

4227. 1  
4226. 1 27

**DIALOGUE**  
CONCERNING THE  
*DOCTRINE of ATONEMENT,*

BETWEEN  
**A CALVINIST**  
AND  
**A HOPKINSIAN;**

WHEREIN  
*A NUMBER OF THE ARGUMENTS*  
ON BOTH SIDES OF THE QUESTION  
ARE ENDEAVOURED TO BE  
CANDIDLY EXAMINED,  
THAT THE  
**TRUTH MAY APPEAR.**

INTENDED AS AN ANSWER TO A LATE PUBLICATION OF  
MR. L. WORCESTER'S ON THAT AND OTHER  
SUBJECTS CONNECTED WITH IT.

.....  
WRITTEN BY WILLIAM GIBSON,  
MINISTER OF REFGATE.  
.....

*He that is first in his own cause, seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh and proveth him. .... SOLOMON.*

.....

WINDSOR;  
PRINTED BY ALDEN SPOONER,  
1803.

## ERRATA.

<i>Page.</i>	<i>Line.</i>	<i>From.</i>	<i>For,</i>	<i>Read.</i>
8	3	<i>bottom,</i>	particular	universal.
13	16	<i>top,</i>	aproximate	and aproximate
do.	do.	<i>bottom,</i>	read	rid.
do.	7	<i>do.</i>	proves	proving.
16	6	<i>do.</i>	see	to see.
25	3	<i>top,</i>	Chap. xi.	Chap. ii.
do.	10	<i>bottom,</i>	imagine	imagine,
28	12	<i>top,</i>	will	while.
32	do.	<i>bottom,</i>	once	one.
35	21	<i>do.</i>	John xi. 2.	John ii. 2.
37	20	<i>do.</i>	atonemne	atonement.
45	7	<i>top,</i>	ment	meant.
46	11	<i>bottom,</i>	had	he had.
51	4	<i>top,</i>	petitia	petitio.
52	9	<i>do.</i>	prevents	prevent.
53	21	<i>do.</i>	or to	or.
do.	do.	<i>bottom,</i>	in order of	in order to.
54	13	<i>top,</i>	than	then
do.	20	<i>bottom,</i>	ar	or.
57	5	<i>top,</i>	ides	ideas.
do.	8	<i>do.</i>	one	none.
61	3	<i>bottom,</i>	is	are.
65	2	<i>top,</i>	obtain	maintain.
do.	19	<i>bottom,</i>	was	were.
74	1	<i>top,</i>	to	was to.



.....

## INTRODUCTION OR PREFACE.

.....

*To form an apology for my publication I do not intend to spend many words, as both the people in connexion with me, in this place, and those in the neighbourhood, know that the foundation upon which we that are Calvinists have held, has been boldly attempted to be overturned by a gentleman in our neighbourhood, who seems to be well acquainted with the new American divinity—or, in other words, the Hopkinsian System, and has even improved upon it, though Mr. HOPKINS has laid the foundation on which he builds. As the generality of what is said strikes at the System of Calvinists, I should have left the defence of it, in print, to some more able divine of that party, had it not been that a Sermon of mine, lately published, gave occasion for his last publication: also, he charges me personally with holding some erroneous opinions which I disclaim—such as, that unbelief is not sinful, for which I am called to take up my pen, which I did not design to resume in this way, and defend myself from these aspersions. I have neither had time nor conveniency to discuss this subject as it deserves, being very important. I have only brought a few things into view to help the weak of the flock until something more valuable be brought forward by the Church on the Hopkinsian System. In order that it may be adapted to the weakest capacity, I have done it by way of dialogue, that it may be easily understood, and that the sentiments of each may appear by themselves. It was not my intention to contend for personal honor, but for the truth, and therefore I have used such a style as, I suppose, any person may understand, shunning every word that might not be easily understood; knowing in some measure the capacity of the people in the corner. I have treated the subject as candidly as possible, and used no arguments in defence of the opinions I hold but what appear to me to be lawful and scriptural; and which appear to have real weight in this contest, at least, I am fully convinced that they are so. I have kept as close to the subject in dispute in this dialogue as the nature of the subject would admit. I have treated my opponent sometimes as an Arminian, as he seems in many things to hold with them, and useth the same arguments with them frequently. I have passed no part of Mr. Worcester's publication because of the difficulty of answering it, where he seems to attack Calvinism, or the sentiments which I held: on the contrary, I have*

fixed upon all places where his arguments appear strongest, and have paid little attention to some of it, as being unworthy of notice; other parts are so easily answered by every one who believes the shorter Catechism, that I have passed them over for the sake of brevity. I have quoted his own words, in general, that fair play might be given to him, and where I did not, I have taken what I understood to be his sentiment, and have allowed his arguments all the weight they will reasonably bear; and as the doctrine of atonement is a fundamental doctrine, I have dwelt most upon it where it came in my way. I have attempted to make the scriptures my counsellors on these subjects, and may say with the Apostle, I have not consulted with flesh and blood, as none of my brethren in the Ministry were within my reach: therefore, if there is any thing wrong in this essay, to defend the truth, no one is to blame but myself; the Church is not to be blamed. Had health and other things admitted, I had written it over again, and abridged some places, enlarging upon others: but as this cannot be done, I hope the candid will pardon weaknesses that appear, if truth is not injured. So praying that the Lord may get glory and the people good by it, however weak the performance, this is all the desire of

W. G.

*A Dialogue between MR. WORCESTER, Pastor of Peacham, and  
Mr. GIBSON, Minister of Ryegate, supposed to take place*

1863.

**M**R. WORCESTER, Good morning Mr. Gibson, how do you do, and how does your family?

Mr. Gibson, Well, sir, are you and family well?

Wor. Well, sir, what is your news?

Gib. Nothing of importance at present, have you any thing new, sir, at this time?

Wor. Not much, sir, but I have seen a sermon of yours, in which you have in some places, mistaken my meaning; and in other places, accused me of contradiction, in that wherein I think I can convince you, I am not inconsistent with myself, in these doctrines.

Gib. I should be sorry, sir, if I have mistaken your meaning, in any case: for I do not wish to contend about words, with any persons, or the mode of expression. I had no design to misrepresent the subject. But, wherein have I done so?

Wor. Especially, respecting the doctrine of atonement, or the propitiation of Christ, which I do not understand as you do: for I see that you understand it under the idea of a price, or debt paid; but, I never understood it so, nor does it appear to mean a price, or debt paid, in any case; but only a declaration that God is disposed to forgive sins, and no more!

Gib. This is a new notion of atonement, of which I have not been accustomed to hear. It has not been the idea of it, with Calvinist or Orthodox divines that ever I met with, or have been accustomed to read. It is, sir, to me a new idea. I would be glad to hear the arguments for such an opinion: for I have still believed the contrary, and it will be no advantage to me to be wrong; nor, do I desire to be so, in any case. I cannot believe it, as yet, and I believe I shall be very hard to convince, that this is the scriptural idea, of the doctrine of atonement.

Wor. It may be a new idea to *the old country people*; but, it is no novel idea in this country; and, besides some in the old country understand it thus: especially a Baptist Minister of London understands it as I do, and has written convincingly on that subject, which, I will send you, if you will read any thing in opposition to your own opinion! This, I hope, will convince you, that I am right.

Gib. I know that Dr. Owen, a leader among the independents, believes otherwise, and I think he was well acquainted with

the Bible and *new covenant plan of salvation*. I did not know that any person had your idea of atonement. However, I should be glad to see the book, and I shall endeavor to read it with candor, and give my opinion ingeniously: for I mean to yield to what appears to me to be the strongest arguments, and, therefore, shall thank you to send me the book.

*Wor.* I believe I must write again and convince you, that I am not inconsistent, and defend my opinions before the world, and against your attacks.

*Gib.* I should be satisfied you would: for, I have no desire to be wrong, if I be so; but should you do so you will need to bring forth your strongest arguments, on this subject: for, I believe, I shall scarcely be convinced, either that you have right notions of the doctrine of atonement, or that you are consistent with yourself.

*Wor.* I believe I must teach you better.

*Gib.* I have much need of instruction.

So we parted for that time.

A second supposed meeting between Messrs. *Wor.* and *Gib.*

*Gib.* Well, sir, you have not sent me the exhibition of the London Baptist, as you promised; but, I suppose, you have given me substantially, his arguments, on the doctrine of atonement, in your last publication, entitled—*The Doctrine of Atonement*, and others connected with it, stated and vindicated, of which you have been so good as to send me a copy, for which I am much obliged to, and shall do you the like favor.

*Wor.* Well, sir, I shall be glad to have your opinion of it in a few words.

*Gib.* That I can and will cheerfully give, both in public and private. I do not love it much: I look upon it to be much worse, and much more erroneous, and contradictory than your former exhibition; though I do not say, more dangerous: for a person must be very ignorant, both of the doctrine of the Bible, and of the opinions of orthodox writers on that subject, of every denomination, that can believe what you there exhibit, as your opinion of the doctrine of atonement, and other things, &c.

*Wor.* What see you wrong in it, I believe it all to be *scripture doctrine*.

*Gib.* I believe the very contrary, notwithstanding your confidence in the truth of it: I look upon the greater part of it as exceptionable.

*Wor.* Please to specify, and show one thing wrong in it.

*Gib.* Yes, sir, I will. The very title of it is wrong: for, in my opinion, and if the majority of writers on the doctrine of atonement, have understood the subject aright, the title of

your last publication, should have been, *The doctrine of atonement contradicted and opposed*: for, in my humble opinion, you have contradicted and denied radically, every notion substantially, that writers, belonging to the *reformed churches*, have ever had. Indeed, I know of no party, but Socenians that can, at all, agree with your opinion of the atonement.

*Wor.* This is a strange opinion, and I believe wrong, but, suppose it true, that I differed from all men, on this subject, that does not make it wrong: for I pay little attention to the opinions of others; when I suppose them wrong. I am not bound to believe anything because others have believed it. — Besides, I believe, indeed, that the greater part of writers have misunderstood the nature of atonement.

*Gib.* There are two other things in which you appear to be wrong, viz. 1, You make it a matter of no great importance, what be the construction of a text of scripture, on which you preach, whereas the best commentators and preachers make it a matter of the utmost moment. 2, You make it a matter of no concern, whether you preach the doctrine of the text or not, if you preach a doctrine any where taught in the Bible. You say, “if Christ may be found, any where in the scripture, compared to a *high-way*, it is sufficient for your purpose, though he should not be found so compared in your text.” Had I this opinion, I should do as the Quakers do, never take any particular text, but preach away one truth after another, and then I would not be found contradicting the spirit speaking in my text, or giving him the lie, by saying thus saith the spirit, in my text. The received opinion, of Divines, has been, that we are not to preach truth only from our text, but the truth of the text. Is not this a mistake in you then?

*Wor.* That may be your opinion and I may have mine, I will not contend about it; but wherein am I wrong in my notions of atonement? Besides I am not certain that any doctors of Divinity of much importance differ from me.

*Gib.* I shall shew you afterwards that many famous Divines, as *Boston, Owen, Poole, and Henry, &c.* whose praise is in all the Churches, differ from you.

*Wor.* You have not stated the question fairly, you have charged me with maintaining “that it was the *will of God*, and design of Christ, that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth.” Whereas, I had no such opinion: for, I have never supposed, that the atonement expressed the will of God or design of Christ, with respect to the number, to whom the benefits of it should be savingly applied. *The real question is, Whether Christ was, or was not, set forth a propi-*

tion or atonement, for the sins of the whole world of mankind—page 5th.

*Gib.* What is come of all your universal texts now, that may not be limited, one of which says, *I bat it is the will of God, that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth.*—How can you after this, and in consistency with your own doctrine, have the face to deny that it was the will of God, and design of Christ, that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth? when, this text directly says it was the will of God, that all should be saved, &c. &c. Christ says, *He came to do the will of his Father, that was to save all men, agreeable to your other opinions.* You also say, that he died for all men equally, and this must have been in unison with his father's will, which was that all might be saved. Dare you say that this text is any less applicable to universal redemption, nay, to universal salvation, than the texts you have brought afe to universal atonement? you dare not, and where do you land yourself? Is it not in the camp of universalists, of the highest degree. Nay, dare you tell the world that God so loved the world, that he sent his Son into it to die for all men equally, and, yet it was neither his will, nor his Son's design, that all should be saved? you have, sir, told us this much already, when you deny my statement of the question. May I not here say, The legs of the lame are not equal? May I not ask every intelligent reader, whether or not this be a system of mockery to the greater part of the world? The most famous divines have differed materially, and essentially from you here, for they hold atonement, propitiation, and redemption, to be of equal extent, and to respect the same persons. If I am not much mistaken, I can shew, that you jumble, and confound the same things *yourself*, in your answer. Now, with respect to mistating the question, I confess it, and hope I shall be forgiven; for it arose not from design; but out of too much charity for you. Sir, I did not think you were so inconsistent as to limit redemption, and not atonement. It is, truly, the first time ever I heard, one say, that atonement and redemption were not of equal extent. I really thought I was stating the question fair; for had I been intended to extend the one of these terms more than the other, which would be absurd, in any one that knows the meaning of the words originally; I should have extended redemption, rather than atonement, or propitiation. But, sir, you have granted that I stated the question fair yourself, when you set up boldly in opposition to me, and to argue with me, when I was reasoning against particular redemption, which it was evident I was doing all along, and, not against your idea of atonement particularly, which was then unknown to me; is

when I said that it could easily be shewn that no text in the Bible when it respected redemption could mean every individual man and woman, (I did not say atonement but redemption) you, sir, set up boldly in opposition to me in this saying, and went off triumphing, as if you had gained the field, because I did not shew in all these universal texts, though I had shewn in a great many that they would not prove your doctrine. So, as you have conceded the statement of the question to me in this way, you had better act consistent for once, and grant that the question was fairly stated: for upon due consideration, you will find the ground as untenable, upon the footing of *universal atonement*, as upon the footing of *universal redemption*, as I know of no arguments, that can be fairly brought against the one, that will not as fully bear against the other.

*Wor.* I do not think as you do; for I suppose that by what Christ did and suffered, he as really made atonement for the sins of the nonelect, as for the sins of the elect—Page 5th. But you have brought into view a number of things, as implied in atonement, which do not appear to me to be implied in it, or included.

*Gib.* On your supposition, his labor was lost upon the nonelect, or in vain, and no wise man wishes to labor in vain, it is a pity that he that is wisdom itself should be exhibited as doing so; for he will not see of the travel of his soul among them and be satisfied, surely no. They are not one whit the nearer salvation by all that he has done, on your plan, you dare not say they are—and so your thought has little weight, 'till you prove it. As to your hypothesis, as long as you have no proper data to go upon, it does not weigh much with me, for you have not demonstrated your supposition, so as to convince me to suppose the same thing. But what are these things so foreign from the doctrine of atonement, that are forced into it by me?

*Wor.* You suppose that Christ took away the sins of all those for whom he made atonement, and removed the wrath of God from them; the text brought to prove it is, The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.—Compared with John iii. 36. But in making atonement, the Saviour hath not removed the wrath of God from any one; this is not done till the heart is renewed, by divine grace—pa. 6th—So we may suppose, that it is not the blood of Christ that removes the wrath of God, but the renovation of the heart, by the spirit and grace of God!!!

*Gib.* It is not very strange, that I suppose, that Christ did bear the sins of his people, and take them away from them too, altogether, so as that they can never be laid to the charge of them whom he represented, for the Spirit of God supposes the

same thing, speaking by the mouths of Moses, the Prophets and Apostles, as can easily be shewn to any unprejudiced person, or those willing to embrace their doctrine, which if you are, you will soon not only be convinced of but hold as the best article of your creed. I shall turn your attention to Moses, that man of God, first. Hear his words and actions—We are told that Christ is the lamb slain from the foundation of the world; also, that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins.—and the Apostle to the Hebrews tells us, That it was impossible that the blood of bulls and of goats, or the sprinkling of the ashes of an heifer could take away sin.—by which Owen on the place, and the generality of commentators agree, that he meant all the offerings under the old Testament dispensation, as he declares, that all that dispensation could not make the comers thereunto perfect, by means of its imperfection, as nothing but that which is perfect can make perfect. This, then, must be typical of something which was perfect; otherwise the house of God is more like to a slaughter-house than a house of worship, and there is no apparent wisdom in that dispensation. But if all this dispensation had an eye to the perfect sacrifice of Christ, much of God's wisdom and grace shine forth in it: and they had the same gospel preached unto them that we have, although under a different dispensation. Although hundreds of places in the writings of Moses might be fixed upon to my purpose, I shall only call your attention to Lev. xvi. 10—21, 23. Speaking of the *scape goat* that was to be presented before the Lord—In ver. 21 we are told, That the *priest was to lay both his hands on the head of the scape goat, and to confess all the iniquities, transgressions and sins of the children of Israel over him, putting them upon the head of the goat.*—Ver. 22—*And the goat shall bear all their iniquities upon him to a land not inhabited, &c.* Now, sir, if it be true, that you say, that sin is not transferable, did Moses here teach the priests and the people a lie? every rational man among them would naturally draw the conclusion, that sin might be transferred, which would be an absurd opinion if you are right, and this would have been a foolish institution. All on our side agree, that the *scape goat* could not actually, but typically, bear away sin from the people: and, no doubt, all true believers among them, had their eye on *the seed of the woman*, or Shiloh, that was to come. All commentators that have fallen into my hands, allow, that this goat was a type of Christ, and if that is so, then we are taught, from this text, that Christ did actually bear the sins of those for whom he made atonement. Truly, all the sacrifices had an eye to Christ, or there is neither beauty nor wisdom in

them. The Evangelical prophet is very clear on this subject in many places. I shall only turn your attention to Isaiah liii 4. &c. *Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows* : And lest any should say, that this had respect only to his healing of diseases or sympathizing with those that were in grief, we are told in the next verse, *But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed*. These words are so plain to the purpose for which they are quoted, that they need no explanation. How could he be *wounded and bruised for our transgressions and iniquities*, if they were not laid to his charge, or imputed to him ? and he not found chargeable in law and justice. In verse 8th it is said, *For the transgression of my people was he stricken*. Is it not evident, from this, that he was charged with their transgressions, being smitten for them ? Shall I, after your denying the applicableness of what is said in the 6th verse, dare to quote it in favor of my opinion, when there is so great authority as your judgment against me ? Still, sir, I think this portion to my purpose, though but one half of the verse, when the other part does not counteract it. *The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all*. Can words be more plain to my purpose ? Every verse explains another. Please to read candidly the 10th, 11th and 12th verses. What means that expression—*He shall make his soul an offering for sin* ? Surely, sir, you will not say, it was for his own sin, for he had none : Then it must be for the sin of others ; so sin may be transferred—or I should rather use the term imputed. Psalm xxxii—*Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity*. Sin must be imputed somewhere. What mean these words, *He shall see of the travel of his soul, and be satisfied : by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many ; for he shall bear their iniquities* ? This is all I ever said, that he bears our sins in making atonement for us. What means that other expression, *And he bare the sins of many, and made intercession for the transgressors*. Here he changes the universal term into that of many, not all, to let us see that his atonement and intercession are of equal extent, and he prays but for the elect—John xvii. 9, 20. Shall I turn your attention to Daniel the Prophet, speaking the same thing ? Chap. ix. 24. *Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people to finish transgression, to make an end of (or seal up) sin ; to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in an everlasting righteousness, &c. After three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself*—verse 26.—To what end did Christ bear sin but to take it away ? How could he finish it, or make an end of it, but by taking it away

from us? How could he make reconciliation for iniquity, or bring in an everlasting righteousness, if the sins of his people were not taken away by him? The apostle must have been mistaken, when he says, That God is a reconciled God, and reconciling the world unto himself: and all this by Christ Jesus.— Pity that you, sir, had not been at his hand to have told him that he was wrong, and that he misapprehended the meaning of the prophets: for God was never reconciled by Christ, nor sins taken away by him; but that this was done by regeneration, or renovation of the heart. But he tells us, that, *He bare all our sins, in his own body upon the tree.* I presume, though much more might be said to the purpose, on this head, what I have said, may be sufficient at present: for if there is any truth in the Bible, or meaning in words, I have proven this point, to every unprejudiced person. I have shewn that this middle wall of partition, *sin*, that stood in the way of our acceptance with God is taken away: so we begin to be partakers of his purchase in a spiritual manner in regeneration.

*Wor.* You suppose that by the atonement the elect were adopted into the family of God, and became sons, and that God sent his son into the world, that we might receive the adoption of sons, Gal. iv. 4, 5, and I see no ground for this opinion, for it is said, John i. 12, As many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name. Here not these, for whom Christ hath made atonement, but these, that receive Christ and believe in his name, are said to have power given them to become the sons of God. And quoting Gal. iv. 6, you have left out the essential words in the text, and perverted the meaning; but let the words be restored, & the words will prove that we become sons by believing on Christ; not by the atonement! for although a way is opened by the atonement for their adoption, yet that adopts none of itself, but believing: it is necessary that Christ be received in order to adoption.

*Gib.* True, I said in my sermon, that the children are called sons before adoption, and there is no doubt that this is in consequence of the atonement, that they are justified, adopted and sanctified; but I did not say they are sons before adoption.— This is one of your own sayings, and if it be wrong you may correct it. I thought I had proven what I said also, but you think not. I suppose it would be good to ask, what are the benefits purchased by Christ, and how we are made partakers of them, and this redemption? I believe that justification, adoption and sanctification, are the fruits of his atonement. The question is not about the time when declared sons, but what is the cause of adoption? You have certainly, sir, mistaken the

question, or misunderstanding what I said. The question is not; at what time is the adoption of the children constituted? Or, at what time are they declared sons? But what is the cause of their adoption into the family of God? Is faith the cause or the suretyship and death of Christ? It is not my business to enter into the disputes that have been on this question, on which much has been written by able divines. I agree with those who hold that Christ purchased *faith* with all the other *graces of the spirit*; and hence he is called the author and finisher of our faith. He gives faith and repentance, and it is because they are his purchase, that he gives them. These he purchased for the elect, by his death, that it might not be in vain, — *That he might see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied.* So we find him exalted as a prince, and a saviour, to give repentance, and the remission of sins to his people. Sometimes there is an ultimate, a proximate cause of a thing: so is there in adoption. But, sir, you have fallen upon neither of them. The ultimate cause is the love of God. *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish but have everlasting life.* John iii. 16, *He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up to the death for us all. Shall he not with him freely give us all things?* This is the chief or ultimate cause of all good, to men. The proximate cause is the interposition, or mediation, and vicarious sufferings of the Son of God, or his suretyship. Through him we partake of all that is good, and comfortable, whether for time or eternity, Math. iii. 17: *Chl. iii. 10, And ye are complete in him, who is the head of all principality and power.* We lost all by the first Adam, and have all restored by the second Adam. Although, sir, you have quibbled long, and equivocated much, to prepare blinds for your readers, to get read of Gal. iv. 6, yet, all will not do, for I am heartily willing that the whole and entire text be quoted. As I quoted from memory, as I generally do, and did not intend leaving out one word, or notice that I had. *Because ye are sons, he hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba Father.* Now they are restored every word, and I defy any man, of common understanding, to shew what difference there is in the words to answer Mr. Worcester's purpose. None but you, sir, could have been so eagle eyed, as to have seen this text proves that adoption comes not by Christ, but by believing in him. It will not answer your purpose; but it may clearly be seen, to be of advantage to our side of the question: for it is in consequence of his death, that the spirit of the Son is sent, to put the children in possession of what he purchased for them. *It is good for you that I go away, for if I go not away the comforter will not come; but if I go away I will send him unto you, who shall*

*Take of the things that are mine and shew them unto you.* What miserable shifts are men put to, to defend error, when once uttered, and they have too much pride to acknowledge themselves to be wrong. My friend, I have no objection to say, that Christ by his death procured adoption for those for whom he suffered; and also, that it is both unreasonable and unscriptural, to say, that faith which is the gift of God should purchase any thing, for us. Your plan would make the new Covenant conditional on man's part, which we utterly deny. Nay, it would turn the Covenant of grace into a Covenant of works entirely, which makes it inadmissible. Yet, we heartily agree that there is great necessity to receive the Lord Jesus Christ, and that even in order to our being declared to be sons of God.

*Wor.* You consider atonement as the strict payment of a debt; so that God would no more be just in punishing one for his sins, for whom atonement has been made, than a creditor would be in exacting the full payment of an original debt after he had received full payment from the surety. And you have cast reflections on my Sermon, as if in it I would make God so unjust as to require a double price. But this idea of atonement is liable to some insurmountable objections.

*Gib.* I do, indeed, consider that our Lord Jesus Christ, in making atonement for his elect, or in his vicarious sufferings, paid the whole debt that we had contracted, to the law and justice of God, until he was satisfied and said it was enough, and sent his Angels to roll the stone from the door of the sepulchre, and let the prisoner go free, as an evidence that the whole debt was paid and justice completely satisfied: so we are said to be purchased with his blood, called the blood of God, Acts xx. 28. I, also, do not hesitate to say, that seeing God hath received the full payment from our surety, it would be unjust in him to exact the payment either in whole or in part of those for whom Christ suffered. I believe your sermon to be objectionable in this article. But, sir, what are these insurmountable objections? Let the mountains bring forth.

*Wor.* But, sir, you will give me the liberty to bring forth my insurmountable arguments together, without interruption, and then the one will corroborate the other, so that they will appear unanswerable, as I suppose.

*Gib.* In this, sir, you shall be indulged, and if they all, taken together, appear to me insurmountable, you shall have the palm yielded to you, at once; but, sir, it may be possible to answer them in all their force. What is insurmountable to one may be scanned by another. Perhaps you may be answered.

*Wor.* 1st. then, it may be objected that neither sin nor holiness are transferable ! Property amongst men may be transferred, but neither sin nor holiness can be transferred. 2d. It is an important objection to this idea of the atonement, that if it were just, the atonement must have been unnecessary, and Christ has suffered and died in vain ! because it was God who provided the means of making atonement. But why might not God have discharged the debt, without any payment at all, as well as furnish the means of payment ! If one person owes another, why may not the creditor as well discharge the debt at once, as put his hand into his pocket, take out the money, deliver it to a third person, receive it back again, and then give a discharge. 3d. You furnish an objection yourself, for if your doctrine were true, God would be unjust, and take, at least, in part double payment, seeing he punishes men for their sins, in this world, such as Moses & Aaron, David, &c. All the godly have to go through tribulations. Now if your doctrine were true, all for whom the atonement hath been made, whether believers or unbelievers, ought to be freed from all sufferings for their sins. 4th. This is not the meaning of the word, in any case, where it is used in scripture. It is said, *The priest shall make an atonement, and the offender shall be forgiven.*—But no one will pretend that the priest paid his debt. And should every text be carefully examined, where the word occurs, it is believed it would be found, that it is never used in a sense corresponding with the payment of a debt.—So when I say, that Christ hath made atonement for the sins of the whole world, I do not mean that he has actually taken away the sins of all mankind, nor removed from them the wrath of God, nor that he has brought them into a state in which they are accounted sons of God, nor yet that he has paid their debt ; but notwithstanding the atonement, the wrath of God abideth on them ; all the whole debt remains undischarged to the sinner, until he is renewed by divine grace, and the blessings of the new covenant are thus secured unto him—P. 10th.

*Gib.* Are these, sir, your insurmountable objections ? I hope to shew that they are surmountable, and may be easily answered. I cannot help viewing you as a boasting Goliath, coming out of the Socinian or Anti-Christian camp, in full armour, or as you think, in your impenetrable coat of mail, in which you think yourself invulnerable : but I suppose a few smooth stones chosen out of the sacred brook, will bring down a boasting Goliath, who has defied the armies of the living God. These are undoubtedly against you.

I STILL suppose atonement as the payment of a debt, and that the debt of the elect ; and, that when this debt is once

fully paid, it would be unjust to charge it a second time. This God cannot do, for he is just and righteous. It is said in opposition to our idea of atonement; but, surely, sir, you do not think that you have proven that assertion "That neither sin nor holiness are properly transferable; at the same time you acknowledge that property, amongst men, may lawfully be transferred. Now, sir, if property may be according to the law of righteousness transferred, with us, what hinders that the property of Christ may not be transferred to his chosen ones? seeing he has promised to send the spirit to take of the things that are Christ's and shew them unto them; or give them unto his own. May that which is lawful and right amongst men, and that according to the unchangeable law of God, be impossible with God, in propriety? I believe not, I know nothing impossible with the Almighty, but, that he should deny himself, or sin. May not Christ, with the approbation of his heavenly Father, take our place in the broken covenant, and say, If they owe any thing, lay it to my charge? I will pay their debt. And, may not the Lord Jesus Christ, with the same approbation, transfer his law *magnifying righteousness*, Isa. xlii. 21, to us, which he wrought out for us, in our nature, room and stead, since he was under no obligation to come in our nature, nor when come to obey the law for himself? He was wholly voluntary in it. Indeed, sir, your bold assertion includes more than common readers, I fear, are aware of: for it at once denies the imputation of Adam's first sin to us, our sins to Christ, and Christ's righteousness to us! Whereas the scriptures inform us, that his holy obedience to the death, is imputed to his elect, as if they had done it themselves. *For he hath made him to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.* You, sir, are wonderfully fond of new expressions in divinity; and I fear, of new doctrines also. What could have been the harm, according to your opinion, in saying, that neither the sin of Adam, nor the righteousness of Christ, can be imputed to their seed, or to them whom they represented in their covenant with God? I know no reason for not using this mode of expression but that you thought your readers would not understand that you meant to reject the righteousness of Christ, or the guilt of Adam's first sin, which had been favorite doctrines amongst them, time immemorial, & might not have been satisfied see you treating them with contempt. It must have been only to a blind to keep the weak people from starting at your doctrine, or a mode of making the pill more palatable, that they might swallow it at once, and believe that you were contending with a heretic of the worst kind! This, I am the more convinced, is your design; for you do not go to the bible to prove your

doctrine, nor to the opinions of ancient or able divines, whose names are famous in the churches. No, but to a little jesuitical quibbling, and sophistical reasoning, and no text of scripture is brought to support your assertion, or reasoning. Indeed, none can be found to answer your end, and you are obliged to betake yourself to this miserable shift, to get rid of the imputation of our sins to Christ, and his righteousness to us. Yet, sir, if you mean by the word transferred, that we suppose, that Christ is actually a sinner; this we deny. For he was holy, harmless and undefiled, in this respect, none could charge him with actual sin, in thought, word, or deed. But when you suppose, that he could not be charged with it, as our representative and surety: this we shrink from with abhorrence.

You say, page 8, "*But if one man sin against the Lord, he alone deserves to be punished*;" no third person can take his sin upon himself and suffer in his room, so as to render him less guilty, or less deserving of punishment. This debt may be forgiven, but never can be paid." If, sir, you bring down the Deity to a level with the creature, your doctrine will hold good; but not otherwise. And I should think this would be degrading to God, to level him with the creature. Amongst men your doctrine is true, but not with the Trinity. Surely Christ with the approbation of his Father, had a right to take our nature upon him, and be found in fashion as a man, and to lay down that life, that he had voluntarily taken up, in order to pay the debt of these that were given him, to be redeemed by him; to pay that which we could never pay, that justice might have it's full demand, and a way be opened for God, to declare himself reconciled to those whom he represented; and a way be opened for our acceptance with God, on the account of the doing and sufferings of Christ, and no injury offered to the eternal law of righteousness. But you say that, on this footing, there can be no grace in setting the sinner at liberty. I grant that there is no grace in this plan to our representative: for as soon as he came into the world clothed with our nature, the law laid hold upon him as our surety, and never let him go till he paid the uttermost farthing. So no grace was in it to the second Adam. But it is all of grace to us. It is of grace that he devised the plan of redemption, and that he received the price of our redemption, at the hand of our surety: nay, in one word, all is of free grace to the children. Let us hear what the scriptures say about transferring of sins to Christ, or in any case. I hope, sir, you have not gone so far with the Mother of Harlots, as to deny the second command of God's moral Law, nor with Arminians as to amend it or give us a new edition of it. What says it to the purpose? Visiting the in-

iniquities of the fathers upon the children, to the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, &c. Is this transferring or not? The prophet Isaiah tells us, That the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all. And that when he was charged with them, *It pleased the Lord to bruise him.* Also he says,—*For the transgression of my people was he smitten. That he bear the sins of many,—For he shall bear their iniquities. He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities.* Now if they were laid on Christ they must be taken off his children; they cannot lie on him and us both at the same time. Dante! tells us that Messiah shall be cut off; but not for himself—and that he was cut off to *finish transgression, and to make an end of sin,* even the sins of his people. Whether shall we believe these witnesses or you? Judge yourself, whom men should trust to, the inspired prophets, or fallible and prejudiced men. The apostle says, *He bear all our sins in his own body upon the tree.* And if he bear them, it must be by *transferring them over upon him,* or by *imputation*: for he had them no other way. It would be bad for the elect if your doctrine was true. Away, then, with such things, and let the people see in Christ a complete Saviour, and a complete righteousness; for without this we are undone.

2. In your second argument you unmask yourself, and assert what every man of reading knows is not true, that is acquainted with the Calvinist scheme. You say, “according to my idea, the atonement must have been unnecessary, or in-vain.” Your only argument is a question fraught with ignorance, both of the nature and laws of God, and plan of the *New Covenant.* You ask, why might not God have discharged the debt, without any payment at all, as well as furnish the means of payment? I answer because he is a holy God, and has given us good and holy laws, because, he is a true and faithful God, and will vindicate the honor of his majesty, and dignity of his laws and government. Because, he can accept of nothing less than perfect obedience, in order to our salvation and justification. In one word, because he is God that cannot lie, and his glorious perfections could not be honoured otherwise. You may as well ask why is he God and not man. The noble Young, in his night thoughts, speaking of this subject, says, A God all mercy, is a God unjust. And the Psalmist tells us, *That mercy and truth have met together, that righteousness and peace have kissed each other.* This is the answer to your childish question, which has frequently been proposed by Arminians. With respect to what you bring in about creditor and debtor, however right it would be among men, and, I do not know but such should be the case with us, yet, the case

will not apply here : for the Father paid none of the debt of sinners ; but the Son to the Father. But you say he provided all the means of paying the debt, and that this may be looked upon as paying of it. Where, sir, did you learn this doctrine? surely, not in the Bible : for Christ may be said to provide all the means himself. True he says, *A body hast thou prepared me ;* but the same words in the original are translated, *Mine ear hast thou bored.* If you call clothing the Son of God with our nature, providing all the means of payment, I cannot agree with you here. Besides, the human nature of Christ is compared to a garment, which three sisters did weave, and one of them wore it. What will you make of that text, *He took our nature upon him.* And that other.—*No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again.*—Now had he not power to take it up, as well, at first? I need not stay upon this argument : for I am persuaded you fled to it only as one of your miserable shifts. Here, sir, we might easily turn the tables upon you, and turn your *very important argument or objection* against yourself. For if it be true, that all that Christ did by his death and sufferings, was only to convince men that God would pardon sin, upon their repentance and believing, and did nothing to procure faith and repentance for them, which is certainly all that you have left him to do, after the deduction you have made. And if this position of yours be true, he came into the world, clothed with our nature, lived, suffered and died, in vain.—All that was necessary to convince men that God would pardon sin, might have been done without his coming, in the flesh at all—hence all he did was in vain. I believe that the old Testament Church, was as fully convinced that God was a sin pardoning God, as the new is at this day ; even before he came in the flesh, this was believed. Now where is the need of all this work on your plan? If you will take the trouble to read Owen on the person of Christ, he will shew demonstratively, that all that was done was absolutely necessary, in order that a holy God might have it in his power to pardon sin, or to save the sinner, in honor to himself. A compleat satisfaction to law and justice must be made, and this Christ alone could do.

3. YOUR third objection to the doctrine of atonement, as held by Calvinists, will be found as weak and futile as the rest. You say, sir, it exhibits God as unjust, and as in part, at least, demanding payment twice over, which would be unjust, seeing he chastises his people or punishes them for their sins, or seeing they must all suffer tribulation in this world, &c.—Where, sir, in the scripture are we taught that God's chastisements of his children, or his visiting the transgressions of his people with a

rod, or their iniquities with stripes, is any payment of their debt, either in whole or in part? Are we not taught the contrary in the lxxix psalm? God never says that it is to pay their debt, that he chastiseth any of them: for he says, *But my loving kindness will I not take from them. He loves with an everlasting love, and draws with the cords of love, and whom he loves he loves unto the end. Yet, he chastiseth every son and daughter whom he receiveth.* Nay, fatherly chastisements are exhibited as an evidence of son-ship, Heb. xii. Read that admirable expression, *If ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons.* Was it to pay Job's debt that he met with so great tribulation? No, it was to give him an opportunity to exercise his graces, that he might evidence himself to be a son of God, and for other good purposes to the children. Does any father among men chastise his child, to get a restitution for the fault committed? or is it not rather, to benefit the child, and shew his fatherly displeasure at the offence, hinder him from offending in like manner for the future? Are we not told that God chastiseth not for his pleasure but our profit? Who has ever thought, that punishing Moses or Aaron with death in the wilderness, because of their offence, was any payment of their debt, or atonement for the guilt of their sin? So may we say of the chastisement of David and all the other children. It was to shew that though he loved them, and pardoned their sins, he would take vengeance upon their deeds. These are *beacons* set up, *in terrorem*, to warn us to shun the rocks on which they have split. Instead of being a curse, it is a great blessing to us, that there is chastisement, for the children in the covenant. There is a difference between remitting sin, and the punishment of sin; this is evident in the case of David. The guilt of his sin is declared to be taken away while Nathan and he were conversing together, but the sword was never to depart from his house. You, sir, are the first that ever I have known to insinuate, that tribulation, or persecutions of the children were as, or for the payment of their debts, or a removal of their guilt. And, truly, I do not believe it till this day. This tends much to the glory of God; confirmation of the truths for which they suffer, and comfort of the children, in the end. So, I think, that no argument for your side can be drawn from God's shewing his fatherly displeasure at sin in his own children; nor from the tribulations of the children in this world; nay, rather by these we are taught to shun sin as the greatest evil, which God will punish, even in his own people.

4. Your fourth argument amounts to nothing but evasion and a *hypothese of your own*, and one that is, I am bold to say,

without foundation in the word of God—the generally received meaning of the word in common use amongst men, or the definition given of the word in any Dictionary of the English language, either sacred or civil. You, sir, deny that I have given the right idea of the word atonement; and, alas! you have left us fully as bad, for you have given us no definition of the term. True, you have given us a negative to almost all that ever I understood in it; but do not give us the positive. Has the word any positive meaning at all? You say it does not mean this, it does not mean that, and it does not mean a third thing! What, sir, is left but a mere shadow, and a phantom? No judicious person can see more. You have told us the word atonement, no where, means a price in the scriptures. Let us try if this be true. Let us hear Mr. Brown's definition of the word, a man who certainly knew the meaning of it in the original: "The word translated atonement, in the original, signifies *covering*; and intimates, that our guilt is covered from divine justice." We can form the clearest idea of the meaning of the word, from the covering of the Ark, that was dyed red; and as over this stood the propitiatory or mercy seat, Justice and Judgment were the establishment of God's throne in the earthly tabernacle. *What shall I give for the sin of my soul?* is a very interesting question. *This shall be an atonement for your souls,* are words which often occur in the law of Moses, evidently demonstrating, that although the sacrifices of the law "could never make the comers thereunto perfect," yet the law was the beginner (*the introducer*) of a better hope. It served great purposes before the times of reformation. The law, by the atonement for the soul, which it brought to view in all the ordinances of her worship and service, was the schoolmaster to teach the doctrines of the cross of Christ. Christ died for our sins, and rose again for our justification. By his once offering of atonement, he hath forever perfected his guilty chosen company. He hath fulfilled all the righteousness of which the law prefigured; and thus we receive grace for grace. Those who deny the doctrine of atonement, had better renounce the Scripture at once. Conceal this invaluable doctrine from them, and the conduct of all the old Testament saints, in their sacrifices, &c. appears like that of fools, and the services of the worldly sanctuary is more like a slaughter house, than the house of God. Happy for guilty man, the doctrine of atonement stands on a foundation which all the philosophy and deceit of the wise in the world, the sneers of the wit, or the profanity of the deist; nay, which the gates of hell cannot prevail against! I have in my reach at present six dictionaries

which all agree, that the word atonement signifies satisfaction—and atone to agree, satisfy, appease, answer for, &c. And I am in opinion there is not a dictionary of the English language in this world that agrees with your definition of the word, would you give us one. My opinion is, that the word means reconciliation, satisfaction—so it means a satisfaction to divine justice, which required the interposition of the Lord Jesus Christ in our nature, room and stead; and that he should suffer and die for us before offended justice could be satisfied. You have granted that atonement and propitiation, are synonymous terms: and Mr. Brown defines propitiation thus; “That which atones for and covers our guilt as the mercy seat did the tables of the law.” Jesus Christ, is called the propitiation, or atonement, as his compleat righteousness appeases his father, and satisfies his law and justice, for all our transgressions.—Rom. iii. 25. *Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness, for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.* 1st John, ii. 2. *And he is the propitiation for our sins, &c.* So we will see, if we look into the oracles of God, that there is all in atonement that I included in it: for when we look into Isaiah, we find, *the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all, or the guilt of the iniquity of us all.* Compare this with what the Apostle says, *He bore all our sins in his own body upon the tree.* We find also, *that Christ has purchased for his elect, a right to be adopted into the family of God.* Gal. iv. 4—6. *and in believing we are put in possession of the purchased inheritance.* A man may long have purchased an estate for his son before he lets him know that it is for him, or puts him in the possession of it. While he is a minor he is kept ignorant of it; but when he comes to maturity, he is possessed of it, and may be said anew to become the son of this man, tho’ he was so before, as he in a particular way enjoys the privileges of a son. So it is with us before we believe, and in believing we get the spirit of adoption, and cry *Abba Father*, and thus enter upon the inheritance purchased for us before the foundation of the world, by the interposition of the Lord Jesus Christ, who is called *the lamb slain from the foundation of the world.* Also, by atonement, there is a price paid, if we believe the Bible: 1st Cor. vi. 19, 20. *Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price.* Also, vii. 23. *Ye are bought with a price.* And what this price is we are told Acts xx. 28. *The blood of God, that is, the blood of the divine Jesus—Isaiah liii. 10. When he shall make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, &c.* 1st Peter i. 18, 19. *For as much as ye know, that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain con-*

versation, received by tradition from the fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, &c. Eph. i. 7. In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace. — 2d. Peter ii. 1. But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. Did you, sir, remember that there was such a text in our bible, when you ventured to assert, “that Christ in atonement, paid not the debt of any man?” Well may you with fear and trembling ask, what did he do in atonement? No man can say he did any thing of much value, when you have made your deduction, which you make when you say, you do not mean by atonement, that he bare the guilt of our sins, nor that he purchased a right to be adopted into the family of God, for us, nor that he paid, to the law and justice of God, our debt. You will permit me, sir, still to press the question, what did he do in atonement? What did he to bring us to God?

*Wor.* It hath opened a way in which God can make overtures of pardon and reconciliation, to rebellious men, and actually pardon and save all who penitentially return unto him; a way in which he can do this, and yet secure the honor of his law, and the dignity of his government; and, consequently, without injury to his own character, or the interests of his kingdom: a way in which he “can be just and the justifier of the sinner that believeth in Jesus.” Page 10th.

*Gib.* Here, sir, you have granted, that by atonement a way is opened by which God can make overtures of pardon, and actually pardon, and save, &c. But it does not appear from all you have said, that a pardon is purchased, or that God by the atonement is a reconciled God, &c. through the merit of the atonement, *reconciling the world unto himself.* Nor doth it appear by your answer, that Christ, by his death and sufferings, purchased faith and repentance for those for whom he suffered and died; but that these must come in some other way, that I cannot understand from what you say. Yet we are told, that he is exalted as a prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and the remission of sins: Now, sir, I ask, does Christ give any thing which he has not purchased by his sufferings and death? Is there any thing too great, or too little for him to purchase for us? He says to his disciples, John xvi. 13. *Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth—ver. 14. He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and show it unto you—* or give it unto you. Now, when the spirit is sent, what does he show or give them? faith and repentance; which, though

they be the gift of God, yet, they are a part of the purchase of Christ, without which, all his sufferings would have been in vain. But you have told us before, that it is from the love that God bears to the Son manifested in the flesh, not from his holy obedience, in life and death, in our stead, nor for the infinite merit of his doing and dying, that God forgives the sins of his children—page 8th—Which, if the similitude of a father and a son has any meaning, introduced by you, you must intend, express your sentiment as you will. This opinion, we believe, has no foundation in the word, and cannot agree with it. The remainder of the 10th page, also the 11th and 12th, I cannot understand, after what you have formerly said about atonement; nor do I know that any person understands it, viz. what you there exhibit. You still seem to insinuate that something was done, and necessary to be done, to secure the honor and dignity of the legislator and laws, and for the good of his subjects; but you have not told us what was necessary; for if it does not mean all that Calvinists hold or include in it, after your deduction, nothing more appears necessary, according to your plan, only that the Son of God should be manifested in the flesh; but not as our representative, in our room and stead, so that what he did might be imputed to us as if we had done it ourselves! Indeed, the amount of it would only be, that God was naturally propitious and disposed to forgive sin, upon our believing Christ, and that he did not bear the wrath and curse of God, due to us for sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. If this position of yours be true, I can see no necessity for his dying, and, indeed, very little for his living in our nature; for an angel, in our nature, could have answered the end, or even a perfect man, such as Adam was at first, any of these might have fulfilled the law, and also died. Where then was the necessity of the Son of God in our nature? There is nearly three pages of your defence that appear to me only to darken council by words without knowledge, and, after your deduction, to be without ideas, or then they contradict your former doctrines. Some expressions are used by you, in these pages, unworthy of a divine—*such as the feelings of God, the feelings of God's heart concerning sin, &c.* From such expressions, one would be led to conclude that God was like ourselves, and that his peace or happiness was marred by the beholding of sin, which is impossible, and therefore it is certainly improper to bring down the Deity to a level with the creature, in this way. Indeed, all you say in these pages seem to me to be blindfolding the people, that they may not understand what you would be at. I should be glad such expressions were not used as would im-

press the mind with such mean ideas of God. I do not believe there is any warrant for such expression in the Bible.— Chap. xi. Here is a conversation introduced between Messrs. *War.* and *Gib.* concerning the universality of atonement, wherein the former means to prove, that Christ has made atonement for the sins of all mankind equally, and the latter to disprove the same.

*War.* You are entirely mistaken about the objects of atonement; you suppose, that the atonement was made for the elect only; but, I can prove, if my former doctrines on that subject be true, and that by four unanswerable arguments, that Christ hath been set forth a propitiation, or atonement for the sins of the whole world of mankind, without exception, whether elect or nonelect, believers or unbelievers: and this will shew who is holding up a system of mockery to the world of mankind, in our preaching.

*Gib.* Sir, if I am mistaken in the extent of atonement, as to the number, or persons for whom the propitiation or atonement was made; I am found in the midst of a good company, for many most eminent saints of God have labored under the same mistake, whose praise is in all the churches: All Calvinists of every party hold the same opinion, on this subject. Nay, even what are called regular Baptists, in America, agree with me here. All the Independents of old England hold the same doctrine: Also, the Puritans of that country. Nay, all the branches of the established church of Scotland; both in Europe and America. What is called Presbyterians in America. The Coalescence or Union party. The Seceders or Antiburgher party, hold with me in this article, witness their confessions of faith and catechisms and testimonies &c. all which shew their agreement, although these in some things seem to differ with the confession of faith, or to explain it away, to answer their ends, yet, still they hold with us, in this article.

2. You begin with "if what you have said be true." It is well that this part begins with an *if*; but, let me set an *if* in opposition to your *if*, which I imagine, will be of as much value as yours. Then, if I have proved in my former part, in this colloquy, that all I had formerly supposed to be contained in atonement, is yet included in it, I suppose every unprejudiced person will readily grant, that the scriptures exhibit it as fully containing all that I said it did contain: then all the value of your *if* will fall to the ground so far as it respects your proposition in the preceding part; and of consequence, your four unanswerable arguments will fall with your *if*, so far as respects your former attempt. But let us try the matter a little, and

D

we will leave it to the unprejudiced to judge who holds up a system of mockery, or one fraught with inconsistency.

*Wor.* My first argument is drawn from the nature of *atonement*. The *atonement* essentially consisted, in making a manifestation of the feelings of God, with respect to sin, and of his determination to support the honor of his character and law, though he pardoned the sinner. When this was done the way was fairly open for the pardon of millions of the human family, or of the whole race provided they complied with the terms of pardon, as of one. And this may be illustrated by the brazen serpent, considered as a type of Christ, which was set up for all not for a few!

*Gib.* Your argument drawn from the nature of *atonement*, will not answer, for you seem to consider very little included in *atonement*, much less than the Bible includes in it: if it essentially consists in *manifesting the feelings of God, concerning sin &c.*, as you say, I cannot appreciate the value of that expression, a manifestation of the feelings of God; will you bring down the Deity to a level with the sinful creature? This will not do, surely, as I have said before. But if you take your argument from the merit of Christ's *atonement*, as I suppose you do, then it will either prove nothing, or if it proves any thing, it will prove too much, and cannot be a good argument. This is the foundation on which they build, who hold the doctrine of universal salvation: and, hence hold a system by which hell is depopulated at once, for by pleading the infinite value of Christ's sacrifice, they can bring, in their opinion, both devils and wicked spirits of men out of the pit of misery. And, I really believe they have as good arguments, from this, for their side, as you have for yours; if not more so. In my opinion, your system will never be consistent, until you reject the doctrine of universal atonement, or take up with the doctrine of universal salvation. Certain I am, that Arminians are much more consistent than you. To confirm your notion of the atonement, you bring in the circumstance of the *Brazen serpent*, taken from the history of the Jews. Num. xxi. 6—9 ver. 8, *And the Lord said unto Moses, make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole, and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it shall live. And Moses made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole, and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass he lived.* Here before we go any farther, I will grant you the following things. 1. The infinite merit of the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ: no Calvinist disputes this. 2. That the brazen serpent was a type of Christ. 3. That it was the ordinance of God, to the Jews. 4. That whosoever looked at it believing it to be the ordinance of God,

were healed. Yet, sir, with all these concessions, it will not answer your end. For this Mosaic serpent was not set up for all the world of mankind. Moses did not leave it in the wilderness, standing on the pole, that every traveller, till the end of the world, when bitten might look and be healed by it.— When they left the wilderness, they took it with them, so we find it in Judah hundreds of years afterwards, until one of the reforming kings destroyed it, calling it *Nebushtan*, brazen work, by way of contempt, when it became a snare unto Israel. So this brazen serpent was set up for the Jews only, God's peculiar people, who were a type of his elect children. The portion then is unhappily chosen to answer your purpose. If it had been set up for every traveller, at any time, through the wilderness, and left there standing till this day; or if it could be proven, that any traveller, of another nation than that of the Jews, had been healed by looking on it, it might have answered some end for you: but, sir, as these things cannot be proven, you have failed in your probation. Besides, the people must be told that the *brazen serpent* was set up, the end for which it was set up, by whose orders it was set up, and must be sensible that they are wounded; also, that in order to a cure, they must look to it as the ordinance of God for their healing. Now, sir, until you find the *brazen serpent* extended every where, and to every person in the world, it will not answer your end. So, until you can shew that Christ is extended on the pole of the Gospel, every where, and to every person wounded of the old serpent, you cannot prove your point. The circumstance adduced proves the direct reverse of what you intended: for this was set up for the elect nation, at that time, and to no other people on earth: so Christ is set forth on the *Gospel pole* to his elect people, and revealed to them, and them only, as a *Prince* and a *Saviour*. Thus we grant, that by this we are taught to look to Christ as the only Saviour, and that *whosoever believeth on him, shall not perish; but have everlasting life*. But, *how shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard? If our Gospel be hid it is hid to them that are lost*, 2 Cor. iv. 3. I now draw the conclusion, your argument fails to prove for you.

*Wor.* That Christ was set forth a propitiation for the sins of all mankind, or the whole world of mankind, may be argued conclusively, from the universality of the Gospel invitation. — You seem to be angry with me, for admitting, that salvation is freely offered to all men for acceptance; but it was offered to all in the sense supposed, when the apostles, agreeably to their direction, went into all the world and preached the gospel to every creature. When it is said it is freely offered to all, nothing more is intended, but that it is offered to all, indiscrimin-

ately, to the elect, and to the nonelect. And you, sir, admit this yourself, and assign four reasons for the same.

Gib. This argument, drawn from the universality of the invitation, will be found to come as far short of proving for you, as the former, I presume, upon due consideration. It seems you have been taught at the Arminian school, for you bring forth no new arguments but what the *Mother of Harlots*, with Arminius and his followers, have adduced long ago; and have, long since, been fully answered by Calvinist Divines. No good argument can be drawn from the universality of the gospel call, until you prove that all have power to believe it of themselves; or will the tares and the wheat are mingled together in the world, the elect and nonelect; until we get such penetration, that whenever we see a multitude, to whom we are to preach, that we can discern been the elect and the nonelect, we may not abridge the call, for we know not the one from the other, till the one accepts and the other utterly rejects the call. Can you, sir, when you mount the *Rastrum*, with your bible in your hand, in conscience tell your audience, that God, in laying the plan of the everlasting covenant, had no more respect to the elect than the reprobate, that he did as much for the one as for the other, and that they are all equally objects of his love? Can you tell them that Christ did as much for the one as for the other? If you can do this, can you not tell them that the Spirit is as willing and able to apply as Christ is to purchase or make atonement? Your notion of the universality of the invitation will prove nothing for you, till you once prove that the call is *universal*, till you can prove that the *Gospel is equally preached to all nations*. Although the commission was, *Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature*, yet, sir, has that, in it's full extent, ever, till this day, been done? I presume you dare not answer in the affirmative. Why did the Spirit hinder the Apostle to go into Bythynia, or keep him long in one place? Was it not that he knew that the *Lord had many people in the latter place*, and few in the former, or none, at least, none to be converted at that time? As long then as the tares and the wheat are intermingled, and we do not know the one from the other, we must give the general call, wherever we go, and the travel of Christ's soul will hear, in due time, and none else, Christ having purchased faith and repentance for them.

But lest you should think your arguments of more value than they really are, I shall try to follow you a little, and shew how a Calvinist would shortly answer your "*conclusive arguments*." I still ask, when was the gospel offered freely to all? And the true answer is, never till this day; many nations never had it,

and millions have died and never heard of such a thing as the gospel. You answer, it was preached to all in the sense supposed, when the Apostles went into all the world, and preached the gospel to every creature. But, sir, when was that? Are there not many nations that never saw them? and many creatures that died and never heard it? How had they it offered, and salvation in it? But you say, "that no more is intended, than that it is offered to all indiscriminately, both elect and non-elect." I grant, that it is so where ever the gospel is faithfully preached, in a certain sense, for we offer Christ and all his benefits to all that are willing to receive him freely. Yet, in an indefinite and unlimited sense, you cannot offer salvation thus, while you hold the doctrine of election, as you do, except you tell your audience, that Christ hath made a full and compleat atonement for all; but except you be of the elected number, you cannot go one step in this way of yourself, and all will be of no avail to you. Christ will have suffered and died in vain for you, except you be of this number; for he purchased nothing for you, to put in possession of the benefits of this atonement. — Yet, I must call you all to believe on Christ, to make you a new heart and a new spirit of yourself, and inform you that you will be damned if you do not comply and do so, for there is nothing required but any reasonable man can easily do, and yet this *faith is the gift of God*, which he will give to the elect only; and none can be saved without it. Is such as this a system of mockery or not? I have no difficulty, sir, in granting that the gospel is to be preached to all men indiscriminately, wherever we go; but, this does not imply that Christ died indiscriminately for the *sheep* and the *goats*, nor that there is equal provision made by him, for the elect and non-elect, only that the tares and the wheat are mixed together in the world, and that we do not know the one from the other, and are bound to call all, and the sheep only will hear and obey his voice. True, sir, Christ preached the gospel both to the elect and nonelect, and I can see no impropriety in quoting his own authority to follow his own example, for in many things we are not to imitate him; yet, to the one *he preached in parables*, and to the other *plainly*, assigning this good reason for it, he does not design their conversion. So, it is to the world still as *idle tales, an hard saying, &c.* You say, since ministers are to invite all, wherever they come, that then there must be provision made for all, when they do come. Yes, sir, we have the divine warrant, to tell them that there is provision made for all that will come, without exception; for Christ saith all that the Father giveth me shall come unto me; and he that cometh unto me, I will

in no wise cast out. Here we have two things noticeable—  
 1st, That all that were given to Christ, will be made willing  
 in a day of power, and made to come to him: 2d, That when  
 they are come they will not be disappointed; they will feed  
 with him at his table, for *none can come except the Father draw  
 them*, and whomsoever he draws, Christ will heartily receive.  
 Never, sir, be afraid to embrace the Calvinist system on this ac-  
 count; for it is such as cannot deceive any: let men come  
 and they will find enough and to spare in their Father's house,  
 when they come as the returning prodigal did, naked and hun-  
 gry. But, sir, if you suppose that we should tell them that  
 the provision was made for the non-elect, as well as the elect,  
 we dare not tell them so, more than we dare tell them, it was  
 made for *Devils*, or for them who are now in hell. But, we  
 may safely inform them, with a *thus saith the Lord*, that by  
 the gospel, or Christ in the gospel, provision is made for men,  
 and sinners, of *Adam's family*, of whatever nation, language,  
 tribe, or family. I can hardly believe, sir, you did not know  
 better, than to impute inconsistency to our system here; and  
 the more especially, as you yourself hold the doctrine of ab-  
 solute, eternal and personal election; also, the absolute ne-  
 cessity of free grace, in order to acceptance of Christ as a com-  
 plete Saviour. The argument will turn against your own side,  
 at least as much as against ours; and it is certainly no great  
 wisdom in you to put a weapon into the hand of your enemy.  
 The Free will Baptists will triumph. I ask you, sir, are you  
 able by moral suasion, or all your powers of oratory to make  
 one non-elect soul believe that Christ died for himself in par-  
 ticular? Or, is any able without divine, supernatural grace  
 to believe so? Or will God give this divine, supernatural grace,  
 to any but the elect only? You are obliged from your own  
 system to answer these questions with a negative; or then you  
 must grant that a person that has the faith of God's elect may  
 go to perdition, for all the non-elect will go to hell. Certain-  
 ly, it is the faith of God's elect to believe that Christ died for  
 me in particular. I wish you to weigh this matter deliberat-  
 ly, and see where you land yourself! I am not difficulted to  
 preach the doctrine of absolute, eternal, and immutable de-  
 crees, of absolute, personal election, and of *particular atone-  
 ment*, as they are truths revealed, though I know that many  
 stumble at them, and ruin themselves eternally. All your  
 arguments drawn from the universal invitation will serve you  
 naught, until you can shew that the internal call goes along  
 with the external, wherever it goes; this would prove your  
 hypothesis—Or that all can believe of themselves, or if you  
 can shew that God does as much to draw the non-elect, as the

elect to Christ. The *love* of the Father, the *grace* of the Son, & the *application* of the Holy Ghost are *all equal*, which your system will not, I presume admit. While facts are against you, you will never be able to prove your side. For whom was the supper, *in fact*, provided, Luke xiv. 16. For them who actually partook of it, and for none else, all the rest will find excuses, because he does not internally invite. *He will have mercy on whom he will have mercy : and whom he will he hardeneth.* I wish you may not be incorrect in your notions of this parable ; it is allowed by commentators to be spoken to the Jews, to shew their obitancy and unbelief, in rejecting the Messiah when he came in the flesh, into the world, whom they had been long looking and praying for : who, when he came and did not answer all their expectations of him, was rejected of them as a nation, with contempt ; though many of that people were enlightened, and saw it their interest and duty to come to the gospel supper ; for these latter was the supper provided, because they were the sheep for whom he had laid down his life, and pledged his faithfulness, that they should never perish. John x.—The supper then was provided for Jews and Gentiles, all that have believed, or shall believe till the last day : yourself being judge, none but the elect will have their eyes opened to see duty and interest meeting in going to the gospel supper, at God's call.

*Wor.* A third *conclusive argument*, in favor of universal atonement, may be drawn from the consideration, that unbelief or the rejection of Christ, as a Saviour, is exceedingly sinful. It must be very obvious, that, if atonement has been made for a part of mankind only, there can be no sin, in refusing to confide in him, as a Saviour, until we have evidence, that we are of the number of those for whom salvation is provided. So that if unbelief be sinful, it must be so on the ground of the doctrine, for which I contend. But you have a short way of getting rid of this argument. You deny the sinfulness of unbelief, which I shall prove to be sinful in a subsequent chapter, and then this argument will have weight.

*Gib.* Your third conclusive argument, I behold as inconclusive, when you shall have proved unbelief to be sinful, which I know no person, so bold as to deny. I admit *it without your probation* ; and deny at the same time the conclusiveness of your argument. Review your conclusive argument. "It must be very obvious, say you, that if *atonement* has been made for a part of mankind only, there can now be no sin, in refusing to confide in Christ as a Saviour, until we have evidence, that we are of the number of those, for whom salvation is provided" !!! "So if unbelief be sinful it must be so on the ground of

the doctrine for which I contend?!!! You, sir, should have considered how much your *conclusive argument* would have proved, before you had introduced it, lest it should prove too much, and prove nothing at all, or more than you desire. Do you not, sir, some times preach the eternal decree of election? Now, suppose, some of your hearers afterwards should meet with you, and inform you, that there could be no sin in rejecting the offer of the gospel, until he had evidence that he was once of that election you had been preaching of; for if he was not elected he could not be saved do what he would. Would you, sir, say yes, he could, for there was a compleat atonement made for all mankind, and he might be saved whether he was elected or not? I presume you would not; but answer, *secret things belong unto the Lord.* — That the call was to men and sinners. — That as he was a needy sinner, he should come, and put in his plea: for none that ever came were rejected by him. So say I to you, *Secret things belong unto the Lord.* I know no way to be made certain that he died for me; but that I am made willing to accept him, on his own terms. Thus, sir, we destroy your "*conclusive argument,*" by shewing that it proves too much, even more than you wish. But, sir, how did you learn that I denied the sinfulness of unbelief? You say, "I have a short way of getting rid of this argument, by denying the sinfulness of unbelief!" I positively deny that ever I said so in my life, or ever thought so once: so I take it for granted that unbelief is a sin: for it were the Jews prohibited the *holy land*, in Moses' day, and their bodies fell in the wilderness, *as dung to foul the land.* For this sin were they carried to Babylon: also for this sin they have been rejected as a nation, this eighteen hundred years. Take heed that you be not also rejected for this sin; for you deny the Lord that bought us with his precious blood, saying, that your Saviour, to whom ye trust, paid no price for you. He is not then the Christ of God, but an idol of your own invention. *O Tempora, O Mores.* The bible knows not him that you describe. But, sir, if you see one of their number, that say, that Adam, as our representative in the Covenant, had a *saving faith*, or *the faith of God's elect*, and left it for us, you may enjoy your opinion undisturbed by me; but till you prove it by scripture, and reason, I cannot agree with you. I shall leave this, sir, until I come to where you set up your man of straw and thrash upon him, which cannot injure me, it only can injure yourself, and your associates in this work. Dear sir, can you, after reading with candor my sermon, lay your hand upon your heart, and declare, that you believe I hold that unbelief is no sin? You cannot.

*Wor. Mr. South*, and *Mr. Ingham's* argument, in perfect agreement.

with the foregoing, is the express declaration of many passages of scripture. A few of which shall be cited. John vi. 51.— Heb. ii. 9.—1 John ii. 2. If it be possible for human language to communicate the idea, that Christ hath made an atonement for the sins of all mankind, I should suppose, it must be found in these passages, and others of a similar import; but you say, but have not proved, that these and similar passages are to be understood of the elect only, &c.

*Gr.* I come now to your fortification, behind which you mean to shelter yourself, until you discomfit your opponent; indeed it is the only plausible argument you have adduced.— The former, to a thinking, intelligent person, acquainted with the system of divinity, were not even plausible arguments, they were only bluffs; but this is the strongest that the Arminian, Arian and Socinian tribes have made use of. See Taylor on original sin, and Edward's answer to him. I shall pay a little attention to this argument of yours, as worthy of notice. Only permit me to remark, you have now shifted your ground; formerly I supposed you to be arguing for universal atonement; now you are arguing for universal redemption. Error is very dangerous, and apt to be progressive: take heed lest as you have now got yourself enlisted under the banner of Arminius, you should, in a short time, in order to be consistent, be obliged to enlist under the banner of those who are for universal salvation.

Two reasons I have for raking you with Arminians. 1. WHEN I was endeavouring to open up these texts, which take the appearance of universality, I was reasoning against universal redemption, which is evident, in the Sermon. Now, if you hold the doctrine of particular redemption, you should have passed by these arguments, and said, that they did not pertain to you; for you were arguing for universal atonement, not universal redemption. I shall suppose you now more consistent, and that you see that if you hold the one you must hold the other equally.

2. THESE are the texts fled to by Arminians to prove their tenets, and they will certainly do as much for them, as for you; but they will answer neither of you, except we allow the scriptures to be a bundle of contradiction. I have already shewn that Christ laid down his life for the sheep, for the Church, for his body; for to purchase for himself a peculiar people. Now, either the one text must be explained to answer the other, or by the other, or then we help the Deist and declare that he has told but the truth when he calls the bible "a jumble of contradictions." You say the express declaration of scripture is on your side, and first cite John vi. 51. *And the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.* Mean-

ing all men that ever were, or would be in the world, if your position be true. Now at that time a great number of the world were gone to eternal perdition, and out of the reach of recovery. Did he lay down his life to atone for their sins, and that they might live by him ! This is both absurd and antiscrptural. Did he die to procure life for all that were in the world, at that time, or that would be in it till the end of time ? Why did he not send them all word, that he had done so, and give them all an opportunity of believing on him ; seeing all that believe not in him shall be damned ? But, sir, to use a phrase of your own, " You have got a short way of getting rid of this argument." by denying that it is necessary in order to salvation, even, to hear of Christ ! You can send them to heaven, by him, without any knowledge of him at all. Let us hear what the apostle says, Rom. x. 14. *How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed ; and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard ? And how shall they hear without a preacher ?* Here, sir, the apostle seems to differ from you ; but, you may say he has proven himself, before this, to be uncharitable, and not to be believed here : for he hath said, *If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost.* Solomon seems to be little better. He says, *Where there is no wisdom the people perish.* Perhaps you may think it a small thing to differ from these two witnesses ; but many others will not think so, I presume. Again, let us try what fact says, it says, *that there are few that be saved. Many are called, but few are chosen.* Then, according to you he has failed in the attempt ; for he did not give life to all the world, *by his flesh*, in your sense of the word. The spirit, it seems, hath not faithfully applied, as Christ atoned, or all would have been saved ! It appears to me to border upon blasphemy, to hold such an opinion. Seeing these and many more absurdities would flow from such an exposition of the text, as you give : it is better to agree with Calvinist expositors, and allow that by the word here we are to understand the elect only. Your next citation is from Heb. ii. 9. *That he, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man.* No doubt, sir, like the Arminians of old, you make a mighty flourish, with this text in your hand, as if you would make us believe, that it concludes entirely in your favor. In answer to this, let it be remarked, that the word *Man*, is not in the Greek text, and if it were it would very little support your side : for it must be explained agreeable to the context. Then, he tasted death for all men, or every man, who is one of the sons, to be brought to glory, ver. 10. and of whose salvation he is the captain. Every man who is his brother and sanctified by him, ver. 11. Every man, who is one of the children God had given him, ver. 13. &c.

every man, who by his death is delivered from eternal death, ver. 27. Every man, who is reconciled by his death, and therefore, when it is said he tasted death for every man, the apostle doth not mean, that he died to atone for the guilt of all men, to put them in a salvable state, but for every man of his *sheep* or *elect* given to him in the Covenant, ordered in all things, and sure. Besides, these very words, every man, are used in a limited sense else where, and why not limited here? Coll. i. 28. Warning every man, and teaching every man. Did the apostle warn, and teach every man, of Adam's sons and daughters? It is believed he did not. 1 Cor. xii. 7. *The manifestation of the spirit is given to every man, to profit thereby.*

I ask, sir, is the manifestation of the spirit given to every individual of Adam's family that they profit thereby? No, but to some only. Christ says, *Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.* Surely not to stocks or stones, birds and beasts, nay, nor to every one of Adam's family, that had been, were now, or should be hereafter, but to all ranks and degrees of them without distinction, wherever they came. No decisive argument can be drawn from the words, *every man* to answer your purpose, as this expression is so often taken in a limited sense, and according to the context is so to be taken in this place.

YOUR next text which you think proves so directly for you, is taken from 1st John, xi. 2. *He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world.* Since you, sir, seem so ill pleased with my opinion of this text formerly, I presume you will be so with any that I can yet give. Therefore, I shall give you the opinion of an able divine on it, which appears much more agreeable to the analogy of faith than yours. Lime-Street Sermons, page 255th—"He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. Why may not the words denote the better part of the world, the elect, the church of God? We have as good a right, and greater reason to affirm it, than others have to deny it.

1st. The word propitiation seems to limit the expression to believers. God hath set forth his Son to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood. The word propitiation in scripture never extends to any but believers, or refers to any others; so, vain is the attempt to apply it to all mankind, and thereby prove universal redemption.

2. The persons for whom Christ is said to be a propitiation, are those for whom he is an advocate, or intercessor; but he is not an intercessor for all men, and consequently the apostle could not mean every individual man, when he said that Christ

was a propitiation for the sins of the whole world. There is an inseparable connexion between the propitiation and intercession. We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, who also is the propitiation, for our sins, yea, and for the sins of the whole world; for the sins of all for whom he is an advocate, with the Father; for his intercession is founded on his sacrifice; he suffered and satisfied for those for whom he intercedes; and therefore his intercession is effectual or prevalent with God. This seems to be the sum and scope of the apostle's reasoning, and it very easily points out whom he intends by the whole world, for whose sins Christ is said to be a propitiation, even the world of the elect he means. He adds also that the scope of the doctrine was to comfort weak believers, under a sense of sinful infirmities. The comfort is Christ's pleading in heaven the virtue of his atoning sacrifice, which he had offered up on earth not only for their particular sins, but for the sins of all his people throughout the world.— And such a sacrifice, for virtue and extent, he intimates, would bear a sufficient plea for the pardon of their sins. According to our doctrine the apostle's reasoning is just, and the consolation strong. But what can it be for a dejected christian, to tell him that Christ loved and died for all men a like: for Cain and Judas, as well as for Samuel and David"—that there is a possibility of life and pardon procured for all, if they would repent and believe, and that this they must do or be damned, and yet they cannot do it of themselves, and if they could, they might fall from it and perish. No comfort here but great in our way. Hence, I agree with our author that something like this is the meaning, and not as you think, that he died for them that were then in hell, and never get out of it: or them that would go to it, and so die in vain as to the greater part of mankind. As to this epistle being general, I believe this will not be disputed, yet, we know that this apostle resided chiefly amongst the Jewish converts, and it is very reasonable it should chiefly at first fall into their hands, also that he should endeavour to remove their deep rooted prejudice against the Gentile nations, and let them know that Jesus had other sheep that were not of that fold, but of the Gentile world, that were also to be partakers of the benefits of his death. It is, also, well known that the Jews were then called the Church, and all other nations the world, by the Jews, at that time: hence the generality of commentators have been of opinion that the apostle adopts this mode of expression, well understood at that time; but less understood in our day, when such expressions are less used. I have now shewn what I verily believe to be the meaning of the texts you have brought, and that they will not prove

what you intended by them. I trouble not myself with others of a like complexion, at present; yet, I believe they are equally easily answered with these, were this a suitable time and place for them.

I will now give you some reasons why I cannot agree with you and your party, about the extent of the atonement of Christ.

1. It would exhibit Christ as having come into the world, and suffered and died in vain, as to the greater part of men, while the direct reverse is told us in *Ma. liii. 11. He shall see of the travail of his soul; and be satisfied.* And he could never be satisfied except he got all those for whom he died.

2. Your plan separates two things which God hath joined together, i. e. *atonement* and *redemption*, which, always, the one looks to the other, like the faces of the Cherubim. See *Tit. ii. 14. Who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.* *Gal. i. 4. Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God, even our Father.*

3d. In your system I do not find even the essentials of *atonement*, for if Christ did not suffer the wrath and curse of God, due to us for sin, and thus bear sin away from those he represented, that we might enjoy the privileges of the sons of God, and also procure, by his doing and dying, all that was necessary to put us in the full possession of the *purchased inheritance*. I cannot see the value of all that he has done, for the elect. Your system is not even the image of the doctrine of *atonement*.

4th. The scriptures exhibit Christ as laying down his life for the *sheep*, never for the *goats*. *John x. 15. And I lay down my life for the sheep.* *Acts xx. 28. Feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.* And we are commanded to love our wives as *Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it*. I might here give many more reasons, but these satisfy myself that your system is unchangeable. From what is said it is evident, that these expressions, *the world, the whole world, all men, all the world, &c.* are often restricted in scripture, and mean only a part of the world; and why may not these apparently universal texts be restricted to speak agreeably to other texts of scripture, which cannot be disputed, and agreeably to the analogy of faith. That explanation can never be just, that is fraught with so many absurdities, such as would accompany such a latitudinarian explanation as you give, viz. That Christ suffered in vain as to the greater part of the world—That he suffered for those that were in hell at the time he suffered—That millions for whom he suffered will never be bettered thereby, they cannot, according to you, for God never

those them to eternal life, never designed to give them faith and repentance, or any other saving grace; nor did Christ purchase these things for them, that his death might not be in vain! Away with such explanations, they better become the mouth of the *Mother of Harlots* than a *professed Gospel minister*. As I said already it is not consistent with the limits of the work before me to go through all the texts which put on the appearance of universality; but, would circumstances admit, they might all easily be shewn to be limited, *when alluding to redemption*, which words, by the bye, did not suit your purpose to infer when you quoted my words, which is not a great evidence of a fair disputant. I can now add, or when they respect *atonement*. I expect, sir, after arguing for universal redemption, you will neither hold particular redemption any more, nor deny that you are found in the Arminian camp—  
Chapter third.

*Wor.* I can shew that the promises of the gospel are conditional, and that there is not a promise offered to men but on certain conditions, they always require holiness of heart—And, in whatever form the condition is expressed, it always requires holiness of heart, or that love which is the fulfilling of the law. To any thing short of this there is not a single promise of mercy in the Gospel. This you call melancholy doctrine, if it were true, and thank your maker it is false; and in other places of your sermon condemn it in language equally strong, calling it poor gospel, &c. I do not at the same time dispute that God has absolutely promised to renew and sanctify the hearts of some sinners. You look upon me as holding that sinners are holy before they come to Christ, which I deny that ever I said, or any thing that implied this. I suppose that to come to Christ, in the scripture sense of the term, is the same thing as to exercise holy affections. And therefore there is no propriety in saying that sinners come to Christ before they have any holy exercises, nor that they have any holy exercises before they come to Christ. Besides, you use language which is calculated to impress the idea upon the mind of the reader, that I suppose sinners do actually comply with the condition of themselves. If you had looked a little forward you would have seen, that I believe that men till renewed cannot go one step on this way that leads to heaven, which if you had been candid you would have done. You also express yourself as if you believed I still left men room to boast as if there was something in their own power—This I utterly deny that I have done.

*Gib.* If you can shew that the gospel is a promise of life and salvation on certain conditions, I wish you would shew it to

satisfaction ; for I have always believed the contrary, and that it was an absolute promise of life and salvation to a part of men only, and your arguments are not able to convince me to the contrary, as yet. You blame me for calling it poor Gospel, when you say, " in whatever form the condition is expressed it always requires holiness of heart, or that love which is the fulfilling of the law. To any thing short of this there is not a single promise of mercy in the gospel." I have not yet, sir, changed my mind. I still call this doctrine, poor gospel, nay, no gospel at all, for there is no doctrine like this in all our gospels or epistles. I hope to shew in a little that there are many promises free and absolute that contain life and salvation to sinners, which they may and do lay hold on, and feed upon, without any condition. I still desire to be thankful that there is better news in the gospel than this.— Yes, sir, I do believe it to be an absolute promise of salvation to all that were given to Christ to be redeemed by him—To all the seed royal—To all the elect—To all that will believe in Christ till the last day, both of Jews and Gentiles—<sup>^</sup>And I cannot see glad tidings to any other in the bible. I believe with the apostle, that to others *it will be the savor of death unto death.* The scripture saith, *The promise is to you, and to your seed*—What is the condition here ? And is not this a gospel promise ? Have not many of the saints, as well as Abraham, fed upon this promise ? Surely they have. When the Apostle would comfort his audience, he does not say the promise is to all equally who fulfil the condition ; but the promise, viz. of the Saviour, and salvation through him, is to you, and to your seed, &c. You say " there is not a single promise to any thing less than that right temper of heart you speak of, or that love which is the fulfilling of the law !" What, sir, is there no promise of a new heart made in the gospel unconditionally ? Surely there is, and God has promised to shed abroad his love in their hearts. See Ezek. xi. 19, &c. *And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new Spirit within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh, that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances, and do them ; and they shall be my people, and I will be their God.* Jer. xxxii. 38, 39. *And they shall be my people, and I will be their God : and I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me forever, for the good of them, and of their children after them.*

BUT, sir, you are so ingenious at finding out conditions, that you will find out conditions to all these promises, of the sovereign Lord. You say, " you do not deny that God has absolutely promised to renew, and sanctify some sinners." Who

ere these come? Are they any more or less than the elect? Is there a promise either conditional or unconditional to renew and sanctify any other? I believe not one in the bible. I wish I could believe, that you never said any thing that implied that sinners must be holy before they come to Christ. I cannot as yet, while you maintain the promises to be conditional. You have strange notions about coming to Christ: if your idea be true, but I dispute it till it is proven, then a person indeed may come to Christ without ever hearing of him. I thought, that to come to Christ was to believe in him as a prophet, priest, and king: to cheerfully, and heartily receive him as he is freely offered in the gospel as *our own Saviour*, and the only suitable Saviour, to give up with all other Lords, *to love for him*; to account all but *loss and dung, that we might gain him*; and with Thomas to say, *my Lord, and my God*; to take his laws, and ordinances out of his hand, and keep them, as a rule of life and pledge of his love to us, and our love to him: to look unto him alone for *wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and complete redemption*: *if so our own righteousness being but as filthy rags*, to see to him as a robe to cover our nakedness. You, like the Arminians, are very angry with me when I shew that the tendency of your doctrine, would be to rob Christ of the honor and divide it with the creature; if you would not have this done you must change your system, for it will never be consistent, or exhibit God as just and righteous, until you either allow the promises to be absolute, or, then leave it in the power of fallen man to fulfil the condition of the promises.

*Wor.* Having now set aside all that does not pertain to the question in dispute. The question then is, whether there be any promise of pardon and final salvation, to any individual sinner but upon condition of his becoming reconciled to God? Or, it may be stated thus, Whether there be any promise of mercy, in the gospel, which any individual sinner has a right to appropriate to himself until he finds evidence, that he has some degree of holy love? If there be not, then it must be granted, that the promises of the gospel are conditional: for no one will deny, that there are promises, which individuals may appropriate, as soon as they find evidence of such a temper. When God promises to give his people a new heart, to write his law in their heart, &c. he makes an absolute promise of producing holiness in the hearts of some sinners. But, this is not a promise, which any one may thus appropriate to himself. And, it is believed, there is no promise, which any one may thus appropriate, which is not conditional. Christ says, *Come unto me; all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest*; here is a gospel promise. *I will give*

*you rest*; but therein is also a condition: *come unto me*. Can any sinner appropriate this promise, without presumption, until he finds evidence, that he has come unto Christ? Or can he come to Christ, to as to secure the blessing, without holy love? *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved*. Here, again, is a gospel promise: *Thou shalt be saved*. But, is there not, also a condition? *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ*. And, can any sinner have evidence from this promise, that he shall be saved, until he has evidence, that he believes in Christ? On the contrary, must it not be evident, that neither these, nor any similar promises, secure the salvation of one sinner, unless he complies with the terms, on which the promise is made? Indeed, if the gospel is to be preached to the nonelect as well as the elect, the promise of salvation must necessarily be conditional: for, in this case, it is made to some, who will never be saved! And, surely, then it must be conditional. For God makes no absolute promises, which he will not fulfil!

*Gib*. Here, sir, in pages 21 and 22 of your defence, we have awful quibbling with words, and about stating of the question, and having set aside all that does not seem to suit your purpose, you state two questions, and allow me to take either of them. I have not the least doubt, that either of them has a right side, which is left to me; as I hope to shew you have chosen the wrong side of these questions. I shall look at both your questions. The first is, Whether there be any promise of pardon and final salvation, to any individual sinner, but upon condition of his becoming reconciled to God? Answer, not that I remember to any one by name and surname; but there is a promise that such sinners shall be reconciled to God, by his Spirit and grace, which the sinner believes and rests upon, on the authority, and because of the faithfulness of God, that cannot lie. Heb. viii. 10. *For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their mind, and write them on their hearts, and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people*. Compare this verse with the above promises quoted from Jeremiah's prophesy, and with the following verse of this chapter, and therein you will see, that the gospel is a promise of life and salvation, unconditionally, to sinners. Here the children are promised one heart.—What is this, but “that right temper of heart” you speak of, or the new heart we look for? May not the children, when they feel their hearts hard, stubborn and rebellious, and set in them to do evil, and that continually, look to Christ for that new heart he has purchased and promised to give? Surely, they may, and believing him to be faithful, who has promised, they take comfort. It is also said, *I will put a new spirit within*

you, and take away that hard and stoney heart out of your flesh, and give you a heart of flesh. Nay, to sum up all, *They shall be my people and I will be their God.* This, surely, includes all that is good, both here and hereafter, unconditionally. This, Sir, is the language of the new covenant, and of the gospel. *I will, and ye shall.* I am not able, after all that you have laboured to shew the contrary, to believe that Isa. i. 18. to the children of God, is a conditional promise, but that it is absolute to them, and not connected with the preceding or following verses, in the sense that you suppose. Although, I grant, that when it is addressed to the Jews, as a nation, it is conditional, and the condition such as was in their power, and very reasonable—viz. That they as a nation, should put away their idols and ceremonial uncleannesses, and turn unto the Lord as a people, confessing him and his ordinances externally. This was in their power, without saving grace, to do, so as that God might turn from his wrath's furiousness against them, as a nation, and do them good. Even Jehu did this, and had the kingdom secured in the hands of his family to the fourth generation: and, I suppose, no one will say, that he was under the dominion of saving grace. But to the children that were in the church, at that time, and to believers, in after ages, in similar circumstances, it was, and is one of the absolute, great and precious promises of which the apostle speaks. This is a promise, which, I am convinced, has comforted many a drooping and heavy laden soul and sinner, which it would be badly calculated to do, if all the condition you speak of, is required, in order to comfort, so I can inform every heavy laden sinner that is made duly sensible of his state, that here is a promise to him, and to such as him. *Come, now; let us reason together, saith the Lord, Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as the wool.* Agreeable to this see chap. xliii. 25. *I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions, for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins.* What is the condition here, they had not called upon God; but had been weary of him, and his service; they had been guilty of multiplied omissions; and most aggravated commissions of a heinous nature, and when one would think that he would immediately pour out on them his wrath and fury, or denounce the most awful judgments upon them: then he utters in this great and precious promise. *I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions, &c.* See 22—25 ver. By your apparently plausible explanations of this and similar portions of scripture, you may bewilder the ignorant; but, no experienced Christian will give way to such arguments: for, in fact were the promises conditional, as you say, they could give little comfort to children, as they would

always have their doubts and fears about having fulfilled the conditions aright, not finding that uprightness in heart and soul required. I believe all the promises may be reduced to absolute to the elect, however apparently conditional they may seem. If, sir, you had looked forward to Isa. i. 25. you might have found an absolute promise. *And I will turn my hand upon thee, and purely purge away thy dross, and take away all thy tin.* Compare 26. 27. verses. Indeed, sir, the scriptures are so fraught with absolute and unconditional promises, that I can scarcely find a chapter in the bible without them. Psal. cx. 3. *A willing people in a day of power shall come unto thee.* I cannot see the reason why you oppose my opinion of the promises after the concession you have made; for you grant that "God hath absolutely promised to renew and sanctify the hearts of some sinners." Who are these some? They are neither more nor less than the elect. Or, are they not all them? The question after what you have granted, should have been.—Are there not both absolute and conditional promises? Or, are there any promises, either absolute or conditional, of life and salvation to the non elect? Or, can a child of God feed upon an absolute promise, or take comfort from it? As to the first of these questions I have answered it a little above on Isa. i. 18. As to the second, I am fully of opinion there is not a promise of life and salvation, on any terms, to the non-elect as such, nor one word of good news can be brought to them from the gospel, as such. No glad tidings for them there. The curses of a broken law is only their due, as non-elect persons. Gal. iii. 10. As to the third question.—Did not Abraham the father of the faithful feed upon an absolute promise? And may not his children do the same? God said to him, without any condition.—*I will be your God, and the God of your seed.* And Abraham believed God and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Do you think, sir, that none of the children can take comfort from this promise? Nay, they all feed upon such absolute promises. Let us, now, look a little back, and see how the children have been led forward, and we will find them feeding upon absolute promises. Was the gospel preached by God to Adam and Eve in Paradise, or what was it? *He shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.* This is granted to be a promise of a Saviour, and salvation in him, to Adam and a certain number of his posterity, even before he begins to pass sentence upon the man and the woman, and in order to keep their eye fixed upon the promise, and teach them what it meant, he seems evidently, to have instituted sacrifice, at that time, and clothed them with the skins of the sacrificed animals. This promise was fed upon by the church all along, and since that

time, they still offered up sacrifices as types of Christ, till he himself was crucified and *the daily sacrifice was taken away*.—The *he*, that was to bruise the serpent's head, was the Shiloh that was to come, the virgin's son, spoken of by Isaiah, and all the Prophets. This has always been the food of the church, and it is with great propriety believed that our primeval parents obtained life by this absolute promise.

Look to Gen. xii. and see what is the condition there; and certainly there is a promise of life and salvation to Abraham, and his spiritual seed—ver. 3. *And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.* How can some of all families of the earth be blessed in him but by the Saviour descending from him, according to the flesh, and by them, like him, hoping against hope, in the fulfilment of this absolute, great and precious promise. Did not Abraham believe this promise? And can any thing be more absolute? This promise is renewed in the 17th chap. and Circumcision, the seal of God's covenant, given unto him; by which he is taken into a covenant of duties: still there is no word of a condition. Afterwards we find the same unconditional promise renewed to Isaac and to Jacob with an oath; wherein the Apostle to the Hebrews tells us, *that it was confirmed by two immutable things wherein it is impossible for God to lie.* Noah, a preacher of righteousness, no doubt the righteousness of the Messiah, had this same covenant of promise made to himself and his seed. In Gen. xliii. 10. The promise is still made more plain. Moses and all the prophets have been handing down absolute promises of this Saviour, and great salvation, until he came in the fulness of time; and if you carefully look over the 1st and 2d chapters of Luke's Gospel, you will find, that the saints, of that day, took this Saviour as an absolute fulfilment of the absolute promise, and were comforted. Zacharias and his wife Elizabeth, Mary the mother of our Lord, Simeon the prophet, and Anna the prophetess, these all rejoice in the fulfilment of that absolute promise. I can go a little further than you, and say with a *Thus saith the Lord*, that God neither makes vain promises nor threatenings, to hold out to men, they will every one be fulfilled in due time. *No one good word or promise that ever he hath made whether apparently absolute or conditional but will absolutely be fulfilled, if they are not already.* So it is of all the threatenings, they are not held out as bug bears to children. *Ma. xxxiv. 10. Seek ye out of the book of the Lord, and read, no one of these shall fail, none shall want its mate; for my mouth it hath commanded, and his spirit, it hath gathered them.* So it may be said both of

promises and of threatenings, that they are all absolute and none made but to be fulfilled. Thus, whether the promises appear absolute or conditional, they will all be fulfilled, in due time, to the glory of his grace. To say otherwise, would be levelling the Creator with the creature, which your system would assuredly do, exhibiting him as making promises which he never ment to fulfil. According to your position, if I find one absolute promise that a sinner can take comfort from, you lose your side; out of hundreds that might be mentioned, I shall remind you of Isaiah xliii. 25. *I, even I, am he that blotteth out your iniquities, for my own sake, and will not remember your sins.* There is no condition here but that they have iniquities and sins. See also Psalm xxxii. 8. *I will instruct thee, and teach thee, in the way that thou shalt go; I will guide thee with mine eye.* Psa. xxv. 8. *Good and upright is the Lord; therefore will he teach sinners in the way.* It has been known, that the saints of God have fed upon these promises, and yet they are not conditional. Your mode appears to me adopted to turn the covenant of grace into a covenant of works—Yet, sir, though we teach, that God is faithful and will accomplish all his promises, we can also comfort believers, without fear of being contradicted, and let them know, that he that believeth will assuredly be saved, while he that dieth in unbelief will assuredly be damned—though all the promises may be without doubt reduced to absolute. *None of the children shall lack knowledge, all shall be taught of God*—yet, sir, we may not say that faith is the condition of the covenant, but the *perfect righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ.* God has declared, *that he is a reconciled God, and reconciling the world unto himself, by Christ; and, will he fail to do his own work, renovate and sanctify Christ's sheep?* How, sir, do sinners come to have a right to any promise? Is it not because they are made to men and sinners? They are first made to our representative Christ, who hath fulfilled all the condition of the covenant for us, and then to them that he represented, who were men and sinners. *In him, they are all yea and amen, to the glory of God.* Yes, sir, there is not a promise but a child may feed upon, if suited to his state and condition; there is not a promise he may not appropriate, upon the footing of the faithfulness of the promiser, when his case requires it. Behold your reasoning, you take a call for a promise.—True, he says, *Come unto me all ye that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.* Here he gives them an encouraging call, and invitation, but we find this turned into an absolute promise, that he will bring them. *A willing people in thy day of power shall come unto thee*—Psalm cx. 3. *All that the Father giveth*

*me shall come unto me, &c.* From your reading come as a condition to their getting rest, I should conclude, that you thought that their coming was the cause of their getting rest. But their is no merit in coming, therefore, this is not the cause of their rest. This is only to shew that he means them to come for their own good : and that they should be willing to be saved to glorify him, not to be damned for that end ; this he does not require, this would be inconsistent with the care we should have for our own souls, which Christ enjoins. Your next is, *believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.* This, sir, you make a promise with a condition ; but, I presume, you are incorrect in your sentiment here. This is no promise at all, but a declaration of a fact. It informs us who will be saved, viz. *believers alone.* You might as well read John iii. 16. as a promise, which is only a declaration of facts.—*God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life.* This is agreed to be no promise, but a declaration of what God hath done, and for what end he did it. Divines have disputed whether this portion, cited by you, belonged to the law or the gospel. If it is taken as a command, *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, &c.* then it belongs to the Law ; but if as a declaration of what God will do, by his Son, then it belongs to the *Gospel good news.* I cannot see that there is any promise of life and salvation to the *nonelect*, in the gospel ; if they will enter into life, Christ leads them to the *law or covenant of works.*

In the 24 and 25 pages of your defence, you have strange doctrine ! The gospel, according to my idea of it, never carried *glad tidings, or good news, to all people* in the sense you seem to insinuate. See Gurnal's christian armor on the word gospel. Many millions never heard it, and how could it *bring good news* to them, or bring, to them, life and immortality to light ? And of some that heard it, it was said, it *was better for that man that had never been born.* The truth is that as to their spiritual state they are nothing bettered by it. It sounds in their ears, viz. the law, *Cursed is everyone that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them.* Gal. iii. 10. Can you inform the nonelect, as such, that they may be saved if they please ? And who would wish to be damned ? Not one, but all wish to be saved. I am sorry to find you in the Arminian camp : for an Arminian can agree with all you say about the promises.

In page 25th, you seem to triumph as if you had gained the field, because I admit, that for wise ends, and to put the children upon examination, the promises put on the appearance

of conditionality. You add, "by attempting to prove this, do you not counteract what you suppose to be the design of this appearance?" How? Sir, you should have shewn how I do so: for I do not yet see it. It is easy to ask, does not a person counteract or contradict himself, or his doctrine; but it is often not so easy to shew that he does so. If I did so, it became you to shew it, and not leave a matter of such importance to men to find out how, for it may be, they may not find it out so easy as you have done. Upon this, I might leave the subject till you should shew how I should counteract in proving, or attempting to prove. You say, no doubt, now I will be esteemed charitable, for I had it in my power to shew him in a ridiculous point to view, but I did not. How tender you are! But, sir, it cannot be done on this point yet, and, still I maintain the same. The chief reason, why the children, I suppose, are comforted by the promises, is, that they may all be reduced to absolute, and unconditional; yet, they rejoice to see the gospel characterising the children of God. It is said, *Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.* Now, though these are often taken for promises; yet, they are rather declarations, made to comfort the children in times of trouble: or a characterising of them. Here the examination will run thus. Am I spiritually poor, or do I see myself to be so? Am I one of the mourners of Zion, that shall be comforted? Am I mourning for the afflictions of his Jeseph? Am I meak, lowly, and self-denied? Am I hungering and thirsting after righteousness, that I may be filled, or do I see *my own righteousness to be but as filthy rags*? Do I see any need of being clothed upon with the *law magnifying righteousness of the divine Jesus*? Am I longing for purity and uprightnes of heart? Am I for peace, and the peace maker? Then upon finding such characters in one's self, he can read these declarations of the God of mercy, concerning such characters, and not be afraid, but persevere to the end stedfast in the faith, as he has promised that none such shall finally perish, nor be overcome: for I would not be such, except the Lord by his Spirit and grace had been at work in my soul. Surely such a mode will give as much comfort, as if he had looked upon all these to be conditional promises: to look at all, a declaration of God's mind and will, to people of such and such characters. I do not yet, sir, see any contradiction in declaring that there is salvation offered to men and sinners, of Adam's family, wherever we go, and that he died for the elect only, although they are but a part of the world. *Many are called, but few are chosen, says Christ*; and yet these chosen men will assuredly be made *willing in a day of power. The election hath obtain-*

*nd it; and the rest were blinded.* So, as the tares and the wheat are growing together in the world, and I believe will do so while men are in it; it is our incumbent duty to make a declaration of God's mind and will concerning the way of salvation, whether men will hear or forbear, as we know not the one from the other. Yet, Christ's sheep will hear, and obey; but the other, the goats, will reject to their shame and disgrace. There is, sir, a mighty fuss made, by you, on account of my using a homely phrase about sin, which has been very frequently used by Scotch divines, never that I know of, cavilled at before! True, I said men must come to Christ weary and heavy laden, with all their sins *upon their back!* Admiration, what an unhallowed expression!!! Did you not, sir, know what was meant? If you did, why pun upon a word so much? Did you never use an improper word to convey your idea? No, it would be treason to say you did; yet, I have heard some punning upon some expressions, as more improper than this, in both your performances, there is then room for retaliation; but I disdain such paltry shifts. Does not every awakened sinner feel sin to be a heavy load? Christ speaks of it as such, Math. xi. 25. &c. Allow it to be so, and where do men generally bear a heavy burthen, while in the body, is it not on their back? And what can be the evil to use a similitude taken from such things? No, say you, it is seated in the *heart!*

Sir, when acting the critic, you should have spoken like a philosopher; for it is as philosophically false, that it is seated in the *heart*, in the literal sense of the word, as to say, that it is placed upon the back. It's seat, I presume, is the whole soul and body, *per totum*: But after some punning you come to know what I meant. What good genius led you out of the difficulty? When you have found it out you endeavour to make it appear ridiculous, and you are bold enough to assert it to be an unscriptural sentiment, and say that the "scriptures, it is believed, are not guilty of such absurdity." There is nothing absurd in the scriptures, I acknowledge; yet, sir, I suppose they teach all that I intended, viz. That we were to come weary and heavy laden, with a burden of sin to Christ, who says, *Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest.* It is not said, Cast away your load of sin and guilt, original and actual, and I will give you rest from your heavy burthen, you having disposed of it yourself. You, sir, and the Arminian, seem to speak the same sentiment. He says, Loath sin, and leave sin and come unto Christ, and he will give you rest. You say, make you a new heart, wash you, make you clean, and come to Christ and he will cleanse you, after you have done it yourself! How,

fir, was the priest to do with the sins of the people under the law, was he to leave them all before he came to the altar and sacrifice? or, was he to bring and confess them over the sacrifice and scape goat? I believe, he was to bring, and confess them all over it. You speak as if *we* would be for bringing men to Christ without grace. This is not true, fir, for Christ says, *None can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him.* Solomon says, *My son, give me thy heart.* He does not say, make a new heart and I will take it; but give it such as it is, and you shall have a new one, says God. Jer. 31. Heb. 8. Compare Math. xi. 25. I think I never saw Arminianism more clearly taught than in the 27th page of your defence. But the doctrine of the Bible I take to be this, *Come to him poor and miserable, wretched, and blind and naked,* as you all are by nature, lost and undone sinners, *cast into the open field to the loathing of their own persons;* like the prodigal son, naked, or in rags, nay, just as we are! It is such that Christ counsels to *come and buy of him fine gold, that they may be rich, white raiment that they may be clothed, that the shame of their nakedness may not appear, and eye salve, that they may see.* Rev. iii. 18. This is the way we are to come, however ridiculous we may appear in your eyes. We are convinced of our need, and that he is a suitable Saviour, so we are brought to Christ for all. *He is all and in all,* to believers. True; men are bid to repent and be converted; but does this belong to the law, or to the gospel? Or, being called to believe and repent, that our sins may be blotted out: is this any more than a declaration of the benefits of these to whom the grace of repentance and faith are given, that their sins shall be blotted out? It is also said, *Wash you, make ye clean, put away the evil of your doings,* and such like expressions. Yet, it is generally, by all but Arminians agreed, that this belongs to the law, and not to the gospel. Or, that it is only a motive to induce the children to go on and persevere in sanctification work. Yes, fir, it is said cast away from you all your transgressions. But, where shall we cast them? Are we not like the priest of old, to cast them upon Christ the antitypical scape goat? By confessing them over the head of him that came to bear them all away from us into the land of forgetfulness. It is also said, *Make you a new heart, and a new spirit:* is not this, in gospel language, to look to him for that new heart and one spirit which he promised to give freely without money and without price? You say, it is not to come with such a heart, and such a spirit as ye now have; but *make ye a new heart and new spirit.* Here it must be granted, either that it is in the power of the creature to make this new heart &c. or, then the condition of your gospel is unreasonable: for you cannot do what

is required, and he will not, and then damnation is the consequence. If this doctrine of yours, is not Arminianism I never saw it. I look upon all such expressions as these, culled out by you, to belong to the law, and not to the gospel: and, I fear, if you stay away from Christ till you make you a *new heart*, and do all these things, you will never come to him. As you look upon our made of coming to Christ ridiculous, I will shew you the way Calvinists think of, in the answer of that question in the shorter Catechism. What is effectual calling. Answer. Effectual calling is the work of God's spirit, convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our *minds* in the *knowledge* of Christ, renewing our *wills* he doth persuade, and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ, freely offered to us in the Gospel. If you are agreed with this opinion we need not contend; if not we cannot agree. Therefore, from the whole reasoning you have in this chapter, I conclude that you leave a great part of the work of man's salvation in the power of the creature, and so leave him some room to boast; or then you reflect upon the justice of God: or, lastly, that Christ has a small part in the salvation of man. Yet *he is the author and finisher of our faith—All and in all*, unto believers. I should cheerfully spend a little time on these three things, but lest the work should be prolix I desist at present.

*A short Conversation on the Fourth Chapter.*

*Wor.* There is, yet, another important question which should be considered duly, on which you seem to take the wrong side, and thereby cast reflection on the perfections of God and plan of salvation, as if it were partial and defective. The question is, whether there be any difficulty in the way of the sinner's salvation, but what is found in his own heart? Had there no atonement been made, then there had been an insuperable difficulty in the way of the sinner's salvation on God's part—but it hath been shewn that this difficulty is entirely removed. Atonement has been made for all and every individual of Adam's family equally—hence I conclude it is man's own fault if he is not saved.

*Gib.* That I have often taken the wrong side of a question, and been sorry for it afterwards, may justly be confessed; but that I have done so in the present case I am not yet convinced; and, if it can be shewn that the side which I have taken would cast the smallest reflection upon the *glorious perfections of God*, or the plan of salvation devised by him, I would renounce it at once, being certain it was wrong; but I cannot believe that the former is the case, or that the latter has been done, so I have not yet changed my side. You, sir, grant that there

is an insuperable difficulty in the way, if a compleat atonement has not been made for all, on God's part—You take it for granted that you have proven, that this difficulty is removed; but this, sir, is but a *petitis principii*, for although you think that you have proven this, I & many others think the contrary. That there is a *compleat atonement* made, is not disputed; but that it is not for all and every individual, only for the elect, I fully believe and have endeavoured to prove from scripture, reason, the opinions of able divines, and *from facts*. Now, from what you have conceded yourself, there is an insuperable difficulty on the part of God in the way of all those for whom the atonement hath not been made. I have shewn that it was made for the sheep only, not for the goats. I then conclude my side to be right. Is it not fair to draw this conclusion since it has often been proven before either you or I were on the field, that Christ has laid down his life for a part only, and not the whole of the human family. This was the will of God and design of Christ, that he should live, suffer and die for the sheep only, and not for the goats; these latter were never *designed to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth*. The *election* hath obtained it and the rest were *blinded*. *He will have mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth*.—Rom. 9th—*He is said to have power over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel to honor, and another to dishonor*. That there is difficulty enough within every man to keep him back from this duty is granted; but were God disposed to remove this it would be removed. Yet, I cannot grant that this is the only difficulty, there is still more—So I cannot agree with that expression, “if any man be not saved it is his own fault.” Was it his fault that an atoning sacrifice was not offered for him? that the gospel was never preached to him, as has been the case with many, and so he, or they, could not believe. Try how your rule would work the other way—if any man be saved it is his own merit! If you, sir, startle at this sentiment, you must change your mode of expression, for men will conclude in this manner and take glory to themselves.

*Wor.* You have said “there is not one word of the whole sentence true,” and you have supposed some difficulties standing in the way which I shall shew not to be standing in the way. Such as first, the want of a saving faith; and this is no difficulty, in reality, but what is in ourselves; we have all evil hearts of unbelief; and this is all that stands in the way. And you make no distinction between moral and natural inability: you say all Adam's posterity being dead in trespasses, and sins, are no more capable to do any thing to procure their

own salvation, than a man really dead is capable to walk; and this inability, in regard to faith, you suppose entirely excusable. Yet, in other cases similar, you will not excuse them because they lost their ability in Adam. There can be no comparison between men morally dead, and those that are naturally dead.—And, besides, I suppose that man lost this ability to believe in Christ as a Saviour, for himself, as much by Adam, as any other thing! So it is their own evil hearts which prevents their believing, and nothing else.

*Gib.* Having with as much candor as possible attended to the contents of this fourth chapter of your defence, I cannot see that sound and solid reasoning, which might be expected from a man in your station—it is much more plausible than substantial; yet I do not think myself warranted to overlook it altogether. I still think that sentence from the conclusions, which would be drawn therefrom unwarrantable. I wish you had removed entirely these difficulties, which I supposed to be standing in the way, as you proposed, to my satisfaction, for I still profess to be in quest of truth, I had come over to your side and acknowledged my error; but as this is not done, I am bound to defend my sentiment. The whole amount of your reasoning will turn upon this question—Whether Adam as our representative, in the covenant of works, had and lost for his posterity a *saving faith*, or in other words, the faith of God's elect? The positive of this, by your reasoning, you seem to hold; as for me, I hold the negative, in opposition both to you and a neighbouring Clergyman, from whom better things might have been expected. The plausibility of your arguments I acknowledge, and that you have set your side of the argument in as clear a point to view as it will bear; yet notwithstanding all this you do not reach conviction. That Adam neither had, nor lost, a saving faith, for us, I believe; nor, indeed, had he any need for it in the station in which he stood in that covenant. It is readily granted, that Adam being made perfect, and having a perfect law given him to obey, was bound to believe whatever God had revealed to him, or would reveal to him in that state; also, that he was capable of believing every such revelation as God should see fit to reveal to him, either for his own or his posterity's happiness by the covenant of works, for this covenant required a divine, rational faith; but it was both inconsistent with his station, at that time, under that covenant, and also unnecessary that such a revelation should be made until the covenant of works was broken, and man lost thereby. Hence it would be absurd to say, that Adam had and lost a *saving faith* for us, which has the Lord Jesus Christ for its object, in all his offices. This

was kept a secret in the divine mind till after the fall.—Yet, in my opinion, he had all that you think necessary to salvation, if all that is necessary is to believe Christ, as you seem to insinuate; for you can see no difference between believing Christ and believing in Christ. Is there no difference between believing the Apostles, and believing in the Apostles? Upon this footing with the Mother of Harlots, we would have mediators innumerable. I grant it is man's fault, that he is in need of salvation, and it might with much more propriety be said, that all that are damned, are condemned for their own faults, viz. for their sin original and actual; but the reverse will not hold, that they are saved for their own righteousness or good deeds. What did the elect do to recommend them to God before they were chosen, more than others? Nothing. I grant that Adam could have believed whomsoever God would send; so that men will be justly damned for unbelief. The amount of the whole would be this; are any able to comply with these reasonable terms you speak of, without divine supernatural grace? Or, are all as you grant, morally dead in trespasses and sins? Then this being the case, what good thing can they do that will be acceptable to God, or to recommend them to him? Can they arise from the dead that Christ may give them life? Or, has not God absolutely promised to raise them up out of their graves, for his own name's sake? Ezek. 37. Indeed, it may be reasoned, does not God require of us faith in Jesus Christ, repentance unto life, &c. in order of escaping his wrath and curse, &c. And how could he require this if Adam had it not and lost it not for us? Granted, without these none will ever be saved; but does he not also require a new heart and a new spirit, and had the first Adam the *Spirit of Christ*, and this *new heart*, and lost them for us!! Yes, sir, he requires all these, but he hath also unconditionally promised them. By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. See Zach. xii. 10. *In that day I will pour out upon the house of Judah and Jerusalem a spirit of grace and supplication; and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and mourn for him, &c.*

You say, sir, "that I make no distinction between a moral and natural ability or inability, between the want of a disposition and the want of an opportunity, to do what is required." Your reason for this conclusion is because I have said that man being now, by nature, morally dead, is no more capable to do any thing morally good or acceptable in the sight of God, than a dead man is to arise and walk, of himself. And, yet, you confess that man is morally dead in trespasses and sins! That there is a real difference between moral and natural ability is

not disputed; but may there be no similitude drawn between the one & the other because they are not similar in all things? On this footing you would destroy all parables, or similitudes: for none of them are similar in all things. If they were, then they would identify and become the same thing, and cease to be a similitude. In the sense supposed, there is a similarity. — The one can perform no physical action, and the other can perform no action morally good or acceptable: and this is all that was intended: that man in a natural state can do nothing to procure his own salvation. This sentiment you have granted often, and it is wonderful you should here contend. We are told, *of ourselves we can do nothing*—We are not capable even to think a good thought of ourselves, —much less than to do a good work: for, *it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do of his own good pleasure.* Although every regenerate man, with grace in exercise, has no difficulty in receiving this sentiment; yet, you card and turn it over and over, in order to shew it's absurdity, until you bewilder yourself, and speak inconsistently; falling to your former trade of using similitudes, which would level the *Creator* to an equality with the *creature*. A poor work for a teacher in Israel! You suppose, "that the law does actually require a man to walk, at some times,—but should he murder himself, does the law require he should walk?" I answer, it does, sir, and were it possible that men could find him, they would either make him walk, or punish him for not walking. So until you can find that man has the disposal of his own life, and may live or die as he lists, you must grant this, hence, the laws of every civilized nation shew contempt to the self-murderer, and will either not suffer him a burial, or, then not suffer it among Christians. Now if men follow with punishment so far as they can follow the person guilty of suicide, when will the race of Adam be out of God's reach, that have destroyed themselves, that he may not demand obedience from them, or punish for disobedience? But, behold your conclusion, p. 31. "Just so if men were under an inability of the same nature with respect to any, or all acts of obedience, they could no longer be required"! Strange doctrine! Does any man in the exercise of his sober senses believe this? Do you believe it yourself? Look at the tendency and effect which this doctrine would have, if believed, both on the civil and religious world. Suppose your lawful servant entrusted with your property should squander it away on harlots and riotous living, and that by such conduct, he had disabled himself to make restitution, have you no right to demand it, or have him punished for his wicked conduct? Surely the law will secure you this right. Now until men are gone where

God cannot find them out, he has still a full right to demand a compleat and perfect obedience to all the Moral Law. You, sir, teach men a short way of getting rid of obligation both to God and man: let them only disable themselves for doing duty, and none can be required! This was an early doctrine of the Arminian schools, you have not, even, the honour of the invention. Your whole reasoning on this article is only sophistry, and setting up a few blinds to keep men from starting at your novel doctrine, and to make them despise a Deity such as you represent to them; that had decreed and chosen a number of the human family only to salvation, and a way to bring that guilty, chosen company to Christ, whom he sent to work equally for all, or to suffer and die for all equally; but yet he will not draw them all equally to Christ to be partakers of the benefits of his purchase; nor give his spirit or grace to them; nor even ever let many of them know that there was such a Saviour, and yet will damn them eternally because they did not believe in this Saviour of whom they had never heard. Will the heathen parts of the world, that have never heard of this Saviour be damned for not believing in this Saviour? I believe not. To be a little more consistent, you may deny the doctrine of election altogether and put all on an equal footing every way. Or, can you say that it is in the power of any but the elect to be saved? Have you not told us often that none else can be saved? You will have to take another draught at the Arminian fountain and then you can say that they are chosen because of foreseen faith and good works. Until you either do this, or come over to the Calvinist side, you will be inconsistent with yourself and hold up a system of mockery to the greater part of mankind. Your supposition that Adam lost a saving faith for himself and us is ridiculous. God will be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus; *just*, and yet the condemner of the wicked, without acknowledging that Adam lost for us power to receive Christ in all his offices, as our own Saviour. We all know that if God had willed the salvation of the nonelect, chosen them to it and given them a saving faith, they would have been saved, as well as others, and whether it may be determined that the want of all this lays any difficulty in the way of them that are not saved, extra se, let wiser men determine, and better casuists; for I never desire to say, with some, *that God is the author of sin*. To close up what I have to say on this chapter, you seem to misapprehend the plan of both the covenants. I shall then give you my opinion of them both. God set up Adam, at first, as the representative of all his posterity, and gave him sufficient power to fulfil all the condition of the covenant of works, and

If he stood and fulfilled the whole condition, which was personal, perfect and unremitting obedience, then all his posterity would have been confirmed in happiness, and put out of the reach of falling from that blessed state, they would have been, also, in due time, translated to everlasting blessedness, in heaven, &c. But, upon *his failure*, he and all his posterity were to be banished Paradise, and from the gracious presence of God, and never have it in their power to obtain happiness by that covenant but be liable to death natural, spiritual and eternal; but that after this plan should be shut up, or way to heaven closed: God, from all everlasting, had laid a plan of saving a part of the fallen family, chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, by sending his own Son, in our nature, to represent the elect only, to take up that covenant where Adam laid it down, that he might both give that full and complete obedience which Adam should have given, and satisfy justice for the offence committed, by suffering what was, at least, equivalent in value, to their suffering through eternity, and thus satisfy divine justice for them all: also, God had determined to send his spirit to put us in possession of the purchased redemption, sanctify and make us happy in the full enjoyment of God to all eternity.

As soon as this plan was proposed to the Son of God, he heartily approves of it and says, *Lo! I come to do thy will, O God*, which was to *destroy sin, the work of the Devil*, by taking it out of the way, or by bearing the guilt of the sins of them that were given to him, called *his elect, his sheep, his Church, his body, &c.* In consequence of which it is said, *The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness sake; for he hath magnified the law, and made it honorable.* The Father declares, that in this his only begotten Son, he is well pleased. The apostle declares him, on this account, to be *a reconciled God, &c.* On this account, God can be truly said to search for sin, and none is to be found among the elect. It is well known that the priests, under the law, prayed for all those for whom they offered sacrifice, and they were types of Christ; we also know, that he prayed for the elect only. John xvii. This clearly shews us, that the design of the whole plan was, that *the election should obtain it*, and the rest he given up to the hardness of their own hearts, to walk in their own ways.

I HERE remark that had it been the will of God that his Son should have come into the world, and suffered, and died, for all men equally, one of two things must infallibly be the case—viz. Either, that there would have been no certainty of the salvation of any, and all would have been suspended upon the fleeting will of the creature, *the imperfect creature, and*

Christ might have suffered and died, and never have brought one son unto glory; or, then if he died for all equally, all must be saved infallibly, and then hell would be depopulated at once, as to the human family. I see no alternative. In all just reasoning one of these ideas must be admitted by you, or you must hold up a system of mockery to the world, if you do not agree with the Calvinist. Let us view the first, that Christ came at a venture & ensured the salvation of one: is this plan worthy of him that is wisdom itself? To come to do that which, in the end, might be labor in vain? I believe it is not. 2. The sovereignty of God would not have been manifested in this plan, which is so conspicuous in all his other works both of creation and providence; also it would never have been evident that he designed the salvation of any. 3. It would at once destroy the doctrine of election, which is a scripture doctrine, and which you seem to hold, in which, you must acknowledge, that the life and salvation of the sheep, or elect, are secured. In one word it would be dethroning God and giving his throne to the creature. Let us give God the glory. The other plan, upon due examination, will appear equally unscriptural and absurd, for we know that there are some in hell already, from the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles. Instance the parable of Dives and Lazarus, which clearly teaches that such as Dives were in hell. Besides, in the final sentence, Christ will say to them on his left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels. We are told, that *they have no rest day nor night. That the smoke of their torment ascendeth forever and ever. That the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched.*— This also would oppose the sovereignty of God, and the doctrine of absolute and personal election; likewise, would encourage wickedness, and be antinomianism with a witness, as well as counteract your own doctrine. From all which I conclude you will be more consistent to drop the Universalists altogether, and come over to the Calvinist scheme, the only one clear of absurdities and inconsistencies, which exhibits Christ as laying down his life for the elect only, and purchasing all things necessary to put us in the full possession of the same. He purchased eternal redemption for us.

*A short Dialogue on Chapter 5th, concerning Unbelief.*

*Wor.* Sir, you deny that unbelief is a sin; but I can shew it to be exceedingly sinful, both from reason and scripture.— In this you speak consistent with your own idea of the atonement; but contradictory of the bible, which exhibits unbelief as very heinous. You say, that Adam as covenant head

H

neither had nor could lose a saving faith for us; but I can shew that he had faith, and that by that covenant he was bound to believe in a Saviour so soon as God was pleased to reveal him, though I confess he never exercised it while he stood, but was to be in need of it whenever he fell, and therefore had it before he fell. This I can illustrate by a similitude. While Adam was in innocency he had no opportunity of exercising the duty of a parent to children. But the moment he became a parent, the same law, under which he was originally placed, required him to discharge the duties of a parent. And just so, the moment that a Saviour was revealed, the same law required him to exercise saving faith.— This is but a rational faith, and you acknowledge that men will be condemned for acting unreasonably. Hence unbelief is, indeed, exceedingly sinful!!!

*Gib.* Here, sir, you have prepared your man of straw, bulked him up, and laid him upon your floor; but the corn you will bring off him, will make you little bread, I presume; as, if it be proven that the atonement is particular and not universal, which I presume I have done, you should conclude me right and have no charge; also, you go upon the footing that there is no difference between believing Christ, and believing in him, which is not true, as will appear. Here, sir, I first deny positively your assertion, viz. That ever I said, directly or indirectly, that unbelief was no sin. It is only by taking a superficial view of my arguments that you draw this conclusion; or looking at them with a prejudiced eye, which draws false conclusions from the premises laid down. You take premises to draw your conclusions from which were never granted. 1st. That I assert or hold that Adam had no faith, consequently deny him to be a rational being. 2d. That there is no difference between a rational and a saving faith, which I will not grant. Then you lay it down, as a first principle, that Adam really "had and lost a saving faith for us, as much as any other thing;" this will not be admitted until proven, which, it is believed, cannot be done. I have already acknowledged unbelief to be a sin, and the very worst sin possible, which in its most aggravating circumstances, amounts to the sin against the Holy Ghost; and if there is need of any more than you have said, to convince men that unbelief is sinful, I could adduce many arguments, besides what you have brought, to shew its sinfulness, both from scripture and reason, though you should cry out of my inconsistency. 2d. I will readily acknowledge, that my expressions, on that subject, are not sufficiently guarded, in the sermon, to fall into your hands and many others, who wish to pervert my reasoning, to make

me appear ridiculous: I should have added, *let no man conclude from this that there is no sin in unbelief.* 3d. Could I think that I had given any just ground to any to draw such a conclusion from my mode of expressing myself, I should not only be very sorry, but abhor my own conduct, and with all speed contradict it as publicly as I had exhibited it. I account it my honor to disapprove of myself in that or any other thing wherein I am wrong. No man that has a love to, or magnanimity for truth, but would do so. Therefore, if I have doopt any expression that would give just ground to any to look upon unbelief as no sin, I now inform them that I disapprove of such expressions, and am certain that such cannot be holding the *form of sound words* commanded by the apostle; but I scarcely believe that any unprejudiced person can candidly read over my sermon and draw such a conclusion. I certainly grant that men are bound to believe whatever God is pleased to reveal, and that because they are rational beings, descended from Adam. The moral law binds us to believe God, and whomsoever he shall authoritatively send to reveal his will and our duty. This is certainly granting the sinfulness of unbelief. The Jews and Gentiles have both suffered severely for this sin, and are suffering for it at this day. This is the sin for which the world is pestered with false teachers, in our day, *because they did not love to retain God in their knowledge,* or acknowledgment of him. So I agree that according to scripture, reason, & common sense, unbelief is exceedingly sinful. I shall never contend with you about this point. Yet, sir, I make a great distinction between a saving and a rational faith. So does the Apostle James. *Thou believest that there is one God, thou doest well; the Devils also believe and tremble.* It is not every faith, that is saving faith, or the faith of God's elect. Many writers speak of four kinds of faith, three of which is denied to be saving, viz. an historical faith, a temporary faith, and the faith of miracles, which are not a saving faith. The devil, no doubt, believes *that God sent his own Son into the world,* in our nature—that he is the second Adam, and head of the covenant of grace—that he came to save sinners of Adam's family—that all for whom he died will be saved—and that every one of Adam's family that believes in him will be saved by him. But all this comes short of a saving faith. Did not the enemy believe the words which Christ spake, but did he ever believe in him as his own Saviour? No, he did not. A saving faith appropriates Christ in all his offices and receives him as made of God, unto the person's self, Wisdom, as a Prophet, Righteousness, as a Priest, and Sanctification and compleat Redemption, as a King. Every ra-

tional man, that has objective revelation, has it in his power to believe that Christ is the Saviour, that God hath appointed; that by him and no other, can men be saved; that he is offered to men and sinners, and that he has need of this Saviour as well as others; also, that all that come unto him for salvation, on his own terms, will be saved by him. After all this if they reject him, or neglect to apply to him, as such, may we not say that, at the last day, they will be left inexcusable? Your allowing that Calvinism excuses for unbelief, because we will not allow the universality of the atonement, we deny. Your argument, on this head, against us, would bear as hard against yourself, as against us while you hold the doctrine of election. For, if your argument against me had any weight, then, if the nonelect believe that Christ will not save them, because they were not elected, if they did come unto him, they would, according to your argument, be only believing a truth, and would not be sinful or condemned for it. Here, sir, you furnish your opponent with another argument. Is this wisdom? But perhaps you will say you can free your side of this objection; for they can never say, that they are not elected until they reject the Saviour; so can we, that they can never say he died not for them until they *trample under foot the blood of the covenant and account it an unholy thing*. The atonement was made for men and sinners, and *secret things belong unto the Lord*. None can believe that Christ died for himself, in particular, until he is pleased with him and his salvation; nor the contrary, until he rejects him as a Saviour. You say, "there is no sin in staying away until we have evidence that Christ intends to save ourselves, in particular"! Can you, sir, as you allow the atonement to be universal, tell all, wherever you come, that Christ intends to save all mankind? If he does, what will hinder him to accomplish his intention? Is it want of power or the obstinacy and perverse will of the creature? In power he is omnipotent; and says, *My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure*. As to the creatures, all are equally perverse and obstinate, if this stands in the way of one, in the sense you suppose, it stands in the way of all, for God is no respecter of persons, but loves all equally. As to the text which you say is misquoted, and perverted, it was not introduced to prove that unbelief is no sin, as you say; I have shewn already that I did not intend this; but what is very different from what you suppose. I need therefore make no remarks upon it, as it is certainly the duty of all that have a saving faith, to *stir up the gift of God within them*, and have it in exercise.—For, it is required according to that a man hath, not according to that he hath not, if there be first a willing mind.

*Wor.* But you suppose, that Adam had not a saving faith, as our representative, and could not lose it. Also, that there is a difference between believing Christ, and believing in him; whereas he both had and lost a saving faith, as much as any other thing; and I see no room for a distinction between believing Christ and believing in him. Here you greatly err.

*Gib.* It is granted at once that while Adam stood he had no opportunity of exercising the duty of a parent, and that by virtue of the law, he was then under, he was bound to exercise that duty, as much as others, so soon as he had children: so that he had abilities suited to that duty. But, sir, let me ask if he could not have had children and exercised the duty of a parent without being a fallen, lost, and undone creature? Surely he might: for he was commanded to be fruitful, &c. But could he have exercised a saving faith without being a lost, & undone creature? I believe not. Then the parallel will not hold; you certainly did not believe that this was a proper similitude. I have not read of any other person that believed that Adam had and lost a saving faith for us. Truly, this would be lodging the treasure of Christ, and his purchase and gift, in the first Adam's hand, which is absurd; and had he had saving faith; were it possible for him in a state of innocence, he could not have fallen. That Adam in the covenant of works, had all that was requisite for him as our representative, to make him and us continue in happiness, and go to heaven; but the moment he fell he ceased to be our representative, he is no longer entrusted, has no longer the treasure of his seed in his hands. While he stood, life and happiness were to be had by him, if got at all; but so soon as he fell, another representative was pointed out, by whom we were to attain life and salvation, even, the seed of the woman; and as the Covenant of works admitted not of faith nor repentance, as now faith is exercised, nor in the same manner; but the covenant with Christ did, who was a second covenant head, it is reasonable that that covenant head should have the treasure of it entrusted with him. So we are told, *that he is exalted as a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and the remission of sins. All the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are in him.* Adam as covenant head had no need of a saving faith, either for himself, or for his seed; and, we have reason to bless God, our treasure is now lodged in safer hands. We have a covenant established on *better and surer* principles than the former—*ordered in all things, and sure.* Thus all your arguments for Adam's having and losing a saving faith for us is overturned. Indeed, from your mode of expression on both these points you seem to be in doubt of the truth of your ideas yourself.

Your second objection, "that you can see no ground for a distinction between believing Christ and believing in him:" I am not at a loss to see ground for a distinction here; also the best writers on Divinity make such a distinction: for many believed him and never had a saving faith, say foran. What think you of those that received the word with joy and gladness for a season; but when tribulation or persecution came on account of the word were offended? Consider the stony ground hearers. Doctor Owen, on the person of Christ, clearly demonstrates the distinction between believing Christ, and believing in or upon him. He in the preceding pages is speaking of faith and Christ, and the difference between the faith that is exercised towards those by whom the mind of God is revealed; and that which is exercised toward Christ himself. "So it is said of the Israelites, that they believed the Lord, and Moses. Exod. xiv. 33. i. e. that he was sent of God, was no deceiver, that it was the word and will of God which he revealed to them. 2. Chron. 22. 20. Believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper. It was not the persons of the prophets, that was the object of their faith, but their message. So it is explained by the apostle, Acts xvi. 27. King Agrippa believest thou the prophets, I know that thou believest. He believed that they were sent from God, and that the words they spake were from him; otherwise there was no believing of them who were dead so many ages ago. This is all the faith in Christ that some will allow. To believe in Christ is only to believe the doctrines of the Gospel revealed by him. Hence they deny that any could believe in him before his coming into the world, and the declaration of the mind of God in the gospel, made by him. An assent unto the truth of the gospel, as revealed by Christ, is with them the whole of that faith in Christ Jesus which is requisite. Of all that poison which at this day is infused into the minds of men, corrupting them from the mystery of the gospel, there is no part more pernicious, than this one perverse imagination, that to believe in Christ is no more than to believe the doctrines of the gospel, which yet we grant is included therein. For, as it allows the consideration of no office in him, but that of a prophet; and that not as vested and exercised in that of his divine person, so it utterly overthrows the whole foundation of the relation of the church unto him, and salvation by him: That which my present design, says he, is to evince, that it is the person of Christ which is the first and principal object of the faith wherewith we are required to believe in him; and that so to do, is not only to assent to the truth of the doctrine revealed by him, but also to place our trust and confidence in him, for

every relief, and protection for our righteous acts, life and salvation; for a blessed resurrection, and eternal reward." This he manifests by multiplied texts of scripture, and arguments drawn from them: then he proceeds to declare the ground, nature and exercise of this faith itself. Here he remarks, "that, wherever faith is required towards our Lord Jesus Christ, it is still called believing in him, or on his name, according as faith in God is every where expressed. If no more be intended but only the belief of the doctrine revealed by him, then whose doctrine soever we are obliged to believe, we may be rightly said to believe in them, or to believe on their name. For instance, we are obliged to believe the doctrine of the apostle Paul, the revelations made by him, and that on the hazard of our eternal welfare, by the unbelieving of them. Yet, that we should be said to believe in Paul, is that which he did utterly detest. 1. Cor. i. 13. 15." Here he cites a number of texts of scripture which teach this same doctrine: and adduces a number of strong and irrefragable arguments, to prove, that there is an essential difference between believing Christ, and believing in him. Dr. Owen on the person of Christ, p. 358, 359, &c. And, this has been the opinion of orthodox divines, since the apostles days; but you and the Socinians will agree pretty well in this article of your creed. Alas! you seem to agree in too many articles of your faith. But you may say many of them were learned men; granted, but not by the spirit of God, I fear.

In this 5th, chap. you make a mighty shout, because you have got hold of an unguarded sentence, on which you could quibble, and torture it till you would make it speak false doctrine; which I have never designed to speak, on this, or any other subject, as if you had gained a prize. From which, it would appear to me, that you would rejoice if you could find me guilty of teaching error, on any subject: and if this be true, it does not appear that you have much love for the truth. Truly, your chief talent seems to lie in torturing sentiments expressed to make them speak something different from the intention of the speaker or writer, this is no great accomplishment in a teacher, and never found in a fair disputant. I now affirm, that it is the incumbent duty of every man that hears the gospel, to believe it, and every one to whom Christ is offered, as a Saviour, in objective revelation, as he is offered to men and sinners, to put in his plea for a part in this Saviour, and great salvation; and, if they do not, their condemnation will be greatly aggravated, at the last day, for rejecting God's plan of salvation offered on such reasonable and easy terms.— Is this teaching that unbelief is no sin? I believe not. I shall

now leave you with *your bug-bear, of your own framing*, to make what use of it you please, you and your neighbour Clergyman, who has joined your side, on this subject, who, I should think, should have understood the matter better, and had more love for the cause of Calvinism, than to furnish it's opponents with weapons against it. It is a pity party prejudice should run so high at present! But if he will meet me, at a convenient season, I can answer his arguments as easy as yours; but this is an improper place.

*Now we proceed to Chap. Six, in our Dialogue.*

*Wor.* You wrong me in supposing me inconsistent with myself. You suppose me holding doctrines which will not agree together, as the doctrine of universal redemption, and that of eternal, particular and personal election; but it is not universal redemption I contend for, only *universal atonement*, which is of much larger extent than *redemption*; for if by *redemption* be meant an actual deliverance from sin, and from the wrath of God, into a state of reconciliation and favor with him, the doctrine of universal redemption is not one for which I contend; and it is acknowledged it is used in this sense in scripture. *Atonement* has only opened a way for an actual deliverance; but this *redemption* includes the deliverance itself. So that *redemption*, in this sense of the word, includes much more than is included in *atonement*, must be evident from what has been said in the first chapter. Hence I see no inconsistency in holding the doctrine of *election*; and that of *universal atonement*—as *atonement* only opened a way for an actual deliverance, but *this redemption* includes the deliverance itself!

*Gib.* Pity, sir, you should be wronged, and especially by me, for I did not intend to wrong you, as I have shewn in the beginning of the second dialogue, to which I refer the reader. I have there endeavored to shew what still I believe the scriptures teach, that *redemption* and *atonement* respect the *same persons*, and are of equal extent, those *who were given to Christ*, and for *whom he prays*. It must be acknowledged, that all that the priests, under the law offered up sacrifice for, that they prayed for the same persons; and, also, that these priests were types of Christ. Now, if Christ offered a sacrifice for all mankind, he must pray also for all mankind; or then, in this, the priest did not typify Christ; but that it must be granted that they did, the Apostle to the Hebrews has shewn. According to you he offered for all, and consequently must pray for all for whom he made ~~atone-~~

ment; and if his prayers were heard, all will be saved; hence you will be obliged to obtain the doctrine of universal salvation, to be consistent with yourself. Did he pray for all? Why are not all saved? Perhaps you will say, his prayers were not always answered. This would make Christ and the apostle both to be liars: for Christ says, *I knew that thou heardest me always*, by hearing in this text is meant answering; the apostle saith, *he was heard in that he feared*. Whether shall we believe these witnesses or the objector? Judge yourself. But you may probably object, there were prayers which Christ put up that were not answered. One was that night in which he was betrayed, he prayed thrice the same words, *Father if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done*. Now, says the objector, the cup did not pass from him, therefore his prayers were not answered. Answer, 1. Here Christ was setting us an example how to pray when called to suffer for righteousness sake. 2. His prayer was conditional—*If it be possible*, he does not say, *let this cup pass from me; but if it be possible, let it pass from me*. But it was not possible, for many reasons. What was the burthen of his prayer, *thy will be done*. So it was compleatly answered; for he said, *for this end was he born, and for this end came I into the world, that I might drink that cup*. And it is not to be believed, that he wished to frustrate the design of his divine mission. A second, you may say, was when he was on the cross. Where he says, *Father forgive them for they know not what they do*. This prayer was not answered, for the Jews as a nation, they were rejected for crucifying the Son of God. But, sir, this is begging the question, you should have first proved, that none were forgiven as the answer of that prayer. And second, that this prayer was put up for the whole nation of the Jews, at that time. Both of which are impossible to be proven. For, no doubt, many were converted on account of this prayer. We read of five thousand at one time, and three thousand at another. And more is to be ascribed to the value of Christ's prayer, than to the apostle's sermons, however good they might be. We know that his *intercession* was founded upon the *atonement*. 1. John ii. 1. 2. *If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father—who is the propitiation for our sins, &c.* We know, also, that he did not pray for every individual man and woman. *I pray not for the world; but for them that thou hast given me out of the world*. And lest any should say that this was a particular prayer for the apostles, he adds at the same time.—*And for all that shall believe in me through their word to the end of the world*. From this I draw the conclusion that *atonement* and *redemption* are of equal extent, and respect the

same persons. Them that he atoned for will be *actually redeemed*, every one of them, in due time. Indeed, sir, your system would exhibit the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as having different objects of their love: or, as loving the elect, and non-elect equally, which is absurd: for God says, *Jacob have I loved; but Esau have I hated*. Thus there is a difference in the objects of Divine love.

I CAN, sir, see no warrant in the bible for the distinction which you make between the extent of the terms *atonement* and *redemption*: and your reasoning on the first chapter has been already shewn to be false, and will stand you in no stead here, and even, if it would, it appears to me, you would be still inconsistent. In fact, if Christ, in *atonement*, did no more than you admit of, I cannot as yet see the way to God open. I find the most that you say on this chapter to be reiteration of your former antisciptural arguments; yet, I shall endeavor to follow you, in your turnings and windings, a little. The instance, or similitude brought to illustrate this subject, viz. That of the brazen serpent erected in the wilderness, for the children of Israel, will be of little service to you; as it hath been shewn to be improperly introduced formerly, it will be of as little use to you in this case. I have always been of opinion that this serpent was typical of a whole Christ, and all his benefits, as well as of atonement: for alluding to this, it is said, he is exalted as a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and the remission of sins, to his people: who will all be made to look to him for these things. *A willing people in thy day of power shall come unto thee*, Pt. cx. 3. The atonement which he made for the sheep, insures the application, for says he, I lay down my life for the sheep—*And they shall never perish*, &c.—*Who is he that condemneth*, Rom. viii. 34. *It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is ever at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us*.

Now what is the reason that there is no condemnation? It is the death of Christ, and it is upon this footing that he makes *intercession for these sheep*, for whom he died and suffered. Having answered all the demands of law and justice for them, and borne the wrath of God for his chosen company, he may well advocate their cause, and plead for them. *He was made sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world*. But you would have it read thus: Behold the lamb of God, who hath opened a way by which it is possible the sins of every individual in the world may be got rid of. According to you, John Baptist did not speak accurately, for Christ did not take away the sin

nor guilt of the world. Believing in Christ removes the wrath of God, and men's sins, according to your notion; and neither the sufferings nor death of Christ. Hence the merit is in man's believing, not in Christ's atonement! Pray, sir, was the looking to the serpent the cause of Israel's being healed? or what was the cause? If your plan would do, the apostle could not have told us, *that God was a reconciled God, and reconciling the world unto himself*—and beseech us—to be reconciled to God. In order to induce us he does not inform us that the wrath of God and condemnation is lying on us; nor that our being reconciled to him will reconcile him to us; but that the curse is removed, and God reconciled. For *Christ hath removed the curse—being made a curse for us*; Gal. iii. 13. With this agrees Isaiah xlii. 21. *The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake: for he hath magnified the law, and made it honorable.* I believe, sir, you separate two things which God hath joined together, *viz. atonement and redemption*; and in order to accomplish your end, misinterpret different texts of scripture in this chapter. I also believe, that the wrath of God is as really removed from all for whom Christ died as ever it will be; but that it is not intimated to the person's soul, that his guilt was removed, till after regeneration. Yet we have no right to inform any impenitent person that his guilt is removed from him in particular, until he believes, for until that we do not know whether or not he be one of those for whom Christ died. We may safely say, *that God is a reconciled God in Christ Jesus, and reconciling the world unto himself*, and yet, not contradict our own doctrine, that he died for the elect only, to whom he will be manifested in all his offices, in due time, by the spirit and grace of God.

I HAVE, sir, endeavored to follow you in all your ingenious turnings & windings, that you may get rid of the gospel plan of salvation, and the complete & allsufficient atonement and righteousness of Christ; and, so far as I know, exhibited Calvinist doctrine, and the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles, on these turning and most important points of our holy religion: and, it appears to me, that either you must be wrong on these points, or the most noble divines, who ever lived, have been egregiously mistaken in the plan of salvation, such as Luther, Calvin, the eminent Westminster divines, that ever famed assembly who sat in Glasgow, A. D. 1638. Almost all the Dutch Divines, English Independants, and the Puritans, Isaac Ambrose, and the noble Herry, in all their writings; Fisher and the pious Erskins, Watts also, whose Psalms you sing in your congregation, and in this act inconsistent—I might add to this list, Witsius, Doctor Owen, and a thousand

others that differ with you on these important points. If you are right, all these, and such as hold the same sentiments, must have been, or are dangerously wrong; or then it must with you be a matter of little importance what men believe, whether right or wrong, if they think they are right, which you have substantially told us. You say, "if there is a will to believe, it will be accepted." This I believe is not a scriptural idea, for it is only they that actually believe that will be actually saved, and none else. I shall now leave you to look over your last exhibition once more, and may God, by his grace, open your eyes to see the dangerous errors contained therein, for the glory of his own name, the good of society and the happiness of your own soul, and for the peace and unity of the church of our Lord Jesus Christ.

*Concluding Dialogue on the Miscellaneous part.*

*War.* In the preceding part, I have stated the leading points in dispute between us; and endeavored, (I hope candidly) to vindicate the truth on these subjects. But there are many things in the Sermon which appear to me exceptionable which I shall pass over in silence, and pass to things of more importance.

*Gib.* I grant that you have brought into view, some of the most important truths of christianity; but that you have been engaged in defence of these truths, I am led with many to dispute: also, that you have candidly handled these subjects, we shall leave the unprejudiced to judge; for I cannot agree with you in this opinion, to me you appear deficient in candor some times. Pity, sir, that circumstances did not allow you to point out all the doctrines in which we differ, then the truth might have more fully appeared. I dare not say you are speaking an untruth when you say your design was that truth might appear; but sure I am, though you may think many things truth, for which you contend, this will not make them so: for many of them are really wrong.

*War.* You suppose me to be essentially erroneous in denying the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity; and, also, the imputation of Christ's righteousness to his spiritual seed, as if it were their own: and if by imputation he meant, that Adam's first sin is also the sin of his posterity, and that the righteousness of Christ is actually the righteousness of the believer; it is true, I do not believe that such an imputation is taught in the scripture. But though Adam's first sin was, and still is, his own sin, and not the sin of any one else, yet, in consequence of this sin, agreeably to the

divine constitution, all his posterity are, by nature, sinners.— They are guilty before God, and deserve to die, not for Adam's wickedness, but their own, not for imputed, but for inherent, positive sinfulness. *The soul that sinneth, it shall die.— The son shall not bear the iniquity of the Father, &c. Ezek. xviii:20.*

*Gib.* Here, sir, it will be necessary to make a remark or two, lest we should misunderstand each other, the terms not being defined. 1. By Adam's first sin being imputed to us, I understand, that in law reckoning we are accounted guilty of it as if we had done it ourselves, he being our representative at the time it was committed; not that we, but Adam as our representative ate the forbidden fruit, and committed that heinous and aggravated transgression: so we became chargeable in the eye of law and justice, and this sin is reckoned to us as our own, he standing as our representative. This the scripture clearly teacheth in many places and contradicts in none. 1. Cor. xix. 22. For, *as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive.* Rom. v. 12. *Wherefore, as by one man, sin entered into the world, and death by sin: and so death passed upon all men, (Eph. ho) in whom, all have sinned.* 2. We do not understand that we gave that holy obedience to the law or justice of God that Christ gave, but that this obedience, in law reckoning, is accounted, reckoned or imputed to us as if done by ourselves. 3. We do not suppose that the sin, but the guilt of the sin, is reckoned or imputed to us: so the merit of Christ's holy life and obedience is imputed to his spiritual seed, as if they had done all themselves, he standing as their representative, or *vice illis*. Let these remarks then be kept in view. As I have touched at this subject already, little remains now to be said; but that the doctrine of imputation is a scripture doctrine cannot be denied, both imputation of sin, and of righteousness, and why not of the sin of Adam, and righteousness of Christ? See Psal. xxxii. 2. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity, *sin*, or *guilt*, Rom. iv. 8. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. See verse 6. Where the apostle speaks *of righteousness without works*. Indeed this whole chapter is entirely to my purpose. See Henry, on the place. I shall extract a few words from Mr. Brown on the word impute. "The imputation of sin and righteousness, is a standard doctrine of revelation, much misunderstood, and perverted by many, as they do other scriptures to their own destruction. The literal meaning of impute is, 1. Freely to account or ascribe to a person, that which he himself hath not or did not, Rom. iv. 22.—2. To lay to ones charge, 2. Sam. xix. 19.—3. To be held guilty, Lev. xvii. 4.—4. To suspect, 1. Sam. xxii. 15. Men have started many doubts and

raised many objections to God's way of saving the guilty by the imputation of the righteousness of Jesus Christ: Paul illustrates the nature of imputation in a striking manner in the fifth of the Romans: He reasons that guilty men are saved by the righteousness of Christ, *by imputation*, because God *imputed to him the Just One*, the transgressions of the unjust many, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. Again, as by one man's offence many were made sinners; i. e. as by the transgression of the first man, all his race were considered as transgressors in him, or had his offence imputed to them; so by the righteousness of one (being *imputed*) the free gift came upon all men to justification. Compare Lev. 7. chap. Psalm 32. Rom. iv, 6. 11. and v. 13. "Sin is imputed when it is charged." This is what I take to be the scripture doctrine of imputation, and what has been held by orthodox divines since the apostles days, and with which I am fully agreed. Many texts of scripture, might be cited to prove the *imputation* of the guilt of Adam's first sin to his seed. Let these suffice at present. Eph. ii. 3. And we were by nature children of wrath, even as others. Now if Adam did not stand and fall for us, as well as himself, so that the guilt of his first sin, is *imputed to us*, as our own, how can a just and righteous God account us liable to his wrath and curse, and that only because we are descended from him by ordinary generation, and receive a corrupt nature like his? Or, if we are not guilty by *imputation*, how can you justify God in giving us a corrupt nature, if not on this account. Psalm li. *Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin* (or as it may be better rendered, in guilt) *did my mother conceive me*, meaning the guilt of Adam's first sin. Rom. v. 12. Wherefore, by one man, viz. Adam, sin entered into the world; and death by sin, viz. natural, spiritual and eternal death, and so death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned. Compare ver. 19th. *For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners: so by the obedience of one, viz. Christ, shall many be made righteous.* Consider these portions well, and there will be sufficient cause for supposing you essentially wrong in your notion of imputation. Your quotations from Ezekiel xviii. ch. to prove your position have been quoted by Arminians to a similar purpose frequently, and as often confuted. The Jews were at that time labouring under national judgments, for their national-sins, and threatened with more: then they began to reflect on the justice of God in sending these judgments upon them, saying, *The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the childrens teeth are set on edge*: blaming all the sin that God was punishing them for, upon their fathers: and here God declares solemnly that they shall have no longer cause to use this

to *perish*; for if they have not by their conduct homologated their fathers sins they shall not thus be punished. *But the soul that sinneth he shall die, and no other.* This, Sr, has not the least allusion to Adam's sin, and hence is unhappily chosen to prove your hypothesis; for it will not answer your end: it only proves that they who follow not the wicked ways of their fathers will not be punished for their sins, and no more. The gloss put upon these texts which speak of the righteousness of Christ, is obviously incorrect, as may appear from every commentary extant, none agree with you that I have ever seen.— This every man of reading knows. I therefore pay no farther attention to them, at present.

SOME things in your Miscellaneous remarks I wish you to explain, and let us know what you mean thereby. Viz. "But though Adam's first sin, was, and still is, his own sin, and not the sin of any one else, yet, in consequence of this sin, agreeably to divine institution, all his posterity are by nature sinners. They are guilty before God, and deserve to die, not for Adam's wickedness but for their own; not for imputed, but for inherent, positive sinfulness." Pray, what do these words mean, if they mean not sin imputed.— You allow that we are liable to condemnation, in consequence of Adam's fall, for inherent positive sinfulness. Allow me hence to ask you a question or two. If, as you say, Adam's first sin was, and still is, his own sin, and not the sin of any one else, I ask how can any evil come unto his posterity, in consequence of it, merely because they are descended from him by ordinary generation, and on no other account? Reconcile this doctrine of yours with the absolute and strict justice of God. I presume this will be a hard task, to do it satisfactorily: or to reconcile it with the doctrines of the bible, and, especially with your quotation from Ezekiel xviii. ch. *The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father. The soul that sinneth he shall die.* Children die; who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, i. e. that never committed actual sin; and *the wages of sin is death.* Please to reconcile your doctrine with the scriptures, and with God's strict justice. It will not be an answer to tell me, that death is no punishment. I know it is the wages of sin, and a great punishment. *In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.* It will not do to say that death comes not in consequence of the fall, but of the recovery. *As in Adam all die; so in Christ shall all be made alive,* 2. Cor. xv. 22. Nay, the their off arguments which are generally given, will not be taken as an answer.

2. Do not we suffer great evil in consequence of Adam's fall? Is not the ground cursed on account of his first sin?

Are not our natures depraved and corrupted on that account, and we all by nature become children of wrath? How, sir, do you reconcile these things with the justice of God, if the guilt of that first sin is not imputed to us? I fear you have not just ideas of God, for the phenomena which we see daily will not correspond with your hypothesis. We must esteem God to be a God of justice and equity, rendering to every one as strict justice would demand. Truly, sir, according to your opinion, that the guilt of Adam's first sin is not imputed to us, no man can justify God in giving us a corrupt nature. Your language here only darkens council by words, when you say, Yet, in consequence of Adam's sin, agreeable to divine institution, all his posterity are by nature sinners. How can they be so, if he did not stand as our covenant head and representative? And if he stood and acted in this character, how are we not guilty? I fear, sir, there will be found more inconsistency and error in this than in your former performance. In opposition to all you say against the imputation of *Adam's sin* and *Christ's righteousness*, I shall place one text of scripture: 1st Cor. v. 21. *For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.* This in pointing to Christ as the end of the law for righteousness, will oppose all your doctrine on that head.

*Wor.* I only add, that it is probable you will suppose this to be error, which must necessarily exclude from heaven. It is, however, matter of consolation, that the key of David is not in your hands.

*Gib.* I have no difficulty, sir, to inform you, that I firmly believe this to be an error, a dangerous error; but I hope your opposition to God's plan of salvation, as yet, does not amount to the unpardonable sin. I hope you will not be left to live and die in this error, as it may be an error of the head, and not of the heart. I know that the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin, and it can, if duly applied, cleanse from this sin as well as others. But, sir, if it would serve your purpose any thing to have me more explicit, I can freely inform you, that I would not live and die in your opinions, on these important subjects, for a thousand worlds. So I pray with all my heart, that your eyes may be opened speedily. What you understand by the key of David not being in my hands, upon which you build, as your *great consolation*, I do not well understand. If you mean, by that, that I am not the ruler of the universe, but Christ, the elect's head and husband, I rejoice in this myself. If you mean that I am not to be the judge of the world, this is true, in a certain sense, and we are to judge no man—To his own master he standeth or falleth. But there is a sense

in which the key of David might be found in my hands, contrary to your judgment, if I might not add, contrary to your desire. If it should turn out that I had got that "right temper of heart," you speak of, and was a child of God: though you can seat yourself on God's throne, judge the heart, and tell the world I have it not! *Know ye not that the saints shall judge the world?* Where would the key of David then be, when the saints were passing sentence with Christ upon unbelievers; or acquiescing with him in the sentence passed? Should it turn out, contrary to your expectation, that I was called, by God, as a gospel minister, and as a successor to the Apostles in faith and office, where would the key of David be then? Did not our Lord say to the Apostles, and to their successors in the office, *I give unto you the keys; and whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven.—Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.* The key of doctrine and the key of government are put into the hands of faithful ministers of the gospel, and they have a rule to judge both men's principles and practices by. So you might have a false foundation for this great consolation.

*Wor.* In the beginning of your sermon, you say, "a man may preach all his life about Christ, and never preach Christ fully." I agree with you in this, and ask whether a minister can preach Christ fully as he ought, without bringing into view at all, the nature of saving faith, or the nature of religion and godliness? Now in all you have said, you have never brought into view the nature of saving faith, &c.

*Gib.* I own my sermons all as well as this one to be very defective, in many things, and no doubt this one as much as the rest; but any thing that is defective in it I do not wish to justify: yet, sir, your opinions & mine are so different, in many things, that were I to inform you, in so many words, what I understand by a saving faith, I presume you would not agree with me. I believe, I have brought nothing into view in it contrary to a saving faith, or but what would lead men to appropriate the Christ of God, as the only Saviour, and as one that is both able and willing to save, all that come to him, or to God through him, to the uttermost. The work of a minister, I presume, is not every day to be describing all the articles of a saving faith: sometimes he has to detect dangerous errors, in the corner where he lives, that might lead men away from the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was the work I had in view, that day; and if I got the peoples eyes opened, to see this, then a door was opened to shew more fully the nature of *saving faith*. Yet, sir, if any intelligent and unpreju-

diced person to read with candor, my sermon, he would certainly be able to gather what I understand to be a saving faith, though my work on that day was not to give a particular description of it; but to defend it from those that were about to undermine and destroy *the faith once delivered to the saints*. I have now, sir, had it in my power to read, and have read and considered three of your own performances, and I, not only, do not find in one, or all of them the doctrine of a *saving faith*; but can safely declare that I do not know what you take to be the articles of a *saving faith*: or what you think necessary to be believed in order to salvation. Hence it would not be amiss in you to review your own publications on this article.

You, sir, may hold your opinion about the salvation of men without Christ's being made known to them, seeing every man of reading knows this to be an Arminian tenet, and one that has no foundation for it in the bible, as has been shewn already. I shall leave you to compare your opinion with two texts of scripture. John xiv. 6. *I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.* Now, if you can save men without coming to the Father, you will do well; or bring them to the Father without coming by Christ, you will make him a liar. Acts iv. 12. *Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is no other name given under heaven, amongst men, whereby we must be saved.* If, sir, you compare these with what the Apostle saith, Rom. xi. 14, 15, and after all hold your very charitable opinion, that men will be saved without hearing of Christ, or believing in him, I shall wonder at it. If you can prove that Cornelius had been a proselyte of the gate, or that he had been favored with the Old Testament before that, it will be admitted that he might have been a convert, and that he believed in the Saviour that had long been promised; then all the Apostle's work was to convince him that he was really come, and that him that he preached was the true *Messiah*.— Upon this footing I shall not contend with you whether he was regenerated or not. If you had told us where Calvin holds with you here, I could have looked and seen what he said; but to tell me he is on your side and not quote his words, or inform us where he says so, will do little for your purpose. I am certain he does not agree with you in all you say on this subject. I am certain that Calvin never ascribes pardon or justification to regeneration, but to the interposition of Christ, his doing and dying instead of the elect.

YOUR remark on my saying that I essayed my Sermon under the direction of the Holy Ghost, seems so like yourself, so censorious, so capricious, that it is unworthy of notice. Do

you think I meant that every word of my sermon was to be taken for divine inspiration? Certainly, you do not. Did you not know that it was a modest wish or prayer that I might be directed by the Holy Spirit—also, to be directed by the spirit speaking in the *Word*, and taking the things that are Christ's and shewing them unto us, or bringing to remembrance what he had said on that subject? And what harm was there in expressing my dependance on him? But some, when they enter the pulpit, have no need of such dependance, if they are spared in their ordinary way, with their tongue and eye sight, they can read what was before written. To such dependance on the Spirit, in the pulpit, will appear wonderful mummery! Did you, sir, know what reflection in this you are casting upon many godly Ministers, who have used such a mode of expression, I think you would wish to bury this censorious remark. They never meant that all they said was to be taken for divine inspiration. Notwithstanding, sir, you take it for granted that you have gotten "that right temper of heart" of which you so often speak, which you say means the same with what the Apostle saith, Phil. ii. 5. Let that mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus. You, in your writings, scarcely seem to be clothed with that humility which the Apostle recommends, or you would be a little more cautious, I presume, in judging of the state of others, so often as you do. Please to read the third and fourth verses of that chapter, and see if you are not found counteracting his direction. Your hope that I should make myself acquainted with "that right temper of heart," &c. favors of so much presumption, that I am almost ready to retort, Physician heal thyself. But what is the mind which was in Christ Jesus? Was it not *that he accounted it as his meat and his drink to do the will of his heavenly Father?* This, sir, is my desire, in my place and station, to know the will of my heavenly Father, and do it to the best of my ability, so far as I can judge of my own heart. But as the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked, I have had frequently my doubts and fears, in this matter. This I can say, I have argued for nothing but what I believe to be the truths of God, and what I believe to be lawful weapons have I used, in the defence of it, and have not, to my knowledge, overrated any argument for or against.—The defence of the truth was what I had in my eye all along, and not victory, or my own personal honor. So I leave you for the time, praying that let come of the character of the writer what will, in this world, Jesus and his truths may prevail over all the anti-christian errors that abound in our day and generation—That the Lord may feed and nourish his own

children, and raise up more able hands to defend and propagate the truths of the Gospel; than

Your Humble Servant,

WILLIAM GIBSON.

*A few words to the Church of Peabham, especially the Covenanters.*

HAVING now finished what I intended as an answer to Mr. *Worcester*, I look upon myself bound to publish the following Covenant for the inspection of the people belonging to Peabham Church, that they may take the matter under due consideration, and examine, whether they are going forward in reformation, or turning away from the faith of the gospel and leaving their first love. An oath and solemn Covenant is not to be sported with. True, if they have found that they have sworn to do what is wrong in itself, dishonouring to God, and hurtful to Society, they have a right to repent of this evil, and cease to fulfil their oath; but they have great need to be certain it is wrong before they draw back: for God has said, *if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.* And, *The backslider in heart, shall be filled with his own ways.* As I believe this Covenant to be substantially right, I with those who have sworn it to consider whether they have kept it, or if they have broken their Covenant, lest it should rise against them at the day of judgment. In my answer I believe I have exhibited no doctrine, but what is substantially contained in this Covenant, and as it was given me by one of these covenanters, that I in charity believe, has not designedly broken his vow, I shall publish it verbatim, that the rest may call to remembrance their former oath.

THE Covenant.—God having in his providence placed us in this wilderness, at a great distance from any place where the stated ordinances of the gospel can be administered to us: we esteem it our bounden duty, early to lay the foundation of God's house amongst us. Accordingly being met together with one accord, and having sought the LORD, for his grace, counsel and direction, in this weighty concern, of entering into Church Society, and Fellowship, and in all things consequent or following.

Therefore, in the first place—

We solemnly profess a serious and christian belief of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, to be the pure word of God, a perfect, and the only Rule of Faith and Practice; and we so understand and hold the same, as explained, and held in the *Confession of Faith*, and the *Larger and Shorter Catechisms*, agreed on by the *Assembly of Divines at Westminster*.

In the next place, Being deeply affected with the sense of our utterly lost *Estate* in the first Adam, the total depravity of our *Nature*, our natural enmity and perfect opposition to God's *Will*, before conversion, and absolute inability to help ourselves, either in whole or in part, we desire wholly to recommend ourselves, and to fly to the mere mercy of God in *Christ*, for all grace, and enter into Covenant with God, in the Name of our only *Mediator Jesus Christ*.

Accordingly, (The Covenant.)

We Avouch the Great JEHOVAH, the FATHER, SON and HOLY GHOST, to be our GOD, and we freely and heartily give ourselves, our seed and our all, to Him alone, according to His Gospel.

We renounce the Vanities of this *World*, and all worldly Lusts, promising, through the grace of God, to deny ourselves daily, to mortify our lusts, and to walk soberly, righteously and godly, adorning the doctrine of God our SAVIOUR in all things.

We also promise to attend the Sacraments of the New Testament, *Baptism* and the *Lord's supper*, as God shall give opportunity, and as Christ has directed his Church in his *Word*.— And we further promise, to maintain and attend all the public Ordinances and Institutions of *Jesus Christ*, with that *Reverence, Diligence, Faith and Love* pointed out in the *Word*. To read the scriptures and pray in our Families, and Closets. To bring up our Children and Servants in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, to Catechise and instruct them in the principles of Religion, out of, and according to the *Word of God*, our adopted *Confession of Faith*, and *Catechisms*, especially the shorter, and to set an example of piety before them; yea, and before all men,

FURTHERMORE, we promise, by divine grace, to walk one with and towards another in brotherly *Love*, as the *Word* directs, and faithfully to watch over one another and ourselves, and to keep up and maintain the Government and Discipline of *Christ's House* according to his Institution. We submit to one another according to the *divine Rule*, and we expressly put ourselves under the government of the *Reverend Grafton Pres-*

bytery, so far as they shall direct and govern according to the divine Rule.

HUMBLY imploring divine Grace and Acceptance, through our Lord Jesus Christ, we subscribe our names to this Covenant.

James Bayley,  
Marah Bayley,  
Archibald McLauchlin,  
Christian McLauchlin,  
Jonathan Elkins,

Elizabeth Elkins,  
John Skeels,  
Phebe Skeels,  
John Way, &c.

Peabham, January 22d, 1784.

THEN the Church in Peabham, was gathered and embodied at the house of Mr. James Bayley; and were received as a Presbyterian Church to all privileges of the Presbytery, by me,  
PETER POWERS, Minister.

HERE, my friends, I have taken the liberty to lay before you, your own solemn Covenant with God. I hope that none of you are yet gone so far in apostacy, as that you dare say, that this was a *Covenant with hell and an agreement with death*, and should therefore be broken; if you dare not say this, examine the doctrines, you are getting at present, how far they agree with them, or rather how directly opposite they are unto the doctrines to which you have sworn, and see how you will account to your maker for trampling under foot his truths, if you do so, and your lawful obligations. Were men to deal so with you in their solemn obligations, what would you say of them? Would you not say that they were men that could not be safely trusted? And what do ye think your God to whom ye have sworn will say of you? Can he say any thing less than that you are a backsliding people? Surely no. There is not one thing in which I am opposed by Mr. W. but *his man of straw* that he has made up, if you are faithful to your vows; but he opposes you as much as me. Indeed, there is very little in your Covenant which he has not directly or indirectly attacked, and endeavoured to overthrow. I would not give much for the remainder, after he has done: the essentials of your Covenant is gone. I fear you have without due consideration entered into it; that has made you so soon weary of Christ's yoke and turn to another gospel, like the *foolish Galatians*.

No doubt if you are endeavouring to be faithful your teacher will say of you as he says of others, they have sworn to their Creed and dare not alter it, will not be reformed; but, *my brethren*, mind not these calumnies. You have sworn to *buy the truth and not sell it, and to hold it fast and not let it go*—

to contend for the faith once delivered to the Saints. You should rejoice in the oath that you have sworn like Israel of old. I am not ashamed to say, I have sworn a similar Covenant time after time : That I have opened my mouth to the Lord, and I cannot go back. These principles have been tried by the godly in all ages of christianity, and have been found comfortable. They have been tried living and dying, and found to stand the test of the Word and Spirit, and given comfort to every believer in Christ Jesus that knew them. Erronious men, devils, and persecutors have tried them, and found them too strong for them. I have held them but a few years, comparatively speaking, yet in this short time I do not know one of these principles which I have not been obliged to examine by the rule of God's word, to see that they were so well founded that I might venture to suffer for them. And now I can say, with comfort, the more I try them I am the more confirmed of the truth of them, and the error and danger of all that oppose them. *Let us then be steadfast and immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, for as much as we know, that our labor shall not be in vain in the Lord.* Remember he that confesseth him before men, him will he confess before his heavenly Father; but whosoever is ashamed of him here, of such will he be ashamed in heaven. May the Lord enable you to remember your Covenant, and to pay your vows unto him.

