

erated, saved, sanctified, and glorified before chaos itself was created, and millions of ages before the first man was made or the first sin committed. They were elected, says Mr. Spurgeon "when the un navigated ether was yet unfanned by the wing of a single angel, when space was shoreless, or else unborn; when universal silence reigned, and not a voice or whisper shocked the solemnity of silence; when there was no being, and no motion, no time, and naught but God himself, alone in his eternity." Page 79. In another sermon he says, "*election* is one of those things which were done absolutely in eternity: all who were elect, were elect as much in eternity as they are in time." See Sermon on *Adoption* in the New Park Street Pulpit, page 551. Mr. Spurgeon never forgets to carry his absolutism with him when speaking on his darling doctrine of eternal and unconditional election; and in order to be consistent with himself he should carry his absolutism into every other part of redemption as well as election. If the elect are elect as much in a past eternity as they are, or can be in time, were they not, we ask, on the same principle, as much justified, and adopted and sanctified and glorified in a past eternity as they are in time or ever can be? Why not? Were they not as much raised from the grave, judged, received into heaven in a past eternity as they ever can be? Why not? Mr. Spurgeon to be consistent with his absolutism would require to believe and defend all this nonsense. We must give him credit for the effort which he makes to be consistent with himself. He honestly tries to carry out his principle. He does not shrink from avowing that he is all but a convert to the virtual, absolute completion of redemption in all its parts, countless ages before there was any sin from which men needed to be redeemed.

Perhaps Mr. Spurgeon will by and by favour us with a few sermons vindicating the doctrine of absolute eternal justification, absolute eternal adoption, regeneration, sanctification, &c. Such sermons would just be as scriptural and as consistent as his views of election. But here we must give his own views in his own