

A REPLY
TO
JOHN P. CAMPBELL'S
STRICTURES
ON
ATONEMENT.

BY BARTON W. STONE.

The Philistines be upon thee, Samson--And he brake the withes as
a thread of tow is broken, when it toucheth the fire.

JUDGES.

LEXINGTON, K.
PRINTED BY JOSEPH CHARLESS.

.....
1805.

www.GravelHillchurchofChrist.com

Table of Contents

LETTER I.	3
LETTER II.	8
LETTER III.	14
LETTER IV.	18
LETTER V.	23
LETTER VI.	29
LETTER VII.	34
LETTER VIII.	42
LETTER IX.	50
LETTER X.	53
LETTER XI.	62

LETTER I.

SIR,

A FEW weeks ago, you sent me your Strictures on my Letters written to a friend on Atonement. I read them with attention, and was not a little surprised to find what a different spirit they breathed, from what I had ever before discovered, in all your private communications with me, whether by letter or private conversation. Till now we had called each other by the endearing name of *brother*. But, what a sudden change! You hold me up to public view as a deceiver, a reviler of the cross, a contemnor of the blood of Jesus, an infidel, yea, worse than an infidel. Almost every name of reproach you have illiberally imputed to me. How must I appear in the eyes of those, who have never read my letters? It is impossible for them, from your statement of my principles, to know what I believe; for you have given almost every thing a different turn, from what was ever intended by me. Had my character only suffered, I should never have troubled the press; but when the precious truths of the gospel are assailed, and wrested, I cannot forbear.

Before I enter into the examination of your strictures, I hope you will bear with me, while I briefly state to you the way, in which my mind has progressed in sentiment for several years past.

Soon after I came to this country, it pleased the Lord to give us a little reviving in the congregations in which I yet live. My soul was very happy in the enjoyment of God. I felt an ardent love for all the world, and earnestly longed for their salvation. During this time, on a certain evening, I began to conclude that the spirit I had, was a spirit of delusion. I thus reasoned: The spirit in me loved all the world, and desires the salvation of all; this cannot be the spirit of God, for he does not love all, he does not desire the salvation of all, or else he would save all. In deep distress, I fell prostrate before God, to cry for mercy; but as soon as I began to pray, I

thought that as I was deluded, I must yet be an unbeliever, and if so, my very prayers would be sin; *for whatsoever is not of faith is sin---and without faith it is impossible to please God.* I stopped, and saw plainly that I must believe before I dare pray to God. I tried now to believe. I asked myself such questions as these: Do you believe that Christ died for you? No: for I know not whether I am one of the elect, and for these only he died. Do you believe that God will have mercy on you? No: for I know not whether I am one of the elect, and God can have mercy on none else. Do you believe he will hear your prayers? No: for he will hear none but the elect, and I know not whether I am one of that number, &c.

After trying to believe in this manner for some time, I found it was impossible; because, on this plan, there were no grounds in the scripture, on which the sinner could believe. These texts rolled like thunder through my ears, *He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten son of God---He that believeth not shall be damned.* What! will the Lord condemn me for not believing, when he has given no ground upon which I may believe? Will he command me to do an impossibility, and damn me eternally for not doing it? The fire of hell got hold of my soul, and was kindling to a flame against such a God. I could not believe. I dared not pray. I rolled in agony, not knowing what to do.--Near three weeks I remained in this state, like a creature bereaved of every enjoyment in the universe.

At the end of this time, as I was walking solitary in the woods, these scriptures came into my mind; *This man receiveth sinners---He came to seek and to save that which was lost.* Hope flashed into my soul for a moment. Ah! It is true, Jesus is the friend and lover of sinners; but O! the dreadful God of vengeance, wrath and fury, that stands behind! My heart sunk again. But the words of Jesus to Philip, came to my remembrance; *Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father, and how sayest thou then, shew us the Father---I am in the Father, and the Father in me.* And is this friend and lover of sinners, the very Father? Is this the only true God? Yes, it is--Then "God is love." I cannot describe the

transport of my soul. I sunk into God, and was fully relieved. In this heaven of love I lived several months, without a doubt, or cloud, or fear.

After this relief, I felt the same flame of love to all the world, and longing for their salvation. Now I was convinced that this was the spirit of God in me. If so, then God loved all the world, and was not willing that any should perish. I now saw and could testify in the spirit, that Jesus was sent to be the savior of the world; that he died for all, and that salvation was free for every creature. Now I gave up the doctrines of unconditional election and reprobation---the partial love of God---that Jesus died for a part only---and the notion of a God out of Christ.

After I lived for several months in this happy state, my mind was again bewitched, in this manner. If Christ died for all, and God loves all, and is not willing that any should perish; and if he has almighty power, then if he does not save all, will he not contradict his nature. I searched the bible with diligence to see if universal salvation was not true; but found it everywhere condemned in scripture. From this perplexity I was at length relieved by inquiring, why does God save one sinner and damn another? This text solved the difficulty. *He that believeth---shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.* This I saw to be the purpose of God; and that according to this purpose, he exercised his power, in saving him that believed, and in damning him that believed not.

But here arose another difficulty, "Faith is the gift of God." I now inquired why God gave faith to one, and not to another. I knew it could not be because one asked for faith; for we must have faith before we can pray or receive any thing of the Lord; for, *how shall we call on him in whom we have not believed? He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him.* And James testifies, that a man shall receive nothing of the Lord who asks in unbelief or wavering. I saw farther, that God did not give faith to one and not to another, because of worthiness in some, and not in another. Then it must follow that he gives faith in a sovereign way. If so, then I saw that

God was a respecter of persons--then were unconditional election and reprobation true--then Christ died for a part only---then was God's love partial. Again I thought if God has faith in his own hands, and gives it in a sovereign manner, how then can he condemn a man for unbelief, feeling it was impossible for him to believe, till God gave him faith.

My mind was now in an awful state of confusion: if these doctrines be true, then the religion I had was not; for I could not witness the truth of one of them, but contradicted them all. When I examined the spirit in me by the word of truth, I could not doubt but it was the spirit of truth. In this state of perplexity I remained till I went to see the work of God in the lower parts of this state. There my mind was filled with admiration at the work. Many old and young, even little children, professed religion, and all declared the same simple gospel of Jesus. I knew the voice and felt the power. All my difficulties were removed. I saw that faith was the sovereign gift of God to all sinners, not the act of faith, but the object or foundation of faith, which is the testimony of Jesus, or the gospel; that sinners had power to believe this gospel, and then come to God and obtain grace and salvation. I hastened home, with longing desire to preach the gospel to those committed to my care. In a few days the great and glorious work of God began among us, which yet continues in power.

About eighteen months ago another difficulty occurred to my mind. If Christ died for all as a surety, to satisfy law and justice, then all must be saved. I searched my bible with prayer to God for direction. I began at the foundation doctrine, to find where Christ was said to be surety for sinners. To my surprise, I could not find it in one text. I then concluded that surety righteousness must fall with this. I searched for it, and to find where the surety righteousness of Christ is imputed to us. I could not find it. I farther saw, if Christ be not surety of sinners, then the generally received doctrine of Atonement could not be true. I searched my bible for find where law and justice were ever said to be satisfied by the vicarious obedience and suffering of Jesus. I could not find one text. I then inquired for what purpose did Christ come into the

world, live and die. I found it was to declare the Father---to bear witness to the truth---to confirm the promises---to reconcile sinners to God---to save sinners---to bring us to God, &c. &c. as stated fully in my letters.

Now I proceed to examine your strictures; and shew you where you have misrepresented---where you have erred---and where you have mistaken me. If at any time I expose your weakness, it is for your profit---If I detect your errors, as a Christian you will rejoice---If I use plainness of speech, you will bear with me, for you have done the same. If I appear warm at any time, I hope you will impute it to an honest zeal for the defense of what I believe to be the truth---If I should transgress, or depart from the spirit of the gospel, and descend to personal abuse or invective, I shall patiently suffer the merited reproaches of the righteous.

Yours,

B. W. STONE.

LETTER II.

OF THE COVENANT MADE WITH ADAM AND HIS POSTERITY IN HIM.

SIR,

I find in the very first sentence of your strictures, you have made an egregious mistake. You say, "Mr. Stone denies, very positively, the existence of any covenant made with Adam." No, sir, I do not. My words are these, "I can find no mention of such a covenant in the Bible." p. 4. Surely you must know, that the words *any* and *such* have a different meaning. When I said I could find no mention in the Bible of *such* a covenant, I referred to that just before quoted from the Confession of Faith, in these words, "God entered into a covenant with Adam, by which he bound him and all his posterity to personal, entire, exact and perpetual obedience; promised life upon fulfilling, and threatened death upon the breach of it. This covenant was the moral law." *Confession of Faith* chap. 7, sec. 2; chap. 19, sec. 1, 2, *Large Catechism* question 20. Of *such* a covenant as this, I have not yet found any mention in the Bible, even by all your help. But is this denying, *very positively*, the existence of *any* covenant made with Adam? If we find so palpable a blunder in the very first sentence, what may we expect in the persecution of your work. By this we are, in the beginning, warned not to put implicit confidence in your assertions, and not to believe them unless proved by authentic documents.

I said, p. 5, that *such* a covenant had no foundation in scripture. You produce "some very pointed scriptures as you suppose," to prove the contrary. Let us hear them. Gen. 2: 17, "But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

Let us compare this with that stated in your Confession. In *that*, not only Adam was bound, but his posterity also. But there is no mention of this in Gen. 2: 17. In *that* Adam and all his posterity

were bound to personal, entire, exact and perpetual obedience; but there is no mention of this in Gen. 2: 17. Besides, if in this covenant, *personal* obedience was required of all Adam's posterity, where was the propriety of Adam being the federal head or representative. Surely, if Adam was a representative in covenant, the standing or falling of those whom he represented, depended not on their own *personal* obedience, but on that of Adam their representative. If the posterity were bound by this covenant to *personal* obedience, and life was promised to this obedience, and death threatened to disobedience; then it follows that each were bound singly, and stood or fell singly; so that their standing or falling depended not on the obedience or disobedience of Adam. Therefore, on the principles of the covenant, stated in your Confession, Adam was not a representative of his posterity. What then becomes of the doctrine of imputed sin?

Again the Confession states that this covenant was the moral law; but that in Gen. 2: 17, is called by the same Confession, *a special command*, and not the moral law ... *Large Catechism* q. 92. The fathers have since called it "a positive precept, founded on the sovereign will of God" ... *Syn. Car. Cov. Wor.* q. 15. Again the Confession states that life was promised to the fulfilling of this covenant; but there is no such promise to that in Gen. 2: 17. For there is no propriety in such a promise, seeing Adam already had life, even divine life in him.

But you have some more *very pointed* scriptures to prove that such a covenant, as stated in your Confession, was made with Adam and his posterity ... Gal. 3: 12; Rom. 10: 5; Gal. 3: 10; Exod. 34: 27, 28, &c. Is it possible, Mr. C. that you have mistaken Moses and Israel for Adam and his posterity? The covenant these texts prove, was that made with Moses and Israel on Mount Sinai. But you are not alone in this. Your Confession has taught you that the covenant made with Adam and his posterity in him, was the moral law. If so, then it follows, that Adam was a sinner when this law or covenant was made with him; for, says Paul, *The law entered that the offence might abound.* ... Rom. 5: 20. *The law was added because of transgression.* ... Gal. 3: 19. *The law was not made for a*

righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners. ... 1 Tim. 1: 9.

I have no doubt but that the law of God, or moral law was written on Adam's heart, that is, he loved God with all his heart; and had there been men with him in innocency, he would have loved them as himself. But after men became sinner, the law was published to convince of sin. This law, when given to Moses on Sinai, is called a covenant, as you have proved. We cannot love an object before we know it. ... we cannot know it before we exercise our mental powers. Hence I conclude, that Adam did not love God till he knew him, and he did not know him till he exercised his knowing faculties. Therefore, love or the moral law was not written in his heart in his creation; yet he had a capacity to love whenever he knew God.

You have some more *very pointed* scriptures to prove *such* a covenant as that in the Confession. ... Rom. 5: 12--21; 1 Cor. 15: 21--48. From these you conclude that "Adam was undeniably a representative in covenant, because he was the figure of him that was to come, and because Christ is denominated the last Adam" ... p. 9. Had you proved that Christ, the last Adam, was a representative in covenant, as you understand it, your conclusion would be fair; but this you have not done this you cannot do. Therefore, it is not undeniably certain that Adam was the representative of his seed.

To elucidate the subject of representation, I will state a familiar case. Suppose the government of the United States of America, appoint a person to transact business for them in the court of Britain. This person is their representative. In him is centered all the power of America. All America is in him. He is equal to all America. When he acts or suffers in this character, all America is considered as acting and suffering in him. If he be received and honored, all America is considered as received and honored. But if he be rejected and dishonored, all America is considered as rejected and dishonored. If he does the business for which he was appointed, it is considered as done by all America. In this sense

was Christ a representative from God to our world. He was sent from heaven, not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him. All power was given to him. He was equal to the Father, for the Father was in him.---He that honored or dishonored him, honored or dishonored him that sent him. When he was rejected, the Father was considered as rejected. When he suffered, the Father was considered as suffering in him. Hence it was said, *seed the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood.*

The difference between our views of Christ, as representative, is this: You believe he was the representative of the elect or of man, and acted in their stead; so that whatever he did and suffered is considered as done and suffered by them. My view is, that Christ was the representative of the Father, and acted towards us in his room and stead; so that whatever he did and suffered in that character, is considered as done and suffered by the Father. For the very words and works, which Christ spake and did, he says were the Father's. *For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak.* John 12: 49. *The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.* John 14: 10. In allusion to the same thing, he is called Messiah, and the Messenger of the covenant. Matt. 3: 1.

You proved. ... "Now if God made a covenant with the last Adam, the inference is fair, that he made a covenant with the first Adam. "Now *if*". ... Was I disposed to notice trifles, I would just refer you to your animadversions (p. 32.) on the particle *if*, as used by me. But I have no design to divert the reader from solid, glaring truth, by drawing his attention to trifles. However, Logicians know that the word *if* is often used where no doubt or uncertainty is understood. But you seem to think otherwise; and for this reason, no doubt, you spoke in the passage just quoted; "Now if God made a covenant with the last Adam.---" Therefore, according to your own criticism, it is not certain that God did make a covenant with Christ. Yet you adduce three texts in proof of it: Psalm 89: 3. Isai. 42: 6. Heb. 10: 5---7. That in the 89th Psa. is very uncertain, and contested by man. See Methodist book of Discipline, Art. Pers. Let

the reader examine that Psalm from 5: 38. Your other text in Isaiah, yourself explain away. (p. 57) "I have given thee as a covenant (Berith, a purifier, a purifying victim, or a purification sacrifice) to the people."---Had our translators rendered this verse as you do, could you then have proved from this text that God made a covenant with Christ?

But, sir, I do not doubt that God made a covenant with Christ, if by covenant we understand commands and promises to him, as his representative or messenger. John 12: 49. Isai. 42: 6. 49: 8, &c. But that he made such a covenant as that in your Confession, I do deny. "The covenant of grace was made with Christ, the second Adam, and in him, with all the elect as his seed." Conf. *Large Catechism* Q. 31. To prove this, you must give more substantial evidence than what you or your Confession have yet given.

You draw your fair inference "That God made a covenant with the first Adam." (p. 9.) It has not been denied that God made with Adam *a* covenant; but the question is, what sort of *a* covenant? Is it that in your Confession, or that in Gen. 2: 17?

You want to know "Upon what other principle than that of representation, or Adam's being a covenant head and representative, it is, that his posterity have shared so deeply the sad effect of his fall? Why thousands, who have never sinned personally, writhe in pain and gasp in death." As it is certain that Adam was not a representative in the sense the Confession states it, we must search for the cause of this writhing and gasping of thousands, somewhere else. By sin Adam became mortal, and begat children in mortality like himself.--- And *who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.* The same we now see in nature, when it is acknowledged that parents are not the federal heads of their posterity. Parents, through excess of lust, may and do contract disorders, by which their innocent seed are infected, and writhe in pain and gasp in death. You who have made yourself acquainted with the various disorders incident to our race, are not unacquainted with cases of this nature.

Yours,

B. W. S.



LETTER III.

ON THE WRATH OF GOD.

SIR,

With an utter overthrow, you condemn, at first, my views of the wrath of God; but presently you adopt the very same ideas. Your words are these, (p. 12) "But I choose to credit the plain declarations of scripture, and believe there is that in God which stands in opposition to sin, and which will lead him to punish the sinner." My words in the letters are these (p. 6.) "We are therefore to understand the wrath of God to be nothing else, but his holy nature standing in opposition to sin." Who does not see that the sentiments are one? I will say more. There is that attributed to God, which the scriptures call *wrath*, infinite, eternal and unchangeable. If eternal and unchangeable, then *that which has been, and now is*, the object of his wrath, will *always be* the object of his wrath. But what is the object of his wrath? All ungodliness and unrighteousness of men. *For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.* Rom. 1: 18. Therefore ungodliness and unrighteousness *have been, are now, and ever will be* the objects of God's wrath, nor can God ever be reconciled to them, unless his nature change.

Sinners are also represented in scripture to be the objects of God's wrath; for *The wrath of God abideth on them.* John 3: 36. But if sinners be the objects of his wrath, in the same sense as unrighteousness is, then they must eternally be the objects of his wrath, nor can they be saved, unless God change. Hence we must conclude, that as sinners are saved, they are not in the same sense the objects of wrath, as unrighteousness is. As creatures, they are the objects of God's love; for *God so loved the world---while yet sinners and enemies.* John 3: 16. Rom. 5: 8. But as they are defiled with sin, they are objects of wrath; not properly so, for as creatures they are objects of love. Therefore, sin or unrighteousness in them are the proper objects of wrath. As long as sin dwells in them, the

wrath of God will abide on them, even to eternity. But when they are saved from sin, then are *they saved from wrath through him*. Rom. 5: 9.---then they cease to be objects of wrath. Now God may be said to be pacified, reconciled or appeased to them. Ezek. 16: 63; But has God changed? No: he is the same that he ever was. The change has taken place in the sinners. Sin in them was the object of wrath, when that is gone, wrath is gone from them; but still the wrath of God is as unchangeably opposed to sin as ever.

You say, "When Mr. Stone comes to tell us plainly what he means by that wrath, which he has been proving is not in God, it comes out to be the wrath or anger of men." And to this you are agreed. (p. 11.) If then you understand my meaning, why have you so repeatedly misrepresented me afterwards on this subject? Such conduct may leave a disagreeable impression on the minds of some, that you do not pay that respect to candor, as becomes a minister of truth.

You have so many definitions of wrath, that it is a little more difficult to apprehend your true meaning. Sometime you call it a "sense of justice." p. 11. "An awful principle in God, moving him to punish transgressors." (p. 13.) "A real principle existing in God." p. 42, 43---Sometimes you call it "Judgment of God," or punishment. p. 49. But it is *that* which as *really* exists in God as love. p. 10.

You are very much offended as this expression of mine, "that the scriptures attribute many things to God which are not *really* in him, but relatively only, as grief, repentance, fury, &c." You think this is very short of atheism, and that those things which are attributed to God are *absolutely* possessed by him in some way peculiar to his nature. p. 12. Are then repentance and fury really in God? Yes, you say, they are *absolutely* possessed by him in some way peculiar to his nature, for they are attributed to him. But hands, feet, eyes, ears, mouth, breath, nostrils, &c., are attributed to God; are these *really* in him or *relatively*. To say *relatively* in your opinion is bit little short of Atheism! The old fathers who believed these were in God *relatively*, were almost atheists! (Syn. Cat. Q.

What is God.) Can you deny that eyes and ears in God relate to his knowledge? That hands relate to power? If so, then these things are in him *relatively*. The scriptures also attribute grief, weariness, trouble, and even affliction to God. Gen. 6: 6. Isai. 1: 14. 63: 9. According to your doctrine, they are *really*, or somehow *absolutely*, in him; for to say they are in him *relatively* is gloomy, and one step short of atheism. Yet you affirm that God cannot suffer. p. 35.

On your principles, repentance, grief, fury, wrath, &c. are as really in God as love, and you can prove that these are *really* in God, by the same arguments that I proved him to be love. But you failed in the attempt; because God is said to be love, but never said to be wrath. God says, "fury is not in me," but never said, love is not in me. The salvation of sinners is ascribed to love, but never to wrath.

You describe God as a being made up, or compounded, of various and different principles. "To describe him as having no anger, but love only, is to confound ideas, and stagger all speculation; as if benevolence and hatred to sin, goodness and wrath, judgment and mercy, were the same thing." p. 13. But, sir, do you think that benevolence, anger, goodness, wrath, judgment and mercy, are principles in God different one from the other? Or are they exercises or acts of one eternal principle. If God be a simple un-compounded being, then is his nature one, which is love, and this one nature is the principle, the only principle of every action of God. The action of this one nature in bestowing happiness to his creatures, is called goodness--in opposing and punishing sin, it is called wrath or fury. But goodness, wrath, and fury, are not the real principle, but the exercises or emanations of it. This subject I have already treated in my letters, p. 18, 19. Had you attended to this, you would not have been so much alarmed at the idea of things being in God *relatively*. Nor would you have made so bare-faced an assertion, in representing me as holding that "God feels no righteous displeasure against sin, and does not positively punish sin." Did you find this in my letters? If so; why did you not refer your reader to the page? We have already learned not to credit your assertions without authentic proof.

On the subject of positive punishment, I will offer a few thoughts. Many things are said to be done by God, which he did not actually or positively do, but only suffered them to be done. Thus, the works of Satan in destroying Job's property and children, are ascribed to God: For, says Job, *the Lord hath taken away*. But the whole history of this transaction shews that the work was Satan's, *who is the prince of the power of the air, and who has the power of death*. Satan is described as a roaring lion, going about seeking whom he may devour: and the reason why the whole world is not swept in death by him, is what he suggested to God. Job 1: 10, because *God has made a hedge about them*. For this reason, no doubt, he is called Apollyon and Destroyer. In this sense God is said to have bruised his son; not positively or actually, for wicked men did it, but by suffering it so to be, or not interposing to prevent it. In this sense, God is said to have inflicted heavy judgments on Jerusalem, by bringing Nebuchadnezzar upon them; but God did not positively bring him upon them, for it was the pride of his heart that made him come and make such devastation. Instances of this nature are too numerous to mention. But whether God punishes indirectly, by men or devils, or positively with his own arm, we all agree to say, he does not act contrary to his nature.

Yours,

B. W. S.

LETTER IV.

ON CHRIST, THE SURETY OF THE ELECT, OR OF MANKIND.

SIR,

I said in my letters, p. 6. "in support of this doctrine I can find nothing in the Bible." So I say yet. Who, but yourself, ever took up the idea, from reading that section, that "God's promises were in themselves defective in point of certainty and credibility---that they were not faithful and true, but needed a voucher, to give assurance or certainty that they are so." I never heard of any but yourself, who did not understand it as I intended. You are extremely severe against me on this subject; not in argument but in word only. I cannot blame you, when I reflect, that if this doctrine be taken from you, your whole system is destroyed.

You contend "that Christ must be surety for one of the covenanting parties, God or his people---that every plain man knows that the surety of a bond or covenant is connected with one of the parties mentioned in the instrument, and becomes responsible for the person with whom he has assumed the connexion." p. 19. So far, Mr. C. you are correct. But I will add a few words to complete the whole. Every plain man knows also, that a surety is always connected with the person who gives the bond. But every plain man knows that the elect did not give the bond or covenant to God. Therefore, Christ was not connected with them as their surety. Every plain man knows that God gave the bond or covenant; therefore, Christ is connected with God, as surety of the new covenant or testament, as the apostle says, Heb. 7: 22.

In this covenant, God promises *to put his law in their minds, to write it on their hearts, to be to them a God and they his people, to be merciful to their unrighteousness, &c.* Heb. 8: These promises, in themselves, are true and faithful. But to remove all cause of doubt from his creatures, and to make them sure and certain that

these are the faithful and true promises of God, Jesus becomes God's surety, or surety of his covenant---comes into the world---confirms and establishes them, that they are the true and faithful promises of God. This he did by all the words and works which were said and done by him, in his life, death, and resurrection, as proved in my letters. Dan. 9: 27; Rom. 15: 8; Gal. 3: 17.

Would you have believed this gospel or covenant of God, to have been his faithful and true word of promise, if Christ, the surety, had not confirmed it by such signs and miracles as he did? If so; why so much labor of the Fathers to urge the signs and wonders of Christ, as evidences of the truth of the scriptures? But I remember that your Confession holds, that faith is wrought in us by the immediate operation of the spirit. Therefore, the evidence in the word is of no use to you. But if a sinner cannot believe, of what use is it to produce such evidence?

You labor to prove, that by Christ's confirming the covenant, or the promise made to the fathers, means that he *fulfilled* the covenant, or promises of the covenant. p. 17, 18. Did he then put his law in the minds and write it in the hearts of all to whom the promise was made, in that one week in which he is said to have confirmed the covenant? No--for many thousands, who did not then exist, have since had these promises fulfilled unto them. Read Heb. 2: 2--4, and you will be convinced that *confirming* does not mean *fulfilling*. Read these verses in your Greek testament, and compare them with Rom. 15: 8. and you cannot doubt that I was accurate in my observations on this subject. See also Syn. Cat. Hol. Scrip. Q. 29.

As to Gal. 3: 17. neither your sense of it nor mine as stated in my letters, is accurate. Till now I had not so particularly attended to the text. 5: 16. *Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ.* 17. *And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.* It is very evident that the seed of

Abraham are all believers. Gen. 15: 5; Gal. 3: 29; Rom. 4: 16. These believers are one, and, therefore, not called seeds but seed. *For there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.* Gal. 3: 28. *For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ.* 1 Cor. 12: 12. Hence *by Christ* in this verse, the apostle means believers, who are in Christ. And so I understand, Gal. 3: 16; *and to thy seed, which is Christ,* 1: e. to all believers. Then follows, verse 17, "and this I say, that the covenant which was confirmed before of God in Christ, (eis christon.) It is disputed by none that the preposition *eis* is frequently translated *to*. See Rice on Baptism, p. 40. The verse may then be translated thus: "*The covenant that was before confirmed (Gr. authenticated) by God to Christ.* Christ here meaning the seed of Abraham, or all believers to the end of the world. Gen. 15: 5; Rom. 4: 16; Gal. 3: 29, &c.

You say, p. 17, that I deny the equality of Christ with the Father. Surely you have great confidence in the faith of the public, or you would not venture to state such weighty charges against me, without any show of proof. Take heed lest some ill-disposed person may think that you depart from truth. I do absolutely deny the charge; and do believe that scripture which declares that Christ *thought it not robbery to be equal with God.* Phil. 2: 8. But I do not believe that the man Christ Jesus was equal to God: nor do I believe that the divinity in Christ was equal to God, for that divinity was God himself---*In him dwelt all the fullness of Godhead bodily---The Father dwelt in him,* &c. Sameness and equality have a different meaning. Equality implies plurality, and one cannot be equal to itself. God is one, infinite, self-existent and independent being. Now if there is another equal to this one, then there are two equals in infinity, self-existence, power and independence. The very notion destroys itself; for two infinities is the greatest absurdity; as one infinity fills infinity, and leaves no room for another. But Christ is equal to the Father *in name.* *His name shall be called the mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.* Isai. 9: 6. By office he is equal to the Father. *For all power in heaven and earth is given to him--The Father judgeth*

no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son; That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who hath sent him. John 5: 22, 23.

You revile me very much for saying, "In reference to the same thing (1: e. that Christ was surety of the New Testament) Jesus is often called a witness." You add, "Will he get anybody to believe that a witness to a bond or covenant, and a surety are the same thing?" No, sir, I never tried. I said, "In reference to the same thing, Christ is called a witness." p. 7. Now, sir, is a reference to a thing, and the thing itself, the same thing? By what logic can you prove it?

After you have poured out a flood of eloquence to nullify, or rather to vilify, my views of Christ, the surety of the new Testament, you proceed (p. 20) to establish your notion that he is the surety of the elect. You have two arguments---1. Christ was surety as the Aaronical priests were, only in a higher sense. Where, sir, did you ever find the Aaronical priests were called sponsors or sureties? Or, if they are, were they the sureties of the people, or of the old Testament, as Christ was of the new? 2. "Whatever scripture implies an interference of Christ, as mediator to secure the favor of God to sinners, serves to establish the doctrine of suretyship and substitution." Yes, sir, such scriptures will establish what you please, if you can find them. *To secure the favor of God to sinners.* Had I written this, your penetrating eye would have seen the fallacy; and inadvertently you might have called it blasphemy. For you might have easily concluded, that God was not such a capricious being, as to need a mediator to secure his favor; especially if you had considered, that it was by the favor of God to sinners, that he sent Jesus into the world to save them.

Though your arguments are without force, yet I believe you have said as much as can be said, with any show of reason, in defense of scholastic suretyship; but Paul's doctrine, as I have stated it, will and must prevail; even if Calvinistic election and reprobation---partial love and particular redemption---imputed

righteousness and systematic atonement, should all fall together,
and never more rise.

Yours,

B. W. S.



LETTER V.

ON IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS.

SIR,

Your Strictures on this subject appear to be considerably involved in darkness and uncertainty. I could not, at first, with clearness apprehend your ideas. Sometimes you seemed to lean to the Hopkinsian notion, and sometimes that in your Confession. However, you labor to destroy the force of my plain reasoning on this subject, by denying a principle from which I formed my conclusion. The principle was "that Christ, the surety of the elect, paid their debt of obedience to law in their room and stead, and so satisfied law." You farther affect to deny, that the advocates for imputed righteousness ever had such a principle. p. 21. Yes, sir, they did, and have openly advocated it. See your Confession, chap. 11: 1, 3---"Those effectually called are justified---by imputing the *obedience* and satisfaction of Christ unto them." "Christ by his obedience and death did fully discharge the debt of all those that are justified." "To the regenerate, the moral law is of special use, to shew them how much they are bound to Christ for his fulfilling it in their stead." *Large Catechism* q. 97, 70. "Christ was their surety in a way of satisfaction for all their *debt of obedience* and punishment, by taking it wholly upon himself, as for persons utterly insolvent." Syn. Cat. Cov. Gr. q. 38. The same writers tell us what this debt of obedience was, which the elect owed to law. "It was perfect obedience to the whole law of God in heart and life." Cov. Wor. q. 13. And this debt Christ paid for them. Cov. Gr. q. 60. "He became subject to his own law, and that for this very end, that he might fulfill it in the room of those, who were the transgressors of it. Q. What may we learn from Christ's being made under the law? Ans. The misery of sinners out of Christ, who have to answer to God in their own persons for their debt, both of obedience and punishment. Eph. 2: 12; and the happiness of believers, who have all their debt cleared by Christ's being made under the law in their room. Rom. 8: 1." Chr. Hum. q. 16, 17.

I might multiply quotations to the same purpose, from Harvey, Boston, Willison, &c. but those above are sufficient to convince you, that the principle from which I drew my conclusion, was not assumed, but fairly drawn from your own Confession, and the writings of the fathers. I am glad to find you have rejected this article in your Confession; but you hide under the covering of "moral and pecuniary justice," which you seem to have gotten from Thomas Paine, by your quotation of it from him. p. 31. Your observations respecting pecuniary justice, apply in full force against your Confession of Faith and the writings of the fathers, as is evident from the quotations I have just made from them. If your argument be good, you have established my ideas against your system; not yours, for you deny a part; I mean the Confession of Faith.

Your story of Æschylus and Amintas, shews plainly, that by the suffering of Æschylus, his brother Amintas was saved from suffering, but not delivered from obligations to be obedient to the laws of his country afterwards. This may be "to your purpose." But, sir, this is not at all in point on the subject in debate. My proposition was, that the law required us to love God with all the heart, and our neighbor as ourselves. This was the debt we owed to the law. According to your Confession, Christ has paid this debt of obedience to law, 1: e. loved God with all his heart, and his neighbor as himself, in our room and stead. I thence drew the conclusion that Christ has freed us from the debt or obligation to love God or our neighbor. For what our surety pays *for* us, is considered as paid *by* us. p. 8. How can your story of Æschylus and Amintas be in point with us? By Æschylus' suffering, Amintas was saved from suffering; but I was not speaking of suffering, but obedience to law. Had you shewed that Æschylus was above law, and as to himself was under no obligation to it; that he stepped into the place of his brother Amintas, as his surety or representative, and obeyed the law in his room and stead; and had you then shewed that this did not free Amintas from obligation to obey the law; then your story would be in point. But this is not to your point; for you deny, with me, that Christ ever paid our debt of obedience to law in our room and stead. p. 21.

Though you deny this principle, yet you strangely advocate it. p. 23. For though Christ as God, or as man, in a separate detached sense, cannot fulfill the law for sinners, yet you think he can do it in his compound character as God-man or Mediator. We are not speaking of what this God-man *can* do; but what he *has* done. It has never been proved yet, that he has ever fulfilled the law in the room and stead of sinners, in any sense, whether separate or compound.

It is a very common case, that when a man cannot answer an objection by fair arguments, he will take anything. You have taken a very noted one. p. 24. "Morgan, a subtle and plausible deist, has made the same objections against (Calvinistic) imputed righteousness and atonement that I have done." Am I, therefore, wrong? You say he was a deist. I never heard of the author before you named him. If a deist, he, no doubt, wrote about one God, and his attributes, and moral virtue. By your argument then, there is no God, no moral virtue; for Morgan, Herbert, and Paine, who were deists, said there were such, and they must be wrong. Your argument proves too much.

I have no doubt but these were men of discernment, and could easily see the inconsistencies and absurdities of Calvinism; and had they not considered this to be Christianity, they might not have been deists. But, sir, you are entirely mistaken when you palm the sentiments of Morgan upon me. Your quotation from him proves the contrary, "That all that Christ suffered was upon his own account." p. 25. Had I so insidiously and shamefully misrepresented your sentiments, I should blush to ask forgiveness. You think we are deists. You are at liberty to think. But show yourselves to be Christians indeed, "Do justice, let the oppressed go free, break every yoke, love mercy and walk humbly with God." Then with a better face you may call us deists. Till then the world will think the difference between a deist and a nominal or formal Christian is very little. *By the fruits ye shall know them.*

So much for the doctrine of Christ's surety-obedience to the law in the room and stead of the elect. I proceed now to examine your

strictures on what I stated respecting the surety-suffering of Christ in the room and stead of the elect; or that he, as surety, died in their room and stead, and paid their debt of suffering, and so satisfied justice. These sufferings, according to your Confession, were death, temporal, spiritual and eternal. I shewed that Christ did not pay the debt of suffering temporal death in our room and stead; for fact proves that all men still suffer it---He did not pay the debt of suffering spiritual death; for then must he have been a real sinner: Besides, neither God nor his law could demand this debt from any, unless they can demand sin. Nor did Christ pay the debt of suffering eternal death; for he now liveth forever more.

You are as well convinced as I am that these doctrines are false; and therefore you deny, positively, that anybody held them. p. 26. You ask and answer, "Whoever said that Christ paid our debt of suffering in kind; or that as a substitute he suffered death, or anything else in a strict and literal sense as sinners do? None." Stop, sir, I will answer the question for you. Your confession says, he did. "Christ by his obedience and death did fully discharge the debt of all those that are justified; and did make a *proper*, real and full satisfaction to his Father's justice in their behalf."---"God accepteth the satisfaction from a surety which he might have demanded of them." Chap. 11: sec. 3: *Large Catechism* Q. 71. The suffering, which the sinner had to endure, was death; now can the suffering of the surety be *proper* and *real*, and that which God might have demanded of the sinner, and yet not be of the same *kind*? "Q. What was it that he (Christ) had to suffer? Ans. *The very same punishment* the elect should have undergone for the breach of the covenant of works, and that is death in its full latitude and extent. Q. What kind of death was this which threatened upon disobedience? Ans. It was death temporal, spiritual and eternal." Syn. Cat. Cov. Gr. Q. 68, 69. Cov. Wor. Q. 21. Here is a full answer to your question. But can the law be satisfied with another kind of punishment from what is required? Take care lest you destroy the honors of law at one dash.

You again ask and answer: "Whoever supposed that our release from spiritual death arose from an actual transfer of sin or evil

qualities to him as our substitute? None." Stop, sir. I will answer it. Your Confession declares it. For according to that book, Christ paid our debt, and part of that debt was spiritual death, as shown above. Fisher and Erskine as quoted just before, say, "That Christ suffered death in its full latitude and extent, which was death temporal, spiritual and eternal." They ask, "What was the spiritual death threatened? Ans. The loss of original righteousness and the favor of God." Cov. Wor. Q. 24.

You again ask and answer: "Whoever asserted that he suffered eternal death, or went to hell forever, in the room and stead of sinners to save them? None, but Mr. Stone and they who revile the cross." Stop again, sir. I never asserted it, for I was disproving it; but your Confession does clearly assert it. For eternal death was part of the debt required of us for sin. Chap. 6. Sec. 6. It farther states that "By the obedience and death of Christ, he made a *proper, real and full* satisfaction to God's justice." "By his obedience and death Christ did fully discharge the debt of all those that are justified." Chap. 11. 3. *Large Catechism* Q. 71. Now as the debt or curse was eternal death, and Christ made a *real and full* satisfaction, and *fully* discharged the debt; then it certainly follows that he must suffer eternally. And what is still worse, the debt cannot be paid forever! This is your own professed creed, not drawn up by me, but voluntarily subscribed by yourself. I know it irritates you to have it exposed to the light; but be not angry with me. If you cannot bear it, like an honest man openly reject it.---If these sentiments are equally exploded by us both, why do you censure me so hard for exposing them? Is it to screen yourself from censure? I dare not judge. Long ago they had agreed that if any confessed only the truth, they should be put out of the synagogue.

Yours,

B. W. S.



LETTER VI.

ON THE CONSEQUENCES OF SURETY-RIGHTEOUSNESS.

SIR,

I said "that this doctrine of surety-righteousness destroys the idea of grace and forgiveness." Without bringing one of my arguments to view, and proving them to be false you give an unfair statement of the whole in a few words: "To establish his favorite doctrine of forgiveness, without reference to the Saviour's merit or suffering"--p. 26, you say, "We are hardy enough to deny the doctrine of forgiveness through Christ." p. 27. Again you say "God pardons them on account of their penitence." p. 62. &c. If all who read your strictures, had my letters also, I should pass over this section of yours in silence. But to shew how unfounded your charges are, I will transcribe a paragraph in my letters on this subject. But whom does God forgive? Ans. Believers. Acts 10: 43. *Whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.*---Penitents. Acts 2: 38. *Repent---for the remission of sins.* For whose sake does he forgive? Or, on what grounds? Ans. For his own name's sake---for his compassion--for his mercy's sake--for the riches of his grace. Psalm. 25: 11; 79: 9; 78: 11; 108: 8; Tit. 3: 5; Eph. 1: 7; Isai. 43: 25.

On this subject I will add a few more remarks. It must be given up by all, that *forgiveness* and *remission* are the same thing. This is very evident by adverting to the original words in Greek, *Aphiemi*, *Aphesis*. These are sometimes translated *forgive*, *forgiveness*; sometimes *remit*, *remission*. See Texts where *aphiemi*, *aphesis*, are translated *forgive*, *forgiveness*. Matt. 6: 12, 14, 15---ix. 2, 5, 6---xii. 31, 32---xviii. 21, 27; Mark 2: 5---iii. 20; Luke 7: 47, 49---xvii. 3, 4---xxiii. 34; Acts 5: 31---xxvi. 18; Rom. 4: 7; Js. 5: 15; Eph. 1: 7; Col. 1: 14; 1 John 1: 9---ii. 12, &c.

Texts, where *aphiemi*, *aphesis* are translated *remit*, *remission*. Joh.

10: 23; Matt. 26: 23; Mar. 1: 4; Luke 1: 77 - 3: 3---xxiv. 47; Acts 2: 38---x. 43; Heb. 9: 22---x. 18, &c.

It will not be disputed by the learned, that the radical meaning of these words signify, "to send away." So our translators have sometimes rendered them. Matt. 13: 36; Then Jesus *sent away* (apheis) the multitude." Mar. 4: 36. "And when they had *sent away* (aphentes) the multitude." Comp. Mar. 11: 6; Matt. 27: 50. Gr. &c.--

Hence it appears manifest, that forgiveness or remission of sin, means that sin is not only pardoned, but sent away or put away from us; and so they mean the same thing as redemption or salvation from sin. So the Apostle explains it. Eph. 1: 7. "In whom we have *redemption* through his blood, *the forgiveness* of sins." Col. 1: 14. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the *forgiveness* of sins." Heb. 9: 26. "He hath appeared *to put away* sin by the sacrifice of himself." Joh. 1: 29. "Behold the lamb of God which *taketh away* the sin of the world." 1 Joh. 3: 5. "And ye know that he was manifested to *take away* our sins." 1 Joh. 1: 7. "The blood of Jesus Christ *cleanseth us from all sin.*" Heb. 9: 28. "So Christ was once offered *to bear* (Gr: bear away) the sins of many." 1 Pet. 2: 24. "Who his own self bare [Gr. bear away] our sins in his own body on the tree."

According to the authority of Taylor,^{1} whom you quote with approbation as a Hebrew critic, the Hebrew word translated *to forgive*, is often rendered in our translation to *bear away*, or *take away*. Texts where the word is translated *to forgive*, Gen. 50: 17; Exod. 32: 32---xxxiv. 7; Num. 14: 18, 19; Josh. 24: 19; Psalm. 25: 18---xxxii. 1, 5---lxxxv. 2; Isai. 2: 9. Texts, where the same word is translated to *take away*, or *carry away*, Isai. 8: 4---xv. 7---xxxix. 6---xl. 24---xli. 16---lviii. 14---lxiv. 6; Gen. 47: 30; Num. 16: 15; 1 Sam. 17: 34; Dan. 1: 16; Lev. 16: 22; Exod. 28: 38, &c. This same word is used in Isai. 53: 4, 12. These verses may be thus translated, "Surely he hath *borne away* our griefs," &c. Comp. Matt. 8: 17. "And he *bare away* the sin of many," &c.

But, without the help of criticism, it is sufficiently plain, that *forgiveness* or *remission* of sin is the same as redemption or salvation from sin; and are effected by the same means, that is, by the sacrifice or blood of Christ. But when are we forgiven or redeemed from sin by his blood? Not till we believe; for till then we remain under condemnation and wrath: *He that believeth not is condemned already, and the wrath of God abideth on him.* John 3: 36. But how does faith in the blood of Christ effect this remission or redemption from sin? When we believe in Christ, in his blood, in his name or in his gospel, we see the glory of the Father shining in the face of Jesus, we draw nigh to God, drawn by the cords of love, and are changed into the same image. Let none, therefore, dream of forgiveness, while they are the servants of sin.

You are very unwilling to give up the common translation of Eph. 4: 32; and, therefore, you labor hard to upset my observations on it. I translated it "forgiving one another even as God *in Christ* hath forgiven you." So Doddridge translates it, nor have you dared to say that the translation is not just. I farther said, "why our translators rendered the phrase *en Christo*, in this verse, *for Christ's sake*, when everywhere else, they give the literal translation, I pretend not to say. You positively assert this is not true, and produce several phrases to prove your assertion. p. 31. But, unhappy for you! among all your phrases we cannot find the phrase *en Christo*. You contend that the preposition *en* has many significations; and what novice in Greek did not know that? This is not the point in debate. But had you even found a text in the New Testament, where *en* was translated *for the sake of*, you might have thence inferred that the phrase *en Christo* might be rendered *for Christ's sake*. But this you have not done---this you cannot do. You seem, from your quotation of 1 John 2: 12, to wish your readers to understand that *en* was translated *for the sake of* in that verse, but it is *dia*. I believe, as well as you, that we are justified by, or through Christ---his blood, and for his name's sake, as just before stated; but I acknowledge our ideas widely differ, as we shall see more fully hereafter.

What you say, p. 29, 30, in contradiction to my ideas on the

doctrine of forgiveness, I have already answered. One observation you made, for which you deserve credit. "What whimsies may not be invented, what errors may not be broached, what blasphemies may not be uttered, under the sanction of scripture, if allegory and figure may be the basis of doctrine? Yes, sir, and it is a pity that you and the fathers had not thought of this sooner. Then you would not have founded your doctrine of atonement on the dark figures and ceremonials of the Jewish ritual. You go back to those shadows to find the substance. But the substance, Christ Jesus and the gospel, is come, therefore, we have no more need of that school-master to lead us to Christ. "For even that which was made glorious had *no glory* in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. 2 Cor. 3: 10. But after we have known Christ, then we can trace the wisdom and glory of God through those dark figures.

You take notice, p. 31, of another consequence of surety-righteousness, which I had stated, "that it confirms two contrary doctrines, which are both equally false, viz. universal salvation and universal damnation. my argument was this: The scriptures assert that Christ died for all, tasted death for every man. And as no text in the Bible says he did not die for all; it follows, with certainty, that he did die for all. If he died as surety to satisfy law and justice, then all must be saved. You have no other plausible shift to evade the force of this argument, than by saying, "the first proposition, 1: e. *that Christ died for all*, is denied by the largest part of protestants." Now, sir, if you had proved that the majority always have the truth on their side, you might, with some face, have put the opinion of protestants in competition with the plain declarations of the Bible. But then you must yield to the papists, for they exceed protestants in number.

Universal damnation, I said, was the consequence of the same doctrine: or, as I explained it, p. 13, "None can be saved who ever heard the gospel, unless they have embraced it on their first hearing." My argument was, "That the law required infinite or eternal death---Christ could not suffer more than infinite; therefore, all his sufferings only satisfied law and justice. For sins under the gospel, as unbelief, rejecting the grace of God, &c. there can be no

forgiveness, because there was no satisfaction made for these sins.--Hence I concluded, according to this plan, that all who committed one of these sins, must be damned, and that without remedy." You, without attending to my explanation of the word *universal*, assert that the greatest part of mankind never heard the gospel; therefore, they could not commit sin under the gospel, and so could not be damned. It would be a difficult task for you to prove that the greatest part of mankind, or any part of them, never heard the gospel. Paul says, *Verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words into the ends of the world.* Rom. 10, 18. It is thought by many that traditionary revelation pervades all nations.

But if you attend to my meaning of "universal," as explained in my letters, you will at once see that your argument is not to the point. But you proceed, "The idea contained in the premises, that sins under the gospel are not to be recognized and condemned by law, is indeed the most curious position I have ever seen taken in divinity." And where, sir, did you ever find this position? Not in my letters, I am sure. Yet, you say they are contained in the premises! You must grant, that if God had never given us Christ and the gospel, we never should have committed sin in rejecting his grace, mercy, &c.

Yours,

B. W. S.

LETTER VII.

PROXY SUFFERING REQUIRED BY NO JUST LAW.

SIR,

I said, "It was contrary to justice for the innocent to suffer in the room and stead of the guilty; no just law can demand it, or admit of it. Your popular argument is again introduced, "These are the sentiments and almost the language of Thomas Paine." Well, sir, what follows? Are they therefore wrong? Such arguments can affect the weak and inconsiderate part of mankind only; and as such are more led by prejudice than reason or truth, I leave you and them in the possession of all such arguments. Like a man, spare your pious abuse, and by solid argument confute the error. Your mournful, and almost ditted strokes of rhetoric, may excite the indignation of the credulous bigot, but the honest inquirer after truth wants fair reasoning.

But let us inquire whether any law of God ever required or admitted of proxy-suffering; or that the innocent should suffer in the room and stead of the guilty, so as to deliver them from punishment. Did the moral law require it? Point out the particular command where the innocent shall suffer in the room and stead of the guilty. You are here silent, and that text in Ezek. 18: 2---4, must ever keep you so.---Did this law ever admit that an innocent man, woman or child, should suffer in the room and stead of the guilty? No. But you say it required and admitted innocent beasts to suffer in the room of the guilty. p. 34. But a beast is neither a man, woman, or child; and human sacrifices were expressly forbidden by the law. But do you think that the innocent beast, suffering in the room of the guilty, delivered the guilty from punishment in every instance? Read your bible, and you will find that the sacrifices of the wicked were an abomination to God, and did not clear them from punishment, unless offered in faith which produced repentance. Therefore these innocent beasts did not suffer as proxies.

Did the Adamic law or covenant require or admit of proxy suffering? Point out the clause. But your Confession says, this covenant was the moral law, and we have seen that this law does not require or admit of it. I grant that Adam's offending children do suffer in consequence of Adam's sin; but do they suffer as proxies in the room and stead of Adam? If so, Adam ought, according to law, to be delivered from suffering. Just so in nature, you say, the innocent suffer for the faults of the guilty---p. 36. Yes, sir, but do they suffer as proxies or substitutes in the room and stead of the guilty? If so, the just laws of nature must acquit the guilty. You say "Codrus, Curtius, Eustace de St. Pierre, and many others, became martyrs for the safety of their country." p. 36. But did the law of God require, or even justify their conduct? Or did they suffer as legal proxies or sureties in the room and stead of their guilty country? You have artfully turned the subject and kept it entirely out of view.

You state a case, p. 34---"If the innocent voluntarily substitutes himself for the guilty, and that with a certainty of procuring the penitence of those for whom he suffers; if he possess the power of self-resurrection---would such a case be contrary to justice, or repugnant to law?" You may state cases which you may think not to be repugnant to law; but this is not the matter. Show the law of God, which requires or admits of proxy suffering; if you cannot find it, candidly acknowledge it, and yield to the truth. But this you have done substantially already. p. 25, 26. "Whoever said that Christ paid our debt of suffering in kind? None." If then Christ did not suffer the very same curse or death which the law required, he did not suffer as a proxy or surety at all; unless you can prove from the word of God, that the law can be satisfied with another kind of punishment from what it required. If so, the glory of law is destroyed at once. Upon this principle, the law which demanded death may be satisfied with the light stroke of a rod.

You cannot see how "The innocent can suffer where there is no guilt, either personal or imputed." You ask, "Can God suffer?" I answer, no. But for this you will upbraid me with something little short of atheism; for I proved before, that grief, weariness, trouble

and affliction are attributed to God. According to your doctrine, these must somehow be really and absolutely possessed by him; for to say they are in him relatively, is "gloomy and repulsive, and one step more would lead to atheism." p. 12. You ask again, "Can angels suffer pain without sin?" If they were united to a human body, which was subject to infirmity, as that of Jesus was, I can see no reason why they could not feel pain. The connection between soul and body is very intimate; and where the body is subject to infirmity, why might not an angel connected with such a body suffer? You ask again, "How can Jesus, who is greater than angels, feel the most exquisite torture?" Jesus never suffered till he was made lower than the angels. Heb. 2: 9. But to this question I have given an answer in my letters, p. 34.

You observe my principle is, "That it is unjust for the innocent to suffer for the guilty." p. 34. Yes, as a proxy or surety. But I believe the innocent Jesus died for guilty sinners. The difference between us is this: You believe that Christ died as a surety *for* the elect; making *for* mean *in the room and stead of*. I believe he died as Savior *for* sinners; making *for* mean *for the sake of*. I have no objections against the phrase *in the room and stead of*, if the unscriptural notion of surety or representative, substitute or proxy, be kept out of view.

You charge me with great ignorance for saying the Jews put Jesus to death; you contend the Roman soldiers crucified him. p. 37. If it be ignorance in me, I acknowledge I was misled by Peter and Paul, who both positively affirm that they crucified, slew and killed him. Acts. 2: 22, 23---iii. 12---15; 1 Thes. 2: 15, But "the Roman soldiers crucified." How do you know these soldiers were born in Rome? Might they not have been Jews under the command of Rome?

Having cleared the Jews of the actual murder of Christ, you proceed in the next place to clear the devil of it; for if he had done it, "he then would have found Jesus the weak being he had hoped to see him, and which Mr. Stone's doctrine makes him." p. 38. But farther you clear the Roman soldiers also; for neither the Jews,

Romans, nor devil killed him, but God himself did it. For you say, p. 39, Christ as God offered up his human soul and body, on the altar of Jehovah, for the expiation of sin." This is tradition indeed! You farther think, p. 40, "That the priest must slay the sacrifice." Therefore, as God was the priest, and the soul and body of Jesus the sacrifice, God himself killed and offered the Son. But to whom was the offering made? You think you have established this horrid doctrine from Isai. 53: 10. "It pleased the Lord to bruise him, &c." Though you acknowledge and think you have proved that God killed and bruised his own Son, yet you want to palliate the deed, by observing, that he did not do it violently or without authority. p. 40. But what appears still more strange, neither did God the Father kill him. For according to your gloss of John 10: 17, 18, p. 39. The man Christ Jesus did it. *Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it up again. No man taketh it from me. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.*

Christ was speaking in the whole context under the character of a shepherd. 5: 11. "The good shepherd giveth (*tithesin*, layeth down) his life for the sheep." So does Christ, the shepherd of souls. When the roaring lion and wolves of hell, were destroying his creatures, he interposed. Though he was able to crush his enemies with almighty power; though he had more than twelve legions of angels at command, yet he submitted to death, laid down or gave his life voluntarily for the redemption of souls. This he did, *that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their life time, subject to bondage.* Heb. 2: 14, 15. From this we see, that though some say, God rescues his people from Satan by force, yet he does it by motive. *For we overcome the devil by the blood of the Lamb.* Rev. 12: 11.

"No man taketh it from me," because no man or devil was able, unless Christ had submitted.---No man or devil had a legal right, for none could convict him of sin. "The commandment have I received of my Father." Here at length, you think you have found a law by which the innocent is commanded to suffer in the room of

the guilty. p. 40. But you have not proved that he died as a proxy or surety: and how could this commandment be to him as such? Till this is done your conclusion is nothing.

I see the reasons why you want to clear the devil of the charge of Christ's death; because if you do not do this, you must yield to the "odious idea" that the devil got the blood or death of Jesus, which was the price of redemption. You are also afraid, as you express it, "that Jesus would be esteemed a weak being." This puts me in mind of some Jesuits who went to China, to preach the Gospel. They were ashamed to preach Christ crucified, lest he should be esteemed a weak being. They therefore denied, that he had been ever crucified. But Mr. C. remember, Paul everywhere preached Christ crucified, and was not ashamed to confess that *he was crucified through weakness*. 2 Cor. 13: 4. This was of old a stumbling block. This is called the *weakness and foolishness of God, but it is wiser and stronger than men*. By this, *God has made foolish the wisdom of this world. For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent*. 1 Cor. 1: 18---25.

You say, p. 40, "This daring man presumes upon the mercy of God, and makes the blood of the cross a vain thing." Let us see if the charge be just. I proved from many scriptures, that we are atoned, reconciled, propitiated, justified, purged, washed, regenerated, redeemed, &c. by the blood of Jesus (Lett. p. 20---24.) Do I then make the blood of Christ a vain thing? Can you attribute more efficacy to his blood than this? Yes you can; for according to you, it can cleanse or purge God himself. For you say, it reconciles God; and reconciliation and atonement are the same; and atonement and purging and cleansing are also the same. p. 48, 51.

"According to my hypothesis," you say, p. 40, "the Jews and the devil are raised into the ghostly character of priests, as they slay the lamb of God, and offer him upon the cross! A charming priesthood indeed!" Because the Jews and the devil slay the son of God, they must be priests! Where, sir, did you learn this new doctrine, that the priests had to slay the sacrifices? Read Lev. 1:

and you will blush that you did not know, that the transgressor himself, who offered the sacrifice, had to slay and cut it in pieces, and not the priests. They never officiated in their office, till this was done. Mr. C. forbear such witty trifling, lest you meet with the just contempt of the pious and candid. A man, who pretends to such an extensive knowledge of Moses, should certainly understand the first principles of that prophet.

I said in my letters, that "tradition had sanctioned it as the truth of God, that his sword, in Zech. 13: 7, is the sword of justice." You affect to deny that tradition ever handed this idea of that sword to us; for you ask "What tradition, sir? Where is it? How long has it rolled down the current of time? Is it written or oral?" As you seem to think these queries unanswerable, I will answer them.

1. "What tradition" says that this sword is the sword of justice?

Ans. The tradition of Calvinists.

2. "Where is it?"

Ans. In the Synod's Catechism. Cov. Gr. Q. 33, they ask, "What was the sword that cut this sacrifice asunder? Ans. It was divine justice. Zech. 13: 7.

3. "How long has it rolled down the current of time?"

Ans. From the days of Fisher and Erskine, at least.

4. "Is it written or oral?"

Ans. Written, as just proved.

Did you think that these *knotty* questions, were unanswerable? You certainly did, or you would not have added this remarkable sentence: "Mr. Stone, and every disorganizing spirit, exclaims against tradition, and under that leveling, undefined name, would confound everything." p. 44. The Pharisees and priests of old, esteemed Christ a disorganizing spirit, for speaking against the traditions of the elders, which made the word of God of none

effect; and, for breaking down the walls of partition, to make of twain one new man, or one body, so making peace. This was the spirit of Jesus, and in this I do, and will rejoice. But as it was then, so now; partisans cannot bear this spirit. Paul had much gain when a Pharisee; and, no doubt, this was one reason why he so severely persecuted this disorganizing spirit. But, when his proud party spirit was humbled by grace, he became as disorganizing as his master---counting all his gain but loss.

You think I am shifting my ground, and varying my point of retreat from the difficulty, because I state that the sword of justice is justice itself. p. 41. No, sir, I am not. Tradition states it so, and I was showing how unfounded, in the Bible, was the opinion. See the quotation just before from the Synod's Catechism. You can prove what nobody ever denied---that there were just swords in the hands of God and men; but this does not prove that *justice is called a sword*. You impute "chicanery and trick" to me. "Thou that sayest a man should not steal, doest thou steal?" says Paul.

You sneer at the idea of *wicked men* being the sword of the Lord, which smote the shepherd. Zech. 13: 7. I proved that wicked men are called the sword of the Lord. Psalm. 17: 13. I also proved that wicked men did actually slay him. It is too plain to be denied, with any face, that *wicked men* were the sword mentioned in Zech. 13: 7. "*Awake O sword against my shepherd---smite the shepherd.*" But this will not answer your purpose; for you have labored to clear the wicked from the actual death of Christ, lest he should be esteemed a weak being. You think if God commands the wicked, as the sword, to awake and smite the shepherd, that he would be the author of the sin or crime of murder. But, sir, where is the difference, if he command any other agent to do the deed? If the deed be a crime, as you grant, then the command to do it must be criminal. Thus, while you warn me of making God the author of sin, you yourself, not only make him the author, but the very perpetrator of the crime, the horrid crime of murdering his own son. And lest we should misunderstand you, you literally apply Matt. 26: 31 to God---*I will smite the shepherd, &c.*

O Mr. C. shudder at such horrid ideas! Publish your will immediately, that all your pamphlets may be burnt. lest some should be weak enough to believe them--left in your skirts be found the blood of souls---and left you establish the infidel in his opposition to the scriptures. Your ideas might have gratified the Jews, when the apostles were charging them with the death of Jesus; but, with our Bible in our hands, we choose rather to believe their testimony than yours.

These words in Zech. 13: 7, *smite the shepherd*, were not addressed *to* God, but *by* him. Therefore, he was not the agent of the deed. They do not imply a command to any; for then God would be the author of sin, as you grant. They must then mean nothing more than an expression of God's love in giving up his son to die for sinners. He foresaw how they would crucify him, and that this would be for their salvation and redemption from sin and Satan: Therefore, in infinite love he speaks, *awake O sword--smote the shepherd*. "If nothing less than the blood of my son can save you from sin and Satan, I give him up for you all."

Yours,

B. W. S.

LETTER VIII.

ON RECONCILIATION.

SIR,

In my letters, as you have noticed, p. 42, I objected to the doctrine of God's being reconciled, "that it makes him changeable." You say "this objection rests upon the false principle, that there is no wrath in God, and of course that he needs no reconciliation." Hence, according to you, as there is wrath in God, he *does need* reconciliation. You farther state that "the *principle*, moving deity to punish sin---I call wrath." "There does *really* exist such a *principle* as wrath in God." p. 42, 43. Hence we fairly conclude, that as wrath is a *real principle* in God, the reconciliation is *real* also. This you have attempted to prove by many arguments, drawn chiefly from the Jewish ritual. p. 54---60.

You agree with me, that atonement, reconciliation, and propitiation are the same thing, and in perfect harmony with each other. p. 48---52. This you have ably and learnedly proved from the Hebrew. You also agree with me, that *atonement* signifies to *cleanse* or *purge*. p. 48. This you have also proved from the Hebrew. Hence I conclude, if *atonement* means purging or *cleansing*; and as reconciliation and propitiation are the same as atonement, then they are the same as *purging* and *cleansing*, according to the well-known axiom---things, equal to the same thing, are equal to one another.

Though we perfectly agree in these things, yet we widely differ on the question---who is the proper subject of atonement, reconciliation, purging, &c. You believe God is---I believe man is, *properly*; and the altar, tabernacle, &c. *ceremonially*. That I may not misrepresent your sentiments, I will shew from your own words, that, in your opinion, God is the only proper subject of atonement, reconciliation, purging, &c. and not man. From page fifty-four to sixty, you are professedly proving that God is the

proper subject of reconciliation. Now as reconciliation is the same with *purging* and *cleansing*; then God must be the proper subject to be *cleansed* and *purged*; first, by the blood of goats and bullocks, and by incense; for, you say, "these made an *actual* expiation for sin to the Lord, and turned away wrath. p. 56---afterwards by the blood of Christ. This surely needs the sanction of scripture; for the people and things for which the atonement was made, are said to be the things purified, cleansed and washed, and not God, for he is unchangeable.

But you let us know, p. 42, "That God *really* needs to be reconciled, because he has a *real principle* of wrath in him. Then wrath is the principle to be reconciled, purged, or cleansed. Surely this implies some change in this principle, or rather in God, in whom this principle exists; for the very idea of cleansing or purging a thing, implies that thing was defiled before. This may account for the odious notion of many, that sin has made an awful jar in the attributes of God, and destroyed their harmony. Hence some may think that the blood of victims or of Christ was needful to restore order, or appease the wrath in God.

You farther confirm the notion that God is the proper subject of reconciliation or purging; because, though he has wrath against the sinner *now*, yet he may be reconciled to the same sinner *afterwards*, when no change whatever has taken place in the sinner, or anything done in him. For you contend that atonement is something done *for* us, not *in* us; for if done *in* us, it would be moral purity or regeneration" p. 48. It follows then, that as there is a reconciliation between God and the sinner, by the sacrifice of Christ or of beasts; and as no change has taken place in the sinner, then God must be the proper and only subject in whom the change has taken place. But how can this be, that God is reconciled to the unchanged sinner, when you affirm "there is that in God which stands in opposition to sin." p. 12. Can he be reconciled to a sinner, and yet opposed to him at the same time? This would truly set God at variance with himself.

I proved in my letters, that man was the only proper subject of

atonement, reconciliation, purging, &c. This you deny; "for if these things were done *in us*, they would intend moral purity or regeneration," which would be fatal to your scheme. p. 48. But that man is the only proper subject of them and not God, is plain from the following texts. Rom. 5: 10, 11. "For if, when we were enemies, *we* were reconciled to God by the death of his son, much more, *being reconciled*, we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but we joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom *we* have received the atonement, (or reconciliation). 2 Cor. 5: 18---20. And all thing are of God, who hath reconciled *us* unto himself by Jesus Christ---God was in Christ reconciling *the world* unto himself---We pray you in Christ's stead, be *ye* reconciled to God. Eph. 2: 16. And that he might reconcile both unto God, in one body by the cross, having *slain the enmity* thereby. Col. 1: 20, 21. And (having made peace through the blood of the cross) by him to reconcile *all things* unto himself."

From these texts it cannot be denied that man is the only proper subject of atonement, or reconciliation, and not God. Therefore, as these are done in us, they intend moral purity or regeneration, as you grant. p. 48. This is evident, if you will attend to another "learned hint," that the words *katalasso*, *katallage*, translated *reconcile*, *reconciliation*, and *atonement*, come from the word *allos*, which signified *another*. The man, who is reconciled, is *another* man, because he is changed or born again, or purged from his sin.

It is farther evident, from these texts, that this reconciliation of man to God, is effected by the death or cross of Christ. "For Christ was set forth to be a *propitiation* through faith in his blood." Rom. 3: 25. When we believe in the blood of Christ, we are propitiated or reconciled to God.

The apostles appear to have been entirely unacquainted with your doctrine, or they would not have written as they did. You tell us atonement or reconciliation was something done *for us*, not *in us*; Paul tells us they were done *in us*. You say God was the only proper subject of reconciliation or atonement: Paul says man is.

Whenever they speak of the offering of Christ, his suffering, his blood, &c. they never hint, that God, or justice, or law, or government, is affected, reconciled or satisfied; but man only. 1 Pet. 3: 18. "For Christ hath also once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, *that he might bring us to God.*" Not to satisfy or reconcile God, law, or justice. Heb. 9: 14. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal spirit, offered himself without spot to God, *purge your consciences from dead works, to serve the living God*---Not to purge or reconcile God, but man. This is the general language of the New Testament.

If the New Testament has eclipsed the Old in glory; if it is the substance of all the shadows, types and figures of the Old; surely then we are most likely to find the truth of those doctrines there, than by leaving the glory and substance, to grope among the dark shadows and types. You have already seen that your system of reconciliation and atonement will not agree with Paul's: not that the Old Testament contradicts the New; but because you do not understand the Old. You observed, p. 57, "one reason why men mistake Jesus, is because they mistake Moses." If you had inverted this sentence, it would certainly have been nearer the truth.

Though you have so strenuously contended that God was the only proper subject of reconciliation or atonement, and not man; for atonement is done for us, not in us; if done in us it would intend regeneration;" yet you presently contradict your own plan, and say, "Reconciliation was necessary on God's part, as well as one the sinner's." "God and man both expressed their reconciliation by passing through the *Bereth* cut in twain." p. 56, 57. What! is reconciliation found at length to be necessary on the sinner's part! And this reconciliation effected in them by the sacrifices! The sinner a subject or reconciliation, or atonement! Then it follows according to your own acknowledgment, that as reconciliation or atonement is effected or done in us, they mean moral purity or regeneration. Thus you have established the truth of Paul's doctrine in part; but you appear not to have intended it, for you exert your skill to destroy the idea.

"By purging," you say, p. 49, "it is evident the scriptures mean something different from personal purity or regeneration." Yes, it is a sentiment generally received, that the scriptures speak of both a ceremonial and moral purging. The first you have clearly proved. p. 49, 50. But they also speak of a moral purging or cleansing. Read Mal. 3: 3; Matt. 3: 12; Joh. 15: 2; 1 Cor. 5: 7; 2 Tim. 2: 21; Heb. 9: 14; Isai. 1: 16; Joh. 13: 11---xv. 3; Psalm. 19: 12---li. 2; Jer. 33: 8; 2 Cor. 7: 1; 1 Joh. 1: 7, 9; Ezek. 36: 33, &c. In these texts and many others, purging and cleansing mean or intend moral purity, and you cannot deny it. If so, then purging, and atonement, (for they are same thing,) signify regeneration, as proved in my letters.

You adduce Heb. 1: 3, to prove that purging does not mean moral purity. *When he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high.* You add, "But if the word means a moral cleansing or change of nature, then Jesus did not set down in the right hand of God, till after the regeneration of Christians in the apostles' days." p. 49. Dear sir, how forgetful you are! You had just before contended that atonement or purging was "something done for us, by which wrath was averted." Therefore, when Jesus made the atonement for sinners by suffering, *then* that was done for them by which wrath was averted. If so, then the wrath of God was averted really from all the happy number, for which Christ died, at least eighteen hundred years ago. Yet the scriptures declare "he that believeth not is *condemned already*, and the *wrath* of God abideth on him." Hence it is evident that the wrath of God is not averted or removed from any, till he believe, whether elect or non-elect.

In the same manner you spoke, p. 44, "Jesus has suffered as the sinner's substitute, to meet the claims of justice, though the moral character of the sinner is not changed." These claims of justice you explain to be the punishment of sin. p. 67. "Christ did not redeem sinners from justice, but from a certain effect of justice, which is, the punishment of sin." In p. 61, you tell us when this redemption was made; "the redemption *by blood* was complete, final and eternal when Jesus suffered." From these premises, we must

certainly conclude, that they for whom Jesus suffered, were *completely, finally* and *eternally* redeemed from all punishment, of soul and body at least eighteen hundred years ago. A question naturally arises, why do they yet suffer? It cannot be a claim of justice; for all those claims were met or satisfied when he suffered. It must then be one of two things, either that the redemption was deficient, or that your doctrine is false.

You see that your exposition of Heb. 1: 3, is clogged with such great difficulties that it cannot be true. Therefore, the purging in the text must intend a moral cleansing from sin. Not that our sins were really purged away, or that we were regenerated, at the time Christ suffered and ascended to glory; but a foundation was then laid in his suffering and ascension, by which all that believe, in every age, are purged, redeemed, saved, reconciled or regenerated. This is the tenor of the scriptures, as I proved in my letters; this is the fact in the experience of every Christian; for they all know that they were once under condemnation and wrath, and altogether defiled with sin. They also know, that they were never purged, redeemed or saved from these, before they believed in Jesus Christ. Rom. 7 and 8 chap.

I am highly pleased with your learned definitions of the word *atonement*, as signifying "to purge, expiate, appease or cover." p. 50. But when God is considered the proper subject of them, and not man, they lose their meaning. When a man is regenerated, his sin is then expiated or purged---he is then appeased to God---he is then covered from wrath; for sin, the proper object of wrath, is purged away; then is sin covered by the righteousness or love of God in us, as darkness is covered with light, or as green cloth dyed in blue is covered with blue. *Charity shall cover the multitude of sin.* 1 Pet. 4: 8. *Love covereth all sins.* Prov. 10: 12; Js. 5: 20. Without this atonement or covering of sin, the wrath of God is never averted from the sinner. *If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema maranatha.* 1 Cor. 16: 22. This you grant, when you describe the wrath of God as, "That in God which stands in opposition to sin, and which will lead him to punish the sinner." p. 12. This is also evident from attending to the old

dispensation. All the sacrifices offered then did not avert the wrath of God, unless offered in faith, as Abel's was. Heb. 11. So the sacrifice and offering of Christ never averts wrath from any until they believe; then, and not till then, are they regenerated, purged, and cleansed from sin and wrath, as shown before.

You have learned and granted, by my "instructive hint," that *katallage* rendered *atonement*, Rom. 5: 11, is everywhere else in the New Testament translated reconciliation; but you deny that it intends regeneration or moral purity. p. 51. This you labor to make appear by substituting *regeneration*, in the place of reconciliation in reading, Rom. 5: 10, and Col. 1: 20. "For if when we were enemies we were reconciled (regenerated) to God---much more being reconciled (regenerated) we shall be saved by his life." You add, "Then Paul and all the Christians of his time, were regenerated when enemies, and yet (amazing to tell) after this regeneration, their salvation was yet a future thing!"---Well, sir, let us try the text without substituting regeneration. Then, according to your gloss, Paul and all the Christians of his time, were *reconciled* when they were *yet enemies*; and yet (amazing to tell!) after this reconciliation to God, their salvation was yet a future thing!!

In the same manner, you try your skill on Col. 1: 20, "And having made peace through the blood of his cross by him, to reconcile (regenerate) all things unto himself; by him I say, whether they be things in heaven, or things on earth, *or things under the earth.*" You add, "by this mode of exposition all things in heaven were enemies to God and needed regeneration." p. 51.

Forgive me, sir, when I am obliged to think that this is mere trifling. In your quotation and application of Col. 1: 20, you betray that, with which you so often upbraid me; but modesty prevents me from naming the thing. To the text you have made the addition of "things under the earth." By *the things in heaven* you understand those things in the heaven of final rest, or the eternal abode of the blessed; Whereas Paul meant the Jews; who were said to be in heaven, because they were in the kingdom of heaven, or church. *The things in earth*, were the Gentiles; said to be in earth because

they were out of the kingdom of heaven or church. The plain sense of the text is, that Christ came to reconcile both Jews and Gentiles. Comp. Eph. 2 chap.

From your observations on these texts, we have an additional proof, that you do not allow man to be the subject of reconciliation, or to have any part in it; though you expressed this in two instances, yet it appears that you did it accidentally, not through design, as before observed. Though the texts plainly declare that man is the subject of reconciliation or atonement (for they are the same,) yet if you grant this you destroy your scheme. For it seems that the great, leading doctrine of your book is, that, as all the offerings both of Christ and of beasts were made to God, the reconciliation or atonement must be made to him; that these were done *for* man, not *in* him. That the atonement was designed to avert the wrath of God, and punishment--that this was done completely, finally and eternally when Christ suffered and ascended to Glory---That by the blood of Christ we are redeemed from wrath, or punishment, but not from sin and Satan; for this redemption from sin and Satan is effected by almighty power not by blood. Yet Paul has taught us that it is effected by the cross or death of Christ! But of this hereafter.

In the same manner you shew, p. 52, that propitiation does not mean regeneration. Rom. 3: 25. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation (regeneration)" &c. Had you added the next clause of the verse "through faith in his blood," your reader would have seen that man was the proper subject of propitiation, because it was effected *through faith in his blood*. Then according to your own acknowledgment, p. 48, it intends regeneration.

It is true, that in one text, Ezek. 16: 63. God is said to be *pacified* or reconciled. But this was not effected in him by blood--but when his rebellious people had repented of their sins, and hated them, and followed beliefs; then the nature of God no longer opposed them, but at one-ed or reconciled to them. See my observations, Let. 3.

Yours, B.W.S.

LETTER IX.

ON MR. C'S. CRITICISMS.

SIR,

You smiled at the idea of "conviction and confusion in the same mind." p. 47. And what is more common? Cannot a mind be convicted that one thing is wrong, and yet confused, not knowing what is right?---!!!

You sneer at my definition of *atone* and *atonement*, as meaning at-one and at-one-ment. You say it is trifling with the English language. As good, and, I am certain, more candid critics than you, think very differently. Was it necessary to contradict you assertion, I would prove that my definition of the words, was the sense in which they were primarily used, even down to the days of Shakespeare. But the fathers, to make the word suit their system, twisted it to mean *satisfaction*.

You criticize very severely on my observations on the word *ilaskesthai*. I had said, "The word *ilaskesthai*, translated in the verse, (Heb. 2: 17.) reconciliation, is everywhere else translated propitiation. Rom. 3: 25; 1 John 2: 2---4, 10." Before I take notice of your remarks on this, I will give you another "learned hint," which you really seem to need. In the Greek language one word is the theme or foundation of a great many. This fundamental word is called the *radix* or root, and the words flowing from this are called branches flowing from this root. The root and branches are one word under different forms; as the root and branches of a tree are called one tree. I never dreamed but that all the learned understood this; therefore I spoke as I did. But I will give you another hint, if not a learned, yet a useful one. When your criticize with such severity on others, be sure that you leave no room for another to criticize on you.---This you have done on this very word *ilaskesthai*, making it an active verb, whereas it is passive. You say, "Jesus came to *regenerate* the sins of the people; *ilaskesthai*

tas amartias tou laou." p. 52. This you did to expose my idea of *propitiation* meaning regeneration. But translate it according to your meaning and grammar; "Jesus came to *propitiate or appease* the sins of the people." What have you gained by your criticism?

I candidly acknowledge I was mistaken, when I said that the word *ilaskesthai* was *everywhere* else in the New Testament translated propitiation; for you have produced one text, and but one, where it is translated otherwise. Luke 18: 13. Till now this text has escaped my notice. But a divine, who can defend the leading doctrine of his system by no other argument, than by prove that the words *every* and *all* do not mean *every* and *all*, but a part only; ought to be careful in speaking as you have done on the word *every* just above, left his own arguments be found against himself. But remember, Mr. C. how many blunders you have made, and learn to be less severe against another for so small a one as that just noticed. A heathen poet could say,

----- *et idem*

Indignor, quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus.

Hor.

Happy for you! you think in this verse (Luke 18: 13.) that you have found a text which proves that God is changeable, or that he can be *really* propitiated or appeased; "*God be merciful* (propitiated or appeased) *to me a sinner.*" Hence you conclude that God can be appeased, because the publican prayed so. Then it follows, when Moses prayed to the Lord, *Repent of this evil against thy people*, (Exod. xxxii, 12,) that the Lord can *really* repent---When David prayed to the Lord, *Awake to my judgment*, (Psalm xxxv, 23,) the Lord was *really* asleep---When he prayed *Arise to our help*, (44: 26.) the Lord was *really* sitting or lying down, &c. I explained these *relatively*, not *really*, though you think this is "gloomy, and one step short of atheism." p. 12.

Your criticism on the Greek word *ilasterion*, *the mercy-seat*, is common, and with which I am well pleased. The mercy-seat in the old temple was called *ilasterion*, "And by applying this to Christ, Rom. 3: 25, *Whom God set forth*, (*ilasterion*, a propitiary or mercy-seat,) assures us *that* was the true mercy-seat, the reality of which the *kaparat* represented to the ancient." p. 53. As the mercy-seat represented Christ Jesus, let us point out the resemblance. The mercy-seat stood in the old tabernacle or temple; so the true mercy-seat was in the body or flesh of Jesus, which is the true tabernacle or temple of God, of which the old was a shadow. Heb. 9. From the old mercy-seat the Lord was represented, as communing with his people, meeting with them, and delivering answers of peace and mercy. Exod. 25: 17, 22: so in Jesus the true mercy-seat the Lord dwells in all his fullness, *For all the fullness of Godhead dwelt in him bodily*. From, or through Jesus, the true mercy-seat, God communes with us, meets with us, and delivers unto us answers of peace and mercy. *He is the way to the Father, and no man cometh to the Father but by him*. Again---The old mercy-seat was to be sprinkled with blood. By this we are taught that Jesus, the true mercy-seat, was to suffer and die, and be sprinkled with his own blood for the redemption of sinners.

You will find, after a little more examination of these subjects, that the observations I made in my letters, p. 29, are true. "That the victims slain in sacrifice, were never designed to affect or change the mind of God, not to be an equivalent or satisfaction for sin; but that they were designed to influence or affect the mind or the worshipers."

Yours,

B. W. S.

LETTER X.

ON REDEMPTION.

SIR,

In my letters, p. 23, 24, I proved that Jesus Christ, by his blood, redeemed us from Satan, sin, all our enemies, and from the curse of the law. You deny that Jesus ever redeemed or purchased us from Satan or sin by his blood, but from the curse of the law. You say, "Christ did not redeem sinners from justice, but from a certain effect or claim of justice, which is the punishment of sin." In p. 61, you tell us, when this redemption was made, "the redemption by blood was complete, final and eternal when Jesus suffered and ascended to his glory." Heb. 1: 3---ix. 12. I have already shewed, letter eight, that matter of fact, experience and scripture, both contradict this notion of redemption.

From this false notion of redemption, arose the scholastic notion of justification by the blood of Christ, as you state it, p. 44, "Jesus has suffered as the sinner's substitute, to meet the claims of justice, yet the moral character of the sinner is not changed." When these claims are met, then the sinner is acquitted from punishment, or he is justified. The whole business is done without, or out of the soul; and done too when Jesus suffered. So that if the justification be not from eternity, as some say, yet it has been done eighteen hundred years ago. Hence many poor deceived souls have gotten a hope that they are justified and redeemed from the claims of justice while they *are in the gall of bitterness and bonds of iniquity.*

You appear not to have understood my ideas on justification, seeing you impute this to us---"men are justified on the ground of personal merit, or because they are actually righteous." p. 46. I never used these expressions; but it is probable those I did use, have not so happily expressed my ideas on this subject. But, indeed, I find that a caviler can wrest the best formed expression from its true meaning. All I intended in justification is, that when

the guilty believes God's promise of free pardon, he is acquitted from every charge, not only of punishment, but of sin. By this pardon of sin, the law of love is written in his heart, and so he is really just or holy.

You are extremely merry at my exposition of Eph. 4: 8, Psa. 68: 18. But remember what I said, Letter 8; that when it is said Christ obtained eternal redemption for us, &c. it cannot mean that when he suffered, he then actually redeemed us from "the claims of justice or punishment; seeing all yet suffer, and are under condemnation and wrath; nor that he then actually redeemed us from sin and Satan; seeing all unbelievers are yet under their power: But that he laid a foundation in his death, resurrection and life, by which, all believe, are redeemed, saved, and justified from all things. You ask, "Where did the author learn that leading captivity captive, means captivating sinners?" In the Bible; for there I found and proved that sinners were the captivity, and that sinners are led and drawn to God by the cords of love. I learned the same truth by experience. But, sir, where did you learn that the captivity means the devil and his angels? Not in the Bible; for is never called so there. It is one of the traditions of the fathers.

You say, p. 61. "Our redemption from sin and Satan, is the effect of Christ's death and ascension into his glory, and is a redemption by power, not by purchase." I grant that our redemption from sin and Satan is the effect of Christ's death and ascension. This is all for which I contend. For in the death and ascension, as well as the life, of Jesus, the love, grace and glory of God are manifested, by which all that believe are drawn from sin and Satan to God, and changed into his image. I grant also, that "this redemption from sin and Satan, is a redemption by power." Yes, by the power of God. But this power of God is not a mechanical, but moral power: 1: e. God does not by almighty irresistible power drag us, as machines, from sin and Satan; but by the power of his constraining love, revealed in the gospel. Hence "the gospel is *the power of God* unto salvation to everyone that believeth." And "the love of Christ *constraineth* us." Rom. 1: 16. 2 Cor. 5: 14.

You farther say, "this redemption from sin and Satan is not by purchase." By this you mean that the redemption from sin and Satan was not by the blood of Jesus, "for the redemption by blood was complete, final and eternal, when Jesus suffered." p. 61. Your assertion, that our redemption from sin and Satan, is not by purchase or blood, is perfectly antisciptural. 1 Pet. 1: 18. "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, *from your vain conversation, &c.*" By what authority do you so confidently assert, that redemption from the claims of justice was by purchase or blood, and *that* from sin and Satan was not? You will find is very difficult to establish this assertion from the Bible.

If by purchase you mean that a price was given to sin and Satan, as payment for the captives, I will readily grant that our redemption from them was not by purchase: for we are God's creatures, made and preserved by him; nor has the devil or sin any legal or original claim in us. You also deny that a price was given to God or justice, as payment for the captives to be redeemed; for you deny with me that sinners are redeemed from God or justice; "to say so is impious." p. 67. The purchasing or buying then must be metaphorical or figurative. So it is used in scripture frequently. Isai. 55: 1.--*Buy wine and milk, without money and without price.* Prov. 23: 23, Rev. 3: 18, &c.

God is frequently said in scripture to *sell* his people to their enemies; when nothing more is intended, than that he suffers their enemies to prevail against them, and bring them into servitude and wretchedness. Judges 2: 14. *And the anger of the Lord waxed hot against Israel, and he sold them into the hands of their enemies round about.* Deut. 32: 30. *How should one chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight, except their Rock had sold them, &c.*

On the other hand, God is frequently said to *buy, purchase* and *redeem* his people from their enemies, when nothing more is intended, than that he interposes and uses proper means to deliver them from oppression and wretchedness. Thus were the children of

Israel, *purchased, bought* or *redeemed* from the Egyptians and other enemies. Exod. 15: 16. "Fear and dread shall fall upon them--till thy people pass over which thou hast *purchased*." Deut. 32: 6. "Do ye thus requite the Lord, O foolish people and unwise? is he not thy father that hath *bought* thee? Psalm. 74: 2. "Remember thy congregation which thou hast *purchased* of old." Exod. 6: 6. "Say unto the children of Israel, I am the Lord, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians--and I will *redeem* you with a stretched out arm, and with great judgments." Exod. xv, 13. Thou in thy mercy hast led forth thy people which thou hast redeemed." Deut. 7: 8. Because the Lord loved you---he *redeemed* you out of the house of bond men, from the hand of Pharaoh, king of Egypt." Deut. 9: 26---xxiv. 18; 2 Sam. 7: 28.

Hence it is abundantly evident that in God's *buying, purchasing* and *redeeming* his people from the oppression of the Egyptians, no real price was given; unless we call the heavy judgments and ruin of the Egyptians a price; if so, they surely got it.

All mankind by nature are represented as *sold under sin* and under the tyranny and oppression of the devil. This I fully proved in my letters. Christ is said to have *bought, ransomed, purchased* and *redeemed them* from sin and Satan to God.^{2} By which I understand nothing more than, that he interposed, and used such means as were effectual to draw mankind from sin and Satan unto God. These means are exhibited in his life, death and resurrection. But the death or blood of Christ is most frequently mentioned in scripture, as the means of this redemption. This blood of Christ is called a price, but it is so only metaphorically: called a price, because through faith, it does really redeem us from sin and Satan, and from the curse of the law. This price, or blood, or death of Christ I observed the devil got, for by his instigation, Christ was put to death; but the price, or blood which was shed, was his ruin, the ruin of his kingdom on earth; for Christ Jesus, "through death destroyed him that had *the power of death*, that is the devil, and delivered them." &c. Heb. 2: 14, 15. This price was not given to the devil, nor did he receive it as payment for the captives as

observed before.

You are struck with horror at my expression "the devil got the price." Had you attended to the paragraph which contained those words, you would have seen the explanation. But your horror and fright appear to have been so great, that you lost your reason, and gave vent to the most extravagant imagination that wildness could suggest. We need no other proof of this, than reading page 68. There you exclaim "that the precious blood of Christ was given by God to the devil in payment. That God was so weak that he was obliged to compound with the devil, and pay him a price for the ransom of sinners. That God was so merciless, as to deliver up his only son to glut the malice of a bloodthirsty demon. That the Lamb of God was immolated on the altar of hell, &c." These are truly awful things; but a sober reader of my letters could never find them there. Nothing but a disordered fancy could ever have found them.

You entreat me "to eat these dreadful words." p. 67. Well, sir, I will do it; because the words are not the words of scripture--- because they are so extremely offensive to you, and because, by your public harangues, and writings on this subject, the preachers and people appear to have caught the same wildness of imagination. But when I "eat up these dreadful words," permit me to adopt those of Paul, "he through death destroyed him that had the *power of death*, that is the devil." Heb. 2: 14. I will never contend for an expression, if I may retain the idea. Here I would remind you of a sentiment which you struck at with the spirit of a man, I mean that of *money payment*. When I represented Calvinism in its true colors, you were surprised at my ignorance, as not know that obvious distinction between moral and pecuniary justice. Now when I say that Christ redeemed us from sin and Satan by his blood, which is called the price of redemption, you adopt the ideas so abhorrent to you before, and palm them on me! And this too, when I never mentioned a debt, as your Confession does.

But you think, p. 62, that according to my views of redemption, "it cannot be called such; seeing it may prove utterly unavailing, unless sinners put forth the wonder-working power which they

possess in faith and repentance." True, sir; we are never redeemed actually from wrath or "the certain effect of justice," or punishment, or sin or Satan, before we believe in Christ. Can you deny it? If so, you deny scripture, matter of fact, and the universal experience of all Christians, as I proved before, Let. 8.

You animadvert on my answer to obj. 9, more like a taunter than a serious divine. But, Mr. C. if my views are so ludicrous, let us look at yours, as stated in your Confession. The curse of the law is "death, temporal, spiritual, and eternal." This curse Christ bore or suffered, did he? No; you are ashamed to acknowledge it; you deny it. You yet contend that Christ was cursed of God. You add, if the reader will turn to Deut. 21: 23, he will see a refutation of my ideas; "*he that is hanged upon a tree is cursed to God.*" But the preceding verse gives the reason why he was cursed of God; because *he had committed a sin worthy of death*. Such a person is cursed or condemned both by God and his law. But Jesus is not accursed in this sense. But you think that sin was transferred or imputed to him; because *he was made sin for us---and will come the second time without sin*. These expressions you explain, by saying he was made a sin offering or offering for sin. And whoever denied that Jesus was an offering, or died for sin? But this does not prove that sin was imputed to him. Christ did not die, because he was a real sinner, or sinner by imputation, as I proved in my letters, p. 34.

I had observed "that it was not certain that the Jews of old have respect to the blood of Christ when they offered sacrifices; because Paul said, *they could not see the end of those things which were to be abolished*; and because the disciples of Christ, though justified persons, did not believe that Christ would die, till the fact proved it. Then they began to doubt whether he was the true Messiah." But, sir, is this saying, they knew nothing of a Savior? This is the conclusion you draw; and you quote a number of texts to prove that the Jews of old believed in a Messiah who was to come!! You have a happy flight of misrepresentation. You yourself believe the same thing I stated, though you fight against it when mentioned by me. You state that "the Jewish sacrifices did make an *actual*

expiation for sin---that the offender's guilt was transferred to a substituted victim, and God accepted that victim, and released the offender from punishment." Then the expiation was not by the blood of Christ, and why should you contend that they, who offered sacrifices, had respect to the blood of Christ, when the scriptures are silent? I believe that all, that ever were saved, or ever will be, were and will be saved by Christ; because it was by him that God revealed himself from the beginning. All agree that *that* was Christ who conversed with our first parents, with the patriarchs and saints of old. Hence it is written "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God. John 1: 1.

You endeavor to nullify my remarks on Isai. 53: as explained by Matt. 8: 16, 17. This you have done like the rest, by representing me as denying "that divine power was necessary in the cure of sins." p. 70. You esteem Taylor as an accurate critic in the Hebrew, else you would not have quoted his name for authority to your criticisms in that language. In his Key to the apostolical writings, p. 80, 81, he says the Hebrew word which we render *hath borne* in Isai. 53: 4, 12, signifies to *carry away* or *take away*. And in this sense it is used six times at least by the prophet Isaiah, and so rendered in the English Bible. Isai. 8: 4---xvii. 7---xxxix. 6---xl. 24---xli. 16---lvii. 13---lxvi. 6. Also Gen. 47: 30; Lev. 11: 25, 40; Num. 16: 15; 1 Sam. 17: 34; Ezek. 12: 7; Dan. 1: 16, &c. He farther observes, the Hebrew word in Isai. 53: 4, 11, which we translate *carry* or *bear*, though a verb seldom used, yet signifies to *carry off*, or *carry away*, and so is translated in the English Bible. Isai. 46: 4, &c.

According to these criticisms, let us read the verses: Verse 4. "Surely he hath *borne away* our griefs and *carried away* our sorrows." How exactly does this agree with the explanation given by the Evangelist. Matt. 8: 16, 17. "When the even was come they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils, and he cast out the devils with his word, and healed all that were sick; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, himself *took* our infirmities and *bare* our sicknesses. I

would farther observe that the Greek words *elabe*, *ebastase*, translated in this verse *took* and *bear*, is frequently rendered in our translation, *to take away*, *to bear or carry away*. Mat. 5: 40; Rev. 3: 11; Mar. 14: 13; Joh. 20: 15; Acts 21: 35, &c.

But let us return to Isai. 53: verse 11---"By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall *bear away* their iniquities" 5: 12---He was numbered with the transgressors, and he *bare away* or *took away* the sin of many. That you may see how exactly this comports with the general tenor of scripture I refer you back to my 6th letter. You may labor from this chapter to establish the doctrine of imputed sin; but when the general tenor of scripture speaks a different language, you ought to submit your notions to the truth.

I said in my letters that the cup mentioned in Matt. 26: 39; Joh. 18: 11, was not the wrath of God which Christ had to endure. If so, he gave his disciples poor encouragement, which he said *ye shall drink indeed of my cup*. Matt. 20: 22. This cup I said were the sufferings through which Christ and his disciples had to pass. You still contend it was the wrath of God; "that the disciples partook of it only *partially*; they took only a *sip*, while Jesus drank the full draught." p. 74. What! did the disciples assist him in drinking or bearing the wrath of God, "that certain effect of justice," the punishment of sin? Did they *partially* assist him in "meeting the claims of justice?" Then surely they were *partial* Saviors! and Jesus is robbed of part of his glory in the salvation of sinners! It will remain a difficulty to determine how much glory is to be ascribed to Jesus, and how much to the disciples, on your plan!

You have made frequent mention of the offering of Christ; "how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God." Heb. 9: 14. "And walk in love as Christ hath loved us, and hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling favor." This offering of Christ, you think, was designed to reconcile God, to avert his wrath, to meet the claims of justice, &c. p. 58, 44. But,

sir, these texts speak of no such things. Nor can you find, in the New Testament, one text to establish your notions. As observed before, in the Old Testament, you have found many passages among the dark shadows which seem to favor your ideas, but you ought not to bring shadows to contradict the general current of plain truth. The design of the offering and sacrifice of Christ is plainly held forth in those very texts above, 1: e. to set forth his great love; and to purge our consciences from dead works to serve the living God. These designs are very different from those mentioned by you.

You might as well conclude that when Christians are said to offer themselves as living sacrifices to God, Rom. 12: 1, Phil. 2: 17, &c. that it was to reconcile God, &c. By Christians offering themselves to God as living sacrifices, we can understand nothing more than that they submitted themselves to God, to do or suffer whatever might be according to his will or pleasure. So did Christ; for in the view of his sufferings, he said, "not my will but thine be done;" and in the midst of them "he committed himself to him that judgeth righteously. Christ hath suffered for us, leaving us an example to follow his steps." 1 Pet. 1: 21. But the offering and sacrifice, or blood of Christ, is of infinite efficacy to cleanse and purge every believer from all sin. 1 Joh. 1: 9; Heb. 9: 14; Rev. 1: 5, &c.

Yours,

B. W. S.

LETTER XI.

ON FAITH, DIVISION, PARTYISM, &C.

SIR,

You have frequently, in your Strictures, glanced at, and misrepresented the doctrine of faith as held by us. "Faith and repentance are all that can be necessary in order to forgiveness, and these the sinner can exercise at any moment he chooses to exert his power." p. 46. "Ah! here again is that wondering working faith, which according to the doctrine we hear, does more for the sinner than ever Jesus did." p. 64, &c.

It is strange, very strange, that you have been so long contending against our ideas of faith, and yet unacquainted with the very first principles of our doctrine. This is evident from your words quoted above. "The sinner can exercise faith at any moment he chooses to exert his power." We hold no such doctrine. We do not make *choice*, *will*, or *pleasure*, the foundation of faith; but testimony or evidence.

We may choose or refuse to attend to testimony or evidence: But if we attend, then it is not optionary with us, or left to our will or choice, whether we believe or disbelieve. We do not believe many things which we neither wish to believe, nor have any pleasure in believing. Was it testified by good testimony, to a loving absent husband, that his wife was dead, he would believe it, however contrary to his wishes or pleasure, choice or will. When it is testified to a sinner that he is on the verge of eternal ruin--that the wrath of God abideth on him; if he believe it, surely it is not because these things are according to his will, choice or pleasure; but it is because of the testimony to which he attends.

But, sir, the objection you throw against us, falls directly upon yourself. You, Calvinists, are the very people who can believe at any moment when you please or will. For you can never choose,

will or please, till God made you willing by his almighty power, then you can believe. Till this almighty power, a power extraneous from the word, be exercised on the sinner, he can no more believe than remove a mountain or create a world. This is a common phrase among Calvinists. A sinner can never believe the testimony of Jesus, till this power be exercised by God in him. What a prolific source of evils is this doctrine! The origin of enthusiasm begins here. A sinner cannot believe the word of God; therefore, it is of no use to him; he waits for power to believe, till death sweeps him to hell; he waits till faith is given him, not knowing that God has already given faith, which is the gospel of Christ, to every creature. This is called *the faith*, because it is the ground of it.

Again you say, "faith does more for the sinner than ever Jesus did." Fie! fie! Mr. C. are you not ashamed to palm this upon us, whole writings and preaching are so well known in the country. There is a beggar dying for want; a rich man hands or offers bread to him---he stretches out his hand and takes the bread---he eats and lives. The question now is, would not the beggar have died, had he refused the bread? Was it the bread he ate, or the hand that took it, that satisfied his hunger and saved his life? Surely it was the bread that save him, not the hand which received it. Just so; Jesus Christ is the bread of life, given by God to a dying world. Faith is the hand that receives Christ. The question is, does Christ save the sinner from death, or faith? Are faith and the bread of life the same thing? Or is the hand of the beggar and the bread he receives the same thing? No. It is true Christ is given for the life of the world, but he that believeth not shall not see life, but shall die in his sins. *This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life---and this life is in his sin.* He that believeth not this record hath made God a liar. 1 Joh. 5: 10, 11. How differently was the divinity taught by the apostles, from the modern divinity! John taught that eternal life was given to all, for he that did not believe this record, made God a liar; and surely if eternal life was not given to every creature, that part to whom it was not given could not make God a liar in believing that it was not given to them; for they believed the truth. Do, sir, read the View of the Gospel on the article of faith, published by Springfield Presbytery, before you venture to make

such ungrounded assertions against the doctrine. If not, blame not the world for thinking that you have not such a sacred regard to candor as becomes a minister of Jesus.

Page 76, you severely accuse us of partyism, and making divisions among the churches. Dear sir, recollect for a moment, who were the instigators of the party; not we, for we declared from the beginning that we did not leave your communion, but only the jurisdiction of the Presbyterian church. Witness our protest--Witness our Apology--Witness our Last Will and Testament---Witness the letter we addressed to Synod last fall. But as this letter was not permitted to be read only in Synod, I will transcribe it.

DEAR BRETHREN,

We are happy in having an opportunity of addressing you through the medium of the committee of the general assembly. We are heartily grieved at the distance and coolness which seem to exist between us. God has begun a glorious work in this western country, which calls aloud for the united exertions of all the friends of Jesus, and of mankind. Why should we contend and stand at a distance from each other, while the fields are white to harvest? Why contend while sinners are dying around us? Is not Christ in you, and is he not in us? Shall Christ be divided, or shall he cast out himself from his own house? He is the head of the body, and believers are members of that body in particular. We love all Christians; have lost sight of partyism; and henceforth know no man after the flesh.

We have proposed to the committee the plan upon which we may come together; and if any other plan can be proposed by them or by you, we are ready to hear it. We view Christ as the only center of union, and love the only bond. A living member of the body, an arm or a leg, needs no external bands to keep it in union; such bands, we conceive, would be an incumbrance: a dead member only can need them, but of such a member the body had better be deprived. Where love is wanting, there can be no lasting union; there can be no union at all; for love, as we have said, is the very

bond. This hides a multitude of faults---this hopeth all things, believeth all things, endureth all things, is kind, &c.---this is the sum and spirit of the law---this the very nature and spirit of God---and this is the spirit of unity. Whoever is partaker of this, is partaker of the divine nature. The want of this, therefore, is the cause of division.

Let us labor after this spirit; and when we obtain it, then we shall all be united in one body. You may think a human bond unnecessary, we think otherwise; but while we acknowledge the same bible--the same God and Father of all--the same Mediator between God and man--while we enjoy the same fellowship and communion with the Father and the Son, and are fellow-partakers of his sufferings in the flesh and spirit---while we have the same hope, and are heirs of the same inheritance;---shall we, dear brethren, shall we give place to the devil? God forbid.

Some are groaning for the wounds of the Presbyterian cause; some for the Methodist; some for the Baptist, &c. each believing that it is the cause of Christ for which they are groaning---and some are as heartily groaning for the wounds of the Christian cause, without respect to names or parties. If we should unite our groans and cries to the Father of our mercies for the general release, and the coming of the Lord's kingdom with power, God would hear and answer us. O let us unite in the common cause---fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines to the west, and spoil them of the east together, and cry the sword of the Lord. Then will Zion shake herself from the dust, shine forth as the sun in his brightness, and be terrible as an army with banners---Then shall she be a cup of trembling to all the people round about her, and shake terribly the nations. Then shall that man of sin be destroyed, and righteousness shall flow down as a mighty stream. These things, dear brethren, are not vain imaginations, for God is now about to take the earth. Thy kingdom come. Amen! even so, come, Lord Jesus.

Brethren, yours in the Lord,

R. MARSHALL,
J. DUNLAVY,
B. W. STONE,
J. THOMPSON.

Danville,
October 18, 1804.

To the Moderator of the Synod of Kentucky.

If this public testimony will not convince you that partyism was not our aim, I shall not attempt to give you anything farther. But you see that we are organizing churches---Yes, but who are the people? Many of them are such as your Synod had cut off by their decree, forbidding them to commune with us, attend our ministry, &c. When we are thus cut off, and debarred from the communion of all sects, must we still remain without communion among ourselves? And if a brother in your church want to commune with us, shall we debar him? we dare not. But if he commune with us, he is at liberty to remain in your church as for us; but you cut him off; are we, therefore, breaking up churches? No. You are the people, the very people. We advise the people publicly to abide in the church, in which they are called, but to use the liberty which Christ has given them, 1: e. to have fellowship with all Christians. But you will not give them this liberty, and if they use it, you cut them off.

As to our mode of preaching which you have noticed, p. 76, I leave for them to judge, who have heard us. But whose preaching, yours or ours, be most blessed, let the works prove it. You blame us because of division among professors. Remember it was so, when Christ preached the gospel of old, and he said "I came not to send peace, but division." Truth always had its advocates, and opposers. So it has yet. But, sir, if you are such an enemy to division and partyism, why don't you forsake your party of Presbyterians, and, like us, sink into the general body of Christ, and be called by his name. Till you do this, you ought to be silent in speaking against

division and partyism, lest the world laugh at you. You pray for a union of all Christians. But do you mean that all shall come to your party? The Christians of every sect have been long praying for a union: Now when God is answering their prayers, by opening up, in his providence, the only way in which it can be effected, they all, as parties, oppose it! But the Lord's work will go on in spite of opposition.

Page 76, you are very much diverted at my idea of the *man-child* as meaning the truth. But, sir, after all your vanity and witticism, you have not dared to contradict it. A Voltaire may laugh and sneer at the scriptures, but is this an argument against their truth?

Your concluding address is truly pathetic and awful. But, sir, I am not yet convinced that Heaven is so dreadfully distressed for me. For Heaven knows that I am following the truth; and to this I have the witness of the Spirit in my heart. Dear Mr. C. Heaven knows you are wrong, and you will yet know it, at farthest in the judgment of the great day. For your soul's sake examine yourself, lest your head may be more turned with them, than your heart filled with the love of God. Read with care Rom. 8, and examine whether you are yet delivered from condemnation and fear, for perfect love casts out fear---see whether you are made free from the law of sin---whether the righteousness of the law be fulfilled in you, so that you do love God with all your heart, and your neighbor as yourself, whether he be black or white--whether the spirit of God and of Jesus dwell in you; for Jesus has declared that "we," (both the Father and Son) "will make our abode in him," who loves God and keeps his commandments. The Father dwells in him; that is, his love, faithfulness, truth, justice, goodness, mercy, &c.---all these are in every believer. The Son dwells in him, that is, humility, patience in suffering, self-denial, meekness, obedience, &c.---all these are in every Christian: so that Christians have fellowship with the Father and with the Son. Examine whether you have received the spirit of adoption, the spirit of liberty, the spirit of intercession, &c. True religion is more than a name. It is living in God and God in us---it is heaven on earth---it is not a flash, and then no more for hours, days and months, but it

is a river. Religion in head will soon be plainly distinguished from that in the heart and life. The world begins to see it.

Now Mr. C. for the Lord's sake, be careful in future how you speak against the truth. Shudder at what you have done, and pray God to forgive you. Be not ashamed to acknowledge your error; for it is the part of a Christian. I expect never to appear in public as a writer, after this. I leave the field of controversy, and bid you adieu. Farewell. May the God of peace be with you. Amen.

Yours, to love and serve in the Gospel,

B. W. S.

P. S. You have heard, no doubt, before this time, of the lamentable departure of two of our preachers, and a few of their hearers, from the true gospel into wild enthusiasm, or shakerism. They have made shipwreck of faith, and turned aside to an old woman's fables, who broached them in New-England about twenty-five years ago. While we weep for them, many rejoice, and hope and expect this will be the end of us all. But we find that nothing new has happened under the sun.--Of the twelve who followed Christ, one proved a devil, and another denied him, and all the rest forsook him; but all repented, except Judas. This may yet be the case of our deluded brethren.--In Paul's days, Hymeneus and Alexander, Hermogenes and Philetus, and *all of them of Asia*, made shipwreck of faith. If it is an argument that we are wrong, because two of our preachers have revolted from the truth--the argument is equally strong against the truth of the Christian religion, because many of its professors in every age have done the same; even too in the Synod of Kentucky. It is rather in our favor that we are right, because wolves always go among the sheep for prey. These wolves, in sheep's clothing, have smelt us from far, and have come to tear, rend and devour. But "God has lifted up a standard against them."

Let us, after this, ever keep in mind that memorable description of

a citizen of Zion, Psalm. 15: "He backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbor, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbor." People in these days are as they were in the days of Jeremiah. They hated Jeremiah and wanted to blast his reputation. "Report, say they, and we will report." Let us not take up ungrounded reports any longer.

Farewell.

B. W. STONE.

September 4, 1805.