

tack the doctrine of satisfaction itself. Satisfaction and forgiveness mutually exclude each other. Satisfaction pays the debt ; how then can it be forgiven ? If forgiven why need it be paid ? If it be said that the person who owes the debt is forgiven, because it is not demanded of him but of another ; Socinus then asks, how can a debt be asked except of the one who owes it, or the one who assumes it ? If *paid* by either, how can it be forgiven ? Moreover, punishment is strictly a personal thing. The idea of punishment involves that of guilt. If transferred to the innocent, it ceases to be punishment. Punishment, therefore, cannot be assumed like a debt. Again, satisfaction supposes both the justice and the mercy of God in exercise. But the exercise of mercy would be a free pardon, that of justice determined punishment.

As a matter of fact, satisfaction is impossible, and could never have been made. Every sinner deserves eternal death. The substitute then should endure eternal death for every individual sinner, which is impossible. But in fact Christ did not endure it at all, for he rose from the dead in three days, and has ascended into heaven. Paul says, that " If Christ be not risen, we are yet in our sins." But if his death freed us from sin, his resurrection is unnecessary. Nor was the death of Christ a punishment, since it was the means of his exaltation and glory. If it be said, that Christ made an infinite satisfaction through the dignity of his person, Socinus, replies, that with God " there is no respect of persons." Christ could not suffer as God, and if he could have done so, this Divine suffering would have been no proper satisfaction for human sin. Nor, lastly, could God make satisfaction to himself.

Nor did it escape the acuteness of Faustus Socinus,