

The Double-Doctrine Men:
OR
**THE PREACHERS OF ELECTION
AND FREE-WILL.**

Query—DO THEY PREACH THE TRUTH?

**CALVINISM AND ARMINIANISM
WEIGHED IN THE BALANCES.**

PART THE FIRST.

Price 4d

LONDON: E. MARLBOROUGH & CO.

BRISTOL: W. MACK, 38, PARK STREET.
BIRMINGHAM: B. DAVIES, TEMPLE ROW.

TUNBRIDGE WELLS; R. PELTON.

THE simple object of the following pages is to endeavor to show that the doctrines generally known by the name of Arminianism are not to be found in the Word of God, but that the doctrines of free grace form the subject of its glorious contents. Is it not dishonoring to the Divine Author of the Book to say that it contains such counter statements that they nullify, if not directly contradict, each other? What would the author of any other book say, if such a charge were brought against it? He would answer, "Be quite sure that you properly understand my meaning, before you endeavor to establish your own conclusions about it." How much more is it the duty of finite beings to be quite sure that they properly understand the Word of the Infinite God, before they presume thus to charge it with double statements and double doctrines! The late Rev. Charles Simeon, of Cambridge, however excellent and holy a man he may have been as a practical Christian, nevertheless laid the foundation of this Arminian doctrine in the minds of 1,100 clergymen of the Church of England, who, in the course of his long life, attended his theological lectures. He thought he honored the Word of God when, in accordance with his own declaration, he preached Calvinism one week and Arminianism the next. This was first to lay a good foundation, and then to sweep it all away.

How then was it possible TO BUILD UP the young men committed to his instruction in sound doctrine? Alas! to this day we are reaping the effects of such teaching. The Arminian heresy, *alias* incipient Popery, which has been steadily working for so many years in our church, has now developed itself in almost full-blown Popery—for doctrinal Popery is ever the foundation of practical Popery. We do not for a moment trace the origin of this error to the venerable man whose name we have mentioned. He merely caught its infection from others, and then, believing it to be God's truth, largely spread it in his day and generation. The source of these fatal doctrines must be traced to the fifth century, as we have shown at the end of this little work. After having to a certain extent slumbered for many years, they were carefully revived by the Papists during the Reformation, as, in their opinion, the most effectual means of arresting its progress, thus showing the identity of Arminianism with Popery. It is a well-known fact that the Reformers were, almost to a man, imbued with Calvinistic doctrines, as their writings will testify; and hence the Papists, with a view to arrest God's truth preached by them, set up Arminianism in its stead. Can anything more clearly prove that it is endorsed by Papists.

May this little work be owned and used by the Lord to the clearing away of the Popish heresies of free will and of universal redemption in the minds of many, and of leading men to rest on the solid rock of a free-grace gospel.

THE DOUBLE-DOCTRINE MEN

ALL believers in Revelation must surely be agreed that the Bible is a book at unity with itself. Its Author being divine, there can be no mistakes, no contradictions, no confusion in its statements. There are many *mysteries* in it, but no *mystification*. It contains very much that is infinitely *above* our reason, but nothing that is *contrary* to it when it is enlightened from above. Even its apparent discrepancies exist only through our limited knowledge of science, and fade away in the advancement of science. It is a book which can afford to challenge the very strictest investigation; and the closest scrutiny of its contents will fail to discover any error. The many contradictors *of* it, have failed to discover any contradiction *in* it. And this is equally true of its *doctrines*, as of its *facts*. There is no counter statement, no DOUBLE DOCTRINE in the Bible. All is in beautiful harmony, whether man perceive it or not. Whence, then, come the paradoxes, the contradictions, and the confusion which men are bold enough to say exist in the Book? We are bold enough to tell them that they exist in their own visual organs *only*, and not in the object contemplated by them. The Bible does not say a thing on one page, and unsay it on the next. It does not give two opposite lines of doctrine, the one contradicting the other, and those who say it does, have not received this teaching in the school of Christ. It does not declare on one page that Christ has a definite love which He bestows on His *Bride*, and by virtue of that love seats her in heaven by Himself, and invests her with all that He Himself possesses, and on the next page that He has an indefinite love for anybody and everybody,* and yet that *that love* issues, in the vast majority of cases, in the utter destruction of the objects of it. There is no such contradiction, such counter-statement in the Bible. Men may fancy they see it, but it does not exist. Again, it is not said on one page that Christ redeemed the Church, and by virtue of that redemption saves her from destruction, and on the

* An "able minister of the New Testament" once made this striking observation, "If the Lord Jesus loves any besides His Bride, He does THAT which He has forbidden every member of His church to do, viz., to love another besides his own wife."

next page that He has redeemed everyone, and yet allows so many to come to destruction. There are no such contradictions, no such paradoxes in the Bible. If there were, we might well question if its Author were divine.

And yet we are free to acknowledge that there are two distinct lines of texts in the Bible. One line stating, in unmistakable terms, the one view, and the other line *appearing* to state the other view, but only *appearing* to do so, for, adhering to the principle on which we started, viz., that the Bible is a book at unity with itself, and therefore entirely free from all mystification, or cross-statements of every kind, there must be some way in which these *apparently* contradictory or conflicting statements may be harmonized. Let us examine a few, the Lord being our Teacher. For the sake of *convenience*, we shall call these texts which we propose to analyze Calvinistic and Arminian, merely premising that we mean by Arminian, those texts which the Arminians understand to embody the doctrines of universal redemption, and the gospel offer to all, while at the same time we most emphatically deny that there is a grain of Arminianism in the whole Bible, or, in other words, that there is one single Arminian text. Our object is to bring out the truth by showing that though Calvinistic texts cannot be explained so as to fit in and harmonize with the Arminian, yet that the latter can be made to harmonize with the former.

CALVINISTIC.

“As many as were ordained to eternal believed.” Acts xiii., 48.

ARMINIAN.

“Whosoever believeth in him should not life perish, but have everlasting life.”

We have not quoted the whole of the text from John iii., 16, because we intend to allude to the word “world,” presently, our object being *now*, the word “believe.” In the former text, the Holy Ghost tells us that those “believed,” and those only who “were ordained to eternal life.” He who “ordained” to give them “eternal life,” also “ordained” to give them “faith.” Then it must be clear to every unprejudiced mind, wishing to see the truth, that the latter text cannot possibly mean to give a general world-wide invitation* to all sinners, but merely states, in other words, that all who are led to believe the gospel by the agency of the Holy Ghost, are the

* It is world-wide in one sense, but not in the sense in which the Arminians understand it. It is world-wide in that “no discretion is given in preaching the gospel. We are not entitled to preach it to some, and to withhold it from others. It is to be addressed to all. Its language is— ‘To you, 0 men, I call, and my voice is to the sons of men.’ ‘Look unto me, and be ye saved all the ends of the earth; for I am God.’ ‘A just God and Saviour.’ The gospel is Christ’s voice, by which his blood-bought sheep

identical persons ordained to eternal life. You cannot make “*the ordained to eternal life*” fit in with *all mankind*, for all are not ordained, but you can make “whosoever believeth” fit in and harmonize with those who are “*ordained.*” The Father ordains them, the Son redeems them, the Holy Ghost works faith in them. “*Whosoever believeth*” *i.e.*, (not by Arminian free-will, but by the work of the Spirit) proves himself to be of the number of the “*ordained*” ones. Thus, the gospel is not an offer to all, but a proclamation to be sounded in the hearing of all, that by it the Holy Ghost may gather out “*the ordained ones.*” Man’s free-will is thus negated, and God’s glorious sovereignty clearly asserted and vindicated.

“Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles *to take out of them a people* for His name.”

Acts xv., 14.

“And the Lord added to the church daily *such as should be saved.*” Acts ii., 47.

“But is longsuffering to us-ward, *not willing that any should perish*, but that all should come to repentance.”

2 Peter iii., 9.

“*Who will have all men* to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth.” 1 Tim. ii., 4

These two texts from the Acts contain a *clear* statement that the object of this dispensation to the Gentiles is “*to take out of them a people for His name,*” and that such as are taken out are *such as shall be saved*, or, as the text we noticed before, “those who are ordained to eternal life.” How then is it possible to make these two Calvinistic texts fit in and square with these two Arminian ones? No, says the Arminian, we do not want to make them harmonize: we believe in “an election of grace,” and we also believe in a universal offer to all mankind. Follow out this view, and it lands us in a denial of every attribute of the Godhead, and in the regions of blasphemy. If the object of visiting the Gentiles be “*to take out of them a people for His name,*” and if such “*shall be saved*” as are “*added to the Church*” by the Holy Ghost, and yet all others are invited, it follows as a legitimate conclusion that these others must get to heaven entirely by their own agency, for the Holy Ghost does not take *them* out from the Gentiles, does not add them to the church that they may be saved. He puts forth no agency on their behalf, consequently if they are invited to come, they must be

are conducted into His fold, and are thus separated from the goats. It is the rod of His power, by which He guides His flock, while to others it is a stumbling block and foolishness. ‘I know my sheep,’ says the Lord Jesus, and by the means of the gospel, they are made to know Him.”—Haldane on the Atonement.

invited to save themselves. Their salvation must be through their own agency, and to themselves must be the praise of it.* If the visitation, as Simeon states, is to some, and not to all, how are those who are left, to attain to glory but by themselves? Therefore, we fearlessly assert that this doctrine embodies blasphemy, for it denies salvation by a Triune Jehovah, and makes some men to be their own saviour. In the case of the first two of the last quoted passages, we must remember that they were the utterances of the same *inspired* apostle, viz., St. Peter, and shall we dare to say that the Holy Ghost first taught him to honour God's sovereignty by declaring that He "was visiting the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name," and then afterwards to write what nullified his former statement, viz., that God is wishing every man to come to repentance? The two texts most beautifully agree, for the "us" in St. Peter, whom "God is not willing should perish," are one and the same people whom He is now "*taking out from the Gentiles,*" in order that they may not perish. Thus, while the texts in Acts cannot possibly be made to fit in and harmonize with the one in 2 Peter iii., this last most beautifully fits in and harmonizes with the one in Acts.

"These were redeemed *from among men*
Rev. xiv., 4.

"Who gave Himself a ransom for *all.*"
1 Tim. ii., 6.

Everyone who understands the English language must know that the expression "*from among,*" cannot mean "*all,*" but "*choice*" of "*some*" "out of "*all.*" If a number of jewels or precious stones were placed before a man, and he were told to choose some "*from among*" them, would he think himself authorized to take them "*all?*" Then, if Christ redeemed some "*from among*" men, in what sense must it be understood that "He gave Himself a ransom for *all?*" The answer is clearer than a sunbeam, a ransom for "all those whom He has redeemed FROM AMONG MEN." Thus the "FROM AMONG" cannot be made to fit in with the "ALL," but the "ALL" fits in with the "FROM AMONG."

"Him hath God exalted with His right hand to be a Prince and saviour, for *to give repentance to Israel,* and forgiveness of sins."

"And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." Acts xvii., 30.

"Then hath God also *to the Gentiles granted repentance* unto life." Acts v. 31, xi. 18.

*** Some may call this trifling with holy things; but the charge of doing so rests with those who hold what makes these to be a sequence to the doctrine, and not with those who, for the truth's sake, expose it.**

Is there not a beautiful harmony between these three passages? Before that wonderful vision vouchsafed to St. Peter, the Jewish nation had an idea that salvation with all its concomitant blessings was exclusively for them. That vision was expressly intended by God to dissipate that illusion. The language St. Peter used before he had seen the vision, was “repentance to *Israel*,” the language they used after it, was, repentance for *the Gentiles*, thus embodying the teaching which had been given in the vision, viz., that salvation was not to be confined exclusively to the Jewish nation, but to be extended to all nations; but still the limitation runs, “Even as many as the Lord our God shall call,” thus agreeing with the other statement “to take out of them a people for his Name.” God’s sovereignty is here asserted, and man’s free-will totally denied. Or, take another view. The defenders of Arminian doctrine maintain that the command to repent* is addressed to every human being, and yet in all ages of the world by far the greater portion of mankind have never heard the command, nor been made acquainted with the gospel message. The whole analogy of scripture, when intelligently understood and considered, dearly shows that “all men everywhere” cannot mean every human being, but all sorts of men among all nations; this brings us back to the point, “Even as many as the Lord our God shall call,” for none other can ever obey the gospel call, nor the command to repent.

“For the transgression OF MY PEOPLE
was He stricken.” Isa. liiii. 8.

“And that He died for all.”

2 Cor. v. 15.

The first of these texts contains a clear declaration that Christ died “*for His people*.” But all mankind are not His people. Therefore, He did not die for all mankind. Thus, it is clear that while the words “*my people*” cannot possibly be made to mean “*all*,” or every individual, yet the word “all” fits

* It is quite conceded that this verse is open to this explanation, and that many men whose opinions are entitled to great weight and consideration, hold it to be the true one, viz., that the command to repent is addressed to everyone, and that man’s utter inability to obey it, proves him to be “dead in trespasses and sins,” and therefore necessitates the Spirit’s work on the behalf of all those who ever shall be brought to repentance. The difficulty of this explanation is, how the command can be *addressed* to all, and yet *sent* to so small a portion of mankind, the largest part in all ages of the world never having heard of it But, after all, this view is almost a distinction without a difference, for if it be contended that the command is given to all, it must also be conceded that it takes effect, and can take effect only on the Elect, to whom “Christ is exalted as a Prince and a Saviour for to give repentance.”

in with “my *people*,” for He died for “all” *of them*. But more than this, the context of the verse from Corinthians plainly shows its limitation. See verse 14, “If one died for all, then all have died,” *i.e.*, all for whom Christ died, have died in Him, and through Him their death eternal has been remitted. Now is this the case with all mankind? Have all died in Christ? But the passage goes on to say that “He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them and rose again,” *i.e.*, those for whom Christ died are the very same people who “live not unto themselves but unto Him,” &c., &c. We ask the question again, “Do all mankind live unto Christ?” The answer is, No, only His people. Thus, the more we examine Scripture the more we shall find how completely it is a book at unity with itself, and how wonderfully all its statements harmonize; in other words, it does not contain Calvinism and Arminianism mixed up together.

“And He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the whole world.” 1 John ii. 2.

“We know that *we* are of God, and *the whole world* lieth in wickedness.” 1 John v. 19.

These texts are placed in juxtaposition in order to show that the expression “whole world” cannot possibly mean every human being, for in the one last quoted the words “*whole world*” are used in contradistinction to the word “*we*,” which, of course, means “the Church;” therefore in this verse “whole world” evidently means *the world without the church*. By a parity of reasoning, the words “*whole world*,” in the first quoted text may mean the church without the world, and which is evidently the sense of the text.* There are many other passages in which the word “*world*” cannot mean every human being; for instance, Rom. xi. 15, “For if the casting away of *them* be the reconciling of the *world*, &c.” The “*them*” in this passage clearly means the *Jews*, and the “*world*” as clearly means the *Gentiles*. So again in ver. 12, “Now if the fall of *them* be the riches of the *world*, and the diminishing of *them* the riches of the *Gentiles*, &c.” These passages from Romans xi., and others which might be quoted, thoroughly militate against the doctrine held so firmly by the Arminians,

* We are by no means tied to this meaning of the passage, which is merely suggested as one that it will bear, without doing any violence to language. It will also admit of several other explanations—one is, that He is the propitiation for all, in the same sense in which He is a ransom for all. The whole analogy of Scripture decides the meaning of both passages.

that John iii. 16 must of necessity mean all mankind.* In many parts of Scripture “the world” is used in a limited sense. There went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that “all the world” should be taxed. Here the expression is still stronger. “All the world,” and still it means only a part—viz., the Roman Empire.

“It is *not of him that willeth*, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.” + Rom. ix. 16.

“*Whosever will* let him take the water of life freely.” Rev. xxii. 17.

The text from Rom. ix. so thoroughly upsets the Arminian heresy that is built on the one from Rev. xxii. 17, that they scarcely need any comment, except to say that although the Spirit here so expressly declares that “it is *not of him that willeth*,” man persists in declaring that it is, and thus in contradicting the Holy Spirit, for there is no text so constantly quoted as this to prove that the gospel offer is made to *all*, and that all can accept it, *if they will*, in spite of the Holy Spirit’s declaring that “it is not of him that willeth.” What then is the meaning of the passage? Plainly this, that no will to accept the gospel resides in poor fallen man (for it is *not of him that willeth*), but “that God who showeth mercy” shows that mercy in giving him the will, and thus proves that He has chosen him to be “a vessel of mercy.” Also proving, “thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power.” If the Bible be a book at unity with itself, without any contradictions or cross statements, and if it be here so plainly declared that “it is not of him that willeth,” then it is quite plain that the Lord has

* “If the love of God be universal, then He still loves those who are lifting up their eyes in hell, being in torments;” else He is mutable, and does NOT “rest in His love,” THUS DENYING Mal. iii. 6, and Zeph. iii. 17. This is self-evident, and is of itself sufficient to prove the fallacy of the sentiment of God’s universal love to the human race.” The upholders of universal redemption are very much shocked if told that their doctrines, when fairly carried out, land us in the regions of blasphemy. But surely, the above extract from “Haldane on the Atonement” is conclusive on this point. If any part of our creed must necessarily deny the attributes of God, it is nothing short of blasphemy, whether man will have it so or not. “The doctrine of Universal Atonement sets aside the Atonement altogether. If the world, for which Christ is the propitiation, be not saved, it is evident the propitiation was not sufficient for the salvation of those for whom it was made. If Christ’s sacrifice were accepted, it must have been accepted in behalf of all for whom it was offered. It cannot have been accepted in part, and rejected in part; it was either a link gloriously complete, or an entire failure.”—*Haldane on the Atonement*.

+ “Read the 9th of Romans, and do not blink a word of it: do not apologize for what the Holy Ghost has written.”—REV. J. WEST.

never left the gospel dependent *on the will of man*, but has foreordained whose will shall be turned by the agency of the Holy Ghost, to receive it. And this point being conceded and proved, the whole doctrine and system of universal redemption and the gospel offer to all, comes to the ground. Thus, we see that while the Calvinistic text fits in and harmonizes with the Arminian, the Arminian text cannot be sustained in the sense that is usually attached to it.

“As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” 1 Cor. xv. 22.

“And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all unto me.” John xii. 32.

These texts are collated in order to show the *limited sense* in which the word “*all*” must sometimes *necessarily* be taken. What is the meaning of “*as in Adam*, all die?” Clearly all who own Adam as their federal head. And who are they? The whole human family, he being the common father of us all. Then what is the meaning of “*Even so in Christ* shall all be made alive?” All those also to whom He is the federal Head spiritually, just as Adam is naturally. Now will anyone assert that the whole human family own Christ as their spiritual Head? Is His headship *co-extensive* with that of Adam, or does it extend only to the members of His body mystical? Ignorant indeed must that person be of Scripture who maintains the contrary. Then the passage means that all who have Adam for their head, have died in him, *i. e.*, the whole human family, and all who have Christ for their Head shall be made alive in Him, the first “*all*” meaning literally “*all*,” the second “*all*” meaning some out of “*all*.” And now to come to the text in John xii. 32, “*And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all unto me.*” (The word *men* is not in the Greek). If the word “*all*” here means every one of the whole human family, then we must expect to see everyone drawn to Christ, for His word cannot fail. But is it a fact that everyone is drawn to Christ? Certainly not. Then the word “*all*” must be taken in a limited sense. In both passages it means those who own a common head. In the one case this is *co-extensive* with the whole human family; in the other case it is limited to the members of Christ’s mystical body.

CHRIST’S MYSTICAL BODY.

“No man can come to me, except the Father, which hath sent me draw him.”
---John vi., 44.

“All that the Father giveth me, shall come to me.”—John vi., 37.

“Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.”—
Matt, xi., 28.

“And him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out”—John vi., 37.

The text from Matthew xi. is continually quoted in defense of the universality of the gospel invitations, and of man's free agency to accept them; and this in spite of the very remarkable manner in which the Holy Ghost has restricted them to the elect family of God. This passage, and the one from John vi., both contain the restriction within themselves, as is most evident. 1. The invitation is addressed to character, and therefore cannot possibly be universal — "All who are weary and heavy laden." 2. It cannot be a universal invitation, for it is expressly said that none can come but those who are drawn by the Father — "No man can come to me, except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him." And thus, God's sovereignty is declared, and man's free will or agency is denied. With regard to John vi., 37, although the Holy Ghost has so carefully guarded the last clause by the first, showing thereby to everyone who wishes to understand the mind of the Spirit, that the very same company are spoken of in both, man persists in disjoining them, and in seeing Calvinism in the first, and Arminianism in the last clause.

Some few years ago, a clergyman at B . . . preached from the passage, and after reading the whole verse, he deliberately rejected the first part, and said he would preach the glorious liberty and freedom of coming to Jesus without any restriction or limitation whatever. And he preached what dishonored, because it entirely ignored, the work of the Blessed Spirit, in telling the congregation that all could accept the invitation if they would, thus contradicting the statement in verse, 44, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me, draw him," and upholding freewill. It is far from our wish to write one word that may seem harsh against such preachers, who, as *practical* Christians, are excellent men, but love to God's eternal truth compels us to say that such preaching awfully deludes the people by telling them that they can do that which the Holy Ghost declares they cannot do, but which it is His blessed prerogative to do for them, and will do in the case of all who have been given to Jesus. "All that my Father giveth me, shall come to me."

We have now placed in juxta-position the chief part of those texts that are generally quoted in support of what is called Calvinistic and Arminian* doctrine; and any candid inquirer after truth must be free to confess that while the Calvinistic texts form a solid basis, on which to understand and explain the Arminian, these latter cannot possibly form a

*Their more correct names would be, Bible-truth, and a system which denies it.

basis on which to understand and explain the Calvinistic. Many more might be adduced, but these are sufficient. The question is often asked by those who have but a superficial acquaintance with Scripture—“What is the good of contending so earnestly for this doctrine? Why cannot we go forth and preach the plain gospel, that Christ died for sinners?” The first answer we would give to this question is, that unless the doctrine be maintained and set forth, the plain *gospel cannot be preached*, for the doctrine of universal atonement leads to the doctrine of universal offer*—the doctrine of the universal offer must involve man’s free will to accept it;—the doctrine of man’s free-will to accept salvation denies the agency of the blessed Spirit; and if this be denied, though a man may pretend to do so, he does not, and cannot preach the gospel. For what is the gospel? It is a revelation or proclamation of *mercy* for the *miserable*, of *help* for the *helpless*, of *recovery* for the *lost*, of *restoration* for the *ruined*. Can that man be said to be *miserable*, to be *helpless*, to be *lost*, to be *ruined*, who has it in his power to *get mercy*, to *help himself*, to find the *right road*, and to *rescue himself* from ruin by an act of free-will,⁺ put forth when he pleases. A prisoner may be in his cell, and may look like a prisoner, but if

* There is a great distinction between the universal *proclamation* and the universal *offer* of the gospel. The former was distinctly commanded by Our Lord, and is the means whereby the elect are being gathered out from all nations. The latter is nowhere recognized in Scripture.

+ The advocates and preachers of free-will are continually *denying* that they either hold or preach the doctrine. Alas, the CONFUSION which exists in their minds through holding this doctrine is so great that they do not know when they preach it. But in spite of their denying it, it is manifestly set forth in all their sermons, revival services, and publications. The learned Dr. Cumming has lately published a work entitled, “Present Salvation for all who will *accept* it.” With all his learning and useful labours in defense of Protestantism, he has not yet learned the simple “gospel of the *grace* of God.” Again, at all revival services and sermons, although the preachers will tell the audience now and then that without the Spirit they cannot be converted, they will, almost immediately, and in the same discourse, tell them to come to Christ without delay; that all may stand on the ladder of salvation *who will*, thus conclusively denying their former statement that without the Spirit they cannot be converted. Between these double statements and this double doctrine, the audience cannot know what the gospel is, nor do the preachers know it themselves. The *real* gospel is so plain and simple that any double-doctrine is not only unnecessary, but would spoil it. It is the contradictors of the gospel who try to support their contradiction by a double doctrine. As to their denying that they preach free-will, we have known two Revival preachers to take the hands of a young girl in theirs, standing each on either side of her, and saying to her “Now you can believe, can you not? You can take hold

he has it in his power at any moment that he pleases to unlock and open all the bolts and bars and doors of his prison, and to walk at large on the Queen's highway, is he in reality a prisoner? Certainly not. In like manner man is no longer lost, ruined, helpless, and miserable if he has it in his power at any moment to escape from all this by accepting the Saviour. Thus, the preachers of free-will do not preach the gospel, and are not entitled to be called evangelical. The glorious gospel is, that because man *cannot* rescue and deliver himself, the grace of a Triune Jehovah has done the work *for* His people, and will do the work *in* them.

But more than this, the doctrine of man's free-will, when clearly traced out,* contradicts all the grand statements of the Bible, and denies the attributes of the eternal Jehovah. The doctrine of man's free-will denies his total depravity—it makes void the doctrine of the Trinity—it annihilates the everlasting covenant—it stultifies the Godhead—it dishonors the Creator while it magnifies the creature. It is for this reason that the advocates of free grace are so very jealous in maintaining it, because they can see how greatly the glory of God in all His attributes is concerned in their maintaining it, and the jealousy that they feel for the truth of God is misunderstood and misrepresented by those who hold a conditional gospel and a free-will in man to accept it. The holders of a free grace gospel have always been met with the charge of exclusiveness and narrowmindedness by the holders of a free-will gospel, and for this reason, that while the one accords with poor, proud human nature, the other is in direct antagonism to it. But it has ever been the same. See in the days of our Lord what indignation was excited when He preached the doctrine of election,⁺ as Luke iv., 25—29, and also in that remarkable chapter, St. of Jesus," &c., &c. What is this but practically denying their previous statement that without the Spirit none can be converted. If they really believed this doctrine, as Calvinists do, would they not, after faithfully preaching the gospel, quietly leave it to the Spirit to apply it, instead of directing all their energy, zeal, and rhetoric to touch, if may be, the feelings and will of the audience, forgetting that poor dead sinners, "dead in trespasses and sins," will "not be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

* The compass of this little treatise does not permit this to be done in the first part, but it will be more fully enlarged on in No. 2.

+ The subject which occupied the whole of (what is believed to be) Christ's first sermon, was ELECTION (Luke iv., 25—27), and at the close of His public ministry He declared that His intercession was for none but His own elect (John xvii., 9). These are remarkable facts and revealed scripture truths. "Atonement and intercession are

John vi., in which He condescended to reason so closely with the Jews on the subject. They first challenged His statements and doctrine; they then murmured at them, and finally “they went back from Him, and walked no more with Him,” especially ver. 65, 66. If they would not bear the doctrine from the Master, it is not to be expected that they will bear it from the followers of the Master. Nevertheless, it is the plain duty of all whose minds have been enlightened by the Spirit to see this glorious doctrine, to hold it fast, in spite of all the opposition they meet with. Why is the country now so flooded with Romanizing error? Because the glorious doctrines which the Reformers held and preached have been ignored and denied by their successors. The Romanists and Jesuits fully understand that Arminianism lays the foundation for popery, and they rejoice to know it, as may be proved by the following extract from their writings, “Now we have planted that sovereign drug, Arminianism, which we hope will purge the Protestants from their heresy; and it flourisheth and beareth fruit in due season.” (Taken from an intercepted letter from a Jesuit in London to his correspondent at Brussels, and was sent, in 1627, to Lord Falkland, the Lord Deputy of Ireland, by four of the leading members of the Privy Council in London, to inform him of the secret doings of the Papists).* “Popery is based upon Arminianism, and those who hold the freewill heresy, however they may boast of their Protestantism, have the GERM of popery in their breast. They are the people who are carried captives to Rome. Great are the complaints in the present day of the advance of Ritualism, both in church and dissent, but Popish practices follow only where Popish doctrines have led the way. The dry rot begins in the pulpit, and eats its way into the pew.”

We shall conclude this first part with a short but important extract from church history, bearing on the foregoing subject.

THE ORIGIN OF THE POPISH DOCTRINE OF FREE-WILL, *alias*
 ABMINIANISM, *alias* PELAGIANISM,

James Arminius was born at Oude Water, in Holland, 49 years after the death of Calvin in 1560. After listening to the preaching Beza and

inseparable; they are component parts of the priestly office, and cannot be disjoined; consequently, to represent Christ as dying for the world, while He expressly disclaims praying for the world, is evidently most unscriptural.—*Haldane on the Atonement.*

* See “Rome’s Tactics,” by Dr. Goode, Dean of Ripon.

Calcarde, divines at Geneva, he returned to Holland, and revived the views of Pelagius, which was a name assumed by Morgan, a Welsh Monk of the 5th century. His views were, predestination, grounded on man's foreseen good—his partial depravity—power in man to turn to God—universal redemption—and the possibility of his finally falling. Modern Arminians are thus the same as ancient Pelagians.

Faustus Socinus had an uncle who was contemporary with Calvin. This uncle left some papers on this heresy. Faustus Socinus obtained them, and maintained the doctrine of the uselessness of the atonement, and the rejection of the Divinity of Christ. The doctrine of universal salvation was also part of his creed, and the Popish doctrine of Purgatory was thus pressed into the service. These doctrines found but few converts among stouthearted protestors against popery. The fundamental truths preached by them laid the axe at the root of the errors preached by Arminius and Socinus. One hundred years later, the heretical opinions of Arminius and Socinus turned up again with absurd additions from the Koran, and were blended into a creed by Emanuel Swedenborg, and were professed by a sect called the New Jerusalem Church.

The Benedictine order of monks, founded in the 5th century retaining much truth and enlightenment, kept in check the blood-thirsty Dominican and the ignorant Franciscan order of monks. In the dissolute days of Louis XIV, France was roused by a Fenelon, a Pascal, a Madame Guyon. Port Royal, a convent of great influence, was founded by the Benedictines at this time; these were the Evangelicals of Romanism. The light cast by this section upon the apostate church, and the sparks emitted by God's elect within the Church of Rome, threatened her destruction, but at this crisis Ignatius Loyala (born 12 years before Luther) being badly wounded at the siege of Pampeluna, determined to devote his time to the founding of a new sect with doctrine to arrest the progress of truth, and circulate popery. He entrusted to a friend, Iago Lenez, the doctrinal part of his religious imposture, and kept in his own hands the experimental part. Iago Lenez did not trouble himself to invent a creed, but felt back upon that of the old Welsh monk Pelagius, *alias* Morgan, and drew up his doctrines into a code, which have since been known in the Church of Rome by the term Molinist, answering to our term Arminian, from Lanez's pupil Molena, who drew out to their full expansion the subtleties of the free-will heresy. Francis Xavier was employed to circulate these opinions, which he did very largely, especially in India. About this time God raised up Cornelius

Jansen, born in 1583—23 years after the birth of the great reviver of Pelagianism. He rose to be Bishop of Ypres, and was led to the knowledge of salvation by grace alone, through reading the writings of Augustine. He maintained that all who opposed these doctrines were Pelagians, and thus in the bosom of the Church of Borne was opened up what is called Quincular Controversy. The five contested points of predestination to life—total depravity—effectual calling—particular redemption—and final perseverance— were the means of communicating light in many a dark cloister, and through divine teaching led many of God's elect into the experience of the truth, who yet lived and died in the Church of Rome. The convent of Port Royal, being the stronghold of Jansenism, was hated by the Jesuits and doomed to utter destruction. This was at last effected by the order of Louis XIV at the instigation of the Jesuits, through their tool, Madame de Maintenon, the king's mistress. To this day the Jansenist and Molinist divide the Church of Rome, and have the same proportion that Calvinists and Arminians bear in Protestant Churches. The doctrines of grace were held by all Protestant divines down to the reign of Charles I. His marriage with a Popish princess, the daughter of Henry IV of France, introduced through the Jesuits that "sovereign drug," Arminianism, and took such sure effect, that, but for Protestantism, it would have laid England again under the power of Popery. Baxter and Fuller attempted to solder Calvinism and Arminianism into one system, asserting that *two opposed principles are both right*, and presenting us with the absurdity of *two* first principles. Rev. Charles Simeon supported this view by this analogy— "Don't you know, my dear brother, that the wheels of your watch move in opposite directions, yet they are all tending to one result?" An artisan would not be greatly puzzled to account for the result of opposing *wheels*, but we imagine that two *mainsprings* would confound all the wisdom of all the watchmakers and all the divines that ever existed in or out of Geneva. —*Extract from. The Remembrancer, a valuable serial, upholding free grace, and edited by Rev. W. Lush, Waterloo, Hants.*

SOME OF THE

Statements and Publications
OF

LIVING PREACHERS,

EXAMINED IN A FRIENDLY SPIRIT,

AND

SET IN JUXTAPOSITION WITH THE

WORD OF GOD:

BEING THE SECOND PART OF

“THE DOUBLE-DOCTRINE MEN.”

Price 3d.; One Dozen for 2s. 6d.

LONDON: E. MARLBOROUGH & CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

BIRMINGHAM: R. DAVIES, TEMPLE ROW.

BRIGHTON: G. BEAL, 207, WESTERN ROAD.

TONBRIDGE WELLS: J. COLBRAN, HIGH STREET.

W. ANDRESS, PRINTER, “BRIGHTON TIMES” OFFICE, 205, WESTERN ROAD.

PREFACE

THE Christian public is most earnestly requested to believe that in no unkind, invidious, or unchristian spirit, is this little publication sent forth. On the contrary, love alone, Christian love, has dictated it. Love to the immutable truth of a covenant-keeping Jehovah, and love to the souls of such as are led by the Spirit to inquire “What is truth?” that they may find an answer, to the establishment of their faith in this little tract. A simple wish to defend and point out the truth has originated it.

There are many misnomers in the world, but none greater than calling a loving defense of God’s truth want of charity and intolerance. When a man finds his cherished opinions, his doctrinal error, set in juxtaposition with divine truth, and UNANSWERABLY so, how often he meets the charge, not by the inquiry and prayerful investigation of “What is truth?” but by the cry of uncharitableness and intolerance. The latitudinarian spirit of the day, that “wolf in sheep’s clothing,” desires to live in peace with *all*, in order that *all error* may be tolerated, forgetting the prophet Zechariah’s injunction, speaking by the Spirit of the Lord, “Love the truth and peace.” First truth, then peace. Let us have peace by all means, and at all times, so long as it can be maintained without any compromise of truth, but if one must be sacrificed, let us never hesitate which to surrender.

In proof that nothing personal or invidious is intended, all names, both of persons and places, will be suppressed, the simple object being to set truth and error in juxtaposition.

CONTINUATION OF PART I.

The object of this little publication having been briefly stated in the Preface, no further introduction is necessary, except to say that we shall first notice a very few of the publications of the present day, and then give a few extracts from sermons or lectures lately delivered.

In a book published in 1857, there is a sermon to children on the text, "I love them that love me, and those that seek me early shall find me." In the previous sermons the author has taken a great deal of pains to vindicate the doctrines of Calvin, especially the final perseverance of the saints, but he gives sad proof that he does not in the least understand that THE REDEMPTION OF THE CHURCH is the foundation of all the sound doctrines that Calvin proclaimed. How can final perseverance ever be insisted on, or maintained, IF DISSEVERED from the redemption of the Church? For if the Gospel be an offer to all, *i.e.*, if the free-will of poor fallen man be true, then, though his free-will may lead him to Christ one day, what is to secure that it shall not lead him away from Christ the next day? What, then, becomes of the doctrine of final perseverance? According to this view it is theory, but not practice. And that the author of this book does hold the fearful heresy and popery of free-will, let the following quotation from his sermon attest: — "Last of all, seeking early is the *easiest way*. When you and I have got a great deal of WORK to do, you know there is nothing like beginning in good time. Now, this is just what you should do about your souls: you should begin in good time to seek Him who alone can save them. People that have got WORK to do, that must be done before dark, take care to get up early in the morning. So should you, dear children, in WORKING about your souls. You should seek the Lord in the morning of life, and get your WORK done before the night of death cometh, when none can WORK. Every year you put it off you will find it harder work, more to be done, and less time to do it. Every year you will find your hearts more stubborn— more unwilling to do what is right. Now, they are like trees, so soft and tender, that by God's help you may bend them anyway. In a few years they will be like strong thick trees, so tough and well rooted that nothing but a mighty wind can shake them. Dear children, begin to seek the Lord at once. I want you to have as few difficulties as possible in your journey to

heaven.” The author of this sermon, whose name we will not publish, will probably say, what possible error can lie in this extract, which he, perhaps, thinks embodies a great deal of sound truth, but which (as we are prepared to prove) embodies not only the essence of Popery, but denies all the grand statements of the Word of God. **1st.** It denies salvation to be of *grace*, and makes it a WOBK done by the sinner. It denies the text, “There is none that seeketh after God,” and sets poor dead sinners to do the work of living saints. It denies the text, “The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which is lost,” for it makes the sinner to be beforehand with Christ.

“No sinner can be beforehand with thee,
Thy grace is preventing, Almighty and free.”

2nd. It denies man’s total depravity, and utter alienation from God, for if he have enough free-will for good to seek the Lord, he cannot be totally corrupt and utterly alienated from Him. “The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that would understand and seek after God. They are all gone out of the way; they are all together become filthy; there is none that doeth good—no, not one. There is none that understandeth—there is none that seeketh after God.” * The statement we have quoted distinctly denies Eph. ii., 1, “dead in trespasses and sins.” TO SEEK THE LORD IS THE ACT OF A LIVING SOUL—NEVER OF A DEAD ONE. Jesus would never have said that He was “come to seek and to save that which was lost,” if the sinner were able to seek for himself. **3rd.** It endeavors to establish the delusive and unscriptural notion that the *nature* of children is not so *depraved* and *corrupt* as that of adults. Where do we find such a notion supported either by scripture or by every day’s experience? That they have not gone to the same lengths of enormity in *practice*, is fully conceded from want of power and want of knowledge; but ignorant both of scripture and of human nature must that man be who can affirm that the seeds of every corruption and sin are not only deeply imbedded in the heart of a child, but discoverable in its practice. The same aversion to the things of God is discerned in a little child as in the full-grown man, and ever will be while that passage remains true, “The carnal mind is enmity against

* While it is said so distinctly, “There is none that seeketh after God,” it is also said, “Seek ye the Lord while he may be found.” Do these texts contradict or nullify each other? No; by no means. The one is describing man in his state of nature, without will or inclination to seek after God; the other is an invitation for the Holy Ghost to make use for the comfort of a soul, whom He has quickened and “made willing in the day of his power.”

God." Does it say "The carnal mind 'in adults?'" No; but the carnal mind, wherever it is found. Again, it is said "they go astray from the womb speaking lies." It may be objected to this remark that children will often be greatly interested in a Bible class. True, but this is not because the unconverted mind can ever take an interest in the things of God, but because the teacher possesses the art of making the lesson so interesting. In like manner, a congregation of adults will listen with breathless attention to the Gospel, when preached in a powerful and able manner; whose hearts are nevertheless full of enmity to the truth of the Gospel. The author well remembers a little boy, who once said to his schoolmaster: "I would rather clean out your coal-cellar than go to church." Grace, sovereign grace, must begin the work in the heart of a child as much as in that of an adult. "If by of grace, then is it no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace."

Not very long ago a book was published, entitled "Yes or No, or God's offer of Salvation. Gen. xxiv., 58." The text which forms the subject matter of the work is the question put to Rebekah, "Wilt thou go with this man?" And she said, "I will go." This is to prove that in like manner the Lord Jesus puts the question to every sinner, "Wilt thou go with me?" and that each has the power to answer, "I will go." It is difficult to conceive how any man really taught of the Spirit, can see any analogy in the two cases! In the one instance we have a LIVING woman called upon to decide a very simple question, whether or no she would be married to Isaac. In the other instance the sinner is utterly dead ("dead in trespasses and sins"), and hence the parallelism breaks down at once. But more than this, in order to sustain this parallelism, a large part of the Bible would have to be altered. Instead of its being written, "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost," it should be, "The Son of Man is come to ask the lost if they wish to be sought out and saved." Instead of its being written, "It is your Father's good pleasure to GIVE you the Kingdom," it should be, "It is your Father's good pleasure to OFFER you the Kingdom. Instead of its being written, "Faith is the GIFT of God," it should be, "Faith is OFFERED by God," since, according to this author, all is dependent on the will of man and not on the eternal purpose of a Triune Jehovah. Instead of its being written, "He shall save His people from their sins," it should be "He shall ask His people if they wish to be saved from their sins;" and thus he must go through the Bible

and alter hundreds of texts to carry out consistently this most wonderful analogy. The one fatal error on which all his views make shipwreck, is that he appears either not to understand, or not to believe that man is *dead in trespasses and sins*. Did he believe this, he never could have published his book. How can we be sufficiently thankful that salvation is not left contingent on the will of man, but is settled in the covenant purpose of a covenant God, which precludes the possibility of failure:

**“Fenced with Jehovah’s ‘shalls’ and ‘wills,’
Firm as the everlasting hills.”**

In a large public meeting the following statements were made: —
“God will take you all, if you will all take God.” The Word of God says: “Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you.” The scripture declares that the Saviour chooses the sinner, but that declaration makes the sinner to choose the Saviour, and thus denies the scripture.

**“No sinner can be beforehand with Thee,
Thy grace is preventing, Almighty and free.”**

Again, it was said, “What we have to do, is first to accept the Saviour and rest our souls on Him, and as the *result of this*, God will give us His Holy Spirit, to lead us into all truth.” We would just ask this simple question, “By WHAT POWER does a sinner “dead in trespasses and sins” *accept* the Saviour PREVIOUSLY TO THE ADVENT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN HIS HEART? We read that “It is the, Spirit that quickeneth,” or giveth life, but if the sinner can accept the Saviour previous to the quickening power of the Spirit in his heart, he cannot be “dead in trespasses and sins;” thus this statement also denies the scripture, and makes the gift of the Spirit to be no longer of *grace*, but of *merit*. The sinner takes the Saviour, and as the result or reward of his so doing, God gives him His Holy Spirit. How contrary to that scripture, “If by *grace*, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace.”

A very popular preacher says to his audience: “It is the Church’s office to bring every soul into personal contact with the Lord Jesus Christ.” If the Church can do this mighty, this ALMIGHTY work, then the office of the Holy Spirit in her midst is no longer needed. Again, he says, “I charge you all, ere you leave the church this night, to place yourselves under the creative energy of God the Holy Ghost.” By this latter sentence it would appear that he does think His office is needed, but that it is to be exercised at the will and bidding of dust and ashes. This statement denies the sinner to be “DEAD in trespasses and sins,” for he must first

HAVE life before he can place himself under the creative energy of God the Holy Ghost.

The Word of God says in Ezek. xxxvii.,* “Come from the four winds, O BREATH, and BREATHE upon these SLAIN, that they MAY LIVE.” This text, which contains the very embodiment of the precious Gospel, is the Old Testament paraphrase of Eph. ii., 1, “You hath he QUICKENED who were DEAD in trespasses and sins.” In both cases, the BREATH or SPIRIT comes to the SLAIN or DEAD, and QUICKENS or MAKES TO LIVE. If the sinner, though declared to be DEAD, has enough life to go to the Spirit to be WROUGHT on, has he not enough life to CARRY on the WORK in his soul? Thus, these unscriptural statements deny and ignore the existence, or work, or both, of God the Holy Ghost.

“No sinner can be beforehand with Thee,
Thy grace is preventing, Almighty and free”

Another preacher tells his audience that “sinners come to Christ, ‘ASSISTED’ by the Holy Ghost.” Does this agree with the Divine statement, “You hath he quickened who were DEAD in trespasses and sins?” A person who can *walk* with the *assistance* of another cannot be DEAD. WALKING and COMING suppose life. Oh! what dishonor does this statement do to God the Holy Ghost! Instead of giving Him the glory as the first mover, the ONLY agent in *bringing* a sinner to Christ, it makes the sinner to be a partner with the Holy Ghost in power, thus denying the Scripture from beginning to end.

“No sinner can be beforehand with Thee,
Thy grace is preventing, Almighty and free.”

In another sermon, lately preached, we read these words: “Draw nigh to God; be very importunate. Do not imagine that when His good time comes, He will seek us out. Let us move towards God. He will never allow us to take the whole journey alone: He will run and meet us. God has pledged Himself to co-operate with man: let us feel bound to co-operate with God.” We shall place this most unscriptural extract in juxtaposition with three texts. 1. “Do not imagine that when His good time comes,” God expressly declares, “Thy people shall be willing *in the day of thy power*.” 2. “Do not imagine He will seek us out “Behold I, even I, will both search my sheep and seek them out.” 3. “God has pledged Himself to co-operate with man.” WHERE HAS HE DONE SO? we

* It is fully conceded that this chapter, in its primary application, has reference to the Jewish nation, but in a spiritual sense it refers to the quickening of the redeemed family of God by the work of the Holy Ghost in the heart of each one.

simply ask. The answer they give is, “*We* then, as workers together WITH HIM, &C.” But stop a moment! How does that passage read in Greek? Does it establish or deny this conclusion? It denies it, for it reads “We workers together,” *i.e.*, we, apostles and ministers, work with other or fellow apostles and ministers, but there is no statement that man is a worker together with God; so that the whole superstructure which is endeavored to be based on these words, viz., that puny man can in any way co-operate with the eternal Jehovah in His work of grace, falls at once to the ground, for it has no foundation on which to rest.

**“No sinner can be beforehand with Thee,
Thy grace is preventing, Almighty and free.”**

The salvation of every saved sinner is on far surer ground than this, and we bless our God for it.

**“Fenced with Jehovah's *shalls* and *wills*,
Firm as the everlasting hills.”**

A very excellent and devoted lay preacher, in addressing a large public audience at -----, quoted this beautiful passage. “And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.” He thus explained it: “You must first become sons by accepting Christ, and then God will give you the Spirit of His Son.” With all due deference to this preacher, we must tell him that the very wording of the passage, as well as the whole tenor of Scripture, makes this meaning an utter impossibility. It is not said, “Make yourselves sons, or become sons,” but “Ye ARE Sons.” Is there such a thing known in natural generation as a man making himself a son? The very fact of his birth involves his sonship, which he has no power to make or unmake. And in like manner every member of the heavenly family is born a son, though often long unmanifested. The gift of the Spirit never *makes* any one a son, but manifests him, and shows both to himself and to others what before was known only to the Lord, viz., that he was chosen in the councils of eternity when the “names were written in the Lamb’s book of life,” and was, therefore, born both a son and an heir. “If children, then heirs.” Not make yourselves children and thus become heirs, but because ye ARE children ye are heirs. “Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts.” If a man can make himself a child of God any day that he pleases by believing on Jesus, he must the previous day have been a child of the devil. Is this, we

ask, in all kindness to this preacher, is this the teaching of Holy Scripture? Oh! may the Lord, the Spirit, graciously unfold the meaning of *this* and of many kindred passages, to those who are seeking to teach others, that they may not mislead them by wrong interpretations of the Scriptures.

On another occasion this same preacher said to his audience that "believers were knit by the Spirit into the eternal family of God." The blessed truth of Scripture is embodied in the very reverse of this statement, viz.: that because they were *knit*, or, better to say, *chosen* into the family of God from everlasting, therefore, in due time, "in the day of His power," He gives them the Spirit, which makes manifest that they are of the chosen ones. We would just suggest to him that according to his interpretation of Scripture, it is impossible for him to believe these two texts, "I have loved thee with an everlasting love," and "I am the Lord, I change not." If a man by accepting the Saviour can make himself a child of God on any given day of the year, then it follows that previously to that day either God did not love him, or if He did, He loved a child of the devil. If he says no, that cannot be, then the other alternative is that it makes God a changeable being, because His love begins in time, and was not from eternity. From one of these two dilemmas his interpretations cannot be disentangled.

The error which all these statements involve, is simply that of addressing DEAD sinners as if they were LIVING ones. Not only is the natural heart sealed against the things of the Spirit, being "DEAD" (Eph. ii., 1), but if we may be allowed the simile, it is hermetically sealed, "TWICE DEAD," (Jude 12). We may as well stand by a grave and say to the inhabitant, "Come forth," and expect it to arise from its corruption, and walk in resurrection power, as to expect a sinner, whom the Holy Ghost declares to be "dead in trespasses and sins," to perform any of the acts of a living man. Who then has power to open this *sealed*, this hermetically sealed heart? None but "He who hath the key of David; He that openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth He of whom it is said, "Whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things that were spoken of Paul." (Acts xvi., 14). She could not even attend until her heart was opened; by which we learn that the very first beginning with a sinner is for the Lord the Spirit to open the heart to the reception of the Gospel. The Lord and not the sinner is always the first in reaching out the hand.

**"No sinner can be beforehand with Thee,
Thy grace is preventing, Almighty, and free."**

Very many more quotations might be given, but these few will suffice, as they all involve the one fundamental error, viz., that of putting God the Holy Ghost out of His right place as the very first agent, and putting man into it.

In saying and writing these things, we are continually met with this apology for the preachers, "They did not *mean* what they said, "Let us test this apology. If a man comes and clearly preaches justification by the works of the law, will it do to say, "He did not mean THAT, he meant justification by faith?" How are the audience to know that? They can go only by his statements. If a man gives to one of these apologists a cheque for £50, saying at the same time, "I mean £100," will that satisfy the creditor," will he not say, "What is in your mind can do me no good; I can deal only with the cheque in my hand!" In like manner, if they wish their audience to understand that God the Holy Ghost is the first mover, the first agent, and that man is DEAD until He acts upon him, let them PREACH it, and give a Triune Jehovah *all* the glory of salvation from *first* to last.

It is often thrown in the teeth of those who maintain the doctrines of free grace, and of particular redemption, that, according to such views, we may as well sit still, fold our hands, and do nothing. So far from this being the sequence to the doctrines that they hold, the very contrary view animates them, for they act on the principle of CERTAINTY, while Arminianism is a principle of UNCERTAINTY. The free-will system is all a peradventure. Those who hold a conditional gospel, and the power in man to receive it, *offer* it to sinners in the hopes that they may be induced to accept* it. There is no certainty in the case. They may, or may not, receive it. Their wills may be induced to seek the Lord, and to close with the (so-called) offers of salvation, or they may not.

This is the miserable uncertainty of Arminian doctrine. Now, what is the glorious CERTAINTY of the doctrine of Calvinists? Their dependence is not on what man *may* do, but on what an Omnipotent God HAS PROMISED to do. "Thy people shall be willing in the day of Thy power" is the stronghold of Calvinists." They never expect to find one single human being working himself into a willing state to accept the Saviour, for they know that the Scriptures, from beginning to end, deny this. But they expect to find an Almighty Jehovah, according to His covenant promise, putting forth His power ("which no creature is able to

* If they do not hold this view, why did ----- publish a book entitled "Present salvation for all who will ACCEPT it?"

resist”) and SECURING the heart for the reception of His grace. This is the glorious Gospel that, when a poor *dead* sinner is unable and unwilling, through sin, to believe in the Saviour, and if left to himself would remain forever unable and unwilling, the grace of a Triune Jehovah makes him willing, and prepares his heart to receive all the blessings which He has from everlasting designed to give him. Thus, while the Calvinist denies the miserable uncertainty of the free-will system, making the glorious Gospel dependent on the will of fallen man, he rejoices in the security and stronghold of a free grace Gospel, making its blessings irrevocably sure to the redeemed sinner.

Again, the question is often put to Calvinists, “What is the good of taking the Gospel to every sinner, when you hold that every sinner is not redeemed?” Here, also, the Calvinist has by far the best side of the argument. It is his happy ignorance as to who are the redeemed which encourages him to go to every sinner on the face of the earth, for while we cannot certainly say of any individual in his unconverted state that Christ died for him, or that he is one of the redeemed and chosen ones, so is it also certain that we cannot say he is not. No man has a scriptural warrant to shut himself out from salvation, unless he has committed the unpardonable sin. Therefore, we would preach the Gospel to every creature under heaven, not knowing where the hidden ones* are, but rejoicing in the glorious certainty that by the preaching of the everlasting Gospel, every one shall be gathered in: “not one shall fail.” And here comes in a very important point, and would to God it was better understood: viz., that the preaching of the Gospel does not *make* men to be Christ's sheep, but only manifests them as such. Christ chose His sheep, or we may rather say the Father gave them to Him before the foundation of the world, and the preaching of the Gospel is His voice whereby He calls them out from the world, and gathers them to Himself. “The Gospel is Christ’s voice, by which His blood-bought sheep are con-

* See a remarkable instance of the truth of this statement in Acts xviii., 9,10 : “ Then spake the Lord to Paul in the night by a vision, ‘ Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace; for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee, for I have much people in this city’” i.e., much people in the covenant of grace, whom I have redeemed, but who are as yet unconverted, ungathered in, but who shall be converted and gathered in by the preaching of the everlasting Gospel by thy lips. What a beautiful testimony to the success which shall attend the faithful preaching of the Gospel. It shall be continued in a place till every one of the Lord's redeemed there is manifested by it. Now let us *mark* the word of the Lord to St. Paul. Did He say, go and *offer* the Gospel to every one in Corinth, and see who will accept it? No, but preach it, that I may thereby gather in my hidden ones; hidden to thine eyes, O Paul, but not hidden to mine. Therefore, preach it to all, that I may gather in my people there.

ducted into His fold, and are thus separated from the goats.”* Thus, the preaching does not make the sheep, but gathers them out. It does not make them the Lord’s people, but it manifests who are the Lord’s people. It was a point settled from all eternity in the councils of the great Jehovah, who should be the “called, and chosen, and faithful” ones, and the preaching of the Gospel manifests who these are.⁺ Hence the force of our Lord’s command (which only Calvinists, but not Arminians, really understand), “Go ye into all the world, and preach THE GOSPEL to every creature.” It is NO GOSPEL, no good news, if left to the free will of man, for in that case not a solitary individual of the whole human race would attain to the heavenly glory; but “preach the Gospel” said the Lord, “preach the glorious Gospel that the Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which is lost.” Not come to ask men if they wish to be saved, not come to make it a possibility that they may be saved, but come to save them because of His eternal purpose to do so, and because they cannot save themselves.

Again, the holders of a free grace Gospel are accused by Arminians of being so very tenacious of their own opinions, feeling sure that they are right and others wrong. The best answer to this charge would be that of a man who would say, “I am confident the sun is in the heavens, because I can plainly see him, and if you cannot see him so plainly as I do, the defect must be in your visual organs, and not in his brilliancy, which is so very clear and apparent to me.” Another reason why the holders of a free grace Gospel are so jealous in maintaining their doctrines is because they can see (though the free willers cannot), that **THE REDEMPTION OF THE CHURCH IS THE KEYSTONE OF THE WHOLE ARCH OF SOUND DOCTRINE, AND NO SUBSTANTIAL TRUTH CAN BE PREACHED WITHOUT THIS FOUNDATION BE FIRST LAID.** If man’s free will be true, then his total depravity is denied. He must have some good thing left from the ruins of the fall if he has the power and the will to accept the Saviour. The Father’s electing love is denied, for if ALL can accept the Saviour, what was the use of electing ANY TO eternal life? According to free willers, all can accept it. The power of the Lord’s atoning blood is denied, for if all are redeemed, and all are not saved, it fails in a large majority of cases, or if they say God would save them, but man will not be saved, then man is stronger than God, and thus His Omnipotence is denied. The sanctifying grace and constraining power of God the Holy

* Haldane on the Atonement, page 110.

⁺See Rev. xviii., 14.

Ghost is denied, if free-will be true.

Unless the doctrine of the redemption of the Church be maintained, the union of the Church with Christ cannot be preached, nor the security of the Church in Christ, nor the everlasting covenant which makes mercy sure to all the seed, for according to the free willers, it is not yet known who the seed are, nor who are to compose the mystical body of whom Christ is the head. The free-will system not only denies all the grand statements of the Word of God, but lands us in "confusion worse confounded," and in the greatest MUDDLE that ever was invented by the enemy of souls to rob God of His glory, and to invest poor fallen humanity with it instead.

ARMINIANISM.

Dr. Leighton calls Arminianism "the Pope's Benjamin, the last and greatest monster of the Man of Sin; the elixir of anti-Christianism; the mystery of 'the mystery of iniquity;' the Pope's cabinet; the very quintessence of equivocation." Alike hereunto, Mr. Boas (Master of Eton College), addeth, saying, "Arminianism is the spawn of Popery, which the *warmth of favour* may easily turn into frogs of the bottomless pit." And what are the new Arminians but the varnished offspring of the old Pelagians, that make the grace of God to lacquey it at the foot or rather the will of man. "That makes the *sheep* to keep the *shepherd*. That puts God into the same extremity with Darius, who would gladly have saved Daniel, but could not." —Extract from "Antidote to Arminianism," by Christopher Ness, 1675.

POPERY THE BASIS OF ARMINIANISM.

"Popery is based on Arminianism, and those who hold the freewill heresy, however they may boast of their Protestantism, have the germ of Popery in their breast. They are the people who are carried captives to Rome. Great are the complaints in the present day of the advance of Ritualism, both in Church and Dissent, but Popish practices follow only where Popish doctrines have led the way. The dry rot begins in the pulpit, and eats its way into the pew."—Extract.

FREE- W ILL.

"When God placed man in the Garden of Eden in a state of holiness, he was in possession of free-will. What did free-will do for him?"

It led him and all his posterity into ruin. If free-will led man into sin while he was in a state of holiness, can we suppose that NOW, when man is in a state of sin, freewill would ever lead him to what is good?" — Revd. . .

THE REDEMPTION OF THE CHURCH.

The redemption of the Church is the keystone of the whole arch of sound doctrine, and no truth can be supported which is not built on this as a foundation. It is the key which unlocks the rich treasures of the word of God, and spreads out its contents to the eye of faith. The not seeing this fundamental doctrine is the secret of the delusive preaching of the present day. We are bold to tell the advocates of universal redemption and of free-will (its twin sister), that they do not understand the Bible, for this doctrine is interwoven with the whole of its contents. It is the golden thread from Genesis to Revelation. They may see as far as justification by faith, with a little *glimmering* of the doctrine of election, but beyond this they cannot see, for the dust of universal redemption blinds their eyes, and thus obscures their vision onwards.

We could quote hundreds of passages which they pervert from their right meaning in proof that their non-reception of this fundamental doctrine prevents their understanding the Scriptures, but let one suffice, from Psalm. 139, 16: "Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in Thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them." Will it be believed that all that many see in this magnificent passage is an allusion to the formation of the members of a little infant's body in its mother's womb? The dust of heresy prevents their seeing the full, the blessed truth, which lies within it. They see not that the "BOOK" is the book of the everlasting covenant; that the "MEMBERS" are the members of Christ's mystical body; that they were "WRITTEN" in that book before the foundation of the world; that "IN CONTINUANCE" they are being "FASHIONED," as "the Lord adds to the Church daily such as shall be saved." Above all, they see not the joy expressed in that glorious verse by the Great Head of the Church in the prospect of the birth of all His members. What a paltry interpretation is the first! What a magnificent one is the second! No wonder that the preaching of Universalists is so *stunted*, and their audience equally so, when their views of Scripture are so stunted. Oh! may the Lord be graciously pleased to take the scales from their eyes, and to make them "able ministers of the New Testament."

The following fact is well authenticated in "The Life and Correspondence of Rev. Augustus Toplady," though not generally known in these days, viz. That in the times immediately succeeding the Reformation, when the doctrines of free sovereign grace had been almost universally preached, and as universally received, the teaching of the opposite doctrines of free-will, and of universal redemption, caused such a ferment in the land, that the preachers of them were brought before the civil magistrate, and bound over to keep the peace, by not proclaiming what was THEN considered so subversive of the truth.

A WORD TO THE READER.

DEAR READERS, —If by grace you have been made a partaker of grace, may you be very jealous to give "the God of all grace" all the glory of the grace which He has given you. It was not you who first accepted Christ, but it was Christ who accepted you; who chose you and loved you before the foundation of the world; who in due time (and because He loved you with an everlasting love), sought you out and gave you His Spirit, thereby manifesting you to be one of His. Thus, the Spirit did not make you of the "SONS," but manifested you to be one. "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Unless you stand on the solid rock of the everlasting covenant of God and of His eternal purposes, and love, and grace, in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world, you have really no ground of confidence whatever. The glorious Gospel is summed up in that verse, "He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." Grace begins the work in every vessel of mercy, and what grace begins, grace will consummate; and thus, at the last, "the head-stone shall be brought forth with shoutings, grace, grace unto it."

And, dear Reader, if you are not yet a partaker of grace, who can tell what may be the Lord's gracious purposes yet in store for you, for, while it is true that like "a lost sheep" you can never find the way to the fold, yet it is also true that it is the office of the Good Shepherd "to seek and save that which is lost." "I, even I, will both search my sheep and seek them out." "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out."

APPENDIX

THE following most important couplet was omitted in Part First:—

“God SO loved the world, &c.” John iii., 16.

“Having loved His own, which were in the world,
He loved them unto the end.” John xiii., 1.

The one verse contains a statement that “God loved the world;” the other, that He “loved His own which were in the world.” What then is the conclusion that we must come to? Simply this; that it is a WORLD WITHIN A WORLD that Jesus loves. To hold any other view is to contradict the Word of God, which declares that those whom He loves, He *loves to the end*. If, as the advocates of universal redemption maintain, the expression “loved the world,” means that he loved everybody, then they either deny that He loves them to the end, or they maintain that He sends some of the objects of His everlasting love into everlasting perdition. There is no escaping from one of these two conclusions. See page 9 of Part First, * and also page 143 of “Haldane on the Atonement.”

The Third Part will consist of a Dialogue between a Clergyman and his Wife on the foregoing subjects.

* “The Double Doctrine Men, or the Preachers of Election and Free-will Query: Do they Preach the Truth? Calvinism and Arminianism Weighed in the Balances.” London: E. Marlborough and Co., Paternoster Row. Price 3d.

By the same Author,

BIBLE QUESTIONS, Miscellaneous and in Series, containing 400 Questions and Answers. Price 9d.

Also, SEQUEL TO DITTO, containing 200, on the Typical Meaning of the Dress and Offices of the Jewish High Priests, the Cities of Refuge, &c., &c. Price 6d.

LONDON: NISBET & Co., Berners Street.

BRIGHTON: BEAL, 207, Western Road.

Monthly, Price Threepence,

THE REMEMBRANCER. Edited by Rev. WM. LUSH, Incumbent of St. George's, Waterloo, Hants. “We most strongly recommend *The Remembrancer* to our readers, as containing wholesome spiritual food for the ‘sheep’ and ‘lambs’ of Christ’s blood-bought flock.”—*Gilead*.

LONDON: PAUL, Chapter House Court, Paternoster Row.

Monthly, One Penny,

GILEAD. Edited by Rev. T. H. GREGG, Cradley, Birmingham.

“We have no hesitation in pronouncing of *Gilead* that it will ultimately rank side by side with *The Gospel Standard*, *The Gospel Magazine*, and those other periodicals which are not afraid to declare ‘all the counsel of God.’”—*Remembrancer*.

LONDON: W. FREEMAN, 102, Fleet Street, E.C.

N.B.—Six copies of *Gilead* post free for Six Stamps, from J. SHERREN, 79, St. Mary Street, Weymouth.