T.U.L.I.P. (The Five Points of Calvinism)

Basically, Calvinism is known by an acronym: T.U.L.I.P.

The Five Points of Calvinism

There are two mains camps of theology within Christianity in America today: Arminianism and Calvinism. Calvinism is a system of biblical interpretation taught by John Calvin. Calvin lived in France in the 1500’s at the time of Martin Luther who sparked the Reformation.

The system of Calvinism adheres to a very high view of scripture and seeks to derive its theological formulations based solely on God’s word. It focuses on God’s sovereignty, stating that God is able and willing by virtue of his omniscience, omnipresence, and omnipotence, to do whatever He desires with His creation. It also maintains that within the Bible are the following teachings: That God, by His sovereign grace predestines people into salvation; that Jesus died only for those predestined; that God regenerates the individual where he is then able and wants to choose God; and that it is impossible for those who are redeemed to lose their salvation.

Arminianism, on the other hand, maintains that God predestined, but not in an absolute sense. Rather, He looked into the future to see who would pick him and then He chose them. Jesus died for all peoples’ sins who have ever lived and ever will live, not just the Christians. Each person is the one who decides if he wants to be saved or not. And finally, it is possible to lose your salvation (some arminians believe you cannot lose your salvation).
Basically, Calvinism is known by an acronym: T.U.L.I.P.

**Total Depravity (also known as Total Inability and Original Sin)**

**Unconditional Election**

**Limited Atonement (also known as Particular Atonement)**

**Irresistible Grace**

**Perseverance of the Saints (also known as Once Saved Always Saved)**

These five categories do not comprise Calvinism in totality. They simply represent some of its main points.

**Total Depravity:**

Sin has affected all parts of man. The heart, emotions, will, mind, and body are all affected by sin. We are completely sinful. We are not as sinful as we could be, but we are completely affected by sin.

The doctrine of Total Depravity is derived from scriptures that reveal human character: Man’s heart is evil (Mark 7:21-23) and sick (Jer. 17:9). Man is a slave of sin (Rom. 6:20). He does not seek for God (Rom. 3:10-12). He cannot understand spiritual things (1 Cor. 2:14). He is at enmity with God (Eph. 2:15). And, is by nature a child of wrath (Eph. 2:3). The Calvinist asks the question, “In light of the scriptures that declare man’s true nature as being utterly lost and incapable, how is it possible for anyone to choose or desire God?” The answer is, “He cannot. Therefore God must predestine.”

Calvinism also maintains that because of our fallen nature we are born again not by our own will but God’s will (John
God grants that we believe (Phil. 1:29); faith is the work of God (John 6:28-29); God appoints people to believe (Acts 13:48); and God predestines (Eph. 1:1-11; Rom. 8:29; 9:9-23).

**Unconditional Election:**
God does not base His election on anything He sees in the individual. He chooses the elect according to the kind intention of His will (Eph. 1:4-8; Rom. 9:11) without any consideration of merit within the individual. Nor does God look into the future to see who would pick Him. Also, as some are elected into salvation, others are not (Rom. 9:15, 21).

**Limited Atonement:**
Jesus died only for the elect. Though Jesus’ sacrifice was sufficient for all, it was not efficacious for all. Jesus only bore the sins of the elect. Support for this position is drawn from such scriptures as Matt. 26:28 where Jesus died for ‘many’; John 10:11, 15 which say that Jesus died for the sheep (not the goats, per Matt. 25:32-33); John 17:9 where Jesus in prayer interceded for the ones given Him, not those of the entire world; Acts 20:28 and Eph. 5:25-27 which state that the Church was purchased by Christ, not all people; and Isaiah 53:12 which is a prophecy of Jesus’ crucifixion where he would bore the sins of many (not all).

**Irresistible Grace:**
When God calls his elect into salvation, they cannot resist. God offers to all people the gospel message. This is called the external call. But to the elect, God extends an internal call and it cannot be resisted. This call is by the Holy Spirit who works in
the hearts and minds of the elect to bring them to repentance and regeneration whereby they willingly and freely come to God. Some of the verses used in support of this teaching are Romans 9:16 where it says that “it is not of him who wills nor of him who runs, but of God who has mercy”; Philippians 2:12-13 where God is said to be the one working salvation in the individual; John 6:28-29 where faith is declared to be the work of God; Acts 13:48 where God appoints people to believe; and John 1:12-13 where being born again is not by man’s will, but by God’s. “All that the Father gives Me shall come to Me, and the one who comes to Me I will certainly not cast out,” (John 6:37).

Perseverance of the Saints:
You cannot lose your salvation. Because the Father has elected, the Son has redeemed, and the Holy Spirit has applied salvation, those thus saved are eternally secure. They are eternally secure in Christ. Some of the verses for this position are John 10:27-28 where Jesus said His sheep will never perish; John 6:47 where salvation is described as everlasting life; Romans 8:1 where it is said we have passed out of judgment; 1 Corinthians 10:13 where God promises to never let us be tempted beyond what we can handle; and Phil. 1:6 where God is the one being faithful to perfect us until the day of Jesus’ return.

Now what does the Bible say? Let’s look at the The Parable of the Sower Shall we?
1 The same day went Jesus out of the house, and sat by the sea side.

2 And great multitudes were gathered together unto him, so that he went into a ship, and sat; and the whole multitude stood on the shore.

3 And he spake many things unto them in parables, saying, Behold, a sower went forth to sow; 4 And when he sowed, some seeds fell by the way side, and the fowls came and devoured them up:

5 Some fell upon stony places, where they had not much earth: and forthwith they sprung up, because they had no deepness of earth:
6 And when the sun was up, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they withered away.

7 And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprung up, and choked them:

8 But other fell into good ground, and brought forth fruit, some an hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold.

9 Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.

10 And the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables?

11 He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given.

12 For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath.

13 Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand.

14 And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive:

15 For this people’s heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.
16 But blessed are your eyes, for they see: and your ears, for they hear.

17 For verily I say unto you, That many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them.

18 Hear ye therefore the parable of the sower.

19 When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he which received seed by the way side.

20 But he that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon (soon; shortly) with joy receiveth it;

21 Yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while: for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended.

22 He also that received seed among the thorns is he that heareth the word; and the care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful.

23 But he that received seed into the good ground is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it; which also beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some an hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty.
4 Conditions of the Heart that Increases in Complexity

Reading this Parable Jesus Himself states that All people does have the choice to Salvation, Not just the elect.

There’s the Path

They hear the word and it is quickly stolen from them, Example: Atheists, Agnostics.

Rocky Places

They hear the word they go home to their family and is talked out of what they have heard.

Thorns

They hear the word then cares of this world choke out their faith, These people are so close yet so far! Example: no one knows who the authors of the books of the Bible are, or the Bible isn’t accurate anymore. (I say hogwash to this one, you mean the Almighty that created numerous and by that I mean countless, boundless universes can’t keep track of a few words?)

Good Soil

They hear the word and Praise God they keep their Salvation!
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PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

Reader,

Herein you will find some very old-fashioned divinity, divinity as old as the Prayer Book (as you may see for yourself by consulting the XVII. Article)—yea, older than that—as old as the Bible itself, which informs us that it is as old as the World; yea, older than even that! for the purpose of God to give everlasting life and glory to a people chosen in Christ Jesus, was from all Eternity! (as you may also see for yourself by consulting 2 Tim. i. 9; Titus i. 1, 2; 1 Pet. i. 19, 20; Rev. xiii. 8; Rom. viii. 28—30; and scores of similar texts).

It is divinity that never met with any favour from the world, and is to this hour as much contemned and despised as ever. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, when man by nature is at enmity and war with Him from whose
mind it emanated? It is not likely that God in His
great wisdom, and man in his great folly, should hit upon
the same plan of salvation. Man unchanged is a fool:
God is all-wise. Man unchanged is a proud and imperious
fool: God will suffer no dictation, He being Sovereign.
Man unchanged wants to govern—wants to reign—wants
to have no master—no teacher—no ruler, and most cer-
tainly not an absolute ruler: God is such a ruler, doing
as He pleases, and giving no account of His matters. It
is not to be wondered at, then, that these parties should
not coincide in one another's views and schemes.

But let me speak more pointedly to you.

You may, for anything I know, be a dear child of
God's. If you are already "called," I know you will
thank me for my poor labours; if you are not "called,"
I humbly, yet firmly, submit to your consideration the
awful position you at present occupy. It matters not
whether you are high or low, rich or poor, educated or
uneducated, gifted or ungifted, if you are at enmity with
the God of revelation, you are without the slightest
foundation for hope of salvation. I ask you to read
calmly and dispassionately the following pages. I think
I have been enabled to bring both Scripture and right
reason to bear upon the points in debate between you and
God. If God did not employ means, such as argument for instance, for convincing His people, and stopping the mouths of gainsayers, I had not dared to enlist in His cause the feeble weapons of logic and common sense. But the Lord Jesus Christ has left us an example; and Paul was a keen disputant. Whence we may gather, I am not diverging from the right path in this matter. Reason alone will never do the work of conversion. Many thousands have been converted whose reasoning powers were and are very questionable, and many highly gifted reasoners have never been converted. It is the Holy Spirit who must do the work. But God may choose to bless the means of argument herein employed to convince and convert you.

Perhaps, hitherto, you have never questioned whether you were right or wrong. Haply you are a churchman, and have been content to believe as your neighbours, or as your minister. Haply you are a dissenter, and have been perfectly satisfied with the prayers and ministrations of him who serves in the chapel; but now just suppose for an instant the bare possibility of your minister, or preacher, or teacher, or neighbours, being all wrong! What then?

It is not impossible! Churches have erred—woefully
erred; bishops have erred; pastors, and preachers, and teachers—all have erred; and why may not you?

Bear with me whilst I fearlessly tell you, that he that believes anything because it is the doctrine of this or of that Church, even supposing it to be a scriptural doctrine, has never been awakened by God. Such a one has virtually surrendered his soul into the keeping of his fellow-man, and is, to all intents and purposes, a papist in heart.

Reader, let me tell you in all honesty, that it is not enough for you and me that the most wise, and learned, and amiable of men have believed in this or that dogma. The most wise, and learned, and amiable have erred—grievously erred, from "the faith as once delivered to the saints."

As long as that sentence remains upon record, "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. ii. 14), so long must you or I not accept or reject any doctrine upon the ipse dixit of any man, or any body of men. Learned men differ and have differed from each other, on the most important points in divinity. Doctrines are held—tenaciously held—
in adjoining dioceses, parishes, and districts. All cannot be right. Search the Scriptures, and see. It is the blessed consolation of the poor children of the Church of Christ, that they "all shall be taught of God" (John vi. 45). Were it not for this assurance, we should despair of getting at the mind of God in this thick night of terror and confusion, which the conflicting opinions of men and Churches have flung around us.

THE AUTHOR.

Openshaw, March 1st, 1858.
PREFACE TO FIRST EDITION.

MY DEAR FRIENDS,

The following Sermons you heard delivered extempore, i.e. not without study, but without manuscripts, and, consequently, I could not undertake to reproduce them verbatim et literatim; but I trust you can bear testimony to the fidelity with which their substance is now presented to you.

They are published at the urgent request of many of you, and not to gratify any morbid vanity or ambition of my own, for in truth I have none.

Many of the arguments are those of very superior men to myself. Indeed, as I take a glance at the whole, I am almost induced to say with a celebrated French writer, "I have culled a bouquet of varied flowers from man's gardens, and nothing is my own but the string that ties them." Yet, much is my own. Take it for what it is worth, and if you get any benefit therefrom, give the praise and honour to God.

I dare say the publication now in your hands will bring down maledictions and denunciations upon my poor head;
but these I am used to. As I live before God to-day, I believe these Sermons to contain the very pith and marrow of His Word; and to Him I commit them. I may, however, be permitted to say this much in anticipation of the coming assault: if they should fall into the hands of "professional" critics (for others I care not), all I beg is, that they do not trouble themselves with the style of my composition, but that they logically and honourably apply their acumen to the arguments. If they can overthrow these, they will find in me an ingenuous opponent. I will publicly acknowledge my error.

It will not do to say "pooh, pooh," "eccentric," "crotchety," "one-sided view of Christianity," * "harping upon one string," &c., &c. I simply ask, are these doctrines true, or not true? If they are true, why sneer at them? If they are not true, disprove them!

* Nothing is so common as this saying—nothing so utterly pointless, meaningless, and absurd.

I wish to be informed how many sides has Christianity? Has she two or more faces? one for the Arminian, another for the Calvinist? Then, I suppose, she has one for the Papist, and one for the Socinian. For why not? If Christianity be as a wondrous statue (as our opponents I fancy mean to represent her when they talk of looking at Christianity from this and from that point of view), presenting different features to each as he walks round her, she, of course, has one side where free will is represented with benign expression, and free grace is hidden from view, and another where the unalterable decrees of God are brought cut into bold relief, and another which represents God as variable as the wind, and the creature as Sovereign Lord! If there be more
Neither will it avail to say "great men have differed upon these points;" for one party or the other must be woefully wrong: and all the "great" men in the world cannot save, or help to save you or me! No. The greatest and ripest scholar, the most profound philosopher, the most erudite professor, when he comes to die, cannot help himself, much less another! Ay, when the cold and clammy sweat of death is upon yon doctor's brow; when the voice of yon preacher becomes clogged by approaching dissolution; when this or that idol of the religious world has made his last harangue in favour of free will, and comes to gurgle out his fast-failing breath upon a bed of death,—where, where is his authority, influence, or power? Nowhere! Poor, helpless, vanishing sinner, haply terrified with the awful prospect before him, after deceiving, and being deceived!

O! cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils, for wherein is he to be accounted of? Isaiah ii. 22.

than one side, or one face, or one appearance in Christianity, this must be a fair illustration. Now, I ask, why not have a side for the Papist, where the Virgin Mary might be seen to great advantage (for surely she was blessed amongst women); and why not have another side for the Socinian, where the Divinity of Christ would be veiled (for surely there is as much said of Christ as man as there is said of Him as God)? I should be glad to be informed what men mean when they talk of taking this or that view of Christianity, from this or that point: for to my eyes, she is one, like her glorious Originator, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. All her features exhibited at all times and in all seasons without any variableness or shadow of turning.
The questions for you and me to discuss are:—Are we convinced of our fall and ruin in Adam? Have we an interest in Christ? How do we know? Are we taking things for granted? Are we receiving our divinity second-hand? Have we right conceptions of the Christ of God? for if we have not, we are at present as hopeless as the heathen! we might as well be worshippers of Mahomet or Confucius!

I pray God to bless the perusal of these Sermons to your souls' edification.
THE FALL OF MAN.

"All have sinned and come short of the glory of God."—
Rom. iii. 23.

In accordance with my promise of last Sunday, I am now about to refresh your memories upon the leading doctrines of the Word of God.

You all very well know that I am not one to exalt doctrine above practice; they must go hand in hand; yet a clear knowledge of each of the revelations of God is so desirable for him who would aspire to the title of an educated Christian, so necessary for him who would worship God "with the spirit and the understanding also," and so calculated to inflame the love of him who has just begun to see the preciousness of Christ, that I conceive our time will be well spent in re-examining the foundations of our creed on the present occasion, and on the next four Sunday afternoons.

Besides which, as there is a culpable practice, and alas, a very general one abroad of keeping back from the gaze and admiration of the Church
THE FALL OF MAN.

the great truths of God's Word—as there appears to me to be an attempt on the part of certain, so-called, evangelical preachers to mystify what is perfectly plain, to throw a slur upon those who would earnestly contend for the faith as once delivered unto the saints—as there is a manifest confounding of mysteries with facts, of what is revealed with what is not revealed, I feel constrained to "put you in remembrance of these things, though ye know them, and be established in the present truth." Mysteries, no doubt, there are in God's word and God's mind, but it is no mystery that man is fallen and corrupt, it is no mystery that God has from all eternity elected a peculiar people to glory, it is no mystery that Christ has died for that people, it is no mystery that the Holy Ghost has undertaken to regenerate them, and that neither men nor devils can rob Jehovah of one of those precious jewels. These things are revealed.

Thus I have more than one good reason for bringing before you those leading truths of the Bible, and I now propose to handle them in due order;* and O may the God of all grace and wisdom and truth be with us whilst we meditate upon what He has been pleased to teach us!

* This is not a strictly correct expression in this connection; for ELECTION took place before the fall of man, but I deemed it expedient, for the sake of clearness, to prove the fall in the first place.
I would first descant upon the necessity of having clear ideas upon "the Fall of Man;" secondly, I would prove the fall and ruin of man by Scripture and reason; thirdly, I would make some general remarks upon the whole.

I.—The need for clear conceptions upon the point.

As long as a man has the remotest idea that his health is not seriously impaired, he will never have recourse either to medicine or physician; as long as he believes he is possessed of innate strength, he will never abandon dependance upon himself; as long as he believes he has a personal dignity derivable from his ancestors, or acquired by his own goodness or virtue, he will never cease to carry himself proudly: but once undeceive him, once prove to him that he is really ill, without strength, and devoid of honour or nobility, and then there is a fair prospect of him changing his course and his deportment.

It is precisely so with man as regards God. As long as man fancies he can do something towards his own salvation, as long as he thinks he is possessed of power or will to do good, as long as he imagines he can give a helping hand to Christ to save his soul—so long will he occupy a false position, so long will he carry himself presumptuously before God; but once dash man's absurdities to pieces, once prove free will to do good
in man to be a lie, a delusion and a snare, once blow to the winds man's notions of health, strength, beauty and dignity, and then there is some prospect of him looking unto Him in whom alone help lies, or, at least, some hope that he will cease to boast.

Mark you, I do not insinuate that a mere intellectual knowledge of man's fall and ruin will bring man to his right mind, or induce him to employ the Great Physician, for it is a truth that no knowledge without the regenerating power of the Spirit of God, has any power to lead a soul to Christ; but, speaking after the manner of men, I say it is not at all likely that a man who is without such knowledge would ever go to God, and that it is more than probable that a man with such knowledge would begin to think seriously. Means of themselves are powerless, but the Lord uses means to carry out his purposes; and in the hope of the Lord employing these means, I would boldly, fearlessly, and unmistakably tell man—"You are a fallen, ruined, and powerless creature, and until you know it, you are living without hope, and without God in the world!"

Be assured, my brethren, that it is the absurd and unscriptural notion of innate power, and strength, and dignity in man, that keeps so many professing Christians in darkness, and hopelessness, and practical infidelity.

"What," says Luther, "if any one intending
to compose a poem or an oration, should never think about his abilities, what he could do, and what he could not do, or what the subject he had undertaken required, but should rush upon the undertaking or think thus:—'I must strive to get the work done, it is superfluous to enquire whether the learning I have, the eloquence I have, the force of genius I have, be equal to the task?' or what, if any one desiring to have a plentiful crop, should not trouble himself to examine the nature of the soil, but should rush on at once, thinking of nothing but the work, and plough the sea shore, and cast in the seed wherever the soil was turned up, whether sand or mud? or what, if any one about to make war, and desiring a glorious victory, should not take the trouble to deliberate upon what it was in his power to do, whether the treasury could furnish money, whether the soldiers were fit, &c.—but should rush forward with his eyes blinded and his ears stopped, only exclaiming 'war, war.' What, I ask, would you think of such poets, such husbandmen, such generals?"*

If any one going to build a tower sits not down first and counts the cost, whether he has enough to finish it, what does Christ say of him? Luke xiv. 28.

And is he not a fit object for mockery? Surely

* Luther on the Bondage of the Will.
so! Believe me, so is he who sets about the work of reformation in himself, to repent and believe, to build a tower whose top is to reach to heaven, before he knows what ability he possesses for such work.

"Ah!" says some one, "this is vain, and curious, and superfluous! Work, work! never mind what you can do, or what you cannot do, but do your best, and leave the result to God."

To this, alas, but too common an exhortation, I reply by asking a plain question, viz.: why should we not exercise ordinary precaution and judgment in sacred things, as well as in secular things? who would think of exhorting any one to do this in either art or science? Suppose it to be a fact (which I shall prove directly) that man can do nothing in the way of working, before God wills to take him in hand—suppose it to be a fact that everything which unconverted man does, or can do, partakes of the nature of sin—how dare I attempt to set him on working? Depend upon it, "God is not mocked! whatsoever a man sows that shall he reap." If he sows sin, he shall reap sin; if he sows impertinence, he shall reap impertinence; if he sows ignorance, he shall reap ignorance.

"When you enjoin men to become rash workers," says the great Luther to Erasmus,

* Article XIII.
"and charge them not to be curious about what they can do and what they cannot do in obtaining eternal salvation, this evidently, and in reality, is the sin unpardonable. For while they know not what or how much they can do, they will not know what to do; and if they know not what to do, they cannot repent when they do wrong; and impenitence is the unpardonable sin. To this does that moderate and sceptical theology of yours lead." And again, "if I know not how much I can do myself, how far my ability extends, and what I can do God-wards, I shall be equally uncertain and ignorant how much God is to do, how far His ability is to extend, and what He is to do toward me: whereas it is God that worketh all in all. But if I know not the distinction between our working, and the power of God, I know not God Himself; and if I know not God, I cannot worship Him, praise Him, give Him thanks, or serve Him, for I shall not know how much I ought to ascribe unto myself, how much unto God. It is necessary, therefore, to hold the most certain distinction between the power of God, and our power—the working of God, and our working, if we would live in His fear."

Such, my hearers, is the testimony of a wonderfully taught man, of one who was a giant in his day—a giant in the midst of giants, and in comparison with whom every modern theologian
is but a puling infant. Yet, though giant he was, we do not pin our faith upon his sleeve. It is simply because we believe him to have been taught by the Holy Ghost we quote him, and to remind you that what I am insisting upon was a doctrine of the reformation.

Believe me, man's amount of ability to do good is *Nil*—actually nothing! and that he can no more get to heaven by anything he can do, than can the blockhead make a poem or an oration, the simpleton get a crop who ploughs the sand, or the fanatic a victory who will go to war without men or money! In short, man by nature is fallen, ruined, and totally incapable of thinking a good thought—and now to the proof.

II.—*Proof of the fall of man from Scripture and Reason.*

That man is fallen, most professing Christians grant: but what they mean by the term "*fallen*" is not very easy to understand. I believe that the general impression upon the subject is that man is now mortal, that he is not in the condition in which he came forth from the forming hand of

* This expression has been taken exception to, but I see no reason for altering it, for notwithstanding that many modern divines are clearer and sounder on some points than Luther, I ask what would the best of them have been in Luther's place?
his Creator, that he is liable to sickness and disease, that he is subject to infirmities which require judicious treatment, and that he is doomed to eat his bread in the sweat of his brow; but that notwithstanding these drawbacks, if he employ his powers to the best of his ability, he will be happy at last.

I fancy that this is the view that nineteen-twentieths of the professingly Christian world hold of the fall of man. Say, is it not the view of many of you? But oh! how short of the truth! How dreadfully delusive are such imperfect conceptions as these! Into what awful error do they lead both clergy and laity—ministers and people—preachers and hearers!

Infirmities—sickness—disease—even corporeal death itself, are but comparative trifles in connection with the dreadful fact of man's fall. The dissolution of soul and body is nothing in comparison with destruction from the presence of the Lord! Death with all its gloomy horrors would be but a harmless monster, if separation from the source of purity, holiness and happiness, were not in its wake! Infirmity and lust and passion would be but as thorns to the rose, if incapacity for good, hatred and enmity towards God, were not the chief consequences of the fall of man!

The account of what befell Adam after his fall is so short that much is not to be expected from
and besides, he was so quickly recovered by the grace of God, and brought to repentance for his sin, and had so early the revelation of the seed of the woman as a Saviour from this and all other sins, that the mischief effected by his fall is not so manifest in him as in his posterity. It is by consulting the scriptures that we are enabled to comprehend the full extent of this sad and terrible calamity.

From these we learn that man by the fall became wholly dead in sin, was made liable to all the miseries of this life, and to death both temporal, spiritual and eternal, and rendered utterly unable to help himself out of that miserable condition for ever.

Listen to the Holy Ghost’s description of man through the fall,—Mere darkness, Eph. v. 8, and 1 Cor. ii. 14; with a heart of stone, Ezek. xxxvi. 26; under the dominion of sin and Satan, Acts xxvi. 18; dead in trespasses and sins, Eph. ii. 1—5; without strength in spiritual things, Rom. v. 6; whose carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be! Rom. viii. 7.*

* Some have expounded ἐρώτημα τῆς σαρκὸς sensuality; but, as far as I understand the words, they will not bear this interpretation. Ἐρώτημα denotes the best part of fallen and corrupt man, even his wisdom. And if the very wisdom of the flesh is death and enmity, how much more the foolishness!

I cannot but believe that a vast amount of error has been
What can be more clear and distinct and unmistakable than this? O think!

"ENMITY AGAINST GOD!"

Not merely an enemy but enmity itself—enmity personified—enmity in the abstract, evidently denoting an excess! (An enemy may be reconciled, but enmity cannot; a vicious man may become virtuous, but vice cannot.) And see, too, there is clearly a declaration of impotency here—"it is not subject to the law of God, neither can it be!" and hence man's recovery out of this sad state is expressly termed in scripture, a regeneration, a spiritual resurrection, a quickening and raising from the death of sin to a life of grace, a new creation, and God's own workmanship—Tit. iii. 5; Eph. ii. 1; Eph. ii. 10; Jno. v. 24—5.

spread abroad through the supposition that the Apostle, when speaking of "lust" and "concupisence," necessarily meant sensuality or impurity. The word ἐπιθυμία, translated "concupisence" in the 7th of Rom. means irregular desire: and we all know that such may extend to many things besides the grosser passions. There are many lusts of the flesh besides those forbidden by the 7th commandment. (See Gal. vi. 19—21.) In Eph. ii. 3, the desires of the flesh and of the mind are included in the lusts of the flesh. Man may be comparatively pure with regard to the baser passions, yet be an enemy of God's, vainly puffed up in his fleshly mind (νοὺς σαρκίς), lusting after riches, and honours, and power, with as much detriment to his soul as if he had followed the impure practices of the old Romans or Corinthians.
By the fall the very child hates God, as well as the most moral of men and the most amiable and virtuous of women; by which I mean, they do not hate God, as He is goodness, but as they apprehend something in Him that is contrary to their own sense of right. We hear continually of men declaring their love for God, adoring the Creator, and declaring their ecstasies and raptures in contemplating His works (the reality of this feeling I am not questioning; I hold it to be an impossibility for any sane man to refuse the expression of his admiration of the works of God): but I ask, will these parties love and adore God when He is described as He describes Himself—viz., as a Judge, as a Lawgiver who will assuredly punish for the slightest breach of His laws? Will they, can they love God, when they are informed that He is a Sovereign who does according to His own will, giving no account of His matters; that they, with all their wisdom, and virtue, and love, and philanthropy, &c., are obnoxious to His wrath for their sin and fall in Adam? Will they, or can they love God, when they find Him curbing them, crossing them, chastening them, afflicting them? Nay, nay,—they will then, doubtless, show their natural, carnal disposition; it is then that the enmity exhibits itself; it was dormant as long as God was what they thought He should be, as long as He suffered them to have their own way, as long
as they might, as it were, dictate their own terms of obedience: but now, since they cannot do as they desire, they hate the Lawmaker; and since they have discovered that they are as clay in the hands of the potter, they hate the great Creator, no matter how they may attempt to deceive themselves or us as to the fact.

By the fall, all mankind became subject to him who has the power of death, that is the devil; and in this death, under this condemnation, arising from the disobedience of one (Rom. v.) you and I were begotten in the image of our parents. Thus our nature is entirely perverse and perverted, and our conduct foolish; we are dead in trespasses and sins, without God and without hope in the world, creatures entirely after our kind, nature and constitution, the imaginations of our hearts being only evil, and that continually, altogether carnal with all that is in and belonging to us, with all our faculties and members, body, soul, reason, will, and affections.

Oh! what folly and ignorance it is to suppose that the death consequent upon the fall was mere corporeal death—that the sentence, "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return," was the fulfilment of the threat, "in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die!"

Death as it is represented in the separation of soul and body, although an emblem of spiritual
or moral death, a type of the wrath to come, is something very different from the death which Adam incurred. This is apparent from Christ's declarations—"If a man keep my sayings he shall never see death," John viii. 51; "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die," John xi. 26; for our believing in Christ will not prevent our returning to the dust.* And again, "as the blessing promised to obedience 'do this and thou shalt live;' certainly meant something much greater than mere animal life," well observes Dr. Hawker, "and implied sweet fellowship and communion with God; so the curse on disobedience, 'dying, thou shalt die,' as plainly intimated much more than the mere return of the body to the dust out of which it was taken." As I have already stated, Adam died on the day of his transgression—died to all good—died with regard to God: and his sentence has taken hold of every one of his children, who are in consequence, "all by nature the children of wrath."†

We distinctly affirm that spiritual death, and in consequence, eternal death, is the chief and appalling feature of the fall of man; and that

* Haldane on the Atonement.
† I am induced here to throw out a hint which may be of service to some of my young readers, viz.: Geology has determined that death existed among animals before the fall of man. How, then, is the scripture statement that death is
every man, born into the world is by nature as impotent for real good, as incapable of doing an acceptable work for God, and as thoroughly dead to all truthful impressions, as a stock or a stone, and will ever remain in that condition, going down to the lake beneath, unless God in His might rescue and regenerate him. Adam literally squandered away our stock of ability, and left us, "without strength," Rom. v. 6, and though ten thousand hells were threatened, we are so vitiated and ruined by the fall, that we could not keep one of God's commandments perfectly for a single hour!

I know that there are people, ay, hosts of people, who do not believe this; who fancy that they are not so fallen, so wretched, so ruined, so sinful as I would represent them. There are many people of irreproachable lives, many of great self-denial, many of amiability and gentleness who do not or will not believe that they are dead to all good. I know too, that many, finding themselves inconveniently pressed by texts of scripture, have been bold enough to affirm that such and such texts have direct allusions to the impure Romans, the

the consequence of sin to be reconciled with the fact? If the death threatened on the disobedience of man be regarded, not as the cessation of life, but as the state of separation from God, the difficulty vanishes. Corporeal death was but an emblem of the death threatened upon man, and thus science and scripture may be harmonized.
idolatrous Corinthians, the dull and heavy Ephesians, &c., &c., but have no reference to them. But such are blind, having their understanding darkened; they have never had the straight-edge of the law of God put to their thoughts and deeds, their motives and designs. They have never had a glimpse of the righteousness and spirituality of that law, or the slightest conceptions of the holiness of God. They have never heard the denunciation, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the law to do them."

They forget that one act of disobedience, and that unaccompanied and unaggravated by impurity, or idolatry, or ill-feeling toward any creature, was regarded by God as a crime of such magnitude as to call down the denunciation of heaven upon Adam and all his posterity! They forget, if they ever knew, that the seed of every sin is within themselves, and that all that is required to bring that seed to maturity is importunity and opportunity. They forget that the Pharisees of old were a highly moral and religious people; that Paul himself before his conversion would have put a score of modern amiable professors to shame, and yet there are woes pronounced upon all such as "hypocrites," "generation of vipers," and "children of the devil!"

What, I ask, can men mean by either insinu-
ating or affirming that they are not fallen, or sinful, or hell-deserving, when these things stare them in the face? How great must be the blindness of that man who, professing to believe that Adam by his one transgression brought death and damnation into the world, yet denies that he himself (a transgressor in myriads of instances) is on a par with this or that sinner saved by grace!

Suffer me to call your attention to the following argument in further proof of what I am insisting upon. In the 5th of Romans, the apostle institutes a comparison between the two Adams—between what our first parent did and what Christ did. He contrasts obedience with disobedience, life with death, &c. Now the attentive reader must be convinced that the life here spoken of is not temporal life, but eternal life (the antitheses prove this). It will follow, then, that the death spoken of is not temporal death, but eternal death. But as eternal life is not restricted to the state of glory in heaven, but is begun here below when the sinner is united to Christ (John iii. 36; John v. 24; 1 John v. 11, 12), so eternal death is not restricted to the perdition of hell, but is begun here below from our Adam birth. We are dead, then, when we are born; or, in other words, we are separated from the life and love of God from the moment of our birth until united to Jesus Christ, i.e., manifestly.
So far for the Scriptures: now for Reason. What says reason upon the subject of the fall of man?

Ponder over the sin and crime that have befouled the earth since the day in which Adam broke through the hedge by which his Creator had enclosed him, and say whether there has been no fall! Both sacred and profane history informs us that the darkest deeds and the foulest crimes have left their tracks thickly scored upon this earth, from the murder in the first family that ever trod it, till the latest hour of secular enlightenment!

Look at the awful depravity of the world even now. The testimony of credible witnesses proves that in few years have the records of crime been darker than during 1855.* Swindling and wholesale robbery by men of long standing and high character have divided attention with cases of mysterious poisoning and atrocious murder. The calendars of the various assize towns evince a lamentable condition of public morality. The thousand ingenious shapes which crime has assumed in the hands of the regular practitioners are all tokens telling a fearful tale!

"Infidelity has increased to so great a degree as to leave it in doubt whether England may not

* Have the revelations of 1856 and 1857 tended to mitigate this serious charge?
be the most unbelieving of all the kingdoms in Christendom." So wrote a zealous clergyman of the Church of England, last year. But we see it ourselves—we want no man's testimony to assure us that infidelity is making rapid strides throughout the world. The very religious (so-called) press is manifestly tinged with it! There is a hatred of God, and of God's pure Word abroad that is awful to contemplate! Surely there has been a fall—a fearful fall of man from God!*

See the skill and ingenuity of man; what inventions he is capable of; what progress he makes in learning, in science and in art! and tell me, does he bend that learning or science to the glory of God, to the exposition of His Word, or to the elucidation of difficulties in connection with it? Nay; but, with few exceptions, does his very best to undermine the old foundations, to

* Great efforts are being made just now to "convert the masses." We have "sermons for the working classes," and lectures upon all sorts of subjects, serious, comic, and scientific, delivered by men whose zeal is manifestly not according to knowledge, in the hope of reaching "the million." But I can tell those reverend and other gentlemen that they are spending their strength for nought. It is not an appeal to the feelings that will ever be blessed by God to the conversion of a soul. God will own nothing but His own Word (Isa. lv. 11), and where "the Word" is faithfully preached no crowds or masses will be found.

Has there not been a fall?
throw discredit upon the sacred record, and to make God a liar!

Has there not been a fall—a fearful fall?

Observe the general disinclination to pray, to read the Scriptures, to speak upon serious subjects. Mark that spontaneous mocking smile that passes round nearly all companies when any religious topic is adverted to, and tell me, has there been no fall? Is not man now, as his progenitor Adam, fleeing from God, not wanting communion with Him: for enmity is in his heart towards his Creator?

Mark, too, in professedly religious company, though the Scriptures may be discussed, and though prayer is wont to be made, what an awkwardness of manner, what a hesitation in speech, what a shifting of the subject, are manifested when the doctrines of sovereign grace are introduced; when the words "electing love," or "pre-destinating grace," or "ordination to eternal life" are let drop! Ah! how the apparent gold is transmuted! how the professed love becomes changed! how the paint and varnish of nature vanish! Poor man, at enmity with God, flees from His presence, and tries to hide himself in the trees of his own planting!

Has there been no fall?

Lastly. Notice those evil thoughts,—those questionable actions,—those wanderings in prayer,—that coldness in the affections towards God and
the brethren, many a time and oft experienced by
the saints themselves, and say has there been no
fall? "Oh! how the depth of our lost condition
comes clearly to the view in the very act of
prayer! Alas! we know not what to pray for
as we ought; and even when the Spirit helpeth
our infirmities, when we cannot utter a word
or even a sigh, and without words deeply groan
in the spirit; then these infirmities cry out as
testimony against us that we are undone, and
fallen from God!" Oh! is it not true—is it
not proved that "the carnal mind is enmity
against God, and is not subject to the law of God,
neither indeed can be?" It exists in the very
saints, and continually reminds them of their fall
in Adam!

III.—A word in conclusion.

And now I ask in all solemnity—

If what has been stated is truth, what is the
meaning of man-power, or free-will-to-do-good?
If man is fallen, so fallen as to be dead to all good,
what can those harangues mean for men to be up
and stirring and make their peace with God, of
which we so often hear?

How can that endeavour to do good which is
death? How can that power which is contrary
to God, and which makes Him a liar, endeavour
after that which is good? How can a man "dead
in trespasses and sins," consult his own eternal
interest? "Is it rational," asks an old Divine, "to think to set fallen man with his corrupt nature to work the same way with innocent Adam? This is to set beggars on a level with the rich, lame men on a journey with them that have limbs."

Objection.—But we are to preach, to exhort, and to threaten.

Answer.—Yes, doubtless, but we must see in the first instance that what we preach is the Word of God (2 Tim. iv. 2). We must place man in his proper position, i.e. in the mire and in the pit. We must tell him of God's purpose to rescue a people from that awful position. We must not exhort until we think we can see signs of life. And as for the threatening, we must take care that we tell all the truth,—viz., that it is the Sovereign Jehovah that threatens; that though man can contribute nothing to his own regeneration, yet God commands to flee from the wrath to come; and that though this seems contradictory to poor short-sighted mortals, we must not dare reply to God, as if we, by our sophistry, could catch and entangle the Almighty. Unconverted man must be told distinctly that the sins from which he is unwilling to be freed, will justly damn him; but no man must be suffered to suppose for a moment, that he has any free-will power to do good.

Cavillers against the doctrines of grace are
often insinuating that if these things are so, there can be no use in preaching. They forget that "it has pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save those that believe"—that it is by the Word souls are caught, and that it is either a "savour of life unto life, or of death unto death."

**Objection.**—"But all men are not so fallen as you would make it appear. Abel, and Enoch, and Noah, and Abraham, &c., were not thus fallen."

**Answer.**—This is to contradict the Scriptures. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." "There is none that doeth good, no, not one," &c. &c. It was free grace that made the difference between Abel and Cain, Isaac and Ishmael, &c. &c. "The Lord had mercy," is, or will be, the motto upon the hatchment of every individual fallen asleep in Christ. "There is no difference," says Witsius, "but what God himself makes. All, I grant, are not equally vicious, but even this difference arises from the secret dispensations of God's providence which restrain the affections of men more or less; but all are equally fallen from God, and to whatever length any, before regeneration, have advanced in honesty or virtue, they nevertheless remain on the confines of death in which there is no preparation for life."

**Objection.**—"Though a man is fallen from
God, he can pray, and thus get aid, and become changed."

**Answer.**—I want to be informed, how *can* a man pray to that God whom he hates? Man, by nature, is at enmity with God. Surely prayer where there is no love must be hypocrisy, lying, and mockery!

**Objection.**—"But when God is described to fallen man as being ready to hear, and as being love, &c., man's *sense* will enable him to fall in love with God, and see that He is for his good, &c."

**Answer.**—This is again to contradict the Scriptures, which assert that "the natural man cannot understand the things of the Spirit of God," (1 Cor. ii. 14) no matter how his fellow man may describe them. Besides which, instead of a faithful description of God making a favourable impression upon the mind of a natural man, it would have the direct contrary effect, unless God were to make him willing by His power. It is the universal experience of the Church that the more faithfully the Word of God is preached the more determinately do the heathen rage.

You may be inclined to ask, then, who then can be saved?

We shall see as we pass along in our promised course of addresses.
ELECTION.

"According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will."—Eph. i. 4, 5.

"For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified."—Rom. viii. 29, 30.

That man is not in the original state in which he came from the hands of his Creator, but is fallen, ruined, spiritually dead, i.e. estranged from and at enmity with God, I trust was made abundantly manifest to you on last Sunday afternoon. Both Scripture and Reason testify to this awful fact. If we had only the record of man's creation preserved to us, and all the other scriptures had been lost, our knowledge of the world and of the world's ways, and the convictions of our own natural understandings, com-
pared with that brief record, would be enough to convince us of the fall of man. We are anything but "very good," ourselves being judges; O what must we be in the sight of an all holy God!

Poor man is truly "carnal, sold under sin," not only without power but without inclination to move towards God; ay, and what is more awful still, an actual rebel, a presumptuous, blasphemous rival of the great Jehovah's!

Satan's accursed lie, "ye shall be as gods," is still ringing in man's ears, inciting him to thoughts, acts, and deeds repudiating all submission to his Creator, and secretly or openly questioning His right of dominion.

"Man has not only lost the image of God, but God; and when he became disobedient, God called him "flesh," and his conduct "evil," "sin." And what has been his conduct ever since? Why, he makes use of the constituted creaturehood in which he was created, just as though he had not become a transgressor by the disobedience of one—as though he had not fallen—as though his very heart and mind, thoughts and reflections, his entire nature from its very core, were not perverted and perverse! He employs the gift of God wherewith to reproach Him, that the guilt is not his but God's.

Man makes use of his life to deny his death, and of the truth to make God a liar. In short,
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since his fall man makes use of that which he derives from God in order to place himself by the side of God as an intimate friend, as an adulteress by the side of her husband, so that he may rob God of His crown. He will not have it that he is lost, that he is so good-for-nothing, so unrighteous, so unholy, so worthless, so powerless, so miserable and undone, so entirely separate from God as he really is;—he becomes enraged at it, and absolutely will not remain in the condition into which he was thrown by the righteous anger of God, according to the premonition, "in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die the death!" He maintains that his creaturehood is after the image of God, notwithstanding that he is lost, and defends it with all his might before God, instead of censuring himself that he has sinned against God and against Him only!*

O who with any knowledge of his own fail does not see himself in this likeness? Surely this is what every man is by nature! We feel all this within, and we see it around and about us in the shape of priests and laymen, plebeians and aristocrats! Though man is ruined, he will not confess it, but with all his might and main will insist upon it that he can work his way to heaven, and win the favour of God. Poor, poor

* Dr. Kohlbrügge.
creature! Thou art as helpless in this regard as an infant; thou canst no more get to heaven without a miracle on the part of God, than thou couldst create a world! It is written "without holiness no man shall see the Lord," and where art thou to get thy holiness? Thou wantest none! thou art holy enough in thine own eyes, and the holiness that God has provided for those who are to be with him, is so foreign to thy nature that thou wouldst never seek it, even if thou hadst the power!

Will a man seek that which he does not want? Will a man pray for that which he does not like? Surely no! If a man then does really pray to God for that which by nature he hates, if he really loves God whom by nature he dislikes, a marvellous change must have come upon him. Something must have been done in him or for him by a power altogether extrinsic of himself. Now if all men experienced this marvellous change, we should trace it or attribute it to God's universal grace or love; but as all men do not experience it, we must trace it or attribute it to God's electing or distinguishing grace or love.

I think this is very clear. Indeed, I cannot see how the inference can be avoided. To talk of all men experiencing this change at some time or other of their lives, and of some improving it and others neglecting it, or as some
ELECTION.

will have it, "sinning away the day of grace," is to my mind unmitigated nonsense.

Yes, it is to electing grace we are to trace the change from death to life, from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God. And I would now prove to you by the Prayer Book and the Scriptures that this is the grand basis upon which God builds his Church, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone; subsequently answer some objections, and point out a few absurdities arising from the opposite scheme.

I.— Election, from eternity, of a peculiar people to salvation, is the doctrine of the Church of England and of the Scriptures.

That this is a doctrine of our Church is manifest to every candid mind. Who can read the 17th Article* and deny it? There is no dubiousness

* The wretched effort made by a certain party to explain away the Calvinistic tone of the 17th Article would be beneath contempt, were it not calculated to impose upon the unthinking. It is this, viz., a stress is laid upon the words in the middle of the Article—"they, through grace, obey the calling;" and from these it is made to appear that it was those whom God foresaw willing to obey His calling, He predestinated to everlasting life! Thus is the mantle of free will thrown over one of the most prominently Calvinistic features of the Prayer Book.

This sort of reasoning, however, though it may impose upon weak minds, may soon be torn to shreds by sound logic.

The predestinated, doubtless, "obey the calling," but this
about the language of that Article. It is not a
predestination to do this or to do that, which after
all might end in nothing, that is there spoken of,
but a predestination *unto everlasting life*, secured
in each and every step. The elect persons have

is a *consequence* of their predestination, not a *cause.*
Where all, without exception, are fallen—where one is, by
nature, as much an enemy of God's as another, *it is impos-
sible* that God could see or foreknow any willingness to obey
His motions in one that was not in another.

This puts a *quietus* upon all effectual opposition in this
matter. But the very wording of the Article, even in its
concluding clause concerning the danger to "curious and
carnal persons" from continued consideration of the doc-
trine of predestination, speaks out so unmistakably as to the
views of the framers of it, that we are amazed at the weak-
ness or dishonesty of the mind that can take refuge under
such a cover.

How could any danger accrue in case the matter depended
upon free will to obey the calling?

The man that does not understand this, may be learned,
may be eloquent, may be amiable and well intentioned, but
certainly he is no reasoner.

Some have got it into their heads that even supposing such
men as I allude to do not preach the gospel with the pre-
cision that is expected from a "workman who needeth not
be ashamed," it is better that crowds should go and hear
them than not go to any place of worship. The objection
is specious. But what is so dangerous to the soul as a false
gospel? Whose position so perilous as his who would ex-
plain away God's sovereignty? Whose doom so awful as
his who knew His Master's will and did it not? Whose
soul in greater jeopardy than the free-willing Pharisee's?
Matthew vii. 21—23 is an awful scripture.
been chosen in Christ out of mankind before the foundations of the world, and are to be brought by Christ to *everlasting salvation*. They are in due time called by the Spirit working in them—they obey the calling—they are justified freely—they are made sons of God by adoption—they are made like the image of His only-begotten Son Jesus Christ—they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

There is not an "if," or a "perhaps," or "per-adventure," or a condition in all this. The thing is certain, and beyond the possibility of doubt or failure. And what surprises an ordinary mind is, that with this Article unrepealed there should be found any man in the Church of England audacious enough to question the doctrine, or to deny it as one of the fundamentals of that Church.*

But do we believe this doctrine because it is to be found in the Prayer Book? Do we believe it

* I know that dissenters generally taunt us who are upon this point sound, with the unscripturalness of our baptismal service. They say, "you have no right to charge some of your brethren with inconsistency or dishonesty in evading eternal election, whilst you hold by "baptismal regeneration." But I reply to this, there is a possibility of explaining "baptismal regeneration," so as to remove whatever is unsound in the alleged doctrine; but there is no possibility of getting rid of the doctrine of eternal unconditional election as a doctrine of the Church of England.
because Augustine, and Calvin, and Luther, and a host of Reformers held it, or because many of the bishops of our own Church have held it? Nay. But we believe it because the Scriptures teach it.

We should believe in "baptismal regeneration" after the most approved fashion of the "High Church" school, if we could see it in our Bibles. We should believe in consubstantiation or transubstantiation, or anything else, if we could find it in, or logically infer it from, our Bibles. But as they are not there, and can in no wise be proved thereby, we repudiate them.

We respect the Fathers, we respect the Reformers, we respect the compilers of our Liturgy and Articles, we respect our bishops, but only so far as they are followers of Christ.

The texts that I have chosen for the foundation of this discourse, clearly establish election. Can unbelieving ingenuity twist and warp the passage in Ephesians to mean something conditional, uncertain, or contingent? Can men have been chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, whose salvation depended on their own will to be holy and without blame before God in love? Then who would be holy? Who would or could be without blame before God in love? Can men have been predestinated unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself according to the good pleasure of His will, and yet be left to
their own choice whether they be children or not? Surely the idea is monstrous! Man is fallen, ruined, by nature at enmity with God, and how could he choose to be a child of the all holy God? And how could his salvation ever be attained if it were left to his own will? But some one says, but God does not leave it to man's self to choose; He puts the Holy Spirit in him to give him good thoughts and desires, and this Spirit, working in man, induces him to be holy and without blame before God, &c.

Now we want to be informed, does the Spirit thus work in every man? And if so, why is not every man "induced to be holy, &c.?" Is the resisting principle stronger in some men than in others? If so, then it is not true that all men are alike fallen. And if the Spirit does not work in every man, the question of election or predestination is at an end—that which we would maintain is granted.*

* In one of my tracts ("Arminianism and Calvinism, a Dialogue," &c.) I think I put this vexed question fairly thus, viz.: "Man is ruined—totally ruined (the Bible from beginning to end states this), and the Spirit strives equally with every man. Then, of course it follows, either that the Spirit strives in vain with every man (for what can a ruined man do to help that Spirit?), or every man will be saved. Now we know that every man will not be saved (for 'many are called, and but few chosen'—'few there be that find the narrow way'—'some will rise to everlasting shame and contempt,' &c. &c.), and what is the rational, logical inference? Why
The text from the 8th of Romans is still clearer. These words have been called "the *Golden Chain of Salvation,*" and it was manifestly the doctrine announced by them that caused the apostle to break out in such rapture in the concluding portion of the chapter. He there seems to range through all creation for an antagonist to dispute the point, and is fully persuaded that *nothing* could ever separate the elect soul and God!

Let us examine this text. Mark the *fore-*

this—either that the Spirit strives with greater power with some than with others, or that the Spirit strives with some and not with others. Take which you like: by either, Electing Love is proved, and Arminianism convicted of folly and absurdity. Perhaps a homely illustration will help you to understand me. Suppose twelve men, all equally constituted, one as well formed and as muscularly made as the other;—but all dead. Now suppose I place each of those men beneath the influence of a galvanic battery; not one at a time, but all at the same time—each under a battery of equal power—and some of them are restored to life, whilst others remain as dead as ever. How would you account for it?

"*Mr. Dimview.*—Why thus—either that some of the men were less susceptible to the galvanic influence than others, or that some of the batteries were not so powerful as others.

"*Minister.*—But I have guarded against this; for I have supposed all the men to be equally constituted, and all the batteries to be equally powerful—how then, good friend?

"*Mr. Dimview.*—Really, sir, you puzzle me. I must leave the matter with you to explain.
knowledge here alluded to. This is the foundation upon which the whole frame of the amazing work of man's redemption stands.

Two questions here present themselves, viz.: 1. As God foreknows all things, does the apostle mean here that God merely thus foreknew all men? 2. Could God have foreknown any inherent goodness in any, so as to induce Him to make choice of them?

I answer both questions with a decided negative. For 1st, the individuals foreknown in the text are glorified, and all are not, or will not be glorified. 2nd. Where all without exception are ruined and

"Minister.—I will show you where you are fast. The twelve men are to represent mankind after the Adam-fall transgression—all on an equality, without power, without life. The galvanic battery is to illustrate the Holy Ghost. The fact of some reviving, and others remaining stiff corpses, is meant to show that the Holy Ghost, in working upon all, succeeds in some experiments and fails in others, either from want of power in Himself, or from want of susceptibility in the men; and as both of these are out of the question—for the Holy Ghost is God, and one man is just as susceptible or non-susceptible as another—it follows that the Holy Ghost either does not work similarly upon all, or works upon some and not upon others. If a man be regenerated, it must be either by the influence of the Holy Ghost alone, or jointly by that influence and his own exertions. But he having neither will nor power to make any exertion in this way, it follows, it must be by the Holy Ghost alone; and if every man be not regenerated, it follows that the Holy Ghost has not done the work in every man."
at enmity with God, it is impossible that He could have seen good in one and not in another.

The foreknowledge is evidently a foreknowledge of choice, and a foreknowledge of choice of the particular parties to be glorified.

You see also by this scripture, that those whom God thus foreknew, He did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son.

Now observe, it is not said God foreknew they would be conformed, and so predestinated them; but He predestinated them to be conformed, &c. : i.e., such being designed for glory, they are decreed to grace as the way.

It is vain to object, "God predestinated them to be conformed, &c., but after all they may not be," for it is written, "Whom He did predestinate, them He also called," i.e., not only with an external call, as the many are called but few chosen, but with an internal and effectual call; such a call as is described in our 17th Article: and again, "Whom He called, them He also justified," i.e., absolved from all guilt, and owned and loved as friends and favourites — "And whom He justified, them He also GLORIFIED."

This fact of glorifying all the objects of His choice, to my mind, puts an end to all vain reasoning in this connection. If that link of the chain had been left out, we should have had more trouble with God's enemies than we have now;
but as it is there, we may defy them with this scripture alone.

But what say other scriptures? Time will not permit me to speak at large upon the case of Abraham, who was a stupid idolater when God called him; of Isaac, who was chosen instead of Ishmael; of Jacob, who was chosen instead of Esau; of the Jews, who were chosen instead of the Egyptians or Assyrians; of David, who was chosen to be king, though the most unlikely of all Jesse's sons; or of Cyrus, or Jeremiah, or Paul, or a host of others, who were manifestly pitched upon by God as favourites, not through mere caprice, but by His sovereign will.

Men, doubtless, will object and say, "this is no proof of election to eternal life, but only to temporal privileges, and for temporal uses." But I ask, are these cases to be regarded merely as historical facts? Was there no design—no manifestation of sovereign choice in all this? Granted that these instances display an election to temporal things, will it not follow that there is an election to things of a spiritual and eternal nature? If God is known to have gone out of the ordinary method in things temporal, is it unlikely that He will go out of the ordinary method in things spiritual and eternal?

But the Scriptures afford abundant evidence of personal election to eternal life.

The Lord began His ministry with a broad hint
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at it, see Luke iv. 25, 27; and He closed His ministry with an unmistakable declaration of it, see John xvii.

At your leisure you can read Matt. xi. 25, 26; Matt. xiii. 10, 11; xx. 15, 16—20, 23; Mark xiii. 19, 20; John vi. 36—39; x. 15, 16, 26, 28; John xiii. 18. The choice spoken of in this last passage must refer to salvation, and not to apostleship, for to the latter Judas was chosen, as well as the others, John vi. 70.

The apostles unreservedly preached the doctrine of election to eternal life. At your leisure, you can consult Acts xiii. 48, and xv. 14; Rom. ix. passim: 2 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Tim. i. 8, 9, and ii. 19; James i. 13; 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 Pet. i. 1.

II.—Many objections have been made to the doctrine of election; but this is not surprising. As long as there are fallen men upon earth or devils in hell, the reign of a Sovereign God will find opponents. I will now proceed to notice some of those objections.

Objection.—We are elected or predestinated to eternal life, according to God's foreknow-

* It is especially worthy of remark that the word rendered "obtained" in this last quoted passage, means, in the original, "got by lot," and it is the same verb that is employed in John xix. 24, to describe the way the soldiers disposed of the Lord's coat. λαχοῦσα, λαγχανω.
ledge of our faith, and repentance, and perseverance.

**Answer.**—Such an election would involve us in a covenant of works, and place God's purposes in *time* instead of *eternity*. This would not be *pre*-destination, but *post*-destination, and an inverting of the Scriptures, which place faith and holiness as the *consequents*, and not as the *antecedents* of election. Eph. i. 4; John xv. 16; 2 Thess. ii. 13.

"Some object," observes an old divine,* "that we are predestinated and elected according to the foreknowledge of our faith, and repentance, and perseverance; but if that were Paul's foreknowledge, why then would he say that those that *He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son*? Rom. viii. 29. If God did foreknow them thus conformed, why did he then predestinate them *to be conformed*? And if that were Peter's foreknowledge, why then would he say that *they were elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father—unto obedience*?

*Rev. Isaac Ambrose, A.D. 1663, in refutation of Mr. John Goodwin's exposition (?) of Rom. ix. If any reader desires to know the character of this last named man (a man, by-the-by, highly thought of and often quoted by the Wesleyans), I beg to refer him to Toplady's account of him, in his Introduction to the Historic Proof of the Doctrinal Calvinism of the Church of England. John Goodwin was simply an *Arminian rancer*. 
2 Pet. i. 2. If God did foreknow them first obedient, how then did He foreknow them unto obedience?

I know it is a question whether God in foresight of belief and perseverance in faith and holiness do choose us to salvation? For my part I am for the negative, and upon these grounds—

1. Because election on faith foreseen makes God go out of Himself, looking to this or that in the creature upon which His will may be determined to elect. Now this is against the all-sufficiency of God's knowledge, as if He should get knowledge from the things we know; and it is against the all-sufficiency of God's will, as if He must be beholding to something in us before the business of our election can be determined.

2. Because election on faith or love foreseen, makes God to choose us when we have chosen Him, and to love us when we have loved Him first, but this is contrary to the Scriptures—1 John iv. 19; v. 10.

3. Because election on faith foreseen stands not with the freedom of God's will within Himself, but God tells us plainly, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion"—Rom. ix. 15, 16.

4. Because election on faith foreseen is to say we are ordained to eternal life because we believe,
whereas the Scripture speaks contrary, "as many as were ordained to eternal life believed"—Acts xiii. 48.

5. Because a prime and eternal cause cannot depend upon the self-same temporal effects which are thereby caused. Now election is the prime and eternal cause whence our faith, repentance and perseverance are derived, and therefore our faith, repentance, and perseverance, cannot be imagined antecedent causes, conditions, or motives unto the divine election.

Objection.—The election in the 9th of Romans is merely a national election, and the predestination in the 1st of Ephesians is only to outward privileges.

Answer.—The allusion to the vessels of wrath, and vessels prepared for glory, in Rom. ix. 22, 23, answers the first objection; and the fact of the saints at Ephesus having been "blessed with all spiritual blessings in Christ, and having redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins," disposes of the second.

Objection.—It is an awful doctrine, and calculated to discourage all effort, &c.

Answer.—This is carnal reasoning. The question is not whether it is awful or otherwise, but is it scriptural? If it is, we are bound to proclaim it, "whether men will hear, or whether they will forbear." Besides which, it is not that discouraging doctrine that some would make it;
for no one knows but the very objectors themselves may be amongst the elect family.

We may be certain that wherever the pure gospel is preached, there are some to be gathered in by it.

**Objection.**—These things are secrets with God—we have no business meddling with them.

**Answer.**—This is a mistake. The objects of election are secret to us; but the doctrine is not. It is plainly revealed.

**Objection.**—If God has predestinated some to eternal life, why damn the man whom He has not predestinated?

**Answer.**—No man will be damned because he is not predestinated, but because of his sins. God may show favour to those to whom it is not due, and withhold it from others without a shadow of injustice. No man has any reason to find fault with God for the denial of a mercy until he can lay some claim to it. God damns no man because He will damn him, but because he has brought the punishment upon himself.

**Objection.**—It is unjust of God to save some and not all, when all are alike sinful.

**Answer.**—God might justly have left all to perish, as He has left the fallen angels. Shall not God have liberty to dispose of His own grace and glory as He pleases?

**Objection.**—God hath no pleasure in the death of a sinner, but will have all to come to repentance.
ANSWER.—The death of a sinner affords God no pleasure, as it is the misery of His creature; nevertheless, His terrible attribute of justice must be glorified.

And as for God being willing for all to come to repentance, we must take care to notice, 1st, that God's will, whatever it is, cannot be frustrated, and then we shall understand that this willingness is in reference to the elect; 2nd, that all such expressions as this, and the expostulations of Scripture in general, are means in God's hands for speaking peace and giving encouragement to His poor timid people, who, were it not for such, would hardly dare to look up to an all holy God.

Objection.—The doctrine is unmerciful.

Answer.—It is not so unmerciful as its opposite: for this makes the salvation of millions secure, Rev. vii. 9; whilst the other makes the salvation of only one barely possible.

Objection.—This doctrine discourages people in the use of means, and tends to despair; for if I am not predestinated to life, there is no use in me seeking.

Answer.—This is carnal reasoning; for the end and the means are in the same decree. A beautiful illustration of this is in Acts xxvii. 23—5. The way to everlasting life is through holiness and faith, a conformity to Christ's image.

Objection.—What use of the judgment then?
Answer.—That must necessarily be, for the display and glorification of God’s justice. Nothing will be done in a corner; every mouth must be stopped: the whole world must be intellectually convinced that God is true, and that Christ and His people are one. This evidently is the solution of John xvii. 21 and 23. The world will be made to believe intellectually in the power and designs of God, &c.

Objection.—The word “chosen,” which is tantamount with “elected,” is used in reference to Judas, (John vi. 70), who was lost: then may all the chosen or elected be lost.

Answer.—This is supremely childish and absurd. There is a confounding here of things that ought to be kept distinct. There is a choosing unto office, and a choosing unto eternal life. The apostles were all chosen unto the one, but not unto the other.

Many words in Scripture are employed in more senses than one; and it no more follows that “chosen” may not have reference to eternal life because it was applied in an official sense to Judas, than it follows that “Israel” does not belong to the redeemed and saved, because many of the Jews who were called by that name were damned.
III.—I would now proceed to point out some of the absurdities that must follow from the opposite scheme; and in conclusion, say a few words upon the whole.

1. If there is nothing fixed or predetermined in the matter, then it follows that the will of God in an affair wherein His own glory is so greatly concerned, is dependent upon the will of the creature.*

2. Without predestination, God might be wholly disappointed in His saving design, and the precious blood of Christ might have been shed in vain!

3. Without predestination, man's salvation is a thousand times more difficult under the new covenant than it was under the first.

Man's standing under the first depended upon his free-will. We all know the consequences. Now if free-will ruined man when he was upright, what will it now do since he is fallen?† (Ah! blessed be God! He putteth no trust in his saints! Job xv. 15; but He has taken the matter into His own hands!)

4. Without predestination, the salvation of every man originates in himself, or is divided between God and the creature. Hence man may boast, and give the lie to Scripture, 1 Cor. i. 29;

* Cooper on Predestination.
† Idem.
Eph. ii. 9; Isa. ii. 17. Hence the saved man is furnished with a ready answer to the question, "Who maketh thee to differ from another?" 1 Cor. iv. 7.

And now to bring this subject to a close. Some may be inclined to ask, *cui bono*? What is the good of all this elaborate disquisition? Can't we get to heaven without a knowledge of this doctrine? &c. &c. To which I reply, it augurs badly for the state of the soul to make such objections. I cannot believe that any awakened child of God has ever murmured thus. I cannot believe that any awakened minister of God has ever attempted to keep back the wonderful intelligence revealed through election from the souls intrusted to his care.

But I'll tell you what good comes of all this elaboration. *First, it finds out where a man is.* This doctrine is a terrible searcher of the heart. The loftiness of that man who kicks against it has never been brought down. His haughtiness has never been laid low. *Secondly, without a knowledge of this doctrine, we cannot have right conceptions of the attributes of God.* His sovereignty, goodness, mercy, and love are never so much displayed as in His everlasting purpose to deliver so many of the children of Adam from misery. To deliver some and not all (though this will seem strange to the superficial), renders the divine goodness towards the subjects of this deliverance
more conspicuous and glorious.* Let me illustrate this for you:—

Suppose you all are in want and destitution, and I relieve only some, will not those some laud and magnify me more than if I relieved all?

If all had been relieved, there would have been no difference; or if all had a right to my relief, there would have been no praise—no love—no wonder—no astonishment. But when only some are objects of my charity, then the admiration of those some is constrained, and their praises are real and hearty.

You may depend upon it, albeit many pretend to think differently, that the boon which may be had by everybody will be little thought of. The salvation that is for all will be appreciated by none. But once make it a special favour granted to but few, then hearts will be lifted up in earnest, Rev. v. 9

Thirdly, without election we cannot have right conceptions of the covenant of redemption between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The atonement is rendered a vague and uncertain thing. Free-will, which stands in competition with and opposition to the grace of God, can never, without election, be thrown to the ground as it ought to be. Fourthly, it is the foundation and perpetual spring of consolation to believers. When once a man gets to

* Cooper on Predestination, a Divine of 1765.
know that all things are ordered and sure, and that he is a recipient of grace, his happiness is begun!

"In Christ once, in Christ for ever!" is his song day and night; and so far from the belief leading him to negligence and riot, it is his chief argument to holiness and obedience.

I pray God to bless his word.
PARTICULAR REDEMPTION.

"In whom we have Redemption through His blood."
Eph. i. 7.

REDEMPTION is our subject for this afternoon. And O what a subject! The intellect of an angel is not equal to the comprehension of it! How much less man's! Yet when the Spirit of God has made poor man acquainted with the depth of his degradation, and pointed out to him the great Deliverer, though he cannot scale the heights or fathom the depths of redeeming love, though his intellect be weak, and the power of his imagination feeble, he feels that he ought to stand forth and say a word for his Lord, and tell the world what has been made plain to him by his God. Intellect God needs not to proclaim His truths. Excellency of speech is discouraged by the great apostle. Ordinary intelligence, then, so that it is sanctified, need not shrink from touching upon this glorious theme.

The subject of redemption is, I believe, very imperfectly understood. The general impression
of it I conceive to be erroneous. Is it not this? viz.: That it is universal in its design and results, i.e., that Christ died for every man born of Adam?

I do not suppose that I misrepresent the views of the vast majority of professing Christians when I describe the work of redemption thus. It is a plan of God's to put to rights the fall of Adam: a way of escape for all from the consequences of sin: a bridge that spans the mighty gulf between earth and heaven, between man and God,—open to all the world.

But is this the truth as it is in Jesus? I think not. And I shall now attempt to prove that this view of redemption work is an ensnaring delusion. May the Spirit of God be with us in our effort!

1st. I would inquire what is redemption, and what is its extent? 2. Prove my position by Scripture and argument. 3. Notice some objections.

I.—What is redemption? what its extent?

The word from which the term "redemption" is derived, in the original,* means to dismiss any one for a ransom paid. Hence redemption means deliverance, or liberation procured by the payment of a ransom. It is, in fact, expiation of sin upon payment of a price, or the re-purchase or

* "Δελτολυτρώω"
recovery of that which was lost, or sold, or pledged to another. The words "redemption" and "redeem," I grant, are sometimes used in Scripture in a looser sense than that which they properly mean, e.g. Deut. vii. 8, xxi. 8; Psalm cvi. 10; Luke xxi. 28; but as God's redemption of Israel from the hands of their enemies was manifestly a type of the great and effectual, and eternal redemption of a peculiar people, and as the redemption spoken of in Luke xxi. 28, is evidently in allusion to the realization of all the benefits secured by the work of Christ, this by no means weakens our position.

Ἀπολύτρωσις (redemption) means deliverance procured by the payment of a ransom. Let me illustrate this for you. A person is seized by pirates or banditti, who put a price on his liberation. His friends get to know of his incarceration, and buy him off. Here is deliverance in consideration of a ransom. This would literally be redemption. The man is free. Or to take another figure: a gentleman is in need of a considerable sum of ready money, he mortgages his estate, and gets the sum he wants. When times mend he is enabled to pay back the money to the mortgagee, and thus redeems his estate. The estate is now free. This would literally be redemption. Now, man was taken captive by Satan, and held in cruel bondage by the devil, but God taking pity upon him, sent his Son to
52 PARTICULAR REDEMPTION.

pay all demands that might be upon him, and thus was man redeemed. Or, man had mortgaged his estate, had contracted an enormous debt with God, so great a debt that if he were to live and work to eternity he could never pay it; but Jesus Christ came, and satisfied all the demands of justice, and thus redeemed man. Man is now free. He is "bought with a price," "redeemed with the precious blood of Christ," and consequently is free from all charges or demands.

Your common sense will tell you that redemption can be nothing short of this. If men mean anything short of this when speaking of the work of Christ upon the cross, let them employ some other term than "redemption;" but let them not mislead us by confounding part payment with whole payment, an effort to rescue with a thorough rescue, good intentions with great facts and glorious deeds.

Now comes the question, what is the extent of this redemption—this noble, wondrous and amazing work?

If we are to believe the majority of the preachers of the day, it is universal and unlimited; in other words, Christ redeemed every man, woman, and child born of Adam.

But if this be true, I ask, why is not every man free? Why is not every man saved? For surely, if neither God nor Satan have a lien or
mortgage upon man, he must be free, he must be saved.

Here, perhaps, I shall be told that the meaning of Christ redeeming every man is, that He paid the mortgage which original sin entailed upon every man, but that, having done thus much, He leaves man to work out his own salvation. But I want to know does such a redemption free a man from sin? Does such a redemption render man "a new creation?" Does such a redemption make a man a "clean thing," and do away with the effects of the fall?

Come! let us have an intelligible answer!

If it does not, how can any man be saved? For if Adam in his innocence stood not, how can we, with our guilt and criminal inclinations stand? See you not the absurdity and untenableness of the universalists' position?

But to come back: if Christ redeemed every man, why is not every man free? why is not every man saved? The answer is obvious: every man is not redeemed. Redemption as you may perceive by the text and context, is limited to those who were "chosen of God before the foundation of the world." Election and Redemption are evidently of the same extent. None but those given by the Father to Christ from all eternity are redeemed. And now to the proof.
II.—Proof by Scripture and argument that Redemption is limited to God's people.

Our text compared with the context proves this. Read Eph. i. 7, and compare it with the 4th, 5th, and 6th verses. Those who had redemption through the blood of Christ were those whom God had chosen and predestinated, &c., before the foundation of the world. See Eph. v. 25. It is the Church for which Christ died.

I have seen a very ingenious, and to my mind, a very pointed argument in favour of particular redemption, founded upon this passage and its context. It is this, viz.: Paul here is proposing the conjugal love of Christ for His Church as a pattern for the love of husband and wife. Paul would have all the love of the husband lavished upon the wife, after the fashion of Christ lavishing all His love upon the Church. Is not the limitation of Christ's love inferred? If Christ loved other than His own spouse, He would have been no pattern for an earthly husband.

I beg to call your attention to the following Scriptures in further elucidation of the point, viz.: Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19, compared with 2nd verse; John x. 15, 17; Titus ii. 14. You will observe in these Scriptures that Christ's death is restricted to "the sheep," "the Church," "the people." Now if Christ meant everybody, why employ these restrictive terms?
I know that universal terms are sometimes connected in the Scriptures with the atonement: but if these are to be interpreted in their widest sense, why would the sacred writers have employed the restrictive at all?

The universal terms I allude to may be readily made to harmonize with the restrictive: but no man can make the restrictive harmonize with the unlimited.

Now to our arguments:—

1. Analogy proves the particularity of redemption, the legal sacrifices were offered only for Israel: their sins alone were laid upon the head of the scape-goat. These were "patterns of things in the heavens," and have their full fulfillment in the atonement offered for the true Israel.

The Israelites alone were the chosen people of God out of all the nations of the earth to serve Jehovah: and only some of them were saved: Why should it, then, be thought a strange thing that Christ should redeem only some out of every nation under heaven?

2. If all were redeemed, then the lost were redeemed; and then, it was a temporary redemption: but the redemption by Christ Jesus is eternal, Heb. ix. 12.

O think of the possibility of a redeemed soul being in hell! Could Christ be called the Saviour of such a one? Of one that is lost? Surely
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not! Suppose a man falls overboard a ship, and I plunge after him, lay hold of him and buoy him up, but I am not able to retain my grasp of him owing to the fury of the waves and the violence of his death-struggles, and he sinks to rise no more; could I be regarded as the Saviour of that man? Surely not. I attempted to be his Saviour. I did my best to be his deliverer, but Saviour I was not, or am not; for the man is lost!*

Now I maintain that it is precisely so with Christ Jesus and the lost. He was never a Saviour to them. He never redeemed them: for if He had they would now be in heaven singing, "Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood," &c. Rev. iv. 9. Why don't the damned in hell sing this? Because they were not redeemed. I say again, if men will insist upon different views, let them employ different terms to "Saviour" and "Redeemer:" for positively it is an outrage upon the propriety of language, it is a mockery of the

* I know how our opponents will meet this. They will say, but suppose the man had made some effort to save himself, although it would have been ineffectual without you, you would have been entitled to the name of Saviour, if he had been got on board again. But let us bear in mind that illustrations are not arguments, and that the figure, to be complete, necessarily supposes the man to be "without strength," and me to be possessed of more than ordinary strength.
understanding to call the Lord Jesus Christ my Saviour or my Redeemer, if He has not saved me with an everlasting salvation. But see Matt. i. 21.


The case of ineffectual redemption has been well illustrated thus:—Suppose a wealthy and philanthropic individual visits a prison: He approaches a dungeon in which a wretched captive lies bound with chains and fetters, and strongly secured within walls, and doors, and bars. He proclaims aloud to the captive that he has brought gold sufficient to purchase his ransom, on condition that the captive will liberate himself from his chains, burst open his prison doors, and come forth! “Alas!” exclaims the wretched cap-
tive, "your kindness does not reach my case; unless your gold can effect my deliverance, it can be of no service to me!"*

Here, brethren, is the use and power of general redemption: a thing that offers, and mocks whilst it offers,—far, far too weak to meet the desperate case of a lost sinner! How different is the salvation of God! (See Zech, ix. 11; Isaiah xlii. 6, 7; Luke iv. 18.)

4. The concurrence of the sacred Persons of the Trinity proves our point. There can be no contrariety of design where there is unity of will, counsel, and mind. Jesus and the Father are one. The Spirit will not speak of Himself, but of what is the Father's and the Son's will. Now Jesus Christ came down to do His Father's will, which will was, not that everybody should be saved, and nobody lost, but that none should be lost of those given to Christ. John vi. 39.

How then could Christ lay down his life for any but those given him? Had He done so, He would have gone beyond His commission! He would have done what He had not seen the Father do! Can we, dare we, have such conceptions of Christ Jesus? God forbid!

In the tenderness of His humanity, Christ wept over the impending misery of Jerusalem, the terrible consequences of sin, but He could not go

* Rushton on Particular Redemption.
beyond the councils of eternity to avert those calamities. The language of His heart was, "NOT MY WILL, BUT THINE BE DONE!"

I commend this argument to the serious attention of you all. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit must, necessarily, all think and design alike. If there were any difference of intention amongst them, there would be an end to the unity in the Trinity. So, then, it follows that whom the Father chose, the Son redeemed; and whom the Son redeemed, the Holy Ghost undertook to regenerate. If it can be proved that the Father gave all men to Christ, it must follow that Christ redeemed all men; and if Christ redeemed all men, it must also follow that the Holy Ghost either has sanctified or will sanctify all men. But have all men been sanctified by the Holy Ghost? Nay! There are myriads who have never heard of the Holy Ghost, and myriads more who, having heard of Him, not only are uninfluenced by Him, but deny Him.

5. The vicarious nature of Christ's death proves our point. Vicarious, you know, means substitutionary, i.e. one put in the place of another. We read in the Scriptures that "Christ died for us," "Christ suffered for us," "Christ suffered for sins, the just for the unjust." 1 Pet. ii. 21, and iii. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 3; 2 Cor. v. 20—1, &c.

Now, competent scholars will tell you that
the word "for," in the original (ἐνθέο), means instead of, in the place of. This is ordinarily the signification of the word. Hence it appears that Christ died in the stead of those for whom He died. He was smitten in their room, He was their substitute. "If," says the learned and acute Witsius "there is any point in our divinity accurately proved and solidly defended against the exceptions of the Socinians, by illustrious persons in the Church, it is certainly this, viz.: that Christ satisfied the vindictive justice of God, not only for our good, but in our room, by enduring those most dreadful sufferings both in soul and body which we had deserved, and from which He, by undergoing them, did so deliver us, that they could not, with the wrath and curse of God as the proper punishment of our sin, be inflicted on us."

Hence I argue thus: If Christ vicariously suffered for you and me, God can have no claim upon us, no charge to bring against us, no wrath to manifest towards us. It is an impossibility that the sword of Justice should smite both the Shepherd and the sheep, the Substitute and the substituted, the Surety and those for whom He was bound. God cannot exact double payment, and consequently we are free, "whiter than snow," and may exultingly exclaim with the apostle in Rom viii. 33, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? it is God that justifieth,
it is Christ that died!" But are all in this case? Surely not: for Christ will say to many, "depart from me!" &c. How then, I ask, could Christ's redemption have been universal?

6. The argument of the apostle in the 5th of Romans clearly leads to the doctrine of particular redemption. There is there a contrast between the two Adams. As the first Adam by sin had ruined all those who are born of him, so the second Adam was to save all those that are born of Him. The apostle insists upon the union of the first Adam and all his seed, so that when he fell, they all fell in him, because of their federal union with him; and as he was a figure or type of Him that was to come, as he and his seed stood and fell together, so it was to be with the second Adam, the Lord Jesus Christ and His seed, they were to stand or fall together. For as when the one federal head offended, the offence came upon all the men whom he represented; so when the second Adam obeyed, righteousness came upon all the men whom He represented. Rom. v. 12, 19.

I know of few Scriptures more abused than this. The general idea seems to be that the work of Christ here spoken of was co-extensive with the work of Adam, i.e. that as Adam ruined all men by his disobedience, so Christ redeemed all men by his obedience. But how can these things be? If this were so, all men must be saved.
Let us reflect awhile. From the 12th to the 19th verse there is a comparison drawn by the apostle. The passage is full of antitheses. Those antitheses, or opposites, are Adam and Christ—sin and grace, (or the offence and the free gift,) and their consequences, viz., condemnation and justification, or death and eternal life.

Now if the work of Christ were co-extensive with the work of Adam, either of these two consequences is inevitable, viz.: either all men will be saved, or all men are put upon the same footing as Adam occupied before the fall.

But we know that all men will not be saved. And we also know that we are not placed upon the same footing as Adam before the fall, for we bring sin along with us into the world.

There is, then, manifestly something wrong in the reasoning. What is it? The premises are false. Christ's work was not co-extensive with Adam's.

The mistake lies in supposing the two Adams to have represented exactly the same family. This was not the case.* Adam represented the entire human family: Christ represented the family given Him from eternity by the Father. And the apostle's drift is to show the triumphing power of Christ's work, the superabounding of grace over sin to all interested in it; for though

* Scott in loco.
one sin of one man brought death and condemnation upon a whole world, many offences on the part of any man interested in Christ's obedience cannot bring him into condemnation.

That there was some marvellously comprehensive and amazingly gracious revelation here made, is manifest from the anticipated abuse of it, which the apostle notices in the 1st and 15th verses of the 6th chapter. If the ordinary exposition of this Scripture were the true one, viz., that the benefits of Christ's obedience will only be applied to those who work out their own salvation by duties, I hold that this question had never been put. In fact, it would have no point. But supposing the case to be as I have stated, nothing was more likely than that some careless or carnal listener would have jumped to the conclusion that he might now sin as he had a mind. "Ah, but," anticipates Paul, "shall we sin that grace may abound? God forbid! How shall we who are dead to (the dreadful consequences of) sin, live any longer therein?"

A very common, and apparently well founded objection is made to this view. It is this, viz.:—

"This is to disparage Christ in making Him the representative of only a part of the human race, whilst Adam represented the whole."

To this we answer—"By no means; for as it is more to be a surety for a vast sum for one man
who has nothing and never can have anything to pay his debt, than to be surety for a hundred men who have abundance of their own. So it was more for Christ to contract and undertake for one helpless hopeless sinner, than for Adam to contract for a righteous world."*

Oh, dearly beloved in the Lord—redeemed family of God!—Think of your glorious privileges!—your high destiny!—your unassailable security! "where sin abounded, grace hath much more abounded!" Grace is so ample, so deep, so comprehensive, so efficacious, so perfect, that it has over-topped the most aggravated abounding of sin! It is as if the apostle had said, sin is terrible in its height, and depth, and breadth. It stands up as a huge monster, rearing its head to heaven; but the grace of God is higher, deeper, and broader. The giant creature is flung into the sea of Christ's blood, and is lost to sight for ever in the fathomless depths.—Jer. 1. 20; Ps. ciii. 12.

But enough. If Christ redeemed every man, then every man must be saved; but as every man will not be saved, it follows, either that redemption means something else than what we hold it to mean, or that Christ did not redeem every one of Adam's race. I am content to abide by what I have spoken. If any opponent can scripturally

* Boston on the Covenants.
and logically refute what I have advanced, I trust that the Lord will enable me manfully and ingenuously to confess my error.

III.—I would notice a few objections, and answer them.

Objection.—It would be unjust of God to redeem some, and not all.

Answer.—Rom. ix. 20, supplies a sufficient reply to this, and all other objections of the kind: but I would suggest this important reflection to objectors—God has provided no redemption for devils, and why should He be thought unjust for not providing redemption for some men? Are devils inferior creatures to men? I trow not. As long as it is believed that there is an everlasting place of torment for the devil and his angels, let no man who wishes to support a character for rationality, object to the reprobation of some men.

Objection.—But if Christ has redeemed only some, why then would he give such general invitations to come unto Him?

Answer.—Every attentive reader of those invitations will perceive that they are not general, but particular. It is to the "weary," the "heavy laden," the "thirsty," the "hungry," the "willing,"—they are addressed, and not to those who are unconscious of any want, or unwilling to be reformed.
Objection.—But what do you make of such expressions as "God so loved the world," "Christ tasted death for every man?"

Answer.—The context must explain its respective text. That Christ did not die for every man has been proved, so that the objected passages cannot mean what they appear to mean; and as for the word "world," or "whole world," and the terms "all" and "every," the attentive reader of his Bible will at once see that they are often used in so vague and loose a way as to prevent any stable argument being built upon their employment. An acute writer, in answer to the first objected passage, asks, Did God love Pharaoh, or Moab, or Ammon, or Judas? or does God love the wicked, &c.? The meaning is, God so loved Gentiles as well as Jews, &c.

Objection. But our Catechism teaches us to say, "God the Son, who hath redeemed me and all mankind;" and the 31st Article, and the Communion service teach that "the offering of Christ was for the sins of the whole world."

Answer.—No man admires the Book of Common Prayer more than I. I have often declared it as my opinion that it is undoubtedly the second best book in the world; it is a glorious monument of the piety, the skill, and the experimental knowledge of our Reformers and ancestors. They who compiled it, as well as they who originally composed its prayers, were no formalists or
PARTICULAR REDEMPTION.

hypocrites, but possessed a clear heart-knowledge of the wants, the necessities, and infirmities of God's poor people—but it is a human compilation, and consequently not without error. Whatever error may have crept into the Prayer Book, I am not bound to follow or maintain; for its 6th Article expressly provides, that whatsoever is not read in Holy Scripture, or may not be proved thereby, is not required of any man to be believed;"* as also the last clause of the 17th Article. So that supposing that the Catechism, or the Articles, or any of the services, did insinuate what is contrary to the Word of God, I am to take the spirit of the whole, and to interpret that

* I am aware that this is considered inconclusive reasoning by the High Church party, who maintain that whatever is found in the Prayer Book may be read in Holy Scripture, or may be proved thereby; for otherwise this article would never have been appended to the liturgy and services. But surely this is to claim infallibility for the compilers of the Prayer Book. Is any man to be found who really believes that everything in the Prayer Book was placed there by the direct teaching of the Holy Spirit? If so, he has a faith that may possibly remove mountains, but he is manifestly untaught of God. He is a papist in heart, and yet he professes to be opposed to Popery, and thus do we behold two "infallibles" opposed to each other! Which is right? The Prayer Book, as I have said, is an admirable book, but it is a human compilation, and I believe that any half-dozen men in the kingdom, with common sense and grace, might in half-a-dozen hours, clear away everything that is questionable in its pages.
which is affirmed obscurely or erroneously by that which speaks out unmistakably.

But as the compilers of the Prayer Book had Scripture word-warrant (if I may so speak) for the employment of the terms "world" and "whole world," in connection with Christ's death, I am not concerned to vindicate them against the charge of false doctrine. We must always bear in mind, and make due allowances for, the "natural" prejudices even of those glorious men who compiled our liturgy, whether they were educational or inherent. Those men had been brought up under very disadvantageous circumstances. They had much to contend with, and many to conciliate; but their statements and assertions with regard to the sacrifice of Christ had evident reference to, and were intended as a fatal blow at, the awful error of "the sacrifice of the mass," which would confine the efficacy of Christ's death within the control of the priests, and a certain visible community—thus the expressions "world," and "whole world," and "all mankind," came to be used. But their manifest belief in the doctrines of the Trinity in Unity, Election and Predestination, depravity and ruin of man, together with their discountenance of free-will-to-do-good, put it beyond controversy that, if they did not express themselves as clearly as might have been wished on some points, they were orthodox to the core. Such men could
never have held universal redemption. The doctrine of the Trinity alone, if pushed to its inevitable conclusions, forbids the idea. The Three in One Jehovah are one in counsel, one in purpose—and what the Father purposed, the Son accomplished, and the Spirit applies. To hold otherwise, is to be involved in the grossest absurdity. In short, you must interpret your Prayer Book as you would interpret your Bible—the clear parts must expound the obscure, and always remember with regard to it, as well as with regard to the Scriptures, "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life"—2 Cor. iii. 6.
EFFECTUAL CALLING.

"Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called."
—Rom. viii. 30.

Some have complained of my great warmth in advocating the doctrines of grace; but it is unavoidable—it is necessary. For first, when a man is in earnest, and honest, he cannot help being warm; and secondly, a "preacher must ever bear in mind that his auditory is not only to be instructed and admonished, but terrified," as Luther has remarked.

Preaching, to be effectual, as far as means go, must be searching; it must not be "daubing with untempered mortar"—it must wound!

"I have known dame nature," says an old divine, "run for it, under faithful preaching, whilst a poor sensible sinner has been broken down and melted under it."

The poor ranter, though a mistaken fanatic, is a respectable character in comparison with him who professes to be an ambassador of Christ's, and
yet is never moved to warmth in expounding his Master's Word, and in protesting against error.

I know that the feeling of many is that I am too precise in doctrine, too speculative, and too narrow in my views. "Let us be more expansive, more charitable, more catholic; let us have the Word, without 'Election,' 'Particular Redemption,' &c." say some. My answer is, I am most thoroughly for expansiveness—charity—catholicity: but I have yet to learn how the Word can be preached without continually, invariably, and unmistakably holding up to view its peculiar features. You might as well ask me to paint a landscape without trees, water, hills, sky, fields, &c., as ask me to "preach the gospel without electing love or predestinating grace, &c."

These are, as it were, the energies of the gospel; they are the revelations of Christ's counsel with the Father and the Holy Spirit—the titles of His glorious victories over death, hell, and the grave—the heirlooms left to His family, the contemplation of which was to cheer and comfort them amidst the suffering entailed upon them throughout their earthly pilgrimage.

"Preach the gospel without these?"

Impossible! And he that will attempt it, will find to his cost, that he has run when none has sent him!

But to come to our more immediate subject,
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viz., effectual calling. I would first describe what it is, and show its indispensableness; secondly, prove my position by Scripture and argument; thirdly, notice objections.

I. What is effectual calling?

The term "call," or "calling," or "called," is used in the Scriptures in two chief senses, the one denoting an external call, the other an internal: e.g. Matt. xx. 16, and Rom. viii. 30. The one is sufficient to render man without excuse, yet insufficient for salvation, Acts xvii. 27; it is made by nature, or conscience, or the Word; the other is made by the Holy Spirit efficaciously influencing the heart. The one is the result of generation, if I may so speak, the other of creation. By the one a man is induced to say to himself, "I ought to do this," "I ought not to do that," but there it leaves him; by the other a man is enabled to do what the Lord commands, and not to do what the Lord forbids, by flinging himself upon Christ.

They are as different from one another as your or my birth, by the medium of our parents, was from the creation of Adam. By the one, man followed the course of nature; by the other, God commanded and it was done!

Effectual calling is the result of the operation of the Spirit of God, whereby we are convinced of the sinfulness of sin, as sin, and of guilt and
wrath; whereby our understandings are enlightened in the knowledge of Christ, our will bowed, and our heart inclined to embrace Christ as our Saviour, and obey Him as our Lord and King.

Effectual calling is resistless calling, i.e. a calling which, though resisted in the first instance, cannot finally be resisted. It is a calling from self and earth, to God and Christ and heaven; from sin and vanity, to grace and holiness. In short, effectual calling is that invitation by God to the elect sinner which results in conversion, and terminates in glorification. It is of this the apostle speaks in our text. It is no mere solicitation, but an act of mighty power; yet wrought in such a manner as not to do violence to the will, and in many instances hardly apparent, until the thing is done. "God does not drag along the unwilling by the head and shoulders, but makes them willing." Ps. cx. 3; Phil. ii. 13.

So far for the definition. Now for the indispensableness of effectual calling.

If you can subscribe to what has been laid before you in connection with the fall of man, you must see this in a moment.

Your common sense must tell you that if a man is so fallen as to be at enmity with God, his
enmity must be removed before he will listen to God's call.

Man at enmity may be forced to give ear to a call of God, e.g. in thunder and lightning, the sweeping storm, the raging fire, or racking pain; but the enmity will remain, if God goes no farther. God at best would be an object of terror, not of love; but eternity without love would be but the tedium of hell! Take a mere externally called man to heaven through pain, sickness, poverty, or calamity—the very first thing he would do after the sense of these had left him, would be to wander back to the pleasures of this life.

It is folly to say, "No! he would be so enraptured with God and heaven that he would wonder why he had thought so much of earth," for his nature is the same as ever, he is unchanged, and "except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Ah, be assured, heaven is a prepared place for a prepared people. Is there not, then, an indispensableness for effectual calling?

Let us now proceed to examine the Scriptures.

II.—Proofs from Scripture and Reason.

Our text, Rom. viii. 30, is clearly upon our side: for mark the connection. The "calling" here is the connecting link of a chain stretching from eternity to eternity. "The called" are
the foreknown or the predestinated,—the called are the glorified. But is every man glorified? Is every man that is called glorified? Nay, it is only they who are predestinated to this peculiar call, the internal and resistless call, who are glorified.

A vain and dishonest attempt has often been made to get rid of this passage by saying that the calling and predestination spoken of here are simply a desire on the part of God that men should be conformed to the image of His Son, but by no means guarantees the conformity of any. An honest and reflecting mind is astonished and disgusted at the impudence or ignorance of such deceitful handling of the Word of God as this. How the devil will twist and turn to avoid the arrows of God, and the flaming Sword of the Spirit! Anything but predestination for proud, inflated, yet fallen man! The most arrant nonsense, the veriest trash, the most insane rhapsody, and the very gambols of a mountebank, will all be tolerated by poor deluded man; but God's word in its awfulness, and grandeur, and dignity, and majesty, and glory, will be scouted and abhorred by him until he is changed!

O man! Art thou not fallen?

But to the refutation of this flimsy sophistry.

If God were to content Himself with these desires or commands, no man could be saved: for as all men are ruinously fallen, and at enmity
with God, no man could conform himself to the image of Christ. In case, then, of any man being thus conformed, he must have had extraordinary help. It is folly to say, "all men have this extraordinary help:" for if they have, why are they not all conformed to the image of Christ? Perhaps it will be said, "because all men do not use their help." This, again, is rank folly: for what power has one man more than another "to use his help?"

But those spoken of in the text are they whom God predestinated, i.e. determined, fixed, ordained beforehand* to be conformed to the image of His Son. Is there anything like mere desire without efficacious call, here? Any mere wishing and woulding without settled purpose, or pre-arrangement in all details? I trow not. It is those, then, whom God has marked out as His chosen vessels of mercy, that are to be conformed to the image of His Son. It is those that are "called" with an effectual call in time, and "glorified" in eternity.†

I would refer you to Ephesians i. 19, 20.

* The verb προορίζω, rendered in our version to predestinate, means to fix or describe the limits beforehand: to determine or ordain beforehand, to predetermine. It is the self-same word that is used in Acts iv. 28, in allusion to the crucifixion of Christ.

† I refer the reader to the Sermon upon ELECTION, to see this subject treated at large.
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You will perceive by this scripture that it is by no ordinary operation, or providence of God, that a man believes, but by the working of His mighty power, the same power which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead. Did God's act prove a failure at the resurrection of Christ? If not, it cannot but effect a similar result upon every individual on whom it is put forth, whether in a physical or a spiritual resurrection.

Pray look into Jno. vi. 37.

On this passage it is only necessary to remark that the word "come" means the same as "believe," or "receive," (as the context clearly shows), and that this believing has attached to it the possession of everlasting life—(compare the 40th and 47th verses with the passage.) Those given to Christ, then, shall believe on Him unto everlasting life. It must, then, be by an effectual calling; for if it were a calling, or solicitation, or invitation, or exhortation, left to the sway or caprice of the human will, a will that is fallen and depraved, or to a will assisted by the Spirit of God in some measure, which assistance might or might not prove efficacious, how could Christ say "they shall come, or believe, unto everlasting life?" If there were no other text and context than this in the entire Bible to prove effectual calling, we might undertake to conquer all opponents as far as logical argument goes.
Read Jno. x. 16. Mark here, this "must" imports a duty not to be dispensed with. Christ had received a commandment from the Father (verse 18), and this "shall" is that effectual working whereby He subdues all things to Himself. "The sheep, of themselves, lie as cross to this work as other men—e.g. 'What have I to do with thee?' cries the possessed Gadarene (Mark v. 7); but being a sheep of Christ, he must come, he must be made willing."

Look at Jeremiah xxiv. 7, and xxxii. 38—40; Ezekiel xxxvi. 26, 27; Psl. cx. 3.

Now, I ask, if God will give a new heart, will we not have it? If God will take away the resisting principle, will we not let it go? What is this but to change God's truth into a lie—His omnipotence into weakness, and His glory into the idol of man's free will?

Some, no doubt, would interpret such passages, as conditional offers of God to men—e.g. "I will give you a heart of flesh; I will take away your heart of stone if you are not unwilling, or if you have no objection, or if you ask me, &c." But what outrageous mockery is this! what tampering with God's truth,—what impertinent obtrusion of wretched man's amendments and suggestions is here! Can a heart of stone ask or pray to God? Can a heart that is enmity against God be willing for God to improve it?

* Elisha Coles on the Sovereignty of God.
Can the devil love? or can man who, by nature, is worse than a devil (Jas. ii. 19) be willing for God to work holiness in him? No! most assuredly no!

But in the passages we have just quoted there is a declaration or promise of God, by His mighty power, to do that for poor man which he cannot do for himself;—they are God's absolute promises, with no ifs, no perhapses, no peradventures, no conditions whatever attached to them, but sheer dead lifts to the poor lost and undone sinners given to Christ from all eternity! "I will, and they shall," is language that needs no explanation to any but professors "dead in trespasses and sins." "I will work, and who shall let it?" says the Lord Almighty—Isai. xliii. 34; and if God has declared of any people under heaven, "they shall not depart from me," we defy all the Arminians in the world to show us how that people can be lost!

Now for a few arguments to prove effectual calling.

1. Calling must be effectual from the nature of God.

Whatever God does He must be supposed to have before determined to do, otherwise He would be deficient in wisdom; and whatever God determined to do He must accomplish, otherwise He would be deficient in power. It is not possible, as has been observed already, that God should by
His almighty concurrence influence any creature to act, and yet that creature suspend its acting,—hence we argue that nothing can resist God when He comes to convert a soul.*

Some will say, “but the Jews resisted the Holy Spirit.” To whom I reply, you must first prove that God wanted to convert them, ere your objection can be entertained. Every man who hears the gospel preached, and remains unchanged, may be said to resist God (but this is evidently speaking after the manner of men), for he contemns God’s Word; but this by no means proves that man can resist the mighty power of God when put forth with the purpose of converting him. For as God works in all, without exception (Acts xvii. 28), and yet few are converted, it follows that as all are equally fallen, those who are con-

* “Almighty God! whose power no creature is able to resist.”—Prayer in time of War and Tumult. Is it not strange that men who can take this language into their mouths in the reading-desk, should be so inconsistent as to tell us from the pulpit that there is a creature able to resist God? A nice question for the upholders of the infallibility of the Prayer Book to discuss would be—Is this language scriptural? If not, where is the infallibility? If it is, how dare we contradict it? A question for an Evangelical Arminian would be—Is a human being whom God is “striving” to convert, a “creature?” If so, how comes it that God’s power is not sufficient in all cases to convert? For, according to the Arminian theory, God is “striving” to bring all to repentance.
verted must have had other than the ordinary power of God applied to them.

2. The will of God cannot be dependent upon the will of the creature.

If God does not effectually call, He must be supposed as saying, "I will that all men should be saved, nevertheless, it must finally be, not as I will but as they will!" This is, in fact, to take away the will of God, for He can have no absolute will if it is possible to frustrate it.

If God does not effectually call, then Jehovah's Election, Christ's Redemption, and the Holy Spirit's Sanctification, may all miscarry! which is horrid blasphemy to suppose.

O what folly and impertinence is it to liken God in His will to save man, to poor Darius, who though he set his heart on Daniel to save him, could not!

3. If God needed help, man could give Him none, so God must do the whole work Himself.

The natural man is "without strength;" and even if we should suppose the flesh able in any respect to give assistance, the Holy Spirit would none of it—for what concord hath Christ with Belial? 2 Cor. vi. 2. Such mixtures are an abomination to the Lord!

4. The ordinary observation of man proves that God must effectually call.

The miracles and sermons of Christ Himself produced no lasting effect upon the majority of
those who saw and heard them. Neither prosperity nor adversity, neither sacraments nor judgments, produce any change upon the vast mass of the professing world; we see this with our eyes; it is palpable and patent to every man of common observation. See what different effect the reading of the Scriptures, or the hearing of the Word, has upon some in comparison with others! And what can be the reason? It is an insult to one's understanding to say, because the one will, and the other will not hearken, and take it to heart, and improve his opportunity; for it is proved to a demonstration that all are alike fallen, and at enmity with God by nature,—how then can one child of wrath, with a heart of stone, without strength, an enemy of God, receive, and another not receive, the gospel? Why common sense, even, answers, because of some extraneous influence upon one that has been withheld from the other.—Yes, it is God that makes the difference.

III.—I now come to some objections.

Objection.—God is often represented as complaining of the unwillingness of people to be converted; and Christ is represented in a like manner, and hence it may be argued that grace may be effectually resisted.

Answer.—You must first get rid of all that has been scripturally and logically advanced, ere this objection can have any weight. But it
by no means follows because God and Christ complain, &c., that they have been disappointed or frustrated in their design. It is highly absurd to suppose God, or Christ as God, to complain at all. God is essentially happy. It matters not to His happiness whether all men are lost or saved. But we are to suppose in those figures of speech that God and Christ are speaking of the wicked hardening themselves against the external call in the ministry of the word.

Objection.—Men are exhorted not to grieve the Holy Spirit, hence it may be inferred they may effectually resist, &c.

Answer.—This by no means follows. Men "grieve" the Spirit when they resist His Word preached by His ministers. The saints themselves "grieve" the Spirit by their occasional indulgence of the flesh and of the mind; but this no more militates against effectual calling, than the occasional follies of a child nullify the yearning affection of a doting parent.

Objection.—There are many passages in the Bible such as "if thou wilt," "if thou wilt hearken," "if thou wilt do it, thou shalt," &c., from which we may infer there is a plea for free will, and a plea against effectual calling.

Answer.—"A conditional assertion or observation asserts nothing." It by no means follows that because God commands, or because God proposes, man is able to obey or to do.
will be objected: But would it not be ridiculous to say to a blind man, "if thou wilt see," or to a deaf man "if thou wilt hear, thou shalt, &c.?" To which I reply in the words of Martin Luther, this is nothing but carnal reasoning, and seems to aver thus: because the nature of words, and the common use of speech among men seem to lead to such conclusions, therefore when God speaks He is to be interpreted after a like fashion. But do men never use the phrase "if thou wilt," "if thou shalt," &c., in any other sense than the ordinary? Yea. How often do parents play with their children when they bid them come to them—do this or that—for the purpose of showing them their inability, and to induce them to call for the aid of the parent's hand?

Now, it is in this sense that God speaks both to the world and to His people with His "ifs" and His proposals, such as "Behold this day do I set before thee the way of life and the way of death," &c. The world thinks when God uses such language, that of course it follows power must be in man, and like the self-conceited lawyer in the gospel, to whom Christ said, "do this, and thou shalt live," goes away with the idea that it can and may live by its works and deeds; whereas, on the other hand, the people of God when they hear such language, and are taught of God, know they cannot do this or that to
inherit eternal life, and so cry out to their Father
to undertake for them.

The apostle Paul replies to all objections of
this kind in one sentence, viz., "By the law is
the knowledge of sin," which I may simplify
thus. The command "do this, do that," and
the offer "if thou wilt do this, thou shalt live,
&c." are nothing but the law of God to test
man, and to shew unto him his weakness and
impotence. Now man by nature is blind and
corrupt, yet he is full of self-conceit: to remedy
this, God employs those means of "do this,"
"do that," "if thou wilt," &c., to make it mani-
fest who continue fools, and who are willing to
be wise. The fool takes it for granted that
because God commands he is able to obey!
The wise sees he cannot, and cries out for help,
and so acknowledges his ruin. In short, in all
such passages, man is admonished and taught
what he ought to do, not what he can do; and
woe be to him who is so blind as not to see thus
far, for till he sees thus, he can not understand
the use of Christ!

Ay, it is a never-ending question with free-
willers, "if we can do nothing, to what purpose
are so many laws and precepts, so many threat-
nings and promises?"

We reply to all such—"By the law is the
knowledge of sin." Rom. iii. 20. "The law
entered that sin might abound." Rom. v. 20.
This is the answer of inspiration: how different to that of carnal reason! Reason would answer thus—"The law is given that we obey it, and show our diligence, and strength, and free-will-power, and that we may co-operate with it unto righteousness, &c." But what does God say? This, viz.—"The law was given to prove man's impotency, to give him a knowledge of his sin; it was added because of transgressions, not to restrain them either, but to cause transgressions to abound," i.e., to make them manifest where they were not manifest, and to make many acts and deeds that were considered righteousness appear in their true colours—those of sin! (Rom. iii. 20; Gal. iii. 19; Rom. v. 20.)

* It is an astounding and awful fact, that the majority of professors completely mistake the design of the moral law. They fancy that a man may be justified before God by his obedience to that law! Whereas, 1st, no man ever has obeyed it, or could obey it; 2nd, It "entered," (Rom. v. 20,) not that man might attempt to justify himself by an observance of its precepts, but to convince man of his utter hopelessness through any attempt of the sort—to prove the exceeding sinfulness of sin—to exhibit "the offence" in all its horrible magnitude. The law requires, 1st, that we be good; and 2nd, that we do good. Man reverses this,—he resolves to do good that he may become good!!!

"God has commanded the good," says an eminent divine, "in order to convince me how far I am from good, and forbidden the evil, that I may learn the love I have for evil."

Yet, with good old R. Erskine, and other great men who
Here are thunderbolts against free-will, self-righteousness, and co-operation!

Wretched man! get thee to thy place! put thy hand upon thy mouth, and thy mouth in the dust and let us hear no more of ineffectual or tentative calling or salvation! Those who are called of God—are "the called according to His purpose"—are the privileged and blessed subjects of His MIGHTY POWER, AND MUST BE SAVED WITH AN EVERLASTING SALVATION!

were mighty in the Scriptures, we hold the law to be a rule of life.

"To view the holy law's command,
"As lodged in a Mediator's hand,
"Faith gives it honour as a rule of life,
"And makes the Bride the Lamb's obedient wife.

"Thus doth the Husband by His Father's will,
"Both for and in His bride the law fulfil;
"For her, as 'tis a covenant, and then,
"In her, as 'tis a rule of life to men."

In short—

"The law is good when lawfully 'tis used,
"But most destructive when it is abused."
FINAL PERSEVERANCE.

"I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand."

John x. 28.

Would you not be inclined to think that poor man, wretched and impotent as he is, would seize with delight upon the doctrine of final perseverance—a doctrine that secures to him the possession of eternal bliss, despite of all opposition, all break-downs, all assaults from sin and Satan?

But it is not so. Man cavils at it, argues against it—in fact, hates it! How is this? Why thus, viz.—first, man thinks better of himself than he has any right to do; secondly, the thing is so contrary to all natural experience, that he persuades himself that it cannot be true; and, thirdly, he has sense enough to see that if he admits this doctrine, he cannot avoid the others of free grace. Hence he twists and distorts the Scriptures that speak to the point, and with fatuity and madness clings to such passages as seem to favour his preconceived views.
The fact is that *free grace* is so utterly at variance with man's every day experience, which sees every thing and person treated according to *working*, and *merit*, and *employment of talents*, that he cannot receive God's plan of salvation.

Man must be *doing*, and *working*, *earning*, his wages, *meriting* his reward, *conquering* his opponents, and he has no notion of bounty, or mercy, or pity; and (though God knoweth, he expects very high wages for very sorry work) he flings from him with contempt the doctrines of *grace*, and sets out on his perilous journey to another world with a lie in his right hand!

Thanks be to Almighty God, some of us have been taught differently! We have been brought down from our high estate, and are humble suppliants at heaven's gate, awaiting the alms that a Sovereign God may be pleased to give us!

We will proceed now to discuss the subject of *Final Perseverance*. May our Triune God be with us!

I would first prove the doctrine by Scripture and argument; secondly, notice objections.

I.—My proposition is this, viz: *It is totally impossible for an elect vessel of mercy, having once had the grace of God, wholly to lose it, or finally to perish.*

*What do the Scriptures say?* Look into our text,
John x. 28—9. Can language be more to the point than this? Here is the solemn assurance of the Lord Jesus Christ that a certain portion of mankind, which He termed "sheep," "my sheep," should never perish.

It is an absolute assertion. It is tantamount to the oath and promise of God. Yet our opponents will have it, notwithstanding this assurance, that the sheep may cease to be sheep, and of their own accord fly out of God's hand, though not be plucked out. (!)

I should really be inclined to disbelieve that any rational being could descend to such contemptible evasion as this, had I not seen it somewhere in print. It seems to me to savour so much of what is termed Old Bailey quibbling, that it disgusts me, and induces the exclamation, how intense must the hatred of truth be which could forge such an equivocation as this!

Such nonsense would disgrace a mere moral philosopher, not to speak of the glorious Lord. It would be tantamount to this: they shall never perish, if they do not perish!

Surely, He who spoke as never man spoke, He who in a moment disentangled the sophistries of scribes and lawyers, and put the astute Sadducees to silence, could not have delivered Himself so inconclusively as this! Perish the thought! The whole context goes to prove that the Shepherd's business is to make the sheep willing to
abide under His saving protection, and that not one of them shall ever perish from external or internal assault. How sweet was the assurance of the Psalmist! "The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want!" David knew from his own personal experience, with what untiring, unsleeping vigilance the shepherd watched and tended his sheep. He also, no doubt, had read of his forefather Jacob's devotedness to his flock. How touching is the language of poor Jacob to Laban, see Genesis xxxi. 38, 39, 40. Ah! blessed be God, the great Shepherd of "the sheep" has watched and will watch over his own with greater vigilance than even Jacob or David watched for others.

Come now to Matt. xvi. 18. Here is a promise that the gates of hell, or the gates of death, shall never prevail against the Church.*

Now it is manifest that the Church is composed of individuals, and that "not prevailing against the Church," means not injuring it or

* This passage has been much controverted: some affirming that "the gates of hell," do not mean the hosts of Satan, but the gates of the grave or of death; but no matter which of the two was the meaning of the Lord, the assurance of the safety of the Church is by no means weakened; for if death or the grave shall not prevail against the Church, Satan shall not prevail: for death or the grave is Satan's stronghold. The Lord has overcome him who had the power of death, and for ever released His redeemed ones from its jaws.
destroying it. Assaults may be, and no doubt will be made; but they shall not succeed, they shall not prevail. But suppose an individual of that Church to be finally lost, the gates of hell have prevailed: and if one may be lost, all may be lost, and thus Christ's assurance be no more than idle wind!

I would refer you to Matt. xxiv. 24, for another proof of the point in hand. I understand this last clause to mean that it is impossible to deceive certain parties. I think that any unprejudiced mind would agree to this interpretation. But [would you believe it?] the Arminians obtrude their impertinence even here! They say that the phrase "if it were possible," does not always denote an absolute impossibility, but only a difficulty in doing a thing, and they instance the passage in Acts xx. 16, in proof.

To the reflecting mind, the superficiality or dishonesty of this gloss is apparent: but I have no doubt it would pass current amongst the unthinking crowd. Alas! no wonder there are such multitudes of hypocrites, and ignorant professors, when there are so few thinkers.

We will now read this passage—substituting the Arminian amendment, "For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, with great difficulty, they shall deceive the very elect."

What an unwise speech! No man in his senses
would talk thus. No. But let me untie this knot for you. Christ knew all future contingencies, Paul did not. Paul was in doubt whether he could be at Jerusalem on the feast-day; he could not, unless he made great haste. Christ was not in doubt about the issue of the false prophets' teaching, for He foreknew all things; and evidently employed the phrase for the comfort of the elect, and to signify the absolute impossibility of their being deceived.

Look into Col. iii. 3; Rom. viii. 30—40; Phil. i. 6; 2 Tim. 2, 19; 2 Thess. iii. 3; Rom. xi. 29.

I am aware that this last passage is objected to as a proof of the doctrine in hand, because it has special allusion to the calling in of the Jews; but I wish to know, are Gentiles prohibited from receiving instruction, consolation, or warning, through any Scripture that has reference to the Jews? If so, then it is in vain that the great mass of the Scriptures is read or commented upon; it is in vain that men preach about Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and Moses, and David, and Daniel, and a host of other Jews, saved by grace; it is in vain that we are told of types in sacrifices, and acts, and institutions,—for Jews were specially connected with all these!

I grant that this passage (Rom. xi. 29) has special reference to the national privilege of the
Jews, and does not pointedly speak of the immutable and eternal decree of the eternal election of individuals; yet it is a truth that equally holds good when applied to the perseverance of the saints. Though it be meant of gifts and calling vouchsafed to the nation of the Jews, yet it is fitly applied to the gifts and calling vouchsafed to particular persons. We prove it thus—“If the Apostle, from common grace do rightly conclude this irrevocableness in God, much more may it be determined from that grace which is proper.” If God’s counsel, whereby He chose to Himself the peculiar nation of the Jews, remains firm, surely it follows that His counsel, whereby He chose certain individuals, must remain firm. We conclude from the less to the greater—e.g., if election to external and common privilege be without repentance on God’s part, surely election to eternal and extraordinary privilege must be also without repentance.

But, it may be objected, God rejected the Jews, and so He may reject individuals.

I answer, God has only rejected the Jews for a time, not for ever, for they will be brought again into a visible church state; and so He may hide His face from an elect vessel for a time, but cannot for ever; for the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.

Pray look into Isai. liv. 9, 10; Ezek. xxxvi.
26; and Jer. xxxii. 38—40. Now, think with me.—These promises just read to you were made either to the Jews of the old dispensation, or to the Jews of a future time, or to the Church of God composed of Jews and Gentiles in all dispensations. Which is most likely?

If they were made to the Jews of the old dispensation, it is plain they were never fulfilled; if to the Jews of a future time, it is obvious that such Jews will need an Almighty Regenerator and Preserver, and if such Jews need such a Regenerator and Preserver, why should not the Gentiles or we? For how should it come to pass that we should have hearts less obstinate and stony than the Jews? Or why should it be necessary for God to undertake all this for the Jews and not for us? Can Gentiles do with less help from above than Jews? Nay,—"There is no difference, all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Rom. iii. 22-3.

But the fact is, those promises are not for the Jews of any dispensation, but for the Church at large—for the whole election of grace in all ages. —(See Jno. vi. 45; Heb. viii. 10.)

In those promises the elect are secured on both sides: God will never cast them off, and they shall never desert Him!

But I will not detain you with further quotations; suffice it to say that it may be shown there
are 600 passages of Scripture that might be brought forward to prove the point in hand.

I would now proceed to adduce a few arguments in proof of final perseverance.

1. If the Church were not preserved, the foundation of God's calling or election would be altogether shaken, calling being according to God's purpose, Rom. viii. 28. If every individual of the Church were not preserved, Christ might possibly have no church: for where one may perish, all might perish.

2. If the Church were not preserved, Christ's fidelity would be impeachable: for he undertook the care of each and every member of it. John vi. 39.

3. If the Church were not preserved, the covenant of grace would not be ordered in all things and sure (2 Sam. xxiii. 5), but would be liable to be made null and void like any other covenant.

4. If the Church were not preserved, the union of the saints with Christ would be a mockery and a nonentity, and Christ's saying would be meaningless—"because I live, ye shall live also; and in that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you." John xiv. 19, 20.

5. If the Church were not preserved, the efficacy of Christ's intercession would be frus-
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6. If the Church were not preserved, the promise of the Spirit to be with her for ever would not be true. John xiv. 16.

7. If the Church were not preserved, the saints would have no reason to rejoice on earth. Phil. iii. 1, and iv. 4. How could any man rejoice if he were not sure but at the last gasp he might fail and fall away?

I dare say some of our sceptical friends will even here object, and say, "but the saints are exorted to fear."

To whom I reply. Go and learn what is the distinction between slavish fear and reverential fear. The one, the saints need not have, for they are delivered into the glorious liberty of the sons of God; the other they shall have, for God has promised—Jer. xxxii. 40.

8. If the Church were not preserved, the sacred Trinity would all be baffled! For the Father predestinated the Church to eternal salvation, Rom. viii. 28. The Son purchased the Church with the most dreadful horrors of soul, and an ac-

* I hold it to be awful blasphemy to suppose that it is possible for Christ to plead in vain at the Father's hands. I can have no hesitation in declaring before assembled worlds of any individual sinner—"Be assured, if Christ has ever interceded for you, you must be saved with an everlasting salvation!"
cursed death, Gal. iii. 13. The Holy Spirit takes possession of the hearts of the elect, making each willing in the day of Christ’s power, Ps. cx. 3.

But if the Church be not preserved the Trinity is cheated out of that which It set Its eyes and desires upon, and nature is proclaimed victor—the creature overpowering the Creator!*

9. I might confirm all that has been already said by reminding you of the various similitudes by which the elect, the Church, the saints are represented in the Scriptures. They are the Lord’s own portion, and the lot of His inheritance, Deut. xxxii. 9; His jewels, Mal. iii. 17; set as a seal upon His heart and on His arm, Song viii. 6; graven on the palms of His hands, and their walls are continually before Him, Isai. xlix. 16; they are members of Christ’s body, of His flesh, and of His bones, Eph. v. 30, Col. i. 18; living branches of the true vine, John xv. 1, 2; the espoused to Christ, the bridegroom, John iii. 29, 2 Cor. xi. 12; they are the Lord’s building, founded on the rock of ages, 1 Cor. xiii. 9; Isai. xxvi. 4, and Mal. vii. 24; they are surrounded by God Himself as a wall of fire, Zech. ii. 5; and their place of defence is the munition of rocks, Isai. xxxiii. 16; their faith is more precious than gold that perisheth, 1 Pet. i. 7; their hope as an anchor, sure and steadfast, cast within the veil, whither Christ as

* See note, p. 75.
their forerunner is for them entered, Heb. vi. 19; and where they ultimately must behold the glory which the Father hath given unto Christ, John xvii. 24.

I need not go farther. They who are unmoved by these Scriptures and arguments would not believe though one rose from the dead.

II.—I would now consider some of the chief objections that are urged against this doctrine.

Objection.—What, then, the use of the exhortations, warnings, and threatenings of the Scriptures? What avails exhorting me to take heed lest I fall, if I am sure this will never be the case?

Answer.—First. An exhortation to duty is perfectly consistent with an absolute promise of grace to aid in the discharge of it. This is manifest from Scripture, e.g. in one place we are commanded to love the Lord our God with all our heart; in another, God says, "I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, &c."

Now, either these must be consistent with each other, or the Spirit of God must contradict Himself! Which is the more likely? Is it not far more likely that man misunderstands, and cannot fathom the Scriptures, than that the Scriptures should be inconsistent with themselves?
Secondly. Warning is needful even for believers, for it is an incitement to faith and prayer. When the saint perceives such or such an admonition or warning in the Scriptures, he involuntarily breaks out in prayer to God to impress it upon his mind, and to keep him from the evil.

Thirdly. The Apostles preached or wrote to visible churches, in which were sound and unsound professors. The warnings kept the one in proper fear, and left the others without excuse.

Fourthly. The exhortations, warnings, and commands of the Bible—"God's ifs and imperative moods," says Luther, "are intended to declare what ought to be done rather than what men have it in their power to do."

"The exhortations of the Scriptures," observes another old divine, "are rather to be understood as intimations of our duty, than of our ability—of what we ought to be, rather than of what we have the power to be. At most they can signify no more on our part than the actual exercise of Divine grace when received, and that under the direction of the Divine will; for, Job ix. 30-3; Prov. xx. 9.

Fifthly. They are all means in God's hands for the carrying out of His purposes, and perpetually to keep the lesson before men,

"No flesh shall glory in His presence."
Objection.—The absolute promises, so called, should be interpreted by the conditional, e.g., when God says "I will never depart from you to do you good," we should understand Him to say, "if you will not depart from Me."

Answer.—What use, then, would there be in such promises at all? Would not this be the revival of the covenant of works, and a placing man under far more disadvantageous circumstances than Adam in Eden? Where, then, Grace? If man is to be saved by observance of conditions, he is to be saved by works, and then the Scriptures are contradicted, Rom. xi. 6; Free grace has no place, and the whole economy of God's salvation, and God's righteousness is upset! But here is the solution—we must place the conditional promises first, the absolute second, e.g.,

If ye continue, ye shall be saved;
But ye shall continue,
Therefore, ye shall be saved.

Reverse this, and it will be nonsense, e.g.,

Ye shall continue;
But if ye continue not,
Ye shall not be saved.

What is this but incoherent, inconclusive absurdity; in fact it amounts to this, viz.—if ye continue, ye shall continue! or, as was observed a little while ago—ye shall never perish, if ye never perish!!
In truth all the commands of God are inlaid with gospel promises, e.g.—where the command is, "know the Lord," the promise is, "they shall all know me, saith the Lord," Jer xxxi. 34; where the command is "come unto me," Matt. xi. 28, the promise is, "they shall come," Psl. xxii. 31; where the command is, "love the Lord," Psl. xxxi. 23, the promise is, "the Lord will circum-cise thine heart to love the Lord," Deut. xxx. 6; where the command is, "fear God," 1 Pet. ii. 17, the promise is, "I will put my fear in their hearts," Jer. xxxii. 40; where the command is, be "meek, humble, lowly," Matt. xi. 29, the promise is, "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and a little child shall lead them," Isai. xi. 6.

And thus it is in all other cases, as appears from Heb. viii. 10.

Objection.—But what do you make of the 18th chapter of Ezekiel?

Answer.—I'll tell you what I make of it. I make it out to be the awful law of God, and I see written underneath every portion of it, "Cursed is he that continueth not in all things written in the law to do them."

Have you got no farther on the road than this? O shame, shame! that you should have ever called yourself a Christian! Whosoever will enter into such a covenant with God as is here drawn up, will assuredly find himself in hell! i.e. supposing eternal life to be here spoken of.
Dr. Gill thinks that it is *temporal* calamity and affliction to which allusion is here made. Be this as it may, it is the grossest ignorance to argue from the command of God to power in man. God commands, “Be ye holy, for I am holy.” Shall we conclude that we can be holy as God? God forbid! The design of exhortations like this is to convince men of their want of holiness, of their want of clean hearts and new spirits, which God has promised to give to His own elect. And that man who seizes upon such a Scripture as the 18th chapter of Ezekiel to justify his free-will-to-do-good notions, or the power of man to turn to God and save his soul, is, of all creatures, in the most deplorable state of darkness.

**Objection.**—But do not such passages as those in Heb. vi. 4, 6, and x. 38-9; and 2 Pet. ii. 1, 18, 22, &c., go to disprove the doctrine?

**Answer.**—By no means; there is an external sanctification spoken of in Scripture, such as is sometimes found in “dogs,” and “swine.” But take these passages in their greatest force, they prove nothing. There is not a word about those parties ever having had *grace*. They may have had eminent *gifts*; but gifts are not grace. There is nothing, in fact, here to show that anything farther than an outer change had taken place upon them.

“The redeemed,” says Witsius, “are sanctified, not only by a federal holiness, which gives a right
to the sacraments in the visible Church, 1 Cor. vii. 14,* nor by that external holiness, whereby one has "escaped the pollutions of the world through a knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," 2 Pet. ii. 20, while yet he still retains his canine and swinish nature, but by a true and thorough holiness, whereby righteousness and true holiness are brought into the soul, Eph. iv. 24.

All these things are to be well observed, lest any one should object to us the case of either the covenant-breaking Israelites who were really chosen to the communion of an external covenant, but distinguished from those who were elected to glory, Rom. xi. 7—"or that of the false prophets who deny the master who bought them,"

* I am aware that there is a certain party of Nonconformists who will not have it that this text alludes to external sanctification,—they explaining the word "holy," as meaning legitimate; but this will not stand the test of close criticism.

To be "sanctified," in this passage, means not to be made holy as the regenerate, or to be set apart for God as the visible Saint or Christian, but together with their yoke-fellow to be a holy root to produce a holy seed.

By "holy," is meant federal holiness, to be reputed and received among the people of God who are holy.

By "unclean," is meant a sinner of the Gentiles, an alien and stranger from the commonwealth of Israel.

It seems strange how any man can read Rom. xi. and deny federal holiness, or external sanctification.
and who are far different from those whom not the master, but the Lord, not only bought for any kind of use, but redeemed by His precious blood, 1 Pet. i. 18—"or that of those branches of Christ who abide not in Him, but are cast forth and withered," John xv. 6. For though they may be said to have been in Christ, as to the knowledge and profession of Him, and the external communion with the Church, the mystical body of Christ, and in so far, with Christ himself, yet they were always without the quickening communion of Christ, and the nourishment of His vivifying Spirit.

When we read, then, of those who "trample under foot the blood of the covenant by which they were sanctified," we are to bear in mind that there is an external sanctification, such as gives a right to outward Church privileges, as well as an internal sanctification, which alone is enjoyed by the true disciples of Christ.

Objection.—But why pray to be kept from evil, from everlasting damnation, &c. &c., if it is decreed by God that we shall never perish?

Answer.—The fact of the decree does not release any from continual dependance upon God. The renewed soul always recognizes the Sovereignty and Providence of Almighty God. It is true the Father has assured the children that they shall never want or fail, yet the children are not thereby released from seeking bread and strength
from the Father's hand. No child will seek to be released though the parent had assured it a thousand times of its preservation, for there is always a sense of the relationship and position kept alive in the child's breast.

Then again, we have the examples of Christ, and of David, and Daniel, &c. &c., to warrant us in such prayers.

Christ knew everything that had been decreed, and yet He prayed for the preservation of His people; John xvii.

David set himself to prayer, after it had been revealed to him that God would establish his house; 2 Sam. vii. 27—9.

Daniel set his face unto the Lord God to seek by prayer and supplication, the fulfilment of the Lord's promises concerning Jerusalem, after he positively knew that the time of the captivity had expired; Dan. ix. 2, 3.

Objection.—But David prayed that the Holy Spirit might not be taken from him, and hence we may conclude that it is possible to fall finally away.

Answer.—Rash conclusion! David had foully sinned, and hence he might well begin to question whether he had ever been truly converted. And again, it is not only a revealed but an experienced fact, that when a saint sins the Spirit is "grieved," and hides his face for a time. David might well
pray, then, that the Lord would not altogether take His Spirit from him.

Objection.—This doctrine leads to licentiousness.

Answer.—"Dogs and swine" may so abuse it: but this is no proof that the "sheep" abuse it. For the same Spirit that calls effectually, promotes holiness, Acts xv. 9; 1 Pet. i. 22. It is an irrefragable fact that the clearer a saint beholds his interest in Christ, the more inflamed is his heart with love to God. As in nature, so in grace, where true love exists there is a horror of adultery.

Objection.—In the 20th chapter of Acts, and 30th verse, the apostle foretells, "also of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things, &c." Hence we may conclude against the doctrine of final perseverance.

Answer.—The objection is very weak. If any man would understand the apostle, he must put himself in the apostle's position, viz. addressing an assembly of professing believers, and with an eye to the future increase of their numbers. I can well realize this myself, addressing you all as a congregation of professors, whilst perhaps there are many amongst you nothing more. Now, when I speak to you as believers, I assure you of the infallibility of the doctrine of final perseverance. I assure you on the authority of God that you
shall never perish; but when I begin to discriminate, and point out the difference between professors and possessors, I often say to you, "some high-sounding professors, with a head knowledge of doctrine, but uninfluenced by the Spirit in their hearts, it is to be feared, are amongst our own selves, &c." Do I thereby shake the foundations of God? Do I thereby insinuate the possibility of one of Christ's sheep being lost? Surely not! It was precisely so with the apostle, but with this advantage, that he was permitted to prophesy as to the future of the Ephesian visible Church; I am not.

I humbly submit this suggestion to those who in reading the epistles are often puzzled in finding that whilst the writers in some places speak confidently and assuringly to those to whom they wrote, in other places threaten, and forebode, and denounce.

The apostles spoke or wrote to visible Churches in which were sound and unsound professors. We ministers of the present day do likewise. Hence our occasional apparent contradictions. See 1 John ii. 19.

Objection.—But we read in 2 Pet. ii. 1, of certain parties who "denied the Lord that bought them." Is not the possibility of falling from grace more than inferred from this?

Answer.—Certainly not. The answer given to the immediately preceding objection might be
made available for this,—remember the distinction between professors and believers, between a visible church and the invisible or mystical, but I cannot help quoting the following very ingenious solution to the difficulty, the author of which I know not even by name, viz. :

"In the first place, I must observe that the epistles of St. Peter were written to converted Jews, 1 Pet. i. 1. compared with Acts ii. 5—11. And this will more clearly appear by referring to 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16, 'and account the long-suffering of the Lord salvation, even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him hath written to you. As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things, &c.'

"Here Peter refers to Paul's epistle written to the Hebrews, distinguishing it from those written to the Gentile Churches. And it is necessary to observe this distinction in order to understand what is meant by 'denying the Lord who bought them.' Peter by this expression has reference to their deliverance from the land of Egypt, and doubtless had in his mind Deut. xxxii. 6, where Moses, speaking to Israel, saith, 'Is He not thy Father, who hath bought thee' (redeemed thee from the land of Egypt)? See also Deut. vii. 8, xiii. 5, xv. 16.

"These false teachers, then, in denying the Lord Jesus Christ, denied the Father also (see 1 John ii. 22, 23, and v. 9—11), who had redeemed them
from the land of Egypt. This objected passage, then, has no reference whatever to the redemption by and through the blood of Jesus."

I have now done. That I have proved my case, I fancy, you will readily grant, though you all, perhaps, may not be able to submit to the doctrines of sovereign grace. However, it is one thing what is true, another what men want to be true. Such is the hatred of the natural mind to God, that many men who are intelligent, and shrewd, and thoroughly capable of balancing the pros and cons of an ordinary question, will not admit that such or such has been proved, though it were demonstrated! No. Though an angel from heaven were to assert that Christ redeemed but His own people, and that not one of them should ever perish, the natural man will not, cannot believe it. The thing is contrary to his nature, inconsistent with his experience, opposed to all he has conceived of justice, mercy, and holiness, and he is ready to trample in the dust those who hold or preach it! I know this.

But this does not alter or affect the eternal decree of God, for, "nevertheless, the foundation of God standeth sure; having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are His," 2 Tim. ii. 19; and though every preacher and minister in the kingdom, or in the world, taught differently, it is my duty to proclaim the Word as I have now laid it before you!
Be assured, if I were left to follow my own nature, I should preach very differently. I need hardly remind you that I have a heart to feel for the distress of poor humanity, and a hand always ready to relieve necessity, but "I cannot go beyond the Word of the Lord my God to do less or more of mine own mind, but what the Lord saith, that will I speak;" Numb. xxiv. 13. O! may that Lord, of His sovereign will, reveal these truths to the unawakened amongst you, and bless them with infinite blessing to those who already know them! Amen.
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