



ABS.1.80.184



TRUTH AND ERROR ;

OR,

Letters to a Friend,

ON

SOME OF THE CONTROVERSIES OF
THE DAY.

* There must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved, may
be made manifest among you."—1 Cor. 1 12.

BY THE

REV. HORATIUS BONAR,

KELSO.

EDINBURGH:

W. P. KENNEDY, 15 ST ANDREW STREET.

GLASGOW : D. BRYCE. DUNDEE : W. MIDDLETON.

KELSO : J. RUTHERFURD. LONDON : HAMILTON, ADAMS,
AND CO., AND JAMES NISBET AND CO.

MDCCLXVI.

"Let us be prepared for such a spirit (of error)—let us not be
stumble. If it come glowing with the message of God's love; rebuking,
exhorting, encouraging; weeping over the recital of Christ's sorrows.
All this will Satan be likely now to do; for nothing short of this will be
likely to deceive the elect."—*Letter to a friend on the religious state of
the Country.* 1837. P. 10.



ANDREW JACK, PRINTER.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
INTRODUCTION,	vii
LETTER I.—General Principles.	1
LETTER II.—General Principles, <i>continued</i> .	12
LETTER III.—God's will and Man's will.	24
LETTER IV.—Election.	33
LETTER V.—Predestination and Foreknowledge.	50
LETTER VI.—The Work of Christ.	65
LETTER VII.—Faith—the Gospel—Assurance.	79
LETTER VIII.—Man's Inability.	100
LETTER IX.—The Spirit and the Word.	118
LETTER X.—Present state of Religion.	146

"What is it all? Nothing but a self-achieved and self-wrought acquisition, earned wages, human handywork. He has read himself into it, or it has been talked, preached, persuaded, or practised into him by others; but the Holy Ghost has no share in his illumination; he has not been taught of the Lord; and therefore, also, all that he has thus swallowed down, lies like a dead capital, bringing in no interest; the food has not been digested, and therefore not converted into juice, blood, and life, and his spikenard gives no scent,"—*Krummacher*.

TO THE
CONGREGATION OF THE NORTH CHURCH,
KELSO,

This Little Work

IS AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED AND COMMENDED

BY THEIR PASTOR.

INTRODUCTION.

THESE Letters are little more than fragments. They do not aim at a complete statement of the truth, or a systematic arrangement of it. It is only a few important points that they touch.

To have extended them and embraced a wider range of doctrine would not have suited my design. I wished to warn you against some of the prevailing errors of the time, lest ye, being "led away from your steadfastness," should follow after the "diverse and strange doctrines" of these last days. Hence it was necessary to dwell upon those errors which have been most prominently advanced, and to open up those truths which have been most perverted and denied.

There may be found here and there a few repetitions. This I tried to avoid as much as possible, but could not altogether succeed. I found that so close is the connection between the different truths as well as the different errors, that after I had discussed them in one place, they would rise up in another, springing now out of

one doctrine, and again out of another. I do not regret this. It will tend to show more fully the harmony of all the different parts of truth, and their connection with each other, so that it will be seen that as all truth is linked together in its different parts, so is all error. Hence the danger of slighting any truth or giving way to any error.

My appeal is to the Word. What are the reasonings or opinions of men? What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord. Let the Bible decide each question. It is for this end that I have appended a selection of passages at length, at the conclusion of each letter.

The real question of the present day is just this,—*Is man a totally and thoroughly depraved being by nature?* Is he ruined, helpless, blind, dead in trespasses and sins? Many other questions have arisen, but this is the centre one. According to the views we entertain regarding this, will be our views on other points. It is upon the truth of this doctrine that the whole Bible proceeds. And hence I would at the outset, warn you strongly against any attempt to modify or abate or dilute the statements of Scripture on this point.

Man being thoroughly depraved in nature, is it possible, I ask, to save one soul without a special and direct intervention of Father, Son,

and Spirit in behalf of that individual soul? Or to use the language of science;—given a totally depraved being, is it possible to save that being by any plan which makes the *previous* concurrence of his own will a necessary preliminary, which makes it necessary that he should take the first step in the matter of return to God? In other words, is it possible to save that being in any way which does not involve personal election by the Father, particular redemption by the Son, and the direct, immediate, overcoming operation of the Holy Spirit?

If you place the different errors of the day before you in this light, you will find that they all more or less directly deny or encroach upon the doctrine of man's original or actual depravity.

You will find, also, that the objections urged against God's sovereignty and man's helplessness are just different manifestations of human pride,—the pride into which Satan tempted Adam, "Ye shall be as gods," and into which all his offspring have fallen along with him. Man will not consent to be nothing that God alone may be ALL. And it is curious to observe that the objections urged against these truths are not passages of Scripture, but human reasonings—man's inferences and opinions. You will find many a passage declaring God's sovereignty, but not one declaring the opposite. How, then, do

men contrive to deny this truth? They begin to reason and speculate upon it. They say, "does not God invite the sinner to come to Christ, does he not tell us that he has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but rather that he should turn and live: now how can this be true if He be absolutely sovereign in his proceedings? We cannot reconcile these things together, therefore we must explain away the passages which assert God's sovereignty and electing will." Thus pride of intellect, confidence in human reason, supersede and overturn the Word of God. Scripture is not implicitly relied upon unless borne out by the systems or the syllogisms of reason, and the conclusions of man's poor fallen intellect.

Cleave, then, to the Word of God. Distrust your own hearts, lean not to your own understandings,—but receive with meekness the ingrafted word. "The world through wisdom knew not God:" and we must "become fools that we may be wise:" for the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; they are foolishness to him, neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned.*

It is a singular fact, that the tendencies of the present day are to substitute the operation of general laws for the direct interposition of God. This is Satan's present device; and this is a

* See first and second chapters of 1 Corinthians.

device which he is carrying out into all departments of knowledge, philosophy, science, literature, and theology. Some ten or twelve years ago, for instance, we had a specimen of this in a work called "My Old House, or the doctrine of changes," by an individual calling himself a minister of Christ. He had conjured up a magnificent system of laws, a self-moving universe; and though he frequently spoke of Providence, it was evident that the idea of a Providence was a disturbance of the harmony, an incumbrance upon the graceful beauty of his system. Just so in the theology of some in our day. They would carry on everything by *means* alone, by intermediate agencies; and though they often speak of the Holy Spirit, yet it is very manifest that the doctrine of the Spirit's work sets their system out of joint, and is quite an incumbrance to it. *Their system is quite complete without any such agency.* This is already felt, and hence his direct personal operation is set aside. What may be the issue of this in a few years we shall not venture to predict. Whether such a theory can long subsist with the belief of the divinity and personality of the Spirit, or which of the two is likelier to give way, we shall leave to others to determine.

Of late, the well-known work, "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation," is another

specimen of what we mean. In that work, we are told by the author that he has suggested "a physiological explanation of the development of the vegetable and animal kingdoms, leading to the conclusion that the designs of Creative wisdom *were entirely effected by the intervention of natural laws.*" His object is to prove that God works only mediately and indirectly, through his laws, but not by the forth-putting of his power in any more direct manner. Now it is this very principle that pervades the new theology. Like the above writer, the new divines frequently speak of the Spirit, so as to lead many to suppose that they do not at all question his work; but they never fail to add, that He only works "in the use of means," not by "an inward direct energy."* Now, in regard to the statements of the man of science, we are quite willing to admit that God does work "by the intervention of natural law;" but the question is, does He work in that way *alone*? He affirms: we deny it; and maintain that such doctrine is philosophic scepticism. So in regard to the statements of the divines alluded to, we are equally willing to grant that the Holy Spirit does work by the use of means; but the question is, does he work by the use of means *alone*? They affirm: we deny it. We

* See the Correspondence of the Congregational Churches, p. 26, and other places.

say that he operates *directly* upon the soul, and maintain that the opposite of this is theological scepticism.

Both of these are truly signs of the last days—signs arising in different quarters of the heavens, yet obviously the same in kind. They manifest singular *unity* of design on the part of Satan. In both we see his repugnance to the direct *will* of Jehovah. In both, his object is to separate men from him in whom they live, and move, and have their being. In both, he is seeking to make the creature's communication with the Creator less personal and direct, and set aside the necessity of our acknowledgment of the ever-interposing power of the living Jehovah to do what he wills with his own.

Were these new theories correct, most melancholy were our case! For where would be the blessedness that flows from our direct dealings with God in prayer and praise? Are prayer and praise to be mere messages, sent by us to a far-distant Being, whose feelings and ours can never intermingle? or are they to be the close, real, personal converse of one friend with another, face to face? Admit the modern theory, and direct communion with God must be a thing unknown. For, if God only communicates with us through means, then we only communicate with him through the same. The far-off in-

fluence of the moon upon the tides of ocean is, in such a case, the true emblem of God's operations upon us; and the responsive but cold heaving of the billows upward, would be the only figure of our intercourse with Him. The living God, and the living soul could never meet and embrace each other in love. They could only carry on their intercourse by signs, and means, and influences.*

But let these remarks suffice as an introduction. I put these Letters into the hands of you, my dear people, that you may be helped to understand the truth of God, and may be kept steadfast therein. You know that it is the very truth which, during these eight years of my ministry among you, I have ever sought to teach you. My desire is to lay before you, in a more abiding form, the substance of my teaching from the pulpit. In the freeness of the glorious gospel, I have endeavoured to instruct you in many ways; and I would not, that you should be left unwarned against the errors which some are introducing under pretext of preaching that gospel more freely, "lest Satan should get an advantage over us, for we are not ignorant of his devices."

* This idea has been encouraged by the common expression, "influences of the Spirit." There is no authority for such a term in Scripture. It is a personally indwelling and inworking Spirit, who is there revealed to us.

“Little children, it is the last time; and, as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists, whereby we know, brethren, that it is the last time.

“Behold, I come quickly, hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown.”

KELSO, *April* 1846.

LETTER I.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

“Be not carried about with diverse and strange doctrines. For it is a good thing that the heart be established with grace.”—HEB. xiii. 9.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

You seem bewildered amid the opinions of the day almost as you would be in the midst of a company where each spoke in a different tongue. The difficulty of judging what is truth seems increasing, instead of disappearing. You know not what to think, nor which way to turn, in order to discover who is right, or where certainty is to be found; so many novelties stagger and amaze you. There seem to be good men on both sides, and that perplexes you still more.

You long for peace amid the jar of those unruly elements, and for stability amid these shifting sands. Yet rest comes not. There is no end of change. One novelty begets another, and that, in its turn, becomes equally productive. One error requires another to maintain it; this second must have a third or fourth to lean upon. One false step leads to twenty, or perhaps a hundred more. Who knows where all this is to end?

The changes are numerous. Every month produces some new doctrine, or at least some modification of the old. Fickle minds lie in wait for something new. As the edge of one novelty wears

down, another must be provided in its place to keep up the unhealthy excitement. Thus fickleness becomes doubly fickle by being gratified; novelties multiply, and the sore evil spreads. Men do not tremble at the thought of falling into error. To change opinions upon some casual impulse, or some shallow catch of an argument, is thought but a light thing; as if the falling into error were no great matter, instead of being a fearful calamity; or as if the entrance upon truth were an indifferent occurrence, instead of being the occasion of deep and solemn joy. Many who but lately were high Calvinists are now Arminians of the lowest grade, passing through the different levels with the most singular facility and flippancy, as easily and airily as the musician runs up and down the scale with the finger or the voice.

How is all this, you will ask? It might be enough to answer that it is written, "There shall come in the last days perilous times, when men shall be heady, high-minded, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth;"* "when they shall not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears, and shall turn away their ears from the truth."† But let us inquire a little farther. There seem to be chiefly three reasons for this; first, the soul is not at rest; secondly, the conscience is not at work; thirdly, there is little trembling at the word. I might refer to others, but these are the prominent ones.

* 2 Tim. iii. 4, 7.

† 2 Tim. iv. 3.

1. *The soul is not at rest.*—There is a resting-place for the weary, deep and broad, immoveable and sure—Jesus, the sin-bearing Lamb of God. But these unstable ones have not reached it. They speak much of it, talk as if they alone knew anything about it, as if none could state the gospel so freely as they; yet it is manifest that they have not yet realised that stable peace which comes from the knowledge of the living Jesus. They are not at rest; and till the *soul* be at rest, the *mind* cannot. It will always be making vain searches after new opinions, in the hope that this or that new doctrine may perchance bring to it the peace which it has hitherto sought in vain. Be assured of this, that a mind not at rest bespeaks a soul not at rest; and whatever men may affirm to you about their assurance or their peace, if you see them ever on the watch, ever on the wing for some new opinion, you may be sure there is littlerest within. In many cases it may be vanity, attachment to a sect, desire of proselytising others, or simply self-will; but in most cases I have no doubt that it is really in quest of peace that these poor souls are stretching out their weary hands, ready to embrace anything that will fill the dreary void, and pour over their souls that settled calm and sunshine, to which, in spite of all their profession, they are really strangers. They are not fastened to the anchor cast within the veil, or else they have let go their hold; and hence they are drifting from place to place in quest of anchorage, but unable to find it. They try, by means of change, to allay the fever and fretfulness of an unsettled spirit, yet all the while they

boast of their assurance, and perhaps censure you sorely if you cannot speak their language and assume their tone.

2. *The conscience is not at work.*—The conscience has far more to do in receiving or rejecting opinions than many suppose. It should stand like a sentinel at the door of the mind, to try all truth before it enter. A tender conscience is cautious, and oftentimes very slow in admitting truth, and, on this very account, most tenacious in holding it fast. Hence, a child of God, with a tender conscience, is often much slower in receiving truth than others. For it has to do with conscience in his case; it has to pass in to the mind under a watchful eye, which fears to be rash and hasty, and trembles at the thought of giving entrance to error. A conscience asleep, or seared, or secure, or vainly puffed up by a fleshly mind, makes quick work. A specious objection is presented to some old truth, or a plausible argument in favour of a new one, and, forthwith, the former is thrust out, the latter taken in, without any resistance, or delay, or trembling on the part of conscience, or any light and guidance from God, sought and obtained upon the matter.

Nothing is more needed in our inquiries after truth, than the watchful jealousy of a tender conscience. Yet how little is there of conscience at all in these last days. There is what is called independence of mind, or thinking for one's self; but that is not conscience. There is a spurning of creeds, and catechisms, and all olden theology, but that is not conscience. It is not waiting

upon God for teaching. It is trusting our own heart, and taking the guidance of our own eyes. It is not "ceasing from man," but the mere pretence of it. It is ceasing from one man in order to trust in another, from one age to trust in another, from one book to trust in another, from one heart to trust in another, and that other perhaps the most deceitful of all,—our own. Hence there is such running after novelty, such readiness to receive any plausible error, such instability of opinion and fickleness of spirit; such self-willedness and headstrong precipitancy of judgment; such high-mindedness, pride, and censoriousness of others; so little thought of our own foolishness and fallibility; so slender a sense of the awful responsibility we are under to God, for what we believe ourselves and propagate among others as his precious and eternal truth.

3. *There is little trembling at the word.*—It is a solemn thing for man to be spoken to by God, the God of heaven and earth. Each word coming from his lips should be listened to and received with profoundest reverence. "The Lord has spoken" is enough for us. There is no room for question or cavil where his voice is heard. Each word in the Bible is to be dealt with as a sacred thing—a vessel of the sanctuary, not to be lightly handled or profanely mutilated, but to be received just as it stands. There may be passages difficult to reconcile, doctrines which apparently conflict with each other. But let us beware of smoothing down, or hammering in pieces, one class of passages, in order to bring about a reconciliation. Let us be content to take them as they are. We shall gain

nothing by explaining them away. God has spoken them. God has placed them there. They cannot really be at variance with each other. The day is coming when we shall fully understand their harmony. Let us wait till then, and meanwhile tremble at the thought of explaining away one jot or tittle. Most assuredly we shall not bring about the agreement in any such way. We are only widening the breach, and opening out new difficulties.

People may say, how can you preach a free gospel, and yet believe in election? I answer—I believe in both, and preach both, because I find both in the Bible. I have no authority for preaching an unconditional gospel but what I find in the Bible; and I have the same authority for preaching an unconditional personal election. God has told me that both are true; and woe be to me if I profanely attempt to mutilate either the one or the other. If one man refuses to take the simple meaning of election, another may refuse to take the simple meaning of gospel. And I do solemnly protest, that if I were called upon to say which is the worse, the more profane of the two, I would say the former. I would, indeed, tremble at the thought of denying either election or the gospel; but I confess that I think the denial of the latter a less direct, and a less daring insult to the sovereign majesty of Jehovah. It would be a shutting out of his grace, a closing up of all the manifestations of his character which have come out to us since Adam sinned; and it would be drawing a dark cloud over our eternal prospects,—but it would not be a taking of the reins of government

out of his hands,—it would not be the usurpation of his throne,—it would not be giving the right hand of fellowship to atheism.

But there is no need of any such comparison. Perhaps it was wrong to make it. I have done so, however, because I wish you distinctly to understand that I consider *election* to belong to the highest and most sacred order of truth—not a doctrine to be concealed and muffled as if we were either ashamed or afraid of it, but to be firmly held, and faithfully preached, whether men will hear or forbear. Mere philosophy might tell men this if the Bible did not. Mere philosophy might expose the silliness and shallowness and selfishness of those who trample on God's free will, in order to establish man's,—even if theology and Scripture were silent on the matter.

Why do I believe in a free gospel? Is it because reason has revealed it? Is it because I find it suits me best? No. It is because God has declared it; that is my sole authority. Why do I believe in election? Just because God has made it known. I may find that reason confirms this. I may see that there can be no really free gospel without election; but still my reason for believing is because I find it most plainly revealed.

You can only get rid of election by getting rid of the Bible. And hence you will find among those who deny election and the work of Christ for his church, a great dislike at these passages of Scripture which allude to those topics. They pass them by, they turn away from them, they are angry if a minister even quotes them, though

without a comment. Now I ask, would they do and feel this if they believed that these passages really contained the meaning put upon them? If these passages are quite in harmony with their views, why do they shrink from quoting them or hearing them quoted? Is not this the plainest of all proofs that they feel that theirs is not the honest interpretation? Does it not show that they themselves are secretly persuaded that these passages do teach unconditional election and the absolute sovereignty of Jehovah? They feel that they have twisted them from their plain sense, and that the mere reading of them is enough to expose their distortions. They feel that they have not dealt honestly with the word of God, and that their dishonest dealings cannot bear the light of day.

Let us learn to "tremble at the word." Let us take it plainly and honestly in its simple sense. Let us not be afraid of its apparent contradictions. Let us not think ourselves capable of reconciling and harmonizing all its declarations. We see here but through a glass darkly. The day of light and harmony is coming. All shall then be plain. God will solve our difficulties. Meanwhile, let us reverence every jot and tittle of his holy word. Let us trust our own hearts and reasonings less, and God's word more. Let us not be so anxiously asking, *how* can this be? how can we reconcile God's sovereignty with man's responsibility? how can we harmonize the Spirit's free agency with man's free agency? Let us leave difficulties in the hands of God; and let us beware of making those difficulties greater by our

miserable attempts to reach at things too high for us, or our more miserable efforts to pervert and mutilate the simple word of the God who cannot lie.

There are doubtless other causes of the evils over which we mourn; but these are the three chief roots of bitterness. To these may be traced more of the evils and errors of our day than many may be willing to allow. Till these are removed I have little hope that the instability of the times will die out, or cease to operate for the injury and subversion of the truth. Till the soul gets *rest*—not the name but the reality—and till the conscience is awake and sensitive, and till the Word of God is revered and honestly interpreted, I see small prospect of an end to these changes, if indeed we may venture to hope that such can be until the Lord shall come.

Yet be not amazed. Jehovah changes not; neither does his word. It abideth for ever, firm as the rocks of earth, undimmed as the azure of the heavens. Seek unto God for light, and to his word for wisdom. Take his Holy Spirit as your teacher. Heed not the jar of man's warring opinions. Let God be true, and every man a liar. The Bible is the Bible still. If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God. Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.

Do not be alarmed, as if all this were some new thing in the earth. Many speak as if truth had never arisen among men till they arose to teach it. But the errors of the day are those of former times. They have shot up once and again, and

been as often silenced and put to shame. They are old and worn-out errors, though perhaps more daringly set forth now than heretofore; for the time seems at hand in which "the earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard," and when false teachers and prophets shall deceive, if it were possible, the very elect. Yet do not suppose the attainment of truth a hopeless thing. "The Son of God hath come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true." It was He who taught the multitudes in the days of his flesh; and so he teacheth the multitude still. If he teaches not, all is vain and false; if he teaches, all is true, all is blessed. Learn of me, he says, for I am meek and lowly; and to what teacher can a foolish erring soul betake himself like this meek and lowly one, who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way. He has received gifts for men, when he ascended on high, even for the rebellious; and to whom can you go, save to him who has the Holy Spirit with all his gifts and graces freely to bestow?—I am, yours, &c.

THUS SAITH THE LORD:

"Of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women, laden with sins, led away with diverse lusts; ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."
—2 Tim. iii. 6.

"The time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers having

itching ears; and they shall turn away from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables."—2 Tim. iv. 3.

"There are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers."—Titus i. 10.

"That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive."—Eph. iv. 14.

LETTER II.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES CONTINUED.

“ Shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou? or thy work, He hath no hands.”—ISAIAH xlv. 9.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

Having stated what appears to me to be the origin of the theological opinions that are now trying to make way among us, I would briefly advert to some of the principles out of which they spring. I might at once have gone on to discuss the different points or opinions themselves, but I think it may be useful to notice some of the principles which they involve, or what may be called the general aspect or essence of these opinions. We have already seen the *soil* in which they flourish,—we shall forthwith proceed to advert to the branches and fruit; but before doing so, it may be well to call attention to the *roots* of the tree.

Speaking generally of the new doctrines, and of the movement which has taken place in connection with them, we may affirm several things.

1. Man has too much to do with all this,—God too little. We hear much of what man does, and can do, and ought to do, but by no means so much of what God is doing, and has purposed to do. Man's agency stands very prominently out

to view,—God's arm and power are hidden. It seems almost as if man would thrust aside God, take the reins of government out of his hands, and be to himself a god. Man gets much credit for doing and saying great things,—God gets little glory. The position of the sinner, *as a mere receiver of salvation*, and every blessing connected with it in this life or the next, is denied; and he is exalted to be a co-operator with God in the matter of salvation. He begins the work by becoming willing, and God ends it. He does what he can, and God does all the rest. He is represented as helping God to save him; or rather we should say, God is represented as helping man to save himself! In the old creation, God did all; but in the new creation, as being a far more stupendous work, he requires the assistance of man,—nay, he commits half the work, at least the most difficult and momentous, to man himself! If some of the new theories be true, God is not all in all, but is, on the contrary, considerably indebted to man; and man, in like manner, is not a little indebted to himself. In all this we hear still the whisperings of the old serpent, "Ye shall be as gods;" and we see man, like his first father, aspiring to the Divine prerogative.

2. Man's way, and not God's, is taken as the guide of action. God has a way, a plan, a purpose, well and wisely ordered. This plan, which he acts by, he has revealed, and he expects us to take it as our guide in all our schemes. This plan teaches and rules things both great and small,—nations, communities, churches, with all

their movements. Man's wisdom would be to search out this plan, and shape all his movements accordingly. Inattention to this must not only lead to fruitless efforts and unscriptural schemes, but to much false religion, self-will, formality, excitement, and sectarianism. God's design is to *glorify himself*,—to show to the whole universe what an infinitely glorious Being he is. This is his mighty plan and end in all he does and says—to manifest himself, and show forth his glory. For this, sin was allowed to enter the world; for this, the "Word was made flesh;" for this the Son of God shed his blood and died; for this He is taking out of this world a people to himself; to this all things are tending, and in this shall they be consummated ere long. Nothing less than this does God propose to himself in his doings; and nothing less than this should we ever make our aim and end. All things are but means to this one end. Even the incarnation of his own Son is but a means, not an end. Even the gathering in of his chosen ones is but a means, not an end. Even the salvation of Israel and of the world in the day of coming glory shall be a means, not an end.

Whenever we overlook this, we go wrong, and our efforts are but the beating of the air. When we make an end of any thing lower than this, we are sure to fall into error; because, when we take *ends* of our own, we are certain to take *means* of our own. Take the case of the conversion of a soul,—a blessed thing,—a thing greatly to be desired and sought after. In truth I may say, we cannot be too much in earnest about the

saving even of one lost one. I do believe we know almost nothing of that deep compassion and yearning love for a dying world which, as saints, we ought ever to feel. Yet still it is quite possible to err in this matter,—not in being too earnest, but in being so intent on having men converted as to lose sight of the mighty *end* for which this is to be sought. Hence the glory of God is hidden from view: I do not say denied, but hidden from view. And what is the consequence? We cease to look at conversion in the light in which God regards it, as the way in which he is to be glorified. We think if we can but get men converted, it does not so much matter how. Our whole anxiety is, not how shall we secure the glory of Jehovah, but how shall we multiply conversions. The whole current of our thoughts and anxieties takes this direction. We cease to look at both things together; we think it enough to keep the one of them alone in our eye; and the issue is, that we soon find ourselves pursuing ways of our own. Bent upon compassing a particular object, we run recklessly forward, thinking that, as the object is right, any thing that can contribute towards the securing of it cannot be wrong. We thus come to measure the correctness of our paths, simply by their seeming to contribute to our favourite aim. We estimate the soundness of our doctrine, not from the tendency to exalt and glorify Jehovah, but entirely by the apparent facility with which it enables us to get sinners to turn from their ways. The question is not asked concerning any doctrine, is *it in itself* a God-honouring truth, but will it

afford us facilities for converting souls? Will it make conversion a more easy thing,—a thing which a man may accomplish for himself and by himself? Will it make conversion less dependent upon God, and more dependent upon man? Will it make a man's salvation to hinge less purely and solely upon the will of Jehovah, and more entirely upon the will of the sinner himself? Will it enable us to get quit of such texts as "No man can come unto me unless the Father draw him," "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you," "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots."

The man who thinks of nothing but how he may (as he calls it) get sinners converted, is continually apt to take these devious courses. Impelled but by one force, in one direction, for one motive, he soon errs, and loses himself in mazy thickets, which, as he plunges on, thicken into deeper intricacy and darkness. Such texts as these present themselves and cross his path. Intent on but one thing, he either shuns them, or treads them down. They are incompatible with his *one* idea,—they seem to impede him in the pursuit of his one end. And therefore they must be got quit of. It does not occur to ask, am I not looking at objects in a partial light, from too low a position, and with a false bias which unfits me for coming to a right judgment. Were such a question but asked and answered as it ought, there would be less of one-sided doctrines, misshapen systems, got up to accomplish a favourite and engrossing object. Were the glory of the infinite Jehovah seen in its true light as the

mightiest and most majestic of all objects and ends,—not to the exclusion of other matters, but simply to their regulation and subordination, then should we be saved the pain of seeing men rushing headlong over Scripture and reason, striking out strange bypaths of their own, in their eager pursuit of an object on which they have fixed an exclusive and partial eye.

I do not wonder at men, who either have lost sight of the glory of Jehovah or have made it a subordinate object, or who think that if they can only get men converted, God will look after his own glory,—I do not wonder at them being fretted when such texts as those I have referred to confront them in their schemes for facilitating conversion, and making man the converter of himself. A man with only one object in view, and that not the highest, must be stumbled at such declarations, and feel at a loss to reconcile them with others. But the man who has set his heart upon the glory of his God, and views everything in relation to that, feels no such difficulty. He takes Scripture as he finds it. He has no need to explain away even one verse or clause of the Book of Truth. He enters into the purpose of God; he looks at things in the light in which God looks at them. He tries to see them as they might have appeared in the long past eternity,—or as they will yet appear in the eternity to come. And he finds all harmony. There is no conflict, no discord at all. One class of passages show him the yearnings of God's heart over sinful man. They show him that God is in earnest in beseeching men to come to him; that he

really means what he says when he makes proposals of friendship and reconciliation to them. They show him that the sinner's unbelief is the cause of his damnation; and that if he is lost, it is not because God would not be reconciled to him, but because he would not be reconciled to God. They show him that the water of life is *free*; free to every man; free to every sinner as he stands; and that he is invited to partake, without price or preparation, not only *although* he is a sinner, but just *because* he is a sinner. They show him these things, and in them he greatly rejoices. He does not wish to abate one jot of the blessed freeness, or cloud by one restriction the joy of the glad tidings. No. He takes these passages just as he finds them. He sees how suitable they are to one of the objects on which his heart is set,—I mean the conversion of souls. But then he finds another class of passages which follow out another line of truth. They run him up at once into the purpose and will of Jehovah as the fount and cause of every thing great or small. They are quite explicit; just as much so as the other. He cannot explain them away. They are so plain and simple, that a child may see what they mean. But he has no wish to take them in any other than their obvious sense. He sees in them that which exactly meets his own feelings, and coincides with his view of God's glory as being the paramount and all-regulating end in all the movements of the universe. He sees in them not a restriction upon the gospel, but the simple statement of an infinite truth. That infinite

truth is just this, that God's will is the law of the universe, his glory the object and end both in creation and in redemption, his everlasting purpose the mighty and all-perfect mould in which all things are cast, and from which they take their shape and fashion from first to last. In such passages he sees God pointing out to men the true end which they ought to have in view, and by which all their movements are to be regulated. In them he sees God setting a fence and guard around his own majesty, lest men should imagine that their will is everything, their salvation God's only end, and that in the gospel He has thrown the reins of this fallen earth into the sinner's hands, telling him that every thing depends upon his own will and power, and that he has but to put forth that will and power in order to save himself, and restore a ruined world to the perfection of its former beauty.

Whenever we lose sight of God's great end in all things,—his own glory,—we fall into a wrong track. We go wrong in judging of doctrine; we go wrong in the formation of our plans; we go wrong in the bent of our efforts; we miscalculate the relative importance of different truths. Thus our whole tone of feeling, judging, and working is lowered and contracted. Zeal for our own ways and opinions takes the place of higher aims: A revival is got up to propagiate these opinions, or to prop up a sect. Sectarianism and selfish exclusiveness steal in. Egotism, boasting, censoriousness are introduced. Religion becomes an instrument for working out our own views and ends. The most solemn and spiritual things

are spoken of with levity and irreverence. Conversion soon becomes the same as the holding of certain opinions, and the mark of an unconverted man is, that he rejects these opinions. Being loosened from their anchorage, men drift away without a guide. One doctrine after another is embraced, and change succeeds change, as month follows month. To make conversion easy is the great object; and to accomplish this particular end, favourite passages must be dwelt upon incessantly, doctrine after doctrine smoothed over, and text after text pared away.

From such roots many other evils spring, which I cannot here enumerate. There is often manifested a narrow-mindedness, a contraction of the spiritual eye, and a limitation of the spiritual horizon, which is apt to end in engrossing selfishness. Hence, we see often greater zeal to proselytize to a sect than to win to Christ. We see great activity displayed in making known and forcing upon others the points on which the difference exists, and much less concern about propagating those in which all believers are agreed. We hear much talking about doctrines and peculiarities, little about Christ himself. We find conversation turning too much upon the spiritual state of others, and that often in flippancy or censoriousness,—this one being pronounced unconverted, that other converted,—this one being mentioned as having joined the sect, or that other as being inclined to join it, or that other again as standing aloof. We find discussions arising as to whom this one was awakened under, or whom this other, as if this were a matter of any moment,

provided the soul be saved, and Jesus glorified. We find people extolling the exploits of their ministers, or the doings of their sect, numbering up the conversions that took place at this or that revival, under this or that minister, in this or that town or village.

How much is there in all this of selfishness and sectarianism, how little of simple zeal for the glory of the name of Jesus! A taste for religious gossip, in which the spiritual state of others is freely canvassed, criticized, and decided on, is a very different thing from that relish for the things of God and Christ, which shows itself in the saint by the delight which he takes in truly spiritual converse on things pertaining to God and his glory, to Jesus and his love.—I am, yours, &c.

THUS SAITH THE LORD :

“The Lord hath made all things for himself, yea, even the wicked for the day of evil.”—Prov. xvi. 4.

“Nay, but O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?” Rom. ix. 20.

“To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God; according to the ETERNAL PURPOSE which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.”—Eph. iii. 10.

“Vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt.”—Job xi. 12.

NOTE.

As a specimen of the way in which plain texts are twisted, we refer to Rom. ix. 15, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy," &c. This they venture to translate, "I will have mercy on whom I *can* have mercy,"—that is, "I will have mercy on those on whom I *can* consistently with righteousness have mercy." Now I say at once, and without hesitation, that such is *not* the meaning of the Greek words. They have wrung this meaning out of them because it was the only way in which they could destroy their explicit testimony to Jehovah's sovereignty. But no scholar will ever say that such is the meaning of the words. If any doubt existed as to their meaning, Paul removes it completely in the 18th verse, by giving us his comment upon them, "therefore hath he mercy on whom he **WILLETH**," not on whom he *can* merely, but on whom he **WILLETH**. Even though they might succeed in thrusting *can* into the words of Moses, they must admit that Paul is explicit enough. And will not his testimony suffice? Lest, however, our statement should be suspected, we add higher authority, which is beyond suspicion. Grotius, an old commentator, whose dislike to Calvinism makes his testimony the more impartial, translates it exactly as in our version, and illustrates the statement by referring to the way in which kings issue orders according to their pleasure, without making known their reasons. Limborch, also, another Arminian divine, takes precisely the same view. Wolfius, another divine of the same class, when referring to one critic who wished to substitute *can* for *will*, makes this remark—"I would not, however, depart from the interpretation of the Septuagint, which Paul has here approved of, and which the connection of Paul's discourse seems to require." I observe also, that a modern Neologian, or at least semi-Neologian critic, Kuttner, takes the same view. He denies the doctrine of personal and unconditional election, maintaining with others of his own stamp, that it is a *national* election that is spoken of, yet he has no hesitation about the meaning of the 15th verse. The substitution of the *can* for the *will* does not seem to have occurred to him. He interprets honestly, and as a scholar. The sense, says he, is, "I will show kindness to whom I will to show kindness," *beneficiis afficiam cui bene-*

facere volo (see his *Hypomnemata* upon the New Testament, p. 243.) I might have quoted other Arminian commentators to the same effect. But I need not. These are enough. We see what honest men and scholars think of the passage. Even when wishing to hind it to their theory, they cannot. Even when alluding to the very interpretation now sought to be put upon it, they refuse to allow it to be either possible or tenable. They at once set aside the *con*, as not only not admissible according to the rules of criticism, but as positively discountenanced by the apostle's interpretation of the words of Moses. It is somewhat strange to see the Arminians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the Neologians of the nineteenth, united in this view, and the authors of the new theology setting themselves against it. Are the latter better critics and scholars than the former? No man will assert that. Of criticism and scholarship they seem to know almost nothing; yet they, with strange self-confidence, insist upon trying their hand at new translations, and boldly asserting them to be true and right in the face of all critics and scholars, ancient and modern. How is this? We do not pretend to account for it entirely. But one thing is very evident, that these old Arminian critics were honest men, who, though they held false doctrine, yet would not misinterpret Scripture in order to support it. Besides, they were really scholars, and had some reputation to sustain, which might have been materially damaged had they ventured upon any gross perversions of the original. Modern divines who have no such name to uphold, may do what they like with the Greek. They have nothing to lose, even though their attempts at criticism should betray their utter ignorance of the language. And again, we fear that the Arminianism of the present day is really of a *lower grade* than that of former centuries. Most of the Arminians of the seventeenth century would have scorned the ultra-Pelagianism of the present day. The tone of doctrine being lowered, the tone of interpretation has of necessity become laxer and more pliable. Perhaps this may in no small measure account for the difference alluded to above.

LETTER III.

GOD'S WILL AND MAN'S WILL.

“ Cannot I do with you as this potter ? saith the Lord. Behold as the clay in the potter's hand, so are ye in my hand, O house of Israel.”—JER. xviii. 6.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

Much of the present controversy is concerning *the will of God*. On this point many questions have arisen. The chief one, I think, is that which touches on the connection between the will of God and the will of man. What is the relation between these? What is the order in which they stand to each other? Which is first?

There is no dispute as to the existence of these two separate wills. There is a will in God, and there is also a will in man. Both of these are in continual exercise—God willeth, and man willeth. Nothing in the universe takes place without the will of God. This is admitted. But it is asked, Is this will *first* in every thing?

I answer, Yes. The will of God goes before all other wills. It does not depend on them, but they depend on it. Its movements regulate them. The “ I will” of Jehovah, is that which sets in motion every thing in heaven and in earth. The “ I will” of Jehovah, is the spring and origin of all that is done throughout the universe, great or small, among things animate or inanimate. It was this “ I will” that brought angels into being,

and still sustains them. It was this "I will" that brought this world into being, and still sustains it. It was this "I will" that was the origin of salvation to a lost world. It was this "I will" that provided a Redeemer, and accomplished redemption. It is this "I will" that begins and carries on, and ends salvation in each soul that is redeemed. It is this "I will" that opens the blind eye, and unstops the deaf ear. It is this "I will" that awakens the slumberer, and raises the dead. I do not mean merely that, generally speaking, God has declared his will concerning these things: but each individual conversion, nay, and each movement that forms part of it, originates in this supreme "I will." When Jesus healed the leper, he said, "I will, be thou clean;" so when a soul is converted, there is the same distinct and special forth-putting of the Divine will, "I will, be thou converted."

I do not deny that in conversion man himself wills. In everything that he does, thinks, feels, he of necessity wills. In believing he wills; in repenting he wills; in turning from his evil ways he wills. All this is true. The opposite of this is both untrue and absurd. But while fully admitting this, there is another question behind it of great interest and moment. Are these movements of man's will the effects of the forth-putting of God's will? Is man willing, because he has made himself so, or because God has made him so? Does he become willing, entirely by an act of his own, or by chance, or because acted on by created causes and influences from without?

I answer unhesitatingly, he becomes willing,

because another and a superior will, even that of God, has come into contact with his, altering its nature and its bent. This new bent is the result of a change produced upon it by him who alone, of all beings, has the right, without control, to say, in regard to all events and changes, "I will." The man's will has followed the movement of the Divine will. God has made him willing. God's will is *first* in the movement, not second. Even a holy and perfect will depends entirely for the guidance of every motion upon the will of God. Even when renewed it still *follows*, it does not *lead*. Much more an unholy will, for its bent must first be changed, and how can it be changed if God is not to interpose his hand and power?

Yes, it may be said, It is even so. But God works by means in changing the will. There is no need that there should be the special and direct forthputting of his will and strength. He has ordained the means, he has given his word, he has proclaimed his gospel, and by these means he effects the change. His will does not come directly into contact with ours. He leaves it to these instruments to effect the change. Well, let us see what amount of truth there may be in this. I suppose no one will say that the gospel can produce the alteration in the will so long as the will rejects it. No medicine, however excellent, can operate unless it be taken. The will of man then rejects the gospel; it is set against the truth of God. How then is it made to receive it? Granting that in receiving it there is a change, yet the question is, How was it so far changed already as to be willing to receive it? The worst feature

of the malady is the determination *not* to touch or taste the medicine; and how is this to be overcome? Oh! it will be said, this resistance is to be overcome with arguments. Arguments! Is not the gospel itself the great argument, and it is rejected? What arguments can you expect to prevail with a man that refuses the gospel? Admit that there are other arguments, yet the man is set against them all. There is not one argument that can be used which he does not hate, so that it is foolishness to speak of arguments being successful when the gospel, which is the grand argument, has failed. His will resists every argument, and how is this resistance to be overcome? How is this opposition to be made to give way? How is the bent of the will to be so altered as to receive that which it rejected? Plainly by his will coming into contact with a superior one,—a will that can remove the resistance,—a will such as that which said, “Let there be light, and there was light.” The will itself must undergo a change before it can choose that which it rejected. And what can change it but the finger of God? Were man’s rejection of the gospel simply occasioned by his misunderstanding it, then I can see how, upon its being made plain, resistance would give way. But I do not believe that such is the case; for what does it amount to but just that the sinner never rejects the *truth*, it is only error which he rejects, and were his mistake rectified, he would at once embrace the truth! The unrenewed man, then, so far from having enmity to the truth, has the very opposite! So little of depravity is there in his heart, and so little perversity in his will; such

instinctive love of truth and abhorrence of error is there in him, that as soon as the truth is made plain to him, he embraces it! All his previous hesitation arose from the errors which had been mingled with the truth presented! One would think that this was anything but depravity. It might be ignorance, but it could not be called enmity to the truth, it is rather enmity to error. It would thus appear that the chief feature of the sinner's heart and will is not enmity to truth, but hatred of error and love of truth!

Now, in opposition to all this, I believe that the unrenewed will is set against the gospel; it is enmity to God and his truth. The more closely and clearly truth is set before it, and pressed home upon it, its hatred swells and rises. The presentation of truth, however forcible and clear, even though that truth were the love of God in Christ, will only exasperate the unconverted man. It is the gospel that he hates, and the more clearly it is set before him he hates it the more. It is God that he hates, and the more closely that God approaches him, the more vividly that God is set before him, the more does his enmity awaken and augment. Surely, then, that which stirs up enmity cannot of itself remove it? Of what avail, then, are the most energetic means by themselves? The will itself must be directly operated upon by the Spirit of God. He who made it must re-make it. Its making was the work of Omnipotence: its re-making must be the same. In no other way can its evil bent be rectified. God's will must come into contact with man's will, and then the work is done. Must not God's will then be first

in every such movement? Man's will follows; it cannot lead.

Is this a hard saying? So some in these days would have us to believe. Let us ask wherein consists its hardness. Is it hard that God's will should take the precedence of man's? Is it hard that God's will should be the leader, and man's the follower in all things great and small? Is it hard that we should be obliged to trace the origin of every movement of man towards good in the will of a sovereign Jehovah?

If it be hard, it must be that it strips man of every fragment of what is good, or of the slightest tendency to good. And this we believe to be the secret origin of the complaint against the doctrine. It is a thorough leveller and emptier of man. It leaves him not only nothing, but worse than nothing; and this he cannot tolerate. Admit that man is totally worthless and helpless, and where is the hard saying? Is it hard that God's blessed and holy will should go before our miserable and unholy wills, to lead them in the way? Is it hard that those who have nothing should be indebted for every thing to God? Is it hard, seeing that every movement of my will is downwards, earthwards, that God's mighty will should come in and lift it omnipotently upwards, heavenwards?

If God's will were an *obstruction* to mine, there might be something hard in the doctrine of Jehovah's sovereignty. If the latent relics of goodness in me were thwarted by God, or at least disregarded by him, there would be something hard indeed. But when his will never interferes with

mine, save to arrest its downward course, what can be less hard or more blessed than this?

If I admit that God's will regulates the great movements of the universe, I must admit that it equally regulates the small. It *must* do this, for the great depends upon the small. The minutest movement of my will is regulated by the will of God. And in this I rejoice. Woe is me if it be not so. If I shrink from such unlimited control and guidance, it is plain that I dislike the idea of being wholly at the disposal of God. I am wishing to be in part at my own disposal. I am ambitious of regulating the lesser movements of my will, while I give up the greater to his control. And thus it comes out that I wish to be a god to myself. I do not like the thought of God having all the disposal of my destiny. If he gets his will, I am afraid that I shall not get mine. It comes out, moreover, that the God about whose love I was so fond of speaking, is a God to whom I cannot trust myself implicitly for eternity. Yes, this is the real truth. *Man's dislike at God's sovereignty arises from his suspicion of God's heart.* And yet the men in our day, who deny this absolute sovereignty, are the very men who profess to rejoice in the love of God,—who speak of that love as if there were nothing else in God but love. The more I understand of the character of God, as revealed in Scripture, the more shall I see that he *must be* sovereign, and the more shall I rejoice from my inmost heart that he is so.

It was God's sovereign will that fixed the time of my birth. It is the same will that has fixed

the day of my death. And was not the day of my conversion fixed as certainly by that same will? Or will any but "the fool" say that God has fixed by his will the day of our birth and death, but leaves us to fix the day of our conversion by our own will; that is, leaves us to decide whether we shall be converted or not, whether we shall believe or not? If the day of conversion be fixed, then it cannot be left to be determined by our own will. God determined where, and when, and how we should be born, and so he has determined where, and when, and how we shall be born again. If so, his will must go before ours in believing; and it must be that it is just because his will goes before ours that we believe. Were it not for this, we would never have believed at all.

But in all this opposition to the absolute will of God, we see the self-will of the last days manifesting itself. Man wanted to be a God at the first, and he continues the struggle to the last. He is resolved that his will shall take the precedence of God's. In the last Antichrist, this self-will shall be summed up and manifested. He is the king, that is, do "according to his will." And in the free-will controversy of the day, we see the same spirit displayed. It is Antichrist that is speaking to us, and exhorting us to proud independence. Self-will is the essence of anti-christianism. Self-will is the root of bitterness, that is springing up in the churches in these days. And it is not from above, it is from beneath. It is earthly, sensual, devilish.

I am, &c.

THUS SAITH THE LORD:

“I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy.”—Exod. xxxiii. 19.

“See now that I, even I am he, and there is no God with me. I kill and I make alive; I wound and I heal; neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand.”—Deut xxxii. 39.

“Behold he breaketh down, and it cannot be built again: he shutteth up a man, and there can be no opening.”—Job xii. 14.

“When he gives quietness, who can give trouble; and when he hideth, who can behold him.”—Job xxxiv. 29.

“He doth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay his hand, or say unto him what doest thou.”—Dan. iv. 35.

“Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to HIS OWN PURPOSE and grace, given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.”—2 Tim. i. 9.

LETTER IV.

ELECTION.

"Many are called, but few are chosen."—MAT. xxii. 14.'

"As many as were ordained to eternal life believed."
—ACTS xiii. 48.

MY DEAR FRIEND,—

You know what a very prominent place in Scripture the doctrine of election holds. It meets us every where, both in the Old and New Testament. Whatever may be the meaning of the word, one cannot help feeling that the truth which it expresses must, in God's sight, be a vitally important one.

But how can this be the case, if it mean no more than God's choosing those that choose him? If it mean no more than God's choosing those who he foresaw would believe of their own accord, and by their own power, it is not worthy of the prominent place it holds in Scripture; nay it is not worthy of a separate name, least of all of such a name as election. If there be any election at all in such a case, it is plainly not God's election of man, but man's election of God. So that the question comes to be simply this, does election mean God's choosing man, or man's choosing God? It cannot mean both; it must either be the one or the other. Which of the

two can any reasonable being suppose it to mean ?*

I would just ask, what does the word mean in common speech? When we speak of the election of a member of parliament, does that mean that

* As the right understanding of this word is of great importance, I think it well to note down a few passages, which will help to shed light upon the meaning of the word.

"The man's rod, whom *I shall choose*, shall blossom."—Num. xvii. 5.

"Thou shalt set him King over thee, whom the Lord thy God *shall choose*."—Deut. xvii. 15.

"Did I *choose him out of* all the tribes of Israel."—1 Sam. ii. 28.

"The place which the Lord *hath chosen*, to put his name there."—Deut. xii. 21.

"Them the Lord thy God *hath chosen* to minister unto him."—Deut. xxi. 5.

"Jerusalem, the city which I have *chosen out of* all the tribes of Israel."—1 Kings xi. 32.

"The Lord *chose* me, before all the house of my father, to be King over Israel."—1 Chron. xxviii. 4.

"He refused the tabernacle of Joseph, and chose not the tribe of Ephraim, but *chose* the tribe of Judah, the mount Zion that he loved."—Ps. lxxviii. 67, 68.

"Many are called, but few are *chosen*."—Matt. xx. 16.

"For his elect's sake whom he *hath chosen*."—Mark xiii. 20.

"He is a *chosen* vessel unto me."—Acts ix. 15.

"I know whom I have *chosen*."—John xiii. 18.

"Ye have not *chosen* me, but I have *chosen* you."—Jo. xv. 16.

"According as he *hath chosen us* in him before the foundation of the world."—Eph. i. 4.

"God *hath* from the beginning *chosen* you to salvation."—2 Thess. ii. 13.

These are but a few out of the many passages that might have been chosen. But they are quite enough to show the meaning of the word. No one who wishes to take words plainly as he finds them, can find any difficulty in understanding what choosing or election means after reading such passages as these.

the member first chose himself, and then the people chose him, because he had chosen himself? Or when we speak of the election of a minister, do we mean that he first chose himself, and then the people chose him, because he had chosen himself? No such theory of election would be listened to for a moment in such matters. Election has but one meaning there. It means the people's choosing their representative by a distinct act of their own will, or the congregation choosing their minister by an equally distinct act of their own will. And shall man have his will, and shall not God have his? Shall man have his choice, and shall not God have his?

But let us take an instance from the Bible. What does God's choosing of Abraham mean? He is a specimen of a sinner saved by grace; a sinner called out of the world by God. Well, how did this choosing take place? Did not God think of him long before he ever thought of God? Did not God choose him long before he ever thought of choosing God? Were there not thousands more in Chaldea that God might have chosen, and called, and saved, had he pleased? Yet he chose Abraham alone. And what does the Bible call this procedure on the part of God? It calls it *election*.* Does any one say, Oh, but God chose Abraham, because he foresaw that Abraham would choose him. I answer, the case is precisely the reverse of this. He chose Abraham just because he saw that otherwise Abra-

* "Thou art the Lord, the God who didst choose Abraham, and broughtest him forth out of Ur of the Chaldees."
—Nehem. ix. 7.

ham would *not* choose him. It was God's foreseeing that Abraham would *not* choose him, that made election necessary. And so it is with every sinner. So it is with us. God chooses us not because he foresees that we would choose him, or that we would believe, but for the very opposite reason. He chooses us just because he foresees that we would neither choose him nor believe of ourselves at all. Election proceeds not upon foreseen *faith* in us, but upon foreseen *unbelief*.

The truth is, that election has no meaning at all, if it be not the expression of God's will in reference to particular persons and things,—saying to each, thus and thus shalt thou be, not because thou chooseth to be so, but because I, the infinite Jehovah, see fit that thou shouldest be so. To one creature he says, thou shalt be an angel, to another, thou shalt be a man. To one order of beings, thou shalt dwell in heaven, to another, thou shalt dwell on earth. To one man, thou shalt be born in Judea, where my name is named and my temple stands; to another, thou shalt be born in Egypt, or Babylon, where utter darkness reigns. To one he says, thou shalt be born in Britain, and hear the glad tidings; to another, thou shalt be born in Africa, where no gospel has ever come. Thus he expresses his will, and who can resist it? Who can find fault, or say to him, what doest thou? Election, then, is the distinct forthputting of God's sovereign will, for the purpose of bringing a thing to pass, which, but for that explicit forthgoing of will, would not have come to pass.

In farther explanation of this point, let me

quote a few paragraphs from a tract which I published some years ago. It was written before the "new light" dawned; and the present controversies have only tended to deepen the sense I then had of the importance of the truth contained in it. It has been much spoken against; but it is easier to abuse or to burn it than to refute it.*

* Election means *choice*, and to elect means to *choose*. The sovereign right of choosing belongs to God alone. Hence He said himself to Moses, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy." (Rom. ix. 15.) His will is the law of the universe. We are the clay, and he is the potter. (Isa. lxiv. 8.) All things take place according to "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God." (Acts ii. 23.) He has made his choice or election from all eternity. (Eph. i. 4.) Every thing in this world happens according to God's eternal arrangements. Nothing takes place except what God causes to be, or permits to be; and whatever happens in time, is decreed from eternity. (Isa. xlv. 10.) Even the wicked deed of those who crucified the Lord of glory is said by the apostle to be determined before by the hand and counsel of God. (Acts iv. 27, 28; also ii. 23.)

All that God does, he arranges beforehand in his eternal counsels with infinite wisdom. He does not leave any thing to chance, or to the direction of beings less perfect in wisdom than himself. If he were to do so, every thing would go wrong. And what he intends to do is not left undetermined till the moment, or the day, or the year, before doing it, for then He would be a changeable being like man; but it is settled from all eternity. Hence it is said, "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world," Acts xv. 18. Thus God decreed from all eternity to make the world, and when his appointed time came, he made it. So God decreed from all eternity to create man, and when the fixed time came, he was created. It was not Adam who chose to be made; but it was God who chose to make Adam.

Now, what is true of the *making* of man, is far more true of the *saving* of man. Adam was made, not because he chose to be made, but because God chose to make him; and Adam was saved, not because he chose to be saved, but be-

I know that the sinner must have a *will* in the matter too. It is an absurdity to speak of a sinner loving, believing, &c., against his will, or by

cause God chose to save him. Adam's salvation depended wholly upon God's having *chosen* him to salvation, that is, upon God's having *elect*ed him. Had God not chosen him, he never would have chosen God, and so would never have been saved. So it was with Cain and Abel. Both were equally lost by nature, yet Abel was saved, and Cain was not. Why was Abel saved? It was not because he chose God any more than his brother Cain, but because God chose him. Therefore it is written, "He hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." (Rom. ix. 18.) What is true of Abel is true of all that ever have been, or ever shall be saved. It is God's electing love that saves them. It is God's choice, not their own, that makes them to differ from those who are consigned to wrath.

What shall we say then? is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid! (Rom. ix. 14.) God cannot be unrighteous in saving whom He pleases, or in passing by whom he pleases. Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour? (Rom. ix. 21.) Shall worms of the dust say, What doest thou? His decreeing to save *man*, did not make it unjust or cruel to pass by the *angels*. It could not be so unless they had *deserved* to be saved, which they did not. He decreed to save *none* of the angels, but he decreed to save *some* from among men. He needed not have saved any. He might have left them all to perish just as he left the angels. But he determined to save *some*. He did not determine to save all, or all would have been saved, just as all the angels were kept from falling whom he decreed to keep. It would have been infinite love to have saved one single soul; but it was far greater love to save so many. And then how wonderfully was this love shown forth in determining to do so from all eternity! O what unfathomable love is displayed in God's eternal decree of electing love! To be thinking of us from all eternity! To leave nothing to chance, but to fix everything beforehand! To leave nothing to our own wretched choice, but to arrange everything from all eternity according to his own glorious choice, his infinitely perfect and unerring plans! O what a universe is this, where nothing, not even the fall-

compulsion. The sinner must doubtless *will*. He must will to refuse, and he must will to receive Christ. He must will to take the broad

ing of a sparrow, is left to anything short of infinitely perfect wisdom, infinitely pure and perfect love! O, if there were no eternal and unchangeable decree of the God only wise, ordering every thing aright, what a mass of unutterable confusion would this world be! How unutterably consoling to think that everything that occurs is ordered by the eternal will and wisdom of the blessed God!

By nature man chooses nothing but sin. No man would choose God, or ever think of God, if God did not first choose him. If men then were left to their own choice, all would be lost. If there were no decree of God, no man could be saved. What an awful doctrine is that of those who say there is no eternal decree! To take away God's *electing* grace, is to take away a poor sinner's only hope of salvation. It must be plain then to all, that God's decree does not *hinder* any man from being saved. Those that are lost, are lost not because God wanted them to perish, but because they would not be saved. *They would have been lost even had there been no decree, because they were sinners.* God's decree did not *make* them sinners; it did not *force* them to be lost. It *found* them sinners, and it left them so; it *found* them lost, and it left them so. It did nothing more. It did not compel them to sin; it did not drive them to ruin. No. It simply passed them by: And was the sovereign God not entitled to do this?

Man could not *create* himself, and far less can he *save* himself. When God made him, he brought him out of nothing; when God saves him, he brings him out of a state far lower and worse than nothing. If in the one case, then, everything depended upon God's will and decree, much more in the other. There can be no injustice here. Had God pleased, He might have saved the whole world. But He did not; and thousands are now in hell, and shall be to all eternity. Who will say that God is unjust, because He has left them to perish for ever, while He has saved others as vile as they? If there be any cruelty at all in the matter, it must be in his allowing any to perish when he might have saved all. The opposers of election say, there cannot be such a thing as a decree fixing everything, or God would not be sincere in saying that he willeth all men to be saved.

way, and he must will to take the narrow way. His will is essential to all these movements of his soul. But in what state do we find his will at present? We find it wholly set against the truth. Every will since the fall is wholly opposed to God and his truth. Man needs no foreign influence, no external power, to make him reject the truth. That he does by nature. He hates it with his whole heart. When a sinner then comes to receive the truth, how is this accomplished? Does he renew himself? Does he change the enmity of his will by an unaided act of his will? Does he of himself bend back his own will into the opposite direction? Does he, by a word of his own power, cause the current that had been flowing down the hill to change its course and flow upward? Does his own will originate the change in itself, and carry that change into effect? Impossible. The current would have flowed for

But they might far more plausibly argue, that God cannot be almighty, for he says he *wills* all to be saved and yet does not save all!

If there be any injustice in the case, it must be, not in *decreeing* the thing, but in *doing* it. And yet the thing is done! Whether decreed or not, the thing is done! To remove the decree will not extinguish the flames of wrath. Hell is peopled already with millions of immortal souls, doomed to fiery wrath; while heaven is filled with millions of ransomed sinners, as vile, yea, perhaps viler far than they! What has made the difference? Man's will or God's?—man's choice or God's? Those that deny God's electing love may say, "Man's will;" but they who own a sovereign God, will say at once, "God's will, not man's." Yes! God's *eternal* will; for Jehovah changes not, but his plans and purposes are, like himself, from everlasting. "Who hath made us to differ?" is the wondering exclamation of earth. "Who hath made us to differ?" is the rapturous song of heaven!

ever downward had it not been arrested in its course by something stronger than itself. The sinner's will would have remained for ever in depravity and bondage, had not another will, mightier far than itself, come into contact with it, and altered both its *nature* and its *course*, working in the sinner "both to will and to do." Was the sinner willing *before* this other will met his? No. Was he willing *after*? Yes. Then, is it not plain that it was God's will meeting and changing his that made the difference? God's will was *first*. It was God's will that began the work, and made the sinner willing. *He never would have willed had not God made him willing.* "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power." It is the power of Jehovah applied to us that makes us willing. Till that is applied, we are unwilling. It is his hand, operating directly upon the soul, that changes its nature and its bent. Were it not for that, our unwillingness would never be removed. No outward means or motives would be sufficient to effect the change. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?"

Are all, then, willing? Does not the depraved will remain in most, while the new will appears in few? What makes the difference? God's choice. "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?" (Rom. ix. 21.)

Does God then hinder sinners from believing and willing? No, by no means. He hinders

none. They are their own hindrance. "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life." Not one soul would be saved if left to their own will. But in his infinite mercy God does not leave them to their own wills. He puts forth his mighty power on some to make them willing. Were it not for this all would be lost, for all would reject the Saviour.

But is not this unjust? Is God dealing fairly with his creatures in making some willing, and leaving the rest to their unwillingness? What! are we to prohibit God from saving any, unless he saves all? Are we to accuse him of injustice, because he leaves some to reap the fruits of their unbelief, and delivers others from them? Is God unjust in saving whom he will, when all were lost?

But why does God save some and not all? Because such is "the good pleasure of his will." He has infinitely wise reasons for this, though we understand them not. Might we not with equal propriety ask, Why did he keep some angels from falling, and why did he allow others to fall? Or may we not ask, Why did he not think of saving angels, why think of men alone? Is Jehovah not at liberty to do what he will with his own? Is he not at liberty to create as many worlds and as many beings as he pleases? And when these are ruined, is he not at liberty to redeem as many or as few as he pleases?

The real question in all this is just, "Are all men so depraved that they will not be saved unless God puts forth his Almighty power?" If so, then it is plain that God must put forth his power

to save every one that is saved ; and surely, then, he is at liberty to choose whom he is to save. If indeed men are not totally depraved, then there is no need for the interposition of God's hand, either in choosing or in saving. But admit man's total ruin and depravity, and you must admit the direct forthputting of the arm of Jehovah. And hence it is that many in our day are beginning to deny man's total depravity of nature. They are smoothing down the expressions referring to it in Scripture, and claiming for man as much remaining power and goodness as will enable him in part to save himself, and do without the interposition of the hand of God.

Oh, but it is said, we do not deny election. We merely maintain that God elected those who, he foresaw, would believe. I answer, this is a total denial of election altogether; and it is miserable dishonesty or ignorance to call this election. None but a fool or a deceiver would call this election. God elected those who he foresaw would believe! And who were they? None,—absolutely none. He foresaw that none would believe, not one. And because he foresaw this, he elected some to believe. Otherwise not one would ever have believed at all.*

* The following remarks of Calvin will show, that in his day none but "Papist theologians" held the doctrine, that God elects men because he foresees they will believe.

"The Papist Theologians have a distinction current among themselves, that God does not elect men according to works which are in them, but that *he chooses those whom he foresees will be believers*. And therein they contradict what we have already alleged from St Paul, for he says that we are chosen and elected in him 'that we might be holy and without blame.' Paul must needs have spoken

Oh, but some profane objector says, "Does God make man to be damned?"* Let me in few words answer the miserable atheism of such an objection; and I do it not out of regard for the pride of the objector, but for the sake of those who may be perplexed by this poor catch of an argument, which is so freely and flippantly bandied about,—an argument which befits a scoffer only,—an argument whose father is the father of lies.

It is somewhat remarkable, that this is precisely the argument of Socinians, Universalists, and Deists, against the doctrine of future punishments, and against the existence of such a place as hell. If you speak of hell or of everlasting fire, to such, the answer is, "Did God make men to damn them?" And however abominable and unscriptural their notion is, it is at least consistent with their own theory. Making God to be all love and nothing else, they think it inconsistent with his love that he should allow such a place as hell in the universe. They believe in

otherwise, if God elected us having foreseen that we should be holy. But he has not used such language: he says 'he hath elected us that we might be holy.' He infers, therefore, that the latter (faith) depends upon the former (election). Those who think otherwise, know not what man and human nature is."

Such is the testimony of Calvin against the Papist theologians of his day. Since that time many have joined the ranks of these theologians and glory in their heresies.

* Were it not that I have heard these words used, and know that the expression is a current one among a certain class, I would not have mentioned it. Its flippancy is revolting; its downright blasphemy still more so. It is the devil's original suggestion translated into modern language, "Ye shall not surely die, i. e., God would not make you to damn you." Thus men, in these last days, "foaming out their own shame."

no hell, and ask scornfully, "Did God make men to damn them?"

But let me answer the question, however profane it may be. God made man,—every man, and every thing, to glorify him. This every creature, man and angel, must do, either actively or passively, either willingly or unwillingly,—actively and willingly in heaven, or passively and unwillingly in hell. This is God's purpose; and it shall stand. God may have many other ends in creation; but this is the chief one, the ultimate one,—the one which is above all the rest, and to which all the rest are subordinate.

In this sense then plainly, God did not make men either to destroy or to save them. He made them for his own glory. If the question is asked, Did God make the devil and his angels only to damn them? I answer, He made them for his own glory. They are lost for ever; but does that prove that he made them only to destroy them? He kept their companions from falling, and hence they are called the "elect angels,"—while he did not keep them. He *could* have kept them all by his power, yet he did not. But does this prove that he made them to destroy them. They fell, and were in a moment consigned to everlasting fire; he made no effort to save them; he sent no redemption to them. But does this prove that he made them only to destroy them? If ever such an accusation *could* be preferred against God, it must be in the case of angels, to whom no salvation was sent. It cannot be said of *man*, to whom a Saviour has come.

No, but it is said, you believe in election; and

it is this that makes us put the question. If there be no election, then God has not made man to destroy him. On this let me make one or two remarks.

1. This is absurd, unless it can be proved that *election is God's plan for hindering men from getting to heaven, and for forcing them against their will down to death.* But God hinders no man from being saved, neither does he compel any man to be lost, either by what he *decrees* or what he *does*. How then does election prove that he made men to destroy them?

2. Whatever is right for God to *do*, it is right for him to *decree*. If God's casting sinners into hell be not wrong or unjust, then his purposing to do so from all eternity cannot be wrong or unjust. So that you must either deny that there is a hell, or admit God's right to predetermine who are to dwell there for ever. There is no middle way between Calvinism and Universalism.

3. If there be no election, then everything must be left to chance, or to man's own will. Either God must settle everything great and small; or man must settle everything; or chance must settle everything. We are told, that for God to settle everything is an intolerable hardship, and is just "creating men in order to damn them." Now we maintain, that for God to settle everything is the only right, as well as the only blessed condition in which our world can be. But let us ask, what better would it make matters were God *not* to settle everything beforehand? This appears to us unspeakably worse. For an infinitely wise, holy, gracious Being to

arrange everything according to his own wisdom, holiness, and grace, appears to us the very perfection of things. For him not to do so, but to leave all things either to chance, or to the will of foolish, unholy, wicked beings, seems to us the perfection of cruelty and folly. How *cruel* to leave sinful, foolish, blind, perverse creatures to do whatever they please! Yet we are told, that unless we admit of this infinite cruelty and hardship, we are making God a tyrant, who has created men to damn them!

With these remarks I leave this point; and in doing so I would merely call your attention to one or two passages of Scripture, which it would be well for those to ponder who put such a question as that to which I have been adverting. "The Lord hath made all things for himself; yea even the wicked for the day of evil," Prov. xvi. 4. "As many as were ordained to eternal life believed," Acts xiii. 48. "The Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth . . . what if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction," Rom. ix. 17, 22.

Texts like these are not to be explained away or overlooked. They are part of God's holy word, just as much as "God is love." And if one class of texts is to be twisted or turned away from, why not another. Let us honestly look both in the face; and let us believe them both,

whatever difficulty we may find in reconciling them. Our duty is to *believe*, not to *reconcile*. There are many things which in this life we shall not be able to reconcile; but there is nothing in the Bible which we need to shrink from believing. Notwithstanding all that I have said regarding election, I believe most firmly that "God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked." I believe that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son." I believe that God is in earnestness and honesty making proposals of friendship to sinners, and beseeching all to be reconciled to him. I believe that the invitations of the Gospel are to all without exception. Yet, while I believe all this, I believe in election too. "Many are called, but few are chosen." If I am asked, How can you reconcile these things? I answer, I am not careful to reconcile them. I am satisfied that God has told me that *both* are true. Therefore I believe them *both*. The day is coming when he will make all things plain. "He that believeth doth not make haste." I would not fret myself or be impatient at the difficulty. He will solve it in his own time and way. Who am I that I should say to God, "I cannot believe both of these doctrines, for, to my mind, they are inconsistent with each other." Is my inability to comprehend their consistency a reason for my rejecting either the one or the other? In that case the infidel alone is consistent, for he rejects both. I am yours, &c.

THUS SAITH THE LORD:

“The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people, for ye were the fewest of all people, but because the Lord loved you.”—Deut. vii. 7.

“Was not Esau Jacob’s brother? saith the Lord, yet I loved Jacob and I hated Esau.”—Mal. i. 2.

“I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight.”—Matt. xi. 25.

“It is given to you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given.”—Matt. xiii. 11.

“To sit on my right hand, or on my left, is not mine to give, save to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.”—Matt. xx. 23.

“Many are called, but few are chosen.”—Matt. xxii. 14.

“Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit.”—John xv. 16.

“According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world.”—Eph. i. 4.

“All that dwell on the earth shall wonder whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world.”—Rev. xvii. 8.

LETTER V.

PREDESTINATION AND FOREKNOWLEDGE.

“ Being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.”
—EPH. i. 11.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

It is of some importance that we should settle the real nature of these two things, predestination and foreknowledge, and ascertain which of the two is first. The question is, does God fix a thing simply, because he foreknows it, or does he foreknow it because he has fixed it? There are vague ideas in men's minds on those points, and it is well to know the truth with distinctness.

I answer then unhesitatingly, that predestination must be the foundation of foreknowledge. God foreknows every thing that takes place, because he has fixed it. In proof of this, I remark,

1. *The opposite of this is an impossibility.* To fix a thing is to make that thing certain to come to pass, which, but for that fixing, would not have come to pass. If then there be any kind of foreknowledge before predestination, it is simply the foreknowledge that the thing which he desires would *not* come to pass, unless he sees fit to fix it.* God knew all that might *possibly* have

* “ For the decree of predestination, in as far as the order

come to pass had he let the world alone to act out its iniquity. In all that infinity of *possibles*, he saw that the thing he wanted was not to be found. Seeing the end from the beginning, he saw that the thing he desired would never be

of intention is concerned, no foreknowledge is required or ought to be presupposed beyond the simple intelligence of all things which are possible, seeing this decree depends on no cause, reason, or condition, but purely on the will of him who decrees."—*Ames. Medulla Theologicæ*, p. 106.

I add also the following passage from *Barnes' Notes*. It is a comment on Eph. i. 5. The word used ($\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\zeta\omega$) means properly to *set bounds before*; and then to *pre-determine*. There is the essential idea of setting bounds or limits, and of doing this beforehand. It is not that God determined to do it when it was actually done, but that he intended to do it beforehand. No language could express this more clearly, and I suppose this interpretation is generally admitted. Even by those who deny the doctrine of particular election, it is not denied that the word here used means to *pre-determine*; and they maintain that the sense is, that God had pre-determined to admit the Gentiles to the privileges of his people. Admitting then that the meaning is to predestinate in the proper sense, the only question is, *who* are predestinated? To whom does the expression apply? Is it to nations, or to individuals? In reply to this, in addition to the remarks already made, I would observe, (1.) That there is no specification of *nations* here as such, no mention of the Gentiles in contradistinction from the Jews. (2.) Those referred to were those included in the word 'us,' among whom Paul was one—but Paul was not a heathen. (3.) The same objection will lie against the doctrine of predestinating *nations* which will lie against predestinating *individuals*. (4.) Nations are made up of individuals, and the pre-determination must have had some reference to individuals. What is a nation but a collection of individuals? There is no such abstract being or thing as a nation; and if there was any purpose in regard to a nation, it must have had some reference to the individuals composing it. He that would act on the ocean, must act on the drops of water that make up the ocean; for besides the collection of drops of water there is no ocean. He that would remove a mountain, must act on

found there unless brought into it by a direct act of will. The thing he wanted was not to be found among the *possibles*, but among the *impossibles* if matters were left to themselves, and to the

the particles of matter that compose that mountain; for there is no such thing as an abstract mountain. Perhaps there was never a greater illusion than to suppose that all difficulty is removed in regard to the doctrine of election and predestination, by saying that it refers to *nations*. What difficulty is lessened? What is gained by it? How does it make God appear more amiable and good? Does it render him less *partial*, to suppose that he has made a difference among nations, than to suppose he has made a difference among individuals? Does it remove any difficulty about the offer of salvation, to suppose that he has granted the knowledge of his truth to some *nations*, and withheld it from others? The truth is, that all the reasoning which has been founded on this supposition, has been merely throwing dust in the eyes. If there is *any* well-founded objection to the doctrine of decrees or predestination, it is to the doctrine *at all*, alike in regard to nations and individuals, and there are just the same difficulties in the one case as in the other. But there is no real difficulty in either. Who could worship or honour a God who had no plan, or purpose, or intention in what he did? Who can believe that the universe was formed and is governed without design? Who can doubt that what God *does* he always meant to do? When, therefore, he converts and saves a soul, it is clear that he always intended to do it. He has no new plan. It is not an after-thought. It is not the work of chance. If I can find out any thing that God has *done*, I have the most certain conviction that he *always meant* to do it—and this is all that is intended by the doctrine of election or predestination. What God does, he always meant to do. What he permits, he always meant to permit. I may add further, that if it is right to *do* it, it was right to *intend* to do it. If there is no injustice or partiality in the act itself, there is no injustice or partiality in the intention to perform it. If it is right to save a soul, it was always right to intend to save it. If it is right to condemn a sinner to woe, it was right to intend to do it. Let us then look *at the thing itself*, and if that is not wrong, we should not blame the purpose to do it, however long it has been cherished." Pp. 22—24.

operation of the usual laws. How then shall that which is impossible be rendered not only possible but certain? Evidently by the direct interference of God. God having thus interfered and *arranged* everything according to his wisdom, of necessity must *know* them as to come to pass. In other words, he foreknows everything, because he has arranged everything. Everything is certain in his foreknowledge, because everything is certain in his arrangements.

Take the case of a saved sinner, such as Saul of Tarsus. In looking forward from eternity, God saw that sinner. He saw him in his guilt and sin. He saw him hastening away from himself. He saw that if left to himself, or to the usual laws of things, he would only go deeper into sin, and farther from himself. He saw that in such a case his salvation was impossible,—that he would never believe, and never repent, and never turn. This was all that mere foreknowledge could tell. Foreknowledge alone can say nothing as to salvation. But here predestination comes in. God forms a design to bring that man to glory; he is a “chosen vessel.” And having this design regarding him, he resolves to put forth his power, he pre-arranges all his plans concerning him, he fixes the day and hour of his conversion, and thus he *foreknows* its certainty, because he has *fore-arranged* it. Otherwise it could not have been known; nay it would have been an impossibility.

2. *The opposite of this is an absurdity.* What can be more absurd than to *fix* a thing which I already know will come to pass, whether I fix it

or not? This is truly imputing foolishness to God. It represents him as giving forth a solemn decree, to fix a thing which is already certain. As if the queen of this realm were giving forth a statute, decreeing that the sun should rise tomorrow, because she knew that such would be the case from the laws of nature. Is not this a mockery of God? It makes him thus to speak; "I foreordain that such a sinner shall be saved because I foresee that he will be saved." Unless then we impute folly to God, and affirm that there is no meaning in the word predestination at all, we must admit that God must foreordain before he foreknows, and that he knows everything, just because he has fore-arranged everything according to his own infinite wisdom and grace.

These are two arguments which appear to me quite conclusive. But let us turn to Scripture. I need not again direct your attention to the passages already quoted in the previous letters. I shall rather notice one or two which I have not yet pointed out. Acts ii. 23, "Him being delivered by the DETERMINATE COUNSEL and foreknowledge of God ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Acts iv. 27, "Of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel were gathered together for to do whatsoever THY HAND AND THY COUNSEL DETERMINED BEFORE to be done."

On these passages I would offer a few remarks.

1. The language is very explicit and plain. It is the strongest that could possibly have been

used to denote foreordination. To understand it in any other sense would be absurd.

2. This determinate counsel is said positively to have fixed certain events in Christ's history. Now, if some were fixed, we have reason to conclude that all others also were. Yet in the life and death of Christ we see nothing, but what seemed outwardly to occur in the natural order of events. It will certainly be conceded that the will of the Son of God was *free* from first to last. Yet we learn that what he *voluntarily* did and suffered was also predetermined by God. In his case there was entire free-will, yet entire pre-ordination. What then becomes of the objection to predestination, arising from its supposed interference with the free-will of moral agents? In Christ's life and death we have a series of pre-ordained events, and at the same time a series of free actions. And this is a sufficient answer to the current objection. We may not be able to reconcile these things, yet there they stand palpably before us.

3. This determinate counsel is said to have delivered up Christ into the hands of men. Pilate and Herod, &c. are said to have done what God's hand and counsel had predetermined. Here is something still more striking. The deeds of these wicked men are said to have come to pass according to this counsel, yet these deeds are not the less wicked, and those men are not the less responsible. Here, again, we have another objection answered, or at least silenced. To reconcile these things may be difficult, yet the statement of this passage is plain. What pride

and folly then are there in the questionings and cavils which we so often hear in connection with this doctrine! "If God has arranged everything, man's will is not free. How can the sinner be responsible? How can he be plied with motives and arguments? Of what use is it to do anything towards an end, if all be fixed already. How unjust is it in God to warn and invite sinners when he has fixed everything already." All these cavils have their answer in the passages quoted above. It is vain to think of putting questions such as these, till these strong and explicit declarations have been explained away or denied. They teach us plainly that our world's history in all things great and small, is a history of events preordained by God from eternity, yet at the same time coming to pass by the free agency of man. This pre-ordination is the effect and the expression of God's will, yet it does not in the least interfere with man's responsibility; nor does it suppose any violence done to the will of man.

But it will be said, Are we not told that this election or predestination is according to foreknowledge? (1 Pet. i. 2. Rom. viii. 29.) In reference to the first of these two passages, I would remark that the word "foreknowledge," in the second verse, is the same as that rendered "foreordained" in the twentieth. Now, in the latter of these (20th), there can be no doubt that it means pre-ordination, for it refers to Christ as the appointed Lamb; and if so, then it is impossible to suppose that the word foreknowledge, in the 2d, refers simply to foreseeing, and nothing

more. Or there is another view that may be taken of it. I quote from a tract which I wrote sometime ago. "There are some who deny this choosing. They are so zealous for man's free-will that they will not admit of free-will in God. All the choosing they will allow God to exercise is the choosing of those whom he foreknows will turn to him,—*i.e.* choosing those who first choose him. They quote in defence, 1 Pet. i. 2, 'elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father;' and they ask, Is not this choosing according to foreknowledge? Yes, beyond all doubt it is. But of what is it the *foreknowledge*? Is it of the evil or the good? Certainly of the *evil*; for what else was there to foreknow? God, foreknowing all the circumstances of the case,—the evil of the whole race of Adam,—that there was nothing but evil about any, no desire even to turn or believe, nothing but absolute corruption, enmity, helplessness, and death,—God foreseeing all this, chose some out of this mass of wickedness. And thus they are 'elect according to the foreknowledge of God.'"—*Kelso Tracts*, No. xxxii. p. 2.

But then we are asked to look at Rom. viii. 29, "Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son." Now, to this the very same answer might be made as in reference to the preceding. But in addition to these let me remark, that the word "foreknow," means not simply to know beforehand, but to "fix the choice upon."* The

* The German critics Schleusner, Kuttner, though Neologian and Arminian, give this as the undoubted meaning of the passage.

meaning of the passage is then evidently,—whom God set his choice upon, them he predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son. These saints were the objects of his eternal choice, and being so, they were appointed by him to the honour of being made in the image of his own Son.

But on this I shall not dwell farther. I wish to notice some concessions of our adversaries which appear to me to overthrow their whole system. They admit that in certain things there is a real election. They admit, for instance, that there was a real election of the tribe of Levi to the priesthood, and a real election of David to the throne. They admit, also, that there is a real election of particular nations to particular privileges and favours.*

This admission is fatal to their theory. Their main prop was, that the election of individuals was just another word for favouritism and injustice. Now, if the election of persons be unjust, that of nations must be more unjust. If the election of persons be inconsistent with man's responsibility, so must the election of nations. If the election of persons be showing an undue partiality, much more must the election of individuals. For God to reveal himself to the Jews, and not to the Egyptians, is as much favouritism as for him to convert one soul and not to convert another. He did far more for Israel than he did for other nations. He brought them near him. He gave them his word. He taught them the

* See among others, a book published or republished at Glasgow about two years ago, entitled, "The Doctrines of the Atonement and Election Considered." P. 42, &c.

way of forgiveness through the blood of the sacrifice. He placed them in circumstances of peculiar advantage. He did not do this to Babylon or Nineveh, to Assyria or Egypt. Can it be wrong then to choose individuals, and right to choose nations? Can it be wrong *not* to choose an individual to salvation, and yet right not to choose a nation to these privileges through which alone salvation comes? Can it be right to pass by some nations, and yet wrong to pass by individuals. Nations are composed of individuals, and to choose a nation is *to give the individuals in that nation a peculiar advantage which is denied to others*, an advantage which issues in the eternal life of thousands. And hence if there be any injustice in the matter, there is more injustice in a national election than in a personal one.

“What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So that it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy. For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, even for the same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth. Thou wilt say then unto me, why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will? Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, why hast thou

made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour? What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction; and that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory, even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles?"—Rom. ix. 16—24.

Let me conclude this letter, by calling your attention to the following narrative. If I am not mistaken, the conversation related took place more than half a century ago. It is, however, very suitable as an illustration of some of the points discussed in the preceding pages. The chief speaker was a minister of an Independent congregation. Being once on a journey, he was overtaken by a stranger who urged some objections to predestination, and among others, that it made God unjust. "Before that can be admitted," said the minister, "you must prove that God owes eternal life to any of his fallen creatures; and further, that the vindication of a mortal is essential to the equity of a God. Besides, the question is not, What are the difficulties connected with the doctrine, or can a worm solve them all? but, Is this doctrine of predestination scripturally and philosophically true, or is it not? The difficulties of the subject will prove nothing against the fact; and he that brings the legislation of his Creator before the tribunal of his own understanding, should first be able to measure

the length of his eternity, the breadth of his immensity, the height of his wisdom, and the depth of his decrees. Is it not a sad evidence of human depravity, that creatures of a day will sit in judgment on spiritual and eternal things, as if the Author of the great mystery of godliness were altogether such an one as themselves?"

"I hope you will not be offended," replied the gentleman, "if I declare, notwithstanding all you advance, I do *not*, I *cannot* believe in this doctrine of predestination."

"And I hope," rejoined Mr C., "that you will not be offended if I declare, I am quite of opinion you *do* believe in it."

"I beg, Sir," said the other, "you will explain yourself."

"If you will favour me with the short answer of Yes or No, to a few explicit questions I shall take the liberty to propose," replied Mr C., "I have little doubt but I can prove what I have affirmed."

"It will afford me great satisfaction," said the other, "to comply with your proposal."

Mr C. then began, "Are you of opinion that all sinners will be saved?"

"By no means," said the gentleman.

"But you have no doubt," added Mr C., "it will be formally and finally determined, at the day of judgment, who are to be saved, and who are to perish?"

"I am certainly of that opinion," replied the stranger.

"I would ask then," continued Mr C., "is the great God under any necessity of waiting till

these last awful assizes, in order to determine who are the righteous that are to be saved, and the wicked who are to perish?"

"By no means," said the other; "for he certainly knows already."

"When do you imagine," asked Mr C., "that he first attained this knowledge?"

Here the gentleman paused, and hesitated a little; but soon answered, "He must have known from all eternity."

"Then," said Mr C., "it must have been fixed from all eternity."

"That by no means follows," replied the other.

"Then it follows," added Mr C., "that he did not *know* from all eternity, but only *guessed*, and happened to guess right: for how can Omniscience *know* what is yet uncertain?"

Here the stranger began to perceive his difficulty, and after a short debate, confessed it should seem it must have been fixed from eternity.

"Now," said Mr C., "one question more will prove that you believe in predestination as well as I. You have acknowledged, what can never be disproved, that God could not know from eternity who shall be saved, unless it had been fixed from eternity. If then it was fixed, be pleased, Sir, to inform me who fixed it?"

The gentleman candidly acknowledged he had never taken this view of the subject before, and said he believed it would be the last time he should attempt to oppose predestination to eternal life.

With this illustration I leave this subject,

which I have handled at some length, both because I believe it to be important in itself, and because right views of it lie at the foundation of the Gospel, and of salvation by free grace.

I am yours, &c.

THUS SAITH THE LORD :

“ In very deed for this cause have I raised thee up, for to show in thee my power, that my name may be declared throughout all the earth.”—Exod. ix. 16.

“ Who hath wrought and done it, calling the generations from the beginning? I the Lord, the first and with the last; I am he.”—Isa. xli. 4.

“ Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations.”—Jer. i. 5.

“ And hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation.”—Acts xvii. 26.

“ Of him and through him and to him are all things.”—Rom. xi. 36.

“ The called according to his purpose.”—Rom. viii. 28.

“ Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.”—Eph. i. 5.

“ Being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.”—Eph. i. 11.

“ According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.”—Eph. iii. 1.

“God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ.”—1 Thess. v. 9.

“God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation.”—2 Thess. ii. 13.

LETTER VI.

THE WORK OF CHRIST.

“The Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood.”—ACTS XX. 28.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

I do not intend to enter fully upon the subject of Christ's work. This would require a much fuller discussion than I am able at present to bestow upon it. It would in truth require a volume by itself.

This, however, is the less necessary on account of Dr Candlish's admirable work on the atonement, to which I would, in passing, call your attention. You will find sufficient materials there to enable you to judge for yourself on this momentous doctrine. All that I mean to do is, merely to advert to one or two points which may tend to establish you in the truth, and assist you in disentangling yourself from the snares laid for unwary feet in the present day.

I set out then with asserting that Christ is said in Scripture to have given himself as a ransom and substitute for his Church, and to have done so in a way such as he has done for no other.

This seems implied in the very first promise,—the promise regarding the woman's seed. Here

we have at the very outset the identifying of Christ and his people,—the setting them before us as entirely *one* with him. For while it is especially Christ himself that is the woman's seed, it is doubtless also his church as one with him. His destinies and theirs are thus from the beginning represented as entirely one. We recognise here not only the Redeemer, but the chosen people, the people given him of the Father, with whom he identifies himself, for whom he is to substitute himself, and in whose behoof he is to do and to suffer,—to bruise the serpent's head, and to submit to the bruising of his own heel.

Or to present it in another aspect. Adam stands before us as the figure of Christ, Eve as the representative of the Church or "seed of the woman," for it is evident that it is not all who are her seed according to the flesh that are here called her "seed," but only the chosen ones between whom and the seed of the serpent a deadly warfare was to exist. As there existed then a peculiar relationship between Adam and Eve, so there exists between Christ and his Church. And as Eve was given to Adam by God as his wife, so is the Church given by the Father to Christ as his Bride. Thus two personages stand before us from the beginning,—Christ and his Church, the Bridegroom and the Bride. These two personages we find meeting us at every turn in sacred history; it is with the history of these two personages that the whole Bible may be said to be occupied; and in the glorious consummation when the Lord returns, we find these same two personages that are seen at the beginning, com-

ing forth in visible glory and brightness,—the long absent Bridegroom returning to the beloved of his heart, and sitting down with her in festal triumph at the marriage-supper of the Lamb.

—Who chooses this bride for Christ? It is the Father. Who gives this bride to him? It is the Father. She is his eternal choice. She is his eternal gift to his beloved Son. She must then be the object of her Father's personal affection and regard. And as we know that this Bride is composed of the great multitude that no man can number, so we are sure that each individual composing that multitude must be known and loved of the Father in a peculiar way. In the Father's purpose she is from eternity the Bride, just as in that purpose the Son is from eternity the Bridegroom. She then must be a distinct object in the Father's eye, just as much as he is. And if so in the Father's eye, so also in the Lord's. If she was an object of personal and peculiar affection to the Father, so also must she be of the Son. Yea, if we may so speak, even more so to the Son than to the Father. For she is *his own* in a peculiar sense,—his own in the Father's gift, his own in everlasting betrothement,—his own in a way such as she can be to no other in the universe.

But the Bride is a captive, and must be won from the enemy. She is a lawful captive, and a ransom must be paid. She is lost, and must be found. She is naked, and must be clothed. She is diseased, and must be cured. She is polluted, and must be washed. And who is to do all this for her? The Son himself. Her betrothed bridegroom. He as the bridegroom is to redeem her

as his bride. All that he does for her, in seeking, ransoming, freeing, clothing, cleansing, he does for her as his bride, and because she is already betrothed to him in the Father's purpose. And will he go to redeem a bride whom he does not love? And will he love one whom he does not personally know? Will he work a work for one whom he knows not? Will he shed his blood upon a vague peradventure that some lost ones will choose him and cleave to him? Will he pay down a priceless ransom, and then leave it to chance, or what is worse than even chance, man's sinful will, to determine who is to be his bride?

The work of Christ is the work not of a man for men, but of a bridegroom for his bride.

Next to Christ himself, it is his bride who is most glorious in the Father's eyes. It is she who is so specially to share the love of God,—the love of the Father and the Son; "as the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you." It is she who is to be brought nearest to the Godhead of any created being. It is she who is to share the royalty of the Son of God, to sit upon his throne, to wear his crown, and to wield with him the sceptre of universal dominion. From first to last then she stands out before the Father's eyes, and also before ours, as next to Christ, the one glorious and prominent object in Scripture.

The Father has prepared, and the Son has purchased a throne for her; and to raise her from the miry clay to that everlasting throne is the work which the Son of God undertook and accomplished. That work did all for her. That work did not merely leave her within the reach

of salvation,—it made salvation sure, nay, it made glory sure, it made the crown and kingdom sure. The bridegroom came forth out of his royal palace to bring in the bride which the Father had given him. He loosed her cords, he opened her prison doors, he bound up her wounds, he threw his mantle over her, he made her meet for the kingdom, and when the day arrives when he shall appear in glory, he shall conduct her in joyful triumph into the kingdom prepared for her from the foundation of the world.

But how can there be any truth in all this if Christ had no special object in view in dying, save merely to render salvation possible to all, but certain to none? In that case, he could only die as a man for his fellow-men—not as a substitute, not as a representative, not as a surety, not as a shepherd, not as a bridegroom at all. I put it to you, my friend, which of these is most in accordance with the word of God. Being myself what is called a millennarian, I confess this view is a very important one in my eyes, and weighs very strongly with me; but I am sure that even with others it cannot fail to have its weight.

It is the view which would present itself to an eye looking from the past eternity into the future, contemplating the glorious issue. And it is the view which we hereafter shall, I doubt not, more fully realize when we get into that eternity, and begin to look back upon the whole finished scheme. Viewed from either of these points, the far past or the far future, the thing seems striking and vivid.

I confess, that, standing as we do at present in the very midst of the scenes, with the smoke, and confusion, and sin of the world around us, seeing but through a glass darkly, we may find it more difficult to realize this. But faith can rise out of these dark elements below. It can transport itself to either of these eternal eminences of which I speak; and, looking at things as God looks upon them, contemplating *results* as He does, it will be able to realize God's purpose regarding the church in all the different stages of its progress now, as if it had actually been presented in visible brightness, and the other parts which confuse us hidden from view. The moment when the statuary is hewing out his statue is not the best time for ascertaining what he means. You must either look at his designs, or you must wait till he has finished his work.

In connection with this, I may appropriately introduce here some of the many passages which represent Christ's work as a peculiar one on behalf of his church.

"I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep," John x. 11.

"I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine," John x. 14.

"I lay down my life for the sheep," John x. 15.

"Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep," John x. 26.

"Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him," John xvii. 2.

“I pray for them, I pray not for the world, but for them whom thou hast given me,” xvii. 9.

“Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it,” Eph. v. 25.

In these passages we hear Christ repeatedly speaking of those whom he calls *sheep*, and telling us he gave his life for them—for them in a peculiar sense, as he did for no other. It is as a *shepherd* that he dies, with a shepherd’s love and a shepherd’s care,—for his sheep as such.

Again, he prays for his own, for those whom the Father has given him, NOT FOR THE WORLD. Can words be plainer? Here is certainly a distinction made, “I pray not for the world.” Here, at least, is something peculiar, for his church alone. And *one* such peculiarity is enough, at least, to answer the objections of adversaries. Some have said, Oh, but he prays for the world in another place. I answer, he does not. But even though he had, here is at least one prayer of Christ, in which he expressly leaves out the world. And who can say how much virtue there was in that one short prayer? Is not the way in which he prayed, an illustration of the way in which he died. Are not those for whom he prayed the same as them for whom he died?

Again, Christ is said to have loved the church as husbands love their wives. This surely is decisive. The love of the husband for the wife is such as he bears to no other. So is the love of Christ. And as was his love, even so was the purpose of his death. These are the true sayings of God.

But over against all this are set those many passages in which the word *all* occurs, and in which we read Christ died for all. Now, with reference to this, I ask your attention to a few remarks.

1. The passages I have already quoted are quite explicit, and cannot be overthrown. They are too plain to be mistaken. And if our opponents would take them in their simplicity, I confess I should have less fear with regard to others. But this they refuse to do.

2. I admit there are difficulties with regard to some of the passages in which the word *all* occurs. But I would rather confess the difficulty, and wait for farther light, than at once proceed to do violence to the passage itself, or make its difficulty a reason for doing violence to others.

3. I also admit that there are passages in which there can be no doubt as to the universality of the terms. These you will find enumerated by Dr Candlish, to whose work I again refer you. Such passages, says he, refer to the discovery which the work of Christ is "fitted to make of the Divine character, especially of the Divine compassion and benevolence, and are to be regarded as giving intimation of the widest possible universality. This is particularly the case in that most blessed statement, 'God so loved the world,' &c.; for we would be little disposed to qualify or explain away the term 'world,' as here employed. We would rather rejoice in this text, as asserting that the gospel has a most gracious aspect to the world, or to mankind as such."

P. 26.

4. With regard to the meaning of the word "all" in the Bible, especially in the New Testament, a few remarks will be necessary. It occurs there upwards of 1200 times, as any scholar will find by consulting his Greek Concordance. These 1200 texts may be subdivided into four classes.

Class I. consists of a very large number of passages, several hundreds, I am sure, in which it is undeniable that the word *cannot* mean literally *all*. I give one or two specimens. We are told in one place, (Mark i. 5,) "there went out unto him *all* the land of Judea and they of Jerusalem, and were *all* baptized of him," &c. This we know was not literally the case. Every individual in the whole land did not come; for we are expressly told in another place (Luke vii. 30,) that "the Pharisees and lawyers were not baptised of him." Again, we read, (Mark i. 37,) "All men seek thee." Literally this was not true. Every individual in the human race, or even every individual in Judea, did not seek him. Again, we have such passages as these—"He told me all that ever I did"—"all things are lawful to me"—"all our fathers were under the cloud"—"all they who are in Asia are turned away from me"—"ye know all things."

Class II. consists of passages in which it is very doubtful whether *all* be literally universal. It may or it may not. There is nothing positively to determine it. "*Every* nation under heaven," Acts ii. 5. "*All* they which dwelt in Asia," Acts xix. 10. "The care of *all* the churches," 2 Cor. ii. 28. "All that dwell upon the earth shall worship him," Rev. xiii. 8. These are specimens

of a very large class of doubtful passages, which, of course, can prove nothing as to the literal meaning of *all*.

Class III. consists of passages which are only determined to be literal by the context, not by the expressions themselves. The whole passage, taken together, fixes the literal universality. But were it not for that, the literal meaning would have been doubtful. "All ye are brethren," Matt. xxiii. 8. "All these things shall come to pass," Matt. xxiv. 6. "They all slumbered and slept," Matt. xxv. 5. "When Jesus had finished all these sayings," Matt. xxvi. 1. In all these passages, and many similar ones, it is not the word *all* itself that points out the strict universality; it is some other word that occurs along with it, such as "all *these* things"—"all *these* sayings." In these cases, while in one sense the word has a universal sense, in another it has a limited one—limited by the words with which it is connected. It means all of a certain class, all of a certain number. So that we gather from these, that when *all* is to be understood literally, we must learn from the context what "all" it is that is to be understood—whether all of one nation, or all of another—whether all of one class, or all of another. And this consideration answers at once the oft-repeated argument, which consists merely in vociferating the word "all," as if the loudness or the frequency of the outcry were enough to demonstrate the meaning of the word. That meaning must be determined in each separate case by the other words, or other parts of the passage.

Class IV. are the passages in question, which are supposed to imply a universal atonement. On these I cannot enter here. They are, in point of numbers, the fewest of all the four classes. Our opponents say, that they must be interpreted literally. Let us see how the proof stands.

There are upwards of 1200 passages in which the word "all" occurs in the New Testament. Of these a very large number cannot possibly mean literally *all*. Another large number are exceedingly doubtful. Another large number are only proved to mean literally "all" by the context. The fewest in number of these four classes are those which are claimed by our opponents! You may judge of the strength of their argument.

The result of this statement is simply this, that the mere occurrence of the word "all" does not determine the question at all. Nothing but a careful examination of the whole passage can settle it. Do not, then, I beseech you, be deceived by the loud repetitions of the words *all* and *every* which you hear, and which are intended to supply the place of more solid proof.

I should like to have entered into an examination of some of the passages often rested on. But this is impossible. I select one, as being one of the strongest, and also one that affords an admirable illustration of the necessity of looking at the context to determine the meaning of the word. It is Heb. ii. 9. He tasted death for every man. It is literally "for each;" there is nothing about *men* in the original. The question then arises, what does the apostle mean by "each"? The context must settle it. It either carries us back

to the "heirs of salvation," or forward to the "many sons." For obviously it must refer to some of whom the apostle was speaking. Now, he was only speaking of the angels and the many sons, and of no other. It cannot be meant of the former, and therefore it must be of the latter. They may be said to be the peculiar theme of the whole chapter, and any one following the apostle's reasoning would *naturally* understand this expression to refer to them. It is straining it to refer to any others. If it does refer to others, it might as well refer to angels; more naturally so than to the *world*, for he is speaking of them, but not of the world at all. The fifteenth chapter of 1st Corinthians is an illustration of this. The apostle is treating of the resurrection of the *saints*, and not of the wicked. It is only by keeping this in view that his statements there can be fully understood. So here the $\pi\alpha\varsigma$ must be the *each* of those he was speaking of. And very strikingly is the singular used here,—not simply as individualising the saints, but as doing so in connection with the *whole* work of Christ. *All* that Christ did, he did for each. His *whole* work, his *whole* propitiation, his *whole* tasting of death, belongs to each, just as much as if only one had been saved. The *whole* of what Christ did is the property of each saint. His work is not made up of so many parts, or extending to certain dimensions, greater or smaller, according to the number of the saved; so that each of them only gets a *part* of himself, and a part of his work. No. His work is such, that each gets the whole of it,—the whole of his glorious self,

and the whole of his glorious work. Each gets the benefit of his tasting death, as if endured for himself singly and alone.

But I cannot dwell longer upon this topic. I have merely thrown out a few hints, which may lead to stablish you in the faith, and may assist you in repelling the objections of opponents.

The real question before us is, was the atonement of Christ a definite or indefinite thing? That is the essence and marrow of the controversy. It is upon this that the case hinges. There is a mighty difference between a definite and an indefinite work. Search the Scriptures, and see if the language in which they speak does not necessarily imply something definite and certain—*something which infallibly secured the object for which the Son of God took flesh and died.* That was, you know, “to bring many sons into glory.”

I am, yours, &c.

THUS SAITH THE LORD:

“I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.”—John x. 11.

“As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father, and I lay down my life for the sheep.”—x. 15.

“Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep.”—John x. 26.

“Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he may give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.”—John xvii. 3.

“I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world.”—John xvii. 6.

“ I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for them whom thou hast given me.”—xvii. 9.

“ Those that thou gavest me I have kept.”—xvii. 12.

“ For their sakes I sanctify myself.”—xvii. 19.

“ Feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.”—Acts xx. 29.

“ Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it.”—Eph. v. 25.

LETTER VII.

FAITH—THE GOSPEL—ASSURANCE.

“By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God.”—Eph. ii. 8.

“Being justified by faith, we have peace with God.”—Rom. v. 1.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

I find Scripture presenting *faith* to us in more aspects than one. It is sometimes called *hearing*, sometimes *knowing*, sometimes *believing*, and sometimes *receiving*, and sometimes *trusting*. Strictly speaking, it is simply the belief of the truth, yet it is referred to throughout Scripture under these different names. These may be said to be its different stages; and it is useful oftentimes, to arrest it, as it were, at each of these, and contemplate it under each of these views.

I see, for instance, a person glorying in what he calls his simple views of faith, and spurning every other idea of it but what he calls “the bare belief of the bare truth.” I ask such an one, “where is your childlike confidence in God, where is the clinging to the cross, the *resting* of the soul upon Jesus HIMSELF as the resting-place? You are making a saviour of your faith, an idol of the truth. You are just as self-righteous and proud in your “simple views of faith” as is the mystic whose religion you pro-

fess to shun. Your God seems to be a mere bundle of abstract propositions; your Saviour a mere collection of evangelical phrases which you seem to use as the mere *shibboleth* of a sect." *

Or again, I see another individual going into the opposite extreme. He overlooks the simplicity of faith. He undervalues the truth. He is wholly occupied with some mystical actings of his own mind, and trying to exert himself to put forth some indescribable efforts which he calls receiving and resting on Christ. I say to such an one, "You are on the road to mysticism, if you be not already enveloped in its mists. You are occupied with your own self, with your own actings and feelings; and you are making a Saviour of these. You certainly need more simple views of true faith. You need to be recalled from your self-righteous perplexities about your own acts, to the precious word of truth which you are despising as if it contained no comfort for you unless you can be conscious of putting forth certain acts of your own in connection with it." †

* Thus Calvin speaks. After admitting that the general object of faith is the truth of God, he thus remarks,— "faith has no firm footing unless it be placed in the tender mercy of God. Why, then, do we dispute about faith? Is it not that we may lay hold of the way of salvation? Yet how can faith be saving unless in so far as it grafts us into the body of Christ? There is nothing, therefore, of absurdity, if, in defining it, we thus urge its principal effect; and by way of distinction, subjoin its general character, that special mark by which it distinguishes the believer from the unbeliever."—Inst. B. iii. ch. 2. § 30.

† No man wished more to avoid giving countenance to the idea, that faith is a bare intellectual act, than Mr Robert Haldane, yet he does not scruple to use such lan-

From this you will see how it is quite possible to admit the full meaning of those words in Scripture which speak of confidence, and trust, and rest, &c.; while, at the same time, we rejoice in those other expressions which represent faith as "an acknowledgment of the truth," and the salvation of the sinner as the result of his "coming to the knowledge of the truth." It is quite consistent with Scripture to represent peace as flowing from confidence in God through Christ, and yet as arising from "believing the record which God hath given of his Son."

I shall not, however, attempt a definition of faith. This only let me say in a few words, that that faith which goes no farther than the intellect, can neither save nor sanctify. It is no faith at all. It is unbelief. No faith is saving, but that which links us to the PERSON of a living Saviour. Whatever falls short of this is no faith at all. Hence, while salvation is described sometimes in Scripture as a "coming to the knowledge of the truth,"* it is more commonly repre-

guage as the following,—“A man becomes righteous, perfectly righteous, through believing God’s record concerning his Son.”—Exposition of the Romans. Vol. ii. p. 554.

* We often hear the expression “coming to the truth” used as a description of conversion. Now the Bible word is “coming to the knowledge of the truth.” Even this expression however, is seldom used. The more frequent one is “coming to Christ;” not coming to *the truth*, but coming to the *True One*. It is strange how men should so much prefer the phrase “coming to the truth,” to the former scriptural and blessed one “coming to Christ.” It would almost seem as if they disliked the idea of a *personal* Saviour in the matter; or as if they had a secret suspicion, that while their kind of conversion might be called a “coming to the truth,” it could not be called a “coming to Christ” at all.

sented as a coming to Christ himself." "Ye will not come to ME that ye might have life." "Him that cometh to ME, I will in no wise cast out."

But whatever view of faith we take, one thing is obvious, that it is from first to last "the gift of God." Make it as simple as you please, still it is the result of the Holy Spirit's direct, immediate, all-quickenings power. *Never attempt, I beseech you, my dear friend, to make faith simple, with the view of getting rid of the need of the Spirit to produce it.* This, I believe, is one of the wretched devices of Satan in the present day. By all means correct every mistake in regard to faith, by which hindrances are thrown in the sinner's way, or darkness thrown around his soul. Show him that it is with the object of faith, even with Christ and his cross, that he has to do, not with his own actings of faith;—that it is not the virtue or merit that is in his faith that saves him, but the virtue and merit that are in Christ Jesus alone. Tell him to look outward, not inward for his peace. Beat him off from his self-righteous efforts to get up peculiar kinds of acts of faith in order to get something in himself—something short of Christ, to rest upon. Simplify, explain, and illustrate faith to such an one, but never imagine that thereby you are to make the Spirit's help less *absolutely necessary*.

This, I believe, is the aim of the propagators of the new theology. Their object in simplifying faith is to bring it within the reach of unrenewed man, so that by performing this *very simple* act, he may become a renewed man. In other words,

their object is to make man the beginner of his own salvation. He takes the first step, and God does the rest! He believes, and then God comes in and saves him!

This is nothing short of a flat and bold denial of the Spirit's work altogether. If at one time more than another the sinner needs the Spirit's power, it is *at the beginning*. And he who denies the need of the Spirit at the *beginning* cannot believe in it at the after stages,—nay, cannot believe in the need of the Spirit's work at all. The mightiest and most insuperable difficulty lies at the beginning. If the sinner can get over *that* without the Spirit, he will easily get over all the rest. If he does not need the Spirit to enable him to *believe*, he will not need him to enable him to *love*. If, when a *true* object is presented to me, I can believe without the Spirit; then when a *loveable* object is presented, I can love without the Spirit. In short, what is there in the whole Christian life which I cannot do of myself, if I can *begin* this career without help from God? *The denial of the Spirit's direct agency in faith and conversion, is the denial of his whole work in the soul.*

But is it not said, "Faith cometh by hearing?" Certainly it is. And who doubts the blessed truth? How can there be faith where there is not something to be believed?* But does this mean that hearing alone is necessary to the pro-

* "There is an inseparable relation between faith and the word, and these can be no more torn asunder from each other than rays of light from the sun"—Calvin's Institutes, B. 3. ch. 2. § 6.

duction of faith? The words in the original explain this. They are these, "faith ariseth out of ($\epsilon\xi$) what we hear, and what we hear comes to us through means of ($\delta\epsilon\alpha$) the word of God." Who then would say any thing but what the apostle does here?—viz. that the foundation of faith is what we hear,—(lit., a hearing or report.) But does this exclude the Spirit from his work in preparing the soul for believing what it hears?

Used in a right sense, I have no objection to the expression so common even in our best writers, that it is "the truth which produces faith." And had it not been for the improper use made of it in the present day, no one would hesitate to use it. We are told that before the days of Pelagius there were many expressions in use, which after his heresy arose the fathers were afraid to employ. And so we find it here. Calvin, for instance, does not hesitate to speak of the word as that "by which faith is *conceived*."* And again, "faith stands no less in need of the word than fruit does of the living root of a tree."† Again, Trail in one of his sermons thus speaks, "it is called the word of faith because it

* Unde fides concipiatur, Inst. B. 3. ch. 2. sect 6.

† Ibid. B. 3. ch. 2. sect 31. In like manner Calvin frequently speaks of faith, or of the truth, as producing life,—nay, he even speaks of our being regenerated by faith; but then on the other hand he as distinctly makes the Holy Spirit the real fountain of everything like life or regeneration. If you take merely one class of extracts, you would say that he gave countenance to some of the modern heresies, but if you look at others you will see that his meaning is totally opposed to these.

is the means of faith *and begets faith*: what think you is faith, but only the impression, the stamp that the word of the gospel, when brought home with power, leaves upon the soul: it is the heart's echo to the voice of salvation by Christ in the gospel."* Again, the same author thus speaks; "believing is but thinking, it is no more; but it is a rare thing, it is a great thought."† In like manner Mr Haldane makes this remark upon Rom. x. 17, "Faith never comes but by hearing, that is from the word of God."‡

I might quote many similar passages from the very best of our divines; but I need not. These will show you that while they all held faith to be directly "the gift of God," they never hesitated to use such expressions as "faith is begotten by the word." And the reason is obvious. If men separate faith from the word, then they immediately fall into mysticism or quakerism. They torment and perplex themselves by an attempt to work up some feelings of their own, or they sit down and wait for the uprising of some inward light, or the coming down of some new revelation.

And now, having said this much as to faith itself, let me add a few words as to that which it receives, "the glorious gospel of the blessed God." That which we preach, and that which faith believes, is "the glad tidings of great joy." These tidings are *free*: truly, absolutely, unconditionally free. They are without money and without

* Trail's Works, vol. 2. p. 103.

† Ibid. p. 51.

‡ Exposition of Romans, vol. 2. p. 567.

price. They make known the exceeding riches of the grace of God. They show us how these riches are pouring themselves freely out upon this fallen world. They tell us that not only is there *grace* in God for sinners, but also that that grace has found vent to itself, and is flowing out in a *righteous* channel to *unrighteous* men. They come up to every man and invite him to partake of all the fulness of God. They make no exception, but address themselves in all their gladness and amplitude, to each man as he stands. "Whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." Hear the words of Trail: "Shall we tell men that unless they be holy, they must not believe on Jesus Christ; that they must not venture on Christ for salvation till they be qualified and fit to be received and welcomed by him? This were to forbear preaching the gospel at all, or to forbid all men to come to Christ. For never was any sinner qualified for Christ. He is well qualified for us; but a sinner out of Christ hath no qualification for Christ but sin and misery. . . . Shall we warn people that they should not believe on Christ too soon? It is impossible that they should do it too soon. Can a man obey the gospel command too soon; or do the great work of God too soon? . . . If he should say, what is it to believe on Jesus Christ? As to this, I find no such question in the word, but that all did some way understand the notion of it. They all, both Christ's enemies and disciples, knew that faith in him was believing that the man, Jesus of Nazareth, was the Son of God, the Messiah and Saviour of the world,

so as to receive and look for salvation in his name. If he yet ask *what* he is to believe, you tell him that he is not called to believe that he is in Christ, that his sins are pardoned, and that he is a justified man; but that he is to believe God's record concerning Christ; and that this record is, that God giveth (that is, offereth), to us eternal life in his Son, Jesus Christ, and that all who with the heart believe this report, and rest their souls on these glad tidings shall be saved. If he still say that believing is hard, ask what it is he finds makes believing difficult to him? Is it unwillingness to be saved? Is it a distrust of the truth of the gospel record? This he dare not own. Is it a doubt of Christ's ability or good-will to save? This is to contradict the testimony of *God* in the gospel. . . . If he say that he cannot believe on Christ, and that a divine power is needful to draw it forth, which he finds not; you tell him that believing in Jesus Christ is no work, but a resting on Jesus Christ, and that this pretence is as miserable as if a man wearied with his journey, and who is not able to go one step farther, should argue, I am so tired that I am not able to lie down, when, indeed, he can neither stand nor go."*

But it may be asked, how is all this freeness consistent with Christ's substitution for his church alone? I answer, that the gospel is not, "Christ died for the elect;" neither is it, "Christ died for all." But it is, "Christ died for sinners." It was thus that the apostles preached and that

* Select Practical Writings of Trail, issued by the Cheap Publication Committee, pp. 153, 161.

men believed. Any reader of the Acts of the Apostles may see this. They preached the glad tidings in such terms as these; "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins," Acts x. 43. Or again, "Be it known unto you, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses," xiii. 38.

The passage in 1 Corinthians xv. 3., is often appealed to as a proof that the apostles preached everywhere that Christ died for all. I have already remarked, that in the only book in which we have a full account of their preaching (Acts), there is nothing of the kind stated. And, in regard to this passage, I would just ask any one, how it is possible to extort such a declaration out of it. The apostle went to Corinth. He stood up in a city of heathens. He cried out, "Christ died for *our* sins." He did not say "for all and every one;" nay he did not say "for *your* sins;" he simply said "for *our* sins." Now I have no wish to restrict the gospel, or to make it appear as if not literally and actually free to all. But it is plain that the words here are more *restrictive* than usual. So much so, that had there been some cavilling hearer in the way, he might have said, like some modern objectors,—“Oh! he does not preach the gospel; he says, Christ died for *our* sins,” he should have said, “Christ died not for our sins only, but for the sins of *all*.”

The man who lays the stress of what he calls the gospel upon the *all*, the *me*, or, on the other

hand, upon the *elect* or the *Church*, plainly does not preach the gospel as the apostles did. And the man who, in believing, is turning his whole thoughts to these words, is plainly going aside from the glad tidings themselves, and is thinking of nothing but *himself*, and the bearing of the gospel upon *himself* alone. He is losing sight of the glorious revelation of HIMSELF which God has made in the gospel, and is only concerned about that part of it which he thinks includes his own salvation.

“Christ died for ALL,” it is said, and this is the gospel. Well, what does this mean? Did he by dying infallibly secure salvation for all? Oh, no. Did he by dying infallibly secure the Holy Spirit for all? Oh, no. Did he by dying infallibly secure regeneration, and faith, and love, for all? Oh, no. Then I ask, what is meant by his dying for all, beyond what John Owen lays down in his work on the death of Christ: “Sufficient was the sacrifice of Christ for the redemption of the whole world, and for the expiation of all the sins of all and every man in the world?” Or wherein does their gospel present a freer or larger aspect to all men than does the following statement of a recent American divine:

“The righteousness of Christ therefore, consisting in the obedience and death demanded by the law under which all men are placed, is adapted to all men. It is also of infinite value, being the righteousness of the eternal Son of God, and therefore sufficient for all. On these two grounds, its adaptation to all, and its sufficiency for all, rests the offer made in the gospel

to all. With this, its design has nothing to do; who are to be saved by it we do not know. It is of such a nature and value, that whosoever accepts of it shall be saved. If one of the non-elect should believe, (though the hypothesis is on various accounts unreasonable) to him that righteousness should be imputed to his salvation. And if one of the elect should not believe, or having believed, should apostatize, he would certainly perish. These suppositions are made simply to show, that according to our doctrine, the reason why any man perishes, is not that there is no righteousness provided suitable and adequate to his case, or that it is not freely offered to all that hear the gospel, but simply because he wilfully rejects the proffered salvation. Our doctrine, therefore, provides for the universal offer of the gospel, and for the righteous condemnation of unbelievers, as thoroughly as Dr Beman's. It opens the door for mercy, as far as legal obstructions are concerned, as fully as his; while it meets all the other revealed facts of the case. It is not a theory for one fact. It includes them all,—the fact that Christ died by covenant for his own people; that love for his own sheep led him to lay down his life; that his death renders their salvation absolutely certain; that it opens the way for the offer of salvation to all men, and shows the justice of the condemnation of unbelief. **NO MAN PERISHES FOR THE WANT OF AN ATONEMENT,** is the doctrine of the Synod of Dort, it is also our doctrine."*

* Hodge on the Extent of the Atonement.

But whilst such is the gospel, you will perhaps ask me what I think of the doctrine of assurance, as maintained by the holders of the new theology. On this point I have the following remarks to offer.

1. The doctrine of assurance is stated and pressed by many of them in a most arrogant, dogmatical, and offensive way; so much so that the very word has become a suspicious one to many. They make a god of their assurance, and condemn with the utmost flippancy and ease every one who does not come up to their standard of assurance. Just *say* that you believe, *say* that you are perfectly assured of your salvation, and this will cover many defects which others would not have consented to overlook. And if in addition to this saying, that you are sure, if you will join the sect, all defects will be passed by. I have been often both amazed and shocked at the vain-glorious boastings of assurance, and the contemptuous condemnation of others, which are indulged in. Ah, it is easy to speak of assurance, to boast of it, to despise others for not having it; but it is not so easy to “walk *humbly* with our God.” And I have seen such pride, such unmeekness, such boasting, such sectarianism, such censoriousness, such evil speaking, in connection with this pretended assurance, that I could not help coming to the conclusion, that the man who could boast of his assurance while indulging in such tempers, was either deceiving himself or others most grossly, and had no title to the name of Christian at all. I am not prepared to deny the name of Chris-

tian to men, simply because they hold much that I conceive to be error; but I am quite prepared to deny such a name to the proud, the censorious, the uncharitable boasters of their assurance.

2. The doctrine of assurance is made wholly to rest upon the doctrine that Christ died for *all* in the most universal sense. It is maintained that there can be no assurance if this be not its foundation. 'Christ died for *me*,' is that which every sinner is called upon to believe. Yet it is maintained, at the same time, that Christ did not die for any so as actually to *secure* salvation for them, but merely to make it possible to them! And to believe that Christ died so as to make salvation possible to me, is all I need to believe in order to have assurance!

3. The doctrine of assurance sounds very strangely in the lips of men who deny the perseverance of the saints. No man, it is said, can be a Christian who is not assured of his salvation, yet a saint may fall from grace! Can any thing be more utterly absurd than this? In becoming a Christian, I am to be *quite sure of being saved*, yet I am also to believe that *I may fall away and be lost!* What is this but telling me that I am to be sure of heaven, and yet I am not to be sure of it? It is plain, then, that if the doctrine of the saints' perseverance be denied, there can be no such thing as assurance. It is an absurdity, an impossibility. The doctrine of assurance implies that of perseverance, and that of perseverance implies that of election.

But having made these remarks, I would not leave the matter here. While I say these things, I am not denying assurance. Far from it. I would maintain it most strenuously as a vital and momentous truth. The doctrine of the Reformation, and that which Popery hated so mortally, was, "that a man is justified through faith alone, and that he *must know that he is justified.*"* And in truth, how can there be otherwise peace of conscience or peace with God? But just in proportion as I would prize and preach the true doctrine of "assurance of God's love," and "peace of conscience," according to the words of our Catechism, in that very proportion would I condemn and warn you against the flippant, boasting assurance of our day. "Peace with God" is the most humbling, solemnizing, and sanctifying of all truths. And when I see no such fruits brought forth by those who speak of it so loudly, I would beseech you to be upon your guard, lest the peace into which you may thus be led be the peace of a seared conscience, or the peace of a hard heart, or the peace of the devil, or the peace of the fancy or the flesh.

As to the doctrine of assurance, I should have liked to have spoken at some length. This, however, I cannot do without curtailing other points of much moment, to which I am hastening on. To be as brief as possible, and to give greater weight to what I advance, I would quote from that admirable work of Mr Haldane's, to which I have already referred. He thus writes:—"The full

* See that precious little German work, Sanders' *Jehovah Zidkenu*, p. 20.

assurance of faith in which believers are commanded to draw near to God, stands inseparably connected with having their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience. An evil conscience accuses a man as guilty, as liable to punishment, and keeps him at a distance from God, regarding him as an enemy and avenger, so that the natural enmity of the mind is strengthened. On the contrary, a good conscience is a conscience discharged from guilt by the blood of Christ. Conscience tells a man that the wages of sin is death, and that he is liable to it; but when the atonement made by Christ is believed in, it is seen that the punishment due for sin, which is death, has been inflicted on him, the demands of the law have been fulfilled, and its penalty suffered. On this the believer rests, and his conscience is satisfied. It is thus purged from dead works; and this is what is called the answer of a good conscience toward God, (1 Pet. iii. 21.) This answer of a good conscience cannot be separated from assurance of our acceptance with him to whom we draw near, and the degree in which both this assurance and a good conscience are enjoyed will be equal.

“The same is true respecting the grace of hope. This as well as having a good conscience purged from dead works (the duty of possessing which, no Christian will deny,) stand inseparably connected with the personal assurance of an interest in the Saviour, and all of them lie at the foundation of love to God, and consequently of acceptable obedience to him. We love him when we see that he hath loved us, and that his Son is the

propitiation for our sins. How can there be love without a sense of reconciliation with God, and how can the fruits of joy and peace be brought forth, till the conscience is discharged from guilt? Love proceeds from a pure heart, a pure heart from a good conscience, and a good conscience from true faith.

“ In the hope of the promised salvation they who received the doctrine of the apostles, rejoiced as soon as it was announced to them, Acts ii. 41; viii. 39; xvi. 34. Their joy then had not its source in reflecting upon or being conscious of their faith, although afterwards so confirmed, but arose from the view they had of the glory and all-sufficiency of the Saviour and his perfect righteousness, made theirs by faith, resting on the divine warrant and promise. Although the assurance of sense be confirmatory of the assurance of faith, it is not so strong as the latter. ‘ Sanctification,’ says Rutherford, ‘ does not evidence justification as faith doth evidence it, with such a sort of clearness as light evidences colours, though it be no sign or evident mark of them; but as smoke evidences fire, and as the morning-star in the east evidences that the sun will shortly rise, or as the streams prove there is a head-spring from whence they issue;—so doth sanctification give evidence of justification only as marks, signs, effects, give evidence of the cause. But the light of faith, the testimony of the Spirit, will cause us, as it were, see justification and faith, not by report, but as we see the sun’s light.’

“ If it be objected that a man cannot know that he has faith without seeing its effects, it is re-

plied that this is contrary to fact. When a thing is testified, or a promise is made to us, we know whether or not we believe it, or trust in it. According to this objection, when Philip said, 'If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest,' the eunuch should have replied, you ask me to tell you a thing I cannot know, but instead of this he answers, 'I believe.' When the Lord asked the blind man, 'Believest thou in the Son of God?' he did not ask a question which it was impossible to answer. 'In this first act of believing,' says Mr Bell on the Covenants, 'sinners have no evidence of grace in themselves; they feel nothing within but sin; they see a word without them as the sole foundation of faith, and on that alone they build for eternity; this is a point of no small importance to saints and sinners. Many of the modern builders are at great pains to keep their hearers from all confidence, till they first discern the evidences of grace in their hearts, and having got evidence, then, and not till then can they have any just, lawful, or well-grounded, confidence; nay, they seem pretty plainly to intimate that a sinner's right to Christ turns on something wrought in him, or done by him, and till he have evidence of this he can claim no interest in Christ, nor assure himself of salvation by him. According to this, Christ, the tree of life, is forbidden fruit, which the sinner must not touch till he has seen inward evidence. I confess that I have not so learned Christ. * * *

The religion of the Church of Rome leaves a man nothing but doubts respecting his salvation. It teaches that a Christian should believe in general the promises of God, while the application to him-

self of these promises, and the assurance of God's love, it calls presumption. This subject was one of the grand points of discussion between that church and the reformers. But how many Protestants have forsaken the ground which their predecessors here occupied, and have gone over to their opponents? The doctrine of the duty of our personal assurance of salvation, and the persuasion of our interest in Christ, is denied by many, and even doubts concerning this are converted into evidences of faith, although they are directly opposed to it. Doubts of a personal interest in Christ are evidences either of little faith or of no faith."*

Such is the doctrine of assurance, as stated by one whose jealousy for every jot and tittle of Divine truth, gives peculiar weight to all he wrote. And with this statement I leave the subject. The sentences I have quoted are worthy of being pondered. While they give no countenance to the boastful assurance of the false professor, they equally condemn those who either deny that there can be assurance, or who place it afar off,—at the end instead of the beginning of the believer's career; who discountenance the idea of its immediate possession; who actually prefer the doubting to the assured Christian; nay, who make doubts an evidence of faith, darkness an evidence of light!

There is great danger of making a saviour of our actings, our feelings, or our faith. These may steal the heart away from Christ as effectually as the works of the self-righteous. The

* Haldane on the Romans.

search for these, in which many seem to spend their lives, and which makes up the religion of not a few, is often Satan's subtle device for drawing the eye off from the cross of Christ.

There is oftentimes a far greater prominence given to what man *has to do* in order to be saved, than what God *has done* for his salvation. It is the latter, not the former, that contains the Gospel, for it is the latter that opens up the riches of the grace of God. It is not the sight of what we do or feel, but the sight of what Christ has done and felt, that relieves our conscience, removes our burdens, and fills the soul with assured peace. As preachers of the everlasting Gospel, we come to tell the sinner not what he has to do, but WHAT GOD HAS DONE: It is this that is the "good news," the glad tidings of great joy which are freely preached to ALL. "I am come a light unto the world, that whosoever believeth in me should not walk in darkness."

And it is a *righteous* as well as a *gracious* Gospel which we preach. Christ's death has made it a righteous thing in God to send you the free message of salvation, a message as honest and sincere as it is free. God is making proposals to you! He is making them in real earnest. He does not mean to mock or to deceive you. "Remember," says Dr Owen, "that the proposal made unto you this day cost no less than the price of the blood of the Son of God. It is the fruit of the travail of his soul. For this he prayed, he wept, he suffered, he died. And shall it now be neglected or despised by you? Will you yet count the blood of the covenant a common thing? Will you exclude yourselves from all be-

nefit of the purchase of those terms, and only leave your souls to answer for the contempt of the price whereby they were purchased."*

I am yours, &c.

THUS SAITH THE LORD:

"Look unto me and be saved all the ends of the earth."—Isa. xlv. 22.

"Hear and your souls shall live."—Isa. lv. 3.

"God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."—John iii. 16.

"He who heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life."—John v. 24.

"These things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name."—John xx. 31.

"To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."—Rom. iv. 5.

"Being justified by faith we have peace with God."—Rom. v. 1.

"In whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him."—Eph. iii. 12.

"We have known and believed the love that God hath to us."—1 John iv. 16.

"This is the record that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son."—1 John v. 11.

* On the 130th Psalm, p. 336.—*Tract. Soc. Edition.*

LETTER VIII.

MAN'S INABILITY.

“Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots.” JER. xiii. 23.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

You ask me what I think of the distinction commonly made between moral and physical inability. I answer, that to a certain extent it is a right one. For clearing off certain difficulties and obligations it is excellent; for bringing out man's responsibility, and man's real guilt, it is often most useful. But it must not be carried too far. It must not be abused, nor misunderstood.

The distinction, we say, is a good one, and ought never to be lost sight of. There is, for instance, a great difference between my being determined not to go to church, and my being held from it by force. In the one case I am guilty, in the other I am not. The former is called *moral*, and the latter *physical* inability.

But I fear we cannot carry this distinction so far as some would have it carried. You say, why not? I answer, because if we make every thing to turn upon this distinction, we must maintain, that wherever there is guilt, there can be nothing *physically* wrong with the guilty person. Anything like physical infirmity or inability would render him irresponsible. I know

this is delicate ground. I know also, that many may be unable to follow me in this part of the argument. I shall, however, seek to be as plain as possible.

The question is often asked, "is moral depravity possible, if there be any physical incapacity?" Now, in answering this, allow me to put another which must be previously answered, "Is moral depravity possible, if there be nothing *physically* wrong with the soul?" I apprehend not. In moral depravity the mind or soul is diseased; that is to say, some physical change has passed upon them. Sin has brought on a real alteration of their nature. For how can a thing be diseased and not physically altered? Can the tree rot and yet remain physically unchanged? Can the limb be palsied, and yet remain physically the same? Can the soul be corrupted, and yet be physically unaltered? Impossible! a depraved act might not necessarily infer a physical change, but a depraved *nature* must.

If then this be true, the distinction alluded to will not suffice to carry us through all the intricacies of this controversy. If we admit *sin*, we must admit a change in the constitution of the soul. You may call that change a moral one. And no doubt it is. But it is also a physical one. Hence, while you may say that the sinner's inability is a moral one, you cannot help admitting that there is something more involved in it. Nor have I any doubt that it was this something more that the prophet alluded to, when he said, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leo-



pard his spots;" and that Christ alluded to when he said, "No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him;" or again, "no man come unto me except it were given unto him of my Father." John vi. 44, 65.

Is then this physical change, or deterioration, or inability, or by whatever name it is called, consistent with *responsibility*? This is the question. Let us examine it calmly, and see how it stands.

Men are depraved. "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me."*

This depravity is thorough and total. It has deteriorated the soul in all its powers. It has not certainly taken away any powers or faculties from the soul, but it has most materially affected our power of using them aright. If you admit depravity in any degree, you must admit deterioration, and consequently less physical capacity for willing and acting right. Does then this enfeebled capacity infer diminished responsibility and guilt? We have already, so far answered this question. We answer again, that it does not, and cannot do so: unless this inability has been *forced* upon us by another mightier than our-

* Finney of America, who holds almost exactly the same views as the Pelagians on this side of the Atlantic, ridicules the idea of taking this text literally. He maintains that a sinful *nature* is an absurdity, and that our *natures* as they come into the world, are as good as Adam's was; see his Lectures to Professing Christians, Pp. 181 and 301. His imitators in this country are rapidly advancing to the same point. Some of them seem to have reached it.

selves. The question does not turn solely upon the kind or amount of ability, but upon this,—is it or is it not an inability produced by our own deliberate choice? Did not God give you ability, and you threw it away? You could not, indeed, throw away the *powers* themselves, love, judgment, memory, and such like; but you did what was far worse, you disabled and besotted them, so as to make them only capable of acting wrong. You changed the physical organization of these powers from good to evil; and will you after all this, venture to say, that you are not responsible for the change?

You have done the evil, and you cannot undo it. But we are responsible for many things which we cannot undo. If we wilfully did them, we are guilty. If a pilot undertakes to steer your vessel into port, and then deliberately besots himself so that he *cannot*; is he not responsible? Rather, is he not doubly responsible, doubly guilty; guilty for not doing the thing contracted for, and guilty for rendering himself unable to do it? Is not the fact that he himself has rendered the doing of what he undertook, a physical impossibility, an aggravation of his guilt? If a stronger than he were to imprison him, and prevent his executing his trust, that would be a very different case. He would not then be guilty. In that case he could in no sense help it. His inability was not his own doing at all. His not doing the thing undertaken for, arose neither from his unwillingness, nor from his refusal to exercise the powers given him, nor from his having perverted them or thrown them away.

None of these being true, he is not guilty. But if any of them should be true, he would be guilty, even if he should plead physical inability. If he wilfully wasted, or destroyed his powers, he would be responsible for the complete exercise of them still. On any other supposition, there would be no such thing as right and wrong, nor any such thing as responsibility at all. If a man is not responsible for that which he is now unable to do, when he himself is the real cause of the inability, then nothing can be more easy than to evade responsibility altogether. If I have a disagreeable duty to perform, I have only to induce disease, or maim my limbs, and then I am no longer responsible for the neglect! If I have to pay a debt of a hundred pounds, I have only to throw away the money or mispend it, and then I am no longer responsible for it!—Nay, I may contract debts to any amount, and no man can make me responsible for them, if I can only prove myself unable to pay them. This was exactly Jonah's way of avoiding the danger and pain of carrying God's message to Nineveh. He fled away so as to make it physically impossible for him to go to Nineveh, as if the Lord would be mocked with such an excuse! If the simple fact of a person's being unable to perform a thing, excuse him for the neglect of it, then moral obligation must be very loose and uncertain, and the law of God a thing easily dispensed with or trifled away.

The real question is not simply, am I unable? but how did this inability come to pass? Have I destroyed and disabled myself, or did God do it?

It is in vain to plead inability, so long as it is true that I produced it myself, in direct opposition to the will of him that made me. We may in many cases measure a man's guilt by reference to his present resources and capacities; but God measures it by reference to the original powers conferred upon him, and which he has deliberately thrown away. To measure it by any other standard would be to give man the entire power to fix the amount of his own guilt, and estimate its penalty.

It is vain to say, Oh yes, man is responsible for the *act* of throwing away his powers, but not for every thing that has happened to him, or been done by him, in consequence of these being disabled. I answer, if a man is responsible for the first act, then he is so for all the others; for what are the others but a repetition of the first? and even though they were not, yet in every act the measure of responsibility must be the power which God gave him to perform the act aright? You may say perhaps, Yes, man is responsible for every thing into which his will enters; but not beyond the degree of will involved, or the degree of power possessed. Now, I admit that more or less of will must be involved in what a man does. Even what are called involuntary movements, both of body and soul, have perhaps more of the will in them than we suspect, however unconsciously brought into play. Hence in things which seem the mere result of physical constitution, there may be a far greater amount of will than we imagine. So that to determine the amount of *will* in any thing is a matter of exceeding diffi-

culty. In any particular sin it is impossible for us to say how much may be the result of will, and how much of power. How vain then to say, we must ascertain how much will and how much power are involved in an action, before we determine the amount of guilt.

I am willing to admit that we have all the *powers* that man ever had. We need no more. We require no new powers to be created in us. But then the *power* of using these powers aright is gone. These *powers* we still possess, the *power* we have cast away. I have all the bodily limbs that Adam had, but the power to use them is not like his. I have all the mental and moral powers which he possessed, but the power to use I have sinned away. Now, it is the possession of the *powers* that makes me responsible, not the possession of the power. If I came into the world bereft of intellect, then I could not be expected to understand truth, nor commanded to believe it. But if my understanding remain, however paralyzed and darkened by sin, I am responsible. If I came into the world without a conscience, I could not be commanded to keep the holy law of God; but if I have a conscience, however depraved by sin, I am responsible for keeping it. If I came into the world without a heart to love, any more than the worm beneath my feet, I could not be enjoined to love. But if I have a heart still, however changed in regard to its tastes, then I am responsible up to the extent of my original powers of loving. If I came into the world without a will, like a stone, I could not be guilty; but if I have a will, though

utterly set against God, utterly in bondage to sin, then I am responsible up to the full measure of that for which that will was at first given.

Man is truly a far more depraved being than many seem to suppose. The seat of his disease lies far deeper than they imagine. They would make it a very superficial thing, easily cured, by a mere act of his own will. God makes it very different,—deep-seated, awfully malignant, utterly incurable, save by the direct forthputting of the will of God.

Grant that the *seat* of the disease is the *will*, still the case remains unaltered. The will must have undergone a change, so that it is not now what once it was. The *will* has become depraved, and that depravity can only be removed by the mighty power of God. Let the seat of the malady be where you like, still it is a malady of such a nature as to require the interposition of Omnipotence for its cure.

The question then comes to be, not what is the disease, or what is the seat of it, but is it capable of removal by any but God? Grant that there is no inability but what is entirely moral, not physical at all, still the question recurs, is the removal of that moral inability more within man's power than the removal of the physical. If both are equally beyond his power, though in a different way, then really the stress laid upon the distinction between moral and physical inability, though right in itself perhaps, is still far away from the real point before us. My determination not to enter a church is a very different thing from my being positively unable to do so; yet practi-

cally they come to the same point. And the real question is, whichever of the two it be, How is it to be removed? That which concerns me, is not so much the precise seat of the disease, as the amount of power required to cure it. And whether we count our inability a moral or physical one, there can be no doubt that it can only be removed by God.

I press this point for the following reason: As long as the distinction between moral and physical inability was brought out for the purpose of enforcing the sinner's responsibility, there could be little harm in it. Nay, it was right. But when it is brought out in order to prove to the sinner that his disease is of such a kind, that he can remove it all by an act of his own will, then we are called upon to guard against the conclusions drawn from the distinction, and to clear up the distinction itself. I have no doubt that the reason of its being so much dwelt upon by some, is in order to show the sinner that he has the power to heal the disease, or at least to commence the healing process, without the *direct* interposition of God.

Make then the inability small or great, make it natural or moral, make it of whatever kind you will, still this fact comes prominently out, that man cannot remove it. God alone can do this. Man is utterly helpless. God must interpose.

A favourite argument with many is, "how can a man be called on to believe if he is not able of himself to do so? and how can the gospel be free if man be unable of himself to receive it?" On

this I would make the following remarks:—

1. This is a wrong way of settling the matter. The true question is, as to what Scripture says, and not as to what we think. Now, Scripture does call upon us, and command us to believe, yet declares also our entire helplessness. Both of these things are true, whether we can reconcile them or not. The truth of either of them does not depend upon our being able to adjust and explain them, but simply upon God's declaration concerning them. He has revealed both, and it is not for us to ask *how* can both of these be true, or to refuse to admit one of them because it appears to our reason inconsistent with the other. We know so little of the things of God, and are so utterly unable to reconcile many things much plainer than these, that it becomes us to be silent. God commands men everywhere to believe and repent, yet he says, "no man can come to Christ unless it be given him of the Father." Let us receive both of these statements, for both are of God. It is sad, indeed, when men will not believe what God tells them, unless their own reason can approve of it. There can be little reverence for God and for his word when men will not receive a plain statement of the Bible, because they cannot see how it accords with another to which they happen to be particularly attached. There may be perfect harmony, though we do not see it.

How foolish, then, and unreasonable to dwell upon such apparent contradictions, as if these could settle the question. Christ commanded Lazarus to come forth. Did that prove that Lazarus could do it of himself? How profane, as well as foolish,

would it be to say, Lazarus could not be entirely dead; he must have had some life and power remaining, else Christ would never have commanded him to come forth.

But, some one will say, there is a mighty difference between this instance and the matter before us. I grant there is; but the difference is all against such an objector. It does not matter what you call the kind of death or the kind of inability, it may be moral or it may be physical, still it is death, and it is inability. It is such a death and such an inability as requires to be removed by the power of another. And this is enough. Even where the power of another must go forth in order to enable the person to comply with the command, the command is quite consistent with man's responsibility. It is needless to discuss the question of moral and physical inability. All I contend for here, is an *inability which the power of another is required to remove*. In consistency then, our adversaries ought to maintain that wherever the inability is of such a kind as to require the aid of another, then moral obligation ceases. In this point of view it does not matter what the inability be, or where it lie. If it be so great, or of such a nature as to require the forthputting of the Spirit's power for its removal, then, according to the new theology, the sinner is not responsible, and God is unjust in commanding or inviting. We say, if the sinner produced the inability he is responsible. They say, no; he is not responsible, unless he is able to remove it himself. So that it would just come to this;—if you

say that the Spirit's help is absolutely necessary in conversion, and that the sinner cannot convert himself, you make him no longer a responsible agent, no longer a person to whom commands or invitations can be honestly or consistently addressed.

2. Let me grant that the inability is wholly in the *will* and nowhere else: that the sinner *can*, if he *will*, do every thing in believing, loving, &c. Does this get clear of the difficulty? By no means. For still the *will* being wholly set against God presents the grand obstacle. God sees that man never *will turn* of his own accord, and yet he invites, intreats, and commands him to do so. Is not this as great a difficulty as ever? Allowing that it places the question of the sinner's responsibility in a truer light, does it throw any light upon God's reasons for entreating sinners to do what he knows they never will? I might still ask the question, and insist upon a solution of the difficulty, "Why does God call on us to turn, when he knows we never *will* do so until he turns us? Is it not mockery in God to plead with us, and ply us with arguments and motives, when he knows quite well that we never will comply with these of our own accord?" Here is the great difficulty,—a difficulty which exists in our opponent's system as well as ours,—a difficulty which, even upon their principles, would lead to the conclusion that God is insincere in what he says,—giving us invitations which he knows will never be complied with.

3. Let me again grant that the inability is entirely *moral*, entirely in the will; how does this

clear up matters? Moral inability I should imagine to be something much *worse* than physical inability,—something much more difficult to remove. And if so, I may well ask, How is moral inability consistent with the commands of God in the gospel? It may be a different thing from the other kind of inability; it may preserve man's responsibility, but how does it in the very least furnish an answer to the question before us? If the moral be worse than the physical inability, then any prospect of the sinner's believing, turning, &c. of his own accord, and unacted upon by another, is wholly at an end. The impossibility, or at least the unlikelihood, of such a thing, is increased, not diminished. And how is that moral impossibility or unlikelihood to be overcome? Only by God. If so, why does God call on the sinner to do that which is *morally*, though not physically, impossible?

4. God commands the sinner to keep the whole law, in every jot and tittle. The command is a just one. Man is responsible for obeying it. But does this prove that unrenewed man is able to keep the whole law? A man's being unrenewed does not free him from his obligation to keep the law. He is still bound to do so even in his unrenewed state. But does this prove that in that state he is also *able* to keep it? According to some, it does; otherwise God would not be just in enjoining him to keep it. But further, a man has the same power to keep the law as he has to believe the gospel. His powers for both are of necessity the same, unless a new faculty be required in order to his keeping the law. If then,

he can believe of himself, he can keep the law of himself. He is equally responsible for both.

5. God commands us to "make ourselves new hearts," Ezek. xviii. 31. Are we able to do this? Not even the advocates of free-will maintain this. They admit that a man cannot convert himself, and give himself a new heart. Yet God commands us to do this, and tells that if we do not do this, iniquity will be our ruin. We are responsible for making our hearts good, for we made them evil. It is no excuse to say, we have made them so evil that we cannot renew them: it is beyond our power. We are responsible for all the evil that we have done, whether we can undo it or not; and God is righteous in saying to us, Do this good, or undo this evil.

These considerations may help to show us that man's utter helplessness is not at all inconsistent with God's authority over him, and that it is quite possible to hold the doctrine of man's inability, and yet to press upon him the command, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ;" nay, to say, "Ye *will* not come unto me that ye might have life;" "As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the sinner, but rather that he turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die?"

I intended to have spoken at some length upon the freedom of the will. But I must be content with a few remarks upon it. Philosophers and Pelagians say that man's will is free; Scripture says that it is in bondage. I admit that God does not force it, that the devil cannot force it, that nothing outward can force it. I admit that

man is a *free agent* in what he does, in so far as any thing outward is concerned. But still his will is a captive and in bonds. Christ says, "Whosoever committeth sin, is the servant of sin," and he adds, "if the Son make you *free*, ye shall be free indeed." Does this not mean, that till Christ make us free we are not free? In like manner, Paul speaks of our being the "servants of sin," of our being "carnal, sold under sin;" and Peter says, "they promise them liberty while they themselves are the servants of corruption, for of whom a man is overcome, of the same he is brought in bondage." (2 Peter ii. 19.) Let these passages suffice for those who are so boastful of the freedom of the will. But, indeed, if they have not learned, in their own bitter experience, the miserable bondage of their own will, and the sad dominion which sin had over them, I despair of convincing them either by reason or Scripture.*

But you, my dear friend, know something of the struggles of a soul in bondage. Even when rejoicing in forgiveness, and walking in the liberty which the Son hath given, we are continually made to feel the remains of our former bondage, and to cry out because of it. Our former chains no longer bind us, but their fragments still remain upon our limbs. And if even now we feel the traces of our bondage, how heavy and sore must it have been in other days. In

* How like men speak now-a-days to the carnal Jews of old, when Christ told them that they were not free: "We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man, how sayest thou, ye shall be made free."—John viii. 33.

what bondage we once lay! Our wills, our faculties, our whole nature, were in bondage. We were not free till Christ made us so. And it is in this that we rejoice; we once were the slaves of sin, now we are set free; once it had dominion over us, now we are delivered from its yoke! Blessed be the name of him who sent from above and took us and drew us out of many waters! Blessed be his glorious name for ever, who hath opened our prison gates, and brought us forth out of the low dungeon to breathe in gladness the free fresh air of a heavenly day!*

I am yours, &c.

THUS SAITH THE LORD.

“God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.”—Gen. vi. 5.

“Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.”—Job xiv. 4.

“Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.”—Ps. li. 5.

“There is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and sinneth not.”—Eccles. vii. 20.

“The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.”—Jerem. xvii. 9.

* Those who say that the whole disease lies in the *will*, and nowhere else, must have some difficulty in sympathizing with Paul, when he said concerning himself, “*to WILL is present with me, but HOW TO PERFORM that which is good I find not.*” I would earnestly recommend the careful study of the whole of the seventh chapter of the Romans in connection with this letter.

“This people’s heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed.”—Matt. xiii. 15.

“That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.”—John iii. 6.

“No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him.”—John vi. 40.

“No man can come unto me, except it were given him of my Father.”—John vi. 65.

“I am carnal, sold under sin, for that which I do I allow not; for what I would, that do I not, but what I hate that do I.”—Rom. vii. 14.

“To will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not.”—Rom. vii. 18.

“The good that I would I do not, but the evil which I would not that I do.”—Rom. vii. 19.

“I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin.”—Rom. vii. 23.

“You hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins.”—Eph. ii. 1.

“Who being past feeling, have given themselves over to lasciviousness.”—Eph. iv. 19.

“Having eyes full of adultery, and that cannot cease from sin.”—2 Pet. ii. 14.

NOTE.—The following paragraph, from the works of Andrew Fuller, may help the reader to understand how man may be a free and responsible agent, and yet in bondage to sin. “Has not man liberty in respect of the *law*, as well as of the *gospel*? Does he, in any instance, break the law against his will? Surely not. If a bias of mind to evil, be it ever so deep-rooted and confirmed, tends to destroy free agency, then the devil can be no free agent, and so is not accountable. The same holds true of a bias to good,

neither God, nor Christ, nor saints in glory, are capable of doing wrong. The bias of their minds is so invariably fixed to holiness, that it is impossible they should in any instance deviate from it, and yet will any one deny them to be the subjects of free agency?"

LETTER IX.

THE SPIRIT AND THE WORD.

“Then opened he their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures.”—LUKE xxiv. 45.

“When he the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth.”—JOHN xvi. 13.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

You hear it often said by the holders of the new theology,—“we do not deny the Spirit’s work, but we maintain that he works only through the word, nay, that he is *in* the word, so that whenever the word is read or preached, there is the Spirit. He is *in* the word.” Let us examine this statement.

If the Spirit work *only* through the word, how can he have access to the souls of infants? They cannot understand the word, yet we know that he works in them, else all who die in infancy *must* be lost. He wrought in the soul of John the Baptist, and as we have reason to believe in many others, from the womb. In such cases it must have been a direct operation of his hand upon the soul before it was possible that the truth could take effect, or be employed by him as an instrument. Here then is a large class of cases in which the Spirit works *directly* by the immediate touch of his hand upon the soul. And this

shows us that he can and does act oftentimes without any outward means.

Well, but does this prove anything with regard to those of riper years? We think it does. First of all, it shows that the Spirit can operate upon the soul directly, without any outward means at all. And, secondly, it gives us an insight into the way in which he works *through means*. Take the case of one of these children in whom he has been working from infancy; trace the progress of his work onward to maturer years. During the time in which the child could not know the truth, he was working upon the soul; and when the moment came that it did understand the truth, did he stay his hand, did he withdraw his touch, did he cease working in the way in which he had hitherto been doing? Did he not continue his direct working just as before, only now the mind in which he was operating began to take on the the shape and mould of the truth externally applied to it. Previously he had been working upon the clay alone; but now the clay and the mould are brought into contact, and henceforth all his operations are in connection with both. With the one hand he continues to operate upon the clay, and with the other he applies the mould. These are two distinct processes, one direct, *i. e.*, upon the clay; the other indirect, *i. e.*, upon the mould.

Let us take another instance. The word is likened by our Lord to *seed*; "the good seed of the word," is that which is sown. But this is sown in various soils; and however good the seed may be, if the soil be bad it will bear no fruit.

Until the soil be made good, the seed will not spring up. The seed may be the very best: it may be sown by the most skilful sower, and in the most skilful way; it may be shone upon by a genial sun; it may be watered with refreshing showers; but all this will not make it grow. Why? Because the soil is bad; it is sown in sand. No skill in the sower, no excellence in the seed, will convert sand into good soil. No showers nor sunshine will make sand fertile. There must be a direct process altering the character of the *soil*, before the seed will spring up. To make the soil fruitful through the means of the *seed* is an impossibility. What husbandman would speak in such a way? Would he speak about putting power into the *seed* to fertilize the *soil*? Would he speak of getting at the soil through the seed alone? Would he think of rectifying the soil through means of the seed alone? Would he not at once set about the *direct* process of manuring in order to change the soil and make it fruitful? And what would you think of a man who would say to you, "Oh, I do not deny the necessity of a power being put forth to change the soil; all I say is, that it must be put forth through the *seed* alone; the soil must not be touched directly, that would be an interference with the laws of nature; the power is in the seed; let the seed be well lodged in the ground, and it will soon show its power to change the soil." Would you not say that, whatever his professions might be, he did not really believe in any power at all, save that which was inherent in the soil, and in the seed. In like manner, when men say, "Oh, we do not

deny the Spirit's work and power, we merely say, that his power is in the word," I must say that I have difficulty in understanding how these men believe in a Holy Spirit at all.

The only way of getting over this difficulty is, by supposing some small remaining goodness about the soil into which the seed may strike its roots. If this be admitted, then I understand the matter. But if the soil be totally and utterly barren, then nothing can be more unintelligible than to speak of a power in the seed, by which it is able to spring up, without any direct process being applied to the soil.

Or let me take another example. David's prayer was, "open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." These are plain words. David asks God to open his eyes, in order that being opened he may behold these wondrous things. He knew something about the law; he knew that there were wondrous things in it. These he longed to see, but his eyes were closed and dim. What was his remedy? In God alone. In God *directly*, not through the medium of any thing else. God's touch alone, *direct and immediate*, could open David's eyes. Had he lived in our day, and complained of dim and closed eyes, he would have been told, "now you must not pray, you must not go to God to tell him your disease, and say, open mine eyes; you must just set the object before you; there is power in the object to open your eye; but to go to God himself and seek the direct forthputting of his power upon your eye, is nothing but unbelief of his word." But David

knew better than these miserable comforters. He knew himself and his disease better than they did; he knew the real seat of the disease, and the real nature of the cure required better than they; he knew his gracious God, his healer, his enlightener, better than they; and therefore he went directly to him, imploring the *direct* touch of his hand.

He felt exactly as blind Bartimeus felt. He knew that he was blind, and wanted to see. Jesus of Nazareth was passing by. He was said to be able to open the eyes of the blind by his touch. Accordingly he went and was cured. And how? Did Jesus say,—“don't come to me and cry for the opening of your eyes, but just look before you at these objects of light; they have power in them to make you see; I only work *through* them; I do not put forth my power *directly* upon the eye; I only put it forth indirectly through these objects, and in no other way”? No, he *touched* his eyes, and said, receive thy sight. Thus the eye of the body was cured; and thus the eye of the soul is also cured.

But is it not said, “The commandment of the Lord is pure enlightening the eyes?” (Ps. xix. 8.) Yes, it is. But what of this? Does this contradict the other? No. In the first place, it is not said here, that the word *opens*, but merely that it *enlightens* the eyes. In the second place, I admit most fully the efficacy of the word: “It is a lamp to our feet, and a light to our path.” I do not in the very least depreciate the word of the living God. I wish merely to assign to it the place which God does. I see men superseding

the Spirit, and setting aside his work under pretence of honouring the word. And it is this that I refuse to do. I admit the blessed efficacy of the word; but *I maintain also the direct agency of the Holy Spirit upon the soul in order to the reception of that word.* I maintain that there must be an "opening of the eye" by the Spirit, ere there can be a "beholding of the wondrous things out of the law."

As to this "power in the word," of which so much is spoken, I confess it is a mystery to me. That there is power in the word—that the word of God is a powerful word, I cordially admit. In no other words is there such a power and majesty. There are no words like the words of God for excellency and strength. Words so weighty, so fit, so full, so big with meaning, are nowhere else to be found. Though in themselves they be but the language of the creature, the poor speech of man, yet it is the Almighty voice that speaks through them; it is the *thoughts* of God himself which they contain. If this is all that is meant by power being in the word, then no one will dispute the matter. But this is not all. Nay, this is not the point at all. No one denies that the words are the words of God, and that they contain the thoughts of God. But the question is, Do these words contain some mysterious power of making these thoughts to be known and felt by the sinner? Do they contain a power, *independent of their meaning*, to make the sinner *feel* these thoughts which they contain? If it is said, Oh no, they contain no such power apart from their meaning; but these *thoughts*, conveyed by

means of the word, have the power: then we must say, that this is hardly intelligible, or, at least, does not touch the point. For thoughts, and words, and ideas are *passive* things; whereas, according to this idea, they are active things, a living agency, capable of operating upon the mind by means of a mysterious power with which they are impregnated. But even granting that they did possess some such active power, still the difficulty is not explained. For the state of the sinner's soul is such as to repel and resist that power. And how is this repelling and resisting attitude of the sinner to be removed? Take an illustration. Suppose the window of my house is darkened by a wall which excludes the sun. The sunbeams beat upon the wall, but still it remains, nay, it grows harder and more impenetrable under their influence. Had it been a wall of ice, it would have melted away; but its nature is such as to harden, not to soften, under these beams. And how, then, is the evil to be remedied? By putting greater power into the sunbeams? That is an absurdity. Besides, it is the nature of the wall to resist the sunbeam, and to harden under it; and, to put additional power into the sunbeam would only be to call forth additional resistance and produce more induration. The remedy is plainly, the removing of the wall by a power fitted for that purpose—a power (if you like) going along with the sunbeams, and operating simultaneously, but still a *direct* power put forth upon the fabric for its overthrow.

I know that this illustration is a very imperfect one. It fails in many points of resemblance.

But still it does not make the case of the sinner worse than it really is. Nay, it does not bring out the worst feature of the case. It does not show the *active and positive resistance* to the light which the sinner puts forth, and which is far worse and far harder to be overcome than the resistance of mere inanimate matter. If, then, it be said, that I have misrepresented and mis-stated the case, all I shall say is, that I have *understated* the case; but I have not *mis-stated* it. The difficulty is far greater than such an illustration can give us the least idea of.

I do hold, then, a power along with the word, and in connection with the word; but to say, that that power is *in* the word, is either a mere figure of speech, or it is an absurdity. When God said "let there be light," there went out a power *along with* the word, and the light came into being. Who would say that the power was *in* the word? When Jesus stood at the grave of Lazarus, and said, "Lazarus, come forth," there went out a power *along with* the word; yet how absurd to say that it was *in* the word.

The truth is, that the sinner is most reluctant to admit that he is entirely in the hands and at the disposal of God, in regard to salvation. He wants to have salvation entirely at his own disposal. He sees, that if he can succeed in proving that there is no power apart from the word, nothing but what is contained in the word, he becomes the disposer of his own destiny. But if he admit a power not in the word, a power coming direct from God, then he is at the disposal of God. This is the secret of the modern idea

of the Spirit being *in* the word. Man wants to be his own saviour, and, therefore, he tries to prove that God has made him so by giving him the word, and putting enough of power into it to save him. But not only does this show that man is rejecting God's sovereignty; it proves something more. It shows us that, after all, he does not feel himself safe in God's hands, and, therefore, he wishes to take salvation into his own. And what is this but a clear proof that these very men who speak so loudly of a free gospel and of the love of God, do not believe that gospel, and do not give credit to that love. If they did, they would not be so anxious to take salvation out of God's hands. They would feel far safer in his hands than in their own. And these ideas of theirs, instead of clearing up and enforcing the gospel, plainly prove that the gospel of the grace of God is not understood at all. These men *have yet to learn what the gospel is*. It is from the dark suspicions of their own hearts as to the character of God that the attempt to wrest salvation out of his hands, and to place it in their own, proceeds.

Let me illustrate the point before us a little farther. I shall state the following case. It is no mere imaginary one. A dull, stupid scholar once sat beside an intelligent teacher, who sought to instruct him in the things of God. The Bible lay upon the knees of both. But it was in vain. The boy could not be got even to understand the truth regarding the way of life. The teacher explained, and simplified, and illustrated, but with no effect. Often did he wish that he had

direct access to the boy's soul, that he might touch its secret springs, and rectify his understanding. He felt that nothing save this could be of any avail. But he could only dwell upon the truth, endeavour to open it up more fully, and press it clearly home. Thus, day after day, sat the teacher in his helplessness, and the scholar in his dulness. Meanwhile the former failed not to commend the boy to God, asking Him who had access to its hidden springs to touch them; asking that Spirit, who alone could renew, and enlighten, and enable to comprehend, to do his work upon the soul, that the truth might at length find entrance. Thus he prayed, and the teaching was given up as hopeless. One day his pupil came eagerly to him, exclaiming, "Now I understand it all." "Who taught you?" "No one." "How did you come to see it?" "Oh! in a moment I saw it; and it is just the very thing you have been telling me so long, but I never saw it till now: God has opened my eyes." And so it was. That Holy Spirit, who alone has access to the soul of man, had put forth his power, and the boy's dulness had given way. But the work had not been through the truth upon his soul; it had been directly upon his soul, in order to his understanding the truth. It had been exactly what David sought for in his own case, "give me understanding that I may learn thy commandments," (Psalm cxix. 73.)*

* It is remarkable how David, throughout this psalm, prays in this strain; and yet, at the same time, he says, "through thy precepts I get understanding." Both of these things are true. And to deny either of them

Let me take another instance. There was a poor idiot who could be made to understand nothing. All his life he had been an idiot, and as an idiot, he lay down to die. Beside his bed

would contradict the plain word of God. I admit, most readily, the one truth, that through God's precepts we get understanding; and all I ask is, that the other truth be admitted also, that it is the Holy Spirit who opens our eyes, and "makes us to understand." The two things are quite consistent with each other, and we gain nothing by denying either. Each of these agencies operates in their own way, and according to their own nature: the word in one way according to its nature, and the Spirit in another according to his nature. The only question is, which is *first*? Certainly the Spirit. He brings the soul into contact with the word. He softens the heart, that the word may be felt. He opens the eyes that the word may be seen. He makes tender the conscience that the word may penetrate. He was first in the old creation. He is first in the new. The following paragraph from Fuller is so appropriate that I must be allowed to quote it here. "It is owing to divine agency, and to that *alone*, that one sinner rather than another, believes in Christ. If God does the same for one man as for another, how does he yet *make men to differ*. If God works effectually on some, that is more than any man will pretend he does upon all; and this will perfectly account for a difference between one sinner and another. . . . God has so constituted the human mind, that words, whether spoken or written, shall have an effect upon it. The Holy Spirit speaks to men in his word. It would be strange if God's word had not some effect upon people's minds. The influence of the word upon the mind, seeing that word is indited by the Holy Spirit, may be called, in an indirect and figurative sense, the influence of the Holy Spirit. It was with this kind of influence that he strove with the antediluvians, (Gen. vi. 3.) This influence *ought* to suffice to bring us to repent of sin, and believe in Christ, and were it not for the resistance that is made to it, *would* have such an effect. But through the perverseness of the human heart, it *never has*. From the depravity or perverseness of the human heart arises the necessity of a special and effectual influence of the Holy Spirit."

there stood a man calling himself a minister of Christ, who came to make mirth with the dying idiot. That man had read his Bible, knew well about it, and had often preached from it. Yet his "understanding was darkened." As he stood at the bed-side, all of a sudden, the idiot broke forth with the following "confession of his faith" before the astounded hearers:—

"Three in one, and one in three,
And the middle's the one that has saved me."

Then he died. No one had heard the like from him before. It was strange and new. Who taught him? God. Who opened his understanding? God. Who put those words into his tongue? God. Who made the poor idiot, who could not read a Bible, to differ from the scoffing minister that had read it a thousand times? God. And was *it*, through *the truth*, that he gave understanding to him who had none? No one in his right mind would speak thus. No. In this case it was the direct touch of the Spirit's hand upon the soul that did the work. It was from within, and not from without that the renewing power came. He who made the soul, put forth his power and made it new. It seemed like a broken harp. The mere frame-work was there; but everything else had been torn away. Not one note could be struck. But God needed that harp to swell the new song in heaven. And ere it was "vilely cast away," he took it into his own Almighty hand, replaced the strings, retuned them all, and then, ere he took it from earth, struck one dying note of thrilling power and

beauty, to let men know what a goodly instrument he could make out of that broken harp, from which no music had ever come before.

Let me take another case. Look at the prophets in the Old, and the apostles in the New Testament! Who taught them to speak and write? It is said, "holy men of God spake as they were *moved by the Holy Ghost.*" In teaching them, then, he must have had access *directly* to their souls. He entered at once into their understandings, and taught them. In their case, certainly, there must have been a direct operation upon the soul. Now I know that there is no such kind of inspiration now. I know that this miraculous utterance of new truth has ceased. But I cite this example, in order to disprove the assertion of those who maintain that the Spirit has no direct access to the soul, no way of instructing us save through the truth. And I also adduce it, because I believe that the method which God took to show the prophets truths absolutely new and unheard of, bears a strong resemblance to the way in which he still shows the sinner truth which is *new to him*,—truth of which he understood as little as did the prophets before God had spoken. In proof of this assertion, let me quote a few passages.

L. Luke xi. 12, "*When they bring you unto the synagogues and unto magistrates and powers, take no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, for the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same honr what ye ought to say.*" Here, then, we have the direct and immediate operation of the Spirit upon the soul, suggesting suitable

truth for the occasion. And any one reading the chapter will see that this promise is to *all* believers, not to the apostles alone. It refers not to what we would call miraculous inspiration, but to the ordinary operations of the Spirit. Oh, it will be said, but he does this by means of the truth. Now what does this mean, but that he suggests truth through the truth; that is, I suppose, he suggests one truth by means of another; in other words, one truth suggests another without his interference at all. But even granting that he suggests one truth by means of another, granting that this is all that is meant by the Spirit's teaching, the question naturally occurs, who or what suggested the *first* of the series? If I stand upon the margin of some lake, and find all of a sudden ripple after ripple beating upon the grass that skirts it, I look round to see the cause of this, — what began the rippling. How absurd to say, oh it is merely one ripple raising another, and forcing it forward to the shore. I am sure it was either the wind that suddenly rose, or some stone that had been cast into the waters. Some such cause must have begun the series. And so with *truth*, in the case I have referred to. Even granting that the Spirit did suggest one truth by means of another, how will this account for the suggestion of the *first*? This must have been done in some more direct way, and by some more immediate touch. So that the difficulty still remains; only in the one case it is removed a little farther back, and placed a little more out of sight, as if there was a reluctance to admit the idea of God working directly, as if such an idea

were only fitted to alarm and discourage the sinner.

With the daily consciousness of having within me a heart of sin, a hard and ever-rebelling heart, I know not for myself a more blessed, more precious truth, than that I am the clay and God is the potter,—that it is *his* hand that grasps me, compassing me about, and coming into close, direct, warm contact with my naked soul. The thought of nothing but indirect dealing and communication between him and me, is desolate and cold to me beyond conception. And instead of feeling relieved and comforted by being told that the Spirit never works directly upon the soul, but only through the truth, I am cast down, indeed, as if bereaved of that which was my chiefest hope, my most precious consolation in the hours of infirmity and conflict, when the flesh within, and principalities and powers without, assail me till I faint upon the field, and all that bears me up is the felt grasp of an infinite hand, the circling pressure of the everlasting arm.

II. Rom. viii. 26, "*Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.*" This is something very distinct in regard to the working of the Holy Spirit. He *helpeth* our infirmities, or, as it literally implies, he takes hold of our burden, puts his shoulder under it, and sustains the weight so as to prevent it crushing us. How he can do all this, simply and only through the truth, it is hard to discover. What words can more strongly

express his direct operation upon the soul? If they do not express this, I know not where words can be found to do so. But the case is far stronger when we consider the expression, "groanings that cannot be uttered." How does he awaken those groanings within which cannot be clothed in words? By suggesting truth to the soul? This is absurd. If the Spirit presented truth to the soul, and in that way created the longings, then surely the soul could express these longings. They had been distinctly and definitely presented to him, and surely he could distinctly and definitely speak of them. If this had been said merely of the poor unlettered saints, this objection of mine might not be altogether applicable; for I know that oftentimes they cannot find words whereby to express their thoughts; but it is of all saints that the apostle is speaking. If in answer to all this it is said that we frequently get glimpses of truth, natural truth, which awaken in us longings which we cannot express, I admit that such is the case; but if this be all that is affirmed by the apostle here, there was no necessity for introducing the Spirit at all. His statement in that case is most incorrect, and fitted to mislead; for he speaks of the Spirit actually making intercession for us (or in us) with those groanings that cannot be uttered. He is represented as one who has come into us and taken up his abode in us, as one who thus carries on a work from within by means of a direct, though hidden agency; as one who is so identified with us, that the apostle speaks of his prayers and ours, his voice and ours, as if they were one. He is represented here as

dwelling in us, filling us, using our faculties and organs as instruments for expressing himself, till, as his operations upon the soul become more close and powerful, faculties, words, voice, give way, and nothing comes forth but the unutterable groan. This, surely, is something very *direct*. It conveys most plainly the idea that there is no intervention of any thing (be it the truth or aught else,) between the touch of the Almighty hand and the soul in which he is dwelling. It shows us a workman *within*, carrying on his operations there, quickening, fashioning, moulding all things to his will,—bringing every part of the soul into contact with the truth from without, by means of the pressure of his own hand from within.

III. 1 Cor. xii. 3, “*No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.*” This expression corresponds to many others in the New Testament, such as those; “Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven,” (Matt. xvi. 17); “God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ,” (2 Cor. iv. 6); “When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother’s womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me,” (Gal. i. 15.) These passages all suggest the same idea,—that it is directly through the agency of the Spirit that we are enabled to call Jesus Lord, and that but for this agency we should have remained his enemies. I merely, however, take the first of them, (1 Cor. xii. 3.), as being the most suitable to the object I have

in view. It occurs in a chapter where the miraculous gifts of the Spirit are discoursed of, and this enables us to fix its meaning with more distinctness. Let me cite a verse or two: "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; there are diversities of operation, but it is the same God which worketh all in all; to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; . . . all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." Such is a brief enumeration of the operations of the Spirit. In these his mode of working is, to a certain extent, plainly enough declared. It is direct and immediate. How otherwise is it possible that he can confer the gifts of tongues, of prophecy, of healing, &c. No one in his right mind would say that these were conferred through the truth. It must have been the direct and immediate touch of his hand upon the soul. Nothing else could have made them prophesy or speak with tongues. Well, it is just in the midst of this statement of his works, or rather as the introduction to them, that it is said, "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." And what are we to infer from this, but that he teaches the soul to own Jesus as his Lord, in the same way as he teaches to prophesy. If it is said, but the passage refers to the inspired teaching of the apostles in proclaiming Jesus to others; I answer, that this only confirms my argument,

For if the direct agency of the Spirit was needed to enable them to declare what they knew, much more is that same agency needed to show us the things of Christ. Hence the apostle says in another place, "now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God," 1 Cor. ii. 12.

IV. Phil. ii. 13. "*It is God that worketh in you both to will and to do, of his good pleasure.*" This is one of the plainest statements we could possibly have had. We are told that it is God who worketh *in* us. It is an inward operation that is spoken of,—an operation which none could perform, but he who has access to the inmost recesses of the soul. But this is not all. We are told more particularly in what way he operates upon us, "both to will and to do." The springs of willing and of doing must both be operated upon. The hand of the physician must be laid upon the diseased organ, else there can be no cure. Hence David prayed, "Incline my heart unto thy testimonies." Ps. cxix. 36.

V. Ezek. xxxvi. 26. "*A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh; and I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes.*" If this does not denote a direct inward operation upon the soul, removing what is old, and imparting what is new, we know not how language can describe it. To twist such expressions, and say that they merely

refer to the outward means which God uses, is to do the most reckless and profane violence to Scripture that can be conceived.

VI. Eph. i. 17. "*The God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, give unto you the Spirit of wisdom and revelation, in (or, in order to) the knowledge of him, the eyes of your understanding being enlightened, that ye may know what is the hope of his calling.*" Here the apostle prays that the Holy Spirit may be given to the Ephesians.* And he speaks of him as the Spirit that imparts wisdom, the Spirit that reveals truth. This Spirit is given for the purpose of "enlightening the eyes of the understanding." Can any thing be more explicit than this? Surely the enlightening the eyes of the understanding must be an *inward*

* Here I would notice what I have no room to dwell upon, that all prayer proceeds upon the principle that God has something to give in addition to what he has already given. When we pray to be instructed in the word, we ask God to do something for us inwardly, in order that we may know the word. We may have read the word a thousand times, but still we know that when God touches the springs of the soul, renewing it, and imparting to it a power of relishing the truth, that every word seems full of new sweetness and beauty. Outwardly it is the same word; but the inward touch of the finger of God upon the soul has so wrought upon us, that it seems altogether new. All this is *utterly impossible* upon a scheme which admits of nothing but mere outward influence. If the same verse of the Bible appears sweeter at one time than another, *the cause of this difference must be a change of the state of the soul.* If my soul remains unchanged, the verse will remain unchanged. But if the soul undergo an alteration, the verse will be felt different. It is wretched metaphysics, as well as wretched theology, to deny this. And if in order to relish the things of Christ, my soul must undergo a change,—how can this be accomplished but by the Holy Ghost working in me and upon me?

process,—a thing accomplished, not through the truth, but in order to their understanding the truth. The truth could not be known and felt without this inward enlightening work of the Spirit. I know that in another sense the truth does enlighten. And I would not on any account undervalue the truth. I would rejoice in it as “a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.” But when I find this kind of enlightening declared to be *all* that the Spirit does,—when I find his direct work upon the soul denied, then it is time to declare most broadly the whole truth of God. And here I would offer a single remark upon those passages, which speak of the Spirit being given “to them that obey him,” (Acts v. 32,) and of his being “received through faith.” In these our opponents triumph. They need not. I admit at once that these passages all refer to those blessings which we receive *after* believing, and *in consequence of it*; I have no doubt about that. It is quite plain that we do receive far more abundantly of the Spirit *after* believing. But this has nothing at all to do with the question. Admitting that we receive the Spirit after believing, does that prove that we do not receive him also *before* believing, and *in order to* believing? The truth is, that there is one class of passages which speak of what God does in us, and for us, *before* believing; and another which speak of what he does in us, and for us, *after* believing. And both of these declarations must be held fast. Our opponents admit the one, but deny the other.

VII. Eph. iii. 16. “*Strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man, that Christ may*

dwell in your heart by faith." Here is another testimony equally explicit to the inward operation of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is said to "strengthen;" and he is said to do this in order "that Christ may dwell in our hearts by faith." What meaning has this language, if there be no working of the Spirit, but the outward and the indirect, through the medium of the truth alone?

VIII. John xx. 22. *He breathed upon them, and saith unto them, Receive the Holy Ghost.*" This is surely a direct communication of the Holy Spirit to the soul. And it shows us the way in which the Lord gives the Spirit. There was nothing indirect here. It was not through the truth that this was done. It was the direct impartation of the Spirit by Christ himself.

IX. Rom. xv. 13. *That ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost.*" It is here stated that it is the power of the Holy Ghost that causes us to abound in hope. And does it not refer to a power distinct from the word, and distinct from any outward influence?

X. John xvi. 8. *When he is come he will convince the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.*" This conviction of sin can only be effected by working directly upon the sinner's conscience. That conscience is seared; it is in love with sin; and never will it be convinced of sin, never will it hate it, until the Spirit operate upon it to remove its searedness and insensibility, to soften and make it tender. This must be a *direct* work. The natural conscience repels and resists the truth, nay, becomes more hardened under it. And to say that it is through the ap-

plication of the truth alone that the conscience is affected, is just to say that it is softened by that which is hardening it.

XI. 1John ii. 20. "*Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.*" This unction or anointing of the Holy Spirit is that by which we are made to know all things. Now an anointing is something which comes directly in contact with us. Just as the anointing came down on the High Priest, so does the Spirit come down on us. Surely this is something direct. How can the Spirit anoint us *through means* of the truth? This is an absurdity. He anoints us in order to our knowing the truth.

XII. 2Tim. i. 14. "*That good thing which was committed unto thee keep, by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us.*" It was the Gospel, or the truth of God, that was committed to Timothy; and this he was to keep and hold fast by means of the Holy Spirit dwelling in him. This is manifestly a direct, inward influence,—an influence operating upon the soul, and enabling it to keep hold of the Gospel. What could be more absurd than to suppose that the apostle meant to say, "Hold fast the truth by means of the truth." Yet this is all that some in modern times will allow us to say.

But let these references suffice. I could quote many more equally strong and satisfactory, but there is no need. No simple-minded student of the word of God can read such passages, without being convinced that the Holy Spirit works *by a direct, inward operation upon the soul.*

At the same time, I am quite aware of the many

passages in which the truth is spoken of as the instrument or channel through which he works. I am far from wishing to deny this, or to depreciate the value of the word. All I wish is, to preserve you from running into that most fatal error of the present day, that the Spirit is "in the word," and that he only operates through the word, and in no other way. This I consider to be not only unscriptural, but thoroughly poisonous to the soul. It is one of Satan's devices in these last days, for producing a religion so like the real shape and form of godliness, that multitudes will be deceived by it; cheating themselves into the belief that they are sure of heaven, when they have never been born again. Such a religion has no *depth*. It is meagre, lean, and shallow. It is a self-taught, self-produced religion. For where is the indwelling, inworking Spirit in all this? Where is the living Saviour himself? Ah! he has been superseded by an abstract something that men call truth; and as Israel made their God-given law a substitute for the living Father, so men are now making the Christ-given Gospel, a substitute for the living Son!

I shall conclude this long letter with one observation, on which I should gladly have dwelt, had there been space. It is this. The expression, "*influences of the Spirit*," is not a Scriptural one, and ought to be avoided. The Bible always speaks of the working of the Spirit, or the indwelling of the Spirit,—not of his mere influences. And there is a most important difference between these two things. In the former case, every thing connected with the Spirit's opera-

tions would be direct and personal; in the latter, there is nothing but a certain vagueness which may mean anything, or nothing at all. The *influence* of a person is a very different thing from his personal presence and operation. And we ought to be upon our guard against this form of expression, which I am sorry to think extends far beyond the upholders of the new theology. It is of an indwelling Spirit that the Bible speaks. It is an indwelling Spirit that Christ promises. "He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." John xiv. 17. We are not certain objects acted upon by some distant influence, as the sea is by the moon; we are vessels which the Spirit fills; we are temples in which the Spirit dwells. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." 1 Cor. iii. 16. I am yours, &c.

THUS SAITH THE LORD :

"Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me."—Ps. li. 10.

"Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created."—Ps. civ. 30.

"Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law."—Ps. cxix. 18.

"Incline my heart unto thy testimonies."—Ps. cxix. 36.

"Give me understanding THAT I MAY LEARN THY COMMANDMENTS."—Ps. cxix. 73.

"Quicken me after thy lovingkindness, so shall I keep the testimony of thy mouth."—Ps. cxix. 88.

“Give me understanding THAT I MAY KNOW THY TESTIMONIES.”—Ps. cxix. 125.

“Incline not my heart to any evil thing.”—Ps. cxli. 4.

“Where is he that put his Holy Spirit within him.”—Isaiah lxiii. 11.

“I will put a new Spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh.”—Ezek. xi. 19.

“I will put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live.”—Ezek. xxxvii. 14.

“He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.”—John xiv. 17.

“As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in me.”—John xv. 4.

“Without me ye can do nothing.”—John xv. 5.

“When he is come, he will reprove the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment.”—John xvi. 8.

“When he the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth.”—John xvi. 13.

“The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.”—Rom. v. 5.

“Stephen, a man full of the Holy Ghost.”—Acts vi. 5.

“The Holy Ghost who dwelleth in us.”—2 Tim. i. 14.

NOTE.—I subjoin a paragraph from one of the letters of “the Correspondence of the Congregational Churches.” It contains a statement of the error, and a refutation of it.

“ You distinguish the influence of the Spirit for which *you* plead as an influence *BY* means, and that for which *we* plead as an influence *ACCOMPANYING* means. The latter you disown. Now, we have simply to ask you, if there be no influence *accompanying* the means, what else is there but the means?—The engineer may “turn on” the steam; but it is not the engineer, it is the steam, and the steam alone that propels the vessel. Suppose you were to say, that the engineer “*works by*” *the steam*, would you add any thing to the idea? We think not. The steam is still the only power. And who would speak of the *wind* or the *tide* *resisting* the *engineer* *working by the steam*? The resistance is to the one power,—that of the steam alone. If there be no converting influence *accompanying* the word, what is there besides the word to produce the conversion?—if there be no convincing and saving influence *accompanying* the miracles, what is there besides the miracles to effect the conviction and the salvation? We confess ourselves, therefore, still unable to discern the difference between *resisting the Spirit working by means*, in your sense of the phrase, and *resisting the means themselves*; your denial of any *accompanying* influence of the Spirit, evidently amounting to a denial of any influence of the Spirit at all; there being no other conceivable or possible.

That, if the *external* influence, considered by you as the influence of the Spirit, more is used with some than with others,—and more even with some that are lost than with others that are saved, will be found, when analysed, to amount

to no more than this,—that *men are placed by providence in different circumstances, and enjoy various kinds and degrees of privilege.* Some have better opportunities than others of observing the works of nature; some of reading and hearing the inspired word; and some of receiving impressions from Divine dispensations. What is there more? you deny all *inward* operation of the Spirit *accompanying* such means of information, impression, and conviction. In denying this, you clearly ascribe the efficiency to *the means themselves.* And it is in this that we are constrained to regard you as denying the reality of the Holy Spirit's converting agency altogether. If the influence of the Spirit is merely the influence of the word, of evidence, and of circumstances, operating on the human mind independently of any *efficacious, inward, illuminating, spiritualizing energy,* then is there nothing supernatural in the case,—nothing beyond or different from, the ordinary phenomena of the mind, as affected by information with its attendant proofs, or whatever else may contribute to excite attention and command assent. When you speak of the Spirit as *bringing the means to bear upon the mind, and working by them,* you do no more than put the *Spirit* in the place of *Providence,* or of the human agent, through whose instrumentality providence acts; the means are left to their own natural operation; there being no *other influence accompanying or superadded.*"—Pp. 59, 60.

LETTER X.

PRESENT STATE OF RELIGION.

“Clouds without water, carried about of winds.”—
JUDE 12.

“Alas! we are a company of worn out Christians; our moon is on the wane; we are much more black than white; more dark than light; we shine but little; grace, in the most of us, is sore decayed.”—BUNYAN.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

You ask me what I think of the religion of the present day—its character as well as its progress. I answer, I can hardly tell. Nor am I willing to enter upon a very full or explicit answer to such a question. I am not qualified to judge. Instead, therefore, of attempting any lengthened answer to such a question, I would merely point out a few things which lie upon the surface, which may help your own judgment upon this point, and may tend to stablish you in the midst of so much instability and conflict.

As to the religion of our day, it has a very mixed sort of complexion. Its nature is rather of an indefinite and undefinable kind, and its progress is not easily ascertained and determined. Our present state is not a healthy nor a natural one. It is doubtful and unsatisfactory. There is much to please, but much to grieve over.

There is bustle, activity, zeal, and liberality; yet all these may exist, and still spiritual vitality may be low. There may be much blossom and little fruit—and even that little not of the rich, mellow kind that, in other days, drew our beloved into his garden “to eat his pleasant fruits.”

Religion among us lacks the intense *vitality* of other days. It lacks depth and strength. It lacks natural warmth, and too often seems to make up for the want of it by friction and excitement. Hence it is often wan and pale, relieved by hectic glows which soon depart. It has not the healthy complexion of more primitive times. And in evidence of this, we find it continually turning in upon itself, feeling its own pulse, watching its various symptoms, a sure sign of disease, for health is unconscious of itself.*

It bears about it many marks of man's handiwork. The finger of Jehovah is not visibly impressed upon it, so that one looking at it would be constrained to say, this is the doing of the Lord. There is much that is hollow and superficial. It is wanting in the freshness, the calmness, the simplicity of primitive times.

On the one hand, we have some zealous for

* One of the great literary journals of our day thus speaks:—“The healthy know not of their health, but only the sick. In the body, the first condition of complete health is, that each organ perform its function unconsciously, unheeded. Let but any organ announce its separate existence, then already has one of these unfortunate false centres of sensibility established itself; already is derangement there. The perfection of bodily well-being is, that the collective bodily activities seem one; and be manifested, not in themselves, but in the action they accomplish.”

orthodoxy—tenacious of old forms and phrases, and making an idol of their ancestral creed. On the other, we have men reckless and headstrong in their innovations; rushing from doctrine to doctrine, in the feverish love of change; rash in judgment, and shallow in intellect, despising creeds, confessions, catechisms, and old divinity of every kind, and setting themselves up as those who alone preach or know the gospel; the people with whom only wisdom can be supposed to exist, and with whom it is almost certain to die.

On the one hand, we have men preaching the gospel, and, at the same time, hedging it about with terms, conditions, restrictions, prerequisites, as if afraid of the very freeness which they preach. On the other hand, we have men, in their zeal for a free gospel, reducing it to a mere form of words—a mere set of phrases, talking of it with flippancy and irreverence, as if the process of receiving it were a mere mechanical one, like the learning of the alphabet.

On the one hand, there are those who keep the gospel in the back-ground, and dwell continually on conviction of sin, and repentance, and certain preparatory graces, the depth, and amount, and kind of which are pointed out; as if afraid that men should come to Christ, and have peace too soon. On the other hand, we have men making light of convictions as if they were but hindrances, disparaging repentance as if inconsistent with the peace of the gospel.

On the one hand, we have some dwelling upon evidences, and experiences, and feelings, continually turning the eye backward and inward,

in quest of something there to rest upon. On the other, we have men spurning everything of the kind; not merely rejecting them as the ground of peace with God, but utterly contemning them as nothing but self-righteousness and pride.

On the one hand, we have some giving no counsel to an anxious soul, but merely to go on praying and waiting. On the other hand, we have men forbidding such to pray at all, because God has commanded them to believe, as if prayer were not oftentimes the first utterance and expression of faith.*

On the one hand, we have those who think assurance nothing else than presumption, and the inlet to Antinomian licentiousness; who speak of it only as a thing attainable at the close of a saint's career—as the result of a summing up of evidences; who make doubts a proof of faith, and a mark of humility, and look suspiciously upon any who are rejoicing in the Lord. On the other, there are men who make a God of their assurance, and a Saviour of their faith, and an idol of their peace; who will hear of no struggle with an evil heart of unbelief; no warfare between the flesh and spirit; no deep self-loathing and mourning over indwelling corruption, as if all these were but the symptoms of the weakness or the non-existence of faith, instead of

* "It is the duty of ministers not only to exhort their carnal auditors to believe in Jesus Christ, for the salvation of their souls; but it is at our peril to exhort them to anything short of it, or which does not involve or imply it." Fuller's "Gospel Worthy of all Acceptation."

their being certain indications of its presence and power. For it is where faith is in its strength, that the conflict is often most desperate.

On the one hand, there are those who make the work of the Spirit *in them*, a resting-place for their soul, and the ground of peace between them and God, instead of singly and stedfastly looking to Christ and his work *for them*, as the one resting-place, the foundation of peace and joy. On the other, we see men ridding themselves of the Spirit's work almost entirely, and in professing to make the gospel simple and faith easy, explaining away the office and operation of that very Spirit, without whom, "gospel" and "faith" are, to the sinner, but empty and unmeaning names.

Thus far I have stated the two opposite extremes. But it is only with one of these that I have at present to do. And it is only of the latter that I would speak in the remainder of this letter.

The individuals referred to are certainly very zealous for the propagation of their opinions, and spare no pains in persuading others to join them. "They compass sea and land to make one proselyte." Wherever an inquiring sinner is found, he is immediately searched out, and drawn along with them to attend their meetings and to hear their minister. Books and tracts are thrust upon him; all manner of attention is shown him, and visits paid to him; and the means are plied so perseveringly, that it is not easy to shake himself free. They think it very uncharitable in him to refuse to attend their place of worship, but they do not at all deem it so never to enter

his. They seem to think that every denomination should join them, while they themselves are to stand aloof from all.

They are very censorious. A great part of their religion appears to consist in judging others, and pretending to determine their spiritual state. They talk flippantly about conversion, and seem to have no difficulty in settling who are converted and who are not, by some peculiar tests of their own. Those who have a single doubt, or who shrink from their language of assurance, are pronounced to be upon the way to hell. They will have it, that nobody preaches a free gospel but themselves, and that it is scarcely possible to hear the gospel out of their meeting-place or beyond their sect. Their self-confidence is amazing. They boast much of the progress of their sect, and of all their doings in advancing their cause. If they have contrived to raise a little excitement in a place, immediately they announce a wondrous revival of religion, number up their converts, and proclaim abroad their astonishing success.

They are harpers upon one string—what they call the gospel. One would suppose that there was nothing else in the Bible but this. They never seem to get farther than the first principles of the oracles of God. Those passages or chapters out of which they cannot extract this gospel are passed over. Many portions of Scripture are left unread. We have heard of such profane contempt for the word as omitting in family reading such chapters as the ninth of the Romans, or the first of the Ephesians. As to the “sure word of

prophecy," they turn away from it. None of them seem to know aught about it. The second coming of the Lord is little thought of, little preached upon, as the church's blessed hope. To the millennarian views they have a very strong hostility; for their idea is, that they will ere long be able to convert the world, and hence the thought of Christ's speedy coming, and of the world's waxing worse and worse until he comes, are sad interruptions to their magnificent plans. Hence their antipathy to the subject.

They sit in judgment upon what they hear, not so much caring to be fed, as to criticise and discuss the subject afterwards—to be able to say whether the minister knows the gospel or not—whether he be a converted man or not. They would not scruple to rise and leave the church, if any part of the discourse was not exactly to their taste. "They will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts, they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears."

With these things before me, may I not be permitted to question the reality and solidity of much that is called religion in the present day.

I see careless men taking an easy way of getting to heaven by saying that they believe; and making their own confidence their Saviour. No wrestling with flesh and blood, or with principalities and powers, with the rulers of the darkness of this world, with spiritual wickedness in high places. I see troubled souls saying peace to themselves when there is no peace, by resolving to be quite sure that all is well with them, though their hurt be not healed, but only skinned

over, and their conscience remains unpurged by the blood of sprinkling. I see men intent upon widening the strait gate and the narrow way, making what they call faith a substitute for every thing, superseding conviction, repentance, self-abasement, by their own act of faith. I see men, instead of trembling at the word, taking it into their lips as they would do a song or a proverb, with all the easy flippancy of men who were above being solemnized and overawed with the majesty of the voice of Jehovah. I see men turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, boastful of their conversion, forward to speak of it, yet living much as others live, and counting it bondage or legality to be strict in Sabbath-observance, or days of fasting, or similar forms and duties. I find men holding the doctrine of "perfection," (some having attained it and some not,) yet still censorious, proud, uncharitable, sectarian. I see men mistaking indifference to sin and ignorance of their own deceitful hearts for holiness—making a merit of not mourning for sin, as if that were unsuitable to one who is forgiven,—not seeking for pardon, nor confessing sin in their prayers,—thus combining the vileness of Antinomianism with the mock-sanctity of perfectionism. I see some even, whom I believe to be at heart Christians, running from doctrine to doctrine, from book to book, from church to church, attracted by every novelty in the man or the message. Having lost the glow of their first love, they are seeking it in change and excitement, or the bold asseveration of their assurance. Miserable exchange, indeed, for the loss of their

first-love! Vain device to recover the fresh life and glow of other days by having recourse to something else than the living Christ himself! Sad delusion of the false spirit, to which some seem to be given over, in righteous recompense for having rejected the unction of the Holy One.

But I shall not prolong the description. I have already said enough to give you some idea of the state of religion among many in our day. I do not say among all the holders of the new theology. No; I believe there are some to whom this picture does not apply.

Those to whom it may apply may take offence at what I have written. They may deem me uncharitable and harsh. But I have written strongly because I felt that the evil was great, and that smooth words would have but concealed its magnitude. The words may seem sharp and severe, but no hostile feelings towards any individuals whatever mingle with my exposition of their doctrines.

Having myself written much in defence of a free gospel, I felt the more called upon to write what I have written, and to write it in the way that I have done. I hold and preach as free a gospel as ever I did, nor shall I be driven from it by the extremes into which some have gone. They have brought reproach upon the freeness of the gospel by the false doctrine with which they encircled it. They have made many suspicious even of the very name of the gospel. But this is only Satan's old device. He wants to make the gospel odious; and he has, to no small extent, succeeded. But shall this hinder us from

proclaiming it as before? Shall this lead us to hedge it about and guard it, and affix conditions to it, because of such abuses? No; let us grasp it entire. Let us lift up our voices as loudly as ever,—“Ho! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters.”

We may be accused of inconsistency and self-contradiction,—one sermon may be contrasted with another,—one statement may be held up as the antagonist of the other. But still let us not be moved away, either from the gospel or its hope. We believe in a gospel free to all, and we preach it as such,—going up to every man with the message of peace on our lips, and the blessings of salvation in our hands, saying, “be thou reconciled to God.”

Or, perhaps, we may be accused of an ignorant attachment to antiquated creeds, and of blind veneration for the straitened theology of other days. Now, though wishing to draw direct from the fountain-head, and to call no man master, yet we do confess a liking to those doctrines which, in life and in death, were grasped so strongly by our fathers,—those much-praying, much-believing, deep-thinking, hard-toiling, sore-suffering men, whose eye grew early dim, and whose hair grew early grey. We are not ashamed to confess a satisfaction in sitting at the feet of such men, and listening to their solemn teaching, in preference to seeking instruction from men whose shallowness and self-confidence make us feel, that instead of teaching others, they have need that one teach them what be the first principles of the oracles of God.

Yours, &c.

THUS SAITH THE LORD :

“ They have healed also the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly, saying, Peace, peace, where there is no peace.”—Jer. vi. 14.

“ They are prophets of the deceit of their own hearts.”—Jer. xxiii. 26.

“ I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that steal my words, every one from his neighbour.”—Jer. xxiii. 30.

“ A voice of a multitude being at ease was with her.”—Ezek. xxiii. 42.

“ Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.”—2 Tim. iii. 7.

THE END.

Works

PUBLISHED BY W. P. KENNEDY,

15 SOUTH ST ANDREW STREET.

IMPRESSIONS OF AMERICA

AND THE AMERICAN CHURCHES,

From the Journal of the Rev. G. LEWIS,

One of the Deputation of the Free Church of Scotland to the United States.

In post 8vo, price 6s. 6d., cloth.

"Mr Lewis, with a curiosity that was never satisfied—a vivacity that never flagged—a frankness that made every house a home, and every man a friend—a keenness that penetrated every subject—a discretion that never failed him, and a sagacity that extracted something from every fact, event, place, and person, with an admirable talent for description, has produced one of the most interesting publications that has seen the light for many years."—*Christian Witness*, August.

"Truly interesting, and full of information."—*Presbyterian Review*.

"We have ourselves read this volume with much pleasure and edification, and we would warmly recommend it to others. The author treats in an able, candid, manly manner, the great subjects with which he is led to grapple."—*Scottish Guardian*.

"This is a most engaging volume. We will be disappointed if it does not become a favourite with the reading public."—*Northern Farmer*.

PEACE FOR THE DYING CHRISTIAN ;

Or, Extracts from various Christian Authors, on

THE SUBJECT OF DEATH.

First Series.

Selected by H. DRUMMOND, Author of "The Christian Mourner."

With a Preface by the Rev. D. T. K. DRUMMOND, B.A., Oxon., Minister of St Thomas' Episcopal Chapel, Edinburgh.

And an Introductory Notice, by Rev. E. RICKERSTETH.

In folscap 8vo., price 5s. 6d.

"Both the selections and the anonymous contributions are marked by a clear current of Scriptural sentiment, and by a deep-toned spirituality and devotion. We can heartily recommend the volume."—*Evangelical Magazine*.

"A soothing, encouraging volume, full of cordials for the fainting spirit of the believer."—*Christian Lady's Magazine*.

CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE ;

Being the Second Series of "Peace for the Dying Christian."

Containing some striking instances of Peace and Joy in the Prospect of Death ; many of which are Original Memoirs, or such as have been printed only for private circulation.

Selected by H. DRUMMOND, Author of "The Christian Mourner."

With a Preface, by the Hon. and Rev. E. W. NOEL, A.M. ; and an Introductory Notice, by Rev. D. T. K. DRUMMOND, A.B.

In folscap 8vo, price 4s., cloth.

"We need scarcely say that we most cordially recommend Mrs Drummond's volume to the notice of the Christian public. It will be found replete with most interesting and encouraging details of death-bed experiences, all of which are well fitted to strengthen the faith, purify the heart, and animate the hopes of the believer in Christ. —*Witness*.

LECTURES ON FOREIGN CHURCHES,

Delivered in Edinburgh and Glasgow, May 1845, in connection with the objects of the Committee of the Free Church of Scotland, on the State of Christian Churches on the Continent and in the East.

First Series.

In 12mo., price 4s., cloth.

1. *Introductory.—Mutual Relations of Churches.* By R. S. CANDLISH, D.D.
2. *The Independent Eastern Churches.* By JOHN WILSON, D.D., F.R.S.
3. *The Ancient History of the Waldensian Church.* By Rev. THOMAS M'CRIE.
4. *On the Present Condition and Future Prospects of the Waldensian Church.* By Rev. R. W. STEWART, A.M.
5. *Religious History of Holland and Belgium since the Reformation.* By Rev. W. K. TWEEDIE.
6. *Past and Present State of Evangelical Religion in Switzerland, especially Geneva.* By PATRICK M'FARLAN, D.D.
7. *The Past and Present State of Evangelical Religion in France.* By the Rev. J. G. LORIMER.

THE BIBLE HYMN BOOK.

For General Use, and for Sabbath Schools.

In 12mo., bound, pp. 266, price 1s. ; in cloth, gilt edges, 1s. 6d.

The Hymns have been drawn together from a great variety of sources, both ancient and modern, and so small pains have been taken to render the selection both choice and complete. While all the well-known favourites have been retained, a large number have been added, hitherto but little known.—*Preface.*

, To Schools taking quantities the price will be, for Twenty-five copies, L.1, 1s. ; for Fifty, L.2.

THE PSALMODY OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

Published under the authority of the Psalmody Committee.

Prepared, under the superintendence of GEORGE HOGARTH, Esq.,

By T. L. HATELY, Procentor to the General Assembly.

Complete in Three Numbers, price 1s. Neatly done up, 1s. 3d., or in cloth, 1s. 6d.
An Edition in Royal 8vo, with Pianoforte Accompaniments, price 3s. sewed, and 4s. in cloth.

PROVIDENCE, PROPHECY, AND POPERY,

As exhibited in the First Seven Chapters of DANIEL.

By the Rev. WILLIAM WHITE,

Minister of the Original Secession Congregation, Haddington.

12mo., price 6s. 6d., cloth.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF EPISCOPACY IN SCOTLAND,

FROM 1688 TO THE PRESENT TIME.

With Appendix, by the Rev. D. T. K. DRUMMOND, B.A. Oxon.
Minister of St Thomas' Episcopal Chapel, Edinburgh.

In 12mo, cloth, price 2s. 6d.

FLOWERS OF ZION :

A Selection of Hymns and Sacred Poetry.

In Royal 12mo, cloth, gilt edges, price 2s. 6d.

"This is an elegant little volume. The reader will find not a few 'precious pearls,' which would do honour to any poet, and none which do not breathe a spirit of 'true and undeffled religion.'"—*Witness*.

"The poetry in this pleasant little volume is wholly of a devotional and Scriptural cast. Many of the pieces are delightfully quaint and touching."—*Scottish Guardian*.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

With a Preface and Brief Reflections, by LUTHER.

With a Recommendatory Notice, by the Rev. THOMAS BROWN, D.D., Glasgow.

In 12mo, cloth, price 1s.

"All who know any thing of Luther's writings know how he loved, how he gloried in the Epistle to the Romans. This tract contains a preface which he wrote to the Epistle, and which, as giving a clear and comprehensive view of its structure and argument, together with an admirably drawn statement of the meaning of its principal terms, 'law, grace, righteousness, faith,' &c., is a document of no mean value. The translation is an admirable one, and the Introductory Notice is just such as we should have anticipated from its venerable author."—*Witness*.

"These are the jottings on the margin of Luther's Bible. They are quaint, but characteristic,—brief, but precious,—full of the Reformer's favourite truth, salvation through the righteousness of the Son of God."—*Border Watch*.

A TIME OF CHASTENING IMPROVED.

Six Letters addressed to his Congregation,

By the Rev. CHARLES NAIRN, Forgan.

In 12mo, cloth, price 1s. 6d.; sewed, 1s.

A SHORT VINDICATION OF PRESBYTERY;

WITH TWELVE ESSAYS ON THE CHURCH.

By the late Rev. GEORGE WHYTOCK, Minister of the
Associate Congregation, Dalkeith.

Edited by the Rev. THOMAS M'CRIE, Edinburgh.

In post 8vo, price 2s.

"We hail the appearance of any treatise which discusses existing differences, and especially of such a treatise as that now before us, in which the entire discussion is managed with Christian meekness. . . . We commend it to all who take an interest in the important subjects of which it treats, satisfied that they will find in it much that is original in conception, clear in argument, and candid and dispassionate in spirit."—*Banner of Ulster*.

TREATISE ON THE OFFICES OF CHRIST.

By the late GEORGE STEVENSON, D.D., Ayr.

In 8vo., cloth, price 8s. 6d.

"We give it as our humble opinion, that no treatise could have been more usefully adapted to promote the interests of truth in the present times; that no minister's library ought to be without it; and that it will richly repay all who have the means to procure, the heart to understand, and the good sense to peruse it."—*Presbyterian Magazine*.

WITNESSES FOR THE TRUTH IN THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND;

Being a Series of Engravings Illustrative of the History of the Church of Scotland, with Letter-press Descriptions.

New and Enlarged Edition, neatly done up in cloth, price 2s. 6d.

Also, a Handsome Edition in 4to., price 10s. 6d., with Portraits of Drs CHALMERS, GORDON, WELSH, CANDLISH, and CUNNINGHAM.

"This little work should be circulated in tens of thousands over Scotland. It consists of three sheets, each of which contains twelve engravings, executed with spirit, and embodying most graphic illustrations of Scotland's suffering piety, boldness, zeal for Christian liberty, and resistance to Popery, Prelacy, and Erastian supremacy. The engravings are accompanied with historical sketches, which are happily woven together, so as to form a short connected history of the Church, from the days of Knox, to the recent convocation in Edinburgh."—*Presbyterian Review*.

"The three sheets may be had bound together as a convenient school-book. A copy on large and fine paper has also been prepared for the benefit of the drawing-rooms of Scotland. In the cottage, in the nursery, in the school and drawing-room, this little work will render the Church question, through its historical associations, as intelligible as in the assembly of divines."—*Scottish Guardian*.

"The subjects selected are striking and appropriate, the designs are exceedingly well-conceived, and the execution is most creditable."—*West*.

AN ESSAY UPON CHRISTIAN LOVE.

By the Rev. and Learned HUGH BINNING,

Minister of the Gospel at Govan, 1694.

With an Introduction, by the Hon. AUGUSTA MACKENZIE of Seaforth.

In 18mo, Third Thousand, price 1s. 6d.

"This little volume, pregnant as it is with experimental meaning, and speaking powerfully to the hearts of all those who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth, ought to exist as a manual in the hands of every Christian amongst us.

"The writer of the preface, whose style would do credit to the pen of Hannah More, has her mind evidently deeply imbued with the spirit of the author, from whose book she has probably been enabled to draw much spiritual profit and pleasure."—*West*.

BOOKS AND TRACTS FOR THE YOUNG.

THIRZA ;

OR, THE ATTRACTIVE POWER OF THE CROSS.

Translated from the German.

With a Recommendatory Notice, by ROBERT S. CANDLISH, D.D.

Seventh Thousand, price 6d.

"We do not wonder that twelve thousand copies of the first German edition of this book have been sold, and six thousand of a second, printed. It is most touchingly beautiful, and most intensely interesting. It is likely to have a wide circulation in this country. We are sure it merits it."—*Presbyterian Review*.

SIMPLE HYMNS,

Original and Selected, for Children. In Royal 32mo, price 3d.

"These are truly what they profess to be—'Simple Hymns for Children.' They are full of the Saviour and his grace."—*Border Watch.*

THE WRECK OF THE PEGASUS;

A Narrative for the Young.

Sixth Thousand, in Royal 32mo, gilt edges, with Frontispiece, price 3d.

FOLLOWING THE LORD FULLY;

Being Notes, taken by a Hearer, of a Sermon preached in Roxburgh Church, Edinburgh, on Sabbath 29th November 1842, (the time of the sitting of the Convocation.)

By the late Rev. R. M'CHEYNE.

Third Thousand, in 32mo, gilt edges, price 3d.

THE MARTYRDOM OF JOHN BROWN

OF PRIESTHILL, 1685;

Intended to Illustrate to the Young the Principle for which the faithful Ministers of the Church of Scotland have left the Establishment.

Fifth Thousand, in Royal 32mo, price 1d.

MARY STANDING AT THE FEET OF JESUS;

OR, JESUS THE FRIEND OF SINNERS.

Royal 32mo, price 3d.

FRUIT FROM THE "TREE OF LIFE,"

A Catechism on the 53rd of Isaiah, in Verse.

Royal 32mo, price 3d.

**THE DUTY AND ADVANTAGE OF EARLY
RISING,**

A Sermon on Ephesians v. 16, by the Rev. JOHN WESLEY, M.A.,

Late Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford.

Royal 32mo, price 3d.

THE CHRISTIAN'S POCKET-BOOK.

A New Year's Gift. In 18mo, price 3d.

MARY, THE LITTLE SINGER.

Translated from the German. In 18mo, price 6d.

VI TRACTS PUBLISHED BY W. P. KENNEDY.

G O T L E I B ;

OR, THE WONDERFUL WAYS OF THE LORD.

Translated from the German. In 18mo, price 4d.

CHARLES AND BERNARD ;

OR, THE FRIENDS.

Translated from the German. In 18mo, price 6d.

EXTRACTS

FROM THE MEMORANDA OF A YOUNG MAN,

Who died at Edinburgh, the 4th March 1841, in his Sixteenth Year; with a Brief Narrative of his Life.

Third Edition. In 18mo, price 6d.

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD.

Extracted from "EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS,"

By the late ROBERT HALDANE

In Royal 24mo, price 3d.

TRACTS.

THE ATONEMENT. By J. A. HALDANE. 1½d., or 10s. 6d. per 100.

HISTORY OF A TOKEN. 1d., or 7s. per 100.

AM I INGRAFTED INTO CHRIST, OR NOT? 4s. 6d. per 100.

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD. 3d., or 11s. per 100.

COME OVER AND HELP US: An Affectionate Word to the Parents of Sabbath School Scholars. Tenth Thousand. 3s. per 100.

A PASTOR'S WARNING. Being part of a Letter to his Flock. By the Rev. JOHN LIVINGSTON of Ancrum. Written when in Banishment, 1671. 1s. 6d. per 100.

THE JUST FOR THE UNJUST. 1s. per 100.

TURN, AND LIVE. 1s. per 100.

WHY WILL YE DIE? 1s. per 100.

GRACE FOR THE CHIEF OF SINNERS. 1s. per 100.

A SINNER SAVED. 1s. per 100.

SATAN'S CASTAWAYS. 1s. per 100.

DR DODDRIDGE'S DREAM. 1s. per 100.

THE GALVANISM OF HEAVEN. 6d. per 100.

THE UNANSWERABLE ARGUMENT. 1s. per 100.

QUEEN VICTORIA IN SCOTLAND. 1d., or 7s. per 100.

A LETTER, BY MR JOHN DICKSON, Minister of the Gospel at Rutherglen, to some Friends when he was a Prisoner in the Bass, 1680. With an Introductory Notice, by the Rev. ALEXANDER MOODY STUART. 1d., or 7s. per 100.





