

that active and passive obedience are contradictory to each other. The one either excludes the other, or makes it unnecessary. Christ could not make satisfaction by his active obedience, for he was bound to obey God on his own account. His obedience was rewarded by his own elevation to glory, it could not therefore have been rewarded by the salvation of others. Nor could the obedience of one have made satisfaction for that due by all. However exalted his person, he could only do, what each owes, *i.e.*, obey God perfectly.

In addition to these arguments, Socinus adduced others founded on the nature of man, which we cannot stop to insert here. This bold and profound attack was met by a sufficiently tame reply from the Protestant theologians. They merely repeated again their previous formulas, and relied mainly on the Scripture argument. But here again they were met by their skilful opponents by a mode of interpretation, which was original with Socinus, and which has never been sufficiently carried out since his time. Socinus collected all the texts referring to the death of Christ or to the forgiveness of sin, and arranged them in four classes. Placing in the first class the texts which speak of Christ's death as a ransom or redemption, he easily showed that these were to be taken figuratively. In the second class were those which spoke of Christ as dying for our sins, which he explained as meaning that he died on account of our sins, and in order that we might be freed from them. The third class of texts include those in which it is said that Christ took our sins on himself, or took them away. These either mean that he has taken them away by making us good, or borne them, as one may bear the consequences of another's sin. The