

have passed by all men, then there is no grace in providing a Saviour. If Adam was not still a free, moral, and accountable being after his fall, and if his posterity are not so by nature, there is no grace in making them so by the Gospel. It was simply an arrangement of necessity, without which they could not have been held accountable. If God cannot justly withhold or give his favour in Christ Jesus as He pleases, there is no grace in bestowing it. If the permission of our fall in Adam was not just and righteous in itself, there is no grace in the Gospel, which, Mr. Watson says, makes it just. Where can be the grace in doing that which it would have been unjust not to do? Arminians then are shut up to the necessity of overthrowing the Gospel, or of admitting the essential principles of Calvinism. The fact is that they do both by turns. When they preach the Gospel, so far as it is ever preached by them in its purity, they do the latter. When they oppose Calvinism, they do the former. Are such inconsistent errorists safe guides for immortal beings?

The subject might here be left to the candid consideration of the reader. There are, however, in addition to the subversion of grace, several other strange and unscriptural conclusions which follow necessarily from some or all the Arminian statements on which we have dwelt. A few of these may now be mentioned.

(1) "I deny that God might justly have passed by me and all men. I reject it as a bold and precarious assertion, utterly unsupported by Holy Scripture." Then the atonement itself was not necessary. For if justice required that men should have the offer of pardon, why should Christ suffer to make it consistent for God to do a just thing? If justice were on the sinner's side, the law which is just and good would justify without any atonement. According to this dogma, therefore, Christ died in vain. Surely, the Father of mercies did not require to be lured to do justice by the unutterable agony of his beloved Son. What a picture of his character and of the glorious doctrine of the cross is thus afforded!

(2) "I deny that God might justly have passed by me and all men." Then He has treated the heathen very unjustly. For if He was bound to provide, He must certainly have been equally bound to offer salvation. Simply providing a remedy, and leaving them without the knowledge of it, would not satisfy justice. What avails it to them that there is balm in Gilead, or a Physician there? "How can they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" To be ignorant of it is to them as if no such provision had been made. And since, in fact, the Gospel has not been made known to the great mass of mankind, it follows that they have been treated