

outward, represented the atonement as belonging to the twelve tribes of Israel, and that by its virtue, the scattered family of heaven should be collected from the four quarters of the globe; no doubt these figures were designed, to instruct the mind into the suffering of Christ as the great sacrifice for the sins of his people. To me it seems clear, that those emblems were intended to point out the tremendous wrath of God which was poured out in hot and fiery torrents. The wild gourds in exertion or a state of pouring forth, represented the destructive nature of sin, and showed how justice poured the poisonous contents of every sin into the great sea of the Redeemer's sufferings. There was not a sin that had not its deadly poison, and there was not a sin that failed to discharge its contents into the sufferings of Christ, the poison whereof drank up his spirits. The bull in its rage, as the symbol of fire, denoted Jehovah as exerting his power, and pouring forth his burning wrath into the brazen sea in which Immanuel was baptised. While the lion in its exertion, or triumph, was no insignificant symbol of a triumphant Redeemer, who was *covered* in the sea of wrath, that he might cover his people with everlasting glory; and who also rose glorious and triumphant. "Wrath here made its *demand*, the victim by its purity and innocence made a full atonement, and triumphed upon it, and all turned betwixt the image of the lion and man, whose eyes were fixed during this trial upon a *palm-tree* in bloom: a tree that bears the greatest pressure, and thrives the better for it, its perfection being owing to it."—*Bates' Enquiry into the Similitudes*, p. 147.

"I have a baptism," said Christ, "to be baptised with, and how am I *straitened* until it be accomplished." And observe, he was not baptised in a *bason*, but in a *sea*; not *sprinkled*, but *plunged, buried, covered, &c.* and that in a *poisoned, fiery sea*; a sea into which every sin of ransomed mortals had poured its fiery poison, and God had poured his fiery wrath. But the lion of the tribe of Judah prevailed, and everlasting honour and victory arise out of his sufferings; so that his redeemed flock will sing and shout his glorious conquest through

all eternity. This thought is clearly marked in Rev. xv. 2. "And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire; and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God."

"I asked them whence their victory came,
They with united breath,
Ascribed their conquest to the Lamb,
Their victory to his death."

It might be remarked, that as this sea of brass standing upon twelve oxen expressed the peculiar nature of redemption, it must stand opposed to general invitations; for we cannot suppose that there could ever be an offer of grace designed where there was no atonement made. And if it only embraced the twelve tribes, by expiating the sins of all the spiritual seed, how could it be sufficient for any beside? And if not sufficient, how could it justify a general tender of salvation? Did Jehovah make *inquisition*, or search *diligently* for the sins of any besides the elect? And must not his making such a strict enquiry after sins in order to punish them, suppose that Jehovah measured the punishment of Christ by the transgressions of his church? If not, why make such a diligent search and enquiry after them in order to punish for them? Must not such enquiries and examinations be wholly unmeaning, and to say the least of them, could only be conducted for the sake of *amusement*. But God has done nothing with such a view in either creation or providence, and it is only for the sake of erroneous sentiments that people attribute such conduct to him in the economy of grace. It is clear, that if sins are thus distinctly sought out, and punished in Christ for the sake of the elect, the sufficiency cannot be of greater extent, which scriptural sentiment destroys the very *basis* of general invitations and offered grace. But let us pursue the idea of covering a little further. And

4. The word is used in a JUDICIAL sense, "of whose hands have I received כֶּפֶר a *bribe*, וְאֵעָלִים and *hid* mine eyes therewith." 1 Samuel xii. 3. Now God has received a covering at the hands of his

Son, by which his justice is satisfied, and can bring no law charges against his people. But has he received this *covering* for any besides? If not, how can he invite them to be saved? And by what rule can he make a general tender of salvation? Christ must have either covered the eyes of the law for all mankind or not; if he has, how is it that any of the human race are lost? How came Judas to go to perdition when he went to his own home? The covering surely could not be complete, and instead of a general sufficiency, there seems to have been a general *deficiency*. But if Christ has not given a covering into the hands of God for all mankind, and it is evident that he has not, how absurd it must be to invite them.

5. *To appease an offended person.* Thus Jacob said, "I will *cover* his face with the present." Gen. xxxii. 20. I will appease his anger, and shelter myself from his frowns. So Christ, has presented his sufferings and righteousness to God, who has declared that he is pacified towards his people for all that they have done; and that Christ is his beloved Son in whom he is well pleased. So that while his chosen seed stand sheltered beneath his precious atonement, there is no dissatisfaction nor angry condition of mind in the party offended. But if Christ has not sheltered any beside his church, why invite them? Is God pacified for all that they have done? If not, how can he make them an offer of favour? If he invites all to be saved, must it not suppose that he is alike pacified towards all? If not, offers of grace must be preposterous indeed.

6. *To cover the transgressions of the transgressor.* "And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, ye have sinned a great sin; and now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement (כִּפָּר *covering*) for your sin," Exod. xxxviii. 30. Again, "help us, O God of our salvation, for the glory of thy name: וְכַפֵּר and *cover our transgressions* for thy name's sake," Ps. lxxix. 9. "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, and whose sin is *covered*," Ps. xxxii. 1. Now if sins are covered only by the atoning blood of Christ, it is necessary to enquire

if he has covered the sins of all the human race, and if so, how is it that God should sentence any man to endless torments? He cannot for his sins if they are covered, and the covering is complete. But if not for their sins, what can it be for? Is there any thing else besides sin, that can justify God in pronouncing upon his creatures the awful sentence of damnation? Surely not. Then independent of scripture authority, we must conclude that redemption is particular. And if this is true, we are led to enquire how Jehovah can make an offer of salvation to all mankind when only some are redeemed. Has Christ covered their sins by the worth of his atoning sacrifice? No. Can they cover them from the eye of justice themselves? They cannot. Is there any other covering under the heavens? There is no such thing; the universe cannot afford a shelter. Yet so complete is the covering for his church, that "he beholds *no iniquity in JACOB*, nor perverseness in Israel;" but can this be said of any beside? It cannot, for they are loathsome and in their blood, and the sinner dying an hundred years old shall be *accursed*. Then if Christ has not covered their sins, and there is no other covering, there must necessarily be an everlasting exposure of them. And how can Christ invite those for whom he never provided an atonement? Can they receive remission of sins? That is impossible. Can they be justified in their sins? No, for that is contrary to the *holiness* of God. Then how is it possible for them to be invited upon the ground of offered mercy? The truth is, we must either plead for the arminian doctrine of general redemption, or else discard the notion of offered grace; supposing however that we desire to rank among sober-minded christians.

7. *To annul a covenant, which is engraven upon marble slabs or tables of stone by smearing or covering it.* Isaiah xxviii. 18. is sufficient to justify this idea. It stands thus — your covenant with death shall be *disannulled*, or *besmeared*, or *covered over* as the ark was with pitch, so as to fill up all the cracks or fissures. The idea is to be taken from the ancient practice, of engraving the terms of a covenant on blocks

of stone or marble slabs, with a view of rendering the compact conspicuous and lasting. But the prophet assures them that the articles of the covenant should be so besmeared with things of an adhesive quality, as to render the characters illegible, and thus the covenant should be dissolved by nullifying the terms of agreement. Or in other words, that the dissolution of the covenant should be as sudden and complete, as if some one had obliterated all the characters by which the stipulations were formally expressed; and thus cancelled the obligation by, effacing or rendering the terms obscure and illegible.

This will illustrate the dissolution of the covenant of works by the blood of Christ, in behalf of those for whom he bled and died; which covenant is an everlasting covenant, and hold both the parties to obligation. Ye are not under the law but under grace, said the apostle; by which I understand the dissolution of the covenant of works, as a condemning covenant; or a covenant requiring conditions which cannot be met by empty offenders, and yet condemning them for their breach of covenant. But how is this dissolved? By the precious blood of Christ being poured over the articles and stipulations, so as to obliterate and destroy every vestige of a covenant of works. Here let it be observed, that Christ has not obliterated the *precepts*, but the form of their *arrangement*, by which the obligation to punishment is blotted out. It is the same law in a new relation; the same precepts in a new order. The *form* of precept is altered, but its *morality* remains eternally *untouched*. The stipulations are covered and obliterated for ever by the merits of Christ, whose sufferings have been weighed against those of the law, and taken as an equivalent. The enquiry is now, whether the covenant of works is abolished for all mankind, or *only* for all the elect. Assuming the latter to be true, the next question is, can any man be saved by the covenant of works? The answer is in the *negative*; decidedly so. Can pardoning grace be given to any but those who are delivered from the covenant of works by the blood of the everlasting covenant of

grace? This is seldom contended for. Then if it never can be *given* to any beside, how can it be *offered* to any others? How is this question to be answered? Does Jehovah offer to his creatures what he cannot give? What he has not to impart? Does he know that their depravity is such that they never will make application, and that therefore the offers will never be accepted? Then where can be the utility of making them? Because of human depravity he knows he is secure, will he therefore offer upon pain of eternal death what he never can, nor never meant to bestow? Is he determined to increase the fury of eternal torments, because he knows they never will nor can make application for what he never will nor can bestow, although he may surround them with a system of *empty offers*? Shocking conclusions; insulting divinity. But it *suits* the march of intellect, the improved state of morals and society!

8. *To cover by way of ORNAMENT*, and is applied to the al-hennah, or cypress tree, mentioned in Cant. i. 14. because the African ladies are in the habit of covering, dying, or tinging, their *lips, hair, hands, and feet*, with the powder of this plant. It thus forms an indispensable article for the *toilet*, and the kind ladies are said to be so excessively fond of this plant for ornamental purposes, that they endure with cheerfulness almost any kind of privation in order to obtain the *al-hennah*. "This beautiful odoriferous plant," says Dr. Shaw, "if it is not annually cut and kept low, grows ten or twelve feet high, putting out its little flowers in *clusters*, which yields a most fragrant smell like *camphor*. The leaves of this plant, after they are dried and powdered, are disposed of to good advantage in all the markets of this kingdom (meaning Tunis). For with this all the African ladies, that can purchase it, *tinge* their *lips, hands, hair and feet*; rendering them thereby of a tawney colour: which with them is reckoned a great beauty." —Travels, p. p. 113, 114. And it seems customary for ladies of rank, to *tinge* or *cover* themselves, pretty thickly with the al-hennah previous to their appearing in public. Will not this explain Psalm cxlix. 4. "He

will *beautify* the meek with salvation." And also Psalm xlv. 10. "The King's daughter is all *glorious within*." Within what? Not within *herself* surely; but within the royal Palanquin. The figure is borrowed from oriental customs, and the idea is to be taken from an eastern bride dying, or staining herself with the powder of the al-hennah, and arraying herself in all the splendour of eastern ornaments and apparel. Thus arrayed, she enters within a splendid palanquin, which corresponds in pomp and style with the dignity and grandeur of a royal bride. Within this vehicle are short sentences, fond expressions, and poetical mottos, expressive of the attachment of the bridegroom to the bride. Now under such circumstances as these, i. e. being beautified with the al-hennah, attired in magnificent garments, decked with brilliant ornaments, and seated in a stately vehicle which surrounds her with expressions of glowing affection, she must be all *glorious within*. Such is the church in the covenant of grace, which answers to Solomon's royal palanquin. It is the production of royal love, and designed for Jesus and his royal bride. It is paved or spread with glorious purposes, promises, and expressions of everlasting love; and is composed of the best materials in the best form and manner. Jesus, her beautifying al-hennah, was cut down in bloom, *withered* and *powdered* for her. His royal atonement, united with the Spirit's royal unction, becomes her beautifying righteousness; and adorned in the ornaments of holiness, she will openly appear as Immanuel's bride. Seated in the covenant of grace, in all the splendour of her marriage robes, she will be surrounded with innumerable expressions of covenant love, and borne in triumph by applauding angels to the royal palace above. She shall be *brought* into the *king* in raiment of needle-work. The same train of thinking, might be made to bear upon believers in a distributive sense. They are seated in the covenant of grace, surrounded and borne up by its promises, oaths, and blood; clothed in the robes of righteousness, and beautified with the ornaments of salvation, they shall enter into the *king's palace*.

This likewise illustrates the conditions of the covenant on the part of the ALCIM to the human nature of Christ; viz. that in consequence of suffering the just for the unjust he should be advanced to great dignity, and see the travail of his soul in a progeny as numerous and splendid, as the sparkling drops of dew when the opening morning pour its golden rays of light over the spangled lawns. And that these should willingly offer themselves in the beauties or ornaments of holiness, and live and reign in splendid triumphs with him world without end. These were covenant oaths, and agree with the language of Psalm xxxix. 20. where Jehovah is represented as reciting covenant transactions for the comfort of his church in the following singular language. “I have laid help upon one that is mighty.” Heb. שׁוֹיִתִּי עֹז. I have *equalized* help. Meaning that Jehovah had proportioned or balanced his strength against his sufferings; which seems to denote that his sufferings were weighed or balanced against his people’s sins, and that his strength was equalized to his day of suffering. Now surely it will not be said, that had the sins of his people been more, or his people been a greater number, that the burden laid upon Christ would not have been heavier, and that Jehovah would not have added a proportion of strength so as to have equalized one against the other. This was his debasement and suffering; mark his advancement and glory, as described in Psalm xxi. 6. His glory is great in thy salvation; תְּשׁוּהָה thou hast *equalized* upon him, honour and majesty. Now what can this mean, but that as his sufferings were weighed against the sins of his people, so his glory should be as extensive as his sufferings, covenant promises, and his own anticipations. The honour and glory enjoyed in the salvation of his church, is an equivalent to his sufferings and death; just as they were an equivalent to the injuries which his law sustained. In my view, the sufferings and merit of the Redeemer, were of equal weight to the tremendous load of sin, and the sufferings which were due thereto; and that justice held the balance with such nice exactness, that when it stood in a state of equiponderancy,

he said, it is *enough*; the sufferer exclaimed it is *finished*, bowed his head, and gave up the ghost. *More* would have been *useless*; and I cannot conceive how God could punish his Son in vain. Neither his love, justice, covenant, nor promises, would allow him to do it. He was deeply sunk in suffering and disgrace, but he is as highly exalted in glory and honour. He bore a heavy load of sin and guilt, but God has laid as heavy a mass of honour and majesty upon him.

Such are my thoughts upon the sublime doctrine of redemption, and it is evident that if they are firmly established they must sunder to tatters the mysterious tissue of general sufficiency and offered grace. But let us fairly meet the objections, and though the resistance they may offer is truly feeble, let us be courteous to those where honest integrity guide their little forces.

I begin by noticing those presented by TIMOTHY DWIGHT, S.T.D. L.L.D. in his series of sermons, vol. ii. p.p. 344, 345. The position is, *the atonement of Christ was sufficient in its extent to open the door for the pardon of all human sinners.*

This is a position of great weight, and the writer seemed fully aware of it, by the anxious manner in which he attempted its support. The system of offered grace and lawless invitations turn upon this point, which has been totally destroyed by the preceding observations in this work. With regard to the position itself, it seems to me unpardonably defective. Its strength lies in its deficiency, and we are under the necessity of guessing at the learned gentleman's idea. Allow me the liberty of defending the learned man from the influence of his own position. "The atonement of Christ was (*is*) sufficient in its extent to open *the door* for the pardon of all human sinners." The atonement is here represented as sufficient to open *the door*. But *what door*? This is the chief thing in the proposition, and this is totally concealed from the search of enquiry. It is impossible to tell what door is meant, because *no door* is definitely mentioned; and to put definite articles

before nouns undetermined and unreferred to, is a sure way of involving a subject in obscurity. Such is the case before us.

The most probable sense is, that the door of *sin*, or of *hope*, or of *mercy* is intended. Let us examine each.

1. *The door of sin.* Men are certainly in fetters and in prison, and sin may fitly be compared to a door by which they are kept in awful confinement. Now, as nothing but the atonement can liberate the sinner, the question is, does the atonement embrace the sins of all mankind or not? This is decided by asking another. Were the sins of all the human race imputed to Christ? This will be answered both in the negative and affirmative, by different parties. If the latter, did he make a *full* atonement for them. If he did, can they ever be charged upon the transgressors after they have been expiated by the *atoner*? We are compelled to answer *no*. Then if not, how is it that any of the human race perish in eternal misery? This question is for ever unanswerable, and oblige us to answer the question relating to the general imputation of sin in the *negative*. This opens *the door* for another enquiry, viz. if the sins of all the human race were not imputed to Christ, how can their sins be pardoned and their liberty proclaimed? Can the prison door be opened if the prisoner is not ransomed? And can he be ransomed if his sins were not imputed to Christ? Most certainly *not*. Then so far is the atonement from *opening* the prison door for all mankind, that it does not set it on the *jar*; nor even so much as turn the key, nor draw the bolt. But further, is the atonement sufficient to open the door without the prisoner's assistance, or is it not? If it is, of course the door will be opened, and if it is not, it never can. If the sinner is to open the prison door with the atonement, is the atonement to be brought *into* the prison, or is he to get out of prison before he can find the key and loose his chains? The latter is ridiculous, and if the former is chosen, must not the door be opened before the atonement is possessed? A sinner cannot be in prison when the atonement glows in his bosom. Besides, what can a dead

man in a prison do, towards liberating himself? Throw the key of the door to him through the bars, and entreat him to let himself out, what effect would it have? Just none at all; and would be as *ludicrous* as *un-useful*. And to defend offers of grace by pretending men have a *natural* ability, is like attempting to defend such conduct referred to, by asserting that the prisoner though he was dead, had a *natural* ability to do it; and that he only wanted the *will*.—That the muscular powers of his physical system was quite adapted to the business, and that nothing more was necessary but the *will*. Who would not see through the fallacy of such reasoning? Or if the aforesaid person should attempt to justify his practice, by urging the *general sufficiency* of the key to open *the door* wide enough for the prisoner to receive a pardon for his crimes, provided he would but get up and use it, of what use would that be? The man is dead, unconcerned about his sovereign and himself, and even unconscious of his imprisonment. Of what use is either the key, or its general sufficiency to him? There might as well be no key at all; or a key sufficient to unlock a limited number of wards where the prisoners inhabited a principle of life, would answer as many purposes as one of general elasticity. And perhaps a few more.

Should it be said, but Christ has opened *the door* himself, and therefore the sinner has nothing to do but to dislodge the rivets of his chains and walk out. I ask again, are their crimes expiated? If not, will justice allow the door to be opened at all? If they are, must not justice command some one else, to unclench their chains and set them free? Most certainly. Then why talk about the atonement being *sufficient* to open the door for the pardon of all human sinners. Besides, if Jehovah has opened the door for every individual, must it not be with a design to liberate them? And then why not give life to all the dead? Why not convince every one of sin, righteousness, and of judgment to come? If he has provided, will he not bestow the blessing of spiritual life? especially as his designs cannot be fulfilled without? If he did not design their

spiritual freedom, why open the door at all? If such conduct was ascribed to men, would it not be thought something like playing the *hypocrite*? But some people are in the habit of ascribing to God what they would *scorn* to have imputed to themselves!

2. If the door of hope is meant, I should like to ascertain what hope the atonement can open to those whose sins the Redeemer never bore. Was Jesus the substitute of any beside the elect? No. Did he expiate their guilt? No. Has he wrought out a righteousness for them? No. Will he send down the Holy Ghost to quicken and sanctify them? No. Does he intercede for them? No. Has he entered into heaven as their forerunner? No. Then how is it sufficient to open a door of hope to all mankind? *It cannot be.*

3. If the door of mercy should be designed, may I take the liberty of enquiring, how mercy can be *bestowed* without the expiation of guilt, and how it can be *withheld* if sins are blotted out? Should it be said, their sins are not pardoned but pardonable, I immediately ask what is it renders them pardonable? Is it believing in Jesus as a common Saviour? Then the act of the creature regulates the conduct of the eternal God. But how can mental agency affect divine simplicity? And how can the atonement be complete? If the sinner has anything to do before forgiveness can be obtained, he must be an active party in his salvation; and if he has nothing to perform God must be unjust, enormously unjust, not to extend forgiveness when the equivalent is received. Beside, what becomes of his oath and promises, if those whom Immanuel ransomed are not pardoned and glorified? If salvation is not *finished*, who in either heaven or earth can complete it? Or if that part which respects the elect is perfected, and that part which contemplates the rest unfinished, of what use is the uncompleted part? If it is not finished, it might as well never have been begun; for if men cannot complete it themselves, it must be an *unfinishable* one after all. And then the conclusion is, God began what will never be finished. Or that Christ began what neither himself nor any

body else could conclude! But if he began it and did not finish it, it must be for want of either will or power. If the former why begin it, and why alter his mind? And how can his work answer to divine arrangements? If the latter, how could Jehovah equalize strength upon him? How could he be the mighty God? But let us turn our attention to the arguments in behalf of the supposed sufficiency of the atonement. They are six in number, and stand in the following order.

1. "The atonement which was necessary for a world, was equally necessary and in just the same manner and degree for an individual sinner."

This argument rests upon the assumption, that the design of the atonement was to establish the moral government of God by vicarious suffering, so as to place the lawgiver in a situation of extending mercy to all the human race. This assumption has never been proved, nor never will from the scriptures of truth. I have brought abundant evidence in the preceding pages, to prove that the measures of sin and suffering are of equal extent, which overthrows the argument I am noticing. I therefore dismiss it.

2. "The atonement was, by the infinite dignity and excellence of the Redeemer rendered infinitely meritorious. But it cannot be denied, that an infinitely meritorious atonement is sufficient for all the apostate children of Adam."

To this it is replied, the infinity of the Redeemer's merit, regard the infinite magnitude of sins as *relative* evils, and not as *physical* acts. It will be said, could Immanuel make *less* than an infinite atonement? Certainly he *could*, just in the same manner as an infinite Creator could make a *finite* creature. An infinite being may perform a limited act. But is not his atonement infinite? No. We no where read in the bible that it is. A physical action is *relatively* infinite, this deserves a *certain quantum* of punishment, but evidently not an *infinitude* of punishment, i. e. punishment infinitely intense and eternal in its duration. If that was the case, the Redeemer could not have atoned for more than one *single sin*, nor that neither; because to have done it, he must have suffered through all eternity. An infinite

Being could not enable an inferior nature to bear an infinite load, nor sustain more than infinite intensesness. In addition to this, if every sin deserved an infinitude of suffering, God could not render to every man according as his evil works have been, which would oblige him to falsify his word. Neither could there be any degrees in the magnitude and malignancy of sin; nor could Satan be punished more *severely* than the least offender in the bottomless pit.

The atonement is, in my view, of equal extent with the demerit of his church; and this arose out of his sufferings and death. It does not appear to me, that the worth of the atoning sacrifice arose wholly out of the divine nature, for if it did, less suffering might have sufficed, and the sufferings of his body *only* have been sufficient. The scripture idea seems to be this, viz. that divine justice poured upon the person of Christ all the wrath that was due to the sins of those for whom he suffered; and that the divine nature enabled the human to sustain it. While at the same time the divine nature poured all its worth into the sufferings of the human, which enabled the Redeemer to atone for all the sins of his people in the space of time he did. And from this it seems plain, that had the sins of his people been more or larger, the wrath of God would have been proportioned thereto, and the sufferings of Christ have been enlarged accordingly. But it is exceedingly clear from this view of the subject, that the merit of the atonement is of no larger extent than his sufferings, and that it is infinite in no other sense than the demerit of sin. It will therefore be allowed, as plainly it must, that such an atoning sacrifice while it completely removes the transgressions of his church, extends its influence no farther, nor contains any sufficiency to cancel the guilt of even another individual. This destroys the force of the most respectable argument for general sufficiency.

3. "If the atonement of Christ consisted in suffering what those for whose sins he atoned deserved to suffer, his mediation did not lessen the evils of the apostacy. All the difference which it made in the state

of things was, that he suffered in the stead of those whom he came to redeem, and suffered the same miseries which they were condemned to suffer. In other words, an innocent being suffered the very misery which the guilty would have suffered. Of course there is in the divine kingdom, just as much misery, with the mediation of Christ, as there would have been without it; and nothing is gained by this wonderful work, but the transfer of this misery from the guilty to the innocent."

I have transcribed the whole of this argument, to guard against misrepresentation. The principal thought in this erroneous argument is, the mediation of Christ as designed to diminish the quantum of moral evil. Let us investigate it.

There appears but three ways by which this could be effected, viz. by rendering his mediation meritorious in the same sense as his sufferings; or by forgiving sin without a full atonement; or else by exerting the influence of his mediation to prevent its commission. Now his mediation cannot form any part of the atonement, because, 1. It is evidently founded upon it. 2. It would render the atonement incomplete, until the judgment day. Nor 2, can his mediation lessen the evils of the apostacy by blotting them out, without a full atonement by suffering. For 1. that would place his mediation upon the immediate ground of sovereign favour; which is contrary to its scriptural idea, as represented by the Mediator himself in John xvii. 24. "Father, I *will* that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am," &c. Beyond dispute, his mediation is there represented as resting upon the basis of an acquired right. 2. If so, his mediation would be extended equally to all, which is not the case, the Mediator himself being witness; see the chapter before referred to: "I pray not for the world," &c. 3. It would be equally influential, which is denied by facts; except however, it be said, the creature did not do his part, which is pelagianism, unrefined and unsophisticated. As to the *third* possible way of lessening the evils of the apostacy, by exerting the influence of his mediation, to prevent the commission of evil, this he can do upon the ground of

an atonement limited in its value and design. He implants a holy principle in them, and thus they are prevented from many *internal* errors. He sends the Holy Spirit as a Spirit of instruction that they may be guided into the truth as it is in Jesus, and thus prevent them from many *doctrinal* sins ; and he likewise prays that while his people are in the world, they may be *kept from* the world, and thus prevented from many *practical* transgressions. Now if we consider the vast number of sins which a regenerate person is prevented from committing, after called by divine grace, if we reflect on the innumerable crimes they would have committed in the regions of misery, and if to this we add the subject of infant salvation, we shall easily perceive that the thoughts of the learned man took a *wrong course* when he concluded there was as much misery in the divine kingdom with the mediation of Christ as there would have been without it. “ And nothing is gained,” continues the Rev. gentleman, “ by this wonderful work, but the transfer of this misery from the guilty to the innocent.” Surely Mr. D. could not have thought upon his subject, or else must have aimed at prejudicing the minds of his hearers, by perverting a doctrine which he had not arguments to overthrow. He must know that by the transfer of guilt to the innocent, the guilty gains his justification ; by the spilling of his blood the filthy obtain purity, &c. The Redeemer gains a glorious exaltation, and the whole church a glorious salvation. They enjoy godliness with contentment, which upon the apostle’s calculation was *great* gain. In a word, they escape hell, and they gain heaven ; by which it seems there is not only something gained, but we must die to give a detail of its extent !

4. “ If Christ has not made a sufficient atonement for others beside the elect, then his salvation is not offered to them at all,” &c. This witness is true. And as I have by various arguments proved that the atonement is of limited sufficiency, the argument before me bends all its weight to that side of the question on which I am proud to stand as a feeble advocate.

5. “ The gospel, or glad tidings published by Christ,

is said to be good tidings unto all people. But if there be no atonement made for the sins of all people, the gospel, instead of being good news to them, is not addressed to them at all." Allow me to enquire, if by all people are meant every individual of the human race, how Herod and *all* Jerusalem with him came to be *troubled* when the tidings were conveyed to them? And how it could be good news to all mankind when the major part never heard the report? This must be explained and confirmed, or the argument is totally useless.

6. "Ministers are required to preach faith as well as repentance to all sinners as their duty. But if no atonement has been made for their sins, they cannot believe; for to them, Christ is in no sense a Saviour, and therefore not even a possible object of their faith."

This is begging a debated point, and assuming what ought to be proved. The assumption is likewise involved in perplexity. If by *faith* is meant the act of crediting the report, and by repentance the act of desisting from immoral practices prohibited in the gospel, the things assumed will be granted. But if the faith of God's elect is the faith designed, and that repentance which is the result of spiritual principles infused and implanted in the soul, the correctness of the idea on which the argument turns is denied in *toto*.

But what is the faith of God's elect? Is it a *principle*, a *habit*, a *quality*, an *exercise of the heart*, or a *state of mind*? Without staying to examine the various arguments in support of each, suffer me to state my own thoughts; which is briefly done in the following form. "Faith is a peculiar state of mind, produced by the action of a supernatural principle." This supernatural principle is that of spiritual life, which when acted upon, affects the various attributes of the soul and passions of the mind, and thus gives birth to spiritual hope, love, faith, joy, &c. This divine principle carries the mind in which it resides above its natural sphere in five particulars; in perception, reclamation, appropriation, exultation, anticipation. *Perception*; this regards both the action and quality of the principle,

which is *efficient* and *spiritual*. *Reclination*; the act of reposing or resting, in the worth and efficiency of those things which are presented to the mind. *Appropriation*; taking hold, claiming, and embracing those things discovered and trusted in as my own. *Exultation*; the delightful exercise of pouring out the soul to God in strains of gratitude and triumph. *Anticipation*; enjoying before-hand the happiness and bliss of open vision, and likeness to the Lamb.

“ My soul *anticipates* the day,
Would stretch her wings and soar away—
A song to aid, a crown to wear,
And bow, the chief of sinners there.” *Altered.*

From this statement it will be observed, 1. that faith arises from a principle which Adam never possessed. 2. That therefore he could not lose it. 3. That as such, it cannot be the duty of his posterity to acquire in a state of depravity what they never possessed in innocence. 4. Supposing Adam *did* possess it, he never could have lost it, because it is the seed of God, which *liveth* and *abideth for ever*. 5. Even supposing that he did lose it, it would not follow by just consequences that it is the duty of his posterity to reproduce it. It was his duty to have *preserved* it; but reproduction would make creating power the duty of a creature. A simple illustration will make this idea quite plain. Suppose a master transmits to his servant the sum of a thousand pounds in paper money, to be employed in a manner and form described; and which sum is to be transmitted to all his children, providing that the primeval receiver preserves the donation by consistent deportment. But suppose that instead of employing it, he is tempted to cast it into the fire, and thus reduce it to ashes. He thus loses the principle by which his master's business was conducted, which disables him for his master's service, and involves his posterity in poverty. Now the question to be mooted would be, was it the servant's *duty* to have reproduced the paper, after its materials were dispersed in a thousand different ways? And also if it would constitute the duty of his children to bring into being what their