

his favours where he please, because no creature has a claim upon his grace. Not a single favour was conferred in eternity, but what was guided by the glittering hand of sovereignty. His sovereignty shines with luminous blaze in all the dazzling recesses of eternal redemption; it occupies the very centre, and fills the circumference with untarnished lustre; it gives to mercy, goodness, power and love, all their sparkling hues, tints every beam that fall upon the pyramid of grace, and kindles every ray that crowd within the limits of salvation. It was sovereignty which stretched all the lines of love, pitched all the tents of mercy, and numbered all the heirs of bliss. It was sovereignty which unfolded the encircling arms of friendship, and filled them with its chosen objects. Sovereignty swelled the circle of safety, poured the treasures of Deity at the feet of the church, and opened all his beams upon the favoured objects which fill the mighty enclosure. It resembles the rainbow, in collecting, adjusting, and fixing all the varied colours of nature, so as to depict them in the most fascinating manner. All the beauties, harmonies, and glories of divine grace seem to gather about divine sovereignty. There it is they are united and adjusted, and there it is they shine in all the mingling splendour of eternal grandeur. Thus while his blessings descend like showers upon the ground to render fruitful his people, sovereignty is seen in the hemisphere of favour, collecting and spreading all the tints and hues of the divine character, his attributes, purposes, and communications; and that in a manner that must excite admiration, procure affection, and command obedience.

But now let us see how *offers* of mercy, general redemption, a day of grace, &c. can agree with divine sovereignty.

1. *It cannot agree with election.* Sovereignty in election is choosing individuals to happiness without any regard to their qualifications. It is doing that which might have been left undone. Now offers of grace suppose, that if there is such a thing as election it must be grounded upon the doings of the creature,

so that when they choose to repent and believe, God *must* elect them or be *unjust*. Now supposing this to be true, (which is far from being the case) his sovereignty is necessarily shut out; and if any glory can arise out of the *cause* of election, it must be given to the creature.

2. *It cannot agree with sovereignty in redemption, because all are supposed to be alike redeemed.* If, therefore, offers of grace are true, I cannot see how divine sovereignty can be exercised in redemption. The only possible manner in which it can be, is in providing the sacrifice. But if he acted sovereignly in that respect, why may he not be allowed to act so in the objects who will be benefited thereby? If he might have passed by all the human race without providing a Saviour, surely he may be thought to pass by some of mankind. If he could have retained his justice in the former, surely he may be thought to preserve it in the latter: and then why is such a clamour raised about his being unjust, if he does not afford every one an opportunity of being saved? The truth seem to be this, the system of offered grace is a compound of crudities, and those very arguments which are necessary to defend one part, are as necessarily destroyed by the other. One part can only be supported at the expense of another.

3. *It cannot allow of divine sovereignty in regeneration, which is the scriptural idea of that important doctrine.* "The Spirit quickeneth whom he will;" but, according to offered grace, if there is any necessity of the quickening influences of the Holy Ghost, it is determined and governed by the *will* of the creature. According to that scheme, men may all be saved *if* they *will*, and *when* they will. What is this but transferring the sovereignty of independant Majesty to worthless and dependant humanity? Stripping the Creator, who is blessed for evermore, to clothe a rebel who is under his displeasure, and deserves everlasting banishment? And that this is the case there can be no doubt, for whatever is offered alike to all, open to all, and attainable by all, cannot be distinguishing. It is **only** received by individuals who *distinguish themselves*

by moral industry. To conceive of divine sovereignty as consonant with offered grace is like conceiving of contradictions as true, or contrarieties as being in strict agreement with each other.

*Objection.* 'But the nature and fitness of things, seem to require an offer of grace to be made to all his creatures!' The 'nature and fitness' of what things? Not the nature and fitness of Jehovah's attributes, for we have seen that they are all opposed to the subject. Not the nature and fitness of the atonement, for that regards his church, and suit the condition of quickened persons only. Nor can it be the nature and fitness of the gospel, for that proclaim discriminating truths. Nor yet the nature and fitness of the invitations, for they are adapted only to those who are the subjects of a living and heavenly principle. Nor can it be the nature and fitness of unrenewed persons, because they are undeserving of favour, and unable to do any thing spiritual.

*Object.* 'But such is the *divine plan.*' No such thing. For, in the first place, there is no *plan* at all according to offered grace, but a hideous amalgamation of crude contingencies and *divine* uncertainties. In the second place, it is not a *divine* plan but a *human* contrivance, first rudely suggested by the Arians, and improved upon by the Pelagians. After a lapse of time it was raised from the grave of obscurity by James Van Harmin, generally known by the name of Arminius. This theological resurrectionist, ransacked carefully the tomb of oblivion where it had been deservedly placed, industriously collected all the materials, re-organized them, and inspired them with animation by his theological discussions. The child, however, grew but little either in stature or favour, and strong fears were entertained lest it should be hurried back to the hole of the pit from whence it was dug. Towards the close of the reign of King Charles I. it was anxiously conveyed to England, where its reception was cool and its attacks violent, till Charles I. became its foster parent, and the infamous Laud (who was the first Arminian primate of England) its patron and guardian. No sooner was it laid upon the bed of state than its prin-

cipal members assumed a prominency, was raised into consideration, and filled the circles of political splendor till it effected the ruin both of church and state. In the eighteenth century, Mr. Wesley created considerable attention by exhibiting the old scheme in a new form. This, however, was not the result of deep research and free enquiry, but unresolved whether he should preach free grace or free will, he is said to have decided the conflict by the splendid twirl of a shilling. 'And why,' says Mr. Toplady, in his letter to him, 'should you of all people in the world be so very angry at the doctrines of grace? Forget not the days and months that are past. Remember that it once depended on the toss of a shilling, whether you yourself should be a Calvinist or an Arminian. Tails fell uppermost, and you resolved to be an Universalist. It was a happy throw which consigned you to the tents of Arminius; for it saved us from the company of a man, who, by a kind of religious gambling, peculiarly his own, risked his faith upon the most contemptible of all lots; and was capable of tossing up for his creed, as porters, or chairmen toss up for a halfpenny.' No sooner did he occupy the tents of Hagar, than he formed alliances with the children of the bond-woman; and, in process of time, became master of a celebrated foundry, where he cast manacles and fetters\* to tame his posterity—"to bind his sons in chains, and his nobles in fetters of iron." These chains and fetters surround all his adherents in the present day, who by uniting their mellifluous notes with the music of their chains, produce a stream of harmonical sounds, which allures the mind, fire the passions, and lead to all the lawless eccentricities of wild enthusiasm.

This is a short epitome of the scheme; perhaps, in some future day I may give the 'history and mystery'

---

\* *Cast manacles and fetters*—the system which he framed for the regulation of his bands, classes, and societies. This, perhaps, will be considered by some as too vindictive to be effective. I beg leave to say, that it is not vindictive, but designed to reach the feeling of those who are impervious to the best directed arguments, and sensible to nothing but the effects of irony and satire.

of Methodism, on a scale somewhat larger. This may suffice for the present, and is sufficient to shew, that offers of grace form no part of the divine plan. We may, therefore, safely call it a human invention. And indeed we must do violence to common reason, to suppose that God is the author of a system which will shear him of his beams, involve his affairs in uncertainty, and fix his eternal administrations upon the precarious pivot of '*free-will.*'

## PART V.

OFFERED GRACE AND GENERAL INVITATION COMPARED WITH THE  
FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES OF THE GOSPEL.

---

## PREDESTINATION.

The word, *προθεσις*, signifies, according to Parkhust, a *predetermination, purpose, intention, design*. ‘It is,’ says the intelligent Toplady, ‘worthy of the reader’s notice, that the original word, *προθεσις*, which we render *purpose*, signifies not only an appointment, but a fore-appointment, and such a fore-appointment, as is efficacious and cannot be obstructed, but shall most assuredly issue in a full accomplishment.’ ‘The fore-appointment of every thing to *certain ends*.’ Acts iv. 28. *Wilson*. ‘An act of God immanent and from eternity; also called his *purpose, decree, determination, will, counsel*.’ *Bagwel*. ‘Predestination is an eternal decree or purpose of God, in time causing effectual grace in all those whom he has chosen, and by his effectual grace bringing them infallibly unto glory.’ *Dr. Davennant, Bishop of Salisbury*. If the reader is desirous of more definitions, he may peruse the last quoted author’s animadversions upon a treatise, entitled, ‘God’s love to mankind.’ White’s ‘Defence’—Toplady’s ‘State of Calvinism’—Gill’s ‘Cause of God and Truth;’ where he will find the judgment of ancient and distinguished men upon the subject, and by which he will easily perceive that predestination is neither new nor novel, but a doctrine which have been held in all ages by the uncorrupted followers of the Redeemer.

As many people affect to deny, or to doubt, the doctrine of predestination, the following scriptures arranged under their respective heads, are humbly submitted to their consideration.

*Predestinate*, Rom. viii. 29, 30. Eph. i. 5, 11. *Ordained*, Psalm viii. 2, 3. Jer. i. 5. Hab. i. 12. John xv. 16. Acts x. 42—xiii. 48.—xvii. 31. 1 Cor. ii. 7. Eph. ii. 10. 1 Tim. ii. 7. Jude 4. *Appoint-ed-eth*, Luke xxii. 29. 2 Sam. xvii. 14. Neh. vi. 7. Job vii. 3.—xiv. 5.—xx. 29. Isa. xlv. 7. Micah vi. 9. Matt. xxvii. 10. 1 Thes. iii. 3.—v. 9. 2 Tim. i. 11. 1 Pet. ii. 8. Job vii. 1.—xiv. 14. Isa. xiv. 31.—xl. 2. *Mar.* Dan. viii. 10—x. 1.—xi. 27, 29, 35. Hab. ii. 3. Acts xvii. 26. Gal. iv. 2. *Counsel-s*, 2 Chron. xxv. 16. *Mar.* Psalm xxxiii. 11. Isaiah xix. 17.—xxv. 1.—xxviii. 29.—xl. 14. Jer. xxiii. 18.—xxxii. 19. Acts ii. 23.—iv. 28. Eph. i. 11. Heb. vi. 17. *Determined*, 2 Chron. xxv. 16. Job xiv. 5. Isa. xix. 17. Dan. ix. 24, 26, 27.—xi. 36. Luke xxii. 22. Acts iv. 28. Rom. i. 4. *Mar.* *Decree*, Psal. ii. 7. Dan. iv. 17, 24. Isa. x. 22. *Purpose-es-ed*, Eccl. iii. 1, 17.—viii. 6. Isa. xiv. 24, 26.—xlvi. 11. Jer. iv. 28.—xlix. 20.—l. 45.—li. 29. Rom. viii. 28.—ix. 11, 17. Eph. i. 9, 11.—iii. 11. 2 Tim. i. 9. 1 John iii. 8. *Elect-ed-ion*, Isaiah xlii. 1.—xlv. 4.—lxv. 9, 22. Matt. xxiv. 22, 24, 31. Mark xiii. 20, 22, 27. Luke xviii. 7. Rom. viii. 33.—ix. 11.—xi. 5, 7, 28. 1 Thes. i. 4. Col. iii. 12. 1 Tim. v. 21. 2 Tim. ii. 10. Tit. i. 1. 1 Pet. i. 2.—ii. 6. 2 Pet. i. 10.

*Remark* 1. It will be seen that the words, counsel, appoint, determine, ordain, decree, &c. are terms of synonymous import. 2. That several of them do not contemplate the *eternal* state of mankind; yet 3, they all contain the true idea of predestination. 4. That I have not collected *all* the passages which involve the doctrine. There are a great number of other passages which, like irregular verbs, could not be classified with those above, which notwithstanding, if collected, would assume a high degree of respectability. 4. It is thought that if these are to the *point*, they are sufficient to amuse our Arminian brethren for the present. 5. When those are *honourably* gone through, I pledge myself to bring another army into the field. 6. It will appear that I have not drained the doctrine of predestination from the bottomless pit. 7. It is requested that people will *attentively* examine, and *solidly* refute, these passages

before they rail against the doctrine under notice. These things observed, I will now pass from remarks to statements.

1. *Predestination is eternal and comprehensive.* *Eternal*, because he is not the subject of *new* determinations. *Comprehensive*, because his intuitive or absolute knowledge can never be increased. He is in this as in every other respect, "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." It is so copious as to embrace all the endless multiformity of creatures, in all their diversified situations, postures, and movement, throughout the immense and eternal dominions of Jehovah. It combines in one grand chain the whole order of things, circumstances and events, from the salvation of a world, to the movement of an insect—from the crucifixion of Immanuel, to the destruction of a sparrow—from the registration of elect angels, to the hair upon the human head.

2. *With regard to the eternal condition of mankind it seem to be SOVEREIGN AND DECISIVE.* Sovereign because no creature could lay a foundation for preference. *Decisive*, because he knows no change. "The thoughts of his heart standeth to all generations." Whether predestination passed upon mankind as pure or polluted, their situation was precisely the same, sovereignty made mankind to differ, and the seal of immutability impressed upon the distinctions, rendered decisive the discriminating appointments of heaven.

3. *Solemn and exclusive.* *Solemn*, because it involves an eternity of misery or joy; and *exclusive*, because it shut the gates of glory against a vast number of our fellow creatures, and might have been shut against the reader and myself. Man was not excluded because of his *sin*, but because *sovereignty* and *wisdom* denied the favour. *Sovereignty* closed the avenue of glory, and *justice* opened the door of torment. *Sovereignty* shone upon the page of mercy, and conferred on some what it denied to others. Predestination is too solemn to be *jeered at*, and too solid to be *sneered at*. "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder!"

4. *Simple and productive* *Simple*, as it relates to the unsaved part of mankind, seeing it merely determines their progress through life and their future



state, without either depriving them of any moral excellency, or interfering with their moral agency. *Productive*, seeing it makes ample provision for all the elect.

5. *Consequential and effective.* *Effective*, ONLY, where holiness is concerned. *Consequential*, where sin is committed and guilt is incurred. The difference between consequences and effects, is as simple as it can be important. Effects are produced by *operative causes*; consequences are drawn from *principles and positions*; sin may be committed and sinners may be damned as *consequences* of predestination, but NOT as the *fruit* or *effect* thereof. On the other hand, saints may perform spiritual acts, and be glorified as the *fruit* and *effect* of predestination, and not by the *consequence only*. On the one hand, it is not the consequence, but the effect that saves. On the other hand, it is not the *effect*, but guilt committed in accordance with predetermination.

6. *Efficient and permissive.* Towards the elect it is all powerful, having secured their end by planning the means. It brings them to a point at which they could never have arrived of themselves. Heaven is their final destination—the act was passed in heaven—their inheritance is in heaven—their surety came from heaven, and will remain in heaven until the restitution of all things. Most sublimely is the doctrine handled by Paul, in Eph. i. “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in Christ, according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love; having predestinated us to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace.” “Having *predestinated*,”—there is the *act*; “the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,”—there is the *agent*; “predestinated *us*,”—there are the *subjects*; “by (or through) *Jesus Christ*,”—there is the *medium* through which the act passes from the agent to the subject; “to the *adoption of children*,”—there is the *relation-*

ship formed; “who hath blessed us with all *spiritual blessings*,”—there is the *inheritance* conferred; “in *heavenly places*,”—there is our *residence*; “in *Christ*,”—there is our *centre* and *perfection*; “to the *praise of the glory of his grace*,”—there is the *end*; “we have *redemption* through his *blood*,”—there are the *means*;—“according to the *good pleasure* of his *will*,”—there is the *cause*. The apostle adds,—“wherein he hath *abounded* toward us in all *wisdom* and *prudence*.” It seems God is the author—holy men the subjects—Christ the centre and medium—his will the cause—and glory the end. What shall we say to these things? \* they seem worthy of our best affections, our obedience, and our confidence. They are worth preaching and worth hearing; worth writing and worth reading; they are worth suffering the reproach of men, and suffering the loss of all things. Having these, we possess all that is worth possessing—“*all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ* ;” we have all the *best of blessings* in the *best of places*.

On the part of the *non-elect*, predestination is *permissive* and *passive*. It *permits* evil to be done, but never *effects* the evil committed. The *consequence* of predestination may be endless ruin, because the principle must produce its consequence. Predestination is as conclusive on the part of those who are appointed to wrath, as it is on the part of those who are appointed to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ.

---

\* A popular preacher in the methodist connexion, and not a hundred miles west of Dunstable, was heard in one of his public harangues to exclaim against the doctrine of election, as coming from hell and leading there—as pernicious and damnable. Now as election is represented as coming from God, and leading to God, by what sort of logic are we to conclude that it comes from hell? Is the Almighty there? or are heaven and hell convertible terms? If it invests them with all spiritual blessings how can it injure them? If it saves them from hell, how can it be a damnable sentiment? And if it is for the praise of the glory of God's grace, how can it be a God-dishonouring doctrine? Mr. S. may rage, and his followers imagine a vain thing; nevertheless, the purpose of God, according to *election*, shall stand, and that *not of works*, but of *him* who *calleth*. *Steel* may strike at the *flint* and bruise itself, but if the *flint* strike at the *steel*, the *steel* will be ground to *powder*. The gentleman ought to know, that truth is stronger than *steel* in its *best temper*.

But though this is strictly true, nevertheless, predestination is not the *cause* of their ruin, inasmuch as it never *operates* within them: *sin* is the *working cause* of their condemnation. They could not have been damned without committing sin, any more than the elect could have been saved without the merit of Christ. The reason is clear, because the execution of the decree is a *judicial* act, and therefore must have relation to a *fault*. In the appointment, Jehovah exercised his *liberty*, in the execution thereof he employs his *justice*. In the appointment he did what he *pleased*, in the accomplishment he does what is *just*. He never damns men for his *mere pleasure*, any more than he saves them by his *justice*. Those who are saved are saved by mercy, and those who are damned are damned by justice. The salvation of one class is merciful, and the condemnation of the other is *judicial*. Thus we see, 1. God never acts *unjustly*. 2. That he never causes sin, and therefore cannot be its *author*. 3. That as his decrees are never impulsive men act most *freely*. 4. That their everlasting misery is procured by their own selves. Who can find any fault?

But now seeing he leaves them thus, how can he, 1. Make them an offer of what he has determined to withhold? 2. How can he invite them to be saved seeing he has denied them a Saviour? 3. How can he hold out the idea of happiness to those whom he has appointed to misery? 4. How can he desire to save by his grace those whom he determined to damn for their sin? There appears to be no other alternative, but either to set the face like a flint against predestination, or drop the notion of offered grace. No man can carry them both in his arms at once.

*Hints short and conclusive.*

1. *While predestination INJURE no man's condition it BENEFITS millions.* A great number that no man can number will be saved with an everlasting salvation, and that as the result of predestinating grace.

2. *This doctrine produce the best of effects whenever it operates.* It kindles up the first beam of hope, fills the hand of expectation, elevates the feeling, dignify

the thoughts, fix the affections, produce humility, promote confidence, and advance obedience. It assists in doing all that is well pleasing in the sight of God, and is so far from hindering a sinner's conversion, that it actually produces the very first excitement which puts him upon enquiring, "What must I do to be saved?"

3. *The doctrine of predestination has no unlovely features.* It produces no unwelcome effects, and even where it *denies* it does not *injure*; which seem to me much better than increasing men's damnation by offering favours where there is no intention of bestowing, nor no possibility of receiving. True, as predestination is exhibited by arminians, there may seem to be something extremely terrific about it; but it should always be borne in mind, that by such people it is described by its bitterest enemies—*enemies*, who have not the industry to examine it, the desire to understand it, nor the genius to refute it. Their substitute for these qualifications, is declamation founded upon misrepresentation. They dress it up in all the horrid forms of influential and relentless reprobation, and then exhaust all their stores of eloquence, insolence, metaphor, genius and folly, in pouring down an unmerciful and unmitigated storm of undeserved invective. This, their way, is their folly, yet their hearers approve their sayings. Selah.

4. *The doctrine is discouraging to no one.* Whenever the desire for salvation is felt, predestination wrought the desire and provided the inheritance; it effected the former in order to bestow the latter. It therefore affords the sweetest consolation to think, that I shall possess the thing desired, as sure as I desire the thing.

5. *It encourages no wicked man to sin.* Because, it points out the relation between crime and punishment. The man's destiny is a secret, and while the rolls are laid up in heaven, he is a subject of legal authority, is regarded as a moral creature, and will be dealt with accordingly.

5. *It prohibits no man from seeking after salvation.* The reasons are clear. 1. Because it deprives him of

no moral faculty. 2. Because it operates on no evil principle. 3. Because it places no impediments in his way. 4. Because *sin* has deprived man of the ability and desire, to seek after the welfare of his soul. If there was no predestination, men would never seek after God. It can hinder no effort, because no effort is made.

6. *People therefore, need not be afraid of entering places of worship where the doctrine is preached.* Many people as anxiously shun dissenting meeting houses, where predestination is preached, as they do certain by-lanes, because report say they are haunted by the most frightful of all ghosts—*ghosts*, grinning most horridly—as black as Beelzebub—with long tails, like monkey's—eyes like tea-saucers—cloven feet and dreadful long claws, to tear people to atoms. In short, they believe they come from *hell*. People, however, are assured that they may visit such places without the least danger of being molested, or seeing any frightful ghost, (except their own) much more being clawed to pieces. To be convinced of this, they are recommended to try the experiment, and if they cannot muster sufficient nerve to go by themselves, they are advised either to go with, or follow some one who is in the habit of frequenting such *awful* places.

7. *The doctrine is divine, and cannot be overthrown.* Why do methodist preachers *rave*, and their followers *rage* against predestination? If they imagine they can overthrow it, they imagine a *vain thing*. All things lie within its compass; the whole flux of time flow within its mounds, and the measureless ocean of eternity cannot stretch beyond its reach. It runs its resistless hand along the walls of time, and they moulder beneath its touch. It will apply the torch of dissolution to nature's funeral pile, and complete the general ruin; but itself will remain unhurt, untouched, amidst the war of elements and the wreck of nature. Blessed and happy are they, who are *predestinated to the adoption of sons*.

## THE COVENANT OF GRACE.

It may not be useless to offer a few scriptures to prove that there is such a thing as a covenant of grace. Mr. Wesley pretended, when writing beneath the weight of Gill's polemical arm, that he knew nothing about a covenant of grace; and, indeed, his writings seem strongly to support the fact. I am, however, of a contrary opinion, and submit the following scriptures, in support thereof. 2 Sam. xxiii. 5. Ps. lxxxix. 3—28. Acts xx. 27. 1 Cor. ii. 6—10. 2 Cor. v. 19. Eph. i. 3, 4. 2 Tim. i. 9. It is thought these are sufficient to show, that there is such a thing as a covenant of grace; which covenant I would define, as *a solemn agreement among the eternal three, respecting the salvation of all the elect; in which agreement every thing is properly disposed and infallibly secured.* Such is my definition; the following is the evidence which I advance.

1st. *The signification of the Hebrew roots from whence the word בְּרִית berith, rendered covenant, is derived.* Perhaps no word has ever been more severely criticised than the word *berith*. But truth is never afraid of the critic's sieve. It rather court it as a favour, than dread it as an operation; for the more it is agitated the more pure it becomes, and the more brighter it shines. Discussion when properly conducted, always produce one good effect, and that is, the exposure of minute parts which are of great importance, and which are seldom noticed in commonplace observations. It has also a tendency to preserve truth; but for discussion and criticism, we should have less truth than what exists at the present day. And I am of opinion that as education becomes more general, and a spirit of free inquiry is diffused, that truth will gain ground, and the strong holds of error will be weakened. I feel satisfied that nothing more is necessary than simple and sincere investigation, and I entertain the hope, that some day it will be more extensively encouraged; and that it will be regarded by individuals

as a source of spiritual pleasure and profit, rather than a dry and speculative pursuit. It is under the influence of these feelings, that I shall now collect some of the criticisms on this important subject. The word *berith* is most commonly derived from the word בְּרִית *bara*, which in its primary sense signifies to *create*; and it is certain that the covenant of grace was brought into existence by God. It is a covenant which he calls *his*. He made it, and he established it, so that it stand fast for ever. But in a secondary sense, the same word signifies to *dispose, arrange, methodize, form by accretion of parts*. And then the sense is, that in this covenant every thing is wisely *disposed, arranged, and methodized*. 1. All the vessels of mercy were disposed of in the order of time; when they should be born, regenerated, and die. 2. All the circumstances by which they should be affected, either directly or remotely. 3. All their spiritual mercies were arranged, as to *how, and when, and where* they should be conveyed. 4. As all things are rendered subservient to his church, all the affairs of this lower world are immutably disposed, planned, ordered, and balanced.

But to form by accretion of parts, seem to be another idea. Thus, the earth was without *form, i. e.* in loose unconnected atoms; and its formation or shape was produced by giving a proper disposition to the wild incoherent particles of matter. The animal system which Adam received from the hands of his Maker, was nothing more than atoms of matter mysteriously organized. And the covenant of grace in its formation, seem to answer to this idea, for it is said to be *ordered in all things* and sure. Every thing that falls within the splendid dominions of grace is *ordered* and settled, is placed in a fixed position, and under the fashioning hand of friendship, wise and sovereign, the church with all her blessings have received an aspect and posture, which not all the offers of mercy—not all the carnal measures of the present day—not all the changes and commotions of time—not all the opposition of hell—not all the influence of death—not all the investigation of the judgment day, nor all the rolling

ages of eternity, will ever destroy, will ever derange, or even *interfere* with. Where then is *offered* grace?

But this word in *piel*, has a more significant and impressive meaning, being used to denote *cutting down, slaughtering, dividing*. And hence comes the phrases of *cutting* and *striking* a covenant; though this only regarded the ratification or confirmation of covenants. The ancient method of doing this, was by striking off the head of an animal, cutting it up in pieces, walking between the parts, then sacrificing them, and sometimes even drinking the blood. And practice something like this, according to Mungo Park, and other travellers of credit and interest, seem to exist at the present time in some distant portions of the globe. The parties in the covenant pass between the parts of the slain animal with an oath of execration, signifying their desire to be cut to pieces, to be burnt, and even to have their blood drank by their enemies if they neglected to accomplish the part proposed to them in the agreement. This accounts for the sacred manner in which covenants were always viewed; and the execrable light in which *covenant-breakers* were regarded.

Take an instance or two. The Gibeonites, anxious to preserve themselves and their families from the conquests of the every where successful Israelites, and perhaps more solicitous of maintaining their national character and independence, formed a stratagem that proved partially successful. They dispatched persons who represented themselves as ambassadors from a very distant country, and who presented themselves at the camp, with their old sacks, and old leathern bottles rent and mended. In addition to these, it seems they had old *patched*\* shoes, tattered garments, and mouldy bread—neat *ambassadors* certainly. However, in executing their diplomatic functions, they said, “We be come from a far country, now therefore make ye a

---

\* *Patched shoes*. The word *clouted* signifies here *patched*, from the Anglo-Saxon *clut*, a *clout* or *rag*: and not *nailed*, from the French *clou*, a nail.—C. B.



*league with us.*" *Kirthoo lanoo berith*, "cut or divide with us a covenant;" which seem to denote the covenant sacrifices offered on such occasions.

From quotations out of Homer, and other classical writers, it seems, the Greeks and Romans confirmed their important affairs by the cutting of sacrificed animals; hence the phrase, to cut in pieces the *oath-offering*. See also Jer. xxxiv. 18, 19, 20. Such rights were neither unmeaning nor insignificant, as used by men; but when Jehovah employs such emblematic rites, their magnitude extend beyond the compass of ordinary things, and assume an aspect most solemn and divine. Yet to show the infallible nature of his covenant, he seem to have represented himself as using such rituals. For God, "willing more abundantly to shew unto the *heirs of promise* the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath." Heb. vi. 17. This may explain the phrase of *striking* a covenant. Thus, Jer. xxxi. 33. "This is the covenant that I will *make*,"—that I will *strike*, *i. e.* will ratify by the sacrifice of Christ. Now this is designed to teach us, that the covenant of grace was to be *ratified, sealed, or confirmed* by the sacrifice of Messiah. It was a covenant ratified by *striking, cutting, and slaughtering* the Lord of life and glory. O what a covenant! founded on oaths, and promises, and blood! When he formed the globe he intended to destroy it by water and fire, and as an emblem of its short duration, he "*hung it upon nothing.*" Job xxvi. 7. But when he framed the counsel of peace he designed it to stand for ever, and therefore based it upon his own free and sovereign grace. And to render it free from the appearance of mutation or insincerity, he confirmed it by an oath; and because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself. Now to swear by himself, is to swear by his *life*; the life denote the *best* state of existence; to swear by his life therefore, is to swear by the best state in which he can exist, which stamps the covenant with eternal stability and importance. I must not indulge myself on this subject, but refer the reader to Gen. xv. 9, 10, 17. just remarking that the smoking

furnace and the bright lamp that passed between the pieces, might represent in their highest import, the furnace of wrath into which the slaughtered lamb was cast, and the sparkling, penetrating, and severe nature of divine justice.

Some derive the word from *ברר* *barar*, to *cleanse*, *purify*, *purge*, &c. and this is thought to agree with the greek, *περίκαθαρμα*, to *purge*, or *cleanse all around*, or *thoroughly*; and the thought designed seem to be this, that the covenant should be ratified by cutting off, or cutting down, or cutting to pieces, the purifier as a sacrifice; which sacrifice should be of a strong *deterstive*, *cleansing*, purifying nature, and which had been symbolically represented by the jewish *purification-sacrifice*. If so, this may illustrate these phrases—‘purged away our sins,’—‘the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, *cleanseth* from all sin,—’ ‘forgive us our sins, and *cleanse* us,’ &c.—‘I will keep thee, and give thee for a *covenant* (purifier) of the people.’ Again, ‘I will preserve thee, and give thee for a *covenant*’ (*purifier*) of the people. And it is certain that he bore the sins of *many*, and that the *many* whose sins he bore will be purified and made white; and that through the blood of the everlasting covenant.

O bathe me in thy precious blood,  
Exalt thy power and might,  
Baptize me in thy purple flood,  
And wash the Æthiop white.

Constrain my mind, constrain my soul  
Thy purest love to feel;  
Sprinkle thy blood upon my heart—  
My covenant interest seal.

Lastly, some derive it from the word *ברך* *barah*, which signifies to *eat*, *feast*, &c. Feasting being a sign of lasting friendship; see Gen. xxvi. 30, 31, 34. 2 Sam. iii. 20. where the idea of federal feasting is distinctly marked.

The following case may illustrate the peculiar form and sacred nature of covenants in the East Indies, where self-immolation so extensively prevails. It occurred at *Howrah*, on April 5, 1828. The devotee is described as a young female of prepossessing appearance, and