

these dreadful statements are too gross to need a reply from me, I shall only add on this point a few passages of Scripture too plain to need a comment. "For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens."—Heb. vii. 2, 6. "Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth."—1 Peter, xi. 22. "And in him is no sin."—1 John, iii. 5. "For the Prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me."—John, xiv. 30. "Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity."—Heb. 1. 3. "That holy thing that shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God."—Luke i. 35. "Who knew no sin."—2 Cor. i. 25. "I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea thy law is within my heart."—Ps. xl. 8. "But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." 1 Peter i. 13.

2. Another dreadful error of your system is a denial of *Christ's exercising the office of a priest till after his resurrection. But what saith the Scriptures? "Who needeth not daily as those High Priests to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did once when he offered up himself."—Heb. vii. 27. "Who, in the days of his flesh, when he had offered prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death."—Heb. v. 7. Under that typical economy which God gave by Moses, to represent before hand this great work, no sacrifice could be offered for sin without an officiating priest; but it seems, according to your system, that the great sin offering of which all the rest were nothing but figures, and which is expressly called "the propitiation for the sins of the whole world," was offered up without any officiating priest either human or divine. But, Sir, there is nothing here but what your system requires; for if the High Priest of our profession was such a being as you represent, he could neither officiate with any success on earth nor in heaven, without a new nature.

3. Your system appears dreadful to every candid and pious mind, when it includes the idea that the human nature of Christ required to be regenerated.† Here let your leader again speak: "I count it good, thus early, to make an important distinction between sinful flesh in the regenerate and unregenerate state; and while I assert that Christ's flesh was in the former, utterly to deny that it was in the latter condition." Now this virtually says more than that the holy virgin was an ungodly girl, or in her unregenerate state at the conception: it says, that the

human nature of the Mediator was regenerated, for you call that "holy thing born of her," "sinful flesh—sinful body, and fallen soul." And could that see the Kingdom of God, without regeneration, in his case more than in ours? So your system consistently styled him "the perfect man of regeneration." But my dear Sir, no more perfect in heart than publicans and harlots, if he had "a diabolical feeling," and "that every species of wickedness was inherent in his humanity." But when, Sir, was that only begotten Son of God regenerated or born again? When was "he who knew no sin," but which your blasphemous creed calls "sinful flesh—sinful substance—sinful body—sinless sinner," renewed and made a new creature? I freely confess, that my very soul stands astonished and horrified at such presumptuous and blasphemous language as this. It is more than the madness of the prophet Balaam: it is bringing "a railing accusation against the Lord of Glory." My dear Sir, read, ere it be too late, what the Apostle has written concerning you, "there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies *even denying the Lord that bought them*, and bring upon themselves swift destruction."—2 Peter, ii. 1.—Renounce, renounce, Sir, your heresy before the public, whose faith you are overthrowing; for it is no other than a shipwreck of the Christian faith.

4. Your system denies the atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ; for if the priest was corrupt in his nature, he could not officiate at the altar with any more success than the sons of Aaron; and if the sacrifice offered was "sinful substance," "a sinful body and a fallen soul", "possessed of every variety of human wickedness," the offerer would be accursed for offering such an unholy thing; and so, according to this, he never could, he never did take away sin, by the sacrifice of himself. But perhaps you believe that, like the sons of Aaron, he first made atonement for himself! for this your Teacher virtually affirms, when he says that "His creature nature, a part and parcel of the fallen and rebellious creation, in *reconciling which* he reconciled all.*" In other words, Christ made reconciliation to God for his own corrupt nature, or for himself; for we cannot speak of his nature distinct from himself. Is it possible to read this statement without feelings of the deepest horror? This is so repugnant to all Scripture, so subversive of all faith, and all religion, that it requires no refutation.

5. Your system is self-righteous, and ruinous to society, in holding out that both the righteousness of the law and of faith are our *own performance*. Let Mr. Irving speak

* Haldane's answer to Drummond.

† Irving on our Lord's Humanity, p. 3.

* Irving on our Lord's Humanity, preface. Puncan's Letter to Irving, p. 7; ib. 32.