

**HELP
FOR THE TRUE
DISCIPLES OF IMMANUEL:
BEING
AN ANSWER TO A BOOK,
PUBLISHED
BY THE LATE REV. ANDREW FULLER,
ENTITLED
THE GOSPEL WORTHY OF ALL ACCEPTATION;
OR, THE
DUTY OF SINNERS TO BELIEVE IN CHRIST.
THIRD EDITION,
INCLUDING AN EXPLANATION OF THE SCRIPTURES USUALLY ADDUCED
ON
THE SUBJECT.
BY JOHN STEVENS,
Minister of Salem Chapel, Meard's Court, between Wardour Street and Dean
Street, Oxford Street, London.**

London :

**PRINTED BY J. BRISCOE, BANNER STREET, ST. LUKE.
PUBLISHED BY SIMPKIN AND MARSHALL, STATIONERS' COURT; AND
M. AND S. HIGHAM, CHISWELL STREET; SOLD IN THE
VESTRY OF SALEM CHAPEL; AND MAY BE OBTAINED
BY APPLYING TO ALMOST ANY BOOKSELLER.**

1841.

SECTION XVIII.

CONTAINS ANIMADVERSIONS ON MR. F.'S ANSWER TO THE OBJECTION BROUGHT AGAINST HIS SENTIMENTS, FROM THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF PARTICULAR REDEMPTION.

"IT has been, and still is, thought to be very inconsistent and absurd, to suppose that God can have made it the duty of any man to believe in Christ for the salvation of his soul, or, that he can have promised salvation to him on his so believing, when all the while his salvation was not the end for which he died."

Mr. F. says, "To ascertain the force of the objection, it is proper to enquire, wherein the peculiarity of redemption consists."

Ans. The propriety of this assertion I think may be justly questioned. The objection is not founded so much upon that in which the peculiarity of redemption consists, be that what it may, as upon the idea of its being a scriptural truth, that redemption is particular, or that Christ died for an elect remnant of mankind, and not for the rest. Therefore, saying that it is proper to enquire wherein the peculiarity of redemption consists, in order to ascertain the force of the objection, is rather a quirk to shun the force of it, than a fair and honest way of ascertaining it. The substance and weight of the objection was; "those persons for whom Christ did not die cannot be bound to believe in him savingly, or with that kind of faith which cannot possibly exist, or be exercised, but through a given and influential interest in the merits of Christ, as the Mediator and Surety of the everlasting covenant of grace." I wish Mr. F. had kept close to the point in his answer, instead of running into such distinctions as the scriptures know nothing of, and which are more suited to Arminiansim, than they are to Calvinism; yet Mr. F. wished to be thought an advocate for the latter.

Quot. If the atonement of Christ were considered as the literal payment of a debt, it might, for aught I know, be inconsistent with indefinite invitations."

• Page 109.

Ans. Surely both truth and sound reason will afford sufficient proof, that the atonement of Christ may be considered as the literal payment of a debt, with

proper limitations. The scriptures inform us, that Christ was considered as the Surety of his people in the covenant of grace and redemption: "Jesus was made a Surety of a better testament." Now Solomon considered suretyship as standing connected with the payment of debts. "Be not thou one of them that strike hands (says he), or of them that are sureties for debts. If thou hast nothing to pay, why should he take thy bed from under thee?" "A surety is one who undertakes to pay another man's debt, in case the principal debtor, either through unfaithfulness or poverty, should prove insolvent. It was an ancient custom in suretyship, for the surety to give his hand to, or strike hands with, the creditor; thereby obliging himself to the payment of the debt, in case of the insolvency of the principal debtor.—In Hebrews 7:22. Jesus Christ is called the Surety of a better testament. Sins are, by resemblance, called debts; for as debt obliges the debtor to payment, so sin doth the sinner to punishment. Christ, according to the covenant of redemption, or agreement between the Father and him, interposed as our Surety; and entering into this relation, he sustained the persons of sinners (for, in the estimate of the law, the surety and debtor are but one person), and being judicially one with them, according to the order of justice, he was liable to their punishment." *i Mr. Crliden.

When Jesus taught his disciples to pray, part of the prayer he taught them was, "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors." Now I ask, If Christ is to be understood as teaching his disciples to look for the forgiveness of their sins, which be called debts, without a full payment being made by him, as their Surety, into the hand of justice? Such an idea, in my view, would be an entire exclusion of the atonement in words. But, as the word of God is to be our rule in judging on these matters, and as his word expressly calls sins debts, the sinner a debtor, and the atonement a price,*ii and as those who eventually enjoy it, are said to be bought with it, which certainly supposes the idea of a payment, I must conclude, that Mr. F. has labored in vain to hide that which the scriptures do so plainly set forth to view. But we must not forget his concession: that, " if the atonement of Christ were considered as the literal payment of a debt, it might, for aught I know, be inconsistent with indefinite invitations." (*ii 1- I Cor. vi. 20, and vii.23).

Quot. But Mr. F. says, " that considering the atonement as the literal payment of a debt, is representing it as inconsistent with the free forgiveness of sin, and with sinners being directed to apply for mercy as supplicants, rather than as claimants." (* iii Page 100).

Ans. I wish he had made an attempt to state this inconsistency, and to show how it is implicated in such a consideration of the atonement. The word of truth declares, that grace reigns through the righteousness of Jesus Christ unto eternal life. Christ did not need forgiveness himself, but he obeyed and died, that his people might enjoy it. The scriptures nowhere suggest that the blessing of forgiveness was given in and to Christ, as the Head and Surety of his seed, in the same free and absolute way as it is given to us. That which his people receive freely by grace he dearly paid for. "This covenant," says Mr. Brine (meaning the covenant of grace), "though, as it respects the elect, it is absolute and unconditional, yet, as it respects Christ, their Surety therein, it is properly conditional, and not absolute. Christ's performance of the conditions required of him, brings an obligation on the Father to fulfill all those promises which he made to him upon those conditions; or, right to a participation of all the benefits promised, respecting Christ himself, as Head and the elect, as his members, whom he represented, arises from his performance of those conditions. This right, as to us, is wholly free and unacquired; but, as it respects Christ our Surety, it is matter of debt, and it was properly acquired by him. Nor is the freeness of the grace of God, as the origin of spiritual blessings, in the least diminished hereby; because it was sovereign favour which provided that righteousness and that sacrifice, by which our right to grace and glory was obtained, and into which it must be resolved." And it was grace in the Father, to accept of payment for the elect, at the hand of a Surety; for he was under no obligation to admit a commutation of persons. These remarks may serve to show how forgiveness of sin is a free gift, and yet, in a different respect, fully paid for by Jesus our Surety.

But the quotation further says, that, "considering the atonement as the literal payment of a debt, and proceeding on the principle of commercial justice, is inconsistent with any persons being directed to apply for mercy as supplicants, rather than as claimants." But Mr. F. has not told us how it is inconsistent, therefore I shall only say, that all the mercy and favor the elect seed of God will ever enjoy here and hereafter, is already given them in and by Jesus their Head and Surety: that they have no new blessing to ask for, which is not already theirs; that we are to distinguish between legal right and real possession, according to that right; that I may supplicate my God, in a firm belief that what I request is already mine, and that it is in Christ for me, if it ever is to be enjoyed by me. The work of the Holy Spirit does not consist in giving right to mercy by faith, but he gives a saving knowledge and enjoyment of it.

Mr. F. “If the measure of Christ's sufferings were according to the number of those for whom he died, in such a manner as that if more had been saved, his sorrows must have been proportionally increased ; it might, for aught I know, be inconsistent with indefinite invitations.”* iv Page 109.

Ans. 1. Whatever Christ suffered that had any saving merit in it, was endured by him as a public person, as the Head and Representative of his whole chosen body, for which body he suffered and died exclusively. He loved the church, and gave himself for it. The rest he never knew, and, therefore, certainly never suffered on THEIR account; so that they can have no invitation to the enjoyment of salvation on His account. Now, as it is clear, that Christ did suffer for some, and not for others, and as the scriptures call the atonement he made for some a ransom ; and as the same persons are said to be bought with a price, and their debts forgiven by graciously providing them a Surety, and taking payment of him in their stead ; we may, therefore, safely conclude, that the demands of impartial justice were greater than if only one sinner had been ordained to salvation ; and that they must have been proportionable to the number of criminals appointed to obtain salvation thereby.

2. It is true, that not one sinner could have been saved had not Jesus laid down his life as a sacrifice; but, it is also true, that the expiatory sufferings of the Redeemer did not consist merely in giving up the ghost, but chiefly in what preceded that, for he endured the wrath of God, and paid the dreadful debt required, on account of his chosen people, so as to be able to say, before he expired and left his body, It is finished. Hence it appears that, though death must have been unavoidable, if only one sinner had been redeemed from the second death to endless life; yet, it by no means follows that our Lord's sufferings must have been equally great in dying. As a hint, merely illustrative, it may be remarked that while all men die, they by no means suffer alike in dying. Our Saviour's actual death, rather marks the termination of his sufferings, than the degree of them. Yet, if his sorrows were in proportion to the number of persons for whom he suffered, as they evidently were, **Mr. F.** has acknowledged indefinite invitations might be inconsistent for aught he knew.

3. It is said of the unjust sinner, that he shall eventually “receive according to the things done in his body, according to that he hath done.” But, is there no greater measure of punishment justly due to a world of sinners, than there is to one? Then what is meant by the greater damnation⁹ and the more tolerable condition mentioned by our Lord? (*v.) If there are not different degrees of

punishment, how can some have a more tolerable condition than others? But, if one lost sinner be to suffer as much as all lost sinners, as **Mr. F.'s** mode of reasoning supposes, then it must follow that one sinner does as much dishonor to the name of God as all mankind put together ! It will next follow that man is not only accountable for his own faults, but for those of mankind. Where do the sacred writings hold out such sentiments for our reception? Paul says, The sinner shall receive according to that he hath done in his body; but, he has never said, that any one shall suffer according to what others have done in their bodies. Therefore if we suppose any one to stand in the place of one lost sinner, we are not, in so doing, to imagine, that such a substitute must, on that account, suffer as much as though he had represented all lost sinners. The greater the guilt, the greater the punishment: the greater the number of sinners, the greater the measure of guilt. It must, therefore, follow that, "if more sinners had been saved, the sorrows of the Saviour must have been proportionably increased." But, Mr. F. admitted that if this were the case, then, for aught he knew, indefinite invitations might be inconsistent with particular redemption. (*v Matt. 10:15. and 23: 14). (*vi ROM. 5: 15. Isaiah 53: 6, 12).

Now, as it is impossible that one sinner, in the few years of his embodied state on earth, should commit as much sin and do as much dishonor to God, as all mankind put together, or even as his chosen race, it is incredible that a just God can have punished Christ in the same degree, as though all the world had been to be saved by his death : or, that he would have suffered just the same as he did suffer, had only one sinner been ordained to salvation. Yet, this preposterous idea must be maintained, or **Mr. F.'s** system of indefinite invitations is without foundation in the death of Christ, by his own concession!

Mr. F. "If the measure of his sufferings were according to the degree of their guilt, or if his sorrows must have been proportionably increased, if those who are saved had been more guilty ; it might, for aught I know, be inconsistent with indefinite invitations.": (* vii Page 109).

Ans. To be guilty, is to be chargeable with crimes that expose one to punishment. A man's being more guilty than his neighbor, supposes that he has sinned more heinously, and committed more crimes than his neighbor has. That the measure of Christ's sufferings was proportionable to the guiltiness of his members, whom he represented to God, and covenanted for, I conceive appears from the following considerations:—

1. Some are said to owe "five hundred pence, and others fifty;" which saying Jesus afterwards explained in the same connection, when he said (speaking of a certain woman) "her sins, which are many, are forgiven, for she loved much; but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little."* As all do not owe alike, I apprehend he who was Surety for the whole elect number of debtors was not required to suffer to the same degree for each one of them. Can it be thought that Christ suffered as much for every one of those infants that are saved, as he did for this woman? or, that God the Father shews as much grace in pardoning an infant, as he did in pardoning Saul of Tarsus, who styled himself the chief of sinners, because of his wicked deeds ?

(* Luke vii. 47).

2. The more grace the Father manifests in pardoning and justifying a sinner, the more heinous and numerous his crimes are thereby supposed to have been, and the more was required to be endured by Jesus, his Surety for him. For the sufferings of the Mediator, who agreed in covenant to bear the sins of a particular people, must have been according to the dishonor done to God, the sovereign Lawgiver, who is the party offended; otherwise the dignity and honor of the divine Law-giver would not have been restored.

3. Jesus Christ, in his work of mediation, was considered by his Father, as the Head and Surety of the chosen body, which contains many members. Now all these members are distinctly known, distinctly loved, distinctly brought into the world, distinctly preserved in Christ and called, and he is touched with the feeling of all their infirmities, in a distinct way and manner, and knows what every member bears: and why are we not to suppose that he suffered distinctly for the evil ways of all the members of his mystical body? In short, I question whether it were possible for Christ to suffer for his people, by bearing their sins in his own body on the tree, without suffering for them in a distinct way, according to the exact knowledge which he had of them.* (* Psalm 40: 12).

4. The Lord has frequently set forth the great sinfulness of Israel by the number of their sins; and I see no reason why we are to suppose that the Lord would deal with Israel according to the number of their sins, as in Numb. 14: 22. Jer. 5: 6. Lam. 1: 3. Hosea 9: 7, 9. Psalm 78: 40. and that so as to manifest an inflammation of wrath against the aggressors ; and yet when he came to punish sin to the utmost in Christ, the public Head and Surety of the elect remnant, take no notice of the number of sins, so as to punish him accordingly.

5. Why do the scriptures so particularly set forth the sinfulness of those that

are saved, and also the merits of their Saviour, by the number of their sins, if it all stands for nothing? It is said, "judgment was by one (offence) to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences (*ix) unto justification, by the obedience of Christ." Now, how came the Apostle to speak so emphatically of many offences, if he considered the atonement of Christ in the same way as our author did? (*ix Rom. 5: 16).

6. The Holy Ghost convinces of sins, of many sins, and causes the chosen seed of the Lord to confess their sins as innumerable, and to feel grief at times on account of the number of them, and to ask for the forgiveness of them as being many, like the woman's of old; of whom Christ said her sins, which are many; are forgiven. Now, how is it that the saint, who is a member of Christ's body, and a partaker of his nature and spirit, should suffer under a sense of the number of his sins, and afterward praise God for the forgiveness of his many offences, if Christ his Head and ensample did not so suffer? Can it be thought the believer has a more distinct view of his criminality, and that with sorrow and pain, than what Christ had and felt in the great work of redemption? Surely not.

7. The omniscient and heart-searching God distinctly knows all the sins of his people; yea, he wisely permits them, and perfectly hates them; nor could he fail to punish them according to their desert. For this end they were laid, imputatively on Jesus, as their Head and Surety, who suffered for them distinctly, when he bore their sins, their numbered offences, in his own body on the tree. He, by the mouth of his servant David, said, "Innumerable evils have compassed me about, they are more than the hairs of my head." But why speak thus, unless the number of the sins referred to was the cause of his sufferings being the greater? Punishment is not inflicted in sovereignty, but in equity; and justice consists in assigning to every one his due; but, this implies that the measure of our Surety's sufferings was according to the degree of our guilt: if this be the case said Mr. F., indefinite invitations may, for aught I know, be inconsistent with peculiar redemption.

8. In the great day of judgment, all the deeds done in the body will come under notice, and the ungodly will receive punishment accordingly; from which it may reasonably be imagined that all the sins of the elect world were brought forward against their divine Surety, and distinctly and righteously punished in him, in the garden and on the cross. God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil. The preceding considerations have induced me to conclude, that our sins, as well as our persons, were viewed, numbered, and covenanted for

distinctly, and so distinctly suffered for, that if one person, or one sin, had been lacking of the number atoned for, the load had been lighter on the person of Jesus our Surety and Redeemer: consequently indefinite invitations are inconsistent with the true doctrine of atonement.

Mr. F. "On the other hand, if the atonement of Christ proceed not upon the principle of commercial, but of moral justice, or justice which relates to crime, &c."* (* Page 109).

Ans. I think that which is here supposed to be "on the other hand," is part of it on the same hand. I am unable to see why the atonement should not be considered as proceeding on the principle of moral justice, and yet include in it the idea of commercial justice too. The scriptures evidently include both ideas, nor are they subversive one of the other. When Christ atoned for our crimes he paid our debts. He suffered according to the desert of the sins laid to his charge, as the responsible Surety of his chosen members. Justice could neither inflict more nor less, while the crime was reckoned the same.

Mr. F. "If it's grand object were to express the divine displeasure against sin, and so to render mercy in all the ways wherein sovereign wisdom should determine to apply it, consistent with righteousness : no inconsistency can be ascribed to it." * (* Page 109).

Ans. Sovereign wisdom has no new determinations to form, respecting the future manifestations of mercy ; but, all the works and ways of the Lord were known and resolved on from of old, and the vessels of mercy were afore prepared to glory. Why then did **Mr. F.** speak of the ways wherein sovereign wisdom SHOULD determine to apply mercy? He erroneously imagined that the grand object of the atonement was to express the divine displeasure against sin, and so to render the exercise of mercy consistent with righteousness. But, admitting that the divine displeasure was strikingly displayed against sin in the sufferings of Christ, still it can never be proved that this was the GRAND object designed and obtained thereby. God could, and he does, manifest his wrath against sin in other ways, and will continue so to do for ever; but, the atonement of Christ was essentially necessary to the obtaining of the GRAND object designed in the appointment of it.

"It is pleaded," said **Mr. BOOTH**, "That the principal design of our Lord's atonement, was the manifestation of God's hatred to sin; in order to render the exercise of mercy consistent with justice. This, I recollect, the Dutch

Arminians told us long ago. But, before we adopt the sentiment, it should be observed, that though the atonement made by Jesus, the Son of God and the Lord of glory, both plainly supposes and strongly implies the divine abhorrence of sin; yet this is far from being the first, the most prominent, the characteristic idea of our Lord's death on a cross; or that on which Jesus and his Apostles, when speaking of the atonement, principally dwell. No: the grand idea suggested to an enlightened mind by the atonement of Christ, and to which the new Testament abundantly directs our attention, is, not God's hatred to sin, but his love to sinners—not the purity of his nature, but the compassion of his heart—not his inclination to punish, but his determination to pardon. If the principal intention of our Lord's penal sufferings and accursed exit had been, to exhibit the divine opposition to sin; why should his unexampled sufferings and infamous death be called **THE ATONEMENT**? A name, doubtless, extremely inappropriate, and, in such a connection, absolutely unparalleled. Nay, instead of being called the atonement for sin, why were they not denominated penal justice, divine vengeance, or fiery indignation, against apostasy and rebellion? Did I ask, Of what crime that benevolent and merciful term, atonement, had been convicted, that it must be compelled to speak what it never thought? It seems, alas! to have been found guilty of implicitly, but strongly maintaining, That the substitutionary and penal death of the incarnate Son actually reconciled to the divine Father a great number of our apostate species, even when they were enemies to him;*x and ascertains its own application to the consciences of all those for whom it was made. Now such being the genuine import of our Lord's atoning death, we are led to consider it not merely as the medium, by which mercy may be exercised consistently with justice; but as being in itself the most wonderful of all facts, and the greatest of all favors. Whereas, if we view the atonement of Christ as chiefly intended to express the divine indignation against sin, and that expression of God's displeasure as the medium by which mercy may be exercised consistently with justice; without considering either all mankind, or any select part of our guilty species, as actually reconciled to God by it: we have little or nothing more than the name of atonement."*xi

(*x Rom. 5: 10). (*xi Works vol. iii. p. 89).

The Son of Man we read came to give his life a ransom ,for many—he suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God—that we being dead to sin should live unto righteousness—that he might put away sin by the sacrifice of himself—that he might sanctify the people with his own blood—that he might redeem us from all iniquity —that the righteousness of the law might he fulfilled in us —and that he might deliver

us from the wrath to come. Now, as these are the declared ends of our Lord's sufferings, we may safely conclude, they are amply and infallibly secured; but, we must at the same time observe, that indefinite invitations are excluded from any support in the doctrine of real and particular redemption; and that they are utterly inconsistent with it.

It is not merely the expression of divine displeasure against sin, that can ever entitle any sinner to mercy, or ever render the exercise of mercy consistent with righteousness. It was the merit of Immanuel's sufferings, as the Surety of his people, that rendered the exercise of mercy to many sinners consistent with justice ; and not the wrath of God being poured forth upon him, although that was connected with the procurement of their salvation from wrath to endless felicity. Punitive justice is displayed in perdition, but the exercise of mercy is not thereby rendered consistent with the rectitude of God.

Mr. F. " If the atonement of Christ, be, in itself, equal to the salvation of the whole world, was the whole world to embrace it; no such inconsistency can justly be ascribed to it." (*xi Page 109).

Ans. 1. It has been already shewn that the sufferings of Christ, as the Surety of his people, were according to the number of persons for whom he covenanted, and for whom he in love laid down his valuable life ; and also, according to their guiltiness before God. Hence we must conclude that, those memorable sufferings did not involve an atonement in itself equal to the salvation of the whole world.

2. If the atonement be, in itself equal to the salvation of the whole world, it must be so, whether it be yet embraced by the whole world, or not. It is certainly complete in itself, and can derive none of its worth from the act of reception supposed. And how and by whom it shall be received, it cannot fail duly to ascertain. It is embraced through its worth and influence, as verily as its worth and influence are experienced through its being spiritually embraced. This fact obviates our author's reasoning upon it.

3. If the atonement of Christ had been, in itself, equal to the salvation of the whole world, God must have required and designed it to be so; and he must have known and acknowledged it to be so; but, how then can any part of the world be exposed to his punishing justice? If he has required and obtained satisfaction equal to the salvation of the whole world; how, as a righteous

God, can he punish a part of it for ever? If the ransom paid was for Jacob only, how can it be sufficient for Esau likewise? A plain answer to these inquiries might be very effectual: I may not, however, live to see it.

4. It may not be unuseful here to observe, what was requisite to render our Lord's atonement equal to the salvation of the elect. When this is before us, we may perhaps more distinctly perceive, what would have been necessary to render his atonement equal to the salvation of the whole world. To render it equal to the salvation of the elect, it was needful that the person making atonement should be their responsible Surety; for there must be representation and substitution. God must behold the offenders in the purifier. It was also requisite that their sins should be imputed to their Representative, so as for them not to be imputed to them. Likewise the curse of the law, due to their offences, must be wholly inflicted on him, instead of them, to a plenary satisfaction, through his sufferings and death. And he must endure the whole, in love to God and to his righteous government; in love to those sinners on whose account he suffered; and with the truly merciful design of delivering them from the wrath to come. These things were absolutely necessary to his atonement, in order for it to be equal to the salvation of the elect; all of whom **Mr. F.** allowed would be certainly saved, and the rest would perish. No. 14 and 24. Section II. of this work.

5. It follows from the preceding statement, that unless it can be proved, that Christ is to the whole world, what he is just said to be to the elect ; and unless he has borne and suffered for the sins of the non-elect, as he has for those of the elect, his atonement cannot be equal to the salvation of the whole world. Only suppose for a moment, that God could now will the salvation of the rest, as really as he has that of the elect, would it not hence follow that, their Saviour must represent them—must become charged with their sins—must suffer the curse due to them—and must undergo all this in love as aforesaid, and with the fixed intention of exempting them entirely from perdition? If this be admitted, our author's reasoning on the sufficiency of the atonement is overthrown; if it be denied, then God's acknowledged system of making his Son the Surety of his chosen, with the consequent transfer of their guilt and punishment, is condemned as unnecessary.

6. The sufferings of Christ were vicarious, and therefore of saving effect; and can only profit those for whom he voluntarily agreed to act as their Surety. For it does not appear from the gospel, that the saving merits of Christ have any thing to do with those whose names are not written in the Lamb's book of life ; who will finally be cast into the lake of fire.* For he that believeth

not, the wrath of God abideth on him. And to consider the sufferings of Christ as sufficient for the whole world, when only a remnant were represented by him; and when the sins of the rest were not laid upon him imputatively; and when he had no design of saving any but the elect of God by what he suffered; and when it is owned that none but the elect ever will be saved, and that it is certain the rest will perish; is supposing that he could not suffer less than he did. But who, among the hosts of moderate Calvinists, can prove that our merciful Lord could not have suffered less? As his sufferings were according to the crimes laid to his charge, and were not infinite in themselves, though endured by an infinite person, but are so only in moral estimation, being committed against an infinite God, I conceive the sufferings of the Surety, who was made sin for his chosen members, might have been less, had fewer sinners been chosen, or less dishonor been done to God by them that were chosen. Nor is this sentiment of immoral tendency. (*xii Rev. 20: 15).

7. If the sufferings of our adorable Lord were equal to the sins of the whole world, and a remnant only be saved, then he must have suffered much more than was necessary, either to satisfy the claims of impartial justice, or to benefit sinful men. For it is clearly evident, that a great part of the world has never heard of his sufferings, and multitudes that have had opportunity of hearing of them, have never received any saving benefit from them. But, what Christ suffered was no more than was necessary, therefore, his sufferings were not equal to the sins of the whole world, but to the remnant according to the election of grace, which is finally saved, to the honor of divine justice, and the praise of divine grace. Indefinite invitations are, therefore, inconsistent.

8. The sufferings of Christ, as the Surety of the better testament, were all measured by the righteous WILL of God. This idea is strongly intimated by their being set forth under the emblem of a cup: the cup, said he, which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it? If it be possible let this cup pass from me. And the same notion is intimated by his having a work given him to do, which he knew when he had done, and therefore said, It is finished. Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God. But, the righteous will of God proportions the punishment according to the demerit of crime, therefore, as the sins of the elect only were laid upon Christ, his sufferings, and consequently the satisfaction arising there from, could not be equal to the salvation of the whole world; and, therefore, indefinite invitations must be

inconsistent with the limited atonement of our Lord.

9. If the atonement be, in itself, equal to the salvation of the whole world, it must be so as it is offered to God, apart from the idea of its being embraced; yea, it must be considered as such by God, before it can be so esteemed by his people. If we predicate sufficiency of the atonement, the quality we assign to it belongs to it, in itself, if our predication be correct, irrespectively of its reception. If Barnabas, without erring, declared Saul was a true convert; his being received by the disciples had nothing to do with making him a true convert. By embracing the atonement we experience its sufficiency for our salvation; but we do not alter its real property, nor render it what it was not before. Therefore, as all the world is not saved, we may safely conclude that, the atonement of Christ is not, in itself, equal to the salvation of the whole world. Hence we are allowed by **Mr. F.** to add, that indefinite invitations are not consistent with particular redemption, or a limited atonement.

Mr. F. "If the peculiarity which attends the atonement consists not in its insufficiency to save more than are saved, but in the sovereignty of its application, no such inconsistency can be ascribed to it." (* xii Page 109).

Ans. This is general redemption barefaced ; and the peculiarity of redemption is considered as meaning no more than what belongs to the application, instead of understanding it as pertaining to the purchase made by the shedding of the blood of the Surety of the covenant of redemption. While he speaks of the atonement, he all along contends, Arminian like, that it is sufficient for, or equal to, the salvation of the whole world ; but, when he notices the idea of peculiarity, then he flies off from the atonement and work of the Redeemer, to the work of the Holy Ghost in applying the atonement. Thus particular redemption is in words given up, and it is only particular in its application.

That which proves the sufficiency of the atonement, also establishes its particularity. Nor can that be sufficient to ransom all the world, which was required and paid to ransom a part of it. The particularity of the atonement consists in its having been made for a particular people; and in its consequent insufficiency to save more than will be finally saved. None can be savingly benefited by what Christ did and suffered, but those, whose persons he represented as their responsible Head and Surety ; whose sins he bore in their stead ; whose perfect salvation he absolutely intended to obtain by his own

sufferings and death. These things cannot be said of those who are not finally saved: which proves the atonement to have been peculiar in itself, and not merely from its application. It is no dishonor to Christ to say, that his atonement is insufficient to save those whom he never knew, never loved, never intended to save. The design of our Lord in his sufferings limited their saving effects: the intrinsic worth of his person, and the meritorious worth of his acts, ought neither to be divided nor confounded. There could be no saving sufficiency in the atonement itself, which divine justice would fail to own and duly reward. If Christ has atoned for the sins of all men, punitive justice cannot smite any of them; if he has only atoned for the sins of many of them, justice cannot spare the rest of them. Our blessed Lord has never benefited any of his sinful creatures unintentionally; nor can they be bound to love and thank him for what he never intended to be for their spiritual advantage.

Mr. F. "If the atonement of Christ excluded a part of mankind in the same sense as it excludes fallen angels, why is the gospel addressed to one, any more than the other? The message of wisdom is addressed to men, and not to devils. The former are invited to the gospel supper, but the latter are not. These facts afford proof that Christ, by his death, opened a door of hope to sinners of the human race as sinners; affording a ground for their being invited without distinction to believe and be saved." (* xiii Page 109, 110).

Ans. 1. The gospel is preached to men and not to devils, because God's elect are among men and not devils, and because Jesus died for many men, but no devils, and because the Son of God took on him the nature of men and not of devils, and because he has a right to natural and moral homage from men, as the Lord and King of the whole earth, where they for a time are suffered to reside, and that in things that cannot be required of devils. But the preaching of the gospel to men does not suppose that all men have any saving benefit by the atonement of Christ. Mr. F. imagined, that because the gospel was to be preached to men, and not to devils, therefore the atonement could not exclude a part of mankind in the same sense as it excluded devils. But, this supposition is of no use, when it is considered that the gospel is not preached to all men, but many depart out of this world, who never saw the scriptures, nor had any idea of divine revelation. Now do not such appear to be excluded from salvation by Christ as fully as devils are? This, however, is plain, it obviates the force of **Mr. F.'s** reasoning for the contrary idea ; for the gospel being preached to some men, can be no reason for any one to conclude, that all men were atoned for by Christ, or that none of them are absolutely

excluded from salvation by his atonement.

2. The will of God is immutable, and as he willed not to write them in the Lamb's book of life, who will at last be found out of Christ, and under the curse of the law of creation, it must be utterly impossible for those persons, any of them, to be glorified with Christ. It is "by God's will, as the God of all grace, that the elect are sanctified through the offering of the body of Christ once for all."

And the will of God is as immutable in the one point as the other ; for if it be said that the non-elect may be saved, I am certain it must follow that the elect may be damned. But with God there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.

3. The word door in the scripture, is of the same import when applied to matters of salvation, as the term way: but if Christ has by his death, opened a way TO sinners as such, he must have done all that would have been necessary to be done, in order for all mankind to have entered the kingdom of glory. Yes, sirs, he must have satisfied justice for all mankind, by or according to the will of God and our Father. But how this could be done, and the word of God be true, no tongue can tell! Would Jesus open a door of hope to the world of sinners that he would not pray for? or to those persons to whom he will hereafter say, Depart, ye cursed, I never knew you.

4. I observe **Mr. F.** does not say that Christ by his death opened a door of hope FOR sinners, but TO sinners as such. When the scriptures speak of Christ's death, and what he then did, they say, " He was made sin FOR us—that he was made a curse FOR us—Christ hath once suffered the just For the unjust—He loved the church, and gave himself For it—FOR whom Christ died—Christ our Passover is sacrificed FOR us—By the which WILL we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Christ once FOR all." We may hence see how differently the Holy Ghost words the matter of Christ's death from Mr. F. Where does the word of God aver that Christ by his death opened a door of hope TO sinners?

5. But it is said, "that this door of hope which Christ is supposed to have opened to sinners, as sinners, affords a ground for their being invited without distinction to believe and be saved." Now this assertion must be utterly fallacious if the doctrine of particular redemption, by satisfaction being made to justice for the elect, and not for the rest, be held fast. I confess I can see no medium between being redeemed from the curse of the law, and not being

redeemed from it: between Christ's atoning for sins, and his not atoning for them: between his dying for certain persons, and his not dying for them. I believe the scriptures nowhere speak of persons being sufficiently paid for, whether they are saved or not: the holy word of God speaks positively, "ye are bought with a price"—"He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied." Christ's opening a door of hope to sinners by his death, must suppose that he is both able and willing to save all men. But I have in this work endeavoured to shew, that he is neither able nor willing, or not able because not willing, to save all men or sinners without distinction: therefore he cannot be the author of any invitation that supposes he is both able and willing, and which is supposed to be founded on his power and good-will to sinners as such, without distinction. It should ever be remembered, that Christ Jesus does not save men or sinners, by his own power and will, as he is God personally considered; but as he is God-Man and Mediator, in office by the sovereign counsel and covenant of the adorable Three in One: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Thus the power and grace displayed by Christ, and by the Holy Comforter, in the salvation of sinners, is not merely personal, but also official, by covenant agreement. Hence Christ speaks of "Power GIVEN unto me over all flesh, that he might give eternal life to as many as the Father gave to him" in covenant, for that end. Again, he says, "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just: because I seek not mine own will, (merely) but the will of the Father who hath sent me.—For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." And Christ, when speaking of the Holy Comforter, said, "He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear (to be the will of the Father and the Son also, in covenant), that shall he speak."*xiii Now as Christ did nothing but what was agreeable with, and according to the will of God and our Father, *xiv in the covenant of grace and redemption: and as that covenant made no provision for any but the elect, who will at last be saved thereby: and as it was the immutable will of Father, Son, and Spirit, in that covenant, that none but the elect, whom Christ then represented, as his body, and agreed to act for as a Surety, should ever be exalted to see God face to face, and enjoy the full fruition of his glorious presence, the supposition of Christ's having opened a door of hope TO sinners, without distinction, must be utterly false.

(*xiii John 16: 13). (*xiv Gal. 1: 4).

Mr. F. "But as God might send his Son into the world to save men, rather than angels; so he may apply his sacrifice to the salvation of some men, and not of others." (* xv Page 110).

Ans. Jesus Christ was not sent into the world to save men rather than devils, merely; but to save men and not devils, nor to spew them any favor. He not only may apply his sacrifice to the salvation of some men, but he declares he will do so, according to his own counsel and covenant. (*xvi Heb. 8:10).

Mr. F. "As the application of redemption is solely directed by sovereign wisdom, so, like every other event, it is the result of previous design." (*xvii Page 110).

Ans. Then can it possibly be applied to all mankind, or to sinners without distinction? Or to any but those very persons whom God ordained to life thereby, and who will in the end be found in glory? If it be said, it may, then I ask, How God can be said to be of one mind? And that he changeth not? Can he both will and nill the same thing as a sovereign God? I believe not. If it be said, it cannot be applied to sinners without distinction, then I add, it must be absolutely impossible for some men to be saved, equally so, as for the devil to be saved. Pray where then can flesh and blood find a foundation on which to place the notion of universal invitations to all men to be saved?

Mr. F. "There is no contradiction between this peculiarity of design in the death of Christ, and a universal obligation on those who hear the gospel, to believe in him, or a universal invitation being addressed to them." (*xviii Page 110, 111).

Ans. As to the design or sovereign decree of God, and the consistency of indefinite invitations therewith, as Mr. F. supposed, I have already given my thoughts upon that subject, and cannot think it necessary to go over the same ground again in this place. Besides, it ought to be remembered, that the objection which Mr. F. is answering in this part of his book, is not so particularly founded on the design of God to apply the sacrifice of Christ to some men, and not to others, as on the peculiarity of Christ's merit in the work of redemption itself, by him, as the Surety of the covenant, for all the elect remnant, and as their Husband and Redeemer.

Mr. F. " He that believeth in Jesus Christ, must believe in him as he is revealed in the gospel, and that is, as the Saviour of sinners." (* xix Page 111).

Ans. The question then is, How is Christ revealed in the gospel? Mr. F. eagerly answers, As the Saviour of sinners. But does the Holy Ghost reveal

Christ in the gospel word as the Saviour of sinners without distinction ? Mr. F. thought he did: I believe he does not. Observe: The angel of the Lord said unto Joseph, thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins. Here we are plainly told, that the reason why he was named the Saviour was, because "He should save his people from their sins." I know it is also said, that, Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." Why did he come into the world? To save sinners. What sinners? Who are they? The text above cited answers, His PEOPLE. "All that the Father giveth me, (says Christ) shall come to me; and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out."

Mr. F. "It is only as a sinner, exposed to the righteous displeasure of God that he must approach him. If he think of coming to him as a favorite of heaven, or as possessed of any good qualities which may recommend him before other sinners, he deceives his soul: such notions are the bar to believing."

Ans. Mr. F. has said, that "A being sensible of our guilty and lost condition is absolutely necessary to an application to the Saviour." (* xxi Def. p. 38). Now this is not the case with all men, nor with any but those who are quickened to a life of feeling by the almighty power of the Holy Ghost, from and through Christ, who is the living head of all his chosen members. Therefore, though such a person may be sensible of nothing but his guilt and filth, and a desire for mercy, in his approach to Christ, yet, it is evident, that the scriptures deem him a living child Of the living God ; for he approaches in the power and exercise of new life, and as being taught of the Father, and drawn by him to Christ; and ministers have to do with the scriptural characters of persons in their work of preaching and exhorting, and not merely with the thoughts that persons may have of themselves. Though it is not necessary for a man to be assured that he is a favorite of heaven, in order for him feelingly to confess his sinfulness to God, and to rely on Christ in saving hope, that he will manifest the pardon of his sins unto him by the power of his Spirit in his heart ; yet, a real interest in, and possession of the favor of the Lord, in the power and work of the Spirit of Christ, is essential to such experimental application to, and true dependence on, the sinner's Friend. So that, after all that can be said, the gospel when rightly viewed, contains no revelation of salvation for any but such persons as are sensible of their guilt and pollution by nature, together with all the rest of the Lord's chosen ones, who being chosen to salvation and perfect holiness, through sanctification of the Spirit, shall sooner or later be brought by the Holy Ghost to know their great guiltiness and filthiness before God. The people of God,

whom he hath appointed to obtain salvation by Jesus Christ, with eternal glory, are sometimes spoken of in the scriptures according to their nature-relation to Adam, their natural Head; then the Holy Ghost says, Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; and that he died for the ungodly. But, at other times, or in other parts of the word, they are spoken of according to their grace-relation to Christ, their spiritual Head; then the Holy Ghost tells us, That Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it; that he laid down his life for his sheep. Thus, when the Holy Ghost speaks of Jesus Christ as coming into the world to save sinners, he alludes to the same persons, as when he said by Caiaphas, That Christ should not die for the nation of the Jews only, but that also he should gather together in one, the children of God that were scattered abroad.

Mr. F. " Any man that owns himself a sinner, hath as fair a ground for his faith as any one in the world that hath not yet believed; nor may any person, on any account, exclude himself from redemption, unless by his obstinate and resolved continuance in unbelief, he hath marked out hi myself." (* xxiii Page 112).

Ans. Our author speaks here in the words of Elisha Coles. That good man has written some excellent things on God's sovereignty ; but this saying, and others of a like kind in his treatise, bring to my mind this circumstance; at a certain time when I was about part of my employment, which was to milk a cow that the person had with whom I lived, after she had given me almost all the clean white milk her udder contained, she began to fidget about, and before I could get my pail away, she plunged her filthy foot into it, and thus spoiled, in a great measure, what she had given. And there are many of our good ministers to whom the words of the Lord are applicable, where he says, "As for my flock, they eat that which ye have trodden with your feet; and they drink that which ye have fouled with your feet." (* xxiv Ezek. 34:19).

Mr. F. says, "Any man that owns himself a sinner, hath as fair a ground for his faith as any one in the world that hath not yet believed." Here it is evident, that none but those who own themselves sinners, have a fair ground for their faith; elsewhere all men are said to have a fair ground to believe to the saving of their souls ! But is not a true knowledge of the guilt and pollution of nature, the effect of regeneration? And does not an honest confession of the same suppose the person so confessing to be possessed of a spirit of faith? Would not such persons be taken to glory, were they to depart this life before this supposed act of belief, of which Mr. F. here speaks, was put forth ?, (* xxv He admitted they would, p. 214).

This is all the same as saying, that all those who have heard and learned of the Father, are warranted to look to Christ, and trust in him, for life and salvation: which to me appears scriptural, and agreeable to sound experience, and is the way in which the people of God are brought to enjoy the God of all grace.

It is added, "nor may any person on any account, exclude himself from redemption, unless, &c." Those whom Christ has redeemed, and, as Paul says, have redemption in Christ, they, we are certain, cannot exclude themselves. "Shall the creature's unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid!" I cannot see how any man can be excluded from redemption by his own act at all; for if God has not included him by an act of grace, it must be puerile to talk of his excluding himself: and if God has included him, it is making God a liar to say he may exclude himself. But, perhaps, **Mr. F.** considered redemption to be conditional, and that Christ had done nothing by his atonement for any persons absolutely, but that he had by his death, brought all men into a salvable state, so that all may be saved if they will, or all may be damned if they will. Then it must go ill with the obstinate indeed (as he says) who continue in unbelief, and do not overcome their obstinacy, and become pliable, that Christ may then apply his merits, and help them the rest of the way to heaven. But as this citation which **Mr. F.** introduced and approved, is Arminianism barefaced, it will not be so likely to beguile the simple lovers of truth, as some others; therefore I will leave it and pass on.

Mr. F. "The preachers of the gospel, in their particular congregations, being utterly unacquainted with the purpose and secret counsel of God, being also forbidden to pry or search into it, (* xxvi Deut. 29:29). may justifiably call upon every man to believe, with assurance of salvation to every one in particular upon his so doing; knowing, and being fully persuaded of this, that there is enough in the death of Christ to save every one that shall so do: leaving the purpose and counsel of God, on whom he will bestow faith, and for whom, in particular, Christ died (even as they are commanded), to himself." (* xxvii Page 112).

Ans. These words are quoted by **Mr. F.** from Dr. Owens's Death of Death. I shall consider the words as spoken by **Mr. F.** as it is him I have to do with. The quotation contains the following assertions respecting the preachers of the gospel, to which I will make a brief reply as I go on.

I. "They are utterly unacquainted with the purpose and secret counsel of God."

Reply. The sovereign purpose of God is in part revealed, and therefore God's ministers cannot, properly speaking, be utterly unacquainted with it. Although they cannot know the elect people of God from the rest, until they are called according to God's purpose, yet they do know, by the word of God, that some are elected, and that the rest are left and rejected, as vessels of wrath fitted to destruction :(* xxviii Rom. 9:21-22). that Christ stoned for the sins of the elect, but not for the sins of the rest; that faith is given to, and shall certainly be enjoyed by, all the elect, through the righteousness of Christ; but that it is absolutely impossible for any of those persons to possess it, for whom Christ was not made sin, that they might be made the righteousness of God in him. And this is sufficient for the preachers of the gospel to know, in order for their work of preaching and exhorting, and sufficient to prove that indefinite calls to sinners, without distinction, are not of God, but of men.

II. " Preachers of the gospel are forbidden to pry or search into the purpose and secret counsel of God."

Reply. They may pry and search into those things which are revealed in the word; and I think there is but little danger of God's ministers ever pretending to know his people from others, but by the work of the Holy Ghost in them and upon them, according to the purpose of the Lord. But as they believe the gospel word, they must know that God is a God of sovereign grace, and that he will save all those whom he has loved and chosen in Christ; and that he absolutely willed that the rest should never any of them enter glory. (* xxix Rev. 20:15).And what was his will before the world began, and will be found to be his will at the last day, must certainly be his will now, for he is of one mind. He will have the liberty of giving heaven, in pure sovereignty, to whom he pleases, and of withholding it from whom he pleases, independently of the will of the creature.

III. " Preachers are commanded to leave the purpose and counsel of God, on whom he will bestow faith."

Reply. In what part of the word does this supposed command stand? Had the Apostles been of **Mr. F.'s** sentiment, should we have had so many texts. On election, predestination, reprobation, and the like? I believe not. When Paul

said, I endure all things for the elect's sakes that they may obtain the salvation which is IN Christ Jesus, with eternal glory: he could not well be said to leave the purpose of God. But, perhaps, all that is meant is, the preachers of the gospel are not to pretend to be wiser than what is written in the word of God: not to affirm that they are possessed of sufficient penetration to know who of the unregenerate part of their community shall have faith, and who of them shall not. If this be all that is meant, I agree with Mr. F.; but then, I am unable to see why such an idea should be brought forward in the way it is. "ALL scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Therefore, all the doctrines of the scriptures ought to be faithfully preached and contended for; and contrary principles opposed faithfully, for the honor of Jesus, our Lord and Law-giver. Ail that kind of preaching, which suggests notions opposite to the doctrines of pure and distinguishing grace, must be dishonoring to God, and injurious to men.

IV. " They are commanded to leave the purpose and counsel of God, as it respects who in particular Christ died for."

Reply. This is answered in part by what has gone before. Therefore I shall only say, that if any man conceals the doctrines of election, reprobation, and particular redemption by the blood of Christ, and justification freely by grace, through the redemption that is IN Christ Jesus, no matter from what principle or reason, he is an enemy to truth in such practice. If a man's way of preaching suggests that, both salvation and damnation, heaven and hell, are set before men in general, for them to choose which they please, and that they may have any of them, heaven or hell, which they will—that God has done as much for the salvation of one as for another—and that it is possible for all men to be saved or lost: such prating must not be termed preaching the gospel of the Lord Jesus, because that informs us, that redemption 46 is FINISHED"—that Christ hath been made sin for his people, that they might be made the righteousness of God in him—that holiness is not of the will of man, but of God—that God will not cast off his people whom he foreknew—that whom he loveth now he loved from everlasting, and will continue to love them for evermore.

V. "Knowing, and being fully persuaded of this, that there is enough in the death of Christ to save every one that shall so do." That shall believe.

Reply. I have before given my thoughts on the sufficiency of Christ's death,

and I observe it is again said, that there is enough in his death for every one that shall believe. So say I; for all true belief of the gospel, or special saving faith, arises out of an everlasting interest in the covenant of grace and redemption. But the Holy Ghost himself cannot cause the non-elect and non-redeemed to believe in Christ savingly, consistently with the perfections of Jehovah, and the settlements of grace in Christ from eternity.

Finally. "The preachers of the gospel may, justifiably, call upon every man to believe, with assurance of salvation to every one in particular upon his so doing."

Reply. What a blind way of going on, without any distinction this must be! Observe: The preacher is to call upon every person in his congregation to believe, and to assure them that they shall every one of them be saved, if they will but do so. But is not this supposing that all his congregation is in an unregenerate state, and that they are all destitute of faith? It must indicate strange darkness of mind, and inattention to the gospel, to address the living and the dead in the same way, and without any distinction. It cannot be separating the precious from the vile ;(* Jer. 15:19). for the audience must perceive, if attentive to their preacher, that he addresses them all alike, and holds forth a promise of life to them all ; if they will but do as he bids them, they shall be sure to be saved. They will never know any thing of distinguishing grace through such preaching to be sure. One while the work of salvation from wrath is finished, then presently it is all to do, and that by the creature. Then all the congregation are threatened with damnation if they do not believe; when perhaps there may be a few among them that are delivered from the curse of the law, by the atonement of Christ, but that signifies not; when their distinguishing teacher gets warm in his work; he scatters his dreadful curses upon them all, if they will not believe!

Thus the sovereign will of God, in election and redemption, is as far from his thoughts as the east is from the west; while the will of the creature is to fix and determine all things.

The promise of salvation is not conditional; but absolute. Salvation is a sovereign gift, in and through Christ, and so is the faith that receives it.(* xxx Eph. 1:3-12 and 2: 4-10). The blessings of sovereign love were not given on condition of the creature's believing, for that spirit of faith, whereby the chosen seed shall all sooner or later believe in Christ, is as much a spiritual blessing as other things, and was as sovereignly given, in the covenant of grace, to all the elect, on the footing of Christ's obedience and death.

Mr. F. has unreservedly declared, " that none ever did or will believe in Christ, but those who are chosen of God from eternity ; and that the rest are sure to perish ;" (* xxxi Preface xii). as this is evidently true, his system can save none of the unredeemed ; and ours allows none to perish eternally for whom Christ died. The indefinite invitations so much talked of, can do nothing for those whom the divine persons have passed by in their sovereign acts of grace. On men unknown, unloved, unredeemed, and unregenerate, invitations can affect nothing. Moral means have no spiritual efficiency attending them, without, or prior to, subjective grace. Bellows have their utility in raising a flame where there is fire; but, if tried where that element is absent, the fuel, whether wet or dry, yields not light and heat, however well you ply your bellows. So, invitations to spiritual acts can avail nothing on the unregenerate sinner, until the Holy Spirit has generated the needful spark of holy life in the soul. From this order God never departs in saving a sinner. Blind zeal may be very active in plying the pulpit bellows; but without the essential spark, the toil must terminate in wind and darkness !

The objection raised against **Mr. F.'s** useless sentiment, from the particularity of our Lord's redemption, is still valid; and indefinite invitations to sinners without distinction, are proved to be utterly inconsistent therewith.