

for Paul *only*, as it would be to infer from passages that teach that he gave himself for the church, that he gave himself for the church *only*. In the light of the universal atonement we see the beauty of the invitations of the gospel, addressed to all men; we see too by that luminous truth how the Saviour's behest can be obeyed, "Preach the gospel to every creature." The doctrine of universal atonement also makes clear the justice of the condemnation of sinners because of unbelief, for if Jesus did not die for any number of persons, *they* can be as little guilty of unbelief as "the devil and his angels." This doctrine too is gloriously consistent with the relation which Jesus sustains to the race as "a partaker of flesh and blood," and as "made under the law," which requires love to God and to all men.

Objections of a grave and serious character are however brought against the doctrine of universal atonement. It is said that it leads to universalism, or the doctrine that all men will be saved. If the abettors of unlimited atonement state that they repudiate universalism as much as any, and believe in the conditionality of salvation; that those who receive the atoning Saviour will be saved, while those who reject him will be lost;—it is then objected, that for those who are not saved by his death, he must have died in vain; and that for the sins of such God exacts a double penalty, first, from Christ, who, it is alleged, died for them, and secondly, from themselves in hell. Now to these and such objections to the doctrine of universal atonement, we might reply that they must be invalid and inconsequent, because the doctrine against which they are brought does not rest on inferences from passages of Scripture, which might be illegitimately drawn, but is expressly declared therein.

These objections obviously arise out of an erroneous view of the atonement. The idea that the atonement is a commercial transaction, the endurance of so much suffering for the sins of so many sinners, must be in the mind of the person that makes them. Let it be shown that the work of Christ is not a *quid pro quo* transaction, let the truth as to the nature of the atonement be exhibited, and these objections will vanish into thin air. They appear to have force only when a false and degrading view of the nature of that wondrous transaction is entertained in the mind. If, then, we succeed in showing that the propitiation of Christ is not analogous to the payment of a debt, we shall by consequence remove all such objections to its unlimited extent.