

ing to overthrow election, showed just where Arminians stand. Why do they not all come out and candidly enroll themselves under their banner, and not try to be on both sides. The ox and the ass do not plow well together. Let them take one side or the other. If grace is true, then let it be grace. If work is true, let it be work. I have respect for the candor and consistency of a Methodist who comes out thus openly and takes his stand under his own colors.

The doctrine of Arminianism rejects effectual calling, imputed righteousness, and final perseverance.—These all grow in a cluster on the same vine. Kill God's purpose and all these die together. How different are some in their views and motives. What would I take to have the truth of effectual calling blotted from the bible? "But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."—1 Cor. 1: 25. If it is the power and wisdom of God to them that are called is it not an effectual calling? If the power and wisdom of God do not make a calling an effectual one what would? "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions which were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."—Heb. 9: 15. If this call gives the promise of *eternal inheritance*, is it not an effectual call? They who are called receive the promise of eternal inheritance.—Great as is the promise of eternal inheritance it is not as great as God who promised it. What makes a promise valuable is the character of the one promising. God, who cannot lie, promised salvation to the heirs of promise before the world began.

What would I take to have the precious doctrine of imputed righteousness expunged from the bible? If our righteousness is of the Lord is it not imputed to us? If it comes from another is it not a gift or imputed? Did not Christ bear our sins, and does he not give us his righteousness? "Surely shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength." "Who is made of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." "God made him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputed righteousness without works."—Rom. 4: 6. How else can a sinner be justified?

He says, "The Arminians believe and teach that when Adam fell, God might in justice have visited the penalty of the law upon him, but could not in justice allow him to live a fallen man and propagate a race of fallen children, without their knowledge or consent, and make no provision for their recovery. They teach that God therefore entered into a covenant with Adam, through Christ for his redemption and the redemption of the race."

This is Arminianism sure enough.

What a strong creature man is!—God might in justice have punished Adam for his transgression, but could not in justice withhold provisions of a recovery from his fallen offspring. If justice required God to provide salvation for sinners, how could it be said to be by grace we are saved? Again, he says God made a covenant *with Adam*, through Christ, for the redemption of his race. He makes a promise of mercy to man through Christ. But he does not make a covenant *with Adam*. Arminians hold Adam or man can do so much to save himself and his race. They do not realize nor even hold, that Adam died and all his offspring are corrupt, dead in trespasses and in sins. There was one that preached to Eve before the transgression that when they transgressed they would not die. There have been many since preaching the same thing in substance, by saying man is not dead, is not a condemned, corrupted, and depraved sinner.

If all men are redeemed from the penalty of Adam's transgression, why do men die? Why do infants die in early infancy? Why, if men are not born sinners, do they go astray so much? Why do we not find some that do not sin and die?

"Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgement came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life."—Rom. 5: 18. The preceding verse explains; "For if by one man's offence, death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace, and the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ." This limits the number of those who receive *justification unto life to the same number that receive abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness*. The Two Adams, Adam the first and Adam the second, or Christ, are here contrasted; for each is the head of a race.—All that are of Adam are made sinners by his disobedience: So all that are of Christ are made righteous by his obedience. All that ever receive the atonement are by grace the sons of Christ: for in them grace reigns through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.—Grace actually reigns through righteousness *unto eternal life* to all these heirs of grace.

What a queer grace is that which may save a man or damn him either? "In a word, if he has the power by the grace of God to get religion, he has the power by the same grace to lose his religion." This is his language. It is then by grace a man is saved or by grace he is lost. This is not my idea of grace. How much better is a man by the death of Christ than he was before? He says no man is absolutely saved by the death of Christ, &c. Then he is his own Savior, and just has the matter in his own hands to be saved or lost, just as he pleases. Freewillism, sure enough. The death of Christ, election, repentance, faith, and obedience generally, are so joined that nothing can sever them. But of this hereafter.

He says, there is no mystery in the word of God, as it respects the doctrine of salvation, when the bible is

allowed to explain its own teachings. What a pity then he does not allow it to do so. With this bold, flaunting assertion he approaches "to examine and explain what is supposed to be the most difficult doctrine taught in the bible." He asserts that the Pharisees believed they were the elect of God. Well, they did not talk like people who believe it now. The people that believe in election now confess and hold that they are sinners, guilty and lost, and are not able to deliver themselves or save themselves at all; and hence rely on the grace of God to save them. But the Pharisees said they had no sin, and said they were able to do many good deeds, and boasted of their ability and performances.—"Lord, Lord, have we not done many wonderful works," &c. Jesus told them that "no man can come to me except the Father which sent me draw him;" and again, "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me." And again tells the Pharisees that they believed not on him because they were not of his sheep, and that if they had been of his sheep they would have believed on him—and this offended Pharisees very much. People of Christ are his before they believe on him, and believe because they were his before. Hence these Pharisees believed not because they were not of his sheep. All this looks very hard to the proud, corrupt nature of Pharisees, or self-righteous people, and is contrary to the wisdom of this world, I freely admit: and I shall not attempt to reconcile the carnal mind of man, or the wisdom of this crafty world to it. God hath hid it from the wise and prudent and revealed it unto babes; for so it seemed good in his sight. The election hath obtained and the rest were blinded. They are so blind they do not even understand the letter of the doctrine of the bible clearly.

On the verse of scripture he selected (*I suppose he was bound to choose one*, but I do not see wisdom in his choice) for his text to overthrow personal election, he makes in substance this statement, and thinks he has covered the ground and flanked the predestinarians. Unconditional election "refers always and specially to the plan of salvation, and never to salvation itself of any one," or again he says, "The key to the whole mystery of unconditional election, as clearly taught in the bible is that all this election specially applies to the working out of the plan of salvation, and never applies in any instance to the personal salvation of the parties chosen." It is true that God chose men to be prophets, and Christ chose apostles and sent them to preach and teach, and that often he chose men for certain services. But now is that what Paul is speaking of in Rom. the 9th ch.? In 8th verse he says, That is, they which are the children of the flesh these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Here the question is not about doing some service for others; but the question is, who are the children of God? And if the children of God are not saved who are saved? In the 11th verse the personal, unconditional election of

Jacob is taught, and his election to salvation too, and the reason is also given why. Before Jacob or Esau had done either good or evil, that the *purpose* of God, (it does not say love) according to election might stand, not of works (though men have it according to works) but of him that calleth; It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger; (contrary to nature). As is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Arminians say the Lord did not hate Esau. I have yet to find an Arminian that will not defend Esau. Birds of a feather will flock together. I have yet to find a predestinarian that does not defend and love Jacob. In this same chapter Paul tells us that the elect ones are the vessels of mercy which he had afore prepared unto glory. Even those he has called, not only of the Jews, but also of the Gentiles. It is true that God has an elect people among the Gentiles, as well as among the Jews. If naming people by their individual names is not a personal salvation what could be? If having ones name written in the lambs book of life is not personal what is? If having been chosen before one is born, or has done good or evil, is not unconditional election what is unconditional election? If it is done to show that the purpose of God, according to election, is to stand (not of works but of him that calleth) does not that prove election? and if the choice is to make Jacob the son of God, according to the promise of eternal inheritance, does it not prove that his election was to salvation?

Is God bound to choose between two methods both equally good in order to save sinners? If the debtor has two five dollar gold coins to pay five dollars with, he can offer either and the creditor is bound to choose one. Man had nothing to offer. There is only *one* way (no choice of ways) to save sinners. God's choice does not refer to one out of several plans to save sinners, but his choice refers to the objects to be saved.

There is no lottery about it. Nothing like two lottery tickets, either of which may win (and likely neither) and he must choose between them; though he does not know which will win. To suppose that God must thus choose between these ways, either of which is uncertain, (for according to Arminianism the plan which God has chosen will fail to save many for whom Christ died) is to suppose that God is quite like a man.

The notion that election applies only to the *plan of salvation* and not to the *people saved* may suit Arminians; and almost anything will suit them except the truth. Their idea is that God in justice was bound to offer salvation to man, and he elected to do so by Christ because he was bound to do so by him; for he could not do so in any other way. It is strange that the men who love personal liberty and freedom as much as they do should deny to the Almighty the liberty of choice. Christ is the chosen of God, the elect, and all his members are elect members too. Salvation is by grace and all the means are chosen of God, and the people

(SEE 146TH AND 147TH PAGES.)