ What a conquest we would have proclaimed if it had been affirmed anywhere that Christ died for all flesh, all nations, all kindreds, etc.! These are merely the liveries² of believers, though garments as wide and as large as this expression, “the whole world.” Believers are called “all nations” in Isa. 2:2, 66:18; indeed, “all men,” Tit. 2:11. For it is to believers alone that the salvation-bringing grace of God is manifested. If then the children of God are, as is apparent in the Scripture phrases *all flesh, all nations, all kindreds, all the ends of the world, all the ends of the earth, and all men*, then why not also *the whole world*?

Thirdly, “the whole world” does sometimes signify the worser part of the world; and why may it not, by a like *synecdoche*,³ signify the better part of that? Rev. 12:9, “The Devil, and Satan, which deceives the whole world, is cast out;” that is, the wicked and reprobate in the whole world, while all others rejoice in his overthrow, verse 10. 1Jn. 5:19, “The whole world lies in wickedness,” where “the whole world” is opposed to those who are “of God” in the beginning of the verse. You have the contrary sense in Col. 1:6.⁴

This then being said to clarify the meaning of the expression that is insisted on here, will make it evident that there is nothing at all in the words themselves that would force anyone to conceive that all and every man in the world are denoted by them. Rather they denote believers, all that did or would believe throughout the whole world, in contrast to believers of the Jewish nation. Besides what has been clearly demonstrated so far, I further prove that this is the meaning of the passage in 1 Jn 2:1-2 for these reasons:

First, this passage does not address the ransom of Christ with regard to impetration,⁵ but with regard to application;⁶ for it affirms that Christ is a ransom by his death, which he is, but only

¹ Lk 3:6

² Distinctive clothing, like a uniform, that identifies the servants of a particular household.

³ A figure of speech in which a part is used for the whole (as *hand* for *sailor* – “*all hands on deck!*”), the whole for a part (as *the law* for *police officer*), the specific for the general (as *cutthroat* for *assassin*), the general for the specific (as *thief* for *pickpocket*), or the material for the thing made from it (as *steel* for *sword*).

⁴ Col 1:5-6 For the hope which is laid up for you in heaven, of which you heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel; Which has come to you, as *it has* in all the world; and brings forth fruit, as *it does* also in you, since the day you heard *of it*, and knew the grace of God in truth:

⁵ Impetration: obtaining by petition or entreaty.

⁶ i.e., Jn 3:16 is not about applying for a general ransom, but applying that ransom specifically to believers.

by faith, as manifested in Rom. 3:25.¹ Also, consolation only arises from the actual application of that ransom to a believer; now, no one ever said that the application of the death of Christ was universal: therefore, this passage cannot regard everyone.

Secondly, Christ is said here to be a propitiation only for those who are intended in the passage, which is apparent; but only believers are intended, for it is intended to console them in their failings (in which case consolation belongs to them alone²): therefore, it is only for believers, though believers of all sorts, times, places, and conditions; those for whom Christ is said to be a propitiation.

Thirdly, this kind of phrase and expression in other places *in Scripture* cannot possibly be tortured to such an extent as to comprehend everyone, as should be apparent from the previous passages which alleged to do so. To these we might add Matt. 3:5, “Then all Judea went out to him, and all the region round about Jordan;” this included the Pharisees who rejected his baptism.³ Why, then, should the phrase be understood to include everyone here in 1Jn.2:1-2, especially when all the circumstances (as has been shown) are contrary to such an interpretation?

Fourthly, the most clear parallel passages in the Scripture are opposite to the sense being imposed on 1John 2:1-2. See Col. 1:6;⁴ John 11:51, 52.

Fifthly, if the words are understood to signify everyone in the world, then the whole assertion is useless as to the chief end it intends, namely, the consolation of believers. For what consolation arises to any believer to say that Christ was a propitiation for those who perish? Indeed, to say that he was a sufficient propitiation for them, though not effectual, yields no more comfort to them than it would have yielded Jacob and his sons to hear from Joseph that he had sufficient corn to sustain them all, but whether he would do so was altogether uncertain. For had he told them he would sustain them sufficiently, though not effectually, they might have starved notwithstanding his courtesy.

“The whole world,” then, in this passage, is the whole people of God (as opposed to the Jewish nation), who are scattered abroad throughout the whole world, of whatever nation, kindred, tongue, or family. It is those who are some of all sorts, not all of every sort, so that this passage makes no argument for general redemption.

There are some objections usually laid against our interpretation of this passage of the apostle, but they are all prevented or removed in the explication itself; so it will suffice for us to name just one or two of them:

OBJECTION 1. “It is the intention of the apostle to comfort all in their fear and doubt; but everyone in the world may be in fear and doubt: therefore, he proposes this propitiation for all, that they may all be comforted.”

¹ Rom 3:25 Whom God has set forth *to be* a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;

² Unbelievers, who remain dead in their trespasses and sins, are not consoled.

³ That is, all the Pharisees could not have been included in “all” those gone out to him, because they rejected such a baptism. Who then was John the Baptist referring to as the brood of vipers, if not the The point is that not every man, woman, and child in Judea and the Jordan territory went out to him.

⁴ Col 1:5-6 You heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel, which has come to you; even as it is also bearing fruit and increasing in all the world, as in you...

ANSWER: All may be in fear and doubt, yet as far as the business of consolation goes, the phrase must of necessity be restrained to believers, as declared before.

OBJECTION 2. “All *believers* are comprehended in the first part, ‘For *our* sins;’ and therefore by extending the assertion, all others are intended by adding, ‘For the sins of the whole world’”

ANSWER:

1. In the first part, the believing Jews alone are intended, of whom John was one;¹ and the addition is therefore not an extension of the propitiation of Christ to others who are unbelievers, but only to other believers.²

2. It might be granted that in the first part, all believers then living were comprehended, those who might presently be made partakers of this truth; if so, then by analogy the increase must be only those who were to become believers in later ages and in remoter places than the name of Christ had then reached; it would refer to all those, according to the prayer of our Savior in John 17:20, who would believe on his name to the end of the world. And thus the two main passages produced to confirm the first argument are vindicated from the false glosses and violent twists of our adversaries; the rest will be easily cleared.

3. *John 6:51*

The next passage urged in the argument is John 6:51³, where our Savior affirms that he will give his “flesh for the life of the world.” This giving of himself was the sanctifying and offering up of himself as an acceptable oblation for the sins of those for whom he suffered; his intention is that those for whom he offered himself in dying might thereby have eternal life. Because it was not for the Jews only, but also for all the elect of God everywhere, he calls them “the world.” The world here cannot signify everyone that ever was or will be; this is as manifest as if it were written with the beams of the sun; and that is because “the world” is made the object of Christ’s intent, which is to purchase for them, and bestow upon them, life and salvation. Now, I ask whether any man, not bereaved of all spiritual and natural sense, can imagine that Christ, in his oblation, intended to purchase life and salvation for all those whom he knew to be damned many ages before, the irreversible decree of wrath having gone forth against them? Or who dares affirm that Christ gave himself for the life of those who, notwithstanding his sacrifice, by his appointment to save, still come short of salvation unto eternity? If we had no other place but this one to show that the word “world” does not always signify all, but only signifies some of all sorts, as are the elect of God, though this passage is produced by our adversaries to prove the contrary, I hope with all equitable readers that our defense of it would receive no prejudice.

4. *2Cor 5:19*

I find various other passages produced by Thomas Moore in chap. 14 of the “Universality of Free Grace” to prove the pretended universal redemption; these, along with that whole chapter, will be briefly considered.

The first insisted upon by him is 2Cor 5:19, “God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses to them.”

¹ Hence “our sins”

² That is, to other non-Jewish believers – specifically the Gentiles to whom Paul was called to preach.

³ John 6:51 I am the living bread which came down out of heaven: if any eats of this bread, he shall live forever: indeed, the bread which I will give for the life of the world is my flesh.

ANSWER:

1. Really he must have no small confidence in his own strength and his readers' weakness, who would undertake from this passage to conclude the universality of redemption, and that "the world" signifies everyone in it. Those who are called the "world" in verse 19 are termed "us" in verse 18, "He has reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ;" this is also true in verse 21 where they are further described by Christ's being "made sin for them," and their being "made the righteousness of God in him." Are these things true of all who are in the world? If this text may receive any light from what is before and after it, if the word may receive any interpretation from those expressions which directly speak to it, then "the world" here can only mean elect believers.

2. The description of God's reconciling the world to himself evidently consists in or necessarily infers a non-imputation of sin to that world and an imputation of the righteousness of Christ, verse 21. Now, the blessedness of justification in Christ consists in these two things, Rom. 4:6, 7; therefore this whole world, which God in Christ reconciles to himself, is a blessed, justified world; and therefore not every one of the sons of men that ever were, or are, or will be in the world, are included; for the great part of them lie in evil.

3. This "God in Christ reconciling" holds out an effectual work of reconciliation. Now, this must be either an absolute reconciliation or a conditional reconciliation. If it is absolute, then why are not all actually and absolutely reconciled, pardoned, and justified? If it is conditional, then, first, how can a conditional reconciliation be reconciled with what is actual? Secondly, why is no condition mentioned here? Thirdly, what is that condition? Is it faith and believing? Then the sense of the words must be either, first, "God was in Christ reconciling a believing world to himself," in which case there is no need, for believers are reconciled; or, secondly, "God was in Christ reconciling an unbelieving world to himself, on condition that it believes;" that is, on condition that it is not unbelieving; that is, on condition that it is reconciled. Is this the mind of the Holy Spirit? Fourthly, if this reconciliation of the world consists (as it does) in a non-imputation of sin, then this is either a non-imputation of all their sins, or only of some sins. If it is only of some, then Christ saves only from some sins. If it is of all sins, then it is of unbelief also, or else unbelief is no sin; if that were true, then all the men in the world must be saved, because their unbelief is pardoned. The world here, then, is only the world of blessed, pardoned believers, who are "made the righteousness of God in Christ."

What Thomas Moore brings to enforce the opposite meaning of the word is, in so many words, very little. He spends a great deal of time with many uncouth¹ expressions to prove that there is a twofold reconciliation intimated in the text. The first reconciliation is of God to us by Christ, the other is of us to God by the Spirit; which we also grant, though we do not divide them, but make them several parts of the same reconciliation. The former is the rule of the latter for, look, whomever is reconciled to God in and by Christ, will certainly be reconciled to God by the Spirit; God's reconciliation to them consists in a non-imputation of their sins; their reconciliation to him consists in an acceptance of that non-imputation in Jesus Christ. And as it is the rule of the latter, so is it the chief motive for it. It is the subject or matter of the message in the gospel by which it is effected. So the assertion that there is a twofold reconciliation, or rather two branches of the same complete work of reconciliation, establishes our persuasion that "the world" can only be taken to mean the elect in that world.

¹ That is, uneducated or unrefined.

But he brings further light from the context to strengthen his interpretation. “For,” he says, “those of the world here are called ‘men,’ verse 11 ; men that must ‘appear before the judgment-seat of Christ,’ verse 10; that were ‘dead,’ verse 14; that ought to live unto Christ, verse 15: therefore, *all* men.” Now, “*homini homo quid interest?*” How easy is it for some men to prove what they please! Only let me tell you, one thing more is to be done so that the cause may be yours, namely, proving that the elect of God are not men; that they must not appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that they were not dead; that they ought not to live to Christ. Do this, or you lose the reward.

But he adds,

First, “Of these, some are reconciled to God,” verse 18.

ANSWER: It is most false that there is any limitation or restriction of reconciliation to some of those whom he addresses; it is rather evidently extended to all of them.¹

Secondly, “But some are not reconciled,” verse 11.

ANSWER: There is not a word of any such thing in the text, nor can the least hint possibly be wrested from the text for any such assertion. “Many corrupt the word of God.”

5. *John 1:9*

A second passage he urges is John 1:9, “That was the true Light, which lights every man that comes into the world.” “This world,” he says, “is the world of mankind, verse 4, made by Christ, verse 3; which was his own by creation, mercy, and purchase, yet they ‘received him not,’ verses 5, 10, 11. Therefore, it is manifest that there is life, and that Christ died for all.”

ANSWER: “The world” here does not mean men in the world, whether all or some, but the habitable part of the earth. This is more apparent than can well admit of proof or illustration. The phrase “coming into the world” cannot possibly be apprehended any other way. It is the same as being born, and coming to breathe the common air. Now, among the expositions of this passage that seem most consonant and agreeable to the discourse of the apostle, with other expressions that are used here, the word “coming” refers to “light” and not to “man”; the words should thus be rendered, “That was the true Light, which, coming into the world, lights every man.” So it is in John 3:19, “Light has come into the world;” and chap. 12:46, “I am a light come into the world;” – parallel expressions to this one. So nothing can be extorted from the word “world” for the universality of grace or ransom. The whole weight must lie on the words “every man,” which Thomas Moore does not at all insist upon; and if anyone else should insist upon them, the subject of the phrase which holds out the actual illumination can be extended to no more than those who are indeed illuminated.

Christ, then, coming into the world, is said to enlighten every man, partly because every man that has any light has it from him; that is partly because he is the only true light and fountain of illumination, so that he enlightens everyone who is enlightened. This is all the text avers, and it is denied by none. But whether everyone in the world, before and after his incarnation, were, are, and will actually be enlightened with the knowledge of Christ by his coming into the world, let Scripture, experience, reason, and sense determine. And this, in brief, may suffice to manifest the

¹ More’s assertion is that all men are being reconciled, and elect are men; therefore some are reconciled and some are not. Owen rejects More’s premise that Christ reconciled all men but saved only some. Rather, Christ reconciled *all* the elect without exception, because all men are *not* elect, and Christ intended to reconcile only the elect.

weakness of the argument for universal redemption from this passage. Waiving for the present another interpretation of the words, and rendering the enlightening that is mentioned here as that of reason and understanding which is communicated to all, Christ is here proposed to be in his divine nature the light of all, even the eternal wisdom of his Father.

6. *John 1:29*

A third place is John 1:29, “Behold the Lamb of God, which takes away the sin of the world;” and this, he says, is spoken of the world in general.

ANSWER:

1. Even if it is spoken of the world in general, yet nothing can be inferred from that which leads to a universality of individuals.
2. That Christ is “the Lamb” is most certain; He is the one that takes away, bears, purges, or pardons, as the word is used in 2Sam. 24:10. He takes away “the sin,” great sin, original sin, “of the world,” meaning the sin that is common to all. He takes it away by justification so that it will not condemn; he takes it away by sanctification so that it should not reign; he takes it away by glorification so that it should not exist. But to say that he takes it away from, bears it for, pardons it for, and purges it out of all and every man in the world is not in the least manner intimated in the text, and this is exceedingly false in itself.

7. *John 3:17*

John 3:17 is the next passage urged by him, “God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world might be saved through him.”

ANSWER: A notable or eminent inversion of the word “world” in this passage was observed before; it is like that in chap. 1:10, “He was in the world,” or on the earth, a part of it, “and the world was made by him,” the whole would, with all the things contained in it, “and the world did not know him,” or most men living in the world. So here in the first place, “the world” means that part of the world in which our Savior lived has the name of the whole world assigned to it. In the second place, you may take it to mean everyone in the world if you please (though from the text it cannot be enforced); for the prime end of our Savior’s coming was not to condemn anyone, but to save his own; much less was it to condemn everyone in the world out of which he was to save his elect. In the third place, only those whom God sent his Son on purpose to save are intended, as the words eminently show. Saving those who then are called “the world” was the very purpose and design of God in sending his Son. Now, it is evident that these are not all men, but only believing Jews and Gentiles throughout the world because:

1. All are not saved, and the Lord has said “he will do all his pleasure, and his purpose shall stand.”
2. Most men were at that instant actually damned. Did he send his Son so that they might be saved?
3. Christ was appointed for the fall of some, Luke 2:34,¹ and, therefore he was not appointed so that everyone might be saved.

¹ Behold, this *child* is set for the falling and the rising of many in Israel;

4. The purpose of Christ's actual exhibition and of being sent in the flesh is not opposite to any of God's eternal decrees which were eternally fixed concerning the condemnation of some for their sins.

Did he send his Son to save such as these? Does he act contrary to his own purposes, or fail in his undertakings? The "saved world" is the people of God scattered abroad throughout the world.

8. *John 4:42; 1Jn. 4:14; John 6:51*

John 4:42, and 1Jn. 4:14, along with John 6:51 (which was considered before), are also produced by Thomas Moore; in all of these passages Christ is called the "Savior of the world."

ANSWER: Christ is said to be the Savior of the world either because there is no other Savior for anyone in the world, and because he saves all who are saved, meaning all the people of God all over the world (not the Jews only); or else it is because he actually saves all the world and everyone in it. If it is in this latter way, victory to Mr. Moore; if it is meant in the former way, "we are still where we were."

9. *John 12:46*

Urging John 12:46, "I am come a light into the world," deserves to be noted, but not answered. John 3:16-17 and 1John 2:1-2 have been already considered. Some other texts are produced, but they are so exceedingly wrested, strangely perverted, and so extremely useless to the business in hand, that I dare not make so bold with the reader's patience as once to repeat them.

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

CHAPTER IV – Answer to Second Argument for Universalism

Answer to the second general argument for the universality of redemption.

II. Passages that signify Christ died for all, or God wills salvation for all.

The second argument with which our adversaries make no less flourish than with the former, is raised from those passages of Scripture where there is mention made of all men and every man in the business of redemption. With these bare and naked words, attended with inflated and vain expressions of their own, they commonly proclaim a victory rather than study how to prevail. Their argument does not need not to be drawn into any form, seeing that they pretend to plead from the express words of Scripture. Therefore we will only consider several passages of this kind that are usually produced by them, with such enforcements of their meaning as the ablest of that persuasion have used. The chief passages insisted on are 1Tim. 2:4,6; 2Pet. 3:9; Heb. 2:9; 2Cor. 5:14,15; 1Cor. 15:22; Rom. 5:18.

As for the use and meaning of the word "all" in Scripture, so much has been said already by many others that it would be unnecessary for me to insist upon it. Something also to this purpose has been spoken of before, and that was abundantly sufficient to show that no strength of argument can be taken from the word itself; therefore I will apply myself only to the examination of the particular passages urged, and the objections that are raised from them:

1. 1Tim. 2:4,6

The first and chief place is 1Tim. 2:4,6, “God will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth Christ gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.” Hence they draw this argument, Rem. Act. Synod: “If God will have all men to be saved, then Christ died for all; but God will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth: therefore, Christ died for all men.”

ANSWER: The whole strength of this argument lies in the ambiguity of the word “all” which has diverse meanings. If it were to be interpreted suitably to the matter in hand and to the things and persons of which this word is spoken, then either the whole argument may be granted, or else several of the propositions may be denied. This depends on whether the word “all” or “all men” always comprehends all and every man that were, are, or will be. This may be made apparent from the Scripture by nearly five hundred instances of its use. Taking, then, “all” and “all men” distributively, as meaning some of all sorts, we grant the whole of the argument; but taking them collectively, as meaning all men of all sorts, we deny the minor premise, namely, that God would have all of them saved. To make our denial of this an evident truth, and agreeable to the mind of the Holy Ghost in this passage, two things must be considered: 1. What is the will of God by which he wills all to be saved? 2. Who are the “all” whom the apostle is addressing in this passage?

1. The will of God is usually distinguished into his intending will and his commanding will; in other words, “will” is used in reference to God in this twofold notice,

- (1.) For his purpose, i.e. what he wills to do;
- (2.) For his approval of what we do, i.e. what he commands to be done.

Those who oppose our argument may choose how this passage refers to the will of God, or how he wills the salvation of all.

First, if they say he does it “voluntate signi,” with his will commanding, requiring, and approving, then the sense of the words is this: “God commands all men to use the means by which they may obtain the end or salvation, the performance of which is acceptable to God in any or all men;” and so it is the same sense as that of the apostle in another place, “God commands all men everywhere to repent” (Ac 17:3). Now, if this is the way by which God wills the salvation of all who are mentioned here, then certainly those “all” cannot possibly be more than to those to whom he grants and reveals the means of grace; which are indeed a great many, but yet they are not one hundredth the posterity of Adam. Besides, if we take God’s willing the salvation of all men in this sense, then we deny the sequel of the first proposition, namely, that Christ died for as many as God wills should be saved. The foundation of God’s command to men to use the means granted them is not Christ’s dying for them in particular, but the connection which He himself, by his decree, has fixed between faith and salvation; the death of Christ is abundantly sufficient for holding out that connection to all, there being enough in his death to save all believers.

Secondly, if the will of God is taken for his efficacious will, that is, the will of his purpose and good pleasure, then certainly it must be fulfilled, and all those must be saved whom he would have saved; for whatever God *can* do and *will* do, that will certainly come to pass and be effected. Truly, to me it seems exceedingly evident that this is what is intended here, because the will of God is made the ground and the bottom of our supplications; it is as if in our prayers

we should say only, “your will be done,” – and his will is to have them all be saved: now, we have a promise to receive of God “whatever we ask according to his will,” 1John 3:22, v. 14; and therefore this will of God, which is proposed here as the ground of our prayers, must be his effectual or rather efficacious will, which is always accomplished. No one doubts that God *can* save all (not considering his decree); and that he *will* save all is affirmed here. Therefore, if “all” here is everyone, then everyone shall certainly be saved. “Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die.”¹ “For who has resisted God’s will?” Rom. 9:19. “He has done whatever he has pleased,” Ps. 115:3. “He does according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth,” Dan. 4:35. If “all”, then, is here to be understood as all men universally, one of these two things must of necessity follow: either God fails in his purpose and intention, or else men universally will be saved. That leads us to the second thing to consider in the words, namely, who are meant by “all men” in this place.

2. By “all men” the apostle here intends all sorts of men indefinitely living under the gospel, or in these latter times, under the enlarged dispensation of the means of grace. In dealing with Perkins about this passage, Arminius himself acknowledges that only men of these times are intended. The intended scope of the apostle in addressing the amplitude, enlargement, and extent of grace, in the outward administration of that grace under the gospel, will not allow it to be denied. He lays this down as a foundation of our praying for all, because the means of grace and the habitation of the church is now no longer confined to the narrow bounds of one nation; it is promiscuously and indefinitely extended to all people, tongues, and languages; and to all sorts of men among them, high and low, rich and poor, one with another. We say, then, that the words “all men” are here intended only to refer to all sorts of men, as suited the purpose of the apostle, which was to show that all external differences between the sons of men is now taken away. We further confirm this *ex abundantia* by the following reasons:

First, the word “all” in the Scripture is most commonly used in this sense (that is, for “many of all sorts”); there is nothing in the subject-matter of the passage which would in the least impel another interpretation of the word, especially not a universal collection of every individual. We hold it safe to cling to the most usual sense and meaning of it. Thus, our Savior is said to cure *all* diseases, and the Pharisees to tithe *every* herb, Luke 11:42.

Secondly, Paul himself plainly leads us to this interpretation of it; for after he has enjoined us to pray for all, because the Lord will have all saved, he expressly intimates that by “all men” he understands men of all sorts, ranks, conditions, and orders. He does so by dividing “all” into several kinds, expressly mentioning some of them, as “kings and all in authority,” not unlike the expression we have in Jer. 29:1-2: “Nebuchadnezzar carried away *all* the people captive to Babylon, Jeconiah the king, and the queen, and the eunuchs, the princes of Judah and Jerusalem, the carpenters, and the smiths;” all the people is interpreted to be some of all sorts, by distributing them into the several orders, classes, and conditions to which they belonged. In the same way, the apostle defines “all men” by giving us the names of some of those orders and conditions whom he intends. “Pray for all men,” he says; that is, all sorts of men, such as magistrates, all that are in authority, the time having come in which the Lord will save some of all sorts and nations without those distinctions which formerly were observed.

¹ 1Co 15:32

Thirdly, we are bound to pray for all whom God would have saved. Now, we ought not to pray for everyone, knowing that some are reprobates and sin unto death; concerning these, we are expressly cautioned not to pray for them.¹

Fourthly, All will be saved whom God wills to save; this we dare not deny, for “who has resisted his will?” Seeing, then, that it is most certain that all will *not* be saved (for some will stand on the left hand)², it cannot be that all men universally are intended here.

Fifthly, God would have no more “saved” than he would have “come to the knowledge of the truth.” These two things are of equal latitude and conjoined in the text. But it is not the will of the Lord that everyone, in all ages, should come to the knowledge of the truth. Of old, “he showed his word to Jacob, his statutes and his judgments to Israel. He has not dealt so with any other nation: and as for his judgments, those others have not known them,” Ps 147:19, 20. If he would have them all come to the knowledge of the truth, then why did he show his word to some and not others? For without his word, they could not attain to the knowledge of the truth. “He suffered all nations” in former ages “to walk in their own ways,” Acts 14:16, and “winked at the time of this ignorance,” Acts 17:30. He was hiding the mystery of salvation from those former ages, Col. 1:26, continuing the same dispensation even until this day with regard to some; and he did that because “it seems good in his sight,” Matt. 11:25-26. It is evident, then, that God does not will that everyone in the world, of all ages and times, should come to the knowledge of the truth, but only all sorts of men without difference; and, therefore, only they are intended here.

These, and similar reasons compel us to understand “all men” in verse 4, those whom God would have saved, refers to men of all sorts. They also prevail for the same interpretation of the word “all” in verse 6 where Christ is said to give himself “a ransom for all.” To these you may also add all those reasons we declared before: that it was of absolute necessity and just equity that all those for whom a ransom was paid should have a part and portion in that ransom; and, if that ransom is accepted as sufficient, then they must be set at liberty. Paying and accepting a ransom intimate a commutation of sentence; it sets free all those for whom the ransom is paid and accepted. By “all”, then, none can be understood but the redeemed, the ransomed ones of Jesus Christ. These, for Christ’s sake and by virtue of the price of his blood, are vindicated into the glorious liberty of the children of God. These children are expressly said to be some of all sorts in Rev. 5:9³ (and that passage is interpretative of this one), so that the assertion that it means all men in the world universally is confessedly false.

Having thus made evident the meaning of the words, our answer to the objection (whose strength is a mere fallacy, from the ambiguous sense of the word “all”) is easy and facile. For if by “all men”, you mean the “all” in the text, that is, all sorts of men, we grant the whole, namely, that Christ died for all; but if by “all men”, you mean all men universally, then we absolutely deny the minor premise, having sufficiently proved that there is no such “all” in the text.

In his “Universality of Free Grace,” Thomas Moore makes his objection from this passage the subject of one whole chapter. It is also one of two passages he uses to lay the foundation of the

¹ 1Jn 5:16

² Mt 25:41

³ Rev 5:9 - Worthy are you to take the book, and to open its seals: for you were slain, and purchased for God with your blood *men* of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation.

whole building, and to which he always retires at a dead lift.¹ Therefore, I thought to have considered that chapter of his at large; but, upon second consideration, I have laid aside that resolution, and done so for three reasons:

First, because I desired not *actum agere*, to do what has already been done, especially because the thing itself is not such as deserves to be meddled with at all. Now, about the time that I was proceeding in this response, the learned work of Mr Rutherford², about the death of Christ and the drawing of sinners thereby, came into my hand; in this work, he has fully answered that chapter of Mr. Moore's book; I remit the reader to it.

Secondly, I find that he has not once attempted to respond to any of those reasons and arguments by which we confirm our answer to the objection from the passage, and by which we prove undeniably that by "all men" is meant only men of all sorts.

Thirdly, because, setting aside those bare naked assertions of his own by which he seeks to strengthen his argument from and his interpretation of this passage, the remainder with which he flourishes is but a poor fallacy running through the whole of it; the strength of all his argumentations consists in this, that the "all" we are to pray for does not mean only all who are at present believers, which no man in his right wits will affirm; so the one who concludes from there, that because they are not just all present believers, therefore they are all the individuals of mankind, is not to be esteemed very sober. We proceed then to the next passage urged for the general ransom, from the word "all", which is,

2. 2Pet. 3:9,

"The Lord is long-suffering toward us, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." "The will of God," say some, "for the salvation of all, is here set down both negatively, that he would not have any perish, and positively, that he would have all come to repentance; now, seeing there is no coming to repentance nor escaping destruction, except by the blood of Christ, it is manifest that his blood was shed for all."

ANSWER: Not many words need be spent in answer to this objection wrested from the misunderstanding and palpable corrupting of the sense of these words of the apostle. It is a rule in the opening of the Scripture that indefinite and general expressions are to be interpreted in proportion to the things of which they are affirmed. See, then, of whom the apostle is speaking here. "The Lord," he says, "is long-suffering toward us, not willing that any should perish." Will not common sense teach us that "us" is to be repeated in both the following clauses, to make them complete and full, namely, "Not willing that any of us should perish, but that all of us should come to repentance?" Now, who are these of whom the apostle speaks, those to whom he writes? Those who had received his "great and precious promises," chap. 1:4; those whom he calls "beloved," chap. 3:1; those whom he opposes to the "scoffers" of the "last days," verse 3; those to whom the Lord has respect in the disposal of these days; those who are said to be "elect," Matt. 24:22.

Now, truly, it comes just short of extreme madness and folly to argue that, because God would have none of those perish, but would have all of them come to repentance, he therefore has the

¹ That is, he returns to it again and again like a dumb waiter that goes in circles.

² He refers to the eminent Scotch divine, Samuel Rutherford, 1600–1661. The work mentioned above was published in 1647, and is entitled, "Christ Dying, and Drawing to Himself; or, a survey of our Saviour in his soul's suffering," etc. The opinions of More are discussed in it from page 375 to 410. — Ed.

same will and mind towards everyone in the world (including those to whom he never makes known his will, and never calls to repentance if they have never heard of his way of salvation). Nor is it of any weight to argue the contrary, that those to whom Peter wrote were not all elect: for in the judgment of charity he esteemed them so, desiring them “to give all diligence to make their calling and election sure,” chap. 1:10; He implicitly calls them elect even as he expressly calls those to whom he wrote his former epistle “elect”, 1Pet. 1:1-2, and a “chosen generation,” as well as a “purchased people,” 1Pet. 2:9.

I need not add anything concerning the contradictions and inextricable difficulties with which the opposite interpretation is accompanied (e.g. that God should will those to come to repentance whom he cuts out of the covenant in their infancy; those he hates from eternity and from whom he hides the means of grace; those to whom he will not give repentance, and yet knows that it is utterly impossible for them to have it unless he bestows it). The text is clear, that it is all and only the elect whom he would not have perish. We have a passage supposedly parallel to this one in Ezek. 18:23, 32, which will be considered afterward. The next is,

3. Heb. 2:9,

“That he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.”

ANSWER: All acknowledge that “for every man,” is intended here to mean “for all,” by an enallage¹ of the number. The whole question is who these “all” are, whether it refers to all men universally, or all those of whom the apostle is speaking. It cannot be denied that this expression, “every man”, is commonly used in the Scripture to signify men under some restriction. So it is in that expression of the apostle, “Warning every man, and reaching every man,” Col. 1:28; that is, warning and reaching all those to whom he preached the gospel, those of whom he is speaking there. “The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit with,” 1Cor. 12:7; namely, the Spirit is given to every one of those who were endowed with the gifts mentioned there, whether in the church at Corinth or elsewhere. I have frequently encountered the present passage produced by those who support universal redemption, but never once have I had the happiness to find any endeavor to prove from the text, or in any other way, that “all” here is to be taken for everyone; surely they know that the usual acceptance of the word is against their purpose. Mr. Moore spends a whole chapter about this passage, which I seriously considered, to see if I could pick out anything which might in the least measure prove that the apostle intended everyone, but found only deep silence. With an abundance of smooth words, he does nothing in that chapter but humbly and heartily beg the thing in question; though he is exceedingly earnest, we cannot consent to his petition for the following reasons:

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

Secondly, we see an evident cause which moved the apostle here to call those for whom Christ died “all”, namely, because he wrote to the Hebrews; they were deeply tainted with an erroneous persuasion that all the benefits purchased by Messiah belonged to men of their

¹ In grammar, an enallage is a substitution of one part of speech for another, either of one gender, number, case, person, tense, mode, or voice of the same word for another. Here it is the number: “all” for “every.”

nation alone, excluding all others. To root out this pernicious opinion, it behoved the apostle to mention the extent of free grace under the gospel, and to show the universality of God's elect throughout the world.

Thirdly, the present description of the "all" for whom Christ tasted death by the grace of God will not suit any but the elect of God. For in verse 10, they are called "many sons to be brought to glory;" in verse 11, they are those who are "sanctified," his "brethren;" in verse 13, they are the "children that God gave him;" in verse 15, they are those who are "delivered from the bondage of death;" – none of these can be affirmed as those who are born, live, and die the "children of the wicked one."¹ Christ is not a captain of salvation, as he is styled here, to any but those who "obey him," Heb. 5:9; righteousness comes by him "to all and upon all those who believe," Rom. 3:22. For these and similar reasons we cannot be induced to hearken to our adversaries' petition, being fully persuaded that by "every one" here is meant *all* and *only* God's elect, in whose stead Christ tasted death by the grace of God.

4. 2Cor. 5:14-15

Another passage is 2Cor. 5:14-15, "For the love of Christ constrains us; because we judge thus, that if one died for all, then all were dead; and that he died for all, so that those who live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto the one who died for them." "Here," they say, "in verse 14, you have two "all's" which must both be of equal extent. If all were dead, then Christ died for all, that is, for as many as were dead. Again, he died for all those who must live unto him; but that is the duty of every one in the world: and therefore he died for them all. Further, it is clear from verse 10 that "all" are "all individuals", where they are affirmed to be all those who must 'appear before the judgment-seat of Christ'; none will be exempted from that appearance."

ANSWER:

1. Even taking the words in the same sense that some of our adversaries take it, yet it does not appear from the texture of the apostle's arguing that the two all's of verse 14 are of equal extent. He does not say that Christ died for all those who were dead, but only that all were dead for whom Christ died. That proves no more than this, that all those for whom Christ died were dead, with that kind of death of which he speaks. The extent of the words is to be taken from the first "all", and not the latter. The apostle affirms that all those for whom Christ died were dead; not that Christ died for all those who were dead. The words plainly teach us this: "If he died for all, then all were dead," – that is, all he died for were dead; so that all those who were dead can give no light as to the extent of the "all" for whom Christ died, being merely regulated by this.
2. We deny that everyone is morally bound to live to Christ, *virtute praecepti*²; only those to whom he is revealed are bound to live to him; indeed, only those who live by him, who have a spiritual life in and with him, are bound: all others are under previous obligations.
3. It is true that everyone must appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, and that he is ordained to be the judge of the world; but it is not true that everyone is intended in verse 10. The apostle speaks of us all, of all believers, especially of all preachers of the gospel; neither of these apply to all men. Notwithstanding anything that has been said, then, it in no way appears that "all" here

¹ Mt 13:38

² That is, a required virtue.

means any but the elect of God, all believers; and I prove that they are the only ones intended here using the following reasons, as drawn from the text:

First, the resurrection of Christ is conjoined with his death here: “He died for them, and rose again.” Now, for whomever Christ rises, he rises for their “justification,” Rom. 4:25; and they must be justified, Rom. 8:34. Indeed, our adversaries themselves have always confessed that the fruits of the resurrection of Christ are specific to believers.

Secondly, He speaks only of those who, by, virtue of the death of Christ, “live unto him,” 2Cor. 5:15; who are “new creatures,” verse 17; “to whom the Lord does not impute their trespasses,” verse 19; who “become the righteousness of God in Christ,” verse 21; these are only believers. All do not attain to these things.

Thirdly, the article joined with “all” evidently restrains that “all” to “all of some sort”. “Then were they all dead” (or rather “all these”). These all; *what* all? All those believers of whom he speaks, as argued above.

Fourthly, All those of whom the apostle speaks are proved to be dead, because Christ died for them: “If one died for all, then all were dead.” What death is it which is spoken of here? It is not speaking of a natural death, but of a spiritual death; and of those deaths which come under that name – not what is *in* sin, but what is *unto* sin. For,

First, the great champions of the Arminian cause, such as Vorstius and Grotius (on this particular passage), were convinced by the evidence of truth. They acknowledge that it is a death *unto* sin that is spoken of here, by virtue of the death of Christ; and accordingly they held out that sense of the passage.

Secondly, it is apparent from the text that the intent of the apostle was to prove that those for whom Christ died are dead to sin, and that they should no longer live unto sin, but unto the one who died for them. The subject he has in hand is the same one that he handles more at large in Rom. 6:5-8. There we are said to be “dead unto sin,” by being “planted together in the likeness of the death of Christ;” and there as here, he then presses them to “newness of life.” These words, then, “If Christ died for all, then were all dead,” concern the death unto sin of those for whom Christ died, at least the death of those of whom he speaks there; and what has this to do with the general ransom?

Fifthly, the apostle speaks of the death of Christ with regard to application. What he insists upon is the effectualness of that death towards those for whom Christ died, so as to cause them to live unto Christ. It has not yet been affirmed by any that Christ died for all with regard to such an application. If there is any virtue or efficacy in his applied oblation for that end, then all must live unto him, indeed, live with him for evermore. In sum, there is no mention here of Christ’s dying for anyone but those who are dead to sin, and who live to him.

5. 1Cor. 15:22

A fifth passage urged to prove universal redemption from the word “all”, is 1Cor. 15:22, “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive.”

ANSWER: There is another passage to be considered after this in which the whole strength of the argument usually drawn from these words is contained. I will not need to speak much to this, nor will I turn at all from the common exposition of the passage. Those concerning whom Paul speaks in this chapter are called “all” in this verse. Those are the ones who are implanted into

Christ, joined to him as the members to the head, receiving a glorious resurrection by virtue of his resurrection; thus are they described by the apostle. It is manifest from the arguments which Paul brings to confirm it that, throughout this chapter, Paul expounds on the resurrection of believers, and as such, his arguments have force only with regard to believers: they are taken from the resurrection of Christ, the hope, faith, customs, and expected rewards of Christians. All of these arguments have unconquerable power to confirm and establish believers in the faith of the resurrection; so they would have been, every one of them, exceedingly ridiculous had they been held out to the men of the world to prove the resurrection of the dead in general.

Further, the very words “shall be made alive” denote living again to a good life and to glory, a blessed resurrection, and do not denote the quickening of those who are raised to a second death. The Son is said in John 5:21 to “quicken” and make alive (not all, but) “whom he will.” So he uses the word again in chap. 6:63, “It is the Spirit that” (thus) “quickens;” and in like manner in Rom. 4:17. Nowhere is it used to show that common resurrection which all will have at the last day. All, then, who by virtue of the resurrection of Christ will be made alive, are all those who are partakers of the nature of Christ; they are those who, in verse 23, are expressly called “those who are Christ’s,” and of whom, in verse 20, Christ is said to be the “first-fruits;” and certainly Christ is not the first-fruits of the damned. Indeed, though it is true that everyone died in Adam, yet it is not true that it is being asserted here (the apostle is speaking of none but believers); and yet, if it were to be taken so here, it could not prove the thing which is intended because of the express limitation of the sense of it in the following clause. Lastly, granting all that can be desired, namely, the universality of the word “all” in both places, yet I am in no way able to discern a medium that may serve for an argument to prove the general ransom.

6. Rom. 5:18

This is the last passage urged in this kind, and by some, it is the one most insisted upon: “As by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men unto condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.” It might suffice for us to briefly declare that by “all men” in the latter half of the verse, it cannot be understood to mean any but those whom the free gift actually comes upon unto justification of life. These are the ones who, in verse 17, are said to “receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness,” and so to “reign in life by one, Jesus Christ;” these are the ones who, by his obedience, are to be “made righteous,” verse 19;¹ which certainly, if anything is true and certain in the truth of God, all are not made righteous. Some do not believe; “all men do not have faith;” “the wrath of God abides” on some, John 3:36; upon these, surely, grace does not reign through righteousness to eternal life by Jesus Christ as it does upon all those on whom the free gift comes unto justification, Rom 5:17-18.

We might, I say, answer with only this. But there are some, contrary to the clear and manifest intention of the apostle, who compare Adam and Christ in the efficacy of the sin of the one unto condemnation, and the efficacy of the righteousness of the other unto justification and life; and they do so with regard to those who are the natural seed of the one by propagation, and the spiritual seed of the other by regeneration. They have labored to wrest this place to maintain the error we oppose with more than ordinary endeavors and confidence of success; thus it may be necessary to consider what is brought by them to this end and purpose:

¹ See Book II, Chap. III, Sec. III, [Moore’s Objections](#), no. 2.(Rom 5.19).

Verse 14. Adam is called the type and “figure of the one who was to come.” It is not that he was an instituted type, ordained for that sole end and purpose; but it is only that in what he was and what he did, and what followed from it, there was a resemblance between him and Jesus Christ. Hence, by what he was and what he did, and by reason of the resemblance, many things may be well represented by juxtaposing them to the obedience of Christ and the efficacy of his death. What the apostle prosecutes here in this resemblance (by showing the many comparisons, in all of which he exalts Christ above Adam’s type) is this: that there is a similar though not equal efficacy between the two. For there is more merit and efficacy required to save someone than to lose ten thousand. There is an efficacy of the demerit, sin, disobedience, guilt, and transgression of the one to condemn, or to bring the guilt of condemnation upon all those in whose stead he was a public person. He is the head and the natural fountain of them all; they are wrapped up in the same condition with him by divine institution. Then there is the efficacy of the righteousness, obedience, and death of the other, to bring the absolution, justification, and salvation of all those to whom he was a spiritual head by divine institution, and in whose stead he was a public person. This is what Paul in various particulars has asserted. There is not the least mention that these last ones spoken of were the same “everyone” spoken of in the first part of the verse. The comparison is to be solely considered intensively, with regard to their efficacy, and not extensively, with regard to their objects. The “all” of Adam are called his “many”,¹ and the “many” of Christ are called his “all”,² as indeed they are, for they are all the seed which is given to him.

Thomas Moore, in his “Universality of Free Grace,” chap. 8, p. 41, lays down this comparison instituted by the apostle between Adam and Christ as one of the main foundations of his universal redemption. After premising some strange mixtures of truth and errors, which, to avoid tediousness, we will let pass, he affirms this to consist in four things:³

First, “That Adam, in his first sin and transgression, was a public person, in the stead and place of all mankind by virtue of the covenant between God and him; so that whatever he did with regard to that covenant, all alike were sharers with him. So also was Christ a public person in his obedience and death, in the stead and place of all mankind whom he represented, including every one of the posterity of Adam.”

ANSWER: As to what concerns Adam, we grant that he was a public person with regard to all his that were to proceed from him by natural propagation; and we grant that Christ was also a public person in the stead of his, and in this he was prefigured by Adam. But to say that Christ in his obedience, death, and sacrifice, was a public person, and stood in the place and stead of everyone in the world, of all ages and times is to us such a monstrous assertion as cannot once be apprehended or thought on without horror or detestation; it asserts he stood in the stead not only of his elect and those who were given to him by God, but also of reprobate persons, hated by God from eternity; of those whom he never knew, concerning whom, in the days of his flesh, he thanked his Father that he had hid from them the mysteries of salvation; of those whom he refused to pray for; who were, the great part of them, already damned in hell, and irrevocably gone beyond the limits of redemption before he actually yielded any obedience.

I suppose this is a doctrine that will scarce be owned among those who strive to preserve the witness and testimony of the Lord Jesus: that anyone should perish in whose place or stead the

¹ 1Cor 15:22; Rom 5:15

² Mt 20:28; 1Tim 2:6.

³ Apparently Owen addresses only the first and third of the four parallels before moving on to Chapter V.

Son of God appeared before his Father with his perfect obedience; that any of those for whom he is a mediator and advocate, to whom he is a king, priest, and prophet, should be taken from him, plucked out of his arms, and his satisfaction and advocacy in their behalf be refused (for he is all these for them, being a public person, sponsor, surety, and undertaker for them).

But let us a little consider the reasons by which Mr. Moore undertakes to maintain this strange assertion; which, as far as I can gather, are these, page 44:

First, Christ did not stand only in the stead of the elect, because Adam did not lose election, not being entrusted with it.

Secondly, if Christ did not stand in the stead of all, then he came short of his figure.

Thirdly, it is said Christ was to restore all men lost by Adam, Heb. 2:9.

Fourthly, he took on flesh, was subjected to mortality, came under the law, and bore the sins of mankind.

Fifthly, he did it in the stead of all mankind once given to him, Rom. 14:9; Phil. 2:8-11.

Sixthly, because he is called the “last Adam” – and,

Seventhly, He is said to be a public person, in the stead of all, ever since the “first Adam,” 1Cor. 15:45, 47; 1Tim. 2:5; Rom 5.

ANSWER: Never, surely, was a rotten conclusion based upon more loose and tottering principles, nor the word of God more boldly corrupted for the maintenance of any error, since the name of Christian was known. A man would think the effort quite wasted, except that it is so very easy a labor to remove such hay and stubble. I answer, then,

To the first, that though Adam did not lose election, and the eternal decrees of the Almighty are not committed to the keeping of the sons of men, yet in Adam all the *elect* were lost, whom Christ came to seek, and whom he found, and in whose stead he was a public person.

To the second, Christ is nowhere compared to Adam with regard to the extent of the object of his death, but only with regard to the efficacy of his obedience.

The third is a false assertion; see our foregoing consideration of Heb. 2:9.¹

Fourthly, as to his taking on flesh, etc., it was necessary he should do all this to save his elect. He took flesh and blood because the children were partakers of the same.

Fifthly, No such thing is once affirmed in whole book of God, that all the sons of men were given to Christ to redeem, so that he should be a public person in their stead. No, Christ himself plainly affirms the contrary in John 17:6, 9.² Only some are given him out of the world, and those he saved; not one of them perishes. The passages urged hold out no such thing, nor anything like it. They will also afterward come under further consideration.

Sixthly, He is called the “last Adam” with regard to the efficacy of his death for the justification of the seed promised and given to him, just as the sin of the “first Adam” was

¹ See p. 208

² John 17:6,9 I manifested your name to the men whom you gave me out of the world: yours they were, and you gave them to me; and they have kept your word... ⁹ I pray for them: I do not pray for the world, but for those whom you have given me; for they are yours:

effectual to bring the guilt of condemnation upon the seed propagated from him; this does not at all prove that he stood in the stead of all those to whom his death was never known, nor was his death in any way profitable to them.

Seventhly, it is confessed that he was a public person; but it is not proved that he was a public person in the stead of all men, whether by what has been already said, or by the texts which follow, all of which have been considered.

This is all that is produced by Mr. Moore to justify his assertion; it may be an instance of what weighty inferences he usually asserts from such weak, invalid premises. We cannot also but take notice, by the way, of one or two strange passages which he inserts into this discourse. The first of which is that, by his death, Christ brought all men out of that death into which they were fallen by Adam. Now, the death into which all fell in Adam is a death in sin, Eph. 2:1-3, and the guilt of condemnation which rests upon that sin. If Christ frees all from this death, then everyone must be made alive with spiritual life, which is to be had and obtained only by Jesus Christ; the gospel has already declared, and God will one day determine, whether that is so or not, and whether to live by Christ is the specific privilege of believers. Another strange assertion is his affirming that the purpose of the death of Christ is to present himself alive and just before his Father, as though it were the ultimate thing intended by him. The Holy Ghost expressly affirms that “he loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might present it to himself a glorious church,” Eph. 5:25-27.

The following parallels which he draws between Adam and Christ, have nothing of proof in them to the business in hand, namely, that Christ was a public person, standing in his obedience in the place of everyone concerned in the disobedience of Adam. There is, I say, nothing at all of proof in these parallels. They are a confused medley of some truths and various unsavory heresies. I will only give the reader a taste of some of them by which he may judge the rest, not troubling myself or others with the transcribing and reading of such empty vanities that in no way relate to the business in hand.

First, then, in the second part of his parallel he affirms, “That when Christ finished his obedience, in dying and rising, and offering himself as a sacrifice, and making satisfaction, it was, by virtue of the account of God in Christ, and for Christ with God (that is, accepted by God for Christ’s sake), the death, resurrection, the sacrifice and satisfaction, and the redemption of all, that is, of all and every one.” In this he compares Christ to Adam in the performance of the business undertaken by him. Now, though I consider with trembling what the apostle affirms in 2Thes. 2:11-12,¹ I am still exceedingly amazed that any man in the world would be so far forsaken of sense, reason, faith, and all reverence of God and man, as to publish, maintain, and seek to propagate, such abominable, blasphemous, senseless, and contradictory errors. [Consider the following contradictions]:

- That the death of Christ should be accepted by and accounted before God as the death of all, and yet the great part of these for whom he supposedly died will all be personally adjudged to eternal death by the same righteous God;

¹ 2Th 2:11-12 And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.

- That everyone should arise in and with Jesus Christ, and yet most of them continue dead in their sins, and die for sin eternally;
- That satisfaction should be made and accepted for those who are never spared, and not one penny of their debt shall be satisfied by it;
- That atonement should be made by sacrifice for those who will ever lie undelivered under wrath;
- That when Christ died, suffered, made satisfaction, and rose again, all the reprobates such as Cain, Pharaoh, Ahab, and the rest who were actually damned in hell and under death and torments, that all these would be esteemed by God to have died, suffered, made satisfaction, and risen again with Christ;

That such senseless contradictions, horrid errors, and abominable assertions, should be thus nakedly thrust upon Christians, without the least trace, pretence, or show of proof, except by the naked authority of one who has already embraced such things as these, is enough to make any man admire and be amazed; but we know the judgments of God are oftentimes hid, and far above, out of our sights.

Secondly, in the third of his parallels he goes one step higher, comparing Christ with Adam in regard to the efficacy, effect, and fruit of his obedience. He affirms, “That as by the sin of Adam all his posterity were deprived of life, and fell under sin and death, from which judgment and condemnation passed upon all, though this is done secretly and invisibly, and in some sort inexpressibly,¹ so,” he says, “by the efficacy of the obedience of Christ, all men without exception are redeemed, restored, made righteous, justified freely by the grace of Christ, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, the ‘righteousness that is by the faith of Jesus Christ’ being, ‘unto all,’ Rom. 3:22.” This is where the impostor wickedly corrupts the word of God like the devil in Matthew 4, by cutting off the following words, “and upon all that believe;” both all’s refer to believers. [Moore continues,] “What remains now but that all should also be saved? The Holy Ghost expressly affirms that those ‘whom God justifies, he also glorifies,’ Rom. 8:30. ‘Solvite mortales animas, curisque levate.’”²

This author labors to obtrude³ upon us such assertions as these, without any trace of proof. [He asserts] that men should be restored and yet they continue to be lost; that they should be made righteous and yet remain detestably wicked and wholly abominable; that they should be freely justified by the grace of God and yet always lie under the condemning sentence of the law of God; that the righteousness of God by the faith of Jesus Christ should apply to all un-believers. These are not only diametrically opposed to the gospel of Jesus Christ, but so absolutely at variance and distance one with another, that the poor salve of Mr. Moore’s following cautions will not serve to heal their common wounds. I fear that it would be tedious and offensive to rake any longer in such a dunghill. Let those who have a mind to be captivated by error and falsehood

¹ Owen parenthetically adds here: “I do not know what he means by secretly and invisibly; surely he does not suppose that these things might possibly be made the objects of our senses; and for how it is inexpressible, let Rom. 5:12 along with other passages where all this and more is clearly, plainly, and fully expressed, judge whether it is inexpressible or not.” **Romans 5:12** – Therefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, also death *entered* by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for all have sinned.

² Roughly, “Unbind mortal life, its cares are lifted up.” - WHG

³ To impose oneself or one’s ideas on others with undue insistence or without invitation.

by the corruption of Scripture, and to be denied of common sense and reason because they cannot receive the truth in the love of that Scripture, delight themselves with such husks as these.

How weak are the arguments we have heard, to maintain that Christ in his obedience unto death was a public person in the place of everyone, has already been demonstrated. I will now, by the reader's leave, transgress the rule of disputation a little, and, taking up the opposite part of the arguments, produce a few reasons and testimonies to demonstrate that our Savior Christ, in his obedience unto death, in the redemption which he wrought, and satisfaction which he made, and sacrifice which he offered, was *not* a public person in the place of all and every man in the world, elect and reprobate, believers and infidels (or unbelievers). Briefly, they are these:

First, the seed of the woman was not to be a public person in the place, stead, and position of the seed of the serpent. Jesus Christ is the seed of the woman; all the reprobates, as was proved before, are the seed of the serpent: therefore, Jesus Christ was not, in his oblation and suffering, when he broke the head of the father of the seed, a public person in their stead.

Secondly, Christ, as a public person, represents only those for whose sake he set himself apart to that office and employment in which he was such a representative; but upon his own testimony, which we have in John 17:19, he set himself apart to the service and employment in which he was a public person, only for the sakes of some who were given him out of the world, and not for everyone: therefore, he was not a public person in the stead of all.

Thirdly, as a public person, Christ was a "surety," Heb. 7:22; but he was not a surety for all; for, first, all are not included in that covenant of which he was a surety, the conditions of which are effected in all the covenantees,¹ as stated before; secondly, none can perish for whom Christ is a surety, unless he is not able to pay the debt: therefore, he was not a public person in place of all.

Fourthly, he suffered for those for whom he was a public person, in their places, and he made satisfaction for them, Isa. 53:5-6;² but he did not suffer in the stead of all, nor did he make satisfaction for all; for, first, some must suffer themselves, which makes it evident that Christ

¹ That is, everyone included in the covenant receives the effects of the covenant, which in this case is an inheritance in the kingdom. As our surety under the covenant, the effects or benefits of Christ's righteousness and atonement are, by definition, applied to each and every person whom the covenant covers and whom he represents. Its effects include eternal life, receiving the Holy Spirit, being a child of God, being a co-heir with Christ, and being relieved of all condemnation. To assert that Christ's role as surety applies to all mankind is to assert that all mankind is under the covenant; thus he has either failed to be an adequate surety for those who do not actually receive its benefits, or else all mankind will definitely receive the benefits. Scripture is clear that not all will receive the benefits – some are "prepared for destruction" (Rom 9:22). Therefore, either Christ has failed (which is impossible considering who he is), or else the covenant does not extend to all mankind.

² Isa 53:5-6 But He *was* wounded for our transgressions, *He was* bruised for our iniquities; The chastisement for our peace *was* upon Him, And by His stripes we are healed. ⁶ All we like sheep have gone astray; We have turned, every one, to his own way; And the LORD has laid on Him the iniquity of us all.

did not suffer for them, Rom. 8:33-34;¹ and, secondly, the justice of God requires satisfaction from themselves, to the payment of the last penny (Mt 5:6).²

Fifthly, Jesus Christ, as a public person, did nothing in vain with regard to any of those for whom he was a public person; but many things Christ did perform *as* a public person were altogether in vain and fruitless for the great part of the sons of men; they were incapable of receiving any good from anything he did; specifically, this refers to all those who then were actually damned; with regard to these men, redemption, reconciliation, satisfaction, and the like, cannot possibly be anything other than empty terms.

Sixthly, if God were well-pleased with his Son in what he did as a public person in his representation of others (as he was, Eph. 5:2³), then he must also be well-pleased with those whom he represented, either absolutely or conditionally; but God could not have been well-pleased with many of the sons of men, neither absolutely nor conditionally – as with Cain, Pharaoh, Saul, Ahab, and others who were dead and damned before: therefore, Christ did not represent all as a public person,.

Seventhly, for further testimonies, see John 17:9; Matt. 20:28, 26:26-28; Mark. 10:45; Heb, 6:20; Isa. 53:12; John 10:15; Heb. 13:20; Matt. 1:21; Heb. 2:17; John 11:51, 52; Acts 20:28; Eph. 5:2, 23-25; Rom. 8:33-34.

CHAPTER V - Answer to Last Argument for Universalism

The last argument from Scripture answered.

III. Passages which affirm Christ bought, or died for, those who perish

I come next to the third and last argument, drawn from the Scripture, with which the Arminians and their successors (as to this point) strive to maintain their figment of universal redemption. It is taken from those texts of Scripture which seem to show the perishing of some of those for whom Christ died, and the fruitlessness of his blood with regard to various persons for whom it was shed. On this theme, their wits are wonderfully luxuriant and they are full of rhetorical strains to lay out the unsuccessfulness and fruitlessness of the blood of Christ with regard to most for whom it was shed, with the perishing of bought, purged, and reconciled sinners. Who can believe that this kind of persuasion aids the consolation of poor souls? Its strongest defense lies in making the precious blood of the Lamb vile, indeed, trampling upon it, and treating it as a common thing. But, friends, let me tell you, I am persuaded it was not so unvaluable in the eyes of his Father, that He would cause it to be poured out in vain with regard to any soul. But we must be put to this defense. We cannot but rejoice in this, because it so evidently tends to the honor of our blessed Savior. So let us consider what can be said by those Christians (at least in

¹ Owen is pointing out that there is a distinction made between the elect and the non-elect who oppose them. Rom 8:33-34 Who shall bring a charge against God's elect? *It is* God who justifies. *Who is* he who condemns? *It is* Christ who died, and furthermore is also risen, who is even at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us.

² The justice of God requires satisfaction from *everyone*. The elect have the complete satisfaction of Christ. Reprobates have no surety, and must therefore make full satisfaction themselves, to the last penny, or be eternally condemned.

³ Eph 5:2 And walk in love, as Christ also has loved us and given Himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling aroma.

name) who would enervate¹ the efficacy of the blood-shedding of Christ's death, the very one by whose name they desire to be called. Thus, then, they argue:

“If Christ died for reprobates and those who perish, then he died for everyone, for confessedly he died for the elect and those who are saved; but he died for reprobates, and those who perish: therefore,” etc.

ANSWER: For the assumption or second proposition of this argument,² we will do what we conceive was fit for all the elect of God to do, to positively deny it. We consider the death of Christ, which is here said to be for reprobates, not with regard to its own internal worth and sufficiency, but as it was intended by the Father and Son with regard to those for whom he died. We deny, then, that Christ laid down his life for reprobates and those who perish, by the command of his Father, and with the intention to make satisfaction for their sins.

This, then, they prove from Rom. 14:15; 1Cor. 8:11; 2Pet. 2:1; Heb. 10:29. Now, we will show that no such thing as they pretend, is proved from any of the passages alleged; and we will do so by considering them in the order they are laid down.

1. Rom. 14:15

The first is Rom. 14:15, “But if your brother is grieved with your [eating] meat, then you do not walk charitably. Do not destroy with your meat the one for whom Christ died.”

ANSWER: Had we not experienced the nimbleness of our adversaries in framing arguments for their cause, I would despair to find their conclusion pressed out of this place; for what coherence or dependence, I beseech you, is to be discerned here? “The apostle exhorts strong and sound believers to such a moderate use of Christian liberty that they do not grieve the spirit of the weak ones, who were also believers (professors, all called ‘saints, elect, believers, redeemed,’ and in charity they were so esteemed), and so give them occasion to stumble and fall from the gospel: therefore, Jesus Christ died for all reprobates, even those who never heard word or syllable of him, or the doctrine of the gospel.” One would have to be very quick-sighted to see the dependence of this inference on that exhortation of the apostle.

But you might say, “Is it not affirmed that he for whom Christ died may perish?”

ANSWER: In this passage there is no such thing at all mentioned or intimated even once; only other believers are commanded not to do what goes in a direct way to destroy this person by grieving him with their uncharitable walking.³

“But why should the apostle exhort him not to do what he could in no way do, if the one for whom Christ died could not perish?”

ANSWER: Though the one could not perish with regard to the event, the other might sinfully give cause for perishing with regard to a procuring cause. May not a man be exhorted from attempting that which, even if he should attempt it, he could not effect it? It was no thanks to the

¹ To weaken or destroy

² that he died for reprobates and those who perish

³ Owen misses the simpler response, which involves the definition of the word “destroy.” *Apollumi* also means to corrupt or render useless, or to lose, without any inference of the loss of salvation being required. We often lose weaker brethren out of the church over minor issues, because they will not be reconciled, and will not permit others the freedom Christ allows. And so they walk away from the church. But to conclude that they have fallen out of the hand of Christ is a stretch.

soldier who ran a spear into the side of our dead Redeemer, that he broke none of his bones. Besides, is every one damned that someone else attempts to destroy by grieving him with uncharitable walking? Such arguments are poorly-made straw men. Yet, notwithstanding that, we do not deny that many may perish and utterly so, whom in our walking towards them and in our conversation with them, we are bound to conceive of as redeemed by Christ; even all who think themselves redeemed are to be esteemed “saints and brethren,” as the language of the Scripture calls those who profess the gospel. And this is most certain, that no place in Scripture mentions any who were to be bought or redeemed by our Savior, except those who had the qualification of being members of this visible church; which comes infinitely short of everyone.¹

2. 1Cor. 8:11

But let us see a second verse, which is 1Cor. 8:11, “And through your knowledge shall your weak brother perish, for whom Christ died.” This seems to have more color, but really it yields no more strength to persuade than the previous verse. A brother is said to perish for whom Christ died. I cannot apprehend that “perishing” here means eternal destruction and damnation. What the apostle intimates caused this perishing, is eating things offered to an idol with a guilty conscience, regarding the idol as something, justifying his eating by the example of others who pretended to know that an idol was nothing; and so the weak brother ate freely of the things offered to them. None can doubt that doing so was a sin for him, which is in its own nature damnable. All sin is damnable; every time we sin, for anything that lies in us, we perish, we are destroyed. So the eater of things offered to idols perished. But we deny that God always revenges sin with damnation on all in whom it is found; he has revealed himself otherwise in the blood of Jesus Christ. It cannot be proved that every such person actually perished eternally, as well as meritoriously. Besides, the one who is said to perish is called a brother, that is, a believer; we are brethren only by faith, by which we come to have one Father. As he is said to be a brother, so Christ is said to die for him. It may easily be proved that a true believer cannot finally perish; therefore, he who does perish is manifestly declared never to have been a believer: “They went out from us, because they were not of us.” If anyone perishes, then, he was never a true believer. How, then, is he said to be a brother? Because he is so in profession, and he is so in our judgment and persuasion; it is fitting for us to think so of all of them. As he is said to be a brother, so Christ is said to die for him, even in that judgment which the Scripture allows us of men. We cannot count a man a brother, and not esteem that Christ died for him; we have no brotherhood with reprobates. Christ died for all *believers*, John 17.

So we esteem all men believers who are walking in the due profession of the gospel, and who do not manifest the contrary; yet, no one ever denied that many of these may perish. Furthermore, “so shall he perish” refers to the sin of the one who lays the offense; for nothing that lies in him, he ruins him irrecoverably. Hence we see their argument: “The apostle tells persons walking offensively, that by abusing their liberty in this way, others will follow them, to the wounding of their conscience and ruin; these are brethren, acknowledged so by you, and those for whom Christ died: therefore, Christ died for all the reprobates in the world. ‘Is it just and equal,’ asks the apostle, ‘that, you should do things that will put stumbling-blocks in the way of the weak

¹ This argument is a bit obtuse and double-headed. Owen is suggesting that the visible Church is comprised of wheat and tares, elect and non-elect. It may well be that those in the Church whom we “destroy” by the way we walk, were never elect to begin with, despite their aspirations and profession. But even if we grant that all in the visible Church are saved, the Scripture is clear that only those in the Church were to be redeemed by Christ. Not everyone is in the Church; therefore Christ did not die for all.

brother, things at which he might stumble and fall?’ Therefore, Christ died for all.” We do not deny that some may perish, eternally so, concerning those whom we ought to judge that Christ died for, and while they live and converse with us according to the rule of the gospel. [What we do deny is that they were ever elect].

3. 2Pet. 2:1

The next verse, 2Pet. 2:1, is greatly insisted on, “There shall be false teachers, denying the Lord that bought them, and bringing upon themselves swift destruction.” All things here, as to any proof of the business in hand, are exceedingly dark, uncertain, and doubtful. It is uncertain, that “the Lord” means the Lord Christ; the word in the original is (NT:1203 *despotes*), which is seldom or never ascribed to him. It is uncertain whether the purchase or buying of these false teachers refers to their eternal redemption by the blood of Christ, or a deliverance from the defilement of the world in idolatry or the like, effected by God’s goodness and by the knowledge of the truth, which the last part of the text expressly affirms (v. 20). It is uncertain, whether the apostle speaks of this purchase according to the reality of the thing, or according to their own apprehension and their profession of it.

On the other side, it is most certain,

First, that there are no distinguishing spiritual fruits of redemption ascribed to these false teachers, but only common gifts of light and knowledge, which Christ has purchased for many for whom he did not make his soul a ransom.

Secondly, that, according to our adversaries, the redemption of anyone by the blood of Christ cannot be a special aggravation of the sins of anyone because they say he died for all; and yet this buying of the false teachers is held out as an aggravation of their sin in particular.

I will give a brief account of the former uncertainties upon which our adversaries build their inference of universal redemption (which can still by no means be wire-drawn¹ from that, even if they were most certain in their meaning), and then I will say something as to the proper intent of the passage.

For the FIRST, it is most uncertain whether Christ as mediator is intended by “Lord” here or not. There is nothing in the text to force us to conceive of it this way; the contrary seems apparent,

First, because in the following verses only God, as God, is mentioned with his dealings towards such as these; there is not a word of Christ.

Secondly, the name *despotes*, properly *herus* (Latin), which is attended by dominion and sovereignty, is not usually, if at all, given to our Savior in the New Testament; he is called *kurios* everywhere, but nowhere is he clearly called *despotes*, as the Father is in Luke 2:29, Acts 4:24, and in various other passages. Besides, if it should appear that this name were given to our Savior in any one place, does it therefore follow that it must be so here? No. Is the name proper for our Savior in the work of redemption? *Despotes* is a Lord or Master as it refers to servants and subjection; the outcome of Christ’s purchasing anyone by his blood in the Scripture is always and constantly expressed in other terms of more endearment.

¹ To stretch a piece of hot metal into wire by drawing it through a hole in a plate of steel; and so it means to stretch something by craft or force, or to stretch and twist something out to great length until it become tenuous and weak.

It is, then, most uncertain that Christ should be understood by the word “Lord”.

For the SECOND, suppose that he should be intended here; it is most uncertain that by buying these false teachers it means he purchased them with the ransom of his blood; for,

First, the apostle insists on a comparison with Old Testament times, and the false prophets that were among the people then. He backs his assertion with various examples out of the Old Testament throughout the following chapter. Now, the word “bought” used here (NT:59 *agorazo*), signifies primarily the buying of a thing; metaphorically, it means the redemption of persons; and the word (OT:6299 *padah*) in the Old Testament, which corresponds to it, signifies *any* deliverance, as in Deut. 7:8, 15:15, Jer. 15:21, with countless other passages: and therefore, only some such deliverance is intimated here.

Secondly, there is no mention of the blood, death, price, or offering of Jesus Christ here, as in other passages where proper redemption is addressed; to specifically express proper redemption, some expression is added where the word *agorazo* is used, as in 1Cor. 6:20 (“bought with a price”) and Rev. 5:9 (“by your blood”), which distinguishes it from deliverance *in common* from any trouble.

Thirdly, the apostle sets forth at large the deliverance they had, and the means of that deliverance in verse 20. It affirms that it consists in the “escaping of the pollutions of the world,” such as idolatry, false worship, and the like, “through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ;” this plainly declares that their purchase was only with regard to this separation from the world, and with regard to the enjoyment of the knowledge of the truth; but he is wholly silent as to washing them in the blood of the Lamb.

Plainly, there is no purchase mentioned of these false teachers, but only a deliverance by God’s dispensations towards them, from the blindness of Judaism or Paganism, by the knowledge of the gospel; by this deliverance, the Lord bought them to be his servants as their supreme head. So our adversaries’ argument from this passage is this: “God the Lord, by imparting the knowledge of the gospel, and working these teachers toward a professed acknowledgment of it and subjection to it, separated and delivered from the world various “saints” who were so only in an outward show, but who were really wolves and hypocrites, ordained of old to condemnation: therefore, Jesus Christ shed his blood for the redemption and salvation of all reprobates and damned persons in the whole world.” Who would not admire our adversaries’ chemistry?

For the THIRD, it is no more certain that the apostle speaks of the purchase of the wolves and hypocrites with regard to the *reality* of that purchase; it is rather with regard to the estimation which others had of them and, by reason of their outward seeming profession, they ought to have had; and by reason of the profession that they themselves made to be purchased by him whom they pretended to preach to others. As the Scripture says [of Abaz], “The gods of Damascus struck him,” because he himself so imagined and professed, 2Chron. 28:23. The latter verse makes it probable that it is the perpetual course of the Scripture to ascribe all those things to every one that is in the fellowship of the church, which are proper only to those who are true spiritual members of the same church, so as to render all to be saints, elect, redeemed, etc. Now, the truth is, from their profession, they were bought by Christ; the apostle might justly, and according to the opinion of our adversaries, press these false teachers as having their sin aggravated. For the thing itself, being bought, it could no more be urged as applying to them as to heathens and infidels who never heard of the name of the Lord Jesus.

Now, after all this, if our adversaries can prove universal redemption from this text, let them never despair of success in anything they undertake, be it never so absurd, fond, or foolish. But only when they have first completed the work already cut out for them, and proved,

first, that “the Lord” means Christ as mediator;

secondly, that “buying” means spiritual redemption by the blood of the Lamb;

thirdly, that these false teachers were really and effectually redeemed, and not accounted so simply because they belonged to the church;

fourthly, that those who are really and effectually redeemed may perish, contrary to the express Scripture in Rev. 14:4,¹

fifthly, demonstrate the strength of this [unwarranted] inference, “Some in the church who have acknowledged Christ to be their purchaser, fall away to blaspheme him, and perish forever; *therefore, Christ bought and redeemed all that ever did or shall perish;*”

sixthly, how it may be that what is common to all becomes a specific aggravation to the sin of any one person more than others;

I assure them that they will have more work provided for them, which they themselves already know for a good part where to find the answers.

4. Heb. 10:29

The last place produced for the confirmation of the argument in hand is Heb. 10:29, “Of how much worse punishment do you suppose, shall he be thought worthy of, who has trodden under foot the Son of God, and has considered the blood of the covenant, with which he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and has done insult to the Spirit of grace?” “Nothing,” say our adversaries, “could be affirmed of all this concerning apostates, namely, ‘That they have trodden under foot,’ etc., unless the blood of Christ was in some sense shed for them.”

ANSWER: The intention of the apostle in this place is the same as the general aim and scope of the whole epistle, which is to persuade and urge the Jews, who had embraced the doctrine of the gospel, to perseverance and continuance in it. This he does, as in other places, with diverse and various arguments. Most of them are taken from a comparison at large instituted between the gospel in its administration, and those legal shadows which, they lived under before their profession, and to which they were in bondage. So here, too, he urges a strong argument to the same purpose “*ab incommode, seu effectu pernicioso,*”² from the miserable, dangerous effects and consequences of the sin of backsliding, and willful renunciation of the truth which is known and professed, using any motives and inducements he can bring to bear; which he assures [them] will be no less than totally throwing away and depriving themselves of all hopes and means of recovery, with the dreadful horror of conscience in expectation of judgment to come, vv. 26-27.

Now, this he confirms, as is his manner in this epistle, from some thing, way, and practice which was known to them, and with which they were all acquainted by that administration of the covenant under which they had lived before in their Judaism; and so he makes up his inference

¹ Rev 14:4b – These were redeemed [bought] from among men, *being* the firstfruits unto God and to the Lamb. Also John 10:28 “And I give to them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any *man* pluck them out of my hand.”

² Roughly: “by obliging, or else by bringing ruin” - WHG

from a comparison of the lesser offense to this one. He takes his example from the punishment due, by God's own appointment, to all those who transgressed Moses' law in the same way as apostates sin against the gospel – that is, “with a high hand,” or “presumptuously”. For such a person was to die without mercy, as in Num. 15:30-31.

Then, having abundantly proved that the gospel, and the manifestation of its grace, is to be far preferred to and exalted above the old ceremonies of the law, he concludes that certainly a much worse punishment (which he leaves to their judgment to determine) awaits those who willfully violate the holy gospel and despise the declaration of grace contained in it, and revealed by it. To further manifest this, he sets forth the nature and quality of this sin into which all those who are professing redemption and deliverance by the blood of Christ, shall willfully cast themselves. “It is,” he says, “no less than to tread under foot or despise the Son of God; to esteem the blood of the covenant, by which he was set apart and sanctified in the profession of the gospel, to be like the blood of a vile man; and thereby to insult the Spirit of grace.” This being (as is confessed) the plain meaning and aim of the apostle, we may observe various things, to vindicate this passage from the abuse of our adversaries. Such as,

First, He speaks here only of those who were professors of the faith of the gospel, separated from the world, brought into a church state and fellowship, professing themselves to be sanctified by the blood of Christ, receiving and owning Jesus Christ as the Son of God, and endowed with the gifts of the Holy Spirit, as in Heb. 4:4-5.¹ Now, it is most certain that these things are specific only to some, indeed to a very few, in comparison to the universality of the sons of men; so what is affirmed of such men can by no means be extended to all men. Now, if any one may be exempted, then universal redemption falls to the ground; from the condition of a very few, having qualifications which the multitude do not have, nothing can be concluded concerning all men.

Secondly, the apostle neither declares what has been, nor does he assert what may be, but only adds a threat of punishment based on a supposition of something happening. His main aim is to deter believers from the thing, rather than to signify that it may actually be possible. He does this by showing the misery that must necessarily follow if it should come to pass. When Paul told the soldiers in Acts 27:31, that if the mariners fled away in the boat they could not be saved, he did not intend to signify to them that they would necessarily be drowned if they did it. For God had declared the contrary to him the night before, and he conveyed that message to them; but he only wanted to exhort them to prevent what was a likely way for their ruin and perishing. Neither will the Remonstrants, with all their rhetoric, ever persuade us that it is in vain and altogether fruitless to forewarn men of an evil, and to exhort them to take heed of those ways, and the relationship among those ways, by which that evil is naturally to be incurred; even though, with regard to the purpose of God, the thing itself has no possibility, nor will it ever come to pass. A threat of punishment of the judgment, due to apostasy, is an appointed means to preserve the saints from that sin; it may be held out to them even though it is impossible that the elect should be seduced. Now, that Paul deals here only with a

¹ Possibly Heb. 4:5,6 “And again in this passage he said, ‘They shall not enter my rest.’ Since therefore it remains for some to enter it, and those who formerly received the good news failed to enter because of disobedience.” It is more likely referring to Heb 6:4,5 which Owen refers to in his third point, “For *it is* impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, and then fall away...”

supposition¹ is apparent from verse 26, where he introduces this argument and the motive to persevere: “For if we sin willfully.” As to whether believers may actually do so, he does not speak one word; but if they should do so, he shows what would be the effect; as to whether the soldiers in the ship would perish, Paul did not tell them; but yet he showed what must come to pass if the means of prevention were not used. Now, if this is the intention of the apostle, as is most likely by speaking in the first person, “If *we* sin willfully,” then nothing in the world can be concluded from this, either for the universality of redemption or the apostasy of saints; for this passage is usually urged for both those ends; for “*suppositio nil ponit in esse.*”²

Thirdly, it is most certain that those of whom he speaks did make a profession of all those things mentioned here, namely, that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, that they were sanctified by the blood of the covenant, and enlightened by the Spirit of grace; indeed, as is apparent from the parallel passage, Heb. 6:4-5, they had many gifts of illumination; besides this, in their initiation by baptism, they made open profession and demonstration of these things. So that by renouncing all these things, and openly detesting them, as was the manner of apostates, and cursing the name of Christ, this became a sin of such deep an abomination, attended with so many aggravations, that it might well have this remarkable threat of punishment annexed to it, even though the apostates never had any true effectual interest in the blood of Jesus.

Fourthly, it was the manner of the saints, and the apostles themselves, to esteem as sanctified everyone who is baptized, all initiated persons, everyone ingrafted into the church; so that, when speaking of backsliders, Paul could not make mention of them at the time in any way other than as they were commonly esteemed to be, and were considered to be, in the judgment of charity. Whether those to whom this argument against apostasy is proposed were true believers or not, but only temporary, they could not be otherwise described according to the usual manner of speech used by the Holy Ghost.

Fifthly, if the text is interpreted positively, and according to the truth of the thing itself in both its parts (1. that those of whom the apostle speaks were truly sanctified; 2. that true believers may totally perish), then these two things will inevitably follow from it: *first*, faith and sanctification are not the fruit of election; *secondly*, believers may fall finally from Christ. I have yet to find either of these assertions owned by our new universalists, though both of them are contended for by our old Arminians.

Sixthly, there is nothing of force in the text to persuade us that the persons spoken of here must be truly justified and regenerated believers, much less that Christ died for them; which comes in only by strained consequences. Only one expression seems to give any color to this, that they were said to be “sanctified by the blood of the covenant.” Now, concerning this, we need only consider the following,

first, the manner and custom of the apostles in writing to the churches was to call them all “saints”, ascribing to every one what belonged only to some;

secondly, these persons were baptized; among the ancients, this ordinance was sometimes called “enlightenment,” or “sanctification”; by a solemn sprinkling of the symbol of the

¹ Owen states parenthetically here, “(he is not giving life to the thing, but only showing the connection between apostasy and condemnation, thereby stirring up all the saints to “take heed lest there should be in any of them an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God)” Heb 3:12.

² Roughly, “for they place it where there is no place for it” – the Latin *suppositio* means to place or position under.

blood of Christ, they were *externally* sanctified, separated, and set apart, and they were esteemed as saints and believers by all;

thirdly, the various meanings of the word *hagaizo* (NT:5719) “sanctify” (used here) in the Scripture, the one most frequently intended is to consecrate and set apart to any holy use, as in 2Chron. 29:33 and Lev. 16:4;

fourthly, in this epistle Paul uses many words and phrases in a temple sense, alluding to the old legal observances in the things and ways of the Christian church;

fifthly, this supposed and professed sanctity is often called and esteemed to be sanctity, but only in its estimation. If we consider these things, it will be most apparent that what is intended here is not at all the true, real, internal, effectual sanctification which is proper to God’s elect. Rather, it is only a common external setting apart from the ways of the world and customs of the old synagogue (having the repute and the esteem of real holiness), and setting apart to an enjoyment of the ordinance of Christ representing the blood of the covenant.

So this threat of punishment is being made to all who are so externally and apparently sanctified; and to those who were truly so, it declared the certain connection between apostasy and condemnation, thereby warning them to avoid it. Joseph was warned to flee into Egypt, lest Herod slay the child; yet, with regard to God’s purpose, that could not be effected; it would not happen. With regard to those who were only apparently sanctified, this warning held out the odiousness of the sin, with their own certain inevitable destruction if they fell into it; which it was possible they might do.

And thus, by the Lord’s assistance, have I given you, I hope, a clear solution to all the arguments which up to this point the Arminians pretended to draw from the Scripture in the defense of their cause; some other sophisms will be removed shortly. But because of late we have had a proliferation of arguments on this subject, some of which, at least in form, appear to be new, and these may cause some trouble to the unskillful, I will in the next portion remove all those objections which Thomas Moore in his book, “The Universality of Free Grace,” has gathered together against our main thesis, which is that Christ died only for the elect; Moore puts his objections together in one bundle in chapter 20, sec. 6 of his book, calling them “reasons”.

CHAPTER VI – Answer to Chap. 20 of Universality of Grace

An answer to the twentieth chapter of the book entitled, “The Universality of God’s Free Grace,” etc., being a collection of all the arguments used by the author throughout the whole book to prove the universality of redemption.

THE title pretends satisfaction to those who desire to have reason satisfied; which is a great undertaking, I easily grant; but for the performance of it, “*hic labor, hoc opus.*”¹ I would greatly marvel that Christian reason, rightly informed by the word of God, should ever be satisfied with any doctrine so discrepant from the word, so full of contradiction in itself and to its own principles, as the doctrine of universal redemption. Therefore, I am persuaded that the author of the following arguments (which, lest you mistake them for others, he calls “reasons”) will fail of his intention to satisfy all those who have enough reason as to know how to make use of reason, and so much grace as not to love darkness more than light. The only reason I can conceive of as to why he calls this collection of all the arguments and texts of Scripture, which he had cited before and produced at large, so many “reasons” is, I suppose, that he has given them a logical, argumentative form in this place. I will briefly consider them. And, by the way, take notice of his skill in the regular framing of arguments to which he evidently pretends here. His first reason, then, is as follows:

Arguments made by Thomas Moore:

I. Scripture declares that Christ gave himself a ransom for every man.

“What the Scripture often and clearly affirms in plain words is certainly true and is to be believed, Prov. 22:20, 21;² Isa 8:20;³ 2Pet. 1:19, 20;⁴

“But that Jesus Christ gave himself a ransom, and by the grace of God tasted death for every man [1Tim 2:6], is often and plainly affirmed in Scripture, as shown before in chapters 7 to 13;⁵

“Therefore, the same is certainly a truth to be believed, John 20:31,⁶ Acts 26:27.”⁷

First, the proposition of this argument is clear, evident, and acknowledged by all professing the name of Christ; but with this caution and proviso: that by the Scripture affirming anything that is

¹ “There is the trouble, there is the toil” – In the Aeneid, Homer describes the easy descent into Hell, but the hard return.

² Prov 22:20 Have not I written to you excellent things in counsels and knowledge, 21 That I might make you know the certainty of the words of truth; that you might answer the words of truth to those that send to you?

³ Isa 8:20 To the law and to the testimony: if they do not speak according to this word, *it is* because *there is* no light in them.

⁴ 2Pet 1:19-20 We have also a more sure word of prophecy; to which you do well that you take heed, as to a light that shines in a dark place, until the day dawns, and the day star arise in your hearts: ²⁰ Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.

⁵ Owen has reduced all those chapters to these three lines which have no foundation and cannot support More’s conclusion. Whether Owen’s rancor and dismissive attitude are justified cannot be determined from the little we have to go by here.

⁶ Jn 20:31 But these are written, that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you might have life through his name.

⁷ Acts 26:27 King Agrippa, do you believe the prophets? I know that you believe.

to be believed in plain words, you understand the plain *sense* of those words, plain sense which is made clear by rules of interpretation. It is the thing signified that is to be believed, and not the words alone, which are the sign of that thing. Therefore, the plain sense and meaning is what we must inquire after, and that is what is intended when we speak of believing the plain words of the Scripture. But if by “plain words” you understand the *literal* importance of the words, which may perhaps be figurative, or have various meanings, and are capable of extension or restriction in their interpretation, then there is nothing more false than this assertion; for how can you then avoid the blasphemous folly of the Anthropomorphites, assigning a body and human shape to God, simply because the plain words of the Scripture often mention his eyes, hands, ears, etc. Is it not apparent to every child that the true importance of those expressions is not to be found at all in their gross carnal conception? Won’t transubstantiation, or its younger brother consubstantiation, also become an article of our creeds? With this limitation, then, we pass over the proposition with the passages of Scripture brought to confirm it, only with this observation: there is not one of them suited to the purpose in hand. And because they do not relate to the argument under consideration, we only leave it to men’s silent judgments.

Secondly, we absolutely deny one portion of the assumption, or minor premise, that Christ should be said to give himself a ransom for every man; it is neither often, nor once, nor plainly, nor obscurely affirmed in the Scripture, nor is it at all proved in the place referred to. So this is but an empty flourishing.

For the other expression, of “tasting death for every man,” we grant that the words are found in Heb. 2:9; but we deny, *first*, that “every man” always signifies all and every man in the world. Col. 1:28, “Warning every man and teaching every man.” Every man in the world is not there; neither are we to believe that Paul warned and taught every particular man, for it is false and impossible. So that every man, in the Scripture, is not universally collective of all of all sorts, but either distributive, for some of all sorts, or collective, being restricted to all of some sort. As used in Paul’s phrase, “every man” was only those to whom he had preached the gospel.

Secondly, in the original there is only *huper pantos* “for every”, without the substantive “man”, which might be supplied by other words as well as man, such as “elect”, or “believer”.

Thirdly, “every one” is clearly restrained to all the members of Christ, and the children brought to glory by him, as we have declared before. So this passage is not in any way useful to confirm the assumption, which we deny in the sense in which they intend it; and we are sure that we will never see a clear, or even so much as a probable, testimony for confirming it.

To conclude the syllogism, the author, to manifest his skill in disputing in such an argumentative way as he undertakes, adds some further proofs. It seems he was conscious that it had little strength from the propositions from which it is enforced; and therefore he thought to give some new support to it, although with very ill success, as will easily appear to anyone that will but consult the passages quoted, and consider the business in hand. In the meantime, this new logic of filing proofs to the conclusion which are suitable to neither proposition, and striving to give strength to that by new testimony which it does not have from the premises, deserves our notice in this age of learned writers. “*Heu quantum est sapere.*”¹ Such logic is fit to maintain such divinity. And so much for the first argument.

¹ Roughly - O how great is the understanding! Spoken sarcastically, of course, as the parting shot indicates.

II. Christ came to save *all* sinners, not just some of them.

“Those whom Jesus Christ and his apostles affirm that Christ came to save, in plain terms, without any exception or restraint, he certainly did come to save; and to that end he died, and he gave himself a ransom for, and is a propitiation for their sin; and he gave himself a ransom for *them*, and he is the propitiation for *their* sins, Matt. 26:24; John 6:38; 1Cor. 15:3, 4; Heb. 10:7; John 8:38, 45; 2Pet. 1:16; Heb. 2:3, 4; [Who are they?]

“Jesus Christ and his apostles have, in plain terms, affirmed that ‘Christ came to save *sinner*,’ 1Tim. 1:15; the ‘*world*,’ John 3:17; that he died for the ‘*unjust*,’ 1Pet. 3:18; the ‘*ungodly*,’ Rom. 5:6; for ‘*every man*,’ Heb. 2:9; he ‘gave himself a ransom for *all men*,’ 1Tim. 2:6; and he is the ‘propitiation for the sins of the *whole world*,’ 1Jn. 2:2. Every one of these affirmations, without any exception or restraint, says that “all” refers to the unjust, the ungodly, sinners, and men, and these are of the whole world, Rom. 3:10, 19, 20, 23; Eph. 2:1-3; Tit. 3:3; John 3:4, 6.

“Therefore, Jesus Christ came to save, and he died for, and he gave himself a ransom for *all* men; and he is the propitiation for *their* sins, John 1:29.”

As to the proposition of this argument, I desire only to observe that we do not affirm that in any place does the Scripture lay an exception or restraint upon those persons for whom Christ is said to die. It is not as though in one place it affirms that he died for all men, and in another some exception against it, as though some of all those men were excluded. That would feign a repugnancy and contradiction in the word of God. We only say that one place of Scripture interprets another, and it declares that sense which may have been ambiguous and doubtful in another place.

For instance: when the Scripture shows that Christ died or gave himself a ransom for all, we believe it; and when, in another place, he declares that “all” to be his church, his elect, his sheep, all believers, some of all sorts, out of all kindreds, nations, and tongues under heaven; this is not to lay an exception or restraint upon what was said of “all” before, but only to declare that the “all” for which he gave himself for a ransom was “all his church”, “all his elect”, “all his sheep”, “some of all sorts”: and so we believe that he died for all. With this observation we let pass the proposition, taking out its meaning about as well as the phrase by which it is expressed will afford it. And we accept it together with the vain flourish and pompous show of many texts of Scripture brought to confirm it, not one of which offers anything to the purpose. I am persuaded that he put down names and figures at a venture, without once consulting the texts, having no small cause to be confident that none would trace him in his flourish, and yet that some eyes might dazzle at his super-numerary quotations.

Let me urge the reader to turn to those passages, and if any one of them offers anything to the purpose or business in hand, let the author’s credit be of weight with him another time. O let us not be as many, who corrupt the word of God! But perhaps it is a mistake in the impression, and for Matt. 26:24, he intends verse 28, where Christ is said to shed his blood for many. In John 6, he mistook verse 38 for 39, where our Savior affirms that he came to save what his Father gave him so that none should be lost; which certainly are the elect. In 1Cor. 15:3, 4, he was not much amiss, the apostle conjoining in those verses the death and resurrection of Christ, which he says was for us; and we have declared before how far this advantages his cause in hand. By Hebrews 10:7, I suppose he meant verse 10 of the chapter, affirming that by the will of God, which Christ came to do, we are sanctified, even through the offering of the body of Jesus, ascribing our sanctification to his death, which is not effected in everyone. Though perhaps he supposes the

last clause of the verse, “once for all,” to make his argument for him. But some charitable man, I hope, will undeceive him by letting him know the meaning of the word *ephapaz*.¹ The same thing may be observed about the other passages: that there is nothing at all in them which addresses the proposition in hand, and there is near enough in them to at least undermine it. And so his proposition in sum is this: “All those for whom the Scripture affirms that Christ died, for them he died;” which is true; and so this proposition is granted without doubt.

The assumption affirms that Christ and his apostles in the Scriptures say that he died to save sinners, the unjust, the ungodly, the world, *all*. Based on this, the bare conclusion ought to be, “Therefore Christ died for sinners, the unjust, the ungodly, the world, and the like.”

To which we say,

First, this is the very same argument, for substance, with what went before, as also are some of those which follow; only some words are varied to change the outward appearance so as to make show of a number.

Secondly, the whole strength of this argument lies in turning indefinite propositions into universals; he concludes that because Christ died for sinners, therefore he died for *all* sinners; because he died for the unjust, ungodly, and the world, that therefore he died for every one that is unjust, or ungodly, and for every one in the world; because he died for “all”, it therefore means for every single one of all sorts of men.²

Now, if this is good arguing, I will furnish you with some more such arguments as you have occasion to use them:

First, God “justifies the ungodly,” Rom. 4:5; therefore, he justifies every one that is ungodly. Now, “whom he justifies, them he also glorifies;” and therefore every ungodly person will be glorified.

Secondly, when Christ came, “men loved darkness rather than light,” John 3:19; therefore, all men loved darkness, and so none believed.

Thirdly, “The world knew not Christ,” John 1:10; therefore, no man in the world knew him, and so none believed.

Fourthly, “The whole world lies in wickedness,” 1Jn. 5:19; therefore, every one in the world lies in wickedness.³

I could easily furnish you with such arguments as these, by turning indefinite propositions into universals, for any purpose to which you will use them.

¹ The phrase “once for all” is the Greek word (NT:2178 *ephapaz*); it means “as against once”. The context concerns the offering of the temple priest who had to repeat his sacrificial offering on behalf of the people each week. This is compared to Christ, our Great High Priest, who offered one final sacrifice “as against all” those repeated sacrifices of the temple priest. It carries with it no inference of who it was done for – the single act has been done in lieu of “all” the others.

² I worded it “every *single* one” to convey the idea that there are no exceptions. Owen himself states that Christ died for all men where “all” means some of all sorts of men, and so it might otherwise be confusing as to the distinction he makes here.

³ Apart from God’s grace and His calling, all these propositions would remain true. What is false, Owen says, is extrapolating either universal salvation or universal condemnation from men’s universal depravity.

Thirdly, if you extend the words in the conclusion no further than their intent in the passages of Scripture recited, then we may safely grant the whole: namely, that Christ died for sinners and the world, for sinful men in their several generations living in the world; but if you mean “all” as a universal collective in the conclusion, then the syllogism is sophistical and false.¹ No place in Scripture affirms or produces that conclusion; the object of the death of Christ is assigned in indefinite terms. It receives light and clearness from a more restrained sense in those passages where these terms are expounded, and by which is meant “all his own people”, and “the children of God scattered throughout the world.”

Fourthly, the particular passages of Scripture urged in the beginning of the assumption, 1Tim. 1:15; 1Pet. 3:18; Rom. 5:6, are not at all pertinent to the purpose in hand. John 3:17; Heb. 2:9; 1John 2:2, have been already considered. Rom. 3:10, 19, 20, 23; Eph. 2:1-3; Tit. 3:3; John 3:4, 6, added at the close of the same proposition, prove that all are sinners and children of wrath; but there is not the least intimation that Christ died for all sinners, or for all those children of wrath. And this may suffice to answer the first two arguments, and might easily be a retort to the author. The Scripture is full and plain to confirm the position which he intends to oppose.

III. The purpose of Christ’s death and exaltation is to be Lord of *all*.

“What the Scripture presents as one purpose of the death of Christ, and as one basis and cause of God exalting Christ to be the Lord and Judge of all, and as the equity of his judging, is certainly to be believed, Ps. 12:6, 18:30, 119:4; “But the Scripture does present this for one purpose of the death and resurrection of Christ: that he might be the Lord of all, Rom. 14:9; 2Cor. 5:14, 15. And for that cause (i.e. his death and resurrection) God has exalted him to be the Lord and Judge of all men; and his judgments will be just, Rom. 14:9, 11, 12; 2Cor. 5:10; Phil 2:7-11; Acts 17:31; Rom. 2:16:

“Therefore, that Christ so died, and rose again for all, is a truth to be believed,” 1Tim. 2:6

First, I will not much trouble myself with the unlearned framing of this argument, the uncouth expressions of what is intended, and the failing in its particulars by ascribing it to the person and not the cause; as to the rest,

First, there is an artificial regularity to it caused by bringing his minor proposition, *that Christ is made Lord and Judge of all*, into the major proposition. By including this term in all three propositions, he makes the whole almost unintelligible.

Secondly, he interprets the cause of Christ’s exaltation to include his death. “For this cause God exalted Christ.” Yet it was specifically his resurrection in which he was “declared to be the Son of God with power,” Rom. 1:4; this was the glorious part of his exaltation. To examine and lay open the weakness and folly of countless such things as these, which occur everywhere, would be lavish with precious moments. Those who have the least taste of learning or of the method of reasoning easily see the vanity of these arguments; and for the rest, especially the poor admirers of these foggy sophisms, I will not say, “*Quoniam hic populus vult decipi, decipiatur*,”² “but, “God give them understanding and repentance to acknowledge the truth.”

¹ See notes on pp. 81 and 175 concerning sophistry and syllogism.

² Roughly, “Since in this the people are willing to be deceived by the deceiver.”

Secondly, I have nothing to say to this whole argument as it lies before us, except to entreat Mr. Moore, that if the misery of our times should call upon him to write again, he would cease expressing his mind by syllogisms, and speak in his own manner; by the confusion of countless tautologies in this current work, he may have puzzled his reader a little. For, truly, the kind of arguing used here is exceedingly ridiculous, with its lack of logic by which he is himself deceived, and with its delight in sophistry by which he deceives others; for none can be so blind but that, at first reading the argument, he will see that Mr. Moore asserts what was not in either of the premises, nevertheless inferring it in the conclusion, and “strengthening” it with a new testimony. These passages speak of the exaltation of Christ to become judge of all, which refers to his own glory; the conclusion that Mr. Moore makes, that Christ therefore died for all, necessarily aims at and intends their good, not Christ’s exaltation. Would it not be a noble design to banish all human learning, and to establish such a way of arguing in its place? “*Hoc Ithacus velit, et magno mercentur Atridae.*”¹

Thirdly, the force and sum of the argument is this: “Christ died and rose again that he might be Lord and Judge of all; therefore, Christ died for all.” Now, ask what he means by “dying for all”, and the whole treatise answers that it is paying a ransom for all, so that they might be saved. Now, how this can be extorted out of Christ’s dominion over all, with his power of judging all those who were given to him, which also extends to the angels for whom he did not die? Let those who can understand it rejoice in their quick apprehension, for I confess it escapes me.

Fourthly, the *manner* of arguing being so fruitless, let us see whether there is any more weight in the *matter* of the argument. Many texts of Scripture are piled up and variously applied to the several propositions. In those taken out of Ps. 12:6, 18:30 (as I suppose it should be, and not 130, as it is printed), and 119:4, there is some mention of the precepts of God, and the purity and perfection of his word. I cannot perceive what they have to do with the business in hand. The text in 2Tim 2:6, which is added to the conclusion, is one of those places presented on every occasion as the supposed foundation of the whole assertion. But that is without cause, as has often been shown. Among those texts which are annexed to the minor proposition, we find 2Cor. 5:14-15. I have already made clear the mind of the Holy Ghost in this passage, and made it obvious that no such thing as universal redemption can be wrested from it. So too in this present argument, it has no reference at all. It does not contain one syllable concerning the judging of Christ and his power over all, which was the point insisted on. Phil. 2:7-11, Acts. 17:31, and Rom. 2:16 do mention, indeed, Christ’s exaltation, and his judging all at the last day. But to say that because he shall judge all at the last day, and therefore he died for all, will take more pains to prove than our adversary intends to take in this cause.

The weight, on the whole, must depend on Rom. 14:9, 11, 12; which will be briefly considered as the only place that gives any semblance of right to this kind of arguing. It is the lordship and dominion of Christ over all which the apostle largely insists upon in that passage. It evidences this to believers so that they might be provoked to walk blameless and without offense towards one another, knowing the terror of the Lord, and how all men, even themselves, must come to appear before his judgment-seat. There it will be a sad thing to have to give an account of scandals and offenses. To further ingraft and fasten this upon them, he declares to them the way by which the Lord Christ attained and came to this dominion and power of judging. All things

¹ Roughly, “This Ithacus desired, and the great trade of Atridae.” This is another quote from Virgil’s *Aeneid*, Book II. It is a caustic reference to someone’s longing for prestige, but lacking the requisite means to attain it.

being put under his feet, he also declares what design he had in undertaking the office of mediation, which is there expressed by “dying, rising, and reviving”: namely, that he might execute judgment over all those committed to him, which is part of the “glory set before him,” and which caused him to “endure the cross and despise the shame,” Heb. 12:2.

So that all of what is intimated here concerning the death of Christ is about the end, effects, and result that his death had towards himself, not what his intention was towards those for whom he died. To die for others at least denotes to die for their good, and in the Scripture it always denotes to die in their stead. Now, I sincerely profess that I am in no way able to perceive that it can be deduced from this that Christ died for all. It simply says that by his death he made a way to enjoy that power by which he is Lord over all, and by which he will judge all, casting the great part of men into hell by the sentence of his righteous judgment. If men will still contend that Christ must be said to die for all, simply because by his death and resurrection he attained the power of judging all, then I will only leave them with these three things: *first*, if this is so, then countless souls will be judged by him for not walking according to the light of nature left to them, which directs them to seek the eternal power and Godhead of their Creator, even though they have not the least rumor of the gospel to direct them to a Redeemer, Rom. 2:12-16; ¹and what good will it do such men that Christ died for them? *Secondly*, it also means that he died for the devils, because, by his death and resurrection, he has attained a power of judging them also. *Thirdly*, the whole assertion has nothing to do with the business in hand; our inquiry is about those whom our Savior intended to redeem and save by his blood; respond with this, about those he will one day judge: “*quaestio est de alliis, responsio de cepis.*”²

IV. Christ is the Savior of the whole world, but only believers receive life.

“What the Scripture sets forth as a general truth for all the world of mankind, is certainly a truth to be believed, Acts 5:20.³ The truth it sets forth is that whoever believes the particulars so as to come to Christ and receive him shall not perish, but shall have everlasting life.

“That God sent forth his Son to be the Savior of the world is indeed generally set forth in Scripture for all men, that whoever believes the particulars so as to come to Christ and receive him shall not perish, but shall have everlasting life, John 3:16-18, 36, 1:4, 11, 12: “Therefore, it is a certain truth that God sent his Son to be the Savior of the world, 1Jn. 4:14.”

I hope that no ingenuous man, who knows anything of the controversy in hand, and what issue is driven between us and our adversary, or who is in any measure acquainted with arguing, will expect us to spend many words on such poor flourishes, vain repetitions, confused expressions, and illogical deductions and argumentations, as this pretended new argument presents. Indeed, it is the same argument as the first two, and with almost all that follow. Nor will I be expected to waste much time or pains about them. For my own part, I would in no way be able to undergo the tediousness of the review of such things as these, but that “*eundem est quo trahunt fata*

¹ Rom 2:12-16 For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law (for it is not the hearers of the law who *are* just before God, but the doers of the law who shall be justified. For when the Gentiles, who do not have the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, not having the law, are a law to themselves: which shows the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and *their* thoughts meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another;) in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.

² Loosely: the question is, for others, a promise (*or wager*) for a bribe.

³ Ac 5:20 – Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life.

ecclesim.”¹ I do not, then, want to trouble the reader any more with a declaration of what in particular he must be sufficiently convinced of by barely looking over these reasons. Namely, that this author is utterly ignorant of the way of reasoning, and he does not know how to tolerably express his own conceptions, nor how to infer one thing from another in any regular way. I answer in reply to his arguments,

First, that whatever the Scripture presents as a truth to be believed is certainly so, and is to be embraced.

Secondly, that the Scripture sets forth the death of Christ as an all-sufficient means to bring sinners to God, to all those to whom the gospel is preached, so that whoever believes it and comes in to him will certainly be saved.

Thirdly, we cannot perceive anything can be concluded from this except that the death of Christ is of such infinite value that it is able to completely save everyone to whom it is made known, if by true faith they obtain an interest in it and a right to it. We have previously confirmed this truth by many testimonies of Scripture, and we conceive that this innate sufficiency of the death of Christ is the foundation of its promiscuous proposal to elect and reprobate alike.²

Fourthly, that his conclusion, if it is to have any semblance of an argument, should at least include the entire proposition, namely, “That Christ is set forth to be the Savior of the world, so that whoever believes the particulars,” etc. And then we may fully grant that it makes no argument at all for universal redemption, but only for the fullness and sufficiency of his satisfaction.

Of the word “world”, enough has been said before.

V. Christ gave himself for all, to gain the right of Lordship over all.

“That God will one day cause every man confess to the glory of God is certainly a truth, for God will own no lie for his glory, John 3:33; Rom. 3:3, 4; “But God will one day cause every man to confess Jesus (by virtue of his death and ransom) to be the Lord, even to the glory of God, Phil. 2:7-11; Isa. 45:22, 23; Rom. 14:9, 11, 12; Ps. 136:9.

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

ANS : Based on the premises, the conclusion of this argument ought to be this, and not otherwise: “Therefore, it is certainly a truth that Jesus Christ is the Lord, and is to be confessed Lord to the glory of God.” This is all the conclusion this argument ought to have, unless, instead of a syllogism, you intend to state three independent propositions, each one standing on its own

¹ Loosely, “The very same is what draws folly to the church.”

² Christ’s atonement is infinite in value, and thus it is sufficient to redeem the whole world, every man, woman, and child in all generations. However, it is efficient (applicable and effective) only for the elect who have gained an interest and a right to it through God’s decree. Thus, not knowing who is elect, the Church universally proclaims (promiscuously proposes) the Gospel.

strength. What is inserted concerning giving himself a ransom for all, and what follows of the conviction and condemnation of those who neither believe nor obey the gospel, confirmed from 2Cor. 5:10, 2Tim. 2:12-14, is altogether heterogeneous to the business in hand. Now, if this is the conclusion intended, and our author supposes that those who deny universal redemption question the truth of it, I do not wonder at all why he left all other employment to take up writing controversies. He has such obvious advantages against his adversaries, and small mistakes such as this are able to furnish his conceit with that conclusion. But it may be an act of charity to part him and his own shadow, which are so terribly at variance here and in other places; therefore, I beg him to hear a word in his heat, and to take notice,

First, we do not ascribe a fruitless, ineffectual redemption to Jesus Christ; nor do we say that he loved any with that entire love which moved him to lay down his life, except his own church; and all his elect are effectually redeemed by him. Yet we do not deny that he will also judge the reprobates, namely, all those who do not know, who deny, who disobey and corrupt the truth of his gospel. Nor do we deny that all will be convinced that he is Lord of all at the last day: so the author may spare his pains of proving such unquestionable things. I extremely desire to follow this with something, but indignation must be bridled.

Secondly, as to that cause in the second proposition, “By virtue of his death and ransom given,” we deny that it is intimated once, anywhere in the Scripture, that the ransom paid by Christ, in his death for us, was the cause of his exaltation to be Lord of all. Rather, it was his *obedience* to his Father in his death, and not his *satisfaction* for us, that is proposed as the antecedent of this exaltation; as is apparent in Phil. 2:7-11.¹

VI. The plain meaning of Scripture is that Christ died for all men.

“What may be proved in and by the Scripture, both by plain sentences in it and necessary inferences drawn from them, without wresting, wrangling, adding to, taking from, or altering the sentences and words of Scripture, is a truth to be believed, Matt. 22:29, 32; Rom. 11:2, 5, 6;

“That Jesus Christ gave himself a ransom for all men, and by the grace of God tasted death for every man, may be proved in and by the Scripture, both by plain sentences in it and necessary inferences drawn from them, without wresting, wrangling, adding to, or taking away from, or altering the sentences and words, as was already shown in chapters 7 and 13, which will now be ordered into several proofs:

“Therefore, that Jesus Christ gave himself for all men, and by the grace of God tasted death for every man, is a truth to be believed, Mark 1:15; 16:15,18; 1Jn. 4:14.”

ANSWER:

First, the meaning of this argument is that universal redemption may be proved by the Scripture; which, being the very thing in question, and the thesis to be proved, there is no reason why it should itself be an argument, except to increase the number of arguments. For my part, they should pass without any other answer except that they certainly are a number, but that only those which are actually arguments are to be considered.

¹ Phil 2:7-11 But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in form as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross. For which God has also highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and *things* under the earth; And *that* every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ *is* Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Secondly, concerning the argument itself (seeing it must go for one), we say:

First, as to the first proposition, laying aside the unnecessary expressions, I take the meaning to be this: “What is affirmed in the Scripture, or may be deduced from it by just inference, following those ways of interpretation, affirmation, and inference by which the Spirit of God leads us into the knowledge of the truth, is certainly to be believed;” all of which is granted, although it is not proved by the passages quoted (Matt. 22:29, 32, Rom. 11:2, 5, 6). And this is the only foundation of that article of faith which you oppose.

Secondly, as to the second proposition that Christ gave himself a ransom for all and tasted death for all, it is the very word of Scripture. It was never denied by anyone. But making “all” to be “all and every man” in both passages cited is *your* addition, and not the Scripture’s assertion. If you intend, then, to prove that Christ gave himself a ransom for all, and tasted death for all, you may save your labors; it is confessed by all hands, and no one ever denied it. But if you intend to prove that those “all” are “all and every man”, of all ages and kinds, elect and reprobate, and not all *his children*, all *his elect*, all *his sheep*, all *his people*, all the *children given him of God*, some of all sorts, nations, tongues, and languages only, then I will, by the Lord’s assistance, willingly join issue with you or any man breathing, to search out the meaning of the word and mind of God in this. We will hold ourselves to the proportion of faith, the essentiality of the doctrine of redemption, the scope of the passages where such assertions are found, comparing them with other passages, and in similar ways laboring in all humility to find the mind of the Lord according to his own appointment. I am, by the grace of God, exceedingly confident of the success of such a trial, laying aside such failings as will adhere to my personal weakness. I have, by his goodness, received some strength and opportunity to search into and seriously weigh whatever the most famous assertors of universal redemption have been able to say in this cause, whether Lutherans or Arminians.

For the present, I address myself to what is before me. I only desire the reader to observe that the assertion to be proved by Mr. Moore is this: “That Jesus Christ, according to the counsel and will of his Father, suitable to his purpose of salvation in his own mind and intention, did, by his death and oblation, pay a ransom for all and every man, elect and reprobate, both those who are saved and those who perish, to redeem them from sin, death, and hell, in order to recover salvation, life, and immortality for them; and he did not do these things only for his elect, or the church, who were chosen to be an inheritance before the foundation of the world.” To confirm this assertion, Mr. Moore has produced various passages which, by the Lord’s assistance, we will consider in order.

Proof 1 of argument 6 – God gave his Son to be Savior of the world.

“God so loved the world, that he gave his Son to be the Savior of the world, 1Jn. 4:14; and sends his servant to bear witness of his Son, that all men through him might believe, John 1:4, 7; that whoever believes on him might have everlasting life, John 3:16, 17. And he is willing that all should come to the knowledge of the truth, 1Tim. 2:4, and be saved, 1Tim. 1:15. Nor will he lack sufficiency to help them if, as light comes, they will suffer themselves to be worked upon and receive it, Prov. 1:23, 8:4, 5. And is not this plain in Scripture?”

ANSWER:

First, the main, indeed, the only thing to be proved, as we observed before, is that those indefinite propositions which we find in the Scripture concerning the death of Christ are to be

understood universally. It must be proved that the terms “all” and “world”, when they denote the object of the death of Christ, signify all and every man in the world. Unless this can be done, all other labor is useless and fruitless. Now, as to this, there is nothing at all urged in this pretended proof except a few ambiguous passages barely recited, with a false observation based upon them, for which they give no substance.

Secondly, 1Jn. 4:14, God sending his Son to be the “Savior of the world,” and sending his servant to testify of him, is nothing more than to be the Savior of men living in the world; which his elect are. A hundred such passages as these, so clearly interpreted as they are in other passages, would provide nothing at all suitable to the purpose. The next thing is from John 1:4, 7. Verse 4 is that Christ was the “life of men”, which is most true. No life can be had for any man except in and through him. This does not at all answer the question. The next words of verse 7, that “all men through him might believe;” when pieced together with the sense of another fraction of Scripture, seem to have some weight, as though Christ were sent so that all men through him might believe.

Good show! This seems to prove universal redemption in the same way that the Scripture cited by the devil, after he cut off part of it, proved that our Savior should cast himself from the pinnacle of the temple. But if you cast aside the sophistry of the old serpent, the expression of this passage will serve to invalidate the thesis sought to be maintained by it. The words are, “There was a man sent by God, whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe.” Now, who do you think is there meant by “through him?” Is it Christ, the light? or John, the *witness* of the light? Certainly it is John, as almost all expositors agree, except certain Papists, and Grotius, *that Ishmael*. So it is by the Syriac interpreter, reading, “By his hand or ministry.” And so the word itself infers; for we are not said to believe “by Christ,” or, as it would be here, “by the light.” But instead, as in John 12:36, it reads “in the light,” and not *by* it; and Acts 9:42, “believed *in* the Lord;” so also, Rom. 9:33, “Every one that believes *on* him.” So it is in various passages: “*in* him”. But no mention is made of believing *by* him. That denotes the instrument of believing, which is the ministry of the word, rather than the object of our faith, which is Christ. This being apparent, let us see what is affirmed about John, why he was sent “that all through him might believe.”

Now, this word “all” here has all the qualifications which our author requires of it, to always certainly express a collective universality, that it is spoken of God, etc. And yet who, I ask, were these “all” that were intended to be brought to the faith by the ministry of John? Were they all those who lived throughout the world in his days, and not only those to whom he preached a few years in Judea? Were they also all those who were dead before his birth, and that were born after his death, and will be born to the end of the world everywhere under heaven? Let those who can believe it enjoy their persuasion with this assurance: that I will ever be their rival. For I am fully persuaded that “all men” here means only some of all sorts, those to whom his word actually came. So the necessary sense of the word “all” here completely destroys the proposition.

Thirdly, what is urged from John 3:16, 17, that God sent his Son so that “whoever believes on him might have everlasting life,” is not under debate among Christians as to its sense, as far as I know.

Fourthly, for God’s willingness that all should be saved, from 1Tim. 2:4 (to which a word is needlessly added from 1Tim. 1:15 for show; the text is for another purpose), taking “all men” there to mean the universality of individuals, I then ask,

First, what act of God is it in which this willingness consists? Is it in the eternal purpose of his will that all should be saved? Why then is it not accomplished? For “Who has resisted his will?”¹ Is it his antecedent desire that all men should be saved, though in the end he fails? Then the blessed God is most miserable, for it is not in him to accomplish his just and holy desires. Is it some temporary act of his by which he has declared himself to them? Then, I say, if you will grant that salvation is only to be had in a Redeemer, in Jesus Christ, and if you can give me an instance how God, in any act whatever, has declared his mind and revealed himself to all men, of all times and places, concerning his willingness to save them by Jesus Christ, a Redeemer, and I will never more trouble you in this cause.

Secondly, does this will equally respect the “all” intended here, or does it not? If it *does*, then why does it not have equal *effect* on all? What reason can be assigned? If it does *not* equally respect all, then where does that appear? There is nothing in the text to intimate any such diversity. For our part, we understand “all men” to mean some of all sorts throughout the world. We do not doubt that, to the fair reader, we have made it apparent from the context and circumstances of the passage. The will of God there is what is mentioned by our Savior in John 6:40.²

What follows in the close of this proof, of God’s “not lacking sufficiency to help those who, as light comes, suffer themselves to be worked upon and receive it,” is a poisonous sting in the tail of the serpent. In this is couched the whole Pelagian poison of free-will, and Popish “merit of congruity,” with Arminian sufficient grace in its whole extent and universality. There is not the least witness given to either of these things in the passage produced.

The sum and meaning of the whole assertion is that there is sufficient grace universally granted to all men, subjective grace, enabling them to obedience. That grace receives addition, increase, degrees, and augmentation, according to how those who have it make use of what they presently enjoy. This is a position so contradictory to countless passages of Scripture, so derogatory to the free grace of God, so destructive to the efficacy of grace, and such a clear exaltation of the old idol Free-Will to the throne of God, as to rival anything the decaying estate of Christianity has invented and broached. It is so far from being “plain and clear in Scripture,” that it is universally repugnant to the whole dispensation of the new covenant which is revealed to us there. If ever the Lord calls me to, I hope very clearly to demonstrate that fact. For the present, it does not belong immediately to the business in hand, and therefore I must leave it.

Proof 2. Christ came to take away the sins of the world, a propitiation for all.

“Jesus Christ, the Son of God, came into the world to save the world, John 12:47; to save sinners, 1Tim. 1:15; to take away our sins and destroy the works of the devil, 1Jn. 3:5, 8; to take away the sins of the world, John 1:29; therefore he died for all, 2Cor. 5:14, 15; and gave himself a ransom for all, 1Tim. 2:6; to save what was lost, Matt. 18:11. And so his propitiation was made for the world, 2Cor. 5:19; the whole world, 1Jn. 2:2. And all this is full and plain in Scripture.”

Ans: Those passages of this proof where there is mention of “all” or “world”, such as John 12:47, John 1:29; 2Cor. 5:14, 15; 1Tim. 2:6; 2Cor. 5:19; 1Jn. 2:2, have all been considered already, and

¹ Rom 9:19

² Jn 6:40 And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one who sees the Son, and believes on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.

I am unwilling to trouble the reader with repetitions. See those passages and I have no doubt you will find that, far from giving any strength to the thing he intended to prove, much rather they evert it. As for the rest, (1Tim. 1:16; Matt, 18:11; 1Jn. 3:5, 8), I cannot see how anything can be extracted from them to give substance to universal redemption. The case they make against it has been previously declared. We then pass to,

Proof 3. Christ invites all to repent and believe through his Spirit.

“God in Christ does, in some means or other of his appointment, give some witness to all men of his mercy and goodness procured by Christ, Ps. 19:4; Rom. 10:18; Acts 14:17; and through this, at one time or another, God sends forth some stirrings of his Spirit to move in and knock at the hearts of men to invite them to repentance and to seeking God, and thus to lay hold of the grace and salvation offered: and this not done in a show or by pretence, but in truth and good will God is ready to bestow it on them. And this is all fully testified in Scripture, Gen. 6:3; Isa 45:22; Acts 17:30, 31; John 1:19.”

ANSWER:

First, “*Parvas habet spes Troja, si tales habet.*”¹ If universal redemption has need of such proofs as these, it has great need indeed, and little hope of support. Universal *vocation* (i.e. calling) is asserted here, to maintain universal *redemption*. “*Manus manum fricat,*”² or rather, “*Muli se mutuo scabiunt.*”³ The one is often called in to support the other; and they are the two legs of that idol free-will, which is set up for men to worship. When one stumbles, the other steps forward to uphold the Babel. I will not now address universal vocation (a gross figment⁴), but will only say for the present that it is true that God at all times, ever since the creation, has called men to the knowledge of himself as the great Creator. He has done so in those things which might be known of him by means of the visible creation, “even his eternal power and Godhead,” Rom. 1:19, 20; Ps. 19:1, 2; Acts 14:17.

Secondly, that after the death of Christ, by the preaching of the gospel far and wide, he called home to himself the children of God, scattered abroad in the world, where before his elect were confined almost to one nation, thus giving a right to the gospel to be preached to “every creature,” Mark 16:15; Rom. 10:18; Isa. 45:22; Acts 17:30, 31.

Thirdly, that God should at all times, in all places, in all ages, grant means of grace, or call to Christ as a redeemer, or to partake of his mercy and goodness manifested in him, with strivings and motions of his Spirit for men to close with those invitations. This is so opposite to God’s distinguishing mercy, so contradictory to express passages of Scripture and the experience of all ages, that I wonder how any man has the boldness to assert it, much more to produce it as a proof of an untruth more gross than itself. Were I not resolved to tie myself to the present controversy,

¹ Back to Virgil’s Aeneid, this reads loosely, “Even if so excellent to hold, the hope which Troy held was unimportant.” That is, Troy would fall to its destruction regardless of its hopes and expectations in the matter.

² Loosely, “one hand rubs the other.”

³ Loosely, “mules scratch each other.”

⁴ Arminians assert there is a universal proclamation of God’s purpose of mercy towards all – a *universal vocation or calling*. This is an invitation to receive pardon and salvation. It is accompanied, they say, by a *universal sufficient grace* — this is God’s gracious assistance that is actually and universally bestowed. It is sufficient to enable all men, if they choose, to obtain salvation. Calvinists admit that pardon and salvation are to be proclaimed to all, but this does not indicate God’s intent to save all men, nor does it indicate that His grace and divine help, sufficient to produce faith and regeneration, are given to all men.

I should not hold back from producing some reasons to evert this fancy; something may be done afterward, if the Lord does not prevent me. In the meantime, let the reader consult Ps. 147:19, 20; Matt. 11:25, 22:14; Acts 14:16, 16:7; Rom. 10:14, 15.

Proof 4. The Holy Ghost will judge all as to the sin of not believing in Christ.

“The Holy Ghost that comes from the Father and the Son will reprove the world of sin (even that part of the world that refuses now to believe that they are under sin), because they do not believe on Christ, and it is their sin that they have not believed on him. And how could it be their sin not to believe in Christ, and for that cause be under sin, if there were neither enough in the atonement made by Christ for them, nor truth in God’s offer of mercy to them, nor will and power in the Spirit’s moving at one time or other in any way sufficient to have brought them to believe? And yet this is evident in Scripture, and will be made out by the Holy Spirit to be their great sin, which fastens all other sins on them, John 3:18, 19, 8:24, 12:48, 15:22, 24, 16:7-11.”

ANSWER:

The intention of this proof is to show that men will be condemned for their unbelief, for not believing in Christ; the author says this cannot be unless three things are granted,

First, that there is enough in the atonement made by Christ for them.

Secondly, that there is truth in God’s offer of mercy to them.

Thirdly, that at some time or other, there is sufficient will and power given to them by the Spirit to believe.

Now, though I believe no man can perceive what may be concluded from this for universal redemption, yet I will observe a few things:

As to the first thing required, I say that if by “enough in the atonement for them,” you mean that the atonement, which was made for them has enough in it, we deny it; not because the atonement does not have enough in it for them, but because the atonement was not *for them*. If you mean that there is a sufficiency in the merit of Christ to save them if they should believe, we grant it, and we affirm that this sufficiency is the main ground of proposing it to them (meaning those to whom the gospel is preached).

As to the second, there is truth in all the ways and words of God, and so there is truth in his offer of mercy to whomever it is offered. If we take the command to believe, with the promise of life upon doing so, as an offer of mercy, then there is an eternal truth in it. That truth is that God will assuredly bestow life and salvation upon all believers; the proffer immediately declares our duty to believe; secondly, linking faith and life does not at all consider God’s intention towards the particular soul to whom the proffer is made: “For who has known the mind of the Lord, and who has been his counselor?”

To the third, the Spirit’s giving will or power, I say,

First, that you set the cart before the horse, placing the will before power.

Secondly, I deny that any internal assistance is required to render a man inexcusable for not believing, if he has the object of faith propounded to him; of himself he has neither the power nor the will to believe, having lost both in Adam.

Thirdly, how a man may have a will to believe given him, and yet not believe, I ask you to declare in the next controversy you undertake.

This being observed, I will take leave to put this proof into such form as it alone is capable of, so that the strength of it may become apparent, and it is this: “If the Spirit convinces all those of sin to whom the gospel is preached, that do not believe, then Christ died for all men; he died for both those who have the gospel preached to them and those who do not. The first part is true, for their unbelief is their great sin. Ergo, Jesus Christ died for all.” If this is an argument at all, it is “a baculo ad angulum, “from the beam to the shuttle.”¹ The passages of Scripture cited, John 3:18-19,² 8:24,³ 12:48,⁴ 15:22, 24,⁵ prove that unbelief is a soul-condemning sin; and it is a sin for which those who have the gospel preached to them will be condemned, having rejected it. But *quid ad nos?*⁶

One place is more urged, and because it is more abused than the rest, it must be clarified a little; it is John 16:7-11. The words are, “I will send the Comforter to you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they do not believe in me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and you will see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged.”

First, it is uncertain whether our author understands the words of the Spirit in and with Christ at the last day, or in and with the ministry of the word now, in the days of the gospel. If the first, he is foully mistaken; if the latter, then he should know that the conviction mentioned here intends only those to whom the gospel is preached. What advantage that has for universal redemption, which comprises all those who lived before as well as those who lived after the death of Christ, I do not know.

But, secondly, it is uncertain whether he assumes this conviction of the Spirit attends the preaching of the gospel only, or if it consists in strivings and impulses even in those who never hear the word of the gospel; if he means the latter, then we wait for a proof.

Thirdly, it is uncertain whether he assumes that those who are thus convinced are converted, and brought to the faith by that conviction, and by that attending effectualness of grace.

Nonetheless, the text has been presented and insisted upon. To further manifest how little reason there was for producing it, I will briefly open the meaning of the words. In this, his last sermon,

¹ Actually, it's “from the side to the angle”. It indicates an impossible conclusion since the geometric axiom requires two sides and an angle to determine a triangle. Owen relates it to weaving, in which the yarn woven across the warp with a shuttle is rolled onto the back beam; and so it *never* goes from the beam to the shuttle. He's saying that this argument is back-to-front.

² Jn 3:18-19 He that believes on him is not condemned: but he that does not believe is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. ¹⁹ And this is the condemnation, that light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.

³ Jn 8:24 I said therefore to you, that you shall die in your sins: for if you do not believe that I am *he*, you shall die in your sins.

⁴ Jn 12:48 He that rejects me, and does not receive my words, has one that judges him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.

⁵ Jn 15:22, 24 If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not have had sin: but now they have no cloak for their sin. ²⁴ If I had not done among them the works which no other man did, they would not have had sin: but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father.

⁶ Loosely, “But who is this according to us?”

our Savior Christ intends to comfort his apostles in their present sad condition, which was brought on by telling them that he must leave them and go to his Father. He knew full well that their sorrow and sadness would be further increased when they beheld the vile, ignominious way by which their Lord and Master would be taken from them. He also knew all those reproaches and persecutions which would attend them once they were so deprived of him. He bids them not to be troubled, nor filled with sorrow and fear for all of this. He assures them that all this loss, shame, and reproach would be abundantly made up for by what he would do for them, and bestow upon them, when his bodily presence was removed from them.

And as to that particular, which was the head of all, that he should be so vilely rejected and taken out of the world as a false teacher and seducer, he tells them he will send them in his stead “another Comforter,” John 14:16, one that will “vicariam navare operam,”¹ as Tertullian said, to fill them with all that consolation of which they might be deprived by his absence; and not only so, but also to be present with them in greater things than any for which he had yet employed them. He reminds them of this again in chap. 16:7.² Now, the one who is promised is properly “an advocate,” that is, one who pleads the cause of a person that is guilty or accused before any tribunal, and is opposed there, Rev. 12:10;³ and that is how this word is translated in 1Jn. 2:1.⁴ Christ, then, tells them here that, because he will be their advocate with the *Father*, he will send them an advocate to plead his cause with the *world*; that is, with those men in the world who had so vilely traduced⁵ and condemned him as a seducer, laying this as a reproach on all his followers. Doubtless this principally referred to the plentiful effusion of the Spirit upon the apostles at Pentecost, after the ascension of our Savior; though in some respect, it has continued to all ages in the ministry of the word. Yet what he meant is also made more apparent by considering what he affirms the advocate will do, namely,

1. “He will reprove” or evidently “convince, the world of sin, because they did not believe on him;” This he surely did abundantly in that sermon of Peter in Acts 2, when the enemies and haters of Christ were so reprovved and convinced of their sin that, upon the pressing urgency of that conviction, they cried out, “Men and brethren, what shall we do to be saved?” Then the world was brought to voluntarily confess the sin of murdering Jesus Christ.

2. He will convince the world of “righteousness, because he went to his Father;” not to reprove it of its own righteousness, because it is not righteous; but he will convince the men of the world, who condemned Christ as a seducer, of *his* righteousness, that he was *not* a blasphemer as they pretended, but he is the Son of God, as he himself testified. They will be forced to acknowledge this when, by the effusion and pouring out of the Spirit upon his apostles, it will be made evident that he has gone to and been received by his Father, and is owned by him, just as the centurion would presently do upon Christ’s death.

¹ Loosely, “substitute with zealous service”

² Jn 16:7 Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I do not go away, the Comforter will not come to you; but if I depart, I will send him to you.

³ Rev 12:10 And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night.

⁴ 1Jn 2:1 My little children, these things write I to you, so that you do not sin. And if any man sins, we have an *advocate* with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.

⁵ To cause humiliation or disgrace to by making malicious and false statements; to malign.

3. He will “convince the world of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged;” He will manifest to all those of whom he speaks, that the one whom they despised as the carpenter’s son, and bid come down from the cross if he could, is exalted to the right hand of God. All judgment has been committed to him, having beforehand, in his death, judged, sentenced, and overcome Satan, the prince of this world, who was the chief instigator of his crucifiers and who had the power of death.¹ And this I take to be the clear, genuine meaning of this passage. It includes the efficacy of the Spirit who is working in the same manner (though not to the same degree) for the same end, in the majesty of the word, to the end of the world. But what this has to do with universal redemption, let those who can understand it keep it to themselves, for I am confident they will never be able to make it out to others.

Proof 5. God testifies that he wants his Son to redeem all men.

“God has testified, both by his word and his oath, that he would have his Son so far save as to redeem all men, and likewise bring all to the knowledge of the truth, that thereby redemption might be worked in and upon them, 1Tim. 2:4, with John 3:17. So he does not will, nor does he have any pleasure in, the death of any who dies (even the wicked), but rather that he turn and live, Ezek. 18:23, 32, 33:11. And dare any of us say, the God of truth says and swears what he does not mean inwardly and seriously? O far be such blasphemy from us!”

ANSWER:

First, saying, “That God testifies, by his word and oath, that he would have Christ so far save us,” etc., is a bold calling of God to witness what he never affirmed; nor did this ever enter into his heart. For he has revealed his will: that Christ should completely save those who come to him, and not save “so far”, as is boldly, ignorantly, and falsely intimated. Let men beware of provoking God to their own confusion; he will not be a witness to the lie of false hearts.

Secondly, saying “That Christ should so bring all to the knowledge of the truth, that thereby redemption might be worked in and upon them,” is another bold corruption of the word, and it is bearing false witness in the name of God. Is it a small thing for you to weary and seduce men? Will you weary our God also?

Thirdly, for passages of Scripture corrupted to the sense imposed: In John 3:17, God is said to “send his Son, that the world through him might be saved;” not be saved so far, but saved “from their sins,” Matt. 1:21, and “completely,” Heb. 7:25: so that the world of God’s elect, who are the only ones so saved, is the only world to be understood there, as has been proved. In 1Tim. 2:4, there is something concerning the will of God to save all sorts of men, as has been declared; but nothing conducive to the bold assertion used in this place.

Fourthly, to those verses is added Ezek. 18:28, that God has no “pleasure at all that the wicked should die,” “and, verse 32, “no pleasure in the death of the one who dies.” Now, these texts are quite useless to the business in hand. They might have some value as to universal *vocation* (calling), but none as to universal *redemption*. There is no mention of Christ or his death in the passage from which they are cited. Yet, because our adversaries are frequently knitting knots from this place to lure and hamper the simple, I will add a few observations to clarify the meaning of the text, and to demonstrate how it has nothing at all to do with the business in hand.

¹ Having overcome Satan, his power of death is no longer a threat to the saints. “Where O death is your sting?” 1Co 15:55

First, then, let us consider to whom and of whom these words are spoken. Is it to and of all men, or only to the house of Israel? Doubtless, the latter. Only they are intended, and only they are spoken to: “Hear now, O house of Israel,” verse 25. Now, will it follow that because God says he does not delight in the death of the house of Israel, to whom he revealed his mind and required their repentance and conversion, that therefore he says so of all men? Does he mean even those to whom he never revealed his will as he revealed it to Israel? Has he called these others to repentance as he did Israel in Psalm 147:19-20? So the very ground-work of the whole conclusion is removed by this first observation.

Secondly, “God does not will the death of a sinner,” means either, “God purposes and determines that he will not die,” or, “God commands that the sinner shall do those things by which he may live.” If it means the first, then why are they not all saved? Why do sinners die? For God’s counsel is immutable, Heb. 6:17; “His counsel shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure,” Isa. 46:10. If it means the latter, commanding the sinner, then the sense is that the Lord commands those whom he calls to do their duty, so that they may not die (although he knows that they cannot do this without his assistance). Now, what this contributes to general redemption, I do not know.

Thirdly, let me end with this: the whole passage, in its scope and aim, and in the intention of the prophet, is miserably mistaken by our adversaries, and wrested to apply to what there is not the least thought of in the text. The words are part of the answer which the Lord gives to the repining Jews, concerning their proverb, “The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge.” Now, to what did they apply this proverb? Why, “concerning the land of Israel,” in verse 2,¹ the land of their habitation, which was laid waste by the sword (as it affirms) for the sins of their fathers, though they themselves were innocent. So the issue this verse addresses is God’s temporal judgments in overturning their land and nation; the Lord justifies himself by declaring the equity of these judgments by reason of their sins, those sins for which the land devoured them and spewed them out. He is telling them that his justice demands they should surely die for such things, and that their blood should be upon them, verse 18.² They will be slain with the sword, and cut off by those judgments which they deserved. He is not saying that shedding their blood and casting out their carcasses was a thing so pleasurable in itself, or so desirable to him, that he did it only for his own will. He says for them to leave their abominations, and test whether their lives would not be prolonged in peace.

This is the plain, genuine scope and meaning of this passage, as it presents itself to every unprejudiced man upon first viewing. I have often admired how so many strange conclusions have been wrested from it purporting to show mercy to all: universal vocation and redemption; and also how it has been produced to give substance to that heap of blasphemy which our author calls his “fifth proof”.

Proof 6. The very words and phrases of Scripture imply no less than all men.

“The very words and phrases used by the Holy Ghost in Scripture implies no less than all men when he speaks of the death of Christ, the ransom and propitiation, as to whom it belongs, and

¹ Ezek 33:2-4 Son of man, speak to the children of thy people, and say to them, When I bring the sword upon a land, and the people of the land take a man from among them, and set him for their *watchman*, if, when he sees the sword come upon the land, he blows the trumpet, and warns the people, then whoever hears the sound of the trumpet, and does not take warning, and if the sword comes and takes him away, his blood shall be upon his own head.

² Ezek 33:18 When the righteous turns from his righteousness, and commits iniquity, he shall even die in it.

who may seek it, and in believing find life. For instance: “All nations,” Matt. 28:19, 20; “the ends of the earth,” Isa 45:22, 49:6; “every creature,” Mark 16:15; “all,” 2Cor. 5:14, 15, 1Tim. 2:6; “every man,” Heb. 2:9; “the world,” John 3:16, 17, 2Cor. 5:19; “the whole world,” 1Jn. 2:2; “what was lost,” Luke 19:10; “sinners,” Matt. 9:13; “unjust,” 1Pet. 3:18; “ungodly,” Rom. 5:6. Among those referred to, whoever repents and believes in Christ will receive his grace, John 3:16, 18, Acts 10:43. Now, all these words and phrases being so often and indifferently used, is it not pride and error to devise glosses to restrain the sense in which the Scripture presents them, which is so full and large for all men?”

ANSWER:

First, this argument, which is taken from the words and phrases which express the object of the death of Christ in the Scripture, is what fills up both pages of this book. It is a repeated argument, and most of the passages cited here have been urged a hundred times over. And yet it is so far from being a pressing argument, that indeed it is nothing but a bare repetition of the very thing which is in debate, concluding according to his own persuasion. The main *quare*¹ between us is whether the words “all” and “the world” are to be taken universally? He says so, and then he says so again, which is all the proof we have. He is repeating over and over the thing which is to be proved, instead of offering a proof.

Secondly, for those passages which affirm that Christ died for “sinners,” the “ungodly,” “what was lost,” etc., as in Luke 19:10; Matt. 9:13; 1Pet. 3:18; and Rom. 5:6, I declared before how exceedingly unserviceable they are to universal redemption.

Thirdly, for those passages where the words “all,” “every man,” “the world,” “the whole world,” are used, we have heard them over and over; and they likewise have been considered.

Fourthly, for the expressions “all nations,” Matt. 28:19-20, and “every creature,” Mark 16:15, as they are used concerning those to whom the gospel is preached, I say,

First, that they do not comprise all individuals, nor all nations at all times, much less all singular persons of all nations (if we look upon the accomplishment and fulfilling of that command to disciple all nations); nor, as a matter of fact, was the gospel ever preached to all, although it is fit and suitable in the dispensation of that command that the gospel is to be preached to all, as was declared.

Secondly, the command to *preach* the gospel to all does not in the least manner prove that Christ died with an intention to *redeem* all; but it has other grounds and other ends, as has been manifested.

Thirdly, we deny that the ransom belongs to all to whom the gospel is proposed; there are other ends of that proposal; and Christ will say to some of them that he never knew them: therefore, certainly, he did not lay down his life for them.

Fourthly, “The ends of the earth,” in Isa 45:22, refers to those who look up to God from all parts of the earth and are saved, which is surely not everyone. And to give Christ to be a “salvation unto the ends of the earth,” Isa 49:6, is to do no more among the Gentiles than God promises in the same passage that he will do for his own people, which is to “gather the

¹ Latin: the issue or question before us

preserved of Israel;” in this way he will carry out the salvation of God, and gather the preserved remnant of his elect to the ends of the earth.

And now, I hope, I need not mind the intelligent reader that the author of these collections could not have invented a more ready way to ruin the thesis which he seeks to maintain than by producing those passages of Scripture just recounted to confirm it. He has granted that “all” and “the world” are no more than “all the ends of the earth,” mentioned in Isa 45:22, 49:6. It is evident beyond denial that these expressions clearly intimate in both places only the elect of God and believers. So that, interpreting the one by the other in those passages where “all” and “the world” are spoken of, only the elect and believers are intended. “If pride and error” had not taken full possession of the minds of men, they could not so far deny their own sense and reason as to contradict themselves, and the plain texts of Scripture, by trying to maintain their false and corrupt opinions.

Proof 7. The unique privileges of believers do not exclude ransom for all.

“There are certain high and unique privileges of the Spirit contained in the New Testament and sealed by the blood of Christ, which do not belong to all men, but only to the saints, the called and chosen of the Lord. And when they are distinctly mentioned alone, they are spoken of as belonging to them only, Matt. 13:11; John 14:17, 21-23, 16:13-15, 17:19, 20; Acts 2:38, 39; 1Cor. 2:9, 14; Heb. 9:15, 8; 1Pet. 2:3, 9. Yet many of these unique privileges are spoken of as joined together with the ransom and propitiation, which belong to all. In such cases, they are not spoken of in such a restraining and exclusive manner, or with such appropriating words, but in such a way as to leave room to apply the ransom to all men. And with that, they demonstrate the privileges that are proper to those who believe, so that they may have both their comfort and especial hope. But they also hold forth the ransom and keep open the door for others to come in and partake with them in belief and in receipt of the propitiation. And so it is for his “sheep,” and for “many;” but nowhere is it to be only for his sheep, or only for many: which is a strong proof of the ransom for all men, as is shown in chap. 3:10.”

Ans: The strength of this proof, as to the business in hand, is completely hidden from me; neither do I perceive how it may deserve the name of a proof so as to maintain the intended main thesis. The force which it has is in an observation which, if it has any sense at all, is neither true nor even once attempted to be made good; for,

First, to say that there are unique high privileges belonging to the saints and called of God, is a thing which needs no proof. Among these privileges is the death of Christ for them. He did not die for them as saints, but as elect, who by the benefit of that death and blood-shedding are to be made saints, and accounted to be the holy ones of God. For “he redeemed his church with his own blood,” Acts 20:28; he “loved and gave himself for it,” Eph. 5:25; even “us,” Tit. 2:14; As diverse as the privileges intimated here are, they are expressly assigned to elect, such as those in John 17:19-20.¹ Reckoned among these also, and in the same rank with them, is Jesus’ “sanctifying himself for their sakes;” that is, to be an oblation, verse 19. In a word, all unique

¹ Jn 17:19-20 And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth. Neither do I pray for these alone, but for those also which shall believe on me through their word;

saving privileges belong only to God's elect, purchased for them, and for them alone, by the blood of Jesus Christ, Eph. 1:3-4.¹

Secondly, For the other part of the observation, that where mention is made of these together with the ransom, there is room left to extend the ransom to all, I answer,

First, this is said, indeed, but not once is it attempted to be proved. In anything of this importance, we have small cause to believe the author upon his bare word.

Secondly, as to leaving room to apply the ransom to others, I perceive that if it is not left, you will make it left, even though you must jostle the true sense of the Scripture quite out of its place to do so.

Thirdly, I have already shown that where "many" are mentioned, only the ransom is expressed, as also where "sheep" are spoken of; the same may be said where the word "all" is used; so that there is not the least difference between them.

Fourthly, in various passages, the ransom of Christ and those other unique privileges (which indeed are *fruits* of it), are so united together as to make it impossible to apply the latter to some and the former to all, seeing that both the ransom and its fruits are restricted to his saved ones, Rev. 5:9-10.² Redeeming his people by the ransom of his blood, and making them kings and priests, are united actions; no room is left to extend the ransom to all. It is punctually³ assigned to those who are saved and crowned, as distinguished from the rest of the nations and languages from whom they were taken, and who were passed by in the payment of the ransom. This is directly opposite to all the sense I can make of this observation.

Fifthly, of "sheep, and sheep only," enough has been said before.

Proof 8. As in Adam all fell, in Christ all are redeemed.

"The restoration worked by Christ in his own body for mankind is set forth in Scripture to be as large and as full for all men, and of as much force, as the fall of the *first* Adam was worked by and in himself for all men; in which respect, the first Adam is said to have been a figure of Christ, the *second* Adam, Rom. 3:22-25, 5:12, 14, 18; 1Cor. 15:21-22, 45-47: as was shown before in chap. 8."

ANSWER:

First, it is most true that in some of the passages mentioned here (such as Rom. 5:12, 18) that Christ and Adam are compared together: the righteousness of Christ was communicated to all those who are his, and the disobedience and transgression of Adam was likewise communicated to all those who are born of him. But evidently the comparison is not between the righteousness of Christ and the disobedience of Adam extensively, with regard to their respective objects, but

¹ Eph 1:3-4 Blessed *be* the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly *places* in Christ: ⁴ According as he has chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:

² Rev 5:9-10 And they sung a new song, saying, You are worthy to take the book, and to open its seals: for you were slain, and have redeemed us to God by your blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; ¹⁰ And have made us kings and priests to our God: and we shall reign on the earth.

³ That is, precisely or exactly.

intensively, with regard to the efficacy of the one and of the other.¹ The apostle asserts that the righteousness of Christ is effectual unto justification, answering the prevalence of Adam's sin which is effectual unto condemnation. Just as Adam's transgression brought the guilt of condemnation upon all those who are his *natural* seed, so the righteousness of Christ procured the free gift of grace unto justification for all those who are his *spiritual* seed, those children given to him by his Father.

Secondly, 1Cor. 15:21-22, speaks of the resurrection from the dead, and that is a resurrection only of believers; for though he mentions them all in verse 22, "In Christ all shall be made alive," yet, in verse 23, he plainly interprets those "all" to be all that are "Christ's:" not that the other dead shall not also rise, but that theirs is a resurrection to glory by virtue of the resurrection of Christ, which is what the apostle speaks of here, and which certainly all will not have.

Thirdly, the comparison between Christ and Adam in verse 45 (to say nothing of the various readings of that passage), is only with regard to the principles which they were entrusted to communicate to others: "Adam a living soul," or a "living creature;" was naturally imbued with a principle of life to be communicated to his posterity; "Christ a quickening Spirit," communicated life, grace, and spirit to his posterity. And here I desire that it be observed that all the comparison that is made between Christ and Adam still comes to one thing: they were two common stocks or roots, communicating to those who are ingrafted into them (that is, ingrafted into Adam naturally by generation, and into Christ spiritually by regeneration) that with which they were filled. With Adam: sin, guilt, and disobedience; with Christ: righteousness, peace, and justification. As for the number of those who received these things from one or the other, its consideration is beyond the scope, aim, and end of the apostle in the passages where the comparison is made.

Fourthly, it is true in Rom. 3:23 that, "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God," which the apostle had largely proved before, thereby manifesting that there was no salvation to be attained except by Jesus Christ. But if you will ask to whom this righteousness of Christ is extended, and to whom redemption is had in his blood, he tells you plainly, it is "to all and upon all those who believe," verse 22, whether Jews or Gentiles, "for there is no difference."

Proof 9. The gospel is to be preached to all, therefore all are capable of belief.

"The Lord Jesus Christ has sent and commanded his servants to preach the gospel to all nations, to every creature, and along with this to tell them that whoever believes and is baptized shall be saved, Matt. 28:19, 20; Mark 16:15-16; and his servants have preached to all, 2Cor. 5:19; Rom. 10:13, 18. And our Lord Jesus Christ will make it to appear one day that he has not sent his servants upon a false errand, nor put a lie in their mouths, nor wished them to dissemble in offering to all what they knew belonged only to some, even to the fewest of all, but he wished them to speak truth, Isa 44:26, 61:8; 1Tim. 1:12."

ANSWER:

The strength of this proof is not easily apparent, nor is it obvious in which part or words it lies:

First, it is true that Christ commanded his apostles to "preach the gospel to all nations and every creature," and to tell them "that whoever believes shall be saved," Matt. 28:19, 20, Mark 16:15, 16. Without distinction of persons or nations, they are to call all men to whom the providence of

¹ That is, the comparison does not concern the *scope* of those affected, but the *consequence* to those affected.

God directs them, and from whom the Spirit of God does not withhold them (as he withheld from them those in Acts 16:6-7)¹; they are to warn them to repent and to believe the gospel.

Secondly, it is also true that, in obedience to this command, his servants beseeched men to repent and believe, and to be reconciled to God. They did so over all the nations, without distinction, except where they were forbidden, as mentioned above. They labored to spread the gospel to the ends of the earth, and not to confine it to the Jews, 2Cor. 5:19, 20; Rom. 10:18. It is also most certain that the Lord Jesus Christ did not send his servants with a lie, nor to offer to all what belonged only to some; but instead, they were to speak the truth, all of which needs no proof. But what can be concluded from this regarding universal redemption is not easily discernible.

Perhaps some will say that if Christ did not die for all those to whom the word is preached, then how can those who preach it in fact *offer* Christ to all? That is a poor proof, God knows!

First, the gospel was never preached to everyone, nor is there any such thing affirmed in the passages cited; you would have to prove that Christ died for those who never hear of the gospel as well as for those who do.

Secondly, what do those who preach the gospel offer to those to whom the word is preached? Is it not life and salvation through Christ upon the condition of faith and repentance? And does not the truth of this offer consist in this: that every one who believes shall be saved? And does not that truth stand firm and inviolable, so long as there is an all-sufficiency in Christ to save all who come to him? Has God entrusted the ministers of the gospel with his intentions, purposes, and counsels, or with his commands and promises? Is it a lie to tell men that the one who believes will be saved, even though Christ did not die for some of them?

Such proofs as these need to be well proved themselves, or else what they intend to prove will have a very weak conclusion.

Proof 10. Believers are to pray for all, therefore all may be saved.

“The Lord wills believers to pray even for the unjust and their persecutors, Matt. 5:44, 48; Luke 6:28; indeed, they are to pray ‘for all men,’ and ‘for kings and all in authority,’ even though few in authority loved Christianity. Yet he did not say some of that sort, but, ‘For all in authority.’ And that is done upon this ground: it is good in the sight of God ‘who will have all men saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth,’ Luke 10:5; 1Tim. 2:1-4. Surely there is a door of life opened for all men, 2Tim. 1:10; for God has not said to the seed of Israel, ‘You seek me in vain,’ Isa 44:19. He will not have his children pray for things in vain.”

ANSWER :

The strength of this proof lies in supposing a number of things.

First, that indefinite assertions are to be interpreted as universal, which is false, Rom. 4, 5.

Secondly, that “all” in 1Tim. 2:1 does not mean all sorts of men, and the word “all” is not to be taken distributively; yet the apostle, by enumerating various sorts, obviously demonstrates the distribution he intended.

Thirdly, that we are bound to pray that every single man be saved,

¹ Acts 16:6-7 Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden by the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia, ⁷ after they had come to Mysia, they tried to go into Bithynia: but the Spirit did not allow them.

1. For which we have no warrant, rule, precept, or example;
2. It is contrary to the apostolical precept given in 1Jn. 5:16;¹
3. It is not our Savior's example, John 17:9;²
4. The counsel and purpose of God, generally made known to us in Romans 9:11, 12, 15, and Romans 11:7, makes it evident that praying for "all" is only for all sorts of men, excluding none, and that those who are ordained to eternal life may believe.

Fourthly, it supposes there is nothing else that we are to pray for men except that they may be saved by Christ; which is apparently false, Jer. 29:7.³

Fifthly, that our ground of praying for anyone is an assurance that Christ died for them in particular; which is not true, Acts 8:22, 24.⁴

Sixthly, it most splendidly takes for granted that our duty is to conform our prayers to God's secret mind, purpose, and counsel *in election*.

Until every one of these suppositions is made good, (which will not be soon), there is no help in this proof nor strength in this argument: "We must pray for all; therefore God intends by the death of Christ to save everyone," Its sophistry and weakness is apparent. From our duty to God's purpose is not a good conclusion, though from his command to our duty is most certain.

Proof 11. Christ will always be with his people, preaching to and praying for all.

"The Lord has given his word and promise to be with his servants preaching the gospel to all, and with his people praying for all, wherever they may come, that they may proceed with confidence in both, Matt. 28:20; 1Tim. 2: 3, 8; Luke 10:5; Isa. 54:17.

Ans: It is as apparent that God will be with his people, whether preaching or praying, according to his will and their own duty, as it is apparent that this proves nothing for universal redemption; what can be more evident?

Proof 12. Christ made good his word to all, that none would exclude themselves.

"The Lord has already performed and made good his word to his servants and people, upon some of all sorts of men and all sorts of sinners, showing them mercy to the very end, that none might exclude themselves, but all be encouraged to repent, believe, and hope thereby, Acts 2, 3, 8 – 11, 16, 19, 28; 1Cor. 6:10, 11; 1Tim. 1:13-16."

Ans: If you had told us that God had already made good his word to his servants in saving all and every man, and proved it clearly, you would have evidently and undeniably confirmed your main opinion. But now, by affirming only that he has showed mercy to some of all sorts, and all sorts

¹ 1Jn 5:16 If any man sees his brother sin a sin *which is* not unto death, he shall pray, and God shall give him life – for those who do not sin unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it.

² Jn 17:9 I pray for them: I do not pray for the world, but for those whom you have given me; for they are yours.

³ Jer 29:7 And seek the peace of the city to which I have caused you to be carried away captives, and pray to the LORD for it: for in its peace you shall have peace.

⁴ Acts 8:22,24 Repent therefore of this wickedness, and pray to God, that perhaps the thought of your heart may be forgiven. ²⁴ Then Simon answered, and said, You pray to the Lord for me, that none of these things which you have spoken come upon me. [Peter and John do *not* pray for Simon the Magician, but it is unclear how that applies to Owen's proposition. Perhaps Mt 5:44 is a better support: *But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you; or Lk 6:28: bless those who curse you, pray for those who abuse you.*].

of sinners, so that others of like sort might be induced to believe (the remainder of his elect who are yet uncalled), you have evidently betrayed your own cause and established that of your adversaries. You have shown how the Lord saves in the blood of Jesus only some of all sorts, just as your adversaries affirm, and not everyone, to which your tenet leads you.

Proof 13. The blessing of life extends to all mankind, overcoming God's chosen.

“The blessing of life has streamed to mankind in this doctrine of the love of God. Yes, in the tender and spiritual discovery of the grace of God toward mankind (in the ransom given and atonement made by Christ for all men, along with its fruits), God has overcome his chosen ones to believe and turn to God, Acts 13:48; Titus 2:11, 13, 3:4, 5.”

ANSWER :

First, the freedom of God's grace, and the transcendency of his eternal love towards men, with the sending of his Son to die for them, to recover them to himself from sin and Satan, is a most effectual motive. And when it is set on by the Spirit of grace, it is a most certain operative principle of the conversion of God's elect. We most willingly acknowledge this. It is this in which our hearts rejoice, and by which they were endeared, and for which we desire to return thankful obedience every moment. But we utterly deny that extending this love to all was ever effectual, or at least effectual in invigorating it:

1. Because it is false, and it is a corrupting of the word of God, as was shown; and there can be no good consequence of a lie.
2. It quite enervates and plucks out the efficacy of this heavenly motive by turning the most intense and incomparable love of God towards his elect into a mere desire, wish, and affection of his nature (which, indeed, is opposite to his nature), failing in its end and purpose. This might even be consistent with the eternal destruction of all mankind, as I will abundantly demonstrate, if Providence calls me to the other part of this controversy concerning the cause of sending Jesus Christ.

Secondly, there is nothing of this common love toward all in the passages cited; for,

1. The “grace” mentioned in Tit. 2:11, 13,¹ is the grace that brings salvation with certainty, which a common love does not;² and that grace was the cause of God sending Christ, “that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify to himself a special people, zealous of good works.” This is where we assert that redemption and sanctification are the immediate ends of the oblation of Jesus Christ; we declared previously how this destroys universal redemption.
2. So also is that “love and kindness” mentioned in Tit. 3:4-5;³ By such love and kindness we *receive* the “washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost,” verse 5; and justification, and adoption so as to be made heirs of eternal life, verse 7. Whether this is a common love towards all men, or a special love towards his elect, let all men judge for themselves.

¹ Tit 2:11,13 For the grace of God that brings salvation has appeared to all men, ...¹³ Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;

² That is, a universal love held in common toward all mankind, which fails to certainly save all mankind.

³ Tit 3:4-5, 7 But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, ⁵ Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; ... ⁷ That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.

3. Acts 13:47¹ (verse 48 contains as clear a restriction of this love of God toward his elect, as can be desired) presents the extent of the mercy of God in Christ, through the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles also, and not only to the Jews, as was foretold by Isaiah, chap. 49:6. This hardly gives substance to universal grace; it is the same affirmation we have in John 11:52, “gathering together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad.”

Proof 14. Those who reject the gospel “choose” darkness and destruction.

“When the gospel comes to men, containing any spiritual light, and they refuse to believe it, and allow themselves to be withdrawn from its light by other things, they are said to love or choose “darkness rather than light,” John 3:19. How could that be if no light of truth were intended for them? They follow lying vanities; forsake their own mercies, Jonah 2:8; harden their own hearts, Rom. 2:5; lose their souls, Matt. 16:26; and destroy themselves, Hos. 13:9. Being from Adam, they have fallen into darkness, hardness, and have lost their souls; the sentence of death has been passed on them. How could these things be if no life had been attained by Jesus Christ, no atonement made, no restoration made of their souls, nor means procured and used so that they might be saved? God is no hard master, to gather where he has not sown.”

ANSWER:

The sum of this argument is that those who do not believe upon the preaching of the gospel are the cause of their own ruin and destruction; therefore, Jesus Christ died for all and every man in the world.² Now, although it is clearly a waste of time and labor to answer such an argument, I must add a few observations, lest any doubt remains with the weakest reader.

First, all have not had the gospel preached to them. From the beginning of the world, the great part of men have been passed by in the dispensation of the means of grace, Rom. 2:14; Acts 14:16, 17:30 (“winked at”).³ All these, then, must be left out in this conclusion, which renders it altogether useless as to the business in hand. For universal redemption falls to the ground if any one soul is not intended in the payment of the ransom.

Secondly, it is not disbelieving that the death of Christ was for every individual that ever was or will be that causes man’s destruction (a belief which is nowhere required in Scripture). Rather, it is not believing in the all-sufficiency of the passion and oblation of Jesus Christ for sinners, so as to accept the mercy which was procured thereby, upon those terms and conditions that it is held forth in the gospel. This does not speak to the purpose and intention of God for whom Christ should die, but the sufficiency and efficacy of his death for all that receive him in a due manner: believing that he is the only true way, life, and light, there being no other name given under

¹ Act 13:47-48 47 For so has the Lord commanded us, *saying*, I have set you to be a light of the Gentiles, that you should be for salvation unto the ends of the earth. ⁴⁸ And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord: and **as many as were ordained to eternal life** believed.

² Actually, that is *not* the argument as Owen’s second answer shows. The argument is that, if men are condemned for refusing the light, then the light must have been presented to them. Owen goes on to say that all men have not been presented with the light, and they are not condemned for refusing it. They stand condemned already and have not been relieved of it (Jn 3:18-19).

³ John Gill explains ‘winked at’ this way: “the sense is, he despised this, and them for it, and was displeased and angry with them; and as an evidence of such contempt and indignation, he overlooked them, and took no notice of them, and gave them no revelation to direct them, nor prophets to instruct them, and left them to their stupidity and ignorance.”

heaven by which men may be saved (Ac 4:12). It is “loving darkness rather than light,” as in John 3:19, which is the place urged in the proof. The word there is *mallon*, “rather;” it does not institute a comparison between their love of darkness and light, as though they loved both but darkness more. Instead, it plainly intimates opposition to the love of light by a complete love of darkness. “Men” are said to do thus. And, according to the rules of interpreting Scripture which are followed by this author, this should be taken universally for “all men” because it is spoken indefinitely. But we are content that it is *most* men to whom Christ preached; for some of them also “received him,” those to whom he “gave this privilege, that they should become the sons of God,” John 1:12.

I can see no reason why you should interpret “love” here as “choose,” either as though the words were equivalent, or the word in the original would signify either one: both are exceedingly false. There is a difference between loving and choosing; and as for *agapesan* (NT:25), he would be as bad a translator as an interpreter to render it “they choose.” Now, what is loving darkness more than light except following and cleaving in affection and practice to the ways in which, being alienated from the life of God, they were laboring in ‘unfruitful works of darkness,’ (Eph 5:11)? They were refusing to embrace the heavenly doctrine of the gospel, which holds forth peace and reconciliation with God through Christ, along with life and immortality by doing so. To conclude from this, therefore, that Christ died for all and every man in the world, simply because the great part of those to whom he preached the gospel did not believe, is a wild kind of reasoning. It is much better that we infer from this that therefore he did not die for all men, because it is not “given to them, for his sake, to believe on him,” Phil. 1:29.

The parenthetical statement, “How could that be, if no light of truth were intended for them?” does not give any light to the former inference. If the word “for” (“intended *for* them”) denoted the intention and purpose of God, the truth is, we dare not say that God intends and purposes anyone to receive light who does not actually receive it. Otherwise, by saying so, we would make the Strength of Israel like our own, and contradict the One who has said, “My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure,” Isa 46:10. “The counsel of the Lord stands forever,” Ps. 33:11; he is “the LORD, and does not change,” Mal. 3:6; James 1:17; 2Tim. 2:19; Rom. 9:11. If “for them” means such a supply and fullness of light and grace as there is light in the sun for all the men in the world, though some are blind and cannot see it, then we agree. We say that there is such a light in the gospel for all those to whom it is preached; their own blindness is the sole cause of not receiving it: but this has not gotten the stone moved a step forward; it still rolls back upon him.

Thirdly, the other scriptures he urged do not offer so much as a hint that there is an advantage in considering them, as with any of his references to the business in hand. Jonah 2:8 concerns those who forsake the true God to follow idols, and thus they forfeit the mercies, both temporal and spiritual, which they had received before from the true God. Rom. 2:5 speaks of the Gentiles who had the works of God to teach them, and the patience of God to wait upon them, yet they made no use of them other than, by vile rebellions, to add new degrees of hardness upon their own hearts. Matt. 16:26 concerns men losing their souls and destroying themselves by sin (Hos. 13:9); this is of equal force with the previous verse mentioned.

But, fourthly, the close of this proof seems to intimate a further view of the author, which is not apparent at first: namely, that all men are in a restored condition by Christ. It is not that a door of mercy was opened for them all, but that they are all actually restored into grace and favor, a position from which, if they do not fall, they shall surely be saved. And the argument by which

he proves this is as follows: being lost in Adam, they could not be said to lose *themselves* unless they were first restored by Christ; in other words, being all darkness and hardness in Adam, unless all of them were first enlightened and mollified by Christ, they could not be said to love darkness nor to harden themselves. Now, if this is his intention (as it is too apparent that it is), then I must say something first to the argument, and secondly to the thing itself.

First, for the argument, what he says is this: by original sin men are guilty of death and damnation; therefore they cannot by actual sins make sure of and aggravate that condemnation, and so bring upon themselves a death unto death. Because there is a native, inbred hardness of heart in man, no one can add further degrees of contracted hardness and induration by actual rebellions. Because men are already blind, they cannot undervalue light (when indeed the reason why they undervalue it is because they are blind). Men who have time, opportunity, and means to save their souls, cannot be said to lose their souls, that is, to be condemned, unless their souls were already in a saved condition. Now, this is one of the proofs which, in the close, is called “plain, and according to Scripture.” But, indeed, nothing can be more contrary to reason, Scripture, and the principles of the oracles of God, than this statement, and some of his others as well. I will add no more, knowing that no reader can be so weak as to conceive that refusing a proposed remedy, accompanied by infinite other contempts done to the Lord, is not sufficient to make men guilty of their own condemnation. I speak of those readers who enjoy the preaching of the gospel.

Secondly, for the thing itself, as to an actual restoration of all men by Christ into such a state as they had at first in Adam (I mean with regard to covenant, and not innocence). I take this to be the meaning of the author, because in another place he positively affirms that it is so, and that all are justified by Christ, though he is not able to declare how this is so. To this, then, I say,

1. That there is nothing in Scripture to give the least substance to this gross error, however improbable-sounding it may be. And,

2. It is contrary to a number of fundamental truths:

(1.) It is contrary to many passages affirming that we are “dead in trespasses and sins,” Eph. 2:1; that “except we are born again, we cannot see the kingdom of God,” John 3:3; that until we come by faith to Christ, “the wrath of God abides on us,” chap. 3:36; along with countless passages which reveal the universal alienation of all men from God until actual peace and reconciliation is made through Christ.

(2.) It is contrary to the very nature and essence of the new covenant of grace which proceeds from the free mercy of God toward his elect; that covenant is carried along with distinguishing promises from the first to the last of them, putting a difference between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent, a difference in the members as well as in their federal Head; it is effective and actually works every good thing it promised in and towards all to whom it belongs (which certainly it does not do in all men); everywhere in Scripture this covenant is said to be made with the people of God, or those whom he will own, in opposition to the world; all of these along with various other things, are so plentifully affirmed in the Scripture, that not one can be true if all men are restored by Christ into covenant.

(3) It is contrary to the eternal purpose of God in election and reprobation; of which the latter is a resolve to leave men in their fallen condition, without any reparation by Christ.

(4.) It is accompanied with many strange, absurd, and groundless consequences, such as,

[1.] All infants dying before they come to use reason and before committing actual sin must necessarily be saved. And yet our Savior has said that, “except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God,” John 3:3; and from Paul, the children of infidels are “unclean,” 1Cor. 7:14; now no unclean thing will enter the new Jerusalem, Rev. 21:27). By such reasoning, the infants of Turks, Pagans, infidels, and persecutors, if they die in infancy, are placed in a far more happy condition than the apostles of Christ, better than the best of believers who are not, according to the authors of this doctrine, out of danger of eternal perishing.

[2.] There is nothing more required to be saved than continuing in the estate in which a person was born (because Christ has actually restored all to covenant); and yet the whole word of God cries out that all those who abide in that estate will certainly perish everlastingly.

[3.] That everyone who perishes falls away from the grace of the new covenant, even though the promises of that covenant are that there will never be any total falling away of those who are in covenant.

[4.] That none can come to Christ except those who have fallen from him, for all others abide in him.

Countless other consequences such as these necessarily attend this false and heretical assertion that is so absolutely destructive of the free grace of God. I expect that such proofs as these will make thoughtful men search further into the matter intended to be proved, and yield good advantages which reveal the wretched lie of the whole of it.

Fifthly, as to the last words of the proof,¹ I answer that God sowed that seed in Adam, and watered it with countless temporal blessings towards all men, and spiritual blessings in some, whose limit he will come to require from the world of unbelievers, and not in the blood of Jesus Christ,² any further than as it has been certainly proposed to some of them and despised.³

Proof 15. God’s good intentions in pleading with all men requires that Christ saved all men.

“God earnestly expostulated, contended, charged, and protested to that group of which many perished, Rom. 9:27; Isa 10:22.⁴ As for examples: ‘O that there were such a heart in them, that they would fear me,’ etc., ‘that it might be well with them!’ Deut. 5:29. ‘What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it?’ etc., Isa 5:4-5. ‘What iniquity have your

¹ “Being from Adam, they have fallen into darkness, hardness, and have lost their souls; the sentence of death has been passed on them. How could these things be if no life had been attained by Jesus Christ, no atonement made, no restoration made of their souls, nor means procured and used so that they might be saved? God is no hard master, to gather where he has not sown.”

² That is, there will come a limit to the blessings which rain down upon the just and the unjust alike, but no limit to the blessings which flow from the blood of Christ. Therefore it cannot be that all men should be covered by the blood of Christ and yet some not receive its final blessings of redemption and eternal salvation.

³ That is, the blessing of Christ’s blood has been certainly proclaimed to some, and yet they despised it. Thus, either it cannot be effective to restore all men, or else it is limited in its blessings. It is not limited; therefore all men are not restored by it.

⁴ Isaiah also cries concerning Israel, “Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved...”

fathers found in me, that they have gone far from me?’ Jer. 2:5. ‘Have I been a wilderness to Israel? A land of darkness? Therefore my people say, “We are lords; we will come to you no more?”’ verse 31. ‘O my people, what have I done to you? In what have I wearied you? Testify against me,’ Mic. 6:3. ‘How often would I have gathered,’ etc.’, ‘and you would not!’ Matt. 13:37. ‘O that my people had listened to me!’ etc., ‘I would soon have subdued their enemies,’ etc., Pa 81:13, 14. ‘Because I have called, and you refused; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded,’ etc., Prov. 1:24-31. ‘Because, when they knew God, they did not glorify him as God,’ etc., Rom. 1:21, 28. ‘Therefore you are inexcusable, O man,’ etc. ‘You, after your hard and impenitent heart, treasure up wrath for yourself,’ etc., Rom. 2:1, 5. I hope no Christian will reply against God and say, ‘You never meant us good; there was no ransom given for us, no atonement made for us, no good done to us, no mercy shown to us, nothing, in truth, by which we might have been saved, nothing but an empty show, a bare pretence.’ But if anyone should reason so evilly, such answers shall not stand.”

ANSWER:

To this collection of expostulations I will very briefly answer with a few observations, showing how little use it is to the business in hand.

First, in all these expostulations there is no mention of any ransom given or atonement made for those who perish (which is the thing suggested in the close of his proof). Instead, they are all about *temporal* mercies, with the *outward* means of grace. To this, add what we observed in the foregoing argument, namely, that just as God does not expostulate with them about it, nor will they expostulate with God about it at the last day. I do not deny that there are sufficient things to expostulate about with sinners concerning the blood of Christ and the ransom he paid with it. By such things the elect may be drawn and worked upon toward faith and repentance, and believers may be more and more endeared to forsake all ungodliness and worldly lusts, and live to Christ who lived for them; and others may be left more inexcusable by them. Only, for the present there are no such expostulations expressed here, nor can any be found holding out the purpose and intention of God in Christ towards those who perish.

Secondly, all these passages speak to those who enjoyed the means of grace: those who, in the days in which those expostulations were made to them, were a very small portion of all men. So nothing can be concluded from what is said to them of the mind and purpose of God towards all others, as in Ps. 147:19-20,¹ which undermines the general ransom. There are exceptions to this in Rom. 1:28 and 2:5, which apparently and evidently lay the inexcusableness of sin upon that knowledge which all men may have of God by the works of creation and providence. They reveal him as eternal, almighty, and powerful, yet without offering men the least intimation of any ransom, atonement, and redemption.²

Thirdly, there are no men, especially none of those who enjoy the means of grace, who do not receive such mercies from God, that he may justly plead with them about their unthankfulness and their not returning obedience proportionate to the mercies and light which they received.

¹ Ps 147:19-20 He shows his word to Jacob, his statutes and his judgments to Israel. ²⁰ He has not dealt so with any other nation: and as for his judgments, other nations have not known them. Praise the LORD.

² This distinguishes general revelation, which all men have, from special revelation which is contained in the Gospel.

Fourthly, I would hope it is confessed by all, that God could not only expostulate with the sons of men about any one of these things, if they were absent, but he could, if it seemed good to him, effectually work them in their hearts by the exceeding greatness of his power. So none of these things declares his purpose which he might fulfil, if he pleased; “for who has resisted his will?” Rom. 9:19.¹

Fifthly, ascribing desires and wishes to God is opposite to his all-sufficiency and the perfection of his nature; they are no more in him than he has eyes, ears, and hands.

Sixthly, it is evident that all these are nothing but emotional declarations of our duty as we enjoy the means of grace, strong convictions of the stubborn and disobedient, with a full justification of the excellent ways by which God draws us to perform our duties; ergo Christ died for all men?

Seventhly, some particular passages that seem to be of more weight than the rest have already been examined.

Proof 16. Scripture says it is sin to refuse grace, indicating it belongs to all.

“The way Scripture presents the sin of those who despise and refuse this grace, their estate, and the persons perishing, indicates that Christ shed his blood for them. It says they ‘turn the grace of God into wantonness,’ Jude 4; ‘tread under foot the Son of God, profane the blood of the covenant, with which they were sanctified, offer contempt to the Spirit of grace,’ Heb. 10:29; ‘deny the Lord that bought them,’ 2Pet. 2:1; ‘those perish for whom Christ died,’ 1Cor. 8:11; ‘trees twice dead, plucked up by the roots,’ Jude 12, 13; ‘and bring upon themselves swift destruction,’ 2Pet. 2:1. And how could all this be if God had not given his Son for them in some way? If Christ had shed no blood to procure remission for them? If he had not bought them, nor had any grace or life by his Spirit to bestow on them?”

ANSWER:

First, in this proof there are three passages of Scripture which are frequently urged in this cause, namely, Heb. 10:29; 2Pet. 2:1; 1Cor. 8:11: they have been considered at large already, where it was evidenced that they in no way aid the assertion for which they are violently wrested, and the end for which their sense is perverted.²

Secondly, as for Jude 4, 12, 13, I cannot perceive how they can be hooked into the business in hand. Some are said, in verse 4, to “turn the grace of God into wantonness;” that is, they abuse the doctrine of the gospel, and the mercy of God it reveals, to encourage themselves in sin. Thus, to conclude that Jesus Christ therefore died for all men is an unwarranted inference, because the apostle intimates that Christ did not die for these abusers of his grace. Instead, he affirms that they were “before ordained of old to condemnation;” this ordination stands in direct opposition to that love which moved the Lord to send his Son Christ to procure anyone’s salvation. The strength of the proof lies in the other passages, which have already been considered.

¹ In other words, the fact that God pleads with his people about such things does not indicate what his purpose is in Christ. Even if he were to work these things in their hearts, it would not reveal anything about redemption through the blood of Christ. So they cannot be motivated by their rejection of Christ, which is what the proof asserts is the cause of their “perishing of themselves”.

² See Book IV, Chapter VI, III. The purpose of Christ’s death and exaltation is to be Lord of all..

Proof 17. If some are judged to a second death, Christ first died for them.

“Jesus Christ, by virtue of his death, will be their judge, and by the gospel, in which they might have been saved, will he judge them to a second death; how can that be if he never died the first death for them, and if there were no truth in his gospel preached to them? Rom. 14:9-12; Phil. 2:7-11; Rom. 2:16; John 12:47-48, 50.”

ANSWER:

First, it is confessed that Jesus Christ will be judge of all, and that all judgment is already committed to him. But it does not follow from this that he died for all, as already declared, unless you affirm that he also died for the devils, because they also must be judged by him.

Secondly, it is directly contrary to the gospel that all will be judged by the gospel, even those who never heard a word of it: “For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law,” Rom. 2:12. Doubtless every man shall be judged according to the light and rule which he did or might have enjoyed, and not according to something of which he was invincibly deprived.

Thirdly, saying that Christ died only the first death is neither an expression of the word, nor can it be collected from there. He died the death which was in the curse of the law, but of this he died only by the way.¹

Fourthly, you intimate that there would be no truth in the gospel unless Christ died for all, when indeed there is no assertion more opposite to the truth of the gospel. The passages urged mention Christ being Lord of all, exalted above all, being Judge of all, judging men according to the gospel – that is, those who enjoy it;² but how these passages may be wrested to the end proposed, I do not know.

Proof 18. Believers may contend for, and lose, a common salvation.

“Believers are exhorted to contend for the faith of this common salvation which was once delivered to the saints. Some having heard oppose it; others turn its offers into wantonness. By not heeding and not walking in the faith of this salvation, already worked by Christ for men, they deprive themselves of it. They unwind themselves from that salvation which Christ, by his Spirit, in applying faith, has worked in them; and so they deprive themselves of the salvation to come, Jude 3-5.³

“And every [one] of these proofs is plain and according to Scripture, and if each has force, then how much more do they have altogether! They still justify the sense that 1Tim. 2:6 and Heb. 2:9 import, and the truth of the proposition made in the beginning.”

¹ That is, Christ’s death was incurred to pay the penalty for our sins, not to gain the right to judge all men.

² “Judging men according to the gospel” means applying the benefits of the gospel to its intended recipients. Owen understands that Christ judges all men according to the law; but some are savingly judged according to the mercy of the gospel.

³ Jude 3-5 Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write to you of the common salvation, it was necessary for me to write to you, and exhort *you*, that you should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints. ⁴ For certain men have crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. ⁵ I will therefore remind you, though you once knew this, how the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed those who did not believe.

ANSWER: I can see nothing in this proof, except that the salvation purchased by Christ is called “common salvation.” If you conclude from there that it is common to all, then you may as well conclude that faith belongs to all, because it is called the “common faith” in Tit. 1:4; although it is termed the “faith of God’s elect” in Tit. 1:1. Doubtless there is a community of believers, and what is common among them is extended to the whole church of God; there is *totes mundus ex toto mundo*;¹ and they are all saved by that common salvation, without any hint of that strange common salvation by which no one is saved, the kind maintained by this disputer.

The remainder of this proof is just so many words, characteristic of this author’s persuasion; but in large part, they are unsuitable to the word of God and derogatory to the merits of Christ. They make the salvation purchased by him to be of no effect in itself, but instead leave it to the will of sinful, corrupted, accursed men, whether to make it available or to reject it.

And these are the proofs which this author calls “plain and according to Scripture.” They are a recapitulation of almost all that he has said in his whole book, at least, for the argumentative part of it. There is nothing of weight omitted. And therefore I fixed on this chapter to return a full and punctual answer to it. The thing to be proved by him is this: *it is plainly, clearly, and evidently confirmed from the Scripture that Christ paid a ransom for all and every man.* Now, it is left to the judgment of the Christian reader, who will peruse them with the answers I have annexed, whether this was actually proved, or whether this heap of words is not childish, weak, and ridiculous. He calls them arguments, reasons, and proofs, but their manner of expression is obscure, uncouth, and oftentimes unintelligible. In their way of inference, in their allegations and interpretations of Scripture, they are perverse, violent, and mistaken. And through their ignorance, heedlessness, and corruption of judgment, their direct opposition to the mind and will of God is revealed.

CHAPTER VII – Removing Remaining Objections

The removal of other remaining objections.

The close of our treatise will be the removal of some typical sophisms and captious arguments of the Arminians, which of late have been made common and vulgar. This will wind up the whole controversy which has fervently drawn us thus far. I will labor to be as brief as possible in this, partly because these things have been handled at large by others; and partly I do so because, having removed all hint of opposition to the truth as it is maintained from the Scriptures, all other objections will naturally sink of themselves. Yet, because great boastings and swelling words of vanity have been used concerning some of the objections that follow, it is necessary that something be said to show the emptiness of such flourishes, so that the weakest believer may not be entangled by them.

OBJECTION I. Each must believe Jesus died for him; ergo he died for all.

What we will begin with is an argument of as great fame and as little merit as any that has been used of late, and it is this:

Major Proposition - What everyone is bound to believe is true.

Minor Proposition - Everyone is bound to believe that Jesus Christ died for him.

¹ Roughly, *a commonality of the whole that comes from its lesser parts* – i.e. all things are shared in common to some extent.

Conclusion – Therefore it is true that Jesus Christ died for everyone.

This is an argument which the Arminians and their friends never use, thus revealing their conviction of the weakness of the rest of their arguments; that is, unless they add some notable tribute to it, along with some affronts and threats to their adversaries. Both sides agree that it is termed the “*Remonstrants’ Achilles*”. Now, truly, for my part, as I will not transcribe anything here out of the many full answers given to it by our divines, answers by which this Achilles, or rather Goliath, has often been cast to the ground. So I heartily wish that the many laborious and verbose answers, which the boasting of our adversaries has elicited for this poor nothing, have not given it a repute a thousand times beyond what it warrants of itself, nor what its managers could have procured for it by themselves.

Assumptions of this Objection:

first, “believing”, both as to its obligation and the truth, means the same.

The term “believe” is used in the same sense in both propositions; otherwise the syllogism is false in its form;

secondly, “believing” means Christ is savingly applied to the soul.

Believing is understood as *a saving application of Christ to the soul, as held out in the promise*, for believing that Christ died for me in particular, which is each person’s duty to believe, can be nothing else but such a saving application;

thirdly, “believing” refers to the purpose of the Father and the intent of Jesus.

Believing that Christ died for anyone, according to the business in question, must refer to the purpose of the Father and the intention of Jesus Christ himself; for that is what is opposed by us with regard to *universality*;

fourthly, the condition of everyone for whom Christ died is the same

The term “everyone” must refer to all men as considered in a *like condition*; for several respects and conditions of the same persons may cause them to come under several obligations as to their duties: now, there is no one condition common to all except the state of wrath and death, Eph. 2:3; therefore every man must be considered to be in that condition; so, in sum, the sense of the minor proposition is,

Restatement of Proposition 2: “All men in the world, as considered in a state of wrath and unregeneracy, are bound to believe (and it was the intention of God) that Christ should die for every one of them in particular.”

Minor Proposition: Everyone is bound to believe that Jesus Christ died for him.

Now, ignoring the major proposition (which is false), what men are bound to believe in this minor proposition is neither *true* nor *false*, but *good*. As such, the proposition is absolutely false. It has not the least hint of reason or Scripture to support it; and when our adversaries prove that “everyone” means every individual in the world, I will engage myself to be their proselyte.

First, if it were so, then some must be bound to believe what is false.

This cannot be, for every obligation to believe is from the God of truth. Now, it is false that Christ died for all and every individual of human kind, as proved before at large.

Secondly, men would be bound to believe what is not revealed.

And yet divine revelation is the object of all faith. The Scriptures do not show anywhere that Christ died for this or that particular man as *such*, but only for sinners indefinitely; oftentimes this is *antecedently* specified by God's purpose, and *consequently* by their own purchased obedience.

Thirdly, the objects of faith are God's commands, promises, and threats.

Neither God's purpose nor man's obedience is proposed as the object of faith of anyone, but only his commands, promises, and threats; anything else is left to be collected and assured to the soul by an experience actually enjoyed, and a sense of some sweet infallible result and effect of that experience in the heart.

Fourthly, any command to believe cannot be interpreted by God's intent.

Nor can any command in the Scripture to believe be interpreted by the purpose and intention of God, as though its meaning were, "God intended Christ to die for you in particular;" nor does any promise contain that sense.

Fifthly, unless he hears, how can anyone be bound to believe?

This of itself is enough to break the neck of this argument. All men do not have Christ's death proposed as an object of faith to them. How can they believe unless they hear? Can they be bound to believe what they never heard as the least rumor? How many millions of infants and others, in barbarous nations, go to their "own place" without hearing the least report of Jesus Christ, or his sufferings for them or others, even in these days of the gospel! How much more so before the coming of Christ in the flesh, when the means of grace were restricted to one small nation with a few proselytes! Are all those who remain, everyone, bound to believe that Christ died for them, everyone in particular? Those who think so are doubtless bound to go and tell all of them – I mean those who are still in the land of the living. *Unbelief* is the great damning sin where faith is required (John 3:36).¹ And yet Paul proves that many will be condemned for sinning against the light of nature (Rom. 2:12).² This is an evident demonstration that faith is not required of all, and all men are not bound to believe.

But perhaps our adversaries will except, as they must except if they intend to have any trace or show of strength left to this argument, that they mean it only with regard to those who are called by the word, and so it is of force. To this end it might be proposed this way:

"What everyone called by the word, those to whom the gospel is preached, is bound to believe, is true; everyone so called is bound to believe that Christ died for him in particular; *ergo*," etc.

ANSWER: 1. Only the last foregoing exception is removed by this *reformed argument*; all the rest stand in their full force, which are sufficient to evert it. 2. Who does not see that this very reforming of the argument has made it completely useless to the cause in whose defense it was produced? For if anyone, much less the great part of men, is excepted from this proposition, and

¹ Jn 3:36 He that believes on the Son has everlasting life: and he that does not believe the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abides on him.

² Rom 2:12 For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law;

not accounted for, then the *general ransom* falls to the ground. From the *countless multiples of all*, we come to the *many that are called*, and no doubt we will instantly descend to the *few that are chosen*. As for the exception, that what is true with regard to those to whom it is proposed, I answer,

First, the argument is taken from the scriptural obligation to believe, and it can be extended no further than it is actually extended there.

Secondly, it is not safe disputing what would be or should be, if things were not as God has appointed and ordained them. We see the will of God for the present; we are not to make our suppositions a basis for any argument to which they could otherwise have been disposed.

Thirdly, if the gospel were preached to all in the world, then all the mind and will of God that can in general be signified to them is this, “The one who believes and is baptized will be saved, but the one who does not believe will be damned.” God has so concatenated and knit together *faith* and *salvation* that whoever will enjoy salvation must exercise faith. If the gospel were now be preached to the Turks and the Indians, and they rejected it, they should certainly be damned for not believing what they were bound to believe upon the preaching of it.

Now, did Christ die for every one of them in particular? No, doubtless he did not. Rather this is the truth: “There is no other name under heaven given among men, by which we must be saved,” but only by the name of Christ, made known to us in the gospel (Acts 4:12). What damns the soul is rejecting the counsel and wisdom of God to save sinners by the blood of Jesus. It is not believing the necessity of a Redeemer, and that Jesus of Nazareth was that Redeemer according to his own word to the Jews, “If you do not believe that I am he, you shall die in your sins,” Indeed, the specific infidelity of the Jews was not believing him to be their Messiah, the one whom they saw declared to be the Son of God with power. Not believing these things is the soul-damning infidelity; it is obstinately refusing to come in upon the call of the gospel. But refusing to believe that Christ died for every one of them in particular is *not* what damned them. Indeed, that is something that could not, by the rule of the gospel, be proposed to them, and they never came so far as to question or esteem such a thing.

Still, then, we deny the minor proposition of the reduced syllogism; and we do so partly for the reasons stated, and partly for these reasons which are subjoined:

1. Those to whom the gospel is preached are bound to believe with that faith which is required for justification only. Now, this is not a full persuasion that Christ died for any one in particular, in the intention and purpose of God; for that does not reveal the object of justification, nor the way by which a sinner may be justified.¹

¹ The last clauses of this sentence are obscure. In the edition by the Rev. Adam Gib, 1755 it is proposed to render them, “which is not revealed to the object of justification, or in the way by which a sinner may be justified.” If we were at liberty to change the “nor” into “but,” a meaning sufficiently intelligible would be obtained, without any violent alteration of the text, and quite in harmony with the scope of the reasoning. Ed. [It is reassuring to know that the 1853 editor, Wm Goold, struggled as much as I have with the meaning of the text; yet I disagree with Goold that “nor” should be “but.”](#) Owen’s entire point is that we don’t need to know God’s purpose, [nor his intent, nor the specific objects of justification \(those for whom he died\), in order to be justified ourselves.](#) This conclusion was developed at length in Book IV, Chap 1, Sections 1 to 3.

2. There is a natural order, established by God's appointment, in the things that are to be believed; so that until some of them are believed, the rest are not required (a man is not commanded or reasonably expected to skip all the lower rungs to get to the top of a ladder).

(1.) Repent and believe the gospel to be the word of God, and that it contains his will, and that Jesus Christ, revealed there, is the wisdom and power of God unto salvation.

(2.) There is an inseparable connection, by God's appointment, between faith and salvation; gospel faith carries a sinner quite out of himself and off from his own righteousness.

(3.) There is a particular conviction, by the Spirit, of the necessity of a Redeemer, by which their souls in particular become weary, heavy laden, and burdened.

(4.) There is a serious full resting of the soul upon Christ, rolling onto him in the promise of the gospel that he is an all-sufficient Savior, able to deliver and save to the utmost those who come to God by him; that he is ready, able, and willing, though the preciousness of his blood and sufficiency of his ransom, to save every soul that will freely give themselves up to him for that end, and that he is resolved to be these to them. And in doing of all this, there is not one who is called upon by the gospel to inquire after the purpose and intention of God concerning the particular object of the death of Christ; rather, every one is fully assured that his death will be profitable to those who believe in him and obey him.

Now, fourthly, after all this and not before, it lies upon a believer to assure his soul of the good will and eternal love of God toward him in sending his Son to die for him in particular, as he finds the fruit of the death of Christ in him and towards him. What a preposterous course it would be, and how opposite to the rule of the gospel, to call upon a man to believe that it was the intention and purpose of God that Christ should die for him in particular, and desire him to assure his soul of that, before he is convinced either,

1. Of the truth of the gospel in general; or,
2. That faith is the only way of salvation; or,
3. That he himself stands in need of a Savior; or,
4. That there is enough in Christ to save and recover him if he gives himself up to him in his own way!

Now, it is most apparent that only such persons as these are bound to believe what we have discoursed about. The argument, then, must once again be reformed, and it is proposed thus:

“What every one, convinced of the necessity of a Savior, and of the right way of salvation, hungering, thirsting, and panting after Jesus Christ, as alone able to give him refreshment, is bound to believe, is true; every such person is bound to believe that Christ died for him in particular: *ergo*, it is true.”

Some grant the whole of this without any prejudice to the cause we have undertaken to defend.¹ It is most apparent, then,

1. That all who are called by the word, in whatever state or condition they may continue, are not bound to believe that Christ died for them; but only those who are qualified as described above.

¹ That is, even those who disagree with Owen (*those prejudiced to his cause*) would grant the argument as stated.

2. That believing with fiduciary confidence that Christ died for anyone in particular, is not proposed as a precept; nor is it obligatory to all who are called; nor is *not* believing it otherwise a sin, but has as its root a habit of unbelief, or not turning to God in Christ for mercy.
3. That no reprobate (for whom Christ did not die) will be condemned for not believing that Christ died for him in particular (which would not be true); but for not believing those things to which he was called, listed above, which are all most true in reference to him.
4. That the command to believe in Christ, which is specially urged as given to all (the point of contention), is not obligatory to anyone except upon fulfilling the conditions required for it.
5. To “believe on the name of Jesus Christ,” which is the command in 1Jn. 3:23, is *not* to believe that it was the intention of God that Christ should die for us in particular, but to rest upon him for salvation, as in Isa. 1:11.¹
6. The testimony of God to which we ought to set our seal that it is true, is none other than this, “The one who has the Son has life, but the one who does not have the Son of God does not live,” 1Jn. 5:12; reprobates, disbelieving this, do what lies in them to make God a liar, and are justly condemned for it. Whoever desires to see more of this argument may consult, if he wishes, Piscator, Perkins, Twisse, Synod of Dort, Du Moulin, Baronius, Rutherford, Spanheim, Amesius, and others.

OBJECTION II. Particular redemption causes doubt whether one is saved.

“Any doctrine which fills the minds and souls of poor miserable sinners with doubts and misgivings whether they ought to believe or not, when God calls them to it, cannot be agreeable to the gospel. But this is what the doctrine of particular redemption does. It fills the minds of sinners with misgivings and fears as to whether they should believe it or not; and that is because they are uncertain whether it was the intention of God that Christ died for them in particular or not, seeing that he supposedly did not die for all, but only for his elect. Thus when a soul is called upon to believe, he may justly begin to question whether it will be available for him to do so or not, and whether it is his duty or not, seeing that he does not know whether Christ died for him or not.”

ANSWER:

1. Experience shows that misgivings, doubts, and fears will often arise in the hearts of sinners as the proper result of unconquered remaining unbelief; sometimes it is against, and sometimes it is to escape from, the truth of the gospel. The question is whether the doctrine itself caused the misgiving or stumbling of itself, in its own nature, to those who rightly perform their duty? Or are all those fears and misgivings the natural product and result of corruption and unbelief, setting themselves up against the truth as it is in Jesus? We deny the former, that the doctrine of particular effectual redemption is the cause; and the latter God alone can remedy.
2. This objection supposes that a man is bound to know and be persuaded (that is, believe) that Jesus Christ died for him in particular, by God’s appointment, before he believes in Jesus Christ. No, this is what they make the bottom of their argument: that men of our persuasion may hesitate whether they ought to believe or not, because they are not assured beforehand that Christ died for them in particular by the designation and appointment of God. Now, if this is not an obvious

¹ Probably Isa 11:10 And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious.

contradiction, I do not know what is. For I ask you, what is it, according to Scripture, for man to be assured that Christ died for him in particular? Is it not the very highest improvement of faith? Does it not include a sense of the spiritual love of God shed abroad in our hearts? Is it not the top of the apostle's consolation in Rom. 8:34,¹ and the bottom of all his joyful assurance in Gal. 2:20?² They evidently require that a man must believe before he believes, so that he cannot believe, and he will exceedingly fear whether he ought to do so or not, unless he believes before he believes! I think such a removal of misgivings would be the ready way to entangle doubting consciences in further inextricable perplexities.

3. We deny that being persuaded it was the will of God that Christ died for him in particular either is or can be necessary in any way to draw a sinner to believe. Consider the following texts: sinners have a duty to believe the call of Christ, Matt. 11:28,³ Isa. 55:1;⁴ the command of God given in 1Jn. 3:23;⁵ that promise of life upon the blood of Christ to save all believers in Acts 20:21,⁶ Eph. 5:2;⁷ the assured salvation of all believers without exception in Mark 16:16.⁸ These and their like are enough to remove all doubts and fears, and are all that the Scripture holds out for that purpose.

4. That persuasion,

- (1.) Which asserts the certainty of salvation by the death of Christ to all believers;
- (2.) That affirms the command of God and the call of Christ to infallibly declare that duty which is required of the person commanded and called, which, if it is performed, will assuredly be acceptable to God;
- (3.) That holds out purchased free grace to all distressed and burdened consciences;
- (4.) That reveals a fountain of blood, all-sufficient to purge all the sin of everyone in the world that will use the appointed means for coming to it;

That doctrine, I say, cannot possibly be the cause of any doubt or misgiving in the minds of convinced, burdened sinners, whether they ought to believe or not. Now, all this is presented by the doctrine of particular effectual redemption, in the dispensation of the gospel which is suitable to it.

I will, then, let this objection go without further pursuit, only attended with this query: "What is it, according to the authors of universal redemption, that men are bound to believe, when they

¹ Rom 8:34 Who *is* he that condemns? *It is* Christ that died, yes rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us.

² Gal 2:20 I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ lives in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

³ Mt 11:28 Come to me, all *you* that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

⁴ Isa 55:1 Ho, every one that thirsts, come to the waters; and he that has no money: come, buy, and eat; yes, come! buy wine and milk without money and without price.

⁵ This is his commandment: that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he commanded.

⁶ Ac 20:21 Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.

⁷ Eph 5:2 Walk in love, as Christ also loved us, and gave himself for us – an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor.

⁸ Mk 16:16 He that believes and is baptized shall be saved; but he that does not believe shall be damned.

know beforehand that Christ died for them in particular?” Is it a persuasion of the love of God and good will of Christ? It cannot be; they have that beforehand, John 3:16;¹ Rom. 5:8;² nor is it coming to God by Christ to enjoy the fruits of his death. For what is that, I ask? There are no fruits of the death of Christ, according to the universalists, except what are common to all – which might be damnation as easily as salvation, for more are damned than saved; which might be infidelity as well as faith, for most are unbelievers. The immediate fruits of the death of Christ can be nothing but what they hold in common with those who perish. Plainly, their faith in Christ will at length appear to be Socinian obedience.³

There are two things that remain, about which there is no small contention. Both things, in themselves, are excelling and valuable; both are laid claim to by the several persuasions concerning the topic we address. But they are expressed with such an unequal plea, that an easy judgment might serve to decide the controversy. Now, these are, *first*, the exaltation of God’s free grace (the merit of Christ), and *secondly*, the consolation of our souls. Let us consider them in order, and let each persuasion take its due.

OBJECTION III. Universal Redemption better represents the Love of God.

First, the *exaltation of God’s free grace*. I do not know how it comes to pass, but so it is, that men have entertained a persuasion that the opinion of *universal redemption* better serves to set forth the *love and free grace of God*. Indeed, they make free grace, that glorious expression, to be nothing more than what is held forth in their opinion, namely, that God loves *all*, and gave Christ to die for *all*, and is ready to save *all*, if *they will come to him*. “This,” they say, “is *free grace* and love magnified indeed; this is the universality of free grace,” and similar flourishing expressions; “while the contrary opinion chains up the love and grace of God to a few.”

But wait a moment. What, I ask, is this – your grace, free grace – that is universal?

- Is it the grace of *election*? Truly not; for God has not chosen all to salvation, Rom. 9:11-12;⁴ Eph. 1:4;⁵ Rom. 8:28.⁶
- Is it the grace of *effectual vocation*? No, it is not this either. Doubtless it *cannot* be; for “whom God calls he also justifies,” and “glorifies,” Rom. 8:30, 11:25-26, 29. No, all have not been and are not outwardly called, chap. 10:14.⁷

¹ Jn 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believes in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

² Rom 5:8 But God commends his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

³ Socinians reject the cross as anything but an example to us, and so it is our own obedience that saves us: a doctrine of works.

⁴ Rom 9:11-13 (For *the children* not yet being born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;) ¹² It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. ¹³ As it is written, Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated.

⁵ Eph 1:4-5 According as he has chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: ⁵ Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will,

⁶ Rom 8:28 And we know that all things work together for good to those who love God, to those who are the called according to *his* purpose.

⁷ Rom 10:14 How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher?

- Is it the grace of *cleansing and sanctification*? Why, are all purged? Are all washed in the blood of Jesus? Or is it only the church that has been washed, as in Eph. 5:25-27?¹ Some, to be sure, are still defiled, Tit. 1:15.² Faith is the principle of the heart's purification, and "all men do not have faith."³
- Is it the grace of *justification*, the free love and mercy of God in pardoning and accepting sinners? But, friends, is this universal? Are all pardoned? Are all accepted? See Rom. 1:17,⁴ 3:22,⁵ 5:1.⁶
- Is it the grace of *redemption* in the blood of Christ? See, I pray, Rev. 5:9.⁷

What then, I pray, is this – your universal free grace? Is it not universally a figment of your own brains? Or is it not a new name for that old idol, Free-Will? Is it not destructive to free grace in every branch of it? Does it not tend to evert the whole covenant of selective grace, evidently denying that the conditions⁸ of that covenant are worked in any of the federates⁹ by virtue of the promise of the covenant?¹⁰ Are not the two great aims of their free grace to mock God and exalt themselves? Are they not proposing that the Lord makes a pretence of His love, good will, free grace, and pardon to all, never once acquainting the great number of them with any such love or good will? And he does so, they say, knowing that unless he effects it, they can never come to any such knowledge.

Do they not say, by their universal grace, that the Lord feigns that he loves all those who are outwardly called to the knowledge of these things, feigns that he has sent his Son to die for them all, and feigns that he desires that they all may be saved? For he does so upon such a condition that, without him, they can no more effect their salvation than climb to heaven by a ladder; and yet he will not effect it for them. Do they not openly make God say, "Such is my love, my universal grace, that I will freely love them by it, dare to joyfully embrace them in all things, except in what will do them good?" They would affirm God as a grossly counterfeiting hypocrite who would go to a poor blind man and tell him, "Alas, poor man, I pity your case; I see your want; I love you exceedingly; open your own eyes, and I will give you a hundred pounds." Dare

¹ Eph 5:25-26 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; ²⁶ That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word,

² Tit 1:15 To the pure all things *are* pure: but to those who are defiled and unbelieving nothing *is* pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled.

³ 2Th 3:2

⁴ Rom 1:17 For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith.

⁵ Rom 3:22 Even the righteousness of God *which is* by faith in Jesus Christ unto all and upon all those who believe:

⁶ Rom 5:1 Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.

⁷ Rev 5:9 You are worthy to take the book, and to open its seals: for you were slain, and have redeemed us to God by your blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;

⁸ Not the qualifying conditions that must be met to be joined to the covenant, but the benefits of the covenant; otherwise they could not be 'worked' or 'wrought' in the federates.

⁹ Those joined to the covenant by God's eternal decree – the beneficiaries of Christ's atonement; the elect ('selective grace').

¹⁰ The phrase 'by virtue of' does not refer to what causes the denial, but what works the benefits in the 'federates'; it is the promise of God that ensures they will receive the benefits so that the covenantal conditions of grace will be worked in them.

they assign such deportment¹ to the most holy God of truth? Is their universal grace anything but mocking? Has what is common to all ever done good to anyone in particular as to their salvation? Are these not the two properties of God's grace in the Scripture: that it is *discriminating* and *effectual*? And is not their grace anything else but these?

What if it were granted that all they say concerning the *extent* of grace is true. Is this such grace that ever saved a soul? If so, then why, I ask, are not all souls saved? "Why," they say, "because they do not believe." So then, the bestowing of faith is not part of this free grace. See their second aim: to exalt themselves and Free-Will into the place of grace, or at least they leave them room to come in, and to have the best share in the work of salvation: *believing itself* makes all the rest profitable. See, now, what universal free grace leads and tends toward. Are not the very terms opposite to one another? To bring in reprobates to be objects of free grace, they deny the free grace of God to the elect; to make it universal, they deny its effectualness; that all may have a share of it, they deny that any are saved by it: for "saving" grace must be restrained.

On the other side, in what way, I ask, does the doctrine of effectual redemption of God's elect only, in the blood of Jesus, impair the free grace of God? Is it in its *freedom*? Why, we say it is so free, that unless it is altogether free, it is no grace at all. Is it in its *efficacy*? Why, we say that by grace we are saved; we ascribe the whole work of our recovery and being brought to God in *solidum*² with it. Is it in its *extent*? We affirm that it is extended to every one that is, was, or ever will be delivered from the pit. It is true, we do not call grace that leads to hell free grace, in a gospel sense; for we deem the free grace of God so powerful, that wherever it has designed and chosen itself a subject, it brings that subject to Christ, God, salvation, and eternity.

"But you do not extend it to all; you tie it to a few." *De te largitor, puer.*³ Is extending the love and favor of God in our power? Does he not have mercy on whom he will have mercy, and does he not harden whom he will? Yet, we affirm that it is extended universally to the saved ones. Should we throw the children's bread to the dogs? Friends, we believe that the grace of God in Christ works faith in every one to whom it is extended. We believe that the conditions of that covenant which is ratified in his blood are all effectually wrought in the heart of every covenantee. We believe that there is no love of God that is not effectual. We believe that the blood of Christ was not shed in vain. We believe that, of ourselves, we are dead in trespasses and sins, and can do nothing except what the free grace of God works in us. And therefore, we cannot conceive that grace can be extended to all. For those of you who affirm that millions of those who are taken into a new covenant of grace perish eternally, and that it is left to men to believe that the will of God may be frustrated and his love be ineffectual, and that we distinguish ourselves one from another,⁴ you may extend grace wherever you please. For it is indifferent to you whether the object of God's grace goes to heaven or to hell.

But in the meanwhile, I beseech you friends, give me leave to question whether what you talk of is God's free grace, or your own fond figment? Is it his love, or your wills? For the present, it truly seems to me that it is the latter only. Yet our prayers will be that God would give you infinitely more of his love than is contained in that ineffectual universal grace with which you so

¹ Deportment: conduct or behavior.

² solid; same material throughout, unalloyed; not hollow; dense; unbroken or whole;

³ Roughly, with regard to yourself, give generously, servant.

⁴ As opposed to God making the distinction between us.

flourish.¹ Only, we will labor so that poor souls are not seduced by you with the specious pretences of free grace to all. They do not know that your free grace is a mere painted cloth, one that will give them no assistance at all to deliver them from that condition in which they are found, but will only give them leave to be saved if they can do it themselves. Instead, they are ready, by the name you have given to the brat of your own brain,² to suppose you mean an effectual, almighty, saving grace, that will certainly bring all to God to whom it is extended, and about which they have heard in the Scripture. All the while, you laugh into your sleeves to think how simply these poor souls are deluded with your empty show, the substance of which is this, “Go your way; be saved if you can, in the way revealed; God will not hinder you.”

OBJECTION IV. Universal Redemption better exalts the Merit of Christ.

Each party contests about the *exaltation of the merit of Christ*; making their mutual pretences. Something has been said about this before, so I will be brief. Take, then, only a short view of the difference that exists between them, where each pretends to exalt the merit of Christ in what is denied by the other, and this plea will suddenly be at an end.

First, there is only one thing that concerns the death of Christ by which the authors of the *general ransom* pretend to set forth the excellence of his death and oblation; namely, that the benefits of that death are extended to everyone. By contrast, their adversaries restrict it to a few, a very few, in fact, to none but the elect. This, the authors of the general ransom say, is derogatory to the honor of the Lord Jesus Christ. And in this alone they pretend to so exceedingly advance his name and merit above the pitch of those who assert the effectual redemption of the elect only. The truth is, the measure of the honor of Jesus Christ is not to be assigned by us, poor worms of the dust; what he takes to be honor is what he gives and ascribes to himself, and nothing else. He has no need of our lie for his glory: so that if this did seem for the exaltation of the glory of Christ in our eyes, yet, arising from a lie of our own hearts, it would be an abomination to him.

Secondly, we deny that this serves in any way to set out the nature and dignity of the death of Christ; because the extent of his efficacy to all (if true) does not arise from its own innate sufficiency, but from the free pleasure and determination of God: how that is enervated by a pretended universality was declared earlier.

Thirdly, the value of a thing arises from its own native sufficiency and worth for any purpose to which it is to be employed; those who maintain effectual redemption assert that the sufficiency of the death of Christ is much above what any of their adversaries ascribe to it.

If I were now to declare in how many things the honor of Christ, and the excellence of his death and passion, along with the fruits of it, are contained in that doctrine we have sought to propound from the Scriptures, and compare them with those that are agreeable to the principal maxims of universal redemption, I would be forced to repeat much that has already been spoken. So it will suffice to present the reader with this following comparison between the two:

¹ In the sense of making bold assertions and sweeping claims, not in the sense of prospering.

² That is, the figment that gives rise to Free-Will or Universal Grace.

Universalists

1. Christ died for everyone, elect and reprobate.
2. Most of those for whom Christ died are damned.
3. Christ, by his death, did not purchase any saving grace for those for whom he died.
4. Christ took no care for the great part of those for whom he died, that they should ever hear one word of his death.
5. Christ, in his death, did not ratify or confirm a covenant of grace with any federates, but only procured by his death that God might, if he would, enter into a new covenant with whomever he would, and upon whatever condition he pleased.
6. Christ died, and yet no one might be saved.
7. Christ had no more intention to redeem his church, than he had to redeem the wicked seed of the serpent.
8. Christ did not die for the infidelity of any.

Scriptural Redemption.

1. Christ died for the elect only.
2. All of those for whom Christ died are certainly saved.
3. Christ by his death purchased all saving grace for those for whom he died.
4. Christ sends the means and reveals the way of life to all those for whom he died.
5. The new covenant of grace was confirmed to all the elect in the blood of Jesus.
6. Christ, by his death and based on God's covenant and compact, purchased an assured special people, the pleasure of the Lord prospering to the end in his hand.
7. Christ loved his church, and gave himself for it.
8. Christ died for the infidelity of the elect.

Various other instances of a similar nature might be easily collected which, upon first viewing, the differences would quickly be determined. These few, I have no doubt, are sufficient in the eyes of all experienced Christians, to evince how little conducive the *general ransom* is to the honor and glory of Jesus Christ, or to setting forth the worth and dignity of his death and passion.

OBJECTION V. Universal Redemption offers greater Consolation.

The next and last thing which comes under debate in this contest is *gospel consolation*, which God in Christ is abundantly willing that we should receive. A short discourse as to which of the two opinions gives the firmest basis and soundest foundation for it, will, by the Lord's assistance, lead us to an end of this long debate. *The God of Truth and Comfort grant that all our undertakings for truth, or rather his workings in us, may end in peace and consolation!*

To clarify this, some things need to be premised, such as:

1. All true evangelical consolation belongs only to believers, Heb. 6:17-18,¹ God's people, Isa. 40:1-2;² while the "wrath of God abides" upon unbelievers, John 3:36.

¹ Heb 6:17-18 In which God, willing more abundantly to show to the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed *it* by an oath: ¹⁸ that by two immutable things, in which *it was* impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us:

² Isa 40:1-2 Comfort you, comfort my people, says your God. ² Speak comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry to her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she has received from the LORD'S hand double for all her sins.

2. To offer consolation to those to whom it is not due is no less a crime than to hide it from those to whom it does belong, Isa. 5:20;¹ Jer. 23:14;² Ezek. 13:10.³

3. T. Moore's attempt to set forth the death of Christ so that all might be comforted, meaning everyone in the world, it would appear, is a proud attempt to make straight what God has made crooked, and it is most opposite to the gospel.

4. That doctrine which offers consolation from the death of Christ to unbelievers cries, "Peace, peace," when God says, "There is no peace."

These things being premised, I will briefly demonstrate the four following positions:

1. That extending the death of Christ to a universal object, cannot give the least ground of consolation to those whom God would have comforted by the gospel.

2. That denying the efficacy of the death of Christ towards those for whom he died cuts the nerves and sinews of all strong consolation, even what is proper for believers to receive, and specific to the gospel to give.

3. That there is nothing in the doctrine of redemption of the elect only, that in the least measure debars those to whom comfort is due from consolation.

4. That the doctrine of the effectual redemption of the sheep of Christ, by the blood of the covenant, is the true and solid foundation of all durable consolation.

ANSWER:

1. Universal Redemption is no cause for Consolation.

We begin with the first, that extending the death of Christ toward a *universal* object has nothing in it that is unique to it, that can give the least basis of consolation to those whom God would comfort. That gospel consolation, to properly name it, is a fruit of actual reconciliation with God, and so it is proper and specific only to *believers*. I laid this down before, and my supposition is that it is a truth beyond all question and debate. Now, it is easily proved that no consolation can be conveyed to them out of anything specific to the general ransom. Take the following reasons:

i. No consolation can arise for believers from what is nowhere proposed in the Scripture as a ground, cause, or matter of consolation, as the general ransom is not: for,

First, what has no being can have no affection or operation;

Secondly, all the foundations and materials of consolation are things which are particular and specific only to some, as will be declared.

ii. No consolation can accrue to believers from what is held in common between them and those whom, first, God would not have comforted; secondly, who will assuredly perish to eternity; thirdly, who stand in open rebellion against Christ; and fourthly, who never hear one word of the gospel or consolation. Now, the foundation of *consolation*, as proposed in and

¹ Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil; who put darkness for light, and light for darkness; who put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!

² Jer 23:14 I have seen also in the prophets of Jerusalem a horrible thing: they commit adultery, and walk in lies: they strengthen also the hands of evildoers, that none returns from his wickedness:

³ Ezek 13:10 Because they have seduced my people, saying, Peace; and *there was no peace*; and one built up a wall, and, lo, others daubed it with untempered *morter*:

arising from the *general ransom*, equally appertains to all these others, and such as these, as it does to the finest of believers.¹

iii. Let a man test in a time of desertion and temptation, not in a time of disputation, what consolation or peace he can obtain for his soul from such a syllogism as this, “Christ died for all men; I am a man: therefore, Christ died for me.” Won’t his own heart tell him that notwithstanding all that he is assured of in that conclusion, the wrath of God may still abide on him forevermore? Doesn’t he see that, notwithstanding this, the Lord shows so little love towards millions upon millions of the sons of men, of whom that syllogism is as true as it is of himself (according to the general ransom), that the Lord does not once reveal himself or his Son to them? What good will it do me to know that Christ died for me, if notwithstanding that death, I may still perish forever? If you intend any consolation for me from what is common to all, then you must tell me what it is which *all* enjoy, which will satisfy *my* desires, and which flow from assurances of the love of God in Christ. If you cannot give me more to comfort me than what you might have given to Judas, can you expect me to be settled and consoled? If you cannot, then you are all truly miserable comforters, physicians of no value, Job’s visitors, skillful only to add affliction to the afflicted.

“But be of good comfort,” Arminians will say; “Christ is a propitiation for all sinners, and now you know yourself to be sinners.”

ANSWER: True; but is Christ a propitiation for all the sins of those sinners? If so, how can any of them perish? If not, what good will this do me, whose sins (such as unbelief) are perhaps those for which Christ was not a propitiation? “But do not exclude yourself;” they say, “God excludes none; the love which caused him to send his Son was general towards all.” Don’t tell me of *God’s* excluding; I have sufficiently excluded *myself*! Will he powerfully take me in? Has Christ only purchased my admission, but not procured my ability to enter into his Father’s arms? “Why, he has opened a door of salvation to all.” Good grief! Isn’t it a vain endeavor to open a grave for a dead man to come out? Who lights a candle for the blind man to see by? To open a door for someone to come out of prison who is blind, and lame, and bound, indeed *dead*, derides his misery rather than procures him liberty. Never tell me that what will bring me strong consolation and enjoyment will not preserve the great portion of men who perish everlastingly.

2. *Universal Redemption undermines the true cause of Consolation.*

The general ransom is so far from providing firm consolation for believers from the death of Christ, that it quite overthrows all the choice ingredients of strong consolation which do indeed flow from it; and it does that, first, by strangely dividing and tearing apart those things which ought to be conjoined to make up one certain foundation of confidence; and secondly, by denying the efficacy of Christ’s death towards those for whom he died: both of which necessarily attend the persuasion of a general ransom.

First, they divide the *impetration*² of redemption (which in their judgment is the only proper immediate fruit and effect of Christ’s death) from the *application* of that redemption, so that the

¹ To which an Arminian would say, “Amen!” Owen does not clearly “prove” here that consolation proceeds from the distinction between elect and reprobate. He simply says it as a proposition. He declares his reasoning immediately below in (iii) and in his answer to the next Arminian proposition.

² Impetration: obtaining something by petition or beseeching. Arminians insist that Christ may petition the Father to redeem all men based on his atonement, but the Father’s willingness to actually redeem anyone, is conditionally

one may belong to millions who have no share in the other. Indeed, that impetration of redemption may be obtained for all, and yet no one has it applied to them so as to be saved by it. Now, such as it is, this is an ineffectual and merely possible redemption, notwithstanding which all the sons of men might perish everlastingly. That is because, in this view, the impetration is the whole object of the death of Christ. It is separated and divided from all application of redemption to anyone in a way that might make it profitable and useful in the least measure. For Arminians deny that this application is a fruit of the death of Christ. If it were, then why is it not common to all for whom he died? What comfort this can afford any poor soul in the least degree is beyond my apprehension. “What shall I do?” asks the sinner; “The iniquity of my heels compasses me about.¹ I have no rest in my bones by reason of my sin:² and now, what will cause my sorrow to go?” Be of good cheer; Christ died for sinners. “Yes, but will the fruits of his death be certainly applied to all those for whom he died? If not, I may perish forever.” Universalists refer him to his own strength in believing, or what, in the end, will be resolved into it, “et erit mihi magnus Apollo:”³ and if they send him there, they acknowledge the consolation of which they boast properly proceeds from *ourselves*, and not from the death of Christ.

Secondly, separating the oblation⁴ from the intercession of Jesus Christ offers little consolation to believers. Indeed, it quite everts it. There are, among others, two eminent passages of Scripture in which the Holy Ghost offers consolation to believers. It is offered against two general causes of all their troubles and sorrows, namely, their *afflictions* and their *sins*. The first is Rom. 8:32-34,⁵ and the other is 1Jn. 2:1-2.⁶ In both passages, the apostles make the basis of the consolation which they demonstrate to believers in their afflictions and failings to be that tight bond, and inseparable connection, which exists between the oblation and the intercession of Jesus Christ. Let the reader consult both texts, and he will find that in this lies the stress, and in this consists the strength of what is proposed to console believers. In both places, this is what is principally intended. A more direct proof of this end and purpose cannot be produced. Now, all of the authors of universal redemption divide and separate these two things. They allow no connection between them, nor any further dependence of one upon the other than is effected by the will of man. They stretch Christ’s oblation to all, but his intercession to a few only. Now, the death of Christ, separated from his resurrection and intercession, is nowhere proposed as a

restricted to those who, having heard the gospel, believe it of their own free will. Thus Christ only made *provision* for men’s salvation through his death.

¹ Ps 49:5 – the iniquity of my adversaries or “supplanters” who surround me.

² Ps 38:3

³ Loosely, “And even be myself great Apollo.” Phoebus Apollo occupied the seat of the Oracle at Delphi. He was the author of all those ambiguous oracles of old, given in response to questions concerning personal destiny. And he is mentioned, again, in Virgil’s *Aeneid*. It basically means “I am the answer to my own riddle, the determiner of my own destiny.”

⁴ Oblation: an act of offering, in this case, Christ’s atoning sacrifice is offered. His intercession for us flows from that oblation.

⁵ **Romans 8:32-34** ³² He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? ³³ Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God’s elect? *It is* God that justifies. ³⁴ Who *is* he that condemns? *It is* Christ that died, yes rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us.

⁶ **1John 2:1-2** My little children, these things I write to you, that you do not sin. And if any man sins, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: ² And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for *the sins* of the whole world.

ground of consolation. Indeed, it is positively declared to be unsuitable to any such purpose, (1Cor. 15:14).¹ Certainly those who hold it out as such are no friends to Christian consolation.

Thirdly, they deny that the procurement of faith, grace, and holiness, which is the whole intent of the new covenant, and perseverance in them, by the death and blood-shedding of Jesus Christ, comes to all or any of those for whom he died. This assertion does not appear to be suitable to evoke consolation from his cross, as it is vainly pretended. What solid consolation can be drawn from such dry breasts as those from which none of these can flow? It was declared before that, according to the persuasion of those who assert universal grace, they do not immediately depend on the death of Christ. This is not only confessed by them, but they attempt to prove it. Now, where should a soul look for these things, but in the purchase of Christ? From where should they flow, but from his side? Or is there any consolation to be had without them? Is not the strongest plea for these things, at the throne of grace, the procurement of them by the Lord Jesus?

What promise is there of anything without him? Are not all the promises of God yes and amen in him? Is there any attainment of these things in our own strength? Is this the consolation you afford us, to send us from free grace to free will? Where, I ask, according to this persuasion, should a poor soul go that finds himself lacking these things? "To God, who gives all freely," they say. But does God bless us with any spiritual blessings except in Jesus Christ? Does he bless us with anything in him except what he has procured for us? Is not all grace procured by a Mediator as well as dispensed in him? Is this a way to comfort a soul from the death of Christ, to let him know that Christ did not procure those things for him without which he cannot be comforted? "Credat Apella."²

It is most apparent, then, that the pretended general ransom is far from being the basis of any solid consolation for those to whom it is due. It is directly destructive of, and diametrically opposed to, all those ways by which the Lord has declared himself willing to provide us comfort from the death of his Son. It dries up the breast and poisons the streams from which such comfort would be conveyed to our souls.

3. Particular Redemption does not abridge any part of a believer's Consolation.

The next thing we have to do is to show that the doctrine of the effectual redemption of the elect alone by the blood of Jesus is not liable to any justifiable exception as to this particular. Nor does it in any way abridge any part or portion of the believer's consolation which God intends him to receive. The only thing which is objected by its opposers with any measure of reason, comes to this: "That there is nothing in the Scripture by which any man can assure himself that Christ died for him in particular, unless we grant that he died for all." We are not at all moved by their exclamation that countless souls are shut out from any share in the blood of Christ, seeing that those shut out are confessedly reprobate unbelievers and persons impenitent to the end.

First, it is the experience of all believers that, by the grace of God, they have assured their hearts of their share and interest in Christ as held out to them in the promise, without the least thought of universal redemption: a sufficient testimony that this is notoriously false.

¹ **1Cor 15:14** And if Christ is not risen, then our preaching is in vain, and your faith is also in vain.

² The phrase is a contraction of "Credat Judaeus Apella, non ego" "Let the Jew Apella believe it; not I". The phrase means, roughly, tell it to someone else, not me. It comes from Horace's *Satires*, Book 1, Satire 5.

Secondly, it has acknowledged by all that there is an infallible assurance which arises from a practical syllogism¹ of which one proposition is true in the word, and the second is true by the witness of the Spirit in the heart.²

Now, all believers may have such assurance that Christ died for them, with the intent and purpose to save their souls. For instance: all believers may draw this conclusion out of the truth of the word and the faith created in their hearts:

First, “Christ died for all believers,” that is, all who choose him and rest upon him as an all-sufficient Savior; it is not that he died for them as such, but that all such believers are of those for whom he died. He did not die for believers as believers, though he died for all believers; but instead, he died for all the elect as elect, who, by the benefit of his death, become believers, and so obtain assurance that he died for them. For those who are elected but who are not yet believers, though Christ died for them, we deny that they can have any assurance of it while they continue as unbelievers. You are supposing a foul contradiction if you say that a man can be said to have assurance that Christ died for him in particular while he still continues as an unbeliever. This first proposition, as laid down in the beginning, is true in the word in countless passages.

Secondly, in the witness of the Spirit, the heart of a believer assumes, “But I believe in Christ;” that is, “I choose him for my Savior; I cast myself on him alone for salvation, and give myself up to him, to be disposed of according to his own mercy.” There are also many testimonies in the word of the truth of this proposition in the heart of a believer, and the infallibility of it, as is known to all. From this the conclusion is, “Therefore the Lord Jesus Christ died for me in particular, with an intention and purpose to save me.”

This is a syllogism that all believers, and only believers, can justly make, so that it is unique to them alone; and this treasure of consolation is to be imparted to them alone. The sufficiency of the death of Christ to save every one that comes to him, without exception, is enough to fill all the invitations and entreaties of the gospel to sinners, and to induce them to believe. And when they do so, by the grace of Christ obtaining the promise, the fore-mentioned infallible assurance of the intention and purpose of Christ to redeem them by his death is made known to them (Matt. 1:21).³

Now, let each man judge for himself whether this is a better foundation for a man to assure his soul rest and peace than what our opposers, suitable to their own principles, must lay as a common stone for men, namely, “Christ died for all men; I am a man: therefore Christ died for me.” Especially consider that indeed the first proposition is absolutely false, and that the conclusion, if it could be true, yet, according to their persuasion, it can no more be a basis of our consolation than Adam’s fall. All this is not spoken as though one opinion or the other were able to give consolation by itself. God alone, in the sovereignty of his free grace, can and does create such consolation; but it is spoken only to show what principles are suitable to the means by which God works on and towards his elect.

¹ The syllogism is this: God’s word says it; the Spirit testifies to it; therefore Christ died for me.

² 1Jn 5:6 now these three testify: the water, blood, and Spirit. Christ’s life is in his Word – his body and blood which we eat and drink (Jn 6:53); the Spirit conveys that Word to our hearts, testifying of Christ and reminding us of all he said (Jn 14:26; 15:26).

³Mt 1: 21 And she shall bring forth a son, and you shall call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins.

4. Particular Redemption is the solid foundation of all enduring Consolation.

What should close our discourse is drawing gospel consolation from the death of Christ, which is effectual only for the elect for whom alone he died; but I will not proceed in this. Consider, first, how abundantly this has been done by various eminent and faithful laborers in the vineyard of the Lord already; secondly, how it is the daily task of the preachers of the gospel to make it out to the people of God; thirdly, how it would carry me beyond my purpose to speak of things in a *practical and atheological* way, having designed this discourse to be purely *polemical*; and, fourthly, that such things are no more expected nor welcome to wise and learned men, in controversies of this nature, than knotty, crabbed, scholastic objections are expected or welcome in popular sermons and doctrinal discourses, which are intended merely for edification.

Conclusion -

Just in closing, I desire the reader to peruse that one passage, Rom. 8:32-34; and I have no doubt that he will, if not already infected with the leaven of the error which I have opposed, conclude with me that if there is any comfort, any consolation, any assurance, any rest, any peace, any joy, any refreshment, any exultation of spirit, to be obtained here below, it is all to be had in the blood of Jesus long since shed, and in his intercession still continuing. Both are appropriated and united to the elect of God by the precious effects and fruits of those who are both drawn to believe and preserved in believing, in order to obtain an immortal crown of glory that will not fade away.

Μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀ ἦν.

To the Only Wise God, through Jesus Christ, be the glory forever. Amen¹

¹ Rom 16:27

A FEW TESTIMONIES OF THE ANCIENTS.

I. CHURCH of SMYRNA,

This confession of the holy Church was given a little after the commendation given to it by the Holy Ghost in Revelation 2:9,¹ and upon the martyrdom of Polycarpus:

“Οτε οὔτε τὸν Χριστὸν ποτε καταλείπειν δυνησάμεθα τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου τῶν σωζομένων δωτηξίας παθόντα, οὔτε ἕτερον τιμῆ σέζειν.— Euseb. Hist. Eccles., lib. 4: cap. 15. — “Neither can we ever forsake Christ, the one who suffered for the salvation of *the world of those who are saved*, nor worship any other.”

[It is an extract from a letter of the church of Smyrna to the churches of Pontus, giving an account of the martyrdom of Polycarp.]

II. The witness of holy IGNATIUS,

As he was transported to Rome from Antioch, to be thrown to the beasts for the testimony of Jesus, Epist. ad Philad. [cap. ix., A.D. 107]

Οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα ἄγουσα ὁδός, ἡ πέτρα, ὁ φραγμός, ἡ κλείς, ὁ ποιμήν, τὸ ἱερεῖον, ἡ ζύρα τῆς γνώσεως δι’ ἧς εἰσῆλθον Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, Μωσῆς, καὶ ὁ σύμπας τῶν προφητῶν χορός, καὶ οἱ στύλοι τοῦ κόσμου οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ ἡ νύμφη τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὑπὲρ ἧς, φερνῆς λόγῳ, ἐξέχευς τὸ οἰκεῖον αἷμα ἵνα αὐτὴν ἐξαγοράσῃ. — “This is the way leading to the Father, this the rock, the fold, the key; he is the shepherd, the sacrifice; the door of knowledge, by which entered Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and the whole company of prophets, and the pillars of the world, the apostles, and the spouse of Christ; for whom, instead of a dowry, he poured out his own blood, that he might redeem her.”

III. CLEMENS,

“Whose name is in the book of life,” Philippians 4:3, with the whole church at Rome in his days, in the epistle to the church of Corinth:

Διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔσχευ πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐν ζελήματι αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν σάρκα ὑπὲρ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ ψυχῶν ἡμῶν. — “For the love which he had toward us, he gave his blood for us, according to his purpose, and his flesh for our flesh, and his life for our lives.”

Here you have assigned,

1. The cause of Christ’s death: his love toward us;
2. The object of it: us, that is, believers;
3. The manner in which he redeemed us: by commutation.

This triple testimony is taken from the very best of uncontested antiquity.

IV. CYPRIAN,

Epistle 62 written to Caecilius, a holy, learned, and famous martyr, A.D. 250:

“*Nos omnes portabat Christus, quiet peccata nostra portabat.*” — “The one who bore all of us, bore our sins;” that is, he sustained those for whom he died on the cross. The same was written to Demetrian: — “*Hanc gratiam Christus impertit, subigendo mortem trophaeo cracis, redimendo credentem pretio*

¹ I know your works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but you are rich)

sanguinis sui.” – “Christ has communicated this grace, subduing death in the trophy of his cross, redeeming believers with the price of his blood.”

The same writer, or some other ancient and pious writer of the cardinal works, in Christ, Serm. 7, secund. Rivet. Crit. Sac. in Cyp. [lib. 2:cap. 15] Scultet. Medul. Pat. Erasm. praefat, ad lib.¹ This same author also expressly mentions the sufficiency of the ransom paid by Christ, arising from the dignity of his person: – “*Tantae dignitatis illa una Redemptoris nostri fuit oblatio, ut una ad tollenda mundi peccatum sufficeret.*” – “Of so great dignity was the oblation of our Redeemer, that it alone was sufficient to take away the sins of the world.”

V. CYRIL

Of Jerusalem, in Cataches. 13. [A.D. 350]: –

Καὶ μὴ θαυμάσης εἰ κόσμος ὅλος ἐλυτρώθη, οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ψιλὸς ἀλλὰ υἱὸς Θεοῦ μενογενῆς ὁ ὑπεραποθνήσκων—καὶ εἰ πότε διὰ πιστεύοντες εἰς παράδεισον οὐκ εἰσελεύσονται; – “Do not wonder if the whole world is redeemed; for he was not a mere man, but the only-begotten Son of God that died. If, then, through the eating of the tree” (that is, the forbidden tree) “they were cast out of paradise, then certainly now, by the tree of Jesus” (that is, the cross) “shall not believers more easily enter into paradise?”

And so another of them makes it manifest in what sense they use the word *all*.

VI. ATHANASIUS,

Writing of the incarnation of the Word of God [A.D. 350]:

Οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ πάντων ζωὴ, καὶ ὡς πρόβατον ὑπὲρ, τῆς πάντων σωτηρίας ἀντικέψυχον τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα εἰς ζάνατον παραδούς. —“He is the life of *all*, and as a sheep he delivered his body as a price for the souls of *all*, that they might be saved.”

“*All*” in both passages (Cyril and Athanasius) can be none but the *elect*; as in the following, –

VII. AMBROSE

de Vocat. Gen., lib. 1: cap. 3; or rather, PROSPER, lib. 1:cap. 9, edit. Olivar. [A.D. 370]: – “*Si non credis, non descendit tibi Christus, non tibi passus est.*” – “If you do not believe, then Christ did not descend for you, and he did not suffer for you.”

Ambr. de Fide ad Gratianum: – “*Habet populus Dei plenitudinem suam. In electis enim et praescitis, atque ab omnium generalitate discretis, specialis quaedam censetur universitas, ut de toto mundo totus mundus liberatus, et de omnibus hominibus omnes homines videantur assumpti.*” – “The people of God has its own fullness. In the elect and foreknown, distinguished from the *generality of all*, there is accounted a certain *special universality*; so that the whole world seems to be delivered from the whole world, and all men seem to be taken out of all men.”

In this passage, Ambrose proceeds at large to declare the reasons why, in this business, “*all*” and “*the world*” are so often used for “*some of all sorts*.”

These quotations that follow were written after the rising of the Pelagian heresy, which gave rise to greater diligence in searching out the use of these words, and greater wariness in their expression, than had formerly been exercised by some.

¹ These seven sermons on the cardinal works of Christ are the production of Arnoldus Carnotensis, abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Bonneval, in the diocese of Chartres. He flourished about the middle of the twelfth century. Several of his practical treatises were for a time ascribed to Cyprian. — Ed.

VIII. AUGUSTINE,

de Cor. et Grat. cap. 40: [A.D. 420]: – “*Per hunc Mediatorem Deus ostendit eos, quos ejus sanguine redemit, facere se ex malis in aeternum honos.*” – “By him the Mediator, the Lord declares himself to make those whom he has redeemed with his blood, of evil, good to eternity.” “*Vult possidere Christus quod emit; tanti emit ut possideat.*” – “Christ will possess what he bought; he bought it with such a price that he might possess it.”

Idem, Serm. 44: de Verbis Apost.: – “*Qui nos tanto pretio emit non vult perire quos emit.*” – “The one who bought us with such a price will have none perish whom he has bought.” Idem, Tract. IXXXvii, in Johan.: – “*Ecclesiam plerumque etiam ipsam mundi nomine appellat; sicut est illud, ‘Deus erat in Christo mundum reconcilians sibi;’ itemque illud, ‘Non venit Filius hominis ut judicet mundum, sed ut salvetur mundus per ipsum;’ et in epistola sua Johannes ait, ‘Advocatum habemus ad Patrem, Jesum Christum justum, et ipse propitiator est peccatorum nostrorum, non tantum nostrorum sed etiam totius mundi.’ Totus ergo mundus est ecclesia, et totus mundus odit ecclesiam. Mundus igitur odit mundum; inimicus reconciliatum, damnatus, salvatum, inquinatum mundatum. Sed iste mundus quem Deus in Christo reconciliat sibi, et qui per Christum salvatur, de mundo electus est inimico, damnato, contaminato.*” – “He often calls the church itself by the name of the world; as in, ‘God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself;’ and, ‘The Son of man came not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved.’ And John in his epistle says, ‘We have an Advocate, and he is the propitiation for [our sins, and not for ours only, but also for] the sins of the whole world.’ The “whole world”, therefore, is the church, and the world hates the church. Does the world then hate the world? What is at enmity with God? Is it the reconciled? Is it the condemned, or the saved? Is it the polluted world, or the cleansed world? And that world which God in Christ reconciles to himself, and which is saved by Christ, is chosen out of the opposite, condemned, defiled world.”

Much more to this purpose might be easily cited out of Augustine, but his judgment in these things is known to all.

IX. PROSPER

[A.D. 440], Respon. ad Capit. Gall. cap. 9.: – “*Non est crucifixus in Christo qui non est membrum corporis Christi. Cum itaque dicatur Salvator pro totius mundi redemptione crucifixus, propter veram humane naturae susceptionem, potest tamen dici pro his tantum crucifixus quibus mors ipsius profuit. Diversa ab istis sors eorum est qui inter illos censentur de quibus dicitur, ‘Mundus enim non cognovit.’*” – “No one is crucified with Christ who is not a member of the body of Christ. When, therefore, our Savior is said to be crucified for the redemption of the whole world, because of his true assumption of the human nature, yet he may be said to be crucified only for those to whom his death was profitable. In contrast to these is that lot who are reckoned among those of whom it is said, ‘The world knew him not.’”

Idem, Resp. Object. Vincen. Res. i.: – “Redemptionis proprietas, haud dubie penes illos est, de quibus princeps mundi missus est foras. Mors Christi non ita impensa est humano generi, ut ad redemptionem ejus etiam qui regenerandi non erant pertinerent.” – “Doubtless the propriety of redemption belongs to those from whom the prince of this world is cast out. The death of Christ is not to be laid out for human-kind as a whole, so that those who were not to be regenerated should also belong to his redemption.”

Idem, de Ingrat., cap. 9.: –

“*Sed tamen haec aliqua sive ratione tueri Et credi tam stulta cupis; jam pande quid hoc sit, Quod bonus omnipotensque Deus, non omnia subdit Corda sibi, pariterque omnes jubet esse fideles? Nam si nemo usquam est quem non velit esse redemptum, Haud dubie impletur quicquid vult summa potestas. Non omnes autem salvantur*” – “If there are none whom God would not have redeemed, why are not all saved?”

X. CONCIL. VALENTINUS, can. 4: ¹

– “*Pretium mortis Christi datum est pro illis tan-tum quibus Dominus ipse dixit, ‘Sicut Moses exaltavit serpentem in deserto, ita ex-altari oportet Filius hominis, ut omnis qui credit in ipso non pereat, sed habeat vitam eternam.’*” – “The price of the death of Christ is given for those alone of whom the Lord himself said, ‘As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whoever believes on him should not perish.’”

¹ This was a council held at Valence in a.d. 855, and convened from the three provinces of Lyons, Vienne, and Arles. Remigius presided, five canons by a council in a.d. 853, at Chiersey, were condemned, and the cause of Godeschalcus, who had raised the controversy, was warmly supported. The canon quoted above is designed to contradict the fourth canon of the council at Chiersey, according to which “there never was, is, or will be a man for whom Christ has not died.” — Ed.

APPENDIX

A Reply to Mr. Joshua Sprigge

On the occasion of a recent book published by Mr Joshua Sprigge containing erroneous doctrine.

READER,

I do earnestly entreat your serious perusal of this short appendix. The total finishing and printing, not only of the body of the discourse, but also the preface, before occasion was given to those thoughts which I now desire to communicate, is the rise of this ataxy.¹ This, being irrecoverable, requires no further apology. In the third division of this treatise there are various chapters, namely, 7–9, etc., about the satisfaction of Christ, in which the doctrine is cleared and vindicated from the objections of some. The first aim I had in those chapters was to show the inconsistency of that satisfaction with the general ransom, principally now opposed. In handling it, my eye was chiefly on the Socinians, the known opposers of the person, grace, and merit of Christ. They are the most wretched prevaricators in Christian religion which any age ever yet produced. In the manner of asserting my opposition, I did not look outside the scriptural proposal of Christ's satisfaction, nor did I turn to any controversies, except to remark concerning some *παρορᾶματα* and (I fear willful) failings and mistakes of Grotius in stating this business.² His wretched apostasy into the very dregs of the error (in the judgment of some) strongly opposed even by himself now, sufficiently authorizes anyone to lay open his treacherous handling of these matters in his first undertaking.

If the reader has any doubt of this, let him compare the exposition of various texts of Scripture in Grotius' book against those of Socinus, which Grotius has since given in his so much admired (indeed, in very many things, is so much to be abhorred) *Annotations on the Bible*; and, by their inconsistency the reader will quickly perceive the steadfastness of that man to his original principles of apostasy. *Great* as he was, he was not big enough to contend with truth. Moreover, I had it in my thoughts to endeavor to remove (as I then thought) a scruple³ from the minds of some well-meaning persons, who weakly apprehend that the eternal love of God toward his elect was inconsistent with the satisfaction of Christ; and who therefore began to apprehend, and to instantly to divulge abroad that Christ came only to declare the love of the Father, and to make it manifest to us, so that we, in the apprehension of it, might be drawn to him. That is the manner of doing things in our days; everyone casts upon others the crudities of their own stomach, and scatters abroad undigested conceptions, waiting for someone to lick their deformed offspring, and to see what other capricious brains can make of what they themselves do not know how to improve. So that, as regards *personal* satisfaction and merit, these become but empty terms, obscuring the *true* gospel which holds out no such things. Now, concerning this I know the following:

¹ Something which is out of order

² Greek *paroramata* indicates a logical inconsistency, an error in thought.

³ A qualm: an uneasy feeling arising from the conscience or our principles that tends to hinder action.

1. That this new-named *free grace*, this glorious height and attainment, this varnished deity, was at first in its original “truncus ficulnus,”¹ – an old, rotten, over-worn, Arminian objection, raised out of the *obs.* and *sols.*² of the old schoolmen, to oppose the doctrine of effectual redemption by Christ, or else to overthrow the doctrine of eternal election; for they framed it to look both ways (either we are not chosen in this way, or we are not redeemed in this way), not caring which part of their work it did, so it would be useful in any measure. This was the birth and rise of this “glorious discovery”.

2. That of its own accord, it tends toward the very bottom of Socinian folly; indeed, it is the very same opinion in its substance with which the Socinians have so long troubled the churches of God. They are deservedly esteemed accursed by those churches for preaching another gospel. The sum of this discovery comes to this, that there is no vindicating justice in God, no wrath or anger against sin, nothing requiring satisfaction for it. That Christ came to declare this, and to make known the way of going to the Father,³ is that very Helena⁴ for which the Socinians have so long contended with so much fraud and subtlety, and with so many Sinonian arts.⁵

3. That it is to the extreme dishonor of Jesus Christ, destructive to the gospel faith and of all solid consolation, and it forces men either to a familistical contempt⁶ or sophistical corrupting of the word of God in its defense. Upon these and similar considerations and apprehensions, I deemed that it might not be in vain to disprove the main assertion and also manifest the miserable inconsequence, from its assertion of God’s eternal love to the denial of satisfaction. In what manner the Lord enabled me to perform, you must know, reader, in the text mentioned above. At that time I had only had one conference with someone about it; and for books I had only seen a few, and those were so exceedingly inconsiderable, so fully familistical, and forced with so much contempt of the word, that I was not willing to cast away the least moment on them.

But now, some few days ago (to come to the occasion of this appendix), there came into my hands a book written by Mr Sprigge who, both in his preface to the reader and in various passages in the treatise itself, labors to commend to the world this “glorious discovery”, that Christ did not purchase peace for us but only preached peace to us; that he came only to reveal and declare the love of God, not to procure it; that we only are reconciled to God by him, which

¹ Owen uses this phrase in Chapter 12 of “A Display of Arminianism”. It refers to the wooden idol of Dagon, carved from the trunk of a tree, which Origen described as “a fig-tree log, an unprofitable piece of wood.” - WHG

² Observations and solutions – analytic technique of the Schoolmen.

³ That is, universal salvation apart from any justification by Christ or righteousness by men.

⁴ Helen of Troy, the beauty whose abduction by Paris led to the Trojan War. She was the sinfully sought-after prize.

⁵ In Virgil’s *Aeneid*, the pretended Greek traitor, Sinon, gave a deceptive speech which led the Trojans to leave the wooden Greek Horse alone with a troop of Greek warriors inside, including Odysseus. Sinon let the Greek warriors out and opened the gates; this led to the Fall of Troy; so the phrase “Sinonian arts” refers to Sinon’s craftiness

⁶ “The Family of Love” – Familists were an Antinomian/Perfectionist sect founded in Holland about 1540 by Hendrik Niclaes. They spread to England about 1580. They taught that true believers live in a natural state of Grace without Sin. The Laws of Moses and Man no longer applied to those who attained a state of perfection. Critics of these Antinomians viewed them as immoral, lacking in religious virtue, and unbiblical. “The Familist believed that true enlightenment was only possible by possessing the true inner dwelling spirit of God revealing himself. The Spirit of God dwelling in a true Believer made all things possible. A state of perfection with God was possible here on earth by living your life as Christ. The *life* of Christ was the model for perfection, not His *death* and resurrection. Only those who followed the Familists’ being of love would receive true salvation according to ‘N.H.’”, their founder. – <http://www.exlibris.org/nonconform/engdis/familists.html>

he proves from Romans 5:11,¹ but that no reconciliation with God is procured; that this discovery, and the like, are what we have prayed for all this while – his *Preface to the Reader*.

So it is also asserted in many places of the treatise itself, pp. 65,101. Indeed, everywhere it is his main scope. He bids us not to think that the heart of God was set on having a little blood (see Eph 5:2)² for the sins of his people, p. 59. These things are but pleasant tales and childish things with which to allure us, p. 46. In short, one main aim of the book is to make the whole ministration of Christ out to be the discovery of a mystery that is nowhere revealed in the word. It is not my purpose here to view the whole, or to separate the chaff from the wheat in it, or to distinguish between the spiritual truths and smoky vapors that are interwoven in it, but only to caution the reader a little about that one thing I intimated before, with some brief expostulations about it.

Let me inform you, as well, that my motive here flows not only from the book itself, but also from the pretended “*imprimatur*”³ annexed to it. You will find the truth itself, in opposition to this dangerous notion and the whole fallacy of it, sufficiently confirmed from the Scripture in the foregoing treatise. Christians will not, I hope, be easily shaken from the truth of the word by any pretended revelations whatever. Only, because the greater reputation of the reverend and learned licenser is affixed to the treatise (I know not whether duly), and until he has vindicated himself lest it insinuate itself by the help of his name, I desire to give you these few observations here as a foretaste, reserving you for full satisfaction to what is held out from the word herein in the foregoing treatise.

First, then, observe the absurd consequence, deduced from this position, that Christ is not the cause but the effect of love – namely, that he did not purchase life, peace, and salvation for us. This consequence flows merely from ignorance of the love of God, and it confounds those things which ought to be distinguished. Some look upon love in God as an unchangeable affection, when the truth is, as an affection or passion, it has no place in God at all. All agree that love in spirits, and partly in men, is *in appetitu intellectivo*, in the will, the intellectual appetite; and there it is defined to be θέλειν τινὶ τὸ ἀγαθόν, “to will good to any one.” Certainly, then, in God his love is but a pure act of his will. That love which was the cause of sending his Son is, I say, an act of his will, his good pleasure, – not a natural affection reserved to the creature. There is no such affection in God, as I have abundantly proved in this treatise.

Now, as to his assertion that this love, this act of God’s will, was not purchased, not procured by Christ: very true; who ever was so mad as to affirm it? Can a temporal thing be the cause of what is eternal? This is not at all the meaning of those who affirm that Christ procured the love of his Father for us. No; but the *effects* of this purpose, the *fruits* of this love, are commonly called “love” in the Scripture, because affections are ascribed to God in respect to their effects. Now, for the proof that Christ purchased these fruits for us, see afterward. This eternal act of God’s will, this love, which was the impetus to send Jesus Christ, tended to his glory in these two acts:

¹ “And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement.”

² And walk in love, as Christ also has loved us, and has given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor.

³ This is a caustic reference to the Roman Catholic episcopal authority to issue an official license to publish a book.

first, by removing the wrath, death, curse, and guilt from those for whom Christ was sent, by the satisfaction of God’s vindicating justice;

secondly, by the actual procuring of grace and glory for them, by merit and impetration. These things, though they are not the love of God, which is immanent in Himself, yet they are those things alone by which we enjoy his love, and are purchased by Christ; which I must not prove here, lest I should *actum agere*.¹

Secondly, An eternal act of God’s will, immanent in himself, puts no change of condition into the creature. See what the Scripture says of the elect notwithstanding this, Ephesians 2:3; John 3:36. Let not the word be despised nor corrupted. Do not be wise above what is written. “Though an angel,” etc., Galatians 1:8. Until he draws us, the fruit of his death is kept for us in the justice and fidelity of God.

Thirdly, These things being premised, and to clear the truth in this point, I desire a fair and candid answer to these queries:

First, What is the meaning of that phrase in Hebrews 2:17, Εἰς τὸ ἰλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ, “To make reconciliation for the sins of the people,” and this being done as a priest towards God, Hebrews 5:1, – is the meaning of it a declared love from God to man?

Secondly, Is not the purpose of various typical sacrifices to make an atonement with God on behalf of those for whom they were sacrifices? Exodus 29:33,36; 30:10,15,16; Leviticus 6:7; Numbers 16:46, and many other places; – is this to turn away the wrath of God, or to reconcile men to him?

Thirdly, Is not the death of Christ a proper sacrifice? Ephesians 5:2; Hebrews 9:26,28; John 1:29; is it not the antitype of all sacrifices, in which they find their accomplishment? And did it not really effect what they carnally and typically figured? Hebrews 9:11-14, etc., 10:1-7, etc. And was it not offered to God?

Fourthly, Was not Jesus Christ a priest for his people, to deal with God on their behalf, Hebrews 2:17, 5:1,2, 7:26,27; was he not as well a prophet, to deal with them on behalf of God? Do not all the acts of his priestly office immediately tend towards God to procure good things for those in whose behalf he is a priest?

Fifthly, Does not Christ, by his intercession, appear before God to declare the love of God toward His people? Or is it to procure further fruits of love for his people? Romans 8:34; Hebrews 7:25, 9:24.

Sixthly, Did not Christ, by and in the oblation of himself, through the eternal Spirit, pay a ransom, or a valuable price of redemption, into the hand of his Father for the sins of the people? Matthew 26:28; Mark 10:45; 1Timothy 2:6; Ephesians 5:2; Job 33:24. And is a ransom not the price of deliverance, which argues for a commutation? Exodus 21:30, 30:12. Or did Christ pay a ransom to his Father for the souls and sins of his people, thereby declaring to his people that there was no need of any such thing? And what do you think of the old saying of Tertullian, “Omnia in imagines vertunt, imaginarii ipsi Christiani?”²

¹ Latin: do what has already been done.

² All things in appearance change, the appearances of Christians themselves??

Seventhly, Did not Christ in his death bear our sins? John 1:29; 1Pet.2:24; Isaiah 53:6,11; 2Corinthians 5:21. And does “bear sin” in the Scripture not mean to bear the punishment due to sin? Leviticus 5:1, etc. And is not undergoing the punishment due to sin, making satisfaction for sin?

Eighthly, Did not Christ, as our surety, undergo all that is anywhere threatened for sin, and due for sin by the justice of God? Hebrews 7:22, 4:15; Galatians 3:13; 2Corinthians 5:21; Hebrews 5:7; Luke 22:44, etc.

Ninthly, Are not the purchase and procurement of good things assigned to the death of Christ? Isaiah 53:5; Hebrews 9:12; Acts 20:28; 1Thessalonians 5:9; Luke 1:74; Romans 5:10; Ephesians 2:16, etc.

Tenthly, Seeing that Romans 5:11, “By whom we have now received the atonement,” is urged to disprove the purchase of peace and reconciliation with God for us, does “the atonement” there mean our reconciliation to God? And is it proper to say that we have received or accepted our conversion or reconciliation?

Eleventhly, He asserts that all that was done in and by Christ was but a sign and representation of what is done spiritually in us; does that not destroy the first promise, Genesis 3:15, indeed, the whole gospel, and make it, as it is called, a “childish thing?”

Twelfthly, Is it fair and allowable for men professing the name of Christ, in the trial of truth, to decline the word of God? Is not such a declension an invincible demonstration of a guilt of falsehood? Deuteronomy 4:2, 12:32; Joshua 1:7; Psalm 19:7; Proverbs 30:6; Isaiah 8:20; Luke 1:4, 16:29; John 5:39, 20:30,31; Galatians 1:8,9; 2 Thessalonians 2:2; 1Timothy 6:20; 2Timothy 3:16,17; 2Peter 1:19, etc.

This much, courteous reader, I thought good to premise to you, though it is out of order after discovering a new opposition made to a precious truth of God, which you will find explained and asserted in the foregoing treatise. And I hope I have assumed this liberty without offending any. It is not about trifles that I contend (I abhor such ways), but for the faith once delivered to the saints. Now, “Peace be to the brethren, and love with faith, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. Grace be with all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Amen.”¹

COGGESHALL, APRIL 25, 1648.

¹ Eph 6:23