

save us." Mr. Peden, who ever supposed it would? But surely you must acknowledge that the *non believing* of this is the great reason why men are not saved. "Is there no balm in Gilead? is there no physician there?" There is "balm," but men do not think they need it: there is a "physician," skilful and kind, but men think themselves whole, and standing in no need of a physician. The Irish Board of Health have lately issued a most valuable proclamation on the subject of the approaching cholera. No man in his senses would ever imagine that the remedies they suggest consist merely in the announcement that the sad disease is on its way to us; but assuredly, to have omitted all reference to the melancholy fact, would have argued infatuation and something more. Its announcement, or its recognition, constitute a most important part of the proclamation. Even in this case, it is a great point gained, when men take the alarm; but in the other, Mr. Peden has been long enough a preacher of the Gospel not to know that his Master's commission would be very imperfectly executed by him, were he not, in "preaching the Gospel," to give peculiar prominence to the announcement, "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself!" "They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick;" and much of the Gospel consists in opening up the disease. We have always found that those have been the most successful preachers who have been the best anatomists of corrupt humanity. Experimental preaching is the best of all. Barren generalities won't do; and we never thought much of that cuckoo song—"Peter—Sarah—only believe,—Christ died for thee!"

"The question, What is the Gospel?" Mr. Peden answers by a great variety of quotations from the inspired apostles—from John the Baptist—from the angels, at the birth of Christ—from the ancient prophets—and our blessed Saviour himself. We do not understand Mr. P.'s principle of arrangement: we think it illogical; but that is a small matter comparatively. Our objection goes deeper. His comments are unsound and calculated to mislead. For instance, in the very first that he quotes, (Gal. ii. 20,) Paul speaks of Christ, "as loving him and giving himself for him." What exalted assurance on the part of the apostle! and yet Mr. P. obviously quotes this as a specimen of the manner in which every sinner should be taught to understand the Gospel messages as speaking to him. "Poor Joseph" heard from the lips of Dr. Calamy, a full and free announcement that the blood of Jesus Christ, God's own Son, cleanseth from all sin; and that Christ died indefinitely for "sinners;" and he reasoned with himself in his own simple way, "Christ died for sinners; Christ invites sinners; why not poor Joseph?" We can understand this perfectly well. It is quite consistent with the doctrine of particular redemption; but we much fear that that precious doctrine is not held by our brother before us. Indeed, the general bearing of his comments sets this beyond all doubt. For instance, 1 Cor. xv. 1, 3. "Christ died for our sins." "here is something that neither angels nor devils can believe: they cannot say, Christ died for our sins; but we can say so."—p. 16. Was there ever an advocate

for particular redemption who disputed this; but is this the same thing with what is implied in the avowment—"Christ loved me (A. B.) and died with the specific intention to save me." Mr. Peden indeed contradicts the general strain of his pamphlet in the remark on this very text which immediately follows, p. 17. "God can and does remit the penalty of the law to every sinner that believes in what Christ has done and suffered for him."—This is quite true, but the stream of his argument should have led him to hold that the "penalty is remitted" to every one, whether he believes it or not. In reply to his question, "What Gospel would we have to address to unbelievers?" on the supposition that Christ died merely for the sins of believers; we say unhesitatingly, the very same Gospel we now address, and for this plain reason, that the warrant given by that Gospel to believe, proceeds not on the secret purpose of God at all, but on the absolute sufficiency of the merits of the Redeemer's sacrifice to save all who on any system of interpretation shall be saved.

We see nothing in 2 Cor. v. 20, 21, that is at all inconsistent with this view of the matter; and we feel ourselves perfectly at liberty to say to the most mixed congregation on earth, "God hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." In Gal. i. 3, 4; Titus ii. 13, 14; John v. 2; 1 Tim. i. 15, similar announcements are made, and it surprises us not a little to find Mr. Peden referring to these passages as at all militating against the doctrine of particular redemption. Does he really intend to say, that under such general offers and calls as these, there is implied a declaration that Christ died in the same sense exactly for those to whom these calls were addressed, and for such as were actually suffering the penalty of sin at the very time when these calls were in the process of being addressed to guilty sinners on earth? And is it not idle in Mr. P. to quote the passages in illustration of what no man in Canada at this moment questions—that the Gospel is addressed not to "angels or devils," but to men?

We are surprised to find Mr. Peden quoting 1 Tim. ii. 1-6, in support of his views of universal redemption, when he cannot but know that the passage has always and justly been held as the key to the right interpretation of all those passages which ascribe universality to the death of Christ. The apostle exhorts to the duty of intercession for "all men," and specially for those in authority, such as kings, assigning as a reason, that God "will have all men to be saved." Can any thing be clearer than that the "all," here, has respect to all classes and degrees of men, and not at all to the strict and exclusive universality of the Gospel scheme? On this interpretation the argument would be lame and inconclusive; in our view of it, the plea is irresistible. The same remarks will apply to Tit. ii. 11. There the "grace of God" is spoken of as appearing unto "all men." Christ may be said to have redeemed "all men," in as extensive sense as the grace of God is said to have appeared to all men; for multitudes in the world before the writing of this epistle, at that time and since, neither had, nor even now have any dis-

covery of his grace made to them. The "all men," then, to whom it appears, must mean only some of all sorts, and so makes nothing for the doctrine of universal grace or universal redemption. In the context the apostle had been speaking of the duties of aged men and women, of young men and young women, and of servants to their masters; and to these he excited them by the consideration of that grace which has appeared to all men, or to persons of all ranks and stations, and urges them to adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour. But what argument can be drawn thence for universal redemption?

We do not deny that the scheme of redemption has a general reference, and in this relation Christ may be said to have died for all. But, surely Christ, in laying down his life, did not intend to sanctify and save all. If he did so intend, then he is frustrated of his end; and how does "he see his seed," and how is he "satisfied with the travail of his soul?" or how does he "give eternal life to as many as the Father gave him?" In our view, Christ's words were amply fulfilled: "I, if I be lifted up will draw all men unto me," (John xii. 32); but on Mr. P.'s theory, the blessed Saviour must with reverence be it spoken, have been disappointed in his aim. And yet when does the Scriptures speak of Christ's death and ascension in terms of uncertainty, or represent him as coming short of his aim and intention in dying for sinners? No; the price being paid, all for whom it has been paid shall go free, and none others.

We are amazed to think that Mr. Peden should seem to have fallen into the error of denying the holy character of the faith which justifies the sinner. If there is any thing clearer than another to our view, it is the essential difference that there is between saving faith, and a mere historical assent. Indeed, Mr. Peden himself, readily acknowledges that it is the prejudice and the hardness of the un-renewed heart which stand in the way of a cordial reception of Christ; and how it can be that a simple act of the un-renewed mind without any special influence of grace, can remove this, and secure an interest in Christ to the sinner, we do not see. Nor will Mr. P. maintain that the holy nature of saving faith detracts in any degree from the freedom of grace in the salvation of a sinner, seeing that the highest attainments in sanctification have as little to do with the purchase of pardon as the very first movement of the sinner's soul towards the cross of Jesus. It is true, indeed, Jehovah is said to justify "the ungodly;" but surely Mr. Peden does not mean to put on this expression a Sandemanian interpretation, as if an impenitent and determined enemy of God were the genuine subject of forgiving grace? The "ungodly man" whom the Lord justifies, is not the careless or reckless offender on whom all the calls and appeals of mercy have been spent in vain; it is rather the man who has discovered his utter "ungodliness," and has found in the perfect righteousness of the Redeemer, a relief from all his anxieties and all his terrors. And this man will be less inclined than this awakened sinner himself to make a righteousness of his awaking. Nay, he will feel himself to be "ungodly," not only at the moment when he is first justified, but during the whole period of his life by faith in Jesus.