

sentence of the law by enduring the penalty. In human government this can only be effected by the personal suffering of the offender, who is said to have purged himself of his crime when he has undergone the deprivation and pain to which he was condemned.

In the moral government of God, however, Sovereignty has admitted the principle of satisfaction to the penal claims of the Law by the sufferings of a Substitute, even the Lord Jesus, by whose death the sentence of the Law upon the sins of the elect has been exhausted, so that equity can inflict no further deprivation or pain upon them. (Rom. viii. 3.)\*

Sin is thus regarded as a crime incurring legal punishment. This punishment Christ, as a competent surety, has endured in His own person for His people; thus propitiating Divine justice, removing condemnation, and rendering all the sins of all the elect unpunishable for ever.

\*“For what the Law could not do, in that it was weak,” &c. This is popularly supposed to mean that all that could be effected by the Law in the case of sinners was their condemnation. It could not save them, because of their inability to meet its requirements. It was “weak through the flesh.” Hence

“In vain we ask God’s righteous Law to justify us now,  
Since to convince and to condemn is all the Law can do.”

It is, however, submitted that the meaning is that the whole penal terrors of the Law could never be visited on sinners, because their natures would be too frail to sustain them. No creature is strong enough to stand the full expression of the anger of God. Hence the Law cannot exhibit its majesty to the full. It is weak through the flesh. But what would be impossible if the Law were dealing with creatures, became an actual fact when its penalty was visited on the Lord Jesus. “God sent His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh.” The sins that were laid on Him were punished to the full extent of their enormity. God “condemned sin” in His flesh. In the person of the suffering Saviour, His moral government found its full exemplification and manifestation. Whatever the dread word “damnation” may express and involve, was endured by the broken-hearted Son of God when made sin for us, and on Him, therefore, the Law could exhibit its penal terrors to the uttermost.

The writer owes this thought to THE REVEALED DOCTRINE OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, by B. Winter Hamilton, D.D., LL.D.

#### PARTICULAR REDEMPTION, COMMENSURATE ATONEMENT.

NOTE 5.—If human terms have any intelligibility, when applied to God’s saving acts, Redemption, from its very nature, must be particular. We are redeemed by price, and though a price may be very large, it is a limited and defined sum, and must concern a defined object.

The Atonement, also, must have been restricted to the sins of those whom Christ represented in the Covenant of grace. These are so numerous as to baffle human calculation; but “He bore *our* sins in His own body on the tree:” “He was wounded for *our* transgressions, He was bruised for *our* iniquities.” That is, the precise quantum of suffering adjudicated by the Law as the equitable penalty of the sins of God’s people was endured by Him. “He died for *our* sins according to the Scriptures.”\* The idea involved in propitiation is the enduring by the Saviour of the punishment which His people deserved. From its very nature, the Atonement could not have been of infinite extent, or have been made for sin in the abstract. What sound Divines have called the commercial† view of the Atonement, is, therefore, the truth of God.

#### MISCHIEVOUS DOCTRINES.

NOTE 4.—While fully admitting the Scriptural distinction between Christ’s death as a redemptive transaction and an atoning or appeasing act, certain erroneous applications of this distinction should be guarded against.

Some have insisted on (what *they* style) important differences between the Redemption and Atonement of Christ. While it is conceded that Redemption is “special and particular,” and extends to the persons of the elect *only*, it is denied that the Atonement of Christ was offered for the sins of elect men as individuals at all. “It is not something commensurate with the crime, neither more nor less, exactly measured by the

\*Consistent and Scriptural expositions of passages which appear to contradict the above and to teach the universality of the Atonement, will be found in the Author’s Manual, pages 45—55.

†The writer has elsewhere conceded that the term is an unhappy one, since the Atonement does not present the death of Christ in a commercial aspect—in the light of a *payment*—but as a *punishment* borne by Him for us. On the cross the Saviour offered a perfect penal equivalent to the sufferings to which the Law would have condemned His people for their sins. A commensurate or equivalent atonement would be a more correct term. See “A MANUAL OF FAITH AND PRACTICE,” page 49.

malignity and number of the sins to be pardoned," etc., etc. (See Buck's Theological Dictionary by Henderson, Articles ATONEMENT and REDEMPTION.)

These are rightly styled by William Palmer "mischievous distinctions" which "involve misleading fallacies." "In their root and essence" Redemption and Atonement "are the same." Both spring from one purpose—sovereign election. Both concern the same persons—those whom Christ represented in the Covenant of grace. Both have to do with these under one aspect—as sinners, transgressors of the Law. Both are ascribed to one cause, the death of Christ. Both have the same ends—salvation and eternal glory. They, therefore, have equal dimensions, and extend to those *only* whom Christ undertook to represent. Covenant relationship is not only the foundation of Redemption, but the ground of a just Atonement. See William Palmer's eleven tracts on "THE ATONEMENT," and his "ERRONEOUS VIEWS OF THE ATONEMENT CALMLY CONSIDERED."

#### LOGICAL INFERENCES.

NOTE 5.—While the Article under consideration relies for confirmation solely on the texts cited, the following are important considerations:—

If Christ died to ransom the persons and expiate the sins of all men, it follows:

That if all are not saved, He shed His blood in vain for those that are lost.

That if He died equally for those that have gone to heaven and those that are in hell, His great love has done no more for the blessed than for the damned. Judas was, therefore, as much an object of His affection, when He suffered, as Peter.

That if He died equally for every individual of the human race, He ransomed thousands who were never set free; atoned for sins that were never pardoned: and suffered for sinners who will be punished for ever. Such a ransom, such an atonement, and such sufferings for sins must be worthless to effect salvation at all.

If Christ died for all men, His blood was shed for many millions of the race of Adam, who at the very moment He was offering Himself a sacrifice for sin were in hell, and beyond all hope of the pardoning mercy of God.

If He loved all men equally, and gave Himself for all alike, He died for those to whom He forbade the Apostles to preach His Gospel, and whom He forbade them to call to faith and repentance, (Matt. x. 5; Acts iv. 12;) and who were thus kept without hope of redemption.

Thus those who pretend to exalt His grace by contending that Christ's sufferings were designed and endured for all men, reduce His Redemption to a farce: His sacrifice to a failure: His love to a feeble and inoperative sentiment: and His purpose to a fallacy and an absurdity. According to these teachers He undertook what He could not effect, and attempted what the corrupt opposition of men has in many instances prevented.

Hence, allowing these premises, sin must be more potent than grace, and sinners mightier than God.

Thus the error of general Redemption and a universal Atonement, necessitate conclusions which are blasphemous and absurd in the highest degree.

NOTE 6.—"The elect *only* participate in the special and peculiar blessings that flow from Christ's death." The emphasised words are introduced to indicated the important distinction between the *special* and the *general* benefits of the sufferings of Christ. It is fully conceded that the mediation of Christ has a universal aspect, and that His sufferings and death were the source of unspeakable benefit to all men. See "A MANUAL OF FAITH AND PRACTICE," page 81. It is, however, denied that the special blessings which His sufferings secured—pardon, peace, reconciliation to God, hope in death, and the enjoyment of heaven—were ever *designed* for any but those who were "chosen in Him from before the foundation of the world," nor will they be *bestowed* on any others.\*

#### Article VII. The Intercession of Christ. Page 4.

This Article expresses our belief concerning the ministry of Christ in Heaven, and the Work of the Holy Spirit on earth.

It insists that the present intercession of Christ (like the sat-

---

\*The above discusses the Article of Faith which is the main point of divergence between evangelical Arminians and ourselves. Young readers who desire fuller information are referred to COLES on DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY; RUSHTON'S DEFENCE OF PARTICULAR REDEMPTION, (with the exception of the notoriously erroneous note on page 133;) NESS, ON ARMINIANISM; GETHSEMANE, or Thoughts on the sufferings of Christ, by the Author of the Refuge, (namely, *as is believed*, William Giles, of Chatham, Charles Dickens' Schoolmaster); Dr. Gill's CAUSE OF GOD AND TRUTH; and the Author's MANUAL OF FAITH AND PRACTICE, pages 45—55. William Palmer's FREE INQUIRY, and TRACTS on the ATONEMENT, are, in many respects, the best publications on the subject, but they are so rare as to be unobtainable.

isfaction He made for sin on the Cross) is for His elect only, and that His pleas are invariably prevalent and effectual. It is opposed to the Arminian or Pelagian idea that He is the official representative of all men, and desires that all men may be saved. It thus embodies a distinguishing doctrine of the Particular Baptists, and demands much attention and the boldest enforcement.

It also testifies to our belief in the harmony which exists between the advocacy of Christ and the operations of the Spirit.

It is a popular belief that the Holy Ghost "strives" with all men; making kindly, but often ineffectual, attempts to induce them to accept the offer of the Gospel; give their hearts to God; close with Christ, and thus obtain salvation. To these errors, we, as Strict and Particular Baptists, are earnestly opposed. Scriptures are indeed cited in support of them. These are fully dealt with in the Author's "Manual of Faith and Practice," page 111.

"To His abundant satisfaction and glory." Many popular hymns deny this—representing Christ as being solicitous to save sinners who will not come to Him, and that He is mortified and enraged at their refusal to comply with His terms.

This libel on the character of the Saviour we also resolutely reject—as the article in question asserts.

Serious as are the above errors, texts are cited in their support, which are dealt with in the "Manual of Faith and Practice," pages 86 and 111 to 119.

### Article VIII. Justification and Forgiveness. Page 8.

NOTE 1.—Between these two, important distinctions exist, on which the reader should seek to think correctly.

Justification is a LEGAL act, and proceeds from God in His character of the "Judge of all." Forgiveness is a ROYAL act, and proceeds from God in His character of King.

In human government the two are separable. Criminals who turn "King's evidence" against their former accomplices, are often pardoned and liberated—though, if tried, it is known that they would be condemned. In the government of God the two are inseparable. Those whom God, as a Judge, justifies, God, as a King, forgives.

In the Divine order Justification precedes pardon. God's elect are first acquitted from all legal condemnation—then their sins are forgiven.

JUSTIFICATION A LEGAL OR FORENSIC TERM.

NOTE 2.—It is highly important to understand that, accord-

ing to the use of the word in Scripture, Justification must be understood forensically. It is a law term, derived from human courts of justice, and signifies (not the making of a person righteous by the infusion of grace) but the holding and declaring him to be righteous in law.

This is manifest from the term JUSTIFICATION being frequently opposed to CONDEMNATION. (Deut. xxv. 1; Prov. xvii. 15; Rom. v. 16, viii. 33, 34.)

The force of a word is frequently to be ascertained by examining the meaning of the term to which it is opposed. Condemnation does not lie in infusing wickedness into a criminal, or in making him a wrong-doer, but in judicially pronouncing him guilty according to his transgression of the law. So, Justification does not lie in infusing righteousness into a person, but in declaring that the disclosed facts prove him to be righteous on legal grounds.

It is not a moral process, but a legal, judicial, or forensic act on the part of "God who justifies the ungodly."\*

### JUSTIFICATION BY THE IMPUTATION OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST.

NOTE 3.—The article under consideration—which is taken verbally from Dr. Gill's Declaration of Faith and Practice—is in harmony with all the authoritative Protestant Confessions of Faith—though some are more explicit than others. For example:

The Church of England declares that "we are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and

---

\*The derivation of words occasionally helps to a correct definition of their meaning, but it is often misleading. The verb "justify" is derived from the Latin *justifico*, which is formed from *justus*, just or righteous, and *facio*, I make. It does not, however, follow that the meaning of "justify" is to make righteous. This is by no means unimportant, as Romish divines have insisted on interpreting the word in accordance with its derivation, and have erected on this foundation their erroneous fabric of Justification by infused righteousness. Let the Protestant reader remember the needful distinction—JUSTIFICATION BY IMPUTATION. SANCTIFICATION BY INFUSION.

Robert Barclay in his APOLOGY—the acknowledged text-book of the views of the Friends or Quakers—also bases his refutation of the doctrine of Justification by the imputation of the merits of Christ on the derivation of the verb "justify." Proposition vii., paragraph 7.

Saviour Jesus Christ, by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings." Article xi.

The Assembly's Catechism: "Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein He pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in His sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us and received by faith alone."

The Confession of Faith: "Those whom God effectually called, He also freely justifieth: not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous: not for anything wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone; not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on Him and His righteousness by Faith; which faith they have not of themselves; it is the gift of God."

In the Baptist Confession of Faith, adopted by the General Assembly, which met in London in 1689, the above is transcribed, but lines 7 to 9 are altered thus:—

"....." but by imputing Christ's active obedience unto the whole Law, and (His) passive obedience in His death, for their whole and sole righteousness, they receiving and resting on Him and His righteousness by Faith," &c.

This alteration was probably made to withstand the errors of those who (like Archbishop Whately at a subsequent period) overpressed the statement that we are justified "by the blood" of Christ, (Rom. v. 9,) and denied that His obedience to the Law throughout His whole life had any vital relation to the Justification of His people.

#### IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS—BY WHOM DENIED.

NOTE 4.—So important did Luther deem the doctrine of Justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ, that he styled it, *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesie*—the test of a standing or a falling Church. It was mainly through its proclamation that the Reformation from Popery was effected. It is still, nevertheless, denied by many.

Papists and Ritualists vehemently resist it, for it is diametrically opposed to their whole system.

Broad Churchmen—or the Rationalistic party in the National Establishment—reject it, as they do the converse doctrine of the imputation of Adam's guilt to his posterity, as paradoxical.\*

\*See No. VI. of ESSAYS ON THE WRITINGS OF THE APOSTLE

Many Arminians repudiate it, and indeed it is inconsistent with their entire theology.

The Friends or Quakers—so far as they follow Robert Barclay—repudiate the forensic view of Justification, and contend that men are justified (or actually made righteous and holy) by following the inward light which for Christ's sake is imparted to all men. See note on page 45.

Such of the Plymouth Brethren as follow J. N. Darby, C[harles] S[tanley,] Catesby Paget, and others—namely, the party sometimes called the Exclusive—are opposed to it, substituting for it their incomprehensible doctrine of Justification in the risen Christ. (See Dr. Carson's trenchant work on their errors, and two Articles by Rev. G. Rogers in the "Sword and the Trowel" for 1865, entitled, ON PLYMOUTH BRETHRENISM, and ON THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD, pages 282 and 526.

The opposition of the adversary, exerted through both spiritual and unspiritual men, should awaken our zeal as Strict and Particular Baptists to expound and enforce this great truth to the utmost of our powers.

#### THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST.

NOTE 5.—The excellence of the person of Christ was drawn out in acts of living obedience, which extended from the dawn of His human consciousness to His yielding His spirit to God on the cross. He thus "became obedient (not simply "in," but) unto death," (Phil. ii. 8.)\* His decease was the consummation and completion of the obedience of His life.† This, the continuous, unintermittent, unbroken and consistent obedience of the Son of God, constitutes His merit, or, in Scripture

PAUL by Archbishop Whately. This, like everything from this great author's pen, is most clear and cogent. Young ministers are earnestly recommended to read and refute it.

\*Contrast 1 Pet. ii. 24, which teaches that He was the sin-bearer on the cross only, "Who Himself bore our sins in His body on the tree."

†The older Divines were wont to style the acts of Christ's holy life, collectively considered, His active obedience, and His submission to God's will in His suffering and death His passive obedience. This is useful, provided we remember that His active and passive obedience constitute His one righteousness. Rom. v. 18. The two may (and should) be distinguished, but should never be divided. The once favourite phrase, Christ's "justifying life and atoning death" lacks scriptural authority.

phraseology, His righteousness, which is imputed to His people as the *matter* or meritorious ground of their justification.

#### THE RELATION OF FAITH TO JUSTIFICATION.

NOTE 6.—This Article having been framed by that great Divine, Dr. Gill, the fact that no mention is therein made of Faith is remarkable. The reader is invited to consider why.

The views of Strict and Particular Baptists on the relation of Faith to Justification are given in the Author's "Manual of Faith and Practice," page 200.

Faith is not the cause or condition of Justification. To tell a sinner that God will impute the righteousness of Christ to him, and justify him, if he believes, is to assert what is not true.

The error lies in failing to distinguish between BEING JUSTIFIED as a fact, and a knowledge of that fact on reliable testimony. The fact depends solely on DIVINE GRACE; the knowledge of it is obtained through Faith.

Justification is a Divine and eternal act. Its reality does not depend on anything in favoured sinners, nor does any gracious emotion or action on their part affect it in the least.

Our Faith cannot induce God to choose us. Election was before time. Our Faith cannot induce Christ to die for us, and so provide the righteousness of our justification. He died, long since, for those whom the Father gave Him before the foundation of the world. Our Faith cannot induce God to justify us on the ground of the merit of Christ, unless this were previously imputed to us; or God's acts would depend on a creature's acts, and He would be mutable—whereas He is "in one mind, who can turn Him?" (Job xxiii. 13.)

So Faith has not the relation to Justification popularly asserted.

We are, however, JUSTIFIED BY FAITH as we renounce our own works as a ground of acceptance; as we cordially believe the Gospel; as we rely on the righteousness of Christ; and as we believe God's gracious assurance concerning all who do thus.\*

---

\*The truth that Justification, AS A FACT, is independent of Faith as its cause or condition has an important bearing on the question of the salvation of children dying in infancy. That these are, by nature, sinners, has been demonstrated. Hence they cannot be received into heaven on the ground of their legal innocence. They cannot repent, and believe, and so be justified; for Repentance and Faith (though spiritual acts) are impossible without some measure of developed intelligence. Either, therefore, they are saved without being justified—or

#### DIVINE FORGIVENESS.

NOTE 7.—Sin, to a *conscious* sinner, is an evil of such magnitude, that it becomes to him the question of questions, "How will God deal with it?"

The reply of the Bible is plain. He cannot let it pass without enquiry. He cannot excuse or condone it. He cannot abate one point of His broken law, or revoke one of its curses. Pity will not affect the decision of His equity, nor will mercy mitigate the severity of His punishment. He can propose no compromise, and make no concession. Where He sees sin, He must, sooner or later, smite.

These solemn truths flow from the fact that God is "the Judge of all;" (Heb. xii. 23,) and the business of a Judge is, not to show consideration for the guilty person, but to interpret and enforce the Law.

In speaking of God as an ANGRY JUDGE, some preachers have misrepresented His character. Anger in a Judge, when acting as such, would be most reprehensible. The holy and passionless anger of God, is His indignation, as a Creator and Benefactor, toward those who have offended against His holy Laws, and repaid His goodness with acts of ingratitude and sin.

Far more serious is the error of those who deny that God sustains any other relation to the human race than that of a universal Father, and that He is all love to all men. A God who cannot be angry, is as monstrous a conception of Deity as a God who cannot pity. "A God all mercy is a God unjust."—YOUNG.

God can, however, pardon sin,—freely, fully, finally, irrevocably, "for Christ's sake," (1 John ii. 12.) As "God the Judge," He can pronounce His people legally guiltless, or without condemnation, (Rom. viii. 1,) and as our royal Father He can be "faithful (to His covenant engagements) and just (to Himself, His law, His beloved Son, and all His accountable creatures,) while He forgives our sins, and cleanses us from all unrighteousness." 1 John i. 9.

The blood of Christ is the only power in the moral government of God which can sever sin from the person of a sinner. This it does for all for whom He died, "putting their sin

---

there are two methods of Justification—one of which Faith is an essential condition; another in which Faith has absolutely no place. Christians who contend that Faith is necessary to the *being* of salvation, are intreated to clear up the difficulty, or to abandon their error.

away," (2 Sam. xii. 13, Heb. ix. 26;) "purging" them, (Heb. x. 2:) "cleansing" them, (1 John i. 7:) making them as "white as wool," and "whiter than snow," (Psa. li. 7, Isa. i. 18.) It has thus afforded so perfect an outflow to God's grace, that He is "merciful to their unrighteousness," while He has so completely banished their transgressions from His *penal* mind, "that He remembers their sins no more."

The conduct of God in relation to the sins of His people is variously called absolution, forgiveness, pardon and remission. "Absolution" is not a Scriptural word. "Forgiveness" and "pardon" are both employed in the English Version of the Old Testament—apparently interchangeably—while in the New Testament, the word "pardon" is never found, the term "remission" taking its place. It may help young Bible students to know that the word "remission" in the New Testament, in every case but one, stands for the Greek word *aphesis*,—elsewhere translated "forgiveness," which is its true meaning.

The exception is Rom. iii. 25, where the word is *paresis*, (a passing by or pretermission) which is employed to designate the action of God's grace to Old Testament believers, whom He forgave and took to heaven, though Christ had not then *actually* made expiation for sin by dying for His people. See A MANUAL OF FAITH AND PRACTICE, page 63.

#### GOD ALONE THE FORGIVER OF SIN.

NOTE 8.—In forgiving His people their sins, God deals IMMEDIATELY with them, without the intervention or interposition of any other being. Christ, as Priest, receives their confession: God, as their royal Father, pardons them.

The function of a human Priest, into whose ears the confession of sin should be spoken, and who has authority to declare on what terms God will dispense pardons, is not only unscriptural, but opposed to the whole tenor of the Gospel. "There is (but) one Mediator between God and men," but no Mediator between Christ and the sinner. We "have to do" with Him only (Heb. iv. 13.)\* The notion, in question however, represents that there are many men—whether in or out of the Church of Rome, who have

\*James v. 16, does not enjoin auricular Confession to a Priest. "Confess, therefore, [your] transgressions (or offences) to one another,"—not to the "elders" officially summoned to the sick man. Verse 14. The duty enjoined is a humble acknowledgment of injuries committed on others, whose pardon should be sought "for Christ's sake," Col. iii. 13.

power to act as priests, and thus fill an office that pertains only to Christ. Men who intrude themselves in "the new and living way," which He hath opened up for all who feel the burden of sin, are enemies to God and to the souls of men, and should be withstood as such.

#### CONTRITION AND CONFESSION PRECEDE PARDON.

NOTE 9.—In the nature of things, it is impossible to forgive the innocent. Pardon can be extended only to those who have done wrong.

Moreover, those only can be forgiven who admit that they have offended. While a man contends that he has committed nothing that calls for forgiveness, we (though ourselves knowing the wrong that he has done) may pity his ignorance, or regret his obstinacy, but we cannot pardon him. As long as he continues to deny the commission of what offends us, or justifies wrong as right, he is not in the state in which it is alone possible for him to be forgiven.

This is true, not only between man and man, but also between God and man. Divine pardon presupposes human sin. God *will* to pardon many who are now impenitent, (Jer. l. 20,) but His gracious purpose can take effect only when these are brought to confess sin and sue for forgiveness *as sinners*.

To this the Scriptures testify. If we consult a Concordance for the occurrences of the words "acknowledge," "confess," "repentance," &c., we shall clearly see the inseparable connection between penitence and pardon. The children of Israel were repeatedly forgiven when they confessed their sins. The inhabitants of Nineveh were temporarily pardoned when they repented at the preaching of Jonah. The same principle is exemplified in relation to God's forgiveness of His people's sins. "Let the wicked *forsake* his way, and the unrighteous man his *thoughts*," and "God will abundantly pardon." (Is. lv. 7.) "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper; but he that *confesseth* and forsaketh them shall have mercy," (Prov. xxviii. 13.) "If we *confess* our sins," God "is faithful and just to forgive us our sins," (1 John i. 9.) Hence David spoke for all God's people in all time, in his memorable words, "I will declare mine iniquity: I will be sorry for my sin." "I said, I will confess my transgression unto the Lord, and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin," (Psa. xxxii. and xxxviii. 18.)

None, therefore, become partakers of Divine forgiveness apart from penitence and the confession of their sins to God. Care must, however, be taken not to represent these as CONDITIONS IMPOSED on men, without which the benevolence of

God cannot express itself in acts of pardon. The idea is contrary to the freeness of His grace and His declared readiness to forgive, (Psa. lxxxvi. 5.) Nothing that sinners feel, or say, or do, affects His determination to show them mercy. (Rom. ix. 15, 18.)

He is prepared to pardon them, when they are prepared to receive pardon, (Psa. lxxxvi. 5,) and this preparation is the result of a work of *His* grace within them, (Prov. xvi. 1.) The Holy Ghost breaks their hearts, and renders their spirits contrite—and God accepts these as sacrifices, (Psa. xxxiv. 18, and li. 17.) Christ is “exalted to *give* REPENTANCE unto Israel, and (following this, in the admirable sequence of the Divine order) forgiveness of (their) sins.”\* See A MANUAL OF FAITH AND PRACTICE, pages 63, 170—182.

#### THE SPIRIT'S WITNESS TO GOD'S FORGIVENESS.

NOTE 10.—Up to this point the views of Strict and Particular Baptists on the Forgiveness of Sins accord with those of the majority of evangelical Christians. From these we diverge in insisting that an absolute assurance of pardon is obtainable only through the direct and immediate witness of the Holy Spirit to the minds of forgiven sinners. We indeed know on the authority of the letter of the promise that all who repent or steadfastly purpose to forsake sin, (Prov. xxviii. 13,) and rely on Christ's finished work, as the ground of their acceptance (Luke xxiv. 47) will be forgiven all trespasses. We, however, contend that the Gospel presents a further and richer blessing—a positive, personal, Divine and immediate assurance THAT SUCH IS THE CASE.

This is the witness of the Holy Spirit “with our spirit, (Rom. viii. 16,) that we are the” heaven-born, accepted, and pardoned “children of God.” To receive this, is to be “sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, (Eph. i. 13,)—to enjoy His presence and operations in the heart in such a measure that He becomes the “earnest of our inheritance,” (2 Cor. i. 22,) the Assurer and the assurance that we have been “justified from all things,” (Acts xiii. 39,) and are “forgiven all trespasses,” (Col. ii. 13.)

\*Thus Joseph Hart, in his fine hymn, while bidding the sinner “come” and “buy” true belief and true repentance of Jesus Christ, “without money,” insists that these are bestowed in pure gratuitous favour. The required fitness is given. “’Tis the Spirit's rising beam.”

On this, almost all popular religious books are silent. Sinners are told to trust in Jesus—are promised Justification and pardon if they believe—and assured that they ought to desire nothing further than God's words, as they stand in the Bible, to give them confidence as to their eternal safety.

It is freely granted that gracious Divine declarations concerning those that “confess” and “forsake” their sins, and come in penitence and faith to Christ, and rely solely on His merit, are most precious. Trembling sinners should take God at His word—and solid comfort is to be derived from comparing the condition of one's own stricken and sorrowful spirit with the Scriptural descriptions of those to whom the mercy of God will be extended. The broken-hearted sinner, however, wants more than this. He sighs, “When wilt *Thou* comfort me?” He longs not only for a broken heart, and a contrite spirit, but for a “purged” conscience, and the Divine assurance of peace with God within his soul.

The witness of the Spirit to our Justification and pardon is God's gracious response to this yearning of the quickened and quivering hearts of His people.

So much is this gracious truth overlooked in the professing Church that testimony to it may be almost regarded as a distinguishing doctrine of the Strict and Particular Baptists and the Calvinistic Independents.\*

\*See the Author's MANUAL OF FAITH AND PRACTICE, (pages 308—317,) in which the nature of ASSURANCE, as distinguished from FAITH, and the difference between INFERENTIAL ASSURANCE (or confidence based on a comparison of our own character and condition with inspired descriptions of the experiences of heaven-born persons) and DIRECT ASSURANCE (or that which arises from the testimony of the Holy Spirit in our hearts) are fully discussed.

The subject is finely exemplified by comparing 2 Sam. xii. 13, with Psa. li. David said, “I have sinned against the Lord.” Nathan replied, “The Lord also hath put away thy sin.” Thus David received an assurance from the lips of AN INSPIRED MAN that his sin was forgiven. This, however, did not satisfy his troubled conscience, and Psa. li. records the prayer which he offered, *after his interview with Nathan*, for A DIRECT ASSURANCE FROM GOD HIMSELF that his transgression was pardoned. A parallel may be drawn between his experience and ours. Nathan's words correspond with *the letter* of the gracious promises which assure penitent sinners of Divine forgiveness. The favour sought in Psa. li. corresponds with the direct and personal testimony of the Spirit that they are pardoned.

## Article IX. Divine Chastisement. Page 5.

NOTE 1.—Article viii. states our belief in the rich grace of God as exemplified in the justification of His people and the free and full forgiveness of their sins. Article ix. with great propriety follows, to assert our conviction as to His holiness in chastening them for their offences. The one truth thus balances the other, and relieves the Gospel from the charge of leading to licentiousness.

The word CHASTEN or CHASTISE, in English, signifies to inflict pain for the purpose of correction, and accurately represents the Greek verb *paideuo*. The primary meaning of this is to treat as a child, but it includes the whole discipline of parental love. That the idea of correction by the infliction of pain was often present in the minds of the New Testament writers who employ it, is evident; as the parallelism of Heb. xii. 6 demonstrates. "For whom the Lord loveth, He *chasteneth*, and *scourgeth*\* every son whom He receiveth." So also Rev. iii. 19: "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten; be zealous, therefore, and repent."

It is, therefore, clear that chastening is the act of God as a Parent towards those whom He loves and accepts as His sons; that it is inflicted for conduct which He regards as deserving reproof or rebuke, and for which they ought to repent: and that it consists in the infliction of pain, answerable to giving blows with a scourge.

### DIVINE CHASTENING IS NOT PENAL PUNISHMENT.

NOTE 2.—Chastening is not the infliction of PENAL EVIL, or punishment inflicted on men by God for breaking His holy law. From this all in Christ Jesus are delivered, (Rom. viii. 1, Gal. iii. 13.) They who are "chastened of the Lord" are not of the number who will, hereafter, "be condemned," (1 Cor. xi. 31, 32,) "with the world."

Divine chastisement is thus confined to "the house (hold,)" or "family of God." He that "will judge the world in righteousness *hereafter*," judges His people parentally *now*: and His impartiality in dealing with what offends Him in the conduct of His people, is an impressive forecast of what will be the end of those that obey not the Gospel, (1 Pet. iv. 17, 18.)†

\*The word is *mastigoo*, to scourge, from *mastix*, a scourge or whip.

†See also 1 Pet. i. 17, "AND IF (OR, SINCE—the fact is not questioned) YE CALL ON HIM (OR, APPEAL TO HIM, as in Acts

### ALL DIVINELY-SENT AFFLICTIONS NOT CHASTISEMENTS.

NOTE 3.—God permits His people to suffer for other reasons than to correct their misconduct. The mistake of Job's friends arose from ignorance of this. See the speech of Eliphaz in Chapter xv.

They are afflicted that the propensities of the flesh may be subjugated, and they themselves delivered from the commission of sins into which recklessness or passion might hurry them.

The fruit-bearing branch of the True Vine is purged or pruned that it may bring forth more fruit, (John xv. 2.)—in other words, holy and earnest Christians suffer, that they may become more useful. God's people are brought into the furnace of affliction, that they may exemplify the sustaining power of His grace, and "glorify Him in the fires," (Isa. xxiv. 15.) Christians suffer for Christ's sake, meeting with obloquy and opposition for their fidelity to Him, (John xv. 19—21; Phil. i. 29.) Some are called to endure affliction that they may learn to sympathise with and succour their brethren—"filling up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ, in their flesh, for His body's sake, which is the church," (Col. i. 24.)

### DIVINE CHASTISEMENT SOMETIMES DENIED, BUT NEVER DISPROVED.

NOTE 4.—In their solicitude to exalt the freeness of Divine grace, and the perfection of Emmanuel's justifying righteousness, some godly and otherwise sound men, have denied the truth of this article.

Tobias Crisp unquestionably adhered more closely to the teaching of the Bible than any who opposed him. Moreover, the age in which he laboured for God called for the greatest decision and emphasis in declaring what the Gospel really was. Several expressions in his Christ-exalting sermons are, however undoubted, injudicious,\* and were pressed by his

xxv. 25,) AS (A) FATHER, WHO, WITHOUT RESPECT OF PERSONS JUDGETH ACCORDING TO EACH (elect, redeemed, and heaven-born, see verses 1 and 2,) MAN'S WORK, PASS THE TIME OF YOUR SOJOURNING IN FEAR." R.V.

\*As when he says that "so often as you fear afflictions from (query, for) sins committed, you slander the grace of God. Either He must be dishonest to exact payment twice for one debt, or Christ's satisfaction was insufficient," Vol. ii. 131, 132. "Is not God offended at the sins of believers! No. The offence of God for those sins hath spent itself upon the person



admirers to mean far more than he intended. It cannot, however, be denied that he, in express words, opposed the doctrine of this Article.

From time to time, his errors have been advanced among the Strict and Particular Baptists; but prominent ministers, like J. C. Philpot, J. A. Jones, and others, have promptly and scripturally withstood them.

"Zion's Witness," a magazine devoted to the interests of the Gospel of free and sovereign grace, is the only magazine in England in which the view of the above article is opposed—Dr. Crisp's idea, "chastisement *from* sin, but not *for* sin," being from time to time advocated, and his very phraseology adopted. All that can be advanced in favour of these erroneous views, has, however, been repeatedly refuted.

The error lies in failing to distinguish between God's *legal* and *paternal* character, and His inflicting *penal evil* on those for whom Christ did not die, and His expressing His displeasure as a Father when His children disobey Him. See A MANUAL OF FAITH AND PRACTICE, page 57.

### Article X. Effectual Calling. Page 6.

NOTE 1.—The first part of this Article is designed to oppose the errors that God desires the salvation of all; that Jesus views with solicitude and sorrow the obduracy of those who do not yield to the warnings and accept the tenders of the Gospel; and that the Holy Spirit strives with every man to induce him to close with God's easy terms, and be saved. These have been already referred to on pages 27—29, and are discussed in a MANUAL OF FAITH AND PRACTICE, pages 85, 99, 100.

#### THE SPIRIT'S OPERATIONS IN THE HEART, THE CAUSE OF ALL SPIRITUAL RELIGION.

NOTE 2.—The second part of this Article is (with the exception of the alteration of the word "irresistible" into "invin-

of Christ; and by having so spent itself there remains none of it to light on the persons of believers." Vol. i. 17. "He doth not find the sin of the believer to be that believer's own sin, but the sin of Christ," Vol. i. 16. "Are not the afflictions of the believer for sin? No. Afflictions are unto believers *from* sin, but not *for* sin. God, in afflicting believers, doth not intend to punish them as now laying on them the desert of their sin, for that is laid upon Christ; but He doth afflict them in part to preserve them *from* sin. For my own part I cannot see how a man can say Christ bore all the punishment of sin, if we bear any of it ourselves." Vol. i. 19. SEVENTH EDITION, 1832.

cible"\*) transcribed from Dr. Gill's DECLARATION OF FAITH AND PRACTICE. It boldly withstands the Arminian error called, "FREE-WILL," by a plain and emphatic statement of the truth of God.

It accords with other recognized statements of belief. For example;

"Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to do any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so, as a natural man, being altogether adverse from that good, and dead in sin, he is not able by his own strength to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto." Westminster CONFESSIO OF FAITH, Chap. ix. 3. Also transcribed *verbatim et literatim* into the BAPTIST CONFESSIO OF FAITH, 1689.

"The condition of man since the fall of Adam, is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, (that is 'going before' us,) that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will." BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, Articles of Religion, X. OF FREE-WILL.

The Article before us is thus in strict harmony with the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterians, the early English Particular Baptists, and the Church of England.

#### NATURAL AND MORAL INABILITY.

NOTE 3.—The more thoughtful controversialists who engaged in the discussions which arose from Andrew Fuller's notorious book, were wont to make a distinction between man's NATURAL INABILITY and man's MORAL INABILITY to come to God by Christ. By natural inability they meant that men COULD not come if they would; by moral inability, that they WOULD not come if they COULD. Natural inability is absence of power. Moral inability is absence of will.

The distinction, and the discussions which arose in connection with it, were doubtless originated by the Enemy of souls to divert men's minds from the truth of God, that men are neither able nor willing to flee for refuge to the hope set before them in the Gospel, apart from the operation of the Spirit of God in their hearts.

To this the New Testament abundantly testifies. Natural inability is asserted in John vi. 44, 65. "No one is able

\*For the reason, see A MANUAL OF FAITH AND PRACTICE, page 99.

(*dunatai*) to come to Me, except the Father which sent me draw him." "No one is able (*dunatai*) to come to Me, except it (namely, power to do so) be given unto Him of the Father."

Moral inability is asserted in John v. 40, Phil. ii. 13, Rom. ix. 16. "And ye are not willing to come to Me, that ye may have life," (John v. 40.)... "For it is God who worketh in you, both to will and to work, for (or, "on account of,") His good pleasure." We are passive and inoperative in spiritual things, and destitute of the will or power to be otherwise, till God operates in us, in accordance with "His pleasure," in sovereign grace. (Phil. ii. 13.) "So then, it is not of him that willeth, or of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy," (Rom. ix. 16.) Salvation is not originated by any action or determination of the sinner's will, or by any effort in the direction of reformation or piety which he makes. It has its rise solely in the manifestation of Divine mercy.

Thus the young Christian may fearlessly assert that, apart from grace, men are neither able nor willing to turn to God for salvation.

#### THE SPIRIT'S OPERATION A MYSTERY.

NOTE 4.—How the Spirit effects this work upon the souls of the elect cannot be discovered. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit," (John iii. 8.)

We may, however, rest assured that the effect is produced in a way consistent with man's rational nature. No violence is done to the human mind in bringing it into harmony with the will of God. The Lord sends the rod of His strength out of Zion, and His people are made "willing in the day of power." (Psa. cx. 2, 3.)

NOTE 5.—The different terms employed to describe the operations of the Spirit on the souls of elect and redeemed sinners,—regeneration, faith, conversion, &c., are discussed in A MANUAL OF FAITH AND PRACTICE, chaps. xiii. and xiv.

We beg young Christians to study the distinction between Regeneration (in which spiritual life is imparted) and Conversion (in which it manifests itself.) To use these words as if they were interchangeable is fatal to accuracy of thought.

We also entreat them to note that the faith of God's elect is heaven-born. As a principle, it is "the gift of God," (Eph. ii. 8; 2 Pet. i. 1.) As an act, it is performed through the

grace of the Holy Spirit operating upon the quickened soul of the child of God. (Phil. i. 29; Col. ii. 12.)\*

### Article XI. The Gospel—Its Nature and Invitations. Page 6.

#### THE NATURE OF THE GOSPEL.

NOTE 1.—*The Gospel is of the nature of a DECLARATION OF PROCLAMATION.*

This appears from an examination of the terms by which it is described in the New Testament.

It is "the word of God," (Acts xiii. 44;) the "word of His grace," (Acts xix. 3;) and "the word of this salvation," (Acts xiii. 26.) A word is the expression of a thought—the vehicle in which an idea is conveyed; and the Gospel is the oral or written expression of the gracious thoughts of God concerning the salvation of men.

It is a testimony, (Acts xxii. 18;) and the vocation of the preacher is to testify (or bear witness, or give evidence) to the great facts which the grace of God has originated, (Acts xx. 21, and xxxiii. 11.)

It is a declaration—a 'making known' to men in current speech, of the things which concern their peace. (Acts xx. 21, and xxxiii. 11.)

It is a proclamation—a "fortherying," or urgent and earnest statement of the way of salvation, (Isa. lxi. 1, 2.)

It is the publishing of important intelligence, after the manner of a herald. (*kérusso*, 1 Cor. i. 23.)

It is announcing good news or glad tidings (*euaggelizo*, pronounced euangelizo, Gal. i. 16.)

It is to talk or discourse (*lateo*, Acts xi. 19;) and once it is called speaking with boldness, (Acts ix. 27.)

All these express or imply that the vocation of the preacher is to make known to sinners how they may obtain salvation.

Preaching the Gospel is, therefore, the declaration of all the great and gracious facts on which the redemption and renovation of sinners depend. It is not reiterating the name of Christ without reference to the purposes which centre in the person of the Son of God. It is not threatening men with damnation if they do not instantly believe the message of mercy. It is not shouting, "Come to Jesus," without declaring to whom the invitation extends. It is not begging and intreating natural

\*Books recommended on the subject of this Article are Skepp's "Divine Energy," edited by Upton; Hussey's "God's Operations of Grace, but No Offers of Grace."

men to become spiritual men, and to do what only spiritual men can. It, however, is,—what the words referred to express and involve—the intelligent and comprehensive exhibition and exposition of the “way of salvation.” (Acts xvi. 17, R. V.) The Gospel is a declaration of the way in which sinners are saved by sovereign *mercy*, sacrificial *merit*, and spiritual *might*, and due prominence should also be given to the will of the Father, the worth of the Son, and the work of the Holy Ghost. How far much that is supposed to be Gospel corresponds with this ideal, let the reader, if he is a spiritual man, judge. (1 Cor. ii.)

#### OFFERED GRACE AN ANCIENT ERROR.

NOTE 2.—Antiquity and authority can both be pleaded for regarding the Gospel as an offer of Christ or a tender of grace to sinners. Thus in the CONFESSION OF FAITH agreed upon in 1647 by the assembly of Presbyterian Divines at Westminster, we are told, chap. x. 2, that Effectual Calling “is of God’s free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man; who is altogether passive therein, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to EMBRACE THE GRACE OFFERED and conveyed in it.”

This was, in substance, introduced into the CONFESSION OF FAITH adopted by the Particular Baptists in 1689. They, however, while retaining the notion of offered grace, emphasised the testimony to the necessity of the Spirit’s work, by stating that Effectual Calling “is of God’s free and special grace alone, not from any thing at all foreseen in man, nor from any power or agency in the creature, being wholly passive therein, being dead in sins and trespasses, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it, and that is by no less power than that which raised up Christ from the dead.” Chap. x. 2.

Again, the Assembly’s Shorter Catechism declares that (Question 31) “Effectual Calling is the work of God’s Spirit, whereby convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ, and renewing our wills, He doth persuade and enable us to embrace JESUS CHRIST, FREELY OFFERED IN THE GOSPEL.”

This was adopted by C. H. Spurgeon in “A Catechism with Proofs.”

It was—as Joseph John Gurney approvingly relates—the belief of William Wilberforce that the Gospel is “an effective offer of salvation made to every man born into the world,” and

the vast majority of evangelical Christians would concur in this opinion.

It was through the labours of Tobias Crisp, (1600—1642), Joseph Hussey, (1660—1726), John Gill, D.D.,\* (1697—1771), William Huntington, (1745—1813), John Stevens, (1776—1847), William Palmer, 1800—1873), and others, that the truth of God in this branch of the Gospel was subsequently elucidated.

The question, however, is not whether a doctrine is old or new, but whether or not it is supported by the word of God.

#### OFFERS OF SALVATION LACK SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITY.

NOTE 3.—It is common to assume that offering Christ to sinners is an essential branch of the Gospel. Proof is, however, rarely advanced: but, if the Bible and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants, so important an article of belief should not be regarded as unchallengeable, without positive appeal to the word of God.

Let the studious reader turn to Young’s Analytical Concordance,† and examine the words by which the preaching of the Gospel to the unconverted is described in the New Testament.

\*In his Introduction to the hymns of Richard Davis, of Rothwell, (reprinted in 1833 by J. Andrews Jones) Dr. Gill directs attention to the fact that in some of them the phrase, “offering Christ,” or, “grace” is used. Thus, hymn vi.—

“Sinners, this grace is TENDERED to the vilest of you all; Come, sinners, come, accept this grace, the Gospel gives a call. Stand not for to dispute and die; free, OFFERED GRACE receive; Such love EMBRACE, ACCEPT such grace; O, do this grace believe.”

“To the use of such phrases,” the Doctor observes, “the author was led, partly through custom, THEY NOT HAVING THEN BEEN OBJECTED TO, and partly through his affectionate concern for gaining upon souls, and encouraging them to come to Christ. I can, however, affirm upon good and sufficient testimony, that Mr. Davis before his death changed his mind in this matter, and disused the phrases, as being improper, and being too bold and free for a minister of Christ to make use of.”

†These are *diag(n)gello*, *euag(n)gelizo*, *katag(n)gello*,—all modifications of *ag(n)gellizo*, to act as a messenger; and *kerusso* to proclaim as a herald. When preaching to Christians is described, these words are not used, but the term *dialegomai* (to discourse or argue) is employed.

Let him then turn to Hudson's Critical Greek and English Concordance, and trace these words in all their occurrences. He will find that not one expresses or implies the idea that it is an Evangelist's mission to tender, proffer, or offer Christ, grace or salvation to sinners. Their true meaning is given in Note 1, which consult.

It is observable that no text of Scripture is advanced in support of this doctrine in any of the editions of the Assembly's Confession and Catechisms, whether "printed by authority," or otherwise.

The Rev. J. Macpherson and Dr. Robert Shaw, of Whitburn, in their excellent Expositions of the Confession of Faith (both standard works) are silent upon the statement that grace is offered in the Gospel. Rev. A. S. Paterson, A.M., in his Concise System of Theology on the Basis of the Shorter Catechism (also a standard work) justifies the expression "that Jesus Christ is freely offered to us in the Gospel," in the answer quoted above, by observing that "this offer is tendered to all as sinners of Adam's race; for were not this the case, the Gospel could not properly be called, 'good news, or glad tidings of great joy to all men.' Luke ii. 10, 11. This, it will be observed, is both a misquotation and a misapplication. The angel's words were, 'I announce to you glad tidings of great joy, which (the joy) SHALL BE TO ALL THE PEOPLE,' (R.V.)—the Jewish people. "To them was the first message of joy before its communication, through them, to the Gentiles." DEAN ALFORD and DR. E. H. PLUMPTRE.

A few texts have indeed been pressed to involve the idea of conditional overtures or offers of sovereign mercy to sinners.

"WE ARE AMBASSADORS, THEREFORE, ON BEHALF OF CHRIST; AS THOUGH GOD WERE INTREATING BY US: WE BESEECH [you] ON BEHALF OF CHRIST, BE YE RECONCILED TO GOD." 2 Cor. v. 20. It is granted that were the persons here addressed by the Apostle Paul unregenerate men, who had given no indication of contrition or penitence, this text might fairly be cited to prove that Gospel ministers should tender grace to the unconverted, and beg them to accept God's terms.

It is, however, fully shown in the Author's "Manual of Faith and Practice," page 228:—1. That the persons addressed were MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH at Corinth. 2. That the "you" following the word "beseech" is, on the authority of Dean Alford, rightly introduced in the Authorised, as it is retained in the Revised Version. 3. That the reconciliation contemplated is to be understood of full-hearted acceptance by Christians of the truth of God, and of their cordial resignation

to the conduct of God. And, 4. That this is in harmony with the context.

The parables of the Great Supper and the Marriage of the King's Son have been so used.

These—though resembling each other—are quite distinct. The parable of the Great Supper was delivered in Perea, at the house of "a chief Pharisee," during the last December of the Lord's life on earth, (Luke xiv. 15—24.) The Marriage of the King's Son was delivered in Jerusalem four months later, on the Tuesday before His crucifixion, when the hostility of His enemies had become far more open and pronounced, (Matt. xxii. 2—14.)\*

The applicability of the first parts of both to the sin of the Jewish nation in disregarding the claims of Jesus to be their Messiah, refusing the national blessings and privileges which He would have bestowed on them; and finally conniving at and consenting to His death, is apparent to all.

The second parts of each are supposed to teach offered grace.

Luke xiv. 21. "Then the Master of the house, being angry, said to his servant, 'Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, and the maimed, and the halt, and the blind.'"

Matthew xxii. 8, 9. "Then said he to his servants, 'The wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy. Go ye, therefore, into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid them to the marriage. So those servants went out into the highways, and gathered together all, as many as they found, both bad and good, and the wedding was furnished with guests.'"

Luke xiv. 22. "And the servant said, 'Lord, it is done as thou hast commanded, and yet there is room.' And the lord said unto his servant, 'Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled. For I say unto you that none of those men which were (originally) bidden, shall taste of my supper.'"

\*See "The Bible Students' Life of our Lord," by Rev. S. J. Andrews, First Edition, pages 327 and 358. Also Dr. Hanna's "Our Lord's Life on Earth," page 388, in which a suggestive comment of the first part of the two parables, viewed separately and conjointly, will be found.