

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

THE  
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

---

ARTICLE I.

A DEFENCE OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH CONCERNING THE  
SATISFACTION OF CHRIST AGAINST FAUSTUS SOCINUS  
OF SIENNA WRITTEN BY HUGO GROTIUS.

TRANSLATED, WITH NOTES, BY REV. FRANK H. POSTER, NORTH READING, MASS.

CHAPTER VIII.

ON OUR REDEMPTION MADE BY THE BLOOD OF CHRIST.

326 b] We come now to the second class of testimonies, which relates to redemption. We must first establish, as beyond controversy, the fact that redemption and similar words in the sacred writings are applied to our liberation from deserved punishment.<sup>1</sup> Socinus makes no objection. Nay, even those passages which say that we are redeemed from iniquity and vain conversation<sup>2</sup> pertain to the same thing, since it is very common to put *sin* for *the punishment of sin*. This is made evident in the passage from Titus<sup>3</sup> by the word *καθαρίζειν*, that is, *to expiate*, which we shall explain below; and in the passage from Peter<sup>4</sup> by the reference to a lamb, that is, a victim. Socinus does not deny that this redemption was ascribed to the death of Christ as a cause, since it is the testimony of many passages of Scripture.<sup>5</sup>

But the subject of this investigation is *how* the death of Christ is the cause of redemption. On our part, we say that

<sup>1</sup> Gal. iii. 13; Rom. iii. 24; especially, Eph. i. 7 and Col. i. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Tit. ii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 18.

<sup>3</sup> Tit. ii. 14.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Pet. i. 18.

<sup>5</sup> Eph. i. 7; Rom. iii. 24; Heb. ix. 12.

the death of Christ was the cause of redemption, because God is induced by it to liberate us from punishment. But Socinus denies this. If there were any ambiguity in the testimonies in which mention is made of redemption, it would be sufficient for interpreting them to bring in other passages of the same argument, such as we have cited in great numbers, which show, and not obscurely, that Christ died for our sins, that he bore our punishment, and so obtained remission of sins for us, because God was placated by his death. But we trust that the same doctrine can be proved with sufficient clearness from the passages which contain the word "redemption," and other like words.

There are in the Scriptures two phrases, the one speaking of *the redemption of our sins*, the other of *our redemption*, different in form of expression, but both meaning the same thing.

The former expression occurs in the passage<sup>1</sup> where the death of Christ is said to have been suffered "for the redemption of the transgressions." By this style of speech, *to redeem transgressions*, or in Latin, *culpās, delicta, crimina redimere*, is signified not only the cause influencing one to liberate, but also such a cause as includes compensation or satisfaction. This is so plain that Socinus ought to admit it also.

Since this is the most common signification of that phrase, we shall not feel permitted to withdraw from our position till two things are proved — that sometimes, even if less frequently, the phrase has another meaning, and that there is here sufficient reason why the more infrequent meaning should be preferred to the more frequent. Neither of these things is proved by Socinus. For he quotes no passage from either sacred or profane writer where the phrase under consideration means anything whatever but that which we have affirmed.

In one of Solomon's Proverbs<sup>2</sup> occurs the Hebrew word  $\text{רָפָא}$ , which properly does not correspond to the Greek word

<sup>1</sup> Heb. ix. 15. *eis ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν παραβάσεων.*

<sup>2</sup> Prov. xvi. 6.

*ἀπολυτροῦν*. Socinus notices this, and says that expiation, rather than redemption, is designated by this word. [327 = It may be added that the original meaning of the word is *to cover*, and that the meaning is extended by a figure of speech. It is true that the Hebrew word, like many others, on account of the dearth of primitive words in that language, has many significations, so that it may signify now to redeem, and now other things. But it does not follow that the Greek word *ἀπολυτροῦν* has all the significations which the Hebrew *כָּפַר* has; for the word *ἀπολυτροῦν* has a simple use among the Greeks, corresponding to its derivation; but other significations of the word *כָּפַר* are expressed by other Greek words.

In Daniel<sup>1</sup> we find the word *כָּפַר*, which is by no means equivalent to the Greek *ἀπολυτροῦν*, but properly and frequently signifies *to bruise, to break, to tear off*, and, on account of this last, also *to liberate*. Yet if we interpret it in this passage, with the ancients, *to redeem*, we are not compelled to understand it as beyond the signification which we have defended. For God is induced by the fruits of repentance to prevent temporal punishments, as has been already noted.

The second form of expression, which has reference to the redeemed person, is found very frequently in the sacred writings accommodated to our argument.<sup>2</sup> In Greek the verb is *λυτροῦν* and *ἀπολυτροῦν*, and hence the verbals *λύτρωσις* and *ἀπολύτρωσις*. The question is: Is this act attributed to Christ properly, or improperly?

Socinus defines proper redemption<sup>3</sup> as liberation of a captive from the hands of his keeper by paying a price to that keeper. This is too restricted. For neither by nature nor usage is the word restricted to the captive alone, but may be used of every kind of inconvenience, as also the word liberation. You may therefore define more correctly: *ἀπολύτρωσις*, or redemption, is liberation of any one from inconvenience, *λύτרון* intervening. So Virgil used the words, and properly, when he said:

“ Si fratrem Pollux alterna morte redemit.”

<sup>1</sup> *iv. 24* [i.e. in Heb. Bib.; in Eng. *iv. 27*].      <sup>2</sup> Rom. *iii. 24*; Eph. *i. 7*, et al.

<sup>3</sup> That is *ἀπολύτρωσις*, for the Latin word redemption has various meanings.

Castor is liberated from perpetual death by a *λύτρον* intervening, viz. the alternate death of his brother.

Improperly *ἀπολύτρωσις* and redemption signify any liberation, even when a *λύτρον* does not intervene. But as Socinus confesses, and the laws teach us, we must not depart from the propriety of words, except for grave reasons. Therefore in doubtful cases *ἀπολύτρωσις* must be understood to be made with *λύτρον* intervening. But in this case there is no room for doubt, since the Scriptures plainly name the *λύτρον*. "For the Son of Man came to give his life a *λύτρον* for many."<sup>1</sup> With this passage must be connected those which say that redemption was made by death or in blood.<sup>2</sup> Though these passages were strongly contested by Socinus, he could invent nothing better to say than that *λύτρον* is here used improperly. But he defines *λύτρον* or price, in its proper use, as that which is received by the keeper. Here, first, we must repeat what we have just said, that we ought ☞ not to abandon the proprieties of language, except in urgent cases. But if Socinus has assigned any reasons for inventing an impropriety, we trust they have been explained by us above.<sup>3</sup>

The comparison instituted between Moses and Christ scarcely needs a reply; for every similitude has its limits, beyond which it cannot be pressed. They are compared as liberators, and not in respect to the mode of liberation. It no more follows that Christ did not liberate by making satisfaction because Moses did not, than that Christ liberated by the death of enemies because Moses did. If the comparison illustrated the mode of liberation, to make it more exact you ought to say that Christ liberated us by miracles (like Moses), and not by death and blood, because these things are never ascribed to Moses, and cannot be. But the principal thing is that the word *λύτρον*, of the force of which we are treating here, is connected with the liberation obtained through Christ in Scripture, but never with that obtained through Moses. What are we to say when not even in the opinion

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45.    <sup>2</sup> e.g. Heb. ix. 12.    <sup>3</sup> Chaps. iv., v., and vi.

of Socinus is the mode of liberation the same? For Moses, Joshua, and others liberated, not by doing anything about those who were to be liberated (a thing which Socinus ascribes to Christ), but by removing those who stood in the way of liberty, viz. enemies.

The proper meaning of the word must therefore be retained. Yet the definition of Socinus must be somewhat changed, so that *λύτρον* may be properly understood as a thing or a deed by which any one is induced, although on the point of inflicting some evil on a man, to allow him to be released from it. In defining *λύτρον* a deed or thing, we do not disagree with Socinus, who admits that anything which satisfies another, and not merely money, may properly be called *λύτρον*. But he improperly restricts *λύτρον* to captivity alone, although this word comports with servitude, exile, and death, and every evil from which we can be liberated. For the root, viz. *λύω*, refers to these things, and the common usage is not violated thereby.

There is also another opinion of Socinus's which we do not approve,—that *λύτρον*, properly so called, may be accepted by any one. If the word *accept* be rigidly adhered to, as should be done in definitions, it cannot be applied to deeds, but to things only. But satisfaction can be made and liberation obtained by deeds also. This appears especially in that liberation which is granted upon transfer of punishment. Punishment is not properly accepted by every one, as appears from what we have said above, where we have shown that in punishment no one is properly and naturally creditor. Besides, the word *acceptance* properly indicates, if not a transfer of ownership, at least some advantage to the accepting party. But in punishment regard is had not to the individual advantage of the person who punishes, but to the common good and the order of the state. There is therefore no acceptor in this case, except you please, altogether improperly, to call a judge an acceptor, as the guardian of law, equity, and the common good. *Λύτρον*, nevertheless, has its proper place, even in punishment. So the eye of

Zaleucus was the *λύτρον* of the eye of his son, and in decimation those who are punished are the *λύτρον* of the whole legion.

The ancient Latins, whose whole language is a corruption of the Greek, by the insertion of one letter called *λύτρον* *lustrum*, and *λυτροῦν* *lustrare*. Ennius writes in Latin *lustra Hectoris* what in Greek would be "Ἐκτορος *λύτρα*."<sup>1</sup> To lustrate a city is, therefore, to liberate it from punishment by ~~398 =~~ a lustration, that is, substitutionary punishment, which is also called a propitiatory sacrifice.\* Appianus says:<sup>2</sup> "They bear the purifying articles through the fleet, the officers making the circuit with them, and joining in the prayers that through those lustral offerings things ominous of ill may be averted from the fleet." So, according to the foolish doctrines of the heathen, the Decii lustrated the Roman army. Menoeceus once lustrated Thebes, of whom his mother says, in Papinius :

"Lustralemne feris ego te, puer inclyte, Thebis,  
Devotumque caput, vilis ceu mater alebam?"

On which Luctatius, or whoever that ancient scholiast is: "It is a Gallic custom to lustrate a city with a human victim." He says *lustrate*, where Caesar had said *placate* the divine majesty of the immortal gods. Therefore in punishment *placamen* and *lustrum*, and the Greek *ἱλασμός* and *λύτρον*, are the same. The apostles use them in reference to the truth in the same sense as the pagans used them of a false faith. So in the Epistle to the Hebrews *λύτρωσις* and *καθαρισμός* are put for the same thing.<sup>3</sup>

But we infer that *λύτρον* must be taken in its proper sense in this argument not so much from the fact that there is no sufficient reason for descending to an impropriety, as from this fact, that from no sacred or profane writer has a passage been brought forward in which the signification of *λύτρον* is

<sup>1</sup> Scaliger, 466 catalect.

<sup>2</sup> *Civilium* lib. v. περιφέρουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν στόλων τὰ καθάρσια, συμπεριπλέων τῶν αὐτοῖς τῶν στρατηγῶν, καὶ ἑκαρομένων, ἐς τὰδε τὰ καθάρσια ἀπὸ τοῦ στόλου τὰ ἀπαίσια τραπήναι.

<sup>3</sup> Heb. ix. 12, 14, 15, 22, 23.

carried beyond the description given by us.<sup>1</sup> From the Greek Socinus brings forward no passage, from the Hebrew only one,<sup>2</sup> in which רָפָּא occurs. But in addition to the consideration that רָפָּא has a wider signification than λύτρον, because λύτρον is from λύειν, which signifies to liberate, whereas רָפָּא is a word of many significations, as we have shown above, it cannot be proved that in this passage anything else is designated by the word רָפָּא than that which is able to move him who was on the point of doing injury not to do it, whether he has only the power and disposition to do injury, or also the authority and right. The passage of Solomon: "The רָפָּא (or if you like) λύτρον of a man's life are his riches," is like that of Job:<sup>3</sup> "All that a man hath will he give for his life." For one use of riches, among others, is this, that they are able to soothe many men's wrath, whether just or unjust, and so turn away imminent injury; according to the passage:

"Munera crede mihi, placant hominesque deosque."

And evidently there is in that proverb an elegant comparison of the advantages which the two fortunes each bestow. The rich man has that with which he may placate the enraged; the poor man is less exposed to the wrath of another.

But if it were entirely true that λύτρον may refer to any expenditure whatever, even when no one is induced to liberate (which is proved by no example), yet the word ἀντίλυτρον which Paul employs<sup>4</sup> is too significant to admit so frigid an interpretation. The word ἀντί in composition signifies either contrariety or commutation. There is no place here for contrariety; the meaning is therefore compensation. In the same way the Greeks call those ἀντίψυχοι who devote themselves to death to liberate another. So ἀντίλυτρον is such a λύτρον that in giving it the liberator undergoes something similar to the evil which hung [328] over him who is liberated. There is an excellent circumlocution for this word in Galatians:<sup>5</sup> "Christ redeemed<sup>6</sup> us

<sup>1</sup> See Isa. xliii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Prov. xiii. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Job ii. 4.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 6.

<sup>5</sup> Gal. iii. 13.

<sup>6</sup> ἐξηγόρασεν.

from the curse, being made a curse for us." Of the sense of this passage we have spoken above. Farther, Peter compares the blood of Christ to gold and silver as something far greater than they, so far as price is concerned.<sup>1</sup> Now gold and silver are truly, and not figuratively, a price. Wherefore, also, blood must be equally, or much more truly, a price. Now price is that by expending which some thing or some right is acquired. And such is the nature of price that by its own power, or the estimation of others, it induces another to make over some thing or right, for example, impunity. We may here add those passages which show that Christ gave his flesh or himself for the life of the world and to liberate us.<sup>2</sup> For this phrase, *to give one thing* for another, is perfectly well adapted to express a genuine price.

Socinus can evade the difficulties of these and other passages in which death or the blood of Christ are called the price of our liberation, only by saying that indeed it is the effect of Christ's death to liberate us from sin (for of liberation from the service of sin this is not the place to treat), but that it is in relation to ourselves, and not to God. In other words, God is not induced by it to liberate us; but we are induced to come to liberation. But this refuge is closed against him by what we have already said, and many other things.

For, first, the word *λύτρον*, and much more *ἀντίλυτρον*, are of such a nature as to denote that which is concerned with the liberator before it is concerned with him who is liberated.

Again, although buying is sometimes used for simply acquiring, or selling for alienating,<sup>3</sup> yet the word "price" added to the word "buying"<sup>4</sup> requires a nearer likeness. For it is the chief characteristic of a price that it is estimated by some one as of the same value as the article bought.

Further, the apostle explains *ἀπολύτρωσις* by *ἰλαστήριον*.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

<sup>3</sup> [*Lat. vendere pro mancipare.*]

<sup>2</sup> John vi. 51; Tit. ii. 14.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23.

<sup>5</sup> Rom. iii. 24, 25.

But *ιδόσκειν* is an act which is engaged with the liberator before it is with him who is to be liberated. In other places *λύτρωσις* is explained by *καθαρισμός*, that is, expiation. Of the force of this word we shall treat below.

Still further, when an effect is ascribed to anything very frequently, and in such a way that it is never found ascribed to anything else (as redemption is referred to the death and blood of Christ<sup>2</sup>) we must admit that the end is peculiar and near, rather than common and remote. But in our case Socinus would have the effect of liberation removed by many steps from the death of Christ, and so not peculiar, so that it agrees much more perfectly with other things to which it is not ascribed. His statements concerning the connection of our liberation with the death of Christ may be explained compendiously as follows: Liberation follows holiness of life; holiness the hope of reward; hope arises first and chiefly from the resurrection. But liberation is attributed to death, either because this is the way to the resurrection, or because joined and compared with the resurrection [329 = it confirms the same hope. It follows hence, even upon the confession of Socinus,<sup>3</sup> that we are liberated much more by the resurrection of Christ than by his death. No, if we admit the truth, death has no connection with that effect, except casually. For the resurrection does not produce faith, except as a part of the glory of Christ. But supreme glory could have come upon Christ if he had not died. As for Christ's giving us an example that we should follow, it is a fact which cannot be at all adapted to remission of sins, which does not belong to Christ.

Why, then, is death so often mentioned in this matter of redemption? Socinus gives two reasons. The first is, that there is in death a certain expense which there is not in resurrection, and so the mention of death is more suitable to redemption; the second, because the love of Christ and

<sup>1</sup> Heb. ix. 12 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45; Rom. iii. 24; Gal. iii. 13; Eph. i. 7; Tit. ii. 14; Heb. ix. 15; Rev. v. 9; [Acts<sup>1</sup> xx. 28.

<sup>3</sup> ii. 3.

God is more fully indicated in death. So far as the first is concerned, we rely upon the same reason. For if our liberation has not followed as an effect of the death of Christ in itself (which is the profession of Socinus set forth in unmistakable expressions), there was no need that Christ and the apostles should speak of redemption or price, especially so many times, when the liberation might be explained more fittingly by other words. But the second reason, that it is appropriate to those declarations which set forth the love of God, does not apply very well to others, at least, which do not treat of this; nor does it explain the word employed — redemption. I do not insist, at present, upon the fact that love is not shown by a thing which is not so much the cause of our benefit as the mere occasion. Socinus thinks that he presses our doctrine hard when he says that the Scriptures speak of the redemption made through Christ in such a way as to put something plain before our eyes, and not to indicate some concealed virtue, such as he thinks that is which we have drawn from the Scriptures. This is not wounding us, but supplying a weapon against himself. “For who knoweth the things of God, but the Spirit of God, and he to whom the Spirit will reveal them?”<sup>1</sup> The death of Christ was provided by God that the punishment of our sins might be exacted of him, and that he might be made our *λύτρον*. Isaiah had said this long before; Christ had said it; and the sacred writings under the first covenant had foreshadowed it; so that he who attended to those things could not be ignorant of God’s will in this matter, not to say that even nature says, in a certain sense, that death is the wages of sin. This will of God having become known from the sacred oracles, the great love of God towards us is inferred from it, as John<sup>2</sup> and Paul<sup>3</sup> suggest. The same is indicated by the word *μαρτύριον*.<sup>4</sup> And these things, without any labor of investigation, are conveyed by the mere words of Scripture interpreted with simplicity. But the derivation of liberation from death which Socinus draws out by so many steps and

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11.    <sup>2</sup> 1 John iv. 10.    <sup>3</sup> Rom. v. 8.    <sup>4</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 6; cf. vs. 4.

various ways it is so impossible to make from the words of Scripture that not even from Socinus can we discover easily what he thinks to be the proper sense of Scripture in those passages.

We have, therefore, proved a true redemption, as just now we proved a true placation. But by proving either [329] of these we prove what was proposed, viz. that we are liberated by the punishment of Christ, which he paid for our sins. I do not mean to say that all redemption or reconciliation is of this kind; but the matter under consideration does not admit of any other. It is therefore foolish and foreign to the subject to say, as Socinus does so many times, that one may be appeased though nothing is paid, and that one may be truly redeemed who owes nothing, and hence without payment. We treat of a placation and redemption which the Scriptures indicate was made by the presentation of something, viz. death, and of a redemption by which the same Scriptures testify we are liberated from deserved punishment. But such a presentation as liberates him who owes punishment from that punishment is rightly and properly called satisfaction. Socinus sees this, and in order to destroy satisfaction has destroyed also placation and true redemption.

Let me notice here, in passing, certain other things which he has treated, not indeed while conducting the argument upon redemption, but elsewhere, and which pertain to this argument.<sup>1</sup> He thinks that the only signification of the word *Μεσότης* in the sacred writings is *interpreter of God*. But to me two passages seem to point plainly to another meaning. The one is in Timothy,<sup>2</sup> where there is said to be one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who has given himself a ransom<sup>3</sup> for all. The other is in Hebrews,<sup>4</sup> where Christ is said to be the Mediator of the new covenant, in order that death having come for the redemption of transgressions, they who were called might obtain eternal life. To these may properly be added a third passage: "Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant."<sup>5</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> 1. 7.<sup>2</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 5.<sup>3</sup> ἀντίλυτρον.<sup>4</sup> Heb. ix. 15.<sup>5</sup> Heb. xii. 24.

mediation here appears to consist in redemption or ransom.<sup>1</sup> This is consistent with the word "mediator." For to the duty of mediator pertain offices in behalf of men with God no less than in behalf of God with men. Not only among the unlearned, but also among those who speak more elegantly, he is called a mediator who placates any one. Hence Suidas has interpreted this word by *εἰρηνοποιός*.

Socinus elsewhere says<sup>2</sup> that dignity of person has no influence upon the estimation of punishment; and so the divine nature of Christ and his consummate perfection give no weight to the value of his punishment. But we believe otherwise. We believe that this punishment must be estimated with the consideration in mind that he who bore it was God, although he did not bear it as God. This is the meaning of the phrase which declares that God purchased the church with his *own* blood.<sup>3</sup> In the same way it is elsewhere<sup>4</sup> said that the Lord of glory was crucified. The dignity of his whole person, that is, the dignity of Christ, contributed not a little to this estimation. So we find the following phrases in the Scriptures to give emphasis to the fact: "The blood of the Lord";<sup>5</sup> "The blood of Christ";<sup>6</sup> "The blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God."<sup>7</sup> The perfect innocence and sanctity of Christ is an element of the same estimation. Hence the blood is said to be "precious as of a lamb without spot,"<sup>8</sup> where allusion is made to the custom of the Greeks, as well as the Hebrews, to bring to the sacrifices sheep of surpassing whiteness and every beauty of body. These, **330 a**] because they excelled the whole flock, were called by a word originated in the sacrifices, but transferred thence to profane things,—excellent.<sup>9</sup> The following<sup>10</sup> suggests the same thought: "My righteous servant shall justify many." "He made him to be sin who knew no sin."

<sup>1</sup> [Lat. Apparet hic τὸ μυστήριον statui in ipsa redemptione, aut etiam in ista.]

<sup>2</sup> iii. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Acts xx. 28.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 8.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 27.

<sup>6</sup> Heb. ix. 14.

<sup>7</sup> 1 John i. 7.

<sup>8</sup> 1 Pet. i. 19.

<sup>9</sup> [The Latin play upon words cannot be exactly imitated: *pecudes*, . . . *quos quod a toto grege eximerentur*, . . . *eximias dicebantur*.]

<sup>10</sup> Isa. liii. 2; 2 Cor. v. 21.

Socinus argues that because Divinity itself did not suffer, therefore it does not come into the consideration of punishment. But this is as if one should say that it makes no difference whether you scourge a private man or a king, an unknown man or your father, because the blows are inflicted upon the body, and not upon the dignity or relationship. This dense error Aristotle long ago refuted in the Nicomachian Ethics :<sup>1</sup> "If he struck a ruler, he must be not only beaten, but also chastised." The common opinion also dissents from Socinus. For the peoples whose institutions are most highly praised estimate punishments by the dignity of the persons and other qualities. By the Roman laws, which are confessedly the most equitable, punishments are varied with regard to the condition of persons, and there is thought to be a true equality if persons not equal suffer punishments not equal.<sup>2</sup> That also other nations celebrated for their wisdom had the same opinion has been abundantly shown by those who have written of the republic; and the interpreters of the Roman law prove the same thing.

#### CHAPTER IX.

##### THE MEANING OF THE STATEMENT THAT CHRIST DIED FOR US.

In the third class<sup>3</sup> we have put those testimonies which indicate a substitution, as when Christ is said to have tasted death for all,<sup>4</sup> to have suffered for the people,<sup>5</sup> to have suffered for us,<sup>6</sup> to have died for us when ungodly and sinners,<sup>7</sup> and to have died one for all.<sup>8</sup>

It is the common usage of all languages that when one has done or suffered anything instead of, or in place of, another, he is said to have suffered or done it for him. Thus we find

<sup>1</sup> γ. 8. *Εἰ ἔρχοντα ἐπάταξεν, οὐ πληγῆναι μόνον δεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ κολασθῆναι.*

<sup>2</sup> *L. Moris. § istae. L. in servorum. Et L. Aut facta § persona. L. Capitalium § ult. D. de poenis. L. i. § ult. et L. Qui caedem. D. Ad L. Corneliam de sicariis. L. ult. § 1. D. de incendio. L. iii. D. de Privil. vet. L. ult. D. de sepul. viol. L. 1 et ult. D. de furib. balneariis.*

<sup>3</sup> *Contr. Soc., ii. 8.*

<sup>4</sup> *Heb. ii. 9.*

<sup>5</sup> *John xi. 50.*

<sup>6</sup> *1 Pet. ii. 21.*

<sup>7</sup> *Rom. v. 7, 8.*

<sup>8</sup> *2 Cor. v. 14.*

in Terence: "Pro illo te ducam: Ego pro te molam." In Virgil:

"meliorem animam pro morte Daretis  
Persolvo."

Also:

"Unum pro multis dabitur caput."

This phrase is applied to things, as well as persons. That is said to be given, put, regarded for this or that, which is given, put, or regarded in place of, or instead of it.<sup>1</sup> Socinus rejects this interpretation on account of the ambiguity of the word *for*, which frequently has the meaning *to the advantage of*. This is true of the Latin *pro*, as well as the Greek *ὑπέρ*. But the word *ἀντί*<sup>2</sup> clearly excludes that meaning, and requires a commutation. Thus it is said that "evil is rendered *for* evil"<sup>3</sup>; "an eye *for* an eye, and a tooth *for* a tooth"<sup>4</sup>; 330 5] "serpent *for* a fish"<sup>5</sup>; "birthright *for* one morsel of meat"<sup>6</sup>; "hair *for* a covering."<sup>7</sup> Whenever that particle is applied to persons, it signifies that one person has succeeded to the place of another. So Archelaus is said to have reigned in Judea *in the place of* Herod his father,<sup>8</sup> that is, to have succeeded him in his kingdom. So Peter is commanded to give a piece of money *for* himself and Christ,<sup>9</sup> because in that act he being one sustained the part of two. In the same way in profane writers: "One *for* many,"<sup>10</sup> and similar passages. Checked here, Socinus does not dare to deny that by the phrase *ἀντί πολλῶν* a certain exchange is indicated. But he escapes by a miserable subterfuge. Since redemption is under discussion, he says, there is a place for the preposition *ἀντί*, even if the captive owes nothing for the redemption. This is true, but irrelevant. We do not infer the payment directly from the word *ἀντί*; but we infer from it that Christ died in our stead, that is, unless Christ had died we should have died, and because Christ died we are not to die with eternal death. For the word *ἀντί* joined with the name of a person and the verb *to give* requires, without ex-

<sup>1</sup> ܩܕܝܫܐ Arab., Syr.    <sup>2</sup> Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45.    <sup>3</sup> 1 Pet. iii. 9; Rom. xii. 17.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. v. 38.

<sup>5</sup> Luke xi. 11.

<sup>6</sup> Heb. xii. 16.

<sup>7</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 15.

<sup>8</sup> Matt. ii. 22.

<sup>9</sup> Matt. xvii. 27.

<sup>10</sup> εἰς ἀντί πολλῶν

ception, that the person indicated by the genitive should have given the same in genus or species as another has now given. It makes no difference whether it is according to law, as in a bond for debt, or contrary to law, as in case of anything captured by robbers. This being true, that we should have been subjected to death if Christ had not died, a payment is rightly inferred from the nature of the case. For we must have been subjected to death, either justly or unjustly. Not unjustly, for we had deserved death; therefore justly. If justly, we were therefore debtors for death. From this debt Christ obtained liberation for us by giving something. But to give something that by it another may be liberated from debt is either to pay or to make satisfaction. Therefore the expression "to give for many" indicates a true exchange, as always, not a metaphorical exchange, as Socinus pretends without giving proof.

With reference to another preposition *ὑπέρ*, we must observe that this, not indeed always, but almost always, has the same meaning as *ἀντί*. Paul wishes that he might be accursed for his brethren's sake,<sup>1</sup> that is, instead of the Jews, who would otherwise persevere in unbelief, and be accursed.<sup>2</sup> The apostles are ambassadors for Christ, that is, they are ambassadors instead of Christ himself.<sup>3</sup> Since, therefore, *ἀντί* necessarily denotes exchange, and *ὑπέρ* may sometimes be used in the same sense, what should prevent us from interpreting a word of doubtful signification by one of certain meaning, especially when they are employed in the same argument?

But, in the first place, this interpretation seems to be required by the well-known passage: "If one died for all, then were all dead."<sup>4</sup>

But, again, even if the word *ὑπέρ*, which is in itself ambiguous, had not been employed in these passages, but it had been said openly that Christ died for our good, yet by this the commutation would not have been excluded, — nay, it would rather be included by a comparison of other passages.

<sup>1</sup> *ὑπέρ*.<sup>2</sup> Rom. ix. 3.<sup>3</sup> 2 Cor. v. 20.<sup>4</sup> 2 Cor. v. 14.

For he who dies that he may liberate another thereby, dies for his good.

331 a] Neither can this sense be set aside because elsewhere the act of Christ is proposed to us as an example. For it is sufficient for the example that there should be a certain general resemblance, although there may be a difference in the special mode, of which, notwithstanding, mention is made for the sake of marking it out more distinctly. This is very clear from the exhortation of Peter.<sup>1</sup> He would have us patient in bearing afflictions which we suffer innocently. He adduces the example of Christ, who, he says, also himself suffered. This was enough for the comparison; but he added "for us," which does not belong to the comparison, but refers to the passion of Christ considered in itself. The common thing, therefore, is patience; the mode differs. If not so, in vain would Paul ask whether Paul had been crucified for the faithful.<sup>2</sup> He could have been crucified for the church, that is, for the advantage of the church, as he says that he suffered for the church,<sup>3</sup> and as afterwards, to the great good of the church, he was beheaded, and Peter and other apostles crucified. But in that way in which Christ was crucified, in bearing our sins in our stead, neither could Paul be crucified nor any one else. The word *for* in these passages denotes something peculiar, which cannot be communicated to apostles. But it might be communicated if it differed from that of the apostles only in degree, and not also in its peculiar object. So in Hebrews ii. 10, the example is in this, that Christ by sufferings attained glory; the special mode in this, that Christ suffered "for all."<sup>4</sup> But as in those passages patience, so in other passages love is commended to us by the same example of Christ; but the special mode plainly designates the act of Christ. Yet if we examine those passages more closely, we shall see that the reference is not so much to the act of death as to the peril of death. For the phrase "to lay down life," which John alone employs,<sup>5</sup> is not properly to lose life, but as it

<sup>1</sup> 1 Pet. ii. 19.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. i. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Col. i. 24.

<sup>4</sup> ἐν τῷ πάθει, v. 9.

<sup>5</sup> x. 11, 15; 1 John iii. 16, as well as John xiii. 37, 38, xv. 13.

were to pledge it, that is, to submit to the peril of death. And so in those passages that which is prescribed to us is not merely to the advantage of another, but also involves a certain exchange, very much as Horace says :

" Paratus omne Cacsaris periculum  
Subire, Mæcenas, tuo."

In the remark of Caiaphas,<sup>1</sup> not only where he ignorantly let fall a prophecy, but where he spoke his own true sentiment, there was an indication of a substitution. He imagined the inevitable ruin of the Jews if Christ should be permitted to live; on the contrary, if Christ should be killed, that certain security would be obtained on account of it. Therefore he really wished to substitute the death of Christ for the ruin otherwise impending. And so he wished the same in kind to befall Christ as that which the people would otherwise suffer, and he believed the death of Christ to be a near, and in itself a suitable, cause of the liberation of the people. This is the same as to say that he wished that Christ should perish in the place of the people, who otherwise — that is, under the contrary condition — would perish.

Here, as we pass on, it should be observed that Caiaphas placed the effect of Christ's death first not with the Jews, for whose liberation he was consulting, but with the Roman rulers, whose wrath he wished to escape. So that [331] if it is true, as Socinus urges, that we are to take that interpretation of the words of Caiaphas which at the same time corresponds to the mind of the Holy Spirit and his own mind, this dying for the people must by all means signify that safety is to be secured from another. But that other, according to the mind of the Spirit, can be none but God. Hence it follows that this act of Christ has to do first with God, and then with men, which Socinus obstinately denies.

But those things which have been already said on the signification of exchange in the particle *for* are fully illustrated from the nature of expiatory sacrifices. For Scripture

<sup>1</sup> John xi. 50.

and the common opinion agree that blood is given in them for the life. This now, at last shall be explained.

#### CHAPTER X.

##### OF THE EXPIATION MADE BY THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

There remains a last class of testimonies, which show that the death of Christ was an expiatory act. Since these have been wrapped by the artifice of Socinus<sup>1</sup> in thick clouds, we have reserved them for the last, that they might receive some light from what has gone before.

Socinus and we are agreed upon the word. Both of us say that Christ died an expiatory victim, or sacrifice for sin; for this is the clear testimony of the divine Epistle to the Hebrews.<sup>2</sup> But of the proper force of that word Socinus takes one view, the Christian church another. The disagreement may be briefly and perspicuously explained, if we say that according to Socinus the effect of expiation is primarily and properly concerned with future sins, because the death of Christ, by begetting faith within us, draws us away from sin, but as to sins that are past, only secondarily; and in respect to these also all this action is engaged with us, and not with God; that is, God is not influenced to remit, but we are prepared to receive remission, viz. through emendation of life. But according to the doctrine of the church, which agrees with the Scriptures, the effect of expiation is properly concerned with past sins, and the act first with God, who is influenced to remit. That the act is first concerned with God, and not with men, is proved from the nature of the priesthood. For a priest "is ordained for men in things pertaining to God,"<sup>3</sup> but not for God in things pertaining to men, which is the office of a prophet. But since the sacrifice, especially the expiatory sacrifice, is an act of the priest as such (for the high-priest is appointed to offer "sacrifices for sin"<sup>4</sup>) it follows that a sacrifice is one of those things which are done for man with God.

The whole matter may be made clearer by a comparison

a-23.

<sup>2</sup> Especially chap. ix.

<sup>3</sup> Heb. v. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Heb. v. 1; viii. 3.

of the sacrifices of the ancient law with this sacrifice. This comparison is derived from the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and also from the prophets and apostles.

The ancient law may be viewed in two aspects, either carnally or spiritually — carnally, inasmuch as it is an instrument of the Jewish state; spiritually, inasmuch as it had a shadow of good things to come.<sup>1</sup> In the former view<sup>2</sup> [339 = the expiatory sacrifices of the law sanctified to the purifying of the flesh, the character of which we will explain.

The law of God had this sanction: "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all the things that are written in the law to do them."<sup>3</sup> Any one who had deflected even in the least degree from the law was subject to punishment.<sup>4</sup> This punishment, in a carnal sense, was a violent death, which is clear from the opposite, because life is promised to him who fulfils the law.<sup>5</sup> But as in every state rightly constituted the king, either through his judges or, if these fail, personally, exacts punishment, so in the Hebrew state, which Josephus has rightly called a theocracy (because God was its King<sup>6</sup>) God ordinarily exacted the penalties of the law by judges, yet exacted the same penalties in person if the judges failed in their duty. "The people shall stone him with stones, or<sup>7</sup> I will set my face against that man, and will cut him off."<sup>8</sup> This was not a mere threat; but God executed it frequently, as appears from many examples in the Old Testament. But as the legislator may relax his own law, especially a penal law, God, the King of the Hebrews, in certain crimes admitted expiatory victims in place of the sinner himself, and by them, but not otherwise, decreed to liberate the sinner from death. The rash swearer deserved death according to the law,<sup>9</sup> but could be expiated by a victim.<sup>10</sup> "The priest shall stone for him," says the law, "and it shall be remitted to him."<sup>11</sup> If any one had lied unto his neighbor in that which was committed to him to keep, or in fellowship, or had de-

<sup>1</sup> Heb. x. 1.<sup>2</sup> Contra Soc., ii. 9.<sup>3</sup> Deut. xxvii. 26; Gal. iii. 10.<sup>4</sup> See James ii. 10. <sup>5</sup> Lev. xviii. 5; Gal. iii. 12. <sup>6</sup> Judg. viii. 23; 1 Sam. viii. 7.<sup>7</sup> [Grot. "aut"; Heb. 7; E. V. "And."]<sup>8</sup> Lev. xx. 3.<sup>9</sup> Ex. xx. 7.<sup>10</sup> Lev. v. 5.<sup>11</sup> Lev. v. 6, 13.

ceived his neighbor, or stolen anything, he was guilty, and the law declared it.<sup>1</sup> But the same guilty man, in addition to restoring to the injured man that which was lost, as he was bound to do, might present a victim, be expiated, and receive remission for that which he had done.<sup>2</sup> Expiation and remission are frequently mentioned together.<sup>3</sup> Wherefore in crimes which pertained to the criminal law, God admitted propitiation, redemption, satisfaction, and finally compensation by the death of a beast for the death of a man otherwise due.

But universally, and for all crimes, the law did not permit such a relaxation of the carnal punishment. It was with reference to this that Paul said that through Jesus was announced remission of sins (that is, a spiritual remission), and that believers were justified in him from all sins from which they could not be justified in the law of Moses, even carnally.<sup>4</sup> This is explained by an ancient author,<sup>5</sup> as follows: "But when other crimes have been committed to the injury<sup>6</sup> of the state, or of the life of men, for such crimes the law does not grant forgiveness, either through baptisms or the offering of irrational victims, but it gives a just and worthy recompense of punishment to the criminals by a just law. 'Life,' it says, 'for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth.' But when the just law of recompense cannot be so conveniently administered, it prescribes death by fire, or stoning, or sword, to the criminals. The daughter of the priest, if she has committed fornication is slain with fire; the daughter of the common

<sup>1</sup> Lev. vi. 2; cf. Ex. xx. 15-17.

<sup>2</sup> Lev. v. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Num. xv. 28; Lev. iv. 20; v. 13, 18; vi. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Acts xiii. 38.

<sup>5</sup> Pseudo-Justin. "Quaestiones ad Orthodoxos": τῶν δὲ ἄλλων πταισμάτων γεγενημένων εἰς βλάβην πολιτείας ἢ ζωῆς ἀνθρώπων, τῶν τοιοῦτων πταισμάτων οὐ δίδωσι συγχώρησιν, οὔτε διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, οὔτε διὰ τῆς τῶν ἀλόγων θυσίας, ἀλλὰ δίκαιον τε καὶ ἀξίαν ἀμοιβὴν δίδωσι τοῖς πταίσασι διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῆς ἀντιλήψεως. Ψυχῆς, φησιν, ἀντὶ ψυχῆς, ὀφθαλμῶν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος· ὅπου δὲ τὸ ἴσον τῆς ἀντιδόσεως ἴστω ἀκρετέας, ἐκεῖ τὸν διὰ πυρός, ἢ λίθου, ἢ ξίφους θάνατον ἀνταποδίδωσι τοῖς πταίσασι. Τὴν μὲν γὰρ θυγατέρα τοῦ ἱερέως πορνεύουσαν ἐκ πυρός ἀναλίσκει· τὴν δὲ τοῦ λαϊκοῦ ἀνδρός, διὰ λίθου· τὴν δὲ ὑπαῖθρον διὰ ξίφους. Καὶ οὐδαμῶ ἰσχυρὸς τῷ νόμῳ ἐκ φιλανθρωπίας διὰ βαπτισμῶν τε καὶ θυσῶν σῶσαι τῶν τοιοῦτων τινά.

<sup>6</sup> That is, grave and scarcely tolerable.

man with stones; but the wife with the sword. But the law has never power through benevolence to save [332] any such one by baptisms and sacrifices." The Hebrew masters have observed well on Ps. li. 18 that David did not promise a victim for homicide and adultery, because the law had provided no expiation for such offences. But as we have said before, so here it is manifest that in expiation the death of a sheep is substituted for the death of a man, from the fact that it is provided<sup>1</sup> that when the homicide is not found the people shall be atoned for by the blood of a sheep. The word "atonement" is explained in this passage,<sup>2</sup> "Atone<sup>3</sup> for thy people, O God, and lay not innocent blood to their charge." But the land could be cleansed from shed blood in no other way than by the blood of him who shed it, as the law says.<sup>4</sup> Another passage<sup>5</sup>: "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." Still another passage<sup>6</sup> represents the victim as bearing iniquity, the force of which phrase we have elsewhere explained.

This substitution Socinus is not willing to acknowledge,<sup>7</sup> nor is he willing to say that God is in any way induced by victims not to punish sin. To prove this he adduces the two following reasons: The errors of men could not have been punished in beasts, because there is no connection between men and beasts in species; and, again, God cannot receive anything, for he is Lord of all.

The first of these reasons is false. For a difference of individual (as they say) does not prevent a man's suffering the punishment of another's crime, provided that such infliction of evil be not unjust in itself; nor does diversity of species prevent a beast, which otherwise could have been killed justly, from being used, as an example that in its death may appear what a man has deserved. But man and

<sup>1</sup> Deut. xxi.<sup>2</sup> Deut. xxi. 8.<sup>3</sup> [Heb. "עָפַר"; E. V. "be merciful"; Grot. "*Expia.*"] <sup>4</sup> Num. xxxv. 33.<sup>5</sup> Lev. xvii. 11.<sup>6</sup> Lev. x. 17.<sup>7</sup> ii. 10, 13.

beast are not connected in the order of living creatures alone, but also by that relation which subsists between a possessor and the thing possessed. For a beast is, on the whole, under human control. He who was to be atoned for was especially commanded to give a victim from his own possessions.<sup>1</sup>

The second reason is not pertinent to the subject. For it does not follow, if God gains nothing by the sacrifice, he is not therefore moved by it. For God is well pleased<sup>2</sup> with this, that a man in honor of the divine majesty should deprive himself of something granted to him. We have shown elsewhere that satisfaction may at any time be made not only by punishment, but also by any grateful and pleasing action. **333** ] Holy Scripture indicates that in the case of victims not only the thing but the disposition of the offerer was considered, and even the Gentiles believed the same. Seneca says: "It is no honor to the gods merely to present victims, though they are fat and glitter with gold; but the heart of the worshippers must be reverent and upright." Hence the Scriptures treating of the death of Christ speak now of love, now of obedience.

From what has been said it is now clear how victims for sin expiated sin in the Old Testament, viz. by inducing God to remit carnal punishment, and that by a certain satisfaction. But what the types performed carnally, Christ, the antitype, performs spiritually, and what the types did in certain sins only, Christ did in all, viz. by inducing God to remit spiritual punishment, and that by the most perfect satisfaction. For there is always more, and not less, in the thing designated by the type than in the type, as reason shows. The common feature of both the expiatory legal sacrifice and that made by Christ is, that without shedding of blood there is no remission.<sup>3</sup> This securing of remission through blood the divine writer in the same place calls now

<sup>1</sup> Lev. v. 6, 7.

<sup>2</sup> [Heb. xiii. 16. "But to do good, and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."]

<sup>3</sup> Heb. ix. 22.

*ἀγιασμός*,<sup>1</sup> now *καθαρισμός*.<sup>2</sup> In the ancient law the victims were sheep,<sup>3</sup> but in this law of ours Christ is himself not only the priest, but also the victim.<sup>4</sup> That legal expiation is the "pattern"<sup>5</sup> and "figure"<sup>6</sup> of this celestial or spiritual. But how? Because it gave cleansing to the flesh,<sup>7</sup> that is, the taking away of the offence, but not to the spirit or the conscience,<sup>8</sup> while this expiation cleansed even the conscience.<sup>9</sup> That which in the ancient law was temporal death is in the new law eternal death,<sup>10</sup> and accordingly in that there was a temporal liberation, but here there is eternal redemption.<sup>11</sup> In this same passage an argument is drawn<sup>12</sup> from the efficacy of the legal victim to the efficacy of that offered through the Spirit, and we may consequently argue more securely in the following way: The legal victim took away the carnal offence by influencing God to make remission. Much more, therefore, will the victim offered through the Eternal Spirit take away the spiritual offence by influencing God in like manner to make remission.

Those passages in which Christ is called a lamb look in the same direction. It would be no great concession to admit that it was not common in the law to offer lambs for sin. For in that case holy men might have named one kind of animal for another, so that the comparison should lie in the general signification of animal, and yet at the same time the innocence of the victim be expressed by mentioning a lamb rather than a ram or goat. In this way Peter adds, "Without blemish and without spot."<sup>13</sup> He may have had reference, at the same time, by a certain brevity of expression to the prophecy of Isaiah,<sup>14</sup> in the Greek translation of which the word "lamb"<sup>15</sup> appears. But<sup>16</sup> it is very clear that a lamb was employed in expiating pollutions<sup>17</sup> which by the ancient law were made so far equal to sin as even to receive

<sup>1</sup> Heb. ix. 13.<sup>2</sup> vs. 14, 22, 23.<sup>3</sup> vs. 12.<sup>4</sup> vs. 14, 24.<sup>5</sup> *ὑπόθεγμα*, 23.<sup>6</sup> *ἀντίτυπος*, 24.<sup>7</sup> vs. 13.<sup>8</sup> vs. 9.<sup>9</sup> vs. 14.<sup>10</sup> vs. 19.<sup>11</sup> vs. 12.<sup>12</sup> vs. 14. "how much more."<sup>13</sup> 1 Pet. i. 19. <sup>14</sup> Isa. liii. 7.<sup>15</sup> See Acts viii. 32 [also the present LXX].<sup>16</sup> Contr. Soc., ii. 9.<sup>17</sup> Lev. xiv. 12; Num. vi. 12.

the name sin. Whence it may be said, in either case, that 333 b] the lamb was offered for an offence or a crime. In another place it is expressly added, "For that he sinned by the dead."<sup>1</sup> The effect is also the same in some respects. The polluted man was not admitted to the society of the Jewish state, except by such expiation. Even the paschal victim (which it is well known was for the most part a lamb<sup>2</sup>), in its first institution, had something of an expiatory character. For God said that, looking upon its blood, he would turn away from the Hebrews that ruin which otherwise they would have had in common with the Egyptians, by imitation of whom they had contaminated themselves.<sup>3</sup> Cyril of Alexandria says,<sup>4</sup> "Which you will find to have been best delineated by the ancients in figures in the Mosaic books. For the slaying of a sheep purchased for the Israelites exemption from death and destruction, and placated the slayer. And this thing was a type and a figure of Christ." But the law shows also that for sin, as, for example, a rash oath, a lamb was commonly offered.<sup>5</sup> And when Christ is called a lamb, not only Peter shows that a sacrifice for sins is meant, by saying that we are redeemed with his blood,<sup>6</sup> but also John, in the Apocalypse, in many places, and among others where he says that he was slain.<sup>7</sup> But the sacrifice must be understood as a sacrifice for sin, because, on the testimony of Peter, it was the means of redemption. But this is the character of a sacrifice for sin alone.<sup>8</sup> From this it is the more plain that when the Baptist said that Christ was the lamb which should take away the sins of the world,<sup>9</sup> he was speaking of past sins, and not of future sins, and of taking away the offence by obtaining remission from God, not through the generation of faith within them. Neither is it true,<sup>10</sup> as Socinus says, that the high-priest alone was a type of Christ, and that the yearly expiation alone, or at

<sup>1</sup> Num. vi. 11. [חֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים עַל-יְהוֹשֻׁעַ]

<sup>2</sup> Ex. xii. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Ex. xii. 13; Heb. xi. 28.

<sup>4</sup> In his treatise: Quod unus sit Christus.

<sup>5</sup> Lev. v. 4, 6.

<sup>6</sup> 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

<sup>7</sup> Rev. v. 6, 9, 12; xiii. 8.

<sup>8</sup> Contr. Soc., ii. 17.

<sup>9</sup> John i. 29.

<sup>10</sup> Contr. Soc., ii. 9.

least the sacrifices which were offered for the people alone, gave a type of his sacrifice. For although in the high-priest and that established sacrifice the figure was in some respects more clear, which the Holy Spirit pursues with noteworthy care in the Epistle to the Hebrews, yet it cannot be denied that other priests and other expiatory sacrifices have a reference to the same thing, even if more obscurely. This is shown by the same Epistle,<sup>1</sup> where all carnal purification by victims is compared with the spiritual purification by Christ, and much more where,<sup>2</sup> after saying in general that almost all things are in the law purged with blood, and that without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins, the writer goes on to say, "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these." So also<sup>3</sup> the daily sacrifices are compared with the sacrifice of Christ. Socinus overturns the sense of this passage by expounding "daily" as "yearly," without precedent. For when he brings in Heb. vii. 27<sup>4</sup> to support this interpretation he fails to carry his point, since he falsely assumes that the priest in the annual sacrifices alone ought to make offering for himself. On the contrary, he ought to offer for himself as many times as he was conscious of sin.<sup>5</sup> Other passages<sup>6</sup> show that the paschal sacrifice was a figure of the sacrifice offered by Christ.

Although these things might suffice, yet from the [334 a common conception of the Gentiles, or rather from a most ancient tradition diffused through all lands, it is well to explain the nature of the sacred expiatory offering a little more at large. We cannot doubt that there were sacrifices before the law of Moses, under the imposition of that law which is called the natural law, whose rites were derived from God, and were transmitted to posterity by those who survived the flood and were dispersed through all lands. There remained

<sup>1</sup> Heb. ix. 13.<sup>2</sup> Heb. ix. 22.<sup>3</sup> Heb. x. 11.<sup>4</sup> ["Who needeth not daily, as those high-priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins and then for the people's: for this he did once when he offered up himself."]<sup>5</sup> Lev. iv. 3.<sup>6</sup> John xix. 36; 1 Cor. v. 7.

for a long time among the descendants of Shem, and also Japhet, and perhaps Ham, an uncorrupted religion until it was displaced by the worship of many, and consequently false, gods. But even then, when God had been exchanged for false gods, rites and ceremonies transferred from a pious to an impious use remained, a great testimony against them of truth received but held back in unrighteousness, as the Apostle says.<sup>1</sup> Those nations therefore were most firmly persuaded that the gods were offended, and made angry by the crimes of men. From this anger regularly followed great calamities both private and public. Examine the excellent tract of Plutarch's — "Concerning those whom God is slow to punish," — in which if you write God for gods, you will find many things worthy of being uttered by a Christian. The wrath of which he speaks was inferred from causes or effects; from causes if crimes had come to the public knowledge, from effects, portents, prodigies, heavenly signs.<sup>2</sup> Yet they hoped that they could avert this wrath by certain victims. By these the Divinity was said to be appeased, the guilty one, whether man or people, to be purged, or in ancient phrase, *februari*, the sin to be expiated and lustrated.

For these reasons the same sacrifices were called *ἱλαστικά*, *ἀγνιστικά*, *καθαρτικά*, or in Latin *placamina*, *februa*, *piamina*. The word *ἱλάσκεσθαι* is applied to victims by Homer and many others. The expression *ἀγνίζειν τὴν πόλιν καθαρμοῖς* occurs in Plutarch on Romulus. This *ἀγνίζειν* is written also *ἀγίζειν* and *ἀγιάζειν*. In Herodotus<sup>3</sup> the Phrygian Adrastus, polluted with homicide, "stood in need of a sacred expiation."<sup>4</sup> Croesus made expiation for himself. Herodotus says that there was a similar mode of expiation among the Lydians and Greeks. In Hermogenes occurs the phrase:<sup>5</sup> "Not expiated from acts of sacrilege." Plato<sup>6</sup> for the same idea puts "liberations"<sup>7</sup> and "expiations of crimes."<sup>8</sup> Plu-

<sup>1</sup> Rom. i. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Cic. de Harus. Res., Lucan 1 Phars., Greek and Roman Historians, *passim*.

<sup>3</sup> lib. i.

<sup>4</sup> *καθαρσίῳ ἰδέετο.*

<sup>5</sup> *μηδὲ καθαρμένος ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσεβημάτων.*

<sup>6</sup> Rep. ii.

<sup>7</sup> *λύσεις.*

<sup>8</sup> *καθαρμὸς ἀδικημάτων.*

tarch interprets *καθάρσις* by *ἀποτρόπαια*, that is, *averrunca*, things which avert the divine wrath. In Virgil and others nothing is more frequent in respect to sacred things than the word *placation*, the force of which Horace thus expresses :

“*Mactata veniet mitior hostia.*”

Livy frequently says : “*Pacem Deos exposcere.*” Pliny says that there is favor for the flock in expiatory offerings to the gods. Ovid says that the gods are conciliated to man by victims. The word conciliate we have already shown to be equivalent to placate. *Purgare* and *purificare*, the translation of the Greek *ἀγνίζω*, are employed because a crime seems to be a certain sort of uncleanness. The word *purification* is found in Suetonius and Pliny. Lucan uses the expression “to purify the walls by a lustration.” But the more common word is *to lustrate*, of the origin of which we have spoken above. So Livy speaks of lustrating the army with the *suovetaurilia*. Ovid explains *lustrare* [334 b by *expurgare* :

“*Ego lustror ab illis,*

*Expurgante nefas novies mihi carmine dicto.*”

Servius on Virgil explains *Lustramurque Jovi*,<sup>1</sup> by *purge* and *expiate*. They thought victims to be ransoms substituted for their lives, as life for life.<sup>2</sup> Eusebius<sup>3</sup> teaches that the blood of slain animals atones for the lives of men. Thus he who offered held the head of the victim. Seneca<sup>4</sup> himself explains the *lustrale sacrum* as that by which ships are atoned for.<sup>5</sup> “Papinius in the Thebais used the expression *caput lustrale*, which he explains as follows :

“*Terrigenam cuncto patriae pro sanguine poscunt.*”

and also :

“*Date gaudia Thebis*

*Quae pepigi et toto quae sanguine prodigus emi.*”

Therefore the *lustrale sacrum* is that which buys blood, that is, redeems by blood.<sup>6</sup> This has to do with proving that

<sup>1</sup> Aen. iii.      <sup>2</sup> λότρα τῆς σφῶν ψυχῆς ἀντίψυχα ὡσπερ ψυχῆν ἀντι ψυχῆς.

<sup>3</sup> Apod. Genesis.    <sup>4</sup> in Troad.      <sup>5</sup> [*Lat. piantur.*]

<sup>6</sup> [The text of the second edition, 1617, has been amended in pencil by some reader, so as to be : “*Lustrale ergo sacrum est quod sanguine (for sanguinem) emit, hoc est, redimit sanguine.*”]

for which we contended above in regard to redemption. It is to be noted that very frequently when writers are treating of sacred expiatory rites, mention is made of blood because from the ancient law of God given to Noah,<sup>1</sup> and thence handed down to all peoples, the blood stands for the life, and accordingly is called by the name of life.<sup>2</sup> Hence the passage of Virgil :

“Sanguine quaerendi reditus, animaque litandum.”

Explaining these words from Trebatius, Macrobius says that those victims were called *animales*.<sup>3</sup> Sins are themselves properly said to be expiated,<sup>4</sup> that is, washed away,<sup>5</sup> whether by paying the punishment due, or something which has come into the place of the due punishment. As for example, in Virgil :

“Et culpam miserorum morte piabunt;”

that is, cause them to be atoned. Pliny : “It is common for wars to expiate<sup>6</sup> the luxury of a people.” Cicero : “Your crimes the immortal gods have expiated<sup>6</sup> upon our soldiers.” The same writer frequently has the expression *to expiate crimes by punishment*. Sallust speaks of expiating slaughter by slaughter, blood by blood. The word *supplicium* was first used in the sacred rites, and thence transferred to punishments.<sup>7</sup> But to expiate in sacrifice is to atone by putting a different thing in the place of punishment due. Hence Plautus :<sup>8</sup>

“Men' piacularem oportet fieri ob stultitiam tuam  
Ut meum tergum stultitiae tuae subdas succedaneum.”

Hence the author of the distichs which are ascribed to Cato, says :

“Cum sis ipse nocens, moritur cur victima *pro te* ?”

Here *pro te* means *in your place*. In the same place he says that those who offer victims hope to obtain their own safety by the death of another. Hence sacrifices are in themselves properly expiatory :

<sup>1</sup> Gen. ix. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Arnobius vii. adv. Gent., Servius on Aen. ii.

<sup>3</sup> [lui.]

<sup>4</sup> [Expio.]

<sup>7</sup> Contr. Soc., ii. 13.

<sup>2</sup> See note 6, p. 227.

<sup>4</sup> [piari.]

<sup>5</sup> [Epidicus.]

“*Ea prima piacula sunt.*”<sup>1</sup>

“*Teque piacula nulla resolvent.*”<sup>2</sup>

Ovid calls them *piamina*.

“*Februa Romani dixere piamina patres.*”

The force of this word he immediately explains as “that by which our crimes are expiated.”<sup>3</sup> Pliny calls them *pimenta*. Crimes are improperly called *piacula*, for on account of them *piacula* are due, as Servius rightly remarks upon Virgil’s expression :

“*Distulit in seram commissa piacula mortem.*”

But although, as we have said, *to expiate* is properly *to wash away*, and so may be properly said of punishment or sin, that is, offence or debt; yet men have begun to use it for words of allied signification, to placate, and to lustrate. So Cicero says that the majesty of Ceres may be expiated. Livy: “That slaughter when known may be atoned for by some expiatory offering, the father has been commanded to expiate his son”; that is, lustrate him. So Seneca<sup>4</sup> has used the expression *to expiate the fleet*, that is *to lustrate the fleet*. Tacitus speaks of expiating prodigies, for the crimes on account of which the wrath has been excited which is indicated by prodigies. The passage occurs in his treatment of the Jews: “Prodigies had come forth which the nation, subject to superstition, but averse from religion, did not think it right to expiate by victims, or by vows.”

Here we must note in passing, as we have said above, that means of expiation are not provided in the law of the Jews for expiating all divine wrath. From these things it manifestly appears that the lustral or expiatory sacred rites pertained to placating the divinity, and so to obtaining impunity for sins committed before. Pliny expresses this as follows: “The ancient opinion obtained in former times that all things were expiatory *by which the consciences of malefactors were cleansed, and their sins blotted out.*” But we must not omit the remarkable passage of Porphyry on expiatory sacrifices: “For all divines have agreed in this, that in expiatory

<sup>1</sup> *Æn.* vi.

<sup>2</sup> Horace.

<sup>3</sup> [*Quo crimina nostra piantur.*]

<sup>4</sup> in *Troad.*

sacrifices the victims should not be touched by those who sacrifice them, and that such must use purification ; for, they say, no one should go into the city, or into his own house, before he has cleansed his clothing and body with the water of a river or fountain.”<sup>1</sup> That in which he says theologians are agreed, that the garments of those who had touched expiatory offerings should be washed, plainly agrees with the law delivered by Moses to the Hebrews.<sup>2</sup> But because the nations themselves were not ignorant under the leading of nature, that the more it was which they gave to God the more easily could forgiveness be obtained, especially if there was any equality between the ransom and that which was redeemed ; so they advanced from the slaughter of animals in making expiation to the slaughter of men. Caesar<sup>3</sup> explains the cause : “ Unless the life of a man is given for the life of a man, they think that the majesty of the immortal gods cannot be *placated*.” First of all the Canaanites, that is, the Phoenicians, are found to have practised this. We read of these in the sacred writings that they were accustomed to placate Moloch by the slaughter of their own free citizens. This Moloch was Saturn, as the Jewish masters rightly explained. We learn, on the authority of Porphyry, who read it at the home of its interpreter, Philo of Biblus, that the history of the Phoenicians written by Sancuniatho was full of narratives of sacrifices of that kind. A part of them were Tyrians, among whom it was an ancient custom to immolate to Saturn a freeborn youth.<sup>4</sup> Curtius rightly observes that the Carthaginians, colonists of the Tyrians, had received this sacred custom from the founders of their city. It is to these that the following passage of Ennius relates :

“ Ille suos Divis mos sacrificare puellos.”

Diodorus and Justin relate the same of the Carthaginians, in the following words : “ They immolated men as victims, and brought youths to the altars, beseeching the *peace* of the gods

<sup>1</sup> Πάντες γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ ἑμολόγησαν οἱ θεόλογοι ὅτι οὐτε ἄπτερον ἐν ταῖς ἀποτροπαίοις θυσίαις τῶν θυομένων, καθαρσίαις τε χρηστέον· μὴ γὰρ ἴαι τις εἰς ἕστου, μηδ' εἰς οἶκον ἴδιον, μὴ πύτερον ἐσθήτα καὶ σῶμα ποταμοῖς ἢ πηγῇ ἀποκαθήρας, φασίν.

<sup>2</sup> Lev. xvi. 26, 28.

<sup>3</sup> Gallic War.

<sup>4</sup> Curtius, lib. iii.

by their *blood*.”<sup>1</sup> Lilius Italicus says that they were [335 b accustomed to beg the *favor*<sup>2</sup> of the gods by slaughter. Lactantius, on the authority of Pescennius Festus, tells us that the Carthaginians, thinking that God was *enraged* with them, that they might *make atonement*, immolated two hundred sons of noble families. Minutius Felix mentions it, and Tertullian in his apology, who says that Saturn was therefore called the Tomb of sons;<sup>3</sup> Plutarch also, in his book on superstitions. In Egypt men, and that, too, frequently of exquisite beauty, were anciently sacrificed, as Manetho relates, who adds that the custom was maintained to the times of Amosis, who substituted waxen images for men. The tradition comes concerning Heliopolis, that they made diligent investigation there whether the men who were destined for sacrifice were clean. In Cyprus, likewise, men were slain down to the time of Diphilus, who substituted the immolation of a bull. The same was formerly done in Rhodes, Chios, Tenedos, Salamis, and at Laodicea; also among the Damathian Arabs. The Persians buried men alive. Of the Albans this in particular has been handed down, that they were accustomed to immolate him whom they believed to have the greatest power with the gods through special sanctity. The Ionians, on the testimony of Pausanias, immolated a maiden and a boy, to appease the irate Diana. Of the Blemmyae, Messagetæ, Tauri, Neuri, and on the whole of the Scythæ, we read similar things. This may suffice for Asia and Africa, to which we may add that the same rites were found both in ancient India (of which the same Mela had already treated), and upon the American continent by those who have brought these shores to our notice. In the Canary Islands it is not long since this was given up. To come to Europe, formerly in Crete boys were sacrificed to Saturn; in Lacedaemon, a man to Mars, as Ister and Apollodorus have told us. Nay, even all the Greeks alike had the same custom, according to the testimony of Philarchus, with the consent of Pliny, and examples are

<sup>1</sup> lib. xviii.<sup>2</sup> [veniam.]<sup>3</sup> [tumulus filiorum.]

extant even in the times of the Persian wars. At Rome also yearly was slain a Greek boy and a Greek maiden, a Gallic boy and a Gallic maiden. The Latin Jupiter was also worshipped with human victims,—the Arician Diana as well. Pliny says that these sacrifices were formerly very common throughout Italy and Sicily, and that they were not given up at Rome before the six hundred and fifty-seventh year of the city.<sup>1</sup> The devotions of the Decii have the same origin, by which the ancients, as Cicero says,<sup>2</sup> thought that the gods were *placated*. Livy calls the Decii the atonement<sup>3</sup> for all the *wrath* of the gods, also the atonement<sup>3</sup> for *washing away*<sup>4</sup> the public peril.<sup>5</sup> Lucan :

“Lustrales bellis animas.”

Nor must we omit the remarkable passage of Juvenal :

“Plebeiae Deciorum animae, plebeia fuerunt  
Nomina: *pro* totis legionibus hi tamen et *pro*  
Omnibus auxiliis, atque omni plebe Latina  
*Sufficiunt* Dis infernis, Terraeque parenti:  
*Pluris* enim Decii, quam qui servantur ab illis.”

In this passage first the use of the particle *pro* is to be noted, which we have above indicated as a frequent particle, and, as it were, peculiar to this argument, so as to be the same as *instead of another*. It appears, again, that the Romans thought that the estimation of a sacrifice was increased by the dignity of him who was slain. Lastly, it is manifest from a comparison of authors that the following phrases are equivalent, viz. that God should be placated by a victim; and 336 a.] that the wrath of the gods should be expiated; or that the soul of one sufficed with the gods for the soul of others. The custom of the Gauls, as related by Caesar, on which we have touched above, and which is said by Pliny to have continued to the reign of Tiberius, is most noteworthy.<sup>6</sup> Of the same, Cicero says, The Gauls appeased the gods by human victims. Cicero uses the expression to *placate* the gods, as well as Caesar; Luctatius, to *lustrate the city*.

<sup>1</sup> [B. C. 96].

<sup>2</sup> De Nat. Deor. iii.

<sup>3</sup> [piacula]

<sup>4</sup> [luc.]

<sup>5</sup> Vide supra, p. 406, the passage of Appian.

<sup>6</sup> Notes on the Massilians to Salvianus.

Caesar explains himself : to give life for life. So the Thracians worship Zamolxis ; so the Germans, Mercurius and other gods, of whom Lucan, as follows :

“ Et quibus immitis *placatur* sanguine dno  
Teutates.”

Tacitus and Pliny have told us that in Britain also sacred rites of this kind were celebrated. Procopius writes that to his own, that is, to the times of Justinian, the same was customary in the island of Thule. Porphyry has left the statement that this custom was not outgrown among the nations till the time of Hadrian. It has been specially handed down of the Massilians that whenever they were afflicted with a pestilence they were accustomed to maintain a poor man at the public expense, who, adorned with sacred bows and clothed with sacred garments, was led through the city with execrations, that upon him all the evils of the state might fall, and so was immolated to the immortal gods. All these things being gathered together, we shall see that not without reason did Pliny exclaim of the sacrifices : “ So they harmonized with the whole world, discordant as it was, and ignorant of itself.” The following may be said in passing of human victims. The nations did not sin by them in this respect only, that they made sacrifices to false gods, but also that they had no such command as Abraham had for worshipping the Divine Majesty in this way. But the custom of the Gentiles in expiating sins by the slaughtering of men or of sheep affords no little help in understanding the nature of expiatory sacrifice, and the words proper to this argument. We are not to despise this labor, for Socinus says that the Baptist when he called Christ the Lamb of God, had reference to sacrifices on the whole, by which not only among the Hebrews, but also among the Gentiles, sins were believed to be expiated. But we cannot doubt, since the divine writer to the Hebrews employs very frequently in this very argument on expiatory sacrifice the Greek words *καθαρίζειν* and *ἀγιαρίζειν*, that he employed them in that sense which was the received sense in the Greek language.

From this it is easy to see what is meant when Christ is called a sacrifice for sin, or an expiatory sacrifice. Socinus gives three interpretations: <sup>1</sup> the first, that the death of Christ by generating faith draws us back from our sins; the second, that death itself is a certain antecedent to obtaining remission of sins; the third, <sup>2</sup> that it furnishes, as it were, a testimony to the remission itself, or to the decree made concerning it. Of these three only the second is pertinent here, not because Christ did not do those other things also, — and, indeed, much more effectively than Socinus thinks, — but because those things do not pertain to a sacrifice for sin. For Socinus <sup>3</sup> confesses that the likeness of legal sacrifices for sins (to which similar sacrifices of the Gentiles, considered **336 b**] not according to fact, but according to the opinion of the Gentiles, may be compared) and the sacrifice performed by Christ consists in expiation. But those sacrifices did not draw us away from sin, especially not by creating faith in anything. Neither did they furnish testimony to a remission conferred, nor to a certain decree. But, as Socinus recognizes, they were a certain requisite antecedent of remission. This is shown by the words of the law: “He shall expiate and it shall be remitted.” With this, therefore, the comparison is concerned, and plainly it is necessary that the expiation should signify the same when it is applied to legal sacrifices and when to Christ. For the writer to the Hebrews deduces both from the same decree, viz. that without shedding of blood there is no remission, but that expiation is made with blood.<sup>4</sup> The passage<sup>5</sup> where it is said that it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin furnishes no objection. For we must repeat from the preceding context the phrase *according to conscience*, as appears plainly upon a comparison of similar passages.<sup>6</sup> The blood of beasts took away sins, that is, the temporal offence, but it did not take away the spiritual offence, as has been shown above.<sup>7</sup> In the Apocalypsee, the

<sup>1</sup> ii. 16, 17.<sup>2</sup> ii. 20.<sup>3</sup> ii. 10.<sup>4</sup> Heb. ix. 21.<sup>5</sup> Heb. x. 4.<sup>6</sup> Heb. ix. 9, 14.<sup>7</sup> Contr. Soc., ii. 17.

expression "washed us from our sins" cannot be explained, "who declared us washed," without greatly perverting it. Neither are we permitted to expound the passage,<sup>1</sup> "The blood of Christ *cleanseth* us from all sin," "*declares* us to be cleansed." It is manifestly opposed to the appropriate meaning of the words and the perpetual use of Scripture in this argument. Socinus confesses that the word uncleanness in many places signifies offence. *Καθαρίζειν* and *ἀργιάζειν* are to take away that offence, or to effect remission, as the writer to the Hebrews expounds the words.<sup>2</sup> Christ himself purges our sins.<sup>3</sup> Christ purges our conscience from dead works,<sup>4</sup> that is, on the confession of Socinus himself,<sup>5</sup> liberates our conscience from offence and punishment, and the fear of punishment. In the Old Testament also כִּי־יָצִי has the same sense.<sup>6</sup> The *καθαρίζειν* of these passages is replaced in similar passages by *ῥαντίζειν*<sup>7</sup> and *λούειν*,<sup>8</sup> "to wash," to which also the prophecy of Zechariah refers.<sup>9</sup> There is evidently no reason why we should depart from this sense in the two passages of John. If Jesus is called "faithful witness,"<sup>10</sup> the word "to wash" ought not to be referred to this testimony. The expressions "faithful witness" and "washed" are not immediately connected; but we have between them allusion to the first-begotten of the dead, to the kingdom, and to love, so that even a blind man might see that many offices and benefits of Christ are brought together to illustrate his dignity.<sup>11</sup> In the Epistle of John it is altogether absurd to interpret *καθαρίζειν* of the declaration of cleansing, but not of the cleansing itself, since a little later *ἀφιέναι* and *καθαρίζειν* are brought into close contact. The apostle is arguing from the conjunction. If you walk in the light you shall have cleansing, that is, remission, through the blood [337 = of Christ, because sins are imputed to no one who walks in the light. The declaration of the Baptist, who calls Christ the Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world, since it

<sup>1</sup> 1 John i. 7.<sup>2</sup> Heb. ix. 22.<sup>3</sup> Heb. i. 3.<sup>4</sup> Heb. ix. 14.<sup>5</sup> ii. 15.<sup>6</sup> Ps. li. 9.<sup>7</sup> Heb. x. 22.<sup>8</sup> Heb. x. 22.<sup>9</sup> Zech. xiii. 1.<sup>10</sup> Rev. i. 5.<sup>11</sup> Contr. Soc., li. 13.

has reference to the expiatory sacrifices both of the Hebrews and of the Gentiles, on the confession of Socinus,<sup>1</sup> evidently does not permit us to interpret "to take away sins" otherwise than "to take away the offence." This was the work of the expiatory sacrifices; but they did not allure from sinning.<sup>2</sup> "Putting away sin"<sup>3</sup> is the same as "obtaining remission."<sup>4</sup> This "putting away of sin" was accomplished "by the sacrifice of himself."<sup>5</sup>

But Socinus, although he attempts to wrest certain passages from their true sense, yet, convicted by many others, is compelled to confess that there are indications in the sacrifice of Christ that it makes an expiation antecedent to the remission of sins, as if requisite thereto. Yet he denies that God is induced by that sacrifice to make remission, but says that a certain faith is begotten within us, by which we are led to emendation of life so as to obtain remission of sins. But he forgets what he has previously said,<sup>6</sup> that the figure ought to agree with that which is figured in the point in which the comparison is made. Nor does he remember that which Scripture shows,—that the expression "All things are purged with blood" pertains in the same way to the legal sacrifices and to Christ.<sup>7</sup> But it is evident that the legal sacrifices did not beget such a faith. Nor is it a tolerable exposition of the word *expiate* to say that it is to do anything which is required for remission. On the contrary, all such words as *καθαρίζω*, *ἀγιάζω*, which the apostle uses, are significant, by their own nature and by perpetual use, not merely of antecedence of order, but also of a certain efficacy.

Scripture also supplies us with another and very sure argument for overturning the interpretation discovered by Socinus. For it says that there was need of a new priest after the order of Melchisedec.<sup>8</sup> But proclaiming faith in God — nay,

<sup>1</sup> ii. 9.<sup>2</sup> Heb. ix. 26.<sup>3</sup> εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας.<sup>4</sup> πρὸς τὸ καθαρίζεσθαι ὑμᾶς, and πρὸς τὸ γίνεσθαι ὑμῖν ἄφεσιν.<sup>5</sup> διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ, vs. 26.<sup>6</sup> ii. 10.<sup>7</sup> Heb. ix. 22.<sup>8</sup> Heb. vii. 2.

even confirming this proclamation by death — could have been done by the levitical priesthood. Wherefore if the priesthood of Christ effects nothing else, as Socinus would have it, it follows that there was no need of him.

Besides, that Christ died for our sins is believed upon unto salvation.<sup>1</sup> Therefore the expiation of Christ was not prepared to bring us to believing, since it is itself among those things which are to be believed.<sup>2</sup> For what serves to produce faith in another thing must necessarily be different from that thing.

Again, the expiation of Christ has an effect upon us after the planting of such faith. Christ was appointed High-Priest to expiate the sins of his people, that is, of believers.<sup>3</sup> Therefore to *expiate* cannot be to *bring to faith*.

Notice, also, the passage<sup>4</sup> where Christ's blood of sprinkling is said to speak better things than that of Abel. The blood of Abel cried to God for vengeance; the blood of Christ cries to God for remission. Socinus denies that God is placated by expiatory sacrifices; but the writers above cited [337] by us prove the contrary, inasmuch as they employ the word *placate* to express those sacred rites. Hence arose that phrase employed in the passage quoted from Hebrews, to *expiate sins*,<sup>5</sup> that is, to *atone for sins by placating God*.

Socinus recognizes no satisfaction in the expiatory sacrifices. But the simple word *expiation* means nothing else than *washing*. In many places the authors quoted by us, when they wish to express expiation by circumlocution, say: Give blood for blood, life for life, soul for soul, buy with blood, attain salvation by the death of another. The Hebrew words have the same signification, for  $\text{כַּפֵּר}$ <sup>6</sup> is not only to *cover*, but also to *redeem*,<sup>7</sup> and to *placate*,<sup>8</sup> and consequently to *expiate*.  $\text{רָחַץ}$  is to *wash*,<sup>9</sup> whence it comes to be used in

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 2, 3.

<sup>2</sup> Contr. Soc., iv. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Heb. ii. 17.

<sup>4</sup> Heb. xii. 24. [There is some unimportant variation in the texts at this point.]

<sup>5</sup>  $\text{καθάρσει ἁμαρτίας}$ .

<sup>6</sup> [So the other editions. The Hebrew given by the folio appears to be  $\text{כַּפֵּר}$ ! The references agree with  $\text{כַּפֵּר}$  with one exception. I have accordingly corrected the reading and the doubtful reference. — Tr.]

<sup>7</sup> Ex. xxi. 30; Ps. xlix. 8.

<sup>8</sup> Gen. xxxii. 20.

<sup>9</sup> Gen. xxxi. 39.

the sense *to expiate*. But expiation is first attributed to victims ;<sup>1</sup> then to the priest on account of the victims which he presents ;<sup>2</sup> last of all, to God who accepts the payment.<sup>3</sup> For as the word *redeeming* is employed for any liberation, so expiation is employed for a similar effect, even when no payment<sup>4</sup> intervenes.<sup>5</sup> But to Christ expiation is attributed as a victim, and so the word blood is added. But the blood of the victims, as has been proved above, is given instead of the life of the sinner. Hence it is impossible that the word expiation is used here improperly. Besides, if Socinus's opinion were true, that expiation is much more really made by resurrection and ascension to heaven than by death and the shedding of blood, because the former are better fitted to persuade us to exercise faith than the latter, at least in some passage of Scripture would expiation be attributed to those acts. This is nowhere done.

Socinus makes a false statement when he says<sup>6</sup> that expiation is ascribed to the declaration of the divine will. The passages which he quotes do not prove this. For in Heb. i. 3 Christ is said to uphold all things by his word, because all things obey his command. The word *ῥήμα* is found in the same sense elsewhere.<sup>7</sup> In Heb. x. 26, 29, knowledge of the truth and sanctification with blood are not put for the same thing, but many benefits are conjoined that the crime of the ungrateful man may be more evident. Sometimes, indeed, reference to a covenant is connected with blood,<sup>8</sup> but much more frequently reference to a sacrifice. We must therefore take that interpretation which unites these. This will be accomplished if we consider that part of the covenant in which Christ stipulated that if he should submit to death those who believed in him should obtain forgiveness of sin. God made this promise.<sup>9</sup>

But when Christ is said to present his blood in heaven, — that is, exhibit his death to the Father, and, as it were,

<sup>1</sup> See Heb. ix. 13, 23.

<sup>4</sup> [Initio.]

<sup>7</sup> Heb. xi. 3 ; Luke v. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Frequently so in Leviticus.

<sup>5</sup> Ps. li. 9.

<sup>8</sup> ii. 13, et passim.

<sup>3</sup> [Initio.]

<sup>6</sup> ii. 20.

<sup>9</sup> Isa. liii. 10.

remind God of it,—when, furthermore, it is said that he makes intercession, these things do not take away the expiation made upon the cross. The expiation made upon the cross influences God to grant remission, and secures to us the right, but under a certain condition and mode in [339 = which is comprehended on the part of Christ intercession, and on our part a genuine faith, as was explained when we were discussing satisfaction.

But Socinus contends<sup>1</sup> against the Scriptures when he denies that the expiation was made before Christ entered heaven. The Scriptures have everywhere attributed the redemption, the expiation, the satisfaction, the putting away of sin to death, and indicate that these things are already completed.<sup>2</sup> The offering is indeed made in heaven, but in such a way that Socinus ought not to deny that title to the death completed upon earth, in opposition to the clear words of Paul,<sup>3</sup> where Christ is said to have given himself an offering for us. To have studied the mere order of the words is abundantly to have refuted Socinus. In the same passage offering and sacrifice are properly connected.

All the Greek and Latin books show that the sacrifice is performed at the moment when the victim is slain. Hence it follows that the verb *mactare* signifies, first, *to sacrifice*, and then, by an extension of the meaning to other things, *to slay* in any way. Hence Ammonius distinguishes between *θύειν* and *σφάττειν* as words denoting genus and species: *θύεσθαι* is to slay in honor of the gods, *σφάττεσθαι* to slay for any cause whatever.<sup>4</sup> Plutarch says that the Gauls and Scythians believed that the gods are delighted by the blood of slain men, and that this is the most perfect sacrifice.<sup>5</sup>

Sacrifice consists, therefore, in slaying. In this matter the Scriptures speak in the same way. Abraham, com-

<sup>1</sup> ii. 13, 15.

<sup>2</sup> Contr. Soc., ii. 21.

<sup>3</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Θύεσθαι μὲν γὰρ ἔστιν ἐπὶ τιμῇ Θεοῦ, σφάττεσθαι δὲ τὸ δι' ἡτιναοῦν αἰτίας φονεύεσθαι.

<sup>5</sup> Θεοὶ εἶναι χαίροντας ἀνθρώπων σφάττομένων αἵματι, καὶ ταύτην τελειωτέτην θυσίαν.

manded<sup>1</sup> to offer his son, prepares to slay him; and so, because he had already completed the slaying in mind, although not with the hand, he is said to have offered his son.<sup>2</sup> There are passages where *θύειν* means simply *to slay*, without regard to sacrifice.<sup>3</sup> Christ is called by John the Lamb slain.<sup>4</sup> Paul expresses it thus: <sup>5</sup> Christ our passover is sacrificed <sup>6</sup> for us. But the paschal lamb was not commonly brought into the temple, so that *sacrificed* is the same as *slain*, as *passover* is the same as *lamb*. Christ appeared in heaven with the Father through his sacrifice.<sup>7</sup> Therefore the sacrifice preceded and the appearing followed. So elsewhere in the same Epistle Christ is said to have entered the **335** ] heavenly sanctuary in his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption for us,<sup>8</sup> and to have sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high, when he had by himself purged our sins.<sup>9</sup> In these passages the past tenses show that redemption or expiation had been made before Christ entered the palace of heaven.<sup>10</sup>

Therefore, although Christ was a High-Priest of such a kind that he ought not to remain, like the Levitical priests, upon the earth,<sup>11</sup> but, passing into the heavens, to be made higher than the heavens,<sup>12</sup> since his priesthood was to be eternal and unchangeable,<sup>13</sup> yet he was a true priest, and a true victim, even at the moment when he laid down his life upon the earth. And so he is said to have come into the world<sup>14</sup> (that is, upon this earth, according to the interpretation of Scripture<sup>15</sup>) to do the will of God,<sup>16</sup> that is, to offer<sup>17</sup> his body prepared by God, or sanctified by him,<sup>18</sup> for sin.<sup>19</sup> On this passage we must notice, at the same time, that we are said to be sanctified by the offering "once for all." Now Christ intercedes as often as we have need of intercession. So

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xxii. 2, 10.<sup>2</sup> Heb. xi. 17.<sup>3</sup> John x. 10.<sup>4</sup> ἀμνίον ἐσφαγμένον, Rev. v. 6, 12; xiii. 8.<sup>5</sup> 1 Cor. v. 7.<sup>6</sup> ἑ-θύθη.<sup>7</sup> Heb. ix. 26.<sup>8</sup> Heb. ix. 12.<sup>9</sup> Heb. i. 3.<sup>10</sup> Contr. Soc., ii. 23.<sup>11</sup> Heb. viii. 4.<sup>12</sup> Heb. iv. 14; vii. 26.<sup>13</sup> Heb. vii. 24.<sup>14</sup> Heb. x. 5.<sup>15</sup> John xviii. 37; 1 Tim. i. 15.<sup>16</sup> Heb. x. 7, 9.<sup>17</sup> vs. 10.<sup>18</sup> vs. 5.<sup>19</sup> vs. 8, 12.

that here not intercession but slaying must be understood. The offering of Christ, like that of some victims under the law, is two-fold : first, in the slaying ; secondly, in the exhibition. In case of victims under the law, the first was accomplished in the temple, the second within the sacred fane. In case of Christ, the first on earth, the last in heaven. The first was not the preparation of the sacrifice, but the sacrifice. The last, not so much the sacrifice as the commemoration of the sacrifice already made. Wherefore, since appearing and interceding are not properly sacerdotal acts, except so far as they depend upon the virtue of the finished sacrifice, he who takes away the sacrifice takes away also the true priesthood of Christ, in opposition to the plain authority of the Scriptures, which assign to Christ a priestly dignity, distinct from his prophetic and royal dignity, not figuratively so called, but most truly. His priesthood is set over against the Levitical priesthood, which was a genuine priesthood, as a more perfect species of the same genus over against a less perfect species. The inference of Heb. iii. 8, that Christ must have somewhat to offer, would not be legitimate except for a genuineness of the priesthood into which he had been inducted.

But it is by no means wonderful that they who have taken away from Christ the glory of his nature, that is, his true Deity, should also diminish his offices and refuse to acknowledge his special benefits.

To thee, O Lord Jesus, as true God, as true Redeemer, as true Priest, as true Victim for sins, with the Father and the Spirit, together one God, be honor and glory. Amen.

#### THE TESTIMONIES OF THE ANCIENTS.

**Justin to Diognetus :** He gave his own Son a ransom for us. Oh [339 a sweet exchange!

*The Author of the exposition of the Faith, attributed to Justin :* Through the perfect life blotting out the transgression, and through the death not due extinguishing what was due.

**Justin, Quaestiones ad Orthodoxos, Quaest. xcix. :** But that he who brought the blood of beasts offered it to God as his own life,<sup>1</sup> the sacred Scriptures testify.

<sup>1</sup> [ψυχῆ.]

**Irenæus, Bk. v. Chap. i.:** For he would not have truly had the flesh and blood by which he redeemed us, except he had repaired in his own person the ancient doing<sup>1</sup> of Adam.<sup>2</sup>

**Tertullian against the Jews, Chap. xiii.:** It became Christ to be made the sacrifice for all nations, who was brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so opened he not his mouth.

**Origen on Leviticus, Hom. iii., near the beginning:** If any one accurately recalls those things which have been said, he may object because we asserted that the sacrifice which we have said the high-priest offered for sin was a type of Christ; and it will not seem appropriate to the true Christ, who knew no sin, that he should be said to have offered a sacrifice for sin, although the matter involves a mystery — the same one is himself both priest and victim. See, therefore, whether we may resolve this difficulty as follows: Because Christ committed no sin, yet was made sin for us, while he who was in the form of God thought fit to be in the form of a servant, while he who is immortal dies, and impassible suffers, and invisible is seen, and because to us men both death and every other frailty in the flesh arose from the condition of sin, — he himself also who was made in the likeness of men, and was found in fashion as a man, without doubt offered as a sacrifice to God for the sin which he had received from us (because he bore our sins) a spotless victim, that is, uncontaminated flesh.

**Origen on Numbers, Hom. iv.:** If there had been no sin, it would not have been necessary that the Son of God should be made a lamb, nor would there have been any need that he, placed in flesh, should be slain; but he would have remained what he was in the beginning, the Word of **339** God. But since sin entered into this world, and the necessity of sin required propitiation, and propitiation is made only by a victim, it was necessary that a victim for sin should be provided. — *On Matthew, Chap. xvi. Treatise ii.:* A man can indeed give nothing in exchange for his soul; but God, for the souls of all men, gave in exchange the precious blood of his own Son. For we have not been bought with corruptible silver or gold, but with the precious blood of the spotless Lamb. — *On the Epistle to the Romans, Bk. ii. Chap. ii.:* Ye confess without doubt that it is true which has been written in the Epistle of Peter: Because we were not redeemed with corruptible silver and gold, but with the precious blood of the Only-begotten.<sup>3</sup> If, therefore, we were bought with a price, as Paul also bears witness, without doubt we were bought from some one whose servants we were, and who demanded the price which he wished in order to discharge those whom he held. Now, the devil was the one who

<sup>1</sup> [fictio.]

<sup>2</sup> The Greek of this passage as cited by Theodoret, Dial. ii, chap. xxvi. is as follows: Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν ἀληθῶς σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὀσχηκός, δι' ὃν ἡμᾶς ἐξηγορήσατο.

<sup>3</sup> [1 Pet. i. 18.]

held us, to whom we had been delivered by our sins. He demanded, therefore, as our price, the blood of Christ. But until the blood of Jesus was given, which blood was so precious that it alone sufficed for the redemption of all men, it was necessary that those who were instructed in the law should each for himself, as by a certain imitation of the future redemption give his own blood; and on this account we for whom the price of the blood of Christ has been paid do not regard it as necessary to offer a price for ourselves, that is, the blood of circumcision.

*Origen against Celsus, Bk. i.:* Or did the disciples not see that he who had been so recently crucified willingly received this death in behalf of the race of men, not unlike those who died for their native countries to remove prevailing pestilences, or sterility, or impediments to navigation? For it was likely that among the natural properties of things, for reasons unspeakable or difficult of comprehension by most men, was this property that one righteous man, by dying voluntarily for the public, might avert calamities by appeasing the evil demons who produced pestilences, or sterility, or impediments to navigation, or any such thing. Let, therefore, those who are unwilling to believe that Jesus died in behalf of men by crucifixion say whether they will not receive the many stories of the Greeks and barbarians about the death of certain ones for the public to terminate the evils that had previously seized upon cities and nations; or have those things come to pass, but yet it is altogether improbable that he who was a man died to destroy the great demon, even the prince of demons, who had subjected all the souls of men who had come [340] upon the earth? — *A little below, on Isa. liii.:* They who have become sinners, and have been healed by the death of the Saviour, say these things. God delivered him who had himself known no sin, in his purity, for all who had sinned.

*Cyprian, Epistle viii. to Clem. and the people:* He prayed for us, though he was not himself a sinner, but bore our sins. — *Epist. lxiii. to Caecilius, § 9:* Christ bore us all who also bore our sins. — *To Demetrianus, § 22:* This grace Christ imparts, this gift he ascribes to his own mercy, by undergoing death upon the trophy of the cross, by redeeming the believer with the price of his own blood, by reconciling man to God the Father, by quickening the mortal with heavenly regeneration. — *The same, or rather some other writer of the book On the Chief Works of Christ to Pope Cerevelius, Sermon vii. upon the Reason of Circumcision:* That one offering of our Redeemer was of so great dignity that it was alone sufficient to take away the sins of the world, — who entered by so great authority into the sacred place, in his own blood, that thereafter no request of suppliants stood in need of the blood of another. — *The same, Sermon xvi., on the Ascension of Christ:* Who, having been purchased in our behalf for thirty pieces of silver, wished us to know how great a difference there was between the price which was given for him and that which he himself gave

for the world, since he, though bought and sold for so little money, redeemed the condemned for so great a price. There can therefore be no doubt that the magnitude of the price surpassed the matter in hand, nor could the loss which a just condemnation had by all means merited be made equal to the obedience of Christ, which graciously continued even to death, and, moreover, paid that which he did not owe.

**Lactantius**, *On the Benefits of Christ*: You who enter and come to the doors of the midst of the temple, pause all alike, and gaze upon one who, guiltless, suffered for your crime, etc. — *And again*: For your sake, and for your life, I entered the womb of the virgin; I have been made man, and have suffered a cruel death, etc.

**Eusebius of Caesarea**, *Bk. x., Demonstratio Evangelica, Preface*: For it was necessary that the Lamb of God, which had been assumed by the great High-Priest, should be offered as a sacrifice to God in behalf of the rest of the kindred lambs and of the whole human flock. For since by **340 b** man came death, by man also came the resurrection of the dead. — *Bk. x. Chap. i.*: And, as when one member suffers, all the members suffer with it, so when the many members suffer and sin, he himself also, according to the principles of sympathy (since, though he was the λόγος of God, it pleased him to take the form of a servant, and to assume the common body of us all), receives the labors of the suffering members upon himself, and appropriates to himself our diseases, and suffers and labors in behalf of us all, according to the laws of love. But the Lamb of God not only having done these things, but also suffered punishment, and undergone in our behalf vengeance which he himself did not owe, but which we owed on account of the multitude of our sins, was made to us the source of the forgiveness of our sins, inasmuch as having received death on our behalf, and having taken upon himself stripes and insults and dishonor due to us, and having drawn upon himself the curse attaching to us, he had become a curse for us. For what else is he than a substitute for souls<sup>1</sup>? Wherefore, speaking in our person, the oracle says: "By his stripes we are healed"; and: "The Lord delivered him for our sins." — *Bk. i. Chap. x.*: And God looked upon Abel and upon his gifts, but unto Cain and his sacrifices he had no respect. From this you may understand how he who slew an animal was said to be acceptable, rather than he who brought to God his sacrifice from the earth. And even Noah immediately offered upon the altar whole burnt-offerings of all clean beasts, and of all clean fowls, and the Lord smelled an odor of a sweet savor. But also Abraham is said to have sacrificed; so that according to the testimony of the sacred Scriptures, he was thought by the ancient friends of God to have offered first of all the sacrifice of animals. Now, we do not think that his conception was induced by chance, or that it originated with man, but rather that it was inspired by God. For since they saw, inasmuch as through sanctity

<sup>1</sup> [ἀντίψυχον.]

of manners they were in peculiarly close relations with God, and were enlightened by the Divine Spirit, that they had need of a great remedy for cleansing the sins of mortals, they thought that they owed a ransom for their salvation to him who supplied them with life and breath. Since they had nothing better or more precious than their own lives to sacrifice, [411 a.] they offered instead of this the sacrifice of dumb beasts, reckoning them as substitutes<sup>1</sup> for their own lives. And they did this, not supposing that they committed fault or wrong, because they were not taught that the life of brutes was like the rational and intelligent force of man, or had learned that it was anything else than their blood, and the vital force in the blood. This they esteemed themselves to be offering as bringing life for life to God. And this very thing Moses explained somewhere<sup>2</sup> very clearly, saying: "The life of all flesh is its blood, and I have given you the blood upon the altar to make atonement for your sins. For their blood shall make atonement instead of life. For this reason have I said to the sons of Israel, No soul of you shall eat blood." Notice, now, particularly in this how he said: "I have given it to you to make atonement upon the altar for your souls. For the blood shall make atonement instead of the life." For he clearly says that the blood of the slaughtered animals makes atonement instead of the life of man. Now this very thing, also, the law about sacrifices leads him who examines it carefully to understand. It directs that every one who sacrifices should put his hands upon the head of the victim, and bring the animal to the priest, having hold of its head, as if offering the victim instead of his own head. Now, therefore, it says of each one: "He shall place it before the Lord, and shall put his hands upon the head of the gift." This was observed with every victim, no sacrifice being otherwise offered. By these things the saying that the victims which were offered were substitutes<sup>3</sup> for their lives, is explained. Christ is called "the purification<sup>4</sup> of the world," and "the sub- [413 b.] stitute<sup>5</sup> of sinners. Below he is said to "offer himself as a substitute<sup>6</sup> for us all."

**Antonius the Hermit, Epist. ii.:** In which also the Father of his creatures, moved with pity for our plagues, which could not be cured except by his goodness alone, sent the Only-begotten for us, that through our servitude he might assume the form of servitude, and deliver himself for our sins. And it is our sins which have abased him, but by his stripes<sup>7</sup> have we all been healed.

**Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem, Bk. ii. Acts of the Council of Nice.** But he himself came as the Saviour of all, and in our name bore, in his own flesh, the punishment owed by us.

**Athanasius, On the Incarnation of the Word of God:** But since also that which was due from all was yet to be paid; for the death of all, as I

<sup>1</sup> [ἀντιψύχα.]<sup>2</sup> [Lev. xvii. 11.]<sup>3</sup> [ἀντιψύχα.]<sup>4</sup> [καθάρσιον.]<sup>5</sup> [livore ejus.]

have previously said, was due, which was the chief reason for his coming into the world; for this reason, he first exhibited the signs of his divinity by his works, and then offered also sacrifice in behalf of all, delivering his own temple to death in the place<sup>1</sup> of all men, in order that he might liberate all from liability to account and from the ancient transgression, and show himself superior to death; exhibiting, as the first fruits of the resurrection of the whole, his own uncorrupted body. — *And below*: For there was need of death, and it was necessary that death should be suffered in behalf of all, in order that what was due from all might be paid. Whence, as I said before, the Word, since it was not possible that he should die (for he was immortal), took upon himself a body capable of dying, in order that he might offer it in behalf of all as his own, and might, as himself suffering in behalf of all on account of his entrance into it, conquer him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil, and release those who through fear of death were subject to bondage. Surely, since the common Saviour of all has died in our behalf, all who believe in Christ shall no longer now, as of old, according to the threat of the law, surely die. — *The same, in the same place*: And by such a kind of death has salvation come to all, and every creature been redeemed. This is the life of all, who surrendered to death his own body, like a sheep, a substitute [342 a] for the salvation of all. — *The same, upon the Sufferings and Crucifixion of the Lord*: But seeing how unbearable wickedness was, and that the mortal race was not able to resist death, nor able to pay the punishment of sins (for the excess of iniquity transcended all punishment); and seeing also the goodness of the Father, and seeing his own sufficiency and power (for Christ was the power of God and the wisdom of God), he was moved with benevolence, and, pitying our weakness, he assumed it; for he himself, as the prophet says, took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses. And having had mercy upon our mortality, he was surrounded with it; for Paul says, he humbled himself unto death, even the death of the cross. And seeing how impossible it was that our punishment should suffice for payment, he took this upon himself, for Christ became a curse for us. And thus now surrounded with and clothed in man's circumstances, he brought our offerings in himself unto the Father, in order that, as himself suffering, he might render suffering man blameless, and compensate for small things by great things.

**Hilary of Pictavium, in Chap. xiv. Matt. xiv.:** The Lord who was alone to suffer for all resolved the sins of all.

**Hymn on the Epiphany:** Jesus shone forth, the pious Redeemer of all nations, etc. The happy John trembled to immerse<sup>2</sup> in the river him who is able with his own blood to cleanse the sins of the world.

**Optatus Milevitanus, On the Schism of the Donatists, against Parmenianus, Bk. iii.:** When you say, Redeem your souls, whence have

<sup>1</sup> [dort.]

<sup>2</sup> [mergere.]

you bought them that you may sell them? Who is that un- [349 b known angel who makes a market of the souls which, before his coming, the devil possessed? Christ our Saviour redeemed them with his own blood, as the apostle says: Ye were bought with a great price. For it is certain that all were redeemed by the blood of Christ.

**Victor of Antioch on Mark xv.:** And why, you ask, did the Lord and Maker of all things, being made man for our sakes, endure so great ignominy and so great sufferings? He was made like us; he took upon himself our miseries and crosses that he might raise up our nature, fallen through sin, and finally restore it to its former grade of dignity. The advantages, therefore, which have flowed to us through his sufferings are very many; for he himself paid our debts for us, himself bore our sins, himself for our sake both suffered and groaned.

**Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechism xiii.:** Now he released those who were held down by sin, and redeemed the whole world of men. And do not wonder if the whole world was redeemed; for he who died in their behalf was no mere man, but the only-begotten Son of God. And yet the sin of one man Adam was able to bring death upon the world; but if by the sin of the one death obtained dominion over the world,<sup>1</sup> how shall not rather life reign by the righteousness of one? And if then, on account of the tree of which they ate, they were cast out of Paradise, will not they who believe enter more easily now into paradise on account of the tree of Jesus? If he who was first formed from the earth brought universal death, does not he, then, who formed man from the earth bring eternal life, being himself the life? If Phineas, moved with anger against him who did wrong, caused the anger of God to cease, does not Jesus, not having appointed another, but having given up himself, a ransom, appease the wrath against men?

**Basil, Homily, Ps. xlvi.:** One thing was found, surpassing all things else, which was given for payment for the ransom of our souls — the holy and precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.

**Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. xlii., which is the second upon the Passover:** The victim, great and (so to speak) incapable of being offered according to its primary nature, was mingled with the lawful sacrifices as a purification not for a small part of the world, or for a short time, but for all the world, and forever. — *The same, in the same place:* A few [343 a drops of blood form anew the whole world, and become to all men, like the rennet to milk, a means of drawing and binding us into one. — *The same:* It remains to examine a deed and decree overlooked by most persons, but carefully examined by me. For unto whom was the blood shed in our behalf, and concerning what was it shed, great and celebrated of God, and of the high-priest, and of the victim? For we were held in bondage by the devil, sold under sin, and deriving pleasure from sin. But

<sup>1</sup> [ἡ βασιλευσεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον.]

if the ransom comes into the hands of no one else than he who holds us in bondage, I inquire unto whom it was offered, and for what cause. If to the devil, alas, what an insult! if the robber receives not a ransom only from God, but also God himself as a ransom, and so a reward far exceeding his own tyrannical power, on which account it was just to spare us. But if to the Father, in the first place, how? for we were not held by him. And again, what was the reason that the blood of the Only-begotten was pleasing to the Father, who would not receive even Isaac from his father when he was offered, but changed the sacrifice, furnishing a ram in the place of the commanded victim? Or is it evident that the Father receives the sacrifice, not having asked it, or being in need of it, but for the sake of the dispensation, and because man ought to be sanctified by the human in God, in order that he might himself deliver, having conquered the tyrant by force, and bring us unto himself through our Mediator, and unto the honor of the Father who provided this, and to whom all things appear to be conceded.

*Gregory of Nyssa, to the Monk of Olympius concerning the Form of a Perfect Name:* But having learned that Christ who gave himself a ransom **343 b**] for us is redemption, we are instructed by such a word to learn that, inasmuch as he bestowed upon us a certain gift for each soul, — immortality, — he made those among them purchased from death through life his own peculiar possession.

*Ambrose on Tobit x.:* Lo, the prince of this world comes, and finds nothing of his own in me. He owed nothing, but he paid for all, as he himself testifies, saying, What things I had not taken I was then paying back.—*The same, on the Patriarch Joseph, Chap. iv.:* Joseph was sold into Egypt, because Christ was to come to those to whom it was said, Ye have been sold by your sins. And so by his own blood he redeemed those whom their own sins had sold. But Christ, sold by undertaking a condition, is not held by the price of a fault and sin, because he committed no sin. He therefore contracted the debt at our price, not by his own expenditure; he took away the handwriting, removed the usurer, freed the debtor, alone paid that which was owed by all.

*Ambrose concerning Esau, or concerning the Flight of the Age, Chap. vii.:* God so took flesh as to abolish the curse of sinful flesh, and was made a curse for us that blessing might absorb the curse, perfection the sin, pardon the sentence, life death. For he accepted death that the sentence might be fulfilled, and perfect satisfaction even unto death be made for him condemned through the curse of the flesh. Therefore nothing was done contrary to the sentence of God, since the condition of the divine sentence was fulfilled. For the curse extends even unto death, but after death is grace. — *The same, Bk. ix. Epistle lxxi.:* The Lord Jesus, coming, forgave to all the sin which no one could avoid, and destroyed our accusation<sup>1</sup> by the effusion of his own blood. This is what he says: Sin

<sup>1</sup> [Lat. Chirographum.]

abounded through the law, but grace abounded through Jesus. Because, after the whole world was subdued, he took away the sin of the whole world. — *Bk. i. Epistle ii.* : See whether that is the saving victim which the Word of God offered in himself, and sacrificed in his own body. — *And a little after* : But that he poured out his blood upon the altar, we may understand thereby the cleansing of the world, the remission of all sins. For he poured out that blood upon the altar as a victim, to take away the sins of many. For the victim is a lamb, but not a lamb of an unreasoning nature, but of divine power, of whom it is said, “Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world.” For not only did he cleanse the sins of all by his blood, but also forgave them by divine power. — *The same, on Luke, Bk. vii. Chap. xii.* : The adversary esteems us as captive slaves at a small rate. But the Lord, who is a fit judge of his own work, redeemed us for a great price, as beautiful servants whom he made in his own image and likeness; as the apostle said, For ye were bought with a great price. With a great one, indeed, which [344 a is not estimated in money, but in blood, because Christ died for us, who liberated us with precious blood, etc. And precious, indeed, because it is the blood of a spotless body, because it is the blood of the Son of God, who not only redeemed us from the curse of the law, but also from the perpetual death of impiety. — *The same, on Luke, Bk. x. Chap. xxii.* : “I have sinned, because I have betrayed innocent blood.” The price of our Lord’s passion is the price of blood, therefore the world is bought with the price of blood by Christ. — *Bk. iii. concerning Virginity, near the end* : We had been pledged to an evil creditor by sins. We have contracted an accusation for fault, we owed the punishment of blood. The Lord Jesus came, and offered his own blood for us. — *And a little below* : Do you therefore also conduct yourself worthily of such a price, that Christ who cleansed you, who redeemed you, may not come, and if he finds you in sin say to you : What advantage in my blood ? What have I done for you by descending into corruption ? — *Bk. i. of the Apology of David, Chap. xliii.* : Well says the apostle, Because the Lord Jesus forgave you your trespasses, blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross. He blotted out the ink of Eve with his own blood, he blotted out the obligation of the hurtful inheritance. — *On the Epistle to the Hebrews, Chap. ix.* : But his was the whole bodily cleansing of the Old Testament; but now there is the spiritual cleansing of the blood of Christ. Thus he says : This is the blood of the New Testament for the remission of sins. In those sacrifices, they were sprinkled upon the surface, and again the sprinkled part was washed; for the people did not always go about sprinkled with blood. But in the soul it is not so; but the blood mingles with its essence, making that fountain clean, and producing unutterable beauty. On this account was the slaying of the lamb and

the sprinkling of his blood over the lintels of those who were to be liberated. On this account, also, we read of all the sacrifices of the Old Testament, that they may point out one sacrifice through which there is a true remission of sins, and a cleansing of the soul forever.—*The same, or rather the Author of the Comments on the Epistles of Paul which are ascribed to Ambrose, on 1 Cor. vi.* : Because we were bought for a dear price, we ought more carefully to serve our Lord, lest, offended, he return us to that death from which he has redeemed us. For he bought us with so very dear a price as to give his own blood for us. — *The same, upon the Epistle of the same, Chap. xi.* : We receive the mystical cup of the blood for the protection of our body and soul, because the blood of the Lord has redeemed our blood, that is, has made the whole man safe. For the flesh of the Saviour was given for the salvation of our body ; but his blood was shed for our soul. — *The same on 2 Cor. v.* : Since he was offered for sins, not undeservedly is he said to have been made sin (because even the victim in the law which was offered for sins was called sin), that we might be the righteousness of God in him, who knew no sin ; as Isaiah says : He who did no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth, was slain as a sinner, that sinners might be justified before God in Christ.

*Epiphanius Haeres. lv.* : First he offered himself, in order to abolish the sacrifice of the Old Testament, having offered the more perfect 344 b] living sacrifice in behalf of the whole world, himself being the offering, himself the sacrifice, himself the priest, himself the altar, himself God, himself man, himself king, himself high-priest, himself sheep, himself lamb, having become all in all for us, in order that life might come to us in every way, and that he might establish the unchangeable foundation of his priesthood forever.

*Andreas of Cesarea on Apoc. Chap. i.* : Honor, glory, and dominion are becoming to him who, kindled with burning love, by his own death liberated our race from the chains of death, and by the effusion of life-giving blood and water, washed us from the uncleanness of sins, and received us into a royal priesthood.

*Prudentius on Roman. Mart.* : This is that cross, the salvation of us all. Romanus says : This is the redemption of man.

*Chrysostom in the Preface of his Commentary on Isaiah* : How great is the clemency of God toward us ! He spared not the Son, that he might spare the slave ; he delivered up the Only-begotten, that he might redeem slaves openly ungrateful ; he paid the blood of his own Son for the price. — *The same, viii. To the Romans* : And he prepares others to intercede in our behalf, in order that he may confer benefits upon us, as he did with Moses ; for he says to him, Suffer me and I will destroy them, that he might provoke him to supplication in their behalf. — *Below* : For this reason frequently for David's sake, now such a one and now such a one, he says, is reconciled with them, effecting this very thing again, that also form may be given to the reconciliation.

**Eleazar** in the speech in the *Maccabees* begs God for the people: Make our blood their purification, and for their life receive my life.

**Jerome** against the *Pelagians*, *Bk. i.*: And he says, when he would enter in, let him offer a calf for sin, and a ram for a burnt-offering, and let him take two goats from the whole people: one of them let him offer for his own sin, and one for the sin of the people, and the ram for a burnt-offering. The other goat receives all the sins of the people for a type of our Lord and Saviour, and bears them into the desert, and so God is appeased for the whole multitude.— *The same*, *Isa. liii.*: He was despised and rejected when he hung upon the cross, and was made a curse for us, bore our sins, and said to the Father, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?

**Augustine** on the *Trinity*, *Bk. xiii. Chap. xiv.*: What is the righteousness by which the devil was conquered? What except the righteousness of Jesus Christ? And how was he conquered? Because, though [345] the devil found nothing in him worthy of death, yet he slew him. And truly it is just that the debtors whom he held should be dismissed in freedom when believing in him whom without any debt he slew. This is why we are said to be justified in the blood of Christ. For so was that innocent blood shed for the remission of our sins.— *And below*: Thence he goes to the passion that he might pay for us debtors what he himself did not owe.— *And in the next chapter*: Then that blood, since it was the blood of him who had no sin at all, was shed for the remission of our sins, that, because the devil deservedly held them whom he bound by the condition of death as guilty of sin, he might deservedly discharge them through him whom, guilty of no sin, he had unjustly punished with death. By this righteousness was the strong man conquered, and by this chain bound, that his goods, which while they were in his possession had been, with him and his angels, vessels of wrath, might be taken away, and might be converted into vessels of mercy.— *The same* on *John*, *tract. xli.*: We are not reconciled except by the taking away of sin, which is the medium of separation; but the mediator is the reconciler. That, therefore, the middle wall of partition may be taken away, that Mediator came, and the priest was himself made the sacrifice.— *City of God*, *Bk. vii. Chap. xxxi.*: God sent to us his own Word, who is his only son, by whose birth and sufferings for us, in the flesh that he took, we might know how much God prized man, and might be cleansed by that one sacrifice from all sins, and, love being spread abroad in our hearts by his Spirit, might conquer all difficulties, and come into eternal rest.— *Declaration on Ps. xcvi.*: Men were held captive under the devil, and served demons, but they have been redeemed from captivity. For they could sell themselves, but they could not redeem themselves. The Redeemer came, and gave the price, shed his own blood, and bought the whole world. Do you ask what he bought? See what he gave, and discover what he bought. The blood of Christ is the price. What is of so great value? What except the whole world? What except

all nations? Very ungrateful are they to their price, or very proud are they, who say either that that was so little as to buy Africans alone, or that they are themselves so great that it was given for them alone. Therefore let them not exult, nor be proud; he gave for the whole as much as he gave. He knows what he bought, because he knows for how much he bought it and how much he gave for it. — *On Ps. cxxix.*: Our priest received from us what he should offer for us, for he received from us flesh. In the flesh he was made a victim, he was made a whole burnt-offering, he was made a sacrifice. — *Against two Epistles of the Pelagians, Bk. iv. Chap. iv.*: But how do the Pelagians say that death alone passed to us through Adam? For if we die on this account, because he died, but he died because he sinned, they say that punishment passes over without fault, and that innocent children are punished by an unjust judgment by suffering death without deserving it. Which the Catholic faith acknowledges concerning the one sole Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who was thought worthy to suffer death for us, that is, the punishment of sin, without sin. For as he alone was made **345 b**] Son of Man in such a way that we might be made through him sons of God; so he alone received, without deserving it, punishment for us, that we through him might obtain pardon without meriting it. Because as no good was due to us, so no evil was due to him. — *Against Faustus the Manichæan, Bk. xiv. Chap. iv.*: Christ received without guilt our punishment, that thereby he might resolve our guilt, and also put an end to our punishment. — *The same in the Eighth Sermon concerning Time*: There is principally a twofold cause why the Son of God was made the Son of Man. One is, that, like man, by bearing all things for us, he might liberate us from the chains of sins. For so Isaiah the prophet had prophesied: "He bore our sins," etc. But the other cause of our Lord's passion is that he might excite us, whom he has redeemed by his own blood from vices and crimes, not only by the aid of instruction and grace, but also by his own example, to the pursuit of holiness. *Concerning Time, Sermon ci.*: Death could not be conquered except by death. Wherefore Christ bore death, that an unjust death might conquer a just death, and might liberate the guilty justly, while he was slain for them unjustly. — *And Sermon cxli.*: Our Lord Jesus Christ, by sharing punishment with us without fault, takes away both fault and punishment. — *On our Lord's Sermon in Luke, Sermon xxxvii.*: It is your fault that you are unjust; it is your punishment that you are mortal. That he might be your neighbor he undertook your punishment. He did not receive your sin. Or if he received it, he received it to destroy it, not to do it. — *And presently*: By receiving the punishment, and not receiving the sin, he has destroyed both sin and punishment.

*Cyril on Leviticus, Bk. x.*: Then all the people cried out that he should let Barrabas go, but deliver Jesus to death. Here you have the goat

which was sent away into the desert alive bearing the sins of the people, who cried out and said, Crucify, crucify. The one, therefore, was the goat sent away alive into the desert; and the other is the goat which was offered to the Lord a victim for propitiating sins again, and which made a true propitiation for the people believing in himself. — *The same against Julian, Bk. ix.*: See therefore the sacrament, and how it is well delineated in the two goats. For the he-goat, that is, the goat,<sup>1</sup> was slain for the sins of the priest and of the people, according to what was commanded in the law. But inasmuch as Christ was offered for our sins, he is brought into comparison with the goat. For, as the prophet Isaiah says, “All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.” For two goats are taken not because there are two Christs, that is, two Sons, as some think, but rather because it was proper that he who was even to be slain for us should be seen dying, indeed, according to the flesh, but living according to the spirit. — *The same on John, Bk. ii. Chap. i.*: One lamb is slain for all, that he might offer the whole race of man to God the Father. One for all that he may gain all, that all may live no longer to themselves, but to Christ, who died for all, and for all rose from the dead. For since we were in sin, and were therefore due to death and destruction, the Father gave his own Son for our redemption. [346 a One for all, since both all are in him and he is better than all. — *The same in the Homily delivered at Ephesus against Nestorius*: Truly these impious heretics are the sons of perdition and the seed of iniquity, who deny the Lord by whom they were bought. For we were bought with a price, not indeed corruptible, as gold and silver, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. But how would the blood of a common man like ourselves have been the redemption of the world?

*In the Exegesis to Valerian on the Incarnation of the Word, which may be found Concil. Eph. Vol. vi. Chap. xvii.*: He who was without a body as God, confesses that a body has been prepared for him, that, when it had been offered for us, he might heal us all by his own stripes, according to the word of the prophet. But how could one, having died for all, pay the just price for all, if we say that his suffering was that of any mere man? But if the Word, having suffered in his human nature, transferred upon himself the sufferings of his own flesh, as if they were his own, and claimed them for himself, then, and not until then, do we most rightly assert that the death of one according to the flesh has abounded to the life of all men.

**Theodoret, Question ix. upon Numbers**: For the Lord Christ alone, even as man, is blameless; and foreseeing this the prophet Isaiah cries, “Who did no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.” And for this reason

<sup>1</sup> [Lat. Caper enim, hoc est, hircus.]

he took upon him the sins of the rest, having none of his own. "For he," says the prophet, "hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." And the great John says: "Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world." For this cause, even among the dead, he is free, as having suffered death unjustly. — *The same, Sermon x. on Providence, introduces the Lord speaking as follows:* For I have paid the debt in behalf of the race. For, not owing death, I suffered death, and not being subject to death I accepted death, and being blameless I was enrolled among the blameworthy, and being free from debts I was yet numbered among the debtors. Therefore I paid the debt of nature, and, having suffered an unjust death, I abolish the just; and I, who have been unjustly held, release those who are justly held, from bondage. Behold nature's indictment taken away! Oh bitter death! Behold it nailed to the cross, and freed from the marks of sin! Behold how it has received no accusation of evil! Therefore the eyes of this body made payment for the evil-beholding eyes; the ears of this body, for the ears that had received defilement; the tongue, likewise the hands and the other parts, for the members of whatever kind that had committed iniquity. But since the debt was paid, it was fitting that those who had been imprisoned for it should be released from prison, and should receive their former liberty, and return to the country of their Father.

**346 b.] Proclus of Constantinople, Homily on the Nativity of Christ:** The nature of man owed much in consequence of sins, and was in perplexity over the debt. For through Adam all had been accused of sin; the devil held us slaves; he made boast of having purchased us, employing for a proof our much suffering body. The evil falsifier of the passions stood pressing the debt upon us, and demanding justice from us. There was therefore need of one of two things, — either that death, arising from the condemnation, should be laid upon all, since also all sinned; or that such a payment should be made in recompense as to satisfy every righteous demand. A man, therefore, could not save us; for he lay under the debt of sin. An angel could not redeem humanity, for he did not know how to provide such a ransom. It remained, therefore, that the sinless God should die in behalf of those who had sinned. For this was the only deliverance from the evil left. What then? He that brought all nature from nothingness into being, who was not perplexed to find a way of delivery, found out for them that were condemned a most sure life, and release most becoming to death, and is made man of a virgin in such a manner as he himself knows, — for reason is not able to interpret the wonder, — and dies in what he became, and paid the ransom in what he was; as Paul says: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." Oh great work! he purchased immortality for others, for he was himself immortal.

**347 a.] Leo concerning the Passion, Serm. xii.:** What hope do they leave for themselves in the safeguard of this sacrament who deny the truth of the

human substance in the body of our Lord? Can they tell by what sacrifice they have been reconciled, by what blood redeemed? Who is he who delivered himself for us an offering and a sacrifice for a sweet savor? Or what sacrifice was ever more consecrated than that which the true Priest laid upon the altar of the cross by the offering of his own flesh? For although the death of many saints was precious in the sight of the Lord, yet the slaying of no innocent one was the propitiation of the world. The just received, they did not bestow, crowns; and from the fortitude of the faithful have proceeded examples of patience, not gifts of justice. For the death of each one of them was single, nor did any one pay the debt of any other one by his death, since among the sons of men our Lord Jesus Christ alone has appeared, in whom all have been crucified, all dead, all buried, all also raised again.

**Claudianus Mamertus** on the *State of the Soul*, Bk. ii.: Hilary of Pictavium, in many of his lofty discussions, having a somewhat different opinion, asserted these two things in opposition to the truth; First, that nothing incorporeal was created; Second, that Christ felt no pain in his passion. But if his passion was not genuine, our redemption also could not be genuine.

**Anastatius Sinaita**, *Bishop of Antioch*, on the *True Doctrines of the Catholic Faith*, Bk. iv., on the *Passion and impassible Deity of Christ*: His blood was poured forth, which sufficed to redeem many, perhaps it were better to say *all*, for the *many* are even *all*.

**Procopius of Gaza**, on *Exodus* xxiv.: Since Christ is conjoined with the Father in nature, if we should be made partakers of him through the Spirit, we would be connected through him also with the Father, coming into the society of the divine nature. Nor did they ascend the mountain otherwise than sprinkled with the blood of Christ, who gave himself for us as the price of redemption, offering his flesh as a blameless sacrifice to God and the Father.

**Gregory the Great**, *Moral*, Bk. iii, ch. xiii.: Another, created for Paradise, would proudly seize upon the similitude of divine power, but nevertheless the Mediator atoned for the faults of this pride, without fault. Hence it is, that a certain wise man says to the Father: Since thou art just, thou justly disposest all things; thou also condemnest him who did not deserve to be punished. But we must consider how he is just, and justly disposes all things, if he condemns him who does not deserve to be punished. For our mediator did not deserve to be punished for himself, because he had contracted no pollution of sin. But, unless he suffered an undeserved death, he would never liberate us from deserved death. Since, therefore, the Father is just in punishing the just, he justly disposes all things, because he thereby justifies all things, in that he condemns him who without sin is for sinners.

**Isychius** on *Leviticus*, Chap. xvi.: The Law made the children of Israel

liable to curse and death, that on that account they might have the 347 necessary expiation; and in their behalf, indeed, principally, is the sacrifice of the Only-begotten slain. But he is slain also for all men, so that Caiaphas said, It is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And confirming what was said, and at the same time also correcting it, the evangelist John added: "This, however, he spake not 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," viz. the Gentiles. — *A little below*: Jesus was offered for Israel according to the flesh, and made an offering for all the human race for the expiation of our uncleannesses.

**Antiochus, in the Exomologesis**: Thy Word, stained with no least sprinkling of sin, whom thou didst send through the bowels of thy mercy, that he might call back into the way his own creation, was made flesh, suffered himself, for our sake, to be crucified, and abolished the handwriting that was against us, having been made a propitiation for our sins.

**Sophronius of Jerusalem, Epistle to Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople**: Christ thought fit to die for men, and for their redemption poured his own divine blood, and bestowed a gift more divine than every dignity — his own life.

**Elias of Crete, upon Oration i. of Nazianzen**: Christ is said to be redemption, as bringing us, sold to sin, into liberty, and because, for the expiation of the whole world, he gave himself, as it were, the price of redemption.

**Nicophorus of Constantinople, Epistle to Leo iii. which is extant in Baronius, Vol. ix. Annal. p. 587. Edit. Mor. ii.**: I believe that he was crucified, not in the substance in which he shines with the Father, although it is said that the Lord of glory was crucified, in the declaration of retribution, but in our earthly nature, in which he took upon him our earthly mass, and was made a curse for us, that he might make us partakers in the blessing which flows from him, and suffered to bear death according to the flesh of malefactors, that by sustaining the sting of death, he might condemn death in his own flesh, and destroy him who had the power of death, that is, the devil.

**Mark the Hermit, in his book concerning them that think themselves justified by Works, Chap. xx.**: Christ is master according to essence, and master according to the dispensation, because he both made them that [before] were not, and redeemed, through his own blood, them that were dead to sin, and bestowed grace upon them that thus believed.

**Theodore Abucara, Bishop of the Carians, Discussion xv. Chap. v.**: God, in his just judgment, demanded of us all things that were written in the law, when we were not competent to pay them; for that reason our

Lord paid them for us, and assumed the curse and condemnation to which we were exposed, and further took it upon himself. What things we ought to have suffered, he himself bore. — *The same, in the same place* : Now tell me, what those five enemies are from which Christ has liberated us.

A. Death ; the devil ; the curse of the law, and its condem- [348 a nation ; sin ; and hell.

B. As far as pertain to death, you have said that this was destroyed by the obedience of Christ ; so also you have told how it liberated us from servitude to the devil. Now tell us how he redeemed us from the curse of the law, having been made a curse for us ? — *After a little* :

A. God in his just judgment demanded of us all those things that were written in the law, when we were not competent to pay them ; for that reason Christ our Lord paid them for us, and assumed the curse and condemnation to which we were exposed, and further took it upon himself, and himself bore what things we ought to have suffered, having been scourged, spit upon, smitten, struck upon the ears, crucified, and put to death for us.

**Theophylact**, on those words (*Heb. i.*) “ *When he had by himself purged our sins* ” : When he had spoken of the majesty of the Divine Word, then he discoursed of the care which he took for men through his flesh, which was of much greater importance than that he sustains all things. Moreover, he lays down here two things, both that he cleansed us from sins, and that he did this through himself. For by the cross and death which he sustained he purged us, not only because he died for our sin, though he was himself free from all sin, and because he paid the penalty, which nevertheless he did not owe, for us, and freed that nature, which was condemned simply because of the sin and transgression of Adam, etc. — *On Chap. ix.* : Christ died for this purpose that he might cleanse us, and left to us in his testament pardon of our fault, and the use of our Father's goods, having been made a Mediator of our Father. For the Father was not willing to bestow upon us the inheritance, but was angry with us, as sons rejecting him, and estranged from him. Christ, so made Mediator, reconciled him to us. How ? He himself bore for us that which we ought to have suffered (for we deserved to die), and made us worthy of his testament.

**Anselm**, on the Conception of the Virgin, and Original Sin, *Chap. xxi.* : Does any one say, If they have not each the sin of Adam, how do you assert that none is saved without satisfaction for the sin of Adam ? For how does a just God exact from them satisfaction for that which they have not ? To which I say : God does not exact from any sinner more than he owes ; but since none can pay as much as he owes, Christ alone paid more than is due for all that are saved.

**Bernard**, *Epistle cxc. to Innocent* : It was a man who owed, a man who paid. For if one, he says, died for all, then all died, viz. that the satisfac-

tion of one may be imputed to all, just as he alone bore the sins of all; nor is there any one found to purchase, and another one to make satisfaction, because one Christ is head and body. The head, therefore, made satisfaction for the members, Christ for his own bowels.

**Arnold Carnotensis**, in his work upon the Seven last Words spoken by Christ upon the Cross, *Treatise* i. : He is deserted with them that are deserted, and pays tribute for the nature which he had assumed, and, purposing to convey his race with him beyond the sea of this world, he gave the rapacious pirates the passage-money of his own flesh, and deceived their greedy teeth glued together, and took off, and carried away, both himself and his prey. For debtors he offered himself a debtor, and, what he did not owe of himself, he, of his own accord, refused not to owe, and so the exactor took of him who gave himself for all the sum of the whole debt.

**Nicetas Choniates** in his *Annals*, found in *John Commenus* : Christ, who stretched out his hands upon the cross, and brought the whole world into unity with a few drops, by his own fall raised again our fallen nature.

**Nicolaus of Cusa**, *Cardinal, Excitationes*, Bk. x. : For our justification did Christ so do. For we, sinners, in him paid the penalties of hell, which we justly deserved.

**Rabbi Albo**, *Chap. xxv, Oration* iii, of the *Book on עֲקָרָה*<sup>1</sup> : Besides the wise among them are accustomed to bear penalties and punishments due to a multitude of sins. For so we have found that God commanded Ezekiel the prophet to lie upon his side and sustain punishment, in bearing upon himself the iniquity of the house of Israel, and so it is not to be wondered at, if the priest is punished for the sin of the people.

**Varro** : *Lustrum*, derived from *luo*, that is, to pay, because every fifth year taxes and tribute were paid through the censurers.

**Lucan** : *Hic redimet sanguis populos, hac caede luetur*

*Quidquid Romani meruerunt pendere mores.*<sup>2</sup>

**Julius Firmicus** : That the offence being mitigated, he might compose man with God by fortunate reconciliation.

**John Arn.** Bk. ii. p. 480 : God did not lack other modes of redeeming.

**Sapient.** *Contr.* : The causes why the human race must have been so redeemed, in this infirmity we do not yet discern, but after this they will be an object of study in all eternity.

**Livy.** The word *piaculum* is employed by *Livy*, concerning the *Decii*.

**Servius on Aen.** iii. (*See Theol. notat.* iv. 18, sq.) : To be lustrated is to be liberated from the hatred of the gods.

**Pliny**, Bk. iii. *Epistle* ix. : Finally, that the most powerful, having

<sup>1</sup> [Probably עֲקָרָה, foreign residents among the Hebrews.]

<sup>2</sup> [Prose translation : This blood shall redeem the peoples, by this slaughter shall be atoned whatever Roman manners have deserved to pay.]

given some very cheap thing, as a kind of piacular offering, might not escape other punishment.

**Salv. :** Government cannot be, except there is just judgment in the ruler (21).

**Ovid :** *Hanc animam pro meliore damus.*<sup>1</sup>

[NOTE. — A number of references previously omitted are given by the editor of the folio at this point, which have been also omitted by the translator because their proper places are quite uncertain.]

---

## ARTICLE II.

### THE FIRMAMENT.

BY CHARLES B. WARRING, PH.D., POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y.

AT the present day, when scientific literature is so permeated with the belief that, whatever else may be good and true in our Bible, its account of the creation of the world is of necessity to be rejected, it becomes those who love truth to see whether the apparent difficulties in the Mosaic narrative really belong there, or whether they have been interpolated in the translations by the mistaken zeal of its friends. This duty becomes the more important when we see that the opponents of revelation base their arguments largely upon certain statements in this story which they claim to be errors of fact.

It would be interesting to examine all these "errors"; but I shall for the present confine myself to one which is constantly harped upon by those who reject the Mosaic account, and in reference to which, unfortunately, their assertions are sustained by lexicons and Bible dictionaries, as far as I have examined.

"Whoever," these persons say, "wrote the first chapter of Genesis left upon record the assertion that 'God made a firmament,' by which was necessarily conveyed to the Hebrews then living the idea of something solid, a strong crystalline arch, rising as a dome above the earth, and separating the waters in the seas below it from certain other

<sup>1</sup> ["This life for a better we give."]