

Primary Copyright: -- Digitizer, Warren Haskell, New Castle, Pennsylvania

All Rights Reserved By HDM For This Digital Publication
Copyright 1993 -- 2005 Holiness Data Ministry

Duplication of this disc (CD or DVD) by any means is forbidden,
and copies of individual files must be made in accordance with
the restrictions stated in the B4UCopy.txt file on this disc.

* * * * *

This Holiness Data Ministry
Digital Edition 07/20/05
By Permission From Warren Haskell

* * * * *

ELEMENTS OF THEOLOGY, OR AN EXPOSITION OF THE
DIVINE ORIGIN, DOCTRINES, MORALS, AND INSTITUTIONS
OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY REV. LUTHER LEE, D. D.,
FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN ADRIAN COLLEGE.

[EIGHTH EDITION.]

"Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the God-head bodily."—PAUL.

SYRACUSE, N. Y.

WESLEYAN METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE.
D. S. KINNEY, AGENT.

1877.

PREFACE,

This volume is believed by the Author, to contain a brief, yet entire view of Christianity, as a system of Revealed Religion. The outline comprehends the evidence of its divine origin, the doctrinal truths it reveals, the duties it commands, and the institutions it establishes.

It has been one leading object to adapt the work to common readers, and it is believed that it will be found to be suited to interest, instruct and profit Christians generally. At the

same time, however, the Author has had his eye upon the wants of our young men, who need a course of reading to prepare them for the Ministry, and he believes their wants are largely met, so far as theology is concerned. Of the necessity of such a work to put into the hands of those who are preparing for the Ministry, and who have just entered the Ministry, the Author's own experience is, to him, sufficient proof. He honestly believes that such a volume placed in his hands when he entered the Ministry, would have saved him years of mental labor and solicitude, by which he has gathered and collated the contents of this volume.

It is true there are volumes of Theology, but the Author has never seen any which he has found, as a whole, adapted to his own wants. They are constructed upon a different system of doctrinal truth, or they are largely occupied with an examination and refutation of old and long since exploded errors, while the real living questions of our time and country appear to have been unknown to the writers. Theology, representing, not the true science of God, but only the conceptions of the human mind in regard to God, like everything else is undergoing perpetual changes, so that the most interesting questions now under discussion, are, in many particulars, different from what they were half a century ago, or even twenty-five years ago. The advantage claimed for the present work, is, that it meets the questions now before the public mind that it deals with the living world.

The Author does not wish to disguise the fact that he is neither a high Calvinist, nor a Pelagian, nor even what some may call a low Armenian, but he advocates what he believes to be a true medium ground, where true Gospel salvation is found at the point of union between divine and human agency. But to understand his views, his work must be read. That all will be satisfied with the views advocated, is not to be expected, yet it must be admitted that the work contains much important truth, common to all evangelical Christians, and though some readers may feel compelled to reject some portions, the same persons may be instructed and profited by the study of other parts.

It has cost the Author much labor, but his work is done, and he submits it to the public with a consciousness of an honest intention, and with his prayers that it may be a blessing to the world. Amen.

APRIL, 1856.

CONTENTS,

BOOK I.

THE EXISTENCE AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD, AND THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES

CHAPTER I.

THE EXISTENCE AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD DEMONSTRATED, A POSTERIORI

SECTION I. —The Existence of God

" II. —The Attributes of God

CHAPTER II.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES

SECTION I. —A Revelation from God is possible,

" II. —A Revelation from God is necessary,

" III. —The Genuineness of the Old Testament,

“ IV. —The Genuineness of the New Testament,

“ V. —The Scriptures claim to be Inspired,

“ VI. —The Credibility of the writers,

“ VII. —The Evidence of Miracles,

“ VIII. —Objections to the evidence of Miracles answered,

“ IX. —The argument founded upon Prophecy,

“ X. —The Adaptation of the Scriptures to the wants of mankind.

“ XI. —The Success of the Scriptures,

“ XII. —The Influence of the Scriptures,

BOOK II.

THE DOCTRINES OF THE SCRIPTURES,

CHAPTER I. The Existence of God viewed in the light of the Scriptures.

CHAPTER II. The Character and Attributes of God,

SECTION I. —The Spirituality of God,

" II. —The Eternity of God,

" III. —The Omnipotence of God,

" IV. —The Omnipresence of God,

" V. —The Omniscience of God,

" VI. —The Immutability of God,

" VII. —The Justice of God,

" VIII. —The Goodness, Love, Benevolence, and Mercy of God,

" IX. —The Holiness of God,

CHAPTER III.

THE TRINITY IN THE UNITY OF THE GODHEAD,

SECTION I. —Preliminary Remarks,

" II. —The Unity of God,

“ III. —The Underived Divinity of Christ,

- " IV. —The Hypostatic Union,
- " V. —The Divinity and Personality of the Holy Ghost,
- “ VI. —The Trinity in Unity,

CHAPTER IV.

THE ORIGINAL STATE OF MAN,

SECTION I. —Man was Created Holy,

- " II. —Man was not Liable to Death in his Pristine State,
- " III. —Objections to Man's Exemption from Death answered,

CHAPTER V.

THE FALL OF MAN—Depravity,

SECTION I. —The Fall of Adam,

- " II. —Objections to a literal construction of the account of the fall answered,
- " III. —All men are depraved in consequence of the fall,

CHAPTER VI.

REDEMPTION—Christ's death a ransom for Sinners—The Atonement

SECTION I. —The necessity of Atonement,

- " II. —The Atonement proved from the Mosaic Ritual,
- " III. —The Death of Christ,
- " IV. —The Scriptures represent Christ as a Redeemer and man as redeemed.
- " V. —The Scriptures Represent Christ as a Mediator, Intercessor and Reconciler,
- “ VI. —The Scriptures attribute the removal of sin and the salvation of sinners to the blood, death, and resurrection of Christ,
- " VII. —The Scriptures assert directly the sacrificial and propitiatory character of Christ's death,
- " VIII. —Objections to the doctrine of the Atonement answered,

CHAPTER VII.

THE EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT,

SECTION I. —The atonement was made for universal humanity,

- “ II. —The atonement is not limited in its application by any supposed decree of predestination or foreordination,
- " II. —The atonement is not limited in its application by any supposed decree of election and reprobation,
- " IV. —The Atonement is not limited in its application by any supposed

- influence of God's foreknowledge,
- “ V. —The atonement is not limited in its application by any supposed want of power on the part of sinners to comply with the conditions upon which its benefits are offered,
 - " VI. —The atonement is not limited in its application by any supposed governing influence of motives,

CHAPTER VIII.

SALVATION BY GRACE EXPLAINED AND DEFENDED,

SECTION I. —Justification by faith—Pardon, Remission of sin,

- " II. —Regeneration—The New Birth,
- " III. —Adoption,
- " IV. —The evidence by which persons may know their acceptance with God—the witness of the Spirit,
- " V. —Sanctification,
- " VI. —The case of infants and heathen considered,

CHAPTER IX.

THE WORLD OF SPIRITS—the future state,

SECTION I. —The existence and employment of angels,

- " II. —The existence and evil influence of devils,
- “ III. —The Immortality of the Soul,
- “ IV. —The intermediate state,
- “ V. —The Resurrection,
- “ VI. —The Judgment of the last day,
- “ VII. —The future state of the righteous,
- “ VIII. —The future destiny of the wicked,
- “ IX. —The final destiny of the wicked—they will not be annihilated,

BOOK III.

CHRISTIANITY CONSIDERED AS A SYSTEM OF MORAL GOVERNMENT,

CHAPTER I.

THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF GOD'S MORAL GOVERNMENT,

SECTION I. —The Scriptures teach that God is a universal supreme moral governor,

- " II. —The Scriptures teach that man is a subject of God's moral government,
- " III. —The Scriptures contain God's moral code,

CHAPTER II.

THE DUTIES WE OWE TO GOD,

SECTION I. —Love to God,

- “ II. —Reverence and fear of God,
- " III. —The duty of prayer,
- “ IV. —The duty of maintaining public worship,
- “ V. —The Christian Sabbath,

CHAPTER III.

THE DUTIES WE OWE TO OUR FELLOW BEINGS,

SECTION I. —The duty of universal love to humanity,

- “ II. —Husbands and wives,
- “ III. —Parents and children,
- “ IV. —Masters and servants,

CHAPTER IV.

THE DUTIES WE OWE TO OUR FELLOW BEINGS CONTINUED—CIVIL GOVERNMENT,

SECTION I. —The rightful existence of civil government,

- " II. —The rights and duties of civil government,
- " III. —Objections to civil government answered,
- " IV. —The duties of the people in regard to civil government,

CHAPTER V.

THE DUTIES WE OWE TO OUR FELLOW CREATURES, CONCLUDED—THE DUTY OF MAN TO MAN, AS MAN,

SECTION I. —Man has an inalienable right to life,

- “ II. —The right of property,
- " III. —Man's right to liberty,
- " IV. —The Old Testament does not teach that chattel slavery can be right,
- " V. —The Scriptures of the New Testament do not teach that slavery can be right,

BOOK IV.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND ITS INSTITUTIONS,

CHAPTER I.

- SECTION I. —Visible church organization explained and defended,
" II. —Church government—the rights of the Laity,
" III. —Written articles of faith and practice,

CHAPTER II.

THE MINISTRY,

- SECTION I. —The Gospel ministry was established by Christ as a permanent institution
" II. —The mode of ministerial appointment,
" III. —Ministerial parity,
" IV. —Ministerial parity—Further direct argument—Dr. Bangs reviewed.
" V. —The assumption of apostolic succession exposed,

CHAPTER III.

The Sacraments

- SECTION I. —Baptism—its nature and design
" II. —The subjects of baptism,
" III. —The mode of baptism.
" IV. —The Lord's Supper

ELEMENTS OF THEOLOGY

BOOK I.

THE EXISTENCE AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD, AND THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

CHAPTER I.

THE EXISTENCE AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD DEMONSTRATED, A POSTERIORI.

SECTION I.

The Existence of God.

1. THE idea of the existence of God forms in the human mind, the foundation of all religion, natural or revealed. It is not possible to conceive of religion, without first conceiving of a superior power. Ignorant heathen, it is admitted, often worship that which is inferior to themselves, as when they bow before images made of wood and stone; but these are but *images*, representations of something else, and with them is always associated something else, something beyond, some mysterious pervading spirit, some higher power. If a race of men can be found, who have no conception of a power higher

than themselves, it will be found that they will have no religion; that is, they will worship nothing. Some divines proceed, first to prove the truth of the Scriptures, and then from the Scriptures proceed to demonstrate the existence and attributes of God. The attributes and character of God are proper subjects to be discussed in the light of the Scriptures; but the abstract existence of God need never be proved from the Bible. To attempt to prove that the Scriptures are given by inspiration of God, is to assume that God exists, and to prove the inspiration of the Scriptures, is to prove the existence of God; there need, therefore, be no argument founded upon the Scriptures to prove the existence of God; for, if the Scriptures are inspired, God exists, and if they are not inspired, they cannot prove the existence of God. All abstract arguments in support of the existence of God are most in place before entering upon an investigation of the claims of the Scriptures to inspiration, inasmuch as when the inspiration of the Scriptures is clearly established, the existence of God cannot be called in question. Those only will call in question the existence of God, who deny the Scriptures; hence, arguments to prove the existence of God, are necessary only for those who cannot be reached by any Scriptural demonstration. It is therefore proper, to meet such upon their own ground of reason, and demonstrate, *a posteriori*, that there is a Creator, from the fact of a visible and tangible creation.

2. As nothing cannot produce something—as non-existence cannot produce existence—as non-entity cannot produce entity, there must always have been something self-existing, an eternal entity. To say that nothing can produce something is to say that nothing is something; for that which produces, must be or exist, and that which is or exists, is something, not nothing. Had there ever been a time, however remote, when there was nothing, there never could have been anything, for there could never have been a cause for anything. If anything receives existence, or begins to exist, there must be a cause, and this cause must exist before the effect or the thing caused; and as a cause must be something, when there was nothing, there could have been no cause of anything, and nothing must ever have continued, and something never could have existed. As that which causes must be something, and, as the cause must exist before the thing caused, to say that when there was nothing, something began to be is to say that something existed before any- thing did exist. In like manner, to say that a thing causes or produces itself is to say that it exists before it does exist. The conclusion is, that some one thing or being must have always existed, that something must be eternal; or else that there is nothing now, and that there never will be anything.

Having arrived at the conclusion that something must have always existed, or that nothing now exists, there remains but little ground for argument. It is true, there have been persons who have doubted everything, even their own existence, but this is too absurd to need a refutation. The theory is that men know nothing, that they may be mistaken in everything; they imagine that there is a world, but it may not be so; they fancy that they think, but are not sure of it; they fancy that they are, that they exist, but it may be unreal after all, and there may be nothing. If such intellectual dreaming were worthy of a refutation, it contains a sufficient one in itself. A man fancies that he is, but does not know it. But that which fancies must exist. That which thinks must exist; but the dreamer does not know that he thinks: he may only think that he thinks. But he, who

thinks that he thinks, does really think; and as that which doubts must really exist, he who doubts his own existence, by that very doubt proves his existence, beyond the power of doubt. Thus no man can evade the fact of his own existence; if he denies that anything exists, that which denies must exist, and hence the very denial proves that something does exist. If he doubts his own existence, that which doubts must exist, and the doubt itself proves that he does exist. If his doubt is not real, and he only fancies or imagines that he doubts his own existence, that which fancies or imagines, must exist; and hence, the most ethereal fancy or imagination that ever exuded from the brain of man, proves a real existence. Those who deny or doubt their own existence, mock their own consciousness, and furnish a demonstration of their own folly, which no wise man will undertake to gainsay.

Consciousness is the highest degree of evidence; yea, more, it is knowledge itself which admits not of proof on the one hand, nor of refutation on the other. Every man is conscious of his own existence; consciousness being that notice which the mind takes of its own operations, he thinks and recognizes the world of thought within him, and knows that he is, that he exists. He next sees, and hears, and feels, and tastes, and smells the world without, and becomes acquainted with the visible creation, and traces the outlines of the system and frame of the Universe, and then inquires for a higher power who made them all.

It has now been shown that nothing cannot produce something; that if nothing had ever been, there could have been no cause for anything, and that nothing must ever have remained, and that something never could have existed; and further, that something does exist, and, therefore, something must have always existed, and must be eternal. This eternal existence or being, we call God.

3. The fact being proved, that something must have always existed, and must be eternal, it necessarily drives us to the conclusion that matter, the visible creation, is eternal, and has always existed in some form, or that there is an eternal intelligent being, the Creator of all these things, whom we call God. The objection which learned Infidels sometimes urge against the existence of God, viz., that it is impossible that a being should exist without having begun to exist, that reason cannot comprehend such a truth, but inquires at once on the suggestion that there is a God, who made him or where did he come from, possesses not the slightest force. It has been shown that something must be eternal, and by denying the existence of God, they must admit the eternity of matter, and it is as easy to conceive how God can exist without having begun to exist, as it is to conceive how the world can exist without having begun to exist; and reason no more comprehends the one than the other, yet reason does comprehend most clearly that the one or the other must be true.

The argument is now narrowed down to a single question, viz., is the visible Universe eternal, or is there an eternal God, who created all these things? This question we will now examine.

1. There is no proof of any kind or degree, which can be urged in support of the hypothesis that the world is eternal; nor can there be the slightest proof adduced that there is not a God, and that he did not make the world. No intelligent Infidel will pretend to demonstrate that there is no God; they only claim that we cannot know that there is a God. This leaves a fair field for experiment, and we will try and see what CAN be done in the form of proof.

2. Keeping in view the established fact, that if the world is not eternal, there must be a God who created it, the mode in which we see things deriving existence around us, proves that there must have been a beginning. Plant produces plant, tree produces tree, and animals spring from animals, and man derives his existence from man. Taking this view, it is self-evident that there must have been a first plant, which did not spring from a pre-existing plant; there must have been a first tree which did not grow from the root or seed of a previously existing tree; there must have been a first beast which was not the offspring of any previously existing beast; and there must have been a first pair of human beings, who were not begotten by any previously existing human beings. It matters not how far back your thoughts pursue the succession; they may pass through ages beyond ages, still the same conclusion must be arrived at somewhere, that there was a first of each class, a first man who did not, could not have derived his existence in the way we have derived ours. If the earth now produced plants and trees without seeds or scions; if animals grew upon the trees; and if men grew up from the earth without the hand of culture, we might have some ground for asserting that it had always been so, but such is not the case. We see everything around us which has life, vegetable or animal, deriving existence in a manner which proves beyond the power of contradiction, that there must have been a first plant, a first animal, and a first man, which must have been created; and if so, there must be a Creator, who existed before all things that have been made, and must have been eternal. This being we call God. The existence of the first man can never be accounted for by any theory of Infidelity, which denies the existence of God. Every succession must, in the very nature of the case have a beginning, and every series of causes and effects must have a first cause. Without a beginning there can be no such thing as succession, and without a first cause there can be no second cause, or series of causes. There must, therefore, have been a first man who was not the son of man, whose existence accounts for the existence of all other men, but whose own existence can never be accounted for, only by supposing an uncreated Creator, whom we call God.

3. The marks of design which the visible creation everywhere exhibits prove the existence of a designer, an intelligent Creator. The human mind naturally and necessarily infers a contriver, a designer, from the unmistakable signs of contrivance, and the adaptation of means to an end. Suppose a man traveling upon a desert, should see a human foot-print in the sand, he would have no doubt that some other traveler had passed that way. Should he discover a house in the wilderness he would know that a builder had been there; he would not for a moment suppose that the house made it-self, or that nothing made it, nor yet that it had always been there, because he did not see the builder in or about it. Should he find a watch, as Dr. Paley supposes, he would infer that the watch had been made by some skilful hand. Suppose he had never before seen a watch, and was not able to comprehend the plan of its structure, and the principles of its

movements, still he would never suppose that it made itself, or that it happened by chance to be a watch; but he would infer that it had been made, and that its maker, whoever he might be, was intelligent to design, and skillful to execute. Now we see on the face of the visible creation, marks of the Creator's hand, as plainly as the traveler could see the human foot-print on the sand, and we infer as certainly that there is a God, as he would from the footmark, that a traveler had passed that way. We see in the visible Universe a house vastly superior to the one the traveler discovered in the wilderness, and infer with no less certainty than he, that the builder had been at work. He saw no builder in or about the house, yet knew he had been there from the fact that he saw the house; and so, though we cannot see God in or about his own temple of the Universe, we are equally sure that he is, and that he has been at work, from the fact that we see the building. The sun that rises and sets every day in the year, with all its planets, primary and secondary, constitute a watch infinitely more wonderful than the one we have supposed the traveler to find; it has told the minutes, and hours, and days, and years, and centuries of time since first it was put in motion, without irregularity or once running down; and if the man who found the watch, inferred without doubt that it had a maker, that it could not exist without, much more must we infer that there is a Creator who constructed the great clock of time, which has the plain of the heavens for its dial, suns and worlds for its machinery, comets for its centenary alarms, and an unseen exhaust-less influence for its propelling force. This argument may be rendered still more clear and forcible by a few specifications of obvious marks of design. We need not go beyond ourselves for ample illustrations. Man is "fearfully and wonderfully made," and his organization is too wonderfully adapted to the world without him, to have been the result of accident. The lungs and the atmosphere are suited to each other for the purpose of respiration. The atmosphere is composed of several gases, each of which alone, is fatal to life, and yet they are so combined as to constitute its sustaining power. When we consider that the air did not form the lungs, and that the lungs did not form the air, their adaptation to each other is a clear mark of design on the part of that higher power that formed them both.

The eye and the light are suited to each other in a manner to produce vision. The eye did not form the light, neither did the light form the eye, and yet they are exactly suited to each other in a manner which proves design, and exhibits means adapted to an end. If either the eye or the light were different there would be no vision. Can all this be the result of chance? Certainly not. A *camera obscura* is an apparatus representing the eye. The images of external objects are received through a double convex glass, and are exhibited in their native colors on some white matter placed within the machine, in the focus of the glass. This exhibits the philosophy of vision. Suppose an Infidel should be presented with one of these camera obscura, and should be told that nobody made it, that it happened to be by chance, would he believe you? No; he would charge you with an attempt to impose upon him. How greatly then does he impose upon himself, when he assumes that the real eye should be so wonderfully formed by nothing, or by blind chance, and that light, by the same blind chance should be so wonderfully adapted to the eye, as to produce the wonderful phenomenon of vision?

The atmosphere is adapted to the propagation of sound, and the human ear is adapted to receive the sound by being sensitive to the vibrations of the atmosphere, and to notify the

conscious mind of its presence and quality; while the mind is impressed and feels its fountains stirred, and sounds mingle in accord and harmony, or otherwise. In all this, design is clearly seen, and here are means adapted to an end, which proves the existence of an intelligent Creator. The argument might be extended to almost any length, but need not be for effect, for if what has been said does not prove the point, more of a similar character would fail to do it-The book which we call the Bible, declares that "the fool hath said in his heart, there is no God;" and it appears to discriminate correctly, in this particular at least, for none but a fool would make such a declaration. And he even is represented saying only "in his heart," as though ashamed to speak it Out, but some are less modest in these days; but this fulfills another prediction which Says that " ungodly men shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived."

SECTION II.

The Attributes of God.

It having been shown that there is a God, it is proper to inquire into his attributes. The inquiry, in this place, is not to be made in the light of the Scriptures, but simply in the light of reason.

1. God is eternal. This has already been proved, and will now be made the rallying point for the demonstration of other attributes of the divine nature. The argument which proves the eternity of God need not be repeated; it is simply that nothing cannot produce something; hence, as something now is, something must always have existed. This eternal being, this something which has always existed, we call God. To this conclusion we are driven by the marks of intelligence and design we everywhere see impressed upon the visible creation.

2. God is Omnipotent. This follows from his eternity. As he is the cause of all things, he existed before all things, and hence, once possessed all power in the Universe; all power is therefore derived from him, and must be dependent upon him. He from whom all power proceeds, and upon whom all other beings are dependent for the energies they possess, must possess all power in himself, and must be Omnipotent or Almighty. He who creates can destroy; hence, God having created all powers but his own, must be capable of putting an end to all subordinate powers, and again possessing the only power in the universe in himself; and he who can do this must be Omnipotent or Almighty.

3. God is Omniscient or All-wise. As he is eternal, and existed when nothing else existed, he must have possessed all wisdom in himself, and there cannot be a ray of intellectual light which has not emanated from him; and he, from whom all wisdom proceeds, must be All-wise.

4. God is Omnipresent, or exists everywhere. This follows from all the other at-tributes of the divine nature already established. He who is Almighty must exist everywhere, for as no being can act where he is not, if God does not exist everywhere, he cannot act everywhere, and there must be places beyond his presence to which his power does not

extend; and if there be places to which his power does not extend, he cannot be Almighty. But it has been shown that God is Almighty from his eternity, and hence he must be Omnipresent. The same argument will hold good in relation to the wisdom of God. Reason cannot conceive how perfect knowledge can exist beyond the presence of him who knows; hence, God, to be All-wise must exist everywhere, and as he is necessarily All-wise from the fact of his eternity, he must be Omnipresent, filling all in all. The fact of his being the Creator of all things, must lead us to the same conclusion, that God exists everywhere. So far as the visible creation is concerned, including the solar system and the fixed stars, reason must teach that God pervades and fills the whole, from the fact that he made them, and upholds them by his power, The sun shines without wasting his fires and worlds wing the circle of their orbits without loss of momentum; which involves the presence of supernatural power. God is in the sun or it would cease to shine; he is in every sunbeam or it would not glow; he is in the planets or they would tire in their course; and he is in the flower or it would not bloom. If then, God as Creator must fill and pervade all creation, the point of his Omnipresence follows from the fact first established, that he existed before all things and created all things that now exist.

There are other attributes of the divine nature which might be contemplated in the light of reason, but what has preceded is sufficient to overthrow the Atheist, and lay a foundation to stand upon, to grapple with the Deist on the question of revelation, and then the further inquiry into the attributes of the divine nature, will be more appropriately pursued in the light of the Scriptures.

CHAPTER II.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

An argument for the Inspiration of the Scriptures, supposes it to have been proved or admitted that there is a God, who not only made and upholds the Universe, but who created man, and endowed him with his intellectual and moral nature. It would be absurd to argue that prophets and apostles were inspired to communicate the contents of the Bible to men, except upon the ground that there is a superior intelligence whom we call God, who is affirmed to be the author of such inspiration.

In the preceding chapter, it has been proved that there is a God, which has prepared the way for an examination into the claims of the Scriptures, as a revelation of his will to man. I will commence the examination into the claims of the Scriptures with the possibility of a revelation of the will of God, and hope to proceed from possibility to probability, and from probability to certainty.

SECTION I.

A Revelation from God is Possible.

1. God, who formed man and gave him his reason, and rendered him capable of reflection, of gaining knowledge, and of knowing many things, must be capable of

bestowing a greater amount of knowledge and intellectual light at any time, upon any person or persons, for any general or specific purpose. This is all that is necessary to render a revelation possible; admit that God is capable of this, and you admit the possibility of inspiration. To deny that God can pour increased mental light upon any individual, and in effect, you affirm that when he created man he did all that he could by way of imparting knowledge, and exhausted his resources of intellectual light so as never to be capable of doing more. Such an idea is too absurd for candid common sense, and the conclusion is that God can impart any amount of knowledge he may please, to any individual, and hence, he can inspire any individual or individuals to teach or write his will, and impart to them a knowledge of future events.

2. It is also possible for God to cause a person to be certain of the reception of a divine communication and revelation. The Infidel has often made this one of his strongest points of objection, but it is without force, when viewed in its true light. It is frankly admitted that enthusiasts are often led by a wild imagination, and that persons under the influence of a frenzied hope or fear, are fully satisfied of the things represented to them; but all this does not prove that a man cannot have certain knowledge, and know whereof he affirms. There is much falsehood in the world, and many impostures: and many are deceived, but this does not prove that there is no truth, nor does it prove that no degree of evidence can assure a person of the truth. Men are deceived by falsehood, not by the truth. A man may be really deceived by a counterfeit, or he may be in doubt over it, when, let the genuine be presented, and he will know it in a moment, without doubt or possibility of being mistaken. Thus, though men are often deceived by error in the absence of truth, they may know the truth when it is present. Suppose it possible for a person possessing a wild imagination, to be deceived under strong excitement, so as really to believe he has a divine communication, vision or revelation from God, when he has, in fact, received no such thing; all this does not prove that the same person, should God really make a communication to him, would not know the voice of God within him, or the divine manifestation, so as at once to distinguish between the false and real vision beyond the liability of being deceived. The argument as has been remarked, proceeds upon the *poof* or admission that there is a God, who is the author of the human mind, and God who made the mind, must be capable of communicating with it, and of making it know that he does communicate with it. This is certainly a sufficient reply to the Infidel objection, that a revelation is impossible, and that should man receive one he could not be certain of the fact.

3. It is probable, if not absolutely certain that God did originally, directly instruct man. This is argued from the possession of faculties, which matter of fact declares man cannot acquire of himself. Who taught man the use of language? It must be self-acquired, or it must have been taught him by his Maker. Men now learn language of their fellows, the younger learns of the older, but left to themselves, they would never learn to talk. Says Dr. Gunning. "It was alleged by some skeptics, that if you placed a man in a savage wilderness, he would instinctively know how to express himself in words; but the experiment was once made, and it was found that he grew up dumb. An enthusiast, who went as far in an opposite direction, expressed his belief that if you were to isolate a man in a wilderness, he would be found to express himself in Hebrew; the experiment was

made and he grew up dumb." This proves that man untaught would not learn to express his thoughts by words; how then did the first man learn the use of language? That species of skepticism which denies the divine inspiration, and revelation, denies the doctrine of the fall, so that they cannot maintain that humanity was originally more perfect than at present; it is usually maintained that man has progressed from a lower state to his present elevated one, and hence as man cannot now acquire the gift of language without an instructor, he could not have acquired it originally. The question returns, who taught the first, man the use of language? God, his Maker, must have done it and this is equal to a revelation: it was a revelation itself, and the possibility of a revelation is proved, and the fact of one having been made to man, is shown to be highly probable, if not certain.

SECTION II.

A Revelation from God is Necessary.

It will not be pretended by any for whose benefit the present argument is designed, that a revelation of the will of God is to be looked for in any other book than the Bible. It will be admitted that if we have any divinely inspired writings, the Scriptures are such writings. If, then, it can be shown that the very elements of man's nature, and the state of human society induced by these elements, are such as absolutely to need a revelation, it will go far towards proving that the Scriptures are such revelation, since it is to be found in them, if anywhere, there being no other book with rival claims. Keeping in view the fact that there is a God, who is an Almighty, Infinitely wise and good Creator, it follows that there must be an agreement between the nature and wants of the intelligent creatures his hand forms and the provisions he makes for them, and the manner in which he governs them.

It is, then, only necessary to prove that man, from his elemental nature and circumstances, requires a revelation of his Maker's will, and it will follow that such a revelation has been given, just as certainly as Infinite power, wisdom and goodness are consistent with themselves.

Man is a moral being, possessing intelligence, a will, and a conscience, which are the principal elements of a moral nature, and which render all who possess them accountable for their conduct. In view of these elements of our common nature, man finds within himself the highest proof of his own accountability, viz., his consciousness. Every man is conscious that his actions are right or wrong, and that he is accountable for them, and that he is innocent or guilty as they are right or wrong. A distinction between right or wrong, a belief or feeling that some acts are right and others wrong, is common to human nature, and has developed itself in all ages, and in all countries, and in every branch of the human family. This proves that its development, is not an accident, not the effect of some accidental, local and extraneous cause, but that it has its origin in the elements of human nature, and hence it follows that it is a moral nature; that is, a nature of the developments of which right and wrong may be affirmed, involving accountability on the part of the actor. This proves that man is a moral being, morally accountable for his conduct, and per

consequence, that he must be the subject of a moral government. Government necessarily supposes a law, or rule of action, which emanates from the governor, and which is or may be known by the governed. The will of the Creator must be the paramount law of the creature. There is arising from the very elements of man's nature, a necessity that he, in some way, be made acquainted with the will of God concerning him, as the paramount law of his being, an only and sufficient rule of moral right and duty. It follows, then, that man must, in some way, be capable of understanding the will of God, so far as his own responsibilities and duties are concerned, and the argument is narrowed down to a single question, viz., Is the will of God to be sought in the Scriptures, or may it be known by man through some other medium? The Infidel must meet this issue, at this point, and in this form, or he must go back and take up the foundations of the argument, by denying the existence of God as a Creator, and by denying that man possesses a moral nature, by denying that he possesses intelligence, a will and conscience, producing in him a sense of right and wrong. At this, perhaps, we should not be surprised, since what we claim to be inspiration declares that the fool hath said in his heart there is no God;" yet he who should deny that he possesses a moral nature, and declares himself incapable of distinguishing between right and wrong, and affirms that he is not accountable for his conduct, would find it difficult to invest his opinions with much weight. The Infidel must admit his own moral nature and accountability, and assert the existence of his moral sense, a sense of right and wrong, before he can throw himself into the scale of argument, and having done this, he must meet the issue as stated above, and admit that the will of our Creator is contained in the Scriptures, or maintain that it is communicated through some other medium. Were we to leave the argument here, its weight would be in favor of the Scriptures, but it will be conclusive when it shall be further shown, first, that the wants of our moral nature are not met through any other medium, and secondly, that the Scriptures are precisely adapted to meet these wants.

It has been shown that man, being a moral agent and the subject of a moral government, must, in some way, be made acquainted with the law of the Governor, that is to say, the will of God his Creator. The only question is, are we to look for the will of God, the rule of our faith and practice, in the Scriptures, or is it to be sought elsewhere. We say in the Scriptures; the Infidel says it is to be sought elsewhere? Let the Infidel side of the question be first examined.

Leaving the Scriptures out of the question, where are we to find, or through what medium are we to arrive at a knowledge of the will of God? It must be in some book or record other than the Scriptures, or human reason must be sufficient to deduce the will of the Creator from a view of the visible creation. If it is not to be learned from one or the other of these sources it cannot be learned but from the Scriptures, for there is no other source. If there be, let Infidels point us to it. It has been remarked that there is no volume which can with any degree of plausibility set up rival claims to the Scriptures, and a word only is necessary on this point. The Koran will not be urged by Infidels against the Christian Scriptures as possessing rival claims. Such a position would ruin their own cause, for no one pretends to deny the authenticity of the Koran; that it was written by Mahomet in the seventh century of the Christian era, that is, more than six hundred years after the birth of Christ, is admitted by all. This book does not pretend to reveal a new religion, but to re-

establish the religion of Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus Christ, and clearly acknowledges the authority of the Jewish Scriptures, so that if our Bible is untrue, the Koran must also be untrue, It is also too plain to be denied that all the really valuable doctrines and moral precepts of the Koran are borrowed from our Scriptures.

Nor will Infidels urge that any of the books that may be found among the oriental nations present higher claims to inspiration than the Bible. A ray of truth may here and there gleam upon the dark pages of those books, but the absurdities which make up the volumes are gross and overwhelming. We should not fear to submit the question to enlightened Infidels, if the decision was to be upon the relative claims of the respective volumes. Take all the books in the world claiming to be inspired, and claiming to teach the will of God by authority, and place the Bible among them, and then let it be assured that one of them is and must be received as teaching the will of God and the duties which we owe to God, our fellow beings, and ourselves, and a Voltaire or a Hume would select the Bible as possessing the highest claims, and as containing the most pure morality. There is then no rival book, and we must take the Scriptures, or search for a knowledge of truth and duty in the unwritten volume of nature.

We have now narrowed the question down to a single point, namely, is human reason capable of deducing the will of the Creator from a view of the visible creation? The real point involved is the sufficiency or insufficiency of human reason; to talk about the light of nature aside from human reason, is as unintelligible as to talk to a blind man of the light of the sun, moon, and stars, or of the colors of the rainbow. The visible creation can be read only by the eye of reason, and speaks only in the ear of reason, and the only question is, can reason, left to its own operations without revelation or supernatural light, by availing itself of all the helps which the invisible creator affords, arrive at a sufficient degree of knowledge on the subject of religious faith and duty, to answer the demands of our moral nature? The universal experience and consciousness of mankind answer, no. The proof on this point is overwhelming.

No nation, people, community or family ever did arrive at anything like a reasonable system of religious faith and practice, without a revelation from God. What Infidels may have done, or be capable of doing, who have been reared and educated in a Christian land, and imbibed the moral rules and maxims of the Scriptures, while they have rejected the authority of the book, is not the point; but what has been done by the wisest and best of nations and individuals, who have had no knowledge of the Scriptures? Gather up the records of all nations embracing their history, their religion, their creeds and homilies, and there will not be found in them the elements of a religious faith and practice, which the reason of an Infidel of Christendom will not condemn on sight. The wisest and most refined nations; among whom the arts and sciences have flourished most, have been gross idolaters; and have employed their arts in manufacturing their own objects of worship. The more wise and learned, who were above worshiping the work of men's hands, have known only enough on the subject of religion to convince them of the necessity of celestial light, of a divine teacher. They did not pretend to know what was truth and what was error concerning the gods and human destiny, but only taught things as probable. Plato himself begins his discourse concerning the gods and the generation of the world,

by cautioning his disciples " not to expect anything beyond a likely conjecture concerning these things." "A likely conjecture," then, is all that the wisest philosophers have been enabled to attain to, while the masses paid their blind devotion to images of wood and stone. Let the character, the moral attributes of their gods speak and tell what human reason can do in the discovery of religious truth. Some of their gods were the greatest monsters that ever walked upon the earth. Mercury was a thief, and was enrolled among the gods on account of his being expert at stealing. Bacchus was a drunkard and sensualist. Venus was a dissipated and an abandoned prostitute. Mars was a savage monster, taking pleasure only in war, battlefields and blood. Such was their ambition for god-making, that there was not a vice seen in depraved human conduct, not a lust that clamors for indulgence, not an unholy passion that nestles in the human heart, or flashes out its revengeful fires, which was not deified by the Greeks and Romans, the most learned and refined nations on which the light of the sun ever shone who had not the Scriptures. The countries over which these imaginary gods presided, were the birth-places and homes of Homer, Plato, Socrates, Virgil and Cicero; an acquaintance with whose productions is thought to be necessary to give the finishing touch to a classic education in our own times. If then, human reason cultivated to the highest degree as above, could remain so ignorant on the all-important subject of religion, and confess its ignorance, and sigh for a brighter and more certain light, as it did, the argument is certainly conclusive in proof of the necessity of a revelation. According to Christian chronology the world has been in existence nearly six thousand years; and Infidels generally maintain that it has stood much longer, and yet it cannot be shown that the operations of human reason in a single instance, has ever discovered and embodied a system of religious faith and practice satisfactory to itself. Human reason can discover its own defects, but it cannot supply the lack; it can see the necessity of a certain standard of religious faith and practice, but the desideratum remains until God sends celestial light from above, and the voice of the teacher is heard, who " spake as never man spake." If there were no other argument on the point, this would be sufficient to prove that unaided reason can never make a sufficient discovery of religious truth and duty to answer the demands of our moral nature. In view of the undeniable fact that six thousand years have not sufficed to make the discovery, it is folly, yea, madness to undertake to prove that it ever will or can be made. It is a significant fact that none pretend to the sufficiency of human reason, but such as enjoy the light of the Scriptures. The heathens confess their ignorance and the want of light which is beyond their reach, while Infidels of Christendom, on whose souls the inspired volume has flashed its hallowed beams, alone assert the sufficiency of reason.

It has been proved that human reason, unaided by revelation, has never made discoveries of religious truth sufficient to answer the demands of our moral nature. It is now proposed to show more directly that it cannot; that human reason is not adapted to make such discoveries, and with the data before it, the visible creation, it never can deduce sufficient truth to constitute a certain and authoritative standard of religious faith and practice.

1. The truths necessary to be known, many of them at least, necessarily lie beyond the ken of human reason; neither the mind itself, nor the visible creation furnishes the

elements out of which reason can construct the major and minor propositions of an argument, which shall contain necessarily, and from which may be drawn out the necessary truth as a certain conclusion from the premises. Reason has no power to operate further than it has premises to operate with, which are known and understood. Reason always begins with something already known, or which it takes for granted, and with the materials which it already possesses, it goes to work and arranges them, compares them one with the other, and judging of them, it deduces a conclusion, which conclusion is supposed to contain a newly discovered truth. But which are the known truths without revelation, from which reason can deduce all other needful truths. Which of the endless phenomena contain the elements of religious truth? Is it the sun, the moon, some of the stars, heaven or earth, sea or land, summer or winter, night or day, from which reason can deduce all needful religious truth?

These are the elements with which reason operates, but out of the whole it can never construct a major and minor proposition, the legitimate conclusion of which shall determine the first thing, concerning the nature and punishment of sin, how the sinner may be saved from it, whether there be a future state or not, and if there be, what will be its condition and circumstances. These and other needful religious truths are not contained in any or all of the elements within the grasp of reason. Admitting that the "heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth forth his handy-work," it might still follow, first, that the glory and handy-work are comprehended only by those whose souls have been enlightened by inspiration, concerning God and creation; and secondly, that admitting that the glory and handy-work are visible to all, they may not contain or lead to the discovery of all needful religious truth. The religionists of learned Athens, saw the glory and wonderful works of God, but God himself, his moral nature, and the principles of his government, they saw not, and in their blindness, erected an altar "to the unknown God." It does not follow, that because some truths may be known, or are known, that therefore all truth may be known. Admitting that men may attain to a knowledge of some religious truths and some duties, it does not, and cannot follow, that from these known truths and duties, reason may infer all other truths and duties, by any process of deduction of which it is capable. To make this appear, it must be first proved that there is a necessary connection between the truths and duties which are known, and all others, and that such connection is visible to the eye of human reason. Such proof no man has or ever can furnish. A man may know some of the duties he owes to his neighbor, because he sees, first the relation he sustains to that neighbor, and secondly, the influence certain; acts have upon his neighbor in promoting his happiness or misery: but it does not: follow that he may therefore know all religious truth, for he cannot with equal clearness see all the relations of the moral Universe the relation he sustains to a future state, and the influence of all his acts upon the condition of that state. The moral attributes of God, the principles of his moral government, the nature and punishment of sin how a sinner may be saved under the government of God, the fact and condition of a future state, and the immortality of the soul, can never be satisfactorily understood from the light of reason; the premises which contain these truths, from which alone they can be certainly deduced, lie beyond the ken of human reason; their source is the nature and will of God, of which human reason is but an emitted ray, and it cannot turn back, and scan its

own source, and comprehend him who gave it being, and hence the truths themselves can be attained only by a revelation from God.

2. The imperfect and constantly progressive developments of human reason in all other branches of science, furnishes conclusive evidence of its insufficiency in matters of religion. The figures were invented by an Arabian, the art of printing was discovered in the fifteenth century; Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood about two hundred and twenty years ago; Newton discovered the principle of gravitation, about a hundred and sixty years ago, from the simple circumstance of seeing an apple; fall from a tree; Fulton applied steam to navigation, and went up the Hudson river with his first boat at the rate of nearly five miles an hour in 1807; Railroads have been constructed within the last twenty years; and but few years have elapsed since Morse first succeeded in harnessing up the lightning for the conveyance of intelligence. Progress is the law of reason, and to progress is to change, and to change is to confess that we have been mistaken, or that reason has furnished but an imperfect light.

Reason has at hand, the elements with which to operate in the investigation of the physical sciences, and yet she has not perfected one of them, but is perpetually changing and improving them, while new ones are constantly being discovered which have laid hid from the most penetrating glance of reason's eye from the beginning of creation. With such undeniable evidence before us, of the imperfection and uncertainty of human reason in relation to the most useful and plainest arts and sciences, it is madness to affirm that this same imperfect and uncertain reason can, without the aid of celestial light, grasp the deeper and darker truths of a spiritual nature, truths that have their centre in the infinite mind of Jehovah, and that embrace realities and a destiny that lie beyond the bourn of the physical world we now inhabit, far in a spirit land, to which we have no access until after death, and from which no traveler has returned to give us information? Such is the folly of maintaining the sufficiency of human reason in matters of religion, without the aid of revelation.

3. The different degrees of the power of reason possessed by different persons, necessarily renders it imperfect and insufficient as a guide in matters of religious faith and duty. Suppose it were admitted that such minds as Newton, and Lock, and Franklin, and Webster, can reason acutely enough to discover all needful religious truth and duty from the light of nature without the assistance of revelation, still the masses would be in comparative darkness. The discoveries of such great minds could never be made available for the common people. A religion to meet the wants of mankind must be adapted to all classes, and such as may be comprehended by the smallest capacity where there is intelligence enough to involve accountability. Such is the religion of the Bible, for though it contains truths which none but the learned and wise can understand, and which will require eternity to explain fully to their comprehension, yet all that is essential to practical life, and to the exercise of true saving faith, and the enjoyment of peace with God, and a hope that reaches beyond the shadows of death, may be grasped by the smallest capacity and the most unlettered reader of the Scriptures.

4. The want of authority that must attend all systems and principles, which are the mere deductions of human reason, proves it insufficient in matters of religion. Allowing that the most learned and wise can glean sufficient religious truth from the field of nature to answer their own purpose, the less talented and less learned can never avail themselves of their discoveries. In matters of religion, each accountable being needs to know and understand for himself. This is impossible if the unlearned have got to take the deductions of the philosopher for a standard of religious truth. They understand not the principles upon which he reasons, they understand not his propositions, they comprehend not his mental operation, they see not the connection between his propositions and conclusions, and have only his deductions without any proof which they can understand; they rest, so far as they can see, upon his mere assertion. This is insufficient, and makes a man's religious faith and hopes depend upon the unsupported declarations of a man, who may, for all that we can know, be mistaken, or who may deceive us by design.

SECTION III.

The Genuineness of the Old Testament.

When it is affirmed that the Scriptures are genuine, the meaning is, that the several books were written by the persons whose names they bear. Were there such men as Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, Ezekiel, Daniel, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, James, Peter and Jude, and did they write the books which bear their names? This is an important question; and if it be answered in the negative, the argument is at an end; but if it be answered in the affirmative, an important point is gained towards establishing the inspiration of the Scriptures. It is not necessary to examine the claims of each book separately; it will be sufficient to establish their claims as a whole, and to do this, it is only necessary to distinguish between the Old and New Testaments. Let us now glance at the argument in support of the genuineness of the Old Testament Scriptures.

1. There is no proof that they were written by any other persons, and at any other time, than appears upon their face, and than what has always been claimed for them. We find them in existence, bearing certain claims upon their face, and those who hold them, by whom they have been preserved, claim for them that they are the genuine works of the persons whose names they bear, and so far as we have any means of tracing their history, they have always been held in the same estimation, and the same claim has been urged in their behalf, while no proof has or can be offered that they were written by any other persons, at any other period. This is sufficient of itself. The fact that they are, and are known to have existed for many centuries with certain claims upon their face, which have always been urged by those who have possessed them, must stand good until some proof is offered to the contrary. Let those who repudiate the Scriptures, show who did write them, and when and where they were written, if they are not genuine; let them show when and where they made their first appearance, if their origin was not what it is claimed to have been.

2. The internal evidence that the Scriptures are genuine, found in the volume itself, is very conclusive. The Old Testament is its own best and only connected and authentic

history, and its history of itself, furnishes clear proof of its own genuineness. It opens with what is claimed to be the writings of Moses, and he forms the central point of the Old Testament, and is presented as the first great prophet and lawgiver of the Jewish nation. The work opens with the Creation of the world, and proceeds with its- guilty history, until the Jews become a distinct people, and then it confines its record principally to them. It commences the history of the Jews as a distinct people with the call of Abraham, and completes their nationality with their flight from Egypt, the delivery of the law by Moses, and their settlement in Canaan under the command of Joshua. Here ends the first portion of sacred history with the first five books of Moses and the book of Joshua. Was not this the origin of the Jews as a nation? and is not this the first portion of their history? If the answer be in the negative, we demand what was their origin, and where is the history of that origin.? This is their own history of themselves, and it is more clear and probable upon its face, as a mere matter of history, than can be shown of any other ancient nation. The early history of the Egyptians, Grecians, and Romans is in comparison with Jewish history, more obscure than twilight compared with noonday. If the question be answered in the affirmative, that such was the origin of the Jews as a nation, and that such is the first portion of their history, then are the books of the Old Testament genuine.

Having settled the question of the first division of Jewish history, let us trace their history down to its close, and see if we do not find connecting links, facts and allusion running through the whole, joining the parts together and proving it to be genuine. It appears upon the face of the record that the civil, moral and religious law of the Jews was settled by Moses, their first ruler and historian; this law we find recorded at length in the books attributed to him. According to the record, this law was given 2341 years prior to the present date, A. D. 1850: and through all the other books making up the entire record, and covering about fifteen centuries to the close of the history, we find distinct traces of the system. A few instances will be sufficient for illustration. Four hundred and eighty-seven years after the law was given. David in delivering his last charge to his son Solomon, said, keep the charge of the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, to keep his statutes, and his judgments, and his testimonies, as it is written in the law of Moses;" 1 King 2: 3. This proves that the Book of Kings was written after the Book of Exodus, and that David lived after Moses. Seven hundred and ninety-three years after the law was given, and 317 years after the last mentioned date, the Prophet Isaiah, Chap. 63: 12, inquires, " Where is he that led them by the right hand of Moses with his glorious arm, dividing the water before them, to make himself an everlasting name?"

Daniel, 953 years after the giving of the law, chap. 9: 11-13, refers distinctly to the Law of Moses. Only two years later, 955, after the giving of the law, it was publicly read, and is called the Law of Moses. (Ezra 3: 2.) The Prophet Malachi, who flourished 1097 years after Moses, uttered this expressive text: " Remember the law of Moses, my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb, for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments." (Mal. 4: 4.)

It should be remarked that the same references are kept up to the Law of Moses, and to the several books of the prophets ill the New Testament Scriptures, which are not now

under examination. These facts show the progress of the record, and prove, beyond a doubt, that for a period of fifteen centuries, while it was being filled up, it was acknowledged by the Jews as containing their authentic history, and this settles the question of the genuineness of the books.

To this we have to add the fact, that it is known to have been translated into Greek as early as 250 years prior to the commencement of the Christian era. A copy of the Greek version, called the Septuagint, was deposited in the Library at Alexandria, as early as the above date. We believe no other history of ancient times can be produced, which, on examination, will be found to present such strong internal evidence of its genuineness. Can there be a record produced from "Egypt, Phoenicia, Greece, or Rome, which gives as clear an account of the origin and progress of these nations, and presenting the same amount of internal evidence of genuineness? We think not: we think no student of history will pretend it. Then we must admit the genuineness of the Scriptures, or call nothing genuine that is ancient.

3. History confirms the genuineness of the Old Testament.

Before commencing our quotations from history, it is proper to make three remarks, as follows:

(1.) The Jews, from the very nature of their civil and religious constitution, were very much isolated from the other nations of the earth, rendering them rather obscure. They never mingled with other nations, but in direct violation of their own sacred law, or by being conquered and held as captives by other nations. This would tend to prevent frequent allusions being made to them in the records of other nations.

(2.) The early histories of other nations are exceedingly meager, consisting of mere fragments that have come down to us despite the wasting hand of time, and the ravages of the dark and barbarous ages. This is mainly owing, no doubt, to the destruction of the great Alexandrian Library, which is said to have been burned by the Saracens, when they took the city, A. D. 642.

Here was consumed the history and wisdom of the world, collected from all previous ages. When we find extracts made prior to this date, from authors whose works are not extant, it is reasonable to suppose that the works, from which such extracts were made, were consumed at the burning of the great Alexandrian Library.

(3.) Notwithstanding all these disadvantages for obtaining corroborating testimony to the Scriptures, from profane history, we may still find what is sufficient to answer the purpose; more indeed than could have been reasonably expected. We will now present a few extracts which will go to prove the antiquity and genuineness of the Old Testament Scriptures.

We will first quote a remarkable passage from Josephus, who is regarded quite as reliable as any profane historian. If his direct testimony was to be admitted, it would settle the

whole question, for he professedly vindicates the antiquity and genuineness of the Old Testament; but we do not propose to rely upon him, in this point of light, but only depend upon him as having faithfully quoted other and more ancient authors, to whose works we have not access, or which are now not extant. After having given an account of the flood, and of Noah's Ark, as related in the Bible, Josephus says, "All the writers of the barbarian histories make mention of this flood, and of this Ark; among them is Berossus the Chaldean. For when he was describing the circumstances of the flood, he goes on thus: 'It is said, there is still some part of this ship in Armenia, at the mountain of the Cordyaeans, and that some people carry off the bitumen which they take away, and use chiefly as amulets for the averting of mischief.' Hieronymus, the Egyptian, also, who wrote the Phoenician antiquities, and Manases, and a great many more make mention of the same. Nay, Nicholas of Damascus, in his ninety-sixth book hath a particular relation about them; when he speaks thus: 'There is a great mountain in Armenia, over Minyas, called Baris, upon which it is reported that many who fled at the time of the deluge were saved; and that one who was carried in an ark, came on shore upon the top of it; and that the remains of the timber were a great while preserved.' This might be the man about whom Moses the legislator of the Jews wrote." Josephus Vol. I. 17,18.

From this quotation it is clear, that the records of oriental nations, other than the Jews, contained traces of the flood which is so clearly described in the Bible. If these opinions concerning the flood, were real traditions handed down from father to son, until they were entered upon Egyptian, Chaldean, and Phoenician records, then is the Bible account true; but if these traces of the story of the flood were only stories repeated from the Jewish account of the flood, then is the Bible proved to be older than the records of the most ancient nations, since the traces of its history are found upon their records. At any rate, it proves that the books of Moses were known to the writer, as it alludes to him. Take another quotation relating to the Bible history of Noah's family. The Bible says, Gen. 10: 6.

"The sons of Ham were Cush, Mizraim, and Phut, and Canaan." Josephus writes thus: "Of the four sons of Ham, time has not at all hurt the name of Cush; for the Ethiopians, over whom he reigned are, even at this day, both by themselves and by all men in Asia, called Cushites. The memory also of the Mesraites is preserved in their name; for all we who inhabit this country (of Judea) called Egypt Mestre, and the Egyptians Mestrians. Phut also was the founder of Libya, and called the inhabitants Phutites from himself; there is also a river in the country of the Moors which bears that name; whence we may see that the Grecian, historiographers mention that river, and the adjoining country by the appellation of Phut." Vol. I., 21.

Here are the names of the sons of Ham, as recorded in the Bible, and what gives force to the statements of Josephus, is, the fact that he states them as matters generally known when he wrote, and appeals to most of the Grecian historiographers, as having recorded the facts he stated. This he would not dare to have done had it not been so. Thus are these Grecian historiographers made to confirm the Mosaic record. Josephus says again, "There are then records among the Tyrians, kept with great exactness, and include accounts of the facts done among them, and such as concern their transactions, with other

nations also. Therein it was recorded that the temple was built by king Solomon at Jerusalem, one hundred and forty-three years and eight months before the Tyrians built Carthage; and in these annals the building of our temple is related; for Hiram, the king of Tyre, was the friend of Solomon. He was ambitious to contribute to the splendor of this edifice of Solomon, and made him a present of 112 talents of gold. He also cut down the most excellent timber out of that mountain which is called Libaous, and sent it to him. Solomon also not only made him many other presents, by way of requital, but gave him a country in Galilee, also that was called Chabulon." Vol. II. 481.

What Josephus here gives as from the records of Tyre, is recorded in the ninth chapter of the first Book of Kings, and the accounts essentially agree. Josephus having stated the contents of the records of Tyre, proceeds as follows: " Now that this may not depend on my bare word, I will produce for a witness Dios, one that is believed to have written the Phoenician history after an accurate manner. This Dios, therefore, writes in his histories of the Phoenicians. ' Upon the death of Abibalus, his son Hiram took the kingdom. This king raised banks at the eastern parts of the city, and enlarged it; he also joined the temple of Jupiter Olympus, which stood before in an Island by itself, to the city, by raising a causeway between them, and adorned that temple with donations of gold. He, moreover, went up to Libanus, and had timber cut down for the building of temples. They say further, that Solomon, when he was king of Jerusalem, sent problems to Hiram, to be solved, and desired that he would send others back for him to solve." These things are attested to by Dios, and confirm what we have said upon the same subjects before." Vol. II. 482

It will be observed that the Bible story of the connections between Solomon and Hiram, king of Tyre, is here confirmed by the written history of Tyre, as extant and well known at the time Josephus wrote. Josephus says again, " I will now relate what hath been written concerning us in the Chaldean histories, which records have a great agreement with our books in other things also. Berosus shall be witness to what I say; he was by birth a Chaldean, well known by the learned on account of his publication of the Chaldean books of astronomy and philosophy among the Greeks. This Berosus, therefore, following the most ancient records of their nation, gives us a history of the deluge of waters that then happened, and of the destruction of mankind thereby, and agrees with Moses' narration thereof. He also gives us an account of that Ark, wherein Noah, the origin of our race, was preserved, when it was brought to the highest port of the Armenian mountains: after which he gives us a catalogue of the posterity of Noah, and adds the years of their chronology, and at length comes down to Nabolassor, who was king of Babylon and of the Chaldeans. And when he was relating the acts of this king, he describes to us—' How he sent his son Nabuchodonosor against Egypt, and against our land, with a great army; and how, by that means, he subdued them all, and set our temple that was at Jerusalem on fire; nay, and removed our people entirely out of their own country, and transferred them to Babylon; when it so happened that our city was desolate during the interval of seventy years, until the days of Cyrus, king of Persia.'" Page 483.

Here Josephus actually quotes from the Chaldean historian, what is a perfect confirmation of the Bible record. We will here drop Josephus until we make one quotation

from another source. Does any one doubt that there was such a man as Alexander, called the Great, and that he subdued the world with his armies. Just as surely as there was such a man, there was at the same time a city called Jerusalem, a nation of Jews, holding to and practicing such a religion as is recorded in the Old Testament. Goldsmith in his history of Greece, Chap, xiv. Paragraphs 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, gives the following.

"From Tyre, Alexander marched to Jerusalem, fully resolved to punish that city, for having refused to supply his army with provisions during the last siege, but the resentment of the conqueror was averted by meeting a procession of the inhabitants of that city on his way, marching out to receive him, dressed in white, with a Jewish high priest before them, with a miter on his head, on the front of which the name of God was written.

"The moment the king perceived the high Priest, he advanced towards him with an air of the most profound respect, bowed his body, adored the august name upon his front, and saluted him that wore it with religious veneration. Then the Jews, surrounding Alexander, raised their voices to wish him every kind of prosperity. All the spectators were seized with inexpressible surprise; they could scarcely believe their eyes; and did not know how to account for a sight so contrary to their expectation, and so vastly improbable.

"Parmenio, who could not yet recover from his astonishment, asked the king how it came to pass that he who was adored by every one, adored the high priest of the Jews? ' I do not,' replied Alexander, ' adore the high priest, but the God whose minister he is; for whilst I was at Dia in Macedonia, my mind wholly fixed on the great design of the Persian war, as I was revolving the methods how to conquer Asia, this very man dressed in the same robes, appeared to me in a dream, exhorted me to banish my fear, bade me cross the Hellespont boldly, and assured me that God would march at the head of my army, and give me the victory over that of the Persians.'

"This speech, delivered with an air of sincerity, no doubt had its effect in encouraging the army, and establishing an opinion that Alexander's mission was from heaven. Alexander having embraced the high priest was conducted by him to the temple, where, after he had explained to him many prophecies in different parts of the Old Testament, concerning his invasion, he taught him to offer up a sacrifice in the Jewish manner.

"Alexander was so much pleased with his reception upon this occasion, that before he left Jerusalem, he assembled the Jews, and bade them ask any favor they should think proper. Their request was; To be allowed to live according to their ancient laws and maxims: to be exempted from tribute every seventh year, as they were by their laws exempted from labor, and consequently have no harvest; they requested, that such of their brethren as settled in Asia should be indulged in the same privileges. Thus, being gratified in all their desires, great numbers of them offered to enlist themselves in his army. Soon after the Samaritans demanded the same favors; but he gave them an evasive answer, and promised to take the matter into consideration, upon his return."

This proves that the Jewish system existed in the days of Alexander; their laws were even then called " ancient," which proves that they must have existed for a long time. The

book of Leviticus then existed, for it is in this book that the law is found which exempted them from labor every seventh year, referred to in the last paragraph quoted. The book of Daniel then existed, for it is in this book that the prophecy is contained concerning Alexander, as named in the fourth paragraph quoted. See Lev. 14: 3, 4, and Dan. 8: 5 6, 7, 21. It is said that many of the Jews enlisted in Alexander's army; now let us see what clear traces we can find of these Jews afterwards in confirmation of the record At Babylon, we are told that Alexander employed his army to rebuild the heathen temples, and that the Jews refused to assist, because, we must suppose, their law forbade idolatry. Josephus quotes Hecateus as saying—" Alexander was once at Babylon, and had an intention to rebuild; the temple of Belus that was fallen to decay, and in order thereto, he commanded all his soldiers to bring earth thither; but the Jews and they only would not comply with that command." Josephus, vol. II. 488.

This same story is repeated by Rollin in his Ancient History. vol. II. 575, 576. We need not quote his words as they are in exact accordance with the above, with the exception that he is a little more full than Josephus. One more quotation will close this view of the subject. Josephus affirms that, Hecateus, the author named above, states that "the Jews went as auxiliaries along with king Alexander, and after him with his successors," and then he quotes from him the following story. Josephus represents Hecateus as saying, "As I myself was going to the Red Sea, there followed us a man whose name was Mossollam; he was one of the Jewish horsemen who conducted us; he was a person of great courage, of a strong body, and by all allowed to be the most skilful archer that was either among the Greeks or Barbarians.

"Now this man, as people were in great numbers passing along the road, and a certain augur was observing an augury by a bird, and requiring them all to stand still, inquired what they stayed for? Hereupon, the augur showed him the bird from whence he took his augury, and told him that if the bird staid where he was, they ought all to stand still, but that if he got up and fled onward, they must go forward; but if he flew backward, they must retire again. Mossollam made no reply, but drew his bow, and shot at the bird and hit him, and killed him; and as the augur and some others were angry and wished imprecations upon him, he answered them thus: —'Why are you so mad as to take this most unhappy bird into your hands? for how can this bird give us any true information concerning our march, who could not foresee how to save himself? For, had he been able to foreknow what was future, he would not have come to this place, but would have been afraid lest Mossollam the Jew should shoot at him and kill him.' " vol. II. 489.

This not only confirms the fact we are laboring to prove, but it is an interesting exhibition of the glorious doctrine of the Jewish Scripture, in contrast with the superstition of heathenism, or of the developments of human reason left to its own guidance.

But few remarks are necessary in conclusion. The points intended to be proved are the antiquity of the Jewish Scriptures, and their genuineness, and these points, we think, have been fully sustained. There are other quotations to the same effect which might be made, but the above are sufficient. The fact that many of the works quoted by Josephus are not now to be found, does not destroy the argument, for they must have been extant at the

time he wrote, and he must have quoted them correctly, otherwise he would have been exposed. He appealed to them as to books well known, which no man would have done had there been no such books, There are some slight variations, in the orthography of some names as used by Josephus, and found in the Bible, but these do not destroy the identity of the narratives. Any one will recognize the Hiram of Josephus, as the Hiram of the Bible. Nabucodonosor of Berosus, as quoted by Josephus, will be recognized as the Nebuchadnezzar of the Bible, and so with the other variations. Thus is the genuineness of the Jewish history proved by the profane history of other nations.

SECTION IV.

The Genuineness of the New Testament.

The genuineness of the Old Testament having been shown, it will not require an extended effort to settle the same question in relation to the New. Was there such a person as Jesus Christ? Were there such persons as Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, who wrote the four Biographies of Christ, which bear their names, commonly called the four gospels? Were there such persons as Paul, Peter, James, John and Jude, who wrote the epistles which bear their names? Did Luke write the history of the infant church, called the Acts of the Apostles? Or was it written at the time it purports to have been, and does it contain a real history of actions and events that transpired as described? If these questions be answered in the negative, then are the Scriptures of the New Testament fictitious; if they be, answered in the affirmative, then are they genuine. Now let us glance at the argument in the case.

1. Their existence itself cannot be rationally accounted for, if their genuineness be denied. We call this the nineteenth century of the Christian era; we call this year the Year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty, and this is the mode of computing time adopted by the most enlightened and refined nations on earth. If there was no such person as our Lord Jesus Christ, then has a fictitious name, the name of an imaginary being who never existed, save in the disordered or dishonest brain of some few unknown persons, who wrote fiction, nobody knows when nor where, impressed itself upon the very face of time, and upon the records and chronology of the most learned nations of the earth, so that Kings and Presidents, Senators and Legislators, and Judges, and wise men, and Philosophers, date their acts as performed in such a year of this fictitious nobody. Can any one believe this? If it be so, these few men who wrote the New Testament Scriptures, without disclosing to the world who they were, nor yet when nor where they wrote, were the most successful novel writers that ever wasted their brains on fiction. This is the real case presented on a denial that there was such a person as Jesus Christ, and such persons as the writers of the Four Gospels are represented to have been. There is no proof that Jesus Christ did not live and die as described, and that Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, did not write the Gospels attributed to them; there can be no such proof, and until such proof is produced their very existence is an unanswerable argument in support of their genuineness. If there is any proof that the books of the New Testament were written by other persons, and at other times than is claimed in their behalf, let such proof be produced. If it could be produced it would have been done before this; the malignant

hatred of the truth on the part of infidelity would not have let it slumber in silence, and unknown, until the middle of the nineteenth century.

2. It must appear absolutely impossible for the Scriptures of the New Testament to have been forged and imposed upon the world at any period, and yet no trace left of the real men who did it, and the time when, and the place where it was done. At what period were the books of the New Testament written, if not at the time supposed? When could they have been introduced and the attempt to deceive not have been ex-posed? The antiquity of the Jews and their Scriptures has been established; and they still survive with their Bible in their Lands, the most determined opposers of the New Testament, as they ever have been. They are scattered through every country where Christianity has spread, and have been ever since Jerusalem was destroyed by Titus the Roman General, his father, Vespasian, having first commenced the siege, retiring to Rome to assume the Government on the death of the preceding emperor. Why did not the Jews expose the forgery at the very time and place when these books were first produced, if they are not genuine, and if they are not really in fact connected with Jewish history as appears upon their face? Why have not we some record of the cheat handed down from heathen opposers, who have in all ages, and in all countries, opposed and persecuted Christianity wherever it has poured its light upon their darkness, and exposed their superstition and corruption? Why did not some Rationalist, some Free Thinker, some disciple of reason; expose the forgery when the books first appeared? Were there no Rationalists, no Free Thinkers, and did reason never gain any disciples until since the light of revelation gleamed out this side of what is called the Reformation?

3. We rely not only upon the impossibility that the books of the New Testament should have been written at any other time than that in which they claim to have been, without meeting with an exposure, but it can be proved directly that they were written at about that time.

Jesus Christ is said to have been born during the reign of Caesar Augustus. Luke 2: 1. Here is a historical fact which proves, beyond a doubt, that the book could not have been written before that fact existed. A writer perpetrating a forgery long afterwards, might have falsely laid this scene under the reign of Caesar Augustus, but it is not possible that real history should be anticipated by a fictitious writer. It is clear then, that the Gospels could not have been written before the reign of Caesar Augustus. So with the Acts of the Apostles; this book must have been written during the reign of some one of the Caesars, for Paul is declared to have appealed to Caesar at Rome. Now the time of Caesar may be learned from Roman profane history.

Again, Jesus Christ is said to have been crucified under Pontius Pilate. It is also declared to have been in the time of Herod, Governor of Galilee, who was at Jerusalem at the time. See Luke 23: 6, S. Herod and Pilate are real characters, and their day may be determined by profane history. This proves that these books must have been written during or after the time of these men, for they could not have been written before, as their official career could not have been anticipated.

So in the Acts of the Apostles, persons and places are referred to in a manner to determine the country and nearly the time of the transactions described. In chap. 12: 1. Herod is named as a persecutor. This is not the Herod before mentioned, but was his nephew. In verse 21, he is described as dying a miserable death. This same fact, in its essential points, is described by Josephus. But the point proved is that the book must have been written after the death of Herod, as it could not have been anticipated. Taking the Christian era, it being most common and best understood, and being guided by the best chronological tables, dates stand thus: Augustus Caesar, in whose time Christ is said to have been born, died A. D. 14, that is fourteen years after Christ is supposed to have been born. Pontius Pilate was deposed, banished and hung himself, A. D. 37. Seven or eight years after he condemned Christ to be crucified. Herod's terrible death took place A. D. 49. Vespasian was proclaimed emperor of Rome, A. D. 69, back of which the reign of all the Caesars must have transpired; and, also, prior to this date the historical parts of the New Testament must close, as the last thing recorded is Paul's journey to Rome, to prosecute his appeal to Caesar, and his preaching there two years " in his own hired house." The period occupied by the transactions recorded in the New Testament, is now settled by dates gathered from profane history, and covers a space less than seventy years, commencing fourteen years prior to the death of Augustus Caesar. This is a shorter period than has elapsed since the declaration of American Independence. Could such a stupendous deception have been perpetrated in such an enlightened age and country, within the limits of such a period? It is impossible. These books must have been written within this period, for they profess, upon their face, to have been written by eyewitnesses and participants in the transactions recorded. The conclusion must be irresistible, that the books of the New Testament are genuine, that there were such men as their reputed authors, and that they wrote the books attributed to them within the period so clearly stamped upon their face.

There is but one possible objection which Infidelity can urge against this view, which shall now be met. It is this: it may be said that the books were either written at the time the historical events with which they stand connected indicate, and concealed for ages, or were written ages afterwards, and exhibited as the record of a former period, that had been concealed. It may be urged that making their appearance ages after their apparent date, community had no means of contradicting them. This cannot be; all the facts known in the case prove its impossibility.

1. No one could have any motive to write them and cause them to be concealed that they might be found and imposed upon the world, hundreds of years afterwards, by some one in whom the writer could not have even anticipated any possible interest.
2. The thing could not have been done without detection, the scheme requiring action and concealment at too many distant points. One epistle is directed to Rome, another to Corinth, another to Galatia, another to Ephesus, and another to Philippi, and another to Colosse, and another to individuals in various cities and countries, where they all must have been found, and from whence they must have been gathered to give the least plausibility to the deception. The deception could not have occurred at the time without clear proof that they were found at these different points, and, if they were found thus, it

could not have been the result of a plan laid some centuries previous for deceiving the world.

3. The first and only account we have of these books is, they were in the hands of those who claimed to have received them from their authors and to have possessed them ever since. Infidelity cannot produce the slightest evidence that these books had any other origin, or that they were found under any other circumstances.

4. We have accounts of the entire New Testament Canon too early to admit of the possibility of their having been published for the first time, too late after date to admit of exposure if they were not genuine. They are quoted by writers of the second, third and fourth centuries. Origin gives the entire catalogue, A. D. 210, and Eusebius in 315.

5. What must settle this question, is the early spread of Christianity, as confirmed by profane history. It must be presumed that the record of Christianity was contemporaneous with its first general spread; the life, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ being the rallying point, these must have been published as early and as wide as Christianity spread. That Christian Churches were planted throughout Asia and other parts of the Eastern world, traces of which remain to this day, cannot be denied: By whom, and when was it done, if the New Testament does not contain the record? It has been shown that the New Testament record closes short of A. D. 70, but it is a historical fact, that Rome was set on fire, and that Nero laid it to the Christians as early as A. D. 64. The temple was standing at Jerusalem, during the period covered by the record of the New Testament, but that was destroyed by Titus, A. D. 70. The Emperor Trajan forbade Christian Assemblies, A. D. 98, so numerous and important had they become. There were ten general persecutions waged against the Christians, during the first three hundred years, amid which, Christianity spread, and in 306, it had revolutionized the Eastern world, ascended the throne, and ruled the Roman Empire, in the person of Constantine the Great. As the New Testament record could not have been closed before about A. D. 60, it follows, that within two hundred and fifty years after the date of the books, Christianity overrun the Roman Empire. This proves that the New Testament could not have been first brought to light, at a period so long after its date, as to render it impossible for its enemies among Jews and Gentiles, to expose the cheat. The conclusion is, that it is genuine.

A few historical references, tending to sustain the genuineness of the New Testament will close this branch of the argument. We will commence with Josephus, who was a Jew, and was born A. D. 37, and died A. D. 93, and was present and took an active part in the war between the Jews and Romans, which resulted in the destruction of Jerusalem, A. D. 70. He must have had personal knowledge of the movements of the Apostles, and of the early character and success of Christianity. In his antiquities, Book xviii. Chapter 3, he says : " Now, there was about this time, Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man; for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as received the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him, both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was (the) Christ. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men among us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him; for he

appeared to them alive again the third day; as the divine prophets had fore-told, these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him. And the tribe of Christians, so named from him are not extinct at this day." This surely is sufficient, so far as the testimony of one most creditable witness can go.

Tacitus was a Latin author, and a great enemy of Christianity. He was born about A. D. 56. In his annals, book xv. Chap. 44, he says, in speaking of Christians, " The author of that name or party was Christ, who was punished with death by the procurator, Pontius Pilate."

Suetonius was another Latin author, who wrote about the commencement of the second century. In speaking of the acts of the emperor he says. " He expelled the Jews (or Christians whose origin was Judea,) from Rome, for their continual tumults, instigated by Christ."

Pliny flourished during the reign of Trajan, was governor of Bithenia, and is said to have checked the persecution against the Christians. He died, A. D. 113. He says book x. page 97 of the Christians, " They sing together, by turns, a hymn to Christ as to their God."

We will close our argument in support of the genuineness of the New Testament by a brief appeal to the institutions of Christianity.

1. Christian Baptism is a standing monument of the antiquity and genuineness of the gospel. Wherever Christianity is found this ordinance is practiced, no account of the origin of which can be given, if it was not instituted by Christ. If it was not instituted" by Christ, who first baptized "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy-Ghost;" and in what age was it first practiced? This no one can answer

2. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is another monument of the life and death of Christ. This could never have been instituted without leaving a record of its commencement; but there is no record of its commencement, save that in the gospel which records it as the last act of Christ before he was crucified; this therefore must have been its real origin.

3. The Christian Sabbath is another proof. This is peculiar to Christians, and particularly distinguishes them from the Jews, who keep the seventh day. That it was really instituted in memory of the resurrection of Christ is the only rational account that can be given of it.

We trust it has now been sufficiently proved that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are genuine, that they were written at the times, and by the persons as is represented upon their face. It is not claimed that their inspiration has yet been fully proved, though what has been proved has an important bearing on that question. Having established the genuineness of the Scriptures, a foundation has been laid, upon which to stand while the question of their inspiration is argued. The fact that they were written by eyewitnesses of the events and transactions they describe; and published during the lifetime of many that helped to swell the astonished throngs that attended the personal

ministry of Moses and of Christ, and saw the wonders they performed, cannot fail to render efficient help in the argument in support of their inspiration.

SECTION V.

The Scriptures claim, upon their face, to be a Revelation from God.

The writers of the sacred books claimed to be inspired, each for himself, and for those who had preceded. This is an important point, for when it shall be made plain that the Scriptures claim, upon their face, to be a revelation from God, communicated through the writers by the Spirit of God, moving them to say and write the things they did, it will follow that they are thus inspired, or that they are the most corrupt volume to be found, and are entitled to no credit whatever. If a book be false in its main designs, and in the leading and most important matters of which it treats, it is not to be relied upon in minor matters, or appealed to as authority to settle the facts and circumstances, which from the mere incidents that are appended to the great and leading falsehood of the volume. If then the Scriptures are not inspired, they are false in their leading design and in their fundamental principles, and are not worthy of confidence as mere history; for a historian who should be believed to have made up the fundamental parts of his work of willful falsehoods, would not be trusted for the truth of the unimportant circumstances which he might narrate as merely incidental to great falsehoods he should utter as the leading matters of his history. Those, therefore, who reject the inspiration of the Scriptures, and yet cling to them as a very good history, are utterly inconsistent. If the Scriptures are not inspired, they contain more numerous and greater falsehoods than any other volume, and must have been written by persons more corrupt, dishonest, false, and more artful and malicious deceivers, than any other work that was ever written or read. We must then take them for what they profess to be, a revelation of the will of God, or reject them altogether.

That the Scriptures do really claim to be a revelation from God will not be denied by any one who has candidly read them. A brief view of the evidence on this point, however, may be in place.

Gen. 9: 8. "And God spake unto Noah, and to his sons with him, saying, and I, behold I, establish my covenant with you and with your seed after you."

Gen. 12: 1. "Now, the Lord had said unto Abram, get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee, and I will make of thee a great nation."

Gen. 15: 1. "After these things the word of the Lord came unto Abram in a vision." Gen. 25: 2. " And it came to pass, after the death of Abraham, that God blessed his son Isaac." Chap. 26: 2. "And the Lord appeared unto him, and said, go not down into Egypt: dwell in the land which I shall tell thee of."

Gen. 31: 11. " And the Lord said unto Jacob, return unto the land of thy father, and to thy kindred, and I will be with thee." Chap. 32: 1. " And Jacob went on his way, and the angel of God met him."

Gen. 39: 2. " The Lord was with Joseph."

Exo. 3: 14. " And God said unto Moses, I am that I am; and he said, thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel. I Am hath sent me unto you." Chap. 20: 1. "And God spake all these words."

Isa. 1: 1, 2. " The vision of Isaiah the son of Amos, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, king of Judah. " Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth; for the Lord hath spoken."

Jer. 1: 1,2. " The words of Jeremiah the son of Hilkiah, to whom the word of the Lord came."

Eze. 1: 3. "The word of the Lord came expressly unto Ezekiel the priest."

Hosea 1: 1. " The word of the Lord that came unto Hosea."

It is not necessary to name each of the prophets, we will only add the testimony of the last of the prophets.

Malachi 3: 6. "I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." Chap. 4: 4. " Remember ye the law of Moses my servant which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments."

To the above should be added the fact that the writers of the New Testament claim that the writers of the Old Testament were inspired. The Old Testament is often quoted in the New as divine authority. To adduce all these texts is unnecessary; a few decisive passages will be sufficient.

Matt. 15: 4. " God commanded, saying, honor thy father and mother." This refers to Exo. 20: 12, and 21: 17, and clearly asserts that God was the author of that law.

Mark 12: 36. " For David himself said by the Holy Ghost. The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand." This is taken from the 116th Psalm, and the assertion is clear that David was inspired by the Holy Ghost.

2 Tim. 3: 15, 16. "From a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith that is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God."

Some have attempted to evade the force of this text on the ground that the verb *is* has been supplied by the translators, it not being in the original, but this avails them nothing.

In this form it would read, " All Scripture given by inspiration of God and profitable for doctrine." &c. This would leave the sentence unfinished, and something else would have to be added to obtain complete sense, while it would not destroy the endorsement of the Old Testament as divinely inspired, which it clearly contains. The object of the criticism is to render the text indefinite, by making it assert that all Scripture that is given by inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, without defining what writings are thus inspired and what are not, But this point is settled by the preceding verse, "From a child, thou hast known the holy Scriptures." The definite article *the* in the expression, the holy Scriptures, necessarily points to some particular writings, known and understood as the holy writings, in contradistinction from all other writings. These were the Scriptures of the Old Testament, The Jewish canon had been completed centuries before this, in them it is clear that Timothy had been educated from a child, and it is clearly these Scriptures which Paul endorses as given by inspiration of God; and as he refers to them as a whole, without distinction of parts, the endorsement is of the whole.

2 Peter 1: 21. " For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

These Scriptures are sufficient to prove that the writers of the New Testament claim for the writers of the Old, that they were divinely inspired.

There is one other question, which is; do the writers of the New Testament claim inspiration for themselves? Whether they claim it or not, they clearly had the promise of it.

John 14: 26. " But the comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have spoken unto you."

This covers the whole ground of inspiration so far as the promise of it is concerned. But did the writers in any way assert that they possessed the Spirit of inspiration?

In 1 Cor. 7: 6-10, Paul gives some directions on his own responsibility, and is careful to tell them that he does it " by permission and not of commandment;" after which, in relation to other matters, he says, " I command, yet not I but the Lord." This is a clear assumption of the gift of inspiration, and the exception of a single remark, proves that the apostle claimed that the rest of his epistle was inspired.

1 Cor. 14: 37. " If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." This is a direct and absolute claim to inspiration.

Gal. 1: 12. " For I neither received it of man neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." This the apostle affirms of the Gospel which he preached.

Chap. 2: 2. " And I went up by revelation and communicated unto them that Gospel which I preached among the Gentiles."

Eph. 3: 2, 3. "If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you ward; how that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; as I wrote before in few words."

1 Thes. 4: 2. " For ye know what commandments we gave you by the Lord Jesus."

2 Thes. 3: 6. " Now we command you brethren in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ."

2 Peter 3: 15,16. " And account that the long-suffering of the Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the grace given unto him, hath written unto you; as also, in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are somethings hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction."

Here Peter classes the writings of Paul with " the other Scriptures," and they it is known, all the Jews held to be inspired. Other texts might be quoted to prove that the New Testament writers claimed to be divinely inspired, but the above are sufficient.

We do not claim to have proved by the above that the Scriptures are inspired, but only that they set up this claim for themselves, so that it must be admitted that they are a revelation from God, or maintained that they are more false, corrupt, and deceptive than any other book that was ever written, and are utterly unworthy of any confidence, even as mere history. They must be received or rejected as a whole. To pretend to pick out detached parts as truths, and to reject the balance as false, is absurd. This fact of their claim which they set up for themselves, to be a revelation from God, compelling us to admit their claim, or to denounce them as false, in their most essential principles and designs, has an important bearing on the investigation of their credibility, and on the examination of the evidence which must settle the question of their divinity.

SECTION VI.

The Credibility of the Writers of the Sacred Volume.

Two points have been proved in preceding arguments, which have an important bearing on the subject, and which lay the foundation for the present argument. It has been proved, first, that the Scriptures are genuine, that is, that they were written in the age and country in which they claim to have been, and by the persons whose names they bear; and secondly, it has been proved that these writers claimed to be inspired by God to communicate his will.

The Scriptures must have been written by bad men or good men; bad men would never have written and maintained such doctrines and precepts under such circumstances, and good men would not have done it, only upon the supposition that they were really inspired, as they claimed to be. This argument, when properly elaborated, possesses more force than all the cavils that Infidelity has ever been able to invent.

I. Bad men would not have put forth and maintained such doctrines and precepts as constitute the substance of the Scriptures.

1. The Scriptures contain the most sublime doctrines, and the most pure morality that are to be found treasured up in any volume that has yet been given to the world. Abating those volumes which have been written by authors who have believed and admired the Scriptures, and professedly drawn their truth and light there from, the Scriptures contain more admitted truths, and more clearly defined rules of pure morality, than can be found in all other books, and in all other systems that were ever devised. Let the Deist who despises the Scriptures, undertake to prepare a doctrinal view of the existence of God and his attributes, and he will satisfy enlightened reason, only so far as he conforms his theory to the teachings of the Scriptures on the same subject. To satisfy enlightened reason, he must present a God who is eternal, immutable, almighty, omnipresent, all wise, just and good, and this is the God of the Bible. A Deist cannot devise a system of morality that will claim the respect of enlightened reason, and benefit mankind, only so far as he incorporates therein the moral precepts of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. We challenge Infidels to name one theological truth which they can clearly demonstrate from any and all the sources of truth, light and evidence afforded them by the visible and invisible universe, which is not clearly taught in the Scriptures. We challenge Infidels to name one duty, which clearly rises out of the relation which men sustain to each other as social beings, and which is not clearly taught in the Scriptures. We challenge Infidels to point to one volume, which does not professedly draw its matter from the Scriptures containing as much of what they will admit to be religious truth, as is contained in the Scriptures. If, then, the Scriptures contain more religious truth, and a clearer and purer system of morality than can be found elsewhere, it must be absurd to suppose that they were written by wicked and deceiving men. Bad men, writing a book to deceive the world, would not put more of sublime truth, and pure morality in it, than all good and honest men that ever wrote, succeeded in getting into all other volumes. This is the conclusion to which we are driven, if we deny the inspiration of the Scriptures; the greatest liars that ever lived, in the greatest lie they ever told, uttered more truth and pure morality than all the truth-loving and truth-telling authors that ever wrote, have succeeded in getting into all their volumes.

2. The writers of the Scriptures lived in accordance with the truths and morality they proclaimed. When they taught men to worship God, they worshipped God; when they taught moral and social duties, they practiced those duties; when they taught self-denial, they practiced self-denial themselves; and when they taught the duty of submitting to persecution, bonds, imprisonment and death, for the sake of the truth, they were foremost to endure these things, and took joyfully the spoiling of their goods, and resigned their lives a willing sacrifice to sustain the truth they taught. There is an indispensable necessity that the projectors of new theories should practice the doctrines and duties they teach; this is an essential element of success, without it no system can succeed in its commencement, unsupported by wealth and the civil power. Had not the Apostles and first Christians practiced what they taught, they could not have succeeded. This is an unanswerable objection to the supposition that bad men would ever originate and

propagate such a system of self-denial and rigid morality, as the Gospel of Christ. If they were not inspired they must have been most deeply corrupt, and it is absurd to suppose that such vile seducers could, life-long, practice the most severe self-denial and austere virtue, merely to give countenance to a falsehood, from the propagation of which they derived no earthly advantage. That they did practice what they taught is clear upon the face of the record, for there is here and there a single instance of dereliction distinctly noted as exceptions, and as the only exceptions to the general rule. Their accusers and bitter persecutors never charged them with inconsistency, and a want of conformity in life to the system they taught, but rather the tenacity with which they practiced all the duties inculcated in the Gospel, refusing to accommodate themselves to conflicting systems, and the popular sentiment that prevailed around them was made a pretence to accuse them. Here, then, if we deny the inspiration of the Scriptures, are we driven upon the conclusion, that the most wicked of liars and adroit sinners, once practiced the most rigid virtue and pure morality, without any object, beyond the mere gratification of deceiving-others, not only without gain to themselves, but at great sacrifices of property, reputation and personal ease. Such are the absurdities into which Infidelity rushes in its attempt to fly from the claims of the Scriptures.

3. The circumstances of the labors, zeal, personal sacrifices and sufferings of the apostles and their coadjutors establish their sincerity and prove abundantly that they were not bad men. Stronger proof of their sincerity could not be furnished than is seen in the openness of their testimony, never seeking to conceal, never affecting disguise or shunning investigation. They delivered their testimony before priests and magistrates, kings and princes. They preached Jesus and the resurrection first at Jerusalem and in Judea, where their master lived and died; and then they sought not next the secure retreat of ignorance to unfurl the banner of the cross, but rushed upon the walls and into the market places of the most populous and enlightened cities of the world, and of design encountered the most inquisitive and keen eyed philosophers of their age, everywhere challenging an open examination of the claims of Christianity. This is reconcilable only with their thorough conviction of the truth of what they uttered the entire absence of selfish considerations leaves no spring of action for false and corrupt minds. Bad men never would act as they did without other personal considerations than any that can be found in their case. They, at all times, and in all places, showed to the world hearts infinitely above what is vulgarly called great and happy; they ever exhibited a disposition infinitely remote from worldly ambition, free from the lust of gold, and a passion for popular applause. They worked with their own hands for a scanty subsistence "that they might not embarrass the truth they sought to propagate, showing in the faithful mirror of their own behavior, honesty, industry, deep piety towards God, unconquerable love for mankind, the most sacred regard for truth, humility, sincerity, and every divine, moral and social virtue that can adorn and exalt humanity.

The toils they performed, the sufferings they endured, and the deaths they died, proclaim that they were not bad men. They filled up their entire lives with toilsome efforts to propagate the gospel; they endured all sorts of persecutions, submitted to bonds and imprisonment, and even death itself in its most dreadful forms, with a courage, fortitude, serenity, and even exultation and triumph which nothing could have produced but an

honest heart, a firm belief in the truth of the Gospel, and a sure hope through it, of a glorious resurrection and a better life beyond the grave. It is clear then that the Scriptures were not written by bad men.

II. As the Scriptures were not written by bad men, they must have been written by good men. The argument by which it was proved that they were not written by bad men, proved at the same time that the writers were good men; brighter and purer lives never shone amid the darkness of the world. But without argument, it must follow of necessity, that if they were not written by bad men as has been proved, they were written by good men; and if they were written by good men, they must have been inspired men, for they asserted that they were inspired, and good men would not lie and deceive. This renders the argument conclusive. It cannot be denied that if the Scriptures were not given by inspiration of God, they contain the greatest falsehood of which we can conceive, and have proved the source of a more general deception of mankind than any other book that was ever written, and that this great lie could have been contrived and told, and all this deception perpetrated by good men cannot be believed; the conclusion is therefore irresistible that they are inspired as they were written by good men.

There is but one plausible objection to this argument. It may be said that they were good men but deceived; that they were honest dupes, rather than cunning knaves. This objection, though it possesses but little force, is worthy of a reply which it shall receive.

1. It involves the absurdity of a deceived party without a deceiver, of a duped party, without the practice of duplicity. If they were deceived, who deceived them? There was no deceiver, there was no party concerned but the believers in the pretended revelation, and its enemies and opposers, and the enemies of the revelation could not and would not deceive the people into a belief and support of the very things they were exerting themselves to overthrow. It is clear that if the writers of the Scriptures were honestly deceived into a belief of what they wrote, there was no party to the deception but themselves, and the nature of the case does not admit of self-deception. They could not have been deceived into a belief of all they declared and wrote, without the action of another party, while the very supposition that the Scriptures are the result of an honest deception on the part of the writers, precluded the existence of such other party. Who deceived Abraham? Who deceived Moses? Who deceived Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the rest of the prophets? Who deceived John the Baptist, the apostles, and Paul in particular? There was absolutely no party to do it; the enemies of Christianity would not have deceived men into its belief and support if they could, and the friends of Christianity are admitted by this objection to have been honest, and of course did not practice deception.

2. The facts are such as to preclude the possibility of their having been deceived. When it is urged that they were deceived, it is admitted that they were honest, and related nothing only what they believed to be true. Look then at the state of facts presented. Could Noah have been deceived in relation to the building of the ark, the destruction of the world by water, and the preservation of himself and family? Could Abraham have been deceived in relation to the principal events recorded in his life? Could Moses have been deceived

when God spake to him from the burning bush, and when he wrought wonders in the presence of Pharaoh that confounded all Egypt? Was Moses, with all the hosts of Israel deceived at the Red Sea, when its waters opened to let them pass, and then returned and swallowed up their pursuing enemies? Was Moses and all Israel deceived in supposing that they were led by a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night? Were they all deceived when they stood before mount Sinai, and saw it spoke, and saw the red winged lightnings play in sportive terror amid the gloom that mantled its frowning brow, and heard the voice of thunder that seemed to shake the world, and when more terrific still fell on their startled ears, the fearful notes of Jehovah's trump, speaking from amid the thick darkness? Come down to the New Testament, and could the shepherds have been deceived in whose ears angels sung the advent song? Could the wise men have been deceived when led by a star to the place where the infant lay? Could all the mothers have been deceived who wept for their infants slain by Herod, in his attempt to destroy the prince of Israel? Could John the Baptist have been deceived when he saw the Spirit descend, and heard the voice from heaven? Could the apostles have been deceived when they distributed the loaves and fishes to the five thousand; and could all the multitude have been deceived who ate and were filled? Could Martha and Mary have been deceived in relation to the death and resurrection of their brother? Could Peter, James and John, have been deceived when they saw their master transfigured on the mount, and saw and heard Moses and Elias talking with him. Could the persecuting Jews, the executioners, the court, and all the disciples have been deceived together in relation to the fact of Christ's death? and could all the apostles, who saw him and conversed with him at different times, and five hundred living witnesses who saw him at once, have been deceived as to the fact of his resurrection. Could they have been deceived when they saw him, in the act of lifting up his hands and blessing, ascend up to heaven? Could Paul have been deceived in the facts connected with his conversion? In a word, could all the apostles have been deceived, and all the people, in relation to the gift of the Holy Spirit, and all the miracles wrought by them in the name of Jesus Christ? The thing is impossible.

We come now to the conclusion of this; argument, which may be briefly stated as follows: —

1. It has been shown that the Scriptures were not and could not have been written by bad men, and consequently that they must have been written by good men.
2. It has been shown that the Scriptures having been written by good men, they must be inspired, for the writers affirm that they were inspired, and good men would not lie and deceive. To make this point clear, it has been proved that they could not have been deceived themselves, and hence, being good honest men, and not being deceived, what they affirm must be true, and the conclusion is irresistible that the writers of the Scriptures were divinely inspired, and that the Scriptures are a revelation of the will of God.

SECTION VII.

The Evidence of Miracles.

A miracle, in a Scriptural sense, is an effect produced by the power of God, either with or without secondary agents, independently of what are called the laws of nature, for the purpose of attesting the authority of some person or the truth of some doctrine.

The possibility of miracles wrought by the power of God, can not be denied by any except Atheists. A Deist, who denies the inspiration of the Scriptures, but admits the existence of an intelligent and supreme Creator, cannot deny the possibility of miracles, for a God who has produced the visible universe must be capable of working miracles at pleasure; and He who is the author of what are called the laws of nature, must be capable of suspending them, and of operating independently of them, or contrary to them.

The proof which miracles furnish in support of the inspiration of the Scriptures, arises from the fact of the settled laws of nature which produce uniformity of operation. As the known laws of nature have been established by the Creator, they can never be departed from, controlled, or violated, except by the Creator himself, acting directly, or acting through some secondary agent which he may empower—as a man or an angel. A few illustrations may serve to make this principle plain: It is contrary to the known laws of nature that a bush should burn without being consumed. Every one knows that it is in accordance with the fixed laws of nature, or the principles of natural philosophy, that in proportion to the amount of combustion or flame produced, must be the waste or consumption of that from which it is produced; hence when Moses saw the bush burn without being consumed, there was a clear miracle—the laws of nature were suspended, and the presence of God, who is the author of those laws, and who alone could suspend them, was certain. So it is contrary to the known laws of nature that a dried rod, in which even vegetable life has become extinct, should be infused with animal life, and become a living serpent. When, therefore, the rod from the hand of Moses was transformed into a living serpent, from which he fled with terror, there was a miracle. So when Christ stilled the tempest, there was a clear counteracting of the known laws of nature. Suppose the wind might have ceased suddenly, in harmony with nature's laws; it was contrary to the known laws of nature that the billows should have at once ceased to roll. The known law of force and resistance teaches us that when any body is set in motion, it must move until the momentum it has received is spent; hence when Jesus said to the waves, " be still," and they obeyed and at once sunk to rest, presenting a smooth and tranquil surface, there was a suspension of the laws of nature, and nature's God was clearly there—it was a miracle. The above cases are given as illustrations of the principle upon which miracles prove the inspiration of the Scriptures. When miracles transpire, God is proved to be the operative power; and when they transpire in connection with and confirmatory of a law, doctrine, or system which claims to be a revelation from God, the argument is conclusive.

There is but one more preliminary remark necessary before entering upon the examination of the argument itself founded upon miracles. It is that the miracles recorded in the Scriptures were professedly wrought for the express purpose of establishing their divine authority. Some of them occurred, apparently, in isolated circumstances, yet they confirmed the divinity of the religion in connection with which they were wrought, and

they have been recorded, and the account of them has been preserved for the confirmation of the whole Bible in which they are found. They appear scattered along the course of time for a period of more than four thousand years, and are found in connection with every age and every dispensation, from the very opening of the volume of divine truth until it was finished. Each communication which God made to men under the patriarchal dispensation, was itself a distinct miracle, and must have confirmed the truth of the communication made, whatever may have been the manner. We will at this point glance at a few instances in proof that the miracles were wrought for the express purpose of attesting the authority of some person, or the truth of some doctrine. The first instance of a miracle recorded after man was expelled from Eden, is in connection with the offerings of Cain and Abel, (Gen. 4: 3, 5) " The Lord had respect unto Abel and his offering, but to Cain and his offering he had not respect." The apostle (Heb. 11: 4), comments upon this transaction, by saying that " by faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous God testifying of his gifts."

The respect which God had to Abel and to his offering was marked, distinct, and well understood by Abel, and by Cain also unto whom with his offering God had no respect. This must have been a miracle whatever the manner may have been in which God made known his respect; and it answered the end of a miracle, by sealing the character and offering of Abel with the divine approbation, and condemning the character and offering of Cain, whose offering appears not to have been presented in what the Scriptures call, faith. Thus in the first family of men was a distinction made between truth and error in religion—between true religion, such as God approves, and false religion, such as God does not approve. God, by a miracle, sealed the one with his approbation and the other with his disapprobation.

From the first recorded miracle noticed above, they are interspersed through the entire history of the patriarchs, keeping alive that true religion which God sanctioned in Abel, and presenting a pathway of light across those otherwise long, dark ages. Enoch walked with God, and obtained from God this testimony that he was righteous, and was finally translated that he should not see death, and was not found, for God took him. Here was a miracle, confirming the character and religion of Enoch, first to himself, and secondly to all who knew him.

The history of Noah is but a history of a series of miracles, stamping his character and the doctrine he preached with the seal of heaven. The call of Abraham, with his entire history, with that of Isaac and Jacob, presents a series of miracles which must have been sufficient to convince themselves and all with whom they associated, that they were under the special protection and guidance of divine Providence, and that the religion in which they exercised themselves, was of God's own appointment.

If we come down to the New Testament, and examine into the introduction of the Gospel and its early propagation, we shall find that it was attended by such miracles as could not have failed to convince the candid who were brought in contact with it, that it was divine in its origin, and bore the sanction of Him who rules the world. And that these miracles

were wrought for the express purpose of confirming the truth, and stamping the Gospel with the seal of heaven, no candid mind can doubt, who carefully examine the subject.

Joseph and Mary must have known, to their entire satisfaction, that Christ was of divine origin. The parents of John the Baptist and their friends must have known that he was an extraordinary character, and destined to act an important part in connection with religion. The series of miracles which attended his introduction into the world must have convinced them of this. John himself must have understood the subject of his own message, for God gave him a sign, which was, that upon whom he should see the Spirit descend, the same was he that should baptize with the Holy Ghost, John did bear testimony that Christ was the Son of God. Then when Christ opened his own mission, it was with power and glory; the blind received their sight, the lame walked, the lepers were cleansed, the deaf were made to hear, and the dead were restored to life. Christ appealed to these proofs of the divinity of his mission, as especially designed to stamp it with the seal of heaven, After appealing to the testimony of John he added, " But I have greater witness than that of John; the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, they bear witness of me."

The apostles who accompanied Christ during his ministry, saw his miracles, attended his execution, witnessed his resurrection, subsequently conversed with him, saw him ascend up into heaven, returned to Jerusalem and received the gift of the Holy Ghost, and were after wards enabled to perform similar miracles by the use of his name.

"In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk." The apostles, we say, under all this weight of proof, must have known the things whereof they affirmed when they preached the Gospel. And when we consider the concatenation of evidence arising out of the miracles that are recorded in confirmation of the Scriptures, we are not only satisfied that they were wrought for the purpose of confirming them, but that the admirable disposition of them, presenting a chain extending from the opening page of the sacred volume to its close, gives evidence of the presence of a presiding and foreseeing intellect, beyond what is merely human, be it wicked or consecrated, and who does not see that that mind can be none other than God.

We have now reached a point where the direct evidence of miracles will have its proper force: but before we proceed, it is proper to recapitulate what has been proved, which has a decisive bearing upon the argument about to be advanced.

1. It has been proved that the Scriptures are genuine; that they were written by their reputed authors, and that therefore the facts recorded as miracles, must have occurred, or the people at the time and place could not have been persuaded to believe them.
2. An argument has been advanced in support of the credibility of the writers of the Scriptures, founded upon the facts that bad men would never write such a book, in such circumstances, and that good men would not do it, only upon the supposition that they believed what they wrote, and that the relation the writers sustained to the reputed facts

and miracles, was such as preclude the possibility of their having themselves been deceived.

3. The nature of miracles has been explained, and the principle upon which they prove the inspiration of the Scriptures, has been stated.

The bearing of all this is just here; the occurrence being proved to be real, and the nature and evidence of a true miracle having been explained, it remains only to prove that the occurrences come within the definition of a miracle, and the argument will be conclusive. We repeat the definition of a miracle to render the argument perfectly clear upon its face.

A miracle, in a Scriptural sense, is an effect produced by the power of God, either with or without secondary agents, Independently of what are called the laws of nature, for the purpose of attesting the authority of some person or the truth of some doctrine.

We are now prepared in the light of this definition to examine some of the leading occurrences claimed to be miracles. We will not go back to the patriarchal age and urge the translation of Enoch, the flood in the days of Noah, and the various manifestations to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but commence with Moses, as with him it is believed the recording of the sacred volume commenced. Passing by the early history of his eventful life, which was clearly a school of preparation for the part he was destined to act as a medium of communication between God and men, we find the exiled prince acting the part of a shepherd in the land of Midian, and as he led his flock to the back side of the desert, and approached mount Horeb, God appeared to him amid the solitude, and opened to him the mission upon which he was about to send him. (Exo. chap. 3, and 4.) This opening of the great drama, which ended in the establishment of the Jewish state and polity, assuming, as has been proved, that the persons and acts are real, clearly comes within our definition of a miracle, while there are clustering around it circumstances and incidents which give it all the force that can clothe any miracle. A few remarks only are necessary on this scene in the desert.

1. The phenomenon of the burning bush which was not consumed amid the flame, and which was intended merely, thoroughly to arouse and fix the attention of Moses, was itself a miracle as has been shown above, involving the suspension of the laws of nature.

2. The extreme modesty, and excessive caution of Moses on the occasion, adds great force to the argument, by precluding the supposition that he was led by a wild imagination, or deceived by some slight appearance which might have been accounted for upon natural principles, into a mission to his people which had no existence save in his own dreams. When God spoke to him from the burning bush, and told him to go to his brethren in bondage and lead them out, he anticipated the incredulity of the children of Israel, and appeared disposed to decline even the mission of Jehovah, without being accompanied by such demonstrations as would not only render his own mind free from doubt, but also force conviction upon the minds of his countrymen, despite the frowns and terrors with which an oppressive government would attempt to counteract his efforts to redeem them.

3. To satisfy his mind on this point, God gave him two other signs, in addition to the miraculous appearance in the burning bush, and the voice that spoke from amid the flame. His rod was transformed into a serpent, and his hand, on being put in his bosom and withdrawn, was leprous as snow, and on being again put in his bosom and withdrawn, it was restored as his other flesh. These occurrences were beyond or outside of the operations of the laws of physical nature, and being expressly designed, first, to meet and overcome the timidity of Moses, and secondly, to convince the children of Israel that God had really sent him, which they accomplished, they clearly stamp his mission with the impress of divinity.

Then followed the ten plagues which God by the hand of Moses sent upon Egypt. It is not necessary to examine each of these wonders in detail, but only to state the essential principles which are common to them all, and upon which the force of the argument depends.

1. They were all matters of public notoriety, and of a character to affect community generally, so as to rouse the deepest attention, and invite the most severe scrutiny. They were all public calamities, and could not have passed as miracles for want of attention.
2. They were all such in character as brings them within our definition of miracles, such as are not produced by the ordinary operation of nature's laws, such as the power of God alone can produce. They were ten in number. The rivers and streams were turned into blood; frogs came up and covered the land and filled the houses; lice were produced as the small dust of earth; flies swarmed and filled the atmosphere; murrain smote all the cattle of the country; the people were smitten with boils; hail and rain, lightning and thunder, mingled with fire, desolated the coast; locusts devoured every green thing that the hail had left; darkness spread its gloomy mantle over the land for three days, so thick that it could be felt; and finally, all the first born of Egypt were smitten by the destroying angel, and died in one night. The number of miracles which were produced in succession, taken in connection with their extraordinary character, forbids the idea that they could have been spurious without being detected. Two circumstances prove beyond doubt that they could not have been natural occurrences. First, they were dependent upon the will of Moses, under God. He foretold them, at what hour they would occur, and they were removed at his entreaty. Secondly, the Israelites living in the same neighborhood were not affected by them. These two circumstances preclude the supposition that they proceeded from any natural cause, and that they happened by mere accident, so to transpire as to enable Moses to avail himself of them by a false pretense, to establish his authority. The only possible method of invalidating them is to deny them in toto, and this denial has already been met and shown to be untenable, while discussing the genuineness of the Scriptures. The ten plagues were of such a public character, and so terrible in their nature, that, had they not transpired, every Egyptian and every Israelite would have had the means of contradicting them, and neither could have been deceived into a belief that such fearful events occurred among them, if no such thing took place.

The next great event was the passing of the Red Sea, which was a stupendous miracle. On this it may be remarked, that the place is known where the Israelites past the Red Sea, and that no natural occurrence could have led to the phenomenon recorded.

Moses calls the place where the Israelites encamped before the sea was divided, Piha-hiroth, which signifies "The mouth of the ridge," that is the opening in the chain of mountains which stretch along the eastern shore of the Red Sea. Now, as we are assured by travelers that there is but one mouth or gap through which such a multitude of men, women and children, with their flocks and herds could pass, there can be no mistake as to the place. Near to this place on the western shore is a mountain called Attaka, which signifies deliverance. On the eastern coast opposite is a point of land called Kas Musa, or "the Cape of Moses." At these places the general name of the Gulf is Bar-al-kolsuni, "the Bay of submersion;" and in this bay, there is a whirlpool called Birket Faraun, "the pool of Pharaoh." These facts appear to settle the question concerning the place where the Israelites crossed the Red Sea. At this place, the water is about eighty feet deep, and about twelve miles wide. For authority on these points, the reader is referred to Bruce's Travels. It must then have been a real miracle. But should it be contended that the wind which is declared to have blown all night was natural, and that this drove back the waters, the sufficient reply is,

1. The thing is impossible, as a natural result of the blowing of any wind. The waters formed a wall on both sides, which could not have been the case if the wind drove them back.
2. As the wind blew from the east, it must have blown across the sea, and in the face of the Israelites as they passed, and a wind strong enough to pile up and hold such walls of water, would have blown them all away with their flocks and herds.
3. The sudden return of the waters when the Egyptians attempted to follow shows that it was a miracle.
4. The blowing of the east wind all night, was doubtless, not to divide the waters which followed the lifting up of the Rod of Moses, but to dry the bottom after the waters were divided, that the children of Israel might pass over dry shod, as they are said to have done.

We will only add that nothing like this dividing of the waters ever occurred at any other time, which would be strange indeed, if it was the result of natural causes. To believe that it was the result of natural causes would require much greater credulity than to receive and believe it as a miracle produced by the power of God.

The journey of the children of Israel from Egypt to the Promised Land was one continued miracle, attended by a variety of incidental miracles, extended through a period of forty years.

We appeal to the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night, as one of the perpetual miracles during the journey. It is said Exo. 13: 21, 22: " And the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light, to go by day and night. He took not away the pillar of the cloud by day, nor the pillar of fire by night, from before the people."

Again we read, chap. 40: 38. " For the cloud of the Lord was upon the tabernacle by day, and fire was upon it by night, in the sight of all the house of Israel, throughout all their journeys."

This, if it existed at all, could be nothing but a miracle, and to suppose that it did not exist, would be to do violence to all just rules of evidence, as well as to our own common sense. The Jews believed it, as the whole history of the matter proves; a history written at the time, and written by a man who died while the cloud was yet on the Tabernacle, and their descendants have all believed it ever since, and preserved this history with the greatest care, as a true record of facts. The record then must have been preserved by men who lived while the cloud by day and the fire by night was upon the Tabernacle, and by them it could not have been believed unless it was really so; unless their eyes beheld it, not only once or twice merely, but for years, from manhood to old age, and from infancy to manhood. A generation passed away under its shadow by day and its light by night. The hosts of Israel that came out of Egypt, embracing old men the middle aged, young men, youths and children, spent the rest of their days in sight of it, and closed their eyes upon its light when they died, and their children who were born under it, upon the hour of whose first recollection it gleamed, in turn grew up to manhood in view of it, and understood well its history, and saw it for the last time at the end of their journey, when it lifted itself up from the Tabernacle and passed away. The history proves upon its face, that the generation among whom this miracle is said to have transpired, believed all this, and that their children all believed it after them; and to suppose all this was believed under such circumstances, when no such thing transpired, requires vastly more credulity than to believe the record itself as a true narrative of what actually took place. We appeal to the falling of the manna upon which the Israelites subsisted, as another perpetual miracle during their forty-year's journey. This is a matter in which they could not have been mistaken. We will distinctly note a few of the leading points in this stupendous miracle.

1. The manna fell in such quantities as to sustain the vast multitudes of the Israelites. There must have been over a million of persons, and some learned men suppose there were over two millions, and others say three. There could have been no deception, and no mistake as to the source whence supplies were drawn to support such an army during a forty year's journey through the wilderness.

2. The manna fell upon six days only, there being none found in the fields upon the Sabbath day. This proves it to have been a miracle, and not a natural production of the desert.

3. When it was preserved over night it was found on the morrow to have tainted and produced worms, except upon the Sabbath day, and upon this day it underwent no change. This proves the whole to be a miracle.

4. It melted and vanished under the influence of the sun, when left in the fields, and yet when gathered, it withstood the action of the fire in the process of being baked, and became so hard as to be beat in a mortar and ground in a mill. (Num. 11: 8). This also proves it to be a miracle.

5. The manna continued to fall for the space of forty years, and ceased not until they eat of the corn of the land whither they journeyed, and then it fell no more.

The record says, (Exo. 16: 35.) "And the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, until they came to a land inhabited; they did eat manna until they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan."

Again it is said, (Josh. 5: 12.) " And the manna ceased on the morrow after they had eaten of the old corn of the land; neither had the children of Israel manna any more; but they did eat of the fruit of the land of Canaan that year."

The Israelites must have believed that they were fed with manna for forty years, and they taught it to their children after them, who believe it to this day; the Jews in conversation with Christ, (John 6: 31,) appealed to the fact that their fathers "eat manna in the desert," in proof of the inspiration of Moses, and of the sincerity of their belief on this point, there cannot be a shadow of doubt. Nor can it be supposed that they could have been deceived into such a belief, that a million of persons journeying together, could by any trick, slight of hand or legerdemain, be deceived into a belief that they all subsisted for forty years on manna, which fell fresh from Heaven every night, and which they gathered, each for himself and family, every morning; yet such is the absurd conclusion to which the Infidel must be driven, and such the insult which he must offer to his own common sense, when he denies the miracle by which God sent his people bread from Heaven.

One more miracle shall close what we have to say of the miracles of the Old Testament. We appeal to the miracle of smiting the rock in Horeb and producing water there from. This transaction is recorded in the seventeenth chapter of Exodus. Of this transaction the Psalmist says, (78: 15, 16.) " He clave the rocks in the wilderness, and gave them drink as out of the great depths. He brought streams also out of the rock, and caused waters to run down like rivers." Again, (verse 20.) "Behold he smote the rock, that the waters gushed out, and streams overflowed." Again, (Psalm, 105: 41.) "He opened the rock, and the waters gushed out, they ran in the dry place like a river." Upon this extraordinary transaction we remark:

1. Accounts of travelers go far toward confirming the history of this miracle, independently of the credibility of the record, The rock has been visited and described by Norden, Dr. Shaw and Dr. Pocock, who describe it as a vast block of red granite fifteen feet long, ten broad, and twelve high Dr. Shaw says, "the waters that gushed out and the

stream that flowed withal, have hollowed across one corner of this rock, a channel about two inches deep and twenty wide all over incrustated like the inside of a tea-kettle that has been long used. Besides several mossy productions that are preserved by the dew, we see all over this channel a great number of holes, some of them four or five inches deep, and one or two in diameter, the lively and demonstrative tokens of there having been formerly so many fountains Neither art or chance could be concerned in the contrivance." Dr. Clarke, after referring to the above named travelers, adds: — " My nephew who visited the rock in 1823 confirms the account of the preceding travelers." Here, then, there is a rock near to Horeb from which water once flowed, from the undoubted marks it has left, a place where there is now no water, and where none ever could have been produced by the simple laws of nature.

2. The water must have been produced in great abundance to have supplied such a multitude of people with their flocks and herds. It must have run in streams, as described by the Psalmist. It must also have continued to flow for a long time. "We can not say how long, but at least so long as they remained in that neighborhood, which appears to have been more than a year. Some, however, are of the opinion, that the water continued to flow, and that its streams followed the Israelites in their wanderings, the language of Paul, (1 Cor. 10: 4,) appears to intimate this. But the force of the miracle does not depend upon this doubtful question. The fact that Moses smote the rock and that the waters gushed out is recorded, and the rock is there, bearing all the marks that would naturally result from the miracle described. The multitude who are said to have drank of the water, beyond all doubt, believed they did drink, and their descendants believe it to this day, and have preserved the record with the greatest care. There could have been no deception, the people could not have been made to believe that any such thing transpired, had they not seen and drank of the water; and if they did see it and drink of the water, the miracle must have been real, for water for so many people with their flocks and herds, could not have been brought from a rock, or from any other source, by any deception or legerdemain, so as to conceal its fountain, and palm the abundant stream off as a miraculous production. We have now done with the miracles of the Old Testament, for though there are others, the examination of the preceding is sufficient.

It remains to examine some of the leading miracles of the New Testament, and this argument will be finished. Of course, but few need be noticed of the many that were wrought by Christ and his Apostles. They are too numerous to mention in detail. Take a few for examples. In the eighth chapter of Matthew, we have six distinct miracles, and one of them is in general terms, comprehending many miracles.

1. As he came down from the mountain after preaching his wonderful sermon, a leper met him, and he put forth his hand and healed him. Verse 3.
2. Next came a centurion and besought him in behalf of his servant, and by his word he healed him. Verse 13.
3. Next arriving at the residence of Peter, he found his wife's mother sick of a fever, and he touched her hand and the fever left her.

4. When the evening was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils; and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick. Verse 16.

Here were many miracles wrought as is clear from the expression, " and healed all that were sick."

5. From thence he entered into a ship, and there arose a great tempest, and he rebuked the winds and the sea, and produced a great calm. Verse 26.

6. On his arrival upon the other side he healed the man that dwelt among the tombs.

The apostle John concludes his gospel thus: "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." The idea here communicated, is that a very small portion of the acts and miracles of Christ are recorded. These miracles, were so numerous, and were wrought on such public occasions, and extending as they did through a period of three or four years, it is clear upon the very face of the record that there could have been no deception in the case.

But we will pay particular attention to some few of them, and will select the case of the man who lay at the pool of Bethesda, recorded in the fifth chapter of John. On this miracle it may be remarked:

1. The subject had been diseased for thirty-eight years.

2. He was so infirm as to be nearly helpless. He is called the " impotent man," and he speaks of having no one to help him into the water when it was troubled.

3. He having been there so long, there could have been no chance for deception, as to his identity, the facts of his disease, or his cure. The performance was public, and the direction given him to take up his bed and walk, had a direct tendency to call attention to the matter, and it did arrest the attention of the Jews, and led to investigation.

4. The Jews who persecuted Jesus, did not deny the miracle, but grounded their charge on the fact that it had been performed on the Sabbath day. These circumstances taken together make a strong case, and as the record has already been proved genuine, the reality of the miracle must follow, for it could not have been a mere pretension without being detected and exposed.

The miracle of feeding five thousand persons with five loaves and two small fishes, such as a lad could carry in his basket, as recorded in the sixth chapter of John, was a transaction about which there could have been no deception or mistake.

1. There were five thousand, all of whom partook and were satisfied. This was too large a number to be supplied from some secret source in a desert place, without detection.

2. The miracle had its immediate effect by producing an acknowledgment that he was the prophet that should come into the world.

3. When Jesus afterwards charged upon them, that they sought him not because they saw the miracle, but because they did eat of the loaves and were filled, they were offended, and though they went away they did not deny the fact of the miracle. Such a transaction could not have transpired with all its incidents, and have been believed, and a record of it published during the same generation, without being detected and exposed, had it been a mere pretense.

The resurrection of Lazarus is another miracle of such notorious character, as to preclude all possibility of deception.

1. Lazarus was dead and buried, and had been in his grave four days, so that decomposition had really commenced, as Martha suggested when Christ ordered the stone to be removed.

2. The resurrection of Lazarus was clear and beyond contradiction. The sisters believed it. Many of the Jews believed on Jesus for the first time in consequence of it. Others of the Jews went and reported the facts to the Pharisees, upon which they held a council, in which they admitted the fact of the miracle, and because it was real and not because it was fiction, they resolved to put Christ to death. And finally, they sought to kill Lazarus because many of the Jews were led by him to believe in Christ. Now admitting the genuineness of the record, which has been proved, that there was such a person as Christ, such a person as Lazarus, and his two sisters, such persons as the Pharisees, with such a high priest as Caiaphas at their head, and that there was such a man as John who wrote the gospel which bears his name, and who can doubt that this miracle here recorded, was actually performed? If the miracle had not been performed, the cheat would have been exposed, and the record could not have been believed and handed down only as it should have been transmitted upon the page of the history which should have contained an account of the cheat and its exposure. But we have the record unimpeached, nor is there any other record denying the facts alleged, or pretending to expose them as unreal.

The miracle of Christ's resurrection is the crowning event in his history, and if admitted, must establish the whole gospel system. Let us, then, examine the facts in the case, and see if there is sufficient proof to establish the fact of this grand triumph of the Crucified. A series of facts and circumstances conspire to render the resurrection of Christ certain, beyond the power of successful contradiction, or reasonable doubt.

1. He was really dead. He was crucified as a malefactor, with two criminals, and the execution was public, and under the eye of his worst enemies who had sought and procured his death. It cannot be supposed that the Jews who had pursued him with such murderous hate, and clamored so loudly for his blood, at Pilate's bar, would fail to see the sentence fully executed, when they had him in their power. Moreover, his death was attested in the most minute and official manner. First, we have the testimony of the

executioners that he was dead. It was not lawful with the Jews that the victims should remain on the cross over the Sabbath, and hence, they procured an order from Pilate to dispatch them by breaking their legs, that they might be taken down; so the soldiers in obedience to this order, came and broke the legs of the two malefactors, and when they came to him, and found that he was already dead they broke not his legs, (John 19: 31-34.) In the second place we have the testimony of the centurion, officially communicated to Pilate. Joseph, an honorable counselor, went to Pilate and craved the body of Christ, "Pilate marveled if he were already dead; and calling unto him, the centurion, he asked him whether he had been any while dead. And when he knew it of the centurion, he gave the body to Joseph." (Mark 15: 43-45.) Here, then, it is clear that Pilate declined giving the body to Joseph, until he had official evidence that he was dead.

2. Every circumstance conspired to put the Jews upon their guard against deception in relation to the pretended resurrection. Christ had over and over again predicted that he should rise again on the third day, and the Jews knew it, and acted in view of it. Of this we have a plain and simple history in the following words: —" Now the next day that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate. Saying, sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, after three days I will rise again. Command, therefore, that the sepulcher be made sure until after the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, he is risen from the dead; so the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them, ye have a watch; go your way, make it as sure as ye can. So they went and made the sepulcher sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch." Mathew 27: 62-66.

From all this it appears that their minds were awake to the danger of a pretended resurrection, and that they used every precaution to guard against it, and had the power of the Roman Government to assist them in protecting themselves against the deception they feared. They sealed the stone at the door of the sepulcher with the government seal, and placed a watch to guard it. All was done that could be done to prevent any deception.

3. Under all these circumstances the resurrection took place, furnishing ample means of detecting the deception if it had not been real. We have now got the argument narrowed down to a single point, viz., did he rise from the dead or did his disciples steal him away while the guard slept? Both parties agree that the body was not there, that it had been removed in some way. His friends asserted that he had risen from the dead, while the Jews reported that his disciples stole him away while the guard slept upon their posts. These are the only two suppositions, for no other story was ever told, and no other method resorted to of accounting for the disappearance of his body.

Now let us examine these two methods of accounting for an admitted fact, that the body was not there, and could not be found. We will take the Jewish side of the question first, and see if it be possible to believe that the disciples stole him away.

1. They had no motive to practice such a deception. They made neither wealth, ease, nor honor out of the story. The only interest they could have in the matter depended upon the fact that he did rise, and not upon the fact that they could by false pretense make many

believe that he had risen. The belief that he had risen, which they induced, under the circumstances could do them no good, so long as it was not true. By reporting and adhering to the story that Christ rose from the dead, they secured nothing to themselves but a life of toil without compensation, bitter persecution and a cruel death. If they told a lie it was one of the most unprofitable ones that man ever told.

2. They were not persons who would be likely to perpetrate such a bold crime, had they possessed the motive to move them to it. They were few, poor, unlearned, and timid. They appeared to have generally fled and left him when he was arrested; and Peter, who followed him, trembled under the eye and voice of a servant girl, when she simply charged him as being one of his disciples. Such men would not be likely to undertake the daring enterprise of breaking through the seal of public authority, under the protection of a Roman guard armed to the teeth. The probabilities of success were fearfully against them, had they undertaken it. They could not expect to find Roman soldiers asleep upon their posts, and if they did, the difficulty of removing so large a stone from the door, and bearing away the body without waking them, would be too great to be encountered by such men. They could only expect to succeed by overcoming the guard in a fight, and success in that way would have been defeat itself. The slain among the soldiers, and the wounds of the living would have told who stole him away, and defeated the whole object of the enterprise.

3. Had it been true that they stole him away, the difficulties of concealing him would have been too great to have allowed them to escape without detection. Suppose it to have been a fact that they stole away his body, and that the Jews really believed it, their interest in the matter, and their malignity, would have led them to have searched everywhere for the stolen corpse; every pond would have been dragged, and every new-made grave would have been opened, and every possible place of concealment would have been searched.

4. The only story that was put in circulation on the subject, contradicted itself. The soldiers are made to say that his disciples stole him away, while they were asleep. First, it is not to be believed that they did sleep, for this was a crime punishable with death by the Roman law. Secondly, if they did actually sleep, they could not have known that his disciples stole him away. If they were asleep, how could they know who took him away? If they were not asleep why did they suffer him to be taken away? Such testimony would be ruled out of any court. But what renders it perfectly clear that there was no proof that his disciples stole him away, is the fact that the Jews never availed themselves of it, in their subsequent controversies with them. The apostles were several times arrested and brought before the rulers of the Jews in Jerusalem, within a short time after the resurrection of Christ. See Acts, Chap. 4: 1, 2; and Chap. 5: 29, 32. In these controversies, the apostles, while under arrest, boldly affirmed that God raised Christ from the dead, and actually silenced the Jews. Now, had they possessed the least proof that his disciples stole him away; they would have produced it on these occasions. If these soldiers were competent witnesses in the case they would have availed themselves of their testimony.

Now look at the proof on the other side of the question, and see how triumphantly it establishes the fact of Christ's resurrection.

1. The apostles asserted it as a truth that they saw him, conversed with him, and handled him. About sixteen years after the resurrection of Christ, Paul wrote his first epistle to the Corinthians, in which he sums up the personal evidence of that great event as follows: — "And that he was buried, and that he arose again the third day according to the Scriptures. And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve, After that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as one born out of due time." (1. Cor. 15: 4-8.)

Here are six distinct occasions on which Jesus showed himself alive, and on one occasion he was seen by more than five hundred persons, most of whom were still living, to testify if required. No fact was ever confirmed by a stronger array of living eyewitnesses, and had not these things been so, the apostle would not have dared to have written as he did, and appeared to living witnesses.

2. The testimony of the apostles was confirmed by the gift of the Holy Ghost, the gift of tongues, and the power to work miracles. This appears upon the face of the record, and the result that followed, the conversion of the people by thousands, shows that it was with supernatural influence that they witnessed to the resurrection of Christ.

3. The change that so suddenly came over the apostles proves that they believed their own testimony, when they asserted that Christ was raised from the dead. The doubting timid ones, who wept from sorrow and trembled with fear when their master was taken away, became strong and fear-less, and bore their testimony in the teeth of the Jews who had caused him to be crucified, and before courts and kings, and walked unalarmed amid persecutions, prisons, and death.

SECTION VIII.

Objections to the Evidence of Miracles Answered.

It will not be necessary to extend our defense of miracles against objectors to any considerable length, after what has been said in the preceding section. If the arguments which have been advanced be sound, no objection can prevail against the evidence of miracles, and if they are not sound, no reply to objections can make them sound. There are a few objections, however, which are so notorious, made so prominent by skeptics, that it is proper to notice them. The first to which we will direct the reader's attention, is that urged by that philosophical and popular Infidel writer, David Hume.

We believe it is admitted by all, Christians and Infidels, that Mr. Hume has made the best of the Infidel side of the question in opposition to the evidence of miracles, that has been done by any anti-Christian writer. It may appear proper, therefore, to notice briefly his strong points. The following is the substance of his argument.

"Experience is our only guide in reasoning concerning matters of fact. Experience is in some things variable, in some things uniform. A variable experience gives rise only to probability; a uniform experience amounts to proof. Probability always supposes an opposition of experiments and observation, where the one side is found to over balance the other, and to produce a degree of evidence proportioned to the superiority. Our belief or assurance of any fact from the report of eyewitnesses, is derived from no other principle than experience; that is, our observation of the veracity of human testimony, and of the usual conformity of facts to the reports of witnesses. Now, if the fact attested partakes of the marvelous, if it is such as has seldom fallen under our observation, there is a contest of opposite experience, of which the one destroys the other, as far as its force goes, and the superior can only operate on the mind by the force which remains. Further, if the fact affirmed by the witness, instead of being only marvelous, is really miraculous; if, besides the testimony considered apart and in itself amounts to an entire proof; in that case there is proof against proof, of which the strongest must prevail, but still with a diminution of its force in proportion, to that of its antagonist. A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature; and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, a proof against a miracle from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined. A miracle, therefore, however attested, can never be rendered credible even to the lowest degree."

In reply to the above, which presents the strongest objection to the evidence of miracles which Infidelity has ever yet been able to devise, we present the following considerations: —

The argument of Mr. Hume is based upon two false assumptions, viz., that the fact that no miracles occur in our experience is proof that none occurred in the experience of the sacred writers; and that experience is our only guide in reasoning concerning matters of fact, Both these positions are false, and shall be proved so in the course of this reply.

1. It is not merely an objection against the evidence of the miracles, said in the Scriptures to have been wrought for their confirmation, but against the possibility of the existence of such evidence, it affirms, not so much that there is no satisfactory proof that such miracles were wrought, as that no such proof could exist in any possible case. This is stretching the argument beyond its power to produce the least conviction, inasmuch as at this point it arrays itself against all the evidence of experience, and the dictates of reason and common sense. If it be true, that " a miracle however attested can never be rendered credible even to the lowest degree," then is Omnipotence set at defiance by the argument, and God himself is rendered incapable of so attesting a revelation of his own will, as to render it "credible in the least degree," with those who were not eye and ear witnesses of the communication. It is an insult to our own reason and common sense to deny the possibility of miracles, God who created the visible universe, produced the elements, the solid ground, the water, and the air, the sun, and moon, and stars, and who gave to nature her laws, must be capable of suspending those laws, and of operating independently of them or contrary to them; that is, he must be capable of working a miracle. A miracle then is just as possible in itself, as a shower of rain, a drought, a tempest, or a calm; there

is therefore nothing more strange in itself, in a miracle, than in what our eyes witness every day; for it must be just as easy for an Almighty Creator to produce what we call a miracle, as to produce the original elements of the visible creation, and impress upon them a law which at one time sends the fertilizing shower, and at another, withholds the desired drops from the thirsty soil and drooping plants; which at one time stirs up the wind, and rouses the tempest, and rocks the waters of the deep, and at another time restrains the winds, hushes the tempest into a breathless calm, and lulls the billow to sleep upon the bosom of its mother ocean. Indeed there is nothing more unreasonable in itself, no approach to impossibility, in the idea of a miracle than in the production of a simple spire of grass, the blush of a single flower, the motion of the summer zephyr, or the sultry calm under the influence of which we pant for its cooling breath. As there is then nothing impossible or unreasonable in the idea of a miracle, the presumption is in their favor, whenever circumstances should appear to demand them, or whenever they appear adapted to secure an end which cannot so well be secured by ordinary means. Now, it has been proved that a revelation from God is desirable, and that it is reasonable to expect such a revelation, from the admitted perfections of God, and its adaptation to meet the wants of his rational offspring, man; and we now add that such a revelation of necessity needs confirmation, and that miracles, though not the only attestation, are exceedingly appropriate and most conclusive, and are therefore to be looked for whenever God makes any direct communication to men. We repeat, therefore, that all the force of presumption is in favor of miracles in connection with a revelation from God, and as the whole force of the objection rests upon a supposed presumption against them, the argument falls of its own weight. That is, it makes the force of presumption the ruling point in the nature of evidence, and as the force of presumption is in favor of miracles, the objection is overthrown by the very principle upon which it is made to depend.

2. So far as the objection is made to depend, not upon a supposed impossibility of miracles, but upon the impossibility of attesting them, so as to render the testimony credible, which affirms them to have been wrought, it is equally weak and self-destructive. It may be said that the objection is not that miracles would not sufficiently attest a revelation from God, if the miracles themselves could be sufficiently attested, but it rests upon a denial that miracles can be so attested by human testimony, as even to render it probable with those who do not witness them that they were wrought. Let us then finish the objection by meeting it in this its strongest point of light.

Why, then, cannot miracles be proved by human testimony, as conclusively as any other matter of fact? The objection answers for itself. "Experience is our only guide in reasoning, concerning matters of fact." The application of this is, as we never witnessed a miracle ourselves, the whole of our experience is against the probability of the existence of miracles, while on the subject of human testimony; our experience is that it is sometimes true and sometimes false. Now as the whole of our experience is against the Occurrence of miracles, having never experienced one, and as our experience on the subject of human testimony is variable, part in favor of its veracity, and part against it, our entire experience against miracles, outweighs our partial experience in favor of the veracity of human testimony, and the presumption is that no miracles occurred, however positively they may be attested by persons claiming to have witnessed them. This is the

strongest view of the argument, and yet it is so weak as only to expose the weakness of Infidelity, which it is designed to support. The whole is based upon a false assumption, that the fact that we never witnessed or experienced a miracle is proof that no miracle ever occurred, and not only proof, but proof strong enough to counterbalance the strongest possible human testimony. The truth is, that we have no experience on the subject, because we never received a revelation direct from God, nor were we ever present when a revelation was directly communicated to others, and therefore were never in a position to experience miracles as attestations of the truth of revelation. We have proved above, that miracles are possible, that they are probable, that it is reasonable to expect them in connection with a revelation from God, as the most appropriate and conclusive attestation, hence the whole force of probability is in favor of the occurrence of miracles, whereas the objection rests upon the assumption of their improbability. This assumed improbability is made to depend upon the fact that miracles never occur in our experience, when no revelation is communicated from God. This is extremely fallacious, for the fact that miracles do not occur in our experience, when no revelation of the will of God is being made to us, cannot furnish the slightest presumption against their occurrence, as attestations, when God does make a revelation of his will.

To originate a presumption against the occurrence of miracles, Mr. Hume has to assume that no revelation has been given, by deriving all his proof against miracles, from the fact that they do not occur in our experience, when no revelation is given, and then he uses this presumption against miracles in proof of his denial of revelation, upon which it depends for its own existence. To illustrate, Mr. Hume virtually denies that any human testimony can make it probable that miracles were performed in the days of Moses, because no miracles have occurred in the experience of David Hume, whose lifetime was three thousand years later upon the chart of time than that of Moses. Now as it is not pretended that any revelation from God was given to Mr. Hume, or to any other person in his time, to make the fact that no miracles occurred in his experience, establish even a probability that no miracles occurred in the experience of Moses, it must first be made equally certain that no revelation was communicated through Moses, hence to bring the fact that no miracle occurred in the experience of Mr. Hume, to prove that none occurred in the experience of Moses, is to beg the whole question at issue; it is to deny that Moses was inspired, and then to assert a probability which depends upon the truth of that denial for existence, in proof of the denial itself.

3. Mr. Hume commits the logical blunder of insisting upon, as essential to the evidence of miracles, what, if it existed, would destroy the force of all such evidence. He asserts, as remarked above, the fact that no miracles occur in our experience, when no revelation is being received from God, as strong presumptive proof against the occurrence of miracles as attestations of a revelation when it was given. According to this, in order to give any force to the evidence of miracles, miracles must occur in our own experience, which would of itself destroy all evidence derived from miracles. If miracles were of common occurrence in our experience, when no revelation is received from God, their occurrence in connection with the giving of a revelation, could furnish no proof of such a revelation. It is because they never occur in our experience, that they are sufficient attestations of a revelation from God, when they occur in connection with what claims to be such a

revelation. Thus does Mr. Hume ground his objection to the evidence of miracles, on the non-occurrence of miracles in our experience, whereas, if they did occur it would destroy all evidence to be derived from miracles. Such a great and obvious absurdity is worthy only of the cause of infidelity, and can be needed only to support error.

4. The objection starts with a false assumption, that "experience is our only guide in reasoning concerning matters of fact."

Experience is not our only guide in reasoning concerning matters of fact, for there is, beyond all doubt, an adaptation in human testimony to produce belief, prior to all experience on the subject. That experience has much to do in enabling us to put a proper estimate upon human testimony is admitted, but that it is our only guide is denied. This is maintained from the fact that testimony has an adaptation to produce belief independently of experience, as stated above. If it were not so, testimony would be good for nothing in a case upon which our past experience shed no light to guide us. There must be a first time with every person when a matter is presented on human testimony, and if experience is our only guide, such a person would have no guide, yet he will receive or reject the testimony, and believe or disbelieve in the matters presented, just as certainly, if not so accurately, as when he has become more experienced. The truth is, reason itself can examine facts and principles presented, compare them, and deduce conclusions, independently of past experience; in this way it commences its operations without experience; and by the process acquires experience. As there is a natural adaptation in testimony to produce belief, the light of experience is necessary only to teach us when to doubt or when to reject testimony, not when to believe it. The rule is that testimony is to be received as true, unless there are apparent reasons for doubting or disbelieving it. But though men are known sometimes to give false testimony, the principle bearing of experience is not to teach us this fact, but to teach us under what circumstances men give false testimony, that we may judge of their credibility as witnesses, in view of all the facts presented; not so much from the simple fact that the matter is new, before unheard of, or of common occurrence, as from the position of the witness to know whereof he affirms, and the motives which, in his circumstances are liable to influence his testimony. Cases may occur on which experience sheds no light beyond these simple points of the opportunity of the witness to understand the subject, and the motives that may influence him to give a false testimony.

There is something new every day which is unlike anything that has ever occurred in our past experience, and it is presented for our belief on human testimony. But the witnesses are strangers, concerning them, we have no experience, and the fact to which they testify is one which never before occurred so far as our knowledge extends.

If experience were our only guide, in Mr. Hume's sense, in such a case it would neutralize itself, and there could be no conviction; the uniform experience against the occurrence of such a fact, would balance if not outweigh our partial experience of the veracity of human testimony. But there is conviction produced in just such cases; reason looks at the testimony, and decides, not so much from experience, as upon the face of the testimony itself, as then and there presented for the first time. If it were not so, nothing could be

proved by human testimony the first time it occurred, nothing could be proved only by the personal experience of each for himself, and the experience and observations of each would be lost to all the rest of mankind. This is an inevitable consequence of the position of Mr. Hume. Professor Morse has discovered the principle of the Telegraph, and has invented the machinery for, communicating intelligence on the wings of lightning, and he has sent a dispatch from New York to Washington, and obtained an answer in less than three seconds. This is new, nothing of the kind ever occurred before, the whole testimony of our experience, as Mr. Hume reasons, proves that no such things has been done. Now, persons go out from the office and tell the wonderful story to the honest farmers, who never saw a telegraph, and who would not understand it should they see it, who have never experienced any such thing, any more than Mr. Hume had experienced a miracle, and according to his mode of reasoning against miracles, the report concerning the telegraph cannot be believed only as each experiences it for himself. Thus is Mr. Hume's mode of reasoning contradicted by plain matter of fact.

5. If we were to admit the entire premises of Mr. Hume, his conclusions would not follow, but directly the reverse would follow. Our experience concerning human testimony, we admit is variable; we find it sometimes true and sometimes false. But experience has also taught us how to estimate human testimony from the circumstances under which it is given. An invariable experience teaches us that men never give false testimony but from one of two causes; first, ignorance of the facts in the case, or secondly, selfishness; thus by these two circumstances do we learn to estimate the credibility of testimony, we ask ourselves first, is the witness informed on the subject? Had he an opportunity to know the facts? and secondly, we inquire, is there any strong, selfish motives to induce him to give false testimony. If the witness was not in a position to understand the facts, his testimony weighs but little; and if he has strong selfish motives to give the testimony he does, it greatly lessens its force, though it does not destroy it. A man may testify to the truth when that truth is highly promotive of his personal interest; and a man may testify to the truth when that truth is opposed to his interests; but men, as a whole, are less likely to do so, hence interest lessens the force of testimony, though it does not itself destroy it, But men never knowingly testify falsely without selfish motives inducing them so to do. Apply the above principles to Mr. Hume's reasoning, and his argument will become a powerful one in support of the truth of the record of miracles, as well as of revelation itself. We will construct the principles of Mr. Hume's reasoning into an argument so plain and simple, that we are sure every one will see and feel its force.

1. " Experience," he says, " is our only guide in reasoning concerning matters of fact."

2. " Experience is in some things variable and in some things uniform. A variable experience gives rise only to probability; a uniform experience amounts to a proof." To this we add

3. Universal experience, with the greatest uniformity, teaches us that men never give false testimony, unless through ignorance or selfishness, and especially, never when such testimony is strongly against their own interests. But the witnesses of the Scriptures, as

has been abundantly shown, could not have been mistaken, and could have no motive to have given a false testimony. They testified to their own personal damage, and suffered the loss of all things, even life itself, for the sake of the testimony they gave. Now we maintain that human nature was never known, in any other case, to give false testimony, in connection with such opportunities to know the truth, and under such strong selfish considerations to withhold such testimony; and the consequence is, if we take experience as our guide, which Mr. Hume affirms "is our guide in reasoning concerning matters of fact," the conclusion is irresistible that the testimony of the sacred writers is true. There is no evading this; there is no variable experience on the subject to weaken the testimony, or to throw the slightest shadow of doubt upon the conclusion.

If Mr. Hume could rise from the dead to defend his own argument, he would have to retract his position that "experience is our only guide in reasoning upon matters of fact," and that "a uniform experience amounts to proof;" or else he would have to insist that our experience is that men will give false testimony when every possible selfish consideration in the highest possible degree urges them to a different course; and to retract the former, would be to remove the foundation of his own argument, and to assert the latter would be to contradict every man's consciousness, insult common sense, and render himself ridiculous.

It is then perfectly clear that an invariable experience teaches, that men never give false testimony in such circumstances as those in which the sacred writers gave their testimony; and at this point we will take our leave of Mr. Hume, and let him sleep on, while the gospel he sought to overthrow, lives and spreads to enlighten and bless the world.

There is one other objection to the evidence of miracles worthy of a reply. It is sometimes urged that counter-miracles were wrought by the enemies of the truth, and by wicked agencies which destroy the evidence; of miracles in support of a revelation from God. The first case, to which we allude, is the performance of the magicians of Egypt, in opposition to the miracles of Moses. The Egyptian magicians imitated the three first miracles performed by Moses and Aaron; they threw down their rods and they became serpents, they produced blood from the waters, and brought up frogs from the river. In reply to the objection founded upon these transactions, we remark that it is not certain that anything of the nature of a miracle was performed. They are called sorcerers and magicians; what ever they did was performed "by their enchantments;" it may be therefore, that it was a slight-of-hand operation, by which false appearances were produced. Such performances are still practiced by skillful deceivers. The serpents may have been provided and concealed, and then by art, substituted for the rods at the proper time. So with the production of blood and the frogs from the river.

If this view be admitted, and an Infidel can admit no other, for he who denies that the miracles of Moses were genuine, cannot pretend that the magicians wrought genuine miracles to oppose them: —then if this view be admitted, it constitutes no objection to the evidence of the miracles performed by Moses, for it cannot prove that they were also false, for they were superior to the performance of the magicians.

Aaron's rod swallows all the rods of the magicians, and they were able to imitate only the three first miracles, when they gave it up, and confessed that Moses wrought by the power of God. Upon the supposition then that the magicians only practiced a slight-of-hand, their performances constitute no objection to the operations of Moses as real miracles, but rather strengthen them as such. If Moses had only practiced their own art, they would have been able to have matched him, for they were, doubtless, as skillful as men could be in the art; and hence, the fact that they were entirely out-done by him, and constrained to acknowledge that his acts were performed by the power of God, their performances taken in connection with the whole history, greatly strengthens the evidence that Moses wrought real miracles, which were beyond the highest degree of mere human skill.

If we were to rest our reply here, Infidels would contend that there is as much proof that the magicians wrought miracles as that Moses did, as far as they went, and that they may have performed supernatural acts by the power of some infernal spirits, and if miracles have been performed by the agency of wicked spirits, then miracles cannot be conclusive proof of a revelation from God.

If we were to admit that the magicians did actually produce serpents from their rods, turn water into blood, and bring up frogs from the river, as really as Moses did, it would not invalidate the evidence of miracles as wrought by Moses in support of his divine mission. "We are inclined to this view of the subject. A fair construction of the language employed, it appears to us, must teach that the magicians did succeed in their three first attempts to imitate the acts of Moses and Aaron, and, of course, if they did it, it was not by their own power or art, but through the agency of some evil spirit, whose aid they invoked by their incantations. As this view is held by many eminent Christians and divines, it is necessary to meet the objection on this ground, and to do it several remarks are necessary.

1. We are not required to reconcile it with the skepticism of Infidels, but only with the general doctrines of the Scriptures. Now it is a doctrine of the Scriptures, that there are spiritual agencies, which operate in this world, both good and evil. This was believed among the Jews in Christ's time, from the fact that they accused him of "casting out devils," by Beelzebub, the prince of devils.
2. This view cannot be objected to on the ground that no such spiritual agencies are now proved to operate in the world by any visible results, nor can it be made the occasion for maintaining vulgar superstitions of modern witchcraft and fortune-telling, because it is reasonable to suppose the power of such evil spirits is greatly cur tailed under the gospel, Christ came to destroy the work of the devil, and he cast out devils with his word, and suffered them not to speak; he triumphed over them, and when the age of miracles passed away we must suppose that God would not leave evil spirits free, under the gospel, to work visible supernatural operations.

3. The record, upon its face, proves that the power, by which the magicians performed their operations, was inferior to and under the control of the power by which Moses wrought his miracles. When the magicians threw down their rods and they became serpents, the rod of Moses swallowed them all, and thus did Moses triumph over them. This rendered the testimony of his miracles in favor of the divinity of his mission, just as conclusive, if not more so, than it would have been had nothing been done in opposition. But more than this, the magicians did not attempt to imitate the miracles of Moses but in three instances, and then gave it up, and confessed that his operations were beyond their power.

Thus we trust the objection is removed upon either ground. It has been shown that if the magicians worked a mere slight-of-hand, and performed no real miracle, the proof that Moses did work real miracles, is clear and unimpeached? and if the magicians did work miracles by some infernal agency, this view harmonizes with the general doctrine of revelation, while it does not lessen the evidence from miracles, as the power of Moses triumphed over all opposition, and silenced all counter miracles, by which his mission was fully attested.

There is another case to which we may do well to allude. We refer to the raising of Samuel by the Witch of Endor, 1 Sam. 28: 14, 21. We suppose that Samuel really appeared on this occasion, but we do not suppose the Witch of Endor produced him or caused him to appear. The most rational construction is that God took this method to rebuke Saul, and to announce to him his approaching doom. That the woman did not produce him is clear from the fact that she was so surprised and alarmed at what she saw. His appearance was un-expected to her. The text clearly conveys the idea throughout, that the appearance was unexpected to the woman. This is Dr. Clark's view of the passage. This also was the opinion of the Jewish Church, as expressed in Ecclus. 46: 20, where of Samuel, it is said, that "after his death he prophesied, and showed the king his end." Josephus also describes the appearance as really that of Samuel, Dr. Hales, in his *New Analysis of Chronology*, has an able article on this view of the subject.

Taking the above view of this transaction, the subject is relieved of all difficulty, and it contains not the slightest objection to the evidence of miracles. If it were admitted that the witch did produce Samuel, by her incantations, there would be some force in the objection, but this idea the text itself does not support; and as God caused the old prophet to appear and meet Saul, to the terror of both Saul and his hired conjurer, there is nothing in it inconsistent with the existence of miracles as attestations of a divine revelation.

SECTION IX.

The Argument Founded upon Prophecy.

To prophesy is to tell what will transpire in the future, which can be known only to God. The argument in favor of the inspiration of the Scriptures founded upon prophecy is clear and conclusive, and may be thus stated:

1. To foretell what will occur for weeks, months, years, centuries, and even tens of centuries to come, is entirely beyond the power of human reason and the laws of nature, and can be done only by the infinite mind, who knows all things, and who sees the end from the beginning. Whenever, therefore, a human mind does declare future events with certainty, the proof is conclusive that such mind is in communion with the infinite mind, and only speaks as the revealing spirit dictates.

2. The prophets of the Scriptures claimed to be in such communion with God, frequently prefacing what they said, with "thus saith the Lord," and in his name they foretell events which actually transpired, years and centuries after their predictions were uttered. This renders it certain that they were inspired, and that the doctrines and precepts which they uttered are a revelation from God. The only points necessary to be proved, are the facts that predictions were uttered, such as human foresight could not discover, and that such predictions were subsequently fulfilled.

The first prediction found upon the sacred page, as we read the Scriptures, was pronounced by God himself, without the intervention of prophet: Gen. 3: 15. " And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed, it (he) shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

We believe that this was prophetic of the warfare between Christ and the Devil, and their respective adherents, as developed in the experience and history of mankind. We shall not detain the reader at this point to answer the objection that the whole story of which this is a part, is a mere allegory; the reply to this objection more properly belongs to an investigation into what is called the fall of man, to be made after the truth of the Scriptures has been established. Nor is it necessary to spend much time on the question of a literal application of the words to the serpent, or the race of serpents in general. The common belief among Christians is that the Devil was the real deceiver in the case, and that he used the serpent as an instrument in the accomplishment of his infernal scheme; that the Devil acted through the serpent. This being the case the sentence may be two-fold, affecting both the serpent and the devil that acted through the serpent. The first part clearly concerned the serpent, which though " more subtle than any beast of the field," was cursed above all cattle, and above every beast in the field," and doomed to crawl and feed upon the dust of the earth. Dr. Clark thinks the serpent to have been of the ourang outang species, which appears to have been originally designed to walk erect, but which now puts down hands and goes on all fours.

But that the latter clause, which we regard as a prophecy, relates to the devil, and to Christ as the seed of the woman, we have no doubt. It is not true of any class of serpents; serpents have no more enmity to man than various other animals and insects. They sometimes bite, and so do other animals, but the serpent is less likely to bite than the hornet is to sting. But of Satan and his adherents, and Christ and his adherents it has its fulfillment; there is a perpetual enmity existing, and a perpetual warfare maintained; in this sense it is an important prophecy, and may be clearly seen to be fulfilled, and in process of fulfillment. At the time it was uttered, no human calculation could have reached the conclusions which have been developed through all succeeding centuries. At

the time it was written by Moses, no human foresight could have seen that the struggle would be maintained, and that truth and light would ultimately gain the ascendancy which the gospel assures us will yet be the case. To all human appearances, the probabilities were then on the side of the success of error, for the great portion of the world was given to idolatry, and Moses could not have foreseen that the few would not go over to the many, and put an end to the strife and enmity. But let us look at some of the particulars of this prophecy.

1. It clearly relates to Christ as the woman's seed, and in this sense it has a striking fulfillment. Christ in his humanity, was emphatically the seed of the woman, because he was born of a virgin, and had no father after the flesh. To the same fact the apostle alludes in Gal. 4: 4. "God sent forth his son, made of a woman, made under the law to redeem them that were under the law." The expression "made of a woman," points him out as the seed of the woman that was to bruise the serpent's head. The same allusion to the sentence pronounced upon the serpent is made, Heb. 2: 14,15. "For as much as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." The original prediction said that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, and four thousand years afterwards, we are told that Christ was made of a woman, and took part of flesh and blood, that he by death, might destroy the devil, which strikes us as a very clear fulfillment.

A similar allusion is made in 1 John, 3: 8. "He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil!" Here the devil is referred to as the first sinner and the leader of that side, they are of him. This clearly points to the part he played in the deception of Eve, by which sin was introduced into this world—"the devil sinneth from the beginning." And as it was then predicted, that the seed of the woman should bruise his head, it is here said that he was manifested, "that he might destroy the works of the devil."

2. In a general sense the prediction refers to the moral warfare that has been and still is maintained between the devil and Christ, and all his adherents, and to the final triumph of the former over the latter. It has its fulfillment in every conflict. Satan bruised Christ's heel when he tempted and tried him, and caused him to suffer and die, but Christ bruised his head, when he rose from the dead. Satan bruises Christ's heel in the persons of his followers, when he tempts and tries his disciples, but Christ bruises his head through his followers, when they resist the devil and triumph over him. A most clear allusion to the text in this sense is found Rom. 16: 20. "The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly." The prediction says, "he shall bruise thy head," and Paul, more than four thousand years afterwards, says, "the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly. But Christ will yet bruise Satan's head by a final triumph, for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet," 1 Cor. 15: 25. Satan is one enemy, and hence he will be put under Christ's feet, and putting him under his feet, is a clear fulfillment of the prediction, that he should bruise his head.

Thus does it appear that in the first prediction, uttered at the time of the fall, we have foretold that moral warfare which has shaken the world for nearly six thousand years, and is progressing and developing itself in constant conflicts between truth and error, between right and wrong, between the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of darkness. We have not pressed this first prediction, delivered in the form of a sentence pronounced upon the serpent, because we deem it essential to the strength of our argument, as we trust the reader will be convinced, that there is clear and strong proof enough without it, before we shall have finished; but we have urged and elaborated it because it is the first in order, and sustains an important relation to the plan of human redemption, the first intimation of the ultimate defeat of Satan, who triumphed in his first assault upon our race.

We read, Gen. 49: 10, "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." That this text is a prophecy is clear from its language and the circumstances under which it was pronounced. It is a part of Jacob's dying address to his sons, and is prefaced thus: "And Jacob called unto his sons, and said, gather yourselves together that I may tell you that which shall befall you in the last days." He then proceeded to pronounce a prophecy upon each of his twelve sons, through them upon the twelve tribes that should descend from them. That the prophecy related more particularly to their descendants than to them personally, is clear from the expression, "that I may tell you that which shall befall you in the last days." The prophecy itself foretells two events, which are so related as to render the fulfillment conspicuous. The first event is the supremacy of Judah, which was to continue until the second event should transpire, which is the coming of Shiloh, to whom the government should be transferred, signified by the expression, "unto him shall the gathering of the people be." The literal meaning of the whole text is, that the tribe of Judah should remain as a distinct tribe under the internal government of its own princes, until Christ should come. This has been clearly fulfilled as shall now be shown.

The scepter did not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Christ came. By the term scepter, we are to understand tribeship. The word signifies a rod of authority, because carried in the hand of rulers and chiefs, as an ensign or badge of authority. The word is also often used to denote a tribe. Because it was carried by the head of each tribe, it was the proof of a distinct tribe, or separate governmental authority; and hence, when it is said that the scepter shall not depart from Judah, the meaning is the tribeship shall not depart, or Judah shall not cease to be a distinct tribe until Shiloh shall come.

The expression, "nor a lawgiver from between his feet," appears to us to denote a prince or ruler of his own offspring or progeny. In this sense it has been fulfilled. The tribe of Judah did maintain its distinct independence of all the other tribes; and through all their captivities, and under all their subjugations by other powers; they retained their own princes, with an internal, self-governing authority, until after the Saviour's advent, and then the scepter finally departed.

Shiloh came while Judah yet remained a distinct tribe. By Shiloh is clearly meant the Messiah. It is true that learned critics differ as to the derivation and sense of the word, but

all agree as to its application to Christ. The three more probably renderings of the text are as follows. Some, following the reading of the Septuagint, render the text thus: "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until the coming of him to whom it is reserved;" that is the scepter shall remain with Judah until he shall come to whom it belongs—the Messiah. Others following the Hebrew as they suppose, derive the word from the Hebrew word, *Sha-lah*, which signifies, "he was calm, quiet, contented, at rest, at ease," and hence make Shiloh mean peace-maker, and translate the text thus: "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until the peace-maker comes." Others, and in our view more correctly, derive *Shiloh* from *Shalach*, the primary sense of which is, "he sent forth, appointed, commissioned as a messenger or ambassador." This word occurs, Gen. 24: 7, in the expression, "he shall send his angel before thee." This derivation makes Shiloh signify "the Messenger," or "he that is sent." Those who derive the word as above, translate the text, "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, until he that is to be sent shall come." This, says Dr. Clarke, is the reading of the Vulgate, *qui mittendus est, he that is to be sent*. He also quotes an allusion to this sense of the text from a rabbinical comment on Deut. 22: 7: "If ye keep this precept, you hasten the coming of the Messiah, who is called Sent." Paul, Heb. 3: 1., applies the same name to Jesus Christ when he calls him the "Apostle and High Priest of our profession." This word *Apostolos*, Apostle signifies one sent. By "our profession," or our confession as Dr. Macknight renders it, must be meant Christianity, the religion we profess; and hence Jesus Christ is the apostle, the one sent, or the Messenger of Christianity. Christ is then the Shiloh, the Sent, and the Messenger, at whose coming the scepter departed from Judah.

We are now prepared to close the argument drawn from this particular prophecy.

It was pronounced by dying Jacob, nearly seventeen hundred years before the birth of Christ, and before his descendants had become a nation, or had even multiplied into tribes. From this point, far back on the chart of time, his prophetic eye looked down through dark and undeveloped centuries, and traced the career of his descendants, and saw Judah bearing the scepter long after it had fallen from the hands of the other princes that came out of his loins, until he saw another arise in the midst of "this tribe, the promised seed, the Shiloh, the Sent, to set up a spiritual kingdom, when he saw the scepter depart from Judah and his existence lost as a distinct tribe; while the people, yea, the nations, were gathered to the new and spiritual prince, whose kingdom is not of this world. The points included in the prophecy and distinctly fulfilled are as follows:

1. The subjugation or extinction of the other tribes. The assertion that the scepter should not depart from Judah implied that it would depart from out the other tribes. Ten of the tribes were lost, so that wherever they are or have been is not known, since they were carried away captive beyond the Euphrates. The final removal of the ten tribes took place about nine hundred years after the prediction was uttered, when the scepter departed from them. This left only two tribes, Judah and Benjamin, and Benjamin was so joined to the kingdom of Judah that the scepter passed from his hand, and Judah of all the tribes, alone held the scepter. This which no human eye could see was foretold by Jacob.

2. The prediction asserts that Judah should continue to hold the scepter until Shiloh should come. This also was fulfilled. Judah was carried away captive, but this tribe never lost its distinct organic existence, but even in its captivity had its own heads and princes, and carried its distinctive scepter. This we learn from the fact that when Cyrus issued his proclamation for the Jews to return and rebuild the temple, we read that "then rose up the chief of the fathers of Judah and Benjamin, and the priests and the Levites with them." Also we read that Cyrus brought all the vessels of the temple which Nebuchadnezzar had carried away and delivered them, "unto Sheshbazzar the prince of Judah." They were not delivered to the prince of Benjamin, but to the prince of Judah. Judah alone had a prince, and held a scepter. Thus did Judah maintain its distinct existence as a body politic, until Shiloh came. Even in the days of Christ, when Judah was a Roman Province, they maintained their own peculiar government in internal matters.

3. The prophecy asserts, by implication at least, that the scepter should depart from Judah when Shiloh should come. This also was fulfilled. When the Jews appeared before Pilate to accuse Christ, they declared that they had no king but Caesar, and thereby confessed that the scepter had departed from Judah. Soon after, their civil and ecclesiastical polity was dissolved, and all distinction of tribes lost in the common ruin of the nation.

4. The prophecy includes the fact that Shiloh should be of the tribe of Judah. Judah was to survive and hold the scepter until Shiloh should come, which clearly implies that he was to come of this tribe, which was fulfilled, as Paul says, (Heb. 7: 14), "It is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah." That Jacob understood that a Shiloh, a Savior had been promised, and that he should come through one of his twelve sons, no one can doubt; but how he could have traced the future course of those sons, and the tribes that were to rise from them, and tell that the Great Abrahamic promise would be fulfilled in Judah, can be explained upon no principle, only that the inspiration of the Almighty gave him a view of the events of distant centuries.

These two leading prophecies which have been examined relate to the promised Messiah, but to elaborate other predictions to the same extent would extend our argument beyond reasonable limits. We will sum up the prophecies which relate to Christ, in as brief a manner as possible.

1. He was to come before the scepter should depart from Judah. Gen. 49: 10. This has been explained.

2. He was to come while the second temple should yet stand. Haggai 2: 7. " I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come; and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts." Mal. 3: 1. " The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant." This was fulfilled; Christ came to that temple, and filled it with the glory of the gospel of salvation.

3. He was to be the son of Abraham. Gen. 12: 3. "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." This was fulfilled in Christ.

4. He was to descend from Isaac and not from Ishmael. Gen. 17: 12. "In Isaac shall thy seed be called."

5. He was to be the descendant of Jacob and not of Esau. Gen. 25: 33. "He sold his birthright unto Jacob." In chapter 28: 14, the promise made to Abraham was renewed to Jacob. "In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed."

6. He was to descend from the tribe of Judah. This has been explained in connection with Gen. 49: 10.

7. He was to descend from Jesse. Isa. 11: 1. " There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots."

8. He was to descend from David, the youngest son of Jesse. Psalm. 89: 27 28. "Also will I make him, my first born higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him."

This is said of David. All these points in relation to his genealogy were most clearly and literally fulfilled in Christ.

9. A messenger was to go before him to prepare his way. Isa. 40: 3. "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." Mal. 3: 1. "Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me." This was fulfilled by the ministry of John. Matt. 3: 1. " This is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, (Isaiah) saying, the voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight." See also Mark 1: 2, 3.

10. He was to be born of a virgin. Isa. 7: 14. "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." This was fulfilled in the person of Mary the mother of Jesus.

11. He was to be born in Bethlehem and not in Jerusalem. Micah. 5: 2. "But thou Bethlehem Ephrathah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." This was brought to pass by a decree issued by the Roman government, which brought Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem to be enrolled upon the tax list, at the right time for Christ to be born there. It was not their place of residence.

12. He was to ride into Jerusalem upon an ass colt. Zechariah 9: 9. "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion, shout, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold thy king cometh unto thee; he is just and having salvation; lowly and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass." This was fulfilled as recorded in Matt. 21: 1,11.

13. He was to be rejected by the Jews, Isa. 53: 3. "He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and we hid, as it were, our faces from him; he

was despised, and we esteemed him not." This was so clearly fulfilled that it is unnecessary to quote proof.

14. He was to be scourged and spit upon Isa. 50: 6. "I gave my back to the smiters and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair; I hid not my face from shame and spitting." This was fulfilled, even to the spit-ting upon him. Matt. 26: 67. "Then did they spit in his face, and buffeted him; and others smote him with the palms of their hands." See also Matt. 27: 30.

15. He was to receive vinegar and gall to drink. Psalm. 69: 21. "They gave me also gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink." This was fulfilled. Matt. 27: 34. "They gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall."

16. He was to be numbered with transgressors. Isa. 53: 9. "He made his grave with the wicked." Verse 12. "He was numbered with the transgressors." This was fulfilled in the fact of his being put to death between two malefactors as he was.

17. It was foretold what should be done with his garments. Psalm 22: 18. "They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture," This was fulfilled to the very letter at the crucifixion. Matt. 27: 35. " And they parted his garments, casting lots; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet; they parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots."

18. It was foretold that he should be put in a rich man's tomb. Isa. 53: 9 "And he made his grave with the wicked and with the rich in his death." This was fulfilled as recorded in Matt. 27: 57-60. "There came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph; he went to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus, and laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock." Thus did he make his grave with the rich as was predicted centuries before.

19. It was predicted that he should not see corruption. Psalm. 16: 10. "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell: neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption." This was fulfilled, as he rose the third day before the body was corrupted in the process of decomposition.

20. His resurrection was predicted. The text last quoted from Psalms is a prediction of his resurrection. But we have another, Isa. 53: In verse 8th it is inquired, "who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living. The answer is found in the 10th verse. "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand." Here it is affirmed, that he shall prolong his days after being cut off out of the land of the living. This is a clear declaration that he should rise from the dead.

There are other predictions concerning Christ which might be quoted; but the above is sufficient for this class of prophecies. We have named twenty particulars foretold by prophets, which were fulfilled in Christ, and which were never fulfilled in any other

person, and such an array of facts should be in itself sufficient to settle the question so far as the evidence of prophecy can settle any question.

These prophecies occupy a period of time covering more than a thousand years. The earliest of them were delivered between sixteen and seventeen hundred years before the birth of Christ, and the latest was delivered between three and four hundred years before Christ. This stamps the Scriptures with the mind of the all-knowing God.

Having sufficiently considered the prophecies which relate to our Lord Jesus Christ, we will conclude the argument by briefly noticing a few miscellaneous predictions, which we will select from the general mass that make up so large a portion of the inspired volume. The first prophecy, to which attention is invited, concerns Ishmael, the son of Abraham by Hagar, an Egyptian servant woman. Gen. 16: 12: "And he will be a wild man; and his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him; and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren." This, no doubt, relates not only to Ishmael, but also to his descendants, and has a literal and entire accomplishment in the Ishmaelites or Arabs. That they descended from Abraham through Ishmael there can be no doubt; we not only have the united testimony of all writers of profane history, but we find unquestionable proof among the Arabs themselves; they bear the unquestionable mark of the seed of Abraham. They have always boasted of having descended from Abraham. And they are circumcised, and profess to have derived this rite from Abraham. When we consider that it is said, Gen. 17: 23, that Abraham circumcised Ishmael, and that the Jews and Arabs are the only nations that have practiced the rite as a national distinction, the proof that the Arabs are the descendants of Ishmael is nearly as clear as that the Jews are the descendants of Isaac. But we suppose no one versed in history will dispute either. The character of the Arabs is clearly a fulfillment of the prophecy. Their hand has ever been against every man, and every man's hand against them, and it is so to this day. They have been, and still are, a nation of robbers, and plunder all that fall in their way. They are wild men. They are the only people, save the Jews, that have subsisted as a distinct people from the beginning. There is not, perhaps, another nation except the Jews, that can trace their existence back to its origin as a nation; nations have been swallowed up one after another, the Assyrians were lost in the Chaldeans and Babylonians; the Babylonians were swallowed up by the Medes; the Medes by the Persians; the Persians were lost in the Greeks; the Greeks in the Syrians and Egyptians; these were swallowed up by the Romans; and the Romans were swallowed up by the Goths and other nations; but there Ishmael stands a distinct people, an independent wild man still, and still his hand is against every man, and every man's hand is against him. Between three and four thousand years has Ishmael, through his descendants, "dwelt in the presence of all his brethren," and still dwells upon the same soil, lives in the same manner, and possesses essentially the same character, fulfilling the prediction that was uttered in the ears of his mother before he was born. More than thirty-seven hundred years have passed over the face of the world with their change-producing and wasting influence, since Ishmael was dismissed from Abraham's tent to seek a home and live a wild man in the wilderness, and his descendants are there still, live in tents still, wander like wild men still amid the burning sands, as well as amid the rocky cliffs of their own wild country. They are independent still; many aspiring potentates among the

Abysinians, Persians, Egyptians and Turks, have attempted to tame them, to subjugate these wandering tribes, and though some have had temporary success, they have ultimately failed in the end. It is said that Sesostris, king of Egypt, Cyrus, king of Persia, and Pompey and Trajan, of Rome, all attempted in vain to subdue these wild tribes. The country they inhabit is said to be about 1800 miles long, and 900 wide. They are a living evidence of the fulfillment of the prediction under consideration.

The next prediction to which attention is invited, is found Deut. 28: 15-68. This whole prediction has had a most clear fulfillment in the history of the Jews; to multiply words on the subject is useless, it is seen and read of all men.

A glance at a few of the predictions relating to some of the neighboring nations of the Jews, will finish what we have to say on the prophecies of the Old Testament, The overthrow of Babylon was clearly predicted by Isaiah and Jeremiah. We select the following from among their numerous declarations on the subject.

Isaiah 13: 19, 20, 21; "And Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' Excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation; neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall the shepherds make their folds there. But wild beasts of the desert shall be there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell, and satyrs shall dance there." Jer. 50: 35-39: "A sword is upon the Chaldeans, saith the Lord, and upon the inhabitants of Babylon. Therefore the wild beasts of the desert with wild beasts of the islands shall dwell there, and the owls shall dwell therein; and it shall be no more inhabited forever; neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation." It is clear that Isaiah flourished during the reign of Hezekiah, for he was sent to him when the king was sick, fifteen years before his death. Chapter 38: 5. He also predicted in the ears of Hezekiah, chapter 39: 6 the Babylonian captivity which took place in the days of Jehoiakim, more than a century after, which will appear by numbering the years the several kings, reigned between Hezekiah and Jehoiakim. Then add seventy years, the time of the captivity before Babylon was overthrown, and we see that the fall of Babylon was foretold by Isaiah nearly two hundred years before it took place. The prediction of Jeremiah must have been uttered about sixty years before the fall of Babylon.

But the force of the argument does not depend wholly upon the fact that the prediction was uttered so long before its fulfillment, but also upon the fact that it declares that it shall never be rebuilt or again inhabited. This no human eye could have seen, yet, after more than twenty centuries have rolled away, Babylon is in ruins still, and no traveler can now give a better description of her ruins than the prophets gave more than two thousand years ago, and at a time when she was in her highest glory

The predictions concerning Tyre, have all been minutely fulfilled, and furnish undeniable proof of the inspiration of the prophets. There are several predictions concerning Tyre, noting the various changes through which it passed during its long existence a few of which only will be noticed. Isaiah predicted its depression for seventy years, which was

fulfilled under Nebuchadnezzar, by whom Tyre was taken. These seventy years commenced after the seventy years of Jewish captivity, and Tyre was not rebuilt until after the return of the Jews from Babylon. Isa. 23: 15: "And it shall come to pass in that day that Tyre shall be forgotten seventy years." This was fulfilled as above.

Amos 1: 10; "But I will send a fire on the walls of Tyrus, which shall devour the places thereof." Zech. 9: 3, 4: "Tyrus did build herself a strong hold, and heaped up silver as dust, and fine gold as the mire of the streets. Behold the Lord will cast her out, and he will smite her power in the sea, and she shall be devoured with fire." Tyre was built on an island some distance from the main land, the city first built on the main land having been destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, as noted above. These last predictions were fulfilled under Alexander, who took the new city on the island and thus "smote her power in the sea." To do this he used the ruins of old Tyre to build a causeway between the main land and the city, after which he took it by storm and consumed it by fire. Thus were the words of the prophets literally fulfilled. "I will send a fire on the wall of Tyre."

He will smite her power in the sea, and she shall be devoured with fire."

The final destruction of Tyre was foretold by the prophet Ezekiel, chap. 26: 13, 14: "And I will cause the noise of thy songs to cease, and the sound of thy harps shall be no more heard. And I will make thee like the top of a rock, thou shalt be a place to spread nets upon, thou shalt be built no more, for I the Lord have spoken it." This has been fulfilled both to old and new Tyre. Old Tyre was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, and was never rebuilt. New Tyre was destroyed by Alexander as already noticed, but it was rebuilt. Tyre was finally sacked and seized by the Mamelukes of Egypt, about A. D. 1289. Its present condition is a clear fulfillment of the prophecy last quoted. It is only a fishing town. Huetius relates of one Hadrianus Parvillierius that "when he approached the ruins of Tyre, and beheld the rocks stretched forth to the sea, and the great stones scattered up and down on the shore, made clean and smooth by the sun, and waves, and wind, and useful only for the drying of fishermen's nets, many which happened at that time to be spread thereon, it brought to his memory the prophecy of Ezekiel concerning Tyre, that such should be its fate."

Mr. Bruce says, "passing by Tyre, from curiosity, I came to be a mournful witness of the truth of that prophecy, that Tyre, the Queen of nations, should be a rock for fishers to dry their nets on." Tyre has grown some since Bruce visited it, but it makes no approach to its former wealth and grandeur, and it is not likely that it ever will.

The prophecy of Daniel concerning the four grand empires is so clear, and its fulfillment is so plain that Infidels have sometimes asserted that it was written after the events it describes had transpired. This however, is impossible, for the prophet was quoted by Jesus Christ, which was before the prediction was entirely accomplished. This prophecy is contained in the second chapter, from the first to the forty-fifth verse. Four successive empires are here described which we find spread out upon the page of history as follows:—The Babylonish empire, the Medo-Persian empire, the Grecian empire under Alexander the Great, and the Roman Empire. These four empires were to last until the

God of heaven should set up a kingdom, no doubt meaning the gospel dispensation. See verse 44. Now it is clear that Christ was born during the Roman Empire, the last of the four, and that Christianity entirely subverted pagan Rome. Thus was the wonderful prediction fulfilled.

There are other predictions in the book of Daniel, as well as in the other prophets but those which have been adduced are sufficient to answer all the practical purposes of an argument, and here we close our examination of the prophecies of the Old Testament.

There are many interesting predictions in the New Testament, upon which arguments might be based, but two or three only will be noticed. The overthrow of Jerusalem is predicted in various places in the Evangelists, but we select a clear passage from Luke 19: 43, 44. "The days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another." The same thing is asserted in several other places. That this took place, and was accomplished by Titus no one will deny; so literally did he fulfill the prediction, that he caused a plough to pass over the place where the temple stood, so that not one stone was left upon another. Never was there, never could there be a plainer fulfillment of prophecy.

2 Thes. 2: 3, 4: "Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God setting in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." The people appear to have imbibed the idea that Christ was to come to judge the world immediately, or in a very short time, and this false notion he sought to correct, and in doing this, he assured them that that day should not come "except there should first come a falling away, and that man of sin be revealed." This prediction has been clearly fulfilled in the great apostacy which resulted in the establishment of popery. A similar prediction is found in Paul's first epistle to Tim. 4: 1, 2, 3: "Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving." That this and the preceding prediction embrace the essential features of popery, no one can doubt; and that they are clearly uttered prophecies, clearly fulfilled in a subsequent age, is too plain to be denied. Here we close our argument founded upon prophecy, and trust we have adduced enough to show that the sacred volume bears the undeniable impress of the all-pervading, all-searching and revealing Spirit of God.

SECTION X.

The Adaptation of the Scriptures to the Wants of Mankind.

A revelation from an all-wise and benevolent Creator, given for the benefit of mankind, must be distinguished by its adaptation to the actual condition and wants of humanity, and if this adaptation is found in the Scriptures, it will constitute a powerful argument in their favor, since no such claim can be set up for any other book. That the Scriptures, upon their face, set up claim to such adaptation, and that they actually treat of all the subjects necessary to be treated in such a revelation, cannot be denied, though it may be denied that they adequately treat these subjects, and fully meet the wants of human society. Infidels do not pretend to deny that the Scriptures treat of the subjects necessary to be treated and that they claim to meet the wants of humanity, but they rally all their force on a denial of their sufficiency as a standard of religious truth and duty. A brief examination of the subject will enable the candid to judge whether or not the Scriptures meet the religious wants of mankind.

I. Mankind are actually depraved in heart and life, insomuch that it is as true to the eye of the observer, and to universal experience, as to the reader of the Scriptures, that "all have gone out of the way." "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." This language which we have quoted from the Scriptures is true of mankind of every age, and every land. The adult human being that has never sinned, never done wrong, never gone out of the way, cannot be found. This fact of the universal corruption of our race cannot be denied. Infidels as well as Christians both see it in others and feel it in themselves.

The question then is, are the Scriptures adapted to this state of things. We affirm they are.

1. They affirm the fact; they treat of human nature as it is, as we actually find it. This doctrine of the depravity of humanity, must, of necessity, be recognized by any religion that would meet its wants; it must be fundamental, and rendered prominent in the measures of relief proposed. Now, just this is the fact, depravity is a leading doctrine of revelation, and is made exceedingly prominent in the gospel.
2. The Scriptures alone give any reasonable history of the origin of depravity. They tell us that, "sin entered into the world by one man"—that "by one man's disobedience many were made sinners." They tell us that God created man very good, and that he sinned, and involved himself and his posterity in depravity. This is not merely the only account we have of the origin of sin, but it is the only principle upon which the existence of depravity can be reconciled with the infinite power and goodness of the Creator. For want of this scriptural history of the origin of evil, some of the heathen came to the conclusion that God is a compound of good and evil, and that the good in Deity produces all the good, and that the evil in Deity produces all the evil.
3. The Scriptures present the only adequate relief for the state of things which they describe, and which observation declares actually to exist. Human ingenuity has never succeeded in inventing a remedy for sin; human research has never discovered any adequate source of relief. Intelligence discovers the evil, but never finds the cure; humanity often feels its defects, and deplors its circumstances, but finds not how to improve its condition. The experience of Paul is the experience of all who attempt a new life without laying hold of the remedy offered in the gospel, though all do not succeed in

expressing so well as he did, the conclusion to which their experience leads them. "To will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good, I find not. For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil that I would not, that I do. O wretched man that I am who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" In this state of mind the gospel finds the thinking sinner, and presents to him an adequate relief. To relieve his ignorance it pours upon his mind the doctrinal light of truth, gleaming with the very attributes of God; to relieve his guilt, it presents him with the atonement of Jesus Christ; to relieve his helplessness, it reveals the Holy Spirit with its gracious influences; and to cure him of his propensity to sin and to heal his diseased nature, the same Holy Spirit is presented as a reviving and sanctifying instrumentality. Thus it is plain that the Scriptures are adapted to the condition of mankind as they are really found in view of their undeniable depravity.

II. Man is clearly a compound being, possessing a physical, and intellectual, and moral nature, and to just such a being do the Scriptures address themselves; and of the sorrows and felicities of such a being do they treat, and the wants of such do they propose to relieve.

1. The Scriptures clearly regard the wants of the body. In their legislative and perceptive portions, as well as in their instructions, is this material form, this casket of the immortal gem carefully guarded in contradistinction from the soul which dwells within. Food, drink, raiment and medicine, are treated of in a legal point of view, as between man and man, and in a providential point of view, as between God and man. Death is a constant theme as certain to befall the body, and as one of the consequences of sin, and while reason can discover no remedy, and the eye of the philosopher cannot penetrate the night of the grave, the Scriptures present a remedy in the person of Christ, who died and rose again, and "who has abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."

2. The Scriptures are adapted to man's intellectual nature and wants. They treat of mind, and deal with mind with a masterly philosophic skill, infinitely above the common authors of the ages in which they were written. They seek to enlighten its darkness, to direct and control its efforts; they seek to control it as mind; they appeal to the understanding, present proper motives as well as treat of improper ones, they lay open the mind to its own view, and show the secret springs that move it. They treat of mental culture and teach us the importance of attaining to a high degree of understanding.

3. The Scriptures are adapted to man's moral nature and wants. When we contemplate man as a moral being, we conceive of him as possessed of volition or freedom of will, intelligence to guide it, a conscience which renders him susceptible of impressions of right and wrong; we conceive of him as an accountable being, a subject of moral law, and of a just retribution, and consequently a subject of hopes and fears, connected with the relation which the present life sustains to a future destiny. Now the Scriptures address themselves to mankind precisely upon these grounds; they not only assume to enlighten them by the communication of truth, but they appeal to their understanding, their judgment in vindication of their claims; they appeal to their consciences, and seek to rouse them within, to influence their will in favor of the right; they constantly treat of the

present life as a probationary state, and remind them of the shortness and uncertainty of its duration, and labor to impress them with the unsubstantial character and deceptiveness of the brightest worldly objects that would attract their attention, and divert them from the higher interest of their future destiny; and they enforce the whole by appeals to the claims of God their Maker, and by appeals to their hopes and fears, pointing them to a day of Judgment, and to a retribution, on one hand as bright as hope can paint with the pencil of enlightened and sanctified imagination, and on the other, as dark as fear can suggest, where despair lends the shadow of its wing to give the last gloomy aspect to the picture. Thus is it seen that the Scriptures are fully adapted to meet the entire demands of man's moral nature; and they exhibit a deep philosophical knowledge of his moral nature, of its wants and the influences that control it, unknown to any mere human composition of the times in which they were written.

III. Man is clearly and undeniably, a social being, and the Scriptures are adapted to his social nature and wants.

1. The institution of marriage, which is the first link in the chain of human associations, is recognized, regulated and guarded by the Scriptures. All improper intercourse of the sexes is interdicted, the marriage relation is made sacred and inviolate, and the duties of husbands and wives are clearly defined and enforced by supreme authority.

2. The obligations and duties of parents and children are clearly defined and enforced in the Scriptures. The relation between them constitutes the second link in the chain of human associations, and it is fully recognized and provided for in the Scriptures.

3. Not to multiply distinctions, when we pass beyond the family circle, we find men existing in larger communities, sustaining a relation to each other, as members of the commonwealth, and the whole sustaining a relation to a constituted government, which is or should be established for the mutual benefit of each and all. This is an indispensable condition of mankind, and the great principles, obligations and duties of these relations are found in the Scriptures

The great law governing all men in their intercourse with each other is short, plain, simple, and capable of universal application. "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets." But the duties of both rulers and subjects are specifically pointed out.

4. In conclusion, the unavoidable distinction of classes are recognized in the Scriptures, their relations defined and their duties explained and enforced. There is not a conceivable distinction of classes or condition in society which is not recognized and provided for in the Scriptures; such as the wise and the simple, the rich and the poor, the employer and the employed, the master and the servant, the sick and the well, the offended and the offender, the criminal and the judge, the court and the parties. If the adaptation of the Scriptures to the wants of mankind as they are actually found, constituted the only argument in their favor, the Bible would still appear to be the most wonderful book the

world ever saw; but considered in connection with the other proofs of its inspiration, its origin is clearly divine.

SECTION XI.

The Success of Christianity.

It is not pretended that the success of any system can prove it divine, aside from the circumstances that surround it, and the means it employs to extend itself; but such were the circumstances that attended Christianity, considered in connection with the means employed to propagate it, as to render its rapid and great success conclusive evidence of its divine origin. To present the argument in its proper light, it is necessary to examine into the circumstances of its commencement, as well as to consider its success.

1. Supposing it not to be divine, its commencement was the most unpromising. Its author was the reputed son of an obscure mechanic, and denying his divinity, his very existence, under the circumstances, was proof positive of the corruption and wickedness of his parents. He grew up without education, as his enemies confessed that he had never learned letters. (John 8: 15.) He was rejected by his own nation, and condemned as worthy of death, and was handed over to the Gentiles to be executed. He was crucified as an imposter and common malefactor, a blasphemer, and subverter of the Jewish religion, and a traitor to the government of Caesar. He was buried, and, denying his resurrection, which, if admitted, would prove him divine, his disciples came by night and stole his body, and placed it where it could never be found, and went and told a falsehood, that he was raised from the dead, and that they had seen him alive. So much for the author of Christianity.

The first agencies employed to propagate Christianity were as unpromising as the author of the system, considering them as merely human instrumentalities. His first chosen ministers were twelve, all called from the common walks of life, uneducated, and one of these sold his master for thirty pieces of silver, and then went and committed suicide. Another denied him with a profane oath, and all forsook him when he was arrested. This was certainly an unpromising band to subdue the mental and moral world into a belief in, and submission to Christianity. Themselves unlearned and poor had to represent and defend a leader who had been condemned as a criminal and publicly executed.

2. The nature of the doctrines they proclaimed, considered in connection with the state of the world, greatly increased their embarrassment. So far as the Jews were concerned, they entertained the most deadly hostility to the gospel, and looked upon it as subversive of their long cherished religion. They opposed it with the most bitter persecution, and sought to exterminate it by every possible means, and they commanded all the learning, wealth and official influence of the nation against it

So far as the Gentile world are concerned, they were idolaters, with a legalized religion, and endowed temples and interested priests. Christianity met all the prejudices growing out of these institutions that stood up before them, crusted over with the venerable rust of

antiquity, and waged an uncompromising war upon all their doctrines and forms of worship, and assailed their practices and morals as false, corrupt, dishonorable to God, and ruinous to the souls of men.

In a word, Christianity went forth in the hands of the little feeble party described, against the world, to withstand the force of its learning and wealth, they being unlearned and poor; to resist its governments and arms, they being unprotected by law and unarmed for defense; and to subvert its religion and reform its morals, being allowed to make no compromise, insisting upon the absolute submission of the world to its entire claims.

3. Under all these discouraging circumstances, the gospel triumphed, and swept over the land of the Jews, and hastened to enlightened heathen countries, so that in three hundred years it overrun the Roman Empire, subverted its ancient religion, and brought the Emperor who then held the scepter of the world, to worship at its shrine, and to believe and preach the doctrines of the cross. To suppose all this could be done by merely human instrumentalities, entirely upon the voluntary principle, is actually beyond the reach of human credulity. There is no way of evading the force of this argument; not one of the alleged facts upon which it depends can be denied, and admitting them, the success of Christianity cannot be accounted for upon any other principle than that it is divine, and was attended by a supernatural influence.

The collusiveness of the argument is obvious from the only manner in which Infidels have labored to weaken its force. Unable to assail it as untrue in any of its parts, they have contented themselves with an effort to produce a parallel, in which they have utterly failed. Could they find another instance of equal success, resulting from similar agencies, under like circumstances, it would greatly weaken if not destroy the argument, but a parallel case cannot be found in the history of the world. The only case that has been produced is that of Mahomet, and it is so far from being a parallel, that it only proves that Infidelity must be pushed to the last extremity to bring it forward as an offset to the success of Christianity. A few facts will set this matter all right, and make it plain to the reader.

1. Christianity commenced in an enlightened age, and established itself and flourished most, in the most enlightened portions of the world; while Mahomet commenced in an age of darkness and spread his conquests over unenlightened communities.

He flourished early in the seventh century, when darkness had overspread the nations.

2. Mahomet possessed great advantages over Christ in his family connections. He lost his parents, but was reared and educated by a rich uncle, and married a very wealthy widow, by which he possessed all the influence that wealth, could give him, and had powerful connections.

3. Christ and Mahomet both commenced propagating their respective religions by moral suasion, or by arguments without force. Christ and his apostles made hundreds and thousands of converts; three thousand were converted in one day at Jerusalem. (Acts 2:

41,) and in a few days the number was increased to five thousand, (Acts 4: 4,) from which the number increased daily by the addition of multitudes, both of men and women. (Acts 5: 14.) Compare this with the success of Mahomet, who for the first seven years while he used only persuasion, made only 101 converts to his religion. The difference is absolutely annihilating to Infidelity.

4. Christianity primitively resorted to none but peaceable means to enforce its principles; facts and arguments were its only weapons for the first three hundred years of its career, during which time it overrun the eastern world, and Christianized the Roman Empire.

But Mahomet, after a number of years of unsuccessful effort, during which he made 101 converts, resorted to the sword, and ever after enforced his opinions by the power of arms, war and carnage; exterminating all that would not submit, and embrace his creed.

5. Jesus Christ insisted upon self-denial; and preached purity in heart and life, while Mahomet stimulated his followers to action by the promise of plunder and sensual indulgencies, allowing each of his disciples to have four wives, and to change them at pleasure, and promising all that fell in his cause, a paradise, the principal enjoyment of which should consist of the society of seventy-two immortal virgins, free from all natural impurities, defects and inconveniences incident to the sex in this world. To make it more certain to imagination, Mahomet declares that to prepare the faithful for the enjoyment of paradise, God will give to each the abilities of one hundred men.

The reader must by this time be convinced that there is no parallel between Christianity and Mahometanism, and that the success of the latter can prove or disprove nothing concerning the success of the former, and Infidelity only exposes its own weakness, when it attempts to offset the one against the other. The success of Mahometanism was the triumph of arms upon the battlefield; the success of Christianity was the triumph of moral influence, truth, peace and virtue.

SECTION XII.

The Influence of the Scriptures.

Every tree is known by its fruit. Men do not "gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles." So is it with truth and error. If it be a philosophical truth, that like produces like, and that every cause produces an effect in nature similar to itself, the truth or falsehood of the Scriptures may be determined by the nature of the influence they exert, and the effects they produce. If the Scriptures are false, if they are a vulgar lie, or a cunningly devised fable, they must produce results in accordance with themselves, and human society must be corrupted and rendered vicious just in proportion as the people are led to embrace the Scriptures and are brought under their influence.

On the other hand, if the Scriptures are true, if they bear the impress of divinity, the effects they produce must be assimilated to truth, and must tend to reform and elevate human society, and must leave their Own impress of divinity upon the human mind, just

in proportion to the degree of intelligence and faith with which they are embraced. Let the Scriptures be tried by this standard, and the decision cannot be doubtful.

It is proper to remark at this point, that the Scriptures are not to be charged with what they fail to accomplish, but only what they actually produce. They are not to be held accountable for the lives of those who profess to believe them, but only for such conduct as they countenance, or as the actor performs in consequence of believing them. They are not to be held responsible for any violations of their own precepts and spirit, but only for what is performed in conformity with their requisitions.

The Scriptures themselves treat of men as moral agents, capable of receiving or rejecting them, of obeying or disobeying them. We all know that men often fail to do what they believe they ought to do, and often do that which they acknowledge they ought not to do. This shows that men may reject the Scriptures without making the Scriptures responsible for such rejection. They may also profess to believe them, when they do not believe them, and for that the Scriptures are not responsible. They may also really believe them to be true and yet not obey them, or they may profess to obey them, while they pervert them, construing the Scriptures to suit their conduct, and not shaping their conduct to suit the Scriptures. For none of these things can the Scriptures be held responsible, since they are all a violation of what they require, and since the principle that man, as a moral agent, may violate the law of right, is one of their fundamental doctrines.

These remarks are necessary as a ground of defense against the repeated attacks of Infidels in relation to the imperfect lives of Christians. It is admitted that professed Christians have often done very wrong, in waging bloody wars and persecutions, in maintaining or helping to maintain the scepter of oppression, as well as in delinquencies of private life, but these are neither commanded or tolerated by Christianity, they do not result from Christianity, but from a want of conformity to it. In attempting to test the Scriptures by the effects they produce, the only legitimate questions are, what is their tendency, and what would be the state of things, if all men were conformed in heart and life to what they require.

But we have to deal with facts. What has Christianity done for mankind where it has prevailed, in comparison with Infidelity and all other kinds of religion.

1. Look at the difference between those countries where Christianity exists in its greatest purity and efficiency, and those countries where it is unknown, and the view presents an unanswerable argument in favor of Christianity. Literature and the arts and sciences have followed in the wake of Christianity, and flourish most where Christianity flourishes most. Polite literature is confined to Christian lands at the present time, and all the useful arts, inventions and discoveries that constitute the wonders of this wonderful age, are brought out under the genial sun of Christianity, and advancement in all that is great and useful is most rapid where Christianity is least corrupted and least restrained.

But look at the actual state of society and examine into the social arrangements, and the brightest spots on earth are where Christianity sheds its hallowed influence. Where have

we the most enlightened jurisprudence and most equitable laws but where Christianity prevails? The fugitive slave law of 1850 is an exception; it is a law which outrages the moral sensibilities of the people by whose government it was enacted, and is an excrescence on a general system, which as a whole, this wicked law excepted, is not now and never was surpassed, under any human government, for intelligence and equal justice. This law, as well as the whole sanguinary slave code, is not the offspring of Christianity, but the result of powerful counteracting influences, which have arrayed themselves against the equal justice and the law of love that distinguish the Gospel. Christianity abolished slavery throughout the Roman Empire; it abolished domestic slavery in ancient Europe, has abolished African slavery wherever the British banner waves, has abolished it in all the Northern States of the American Union, and in Mexico, and has kindled a fire that will consume slavery from the land and the world. Slavery with the fugitive slave law is not to be charged upon Christianity, it is one of the evils which Christianity has yet to remove, and which it will remove, unless slavery removes it.

The same is true of war; it is not the offspring of Christianity, but is practiced in violation of the Gospel of peace.

But while Christianity has not yet abolished war, it has greatly changed its character, and given it a milder aspect, and taught enemies in the field to treat their prisoners with humanity, and to restore them to their country, their homes and their friends, by exchange, instead of putting them to the sword, or making slaves of them for life, and it will ultimately put an end to war. So it is seen that, notwithstanding these evils exist in Christian lands, human society presents a bright face, and a greater sum total of happiness under the influence of the gospel, than can be found anywhere on the wide world where it does not shine.

To come back and resume the consideration of the actual state of society where Christianity prevails, we say it has abolished idolatry in every pagan country where it has established itself, and put an end to all the cruel rites connected with pagan altars and pagan worship. It has abolished infanticide, and human sacrifices; and taught children to care for and tenderly nourish their aged parents; it has established hospitals for the sick, alms houses for the poor, and schools for the instruction of the ignorant. It is a striking fact that these institutions are all confined to Christian lands. Christianity has abolished polygamy, and divorce within the universal Church, and has exalted the character of woman from the condition of a domestic slave, or from a mere instrument of gratification for her lord, to an equal, and has crowned her in her sphere, the centre of attraction in, and the presiding spirit of her home of happiness.

We need not pursue these general remarks further, for no one will deny that where Christianity prevails, it elevates the standard of morality, and enlarges the cup of human happiness, to a degree unknown to any portion of the pagan or Mahomedan world.

2. When we look at the influence of Christianity upon individuals, and witness its power in the formation of personal character, and in developing personal morality and purity,

the argument is equally clear and conclusive. Here, again, there may be exceptions; hypocrites may be found among the professedly sanctified; but they are only exceptions to the general rule. The comparison is between those who believe, love and profess to obey the Scriptures, and those who reject, hate and oppose them, There can be no doubt as to the result of such a comparison. All openly wicked and corrupt men neglect, if not hate and oppose the Scriptures; while all truly good and benevolent men are readers and believers of the Scriptures, and those who love and admire the Scriptures most, are the best social and moral beings, and do most good to their fellow beings. If there are exceptions, they are so rare as not in any degree to effect the general rule. A single fact must be sufficient to settle this question, beyond the power of contradiction or doubt, viz.: Men always reform in morals, when they abandon Infidelity and skepticism, and embrace the Scriptures as a standard of religious faith and practice; while on the other hand, men never improve in morals when they renounce the Scriptures and embrace Infidelity, but generally, if not always, retrograde in morals, and frequently become entirely abandoned. This settles the question of the tendencies of the Scriptures.

To be a little more specific, the most distinguished Christians who have done most to promote Christianity, have led the most harmless, useful and pure lives, and died the most peaceful and hopeful death: while those who have been most distinguished for their Infidelity, and have done most to promote it, and to oppose the Scriptures, have lived the most profligate and abandoned lives, and died the most miserable deaths. Let us glance at the views of a few of the most distinguished Infidels.

Lord Herbert declares that lust or passion are no more blameworthy than thirst or hunger. Hobbes, the celebrated Infidel, said that right and wrong are mere quibbles of men's imaginations, and that there is no real distinction between them. Lord Bolingbroke asserted that the chief end of man was to gratify his lusts and passions, that he was so made, and that when he gratified these he got his greatest happiness. Hume declares that self-denial and humility were positive vices, and that adultery rather elevated than degraded the human character. Roseau, taught that whatever man feels, is right. Paine, the gross blasphemer, was a drunkard. Voltaire advocated the very depths of the lowest possible sensuality.

These are the men, whose works are the standard of Infidelity, being republished and circulated to enlighten and reform the world.

But how did these men die? Not as the Christian dies, whose end is peace. Voltaire, during his last sickness, sent for Dr. Trochin, who, when he came, found him in the greatest agony, exclaiming with the utmost horror, "I am abandoned by God and man." He then said, "Oh! Doctor, I will give you half of what I am worth, if you will give me six month's life." The Doctor answered, "you cannot live six weeks." Voltaire replied, "then I shall go to hell." He was the subject of the deepest anguish during his last hours, and would alternately blaspheme God, and cry out, "Oh, Jesus Christ," and complain that he was abandoned of God and man. Finally, after spending his life in the most bitter opposition to Christianity, using the expression, "crush the wretch," as a motto, just before

he died, amid his horrid blasphemies, and his anguish and terrors, he sent for a Roman Priest to administer to him the sacrament.

Mirabeau, died calling out "Give me more laudanum, that I may not think of eternity, and of what is to come." Hobbs, the Atheist, said in his dying hour, "I am now about to take a leap in the dark." Paine is known to have died drunk and swearing.

How unlike these Infidel deaths, is the death of Christians, who have the consciousness in the dying hour of having lived up to the standard of the religion they have professed. Stephen said, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." St. Paul said, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day." Mr. Wesley said, as he left the world, "The best of .all is, God is with us." Dr. Payson said, "The battle is fought, the battle is fought, the victory is won." It is worthy of remark, that Infidels have often abandoned their infidelity at the approach of death, but no Christian ever abandoned Christianity in his last hours, it becomes more precious as he enters the dark valley and approaches the jaws of death; it causes the throat of death itself to flash with the light of immortality, as the passage way to an endless life.

Infidelity has never been very fruitful in poetry, yet it has left us a poetic expression of its views and feelings, from the pen of Lord Byron, a man of transcendent abilities, but corrupt principles and profligate life.

The following lines were written by him at the close of life:

" Though gay companions o'er the bowl
Dispel awhile the sense of ill,
Though pleasure fills the maddening soul,
The heart—the heart is lonely still.
"Aye, but to die, and go, alas!
Where all have gone, and all must go;
To be the nothing that I was,
Ere born to life and living woe!
"Count o'er the joys thine hours have seen,
Count o'er thy days from anguish free;
And know, whatever thou hast been,
Tis something better not to be.
" Nay, for myself, so dark my fate
Through every turn of life hath been,
Man and the world so much I hate,
I care not when I quit the scene."

In the above lines, Infidelity gives its experience of life, and its prospect in view of death, robed in poetry; and in contrast with it, we give the following views of a reclaimed Infidel, under the influence of his new faith in Christianity, with which we close our argument for the Inspiration of the Scriptures. If any one inclined to skepticism, has read

the argument through, we hope he may now adopt the words of the poet, as expressive of his own mental state.

And darkness and doubt are now flying away,
No longer I roam in conjecture forlorn;
So breaks on the traveler faint and astray,
The bright and the balmy effulgence of morn.
" See truth, love, and mercy in triumph descending,
And nature all glowing in Eden's first bloom!
On the cold cheek of death, smiles and roses are
Blending, and beauty immortal awakes from the tomb."

BOOK II.

THE DOCTRINES OF THE SCRIPTURES.

CHAPTER I.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF THE SCRIPTURES.

If the Scriptures contain a revelation of the will of God, as was proved in the preceding book, and then God must exist. By proving the inspiration of the Scriptures, the existence of the divine source of inspiration has been established, just as certainly as the existence of a cause is proved, when we have established, beyond doubt, the truth of the existence of the effects of such cause. To attempt a labored effort, therefore, to prove the existence of God from the Scriptures, would be to prove what is already as certainly true, as the evidence by which we propose to prove it. No argument drawn from the Scriptures can make the existence of God more certain than it is, for it is now just as certain that God exists, as it is that the Scriptures are a revelation from God. The only time to attempt a demonstration of the existence of God is prior to the establishment of the inspiration of the Scriptures, and for this demonstration the reader is referred to the opening chapter of this work.

By some, it is denied that man would ever infer the existence of God from the visible creation, without a first suggestion from some mind other than his own. This may present a point well calculated to excite inquiry by the curious, but it can be of no practical importance, after the truth of the Scriptures has been established. The inquiry is, concerning what would or would not transpire under a state of things which does not and cannot exist. It is admitted by Mr. Watson, who belabors the affirmative of the question, that the human mind is clearly capable of demonstrating the existence of God, from the visible creation, *a posteriori*, after the first thought that there is a God has been suggested. It is not necessary for us to affirm that the human mind can demonstrate the existence of God without the suggestion of such first thought, from the simple fact that it cannot be proved that such first thought is not, in some way, suggested to every rational human being. It is held by most theologians, that man is naturally a devotional being; that even amid the ruins of the fall, there springs religious feeling from the elements of his

nature, and that he is inclined to worship something. If this be so, who can say that it is not the result of the religious constitution which God gave to man when he created him, which sin has not been able to destroy, though it has diverted it from its proper centre of attraction to the worship of devils; and who can say how much of the original impress which God left of his own existence upon the human soul when he formed it, still lingers in this religious nature, which is calculated to suggest the thought of a higher power, even amid its blind devotions at the altar of an "unknown God."

But what may have more force, is the fact that no one can prove that the spirit of God, does not so move upon the mind, as to lead to the conception of that first thought that there is a God. This, perhaps, may be inferred from the language of the apostle, Rom. 1: 19, 20: "That which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." Again, chap. 2: 14,15: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves. Which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." As this is said of the heathen who are destitute of a written revelation, it implies that at least that first thought of the existence of God is in some way suggested to their minds, and having the first suggestion, it is admitted that they can demonstrate the existence of God from his works.

But what is most conclusive on this point is the fact that it can never be proved that the first thought of the existence of God is not communicated to all men by tradition. We find all nations in possession of some idea of a supreme Creator, some great spirit, some overruling Providence, and this may have been handed down from Adam to Noah, and from Noah to all succeeding nations, as his sons spread them selves over the face of the world.

But the simple existence of God, and clear and correct views of God, of his attributes and character, are two things; men may possess a tolerably clear faith in the simple existence of God, while they are dark indeed on the subject of his mode of existence, and his character and attributes. Having then established the inspiration of the Scriptures, it is proper to inquire what they teach concerning God.

The Scriptures take it for granted that there is a God, and that it is understood that there is a God, instead of proceeding to reveal it as a new truth not before known. When God declares himself, it is not so much a revelation that he is, as a revelation of who he is, and what he is. It will be found on a careful examination of the sacred pages, that men often assert that God is, but God does not assert his own existence; when he speaks, he takes his own existence for granted, and declares what he is, and what his will and purposes are. A few examples will be sufficient to make this truth plain.

The sacred record does not open with an announcement of the fundamental truth that there is a God, but with an announcement of what God did, without affirming his existence. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Here it is taken for

granted that there is a God, and that this truth is understood. If the Scriptures were intended to reveal the simple fact that there is a God, this would have been an appropriate occasion for making the first announcement, and the record might have opened thus: — "God is, and was, and ever shall be." As it is taken for granted that there is a God, in the first sentence of the inspired page, by announcing the heavens and the earth as the work of his hands, so this fundamental truth continues to be taken for granted throughout the record, the Scriptures nowhere asserting the divine existence as an abstract truth. The first announcement of the name of God in connection with Noah is that "God saw the wickedness of man was great in the earth." Gen. 6: 5: The first revelation which God made to Abraham is recorded thus: "Now the Lord had said unto Abram, get thee out of thy country." Gen. 12: 1: The first announcement which God made of himself to Moses, was in these words: "I am the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." The language assumes it to be understood that there was such a God. Isaiah opens his sublime predictions thus: "Hear O heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken." God often declares that he is *the* God, in contradistinction from idols or imaginary gods; he often declares that he is *a* God of specific character or at tributes; and often denies the existence of other gods, or asserts that there is no God like unto him, or beside him, but he does not assert his existence as a new and abstract truth to be believed; and the displays of power, and majesty, and glory, in connection with the revelation he has given us, were not so much designed to convince man kind that there is a God, as to convince them that it was God that spake.

But while the Scriptures take the simple existence of God for granted, assuming in every communication to men, that they already have some knowledge of him, his attributes and character are made the frequent subjects of direct revelation. The Scriptures appear designed, not so much to teach men the simple fact that there is a God, as to correct their false views concerning him, and to reveal to them what he is. We may take for example the address of Paul to the Athenian idolaters, Acts 17: 23-29: "Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore, ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you. God, that made the world, and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwells not in temples made with hands. Neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though he needed anything, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things. And hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation. That they should seek the Lord if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us. For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the God head is like unto gold, or silver, or stone graven by art and man's device."

In this discourse the apostle talks of the existence of God as a truth understood though he was discoursing to many who appear to have been worshippers of idols; but he charges home upon them their ignorance of the mode of the divine existence, and of the divine

attributes and character. We propose, then, to inquire what the Scriptures teach concerning God, that we may understand his character.

What do the Scriptures teach concerning the attributes and character of God is an important question. This question opens the very fountain of all theology, and the answer must give character and tone to religion, for religion must be like its source, and must tend to make the devotional like the God they worship, in proportion to the clearness of their conceptions of his character, and the intensity of the devotion they render to him.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHARACTER AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

SECTION I.

The Spirituality of God.

It may not be possible to understand fully what a spirit is, but this constitutes no objection to the doctrine of the spirituality of the divine nature. If the fact that we cannot understand a substance or essence is an objection to its existence, nothing can be allowed to exist, for we cannot comprehend the essence of matter. We know matter by certain phenomena it exhibits, and we may know spirit in the same way. Matter is that which possesses the proper ties of impenetrability, extension, figure, divisibility, inertia, attraction, &c. Spirit is that which exhibits none of these properties, but which thinks, and performs all the operations of intelligence, and possesses inherent powers of action, without being first acted upon. If there be a God, he must be a spirit, for to affirm that he is matter, would be to deny to him every essential attribute of which it is possible to conceive as belonging to his nature, the impress of which is everywhere stamped upon his works. Operative power, wisdom, and universal presence, clearly do not belong to matter, but can belong only to spirit, which must be superior to and pervade all matter. But what does the Bible teach is the question.

John 4: 24: "God is a spirit." While we may not be able to comprehend fully what the Savior meant by spirit, nothing can be more certain than that he used the term in contradistinction from matter, and consequently he denied that God is matter, and asserted that he is something different from matter, which he calls spirit. But there are other texts which teach the spirituality of the divine nature, 2 Cor. 3: 17: "The Lord is that spirit." Every text which speaks of the spirit of God and its operations, teaches the spirituality of the divine nature. Gen. 1: 2: "The spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Gen. 4: 3: "My spirit shall not always strive with man;" Joel 2: 28: "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh." Rom. 8: 9: "If so be that the spirit of God dwell in you;" 1 Cor. 3: 16: "The spirit of God dwelleth in you." Eph. 4: 30: "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God;" 1 Peter 4: 14: "The spirit of God resteth upon you." Those texts which affirm that God is invisible, by implication at least, teach that he is a spirit. Job 23: 8, 9: "Behold I go forward, but he is not there, and backward, but I cannot perceive him; on the left hand where he doth work, but I cannot behold him; he hideth himself on the right hand, that I

cannot see him." Col. 1: 15: "Who is the image of the invisible God." 1 Tim. 1: 17: "Unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God." These texts, by asserting that God is invisible, dearly teach his spirituality.

SECTION II.

The Eternity of God.

That God is eternal, that is, always existed, and always will exist, is most clearly asserted. Gen. 21: 33: "And Abraham called there on the name of the Lord, the everlasting God." This text undoubtedly refers to the past as well as to the future, and implies that God always was, just as clearly as it does that he always shall be; and that he is from everlasting as well as to everlasting. Dr. Adam Clarke renders it, "The Eternal One." Deut. 33: 27: "The eternal God is thy refuge." These are among the last words of Moses, and were uttered under the influence of inspiration. Psalm. 90: 2: "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God." This text teaches the eternity of God as clearly as words can convey the idea. Isaiah 57: 15; "Thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy." Rev. 4: 8: "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come." The obvious meaning of this text is, that God always was, and always will be, and of course, is eternal.

SECTION III.

The Omnipotence of God.

The Scriptures teach beyond a shadow of doubt, that God is omnipotent, or in other words, that he is possessed of almighty power. Only a few of the many texts on the subject need be adduced. Gen. 17: 1; "I am the almighty God." Exo. 6: 3: "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty." Mark 10: 27: "With God all things are possible." 2 Cor. 6: 18: "I will be a father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." Rev. 4: 8: "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty." Rev. 15: 3: "And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty." Rev. 19: 6: "The Lord God omnipotent reigneth." These plain declarations, to which many more might be added, are sufficient to show that the Bible teaches the doctrine that God is omnipotent, or possessed of Almighty power.

SECTION IV.

The Omnipresence of God.

That God exists in all places, and fills all space, is most clearly taught in the Scriptures. 1 Kings 8: 27: "But will God in deed dwell with men on the earth? Behold, heaven, and the heaven of heavens can not contain thee." Psalm. 139: 7-10: "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art

there; if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me." Jer. 23: 24: "Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord." Eph. 1: 23: "The fullness of him that filleth all in all."

The doctrine of the Divine omnipresence is clearly implied in all those Scriptures which promise the divine presence to individuals who trust and worship God in all parts of the world at the same time. The doctrine is absolutely essential to the idea of worship, for worship is supposed to be performed in the presence of, and offered to the object of devotion, hence God cannot be worshipped where he is not.

SECTION V.

The Omniscience of God.

It is very wonderful that any believer in the Scriptures should have ever intimated that it is possible that God may not know all things, with perfect and absolute knowledge. Dr. A. Clarke appears to us to have done this in his notes on Acts, chap. 2, in fine. His language is, "As God's omnipotence implies his power to do all things, so God's omniscience implies his power to know all things. Though God can do all things, he does not do all things. God is omniscient, and can know all things; but does it follow from this that he must know all things?" This brief extract presents the substance of the whole of Dr. Clarke's argument; and it has always appeared to us unworthy of its distinguished author, whose commentaries, as a whole, we consider the best of which we have any knowledge. Without going into a labored argument in review, I will only very briefly state two objections to the view here given.

1. The supposition that the omniscience of God does not imply that he knows all things rests wholly upon a comparison between omnipotence and omniscience, which comparison is without foundation, and entirely false. There is no analogy between power and knowledge; and any argument founded upon the supposed resemblance of the one to the other, must be fallacious. Power consists simply in an ability to do or perform, not in actually doing; the most powerful man often does least; but knowledge consists in actually knowing, not in the capacity to know; hence, it cannot be said that the most knowing man may know least, as the most powerful man often does least. A man is powerful in proportion to his ability to perform, but a man is not wise in proportion to what he is capable of knowing, but in proportion to what he does actually know. The same must be true of God. To be omnipotent it is only necessary that he should be capable of doing all things; but to render him omniscient it is necessary that he should actually know all things.

2. The supposition that God is omniscient, because he has power to know all things, while he chooses not to know all things, and actually does not know some things, because he chooses not to know them, involves the absurdity that God acts in ignorance of the thing concerning which he acts, or acts without a reason. To suppose that God chooses to know some things, and chooses not to know some other things, implies that he knows

nothing until he chooses to know. Now as this implies that he must be alike ignorant of all things, until he chooses to know some things, his choice must be made before knowing, and how God can choose to know some things of which, as yet, he has no knowledge, must be difficult to understand. If God be alike ignorant of two things, there can be no reason why he should choose to know the one, and not to know the other. He must know them both before he can have a reason for choosing to know the one, and not to know the other. In a word, it amounts to this, God must know a thing before he can have a reason for choosing to know it; and he must know a thing before he can have a reason for choosing not to know it.

Thus does this theory which makes the divine prescience depend upon an act of volition, contradict and destroy itself.

An appeal to the Scriptures will settle the question.

1 Sam. 2: 3: "Talk no more so exceeding proudly; let *not* arrogance come out of your mouth; for the LORD *is* a God of knowledge, and by him actions are weighed."

Job. 21: 22: "Shall any teach God knowledge? seeing he judgeth those that are high;" 28: 24: "For he looketh to the ends of the earth, and seeth under the whole heaven."

Ps. 139: 1-6: "O Lord, thou hast searched me and known me. Thou knowest my down-sitting and mine up-rising; thou understandest my thought afar off. Thou compassest my path, and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue, but lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether. Thou hast beset me behind and before, and laid thine hand upon me. Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is nigh, I cannot attain unto it." 147: 5: " Great is our Lord, and of great power; his understanding is infinite."

Prov. 5: 21: "For the ways of man are before the eyes of the Lord, and he pondereth all his goings."

Dan. 2: 22: "He revealeth the deep and secret things; he knoweth what is in the darkness, and the light dwelleth with him."

Acts 15: 18: "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world."

Rom. 11: 33-36: "O, the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counselor? Or hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things; to whom be glory forever. Amen."

The above passages from the Holy Scriptures are among the most decisive texts, and we think must be sufficient to settle the question beyond a doubt. If "his understanding is *infinite*;" if he "understandeth our thoughts afar off;" if he is "acquainted with all our

ways;" if there is "not a word in our tongue but he knoweth it altogether;" if "the ways of man are before the eyes of the Lord, and he pondereth all his goings;" if he "knoweth what is in the darkness, and if the light dwelleth with him," and if "known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world," then is he omniscient, all wise, knowing all things.

SECTION VI.

The Immutability of God.

Before attempting to prove that God is immutable, it may be well to state briefly, what is meant by immutability. Immutability is that perfection of the divine nature, which renders God eternally unchangeable. God is immutable in his nature or essence, in all his attributes, in his purposes, in his promises, and in his threatenings. This immutability however is, not to be so understood as to allow of no change or variety in the divine administration, it absolutely requires change, as changes take place in the moral agents who are the subjects of such administration. The immutability of God supposes him to remain the same in his own nature, and always to act the same, in view of the same moral character and condition of his subjects, while it necessarily supposes a change in conduct towards them as they change from bad to good, or from good to bad. It is a settled principle of the divine administration to punish sinners and to save the pious; and it is said of the sinner that "the wrath of God abideth on him." Suppose then that the sinner repents and turns to God with purpose of heart the wrath of God ceases to abide on him, and he enjoys the divine favor. Suppose, also, a righteous man to turn away from his righteousness, and he ceases to enjoy the divine favor, and the wrath of God now abideth on him. Here is a change in the divine administration, relatively towards these two persons, but no real change in the principles of the administration, for it is immutably settled, to treat such characters as they were treated before the change, and as they are now treated since the change; they have changed, and of course, respectively fall under different principles of the divine administration, while God and the principles of his administration remain the same. When a sinner turns from his sin, and a righteous man turns from his righteousness, God would have to change to continue to treat them the same; but as he changeth not, they must experience a different administration at his hand, according to the change which they have undergone. This view of God, and his government, is fully sustained by the Scriptures. One quotation on this point will be sufficient.

Ezekiel 33: 12-15: "Therefore, thou son of man, say unto the children of thy people, The righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver him in the day of his transgression: as for the wickedness of the wicked, he shall not fall thereby in the day that he turneth from his wickedness; neither shall the righteous be able to live for his *righteousness* in the day that he sinneth. When I shall say to the righteous, *that* he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it. Again, when I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and

right; If the wicked restore the pledge, give again that he had robbed, walk in the statutes of life, without committing iniquity; he shall surely live, he shall not die."

After this explanation of what is meant by the immutability of God, we are prepared to establish the truth of the doctrine, that God is eternally unchangeable.

Num. 23: 19: "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man that he should repent; hath he said, and shall he not do it; or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?"

1 Sam. 15: 29: "And also the strength of Israel will not lie, nor repent; for he is not a man that he should repent."

Ps. 102: 27: "Thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end."

Mal. 3: 6: " I am the Lord, I change not."

Heb. 6: 18: "That by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us."

The two immutable things are the promise of God, and the oath of God. But these could not be immutable, if God was not himself immutable.

James 1: 17: "Every good gift, and every perfect gift, is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

SECTION VII.

The Justice of God.

The justice of God is that perfection of the divine nature whence arises the absolute rectitude of his moral government. Justice is that virtue which consists in rendering to all what is required by the law of absolute right.

1. The justice of God may be said to regard himself. He is just in his own nature, and to himself, acting in all things in perfect harmony with all the attributes of his nature. Justice is not to be regarded as an attribute by itself, opposed to the other attributes of the divine nature, but allowing the perfections of God to be the standard of right, so that what accords with them is right; and so that what does not accord with them is wrong; Justice decrees and enforces that only which is in harmony with the whole.

2. The justice of God is developed in the system of moral Government which he has established. He has decreed in the establishment of his moral system, all that is right and just, and nothing that is wrong and unjust; and all his laws are made conformable to the justice of his own nature.

3. The justice of God is further developed in the administration of his government. He practically does what is just, and will ultimately render to every moral agent of his government, a reward in perfect accordance with the just laws he has established, so that when the destiny of each and all shall be settled by a final decision, and their conduct and ultimate allotment shall be reviewed in the light which eternity will shed on what may now appear dark, divine justice will be fully vindicated in view of an intelligent universe. That this is the doctrine of the Scriptures, a few texts will be sufficient to show.

Deut. 32: 4: "*He is the Rock, his work is perfect; for all his ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity; just and right is he.*"

Ps. 89: 14: "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne; mercy and truth shall go before thy face."

Isa. 45: 21: "There is no God else beside me; a just God and a Savior."

Ps. 19: 8, 9: "The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes: The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever: the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

Rom. 7: 12: "Wherefore the law is holy, and just, and good."

Exo. 23: 7: "Keep thee far from a false matter; and the innocent and righteous slay thou not; for I will not justify the wicked."

Prov. 24: 12: "Shall he not render to every man according to his works?"

Rom. 2: 6: "Who will render to every man according to his deeds."

Rev. 15: 3: "And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou king of saints."

Rev. 22: 12: "Behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give unto every man according as his work shall be."

SECTION VIII.

The Goodness, Love, Benevolence and Mercy of God.

The Goodness, Love, Benevolence and Mercy of God are grouped together, because they are regarded as modified expressions of essentially the same moral element of the divine nature. The term goodness of God, if used in a general sense, would denote universal rectitude, and comprehend every moral element of the divine nature; but when it is used to express a specific attribute of God, as it often is, in contradistinction from justice and

holiness, it denotes benevolence, or that disposition of the divine mind which communicates good to others, and seeks to promote the greatest happiness of all. The same thing is meant by the love of God. The apostle says that "God is love," (1 John 4: 8,16,) but we do not understand by this, that he meant to affirm that love is to be contra distinguished from goodness or benevolence, or that it any more constitutes the essence of the divine nature, than power, justice or holiness. God is love, and so he is wisdom, power, justice and holiness. The apostle also affirms (1 John 1: 5,) that "God is light," but it does not prove that light is any more an element of his nature than goodness or holiness; and so when he affirms that "God is love," it only means that love or benevolence is one of the elements of his nature, or that he is essentially benevolent. Love and goodness cannot be contradistinguished, as distinct attributes, manifested in two distinct classes of actions. The same acts of the divine administration may be attributed to either love or good ness, as the taste of the writer or speaker may dictate. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life;" and yet it would be no perversion of language or sense to affirm that God's gift of his Son was an act of goodness.

But love is sometimes distinguished from goodness, by being used in a more specific sense, as when it is used as the antithesis of hatred. Also when it is used philosophically, to denote particular mental states or emotions, which being analyzed, present different kinds and degrees of love. Good ness is a general term, and when applied to God, denotes his universal rectitude, or specifically his benevolence or disposition to do good and dispense happiness. But the love of God, as the term is used in the gospel, denotes still more specifically his special goodness to mankind, manifested through Jesus Christ. But here it may be subdivided, and rendered still more specific. The term goodness or benevolence, ex presses that quality in the divine nature, which is the fountain whence all practical love, grace and mercy flow. When it is said that God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, the meaning is, that he was moved by the goodness of his own nature to redeem mankind. But it would not be true to say that God loved the world, or that he loves impenitent sinners, in the same sense, or in so full a sense as he loves those who love and obey him.

1. Benevolence or goodness, or a disposition to promote another's happiness, is an essential element of love, or is love itself, in the sense in which God loved the world, and in which he now loves sinners. But this love is not opposed to anger, but is consistent with it, for God is angry with the wicked every day," (Psalm 7: 11,) at the same time he loves them. But this universal love of benevolence is not the antithesis of hatred, for God actually hates the wicked, while he loves them with the love of benevolence". Psalm 5: 5: "The foolish shall not stand in thy sight: thou hatest all workers of iniquity." Psalm 11: 5: "The Lord trieth the righteous: but the wicked and him that loveth violence his soul hateth." Prov. 6: 16, 17, 18: "These six things the Lord hateth; a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood; a heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, a false witness that speaketh lies, and him that soweth discord among brethren." Hosea. 9: 15: "All their wickedness is in Gilgal; for there I hated them; for the wickedness of their doings I will drive them out of my house, I will love them no more." It is clear then that God hates the wicked in some sense, while he loves all men in

the sense of benevolence, or a disposition to promote their happiness. The word love then, must be used in some other sense, in which it stands opposed to hatred and anger.

2. The love wherewith God loves the devoted, holy Christians, has added to the benevolence, which constitutes his love for all men, complacency. He approves of their character and deeds, and loves them with more than benevolence; he takes delight in them, and towards them this delight takes the place of the anger and hatred which he feels towards the workers of iniquity.

" But saints are lovely in his sight, He views his children with delight, He sees their hope, he knows their fear, He looks and loves his image there."

For want of making this distinction, many have reasoned very fallaciously, concerning the divine goodness and love, and have been led to very erroneous conclusions.

The mercy of God is not to be regarded as a distinct attribute, but only as a manifestation of goodness or love. Mercy is clemency, compassion or favor shown to the guilty, and is not to be distinguished from goodness, any more than the stream can be distinguished from the fountain, whence it issues. The goodness of God leads him to have mercy upon sinners, so far as mercy is consistent with justice and the claims of a moral government, and beyond this, goodness cannot go. That the above views are sustained by the Scriptures a few texts will show. The following scriptures prove that God's goodness and benevolence extends to all mankind. Psalm. 25: 8: "Good and upright is the Lord; therefore will he teach sinners in the way. Psalm. 145: 9: "The Lord is good unto all; and his tender mercies are over all his works." Matt. 5: 45: "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." John 3: 16: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life." That this includes all men, there can be no doubt, when we consider that Christ died and intercedes for all men. Heb. 2: 9: "We see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." 1. John 2: 2: "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."

The following texts speak of the goodness, love and special regard of God for his people, those who love and obey him, in contradistinction of transgressors. Psalm. 86: 5: "For thou, Lord, art good, and ready to forgive, and plenteous in mercy unto all them that call upon thee." Here God's pardon and mercy are restricted to them that pray, that call upon him. Psalm. 146: 8: "The Lord loveth the righteous." Prov. 3: 12: "Whom the Lord loveth he correcteth, even as the father, the son in whom he delighteth." Heb. 12: 6, 7: "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons." Prov. 15: 9: "The way of the wicked is an abomination unto the Lord, but he loveth him that followeth after righteousness." Prov. 8: 17: "I love them that love me." John 14: 21: "He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him and manifest myself to him," Verse 23: "If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and

make our abode with him." 1 Cor. 2: 9: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." James 1: 12: "The crown of life, which the Lord hath prepared for them that love him." James 2: 5: "Harken, my beloved brethren hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him."

The above texts clearly prove that God does not regard all men with the same favor, that the love with which he regards all men, is not the same as that with which he regards those who love and obey him. The conclusion to which we are conducted is therefore.

1. That God is good unto all, and that he loves all mankind with the love of benevolence, which seeks to promote the greatest happiness of all, but that this goodness and love can act only in harmony with the principles of a perfectly righteous moral government, so that the sinner comes short of grace and salvation, which the love of God would bestow, by his non-conformity to the divine law, and his non-compliance with the conditions on which goodness can bestow saving grace, consistently with all the attributes of the divine nature, or a perfect moral government.

2. God loves those who truly love and serve him, who are renewed after his image, and are holy, with the love, not only of benevolence, but also of complacency, or approbation. This distinction being well understood, with the principles upon which it rests, will guard us against the fatal error of presuming upon the love and mercy of God while we live in sin, on one hand, and against the no less fatal error, on the other, of fancying ourselves so excluded from the divine favor by such a fatal decree of reprobation as necessarily precludes the power of faith, and shuts out the stimulus of hope.

SECTION IX.

The Holiness of God.

Perfect holiness is entire moral goodness to the exclusion of all moral evil. God is absolutely holy, because he possesses, in his own nature, all possible moral goodness, to the exclusion of every kind and degree of moral evil.

The holiness of God cannot be contemplated as a distinct attribute of the divine nature, capable of existing by itself, as we may conceive of power, wisdom, omnipresence or even justice. We can conceive of power without wisdom, or wisdom without power, or of justice without benevolence, for these are all distinct qualities, which may exist each by itself, but we cannot conceive of the holiness of God, as capable of existing by itself, but only as pervading every other attribute, and as comprehending every conceivable moral perfection of the divine nature. The holiness of God must be conceived of as embracing every moral quality of the divine nature, comprehending universal rectitude, and entire and absolute moral goodness. To illustrate what is meant let it be remarked that we cannot conceive of holiness without justice; to talk of a holy unjust being, would be to contradict our selves. Injustice precludes the idea of holiness, inasmuch as holiness

includes justice as one of its essential constituents. "We cannot conceive of holiness without truth; the holiness of God therefore comprehends his veracity. We cannot conceive of holiness without entire faithfulness. Nor can we conceive of holiness without benevolence, love, yea, and entire goodness. A holy being without the element of moral goodness, is impossible. The holiness of God may then be contemplated in a twofold view.

1. As absolute purity, involving the absence of all moral evil or defilement, and all tendency to moral evil or defilement. If it could be admitted that there might be any thing in the divine mind contrary to perfect holiness, it would follow that such quality must exist there essentially, or voluntarily, neither of which can be true. All imperfection or evil implies want or weakness. But as God is eternal, and existed before all things, and has produced all things, he, as has been shown, must be omnipotent and absolutely independent, and, therefore, cannot know want or weakness. Moreover, we cannot conceive of a self-existing, almighty, independent being, with a nature conflicting with itself, and embracing absolutely opposite qualities as good and evil are opposed to each other. We can conceive of a finite being as man, presenting a compound of good and evil, because man is subject to external and opposite influences, but this is not true of God. He was once the only influence that existed, and, therefore, could be influenced only by himself, by his own infinite nature, and free from all external influences, there could be but one influence arising from his own nature, and that must be wholly good or evil, for it could not be both. Allowing a good and an evil influence to exist in the divine nature, the one must be greater than the other, or they must be equally balanced. If the good influence were greater than the evil influence, it would sway the infinite mind, which would be directed to good ends, and good only, and the evil would be suppressed and remain inoperative, if not eradicated; for God could not do evil, while under a stronger influence to do good. If the evil influence were the greater, it would prevail, and the good influence would be suppressed, and nothing but evil would be developed. If the influences were equal, they would balance each other, and prevent any act from proceeding from either good or evil influence. Thus it is clear that God, being eternal, omnipotent, independent, and subject to no influence but that of his own nature, cannot possess in himself the operative elements of both good and evil, and the conclusion is, that God is perfectly and entirely holy to the exclusion of all moral evil.

It would be equally absurd, to suppose that a principle or habit of evil in the eternal mind can have been voluntarily adopted for unless it existed in the infinite mind essentially and eternally, it could have no cause. There being no evil in the divine nature, existing from eternity, and God being incapable of being influenced by external causes, it is utterly impossible that he should have voluntarily adopted evil. The holiness of God then consists of entire moral purity, to the exclusion of all moral impurity, all moral evil, and all sin.

2. The holiness of God is not merely negative, but positive, consists not only in the absence of all evil, but in the presence of all possible positive operative goodness. The moral attributes of God are not mere capacities, as wisdom and power are mere capacities, but are properties and dispositions essentially active, not only involving

inherent essential goodness, but dispensing it. As a sentiment or disposition, the holiness of God may be regarded as involving three things.

(1.) An infinite hatred and opposition to sin, or moral evil of every kind and degree. Hab. 1: 13: "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look upon iniquity." Psalm. 45: 7: "Thou hast hated wickedness." Heb. 1: 9: "Thou hast hated iniquity."

(2.) An infinite love or regard for all that is good and right and holy. This follows as a consequence, for it is not possible to conceive of an intense hatred of wrong, without a corresponding love of what is right. But God has not left us to this inference. Psalm. 12: 7: "The righteous Lord loveth righteousness; his countenance doth behold the up right." Isa. 61: 8: "I, the Lord, love judgment, I hate robbery for burnt offerings" All the commandments of God, sustained by eternal sanctions, and all the means that he has instituted to suppress sin and promote holiness, including the gift of his Son, testify to the intensity of his love of virtue.

(3.) A practical exemplification, and actual communication of goodness, and diffusion of holiness and happiness, so far as is consistent with the law of right, and as can be done in harmony with all the attributes of God, which, as a whole, render him absolutely and infinitely perfect. Hence, it is that we may read the goodness of God in creation, in Providence and in Redemption; and that in the provision of Grace, all has been done that can be done, to promote human happiness. God himself is limited by the immutable perfections of his own nature, in his modes of operation for the redemption of sinners, and the diffusion of holiness and happiness among moral agents, It has been remarked that we are not to contemplate holiness as a distinct attribute, capable of existing by itself, but as a quality and disposition, pervading all the attributes of the divine nature, so that we cannot conceive of holiness, without justice, truth, and goodness, as constituting its essential elements, and characterizing all its practical developments. And so must it be attended, in its practical developments, by wisdom, for a being who possesses perfect wisdom, cannot be practically holy, only by acting according to the dictates of such perfect wisdom. It is, therefore, exclusively with reference to his harmony of the divine attributes, that we limit holiness in its practical diffusion. To know what the essential conditions are upon which sinners can be made partakers of the divine nature, through its practical diffusion of holiness and happiness, we must study God's gracious offers of salvation as presented in the gospel, and the terms thereunto annexed, for the discussion of which this is not the place, more than to remark that from the nature of holiness itself, omnipotence cannot impart it to a moral agent against the will of such moral agent, but only in accordance with the desires of the heart, and the determination of the will.

CHAPTER III.

A TRINITY IN THE UNITY OF THE GODHEAD.

SECTION I.

Preliminary Remarks— The Points to be proved, Stated.

Trinitarians uniformly assert that there is but one living and true God, everlasting, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there are three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; —the Father, the Son, [the Word] and the Holy Ghost.

The above view is not only asserted as true, but is maintained as fundamental. It may not be regarded as fundamental, in a sense which necessarily denies salvation to all who do not believe it, but only in a sense which would vitiate the whole Christian system, and render it powerless to save, if it were not true. All that is fundamental to Christianity, as a system, may not be fundamental to, and be comprehended in detail, in the faith by which a sinner is justified. The subject necessarily embraces the following points:

1. The Unity of God, or oneness of the divine nature.
2. The underived divinity of Jesus Christ
3. The real humanity of Christ, or Hypostatic Union.
4. The divinity and personality of the Holy Ghost.
5. The Trinity in the Unity of the Godhead.

These five propositions form distinct points for investigation, yet they have such a bearing upon each other, that no one of them, except the first, can be true or false, without carrying with it the truth or falsity of the rest. There cannot be three persons in the Godhead, without the personality and divinity of both Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost, as without these we have no second and third person to make up the Trinity. On the other hand, the personality and divinity of Christ and of the Holy Ghost, cannot be true, without the Trinity, for if these were admitted, and the Trinity denied, the unity of God could not be true, and Christ and the Holy Ghost, with the Father, would constitute three Gods. But, if we admit the doctrine of the Trinity, by saying as above, that "in unity of the God head, there are three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, Son or Word, and the Holy Ghost, then is the divinity of Christ and of the Holy Ghost in harmony with the unity of the divine nature, and the four points above named, mutually explain and support each other, and constitute one harmonious whole. It is the most simple method of presenting these subjects, to examine them separately, and then consider them conjointly, in connection with, and as illustrating and confirming the doctrine of the Trinity. Some labor to prove the doctrine of the Trinity, first, and then proceed to establish the Divinity of Christ, and the personality of the Holy Ghost. This, no doubt, can be done, but it is a more simple method to exhibit the three great truths, viz: the Unity of God, the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and the Personality of the Holy Ghost, and then proceed to establish the Trinity, as a necessary consequence. In the discussion of the subject, the principal argument must appear in proof of the essential divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. This should be made the strong point for the following reasons:

1. The doctrine of the Unity of God is admitted by all parties who profess to believe in the God of the Bible. Men may differ in their views concerning it, they may make different applications of it, and deduce different consequences from it, but all agree in the essential fact of the unity of the divine nature.
2. Unitarians, (so called,) usually make more effort to refute the doctrine of the essential divinity of Christ, than any other one point upon which the doctrine of the Trinity depends. They make this a rallying point, and attempt to disprove the doctrine of the essential divinity of Christ, as a means of overthrowing the doctrine of the Trinity. It is proper, therefore, to make this a prominent point in a defense of the doctrine of the Trinity.
3. The incarnation of Christ, with his life in the flesh, sufferings and death, bring him so distinctly to view as a personal identity, that if his essential underived divinity be established, the doctrine of the Trinity, (allowing the personality of the Holy Ghost,) must follow.
4. When the divinity of Jesus Christ is established, few if any, will deny the personality of the Holy Ghost. We believe that all who admit "the underived divinity of Christ, also admit the personality of the Holy Ghost, and consequently hold the doctrine of the Trinity.
5. The relation which Christ sustains to the plan of human redemption, and the consequent prominence in which he is presented in the Scriptures, renders the proof of his divinity more abundant and clear, than could be expected on either of the other points, separately considered. These are some of the reasons for devoting more effort in proof of the underived divinity of Jesus Christ, than to the unity of God, the personality of the Holy Ghost, or the doctrine of the Trinity, as a point proved distinct from the others, yet all these points need to be clearly presented, with such proofs as the nature of the case admits.

SECTION II.

The Unity of God.

The unity of God is the first point to be presented. On this important point, all professed Christians agree, in the main fact, that God is one, however differently they may explain their views. That class of Christians who call themselves Unitarians, assume this name to denote that they hold to the unity of God, the oneness of the divine nature. This doctrine, it is true, they oppose to the doctrine of the Trinity, as though Unitarian and Trinitarian were antithetical terms. Such is not the fact, only in an arbitrary sense, in which they are now used, to denote certain classes of persons who are known to hold certain opinions. In the true philological sense, Unitarian expresses nothing inconsistent with Trinitarian, since all Trinitarians contend for unity of the divine nature, as earnestly as those who claim the name of Unitarian.

On the point of the unity of God, the Bible is clear. A few passages will be all that need be quoted:

Deut. 4: 39: "Know therefore this day, and consider it in thy heart, that the Lord he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath; there is none else."

Chap. 6: 4, 5: "Hear O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy might."

The last text is quoted by Christ, Mark 12: 29-30: "And Jesus answered him. The first of all the commandments, is, Hear O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; this is the first commandment."

Isa. 44: 6, 8: "Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God. Fear ye not, neither be afraid; have not I told thee from that time, and have declared it? ye are even my witnesses. Is there a God beside me? yea, there is no God, I know not any."

John 17: 3: "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."

1 Cor. 8: 4, 6: "As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him."

Eph. 4: 6: "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

The above scriptures are sufficient to settle the question of the unity of God, they clearly prove that there is but one God, and that God is but one. If there be three persons in the Godhead, as Trinitarians assert, still it must be only in such a sense as is consistent with the oneness of God; God must still be but one, as God.

SECTION III.

The Underived Divinity of Christ.

I. The names and titles by which Jehovah has distinguished himself, are, in the Scriptures, appropriated to Christ.

The first name by which the Supreme Being has distinguished himself is, God. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." This is the common name by which God is known in the Old Testament, and that it is appropriated to Christ, cannot be denied, A few examples from both the Old and New Testaments, will place the question beyond doubt. A most clear and satisfactory proof is found in a comparison between

Psalms 102: 24-27, with Hebrews 1: 8,10,11,12. It will be seen that what the Psalmist said in his prayer to God, the Apostle applies to Christ. Here is the prayer of Zion's bard.

"I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days: thy years are throughout all generations. Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure: yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed. But thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end."

Now, consider the declaration of the Apostle, while he applies the whole to Christ.

"But unto the Son, he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever: a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom. And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish; but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment. And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail."

Here then we have one clear instance in which inspiration has appropriated the name of the eternal God, to our Lord Jesus Christ.

To avoid the force of the above text, so clear and conclusive in itself, it has some times been translated so as to make it read, "God is thy throne forever and ever." But to this verbal criticism, there are three serious and fatal objections, which compel us to abide by the word of God as it is here given in our translation, and already quoted.

1. There is no parallel case to give it countenance.
2. It makes no sense; God is not and cannot be a throne.
3. To make God the throne of a creature would be absurd and false, if not blasphemous. Again. "We have a most remarkable declaration in the Old Testament, giving the title "Mighty God" to Jesus Christ.

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." Isa. 9: 6.

This clearly refers to Christ, because

1. The context is applied to Christ.

The first and second verses of the ninth chapter of Isaiah, read thus:

"Nevertheless, the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation, when at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulon, and the land of Naphtali, and afterwards did more grievously afflict her in the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations.

"The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined."

Compare this with Matthew 4: 12-16: "Now when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee. And leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is upon the sea coast in the borders of Zebulon and Nephthalim."

"That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, The land of Zebulon, and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles; The people which sat in darkness saw great light: and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up."

2. The child thus born is the successor of David, and to reign forever.

"Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." Isaiah 9: 7.

It is impossible to apply this passage to any other person than to Jesus Christ. For no other person was ever spoken of as the everlasting successor of David, except Jesus Christ.

It is said in Isaiah 40: 3: "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God."

This is applied to Christ in Matt. 3: 3: "For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, the voice of "one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight." Observe; the prophet calls Christ "Our God." There can be but one exposition of this. The supreme God must be meant. "This God is our God forever and ever." Psa. 48: 14.

In the following passage, the speaker declares himself to be God. And the speaker in this case was Christ as will be made to appear.

"Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear. Surely, shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength: even to him shall men come; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory." Isa. 45: 22-25.

This text is, in fact, the language of Christ, and is, in part, spoken of Christ. The arguments in favor of this are:

1. The language upon its face concerns Christ.

The same being who says, "I am God and there is none else," is thus affirmed of in the declaration—" In the Lord shall the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory."

The text relates to gospel times, and gospel justification. Hear what Paul says.

"Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; And by him, all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses." Acts 13: 38, 39.

2. This text is clearly applied to Christ by the Apostle.

"But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, as I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So. then, every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Rom. 14: 10-12.

Here the Apostle solemnly admonishes us. that we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. To prove it he quotes the declaration of Isaiah, 45: 23: "Every knee shall bow to me and every tongue confess to God." This is followed by the Apostle's saying, "So then every one shall give an account of himself to God." Thus clearly affirming that "the Lord" spoken of by Isaiah is no other than " Christ," and that Christ is " God."

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." John 1: 1.

The only real ground of dispute in regard to this text is this: is Jesus Christ the person here called the Word? This point shall be made plain.

1. It was to this same Word that John gave testimony.

"In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not. There was a man sent from God whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light."

2. This same Word was made flesh; that is became incarnate. "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth. John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, this was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me; for he was before me."

3. Christ is named as the Word which was God. "And of his fullness have all we received, and grace for grace. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

There you have it. The mystery, if any there was, is all explained now. The Word is Jesus Christ; and as the Word is God, it follows that Jesus Christ is God.

"Whose *are* the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ *came*, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen." Rom. 9: 5. This text is conclusive.

If anything can be more emphatic on this point it is found in the following passage:

"And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true: and we are in him that is true, *even* in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life." 1 John 5: 20.

The reader's attention is now invited to the following argument, drawn from the book of Revelations.

"And he that sat upon the throne, said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write; for these words are true and faithful. And he said unto me, it is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst, of the fountain of the water of life freely. He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son." Rev. 21: 5, 7, 8.

Now who is it that gives the water of life freely? I maintain that it relates to Jesus Christ. The person in this text is he who gives the water of life freely. But Christ gives the water of life. See Christ standing in the temple and crying, while they poured the water round the altar, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink." John 7: 37. Again, it is said, Rev. 7: 17: "The Lamb that sitteth in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and lead them to the fountain of living water." That Christ is the subject of this text will appear further by comparing it with others of which there can be no doubt.

It is the "Alpha and Omega."

Christ is the Alpha and Omega.

"And behold. I come quickly; and my reward *is* with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." Rev. 22: 12, 13.

Here Alpha and Omega is the person who was to come quickly with his reward, to give to every man, as his works should be.

But it was Jesus Christ that was to come quickly.

"I, Jesus, have sent mine angel to testify these things." Verse 16.

"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book." Verse 18.

"He which testifieth these things saith surely, I come quickly. Amen. Even so come Lord Jesus." Verse 20.

The argument stands thus: —Christ is he that was to come quickly. He that was to come quickly was the Alpha and Omega.

The Alpha and Omega is the person speaking and spoken of in the first text.

"And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write; for these words are true and faithful. And he said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst, of the fountain of the water of life freely He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son." Rev. 21: 5, 6, 7.

I will now go back to Chapter 1.

"Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they *also* which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." Rev. 1: 7, 8.

This is entirely conclusive, if it can be shown to be the words of Christ.

It has been shown in the preceding argument, that Christ is the Alpha and Omega.

The context here confirms this position, as follows:

"I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, what thou seest, write in a book, and send *it* unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea. And I turned to see the voice that spake with me. And being turned, I saw seven golden candlesticks; and in the midst of the seven candlesticks, *one* like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. His head and *his* hairs *were* white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes *were* a flame of fire; and his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters. And he had in his right hand seven stars; and out of his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword: and his countenance *was* as the sun shineth in his strength. And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last: I am he that liveth, and was

dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and death." Rev. 1: 10-18.

This is Christ without a doubt. " I am he that liveth, and was dead." Verse 18.

He is "the Alpha, and the Omega." Verse 11.

"The first and the last." *Ib.* It is repeated, verse 17.

It has now been made clear, that Christ is the person, who declares himself to be the "Alpha and Omega," the first and the last. The full force of the name God, therefore is applied to Christ, in Chapter 21: 6, 7.

The name, Jehovah, or Lord, is also applied to Christ, as I will now prove.

In the Old Testament, where the word Jehovah, or Jehovah, occurs in the Hebrew, our translators have usually rendered it Lord, and have printed it in capitals to distinguish it from another word, Adonai, which is also translated Lord.

The common reader may know, then, that where the word Lord is found printed in small capital letters, Jehovah is the word used in the original. This word Jehovah is only applicable to the eternal God. It signifies the self-existent; he who gives existence to others; he who was, is, and shall be. I will prove that this ineffable name, Jehovah, is applied to our Lord Jesus Christ.

In the New Testament the Greek word, Lord, is Kurios, by which the Hebrew Jehovah is usually rendered in Greek.

This word signifies a Lord, possessor, owner, master. It is often applied to men, but is also applied to the Supreme Being.

"Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God." Matt. 4: 10.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God." Matt. 22: 39; Mark. 12: 30.

"They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless." Luke 1: 6.

"The temple of the Lord." Luke 1: 9.

"The angel of the Lord." Luke 2: 9.

"They brought him to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord." Luke 2: 22.

"The spirit of the Lord is upon me." Luke 4: 18.

These cases are sufficient to show that the word Lord, is used in the New Testament to describe the true God.

A few texts will settle this question.

"The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Psalm. 110: 1.

The original here is, "Jehovah said unto my Ladona."

David here calls Christ my Lord.

"While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, what think ye of Christ, whose son is he? They say unto him, the son of David. He saith unto them, how then doth David in spirit call him Lord? saying, The Lord saith unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool. If David then call him Lord how is he his son?" Matt. 22: 41-45.

Christ was David's Lord.

"In the year that king Uzziah died; I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory. Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts. Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then I said, here am I; send me. And he said, Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed." Isa. 6: 1, 3, 5,8,9,10.

Now let us turn to the following text:

"But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him: That the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? Therefore they could not believe because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them. These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory and spake of him." John 12: 37-41.

Isaiah says, he saw the King, the Jehovah of hosts. John says, he saw Christ's glory, and spake of him. Therefore Christ was the Jehovah of the prophet.

Again, it is said in Isa. 40: 3: "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Pre pare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God."

Matt. 3: 3: "For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, and make his paths straight."

This text was before quoted to prove that Christ is called God. It is now quoted to prove that he is called Jehovah.

Isaiah 8: 13-15: "Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling, and for a rock of offence, to both the houses of Israel; for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many among them shall stumble and fall, and be broken, and be taken."

1 Peter 2: 7, 8: "Unto you therefore which believe, he is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner. And a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient: whereunto also they were appointed."

The Lord of hosts is a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence. But Christ was that stone of stumbling. Therefore Christ is the Lord of hosts, named by the prophet.

"And it shall come to pass, that whoso ever shall call on the name of the Lord, shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call." Joel 2: 32.

Acts 2: 21: "And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved."

Rom. 10: 13,14: For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?"

1 Cor. 2: 2: "Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours."

The Jehovah of the prophet Joel is made to be Christ our Lord of the New Testament, by three distinct applications of this prophecy.

Mal. 3: 1: "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts."

This text treats of John and Christ as is seen by the following texts:

Matt. 11: 10: "For this is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of woman, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist."

Mark 1: 2, 3: "As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face which shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight."

Luke 7: 26, 27: "But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet. This is he of whom it is written, Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee."

I will now go back to the Hebrew text.

Mal. 3: 1: "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts."

1. The speaker in this text is the Lord of hosts—Jehovah of hosts.
2. This speaker sent John to prepare his own way for his own coming, which was to follow.
3. But it was Christ whose way John prepared, and who followed him.

II. The attributes which can belong to none but the only living and true God, are all ceded to Christ.

We know but little of the nature or essence of any thing, material or immaterial, and of course we know but little about God, more than that he is a Spirit, and that he possesses certain attributes, which are but qualities of his nature. Thus much is clearly taught in the Scriptures, and admitted by all who believe in their inspiration. The moral attributes of God are, in some degree at least, communicable, such as holiness, truth, and justice; but he has certain natural attributes, which are not and cannot be communicable, such as Eternity, Omnipotence, Omnipresence, and Omniscience. The very nature of these must forever render them incommunicable. If these are truly ascribed to Christ, he is at once invested with the distinctive character of the God of nature and of the Bible.

1. Eternity is clearly one of the essential attributes of God, which is also ascribed to Christ.

Christ is called "the everlasting Father." Isa. 9: 6.

That Christ is here called the everlasting Father does not admit of doubt, and this involves the idea of eternity. He is not called the everlasting Father, in view of the relation he

sustains to the other persons in the Trinity, but in view of the relation he sustains to all created beings, all else that exists but God, as all else is the offspring of his power.

The Hebrew of the expression, "everlasting Father," literally signifies, "Father of Eternity."

"But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, *though* thou be little among the thousands of Judah, *yet* out of thee shall he come forth unto me *that is* to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth *have been* from of old, from ever lasting." Micah. 5: 2.

This text is applied to Christ.

"When Herod the king had heard *these things*, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him. And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born. And they said unto him, in Bethlehem of Judea: for thus it is writ ten by the prophet. And thou Bethlehem, *in* the land of Judea, are not the least among the princes of Judea; for out of thee shall some a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel." Matt. 2: 3-6.

I will next call your attention to the following:

"I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days: thy years *are* through out all generations. Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the work of thy hands: They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed: But thou *art* the same, and thy years shall have no end." Ps. 102: 24-27.

This language is clearly applied to Christ, Heb. 1: 8-12.

"But unto the Son *he saith*, Thy throne, O God, *is* forever and ever; a scepter of righteousness *is* the scepter of thy kingdom: And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thy hands: They shall perish, but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail."

I next adduce in testimony to be taken in connection with the former, this passage:

"Lord thou hast been our dwelling-place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God." Ps. 90: 1, 2.

He who formed the earth and the world is God "from everlasting to everlasting."

Christ formed the earth and the world; therefore Christ is God from everlasting to everlasting.

Again. Look at this declaration. "God said unto Moses, I am that I am." Exo. 3: 14. And we are informed Jesus answered and said:

"Before Abraham was, I am." John 8: 58.

Here the Savior uses the very language that expresses the awful name of the true God, as he is distinguished from all that are called gods. Who can doubt for one moment that the Savior had his eye on the very declaration of Jehovah, and used it to identify himself with God, as one and the same being.

Yet again it is written Jehovah says, "I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God." Isa. 44: 6. But Christ declares himself to be the first and the last.

"And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last: I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold, I am alive forever more. Amen: and have the keys of hell and of death."

Christ's eternity is most clearly and undeniably proved by the fact that he created all things.

Here I anticipate an argument, grounded upon the fact that Christ did create all things, which shall hereafter be elaborated.

His eternity is the only point now in question, which is proved by the fact that he created all things.

"All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him; And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." John 1: 3, Col. 1: 16, 17.

He, who created all things, must have existed before anything was created.

He who existed before anything was created must have always existed.

But Jesus Christ did create all things, and he existed before anything was created, therefore Jesus Christ is eternal.

2. Omnipotence is one of the essential and incommunicable attributes of Jehovah; and this is ascribed to Christ. We have the same proof that Christ is omnipotent that we have that the Father is omnipotent.

"For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead: so that they are without excuse." Rom. 1: 20.

The eternal power and Godhead are seen by the things that are made.

But all things were made by Christ.

Therefore the works of Christ are a development of his eternal power and Godhead.

"In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Col. 2: 9.

All the fullness of the Godhead must embrace omnipotence.

If the Godhead embraces the attribute of omnipotence, and all the fullness of the Godhead dwelleth in Christ, then must Christ be omnipotent.

"But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. Therefore the Jews, sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God. Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." John 5: 17-19.

This text proves the omnipotence of Christ in two ways.

(1.) It asserts his equality with the Father.

The Jews so understood him, and he confirmed them.

(2.) It asserts that Christ does just what the Father does.

If God ever performed an act which nothing less than omnipotence could perform, then, as Christ performs the same acts, he must be omnipotent.

Christ clearly asserts himself to be the Almighty.

"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." Rev. 1: 8.

And it has been demonstrated in a former argument, that Christ is the Alpha and Omega of this passage.

The very name of Jehovah, which I have shown belongs to Christ, implies his omnipotence.

It cannot be pretended that Christ possessed a delegated or communicated omnipotence. Christ could not receive infinite power as a communication from the Father, unless he first possessed an infinite capacity to receive and exercise it.

But an infinite capacity cannot be created.

Creation must be less than the Creator.

God cannot create an equal God.

Omnipotence cannot create omnipotence.

Now as Christ did possess omnipotence, and as that could not be communicated, he must possess that omnipotence in and of himself: and therefore Christ must be God.

3. Christ possessed the attribute of ubiquity, or omnipresence.

In proof of this I quote Matt. 18: 20: "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."

Here is a declaration which is not true, if Christ is not omnipresent.

"Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28: 20.

Here is a promise which none but an omnipresent Jesus can fulfill.

Those ministers who deny the omnipresence of Christ, cannot pretend that he is with them in their ministrations.

"He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him. Judas saith unto him (not Iscariot,) Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world? Jesus answered and said unto him, if a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him."

Let it be understood that these promises are to every individual Christian, in every part of the world.

"And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that come down from heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven." John 3: 13.

Here Christ affirmed himself to be in heaven at the moment he was on earth.

His body was not in heaven, but his divinity filled all in all.

The manner, in which Christ is associated with Christian worship and Christian experience, proves him to be omnipresent.

"Without me ye can do nothing." John 15: 5.

Nothing then can be done where Christ is not.

"I can do all things through Christ which strengthened me." Phil. 4: 13.

Can Christ strengthen where he is not?"

"And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly, therefore, will I rather glory in mine infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me." 2 Cor. 12: 9.

Christ said, my grace is sufficient for thee.

Christ said, my strength is made perfect in weakness.

The power of Christ rested upon Paul in his weakness.

The power of Christ cannot rest where Christ is not.

Our only access to God is through Christ

So, as we could not worship an absent God, neither can we worship God in the absence of Christ.

Christ cannot be in Unitarian assemblies and in Unitarian worship, according to their theory. They can have no present Christ; none in their preaching; none in their worship; none in their joys; none in their sorrows; none in life, and none in death. If their theory be true, theirs must be a Christ less journey to the tomb.

4. Christ possessed the attribute of Omniscience.

"And Jesus knowing their thoughts, said, wherefore think ye evil in your hearts?" Matt. 9: 4.

The marginal reading is, seeing their thoughts.

"All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." Matt. 11: 27.

"As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father; and I lay down my life for the sheep." John 10: 15.

"All things are delivered to me of my Father: and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is but the Son, and *he* to whom the Son will reveal *him*." Luke 10: 22.

In these texts, Christ asserts that he possesses the same knowledge of the Father that the Father does of the Son.

No created being can have the knowledge of God that God has of his creatures. For who by searching can find out God? And therefore, as Christ asserts that he has the same knowledge of the Father that the Father has of him, he must be God, and exist with the Father in the unity of the Godhead.

"But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all *men*; and needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man." John 2: 24, 25.

To know all men, and to know what is in man, must belong not to any created intelligence.

"But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him." John 6: 64.

"He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep." John 21: 17.

The declaration is positive, "thou knowest all things."

"In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Col. 2: 3.

All the treasures of wisdom and knowledge cannot be hid in any created being.

"And unto the angel of the church in Thyatira write; these things saith the Son of God. And I will kill her children with death; and all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts; and I will give unto every one of you according to your works." Rev. 2: 18, 23.

To search the hearts and try the reins of men is a work which belongs only to the all-wise mind.

"I, the Lord, search the heart, I try the reins; even to give every man according to his ways; *and* according to the fruit of his doings." Jer. 17: 10.

It can hardly be doubted that Christ referred to the words of the prophet.

5. Christ is declared to possess the attribute of immutability.

This follows from all that has been proved, but I will add a few texts on this point.

"And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the works of thine hands: They shall perish, but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." Heb. 1: 10-12.

This declares the immutability of Christ in words.

"Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever." Heb. 13: 8.

This is a positive declaration. "And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." Rev. 1: 6.

With these remarks, I close my second direct argument in favor of the Divinity of Jesus Christ.

III. The works which none but God can do, were performed by Christ.

1. Creation was performed by Christ.

This has been involved in proving other points, but shall now be made the point of discussion.

I make it distinctly here, because it is very essential to the chain of argument I have proposed to furnish in favor of the Deity of Christ.

"All things were made by him and without him was not anything made that was made." John 1: 3.

"He was in the world and the world was made by him." Verse 10.

"In whom we have redemption through his blood *even* the forgiveness of sins; Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature: For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether *they be* thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Col. 1: 14-15.

Unitarians sometimes lay great stress upon the expression, "first born of every creature," as though it disproved the assertion that all things were made by Christ. This will not relieve their position, unless, "first born," means first created, which cannot be.

1. His divine nature was never created.
2. His created nature, as he appeared the son of Mary, was not the first being created. Adam was created four thousand years before he was, and Abraham about two thousand.
3. The expression, "first born of every creature," has reference to rank, and not age or pre-existence.

"For whom he did foreknow, he also: did predestinate *to be* conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren." Rom. 8: 29.

First-born, here means the chief or head of all the redeemed and saved. So in verse 18, following the one quoted above.

"And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all *things* he might have the pre-eminence."

It is clear then, that the expression, " first born of every creature," has reference to the rank of Christ as Messiah, into whose hands the government of the world has been committed, and hence it in no degree disproves, or modifies his creative acts.

I will now introduce the testimony of Jehovah himself, to the creative acts of the Son.

"Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens *are* the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed: But thou *art* the same, and thy years shall have no end." Ps. 102: 25, 27.

Now in Heb. 1: 8, Paul quotes the entire passage from the Psalms, and declares that "God saith it unto the Son," and adds:

"Thou Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands." Heb. 1: 10.

Here it appears that he, who is declared by some to have been only the natural son of Joseph and Mary, and by others to have been a created being, is declared by God, the Father, to be he who laid the foundation of the earth, and who with his own hands, formed the earth and heavens. Reader, which will you believe, God or man?

2. The work of Providence, or upholding and sustaining all things, is ascribed to Christ.

"Upholding all things by the word of his power." Heb. 1: 3.

" By him all things consist." Col. 1: 17

Now I repeat this text. "Upholding all things by the word of his power." But it has been said that Jesus told his disciples— "Greater works shall ye do!" There is a very important difference, however, in the manner of doing his works, and those attributed to his Apostles. Jesus Christ did his mighty works in his own name. No other person ever did this. When an apostle performed a miracle, he said, "Jesus maketh thee whole." But if Christ performed the work, he said, "I say unto thee," as in the case of the bed-ridden man—" I say unto thee arise, take up thy bed and walk." In his own name, he spoke to the storm tossed wave, " Be still."

His providential power and care is seen in many of the miracles he performed. He silenced the winds, and stilled the waves, and broke the slumbers of death.

To govern and uphold all things he must be everywhere and possess almighty power.

Now how can he uphold all things—how can all things consist or subsist by him if he is not everywhere? And if he is everywhere present, he must be God. Some tell us about the supremacy of nature's laws. But what are the laws of nature? They are simply God in nature, manifesting himself everywhere. And if Jesus Christ is upholding all things, and if by him all things consist, he must be everywhere present in nature, and must be God. He must ride upon every zephyr that wafts its fragrant breath on the mountain, and along the plain. He it is, who gives to the flower its blooming tint of every hue. He is seen glowing in the radiant sunbeam. And without him the heart would cease to throb, and send the life renewing current through artery and vein. And, in the absence of his power, the universe would be without law, and every shining orb would miss its path, and cease to roll along the ethereal way; for He "upholdeth all things by the word of his power; and by him all things consist."

3. He pardoned sinners, which God only can have a right to do.

"When Jesus saw their faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee. But there were certain of the scribes sitting there, and reasoning in their hearts. Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? who can forgive sins but God only? And immediately, when Jesus perceived in his spirit, that they so reasoned within themselves, he said unto them, why reason ye these things in your hearts? Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins," &c.

The Jews asserted that none but God could forgive sin.

Christ did not contradict it, but showed that he had the power.

When Christ pardoned that sinner, he ascended the throne above the law, and silenced its voice, and hushed its thunder.

IV. The worship which belongs only to God, is rendered to Christ.

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God." Exo. 20: 3-5.

"Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Matt. 4: 10.

These passages are quoted, simply to show that worship is only lawful when offered to God. Towards all other beings it is forbidden. Now let us see if Christ may not be worshipped—and indeed, whether we are not commanded to worship him.

"Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him." Psalm 2: 12.

"Saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him. And when they were come into the house, they saw the young child with Mary, his mother, and fell down, and worshipped him: and when they had opened their treasures, they presented unto him gifts; gold and frankincense, and myrrh." Mat. 2: 2,11.

"And behold there came a leper and worshipped him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." Mat. 8: 2.

"Then they that were in the ship came and worshipped him, saying, of a truth thou art the Son of God." Matt. 14: 33.

"And as they went to tell his disciples, behold Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him." Matt. 28: 9.

"And when they saw him they worshipped him, but some doubted." Matt. 28: 17.

"And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven. And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy." Luke 24: 51, 52.

Here the worshipping disciples were yet in the presence of the bright cloud on which he passed away from them to heaven. In full view of the bursting glories of that vision, and filled with the inspiration of the scene, they worshipped him. And He is a being worthy of the worship of earth and heaven, to whom, with the Father, all ascriptions of praise may be equally awarded.

"And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; Saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to

receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, honor, glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." Rev. 5: 11-13.

2 Peter 3: 18: " But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. To him be glory, both new and forever. Amen

"And again, when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him."

Yes, ye seraphs, beings of the upper world, with your hearts of flame; ye, too, may worship him, for it is written, "let all the angels of God worship him."

An Angel absolutely refused to receive worship.

"And I, John, saw, these things, and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which showed me these things. Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God." Rev.22: 8, 9.

Also the Apostles, Paul and Barnabas, refused worship when it was tendered them by the people of Lystra. When they were about to offer sacrifice, Paul and Barnabas rent their clothes, and ran in among the people, crying out, sirs, why do you these things? Acts 14: 11-15.

But when Jesus had hushed the tempest by a word, and stilled the waves, and the awestricken men came and worshipped him, he breathed not a word of dissent, nor did he on any other occasion intimate that the worship rendered him was misplaced.

V. Christ claimed and had ascribed to him absolute equality with the Father.

"But Jesus answered them, my Father worketh hitherto, and I work. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God." John 5: 17-19.

Now the Jews understood him to claim that he was equal with God. Jesus knew they so understood him, but he did not deny or disclaim it.

"Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all things that himself doeth: and he will show him greater works than these, that ye may marvel. For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all

judgment unto the Son: That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the father. He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father which hath sent him. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." John 5: 17-23, 26.

"Philip saith unto him, Lord show us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me?" John 14: 8-10. "And all mine are thine, and thine are mine; and I am glorified in them. John 17: 10. "But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." 1 Cor. 8: 6.

The prepositions here used, place Christ in precisely the same relation to all things that they do the father.

Again, in Phil. 2: 6: "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God."

" For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Col. 2: 9.

Now, no created being would dare think of being equal with God. Yet Jesus Christ thought it not robbery to be equal with God, It was, peradventure, for a less ambitious aspiration, that Satan was doomed to infamy, and fell like lightning from the battlements of heaven down deep to hell.

The word rendered Godhead is "*Theotees*." This word properly signifies divine nature, so that the fullness of the Godhead meant the fullness of the divine nature. And if in Christ the fullness of the Divine nature dwelt, surely he was equal with God.

VI. Christianity, as a saving system, proceeds upon the assumption that Christ possesses supreme divinity, power and authority.

The gospel proceeds to offer eternal life to sinners, upon the assumption that Christ suffered and died as the sinner's substitute, to make satisfaction for sin, to be the sinner's propitiation, so that sinners may receive pardon through faith in him, and receive the gift of eternal life, which they could not have had without such death.

No mere human or created being could make satisfaction for sin.

There must be something engaged, on which the law had no prior claim. Thus the whole gospel depends on the divinity as well as humanity of Christ. Unitarians have felt this difficulty so forcibly, that they have generally denied the doctrine of Christ's sacrificial death, as an expiation for the sins of men. This abandoned, the doctrine of pardon must be also abandoned, and all the associate doctrines of grace.

On this point I shall sum up briefly. Those who take away the divinity of Jesus Christ, take away our hope of salvation. If I have any hope of heaven there is no other ground on which it rests than that I have laid before you in these arguments for the Divinity of my Lord. If that is lost, all is lost. Without him there is no salvation; no pardon; no rest for the soul; no satisfaction for sin; we have no claim to heaven. But Jesus Christ has become a surety for us. He is the propitiation for our sin. His name, to a lost world, is above every other name. There is no other by which we must be saved. And again I repeat, that if you take away his divinity, we have no Savior. Yes, and every humble believer, every trembling penitent may well exclaim, in accents of grief, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him."

SECTION IV.

The Hypostatic Union.

The Hypostatic Union, or Two Natures of Christ.

Trinitarians affirm that Christ, the Savior, was both God and man, that he possessed absolute Divinity and entire humanity, and that the two natures constitute the one Christ.

This is the only ground upon which the Scriptures can be reconciled with themselves

One class of Scriptures affirm that he is "God, from everlasting, eternal, the same yesterday, to-day and forever."

Another class of Scriptures present him as a child born; the son of Mary; a man, suffering and dying, and rising again, These classes of Scripture cannot both be true of the same nature, but the one class is true of his Divine nature, and the other class is true of his human nature.

In this doctrine of the two natures of Christ, is found a triumphant reply to all the objections urged against his absolute Divinity, founded upon those Scriptures which speak of him as inferior and subordinate to the Father. I propose at this point, to prove the fact of the Two Natures of Christ. This is the key to what would otherwise be contradiction or mystery.

I. That Christ possessed two natures, is proved by a comparison of those two classes of texts, one of which affirms his Godhead, and the other of which affirms his humanity.

The first point, namely, that he possessed a divine nature, has been proved, and the arguments need not be repeated. [See Argument for the Underived Divinity of Christ.]

That Christ possessed human nature may be soon proved.

1. He was the Son of Mary. "She brought forth her first-born Son." Luke 2: 7.

"There was a marriage in Canaan of Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there. John 2: 1.

2. He was the seed of Abraham. As such he was promised to the world.

"And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice." Gen. 22: 18.

"Now to Abraham and his seed, were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed which is Christ." Gal. 3: 16.

If Christ did not possess humanity, he did not correspond to the person promised.

3. Christ was the Son of David. "What think ye of Christ? whose Son is he? They say unto him, the Son of David." Matt. 22: 42.

"And the multitudes that went before, and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest!" Matt. 21: 9.

"And when Jesus departed thence, two blind men followed him, crying, and saying, "Thou Son of David have mercy on us." Matt. 9: 27.

"Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which, was made of the seed of David according to the flesh." Rom. 1: 3.

4. He is declared to be a man.

"For *there is* one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. 2: 5.

"For this *man* was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honor than the house." Heb. 3: 3.

"But this *man*, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood." Heb. 7: 24.

"For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore *it is* of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer." Heb. 8: 3.

"But this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God." Heb. 10: 12.

Here are five texts which call him a man, and more might be adduced.

5. Christ exhibited all the usual phenomena of human nature.

He was born a child, and grew to be a man.

He was hungry and thirsty, and ate and drank.

He grew weary and rested.

He slept and awoke.

He rejoiced, and was sorrowful and wept.

He lived and he died.

The proofs of the two points are now before us, that he was God, and that he was man.

The only conclusion is that he was God and man.

This harmonizes the book of Revelation completely. But if the two-fold nature of Christ be denied, then is the Bible placed at war with itself, as indeed it seems to be the aim of most opposers of the Trinitarian view of the subject.

II. The two-fold nature of Christ is proved by the fact of his pre-existence.

Of course his pre-existence has been proved, while proving his divine nature, but I will now prove the point by another class of texts.

"*What* and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" John 6: 62.

What does that mean?

"Before," means before he came into the world, before his incarnation.

He was then in heaven with the Father.

"I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world, again I leave the world, and go to the Father." John 16: 28.

This asserts that he existed with the Father before he came into the world, as plainly as it teaches that he exists with the Father now he has left the world.

"For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. Then said they unto him, Lord evermore give us this bread. And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst" John 6: 33-35.

This asserts that he came down from heaven.

"Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw *it*, and was glad. Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you. Before Abraham was, I am." 8: 56-58.

If our Savior did not mean to assert that he existed before, and at the time that Abraham existed, he deceived the Jews, for they so understood him, and he knew it.

He used this language in the memorable prayer he offered up before his passion. "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." John 17: 5.

This proves that Christ possessed glory with the Father before the world was.

The fact is now proved that Christ did exist before he was born of Mary.

He had a pre-existing nature, which was not human nature. But as the Son of Mary he was human.

His pre-existing nature joined to the human nature which he derived from his mother Mary, make two natures.

We must either deny his pre-existence, or deny his humanity, or admit that he possessed two natures.

III. The two-fold nature of Christ is proved by a class of texts, which so clearly imply that he was both God and man, that they can be true upon no other principle. Take for instance if you please this passage.

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." Isa. 9: 6.

It cannot be maintained that this is all true of any one nature.

It cannot all be true of a being wholly Divine, because he could never have been a child. It cannot be all true of a human being because he could not be called "The mighty God," nor could it be true of an angel for no angel was ever " a child born."

But shallow critics have remarked upon this text, that it was only said he should "*be called*" the mighty God, not that he *was* the mighty God.

The reply is, he was so called by inspiration. So called by divine appointment.

Again it is said, Matt. 1: 23, "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel; which being interpreted, is, God with us."

"God with us"—God and man. "God with us"—God united to us, clothed in our nature.

" If David then called him Lord, how is he his Son?" Matt. 22: 45.

Now, here is a question asked by our Lord which no one in heaven nor on the earth can answer if Jesus was not possessed of two natures—"if David then call him Lord, how is he his Son?"

This question can be answered only by admitting the two natures of Christ.

It is said—" In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." "And the word was made flesh and dwelt among us." John 1: 1,14.

It is said in 1 Tim. 3: 16: "And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

This can be explained only on the ground of his two natures.

"Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." Phil. 2: 6,7.

"He took" on him the form of a servant, "Was made," &c. That form was humanity. He was, before he took it. That added to what he was, made two natures.

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels but he took on him the seed of Abraham." Heb. 2: 14,16.

He "took part" of the same, supposes it to have been added to what he was.

He took the seed of Abraham. He could not act before he existed. Nor could this be said of you or me, or any other only human being. "I Jesus, have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star."

The "root" and "offspring" implies the two natures.

The "root" is that on which David grew; his Creator. The "offspring," is that which grew on David; his son. This is clear. And no other exposition can be, or has been given to it.

IV. The office and work of Christ required that he should combine a divine and human nature in one person.

The work of making an atonement for the sins of men required it.

1. *No mere human being could atone for sin.*

If Christ was a mere human being, which he must have been if he did not possess two natures, he was under the same law to God that all other human beings are, and could not atone for the sins of other human beings.

In order to an atonement, there must be something engaged, on which the law had no claim.

Every created being is bound to devote all his powers to the Creator, during the entire extent of his rational existence.

But Christ has made an atonement for the sins of men. This I will meet and prove in its proper place.

2. *None but a human being could have made an atonement for men.*

To redeem human nature, right reason, says human, nature must be the offering.

For this we have the opinion of St. Paul: —" Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same: that through death, he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil."

Death was the penalty of the law, and the death of the body was one of the consequences involved.

Christ took our nature and died and rose again, to redeem us from the power of death. The fact that he was a human being, our brother, allies us to him, and through him, to God. The two natures were necessary to render him a suitable mediator between God and men.

"There is one God and one Mediator between God and men." 1 Tim. 2: 5.

"Now a Mediator is not a Mediator of one, but God is one." Gal. 3: 20.

"He ever liveth to make intercession for them." Heb. 7: 25.

"Christ is entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." Heb. 9: 24.

Humanity is there, and he represents us in the court of heaven, with one hand on the throne, and the other upon us, his poor kinsmen.

V. The doctrine of the two natures of Christ may be urged from the fact that no other account can be given of his nature and character.

The Scriptures declare him to be God and man, but they pronounce him nothing else.

If he is not God and man, what is he?

It will be said that he is the Son of God.

But what is the Son of God? Is he a God? or is he a man? or is he neither?

I press the question, what is he?

If it be said that he was God and not man, then God was once born a child, and grew, and lived, and died.

If it be said that he was a man and not God, then we have only a human Savior, a human Redeemer, and a human Intercessor, whose arm is but an arm of flesh.

It is written, "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm." Jer. 17: 5.

But of Christ it is said, "Blessed are all they that put their trust in him." Now put that and that together.

If it be said that he was neither God nor man, what was he? Was he an angel? No, for angels cannot die.

But admit that he was God and man, and all is plain, and we have a Savior worthy of everlasting trust. One to whom we can commit our souls without distrust or fear of being confounded. Beneath his protection we may rest secure, though the universe be moved. For he upholdeth all things by the word of his power. This is our Savior— this is our Christ. In him we now trust and shall for ever and for evermore.

SECTION V.

The Underived Divinity and Personality of the Holy Ghost.

The points to be proved are, that the Holy Ghost is of one substance, power and eternity with the Father, existing personally distinct, yet in unity of the Godhead.

I. The Holy Ghost is called by the names by which God is known. "And one cried to another, and said, Holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory. Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then I said, here am I, send me. And he said, go and tell this people. Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not." Isa. 6: 3, 8, 9.

The point here, is this, the Lord sent the prophet Isaiah.

The speaker said, whom shall I send, and who will go for us. Us, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, The Holy Ghost was the speaker who sent Isaiah, and he is called the Lord, the Jehovah. This is proved by the words of Paul.

"And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word; Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet, unto our fathers, Saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive." Acts 28: 25, 26.

The prophet says, the Lord, the Jehovah sent him, and told him what to say.

Paul says, he spake by the Holy Ghost, or rather, that the Holy Ghost spake by the prophet.

"And he called the name of the place Massah, and Meribah, because of the chiding of the children of Israel, and because, they tempted the Lord, saying, is the Lord among us, or not?" Exo. 17: 7.

Compare this with Heb. 3: 7-9: "Wherefore (as the Holy Ghost saith,) To-day, if ye will hear his voice, Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness; When your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty years."

In the first of these texts, it is affirmed that they tempted the Lord Jehovah.

In the second, the Holy Ghost says," your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty years.

"And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ. Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word: For mine eyes have seen thy salvation." Luke 2: 26, 29, 30.

Here, what was revealed to him by the Holy Ghost, he calls "thy word," addressing the Lord.

"But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." John 1: 12, 13.

"For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." 1 John 5: 4.

"Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John 3: 5.

In the first two of these texts, men are said to be born of God.

In the third text, they are said to be born of the Spirit.

"But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? While it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thy heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." Acts 5: 3, 4.

The conduct of Ananias is called lying to the Holy Ghost; and in the next breath, it is declared to be lying unto God.

The Holy Ghost then, is God.

"Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." Acts 2: 24.

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit." 1 Peter 3: 18.

In the first of these texts, it is said that God raised Christ from the dead.

In the second, it is declared that he was quickened by the Spirit.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." 2 Tim. 3: 16.

In accordance with this declaration we read, "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying, speak unto the children of Israel."

"Then came the word of the Lord to Isaiah, saying." Isa. 38: 4.

So Jeremiah says, "Moreover the word of the Lord came unto me saying." Jer. 2: 1.

"The word of the Lord came expressly unto Ezekiel." Eze. 1: 3.

"The word of the Lord that came unto Hosea." Hosea. 1: 1.

"The word of the Lord that came unto Joel." Joel 1: 1.

"The word of the Lord came unto Jonah." Jonah 1: 1.

"The burden of the word of the Lord to Israel by Malachi." 1: 1.

"For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake *as they were* moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Peter 1: 21.

It is obvious from these remarks that the Holy Ghost is God. The word of the Lord came, but it came by the Holy Ghost.

II. Personal actions are, throughout the Scriptures, attributed to the Holy Ghost, Holy Spirit, and Spirit of God.

"And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep: and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light." Gen. 1: 2,3.

The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters—God said let there be light. Here is a clear distinction of persons.

"Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth." Ps. 104: 30.

God is the sender, and the Spirit is the sent—The Spirit is represented as creating.

"Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there.

"If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me." Ps. 139: 7-10,

The Spirit of God, and the presence of God, are represented as two things. Both are represented as everywhere.

"The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek." Isa. 61: 1.

"And he began to say unto them, this day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears." Luke 4: 21.

What was upon him, if we deny the personality of the Spirit.

"Then the Spirit took me up, and I heard behind me a voice of a great rushing, saying, Blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place, I heard also the noise of the wings of the living creatures that touched one another, and the noise of the wheels over against them, and a noise of a great rushing. So the Spirit lifted me up, and took me away, and I went in bitterness, in the heat of my spirit: but the hand of the Lord was strong upon me." Ezekiel 3: 12-14.

Here the Spirit actually transported the Prophet.

"And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: And lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Matt. 3: 16,17.

Here we see Christ coming up from the water, the Spirit descending, and the Father speaking from heaven.

"Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil." Matt. 4: 1.

The Spirit here performed a personal action.

"But when they shall lead you, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate; but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost." Mark 13: 11.

The Holy Ghost is here said to speak in, or through men. This implies intelligence, as well as personality.

"And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them: And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Acts 2: 3,4.

"Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot." Acts 8: 29.
"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Acts 20: 28.

Here is an official act, said to have been done by the Holy Ghost.

"The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: Rom. 8: 16.

How can the Spirit bear witness with our spirit, if it is not a personal identity and agent.
"Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us, with groanings, which cannot be uttered." Rom. 8: 26.

The Spirit, to help, must be, not only a personal identity, but an intelligent, active agent, or power.

"But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth." 2 Thes. 2: 13.

Here the Spirit is represented as the great agent in our salvation.

We are sanctified by the Spirit.

"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils." 1 Tim. 4: 1.

"How much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God?" Heb. 9: 14.

Here we have the whole Trinity.

Christ offering himself, through the eternal Spirit, to God, the Father.

The Spirit possesses the attribute of eternity.

"And the spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come: and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." Rev. 22: 17.

III. There are many texts of Scripture, Which not only imply the personality of the Holy Ghost, but which can never be explained upon any other principle.

"Wherefore, I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy *against* the Holy Ghost, shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Matt. 12: 31, 32.

Call the Holy Ghost what you may, this text will never make sense, unless you admit its personality.

Call it an attribute of God.

Call it the power of God.

Call it a manifestation of God.

Call it the influence of God.

There is no ground for the unpardonableness of the sin, if you deny the personality of the Spirit. "And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him; and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased." Luke 3: 22.

No one can tell what it was that descended, if the personal existence of the Holy Ghost be denied.

Let Unitarians tell what we are to understand by the Holy Ghost in this text.

"Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye." Acts 7: 51.

Here the Holy Ghost is made to be a uniform something, which both they and their fathers resisted.

What did they resist? "While Peter thought on the vision, the Spirit said unto him, Behold, three men seek thee." Acts 10: 19.

Can any one tell what or who spake to Peter, without admitting the personality of the Spirit?

"How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil: for God was with him." Acts 10: 38.

With what did God anoint Jesus?

With himself? With one of his attributes? With a divine manifestation?

"As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them." Acts 13: 2.

Here the Holy Ghost represents himself as a personal identity, by applying to himself the personal pronoun *me*, and I. Here are three points:

1. The Holy Ghost had called Barnabas and Paul.
2. The Holy Ghost spake to the church, or their leaders.
3. The Holy Ghost required that they be set apart for him or to him.

"And when Paul had laid *his* hand upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied." Acts 19: 6.

There was something that came on them. What was it?

It was something which gave them the use of language before unknown.

It was something which gave them views of truth not before possessed, for they prophesied or taught.

What was that which came upon them, and did all this, called the Holy Ghost?

"And my speech, and my preaching, was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit, and of power." 1 Cor. 2: 4.

The Spirit is here represented as a convincing or proof giving agent, attending and operating through Paul's preaching. What was it?

"But God hath revealed them unto us by his spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. 1 Cor. 2: 10.

1. God reveals the high and holy things he has prepared for us.
2. This is done by the Spirit.
3. And this revelation the Spirit is capable of making, because he searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God."

How can this be explained?

If by the Spirit you mean God himself, or any of his attributes, denying the distinction of persons in the Godhead, you make Paul say that God reveals these things unto us by himself, and that God searches the deep things of himself.

If you deny the essential divinity of the Spirit, you make some created or mere ideal being search the deep things of God.

"For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father." Eph. 2: 18.

The word "both," denotes Jews and Gentiles, both come to God by the same way.

Here we have the whole Trinity.

1. We have access to the Father, the first person in the Trinity.
2. This access is through Christ, the Son, the second person in the Trinity.
3. This access to the Father through the Son, is by the Spirit, the third person in the Trinity.

Deny the personality of the Spirit, and who can tell by whom or by what it is that we have access to the Father through Christ?

What is the third agent?

IV. The difficulty which must attend every attempt to explain what the Holy Ghost is, if its divinity and personality be denied, must go far to confirm the Trinitarian view.

What is the all-pervading, enlightening, sanctifying and saving agent, called the Holy Ghost?

1. Is it a created spirit, as an angel, or any created being.

It cannot be for many reasons.

(1.) It is called "the eternal Spirit" Heb. 9: 14.

(2.) It is called the Holy Spirit, Holy Ghost, God's Spirit, and the Spirit of God, by way of distinction. If it be a created being, it is no more the Holy Spirit, or the Spirit of God, than an angel or the Spirit of a just man made perfect, for they are God's, and are holy.

(3.) The Holy Ghost, so called, is one, but created spirits are, with us, numberless. There is an innumerable company of angels and spirits of just men made perfect. They are all holy spirits, and yet there is but one Holy Spirit, called the Holy Ghost.

(4.) The works which are attributed to the Holy Ghost clearly prove that he is no created spirit.

"The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Gen. 1: 2.

"By his Spirit he garnished the heavens." Job. 26: 13

He inspired the prophets. "Holy men of God spake, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2. Peter 1: 21.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." 2 Tim. 3: 16.

If the Holy Ghost that inspired the prophets was a created being, it is not given by inspiration of God.

The Holy Ghost overshadowed Mary the Mother of Jesus, and he was begotten by the Holy Ghost. Mary was his mother, but was a created being his father? What was that being?

The Holy Ghost is the Regenerator and Sanctifier of mankind.

"Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Titus 3: 5.

He, who would trust the renewal of his heart to any created being, does not know himself, the depth and strength of the depravity of his heart.

(5.) The fact that the one only unpardonable sin is a sin against the Holy Ghost, proves that he cannot be a created being.

2. Is the Holy Ghost called an attribute of God? The subject will be beset with equal difficulties, and shrouded in equal mystery.

(1.) It suggests the question, what, or which attribute of Jehovah is the Holy Ghost?

The attributes of God are known only as God has revealed himself. To say that the Holy Ghost is an attribute of God, is to say that it is one of the known attributes. Which is it?

Is it his eternity. Certainly not, for that is a mere fact and quality which pertains to all the attributes of God.

Is it his omnipotence or power? It cannot be, for it is more than power; The Holy Ghost develops intelligence and volition, neither of which belong to power as a distinct attribute.

"The Holy Ghost said, separate me, Barnabas and Saul." Acts 13: 2.

"It seemed good to the Holy Ghost." Acts 15: 28.

Moreover, power has no existence only as it resides in an operative agent. To say, therefore, that the Holy Ghost is the power of God, as an attribute, is to say that it is God himself.

Is it his omnipresence?

Surely not, this is a mere quality of the divine essence, or mode of the divine existence. The intelligence, will, and personal actions of the Holy Ghost cannot be referred to the mere quality of existing everywhere.

Is it his omniscience or knowledge? "The Holy Ghost exerts a power that does not belong to mere knowledge.

The Spirit transported the prophet. Eze. 3: 12: "Then the Spirit took me up, and I heard behind me, a voice of a great rushing, *saying*, Blessed *be* the glory of the Lord from his place."

Is it his immutability? Surely not, this will not only, not be pretended, but it is impossible that immutability, as a distinct attribute, should be capable of such manifestations and actions, as are attributed to the Holy Ghost. Immutability is a quality that pertains to all the other attributes, and pervades the divine nature.

Is it said that it is the attribute of Justice? It cannot be, for it administers grace and comfort, entirely beyond the ministrations of pure justice.

Is it Goodness, love, or mercy? Surely not, The Spirit is light and power, and exerts physical and moral energy as well as to communicate goodness, grace and love.

The Spirit, or Holy Ghost, then, is no one attribute of God.

3. Is there anything else that you can call the Holy Ghost, which will designate him as something less than divinity itself?

Is it an emanation from God. It cannot be. This would prove that it is God himself or else that God is divisible, and that parts become detached and fly off.

Is it the influence of God? No, for influence is but another word for power, and like power, cannot exist only as it resides in, and is exerted by the agent to which it belongs. The influence of God is God himself, exerting his own power; just as a thought is the mind thinking.

Is it the exerted energy of God? No, for the exerted energy of God, is but another word for the influence or power of God, and can be nothing more nor less than God acting.

There can, then, be no account given of the Holy Ghost, if the Trinitarian view be denied?

SECTION VI.

The Trinity in Unity.

The doctrine of the Trinity is well stated in the following article of faith.

"There is but one living and true God, everlasting, of infinite power, wisdom and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there are three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, [the Word] and the Holy Ghost."

I. The doctrine of this article is a necessary consequence of the points already admitted or proved.

1. It is admitted that there is but one only living and true God.

2. It is admitted that the person called the Father in this article, is God in the fullest and highest sense.

3. It has been proved that the Son or Word is God, possesses all the names and titles, all the attributes, performs all the acts, and receives all the worship which belong to the Father.

4. It has been proved that the Holy Ghost is God, possessing the name and attributes of God.

From these points thus admitted or proved, it follows that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, exist in the unity of the Godhead.

As it is clear that the three are God, it must follow that they exist in the unity of one Godhead, or that there are three Gods,

But it is admitted that there is but one God, therefore the three already proved to possess absolute divinity, must exist in the unity of the Godhead.

II. The doctrine under consideration, receives additional support from an implied plurality in the Godhead, found in the Scriptures.

1. The very name God, *Elohim*, in the Hebrew, is admitted to be in the plural form.

Elohim, is said to be the plural of *El*, or *Eloah*.

"*Elohim*, is the same as *Eloah*; one being singular, the other plural. Nevertheless, *Elohim* is generally construed in the singular, particularly when the true God is spoken of; when false gods are spoken of, it is rather construed in the plural."—*Robinson's Calmet; word Eloah*.

"The name of God occurs frequently in both the singular and plural, but never in the dual."—*Roy, word Elohim*.

Gesenius admits the word to be plural, and refers to Gen. 20: 13. "God caused me to wander, he renders it, "the Gods caused me to wander."

"Let those who have any doubt, whether *Elohim*, when applied to the true God, *Jehovah*, be plural or not, consult the following passages, where they will find it joined with adjectives, verbs and pronouns plural." —*Parkhust*.

The author gives nearly thirty texts. Among them are Gen. 1: 26; 3: 22; 11: 7: 20: 13; 31: 7, 53; 35: 7.

This fact is alluded to in the following comment on the sixth section of Leviticus, by Rabbi, Simeon or Solomon ben Joachi. "Come and see the mystery of the word *Elohim*; there are three degrees, and each degree by itself alone, and yet, notwithstanding, they are all one, and are not divided from each other."

I have not the original of this, but find it quoted by Dr. Clarke, in his note on Gen. 1: 1. I also find it quoted in Roy's Hebrew and English Dictionary. Word *Elohim*.

2. There are several texts in which the name of God is connected with the plural pronouns.

"God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Gen. 1: 26.

Here are two plural pronouns, and one of them repeated. Let *us* make—in *our* image—after *our* likeness.

To whom did God speak?

Not to angels, for several reasons.

(1.) Man was to be made after the image and likeness of the speaker and the spoken to. Our likeness and our image, implies that the speaker and the spoken to were of one essence, presenting one likeness and image. If God addressed angels, in whose image was man made? In the image of God or in the image of angels?

That he was made in the image of the Creator is clearly proved.

"For a man indeed ought not to cover his head; forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God." 1 Cor. 11: 7.

"Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." Col. 3: 9,10.

"And be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Eph. 4: 23, 24.

"Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God." James 3: 9.

These texts prove that it was after the image of God that man was created.

(2.) There is not the slightest evidence that the angels had anything to do with creating man, or anything else. No allusion is found to any such idea, in all the Scriptures.

"And the Lord God said, behold the man has become as one of us to know good and evil." Gen. 3: 23.

"Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech." Gen. 11: 7.

3. The Scriptures often distinctly refer to the three persons in the Godhead, and associate them as equal, in the solemn transactions in which God is concerned.

"In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphims: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory. Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, Here am I; send me." Isa. 6: 1, 2, 3, 8.

Here the prophet saw the Lord. It has been said that the Lord here seen was Jesus Christ.

The seraphims cried one to another, holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts. This may be significant of the three persons in the Godhead.

The prophet then heard the voice of the Lord, saying, "whom shall I send, and who will go for us." Here is a plurality of persons for whom the prophet went.

But the prophet went for the "one living and true God;" there is therefore, a plurality of persons in the Godhead.

"Seek ye out of the book of the Lord, and read; no one of these shall fail, none shall want her mate: for my mouth it hath commanded, and his Spirit it hath gathered them." Isa. 34: 16.

Here are three personalities, the speaker, my mouth hath commanded.

The second person is represented by the pronoun his, in the possessive case.

The third person is the Spirit, "his spirit, it hath gathered them."

"Come ye near unto me, hear ye this; I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I: and now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me. Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; I *am* the Lord thy God which teacheth thee to profit, which leadeth thee by the way that *thou* shouldst go. Oh that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea." Isaiah 48: 16-18.

Here are the speaker, the Lord God, and his Spirit, making three. God and his Spirit are clear. The Speaker may be the prophet, Cyrus, or the Messiah.

"Yet now be strong, O Zerubbabel, saith the Lord; and be strong, O Joshua son of Josedech, the high priest; and be strong, all ye people of the land, saith the Lord, and work: for I am with you, saith the Lord of Hosts: According to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my Spirit remaineth among you: fear ye not. For thus saith the Lord of Hosts, Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the desire of

all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts."
Haggai. 2: 4-7.

Here are three persons, the speaker, the Lord of hosts; His spirit that remained among them; and, the desire of all nations that was to come.

"And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and light upon him." Matt. 3: 16.

Here we have a clear view of the three persons in the Godhead, the Son coming up from the water, the Holy Ghost lighting upon him, and the Father, speaking from heaven.

"How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?"
Heb. 9: 14.

Here is the whole Trinity concerned in the work of redemption.

God the Father to whom the offering is made.

Jesus Christ, the Sacrifice who offered himself to God.

The eternal Spirit, through whom the offering was made.

"Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Matt. 28: 19.

Baptism is a most solemn act of Christian worship, and it is performed in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

Baptism is also a most solemn act of consecration to God.

It is the naming of the person baptized after God, and he is named after the whole Trinity. Baptism is the seal of God's covenant, the introductory rite into covenant with God, by which God covenants to be our God, and we covenant to be exclusively his people.

This makes the form of Baptism absolute proof of the Trinity.

If the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, do not exist in unity of the Godhead, then are Christians consecrated to one God, one creature, and one attribute or influence, or something else, as fancy may explain.

Then does humanity, by baptism, enter into covenant with one God, one creature, and one attribute, influence, or something else.

"But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, Keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life." Jude 20, 21.

Here we have the three persons of the Godhead referred to, as all equally concerned in our worship and our salvation.

"Keep yourselves in the love of God."

"Praying in the Holy Ghost."

"Looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, unto eternal life."

"The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen." 2 Cor. 13: 14.

Here the threefold blessing pronounced, corresponds to the three in the unity of the Godhead.

In the preceding text, the Holy Ghost is named first; God, by which the Father is meant, second; and our Lord Jesus Christ last. In this text, Christ is mentioned first, God the second, and the Holy Ghost last.

CHAPTER IV.

THE ORIGINAL STATE OF MAN.

SECTION I.

Man was Created Holy.

I. Man was the effect of a holy cause. God created man; and as man was passive, and not active, in his own creation, he could have possessed no nature, powers, nor even tendency of powers, which he did not receive from the plastic hand of his Creator. God imparted to man all that he possessed, when he first awoke to conscious being, even the first breath he drew; hence, if man contained in his nature, any moral evil, God must have been its author. Man's body, which was formed of the earth, must have been a lifeless and irrational form of matter; and could not have possessed any moral quality, before it was animated by a rational soul; all, therefore, that man possessed in his first existence that was moral, was imparted to him when God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and constituted him a living soul; therefore, if man was morally corrupt, or contained in his nature any propensity to evil, it must have been infused by Jehovah's breath! Now, as God is holy, nothing but holiness could have proceeded from him; man, therefore, must have been holy in his first existence, as he came from the hands of his divine author.

The only position which can be occupied in opposition to this argument, with any degree of plausibility, is that which affirms that man was neither holy or unholy, good or bad, until he made himself so by his own action. This position cannot be maintained. Its fallacy lies in overlooking the fact, that man has a moral nature or constitution, which lies back of all action, but for which his actions would possess no more moral quality than the actions of brutes. He did not create his moral constitution by his action, but his moral constitution rendered him capable of performing moral actions, and necessarily rendered every act morally good or bad. God's law takes cognizance of the state of the heart, and demands its supreme affections, and, as the mind is never quiescent, it acted as soon as it existed, and there can be no doubt that, as God breathed into man the breath of life, the moral machinery started in the right direction, and must have been holy as soon as it existed. If man's first volition was holy, as no doubt it was, there must have been a cause why it was holy, and no better reason can be rendered why man's first volition was holy, than that the moral nature which put it forth, came from the plastic hand of a holy God.

It would be no reply to the argument, to say that the rocks, and hills, and animals, were also the effect of a holy cause, for these do not possess a moral nature, are not moral beings. But man did, yea, must have possessed moral powers before he did, or could perform the first moral action; he must have been a moral being, under moral responsibilities, before he could perform a moral action, and being a moral being, under moral obligations, he must have been morally good or bad; and that he was holy, is certain, from the nature of the cause that produced him.

II. "God created man in his own image." Gen. 1: 27. By the image of God, in this text, we understand the moral likeness of God, consisting in righteousness and true holiness. No other consistent explanation can be given of the subject. It would be absurd to say that the image of God consists in bodily form, for, if form be applied to the Deity, such form must be bounded by geometrical limits; which is opposed to infinity and omnipresence, perfections which are essential to the Supreme Being. Nor can it be consistently said, that the image of God wherein man was created, consisted in his having authority over the other creatures, which God created, as his vicegerent on earth, for this was only a circumstance in his being, and not an image in which he was made.

Gen 1: 26: " God said, let us make man in our own image, and let him have dominion." Here man's creation in the image of God, and his having dominion, are marked as two distinct circumstances; the one refers to his creation, the other to the design of his creation, or to the circumstances in which he was placed after he was created. Man was created in the image of God, but he did not possess dominion until after he was created; therefore, the image of God, in which he was created, could not have consisted in his having authority over this lower world, as God's vicegerent, because the image existed before he possessed the authority: he was created in the image, but the authority was given him *after* he was created. It must appear equally absurd to contend, as some have, that the image of God, in which man was created, consisted *exclusively*, in the immortality of his soul. There is no evidence, that God's immortality constitutes his image, any more than his justice, holiness, or any other perfection of his nature. Immortality is one of the divine perfections, and if one of the perfections of God be

embraced in the image which he stamped upon his rational offspring it is reasonable to suppose that every communicable perfection of the divine nature, must be embraced to render the image complete; wherefore, we conclude, that, as man was created in the divine image, he received from the plastic hand that formed him, the stamp of every communicable perfection of the divine nature: nor is holiness the least prominent among these perfections, as God has revealed himself in the Bible. But this view of the subject does not depend upon abstract speculations upon the perfections of God, for it is based on the declarations of his word Eph. 4: 24: "And that ye put on the new man which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness." By the new man, which we are here exhorted to put on we understand the true Christian character This, the text informs us, is created after God, i. e., after the likeness or image of God and this is " in righteousness and true holiness." The image of God, then, consists in righteousness and true holiness; and as man was created in his image, he must have been holy; not merely free from unholiness, but positively holy; for he shone in the divine image, which consists in righteousness and *true* holiness.

III. We infer man's primitive holiness from the seal of the divine approbation which was set upon him by his Maker. Gen, 1: 31: " And God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was *very good*" As this was spoken of all the works of God, its meaning must be, that every thing was very good of its kind; the world was a good world, and the man that was created to people it, was a good man. Now as man was a rational being, a moral agent, and destined to lead the moral career of this vast world, when God pronounced him good, it must have been with reference to him, such as he was, a moral being; he must, therefore, have been good in a moral sense. This clearly proves that man was not only free from all moral evil, but that he was positively good, or possessed real moral virtue. If, as some now assert, all moral good and moral evil consist in voluntary action, man being neither holy nor unholy, until he puts forth his volitions, the text under consideration, which asserts, that he was very good, cannot be true; for, in such case, it would be as correct to assert that he was very bad, as it would to pronounce him good. It must be perfectly plain, that, to assert that man was very good, because he was free from all moral evil, would be no more true, than it would be to declare that he was very bad, because he possessed no moral holiness.

IV. One quotation from the pen of inspiration, shall close the subject of man's primitive holiness.

Eccl. 7: 29. "Lo this only have I found, that God hath made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions." That this text relates to man's moral rectitude, and not to the erect posture of his body, appears from two considerations.

1. This is the sense in which the word upright is uniformly employed in the Scriptures. Ps. 7: 10:"My defense is of God which saveth the upright in heart." Prov 11: 6: "The righteousness of the upright shall deliver him." See also, Ps. 11: 7; 18: 23, 25; 19: 13; 37: 37. Prov. 11: 20 12: 6. The above, to which many more references might be added, are sufficient to show that the term upright, is uniformly used to signify moral rectitude.

2. In the text under consideration, the inspired writer represents his discovery of the fact, that God made man upright, to be the fruit of labored investigation: which could not be the case if he alluded to the upright posture of his body. It would reflect no great honor on the intellect of the inspired penman, to understand him as saying, that he had numbered a thousand persons, one by one, examining each, to learn that God had created man to stand erect in opposition to the quadruped race. It is clear then, that God made man upright in a moral sense, and if so, he must have been free from moral evil, on one hand, and possessed positive moral virtue, on the other. With these very brief remarks on man's moral character, as he came from the hand of his Creator, we will proceed to notice his exemption from death, while he remained free from moral evil.

SECTION II.

Man was not liable to Natural Death, in his Pristine State.

This question is of great importance; its consequences must have an important bearing upon other points, yet to be discussed.

1. If the death of the body be in consequence of sin, it must follow, that the consequences of sin are not confined to this world, for, in such case, it cannot be denied that the separation of the soul from the body, must affect it in a future state.

2. As the resurrection of the body depends upon the sovereign will and power of God, and not upon some germinating principle in man's body, it follows, that if sin has caused the death of the body, it has produced an effect which is in its own nature endless, and which would prove an endless evil, were it not counteracted by the power and grace of God, manifested through Jesus Christ. We will then attempt to prove that man would not have died, if he had not sinned.

I. The first annunciation of man's mortality, was in the form of a sentence, inflicted on him for his first disobedience. Gen. 3: 17-19. "And unto Adam he said, because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, thou shalt not eat of it, —in the sweat of thy face, shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken, for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Let it be noted that God first threatened man with death in case he should disobey, and then, after he had disobeyed, he announced his mortality as the fulfillment of his threatening: "*because* thou hast eaten"—"dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." God charges on man his mortality as the consequence of his own disobedience; hence, if man had not sinned he would not have died.

II. The manner in which God executed the above sentence of death, proves that the death of the body was intended, and, as all must see, that it was in consequence of sin. The sentence of death was executed by expelling the offender from the Garden of Eden, and thereby cutting off his access to the tree of life, which stood in the midst of the blooming circle. Gen. 3: 22, 23: "And the Lord God said, behold the man has become as one of us to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life,

and eat, and live forever, therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden." It is clear, then, that if man had not sinned, by partaking of the forbidden fruit, he would not have been expelled from the garden, and cut off from the tree of life; and if he had not been cut off from the tree of life, he would have lived forever, or would not have died; therefore, if man had not sinned, he would not have died.

III. The suffering, which is an inseparable accompaniment of death, proves it to be an effect of sin. With our present views of the divine goodness, we cannot suppose that God would permit a race of sinless beings to suffer. If it be consistent with the goodness of God to permit sinless beings to suffer, his goodness can give no security against the endless suffering of sinners.

I say then, sin is the cause of all suffering, directly or indirectly, but death is inseparably connected with suffering; therefore, sin must be the cause of death, and if man had not sinned, he would not have died.

IV. The resurrection of the body is a part of salvation, which is the gift of God through Jesus Christ; and hence, the death of the body, which renders such a salvation necessary, must be a part of the evil of sin, and the curse of the law, from which Christ has redeemed us. 2 Tim. 1: 10: "Who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." 1 Cor. 15: 12, 13, 20, 21: "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead. But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen. But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept; for since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead." These quotations clearly show that the resurrection of the dead is the result of Christ's death and resurrection, overthrowing thereby the empire of death, and bearing away the spoils of the grave. Indeed, if death is not a part of the penalty of the law, and consequently an effect of sin, we think no good reason can be given why the death of Christ was necessary, in order to our redemption. If the law did not inflict death, as its penalty for sin, it would not have been necessary for Christ to die, to redeem us from the curse of the law; for if the law did not inflict death on the sinner, and yet required the death of Christ in order to his redemption, it inflicted on Christ, what it would not have inflicted on the sinner, as a reward of his transgression, had there been no Redeemer provided, fit is clear then, that as the resurrection of the body has been secured by the death and resurrection of Christ, that the death of the body, which renders such a resurrection necessary, must have been caused by the fall, or must be a part of the evil of sin. To deny this conclusion, would be to say that the mission, death, and resurrection of Christ would have been necessary to secure the resurrection of the dead, had not man sinned; and consequently, that Christ died and rose again, not so much to redeem man from the consequences of his own misconduct, as from the defects of that constitution which was given him by his Creator.

V. Death is said to be an enemy. 1 Cor. 15: 26: "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." Now if death was originally intended as the portion of every man, and that too of necessity, from the constitution of our nature, it is not possible to conceive how it can be an enemy, either of God or man. It would be absurd to say that God created man subject

to death, with an intention that he should die, and *that* death, which is just as God designed it should be, is, notwithstanding, his enemy. As well might it be said that God is his own enemy! Nor can it appear on the above principles, that death is the enemy of man. Had death been originally designed as the means of terminating our earthly existence, and introducing us into a more perfect and permanent state of being, a state of certain and eternal happiness, there would not be that abhorrence of death in the human breast that now exists; death would be welcomed by all, as our deliverer, sent to take us to our abiding home, and dying would be as easy as to answer any other demand of nature.

When nature is weary, we calmly close our eyes on the light of day, and sink into refreshing slumber; and if man had been designed for death, when nature had performed her work, we should *as calmly* close our eyes on the light of time, and retire on the wings of an expiring breath to our proper abode.

SECTION III.

Objections to the Doctrine of Man's Exemption from death, Answered.

1. It has sometimes been objected that if man had been created *immortal*, he could never have become *mortal*, as matter of fact now proves he is; since immortality implies impossibility of becoming mortal. To this it is replied, that it is not contended that man was created absolutely immortal. It is admitted that his body contained the same tendency to dissolution that it now possesses, in itself considered; but it is contended, at the same time, that the fruit of the tree of life would have counteracted this tendency, and preserved him in ever-during vigor, had he not been cut off from it in consequence of his sin. From this it will be seen, that man's original exemption from death, is not argued from his absolute immortality, nor is it contended that death is the natural tendency of sin, but rather that it is an incidental or circumstantial effect of sin. Through sin man was expelled from the Garden of Eden, and thereby cut off from the tree of life, and as this was designed to preserve him in being, his death followed as a consequence of the change sin had effected in his circumstances, rather than by any direct effect it had produced upon his constitution.

2. It has also been objected, that if man did not die, our race could not exist in so great a number of individual beings, since the earth would be too small to contain the swelling tribes of men, were it not that death removes one generation to make room for another. This, it is said, would diminish the amount of final good to be enjoyed by our race, in proportion as it lessened the number of individuals to enjoy good. To this, it is replied, that we are not to suppose that this earth was designed as the place of man's ultimate abode, had death never entered the world; but only as the nursery of his being, in which to prepare to act in a more extended sphere beyond the limits of this terraqueous ball. Matt. 25: 34: "Come ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom *prepared for you from the foundation of the world.*" From this, it is clear that heaven, or a future state of bliss and glory, was prepared for man, as early as when the foundation of the world was laid; therefore, it is certain that man was designed to fill a place in the invisible world, from

which it appears reasonable that he would have been duly translated from earth to heaven, had he never sinned, without passing through the disagreeable, loathsome, and painful gate of death, through which he now passes into the future world. That this is possible, and more than probable, appears from the fact that some of the most holy have gone in this way from earth, overlooking the gate of death, and at the beck of God, lit directly on the battlements of heaven. Enoch, who walked with God, was translated, that he should not see death, and was not found because God had translated him: and Elijah rode to heaven in a chariot of fire, which rose far above the valley of death, and bore the ascending prophet directly into the bosom of heaven!

CHAPTER V.

THE FALL OF MAN—DEPRAVITY.

A large class of errorists deny that man is now depraved, or that he is the subject of inherent corruption of nature, as the consequence of a first transgression, committed by the progenitor of the human family. They maintain that every man enters upon the stage of this life, in moral circumstances as favorable as those which attended the first man, with the exception of the influence of bad examples. This view is believed to be erroneous, and to its refutation the present chapter is devoted. Two points are to be noticed, namely, the fall of the first man, and the consequent depravity of all men.

SECTION I.

The Fall of Adam.

In support of the doctrine of the fall, we urge the Mosaic account of the introduction of evil. This account states that God created man very good, and placed him in a garden in Eden, in the midst of which stood the tree of knowledge, of good and evil, the fruit of which God forbade him to take, on pain of death; and that the woman was beguiled by the serpent, partook of the interdicted fruit, and gave also to the man, who was, consequently, involved with her in the transgression. This account, if literally interpreted, must be decisive; hence, those who reject the doctrine of the fall, as generally understood by the church, allegorize the Mosaic account of it. To show that a literal construction only, can be made to agree with the sacred record, shall now be made the object of a few remarks.

I. The Mosaic account of the fall, is embraced in a series of historical events, all of which, this excepted, are acknowledged to be literal, involving literal and real transactions. The planting of the garden in Eden, stands connected with the creation of the world, and the formation of man, in a manner which shows that the one is as literal as the other; hence, if we have a literal account of the creation of a literal heaven and earth, we have also an account of a literal garden, in which the transaction of the fall took place. Gen. 2: 7, 8: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul. And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there he put the man whom he had formed." Here the

planting of the garden is connected with the formation of man out of the dust of the ground, with a positive assertion, that in this garden, the Lord "put the man whom he had formed." Now, if the garden was not a literal and real one, the man, whose existence is so intimately connected with it, and who was put in it, could not have been a literal man. If the account of the garden be an allegory, the account of the man who was formed in connection with it, and put into it, must be an allegory also. Hence, we are constrained to admit that the garden was a literal garden, or else, that we are, to this day, destitute of any literal account of the origin of the human family. Again, the sacred historian proceeds directly from the scenes of the garden, to record literal transactions which are made to depend thereon, so far as the order of time in which these different events took place, is concerned. The writer, after concluding the story of man's expulsion from the garden, proceeds directly to relate literal transactions, which he connects therewith, by the copulative conjunction, making it a part of the same narration. The creation of man and the birth of Cain and Abel, are acknowledged by all believers in revelation, to be literal events; now, these two events are connected with each other, by the intervening transactions of the garden, which must also be literal transactions, or the history would be broken and incorrect. The inspired penman separates the creation of man from the birth of Cain and Abel, by what is said to have transpired in the garden, the eating of the forbidden fruit. Now, if the transactions said to have taken place in the garden, were not literal and real, the link is broken, and the account of the order of events is false; for it represents the creation of man as severed from the birth of the first sons of man, by the intervention of a train of other events; whereas, no such events took place, if the account of the garden and its reputed scenes are a mere allegory. These considerations are sufficient to show that the account of the transgression and fall of the first man is literal and real.

II. The Garden of Eden, with the events which are said to have transpired therein are referred to in other portions of the Holy Scriptures, as involving literal facts.

Gen. 4: 16: "And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden." That this is a literal reference to Eden cannot be doubted by any one, who considers the connection in which it stands. Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground: Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord, and Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock: God had respect unto Abel's offering, but not unto Cain's, in consequence of which Cain was wroth and slew his brother; for which he was banished, and went to the land of Nod on the east of Eden. Here reference is made to the geographical boundaries of Eden, to describe the settlement of Cain. Now, can any one suppose that the Holy Ghost dictated a reference to a place which had no real existence, to describe the local situation of another place real in existence, from their geographical affinity; and yet, to such a consequence are we driven, if we deny the literality of the Mosaic account of the fall. If Eden was not a literal place, where was the land of Nod situated, which lay on the east of it?

Gen. 13: 10: "And Lot lifted up his eyes and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere, even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt." In this text the plain of Jordan is described by being compared to the garden of the Lord, by

which Eden is doubtless meant. Eden was watered by four rivers to which reference is made, to describe the well watered plain of Jordan. Now, if Eden was not a literal garden, then the plain of Jordan is described by being compared to a place that never existed. That Eden is here referred to as a literal place, and not as a mere description given of it, as an ideal garden, is evident from its being connected with Egypt, which must be acknowledged to be literally a place. "As the garden of the Lord like the land of Egypt." The meaning appears to be this: As the garden of Eden was watered by four rivers, and as the land of Egypt was watered by the flowing of the Nile, so the plain of Jordan was well watered

Isa. 51: 3: "For the Lord shall comfort Zion: He will comfort all her waste places, he will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord." Here the garden of the Lord or Eden is referred to, for the purpose of describing the prosperity of the church, when the moral wastes shall be made glad by the tidings of salvation, and when her borders shall be enlarged by the conversion of the Gentiles to God. As the Garden of Eden presented an assemblage of nature's excellencies, ever clad in a verdant and flowery mantle, strewing her delightful walks and pleasant shades with flowers and fruits; so shall Zion bloom with moral flowers, and shed her fragrance on the world, when her light shall come and the glory of the Lord shall rise upon her. But who does not see, that in order to sustain the Prophet's figure, Eden must have a real and literal existence? If Eden has only an allegorical existence, and God made Zion like Eden, then, the latter day glory of Christianity, which has been predicted by prophets, looked for by saints, and prayed for by all the faithful, vanishes into an allegory, and ends in a mere phantom, that will at last elude the grasp, and disappoint the hopes of the long expecting church, There are other texts which speak of the garden of Eden, that might be noticed. Ezekiel 28: 13: "Eden the garden of God." Chap 36: 35: "And they shall say, this land, that was desolate, is become like the Garden of Eden." Joel 2: 3: "The land is as the garden of Eden." These references to the Garden of Eden, by inspired authors, clearly show that the garden described by Moses, as the first abode of man, had a literal and real existence.

But the Scriptures not only contain references to the Garden of Eden, but direct reference is made to the scenes said to have transpired therein.

Job 31: 33: "If I covered my transgressions as Adam." Job, no doubt, here refers to Adam's attempt to hide himself among the trees of the garden as described, Gen. 3: 8: "And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day, and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God, amongst the trees of the garden." Now who does not see that the account of Adam's sin, and attempt to hide himself, must be a narration of literal facts, in order to justify such allusions to them.

On the above text, Dr. Clarke has the following note: "Here is a most evident allusion to the *fall*: Adam *transgressed* the commandment of his Maker, and he endeavored to *conceal* it; *first* by *hiding himself* among the trees of the garden; *secondly*, by laying the *blame on his wife*."

2 Cor. 11: 3: "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity of Christ." Here the seduction of Eve is directly referred to by an inspired Apostle, in the use of the same terms employed in the original account. Eve said, "The serpent beguiled me;" and Paul says, "The serpent beguiled Eve," referring to it as a literal fact. Again, it is said that "the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field;" while Paul declares that it was through his subtlety that he beguiled the woman. From this, it must be clear that the Apostle understood the account of the first transgression as a literal history; and it is not possible for us to conceive how any one can think otherwise, who has any confidence in his inspiration.

1 Tim. 2: 14: " And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression." The Apostle is here speaking of the subjection of the woman to the man. "I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man." For: he subjection of the woman, the Apostle assigns two reasons. The first is, the man *was first formed*. The second reason is contained in the text under consideration. "Adam was not deceived, but *the woman being deceived was in the transgression*" This plain reference to the deception of the woman, and that too, in proof of an important principle, involved in the matrimonial relation, must clearly show, beyond all doubt, that the account of the fall of man is literal and real. If the account of the fall be a mere allegory, and the deception of the woman, consequently, be not a literal fact, it could furnish no argument in support of the authority of the man, over the woman. Indeed, to say that wives should be in subjection to their husbands, *because* "the woman being deceived, was in the transgression," while, in fact, no such deception and transgression ever took place, the whole being a mere allegory, is too futile to charge upon such a master of logic as the Apostle Paul. Such an imputation, to an inspired Apostle, would not only be trifling, but profane. When the Apostle asserted that wives should be in subjection to their husbands, because "the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression," had some grave Universalist matron objected to his conclusions, saying that the story of Eve's deception and transgression, was a mere allegory, without any foundation in literal fact, he certainly would have been confounded, unless he contended for a literal interpretation of this portion of the Mosaic history.

SECTION II.

Objections to a Literal Construction of the Account of the fall, Answered.

The only clearly stated denial of the literality of the account of the Garden of Eden, and of the scenes said to have transpired therein, which has fallen under the observation of the writer, is from the pen of the Rev. Hosea Ballou, a distinguished Universalist minister. After giving a summary statement of the Scriptural account, he adds:

"This is, in short, the Scriptural representation of the first sin, and I consider it to be figurative. Should it be said that this garden was a literal garden, that the tree of life was a literal tree, and that the tree of knowledge of good and evil was also literal, I should be glad to be informed what evidence can be adduced in support of such an idea. Where is

the garden now? Where is the tree of life now? Where is the tree of knowledge, of good and evil, now? Are these trees now growing on the earth as literal trees? We are not informed in the Scripture, that this garden was carried off to heaven, or that either of the trees was removed. It is written, that God drove the man whom he had made out of the garden, and placed cherubims and a flaming sword at the east of the garden, to prevent the man from approaching the tree of life. If the garden were literal, why could not Adam have gone into it on the north, south, or west side?" *Treatise on Atonement, page 35.*

Mr. B. appears to argue, in this case, altogether, by asking questions; but it should be recollected, that if no answer could be given to the above interrogations, they would not disprove the existence of a literal garden, since a mere want of information on any subject, cannot prove its falsity, or nonexistence.

1. Mr. B. appears to object to a literal exposition of the subject, on the ground that there is no evidence to support it. He says, "I should be glad to be informed what evidence can be adduced in support of such an idea." In answer to this, it may be said, if no other evidence could be adduced, the text itself is sufficient, until some evidence be offered to prove it to be figurative; since every document is to be literally interpreted, unless good reasons can be rendered for a different construction. Taking this view, Mr. B.'s call for evidence in favor of a literal construction, comes with a very ill grace, until some more cogent reasons shall be offered on the opposite side of the question, than any thing we have been able to discover, in his performance on the subject.

But the evidence in favor of a literal construction is ample, as must appear from the preceding arguments.

2. Mr. B. appears to found an objection to a literal interpretation of the subject, on the circumstances, that neither the garden nor the trees are now known to exist on earth. He asks: "Where is the garden now? Where is the tree of life now? Where is the tree of knowledge now? Are these trees now growing on the earth as literal trees?" That the garden now exists, no one will pretend, but this is very far from proving that it never did exist. It is perfectly consistent to suppose, that when man was expelled from the garden, and the ground cursed for his sake, that it should decay and cease to bloom. If Mr. B.'s mode of reasoning be sound, it will disprove many other portions of the sacred history, for it would probably cost as much labor to prove where the Land of Nod was, to which Cain retired, and where he built the city of Enoch, as it would to demonstrate the exact locality of the Garden of Eden.

3. Mr. B. supposes that if it had been a literal garden, from which Adam was expelled, he might have re-entered at another point. His language is: "It is written that God drove the man out of the garden, and placed cherubims and a flaming sword at the east of the garden, to prevent the man from approaching the tree of life. If the garden were literal, why could not Adam have gone into it on the north, south, or west side?" To this a very plain answer is given, in the language of inspiration. Gen. 3: 23, 24: "The Lord God placed at the east of the garden of Eden, cherubims and a flaming sword, *which turned every way*, to keep the way of the tree of life." If then the flaming sword turned every

way, to guard the tree of life, it must have cut off Adam's approach from every point. But it may be asked, why the cherubims and flaming sword were placed at the east of the garden, if they were intended to guard it on all sides? The answer is, because it was doubtless on the east that Adam retired, when God drove him out of the garden; but while the flaming sword was placed at the east, appearing in front of the garden, to guilty and retiring man, it turned *every way* to prevent his re-entering from another direction. On the subject of the cherubims, Dr. Clarke has made the following remark: "These angelic beings were, for a time, employed in guarding the entrance to paradise, and in keeping the way or road to the tree of life. This I say, *for a time*, for it is very probable that God soon removed the tree of life, and abolished the garden; so that its situation could never after be positively ascertained."

SECTION III.

All men are depraved in consequence of the fall.

I. The universal corruption of human nature follows as a consequence of the fall and corruption of the first man, from whom all men have received their being by natural generation.

It was proved in the preceding chapter, that the first man was created in righteousness and true holiness, that he bore the impress of the hand that made him, and shone in the likeness of the divine author. Now, as righteousness and true holiness constituted the moral character or nature of man, as he came from the hand of his Creator, it must follow, that this divine image was designed for his descendants, and would have been communicated to them, had he not sinned and lost it himself, while all men were yet in his loins. If then, the image of God, wherein the first man was created, was designed to have been transmitted to his offspring, it must appear reasonable, that nothing short of a full possession of this image, can answer the claims of the law of our creation; for it would be absurd, to say that God created man in a higher state of moral perfection than is necessary, to answer the claims, and secure the glory of the moral government which he exercises over the human family; or that he bestowed on man a degree of moral holiness, which he did not secure from desecration by the direct interposition of moral obligation, or which might be squandered and lost on the part of man, without incurring moral guilt. It is clear, from this, that any state of human nature which comes short of that moral perfection, or that divine image which God bestowed, when he created man, must be regarded as a lapsed state, coming short of that righteousness which the perfect law of our Creator requires; and, consequently, a sinful state, "for all unrighteousness is sin." If, then, a want of the image of God, which consists in righteousness and true holiness, constitutes a fallen state, it only remains to show farther, that man does not, by nature now possess this divine image. Now, when Adam sinned, he must have lost the image of his Maker; for it would be absurd to suppose that the image of God, consisting in righteousness and true holiness, could be possessed by man, and he be a sinner at the same time, guilty before God, and a subject of divine punishment. As well might it be said, that God could consistently condemn and pour a divine curse upon his own image! As well might it be said, that sin and holiness once formed a harmonious alliance! Adam

was not righteous and truly holy, and unrighteous, polluted and guilty, at the same time. It is certain, then, that Adam could not have retained the image of his maker after he sinned, and being destitute of it himself, he could not communicate it to his offspring; for no being can communicate to another that which he does not himself possess.

It is clear that the image of God, wherein the first man was created, was designed to have been transmitted to his descendants, and that any want of it, on their part, constitutes a degenerate state of human nature. It is also clear, that this image was lost by the first man, to whom it was committed, not only for himself, but also in trust for his offspring, and that he therefore could not transmit it to his descendants, who consequently, cannot possess it by nature, or as the natural descendants of Adam. Human nature, therefore, is degenerate and corrupt, coming short of that state of moral perfection which it possessed, when it came from the holy hands of God, glowing in the brightness of his own moral image.

II. In support of the doctrine of the inherent corruption of human nature, the fact that all men are declared to be sinners may be urged.

It will not be denied, that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," that "all are under sin," that "all have gone out of the way," and that "by the deeds of the law, no flesh shall be justified in the sight of God." Rom. 3: 9, 12, 20, 23. These pointed declarations of divine truth, must convince all who have any confidence in revelation, that all men commit sin, whether they have a corrupt nature or not; and if any should take the trouble to read these pages, who reject the Scriptures, for their benefit, I make an appeal to the consciousness of all men; and ask, where is the man who is not conscious of having, at some time deviated from the perfect rule of right? We think there is no danger of successful contradiction, when we assert, that all men sin, and commence sinning too, so soon as they are capable of feeling the claims of moral obligation, or discerning between good and evil. This general overflowing of corruption, running through all the channels of human society, must have somewhere a cause or fountain from whence it emanates. That this fountain is the corruption of our nature, or the natural bias of the human soul to that which is evil, in preference to that which is good, is very clear from the fact, that it cannot be rationally attributed to any other cause. Why is it that all men sin as soon as they are capable? Those, who deny the doctrine of original sin, assert that it is the result of bad example, or a bad education, or both. Now, as these are the only reasons, or, at least, the most plausible reasons given by our opponents, if the ground is shown to be untenable, it will follow, that we are to look for the fountain, from whence this general wickedness proceeds, in the corruption of human nature. Now, that neither bad example, nor a bad education is the cause of the general wickedness that prevails among men, must appear from one consideration. They themselves are dependent on a state of general wickedness for their own existence, as an effect is dependent upon the cause that produces it.

Generally bad example and education cannot exist, without a pre-existing state of generally corrupt morals; for until men are generally wicked or immoral, example and education cannot be generally bad; hence, to say that general wickedness has resulted

from bad example and education, is to put the effect for the cause. The argument must stand thus: Men are generally wicked, because example and education are generally bad, and example and education are generally bad, because men are generally wicked. This leaves one or the other without a cause, for which we must resort to the corruption of human nature. If bad example, or bad education has produced the general wickedness of mankind, what first caused general bad education and example? If it be denied that men are more inclined to evil than good, we have here an effect—the general corruption of example and education, for which there is no assignable cause; and if it be admitted that this general corruption of example and education are the result of a natural bias in man to evil, the argument is ceded, and the doctrine of the corruption of human nature is established.

Other reasons might be rendered, why bad example and education cannot have produced the general wickedness that has prevailed in the earth, but enough has been said, on this point, to show, that until the opponents of this doctrine can invent some more rational cause for the general wickedness of mankind, than they have yet been able to assign, it will remain a standing memorial of the corruption of our nature through the fall, to the entire overthrow of the Pelagian heresy.

III. Those Scriptures, which represent *all men* as being liable to some sort of divine malediction, in consequence of Adam's sin, clearly prove the corruption of human nature through the fall.

Rom. 5: 15: "For, if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many." The many, which are said to be dead, in this text, embrace the whole human family; for they form a perfect parallel, to the many, unto whom the grace of God is said to abound by Jesus Christ. All are then dead *through the offence of one*. By this one man, through whose offence all are dead, we are undoubtedly to understand the first man, Adam. Now, if by death, in the text, we are to understand the death of the body, which has been shown in the preceding chapter to be an effect of sin, it will follow that we die in consequence of Adam's offence; from which one or two consequences must follow. First, the law inflicts a penalty on those who are perfectly conformed to its divine claims, or else, secondly, the one offence of Adam corrupted human nature, so as to produce in his offspring, a non-conformity to the law. Should it be said, that men produce in themselves a nonconformity to the law, by their own personal sin, and that, therefore, the law does inflict its penalty on those who are conformed to its claims, in the sentence of death upon all men: it is replied, first, that this would be to suppose that all men die, temporally, for their own offence, and not "*through the offence of one*," as the text affirms. Secondly, infants die before they are capable of producing in themselves, a nonconformity to the law. Now, to suppose that the law inflicts a penalty on such as are conformed to its requisitions, would be subversive of all righteous government! The thought cannot be indulged for a moment as the law, then, cannot inflict a penalty on such as are conformed to its claims, and as it does inflict a penalty on all, in consequence of Adam's offence, it must follow, that it produced in all his posterity, a non-conformity to the law, which implies a lapsed and corrupt state of human nature. Should it be denied,

that the death of the body is intended, in the text, and maintained that it is a moral death that is come upon all, "through the offence of one," the argument is ceded, this being the sentiment for which we contend; therefore, whether temporal or moral death, or both, be understood, in the text, the argument remains conclusive. In the 16th verse, the Apostle says: "And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift; for the judgment was by one to condemnation." This clearly shows, that by the offence of one man, Adam, judgment has come upon all, condemning them to death of some sort—"the judgment was by one to condemnation"—' and as we have seen, that the law could not condemn or inflict a penalty upon those who are conformed to it, the offence of Adam must have produced in his offspring a non-conformity to the law, or by its judgment could not have come upon them, condemning them to death, either temporal or moral.

In the 18th verse, the Apostle expresses the same idea, if possible, in clearer language. "By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men unto condemnation." It is settled, then, on the authority of inspiration, that judgment was passed upon *all men*, in consequence of the offence of *one*, i.e., Adam. All men thus condemned, were conformed to the divine law, or they were not; but if they had been conformed to the law, as has been shown, they could not have been condemned, therefore they were not conformed to the law. There is, then, in man, a non-conformity to the law of God, which appears from the fact, that all men have fallen under its condemnation. Now, as condemnation unto death, came upon men, before they were guilty of personal sin, and does now come upon infants, who are incapable of committing sin, it follows that this want of conformity to the law of God, is an inherent defect in human nature, and as it cannot be charged upon the Creator, the conclusion is irresistible, that it was caused by the sin of the first man, the Father and federal head of the human family, by whose offence "judgment came upon all men to condemnation." The 19th verse gives a still more direct view of the subject. "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." It will not be contended by those who deny the corruption of human nature, through the fall, that many were made sinners, by a direct imputation of Adam's guilt to his offspring. How, then, were many made sinners by the offence of one? The only consistent answer to this question, is found in the principles already laid down: a corrupt state of human nature was produced by the sin of the first man and inherited from him, by all men. Is it asked how men can be considered sinners, merely because they inherit a corrupt nature by Adam, which they have not caused, and which they cannot prevent; it is answered, that this inherited corruption of nature constitutes a want of conformity to the perfect law of God, which requires holiness in the inner part, the same "righteousness and true holiness" which man possessed when he came from the hand of his Creator; and this want of conformity to the law is unrighteousness; a coming short of right, and "all unrighteousness is sin." 1 John 5: 17. There is another sense in which it maybe true that "by the offence of one many were made sinners." "The offence of one" corrupted human nature, and this corruption of human nature leads to actual transgression. There is no other sense in which it can be consistently said, that, "by the offence of one, many were made sinners. If, as some contend, human nature has not suffered by the fall, and all depravity consists in voluntary actions, "the offence of one man" cannot have been the cause of the sinfulness of many. It would be futile to say that the first offence led to the sinfulness of mankind generally, by the influence of the example it furnished; for such was the nature of Adam's offence, and

such the condition in which it placed him and his descendants, as to preclude the possibility of a repetition of the same act. Not only so, but what influence can Adam's offence have on the morals of men, in producing sin at this late period of the world! Most certainly none at all, unless it be by a bias to sin which it has produced in human nature. If men are now naturally inclined to sin, in consequence of a bias, which human nature has received through the fall of Adam, it is the very thing for which we contend; but if human nature is not thus inclined to evil, then *many* cannot have been *made sinners* by the *disobedience of one*, and the Apostle stands corrected by the inventors of new doctrines.

IV. Those Scriptures, which describe the unrenewed mind of man, clearly imply his native depravity.

Jer. 17: 9: "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked."

The strength of the argument, drawn from this and similar texts, depends upon what is understood by the term *heart*. If, by the heart, is meant nothing more than the voluntary actions of men, the argument would lose much of its force; but if we understand by it the whole moral man, it follows that human nature itself is corrupt. Now, that by the heart is meant the mind, soul, or whole moral man, appears from the fact that those attributes and characteristics which belong to the soul, are ascribed to the heart, as will be seen by the following references: —1 Kings 3: 12: "A wise and understanding heart." Rom. 1: 21: "Foolish heart." Exo. 35: 5: "Willing heart." Psa. 101: 4: "A froward heart." Matt. 11: 29: "Meek and lowly in heart." Prov. 21: 4: "A proud heart." Psa. 51: 17: "A contrite heart." Exo. 7: 14: "Hardened heart." Rom. 2: 5: "Impenitent heart." Psa. 51: 10: "Clean heart." Isa. 35: 4: "A fearful heart." Deut. 28: 47: "Joyfulness and gladness of heart." Lev 26: 16: "Sorrow of heart." The above quotations clearly show that the Scriptures do not mean the volitions of the mind, exclusively, when they speak of the heart, but that the whole mind or soul is intended; for wisdom, understanding, humility, pride, contrition, impenitence, purity, joy, sorrow, peace, imply powers, passions and qualities, which are not attributable to volition alone, or to voluntary actions, but which belong essentially to the mind or soul. By the heart, then is meant, not the affections or volition only, but the soul or whole moral and intellectual man; or the seat of the understanding, will, or volitions, affections and passions. Now as the "*heart*" which is the seat of the understanding, will, affections and passions, is said to be "*deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked*" it follows that the whole man is depraved, and that entire human nature has become corrupt.

Gen. 6: 5: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually."

This text clearly makes a distinction between the heart and the volitions, or thoughts and purposes of the mind; the former is the source or fountain; the latter are the streams proceeding therefrom. The expression, "thoughts of his heart," marks the thoughts, as not being the heart, but as belonging to the heart, or proceeding therefrom. Now as every imagination of the thoughts of the heart is evil, it follows that the heart itself must be

corrupt. Can that heart from whence proceeds evil without any mixture of good, and without any intermission of the evil, be free from evil itself? When the heart can send forth that which it does not possess in itself, and when an effect can exist without a producing cause, then, and not before, this can be true. Should it be still contended that the evil has its existence alone in the volitions of the heart, and that the thoughts are evil, not in consequence of the source from whence they proceed, but from the objects to which they tend; it is replied, that this does not in the least relieve the difficulty; it still leaves us without a reason why the volitions should all be evil, and every thought tend to an evil object. Can every volition of the human soul be evil, directing every thought towards an evil object, without ever once missing the mark; and still, the soul itself contain no bias to evil? As well may we suppose that something may exist or take place, without an adequate cause; which, to say the least, is very unphilosophical.

Rom. 7: 18, 19, 20: "To will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not, for the good that I would, I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me."

This text clearly teaches that human nature is corrupt, and that too, beyond the will or volitions of the mind. Three things are to be particularly noticed.

1. The Apostle informs us that he could will that which was good. This, no doubt, was through the help of the Holy Spirit, under whose arrest and awakening energies his mind was laboring. Now, as to will was present, while he did not the good that he willed, it follows beyond the possibility of doubt, that the sinner's depravity and helplessness, does not consist exclusively in the perverseness of the will.
2. The Apostle declares that he finds not how to perform that which is good, and that he does that which he would not. This argues that there is in human nature, a strong bias to evil, against which the will has to contend. If the sinner has a natural ability to do all that the perfect law of righteousness requires, without supernatural aid, the perverseness of his will only preventing, it is not possible to conceive how a man can sin by not doing the good which he wills and by doing the evil which he would not.
3. The Apostle explains how he does that which he would not, by saying it is sin that dwelleth in him, "If I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." This clearly points out the corruption of human nature. The Apostle does evil: "The evil which I would not that I do." This clearly points out actual sin. But why does he do it? He declares that it is the work of sin that dwelleth in him. What then is this indwelling sin? It cannot be his volitions or voluntary actions, for he assigns it as a cause why he acts as he does, and it would be absurd to make the Apostle say that his actions were the cause of his actions; hence, there is in man an indwelling corruption which does not consist in action, and this we say, in the language of the creed, "is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is wholly gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually." When the Apostle says it is sin that dwelleth in him, he clearly uses the term sin, to denote something which is not voluntary action.

Psalms 51: 5: "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." On this text Dr. Clarke has the following pointed remark. "Notwithstanding all that *Grotius* and others have said to the contrary, I believe David to speak here of what is commonly called *original sin*, the propensity to evil which every man brings into the world with him; and which is the fruitful source whence all transgression proceeds." That this is the true sense of the text, is clear from the following more critical remarks, made by Rev. Richard Watson. "What possible sense can be given to this passage on the hypothesis of man's natural innocence? It is in vain to render the first clause, 'I was brought forth in iniquity,' for nothing is gained by it. David charges nothing upon his mother, of whom he is not speaking, but of himself: he was conceived, or, if it please better, was born a sinner. And if the rendering of the latter clause were allowed, which yet has no authority, 'in sin did my mother *nurse* me,' still no progress is made in getting quit of its testimony to the moral corruption of children; for it is the child only which is nursed, and if that be allowed, natural depravity is allowed; depravity before reasonable choice, which is the point in question."

We may well exclaim, "What possible sense can be given to this passage," if no reference be had to inherited depravity? On such a supposition, it must stand a mere blank in the midst of a most interesting and pathetic subject. David is making confession of his sin, and imploring pardon for the same, and while thus confessing his actual sins, which he had committed, he adds an acknowledgment of his native corruption. "For I acknowledged my transgression, and my sin is ever before me; against Thee, Thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Understand the Psalmist in the above sense, and the connection is clear, the confession full, and the climax regular and grand. We understand him as saying, I have committed sin; I have not only sinned, but my sin has been of the most daring character, it has been committed against thee, O God, Majesty of heaven! yea, I confess more; I have not only done wickedly, but my very nature is corrupt; these out breaking sins have been only the streams issuing from a fountain of corruption within, existing in my very nature, which was shapen in iniquity, and conceived in sin. When my mother conceived me, she conceived a sinful nature, and when I was formed into an organized being, my moral shape or likeness, was after the form of iniquity; i. e., in the image of a fallen spirit, and not after the image of God in which the first man was created.

Rom. 8: 7: " The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." The whole connection in which this text stands, goes to show that by the "carnal mind," we are to understand the soul of man in its natural state, unrenewed by the quickening grace of God. The Apostle here notes the difference between a natural state and a renewed state. "To be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace; for the carnal mind is enmity against God. So then they that are in the flesh, cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, if so be that the spirit of God dwell in you." To be carnally minded then, is to be destitute of the spirit of God, by which he renews and sanctifies the soul; hence, the carnal mind is one unrenewed by the spirit of God: not "born of the spirit." Now, that this carnal mind or

state of enmity against God is the natural state of the soul, is evident from its being opposed to a state of grace and salvation. The Scriptures speak of a two-fold state: our natural state, and a spiritual or renewed state. " That which is born of the flesh, is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." John 3: 6. The first state must be our state by nature, the second state is a supernatural, gracious, and renewed state. The first state is a fleshly state in which we cannot please God; a carnal state, which is enmity against God: the second state is a state of reconciliation to God, a state of conformity to the divine will and likeness. Therefore the carnal mind, which is enmity against God, being the natural state of the soul, it follows that man is by nature an enemy to God, or possesses a natural and inherent want of subjection or conformity to the divine law, which requires holiness in the inner parts. The texts above quoted, are to be regarded as mere specimens, of the many which, in similar language, describe the human soul in its natural state, as a fallen spirit, full of wickedness, estranged from God, possessing unholy affections and passions.

V. Those scriptures which speak of the necessity, and describe the nature of regeneration, clearly imply the corruption of the human soul through the fall.

John 3: 3.: " Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." That this text has reference to a moral change for the better, of some sort, we trust will not be denied by any; and that it is the change which constitutes the difference between a Christian and a sinner, in the popular sense of these terms, appears from a consideration of the agent by which the change is effected; the Spirit of God is the agent by which sinners are renewed and sanctified; hence, the Apostle says, " he hath saved us by the renewing of the Holy Ghost." The words of Christ, " born again," exactly correspond to the words of the Apostle, " renewing of the Holy Ghost," both implying the same change. That the necessity of such a change, as is implied by being born again, arises from the corruption of human nature, and not merely from the wickedness of human conduct, appears from the reason assigned by him, who " knew what was in man," "that which is born of the spirit is Spirit, and that which is born of the flesh is flesh. Marvel not that I said unto you, ye must be born again." Here the natural birth, which is of the flesh, and by which we are introduced into the world, is opposed to the spiritual birth, by which we are introduced into the kingdom of God or church of Christ; and the *necessity* of the latter is made to depend upon the *circumstances* of the former: we must be " born again," *because* that which "is born of the flesh is flesh" to which an Apostle adds, " they that are *in the flesh* cannot please God." From this it most unequivocally appears that we inherit something by natural birth, or by natural generation which excludes us from the kingdom of God, being naturally unfit for its possession and enjoyments, and this unfit-ness is by birth, and not by subsequent wicked conduct. Therefore, moral depravity, in its first stage, consists in something which we inherit, and not in what we do.

It is worthy of remark, that the change under consideration is termed a *renewal*, a *new creation*; terms which can have no meaning, unless the change is in fact a reparation of lapsed human nature.

Titus 3: 5: "He hath saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Col. 3: 9, 10: " Ye have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the

new man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him." 2 Cor. 5: 17: "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature." Eph. 2: 10: " We are his workmanship, *created* in Christ Jesus." Eph. 4: 24: " And that ye put on the new man which after God is *created* in righteousness and true holiness." These texts, which are adduced merely as a specimen of the many which might be quoted on the same point, imply a renovation of nature as well as of life or conduct, and they can have no meaning, unless they imply a reparation of lapsed human nature; and if they imply this, the doctrine of inherent depravity is established.

VI. The corruption of human nature is proved by those scriptures, which teach that there is in man remaining depravity, after justification or pardon.

2 Cor. 7: 1: " Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." On this text it may be remarked, first, that it is addressed to Christians, as such. Secondly, the expression in the text, "*let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God*" clearly supposes that they were not, or that it was possible that as Christians, they might not have been cleansed from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, and that they were not as perfect in holiness as was their privilege to be; there may be, therefore, remaining in man a degree of moral corruption after he is justified by faith, or has his sins forgiven. It also follows that there is, with man, such a thing as an imperfect state of holiness.

1 Thes. 5: 23: " And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul, and body be preserved blameless, unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

This text supposes that those to whom it was addressed, were sanctified in part, and not entirely sanctified; or, at least, it supposes that sanctification in part without being entirely sanctified, is a possible condition, for it would be absurd to pray to be sanctified *wholly*, if there were no such thing as being sanctified in *part* without being wholly sanctified. Furthermore, as the Thessalonians, to whom the Apostle wrote, were, beyond all dispute, believers in Christ Jesus, it follows that men are not *necessarily* sanctified wholly in spirit, soul and body, when they are converted to God; or when they are justified through the forgiveness of sin; hence, there may be a degree of unholiness remaining in the spirit, soul, and body after justification.

On this point, Mr. Watson has given the testimony of his opinion, in the following language: " That a distinction exists between a regenerate state, and a state of entire and perfect holiness, will be generally allowed. Regeneration, as we have seen, is concomitant with justification; but the Apostles, in addressing the body of believers, in the churches to whom they wrote their epistles, set before them, both in their prayers they offer in their behalf, and in the exhortations they administer, a still higher degree of deliverance from sin, as well as a higher growth of Christian virtues."

Now, this remaining corruption in the hearts of believers, after the pardon of sin, is totally irreconcilable with the native purity or indifference of human nature. When God pardons a sinner, he forgives all his sins that have been committed in past life, hence, if human nature is not corrupt, and if all sin consists in voluntary actions, when a sinner is pardoned, there could be no remaining corruption, or pollution, and the soul would be just as holy, just as free from moral defilement, as it would be if sin had never stained the universe.

VII. The whole gospel economy proceeds on the ground of man's natural depravity, or corruption of nature. It will not be denied, that the whole gospel system is founded on the mission of Christ, and proceeds to offer salvation to the human family on the ground of what he has done and suffered for us. He came to "seek and save that which was lost"—he "gave himself a ransom for all," and tasted "death for every man." That "as by the offence of one," (Adam) "judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one," (Jesus Christ) "the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved;" for he is the "Savior of all men, especially of those that believe." There are two leading truths on the very face of the gospel, on the ground of which the whole gospel system proceeds. These truths are the following: First, all are lost and stand in need of salvation. Secondly, Christ is the Savior of all, able and willing to save all that need, and who will come unto him that they may have life. These which are fundamental, and draw after them every other part of the gospel system, clearly suppose a fallen and corrupt state of human nature; for they can be truths only in view of the truth of our inherent depravity. If man is not corrupt in nature, and if all sin consists in voluntary actions, it is perfectly possible to avoid all sin, so as to need no atonement for sin; no restorer, no mediator, no interposition of Jesus Christ, to reconcile us to God. It would be profane to say that men are unreconciled to God, so as to need a mediator, and lost so as to need salvation, in the same state in which God created them; having never broken his law nor in any way sinned against him: hence, if men are not by nature corrupt, it is possible to live free from all sin, so as not to heed the atoning blood to wash away our sins, or the Holy Ghost to renew our hearts. This would be subversive of the whole gospel system. To such beings the story of Jesus' sufferings and death would be preached in vain; the invitations of the gospel would be heard only as addressed to others, and the proffered agency of the Holy Ghost would be declined, and the mission of Christ and the whole gospel system, would prove an unnecessary and an uncalled for interference with human allotment. The following very appropriate remarks, on this point, are from the pen of Mr. Fletcher. "In every religion, there is a principal truth or error, which, like the first link of a chain, necessarily draws after it all the parts with which it is essentially connected. This leading principle in Christianity, distinguished from deism, is the doctrine of our corrupt and lost estate: for if man is not at variance with his Creator, what need of a mediator between God and him? If he is not a depraved, undone creature, what necessity of so wonderful a restorer and Savior as the Son of God; If he is not enslaved to sin, why is he redeemed by Jesus Christ? If he is not polluted, why must he be washed in the blood of that immaculate Lamb! If his soul is not disordered, what occasion is there for such a divine physician? If he is not helpless and miserable, why is he perpetually invited to secure the assistance and consolations of the

Holy Spirit? And in a word, if he is not born in sin why is a new birth so absolutely necessary, that Christ declares, with the most solemn asseverations, without it no man can see the kingdom of God?"

VIII. In conclusion, on the subject of depravity, it is proper to appeal to the experience of all the good, who have resolved on living conformably to the strict piety and pure morals inculcated by our holy religion, and ask, if they have not found foes within, as well as without? If their disordered and scattered affections, so difficult to control and concentrate in the one supreme object, God; if their unholy passions, so difficult to restrain and correct, which, at touch kindle into forbidden anger, and settle into deliberate and hateful revenge, or melt into compliance with the most low and debasing indulgencies, do not teach that the soul to which such affections and passions belong, is a fallen and corrupt spirit? This appeal may have but little influence with the abandoned, who have never attempted to subdue their unholy propensities, who have yielded to the current of evil without resistance; but he, who has ever made an attempt at the pure religion of the gospel, will feel its force.

While the life of the Christian is a warfare, a warfare not with the world and Satan only, but with the affections and passions which are the attributes of his own soul, a warfare with the elements of his own nature, he will carry with him an ever present evidence of the corruption of human nature; an evidence that will last until the victory is complete, and he finds himself wholly redeemed from the ruins of the fall.

CHAPTER VI.

REDEMPTION—CHRIST'S DEATH A RANSOM FOR SINNERS—THE ATONEMENT.

By the doctrine of the atonement, is meant that view of the sufferings and death of Christ, which affirms that he suffered and died as man's substitute, in a manner to deliver sinners from the punishment due to their sins, and that the merits of his death, as their atoning sacrifice, is the only ground of their pardon and restoration to holiness and happiness.

In opposition to this view, it is maintained by Pelagians and Socinians, and by some Unitarians, that Christ is to be regarded in the light of a martyr only, and that his sufferings and death possess no saving virtue, beyond the influence of a heroic example. The two views are too wide apart, to be parts or modifications of the same system, and the Gospel is fundamentally a different matter, as the one or the other is adopted. So important is the difference, as to demand a thorough investigation of the subject.

SECTION I.

The Necessity of Atonement.

The Divine government requires satisfaction, in order to the salvation of sinners.

I. All men are under law to God. To deny this, would be to deny that the world is under moral government, for government without rule or law, is self-contradictory. The law, by which we should be governed, is the will of our Creator. When God brings any rational being into existence, such being must be under obligation to the hand that made him, and as every power is the work of the Creator, nothing short of the employment of the whole, in accordance with his will, can satisfy the claims of the Creator. Taking this view, we see that no rational being can exist, without law to God, which law commences with the commencement of our rational existence, and continues through the whole extent of our being—while life, and thought, and being, last.

II. It is undeniable, that all men have violated the law of God, and are sinners, " for sin is the transgression of the law." For ample proof on this fundamental point, the reader is referred to the preceding chapter.

III. The penalty of God's law is death, which is in its own nature endless, so that a being having once incurred the penalty, can never be saved, except it be by a pardon, which remits such penalty.

1. Death is clearly the penalty of God's law.

Death was the penal sanction of the first precept given to man. Gen. 2: 17: " In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Ezek. 18: 20: " The soul that sinneth it shall die." Rom. 6: 23: " The wages of sin is death." Rom. 8: 6: " To be carnally minded is death." James 1: 15: " Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death."

2. Death, whether natural, moral, or spiritual, must be endless in its own nature. What is death? It is the negation of life, the absence of that life to which it stands opposed. If death is made to consist in moral depravity, it is the negation of that holiness, that conformity to the divine will and likeness, which constitutes moral or spiritual life. If death is made to consist in the dissolution of the body, it is the negation of those vital energies which constitute animal life. When a person dies morally or naturally, it is the principle or power of the opposite life that is overcome; life becomes extinct, and death reigns. Now when a person is dead on this principle, self-resuscitation is utterly impossible, life has become extinct, and nothing but death reigns and pervades the whole system; hence, death left to the tendency of its own nature, must hold on to its subjects with an eternal grasp, unless it be said that death can produce life, or that inertia can produce animation; for as there is nothing but death now pervading the once animated sphere of the fallen, the energies of life can move there no more forever, unless they can spring from death, or out of nothing rise.

It is certain then, so far as moral or spiritual death is concerned, on which this argument is predicated, that persons once dead must remain dead forever, unless God, who said " thou shalt die," speak to the dead, and say, thou shalt live, and thereby revoke the sentence of his righteous law. We see then, that there is no way of being delivered from the penalty of the law but by a pardon; for when the penalty of the law takes effect in the death of the sinner, as that death is in its own nature endless, holding the criminal under

its dominion, any subsequent deliverance by the communication of life by God, from whom it must proceed, must be regarded in the light of a pardon, since, in such a case, the offender does not endure all that the sentence imports, death being endless of itself. If then, there is no salvation but by a pardon, we are led to enquire on what ground such pardon is to be looked for.

IV. There can be no pardon extended to sinners without an atonement; without a satisfaction to the claims of the divine government. There are but three grounds of pardon which can be maintained with any degree of plausibility, in view of this argument. They are, first, by some provision in the law, or, secondly, by the prerogative of God, or, thirdly, by an atonement. By proving the first two of these grounds of pardon to be false, it will be rendered certain, that the third is the true and only ground of pardon.

1. The law does not and cannot contain a provision for the remission of its own penalty. This question is settled by St. Paul. Gal. 3: 21, 22: " If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily, righteousness should have been by the law, but the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise, by faith of Jesus Christ, might be given to them that believe." In this text, the Apostle asserts, in effect, that no law has been given, which can give life, hence, the law, which inflicts death, can contain no provisions for the removal of death, and the restoration of the dead to life; for in such case the law would give life, which is the point the Apostle denies. A law without any penal sanction, would be of no force, and might be violated with impunity; and a law, making provision for delivering offenders from its penalty, would be the same, in effect, as a law without any penal sanction; since, in such case, no penalty would take effect; therefore, the idea of a law making provision for delivering offenders from its own penal sanctions, is a solecism.

2. Pardon cannot be extended to sinners by the mere prerogative of God. This is maintained from the view already taken of the perfections of God. Every perfection of the divine nature is opposed to it.

(1.) If God be immutable, what he does or sanctions at one time, he must do or sanction at all times, under circumstances involving the same moral principles. God having sanctioned the death of the sinner, by making death the penalty of his law, to counteract it by interposing a pardon, would be to act differently at different times, under circumstances which involve the same moral principles, which would clearly imply mutability or change, unless something be urged as the ground of the pardon which renders the case of the offender a different one from what the law contemplates, as is the case, on the supposition that Christ has made an atonement. Taking this view, it must appear, that for God to pardon merely by prerogative, not only implies his mutability, but also involves the divine administration, in principles which contradict and oppose each other. It makes God say in his law, the soul that sinneth it shall die, and at the same time, say, by an act of pardon, the sinner shall not die; both of which cannot be true.

(2.) Divine justice, on the above principles, must be violated, either in the penalty of death, or else, in the pardon which averts the penalty. The law claims the death of the

transgressor; hence, if the law be just, justice claims the death of the offender; and justice as well as law says, the soul that sinneth, it shall die. On the other hand, if justice does not claim the death of the offender, the law claims more than justice and must be unjust, and, consequently, God must be unjust; for he could not be just in giving an unjust law. Now, as justice claims the death of the sinner, his deliverance by a pardon, founded on mere prerogative, would be a violation of justice; for justice cannot claim the death of a sinner and sanction his life at the same time, all in view of the same moral principles. The conclusion is, that if God pardons sinners by mere prerogative, he must have been unjust in sanctioning his law with the penalty of death, or else, in the pardon which sets aside a just penalty.

(3.) If God is all-wise, he must have seen it proper for the good of the moral system, that transgressors should die, or he would never have sanctioned his law with the penalty of death; for God could not be wise in giving to his law a penalty, the execution of which, would be improper and opposed to the best interests of his government. Now, if perfect wisdom saw that it would be proper and for the best interests of the moral system, that offenders should die, the same perfect wisdom cannot see that it is proper and for the best interests of the moral system that the same offenders should live: It is either proper and for the best interests of the divine government that sinners should die, or it is not: if it is proper and for the best, God would be unwise to pardon them; but if it be not proper and for the best, that sinners should die, God must have been unwise when he gave to his law the sanction of death. The conclusion is, that if God pardons offenders by mere prerogative, he must have acted unwisely when he annexed to his law the penalty of death, or he acts unwisely when he prevents the execution of such penalty by extending a pardon to the offender.

(4.) The same mode of reasoning may be employed in relation to the goodness of God, for it must appear obvious to all, that the same goodness which would pardon a sinner to save him from death, which is the penalty of the law, would have withheld such a sanction from the law; or to reverse the order, that goodness which would annex to the law the penalty of death, would not prevent its execution, but suffer the offender to die.

Let the statement now be repeated, that a pardon can be looked for only, on one of three grounds, namely, first, on the ground of some provision in the law; secondly, on the ground of the prerogative of God, thirdly, on the ground of a satisfaction by a substitute, which is the doctrine of the atonement. As the first two of these grounds are proved to be impossible, the third must be the true ground, and the conclusion is reached, that pardon can be extended to sinners only upon the ground of an atonement, and such atonement must be found, or sinners must perish.

V. The required atonement cannot have been made unless it was made by Jesus Christ, if this position can be made clear, the argument will be conclusive. As it will not be contended that an angel, or any other being, as man's substitute, has made an atonement for him, it is only necessary to prove that man cannot make an atonement for his own sins, and the world of sinners will be compelled to ground their hopes upon the death of Christ, or perish for ever.

1. Man has nothing to present, as an atonement, or to render to divine justice as a redemption price, on which the law had not a previous claim. Were man capable of obeying the law, perfectly, from this time forward and forever, and should he do it, it would not atone for his past sins; for all this the law claims, without any reference to his past disobedience, and would have claimed, if he had never disobeyed. We have already seen that the law claims man's entire obedience, through the whole period of his existence; but if the sinner should, at any time, commence a course of obedience, and pursue it forward, in view of his past disobedience, he could obey God, only during a part of his existence, and hence, must forever come short of answering the claims of the divine law.

2. Man is a fallen and depraved being, and is incapable of perfect obedience, until he is first redeemed and saved, and of course he can make no satisfaction for his past disobedience. How entirely absurd it must appear, to pretend that a fallen being can atone for his past sins, since he must be redeemed and saved from those sins, before he can obey, and answer the claims of the law for the present.

But it may be asked, is not repentance all the restitution that is required of sinners? The answer is, repentance is no restitution, and cannot, in the least, be regarded in the light of an atonement. If repentance be regarded, as it is by those who deny the doctrine of atonement, as a mere reformation from open vice, it would appear a singular atonement indeed. It amounts to this, in principle: I have offended against a good law; now how shall I escape punishment? I will satisfy the claims of the law by an atonement. But what shall I render as a satisfaction? If I can be excused, I will leave off committing the offence. Such notions of atonement are too lax to deserve further notice. But should repentance be viewed as a work of the heart, under the exercise of a godly sorrow for sin, producing confession of sin, and reformation in life, it will still come short of being an atonement, for the following reasons:

1. Repentance is a work, or an exercise which cannot exist without the previous existence of sin, and can be exercised by none but sinners. Now, that which is dependent upon sin for its very existence, the necessity and existence of which is laid in sin, cannot be an atonement for sin. Again, as repentance is an exercise of the heart and soul, under a sense of guilt and exposure, producing a heartfelt sorrow for sin, it cannot constitute an atonement for sin; for the law had a previous claim on the entire heart, requiring the exercise of all its powers, not in repentance, but in the more noble work of loving the Creator. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy might." It has already been noticed, that in order to an atonement, something must be engaged on which the law had not a previous claim, which is not the case in the work of repentance.

2. Repentance is not only insufficient in itself, but in view of the fallen state of man, it cannot be exercised without the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit, which supposes a state of grace previous to repentance; hence, the atonement must be made before repentance can take place, and that which can exist only subsequently to an atonement,

cannot be the atonement itself. We see then, that man cannot make an atonement for sin, nor give a ransom for his soul.

At this point the argument comes to a natural and successful close. It is agreed by all who claim the name of Christian, that God does save sinners by restoring them to holiness and happiness. This he does, by or without atonement. But it has been proved.

1. That the perfections of God, and the principles of his moral government, render it impossible that he should save sinners without atonement.
2. It has been proved that no atonement has been, or can be made, unless it has been made by Jesus Christ. This brings us to rest upon Paul's doctrine, who said of Christ, " In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Eph.1: 7,

SECTION II.

The Atonement proved from the Mosaic Ritual

The Mosaic system, by a variety of types, represented Christ in his great sacrificial office and work, as the Redeemer of mankind, and propitiatory offering for their sins. The whole significance and beauty, and power of Judaism depends upon the fact that it symbolized Christ as the great atoning sacrifice for the sins of men. Deny this doctrine, and its power, and beauty, and glory are gone. A few only of the leading sacrifices of the law need be noticed.

I. The common sin offering, personally required of every individual sinner, is clearly expressive of the sacrificial death of Christ.

Lev. 4: 27-31: " And if any of the common people sin he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats, a female without blemish, for his sin which he hath sinned: and he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin offering, and slay the sin offering in the place of the burnt offering. And the priest shall take of the blood thereof with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and shall pour out all the blood thereof at the bottom of the altar; and he shall take away all the fat thereof, as the fat is taken away from off the sacrifice of peace offerings, and the priest shall burn it upon the altar for a sweet savor unto the Lord; and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him."

If God did not require a sacrifice for sin, as an expiation of the sinner's guilt, there can be no meaning in the whole of the above performance. The sinner laid his hand upon the victim that was to be slain, denoting a symbolical transfer of sin from the sinner to the sin offering; the latter dying in the place of the former. Nor can it be pretended that the offering was a mere fine for the sinner's trespass, for in such case it would have been an offset, in itself considered, which was not the case, as appears from two circumstances.

1. The victim received all its validity, as a sacrifice for sin, from the place and circumstance of the offering, and not from any intrinsic value it possessed in itself, as being equal to damages sustained by the sinner's trespass. Had the victim been offered in any other place, save in the sanctuary, it would not have been accepted as an atonement for sin. The sanctuary was regarded as the place of the divine presence, for in it God had recorded his name; and this being the place where the sacrifice was made, marked it as *an offering to God on the part of the sinner*. The offering was made by the priest, who must be acknowledged to be the type of Jesus Christ, in his great sacrificial work. Had the sacrifice been presented by any other person save the priest, it would have been no atonement; whereas neither the place nor the person making the offering, could have effected its value, if it was to be regarded as a mere fine for trespass. Again, nothing else, of the same or even greater value, than the victims prescribed by the law, could have been accepted in their place, as a sin offering, which shows that the law did not have reference to their value as a fine for an equal amount of damage done, but that they were by divine appointment, rendered acceptable in their death, as a substitute for the sinner's death, who had forfeited his life by his sin.

2. The offender was not released on the ground of having paid an equivalent for his sin, which must have been the case if his offering was regarded as a mere fine for his trespass; but he received a pardon of the offence on the presentation of his sin offering. It is said, "the priest shall make an atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him." This clearly proves that an atonement for sin was directed by the law, to be made to God, to procure his pardon, and not to man, exclusively to procure his reconciliation to God. It also proves that the atonement, directed by the law, was an expiation of the sinner's guilt, effecting his deliverance from the punishment he deserved, not however, by an absolute payment of the debt, but by procuring a pardon. God pardoned the sinner on the ground of the sin offering or atonement, directed to be made by the priest of the sanctuary, which was rendered acceptable by two circumstances.

1. It was of God's own appointment.

2. It had reference to, and typically pointed out, the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ, "Who gave himself a ransom for all" "and by whom we have now received the atonement."

In view of these facts, it was rendered efficacious in procuring pardon, when offered through faith in the promise of God made to Abraham, that in his seed, that is Christ, all nations should be blessed.

II. The annual atonement offered by the high priest for the whole nation, clearly symbolized Christ. Lev. 16: 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 21, 22: "And he shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel, two kids of the goats, for a sin offering, and he shall take the two goats and present them before the Lord at the door of the congregation. And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats one lot for the Lord and the other lot for the scapegoat; and Aaron shall bring the goat upon which the Lord's lot fell, and offer him for a sin offering. But the goat, on which the lot fell to be the scapegoat, shall be presented alive before the

Lord, to make an atonement with him, and to let him go for a scapegoat into the wilderness. And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon; he head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness; and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited."

On this offering Dr. Clarke has made the following remarks: " It is allowed on all hands that this ceremony, taken in all its parts, pointed out the Lord Jesus dying for our sins, and rising again for our justification; being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit. Two goats are brought, one to be slain as a sacrifice for sin, the other to have the transgressions of the people confessed over his head, and then to be sent away into the wilderness. This animal, by this act was represented as bearing away, and carrying off, the sins of the people. The two goats made only one sacrifice; yet only one of them was slain. One animal could not point out both the divine and human nature of Christ, nor show both his death and resurrection, for the goat that was killed could not be made alive. The divine and human natures of Christ were essential to the grand expiation: yet the human nature alone suffered; for the divine nature could not suffer; but its presence in the human nature, while agonizing unto death, stamped those agonies, and the consequent death, with infinite merit. The goat therefore, that was slain, prefigured his human nature, and its death: the goat that escaped, pointed out his resurrection. The one shows the atonement for sin as the ground of justification; the other Christ's victory, and the total removal of sin in the sanctification of the soul."

In addition to the above extract from the learned Doctor, it is proper to remark,

1. That the offering must be regarded as an atonement for sin and expiation of the sinner's guilt, from the plain and simple language in which it is set forth. " And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel and the goat shall bear on him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited." Here is an actual removal of sin, not by suffering its punishment, but by an atonement or expiation. Is it said that this bearing away of the sins of the people by the scapegoat, was not real, but symbolical, or typical? It is replied, that this does not in the least invalidate the argument; for if the Mosaic ritual, in pointing to better things to come, symbolically represented the removal of sin by an atonement, then, it must follow that the better covenant provides a real atonement which does in fact remove sin and save from the punishment it deserves.

2. The atonements, made under the law, were symbols and types of the atonement or offering of Jesus Christ, who gave himself a ransom for all. This position is clearly sustained by the reasoning of the Apostle. Heb. 9: 1, 9,11, 12,13, 14, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26: " Then verily, the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary, which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience. But Christ being come, a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands; neither by the blood of goats and calves,

but by his own blood, he entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot, to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens, should be purified with these; for Christ is not entered into the holy place made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

This language of the apostle is too plain to be misunderstood or to need explanation. It must be seen that he draws a comparison between the offerings under the law and the one offering of Jesus Christ, and represents the former as shadowing forth the latter, and the latter as the substance, object, and end of the former; exceeding them in character and value in the same proportion in which a substance outweighs a shadow, or a thing itself transcends its mere pattern or symbol. He refers directly to the annual atonement made by the high priest: "Nor yet that he (Christ) should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others." This offering he represents only as a temporary relief, saying, Chap. 10: 3: "But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance made of sins every year," but the offering of Christ he represents as being more perfect, saying, "he entered in *once* into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us," having "now *once* in the end of the world appeared to put away sin by the offering of himself." Much more might be said under this head, but sufficient has been advanced to show that the sacrifices of the Mosaic ritual, point out Jesus Christ, as a real atonement and expiatory sacrifice for sin. Deny the vicarious and expiatory character of the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, and the ceremonial worship of the Jews loses its charm, their sanctuary is divested of its significant grandeur, their smoking altars lose their sanctity, the confession upon the head of the scapegoat becomes foolish mummery, and their sacrifices of slaughtered hecatombs are rendered use-less, barbarous and cruel.

SECTION III.

The Death of Christ.

The peculiar facts and circumstances connected with the death of Christ, prove that he died as the world's atoning sacrifice. Christ suffered as man's substitute and atoning sacrifice for sin, or he suffered only as a martyr. There is no middle ground, nor other ground than the one or other of these positions. The argument rests upon the fact, that the peculiar phenomena connected with his death, cannot be explained upon the supposition that he died as a martyr only, but upon the supposition that he died as the world's atoning sacrifice for sin, all is accounted for.

I. The terrible agony and principal suffering of Christ, clearly resulted from some unknown cause, unless he suffered for the sins of men. What produced that fearful scene in the garden?

1. It was not self-inflicted. This is clear, from the fact that he prayed to be delivered from it: " Father, if thou be willing, let this cup pass from me."

2. His sufferings in the garden were not produced by his enemies. This is clear, from the fact that the officers commissioned to arrest him, had not arrived when the scene of his agony transpired. He was alone, with his sleepy disciples at the distance of a stone's cast, when his soul became " exceeding sorrowful, even unto death."

3. To say that his agony was the result of his fears of what he saw would be inflicted, would render him inglorious, and an unworthy example as a martyr. Not one of his martyred followers ever betrayed such weakness. There was then something present in his suffering, beyond the sufferings of any common death; beyond what any mere martyr ever suffered.

II. Christ clearly suffered more in the process of dying, than other men do or can suffer.

1. The description given of his agony by the several writers, proves it to have transcended all other deaths.

Matthew says, " He began to be sorrowful and very heavy." The Greek word, *adeemonein*, here rendered, " very heavy," signifies, to faint with labor, or to be overwhelmed with anguish.

Mark says, " He began to be sore amazed."

Sore amazed, from *Ekthambeo*, *ek*, intense, and *thambeo*, to amaze; intense amazement, or intensely amazed.

Luke says, " Being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly."

The Greek word, *agonia*, rendered agony, occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. It signifies strife, conflict for victory, a violent struggle which produces anguish.

The Saviour's own words are, " My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." The Greek word, *perilupos*, here rendered exceeding sorrowful, is composed of *peri*, intense, and *lupee*, grief, hence, it expresses intense grief. The sense is very, or exceeding sorrowful. In all these descriptions of the Saviour's agony, those terms are employed which express the highest degree of mental anguish, which any words in the language could express, in the respective forms of speech employed. Compare all this with the accounts given of the deaths of the early martyrs, and how clearly does it appear that Christ suffered more in the process of dying, than other men do or can suffer.

2. His own prayer proves the intensity of his suffering, above those of any martyr of whom we have any account. Matthew says he prayed, " O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me."

Mark says, " He went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed, that if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee, take away this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt."

Luke says, he prayed, " Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me." The cup spoken of was that bitter agony which was then crushing his soul, and under which he must have died before reaching the cross, had it not been removed. But it was removed, the cup did then pass in answer to that prayer, and he became calm. To this the apostle doubtless alludes, Heb. 5" 7: " Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared."

He was saved as remarked above, and was calm until he had passed through the forms of his mock trial, and until all was fulfilled that had been predicted of him, and then the cup returned, and he died from its bitter, soul crushing agony.

3. The fact that an angel came from heaven and strengthened him, is clear proof that his sufferings were greater than other martyrs endured, who had no such support. The language of Luke is, " There appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him." This angelic support was rendered before any violence had been offered to his physical nature, and hence it was a support under the mental anguish which he endured under the weight of the world's sin.

4. His bloody sweat is proof of the terrible nature of his anguish. The language of Luke is, " And being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling to the ground." There was no cause of sweat at all, but the anguish of his soul, for which there was no visible cause. It was in the cool hour of night. It was also on the night of the second day of April, a cool season of the year. How terrible must his agony have been, to so convulse his whole organization, as to mingle his blood with his sweat, producing great scarlet drops falling to the ground, from the open pores of his prostrate body?

5. His complaint upon the cross, proves his sufferings, not only to have been great, but such in kind as no mere martyr ever endured. In his agony in the Garden, support was rendered him from heaven, and the Father heard his prayer, and removed the cup of anguish, but when that cup was returned to him upon the cross, no angel strengthened him, and the Father closed his ear to his prayer, and hid his face behind the cloud of divine wrath, which hung over a world of guilty sinners, and then he cried, " My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" He cried with a loud voice, as no martyr ever cried, and complained of an evil of which no martyr ever complained, that God forsook him in the dying hour. He then appeared as man's substitute, as the atoning sacrifice of the

world, and the divine law, violated by universal humanity, rose between him and the Father's smile, and shot its ten thousand lightning stings into his soul, and he died.

6. His early death proves his suffering to have been greater than the natural consequences of crucifixion. Death upon the cross must be terrible, from the fact that it is so protracted. But Christ endured none of its lingering anguish. He died suddenly, and with a fearful convulsion, which rent the rocks and caused the earth to quake. He died before the other persons, crucified at the same time, and sooner than was usual, and sooner than was expected. As it was not lawful for them to remain on the cross over the approaching Sabbath, they made a finish of life by breaking their bones, but when they came to Christ, they found him already dead, and broke not his bones. And so unusual and unexpected was it for persons to die so soon, that Pilate marveled and refused to give up his body, until he had called the centurion, and learned from him that he was really dead. All this shows that he suffered more than a mere martyr, and that his death did not result from the violence offered to his physical nature, but that he died as a free will offering, a voluntary sacrifice for the sins of men. He died under the weight of the world's sin. No other explanation can be given of the various phenomena connected with his death, only that he died for the sins of men.

SECTION IV,

The Scriptures represent Christ as a Redeemer, and man as Redeemed by him.

The terms employed are various, but the idea of Redeemer and redeemed, is found running through the whole record of the New Testament. Let the argument be opened with the word ransom. Matt. 20: 28: " The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many." 1 Tim. 2: 6: " Who gave himself a ransom for all."

If the argument was to be settled by the English word, ransom, it would leave but little room for dispute. The noun, ransom, signifies the price paid for the release or redemption of a prisoner or captive. Or it denotes the deliverance which is effected by a price paid.

The verb, to ransom, signifies, to redeem from captivity by paying an equivalent. Now, if it was in this sense that Christ gave his life a ransom for sinners, the argument is conclusive. The question then is, does the word ransom fairly represent the sense of the original? The Greek word used by the Evangelist is *lutron*, which signifies, ransom, redemption, atonement, the price paid for deliverance.

The word used by Paul in the text above quoted, is *antilutron*. This word is compounded of *anti*, against, opposite, and *lutron*, a ransom or price, hence, *anti-lutron* signifies a price put down against or opposite a captive, to purchase his release. There is not another word in the Greek language, which would so perfectly express the idea that Christ died to redeem sinners, by giving his life a ransom for theirs.

The same idea is expressed by the words redeem and redemption.

Rom. 3: 24: " Being justified freely by his grace, through the *redemption* that is in Christ Jesus." 1 Cor. 1: 30: " But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who, of God, is made unto us *redemption*" Gal. 4: 4: " God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to *redeem* them that were under the law." Tit. 2: 14: " Who gave himself for us, that he might *redeem* us from all iniquity." Heb. 9: 15: " And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the *redemption* of the transgressors that were under the first testament, that they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."

It is clear, from these texts, that Christ has redeemed us, that he is the Redeemer, and we the redeemed. What then is it to redeem?

" To purchase back; to ransom; to liberate or rescue from captivity or bondage, or from any obligation, or liability to suffer or to be forfeited, by paying an equivalent. To re-purchase what has been sold; to regain possession of a thing alienated, by repaying the value of it."

Hence redemption is the " re-purchase of captured goods or persons; the act of procuring the deliverance of persons or things from the possession and power of captors by the payment of an equivalent. ***In *theology*, the ransom or deliverance of sinners from the bondage of sin, and the penalties of God's violated law, by the atonement of Christ."—*Webster*.

Let it now be shown that the English words fairly represent the Greek.

Apolutrosis is the Greek word rendered *redemption*, which signifies a releasing on payment of ransom, a ransoming, deliverance, redemption. This word occurs only ten times in the New Testament, and is used essentially in the same sense in every instance. The following are the texts, Luke 21: 28: " Your *redemption* draweth nigh." Rom. 3: 24: " Through the *redemption* that is in Christ Jesus." 8: 23: " . The *redemption* of our body." 1 Cor, 1: 30: " Righteousness, sanctification and *redemption*. Eph. 1: 7: " In whom we have *redemption*." 14: " Until the *redemption* of the purchased possession." 4: 30: " Unto the day of *redemption*." Col. 1: 14: " In whom we have *redemption*" Heb. 9: 15: "For the redemption of the transgressions." 11: 35: " Not accepting *deliverance*." In the last text the word is rendered *deliverance*, and might as well, or perhaps better have been so rendered in the first, but the sense is perfectly clear. In every case where it speaks of redemption by Christ, redemption by his death is meant.

There are two Greek words which are rendered redeem and redeemed. The first is *exagorazo*. This word signifies, to buy from one, to release, to redeem, to redeem for one's self. It occurs but four times in the New Testament, as follows: " Gal. 3: 13: " Christ hath *redeemed* us from the curse of the law." 4: 5: " To *redeem* them that were under the law." Eph. 5: 16, and Col. 4: 5: " Redeeming the time."

In the first two of these texts, the doctrine of the redemption of sinners by price, is clearly affirmed. The other Greek word rendered redeem and redeemed, is *lutroo*. This word

signifies to release on receipt of ransom, to hold to ransom, to release by payment of ransom. The word occurs but three times in the New Testament, as follows: " Luke 24: 21: " We trusted that it had been he which should have *redeemed* Israel." Titus 2: 14: " Who gave himself for us, that he might *redeem* us from all iniquity." 1 Peter 1: 18,19: " Ye were not *redeemed* with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ."

If the doctrine that Christ died for sinners to save them by giving his life a ransom for theirs, is not taught in these passages, it could not be taught in the use of any language.

There is yet another word which expresses the same doctrine. It is *agorazo*, which signifies to buy for one's self, or to acquire by a ransom or price paid. This word occurs thirty-one times in the New Testament, and is rendered, buy and bought, in every case but three, and in those it is rendered redeemed. These three cases are Rev. 5: 9, 14: 3, 4. Out of the twenty-eight times in which it is rendered buy and bought, it is three times applied to redemption by Christ as follows: 1 Cor. 6: 20: " Ye are *bought* with a price; therefore, glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are his." 7: 23: " Ye are *bought* with a price; be not ye the servants of men." 2 Peter 2: 1: " Even denying the Lord that *bought* them." This clearly settles the fact that the redemption of sinners by Christ, is represented as a purchase.

SECTION V.

The Scriptures represent Christ as a Mediator, Intercessor, Reconciler and Advocate.

Christ is clearly declared to be a Mediator between God and men. Dr. Webster's definition of the English word is so much to the point as to render it proper to quote it as follows: " Mediator." 1. One that interposes between parties at variance, for the purpose of reconciling them. 2. *By way of eminence*, CHRIST IS THE MEDIATOR. Christ is a *mediator* by nature, as partaking of both natures, divine and human; and *mediator* by office, as transacting matters between God and man." This settles the matter, so far as the English word is concerned. But does it truly represent the Greek. This cannot be successfully denied.

The Greek word rendered mediator, is *mesitees*, and signifies, literally, one that is in the middle, a mediator, a peace-maker. The word never was used by Greek writers in any other sense. The word occurs only six times in the New Testament, and in every instance it is used in the above sense, as follows: Gal. 3: 19, 20: " Wherefore, then, serveth the law? It was added, because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made, and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is one."

This text has generally been understood to speak of Moses as the mediator, but this construction appears to depend more upon the force of the words which the translators have added, which are not in the original, than upon the text itself. These words are, " *and it was*" in the 19th verse, and " *a Mediator*," in the 20th verse. Omit these words, which

are no part of the text, and it will read thus: " It (the law) was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come, to whom the promise was made, ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. Now, a mediator is not of one, but God is one." Thus reading the text, the 19th verse asserts that the promise, and not the law, was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. This clearly makes Christ the mediator, in whose hand the promise was ordained for fulfillment. The sense of the 20th verse is, " Now a mediator is not of one [party] but God is one." [party.]

This relieves the text of all the obscurity which commentators have fancied enveloped it, and makes it assert a very simple truth. Christ, the mediator, is not a mediator of one party, as a mediator acts between two parties, and God is one of these parties, and man the other. This view also has the advantage of harmonizing with the use of the word mediator in every other instance. Moses is nowhere else called a mediator, but Christ is, in every case where the word is used. It also agrees better with the general design of the apostle's argument, which is to prove that the law could not disannul the covenant which was confirmed in Christ the mediator.

So much space has not been devoted to this text, because it is of vital importance in itself, but because it contains the word mediator, which, in every other instance of its use, is applied to Christ. 1 Tim. 2: 5: "For there is one God and one *mediator* between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

This text is clear and decisive. Christ is a mediator between God and men, and on what ground he mediates, the next verse affirms, when it says, he " gave himself, a ransom for all," that is, all men. Heb. 8: 6: " But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much more also, he is the *mediator* of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises."

How Christ is a mediator of a better covenant, will be seen by consulting the next case in which the word occurs, as follows. Heb. 9: 13-15: "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? And for this cause he is the *mediator* of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressors that were under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." This clearly proves that Christ was inducted into his office of mediator, by a baptism of blood and death, and that his blood and death were for the redemption of those in whose behalf he mediates. Heb. 12: 24: " And to Jesus the *mediator* of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling. Here again the mediation of Christ is associated with his blood, that was shed for our redemption.

The reader now has before him every text in which the word mediator occurs, and it must appear plain that the whole doctrine of mediation is grounded upon Christ's sacrificial death for sinners.

But the doctrine of Christ's intercession, and advocacy with the Father for us, is but another form in which the same great truth is clearly presented in the Scriptures.

Rom. 8: 34: " Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God who also maketh intercession for us."

Heb. 7: 25: " He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."

Heb. 9: 24: " Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us."

The doctrine of Christ's intercession for us, is that he interposes his own merits with God for us, which involves the atonement. With this view of the intercession of Christ, that remarkable text accords, 1 John 2: 1, 2: " If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." This text is very decisive, for it declares that Christ is our advocate with the Father. And on what ground he advocates our cause, is clearly explained in the declaration, that he is " the *propitiation* for our sins." He is our advocate with the Father, because he is the propitiation for our sins. The same word is used again in chap. 4: 10: " Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his son to be the *propitiation* for our sins." This word occurs only in these two texts. The original is, *hilasmos*, which signifies, atonement, reconciliation, a sacrifice, or sin offering.

It is clear then that the doctrine of Christ's mediation, intercession and advocacy, as taught in the Scriptures, involve the doctrine of his sacrificial death for sinners, as their substitute, and expiatory offering for sin.

SECTION VI.

The Scriptures attribute the removal of sin, and the Salvation of sinners to the sufferings, blood, death, and resurrection of Christ.

John 1: 29: " Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."

1. This text attributes the removal of the sin of the world to Jesus Christ, which can in no wise be true unless he was, in some way, an expiation for sin, removing its guilt, and delivering the offender from its punishment. If, as Universalists contend, Christ does not save from guilt and punishment, only by saving from the future commission of sin, in no sense can it be said that the sin of the world is taken away by him. It might be said, on this principle, that he prevents the future sin of the world which would be committed, were it not for his interposition; but it cannot be said that he takes away the sin of the world, for that which has not been committed has no existence, and cannot be removed, and that which has been committed, is not taken away, on the above theory, since it asserts that Christ, does not save from its guilt and punishment. Now, as this text can be

true only on the ground of the sacrificial death of Christ, it is to be regarded as proof that such death was an expiatory offering, by which the guilt of sin is removed, and its punishment averted.

2. The manifest allusion, which the text contains, to the sacrifices of the law, shows that John referred to the sacrificial death of Christ, as the means by which he takes away the sin of the world. " Behold the LAMB of GOD." He is termed the Lamb of God, no doubt, in reference to the Paschal Lamb, or to the sacrifice of two lambs for a daily offering. Exo. 29: 38, 39: "Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar, two lambs of the first year, day by day continually. The one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning, and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even." Now, as lambs were offered for daily sin offerings, which offerings were typical of the one offering of Jesus Christ, he is called the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, of whom the prophet says, (Isa. 53: .7,) " He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter."

Dr. Clarke's note on the text under consideration, deserves particular attention. " Behold the Lamb of God.' This was said in allusion to what was spoken Isa. 53: 7. Jesus was the true Lamb or sacrifice required and appointed by God, of which, those offered daily in the tabernacle and temple, Exo. 29: 38, 39, and especially the Paschal lamb, were only the types and representatives. The *continual* morning and evening sacrifices of a lamb under the Jewish law, was intended to point out the continual efficacy of the blood of atonement: forever at the throne of God, Jesus Christ is ever represented as a Lamb newly slain. Rev. 5: 6. But John, pointing to Christ, calls him *emphatically the Lamb of God*—all the lambs which had hitherto been offered, had been furnished by men; this was provided by God, as the only sufficient and available sacrifice for the sin of the world. In three essential respects, this lamb differed from those by which it was represented. 1st. It was the Lamb of God: the most *excellent* and most *available*. 2nd. It made an *atonement* for *sin*: it carried sin away in reality; the others only *representatively*. 3rd. It carried away the *sin* of the world; whereas the other was offered only in behalf of the *Jewish people*"

John 6: 51, 53, 54, 55. " And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; for my flesh is meet indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." We presume it will not be necessary to attempt a refutation of the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation, as inferred from the above text, for the satisfaction of Universalists, who pay less attention to the holy sacrament, than any other class of professing Christians, with the exception of the honest Quakers. And without any reference of this absurd notion as to the manner of partaking of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, how clearly does the quotation attribute salvation to the broken body and spilt blood, or in other words, to the suffering and death of Jesus Christ? When Christ speaks of giving his flesh and blood for the life of the world, it is evident that he has reference to the offering which he made upon the cross. And as he declared " except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood"—i. e. except ye partake of the merits of his death, through faith in his name—" ye have no life in you;" his broken body and spilt blood are here represented as the source of eternal life: " Whosoever eateth my flesh and drink-eth my blood hath eternal life." And in no

other way can the death of Christ be the source of life to the world, only by being an atonement for sin, by which sinners are "redeemed from the curse of the law," which is death, " for the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Rom. 5: 9: " Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." In this text, the blood of Jesus Christ is asserted as the ground of our justification; and that justification implies the removal of our guilt, and remission of our punishment, is clear from its being followed by salvation or deliverance from wrath, " being *justified by his blood* we shall be *saved from wrath* through him." This most clearly marks the death and blood of Christ as an atonement and expiation of the sinner's guilt; for on no other principle can we be justified by the blood of Christ, any more than by the blood of Paul or of Peter.

Heb. 2: 14: "For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." This text does not, as some have supposed, prove that the devil will cease to exist, because destruction does not mean annihilation. This will not be maintained by those who deny the atonement, for they generally hold that all men will be saved, notwithstanding the wicked are to be destroyed. But while the text does not teach the destruction of the devil, in the sense of annihilation, it furnishes the most conclusive evidence that the success of the Redeemer's kingdom, in the overthrow of the devil, and in rescuing from the bondage of sin and death, all that believe in Christ, and cleave to his cross, is the result of his sufferings and death: " that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death." Whatever different views may be entertained concerning the devil's having the power of death, and in relation to his destruction, they cannot affect the argument; since, all must admit, that the text teaches that the death of Christ was necessary in order to the accomplishment of the object of which it speaks, and that this object is one inseparably connected with the salvation of sinners. The death of Christ, then, was intended to destroy him who had the power of death, and thereby to deliver those who through fear of death were subject to bondage; the death of Christ, therefore must have been a substitute for the death of those who were delivered from death by it.

Eph. 1: 7: " In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Col. 1: 14: " In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins."

Here are two texts, which, in the use of the same language, attribute our redemption and forgiveness of sins to the blood of Christ. Without the shedding of blood, therefore, there would have been no redemption nor forgiveness of sins, and without these, there could have been no salvation. Our entire salvation, therefore, is attributed to the blood of the cross. 1 Pet. 1: 18,19: " Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."

1 John 1: 7: " But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." It can

hardly be necessary to make a remark to show that this plain declaration attributes to the blood of Christ the power of removing sin. The entire washing of the soul from the pollution of sin, is here ascribed to the blood of the cross. And from what sin does the blood of Christ cleanse? Most certainly from that which has been committed; for it would be trifling to talk of being cleansed in anticipation of pollution. It is from "all sin," which includes sin of every kind and degree. The blood of the cross, therefore, is an expiation for sin, and has the power of removing its guilt, washing away its pollution, and averting its punishment.

Rev. 1: 5: "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, be glory and dominion forever and ever." Chap. 5: 9: "And they sung a new song, saying, thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." Chap. 7: 14: "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Such plain declarations of the efficacy of the blood of the cross, in washing away our sins, clearly point out the death and blood of Christ as an atoning and expiatory sacrifice for sinners, and show that our entire salvation depends upon what he has done and suffered for us.

SECTION VII.

The Scriptures assert Directly, the Sacrificial and Propitiatory Character of Christ's Sufferings and Death.

The Scriptures teach directly, that the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, were in the place of the punishment which was due to sinners; he suffering in their stead, bearing the punishment which they otherwise must have borne, and from which they, consequently, may now be delivered on gospel terms.

Isa. 53: 5,6,8,11,12: "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all; for the transgression of my people was he stricken. He shall bear their iniquities, and he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."

That this whole chapter relates to Jesus Christ, there is no doubt, and if it does not teach that he suffered for sinners, bearing a punishment for their sins, it is because the sentiment cannot be couched in the English language. Why was he wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities, if it was not to save us from being thus wounded and bruised? It is worthy of remark, that in this interesting chapter, Christ is represented as suffering for us by divine appointment, and under the divine sanction: "the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all"—"When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin." Now, if it was not the divine purpose to save us from the punishment our sins deserve, by laying our iniquities on Jesus Christ, and making his soul an offering for sin; if after all this, we must inevitably suffer *all* that our sins deserve then what

Christ suffered for us, must have been over and above what justice requires, and, consequently, unjust and cruel.

Rom. 4: 25: " Who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification." Here, the Apostle clearly asserts Christ's death for sinners, and their deliverance or salvation from the guilt of sin by his resurrection; i. e. he died to atone for our sins, and rose again to intercede for us, by pleading the merits of his death; we therefore, may be justified, i. e. saved from the guilt, and consequently, the punishment of sin, through his resurrection.

1 Cor. 15: 3: " For I delivered unto you first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures."

Several points in this text, deserve notice

1. The substance of the Apostle's declaration is, " *Christ died for our sins.*"
2. This doctrine of the vicarious death of Christ, he declares, he received: " I delivered unto you that which I also received." It was not a thought of his own, nor the invention of man, but he received it from God who called him to preach Christ crucified.
3. This doctrine of *Christ's death for our sins*, he says, he " delivered unto them *first of all,*" showing that he considered the doctrine of Christ's vicarious death, one of the first principles of the Gospel, of the first importance, on which the sinner's hope rests, and upon which the whole Gospel fabric is reared.
4. This doctrine of Christ's death for our sins, he declares, is " *according to the Scriptures,*"

Let it be understood, that by the Scriptures here, the Old Testament only can be intended, and what has been said on this subject, reasoning from the law and the prophets, is confirmed. As the apostle declares that Christ's death for our sins was according to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, it follows that the sin offerings made under the law, were representations of his death, and pointed him out as suffering for sinners; and that the prophet, in foretelling his passion, referred to the same object of his death, saying, "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin he shall see his seed."

2 Cor. 5: 21: " For he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." On this text, it may be remarked,

1. By Christ's being made sin for us, we are to understand that he was made a sin offering for us or an offering for our sins.
2. The design of this was that we might be made the righteousness of God in him, by which we understand, being made the partakers of God's justifying and renewing grace, whereby we are rendered righteous. This is termed the righteousness of God, because the

pardon of sin on the ground of the sin offering of Christ, whereby we are justified from sins that are past, is the prerogative and act of God, and because the internal work of renewing the heart and sanctifying the soul, whereby we are rendered righteous in heart and life, is the work of God's Holy Spirit.

1 Peter 2: 24, 25: " Who his own self bare our sins, in his own body, on the tree, by whose stripes ye are healed; for ye were as sheep going astray." This is almost a literal quotation from the prophet, whose words we have already considered, and goes farther to show that we are sustained by the New Testament writers, in our application of the prophet's language to the death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin. The apostle here is so plain and precise that it seems hardly possible to misunderstand or misapply his language.

1. He states that Christ bore our sins.
2. To show beyond all dispute, that he bore them literally, and not in some symbolical or allegorical manner, he notes the manner in which he bore them, in three particulars.

First, he bore them " his own self." *Secondly*, he bore them " in his own body." *Thirdly*, he bore them " on the tree," i. e. on the cross.

3. Lest some skeptic should still question the meritorious character of Christ's sufferings, the apostle adds, " by his stripes ye are healed."

1 Peter 3: 18: " For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit."

1. This text declares that Christ suffered for sins.
2. It was not his own sins for which he suffered, for he was without sin, but he suffered " the just for the unjust," his sufferings were therefore vicarious.
3. The object of his sufferings was that he might bring us to God; his sufferings, therefore, must have been necessary in order to our salvation.
4. To show that the salvation of sinners depends upon the merits of Christ's death, and not upon the influence of his example and truth, revealed in his gospel aside from his death, the apostle refers the whole to his passion: " He suffered for sin, that he might bring us to God, *being put to death in the flesh.*"

Heb. 9: 28: " So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Chapter 2: 9: " But we see Jesus," " that he by the grace of God should *taste death for every man.*" This class of texts might be multiplied to almost any extent, but it is unnecessary to add, enough has been produced to show, beyond dispute, that Christ did suffer for sinners, and that he suffered and died by divine appointment on the part of the Father, and as a free-will offering on his part. The death of Christ then, must have been an atonement for sinners,

essential to their salvation, or it would never have been voluntarily endured by himself or sanctioned by the Father.

If Christ did not die to save men from the guilt and punishment of sin, what was the object of his death, and wherein are we benefited by his passion, any farther than we might have been by his mission, had he appeared on earth, lived, preached, established a system of religious truth, appointed others to preach it after him, and retired to his native clime without heaving a sigh, uttering a groan, or shedding a drop of blood? If his death was not an atonement for sin, essential to our salvation, we can conceive of no benefit arising from his death, which we might not have enjoyed without it. When it has been asked for what purpose Christ suffered and died, if it was not to make an atonement for sin, our opponents have answered that he suffered to furnish an expression of the Father's love to a lost world. To this it is replied, that if the death of Christ was not an atonement for sin, essential in order to our salvation, it was no expression of God's love to us, but an expression of cruelty towards his beloved Son, in whom he declares himself well pleased. Suppose, as the Socinian view of the atonement does, that God was perfectly reconciled to us, and that nothing in his perfections or principles of administration, rendered it inconsistent for him to extend saving mercy to offending man, and, hence, that no offers of grace are now made to sinners which might not have been made without the death of Christ, and it not only strips his death of all that importance which is given to it in the Scriptures, but renders it useless and cruel. But it is said that the death of Christ was not designed to procure the favor of God, but to benefit the sinner, acting directly upon his mind as an evidence of the divine love.

To this it is replied, that if it were viewed in this light, it would not be calculated to produce such an effect. What is there in the sufferings of Christ calculated to convince us of the divine goodness, and to win our rebellious hearts to God, if we are assured at the same time that they were intended to produce no other happy effect, farther than to convince us that God is good and that he loves us? Look at the picture as this view presents it. God informs rebellious man that he is good, that he loves them, and that he is able and willing to save them; but incredulous man will not believe that God is love. The Father of mercies adds, hear, ye unbelieving children, and I will convince you that my very nature is love, and that my bowels yearn over the miseries of a fallen world; I have one only well beloved son, and to convince you that I am all goodness, I will send him into the world, and he shall suffer and die before your eyes. He is innocent, he is neither guilty of crime nor worthy of pangs; nor is his death necessary in order to render it consistent for me to save you, but is only necessary to convince you of my tender love. Look now on his pangs, hear him cry out under the most excruciating tortures, and see him sweat great drops of blood, and then ask your unrelenting hearts, if I am not pure unmingled love, who can inflict such sufferings on the *innocent*, merely to convince the *guilty* and *hell deserving* of my goodness towards them. What soul would not turn away with horror, frightened to despair, at such an exhibition of divine love, or rather divine wrath?

SECTION VIII.

Objections to the Doctrine of the Atonement, Answered.

I. It has been objected to the doctrine of a vicarious atonement, that it would be unjust for the innocent to suffer in the place of the guilty.

To this objection it is replied: 1. To suffer, endure privation, or inconvenience for the good of others, is uniformly represented as virtuous and benevolent. "I could wish," said Paul, "that myself were accursed from Christ, for my brethren, my kinsmen, according to the flesh." Rom. 9: 3: "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." John 10: 11: "To endure a smaller evil to save others from a greater one, or to secure to them a greater good, is certainly an act of benevolence; it is benevolence in the light of the Bible, it is benevolence in the sight of the world; such conduct has been made the subject of eulogy by orators, and the matter of song by bards. It is worthy of remark, that it is not pretended that Christ suffered as much in quantity as sinners would have suffered, through coming ages, had they been left unredeemed; his sufferings, therefore, save men from a greater amount of evil than he endured for them, while, on the other hand, it brings to them a greater amount of good than he had to forego in accomplishing the work of their redemption. Thus, it is clear, that to suffer for others, under the circumstances in which Christ suffered, is an act of virtue and benevolence, unless it can be shown that such sufferings are an infringement upon the prior claims of a superior. When it can be shown that by such sufferings, some just claim, some paramount obligation is violated, then, and not till then, will such sufferings appear unjust. Now, it is maintained that this is not true of the offering which Jesus Christ made of himself, once for all; no prior claim or law, by which the act could be determined an unjust one, was violated. Let it be particularly noted, that Jesus Christ suffered voluntarily on his own part, and in accordance with the will of the Father at the same time. Nothing is more clear than that the Father and the Son both willed the offering which Christ made "of himself once for all."

This being understood, if, as those who hold the doctrine of vicarious atonement believe, Christ was God as well as man, equal with the Father, he must have been the source of all law, so that no law could be of higher authority, than that of his own will; hence, as he willed to suffer, he suffered under the highest authority, and, therefore, the act cannot be determined to be unjust by a paramount law. But if, as Socinians contend, Christ was a mere created being, bound by the law of his Creator, then, there could be nothing unjust in the offering, since, he suffered in accordance with the will of the Father, the act being sanctioned by the highest authority in the universe, while he voluntarily suffered on his own part, for the good of others, delivering them from a greater evil than he endured, and bringing to them a greater amount of good than he sacrificed; which has been shown to be an act of virtue and benevolence, provided no law or prior claim is thereby violated. View the subject in this light, and the charge of injustice, on the doctrine of vicarious atonement, disappears.

2. While the vicarious atonement is thus vindicated from the charge of injustice, the charge returns upon those who have originated it, with a force beyond the power of their theory to resist.

That Jesus Christ did suffer and die voluntarily, and at the same time in accordance with the will of the Father, cannot be denied. This has been sufficiently shown in the preceding arguments, to which may be added, John 10: 17, 18: " Therefore doth my father love me, because I lay down my life for the sheep, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again: this commandment have I received of my Father." It is clear then, that Christ did lay down his own life, in which he had the sanction of the Father. Now, suppose the act was unjust, on the supposition that his death was vicarious, i. e. in the place of the sinner's death, we ask in what respect it would be less unjust, on the supposition that it was not vicarious? Is it *unjust* for Christ to die to redeem the world, by giving his life a ransom for the forfeited lives of sinners, while it is *just* for him to die under circumstances in every respect similar, with the exception that his death is not a ransom for the lives of sinners? If Christ suffered vicariously for sinners, his death contemplated a greater amount of good, than it could have done had he died merely as a martyr for the truth; hence, if our opponents prefer the charge of injustice against the doctrine of Christ's vicarious death, they aggravate the circumstance of injustice in proportion as they lessen the amount of good to be secured by it, by denying its atoning merits.

II. It has sometimes been objected to the doctrine of the vicarious sufferings and death of Christ, that if Christ made a full atonement for the sinner, as his substitute, then the sinner cannot be held responsible to the law, his substitute having satisfied its claims. This ground has been taken by Antinomian Limitarians, to prove the absurdity of a general atonement, and by Universalists to prove that universal salvation must follow from a universal atonement; both of which positions are equally absurd.

The fallacy of this argument appears to consist in blending the atonement itself with the conditional benefits which flow from it; or, in overlooking the conditions on which men, as moral agents, are made the partakers of the benefits of the atonement. The atonement was unconditionally made; i. e. no condition was required of man, in order that the atonement might be made, for when we consider man as a fallen being, it is clear that the atonement must first be made, and man become a partaker of its benefits to some extent, before he can be capable of complying with any condition; it must therefore, appear that the atonement is not only unconditional, but that some of its benefits must be unconditional also.

The main point, upon which this reply rests, is the facts that the full and final benefits of the atonement are conditionally offered in the gospel. If this point can be sustained, the objection vanishes. The question is, then, whether it be a part of the divine plan of human redemption, that the atonement should be so applied as to deliver sinners from all obligation, or whether it was intended to render the forgiveness and salvation of sinners consistent with the best interest of the moral system, on certain conditions to be complied with on the part of the sinner himself? If our opponents will prove that it was the intention of Jesus Christ, in dying for man, to deliver him from all obligation, satisfying the claims of the law fully and unconditionally, and that God has accepted the atonement

in this full sense, without the reserve of a single condition to be complied with on the part of man, we shall then be obliged to yield to the force of the objection under consideration, and take ground with the high toned Antinomian Limitarians, and deny that the atonement was made for all men; or else, admitting the universality of the atonement, strike hands with the Universalists, and say that all will and must be saved. On the other hand, if it can be proved that it was not the design of the Father, in the gift of his Son to die for us, and that it was not the design of Jesus Christ, in giving himself for us, to deliver us from all moral obligation, nor yet, that the benefits of the atonement should be unconditionally applied to us, in their full extent; that the atonement was never intended to deliver us from our obligation to obey God, but only from the penalty of the law after it has been transgressed, and from this only on certain conditions to be complied with on the part of the sinner himself : then, it must follow that the objection is unfounded, that the sinner is held responsible to the divine law, though Christ has died as his substitute, and that he is liable to the divine penalty, until he complies with the conditions of the gospel, on which salvation is offered. To suppose to the contrary, after the above positions shall have been established, must be the same as to assert that the atonement must, of necessity, produce an effect which was never intended by God in the gift of his Son, or by Jesus Christ in the offering of himself, which is vanity in the extreme. Must an atonement, if made, do more than its author intended it should? If an atonement has been made, which God intended should save men from the penalty of a violated law, only on certain conditions, is it logical or theological to infer, that because such an atonement has been made, it must therefore save men from all obligation to obey the law, and from all liability to punishment, without reference to any conditions? If God has given his Son to make an atonement, whereby we may be saved on certain conditions, is it just, true, or modest, for us to start up and assert that he must, therefore, save us irrespective of all conditions?

The question now being fairly stated, the words of the Master himself shall decide it. John 3: 16: " For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." If the Savior understood his own mission, this text must be conclusive in proof of a conditional application of the atonement. Indeed, we think it clearly asserts the doctrine of the atonement, while it guards it from abuse on either hand.

1. The text asserts that God was moved by love to the world, in the gift of his Son. Now as by the world, in this text, nothing can be meant less than the whole human family, the atonement is shown to be universal, in opposition to Limitarianism.
2. As the object of this divine gift was the salvation of *such only as believe*; or, in other words, as the design of God in giving his Son was to save men *only through faith*, salvation is proved to be conditional; from which it appears that the sinner's entire release from the claims of the law, does not follow from a universal atonement. The expression, " that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life," clearly supposes that to perish is the opposite of everlasting life, so that they cannot both take effect in the same subject. It also supposes that the sinner may believe or he may not; or that some sinners may believe and have everlasting life, and that others may not believe,

and perish. It is clear then, that God did not intend that the atonement should deliver men from all moral obligation, or save them from the penalty of the law, so far as adult sinners are concerned, only on condition of faith in Jesus Christ, by whom the atonement was made; therefore, to urge such consequences as necessarily following from the doctrine of atonement, is no less than an attempt to wrest the atonement from the simple object for which God intended it, and apply it to other purposes never contemplated by its divine author, and foreign to the divine plan of human redemption; and we think that an objection founded in such arrogance and profanity, as this is proved to be, may be dismissed without other consideration.

III. It has been objected to the doctrine of atonement, that it excludes the benevolence of God from the plan of salvation; for, say objectors, if God required a full atonement, and if such atonement was made by Jesus Christ, then, justice must be satisfied and there can be no room for the exercise of benevolence on the part of the Father.

To this objection it may be replied,

1. That God did not require an atonement through any want of love to his fallen creatures, but because it was inconsistent with his perfections, and the principles of his moral government, to save offenders without an atonement.

2. It being inconsistent with the perfections of God, to save sinners without an atonement, as has been shown in the remarks on the necessity of an atonement, God's benevolence or love to his fallen creatures, led him to devise the plan of salvation through the gift of his Son, our atoning sacrifice; " for God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." It is seen then, that the doctrine of atonement is so far from excluding the divine benevolence from the plan of human salvation, that the atonement itself is the brightest display of divine love that ever dazzled the visions of angels or men.

Here let this protracted chapter be closed, under the settled conviction, that as Christians we can never give up the atonement. What, renounce the atonement, which has already washed away the guilt of sin and given us peace with God through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ—renounce the efficacy of the blood of the cross, the cleansing power of which we have already felt in our souls by blessed experience—renounce the atonement, trusting in which holy Martyrs shouted in the flames—renounce the atonement, which has dispelled the horrors of death, and shed the light of eternity on the night of the grave—renounce the atonement, while redeemed spirits which have already gained the blest shore, ascribe their salvation to the blood of the Lamb, as they surround the throne with songs of deliverance, saying, " Unto him that loved us and hath washed us from our sins in his own blood, be glory and dominion forever and ever : thou art worthy, for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood"—No, heaven forbid it! Holy Ghost inspire us, and the atonement shall be our rallying point forever.

CHAPTER VII;

THE EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT—ITS BENEFITS ARE AVAILABLE TO ALL MEN.

SECTION I.

The Atonement was Made for Universal Humanity.

The denial that Christ died for all, is now an uncommon thing to be heard from an American pulpit, yet, a century has not elapsed, since it was the prevailing doctrine with a large portion of professed Christians. But while Limitarianism has disappeared from the popular surface of the religious community, it still finds a lurking place with a few ministers and a few congregations, who have resisted the rising tide of the opposite opinion, and it may be found in many doctrinal publications, not yet out of print. Under these circumstances it appears proper, in a work like this, to demonstrate the great truth, that Christ died for universal humanity. "The Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." most clearly contains the doctrine that Christ died for only a part of the human family.

It is asserted that, "some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death." Of those who are ordained to life, it is said "Wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ Neither are any others redeemed by Christ but the elect only." Of the non-elect it is said, "The rest of mankind God was pleased to pass by."

"The Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he through the eternal spirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of his Father, and purchased, not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto him." This certainly implies that Christ has satisfied the justice of his Father, and purchased an everlasting inheritance for none but the elect, or such as will be finally saved.

"For all those for whom Christ hath purchased redemption, he doth certainly and effectually communicate the same." This certainly implies that Christ has purchased redemption for only a part of mankind.

For the above extracts, see Confession, chap. 3. sec. 3, 6, 7, and chap. 8. sec. 5, 8. It is not charged that the members of the Presbyterian church believe this doctrine, many of them do not, but it is in their Confession of Faith, and this fact is sufficient to justify an examination of the question.

That Christ died for the whole human family, is maintained from the following considerations.

I. It cannot be made to appear that any atonement could be made on the plan of Christ's offering of himself, sufficient to save one sinner, or any portion of sinners, which would not be sufficient to save the whole human family on the same conditions that it could

save a part. The law of God was violated by universal humanity in the person of Adam, for he was the whole of humanity when he committed the offence by which "judgment came upon all men to condemnation." "With judgment resting upon all men to condemnation, on account of Adam's sin, none of the race could be saved until that one sin was atoned, and any atonement which would so expiate that one sin, as to remove the condemnation of any part, would equally remove it from all upon whom it came by that one offence. No sinner could be saved without an atonement which fully expiated Adam's sin, and any atonement which should fully expiate Adam's sin, would necessarily reach all mankind, for all were involved by that sin. The offence was one which reached to all mankind, and the expiation of that one offence, must necessarily reach to all mankind. Nor, can it be made to appear that an atonement of sufficient merit to absolve one sinner, would not be sufficient to absolve a whole world of sinners. The entire claim of the law of God, its entire penalty, and every principle, and all the integrity and honor of the divine government, are involved in the salvation of one sinner, and when these are all met and secured by an atonement, the way must be open for the salvation of universal humanity, upon the same terms that any part can be saved.

II. The Scriptures nowhere assert that; Christ did not die for all men. *No* one will pretend that there is one text which clearly and distinctly denies that Christ died for every member of the human family. This consideration, though less conclusive than some other arguments which shall soon be spread before the reader, possesses great force. The point in issue is a vital one, next to the fact that Christ died for sinners, in point of importance, is the question, whether he died for all or only a part. If he died for only a part, it is hardly possible, that amid all the multiplied forms in which the death of Christ for sinners is set forth, it should never once be asserted that he did not die for all, or that he died for only a part. If there was not one text which asserts that Christ died for all, the advocates of a limited atonement, would consider it conclusive against a universal atonement, but it would be no more conclusive than is the fact, that no text asserts Christ did not die for all men, is in proof that his death was for all. It is not conceivable, that the Scriptures should be silent on so important a point, and the fact that they, in various forms of speech, assert that he died for all men, renders the fact that not one text asserts that he did not die for all, conclusive against the doctrine of a limited atonement.

III. The Scriptures affirm most specifically and positively, that Christ died for all men. But little is necessary, more than to quote a number of the texts, which, in various! forms of speech, declare that Christ died for the whole human family.

John 1: 29: " Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world."

Chap. 3: 17: " God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved."

Chap. 4: 42: " This is indeed the Christ, the Savior of the world."

In these texts, the term world can mean nothing less than universal humanity.

Rom. 5: 18: " As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life."

2 Cor. 5: 14: " We thus judge, if one died for all, then were all dead." Verse 15: "And that he died for all."

1 Tim. 2: 6: " Who gave himself a ransom for all."

Heb. 2: 9: " That he, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man."

1 Jon 2: 2: " He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."

These Scriptures make the matter as plain as words could make it. 'If they do not teach that Christ died for all men, no form of words could teach it, for no change of words, or different arrangement of words could make it plainer or stronger.

IV. The gospel proceeds to invite all, and to offer salvation to all, upon the supposition that provision has been made for all, which cannot be true, if Christ did not die for all.

Isa. 45: 22: " Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth."

Chap. 55: 1. : " Ho every one that thirst-eth, come ye to the waters."

Matt. 11: 28: " Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

John 7: 37: " Jesus stood and cried, saying, if any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink."

Mark 16: 15: " Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

Rom. 1: 16:" For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth "

2 Cor. 5: 19, 20: " To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God."

Col. 1: 28: " Whom we preach, warning every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus."

Rev. 3: 20: " Behold I stand at the door and knock, if any man hear my voice and will open the door, I will come in unto him, and sup with him, and he with me."

Chap. 22: 17: "The Spirit and the bride say, come, and let him that heareth say, come. And let him that is athirst come; and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely."

Such declarations, commissions, invitations, and offers of salvation, are irreconcilable with the assumption that Christ has not made an atonement for all men, which is sufficient to save all, if they would comply with the conditions upon which salvation is offered.

V. The Scriptures teach that Christ died for such as are, or may be lost. If this argument can be sustained, it must be conclusive, for if one for whom Christ died perishes, the whole ground of the assumption that he died for only a part is removed, and it will follow that he died for all that perish, and consequently for all mankind. A few decisive texts follow.

Rom. 14: 15: " Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died."

1 Cor. 8: 11: " And through thy knowledge shall thy weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?"

These texts teach beyond a doubt, that it is possible for those to perish for whom Christ died.

2 Cor. 2: 15,16: " For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish: to the one we are the savor of death unto death; and to the other the savor of life unto life." It is not possible that a Gospel minister should be a savor of death unto death, in them that perish, only upon the assumption that Christ died for them, and that they perish, not because he did not die for them, but because they reject the offer of salvation through him.

2 Cor. 4: 3, 4: " But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them."

If Christ never died for them, the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, never could savingly shine unto them, and the God of this world, who blinded their minds, lest it should shine unto them, performed a foolish and unnecessary work. Whatever may be the fact in the case, it is clear from this, that the devil believes that Christ died for such as perish, and that they might believe in him and be saved, for he would never blind their minds lest they should, were it not possible in his view.

Heb. 10: 26-29: " For if we sin willfully, after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversary. He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer

punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of Grace." Common sense will never deny that Christ must have died for the persons treated of in this text, and that they are described as in danger of perishing, or of coming short of salvation, and the conclusion is certain, that Christ died for such as do or may perish.

2 Peter 2: 1: " But there were false prophets also among the people, even as 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"

These persons deny the Lord that bought them, they were therefore bought, Christ died for them; and they bring upon themselves swift destruction, it is therefore certain that Christ died for such as perish, and the conclusion is, that he died for all men.

VI. The Scriptures demand" faith of all men, and make their unbelief a ground of their condemnation, which they could not do, if Christ did not die for all.

Mark 16: 16: " He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."

John 3: 18: " He that believeth in him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." Verse 36: " He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not on the Son, shall not see life."

John 6: 29: " This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent."

John 8: 24: " If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins."

It is clear then, that the Gospel requires faith of all men, and that sinners are condemned for not believing in Christ. Faith includes both credence and trust. The faith which a sinner is required to exercise in Christ, includes a belief that Christ died for him. But God could not require sinners to believe that Christ died for them, if he did not die for them, for that would be to require them to believe a falsehood. And as sinners are condemned for not believing in Christ, if he did not die for them, they are condemned for not believing a lie.

VII. The Scriptures charge upon sinners their destruction, as a consequence of their own rejection of Christ, which could not be true, if Christ did not die for them.

Matt. 23: 37: " How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not."

Luke 7: 30: " The Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves."

John 5: 38, 40: " Ye have not his word abiding in you; for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not. And ye will not come unto me that ye might have life."

Acts 13: 46: " It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles."

Heb. 12: 25: " See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven."

From the above texts it is perfectly clear that sinners are represented as perishing, on account of rejecting Christ, and that the fault is their own. This could not be, if he did not die for them. If he did not atone for their sins, and if they might not avail themselves of eternal life in him, he must have uttered words of deceit when he said, " ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." It is not claimed that all the arguments have been advanced, by which it might be proved that Christ died for universal humanity, but enough has been said to settle this question. But some, who admit that Christ died for all men, that the atonement is universal, hold that it is necessarily restricted in its application, by settled principles of the divine government. These supposed principles must be made the subjects of inquiry in future sections.

SECTION II.

The Atonement is not limited in its Application, by any supposed Decree of Predestination.

The doctrine of God's supposed decree of foreordination, and predestination, is stated in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, Chap. 3. as follows:

" God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creature, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established."

" Although God knows what may or can come to pass upon all supposed conditions, yet hath he not decreed anything because he foresaw it as future, or as that which would come to pass upon such conditions."

It is frankly admitted, if the doctrine of God's eternal decree of foreordination, including everything which comes to pass, as stated above be true, the application of the atonement must be limited by such decree. Its application must be fixed and unalterable, whether it be applied to all men, or only to an elect few. But is the doctrine true? Has God, from all eternity, unchangeably ordained whatsoever comes to pass? This is denied, and in support of this denial, the following considerations are offered:

I. There is not sufficient proof of the doctrine to support a conclusion so grave and momentous. If it be a truth, it is a momentous truth, a fundamental truth, to which every other truth sustains a relation, similar to that which all the links of a chain sustain to the first link, which draws all the parts after it. If we adopt it, all our views of theology must be modified and controlled by it. Such a truth, if it be a truth, must be a matter of direct and clear revelation. It cannot be supposed that, in making a revelation of his will, God has left so important and leading a truth to be established by far-fetched inferences, by doubtful philosophical deductions, or by metaphysical disquisitions, too obscure for the comprehension of common minds. If it be a truth, it must be a revealed truth; and if it be a revealed truth, it must be clearly revealed, and distinctly marked upon the inspired page. But is it so? Where is it affirmed? Which of the inspired penmen have declared it? What one text asserts it? A glance at the proof texts cited in connection with the article as quoted above, is sufficient to show that a famine reigns in the land of evidence. It is fair to conclude that the General Assembly, in publishing such a doctrine to the world with proof texts, cited the most direct and conclusive texts they could find in the Scriptures.

They have cited four in order, as follows:

Eph. 1: 11: "In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." Whatever else this text may teach, it does not affirm that " God, from all eternity, ordained whatsoever comes to pass."

We, stands opposed to *ye*, in verse 13: "*We* have obtained an inheritance—who first trusted in Christ. In whom *ye* also trusted, after that *ye* heard the word of truth." The distinction is between the Jews and Gentiles. The first converts were Jews, who trusted in Christ before the gospel was preached to the Gentiles. This makes the apostle's distinction between *we* and *ye*, plain. The 10th verse speaks of the formation of the one gospel church out of both Jews and Gentiles, and this was to be done by gathering both together in Christ, and it was "according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself," as stated in verse 9. This is the thing God has predestinated; this is God's predetermined plan of grace and salvation; he determined to bring both Jews and Gentiles to salvation by Jesus Christ. It is admitted that this was foreordained, decreed and predestinated; but how it proves that God ordained all things whatsoever comes to pass, including all the actions of wicked men and devils, remains yet to be shown.

But it may be presumed that the proof is supposed to be contained in the clause, which asserts, that God " worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." This, however, does not prove the point, for it comes far short of being equivalent to the statement, that " God ordained all things whatsoever comes to pass." The apostle is speaking of the great plan of human redemption, and of this plan he affirms, that God work-eth all things according to the counsel of his own will, and no one can doubt that God has thus worked and effectuated that plan.

But should it be insisted that the expression, " all things," is too comprehensive to be limited to the plan of redemption, it may be admitted to comprehend everything that God

works. God works all that he works after the counsel of his own will, but God does not work the wicked actions of men and devils. To say that he does, would be to say, that God works a violation of his own will, in opposition to himself, to his holy nature and government, for every wrong act is a violation of the will of God, and opposed to his nature and government.

Dr. McKnight has given the sense of the text with such candid simplicity, that it is worthy of being quoted, as follows:

" By whom, even we Jews, have inherited the promises that were made to the children of Abraham, and of God, having been predestinated to the adoption of sons, not through obedience to the law, but through faith, according to the gracious purpose of him, who effectually accomplisheth all his benevolent intentions, by the most proper means, according to the wise determination of his own will." The Doctor's note on the verse, is as follows:

Verse 11. " According to the counsel of his own will. —The apostle makes this observation, to convince the believing Jews that God will bestow on them, and on the believing Gentiles, the inheritance of heaven through faith, whether their unbelieving brethren are pleased or displeased therewith." The next proof text quoted, is Rom. 11: 33: "O, the depth of the riches, both the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out." It is frankly admitted, that God's wisdom and knowledge, are so rich and deep, as to render his judgments unsearchable, and his ways past finding out, and this is all that the text asserts. But it is so far from proving that God ordained everything that comes to pass, that it does not intimate any such thing.

The next text is Heb. 6: 17: "Wherefore God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise, the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath."

The counsel of God here named, was his purpose to send Christ, the promised seed of Abraham, to save sinners. This counsel he showed to be immutable, by confirming it with an oath. This, every Christian believes, but how it proves that God ordained everything that transpires, has yet to be shown. The last text quoted, is Rom. 9: 15,18: " For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. Therefore, hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will, he hardeneth."

The first of these texts asserts the simple fact, that God bestows his mercy and compassion according to the dictates of his own will. Other texts show upon whom he will have mercy, namely, all who comply with the conditions of the Gospel, upon which he offers salvation to a guilty world; nor will he alter these terms to favor this individual or that, or this nation or that. But how all this proves that God, from all eternity, ordained whatsoever comes to pass, must be very difficult to see.

The text also asserts, in addition, that "whom he will he hardened," This only asserts what God does, not what he ordained. It does not intimate that even what he does, was ordained from all eternity, much less, that whatsoever comes to pass was thus ordained. But whom and how does God harden? Rev. Albert Barnes, of in his notes on the text, says, "The word hardeneth, means only to harden in the manner specified in the case of Pharaoh. It does not mean to exert a positive influence, but to leave a sinner to his own course." In this sense, God hardens all sinners who resist and grieve his Holy Spirit. That God does sometimes give sinners over to hard-ness of heart, to believe a lie and be lost, there can be no doubt, but not until they have wickedly resisted God's influences put forth to save them.

The proof texts cited on the particular point under discussion, have now all been examined, and it is seen that there is no proof sufficient to support such a momentous conclusion. It is reasonable to suppose, if there are any stronger proof texts, they would be cited, but the fact is, there is no proof in the Bible, that God, from all eternity, ordained whatsoever comes to pass, but it will be found there is much proof against it before this argument is closed.

II. The doctrine that God did, from all eternity, ordain whatsoever comes to pass, would annihilate all distinction between right and wrong. What God has, "by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely ordained," must be in harmony with the attributes and perfections of his own nature, and his own mind and will; and what is in harmony with the attributes, perfections, mind and will of God, must be right, or God's nature, attributes, mind and will must be wrong. What God has "freely ordained," must be in harmony with himself, if, therefore, God has ordained whatsoever comes to pass, whatsoever comes to pass is in harmony with God. Right and wrong never can be in harmony with each other, and, therefore, if God has ordained whatsoever comes to pass, whatsoever comes to pass must be right, and there is no wrong in the universe, or all distinction between right and wrong is destroyed.

Another statement of the case will bring us to the same conclusion. "The most wise and holy counsel of God's will," must be the standard of right for the moral universe. If it is not, what is that standard of right? If, then, the most wise and holy counsel of God's will is the standard of right for the moral universe, what has been ordained by that "most wise and holy counsel of his will," must be right. All that the "most wise and holy counsel of his will" has ordained, must be in harmony with itself, and what is in harmony with the standard of right, must be right. The conclusion is, that if God has ordained whatsoever comes to pass, whatsoever comes to pass must be right, or the most wise and holy counsel of God's will, must be wrong. Thus does the doctrine of God's eternal decree of whatsoever comes to pass, annihilate all distinction between right and wrong.

III. The doctrine that God did, from all eternity, ordain whatsoever comes to pass, if true, would annihilate human responsibility. It is not possible to see how men can be responsible for doing what God, from all eternity, ordained they should do. According to the doctrine, it was of God's most wise and holy counsel that he ordained whatsoever

comes to pass. Can men then be guilty for executing God's most wise and holy counsel? It is impossible.

But it will be said; that men act as they do, freely, from choice. This is granted, but this fact is comprehended in the decree, if it exists. God as much ordained the freedom of their choice in what they do, as he did the acts themselves, which they perform. Can men be guilty for executing God's most wise and holy counsel *freely*, or from *choice*, when that very freedom of choice with which they do it, is a part of the execution of such wise and holy counsel? It is impossible.

But, it will be said, that men act with evil intention. Granted, but this so called evil intention, is the very thing which God did, by his most wise and holy counsel ordain. The question is, can a man be rendered guilty for executing God's most wise and holy counsel, by the character of the intention with which he acts? Surely not, any more than by the kind of act performed. This all-comprehensive decree makes the act and the intention with which it is performed, equal parts in the work of executing God's most wise and holy counsel, for which no man can be guilty.

But, it will be said, that sinners think they oppose God and violate his will. To this it is replied.

1. So far as it is true, it is also one of the things which God ordained, if he ordained whatsoever comes to pass. By thinking that they oppose God and violate his will, they only fulfill his most wise and holy counsel, for which no man can be guilty.

2. It is true, that men think they oppose God and violate his will, only of such as do not believe the doctrine of God's eternal and universal decree of foreordination. All who believe that " God did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his will, from all eternity, ordain whatsoever comes to pass," cannot think that they oppose God or violate his will; they must believe that all they do in thought, word and deed, and in the spirit and temper of their mind, is in absolute harmony with the mind of God, and is an execution of his most wise and holy counsel, and how such can be guilty, cannot be understood.

IV. The doctrine that God did, from all eternity, ordain whatsoever comes to pass, renders the universal consciousness and conscience of mankind deceptive and false. By consciousness, is meant that notice which the mind takes of its own operations, or that knowledge which the mind possesses of its own acts and states. Every mind is conscious of acting freely, and of being capable of acting differently from what it does act, which consciousness must be deceptive and false, if God has unchangeably ordained whatsoever comes to pass. If God has unchangeably ordained whatsoever comes to pass, no man can act differently from what he does act, but every man is conscious of being capable of acting differently from what he does act, and therefore the doctrine that God has unchangeably ordained all that comes to pass, renders man's universal consciousness deceptive and false.

The doctrine is no less false to conscience than it is to consciousness. With a knowledge that God, by the most wise and holy counsel of his will, ordained every act we perform, with all the circumstances, influences, and motives leading to the same, the conscience could never condemn the soul. Guilt is the result of a known violation of what is believed to be the will of God; if, therefore, all that comes to pass in the actions of men, is the determination of God's most wise and holy counsel, conscience plays false when it condemns the soul for its conduct. This difficulty will not be relieved, by resorting to a fancied distinction between God's secret and revealed will, and affirming that it is for a violation of the revealed will that conscience condemns us. If the doctrine of the eternal decree be known to be true, then it is known that God's most wise and holy and eternal will, is that everything should be done just as it comes to pass, and that what is assumed to be his revealed will, is not his will in those matters where it is violated, and conscience could not, without playing false, condemn us for violating what is known not to be God's real will, when such violation is by way of doing what is known to be according to his most wise, holy, and eternal will.

In conclusion, the fact that conscience does condemn us for violating God's revealed will, proves that the doctrine of a secret will different from it, exists only in the head, while its contradiction and refutation is written deeper down in the moral elements of the soul.

V. The doctrine that God did, by his most wise and holy counsel, ordain whatsoever comes to pass, would represent God as insincere in his provisions and offers of grace, and in his invitations to, and exhortations with mankind.

If such an eternal decree of foreordination exists, comprehending everything that comes to pass, it is a very different thing from God's will as it is declared in the Scriptures. Then we have this admitted fact, admitted by all predestinarians, that God has an eternal and unalterable counsel, purpose and will, that everything should come to pass just as it does, while he has given us the Bible, declaring it to be his will, which differs very materially from things as they actually come to pass, proving it not to be his will in many things. How this can be reconciled with sincerity, has never yet been explained. It is declared that " God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him, might be saved." John 3: 16,17. If God unchangeably ordained whatsoever comes to pass, the world cannot be saved, how then could God send his Son that the world might be saved? It has every aspect of a false pretence.

God by his prophet, exhortates with sinners, saying, "turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die?" Eze. 33: 11. How could God in sincerity thus exhortate, if he had unchangeably ordained their course? Christ complained to the Jews, " Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." John 5: 40. What sincerity was there in this, if God, by an eternal decree, had determined that they should not come to Christ.

God declares through Paul, that he " will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." 1 Tim. 2: 4. Where is the sincerity, or even truth in this declaration, if God had ordained directly the reverse of this declared will?

There can be no necessity for multiplying texts, or remarks of this character, for the Scriptures must appear a mere pretence upon their entire face, if God's most wise and holy counsel and will is that everything should come to pass just as it does.

VI. The doctrine that God did, by his most wise and holy counsel, ordain whatsoever comes to pass, conflicts with the clearest declarations of his word, in which he denies having made any such universal decree of foreordination. As the decree is claimed to comprehend everything that comes to pass, if it can be shown that God has denied having ordained any one thing which has actually transpired, the decree will be disproved.

Jer. 32: 35: " They built the high places of Baal, which are in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to cause their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire unto Molech, which I commanded them not, neither came it into my mind that they should do this abomination."

The clause relied upon in this text, is that in which God asserts that it came not into his mind that they should do that abomination. By this God is not to be understood as denying that he foresaw, or foreknew that they would do it, but simply that he designed, purposed, intended, decreed, or ordained that they should do it. Had God, from all eternity, by the most wise and holy counsel of his will, ordained that they should do that thing, he could not say in truth, " neither came it into my mind that they should do this abomination." Here then, is one thing which came to pass, which God did not ordain; of this we are certain from his own absolute denial. The case might be safely rested on the one declaration of Jehovah, but God has, in various texts denied having ordained everything that comes to pass, by the most clear implication.

In all those texts in which God is represented as changing his course of conduct towards nations and individuals, on account of a change in their conduct, there is a clearly implied denial of the doctrine of an unchangeable decree.

Take the following texts as samples.

Jer. 18: 7-10: " At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up and to pull down, and to destroy it: if that nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil I thought to do unto them. And at what time I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it: if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them."

Jonah 3: 9,10: "Who can tell if God will turn and repent, and turn away from his fierce anger, that we perish not. And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and God repented of the evil that he had said he would do unto them, and he did it not."

Such texts as the above, clearly prove that God has not, from all eternity, unchangeably ordained whatsoever comes to pass. The existence of such a decree, could it be demonstrated, would prove the record false upon its face. Again, all those Scriptures in which God declares a design, will or purpose, different from the actual state of things which are seen to exist, clearly involve a denial of the supposed eternal, unchangeable decree. Take the following texts as samples.

Eze. 18: 32: " For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God; wherefore turn yourselves and live ye." Chap. 33: 11: " As I live saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live "

In these texts God denies the existence of the supposed decree in two ways.

1. He denies that he has any pleasure in the death of him that dieth. That is, in fact, a denial that he did by his most wise and holy counsel ordain that death.
2. God affirms that he has pleasure in the return and life of sinners, and this is a denial that he has ordained that they should not turn and live, and yet many do not turn and live. It is clear, therefore, that God denies having decreed everything which comes to pass.

2 Peter 3: 9: " The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, but long suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."

This text declares that the will of God is that none shall perish, which is a denial that he has decreed that they shall perish, yet some do perish; there are some things come to pass which God has not ordained. The text also affirms, that it is the will of God, that all men should repent, which is a denial that he has ordained their impenitence, yet, all men do not repent. It is therefore certain that God has not, from all eternity, ordained whatsoever comes to pass, for he has not ordained the continual impenitence of sinners. He declares that he wills that all men should repent, and to affirm that it is his will that they should repent, is to deny that he has ordained their continued impenitence; their impenitence therefore is a thing which comes to pass, which God did not ordain.

Rev. 3: 15: "I know thy works: that thou art neither cold or hot; I would thou wert cold or hot." Here the will of God is declared to be different from the actual state of things that existed. How could God declare that he would have them something different from what they were, if he had, by his most wise and holy counsel, ordained that they should be just what they were? It is impossible, unless God ordained in contravention of his own will, or wills two opposite things at the same time.

SECTION III.

An Argument in Support of Divine Decrees Answered.

Calvinistic writers have not been wanting in efforts to repel the difficulties thrown in the way of their theory, and it is no more than justice requires, to pay some attention to their arguments. The following argument, though short, is the best of its class, and well calculated to bewilder, if not convince common minds. It speaks for itself as follows: —

" Two leading objections are urged against the doctrine of Divine Decrees, viz: that it is inconsistent with man's free agency, and that it makes God the author of sin. There is a very short method of testing the strength of these objections. We propose to the opposers of this doctrine, the following question: Do the Scriptures teach that God decreed any one event which was brought to pass by the instrumentality of men? For instance, did he decree the taking of Babylon, and the restoration of the Jews at the end of seventy years? Or did he foreordain the crucifixion of Christ? Will any one venture to deny that both these events were foreordained or decreed? See Isaiah 14: 24 -27; Acts 2: 23, and 4: 27, 28. Since these events were evidently foreordained, were those by whose instrumentality they were brought to pass, deprived of their free agency? and did God become the author of their sins? If God's decree did not, in either of these instances, destroy free agency, and make him the author of sin, is it not evident, beyond all cavil, that these two objections are utterly without force? nay, that they are urged against the plain and admitted teaching of the Bible?"

As the above is judged conclusive, and has been so pronounced by strong men, the reader will have patience while it receives a thorough review, and a close sifting.

There is, perhaps, no more fruitful source of division of sentiment, controversy, and fallacious reasoning, than a misapprehension of the question in issue, or in a failure of parties to understand what each other mean by the terms in which propositions are stated. We believe firmly in the doctrine of " Divine Decrees," as we understand it, and yet we do not believe the doctrine, and look upon it with abhorrence, as some others appear to us to understand it. We believe that Divine Decrees and free agency are perfectly consistent with each other, as we understand decrees and free agency; and yet as some others appear to understand them, it is not possible for us to see how the one can be reconciled with the other. This renders it proper to explain terms before rushing into a controversy about conclusions, which must depend upon the sense in which they are understood.

What is meant by " Divine Decrees?" The word " divine" is a mere qualifying term, to denote that the decrees in question, are the decrees of divinity, and not of humanity; or, that they are the decrees of God, and not of men, angels, or devils. We have, therefore, only to deal with the word " decrees." In a civil and legal sense, a decree is an edict or law, or a decision of judgment rendered by a court in a litigated case; but in theology, as used in the argument, it must denote a predetermined purpose of God. In this simple sense, we believe in " Divine Decrees." We believe that God has predetermined purposes. Nor do we believe that these " Divine Decrees" conflict with man's free agency, as we understand it, in the slightest degree. A decree, or predetermination in the mind of God, does not, and cannot of itself, act on the human mind, nor does it, nor can it present an object for the action of the human mind, until the decree is declared or revealed. It is not possible to conceive how a decree or purpose in the mind of God can have any influence

upon the minds of men, until that purpose or decree is made known to them. It can have no more influence in controlling the human mind, than the ten commandments or the Gospel of Christ can, in molding the lives of the heathens, who never heard of either. The mere act of determining or decreeing in the mind of God, cannot control the human mind of itself, since the decree is supposed to have existed from eternity, before the mind of man existed; and since it must be admitted, the decree exists in the Divine mind, years after the existence of the human mind to which it is supposed to relate, before the decreed act or event transpires. If the simple decree of God produced the thing or act decreed, without the putting forth of an executive power beyond the simple act of decreeing, the thing or act would of necessity transpire simultaneously with the decree in the Eternal Mind. A decree, then, does not and cannot execute itself, from which one of two consequences must follow.

1. The decrees of God must be liable to fail of being executed, some being accomplished and others not, as different men in the exercise of their " free agency," act differently under the same responsibilities, as though we were to suppose that God decreed that Cain should not kill Abel, and that Cain broke the decree, and that he decreed that Enoch should walk with God, and he did walk with God and fulfilled the decree. This view is certainly consistent with man's free agency. But if this view be denied, then it must follow,

2. That as a decree is not and cannot be self-executive, God must, in some way, put forth an executive power, which accomplishes the thing decreed, maugre all opposition. If this be the position, the objection does not lie against the supposed decree, as being " inconsistent with man's free agency," but against the executive power which God is supposed to put forth to execute his decrees, and on this point we will raise the issue in its proper place. It is fallacious to confound the supposed decrees of God, existing from eternity with the executive power which he puts forth in time to execute them. They are distinct matters, as distinct as a prospective determination of the mind, and an actual execution of a pre-conceived purpose, as distinct as the act of willing is from the act of executing the will, or the act of willing a free agent to perform a given act, and the act of so operating on him in some way as to cause him to perform it, they are as distinct as intransitive action is from transitive action. The act of decreeing is intransitive what takes place in the mind of God; the execution of such decrees, by putting forth the necessary executive power, is transitive action which must terminate on agencies without the mind of God. The act of determining or decreeing, and the act of executing the things determined or decreed being clearly distinct, we repeat that the charge of inconsistency with " man's free agency," cannot lie against simple " Divine Decrees," but if it exists at all, it lies against the exercise of the executive power by which the things decreed are brought to pass.

On the subject of decrees, we hold that God has decreed everything that is right in the conduct of free agents, and that he has decreed nothing that is wrong in their conduct. If an issue be raised with us in opposition to this view of " Divine Decrees," it must be distinctly on one of two grounds, viz., on the ground that God has not decreed all that is

right in the conduct of free agents, or else on the ground that God has decreed some things that are wrong in the conduct of free agents. This presents the following points:

1. If our view be admitted, that is, if it be admitted that God has decreed all that is right in the conduct of free agents, and that he has decreed nothing that is wrong in their conduct, the controversy is at an end, and it is clear that the " Divine Decrees" neither conflict with free agency, nor make God the author of sin, so that all that is right in the conduct of free agents does not transpire, showing that all that is decreed does not come to pass, and since some things that are wrong do transpire in the conduct of free agents, showing that some things come to pass which God has not decreed.

2. If an issue be raised with another view on the ground, that God has not decreed all that is right in the conduct of free agents, it will only be a negative position, a denial of decrees; and though it might argue an indifference in the mind of God in relation to the right action of the agencies he has created, yet it makes nothing in support of divine decrees, and need not be further considered in this review.

3. If an issue be raised with us on the ground, that God has decreed what is wrong in the conduct of free agents, we accept the issue, and will meet the argument under review, and prove that the " Divine Decrees" are either mere purposes of the Divine mind, or a mere choice of the Divine will, necessarily bringing nothing to pass, or that their execution is " inconsistent with man's free agency, and that it makes God the author of sin."

The argument now under review, rests wholly upon the assumption that if the "Scriptures teach that God decreed any one event which was brought about by the instrumentality of men," then decrees are consistent with man's free agency. This can be true only upon the supposition that a decree of itself has no controlling influence over the human mind, which we have shown to be the case. If this be the case, and it must be, as a decree is distinct from the power that executes it, God may have decreed certain acts of free agents, and left them free to perform them or not perform them; and some things which he decreed may have come to pass, as upon the supposition that he decreed that Enoch should walk with God, and he, in the exercise of his free agency, did walk with God; while some other things which he decreed may not have come to pass, as upon the supposition that he decreed that Cain should love his brother; and Cain, in the exercise of his free agency, did not love his brother. Such a view of decrees, we repeat, does not conflict with man's free agency, or make God the author of sin; but it has been shown that it is not the decree that conflicts with free agency, but the executive power which executes it. The fact, therefore, that " God did decree one event which has been brought to pass by the instrumentality of men," admitting it to be true, does not meet what we understand to be the Calvinistic view of " Divine Decrees," but only meets the Armenian view of decrees. The point to be proved is, that God has not only decreed what is wrong in the actions of men, but that he so puts forth an executive power, in some way, as to place it beyond the possibility of man to fail to do what is decreed, rendering it impossible, that he should act otherwise than he does act. If God has decreed what is wrong in the actions of men and if he renders it impossible, by an executive influence, for man to act otherwise than is decreed, then man cannot be a free agent, and God must be the author of sin. Allowing

the decree to exist, it follows that God does, by an executive influence, exerted over the minds of men, in some way, render it impossible that men should act otherwise than is decreed, otherwise than they so act, or he does not exert such executive influence over the minds of men. If God does not exert such an executive influence over the minds of men, as to render it impossible that they should act otherwise than they do act, then men might act otherwise than is decreed, might fail to fulfill the decree, and it is possible for what God has decreed not to come to pass. If this be admitted, it must follow, that " Divine Decrees," in all matters where human agency is involved, are inefficient, that they bring nothing to pass, that men do nothing under the influence of decrees or in consequence of decrees, that they act just as they would have acted, if there had been no decrees, and that all such matters as involve the agency of man, come to pass, just as they would have come to pass if God had formed no decrees. If this be admitted, the whole argument is at an end, and there will be no more controversy with the " Doctrine of Divine Decrees," on the ground that it is inconsistent with man's free agency, or that it makes God the author of sin. On the other hand, if it be affirmed that God does exert such an executive influence over the minds of men, as to render it impossible for them to will and act differently, from what they do will and act, by which he certainly secures the fulfillment of what he has decreed, in relation to actions which are wrong, then such executive action " is inconsistent with man's free agency, and makes God the author of sin."

The first of these points must appear, from a consideration of what constitutes "free agency." By man's free agency, must be meant a power possessed by man to will and act freely. The word " agency," means simply an actor—or action, or operation; and the qualifying word, " free," means unrestrained, and is used in contradistinction from necessary: it is the antithesis of necessary. When action, or the power or will to act, is the subject of remark, freedom and necessity are terms antithetical to each other, so that when we affirm that man wills and acts freely, we affirm, in effect, that he does not will and act necessarily, and when we affirm that he wills and acts necessarily, we affirm, in effect, that he does not will and act freely. " Man's free agency," therefore, if allowed, must include, not only the power to will and act as he does will and act, but the power to will and act differently from what he does will and act. When an agent can act only in a given direction, and cannot refrain from acting in that direction, we say that he acts necessarily, and, consequently, we affirm that he does not act freely; hence, when we affirm the doctrine of " man's free agency," we affirm in effect, that he has the power to will and act differently from what he does. To affirm that man is a free agent, and to affirm that he cannot will and act differently from what he does, is to confound terms, by affirming, in effect, that man is a free agent, and a necessary agent at the same time. The fact of man's free agency is not in dispute, the argument under review admits it. The argument is designed to prove that the doctrine of " Divine Decrees" is not " inconsistent with man's free agency," which is an admission of the existence of such free agency. Now, as a " free agent is one who can act differently from what he does act, in contradistinction from a necessary agent, who can act only in one way, to affirm that God exercises such an executive influence over the minds of men, as to render it impossible for them to act otherwise than they do act, is necessarily to conflict with man's free agency," it must destroy it.

The second consequence must appear, from a consideration of what it is to be, " the author of sin." " Sin is the transgression of the law." The law requires all right action, and forbids all wrong action by free agents; any non-performance of right action, or any performance of wrong action, is a transgression of the law, and is sin. Now, if God has decreed what is wrong in the actions of men, and if he exerts such an executive influence over men, as to render it impossible for them to do otherwise than perform that which he has decreed, that is wrong in their actions, he is the author of the sin. If God decrees the act which transgresses the law, and so controls man's agency, as to render it impossible for him not to perform the act, he is the author of the sin, in every true sense of authorship. The author of anything, is he who causes it to exist or transpire, and if God decreed the sinful actions of men, and executes that decree by an executive influence, which renders it impossible for them to do otherwise than perform those sinful actions, he is clearly the author of sin.

It will be futile to attempt to evade this conclusion, by affirming that man executes the divine decree freely, that, though God decreed the acts which are wrong in his conduct, yet he performs those acts freely and from choice, in consequence of which, he is responsible and guilty. Suppose we admit all this, suppose we admit the anomaly in metaphysics, that men act freely when they act necessarily, or under a divine executive influence, which renders it impossible for them to act otherwise than they do; and suppose we admit the anomaly in morals, that men are guilty for acts because they choose to perform them, where they could no more help so choosing, than a balance can help turning when a weight is thrown into one end of the scales; suppose we admit all this for the sake of the argument, it will still leave God the author of sin, according to all just rules of interpretation. If, under this admission, man is the author of his own sin, in a sense which renders him guilty, God is still the author of the man, and of all his sin and consequent guilt. The decree of God is supposed to include the whole subject; if man acts, God decreed that action, according to the theory we oppose; if man acts freely, God decreed that he should act freely; if man acts from choice, God decreed that choice, and if man is guilty because he acts freely and from choice, God decreed that guilt, and God has brought the whole to pass by an executive influence, as has been shown must be the case, to give any efficiency to " Divine Decrees." There may be more parties than one to a transaction, and hence the fact, that man is guilty, does not, in the least degree, prove that God is not the author of sin. According to the doctrine of " Divine Decrees," the wrong action had its first prospective existence in the mind of God, in the form of a decree or determination, and it was brought into actual being by an irresistible executive influence. God is, therefore, the original projector, the first and efficient author, and whatever secondary agencies may intervene and be involved, God necessarily sustains the relation of author to them all, and must be the author of sin, for sin is included in these secondary agencies, of which he is author, and which he controls.

We trust the candid reader by this time is satisfied that the argument under review is based upon a fallacious principle: the principle being that if the " Scriptures teach that God decreed any one event which was brought to pass by the instrumentality of men," the doctrine of divine decrees is vindicated. Still, it may be well to glance at the texts of

Scripture referred to as proof. The first text referred to is Isa. 14: 24-27. We admit that God here declares a purpose, and that such purpose was executed by the instrumentality of men. The purpose was the overthrow of Babylon, and the return of the captive Israelites to their own land.

1. This purpose does not necessarily include the sinful acts for which the Israelites were sent into captivity, nor does it include the wickedness of Babylon, for which they were to be punished. The just punishment of Assyrians, and the deliverance of the children of Israel, is all that is declared as the decree.

2. The fact that this declared purpose was brought to pass by human agency, does not prove either that every act and result of human agencies are decreed, or that human agency, left to its own free action, does in every case accomplish what God has decreed, admitting God to have a book of unrevealed decrees; nor yet does it prove, that there was exerted any executive influence over the agencies by which the purpose of God was fulfilled, in this particular case, which did not leave it possible for them to have acted differently, in which case, God would have had to call in other agencies to accomplish his purpose, as he often has done in the course of his administration, when one agency actually employed fails to accomplish its mission, he casts it off, and employs another.

3. God may have raised up Cyrus for the purpose of having him execute his judgment upon Babylon, and in doing so, he foresaw just what Cyrus would do, and pre-publish-ed him as his minister of justice, and the fact of the publication, was one influence that led to its accomplishment. It is stated that Cyrus read the prophet on the subject, and understood that it related to himself. We admit that the published purpose of God, understood by the agency by which it is to be accomplished, may exert an influence over those agents, but this is an influence perfectly consistent with " man's free agency;" but an unpublished decree can have no influence on the minds of men, as has been shown, and can secure nothing in the line of human agency, without an executive influence, which is inconsistent with human agency.

Acts 2: 23 is next referred to. It reads thus: —" Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain."

1. The delivery " by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," relates to the gift of Christ, by the Father, for the redemption of the world, as declared John 3: 16-17. It is said that God gave his Son, and that he sent his Son into the world.

2. The taking by wicked hands, was not included in the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, as here expressed. It was doubtless foreknown, but it is not the thing affirmed of the foreknowledge, nor was it a necessary part of the design of the delivery or gift of Christ. The crucifixion was a circumstance attending the death of Christ, growing out of the state of things existing at the time, but it was not essential to that death or to the atonement. He said, " No man taketh my life from me, I lay it down of myself." John 10: 18. He commenced his sorrowful death-struggle in the garden, before

wicked hands were laid upon him, and it does not appear that he finally died of the violence offered to his physical nature, but the reverse; he died under the weight of the world's sin, he yielded up the ghost a voluntary sacrifice. The Jews are here charged with killing him in view of their wicked intentions, they designed his death from wicked motives, but it was the Gentiles who crucified him, the Jews having no legal power to take life at this time. It does not appear, then, from the text that God decreed anything that was wicked in the actions of men.

The last text referred to is Acts 4: 27-28, as follows: —" For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together. For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done."

The only comment necessary to be offered on this text is to transpose its parts, without altering a word, so as to make it read as follows: —" For of a truth, against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together." The things determined by God to be done, were what Christ was anointed to do, and not what his enemies were gathered together to do. They were gathered against him, and not to do what the counsel of God had determined. There is then, no proof here that God decreed any of the wicked actions of men.

But it will be said those wicked actions were foretold. True, they were; God fore-saw how wickedly they would act, and he declared it by his prophets; but they did not act wickedly because it was prophesied that they would, but it was prophesied because God foresaw that they would act wickedly. God foresaw what men would do, and in a few instances revealed what he foresaw, and they did as God saw and said they would; but to argue from this that God has decreed whatsoever comes to pass, bad as well as good, is to put in the conclusion what is not in the premises.

The subject of Divine Decrees and fore-ordination, have been treated at greater length than it would have been, but for the important bearing it has upon several other questions yet to be discussed.

SECTION IV.

The Atonement is not limited in its Application, by any supposed Decree of election and reprobation.

The doctrine of election and reprobation, like predestination or foreordination, is rapidly becoming obsolete in popular theology, and is now but seldom heard from the American pulpit, yet it still has its lurking places, and finds its advocates. It is found in the creeds of long established churches, rather than in the popular theology of the pulpit.

It is stated as follows, in the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, Chapter 3.:

" By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.

" These angels and men thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished.

" Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith, or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving him thereunto; and all to the praise of, his glorious grace.

" The rest of mankind God was pleased according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy, as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sins, to the praise of his glorious justice."

The above extract has not been made for the purpose of subjecting the verbiage to severe criticism, to which it is exceeding liable, and by which it might be made to appear self-contradictory and ridiculous; the sole object is to spread before the reader an authentic statement of the doctrine of election and reprobation, as held, at least by one class of Calvinistic divines. And the doctrine being thus stated in the language of its advocates, without taking any exceptions to the manner, an attempt will be made to refute the fundamental principles involved.

I. The refutation of the doctrine of God's eternal decree of foreordination, in the preceding section, has removed the only foundation of the doctrine of eternal and unconditional election and reprobation. The doctrine of election and reprobation, as set forth in the extracts which have been made above, cannot be maintained only upon the assumption that God has foreordained whatsoever comes to pass. The act of electing all that will ever be saved, and the determining all the means; and the act of reprobating all that will ever be lost, and the determining of all the means, necessarily comprehends whatsoever comes to pass, so far as regards human conduct and destiny. If God has not decreed the certain salvation of a part, and the certain damnation of the rest of mankind, and also unchangeably decreed all the means leading thereunto in both cases, there is no such thing as certain election and reprobation. But if God has decreed all these points, he has decreed and ordained whatsoever comes to pass, so far as human conduct and destiny are concerned. With the doctrine of God's eternal unchangeable decree of foreordination, must the doctrine of election and reprobation stand or fall. At this point the reader will fall back upon the preceding section, where it was demonstrated that no such decree of foreordination exists, and he will find his mind irresistibly brought to the conclusion, that the doctrine of eternal unconditional election and reprobation cannot be true. The argument need not be repeated here. If the doctrine of God's eternal, unchangeable decree

of foreordination was not refuted in the preceding section, a repetition of the arguments would not accomplish such refutation; but if that doctrine was refuted, as no doubt it was, the conclusion is legitimate in this place, and it follows that the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation is not true.

II. The clearly established fact that Christ died for all mankind, is a standing refutation of the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation. For the argument on this point the reader is referred to the first section of the present chapter. It is there demonstrated that Christ died for all mankind, that the atonement made by him was for universal humanity. Of the conclusiveness of the argument there offered, there can be no doubt. The fact then being established that Christ died for all men, the doctrine of eternal and unconditional election cannot be true. That God predestinated a portion of mankind to eternal death, and at the same time so loved them as to give his only begotten Son to die for them, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, is impossible. To suppose that he was moved by love to give his Son, that those might not perish, but have everlasting life, whom he had from all eternity ordained and predestinated to eternal death, is an absurdity too monstrous for common sense to brook. It has then been proved that Christ died for all, and from this it follows, that none were eternally predestinated to damnation, and the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation cannot be true.

III. God denies having elected and reprobated mankind, unconditionally, the one portion to eternal life, and the other portion to eternal death. In some texts the denial is direct, and in others it is by the clearest implication. Take the declaration of God to Cain. Gen. 4: 7: "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door." Allow to God only the freedom from duplicity which we require of men, and this text amounts to a denial, on the part of God, that he had either unconditionally elected Cain to life, or reprobated him to death.

Deut. 30: 19: "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live."

Setting life and death before them, must mean, putting them in such relations to both, as to render either possible. If any were by an eternal decree, elected unconditionally to eternal life, death was not set before them, for death was never possible unless the election could fail; and if any were reprobated to eternal death, life was never set before them, for it was never within their reach, never possible that they should live, unless the decree of reprobation could be broken. The declaration, therefore, that both life and death were set before them, was, by the clearest possible implication, a denial that they were either elected or reprobated unconditionally.

Eze. 18: 23; "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God; and not that he should return from his ways and live?" In this God most positively denies having reprobated and ordained the wicked to death. But in verse 26 and 27, God denies both election and reprobation. "When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath

done shall he die. Again, when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive." In this, God absolutely denies that he has unconditionally elected some men to everlasting life, and foreordained others to everlasting death, and that the number thus elected and reprobated " is so certain and definite that it can be neither increased or diminished." The declarations of the text are so entirely inconsistent with this doctrine, that both cannot be true, and God is to be believed before the speculations of men. The same sentiment is repeated in chap. 33, with the solemnity of an oath, and if God is to be believed under oath, the question must be settled. But God further confirms his denial of any such decree of election and reprobation, verse 29, by replying to their charge of unequal dealing upon the divine administration. " Yet saith the house of Israel, the way of the Lord is not equal. O house of Israel, are not my ways equal? are not your ways unequal?" This reply of Jehovah cannot be reconciled with the supposed decree of election and reprobation.

If we come down to the New Testament, we shall there find the same denial repeated in various forms.

Acts 10: 34: " Then Peter opened his mouth and said, of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons."

Rom. 2: 9-11: " Tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile: but glory, honor and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jews first, and also to the Gentiles; for there is no respect of persons with God."

Eph. 6: 9: Neither is there respect of persons with him."

1 Peter 1: 17: " And if ye call on the Father, who without respect of persona man judgeth according to every man's work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear."

To elect some men to eternal life, and to reprobate others to eternal death, without any reference to their prospective moral character, virtue or vice, would be to have a respect of persons, and it is this very thing which is so repeatedly denied.

The above texts are given as a specimen of a very numerous class, but they are sufficient to show that God denies any such partial proceeding as the doctrine of election and reprobation attributes to him, and asserts the entire impartiality and equality of his government.

IV. The gospel addresses itself to all, invites all, and promises to save all that will comply with its conditions. This argument need not be elaborated in this place, as the principal proof texts have already been adduced on another point. The reader is referred to the first section of this chapter, and to the fourth argument, where the principal texts were quoted to prove that Christ died for all men. Availing the argument at this point, of the fact there made plain, that the gospel addresses itself to all, invites all, and promises to save all who will comply with its conditions, the whole is conclusive against the doctrine of election

and reprobation. To preach the gospel to reprobates, to say the least, is useless. To invite them to come to Christ, and be saved, is to trifle, if not to mock them, since God designed they never should come, and has made their refusal to come, certain, by an eternal decree. To promise them salvation on condition of coming, to tell them that they can be saved by any measures or means, or on any conditions, or in any way, is to perpetrate an absolute unmitigated falsehood, since if the supposed decree of election and reprobation be true, it is not, and never was possible for the reprobates to be saved.

V. The argument offered in proof that Christ died for all, based upon the fact that the Scriptures demand faith of all men, is just as applicable and conclusive against the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation. It is the sixth argument in section one, and the reader can turn to it and save repeating it in this place. The application of the argument is plain. As all are required to believe and trust in Christ that they may be saved, believe and trust Christ for salvation, salvation must be possible in and through Christ, or they are required to believe a lie. But if salvation is possible in and through Christ, the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation must be false.

VI. Of the same applicability and force, is the seventh argument of the same series, upon the same point, to which the reader is referred. It is there shown that the Scriptures charge upon sinners their own destruction, as a consequence of their own conduct, in rejecting Christ. This charge is false, if they were from all eternity passed by and ordained to eternal death. The supposed decree of God was prior to their conduct, and as that comprehended and made sure not only their damnation, but also their conduct, to charge their damnation upon their conduct as their fault, must be false as well as an insult poured upon the top of the injury and misery of perdition.

VII. The plain Scriptural doctrine of the conditionality of salvation, is a standing refutation of the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation. There are a variety of arguments, by which salvation might be proved to be conditional, but a simple appeal to the Scriptures, is all that will be attempted in this place.

Matt. 19: 16, 17: " And behold, one came and said unto him, good master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments."

Mark 16: 16: " He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, and he that believeth not, shall be damned."

John 3: 36: " He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life, but he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life."

Rev. 2: 10: " Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee a crown of life."

John 6: 40: "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one, which seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlasting life." Verse 47: " Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life."

John 5: 40: "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life."

John 3: 14,15: "So must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life."

Rev. 3: 5: " He that overcometh, shall be clothed in white raiment, and I will not blot his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels." Verse 21: " To him that overcometh, will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne."

These texts obviously refer to the final state of mankind, and they clearly teach that salvation is conditionally offered to mankind. The state of things presented is, some are saved, and others are not. But salvation is conditional, and what is conditional, may be secured or lost, and the conclusion is, that those who are saved, might be lost, and that those who are lost, might be saved. To deny that those who are saved could be lost, and that those who are lost could be saved, would be to deny that salvation is conditional. If then, those who are saved might be lost, and those who are lost might be saved, the doctrine of God's eternal decree of election and reprobation, by which the numbers of the saved and lost are rendered so certain and definite, that they can neither be increased or diminished, must be false.

VIII. The Scriptures teach that real Christians are in danger of apostatizing, and being lost, which proves the doctrine of unconditional election, to be untrue, in which case, reprobation must also be untrue.

Those who hold to the doctrine of unconditional election, deny that Christians can so fall away as to be lost, but this denial is a matter of necessity, to sustain the doctrine of election, and is maintained against the most positive Scriptural proof, as will be seen.

1. The Scriptures in the most direct and conclusive manner teach the possibility and danger of apostasy and final ruin on the part of Christians. The class of texts which prove this point, are so numerous, that but a few out of the whole need be adduced. 1 Chron. 28: 9: " And thou Solomon my son, know thou the God of thy father, and serve him with a perfect heart, and with a willing mind; for the Lord search-eth all hearts, and understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts; if thou seek him he will be found of thee; but if thou forsake him, he will cast thee off forever." The expression, "if thou forsake him," implies that it was a possible thing for Solomon to forsake God; and the expression, " he will cast thee off forever," proves the liability of being finally lost.

Eze. 18 24: When the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned, in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die." This matter is repeated in Chap. 33: 13: " When I shall say to the righteous, that he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered; but for

his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it." The doctrine in question could not be taught in plainer and stronger language, and it is not possible that any fair construction should be put upon it, which will destroy its force, or make it bear any other sense. That the text treats of really righteous persons, and not of self-righteous persons, as some have affirmed in their desperation, is perfectly plain.

(1.) It is a righteousness from which they are supposed to turn, which would save them alive, if persisted in. Their death is in consequence of turning from it. This could not be true of self-righteousness. No man will die for turning from self-righteousness.

(2.) It is a righteousness in view of which God says to the possessor, that he shall surely live. This is God's own word, " when I shall say to the righteous, that he shall surely live," God never said to a self-righteous man that he should surely live, it is therefore really righteous persons treated of in the text.

(3.) There is no such thing as turning away from self-righteousness to commit iniquity, for self-righteousness is iniquity itself, yet the righteousness is that from which a man turns away when he commits iniquity.

(4.) If it were self-righteousness, turning away from it would be a real reformation, and not a crime, and could not bring death.

(5.) God himself marks the distinction between this righteousness and self-righteousness. " When I shall say to the righteous, that he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered." Here are two kinds of righteousness, one in view of which God says the possessor shall live; then there is what is called his own righteousness, to which if he trust the other righteousness in view of which God said he should live, shall not be remembered, but for trusting to his own righteousness and for his iniquity which he commits he shall die. It is perfectly clear therefore, that the righteousness, from which the man is supposed to turn, is a real saving righteousness and not a wicked self-righteousness. That final and fatal apostasy is meant, is clear from the 26 verse of chap. 18: "When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done, shall he die." Here the apostate first dies in his iniquity, and then after this it is said that he shall die for it.

John 15: 4-6: " Abide in me and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine: no more can ye except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches; he that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned."

If there is any force in this illustration used by our Savior, then, just so sure as a branch may be cut from a vine and wither and die, so sure may one in Christ, the true vine, cease to abide in him and be cast forth as a branch and perish. The subject illustrates the possibility of losing our interest in Christ, and nothing else.

Gal. 5: 4: " Christ is become of none effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law: ye are fallen from Grace."

This text declares, in so many words, that certain of the Church at Galatia, had fallen from Grace. To fall from Grace must be to lose the saving benefit of Grace. That this fall was an entire and ruinous one in degree is certain, from the declaration that Christ had become of no effect unto them. Those to whom Christ is of no effect are not in a state of saving grace, and cannot be saved, only as any other sinner may be saved by repentance and faith.

Heb. 6: 4-6: " It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and of the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves, the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame."

There can be no doubt that this text speaks of real Christians. It most probably refers to such as had been made partakers of extraordinary and miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, which were peculiar to the apostolic age. If such fell away and denied Christ, their sin was so great that they could not be reclaimed. But while the texts speaks of real Christians, it is equally certain that they could fall away, and fall below the possibility of being reclaimed. That Christians can fall and be lost is therefore certain.

2 Peter 1: 9, 10: " But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall."

This teaches the possibility of apostasy in two ways. First, it supposes a class already fallen, such as had forgotten that they had been purged from their old sins. Secondly, the text gives directions how to prevent falling, which implies that those will fall who do not attend to the things named. Chap. 2: 14, 20, 21: "Cursed children which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the ways of unrighteousness. For, if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world, through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein and overcome, the latter end is worse than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them."

The force of this text depends upon two facts, which need to be distinctly noted.

(1.) The text treats of those who had been real Christians. They were such as had forsaken the right way, and must have been in, the right way or they could not have forsaken it. None but real Christians can be said to be in the right way. Common sinners are not in the right way. False professors are not in the right way, whether they be hypocrites or

self-deceived persons. None but real Christians are in the right way, and these must have been real Christians, for they forsook the right way, which they could not have done, had they not been in it. Again, they had escaped the pollutions of the world, through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. This clearly implies that they were real Christians. No sinner, no hypocrite, and no self-deceived professor, can be said to have escaped the pollution of the world, through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

Yet again, they had known the way of righteousness, which knowledge none but Christians have. To know the way of righteousness, implies the experimental knowledge of a Christian. It is a knowledge which common sinners, hypocrites and self-deceived persons never have. It is clear then, that the text treats of those who had been real Christians.

(2.) The text treats of final and ruinous apostasy. Of this there can be no doubt. It is said of them, that they bring upon themselves swift destruction. Verse 1. It is said that they shall utterly perish in their own corruption. Verse 12. It is said that to them " the mist of darkness is reserved forever." Verse 17. It is said "the latter end is worse with them than the beginning." Verse 20.

This cannot be true of any one reclaimed and finally saved. It is clear then, that the text treats of the final apostasy of real Christians, and here let this branch of the argument close.

2. The Scriptures clearly teach that some real Christians or pious persons have fallen, and furnish a variety of examples. It is a common faith among Christians that angels fell, and were hurled from their celestial spheres; and that Christians, struggling amid the surrounding corruptions of earth, enemies without, and enemies within, stand more securely, does not readily appear upon the face of things. It may be said that there is no analogy between the fall of angels and the fall of Christians. Such a statement is easily made, but it is made in the face of the fact that the spirit of inspiration has seized upon the fall of angels, to impress us with a sense of our danger. Our first parents fell from a higher state of perfection than common Christians have attained. But it may be said that their fall does not prove that Christians may fall. Be that as it may, it is certain that Paul used the fact of their fall, to impress Christians with a sense of their danger. He says, 2 Cor. 11: 3: " But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." With the dark destiny of fallen angels before us, and with the visible proofs of the universal corruption of humanity, through the fall of a common father, it is discordant with all the facts around us, to contend that we, as Christians, stand secure beyond the possibility of fatal apostasy. But to all this we may add the apostasy of the Israelites who fell in the wilderness, to whom Paul appeals with such force, as a warning to Christians, not to follow their examples, lest they share their destiny. The case is presented so clearly by the apostle, that no better argument can be made than to quote his language:

1 Cor. 10: 1-12: " Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ. But with many of them God was not well pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness. Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them; as it is written, the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play. Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day, three and twenty thousand. Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents. Neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer. Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples; and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come. Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall."

The Apostle here appeals to the Israelites as to persons who actually fell, to warn Christian brethren of the danger of falling, and to convince them that there was real danger in their case. The attempt sometimes made to evade the force of the apostle's remarks, by a cavil upon the concluding words, " let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall," comes entirely short of the object aimed at, and is so weak as only to expose the desperate nature of the cause in which it is employed. It is, that the danger pertains only to those who *think* they stand, and not to those who do really stand. To this it is replied, that those who only think they stand, but do not really stand, cannot be in danger of falling.

But what is an entire annihilation of this attempt at evasion, is the fact that the words, " him that thinketh he standeth," include all who do really stand. It includes all who think they stand, and real Christians think they stand, it therefore includes real Christians, and they are admonished to take heed, lest they fall, after the fearful example of the Israelites, who fell in the wilderness. Another clearly marked instance of apostasy, is found in the case of king Saul. That Saul was a renewed man, is clear. Samuel told him that he should meet a company of prophets, and added, " And the Spirit of the Lord will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be turned into another man." 1 Sam. 10: 6. It is said again, verse 9: " God gave him another heart;" and in verse 10, it is said, " the Spirit of God came upon him, and he prophesied."

After all this it is said, Chap. 16: 14; "But the Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him."

This was after he disobeyed God and sinned, as charged upon him by Samuel, Chap. 15: 19: " And Saul finally perished by his own sword, in an hour of desperation, when he found himself forsaken of God, and overpowered by his enemies."

He was clearly once a good man, but he died a self-murderer, and here we leave him, a standing proof of the possibility of apostasy.

Solomon presents another case of sad apostasy, 1 Kings 11: 4: "It came to pass, when Solomon was old, that his wives turned away his heart after other Gods."

It cannot be affirmed upon sufficient proof, that he did not repent before he died, for on this point the Scriptures are silent. His apostasy is clearly stated, and it amounted to idolatry, and here his history ends, and here let the subject rest.

Judas presents another clear case of apostasy. That Judas died a sinner and perished, so far as any sinners perish, is not denied by those who deny that real Christians can so fall as to perish. The only defense against this argument is based upon a denial that Judas was ever a good man. The proof that he was a sincere believer in Christ at one time may be summed up in a few words.

(1.) Our Lord ordained him one of his Apostles, after special and solemn prayer. In this the Evangelists agree. This fact ought to settle the question, for to maintain an opposite view, is to suppose that Christ appointed an unbeliever, and a wicked man, one of his Apostles.

(2.) Christ actually bestowed upon Judas miraculous gifts, and sent him out to exercise them, and to preach the Gospel. Of the two points above stated, there is abundant proof.

Matt. 10: 1, 5, 8: " And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease."

Then follows the names of the twelve, including Judas, after which it is said, " These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give."

Mark 3: 14, 15: " And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have power to heal sickness, and to cast out devils."

Again, Peter says of Judas, Acts 1: 17: He was numbered with us, and had obtained part of this ministry."

Again, he says of Matthias, verse 25: " That he may take part of this ministry, and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell."

The simple point is, that Judas was really in the ministry, and fell from it by transgression.

The only possible method of avoiding the conclusion, that Judas being a good man, fell and was lost, is to maintain that Jesus Christ chose, and ordained a wicked man and sent him out to preach his gospel. As absurd as this may appear, it has been often asserted, and

John 6: 7, has been adduced as proof: "Jesus answered them, have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?"

This is very far from proving that Judas was a devil when he was chosen, and when he, with the other apostles, preached the gospel and cast out devils. The word devil here is not used in its technical sense of an evil spirit, or the devil, but a common sense of an adversary. The word in a general sense denotes an adversary, and in this sense Judas was then a devil. There was a time when Satan got control of the mind of Judas.

John 13: 2; " The devil having now put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him."

Luke 22: 3; " Then entered Satan into Judas, surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve."

These facts tend to prove that Judas was not a devil from the beginning of his connection with Christ; the fair conclusion is, that he fell. Another clear case of apostasy is given by Paul, 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20:

Holding faith and a good conscience; which some having put away, concerning faith have made shipwreck; of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander."

Here Paul declares that some had made shipwreck of faith, by which apostasy must be meant. The apostle then names two of the leaders in this apostasy, Hymeneus and Alexander. Both of these persons are mentioned in his second Epistle, Chap. 2: 17, 18:" And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus; who, concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some."

Here another of the apostates is named, and the consequence is stated. The faith of some was overthrown.

Chap. 4: 14, 15: " Alexander, the coppersmith, did me much evil: the Lord reward him according to his works: of whom be thou ware also; for he hath greatly withstood our words."

The apostasy of these men and their associates, from the true faith of the gospel, is undoubted.

Rev. 2: 4, 5: " Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen; and repent and do thy first work; or else I will come unto thee quickly and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent."

That the members of this church were fallen cannot be denied. To say that such fallen ones will certainly repent and reform is groundless. There is no proof that they did repent.

Moreover, the text is positive proof that it was a possible case that they should not repent. "Except thou repent," is language which implies that they might or might not repent, and if it was a possible case that they might not repent, then is it clearly possible for Christians to fall so as to perish. It has now been proved that real Christians may fall away and be lost; and this truth being established, must entirely overthrow the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation.

It has now been proved, by eight distinct arguments, that the doctrine of God's eternal decree of election and reprobation, is unfounded, and but one more shall be added.

IX. The proof and arguments which have been adduced in support of the supposed doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation, are altogether insufficient to support such a momentous system, a theory so directly affecting the character of God, and the destiny of man. It will be sufficient to examine the Scriptural proofs of the doctrine in this place, and that only in regard to men, leaving the asserted election and reprobation of angels out of the argument.

It is taken for granted, in this examination, that the General Assembly has cited the clearest and strongest texts in support of the doctrine of election and reprobation, as quoted above, from their confession of faith. The following are the texts which they have cited.

Rom. 9: 22, 23: " What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering, the vessels of wrath fitted for destruction. And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy which he had afore prepared unto glory."

In order to come to a right understanding of every text, it is necessary to inquire what the subject is, of which the writer is treating. On this text it may be remarked,

1. The apostle is not treating of personal and individual election to eternal life. This was entirely foreign to his theme, and hence, the text proves nothing in regard to the subject.
2. The apostle was treating of the original election of the Jews, as a nation, and of their present rejection, and of the call or election of the Gentiles. The great design of God, from the beginning, was to make the Jews his peculiar people, and through them, prepare the way, and introduce the Savior, and then open the door of equal religious privileges to the Gentile world, and make them equal to the Jews. To this the Jews objected, and, no doubt, many rejected the gospel who would have embraced it, but for the fact that it offered salvation to the Gentiles, on the same terms that it offered to save them. In view of these circumstances, the apostle wrote, and in this light is his language to be construed.
3. To illustrate this subject, and to justify God in the premises, the apostle says what he does in this chapter.

To illustrate the subject, he appeals to the choice of Jacob over Esau, which had nothing to do with personal election to eternal life, but the choice of one nation or family above another, as a preparatory means of bringing in the Savior and introducing the gospel. The apostle appeals to the case of Pharaoh, and under this head, the text occurs which is under consideration. The apostle brings the punishment which God inflicted upon Pharaoh and his people, to bear directly upon the case of the unbelieving Jews, to show that God will be just in their overthrow. The points in the text may be thus stated.

(1.) By the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction, is meant the Jews, who were already rejected and were soon to be destroyed. God had not fitted them for destruction, but they had fitted themselves by their sins, their rejection of the Savior and of the gospel, and by their abuse of all the divine mercies. If ever a nation deserved the divine wrath, it was the Jews, and if ever a nation corrupted itself, and fitted itself for destruction, the Jews did that very thing.

(2.) God endured these vessels of wrath, fitted for destruction, with much long-suffering. The idea is, he bore with them a great while, after they were ripe for destruction, instead of destroying them so soon as they were fit, so soon as they deserved to be destroyed.

(3.) God had a very important end to secure by bearing with the Jews so long. It was two-fold.

First, to make his wrath and power known. By bearing so long, and selecting the time he did for the fall of the Jews, he made the stroke of his wrath, and justice of procedure more visible.

Secondly, by this course he made "known the riches of his glory on the vessels which he had before prepared unto glory." Who these were, we learn from the next verse. "Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles." Thus was the riches of God's grace and glory generally magnified, by the long-suffering with which he bore with the wicked nation of the Jews. The opening of the gospel door to the Gentiles, they made a reason for rejecting it, and God made it the occasion and time to make an end of the Jewish nation and polity, by a stroke of his vengeance. God bore with them until he had gathered a gospel church from both Jews and Gentiles, which were the vessels of his mercy. How much more was both God's justice and grace magnified, by bearing with the wicked Jews, until they perished by their opposition to the extension of his grace to the Gentile world,

Dr. McKnight, though a Calvinist, understands these verses in the same sense, and as having no reference to individual election to eternal life, or to individual reprobation. His comment is as follows:

"Yet not to rest the matter on God's sovereignty, if God, willing to show his wrath for the abuse of privileges bestowed, and to make known his power in the punishment of such wickedness, hath upheld, with much long-suffering, the Jews, who, because they are to be destroyed, may be called vessels of wrath fitted for destruction, where is the fault? And

what fault is there, if God hath long preserved these vessels of wrath for this other purpose; that he might make known the exceeding greatness of his goodness on the objects of his favor, whom, by his dealing with the Jews, he had before prepared for the honor of becoming his people?"

There is, then, not the slightest reference, to the doctrine of an eternal decree of personal election and reprobation.

Eph. 1: 4, 5, 6: " According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy, and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, to the praise of the glory of his grace."

This is undoubtedly regarded as the strongest text in the New Testament, and yet it is only by overlooking the leading design of the apostle, that it is made to relate to the subject. The apostle is not treating of personal and individual election, and hence his sense is perverted, when the words are applied to this subject. The subject is the constitution of the Gospel church of converted Jews and Gentiles, and not as under the former dispensation of the natural seed of Abraham. This is the election, all believing Jews and Gentiles are elected to the adoption of children, to constitute the one universal Gospel church, without distinction of race, and without circumcision, to the praise of the glory of his Grace. By the pronouns " we" and " us," the apostle means the Jewish converts, who constituted the first Gospel church, and by " ye," he means the Gentile converts, who were afterwards called by the preaching of the word, " That *we* should be to the praise of his glory who first trusted in Christ. In whom *ye* also trusted after that ye heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation." Verse 12, 13. Here is the union of two elements of which the Gospel church was composed, not by a personal election, but by the choice of both Jews and Gentiles in the place of the Jews, who alone had been God's People. This, the apostle affirms, was God's purpose from the beginning, thus to call the Gentiles, and the end he asserts to be, " that in the dispensation of the fullness of time, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are in earth." This view the apostle more fully illustrates in the next chapter, which is a continuation of the same subject. In the following quotation, the words in brackets are added to make the sense clear.

" But now, in Christ Jesus, ye [Gentiles] who were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition [between Jews and Gentiles]; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace: and came and preached peace to you [Gentiles] which were afar off, and them that were nigh, [the Jews.] For through him, we both [Jews and Gentiles.] have access by one spirit unto the Father. Now, therefore, ye [Gentiles] are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." This household of God is the one Gospel church, and the election is not of individuals, whereby others are reprobated, but all believers among both Jews and Gentiles are elected to membership in this one Gospel church. God always designed this,

and how much more does this redound " to the praise of the glory of his grace," than would a personal election of a few, carrying with it the reprobation of the greater portion of mankind to eternal damnation, without the possibility of their being saved? On the clause which asserts that the number elected and reprobated, is so definite and certain, that it can neither be increased or diminished, the following references are made.

2 Tim. 2: 19: "Nevertheless, the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are his,"

The text asserts a simple fact, which no believer in Christianity denies, namely: that God knows his own children. It is just as true if the doctrine of election be false, as it is if that doctrine be true. It proves nothing concerning the matter of election. One other text is quoted on this point as follows:

John 13: 18: "I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen, He that eateth bread with me, hath lifted up his heel against me."

This has not the slightest reference to the certainty of an eternal decree of election and reprobation. It related to the twelve, and Christ not only knew which he had chosen, but what they were, whom he had chosen. But this has nothing to do with the certainty of election to eternal life, for he had chosen the twelve, and one of them was lost, so that the number of the chosen was diminished by the fall of Judas.

The above, are the only texts quoted on the point, and it is clear that there are none which prove the point, or these would never have been referred to. Another class of texts has been adduced as proof that God has unchangeably predestinated some men to eternal death, as follows:

Prov. 16: 4: " The Lord hath made all things for himself, yea, even the wicked for the day of evil."

To make this text sustain the doctrine of an eternal decree of reprobation, the word *made* must be understood in the sense of created, and the *day of evil*, must mean eternal damnation. If this be true, then God made the wicked on purpose to damn them, and does not damn them because they are wicked. But common sense, and the original join to forbid any such construction. It would be more literal to render it, " The Lord doth work all things for himself, yea, even preserves (or feeds) the wicked for the day of evil." This makes it assert a truth about which there is no dispute, and it is quite as consistent with the original. The Caldee renders it, " All the works of the Lord are for those who obey him; and the wicked is reserved for the day of evil."

Coverdale renders it thus: " The Lord doth all things for his own sake; yea, and when he keepeth the ungodly for the day of wrath." Some understand the sense of the text to be, that God prepares the wicked to be used by him in the day of evil, as he uses one wicked nation to punish another. Any one of these senses, is better than the one which would

represent God as creating rational beings for no higher end than to pour upon them his eternal wrath.

Matt. 11: 25, 26: " At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight."

This does not contain the slightest proof of that supposed eternal and horrible decree of reprobation.

1. By the wise and prudent, is meant the learned Scribes and Pharisees of our Lord's time, who rejected him and his Gospel.

2. By the babes, to whom the things of the Gospel were revealed, is meant, such as received his word, believed, and were enlightened and saved, who were mostly from the common people and unlearned classes, who had but little of the wisdom and prudence of this world.

3. Christ did not thank the Father that of the wise and prudent rejected him and his truth, but as their wicked and proud hearts led them to do it, by which, from God's very economy of grace, these things were hid from them, he thanked the Father that they were revealed to babes, to the ignorant, honest and humble inquirers after truth and salvation. Every right minded Christian will say, amen, to Christ's declaration, without the slightest idea that there is concealed in the sentiment he approves, the doctrine of an eternal decree of reprobation, by which millions on millions of human beings were consigned to hell before they were born, because it pleased the Creator to make them for hell torments. How such a text can be quoted by a Christian mind, to prove such a doctrine, can be accounted for on no other principle, than that the simplicity of the Gospel is hid from some who think they are wise and prudent. Rom. 9: 17,18, 21, 22, is referred to in this connection, but it has been sufficiently explained in preceding remarks.

2 Tim. 2: 20: " But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earth, and some to honor and some to dishonor." This is true of some great houses, but how the fact proves that God, from all eternity, passed by some men and ordained them to eternal death, is not easy to see. That Paul did not mean to teach that some men are rendered vessels of dishonor, by an eternal and unchangeable decree is certain, from what he says in the very next verse. " If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified, and meet for his master's use, and prepared unto every good work." The whole is made to turn on the conduct of the person, and not on an eternal decree, which unchangeably settles both character and destiny.

Jude 4: "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation." It is very remarkable that learned men should cite such texts, to prove such an awfully solemn doctrine, as the reprobation of men from eternity, to eternal damnation. There is not the slightest allusion to an eternal decree. The expression, " before of old," does not refer back to eternity, but only to the times covered by the history

of the Old Testament, and the sense of the text is, that the corruption and punishment of the persons named were foretold, or written before. The Greek word *prographo*, here rendered " *who were before ordained*" simply means " *written before*" or " *before written*." The word is compounded of *pro*, before, and *grapho*, to write, and the sense is, that the matters in question were before written of those men named. The word occurs in but three other texts in the New Testament. In Rom. 15: 4, it occurs twice, thus, "Whatsoever things *were written afore time, were written* for our learning." Gal. 3: 1: " Before whose eyes Jesus Christ *hath been evidently set forth*, crucified among you."

Here the word is rendered, " *hath been evidently set forth*," which could not be done by an eternal unwritten and unseen decree, but which might be done by word of mouth in preaching the Gospel, or by a written epistle.

The only other text in which the word occurs, is Eph. 3: 3: " How that by revelation, he made known unto me the mystery, as I *wrote afore* in few words." Here the word is rendered " *wrote afore*."

Dr. McKnight renders the above thus:

" Who long ago have been before written to this very condemnation."

His comment runs thus:

" For certain false teachers have come into the church privily, that is, under the mask of being inspired, who long ago, in what is written concerning the lascivious Sodomites, and the rebellious Israelites, have been foretold, as to suffer this very punishment."

1 Peter 2: 8: " And a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient: whereunto they were appointed."

This does not intimate that the persons named were the subjects of an eternal decree of reprobation. The only point that can be made out of it, is that they were appointed to the disobedience laid to their charge, but this is unfounded. The sense is not, that they were appointed to be disobedient, but that they were disobedient in regard to matters or duties to which they were appointed. They violated the trust committed to them. Dr. McKnight, translates the clause thus: " The disobedient stumbled against the word, to which verily they were appointed."

In his note, he says, " In our Bible, the translation implies that the disobedient men were appointed to be disobedient; but the original does not convey that idea, for the words in construction stand in this manner: The disobedient stumble against the word, to which verily they were appointed." This makes the sense plain.

They were appointed to the word, and being disobedient to it, they stumbled against the word to which they were appointed, and fell.

All the texts have now been examined, which are cited on the particular points of the confession of Faith which we have quoted, and it would be fair to take it for granted that the strongest texts have been produced, and that if the doctrine of election and reprobation, by an eternal decree, is not found in them, it is not found in any other texts.

It may be well however, to notice a few other texts which are often pressed into the service of the doctrine of election, and reprobation.

2 Thes. 2: 13: " God hath from the beginning, chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth."

The doctrine under consideration is, that God from all eternity elected some men." This text cannot therefore refer to that election, for these were chosen at a later period, only " from the beginning."

This cannot mean from all eternity, for eternity had no beginning.

"The beginning," here means from the first of the preaching of "the Gospel among them. The true sense is, that from their first reception of the Gospel, they had given evidence of the genuineness of their call, and the soundness of their conversion, having showed no symptoms of apostasy as many others had.

The manner too, in which they are said to have been chosen to salvation, is very decisive against the idea of its having been done " from all eternity." They were " chosen to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth." They were sanctified by the Spirit and believed the truth when Paul first preached the Gospel in that place, and then were they chosen to salvation.

1 Peter 1: 2: " Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through led; sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." This text furnishes the most conclusive evidence against the supposed election from all eternity, by the decree of God.

1. They are said to be elected according to the foreknowledge of God, which proves that the election was foreknown before it took place, and hence they were not elected " from all eternity."

2. Their election is said to have been through sanctification of the Spirit, and hence it did not and could not have taken place until the time of the sanctifying operations of the Spirit upon their hearts.

3. Their election was " unto obedience." Obedience is not the object of the election, but the result, as it follows the sanctifying work of the Spirit, through which the election takes place. It is clear, therefore, that their election can date no further back than the commencement of their obedience.

4. They were elected unto the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." The sprinkling of the blood of Christ, was not the object of their election, but in connection with the Spirit, was the means of their sanctification through which they were elected. Now, as the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, is always and only apprehended by faith, their election could not have taken place before, but must have taken place at the time they exercised faith. This is a clear and true exposition of the doctrine of Gospel election, and here the subject may be dismissed.

The point gained in this section is this; it has now been proved that the application of the atonement is not limited by any supposed decree of election and reprobation.

SECTION V.

The Atonement is not limited in its Application, by any supposed Influence of the Foreknowledge of God.

The whole system of foreordination, and election, and reprobation, have sometimes been made to depend upon God's foreknowledge.

The argument is, that God absolutely knew, from all eternity, just how each human being would act, just who would be saved and who would be lost, who would believe in Christ and who would not, and as God cannot be disappointed, no person can act differently from what he does act, and none who are saved could be lost, and none who are lost could be saved.

In reply to this view, it may be urged,

I. The foreknowledge of God cannot be urged as proof of the doctrine of foreordination or divine decrees, since there is no necessary connection between them. Decrees cannot be made to stand upon foreknowledge, because their existence does not necessarily follow from the existence of foreknowledge. This shall be made plain.

1. To say that God has decreed all things, because he foreknew what would come to pass, is to admit that foreknowledge brings nothing to pass. If the fact of foreknowledge brings everything to pass, by an unerring and irresistible necessity, the supposed decree upon the back of it brings nothing to pass, and is useless. If knowledge brings all events to pass, to say that God has decreed them because he foreknew them, is to say, in effect, that God has decreed that they should come to pass because they were sure to come to pass before he decreed it, that he made them sure by a decree, because they were sure without his decree. If the foreknowledge of God brings everything to pass, why introduce the decree? If the decree brings everything to pass, why argue from the foreknowledge? Just prove the existence of the decree, and the question is settled. The truth is, it is so plain that foreknowledge, however perfect, has no executive power in itself, and brings nothing to pass, that resort is had to the doctrine of decrees, to make the argument sure, as foreknowledge

does not make it sure. If, then, it does not follow that God has decreed everything that comes to pass, because he foreknew what would come to pass, so it may be said,

2. God cannot be said to know all that will come to pass, because he has decreed it. It is admitted that God knows all that comes to pass, and always knew it, but to say he knew it because he has decreed it, is to say that he did not know it until he decreed it. If so, God formed his decrees in ignorance, and the act of decreeing gives birth to his knowledge of future events. This cannot be, and if he neither decreed events because he knew they would come to pass, nor knew them because he decreed them, then there is no necessary connection between foreknowledge and decrees, and no argument can be founded upon the one concerning the other.

II. The foreknowledge of God can have no possible influence upon moral agents to control their conduct, or in producing one class of actions more than another.

1. This follows from the nature of knowledge, God's foreknowledge is his perfect conception of all events, or sight of all events as they take place, this conception or sight having always been present to the infinite mind. There is, in this knowledge, no executive power; knowledge is not an executive attribute. It is not knowledge that effects what God himself does, it only determines what is proper to be done, but it is his power and not his knowledge that does it. Much less, then, does the knowledge of God exert a power upon human minds to cause them to act. God knows or sees what moral agents will do, but if he influences them to do it, or in any way causes them to do it, that must be an act of his power, and not of his knowledge. If such divine executive action can be proved in regard to all the actions of all moral agents, the point will be gained; but that is another subject, and has nothing to do with the question of foreknowledge.

2. God's perfect foreknowledge is not the cause of the actions of moral agents, but their actions are the cause, not of his power to know, but of the fact that his knowledge is what it is in regard to their actions. His knowledge of their actions arises from the fact of their actions, not the fact of their actions from his knowledge. Therefore, when we see the actions of moral agents, it is legitimate to affirm that God knew they would act so, because they do so act, but it is not legitimate to affirm that they act so because God knew they would. As the knowledge of God is perfect, he must know things just as they are, certain or contingent, necessary, or merely possible. Now, the fact in the case is, the sinner, who shall be finally lost, is a moral agent, and might do differently from what he does and be saved; and if so, God knows this as a thing possible. *Now*, if the sinner were to do differently from what he does and be saved, still there would be no disappointment in the divine mind; for, as the perfect knowledge of God arises from a view of the facts, and not the facts from his knowledge, were the acts and end of the sinner different, the knowledge of God on these points, would be different. Thus, we plainly see, that the knowledge of God can have no influence in producing events, while we see equally plain, how events, growing out of the moral agency of man, might be different from what they are, and still be in accordance with the foreknowledge of God.

SECTION VI.

The Atonement is not limited in its Application, by any want of moral power, or any moral inability, whereby Sinners are rendered incapable of complying with the conditions upon which its Benefits are offered.

A class of theologians, who shrink from the stern and rugged features of eternal, absolute and unconditional election and reprobation, hold views, which if true, must as certainly conduct every member of the human family to the same destiny, without the possibility of a different result. They admit that Christ died for all, that the atonement is sufficient to save all, and that God invites all, and is willing all should come and be saved.

All this they preach, and pour it over their pulpits upon their hearers, with as much earnestness as they would if they really believed God's economy of grace impartial, and that God is as desirous that all should be saved as he is that a part should. But they hold, at the same time, that while man has all the natural ability to repent and obey the Gospel, there is in the case of all sinners a moral inability, consisting of a perverseness of will, which renders it certain that no sinner ever will accept of the Gospel offer of salvation, so that all would be lost, if left to those common influences of the Gospel and Spirit which are brought to bear upon all men. In these circumstances, they hold that God, by a special influence of his Spirit, calls and saves a part by a power which would save all, if exerted to the same degree upon all, but which is not exerted upon all. They insist that all men are guilty, and that the non-saved are justly damned because they have a natural ability to repent and believe and obey the Gospel, and that it is at the same time, certain that none ever will repent and be saved, only such as God calls by this supposed special call, because they have no will to accept of salvation on the terms of the Gospel. They insist also, that as all by the perverseness of their own wills, reject the offers of salvation and deserve to be damned, God is in no sense unjust, because he comes in with his power and saves a part.

This is now perhaps the theory most commonly advocated by Calvinistic divines, and it is believed to be fairly and clearly stated above. To meet and refute it, in its principal points, will require some patient labor on the part of both writer and reader, which it is trusted will not be wanting.

I. The theory in regard to the aspects effecting the moral rectitude of the government of God, is subject to all that has been or can be urged against election and reprobation, by an eternal and absolute decree. The design of the theory is, to escape the consequences charged upon the Predestinarian election system, which makes the damnation of sinners depend, not upon their sin, but upon the eternal purpose or decree of God, which secures both their sin and damnation. But it will be seen that the responsibility can never be avoided, while the end is so certainly reached.

1. It makes the damnation of sinners depend upon the will of God, they are damned because God prefers to have them damned. The case is just this, all are sinners, all deserve to be damned, and all would be damned, if God did nothing for those who are saved, more than he does for those who are lost. They are all alike, and God steps in and

saves a part, and leaves the rest to perish. Is it not clear then, that the saved are saved because God wills it, and that the lost are lost because God wills it. When God, who has equal power to save all, exerts a power to save a part, which he does not exert to save the rest, it furnishes the clearest proof that God wills that part shall be saved and that part shall be lost. Those whom God saves, he wills should be saved, and those whom he leaves to perish, he wills should perish. But it will be said the sinner wills to reject the offer of salvation. True, but all sinners will to reject the offer of salvation, and God changes the will of a part, and does not change the will of the whole, and as he has equal power to change the wills of all, this fact proves that he wills that part shall be saved, and that part shall be lost. What does it avail to say that sinners will to reject the offer of salvation, since it is so clear that God wills that sinners should will as they do? All sinners will to reject the offer of salvation, and God changes the will of a part, and does not change the will of all, he therefore wills that part should accept the offer of salvation, and that part should reject it. We should reason just so concerning a man's acts. Suppose two men were attempting to drown themselves, and a third person coming up, having power to save them both, should save but the one. If he could just as easily have saved both as the one, and did not, we would say it was his will, his choice, that one should live, and that the other should die. God is just as able to save all as he is a part, in view of the theory under consideration, and yet he saves but a part, and lets the rest perish, whom he might just as easily save, therefore he wills that a part should be saved, and that a part should not be saved. It is seen then, that this theory clearly makes the damnation of sinners to depend upon the will of God, and the Predestinarian theory does no more. The theory which stands opposed to this, and which will hereafter be explained, is not liable to this objection, because it is based upon the assumption that God does all he can consistently with the principles of his moral government, and the freedom of the human will, to save all sinners, and that as much is done for those who perish, as for those who are saved, up to the time they accept of the offer of salvation.

2. It throws the aspect of insincerity over the whole economy of grace, and invitations of the Gospel, in regard to the unsaved, just as much as does the Predestinarian theory.

Christ died for all, the Holy Spirit strives with all, and God invites and expostulates with all, and yet stops short of that degree of influence necessary to bring them within the reach of salvation. Now, why is all this effort, or rather, pretended effort to save such as are lost? God does everything necessary to save them, but one thing, and that is, he does not exert moral influence enough to overcome their moral inability, consisting in the perverseness of their wills. This he might do if he would, from the fact that he does it in regard to others, and yet he does it not to these, and without it all that he does is lost, so far as the salvation of these morally incapable sinners is concerned. This certainly looks a little like duplicity; as though God does not desire their salvation. It is perfectly certain that he does not desire their salvation, as he desires the salvation of others, for he does for others what he does not do for these. It looks as though God desired that they should perish, and yet wished to make the impression on the mind of the intelligent universe, that he wished them to be saved. Suppose a man to make a feast, and invite many. He prepares enough for all he invites, and invites them all by the same form of words, a public and free invitation. But all are alike averse to coming, so that every one will reject

the public invitation, and he knows this before he begins the preparation of his feast. There is in every one a moral inability to accept the call, they all freely will to reject it, but have no moral power to will in the opposite direction. It is true they all have natural ability to come, they have power to walk, and they have intellectual light enough to comprehend the import of the invitation, but their wills tend so naturally and freely in the opposite direction, that they have no power to will to come, and herein lies their moral inability. But the author of this feast, has a secret unseen influence which he may exert over every one he invites, which will change the current of their wills. He sends out his invitations, which shows upon its face every mark of an earnest desire that all should come, and yet he accompanies a few of the invitations with this secret, unseen power, which brings them to the feast, and withholds it from all the rest, which leaves them under the control of their perverse wills, to pass on and starve for want of the feast which he has provided. The rules of logic and morals, by which a man acting thus, would be defended against the charge of insincerity and duplicity, have not yet been made plain to common sense, and it is not easy to see how it can be any more honorable to God than to man.

3. It no less annihilates human responsibility, than does the Predestinarian theory of election and reprobation. The theory proceeds upon the assumption, that in view of all the circumstances and influences which surround man, the will is naturally constitutionally, and fatally wrong; that it comes into existence wrong, and necessarily continues wrong, with no power in the universe that can set it right but God alone.

The fact that men might act differently from what they do, alone can render them responsible for their conduct. But this theory assumes that the will is so perverted, constitutionally and by nature, that men cannot will differently from what they do will, and the conclusion is that they are not responsible for the manner in which they will. It will not relieve the difficulty to say that the sinner might will differently if he would. It might as well be said that he could will differently if he did, or that he would will differently if he did. The difficulty lies in the fact that his will runs in the direction it does from the necessity of his nature, and that he has no power, under the circumstances of his being, to will differently, nor to will to will differently. What does it avail to say that he might will differently if he would, so long as he cannot will to will differently. He could if he *would*, but it is the *would* that is impossible.

If it be said that sinners might will differently, in the common sense of the expression, the whole theory of moral inability is abandoned, and the doctrine of a special call, by which those who are saved are brought in, which call is not extended to those who are lost, is blown to the winds. God openly and freely calls all, and it is admitted that his Spirit moves upon all, and there is no evidence of any call beyond this, save the fact that some come and others do not. Now, if it be admitted that sinners, in the circumstance of their case, can will differently, it may be that those who come at God's call, do it in the exercise of their power to will differently, which all have, without any special call or influence more than is extended to all sinners. If all sinners have power of will to accept and come when God calls, it can never be proved that those who obey the call, do not do it in the simple exercise of the power of will, which those possess who reject the call, and that

the fact that some come and others refuse, is to be attributed to the different manner in which sinners exercise their power of willing under the influence of grace which is extended to all, and not to some special call or influence. If all this is admitted, the controversy is at an end, for this is all that any believer in free will and free grace will contend for. If it be denied, on the ground that man cannot choose differently from what he does, then is he not responsible for his choice, and the theory as effectually annihilates human responsibility as does the Predestinarian theory.

The difficulty is in no sense relieved by the pretended distinction between natural and moral ability. The question is, has man power to comply with the conditions of the Gospel? The theory under review, answers, he has a natural ability, but there is a moral inability existing in the depravity of his will. This, it is replied, is a contradiction in itself. There is no natural ability, or there is no moral inability, for both cannot exist at the same time, in regard to the same required action. An ability to perform a given work, comprises all the power necessary to the performance. Now, if there be a natural ability to comply with the conditions of the Gospel, that natural ability must comprise all the power necessary to a compliance with the conditions of the Gospel, and if so, no moral power or ability is requisite, beyond what is included in the natural ability. There can then be no moral inability, for moral inability cannot exist in regard to a performance, which does not require a moral ability. To say that there is a natural ability to perform a given act, is to say that no moral ability is necessary, beyond what is included in the natural ability; and, of course, where the natural ability exists, there can be no moral inability. To say that there is a moral in-ability to perform a given act, is to say that it cannot be performed without this moral ability, the presence of which is denied, by affirming the presence of an inability; and if a moral ability is necessary to the performance of the act, there can be no such thing as a natural ability to perform it, which does not include this necessary moral ability; to affirm, therefore, that there is a moral inability, is to affirm that there is no natural ability to perform the act. It is clear therefore, that to affirm that there is a natural ability and a moral inability, at the same time, is to affirm a contradiction. It is to affirm that there is an ability, and that there is not an ability at the same time. Nor can the difficulty be obviated by affirming that men are at fault for the perverse-ness of their wills, in view of the theory under examination. It has already been shown that the theory is based upon the assumption, that the will is naturally and constitutionally so depraved as to render it impossible that it should go in any other direction than it does. For this natural and constitutional depravity of will, the sinner cannot be to blame. It has not been produced by his bad conduct, but his bad conduct has been produced by it. It is admitted to be the result of the fall, of the sin of Adam, for which sinners are no more responsible than a son is now responsible for the sin of his father, which may be his misfortune, but cannot be his crime. Adam might have been justly cut off for his sin, without a Savior, in which case his race would have been cut off in him, and the offender alone would have suffered the punishment. But God provided a Savior, by which Adam was spared to propagate his kind, and a stream of depraved humanity issued from him. All human beings are now introduced into existence, with this perverseness of will, which is affirmed to amount to a moral inability to accept of God's offer of salvation. This view charges God with sparing Adam, after his life was justly forfeited, and allowing him to propagate a race of descendants, without making an adequate provision for their recovery

from the consequences of his sin. It is of no use to talk about a universal atonement, of calls and invitations extended to all, so long as these provisions fail to reach the perverseness of the will which they have inherited from Adam, which is an element of their moral nature, not produced by themselves, and which amounts to a moral inability. This perverseness of will, this moral inability, is the result of Adam's fall, and is an obstacle in the way of the sinner's salvation, and according to the theory under review, it is the only obstacle in the way of the salvation of all that perish. For the removal of this difficulty in the way of the sinner's salvation, no adequate Gospel remedy is applied, in the case of those that perish. If it be allowed that God exerts a moral influence upon the minds of sinners, sufficient to counterbalance the natural wrong tendency of their wills, so that the course of sinners does not necessarily depend upon the natural wrong tendency of the will, nor yet upon the influence which God exerts, but upon the self-determining power of the will, which is now rendered free to act between these two moral forces, then the whole theory of a moral inability, is given up. If this state of things is not admitted, then it follows that God has provided no adequate remedy for the consequences of Adam's sin, for nothing short of a moral influence, in some way exerted upon the sinner's mind, sufficient to enable him to overcome the natural force of his depraved will, can be an adequate remedy for this consequence of Adam's sin, and the conclusion is that sinners perish, not for the guilt of what they do, but as the necessary consequence of what Adam did six thousand years before they were born.

The subject is very fruitful, and would admit of the introduction of other objections, and of a more extended elaboration of the points which have been treated, but enough has been said to show that the theory of a natural ability to convict sinners of wrong, and to justify the divine administration on one hand, and of a moral inability, to secure the sinner's certain damnation on the other, subjects the divine administration to all the objections that have always so terribly pressed the theory of election and reprobation by an eternal decree.

II. The theory under review is clearly untrue, when examined in the light of the evidence for and against it.

1. It is not true that man has a natural ability to do all that God's holy law requires of him. If it be asked, at this point, how man can be accountable or to blame, for not doing all that God's law requires of him, if he has not a natural ability so to do?

The answer is, he is guilty because he has an ability to do, but it is denied that it can be properly called a natural ability. The character of this ability shall soon be explained. If man has a natural ability to do all that God's law requires, then he is not naturally depraved, and his powers must be unimpaired by the fall. It would require all the powers of humanity in an unlapsed state, to meet the entire claims of God's law, and hence the lapsed powers of the same humanity cannot meet the claims of the same law. To say that man has a natural ability in a lapsed state, to do all that the law requires, on the ground that the law requires less of humanity in a lapsed state, than in an unlapsed state, is to say, that the law of God abates to suit its claim to the waning powers of its subjects, as they descend in depravity and impair their powers. This cannot be, for the whole plan of

redemption contemplates no abatement of the claims of the law, but proposes to sustain the honor of the law by the atonement, as a substitute for the sinner's death, and by securing that renewing grace by which sinners are again elevated to the high and holy claims of the law.

A natural ability must be an ability possessed by man in himself, without supernatural aid, or the influence of divine grace. Such an ability a fallen being cannot have. Such a natural ability, if it exist, must embrace the power to reverse the natural bent of the will to evil, and direct it to all that is right and holy. Such is not man's condition, and such is denied to be his condition by the advocates of the theory under review, when they affirm that there is a moral inability, consisting in the perverseness of the will.

2. It is not true that there is pertaining to man, a moral inability to comply with the conditions of the Gospel. The will is admitted to be depraved, so that man, from the tendency of his own depraved moral constitution, always wills wrong, and this, under other circumstances, would constitute an inability to will right; in the circumstances of the sinner, it does not. God exerts a moral influence upon sinners in opposition to the tendency of the will to that which is wrong, and if this is as great, or greater than the influence of depravity, then it must be as easy for sinners to will right as to will wrong. Now, it is admitted that God does act upon the minds even of those who are lost; he enlightens their understandings, he awakens their consciences, and quickens their moral sensibilities, and moves them powerfully to forsake sin, and turn to that which is right. This God does only in a degree which is consistent with man's moral agency, or the freedom of his will. There is admitted to be an evil moral influence, which tends to urge man on in sin, and there is also admitted to be a right moral influence drawing him in an opposite direction, and it can never be proved that these are not so balanced as to leave the will perfectly free to choose and decide the destiny of the soul, by its own determination between these two moral forces. The fact that the will is naturally inclined to evil, with a force which would amount to a moral inability to will right, if there was no counteracting moral influence, does not constitute a moral inability, when opposed by this counteracting moral force. The light of truth, the voice of conscience, the strivings of the Spirit, and the attractions of heaven, and the terrors of hell, may be equal to all the moral force of depravity, and if so, the whole argument in regard to a moral inability, falls to the ground. This view clears, the divine administration of all the charges that are brought against it, in view of all the other theories which have been examined; while it holds man to a strict and just accountability, making virtue virtuous, and vice vicious.

The same is true, in a modified sense, of Christians; they act between two moral forces, and though the right prevails, the evil is powerful, and a moral warfare is the result. The true Christian often has severe conflicts with powerful temptation, yet God will not suffer him to be tempted above what he is able to bear; yet, who can doubt that Christians would often be carried away with temptations, which they do actually bear, were it not for the counteracting moral influence which God exerts upon the minds? Between these two moral forces, the will decides the contest by its own force and decisive act, as when, at conversion, it resolved to forsake sin and turn to God. No other just views can be entertained of a probationary state.

It must then be regarded as settled, that in the light of the gracious dispensation under which sinners now live, and all the powerful influences by which they are moved to seek God and salvation, there can be no want of ability to comply with the conditions of the gospel.

SECTION VII.

The Atonement is not limited in its Application by any supposed Governing Influence of motives, by which some are necessarily prevented from complying with the conditions of the Gospel.

A class of theologians, who are determined to have man governed by the law of necessity, when driven from the doctrine of decrees, resort to the philosophy of the mind, and attempt to draw from thence, what they fail to find in the Bible, namely, proof that the human will acts from necessity.

The argument is based upon the assumption that the will necessarily acts in the direction of the strongest motive, and as motives exist beyond the power of the will to create or annihilate them, the conclusion is reached that the will can act only as it does, that it is not capable, under the circumstances, of acting differently from what it does act. This is but another invention to secure the end of an eternal decree of election and reprobation, without assuming the responsibility of making God the direct author of sin and damnation by an eternal purpose. From the fact of its metaphysical, character, and the obscurity of the subject, and the circumstance that its force is made to depend upon assumed positions and reasonings, which have neither visible facts nor clear declarations of God's word for a basis, it has misled many. In reviewing it, it is proper to show that it fails to evade the consequences chargeable upon the Predestinarian system; and then by an examination of its logic show that it is unsound.

I. The assumption that the human will is necessarily controlled by the strongest motive, as clearly annihilates human responsibility and makes God the author of sin, and the sinner's damnation, as does the Predestinarian system. This may be established by a short process.

The whole question must turn upon the origin and disposition of motives.

There are but three relations which the mind can sustain to these motives, by which it is supposed to be governed. They must be matters of the mind's own creation and government, or they must be the result of some influence or power, beyond the control of the mind, and yet other than God; or they must be produced and arranged by God himself. There can be no evading this, because there can be no other origin and arrangement of motives; the propositions include every possible source of motives. The first includes the human mind, the second includes everything but the human mind and God, and the third includes God, and there is no other source, power or influence, from whence motives can arise. Let them then be separately examined.

1. Are motives produced, arranged and governed by the human mind itself? If it be admitted that they are, the whole controversy is at an end.

The will cannot be governed by the strongest motive in any sense which effects the question of moral liberty, produces any sort of moral necessity, or secures any certain course of conduct and destiny, if the mind creates, arranges and governs the motives in view of which it acts. To say that the mind is governed by motives, and that these governing motives are matters of its own creation, is to say that the mind governs itself.

2. Are motives produced by some power or influence beyond the control of the mind, other than God? This cannot be allowed for two reasons.

(1.) It would entirely annihilate human responsibility. If the will is necessarily controlled by the strongest motive, and motives are produced and arranged by some power beyond the human mind, other than God, there is a clear end of all moral responsibility. In such case man does not govern himself, and God does not govern him, and how God can hold him to a moral accountability cannot be understood.

This view virtually shuts God out of the world, so far as the government of man is concerned, and leaves man the subject of some mysterious dark, and all controlling fatality, without power to resist it on one hand, and without a God to relieve him on the other.

(2.) This view cannot be allowed, because, instead of evolving light enough to make itself understood, it conceals its own most essential proposition in utter darkness. It creates a governing power more mysterious than Melchisedek, who is said to have been without father and without mother, and without beginning of days or end of life. If motives are not produced and arranged by man, nor yet by God, by what power and influence are they produced? Do they result from nothing? or are they the creatures of the Infidel's almighty chance? The very thought is Atheistical and may be dismissed without further notice.

3. Are motives produced and arranged by God. This is the only ground upon which a professed Christian can pretend to stand, who asserts that the human will is necessarily controlled by the strongest motive. But to admit that God produces and arranges all the motives that are presented to the human mind, and to insist at the same time, that the strongest motive necessarily controls the will, subjects the divine administration to all the objections which have been urged against the Predestinarian theory, and which have driven its advocates to invent this philosophical subterfuge.

(1.) It makes the sin and damnation of the wicked depend upon the will of God, as clearly as does the Predestinarian theory. God made the will in all its philosophical structure, and if it is necessarily controlled by the strongest motive, it is because God made it to be so controlled. Now, if God causes and arranges motives, he causes them and arranges them in a manner to execute his own will, and to secure his own purpose. If one motive is stronger than another, and consequently necessarily determines the will in its direction, it

is because God made it. This makes the determination of the sinner's will as much the act of God, as the turning of the balance is the act of him who throws the heavier weight into one end of the scale, for the purpose of having it turn as it does. If God brings one motive in contact with a human mind stronger than all other motives, it is his act, and his means of determining the will in that direction, and it must follow that God wills that the human will in that case should be determined in the direction it is, unless it be said that God acts in opposition to his own will, and defeats himself.

When a sinner's will is determined in the direction of sin, and pursues it, until sin, being finished, bringeth forth death, it is because God arranged the strongest motives in that direction, and consequently, the sinner sins and dies because God wills that he should sin and die. To deny this, is to deny, either that the mind is governed necessarily, by the strongest motive, or that God produces and arranges motives, either of which is to give up the motive theory.

(2.) This motive theory as clearly annihilates human responsibility, as does the Predestinarian theory. The theory is, that the will is necessarily controlled by the strongest motive, while motives are originated, arranged and balanced by God himself. If this be true, man is not the author of, nor responsible for, the determination of his will, any more than the balance is the author of, and responsible for its motion, when the proprietor throws a heavier weight in one end than he does in the other. The theory is, that he wills necessarily, in view of the strongest motive, and can will in no other direction, while the motives are beyond his control, arranged and balanced by God himself. The act cannot be man's in any moral sense, which renders him accountable. However much intellectual light there may be connected with the action of the will, it has no guiding and controlling influence over its determination; and however much moral sensibility there may be excited in connection with the action of the will, it is only as the creaking of the uncoiled balance groaning under the weight that irresistibly turns it. If the will is so constituted in its nature and philosophy, as necessarily to determine it in the direction of the strongest motive, whatever intellectual light and moral sensibility there are connected with its motives, its determinations are as much a result of its physical nature, and as much a physical necessity, as when the water rushes down the cataract, when the steel is drawn by the loadstone, and when the needle points to the pole. Such a being cannot be morally responsible.

(3.) It no less throws suspicion upon, and gives a confused and self-conflicting view of the divine administration, than does the Predestinarian theory. It admits that there are a variety of motives presented to the sinner's mind, some good, and some bad, some greater, and some less, and that these are all produced, arranged and controlled by God. The Gospel, with all its appliances, and the striving of the Spirit, are so many influences, so many motives to act on the sinner's will, and how does it represent God, who, while marshaling all these around the sinner, apparently to draw him from sin to holiness, and from hell to heaven, is made to keep before the sinner's mind, another class of motives, which as certainly and irresistibly draw him onward in sin and towards hell, as the river flows towards the ocean.

Again, what contradiction and conflict does this view involve in the divine government? There are motives opposed to motives, tending in opposite directions, and all produced and arranged by God himself. It is impossible, and the theory must appear false in the light of its own consequences. There is no way to escape these difficulties, but to fall back upon the freedom of the human will, and give up the point that the will is necessarily controlled by the strongest motive. Allow the will to be free, to be a self-determining power, never acting without motive, but always capable of making a free choice between motives, without being necessarily controlled by any one, and all is plain and in harmony with the word of God, and human consciousness. Then will motives be seen in their true relation to the mind, which is not like the relation of a weight to a turning balance, but the relation of reasons for action to an intelligent, free and morally accountable actor. Then also, will motives be seen in their true relations to the causes that produce them. All right motives, or motives to right action will be regarded as arising directly or indirectly from God; and all wrong motives, or motives to wrong action, will be regarded as arising from the devil, from the corrupt state of the world around us, or our own depraved natures, or from all these sources combined. Then will the divine government appear impartial, and man will be held to a just accountability for his conduct.

II. The motive theory is clearly untrue. Having examined it in the light of the consequences it involves, it is proper to look at it in the light of Scripture, reason, and logic. It is not true that the human will is necessarily determined in the direction of the strongest motive.

1. There is not the slightest proof of the assertion, that the will is necessarily governed by the strongest motives. The assumed fact is asserted, not as an ultimate truth, but as an antecedent, to which moral necessity is made to sustain the relation of a sequence. Moral necessity is the point to be proved, to prove which, it is affirmed that the will is necessarily controlled in its determination, by the strongest motive; this assertion therefore, is the major proposition in the argument, and should be proved, and though it has always been denied by the opponents of the theory, it has always been taken for granted, and to the present hour stands unproved. By what argument has any man ever proved that the will of man is necessarily controlled by the strongest motive, or that it always follows the strongest motive? The answer is, by no argument which is valid in reason or logic. The fallacy lies in asserting the main point to be proved, as proof of the whole subject. Let it be tested by demanding proof in a single case. Any argument which can prove that the wills of all men, are at all times determined in the direction of the strongest motive, must be capable of being so applied as to prove the same fact in an individual case. Let the attempt then be made.

Christ said to a certain man, who inquired what he must do to inherit eternal life, "sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven." Here, the riches of this world and heavenly riches are two motives, each acting on the will to determine it in opposite directions, and the will was determined in the direction of the riches of this world. Now the point to be proved is, that the riches of this world were the strongest motive. Of this there is not the slightest evidence, beyond the simple fact that

the man chose the riches of this world, to the neglect of heavenly riches. This was the strongest motive, say the advocates of the theory, because the will was determined in its direction. But this takes for granted that the will is determined necessarily in the direction of the strongest motive, the very thing which should be proved. This is arguing in a circle. This was the strongest motive because he chose it, and he chose it because it was the strongest motive. Why was it the strongest motive? The answer is, because he chose it. But why did he choose it? The answer is, because it was the strongest motive. There is no proof that the man's will was governed by the strongest motive. It is said the motive in the direction of which the will was determined, was the strongest, because the will was determined in its direction, but this takes for granted, without proof, that the will is always governed by the strongest motive, the very thing which is denied, and which should be proved.

If it be first proved that the will is necessarily determined in the direction of the strongest motive, then it will follow that in the case under consideration, the riches of this world were a stronger motive than heavenly treasure; or if it be first proved that the riches of this world constituted a stronger motive than heavenly treasure, aside from the fact that the will was determined in that direction, then it will follow that in that particular case, the will was determined in the direction of the strongest motive, yet, it would not, from a single case, follow that it always is. But until one of these points be proved, without the aid of the other, either that the will is necessarily determined in the direction of the strongest motive, or that the motives in the direction of which the will is determined are always the strongest, which must be proved without the aid of the fact that the will is determined in their direction, no progress is made in the argument beyond the circle, which is, the will is determined in the direction of a given motive, because it is the strongest motive, and that is proved to be the strongest motive by the fact that the will is determined in its direction. A man wills in a certain direction, because there lies the strongest motive, and there lies the strongest motive because he wills in that direction. Such reasoning is no reasoning at all, and proves nothing.

2. The will cannot be controlled by the strongest motive, as a matter of necessity, from the fact that the mind has no power or faculty of estimating and determining the strength of motives, which the will does not by turns, overrule in its actual decisions. Motives have no power to act upon the will, except through the intellect or through the sensibility. The will is not a judging faculty, but an executive power, and has no capacity, aside from the intellect, and sensibility to measure or even feel the force of motives. Now, when it is said that the will is controlled necessarily by the strongest motive, it is implied that the strength of motives is estimated and determined by some faculty of the mind, and the present argument is that the mind has no one faculty by which such estimation and determination can be made in regard to the strength of motives, whose decision the will does not in turn repudiate, and therefore it cannot be necessarily governed by what is declared to be the strongest motive.

The intelligence is one mental power or faculty by which motives are estimated, and their strength determined. But the will does not always determine in favor of that object which the intelligence declares to be the greatest good, and consequently, the strongest motive.

This cannot be denied. The will always repudiates the decision of the intellect, when moral obligation is violated. If the will always executed the decision of the intelligence, there could be no sin and ill desert. What can God do more than act in accordance with his perfect intelligence? What do angels do more than to act in accordance with their intelligence? What can man do more than to act in perfect harmony with his intelligence? This need not be argued at length, for every man knows that men do not always act in harmony with the intelligence, and whenever they do not, the will repudiates the decision of the intelligence, and rejects what the judgment declares to be the strongest motive. The truth is, the will sometimes executes the decision of the intelligence, and sometimes it repudiates it, and in all such cases it is not under the controlling influence of what the intelligence declares to be the strongest motive.

The sensibility is another faculty or susceptibility of the mind, by which motives are estimated, and their strength determined. The strength of the desire they awaken, is the measure of their power, as it is determined by the sensibility. But the will does not always determine in favor of that motive which awakens the strongest desire, and consequently which the sensibility declares to be the strongest motive. If the will never overrules the strongest desire, the duty of self-denial, as taught by Jesus Christ, is the greatest cheat that was ever imposed upon the human mind. Whenever the will upholds a right principle, in opposition to strong desire, or the impulse of strong feeling and passion, it repudiates what the sensibility declares to be the strongest motive.

There is but one other method by which the power of a motive can be determined by the mind, and that is by a union of the intelligence and sensibility on the same motive. That they both sometimes respond to the same motive, is admitted, but this class of motives cannot be meant exclusively, when it is affirmed that the will is always necessarily controlled by the strongest motive, for if the will is controlled by motives only when the intelligence and sensibility act in harmony, then the will is controlled by motives in but a small portion of its determinations, even if it were admitted that it is in these particular cases, where the intelligence and sensibility harmonize. It is an undeniable fact, that the intelligence and sensibility often influence the will in opposite directions, and that the will sometimes determines on the side of the intelligence, and sometimes on the side of the sensibility. This makes the will an umpire between the intellect and sensibility, and proves beyond a doubt, that it is not necessarily controlled by either, or that it does not necessarily follow the promptings of either, but that it yields to the one or the other, and resists the opposite; or, as is often the case, it suspends its decision for the time being, and holds them both at bay. *The* question is settled then, that as the mind has no faculty by which it can estimate the strength of motives, which the will does not often overrule, it cannot be true that the will is always necessarily controlled by the strongest motive.

3. The will is not necessarily controlled by the strongest motive, from the simple and undeniable fact, that it often acts where there is no one motive stronger than another, to move it to the particular determination it makes. If the decisions of the will were the necessary result of a stronger influence called a motive, moving it in that direction, it could never move or act in the absence of such stronger motive. But the will does act where there is no one motive stronger than any other, and therefore its determinations

cannot be the necessary result of the presence of one motive stronger than any other motive. There are cases in which different objects are presented, where the intelligence affirms that there is no ground of preference, that the objects are of equal value and interest. In such a case the will could make no determination in favor of either object in particular, upon the assumption that its determinations are the necessary result of the presence of a stronger motive. " I receive a letter," says President Mahan, " from a friend, informing me that he has just taken from a bank, two notes, perfectly new and of equal value, that the one lies in the east and the other in the west corner of his drawer, that I may have one and only one of them, the one I shall name by return of mail, and that I must designate one or the other, or have neither. Here are presented to my intelligence two objects, absolutely equal. Their location is a matter of indifference, equally absolute." In this case there is no possible stronger motive for the choosing of one bill rather than the other. There is a motive for choosing a bill, for choosing one or the other, which may be stronger than any motive not to choose, but the act of choosing one rather than the other, or of deciding which to choose, is an act of the will which is performed, if performed at all, without the application of a stronger motive. Such acts of the will are common occurrences, every man is conscious of performing them, and the will performs them without any conscious difficulty; it is therefore certain that the determinations of the will are not the necessary result of the presence of a motive stronger than any other motive.

4. The intelligence and consciousness of every enlightened mind affirm that the determinations of the will are not always in the direction of what is affirmed to be the strongest motive. This may appear a bold position, but it is insisted that he who affirms that the will is always controlled by and determined in the direction of the strongest motive, by such affirmation, contradicts both his judgment and consciousness, and places them under the ban of a metaphysical sophism.

It becomes now necessary to define what is meant by the strongest motive. This point settled, it will be proved that the strongest motive is often overruled by the will, and that its determination is in the direction of the weaker motive. By what rule are we to determine which is the strongest motive? The fact that the will is determined in the direction of a particular motive, cannot be admitted as proof that it is therefore the strongest motive, because, whether or not, the will is necessarily controlled by the strongest motive, is the main question in dispute. For a definition of the strongest motive, an appeal may be made to President Edwards, who has given the following. " The will always is as the greatest apparent good." Again, " The act of volition itself is always determined by that in or about the mind's view of an object which causes it to appear most agreeable." Here are two definitions which conflict with each other. That object which appears the greatest good is the strongest motive, according to the first definition, and that object which appears most agreeable is the strongest motive, according to the second definition. Now, our own judgments, and the Scriptures combine to declare that the greatest apparent good, and that which appears most agreeable are not always the same, but are often opposed to each other. In such case the will has to decide between that which appears the greatest good, and that which appears most agreeable, and as it sometimes decides in favor of the one, and sometimes in favor of the other, it is proof

positive that it is absolutely controlled by neither. A clear distinction between what appears the greatest good, and what appears most agreeable, is involved in the choice of Moses.

" By faith, Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt; for he had respect unto the recompense of reward." Heb. 11: 24-26. Here are two conflicting motives presented. The treasures of Egypt, and the pleasures of sin for a season, viewed with reference to the consequences which would follow, constituted one motive. The recompense of reward, viewed with reference to the affliction which he must suffer with the people of God to obtain it, was the other motive. The pleasures of sin were most agreeable, but the recompense of reward was the greater good, and the will determined in favor of the greatest good, and against that which appeared most agreeable. This proves that to appear the greatest good, and to appear most agreeable are not identical, as the language of Dr. Edwards implies. It also proves that the will is not always determined in favor of that which is most agreeable. This last point undeniably follows, from the duty of self-denial. Jesus Christ says, " If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, take up his cross and follow me." Matt. 16: 24. He, whose will is determined in favor of that which is most agreeable, neither denies himself or bears a cross. It is, then, settled that the will is not always and necessarily determined in the direction of that which appears most agreeable, on authority that will not be disputed. Now for the main question, does the will necessarily determine in favor of that which appears to be the greatest good. It certainly does not, if there is truth in our judgment, and in our consciousness, and in the word of God combined. If it were so, all enlightened minds would will in the same direction, on the great question of human destiny. The argument is based upon the case of such as are well informed in regard to the Gospel plan of salvation. They believe that there is a heaven and a hell, and they intellectually understand the terms upon which the Gospel offers eternal life. To such persons, apply the words of Moses. " I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore, choose life that both thou and thy seed may live." Deut. 30: 19. Or apply the words of Christ. " What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" Matt. 16: 26. Or apply the words of Paul. " Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh, shall of his flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." Gal. 6: 7, 8. Here are presented to the mind, obedience to God with its result, life everlasting; and sin with its consequences, death, the loss of the soul, a harvest of corruption. In a word, the path of obedience is here presented with heaven at its end, and the path of sin with hell at its end. Will any one dare to say, that the way of sin with hell at its end, is, or can be to any enlightened sinner, "the greatest apparent good?" Surely not. The Christian and the Christian minister affirm to the sinner, that the greatest apparent good lies in the way of obedience, ending in heaven; and they assume that the sinner knows it, as a means of rousing his conscience and making him feel his folly and guilt. The sinner's personal guilt is made to depend upon the fact that the way of obedience with heaven at the end is to his own mind, a greater apparent good, than the way of sin with hell at its end, which he pursues. Go and enquire of the sinner

himself, and he will tell you that he understands these things, that obedience to God leading to heaven, is beyond all doubt the greatest apparent good, and that he knows that he ought to forsake sin, and that it would be for his greatest good so to do. The Bible affirms this, and he believes the Bible. His judgment affirms the same thing, and nothing can be to the mind the greatest apparent good which the judgment affirms is not the greatest apparent good. His conscience declares that obedience, leading to heaven, is the greatest good; for though conscience deals mainly with questions of right and wrong, yet where the highest interests of the soul are so clearly connected with the right, it adds deeper thunder tones to the reproofing voice of conscience. To conclude, the sinner's consciousness settles the whole question, beyond the power of contradiction. Consciousness is the knowledge which the mind has of its own states and operations. It relates exclusively to what exists or passes within the mind. Knowledge of facts which exist outside of the mind, is to be attributed to the understanding or judgment, not to consciousness. The judgment pronounces, without a doubt, that the way of obedience, leading to heaven, presents a greater good than the way of sin, leading to hell. At this point consciousness comes in and pronounces two facts. First, the will is determined in the direction of the path of sin, leading to hell, which the judgment declares is not the greatest apparent good. It is certain, therefore, that the will is not always "as the greatest apparent good," as President Edwards affirms. The second thing which consciousness affirms, is that the determination of the will in the direction of the way of sin, leading to hell, which is not the greatest apparent good, is its own free unrestrained determination, and that it is capable of a different determination at the same time, and in the same circumstances. No man ever was conscious of willing from necessity, and no man can be. No man ever was, or can be conscious of any act of willing, without being conscious at the same time, of being capable of willing differently. Here the argument closes, and it is believed that the reader will agree with the writer, that the human will is free, free in the sense of not being governed by the strongest motive, but always freely, by its own self-determining power, chooses between motives, and that it is capable, at all times, of making a different choice from that which it actually makes.

All the theories have now been examined which have been resorted to, for the purpose of limiting the atonement of Christ in its application, and they have all been proved to be unsound. The conclusion is, that the atonement is limited in its application, only by the sinner's free, willful, and wicked refusal to comply with the conditions upon which its benefits are offered.

CHAPTER VIII.

SALVATION BY GRACE EXPLAINED AND DEFENDED.

SECTION I.

Justification by Faith—Pardon—Remission of Sin.

The doctrine of justification by faith, is the first in order, which is practically developed, after the atonement, in the execution of God's plan of salvation.

The best method of presenting this doctrine will be, first to make a clear statement of the doctrine itself, and then to adduce the Scriptural evidence in its support.

1. Sinners are justified by God, when he pardons their sins, remits the punishment they deserve, and treats them as though they were really just, or as though they had not sinned. It is not to make them just or righteous, but to pardon them as guilty sinners, to remit the punishment they deserve, and to receive them into his favor and fellowship, and treat them as though they were righteous. Gospel justification is bestowed upon none but the guilty and ill-deserving. There are other blessings bestowed, and an additional work done in the sinner, concomitant with justification, but they are to be distinguished from justification, and will be separately considered.

2. Sinners are justified alone on account of the atonement of Christ, or on account of the merits of his death, as a sacrificial offering for the sins of men. This doctrine of the atonement was fully considered and demonstrated, in Chapter VI. to which the reader is referred for proof. It was there proved that the sinner can be delivered from the guilt of sin, and the punishment it deserves, only by a pardon, and that such pardon can be granted only by virtue of an atonement, which atonement Christ has made by his sufferings, death and resurrection.

3. Faith is the only condition of justification. Faith by which we are justified, clearly includes both belief and trust. There must be the assent or persuasion of the mind, that the Gospel is true, that Christianity is of God, and that it reveals God's plan of saving sinners.

But this is not sufficient. Many sinners believe this intellectually, and are not justified.

Indeed, St. James tells us that " the devils believe and tremble," but the devils are not thereby justified. Many sinners believe the Gospel as a system of salvation, without being saved by it, because their faith is only an assent of the judgment to what is true, without engaging the heart and reforming the life.

To this belief there must be added trust in God, through the atonement of Jesus Christ, in order to constitute justifying faith. The belief may exist without the trust but the trust can never exist without the belief. The practical development of saving faith is described by Paul, Rom. 10: 9, 10: "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." This is a very important text and should be carefully considered. There must be the belief of the heart that God hath raised Jesus Christ from the dead. To believe with the heart, doubtless embraces more than a mere conviction or consent of the understanding, it may be regarded as embracing,

(1.) Entire sincerity and with full persuasion of the soul, without a doubt,

(2.) Such a belief as engages the affections of the soul and controls the life, conforming it to the claims of that Gospel which is thus believed. This the mere belief of the understanding, which devils and many sinners have, does not do.

The fact that God has raised Jesus Christ from the dead, the thing to be believed with the heart, is the great central truth of Christianity, and hence is named by the apostle as implying the truth and validity of the whole Gospel. It clearly implies his death as our atoning sacrifice, as well as his resurrection, as our justifying Savior; for he " was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification." Rom. 4: 25: To believe that God raised Jesus from the dead, in the apostle's sense, is to believe all the glorious doctrines which are associated with it in the Gospel plan of salvation. These must all be believed with the heart, with a faith which engages the affections and controls the life. It must be such a sincere, earnest faith as ventures upon Christ, and rests the soul's eternal interest upon the merits of his death, in full confidence. It may be summed up in these few words. I am a lost sinner; Christ died and rose again to save me; he is able to save me; he is willing to save me now; I venture upon the promise; I am saved. Such is the experience of every sinner that comes to Christ. This is what Paul means when he says, " with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." The sense is, believing in such a way as to obtain justification, as to be pardoned and treated by God as a righteous person.

There must also be the confession of the mouth. " With the mouth confession is made unto salvation." In order to justification, there must be a public confession of faith in Christ. The mouth must and will speak, when the heart believeth unto righteousness, for " of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." By an attempt to conceal the belief of the heart, by keeping the mouth closed, the believing would not be unto righteousness, there would be a coming short of justification. Hence the truth of the remark, that those who profess no religion have none. But when the heart believes with such a faith as causes the mouth to confess the things believed, the blessing of justification is received, for it is written, " if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, thou shalt be saved." This belief of the heart, and this confession of the mouth must go together, and justification will be the certain result.

(3.) This justifying faith, described above, supposes a pre-existing mental state and exercise, called repentance. Repentance is often associated with faith in gospel language, and often urged as absolutely essential to salvation.

Matt. 4: 17: "Jesus began to preach, and to say repent; for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."

Mark 1:15: "The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand; repent ye, and believe the Gospel."

Luke 13: 3: " Except ye repent, ye shall all like-wise perish."

Act 20: 21: " Testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ."

From the above texts it is clear that there can be no salvation without repentance. This does not prove that repentance is a condition of justification; it results from the fact that a state of impenitence is a state of hostility to God, and that repentance is a pre-requisite to the exercise of faith, which is the true condition of justification. No impenitent sinner can believe with his heart unto righteousness. Repentance is a sorrow for sin It is described by Paul as a " godly sorrow that worketh repentance to salvation, not to be repented of." 2 Cor. 7: 10.

There is in repentance a conviction of sin, a sense of its ill-desert, as against God, and an apprehension of, the fearful punishment, to which it renders the sinner justly liable. In this state of mind the sinner feels, and owns himself lost. There is nothing in this repentance meritorious; nothing saving in its nature, but it prepares the sinner to accept of Christ, as the only Savior of lost sinners. He is now cut off from every other hope in his own view; and accepts of the offer of salvation as tendered to him in the Gospel. He ventures upon the promise, he takes God at his word " Lord thou hast promised to save all that come to thee in the name of Jesus Christ and I come, lost and undone, to be saved now." God grants a free pardon, and he feels in his heart,

" My God is reconciled;
His pardoning voice I hear:
He owns me for his child;
I can no longer fear:
With confidence I now draw nigh,
And Father, Abba, Father, cry."

This is justification by faith.

(4.) The faith by which sinners are thus justified, also secures the renewing and supporting influence of the Holy Sprit, whereby they are enabled to live a life of obedience for time to come. There is a vital union between justifying faith, and all good works. No man can believe with the heart unto righteousness, or so as to obtain justification, while living in the practice of any known sin, or in the neglect of any known duty. God requires the entire surrender of the heart, and this demand must be complied with, before justification can take place. The sinner must come to the point where he renounces all sin, and purposes in his heart to do every duty. This must be universal and absolute in the purpose of his heart, and in practice, it must come up to the measure of light enjoyed. This purpose must abide in the heart, and be perpetually carried out in the life; every sin must be forsaken, and every duty must be performed, as sin and duty may appear in view of any increased degree of light, which may shine upon the path of progressive experience. The justified person must continue to obey, in order to retain his justification. The moment he does what he knows to be a sin, or neglects what he knows to be a duty, faith, by which he is justified, lets go its hold upon God, and he loses his justification. This view stands intimately connected with the renewal of the heart, in what is called regeneration, which is a concomitant of justification, and which will be explained hereafter. Thus is it seen that justification, which is by faith alone, carries with it entire

submission and obedience to God. It was upon this principle that St. James wrote, not to controvert the doctrine of justification by faith, but to correct an abuse of it, and to show that it cannot exist where there are not works springing from it. He says of Abraham, "Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect." This is true in every case of Christian experience. Faith precedes a life of obedience, and works in all obedience, producing the same, and by this obedience is faith itself made perfect. To say nothing about perfect faith, faith does not justify until it reaches a point where it controls the heart, and conforms the life to the rule of duty. St. James could have meant no more than that a man cannot be justified without works, that the faith which does not produce works, cannot justify, when he said, "Ye see how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." "Not by faith only," can mean nothing more nor less than, "not by faith which does not produce good works." James, at the same time, admits that Abraham was justified by faith, in Paul's sense of the subject, when he says, "And the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith, Abraham believed God and it was imputed to him for righteousness." The imputation of faith for righteousness, is the kind of justification by faith, for which Paul so earnestly contends, and James and Paul are in harmony, and the opinion entertained by some that they disagreed, is the result of a misconstruction of the fact that James found it necessary, more particularly to insist that the faith which justifies, always produces good works, that no faith can save which does not produce good works, a fact which Paul never denied, but often insisted upon.

4. Justification is an instantaneous work. As its most essential feature is that of a pardon, it is necessarily instantaneous. We cannot conceive of a gradual pardon. If justification was by the merit of works, it might be argued that it requires time for the sinner to work it out, but it is by faith. And, as there is no merit in faith, nothing is gained by regarding justification as gradual. As faith is the only condition of justification, God must justify the moment true faith is exercised. Suppose we could conceive of a pardon as gradual, can any one tell how long it would take God to fully pardon a sinner, after he began the work? Again, what would become of the sinner, if he should die when God had half pardoned him?

Having explained the leading principles of the doctrine of justification by faith, it is proper now to confirm it, by a more direct appeal to the word of God.

Acts 13: 38, 39: "Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses."

Here the forgiveness of sins, and justification, are clearly the same thing. Those who believe in Christ are justified from all things, and it is clearly made to rest upon the fact, that through him the remission of sins was preached unto them. It is clear, therefore, that to receive the remission of sins, and to be justified are the same thing. Faith is also made the condition of this justification. By him all that believe are justified, which implies that unbelievers are not justified.

Rom. 3: 20-22: "By the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified in his sight, for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe."

In this text, Paul denies that men are justified by the deeds of the law, that is, by works. He then declares that the righteousness of God, without the law, is manifested. By the righteousness of God, is meant, God's method of justifying, or of making righteous men out of unrighteous ones. This is declared to be "without the law," that is, it is without any provision of the law, without being regulated by the law, without any assistance from the law, and without obedience to the law, as a condition of justification.

This righteousness of God, this plan of justifying sinners, is "by faith of Jesus Christ." It is through faith in Jesus Christ, that this righteousness of God is embraced, and it is unto all, and upon all them that believe."

How this is brought about through faith in Christ, is more fully explained in verses 24-26: "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness, for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness; that God might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus."

In this text, we have the doctrine of justification by faith so plainly set forth, that it is difficult to make it any plainer than Paul himself has made it. Observe,

1. They are justified freely by his grace. Grace is undeserved goodness. They are freely justified, that is without merit or claim, or consideration on their part.
2. This justification is, "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." It is not a mere prerogative act, but an act done in consideration of what Christ has done and suffered, as the sinner's substitute. This redemption which is in Christ Jesus, and through which God justifies sinners, is further explained where it is said, that God has "set Christ forth to be a propitiation for the remission of sins that are past." "A propitiation," that is, an atoning sacrifice; for so the word signifies. This is further explained, and the sense made sure, when it is added, that it is "through faith in his blood," that he becomes an available propitiation for us, securing our justification.
3. This whole plan of an atonement, or of setting Christ forth to be a propitiation, an atoning sacrifice, is that God "might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." This clearly implies, that without the atonement, God could not justify sinners consistently with the claims of justice. Faith is, through the whole, kept in view as the condition of receiving justification.
4. The justification resulting from this divine economy, through faith in Jesus Christ, consists of a pardon. God's righteousness is declared, "for the remission of sins that are

past, that God might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Thus is it plain, that to remit past sins, is to justify, in the apostle's sense. To remit sin, is to pardon the sinner, and to exempt him from the punishment his sins deserve. In this sense Paul clearly taught the doctrine of justification by faith. From these premises the apostle comes to the conclusion, in the 28th verse, " Therefore, we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law."

Rom. 4: 5: " But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." This text is clear and decisive.

1. The persons justified are ungodly persons; they are sinners guilty and ill-deserving.
2. They are such as work not. That is such as had not kept the law, for had they done all the works of the law, they would not have been ungodly. Nor did they work, or depend upon their works, as a means of justification.
3. They simply believed on him that justifieth the ungodly; that is God, They believe his promise made and ratified in Jesus Christ, and their faith is counted for righteousness, and such are justified by faith.

Rom. 5: 1: " Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."

This text not only proves that justification is by faith, but also that a state of justification, is a state of reconciliation to God, and of communion with him. " Peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Through him as our atonement, our propitiation, as the " one mediator between God and men."

Gal. 2: 16: " Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even as we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." This needs no comment to make it teach the doctrine of justification by faith, and by faith alone.

There is but one more point to be considered, and that is the relation between faith and justification. This is a point in regard to which there has existed, in some minds, very great confusion.

There is no merit in believing. There is nothing in the nature of faith which annuls or removes the guilt of past sin. Believing does not justify him who believes. It is God that justifies the believer, not his faith, not his belief. In regard to the relation between faith and justification, two things may be affirmed.

1. Faith is the condition upon which God has seen fit to promise pardon to sinners. When sinners believe in Jesus, God, according to his own Gospel plan, forgives their sins, that

is, he justifies them. But he does it for Christ's sake, on account of what Christ has suffered, in whom the faith is centered, upon whose atonement it rests for salvation.

2. True faith, when exercised by a sinner, is accepted by God, in the place of obedience which the sinner should have rendered, but which he has failed to render. On this important point, let the proof be spread before the reader.

Rom. 4: 3: " Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness."

Verse 5: " But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."

Verse 9: " For we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness."

Verse 22: " And, therefore, it was imputed to him for righteousness."

Gal. 3: 6: " Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness."

James 2: 23: " Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness."

In these texts, faith is said to be reckoned for righteousness, counted for righteousness, accounted for righteousness, and imputed for righteousness. The sense is the same in every case. The difference is only in the translation; the same Greek word, *logizomai*, is used in the original of all these texts. The simple sense is that faith was accepted or put to the credit, for, that is, in the place of righteousness. By righteousness, obedience to the law is meant, the state of being and doing right. This all men owe to God, but they have failed to obey, and now they can never obey God for the time past during which they disobeyed.

The law demands righteousness, but it is impossible; the sinner cannot obey for past time, but he can believe, he comes to God not bringing the righteousness which he owes, but he brings faith in the merits of Christ's death, and God places that to his credit, for or in the place of the righteousness he owes, and justifies, that is, pardons him, and treats him as though he was righteous, as though he had always obeyed the law.

This is what is to be understood by faith being counted, reckoned, or imputed for righteousness. This is justification by faith, while the atonement of Christ is the meritorious ground of justification.

SECTION II.

Regeneration. —The New Birth.

The reader's attention is now invited to the great and vital subject of regeneration. It will not be necessary to wade through all the false theories of regeneration which have been

advocated by different classes of errorists, but only to present a clear statement of the truth on the subject, as it is found in the word of God, and as felt and observed in deeply experienced Christians.

I. It is proper to explain the nature of regeneration.

Regeneration is a renewal of our fallen nature, by the power of the Holy Spirit, received through faith in Jesus Christ, whereby the regenerate are delivered from the power of sin which reigns over all the unregenerate, so that they love God, and, through grace serve him with the affections of the heart.

That regeneration is all that is implied in the above definition must be seen from but slight attention to the different terms employed to describe it.

The word regeneration is used but twice in the New Testament, and but once applied to the change under consideration. It is in Titus 3: 5: " Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."

The Greek word here rendered regeneration, is *palingenesia*, which is compounded of *palm*, again, and *genesis*, to be, literally, again to be, or, to be again. This is very forcible, as the change restores man to a new spiritual life, which was lost by the fall. The Apostle was speaking of a work already wrought, a change which had already taken place. " He hath saved us," describes a work already done. This work was effected by the washing of regeneration; that is such a washing as caused us again to be, again to exist in the image, life and favor of God, which were lost by the fall. The word washing is used in a figurative sense, perhaps with reference to water baptism. As it is by washing that a thing is made clean, so the purification of the heart is called the washing of regeneration, such a cleansing as makes the heart new and clean. The above sense of washing is confirmed by the expression, " renewing of the Holy Ghost." This proves the change to be wholly spiritual, and that the Spirit is the efficient agent in its accomplishment. To be regenerated, is, clearly, to be renewed by the Holy Ghost. The other terms used by the inspired writers to describe this change, are no less significant.

John 1: 12, 13: " But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believed on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

Here the same change is called being born of God. And what is it to be born of God, more or less than to be renewed by God's Holy Spirit? It is clearly the same thing as the " renewing of the Holy Ghost," and that is the same as the " washing of regeneration." Those who are said in the text last quoted, to have been " born of God," were, thereby rendered the " sons of God." " To them gave he power to become the sons of God." As by natural birth, we are the sons of natural fathers, so by being born of God, we are the sons of God.

John 3" 3, 5: " Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God. Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God."

Here the allusion is probably to baptism. To be baptized is, probably, to be born of water, in the Saviour's sense. But while baptism is named as a new birth by water, it can only be figuratively, as a sign of the internal washing and renewal of the heart, by the Holy Ghost. It is the Spirit which renews the heart, and not the water. This is certain from the 6th verse: " That which is born of the flesh is flesh: and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." It is clearly a birth by the Spirit, that produces spirituality of heart and mind. It is not the water externally applied, but the renewing of the Spirit within, that saves. Christ joins the water and the Spirit in this great change, and man has no right to separate them. Baptism is a Christian duty, and if all attended to this duty, in every case of a new birth by the Spirit, the water externally applied, would signify and witness to the washing of the heart by the Spirit. That the Savior meant more than an external washing, more than any external form or ceremony, or any mere change of opinion or outward habits of life, is certain, from the wonder his words excited in Nicodemus. He was familiar with form? ceremonies, sprinklings and ablutions. Gentile proselytes were received into the Jewish communion by water baptism, and had our Saviour's words meant no more, all would have been plain to Nicodemus. But the renewing of the Holy Ghost, was a matter he did not understand.

Should it be urged that the words of Christ, as understood above, still make water baptism essential to salvation, the reply is, it is no objection at all; it is admitted, that as a rule, baptism is necessary to salvation. There can be no doubt that all the converts under the Apostle's ministry, were baptized, nor could they have been saved without it. They had an inspired ministry, and when that ministry preached " Repent and be baptized, every one of you," there could have been no salvation without baptism. Baptism is still a Christian duty, and as a rule, the performance all duties is essential to salvation. Those who are not baptized can be saved, only on the same ground that persons may be saved who neglect other duties. The rule is that we must do all duties but when the head is wrong, when the intellect is dark, when the judgment is misinformed, and the heart is right, a person neglecting to be baptized may be saved, as those whose motives are right but who err in judgment, may be saved in neglect of anything else which is commanded in the Gospel.

But while all this is admitted, it does not follow that any can be saved without being born of the Spirit. There is a wide difference between baptism by water, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. Baptism by water is a work which man performs; the renewing of the Holy Ghost is a work which God performs. We may suppose that water baptism may be administered to persons who are not renewed by the Spirit, in which case there is no salvation from sin accompanying it. So we may suppose that the renewing of the Spirit may take place in those who have not yet received water baptism, in which case salvation transpires without baptism, for the renewal of the heart by the Spirit, is salvation itself. These remarks have been thus extended for the purpose of shewing that Christ clearly taught the doctrine of regeneration by the Spirit, without teaching baptismal regeneration.

Eph. 2: 5: " Even when we were dead in sins, hath he quickened us together with Christ." The expression, " together with Christ," is an allusion to Christ's resurrection. As God raised Christ from the dead, so had he quickened those who were dead in sins. God had already quickened them by a moral resurrection, as he had raised Christ from the grave. To quicken, is to give life to, to cause to live. Verse 10: " For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." Here the same change is called a creation in Christ Jesus, and as it is " unto good of works," it is clear that this creation is a renewal of the heart, so that with its affections the subject of the change obeys God.

Eph. 4: 24: " And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."

Col. 3: 10: " And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him."

These texts imply an entire moral renovation, all that is included in the definition given of regeneration at the opening of this section. In the last text, there is a clear allusion to the fact that man was created in the image of God, and he is declared to be renewed after this image; regeneration is therefore a restoration of humanity to its pristine state, a recovery of what it lost through the fall.

From all that has been said, it follows that regeneration is not a physical, but exclusively a moral change. There are no new powers of the mind or affections of the soul created, but the soul, with all its powers and affections is renewed, and turned from wrong to right. There is a change of disposition or bent of mind. The heart, the mind, ceases to be " enmity against God," as is the carnal mind, and love to God, becomes the ruling passion of the soul, producing obedience. There is a change in the feelings, peace and joy fill the heart. There is a change of relations, the regenerate become the children of God, " and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ." And this leads to a final remark, which is, that there is a change in the hopes and prospects of the soul, heaven is contemplated as a final home, and eternal life, and glory, and joy, as an ultimate destiny.

Having explained the nature of the change called regeneration, it is proper to remark:
II. Regeneration is an instantaneous change. In point of time, it takes place at the moment of justification. Justification may be regarded first in point of order or classification, but in point of time, both are instantaneous, and transpire at the same moment. When God changes the heart he does it at once, in a moment. It does not take God a year, nor a month, nor a week, nor a day, nor yet an hour, to regenerate a soul, when that soul exercises the required faith. Nor does God half regenerate souls, the whole work is done, or no part of it is done. The absurdity of a gradual regeneration, or regeneration by a succession of acts by which it is accomplished, part at a time, is too manifestly absurd to need refutation. Yet, as every absurd notion has its advocates, it may be well to glance at some of the objections to the idea of gradual regeneration.

1. The idea of a gradual regeneration, implies that God is limited in his power to work. Faith is the condition, and faith must exist before the work of regeneration can begin, and when faith, the only condition, is exercised, God has promised to do the work, and if it does not take place at the moment true faith is exercised, it must be because God needs time, because he has not power to do it in a moment.

2. The idea of a gradual regeneration would embarrass the exercise of faith, as it would place the object desired, prayed and believed for, regeneration, beyond the possibility of the present moment, without giving any information how distant it is in point of time, how soon we may obtain it, or how long we may have to wait. It will not be pretended that God has anywhere in the Bible, told us how long it takes him to regenerate a soul, upon the supposition that it is not an instantaneous work.

3. It involves the absurdity, of supposing that there is a time in the history of moral accountable agents, when they possess no distinctive moral character. Suppose a sinner, no matter how wicked, and by re-generation he becomes a saint, no matter how good, if regeneration is gradual, there must be a time during the process of the change, when he is neither good nor bad, neither a sinner nor a saint.

4. It would involve the absurdity of supposing a class of persons not proper subjects of heaven or hell. If regeneration is gradual, there must be a time in the history of every person regenerated, when they are half regenerated. A person only half renewed, would not be fit for heaven, and one who should be half renewed, would not be fit for hell. Such an one would make a strange specter in perdition with God's renewing work half finished upon him."

5. All the recorded facts in regard to regeneration are against the idea of a gradual work, and support the theory of an instantaneous change.

Matt. 9: 2: " Jesus seeing their faith, said unto the sick of the palsy, son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee." The forgiveness of sin is inseparable from regeneration, therefore Christ regenerated that sinner that moment.

Luke 7: 47: " I say unto thee, her sins, which are many, are all forgiven." This must have been done in a short time, for she went into the house a sinner.

Luke 23: 43: " Christ said to the dying criminal, " To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." In a few moments Christ was dead, and so was the other in a very short time. Regeneration must have been accomplished within an hour or two in this case.

At the day of Pentecost, three thousand were regenerated in less than one day.

The keeper of the prison and his whole household appear to have been regenerated in about an hour. Acts 16: 33, 34.

As plain as is the doctrine of instantaneous regeneration, it needs to be guarded against abuse.

1. It is not to be understood that a previous preparation of mind is not necessary, which may require time, sometimes longer, sometimes shorter. There must at least be some gospel light, some knowledge of the plan of salvation. The sinner's attention must be directed to the subject, and there must be conviction, what some call an awakening. There must be genuine repentance, and faith must be exercised, and the moment it is, regeneration takes place. This previous mental preparation does not require the same length of time in every case. Sometimes it all transpires in a very short time; in others, it is the work of weeks, months, or years. Yet, it need not require so long a time.

2. It is not to be understood by instantaneous regeneration, that the regenerated person is necessarily thereby rendered perfect, or has reached the highest degree of Christian attainment. Regeneration reverses the current of the affections, and so renews the whole soul that all the Christian graces exist. They may not all exist in an equal degree of maturity and power, but they are all there. They may not, they do not usually, any of them, exist in full maturity and power. A child may be a perfect child in all its members, there may be no member wanting, yet none of them are matured, and when the child has grown to manhood there will be only the same members in number and kind, more fully developed. So the newly regenerated person, is born again, is a child of God, but may yet be only a babe in Christ, and he must grow and increase in strength.

There may be great moral weakness with the regenerated person; with some, more than others, as the moral constitution of some may have been more injured by sin than others, and when the disease is removed, there will remain greater weakness, and greater danger of relapse. A man who has long been accustomed to habits of inebriation, or who has long suffered the passion of anger to rage on every slight provocation, or who has habitually indulged in any one vice for a long time, will feel a peculiar weakness in the direction of that particular sin, and will be more liable to be overcome by temptation in that direction than in any other. There must, therefore, be maintained constant watchfulness and a perpetual warfare, by which the babe in Christ will become a strong man. There is one text which some have regarded as contradicting this view, and which others have found very difficult to explain, and reconcile with their peculiar views of the regenerate state, which shall be introduced at this point.

1 John 3: 9: " Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."

Some have supposed that this text proves the doctrine of Christian perfection, and others have attempted so to explain it, as to make it refute that doctrine. Both are, no doubt, wrong, the text cannot relate to that subject. The text certainly proves nothing against the doctrine, for it does not affirm or intimate that we cannot live without sin. On the other hand, it cannot be relied upon to prove the doctrine of Christian perfection, as held by some, because it affirms, of all that are born of God, whereas the believers in the doctrine do not contend that all who are Christians, are perfect, or wholly sanctified. If it be made

to bear this interpretation, it will prove equally certain, that no person ever does or ever can sin after being born of God. It affirms, that "whosoever," that is, any one and every one, that "is born of God does not commit sin." Yet it is a matter of fact that many, not to say all, who are born of God do sin, sometimes at least, and some fall grossly into sin. Again, the text affirms, that "he " the person that is born of God, " cannot sin," but we know they can sin, and too frequently do sin. What, then, is the true exposition of the text. It cannot mean what is not true, but must mean what is true. In what sense, then, is it true, that persons born of God do not sin, cannot sin? The Apostle is discussing the difference between the regenerate and the unregenerate, and this is true in regard to the difference. The unregenerate, sin as a habit of life, with them a life of sin is the rule; the regenerate do not sin as a habit of life, obedience, holiness is the rule with them, and when Christians sin, as they sometimes do, it is an exception. This is all that is true of the whole number that are born of God. The expression, " he cannot sin," means, he cannot sin as a habit of life, as the rule of living, for, with all who are born of God, obedience and holiness is the rule. We must also make a distinction between sin committed as a habit of life and by deliberate thought, and set purpose of heart, and sin committed as an exception to general habit of life, by sudden impulse under strong provocation or powerful temptation. This distinction common sense makes, all churches make it in matters of discipline, and the Gospel makes it. There are many Christians who can affirm, with a clear conscience, that they have never committed a deliberate willful sin since they were converted, but there are but few, if any, who will affirm, that they have never sinned since they were converted. Here, then, is the distinction. Here are two members of the same church. One by a preconcerted and deeply laid plan, perpetrates a deliberate wrong. The other, under strong provocation becomes angry and uses sinful language. He was a man addicted to passion before he was converted, and this is his weak point, and this is his first offence since he was converted. Both are arraigned before the church, and the one who committed the deliberate wrong finds no sympathy more than any common sinner would; the other says, " I was wrong, I have sinned in letting my anger get the upper hand, I am sorry, I will try to be more watchful, and I pray God to forgive me, and I hope you, brethren, will forgive me;" and he has the deep sympathy of every true hearted Christian, and his sin is overlooked. It is in this sense that regenerate persons too frequently sin, not of necessity, but through weakness and strong temptation, and how many have thus sinned without entirely falling, or wholly losing the advantages of their regenerate state, the experience of all Christians, if summed up on the subject, would show. The Scriptures, in many other texts, clearly teach that the regenerate are not only in danger of sinning, not only that they can sin, but they do often sin, without final apostasy, which is also a possible case.

Gal. 6: 1: " Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such a one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.

1 John 2: 1: " My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous."

These texts prove that regenerate persons may commit sin.

Chap 5: 16: "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death."

Sin is sin, and all sin, if persisted in, is unto death; for " sin, when finished, bringeth forth death." This text, which has so terribly troubled commentators, will be plain, if understood in the light of the subject under consideration. Observe, it refers to regenerate persons. For the Apostle, to talk about seeing a common sinner, one who sins as a habit of life, and who is dead in sins, sin a sin unto death, would be to talk without sense. He who is alive, alone can sin unto death. The sense, then, may be this: " a sin not unto death," may be a sin committed as above supposed, as an exception to the general habit of life, through weakness, and sudden and powerful temptation. Such a sin is not unto death, if repented of and forsaken so soon as the mind is restored to a state of calm reflection, and the will rallies and makes its determination of its future course with reference to the wrong act. On asking, the life of God in the soul, the life of peace and joy is restored to such an one. By a sin unto death, a deliberate willful sin may be meant, such a sin as amounts to a heart abandonment of Christianity. Such are not subjects of prayer, as erring Christian brethren, but only in the sense that all sinners are to be prayed for.

John cannot have meant to say that they should ask life for all sinners, except those who had committed the unpardonable sin, so called, and life should be given.

It is hoped that the reader has not lost sight of the question, which is, that instantaneous regeneration does not imply that regenerated persons are necessarily thereby, rendered perfect, or have reached the highest degree of Christian attainment. The power of sin is broken, the principle of obedience is planted in the heart, holiness is the rule and habit of life, and an increase in the strength and development of all the Christian virtues is a duty. Here the state of the regenerate must rest for the present.

III. It is proper to notice the relation which regeneration sustains to justification, noting at the same time, wherein the one differs from the other. The facts to be exhibited under this head, have been involved, to a large extent, in what already has been said on the two subjects, but it will give greater clearness to present a condensed view at this point.

Justification and regeneration are concomitant, that is, they transpire at the same time, and exist together. It may be said, that God never pardons a sinner without renewing him, and never renews a sinner without forgiving all his past sins at the same time. Yet there is a wide difference between them.

1. Justification is a work done for us, but regeneration is a work done in us.
2. Justification changes our relation to God, and restores us to his favor by a pardon, while regeneration changes our state, our real character.
3. Justification removes the guilt of the sin which we have committed, while regeneration removes the love of sin and takes away our bent of sinning.

4. Justification removes the punishment we deserve, remits the penalty of the law, but regeneration plants the principle of obedience in the heart.

5. Justification brings the favor of God, while regeneration brings back the image of God, and again impresses it upon the soul.

SECTION III.

Adoption.

1. Adoption is the act of God, whereby he, in the exercise of free grace, receives sinners, who were strangers, aliens and enemies, into his family, and constitutes them his children and heirs of his eternal glory.

That true Christians are the children of God, sons and daughters, is too plain to need proof. They become such by adoption. On this point the word of God is plain.

Rom. 8: 15; " Ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba Father."

Gal. 4: 4, 5: " When the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."

Eph. 1: 5: " Having predestinated us unto the adoption of sons by Jesus Christ, to himself."

Besides these texts which speak of adoption by name, there are many which imply the same fact.

2 Cor. 6: 17,18: " Come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."

Eph. 2: 19: " Now, therefore, ye are" no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God."

Gal. 3: 26: " Ye are all the children of God by faith." Of course they were not the children of God before they had faith.

1 John 3: 1: " Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the sons of God."

2. Adoption is concomitant with justification and regeneration, and cannot be separated from them. It does not appear to be a distinct act of God, but to be involved in those of justifying and regenerating sinners. As justification changes our relation to God, and as

regeneration renews us after the likeness of God, the two appear to embrace the entire operation of constituting us the children of God, that is, of adopting us. At any rate, it is perfectly certain that adoption takes place at the same time we are justified and regenerated.

3. Adoption, as a matter of course, constitutes us heirs of God and entitles us to the inheritance of his children.

Rom. 8: 17: " If children then heirs: heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ."

Gal. 4: 7: " Wherefore thou art no more a servant but a son: and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ."

Col. 1: 12: " Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light."

Heb. 9: 15: " He is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."

1 Peter 1: 4: " To an inheritance, incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you."

The inheritance includes the redemption of the body from the grave and eternal life, which in a Scriptural sense, implies eternal happiness and glory, in a word, all the beatitudes of heaven. But these are points which will require attention under another head.

SECTION IV.

The Evidence by which persons may know their acceptance with God. — The Witness of the Spirit. — Assurance.

No subject is more important to those who professes to be children of God, than the one proposed to be discussed in this section. This place has been selected for its consideration, because it sustains an equal relation to the three subjects discussed in the last three sections.

It has been shown that justification, regeneration, and adoption are concomitant blessings, that they exist together, but never exist separately.

Any one argument therefore, which can prove either of these blessings to have been attained or to be enjoyed by an individual, must prove the presence of all three. Having explained the nature of these blessings, and established the fact that they exist with, or are enjoyed by all true believers, all true Christians, all the real children of God by faith, it is now more proper to discuss the question, by what evidence may an individual be satisfied

that he is a child of God? than to have discussed it before considering these points, or in connection with either of them alone.

The whole truth may now be exhibited in support of either part, justification, regeneration, or adoption, and it will all bear equally on the same great fact, that the person to whom it relates is a child of God, has passed from death unto life.

There is no fact about which it is so important to be sure as this. The point proposed to be proved, is that Christians may know their calling, may attain to a satisfactory knowledge that they have been justified, regenerated, and adopted, and that they are the children of God by faith. But before opening the argument, it is proper to define the question, and guard against a misapplication of the principles and proof.

I. The argument is not to be understood as designed to prove that there is no possibility or even danger of being deceived or mistaken in regard to our religious state.

There is danger, and no doubt many are deceived or mistaken and rest their hope of heaven upon insufficient proof.

But it is maintained that men need not be mistaken, that if they will be honest and thorough with themselves, they may know their true condition.

2. It is not pretended that real Christians are not sometimes in doubt in regard to their acceptance with God. It is admitted that they are, but it is insisted that it is not necessary, or if it appears to arise necessarily from their circumstance, at the time of their conversion, their doubts may be dissipated by a progressive experience, if they are faithful and true to the light they have. Christian experience, while presenting a general sameness, is in some respects, exceedingly various.

Some appear to be born into the kingdom, as amid the light of noon with full assurance, while others enjoy but an obscure light at the moment of conversion. Their experience is like that of the traveler who approaches a longed for town amid the darkness of night; his eye catches the faint glimmer of a light in the distance; so faint that at first he doubts whether or not it be a light. As he advances it becomes more distinct, yet he may doubt if it be the light of the town, but a few more progressive steps satisfies him; there is no doubt that the light of the town flashes upon him.

3. It is not pretended that all Christians enjoy the same degree of assurance at all times. Different persons, who are real Christians, may enjoy different degrees of assurance, and the same Christian may enjoy clearer evidence of his acceptance with God at one time than at another. This arises from different causes, which need not be explained. One general cause, however, is a difference in the degree of faith exercised, and in the degree of devotedness to God. All Christians are not equally faithful and devoted to God, and equally matured in Christian experience, while too many vacillate, and appear to enjoy the undoubted smile of the divine favor to-day, who, tomorrow, will be found upon the vapor-clad banks of the river of Babylon, with their harps hanged upon the willows.

These are eccentricities in Christian experience, which are to be deplored and corrected; they are not necessary. All these admissions prove nothing against the main fact, that it is possible, that it is the privilege and duty of every Christian to enjoy constantly an assurance of his acceptance with God. The way is now prepared for the introduction of the proof, that Christians may know that they are justified, that they are born of God and adopted into his family.

I. The witness of the Holy Spirit is the first proof to be named, by which we may know our acceptance with God.

This is an important matter, and involves the vitality of Christianity, by involving the question of the direct influence of the Holy Spirit, on the hearts of men, which gives to Christianity its vital, soul-renewing, and saving power. The gift of the Holy Spirit is one of the richest blessings which flows from the Redeemer's mediation; it is the blessing, without which, all other blessings poured upon us would be lost.

The Scriptures teach that the Holy Spirit does witness within believers, to their acceptance with God. Let the argument be opened with the most direct and conclusive text.

Rom. 8: 16: "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God."

1. This text clearly speaks of the Holy Spirit.

The Apostle is speaking of the Holy Spirit, verse 11: "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you."

This is the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit.

Verse 14: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God."

Of this same Spirit the Apostle says, "The Spirit itself beareth witness."

Indeed, the expression, "the Spirit itself," can mean nothing but the Holy Spirit, It cannot mean our spirit; that is separately named. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with *our* spirit." The Spirit itself is clearly distinguished from our spirit. It cannot mean a disposition or temper of mind, for the simple reason that a disposition cannot be distinguished from our own spirits. Our disposition or temper of mind, is in fact the mind itself.

2. The expression, "beareth witness with our spirit," is so plain and direct, that it cannot be so explained as to mean anything else. To bear witness, is to give evidence, or to testify, and if the text means anything, it means that the Holy Spirit does, in some way, testify within the children of God, to the fact that they are his children. It is true some writers render it, "beareth witness *to* our spirits," but this does not destroy its proof to

the main fact, it only affects the mode; the Spirit still " beareth witness that we are the children of God," and that is the only vital point in the argument. The most obvious sense of the text, however, is as follows: The Spirit itself beareth witness to our minds, and our spirit bears witness to the same fact, that we are the children of God. We have the testimony of the Holy Spirit, and we have the testimony of *our* own spirit. It is the testimony of the Holy Spirit, which is now under consideration. The fact that the Spirit testifies within us, is so directly and positively affirmed, that the only room for controversy or cavil, must be in regard to the manner. But if the manner was entirely a mystery, it would not invalidate so plainly a stated fact.

When Nicodemus was utterly unable to understand the Saviour's doctrine of the new birth, and enquired how it could be, he received for an answer, " The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." If no clearer explanation could be given of the manner in which, " the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God," the fact would remain the same, resting upon the authority of the word of God.

3. The most rational and simple explanation of the manner in which the Spirit beareth witness, is given, when it is said that it is by the direct action of the Spirit on the mind, producing an impression or conviction, that my sins are forgiven, and that I am a child of God. Nothing short of this appears to meet the full force of the language employed.

To this, it has been objected, that it amounts to a revelation from God in the soul. The writer does not call it a revelation, but chooses to limit that term, by way of pre-eminence, to that action of the Spirit, whereby truth was communicated to the authors of the sacred Scriptures, for the benefit of the world. But if others choose to call this witness of the Spirit, a revelation, there can be no valid objection to it. Suppose it were said, God makes a revelation in the souls of his children, of the fact that they are his children, what would be the error, or wherein would it go in sense, beyond the sense of the simple words of Paul, " The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God." The revelation, if it be called a revelation, is limited to a single fact, and that fact is clearly proved to be made known by the Spirit in some way. Nor is the objection of force, which affirms that this view renders the testimony uncertain, and tends to self-deception. The Spirit can testify within a Christian, that he is a child of God, just as clearly and satisfactory, as it could testify in Agabus, that the Jews would bind Paul. Acts 21: 11. To deny that the Spirit can produce a certain conviction in the mind, in regard to our acceptance with God, would be to take the infidel ground, that God cannot reveal truth to the human mind by the direct action of the Spirit.

But in this case, there are corroborating proofs of the fact, to which the Spirit gives witness, which cannot fail to render it certain, but these must be made distinct points of discussion.

4. Other texts of Scripture which clearly relate to the same point, confirm the exposition given of Rom. 8: 16, considered above. It was said that that was the most direct and

conclusive text, but there are many more which confirm the view given of it, some of which shall be now adduced. The two preceding verses are clear on the subject.

"For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." The original is Abba, Pateer. These two words both signify the same thing. Abba, is the Syriac word for father, and Pateer is the Greek word for father, and our translators have rendered the latter by the English word, father, and left the former untranslated. But observe.

1. "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." Here is the direct action of the Spirit of God upon the mind, for without it they could not be led by it. To be led by it is to respond to its promptings and the influence which it exerts upon the mind.

2. All such are the sons of God, in fact, and have been adopted into God's family.

3. Of this fact they have a negative proof, in the absence of fear and condemnation, or in their emancipation from the slavery and guilt of sin, " for they had not received the spirit of bondage again unto fear." They once had this spirit, but now they are free from it.

4. They had the evidence of the presence of the opposite spirit. " Ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba Father." This was the Holy Spirit, Called " the Spirit of adoption," because it was by its action that they were renewed and adopted, because it produced in them the affections and tempers of children towards God, and because by its presence, their adoption was proved. They had received the Spirit of adoption whereby they cried Abba Father. How could they cry Abba Father by the Spirit, unless they knew that they had the Spirit? The Spirit first witnessed within them, that they were the children of God, and on the ground this testimony, they call God their Father, or, in the words of Paul, " cry Abba Father." The Apostle having stated this general fact, he more specifically states how it is that they can call God their Father by the Spirit of adoption that is in them, " For the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." The language, " For the Spirit itself beareth witness," following the declaration that they had received the Spirit of adoption whereby they cried " Abba Father," becomes not only an explanation of what had preceded, but a reason why they cried Abba Father. Because the Spirit bore witness that they were the children of God, they cried Abba Father, and their crying was not the first witness to themselves that the Spirit gave, or the witness of the Spirit itself, but was the result of the witness the Spirit first bore that they were the children of God. The order of antecedence and sequence is this, " the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits that we are the children of God," which is the antecedent, and then as a sequence, " we cry Abba Father." It would subvert the whole of the Apostle's argument, to change the order, and say that we cry Abba Father, as an antecedent, and then infer as a sequence, that we are the children of God.

Gal. 4: 6: " And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba Father." There can be but little doubt that the Holy Spirit is here

meant by the " Spirit of his Son." It may be so called because he was anointed with it, and God gave it to him without measure, because it was the active power by which he performed all his works, by which he was raised from the dead, it is sent in response to his prayer, in his name, and to testify of him. It cannot properly mean the disposition or temper of mind which Jesus Christ had, for the simple reason that it is said to be sent forth into their hearts. This is not proper language if spoken of a disposition or temper of mind, but exactly suits the usual representations of the Holy Ghost; it is poured out, sent into the world, shed abroad. This Spirit cries, " Abba Father," that is, bear-eth witness that God is our Father, and that we are his children. It prompts us to call God Father, by revealing the fact of our adoption.

1 John 5: 10: " He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." Here the declaration is positive that the believer has the witness in himself. That this witness is the Spirit, is clear from the connection. Verse 6: " It is the Spirit that beareth witness."

Verse 8: " There are three that beareth witness in the earth, the Spirit and the water and the blood." From these premises it is concluded that " He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." But it cannot be the water or the blood that is within him, it must therefore be the Spirit that is the witness in him.

II. The witness of the Christian's own spirit, is another proof by which he may know that he is a child of God. This proof may comprehend that entire class of feelings which distinguish a Christian from a sinner; which distinguishes a child of God from one who is not a child of God.

Let the argument be opened with the text already so largely considered in regard to the witness of the Spirit. " The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." This represents the Holy Spirit, and our spirit as giving a joint testimony to the same fact. The witness of the Holy Spirit has been considered, but what is the witness of our spirit? This is,

1. Our consciousness of the fact that the Holy Spirit does bear witness that we are the children of God. If the Spirit bears witness within us, it must be a matter of consciousness, and this consciousness assures us that we do not mistake the fact that the Spirit beareth witness. Consciousness is the highest degree of evidence, that of which a man is conscious cannot be proved by any clearer or more certain evidence. This renders the proof sure as the witness of our own spirit perfectly confirms the witness of the Holy Spirit, as follows.

Whatever the Holy Spirit testifies, must be true, hence, the only doubt is as to the fact that it does testify. If the Holy Spirit testifies that I am a child of God, then it is certain that I am, for the Spirit cannot lie. Here consciousness comes in and affirms that the Spirit does thus testify, and consciousness is the highest proof the soul can have of any fact.

2. The testimony of our own spirit is a good conscience towards God and all men. Conscience taken alone would not be sufficient proof, yet it is an indispensable item in the chain of evidence. This proof is clearly alluded to by the Apostle.

1. John 3: 19, 20, 21: " And hereby know we that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him. For if our hearts condemn us. God is greater than our hearts, and knoweth all things. Beloved if our hearts condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God."

A man's heart condemns him in the Apostles sense, when his conscience condemns him.

Paul applies the same rule of evidence to the Gentiles. Rom. 2: 15: " Which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing one another."

The apostle appeals to this rule of evidence in proof of his own declaration. Rom. 9: 1: "I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost."

2 Cor. 1: 12: " For our rejoicing is this the testimony of our conscience."

3. The testimony of our own spirits arises from the peace and joy which reign in the hearts of true believers.

Psa. 119: 165: " Great peace have they that love thy law and nothing shall offend them."

Rom. 5: 1,5: " Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulation also; knowing that tribulation work-eth patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us."

Luke 17: 21: " Behold the kingdom of God is within you." Rom. 14: 17: " The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

Rom. 15: 13: " Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost."

John 16: 24: " Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full."

Phil. 4: 7: " And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding shall keep your hearts and minds through Jesus Christ."

1 John 1: 4: " These things write we unto you, that your joy maybe full."

It is a sufficient comment upon all these texts, to say that they describe a state of things, which cannot exist and remain unknown to the person, in whose mind the development takes place. Let one more text be quoted under this head.

1 John 3: 14: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren."

This language is clear and positive, and represents Christians as knowing that they are Christians by their own feelings. They feel a love to the brethren which an unbeliever does not and cannot feel.

4. The descriptions given in the word of God, of the change by which sinners become Christians, clearly prove that it is a fact to be known by those who experience it. The figures are borrowed from natural things, and are so striking that they cannot be employed to represent an unknown change. The mind must take cognizance of the change where it takes place, and of the new state, where it exists, and our spirits consequently bear witness with the Spirit itself, that we are the children of God. The change is described as so great as to leave no room to suppose that either our consciousness or our judgment can overlook it.

(1.) It is represented as a transition from darkness to light.

Acts 26:18: "To turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive the forgiveness of sins."

This Paul declares was the object of his mission to the Gentiles, and it will not be pretended that he, under God, could do this and the Gentiles not know it.

Eph. 5: 8: " For ye were sometime darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of the Light."

These, Paul had turned from darkness to light.

Col. 1: 13: " Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son."

1 Peter 2: 9: " But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praise of him, who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light."

It would have been marvelous indeed, if such a people had not known themselves, after an inspired Apostle had told them who and what they were, in addition to what they had felt in their own experience.

(2.) The change from nature to grace is represented as a release from imprisonment, and as an emancipation from bondage or servitude.

Luke 4: 18: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised."

This is descriptive of the effects of the Gospel. Those who are saved by the Gospel are represented as experiencing what is properly described as the healing of a broken heart, as a release from captivity, as the bringing out of a prisoner from prison where he was bruised and galled with irons that bound him. Such representations cannot refer to a change that cannot be known.

John 8: 36: " If the Son, therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

This refers to a release from bondage, as an illustration of the change which takes place in the state of one whom Christ saves from sin.

Rom. 6: 18, 22: " Being then made free from sin, ye become the servants of righteousness. But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life."

Rom. 8: 1,2:" There is therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, hath made me free from the law of sin and death."

Such language can describe none but a change and a state which may be known.

(3.) The change from nature to grace is represented as a moral resurrection, a restoration from death to life.

John 5: 24: " Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation but is passed from death unto life."

The expression, " hath passed from death unto life," denotes the change through which a sinner passes, when he becomes a Christian.

Eph. 2: 1, 6: " And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins Even when we were dead in sins, he hath quickened us together with Christ."

Col. 2: 13: " And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him having forgiven you all trespasses."

5. Another and final ground upon which our spirits bear witness, that we are the children of God, is a general conformity to the requirements of the Gospel.

John 14: 21, 23: " He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me, shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him. Jesus answered and said unto him, if a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him."

1 John 2: 5: " But whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in aim."

Chap. 3: 24: " And he that keepeth his commandments, dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us."

To say that a man cannot know whether or not he keeps the commandments, is virtually to deny human responsibility in regard to them. How can a man be held responsible for not doing that in regard to which he has not and cannot have light enough to know when he has done it. To admit that a man can know that he keeps the commandments, is to admit, in the light of the above texts, that he may know that he is a child of God. Here let this argument close.

SECTION V.

Sanctification.

The doctrine of sanctification is approached with a large degree of solicitude, not on account of any doubts in regard to it, but in view of its vast practical importance, in connection with the fact that there exists a great diversity of views on the subject. No question in theology is of greater practical importance to every Christian, and yet there are few, if any points, in regard to which the views of Christians appear less clear and perfect. It is, doubtless, in some sense, plain in experience to those who enjoy it, but so to put it upon paper as to render it plain to those who have never experienced the blessing, or who have experienced it only in a very limited degree, is not the easiest task which the author of a system of theology has to perform. A work like this would be incomplete without an examination of the subject, and as difficult as it may be to present it, so as not to add obscurity to what has already been rendered too obscure, the task must be undertaken.

I. Sanctification has its beginning in regeneration.

This point is universally admitted. Whatever controversies have arisen in regard to other aspects of sanctification, it is believed, that no evangelical writer has denied that sanctification begins with regeneration, and that every regenerate person is, in part, sanctified.

Mr. Wesley, in denying gradual regeneration, says, "This is undeniably true, [that the work is gradual] of sanctification; but of regeneration, the new birth, it is not true. When

we are born again, then our sanctification, our outward and inward holiness begins."— [Vol. I., 406.]

Here Mr. Wesley clearly fixes the commencement of sanctification at the time of regeneration.

Mr. Wesley says, again, " At the same time a man is justified, he is born again, born from above, born of the Spirit, which, although it is not the whole process of sanctification, is, doubtless, the gate to it. It is only the threshold of sanctification; the first entrance upon it. The new birth, therefore, is the first point of sanctification, which may increase more and more unto the perfect day."—[Vol. II. 389, 390.]

The above is sufficient to show that Mr. Wesley held that sanctification commences with regeneration, and that every regenerate persons is, in part, sanctified.

Mr. Watson holds the same view, for though he has not made it a distinct point; he has incidentally brought it to view too clearly to admit of doubt. He says, " To be in Christ is, therefore, to be justified, and regeneration instantly follows. The regenerate state is, also, called in Scripture, sanctification, though a distinction is made by the Apostle Paul, between that and being sanctified wholly. In this regenerate state, or sanctified state, the former corruptions of the heart may remain and strive for the mastery, but that which characterizes and distinguishes it from the state of a penitent before justification, before he is in Christ, is, that they are not even his inward *habit*: and that they have no dominion."

Again, Mr. Watson most clearly confounds sanctification with regeneration. He says " Justification, being the pardon of sin, this view of the doctrine guards us against the notion, that it is an act of God by which we are made actually just and righteous. This is sanctification, which is, indeed, the immediate fruit of justification; but nevertheless, is a distinct gift of God, and of a totally different nature. The one implies what God does *for us* through his Son; the other, what God does *in us* by his Spirit."

Bear in mind that Mr. Watson here asserts, that the work of God within us, " by which we are made actually just and righteous," is sanctification, and then compare it with his definition of regeneration, which is as follows:

" It is that mighty change in man, wrought by the Holy Spirit, by which the dominion which sin has over him in his natural state, and which he deploras and struggles against in his penitent state, is broken and abolished, so that, with full choice of will, and energy of right affections, he serves God freely, and runs in the way of his commandments. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace. But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. Deliverance from the bondage of sin, and the power, and will to do all things which are

pleasing to God, both as to inward habits and outward acts, are, therefore, the distinctive characters of this state."—[Watson's Institutes, Part II, chapters 23, and 24.

This is Mr. Watson's own definition of regeneration, and it will be seen at a glance, that it includes all that is included in the previously described state, of which he affirms, " This is sanctification."

If we turn to chapter 29, where Mr. Watson treats of sanctification, as a distinct benefit derived from redemption, we shall not find sanctification explained or proved, as embracing anything more than is embraced in his definition of regeneration above given, beyond a mere growth in Christian virtues already possessed.

Mr. Watson enters upon the subject by way of resuming the consideration of the benefits of redemption, and introduces it as follows:

" We have already spoken of justification, adoption, regeneration, and the witness of the Holy Spirit, and we proceed to another [benefit] as distinctly marked, and as graciously promised in the Holy Scriptures: this is the entire sanctification, or the perfected holiness of believers. That a distinction exists between a regenerate state, and a state of entire and perfect holiness, will be generally allowed. Regeneration, we have seen, is concomitant with justification; but the Apostles, in addressing the body of believers in the churches, to whom they wrote their epistles, set before them, both in the prayers they offer in their behalf, and in the exhortation they administer, a still higher degree of deliverance from sin, as well as a higher growth in Christian virtues."

It is now clear that Mr. Watson regarded sanctification, as having its beginning in regeneration, and entire sanctification as the maturity or perfection of the regenerate state. This is very certain, from the following facts:

1. He declares, in so many words, that "the regenerate state is also called in the Scriptures sanctification," admitting at the same time, a distinction between it " and being sanctified wholly."
2. In stating the doctrine of entire sanctification, he does not represent it as embracing anything more than regeneration in kind, but only an increased degree of the same thing. He declares that regeneration includes " the power and will to do all things, which are pleasing to God, both as to inward habits and outward acts." This leaves nothing to be embraced in sanctification, save an increased degree or perfected state of the same thing. Hence our author, in perfect harmony with his own theory, describes entire sanctification as " the perfected holiness of believers." This supposes there is an unperfected holiness of believers, before reaching this perfected holiness, which is " entire sanctification," hence regeneration must establish an unperfected holiness in the soul, and entire sanctification is the perfecting of that holiness.

Again, our author describes entire sanctification, with reference to regeneration, as "a still higher state of deliverance from sin, as well as a higher growth in Christian virtues." This supposes that regeneration is "a deliverance from sin," and that entire sanctification is only "a still higher deliverance from sin;" and that regeneration plants every Christian virtue in the soul, and that entire sanctification is only "a higher growth in Christian virtues." It is certain then that Mr. Watson held, that sanctification has its beginning in regeneration.

This extended notice of Mr. Watson's views has not been given, because he is thought wanting in clearness, to those who are themselves clear, but because some whose own vision has been wanting in clearness, have read Mr. Watson, through the cloud that hung over their own minds.

Rev. William Cook, an able writer of the Methodist New Connection, holds the same view. In speaking of the state of Christians, prior to entire sanctification, he says, "That the believer is already sanctified in an important degree, is manifest from his being born again, and made a new creature in Christ Jesus."

Having further described the state of Christians prior to entire sanctification, Mr. Cook adds: "Thus far then, every believer is sanctified at the moment of his justification; and this state is inexpressibly great and glorious. But great and glorious as is this state, it is not perfect."—[Theology, pages 448-9.]

The above is sufficient to show that Mr. Cook holds, that sanctification begins with regeneration, which is the only point now under consideration.

The above is sufficient to show what is the Methodist view of the subject. The Calvinistic view is the same on this one point.

The Rev. Dr. Hill says, "That change of character, which is the effect of the operation of the Spirit, and the beginning of sanctification, is called conversion."—[Lectures on Divinity, chap. 4.]

"Sanctification then, means a new life, the production of the habit of righteousness, as well as an aversion from sin."—[Ib.]

The "habit of righteousness" and "aversion from sin" must commence with regeneration, and hence here our author must date the beginning of sanctification.

Rev. Charles Buck says, "Sanctification is that work of God's grace, by which we are renewed."

Again, he says it is, "a progressive work, and not perfected at once."—[Buck's Theological Dictionary.]

This proves that Mr. Buck held that sanctification commences with regeneration, and from thence progresses onward.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States, in her Confession of Faith, says of sanctification, " They who are effectually called and regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, are further sanctified, really and personally, through virtue of Christ's death and resurrection, by his word and Spirit dwelling in them." Chap. 13.

The expression, " farther sanctified," implies that they are sanctified in part at regeneration.

The Rev. Samuel Helffenstein, D. D., a writer of the German Reform Church in the United States, is very distinct on the point. He says " sanctification is that act of God's free grace, whereby believers are gradually cleansed from the remains of sin, and indwelling corruption, and renewed after the image of God. This work is commenced in regeneration; the principle of spiritual life is there implanted, and the man is renewed in knowledge after the image of God, and in true righteousness and holiness. This work, thus commenced in regeneration, is carried on in sanctification. It is true, as soon as the sinner is regenerated and justified, he is likewise sanctified; however, there is a difference between justification and sanctification. Justification is an act completed at once; sanctification is a work which is gradual and progressive."

— [Helffenstein's Theology, pages 324, 325.]

Dr. Dwight says, " The first sanctifying act of the Spirit of God, is employed in regenerating the soul. Succeeding acts, of the same nature, are employed in purging it through all the successive periods of life."—[Dwight's Theology, Vol. II., p. 522.]

Rev. Charles G. Finney, says of regeneration, " It implies an entire present change of moral character, that is, a change from entire sinfulness to entire holiness. When the Scriptures require us to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ, this does not imply that there is yet sin remaining in the regenerate heart."— [Vol. I., pages 500, 501.]

The above language appears to imply that sanctification is not only commenced in regeneration, but finished also. Regeneration is declared to imply a state of entire holiness, and what sanctification can embrace more than entire holiness, it is not easy to see. When Mr. Finney speaks of sanctification, his language implies no more than what he affirms of instantaneous regeneration. He says, " Sanctification, then, is nothing more or less than entire obedience for the time being, to the moral law."

—[Vol. II., page 200.]

Now, as our author says regeneration is an instantaneous change to entire holiness, and as he declares that entire holiness is entire obedience, and that sanctification is nothing more or less than entire obedience for the time being, to the moral law," it follows that according to his theory, every regenerate person is sanctified at the moment of regeneration, and that entire sanctification is only the act of abiding in the simple

regenerate state. This conclusion he affirms himself, when he says on page 301, "entire sanctification, as I understand the term, is identical with entire and continued obedience to the law of God." This entire obedience is regeneration, that is, regeneration is a change to this entire obedience, hence, according to his theory, entire sanctification, is a simple continuance in the regenerate state as it transpires at the moment of the change. This certainly differs from the views of many, and from the one which will hereafter be advocated. The object of the above extracts has been to show that all agree on the one point, that sanctification begins with regeneration. This they prove, and beyond this the reader is not to regard them as endorsed. The fact that sanctification commences with regeneration being admitted by all, any conclusions which may hereafter be fairly drawn from the fact, will be conclusive on all classes of Christians.

II. The way is now prepared to enquire what is entire sanctification, more than is implied in regeneration.

To make the matter as plain as possible, it will be necessary to explain what sanctification is, and then point out wherein it transcends regeneration?

Before attempting an explicit answer to this question, it is proper to notice the primary sense of the terms employed to express the thing after the nature of which we inquire.

To sanctify is to separate a thing from common use, and to devote it exclusively to holy or religious purposes. It contains the two ideas, that of separation, and of consecration. Christians are sanctified by being separated from the world, and by being devoted to God. It implies real holiness, hence, to sanctify, is to purify and make holy.

The Hebrew word rendered sanctify, is *kadash*, and signifies to cleanse, purify, make holy.

The Greek word rendered sanctify, is *hagiazō*. It is derived from *hagios*, which signifies *holy*, hence *hagiazō* signifies, to consecrate, separate, set apart, purify, cleanse from pollution, make holy. This word occurs twenty times in the New Testament; twice it is rendered " *hallowed*," once it is rendered " *be holy*," and in all the other cases it is rendered sanctify, sanctified, and sanctifieth.

The noun rendered sanctification in Greek, is *hagiasmos*. This is derived from the same, *hagios*, holy. This word occurs only ten times in the New Testament, and in five cases it is translated *holiness*, and in five it is translated *sanctification*. As specimens of the texts in which the word is rendered by each of these English words, the following is sufficient.

Heb. 12: 14: " Follow peace with all men, and [*hagiasmon*] holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord."

1 Cor. 1: 30: " Who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and [*hagiasmos*] sanctification, and redemption."

These explanations, though not essential to the argument, clearly show that to be sanctified, is to be made holy, to be cleansed from sin. The way is now prepared to give a definition of sanctification, which shall be done in as few and clear words as possible. Sanctification is that renewal of our fallen nature by the Holy Ghost, received through faith in Jesus Christ, whose blood of atonement has power to cleanse from all sin; whereby we are not only delivered from the guilt of sin, which is justification, but are washed entirely from its pollution, freed from its power, and are enabled, through grace, to love God with all our hearts, and to walk in his holy commandments blameless.

This definition is in harmony with the established fact that sanctification commences with regeneration, because it includes all that is ascribed to that change, while, in extent, it expresses a higher state than all regenerate persons can be said to enjoy, at the commencement of their Christian experience.

But what does sanctification embrace more than is implied in regeneration?

It is not to be understood that sanctification adds any new virtues which are not present in every regenerate soul, before entire sanctification. It was said, while treating of regeneration, that it reverses the current of the affections, and so renews the whole soul that all the Christian graces exist.

They may not all exist in an equal degree of strength, but they are all there, though some of them may be as the shining of a faint light. None of them are likely to exist in a full degree of maturity and power at the moment of regeneration.

The power of sin is broken, the tyrant is dethroned, and his reign ceases in the soul at the moment of regeneration; yet, sin is not so destroyed as not to leave his mark upon the soul, and even yet struggle for the mastery.

There is still a warfare within, and however clear the intellect may be to see what is right, and however determined the will may be to execute the decision of the judgment, there will be found an opposing element in the sensibility of the soul, which, though it no longer controls the will, often rebels against it and refuses to obey it. That depravity does not lie exclusively in the will, but also in the perverted passions and appetites is too plain to be denied, and that these struggle for unlawful indulgence after regeneration, is too universal in Christian experience to need proof. This state of things, as a matter of fact, must be admitted by all, yet theologians explain it in the light of their different creeds and different systems of philosophy. Hence some call it the remains of original sin, some call it indwelling sin, and some say it is the depravity that remains after regeneration. Rev. Charles G. Finney, denies that it is moral depravity, and hence he denies that there is any sin or moral depravity remaining in the soul after regeneration. He denies that any moral quality pertains to the sensibility of the soul, and hence he does not include the subjugation of the passions to the sanctified will in his idea of entire sanctification, beyond the mere fact that the will is not governed by them, and does not endorse or execute any of their irregular motions. His words are, " It is evident that sanctification in the Scripture, and proper sense of the term, is not a mere feeling of any kind. It is not a

desire, an appetite, a passion, a propensity, an emotion, nor indeed any kind or degree of feeling. It is not a state or phenomenon of the sensibility. The states of the sensibility are, like those of the intelligence, purely passive states of mind, as has been repeatedly shown. They of course can have no moral character in themselves. The inspired writers evidently use the terms which are translated by the English word sanctify, to designate a phenomenon of the will, or a voluntary state of mind."—[Systematic Theology, Vol. II., page 200.]

If the above be all true, the conclusion appears undeniable, that every man is entirely sanctified the moment he wills right, and as Mr. Finney contends for the freedom of the will, that man has natural power to will right, all can sanctify themselves by an act of will in a moment. Perhaps Mr. F. and his friends will feel no desire to escape this conclusion, for it really appears to be the result aimed at. Mr. Finney's view of sanctification, as above given, appears to be defective. While, " it is evident that sanctification is not a *mere* feeling of any kind," it is no less evident that it includes all right feelings, and excludes all wrong feelings. While, " it is not a desire, an appetite, a passion, a propensity, an emotion, nor indeed any kind or degree of feeling," it comprehends and implies a right state of all the desires, appetites, passions, propensities, emotions, and every kind and proper degree of right feeling. While " the states of the sensibility are, like those of the intelligence, purely passive states of mind," still while they rebel and struggle against the dictates of the intelligence, and the decisions of the will, they mar the perfection of the sacrifice which the worshiper is bound to make of his entire self to God, and their rebellion is inconsistent with what many at least believe to be a state of entire sanctification. While sanctification is " a voluntary state of mind," so far as to exist only as a sequence to the determination of the will, it includes much more than right volition, and more than volition has power to effect.

The fact cannot be overlooked that Mr. Finney's view of sanctification differs very materially from that commonly held by all other schools of theology. It differs by being grounded upon a denial that moral depravity extend to the states of the intelligence and sensibility of the soul, depravity being confined wholly to the state of the will.

It does differ by being made to include, according to the above view, only a right state of the will, while others hold that it includes a right state of all the powers and susceptibilities of the soul.

Mr. Finney denies that there is any sin or moral depravity remaining in the soul after regeneration, but this he does by denying that the states of the sensibility, in which they war against the right determinations of the will, and clamor for indulgences which the will cannot allow without sin, involve sin or moral depravity. This makes the discussion turn upon the mere name by which a mental state is called, and not upon the fact of the existence of the state. That such states of the sensibility exist after regeneration all must admit, but while old school men call it depravity remaining after regeneration, Mr. Finney denies that it is sin, or moral depravity, and affirms that it is physical depravity, referring to the same mental state which others call remaining sin after regeneration, allowing regeneration to take place instantaneously with justification. It is not necessary

to take issue with Mr. Finney on the use of terms, since the thing called by different names is now understood. Allowing Mr. Finney to be right in calling it physical depravity, it is then maintained that entire sanctification includes the removal of this physical depravity, so that in all purely mental states, the sensibility shall be in harmony with the enlightened judgment, and sanctified will, and all be in harmony with the divine law.

What Mr. Finney calls physical depravity, must be admitted to be a consequence of the fall, and also to be greatly aggravated and made worse by sinful practices. All propensities and passions, and appetites which prompt to evil, gather strength in the direction of evil, as they are indulged by the practice of evil. Now, whether we call them sin, original sin, moral depravity, or physical depravity, the thing itself must be corrected or removed before there can be an entire consecration of all the soul to God, or before the man can be said to be wholly sanctified? Let this point now be illustrated. The passion of anger results from an original susceptibility of the soul; the susceptibility is not wrong in itself, it is God's work for a good end. A depraved or perverted development of this susceptibility is seen, when anger is produced by what should produce a feeling of complacency. This is often the case, as when one sinner is angry because another sinner gives his heart to God. Another depraved development of this susceptibility is seen when real wrong, which ought to produce a feeling of detestation towards the act, awakens a feeling of anger towards the actor, wrong in kind and degree, and prompting to wrong acts towards him. So far as the will does not acquiesce, Mr. Finney, if he is understood, calls it physical depravity. But with sinners, the will does acquiesce, often at least. This propensity to anger becomes stronger as it is indulged. Now, suppose a person naturally given to passion, and who has never restrained his anger, is converted at the age of forty, and the sin of anger will be found to have left its mark upon the soul after regeneration, in this increased susceptibility to anger, or increased liability to become angry. The first time the man is insulted, he will feel the very pulsations of anger throb within him, whether the will consents or not. If the will is not carried away by the storm of feeling, but maintains its right position, the storm will soon lull, and he will have gained a victory. In this conflict it is supposed that he cried in his heart to God, in the name of Jesus Christ, and when the conflict is over, though he feels that he has been preserved from a great fall, yet he is impressed with his own weakness, and is dissatisfied with himself, and feels the necessity of having a still deeper work wrought within him. If he remains watchful and prayerful, under the next provocation, the impulse of anger will be less powerful, and the victory over it will be achieved with greater ease, and so on, until the propensity is wholly subdued.

Apply the principle and operation here evolved, to the entire soul with all its powers and susceptibilities, so far as applicable, and the reader will have spread before him the work and process of gradual sanctification, after, and above, and beyond what is implied, necessarily, in regeneration. This, however, needs to be further guarded and explained as follows:

1. This progress is made in the strength of God, by grace constantly supplied through faith in Christ, and by the influence of the truth, and the power of the Holy Spirit, who is the efficient agent in sanctification.

2. It is gradual, as above described, not in the sense of making equal and even progress, through each day, week, month, or year, but in the sense of a succession of victories over our internal foes, and a succession of larger and larger blessings, or deeper and deeper baptisms of the Holy Spirit, until the work is finished, in the full sense of the definition of sanctification, which has been previously given.

3. This progressive work may be cut short and finished at any moment, when the intelligence clearly comprehends the defects of the present state, and faith, comprehending the power and willingness of God to sanctify us wholly, and do it now, is exercised. This faith, of course, is exercised in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, relying upon the merits of his death, and expecting the work to be wrought by the agency of the Holy Spirit which he promised to send, and which he has sent, and does send. This view explains how sanctification may be both gradual and instantaneous. It may not be safely affirmed that it cannot take place at the moment of regeneration, yet it is clear that it very rarely does. If the intelligence did then comprehend the necessity of the entire work, and faith was exercised accordingly, it would take place, but this is not likely to be the case. The awakened sinner has his mind mainly directed to the guilt of his sin, and his inability to save himself without God, and cries to God for pardon and a new heart. Faith is limited by the view his intelligence takes of his necessity and the work wrought, and the blessing obtained, are according to the faith exercised. With most persons it may be presumed that their view of the whole subject, at the time of their conversion, may be expressed in these few words, " I am a sinner lost, Christ is a Savior, who died to save me; able and willing to save now. Lord, for Christ's sake, save me this moment." Subsequently, the necessity of a deeper work, as illustrated in the supposed case of the man of passion, converted at the age of forty, is seen and felt. At any time when the intelligence comprehends what is wanting to constitute a state of entire sanctification, and faith is exercised, the work will be finished. The end may be reached by a succession of these instantaneous advances towards it, as light increases and faith is exercised; or it may be reached at once, when light and faith are sufficiently clear, comprehensive and powerful.

4. This state of entire sanctification, does not place the sanctified beyond the power of temptation from influences without; it only subdues and expels all the foes within. Adam could have had no foes within, until they were admitted from without, and so may it be with those who are sanctified wholly, in spirit, soul, and body. In this state, all is right and peace within. The will is right at the moment of regeneration, and it must remain right, or willful sin will be the result, and justification will be lost; but while the will is right, the propensities, passions and appetites, may struggle against the decisions of the will, and keep up a warfare within, and these must be subdued. The will can and does resist them in a regenerate state, but it cannot silence them, renew, or change their direction, by an act of volition. These belong to the soul, and must be brought into harmony with right, and the sanctified will, before the whole soul can be said to be

sanctified, or to be entirely consecrated to God. When this work is wrought, then the war within will cease, and there will be a development of all the Christian virtues, in such a state of strength and maturity, as to exclude the opposite vices. There will be love without hatred, submission without rebellion, faith without unbelief, humility without pride, meekness without anger, patience without impatience, and peace, without contention, strife, or wrath.

5. This state of entire sanctification does not preclude a further growth. It ends the warfare within, and leaves the whole soul, with all its passions, to be led on in the path of holiness, while increasing intelligence points out the way, as it obtains clearer and higher views of human duty and destiny, and the regenerated will presses the whole soul on to know and enjoy more of God. When the embarrassments are thus removed out of the soul itself, progress will be more rapid, every virtue may increase in strength and brightness, and the will may become stronger and stronger, in its determination in the direction of holiness.

6. As a concluding remark under this head, let it be observed, that the above exposition of entire sanctification, appears to accord with Christian experience. It accords with the experience of those who have not reached the state. If the whole number of Christians were consulted, at or near the time of their conversion, few, if any, would be found to believe themselves to have been wholly sanctified at the time of their conversion, or to have been freed from all depravity, yet they feel confident that their sins have been forgiven, and that they love God. Whatever may be their creed, whatever may be their philosophy of regeneration and sanctification, if they are real Christians, experience has but one language; they feel, they are conscious that they love God and enjoy his favor, yet that they have not attained all that is implied in entire sanctification, as taught in the Scriptures, and as it has been explained above.

If the experience of those who have obtained this great blessing of entire sanctification, were consulted, it would doubtless be found to accord with the explanation above given. But this is a point which is likely to be fully comprehended, by those only, who enjoy a state of entire sanctification, and need not be further pressed.

III. The proof that entire sanctification may be attained and enjoyed in this life.

1. God is able to sanctify believers wholly. It will not be denied that God is omnipotent, and of course can do anything and everything which comes within the bounds of moral propriety. If it be right and desirable that saints should be wholly sanctified in this life, omnipotence can do it. We also have a practical development of this power, in the work of regeneration. It has been seen that all agree that regeneration is sanctification in part, and that every regenerate person is in part sanctified. It is admitted that the guilt of sin is removed, and that the power of sin is broken, so that sin ceases to have dominion over the regenerate. This being admitted, the greater part of the work is done, so far as the power of God is concerned. If God has moral might to break the power of sin in the soul, and deliver the soul from its control, he must be able to deliver entirely from all sin. If God can save men from most of their sins, and from the greatest of their sins, he must be able

to save from the smaller number and from the least in magnitude. This reasoning would appear conclusive, if left to make its own impression upon the common sense of the reader, but the fact is clearly asserted in the Scriptures.

2 Cor. 9: 8: " And God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye, always having all-sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work."

2 Cor. 10: 5: " Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

Eph. 3: 16-20: " That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints, what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God. Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think; according to the power that worketh in us."

The above Scriptures clearly comprehend the blessing of entire sanctification, and declare that God is able to bestow it.

2. God has clearly promised a state of entire sanctification.

This blessing was promised under the Old Testament covenant. Gen. 18: 1,2: "The Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God: walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make my covenant between me and thee."

This covenant was with Abraham and his seed forever. Now as God on entering into covenant commanded him to walk before him and be perfect, the covenant itself must have secured the blessing of a perfect state of all such as take hold upon it by faith to the extent of its provisions. In perfect accordance with this view of the covenant, do we find the gracious promises of God. Deut. 30: 6: " And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live."

This clearly includes what is called being made perfect in love. Ezek. 36: 25-27: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do *them*" 1 Thes. 5: 23, 24: " And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly: and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful *is* he that calleth you, who also will do *it*."

This text implies a promise. Paul prays for the blessing of entire sanctification, and true prayer is based upon the covenant promises, But the declaration that God is faithful and will do it, implies that God has promised it, and shows that Paul had his eye on the promise when he uttered the prayer. When God is said to be faithful, it is always with reference to his covenant and promises. 1 John 1: 8, 9. " If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us *our* sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

The expression, " he is faithful and just," clearly implies that the thing is secured by promise, and that the promise reaches, not only to the pardon of sin, but comprehends the act of cleansing us from all unrighteousness."

3. God has commanded us to be sanctified wholly, to be perfect, to be holy. Matt. 5: 48: " Be ye therefore perfect, even as your; Father which is in heaven which is perfect."

Rom. 12: 1, 2: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God."

This text contemplates nothing short of entire conformity to the will of God,

2 Cor. 7: 1: " Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

This text was addressed to Christians, and yet it is clear that there is a state of purity from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, and of perfected holiness, which may be reached in this life, which they had not attained, or which it was possible, that they, as Christians, had not attained. When a Christian is cleansed from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, and has perfected holiness in the fear of God, he has reached a state of entire sanctification.

Chap. 13: 11: " Finally, brethren, farewell. Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you."

If Paul aimed at expressing any definite idea by being perfect, he must have meant being made perfect in love, or a state of entire consecration to God.

Heb. 6: 1:" Let us go on unto perfection," What can we understand by perfection, unless it be entire sanctification?

James 1: 4: " But let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing."

This is very comprehensive, and expresses the idea by three different terms. They were to be perfect, which denotes all they were required to be, just what they ought to be. Then

they were to be entire, which denotes every part of what was necessary to make them perfect and then to make the sense still more full if possible, the Apostle adds, " wanting nothing." Those who are wanting in nothing to complete their Christian character or state must be entirely sanctified.

1 Peter 1: 15,16: " But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy."

In the light of the above Scriptures it cannot be denied that Christian perfection, entire sanctification or consecration to God, is commanded, as a Christian duty.

4. The Scriptures teach that the attainment of a state of entire sanctification is a proper subject of prayer. This is principally taught by example, in the prayers of inspired men.

In the prayer of our Lord Jesus Christ, which he offered upon the eve of his passion, we have these remarkable words in regard to his disciples. John 17: 23: " I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me."

Perfection in unity is the principle thought in this text.

Psalms 51: 2, 7,10: " Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin. Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow. Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me."

It may be said that David was fallen at the time he uttered this prayer, and that he prayed for pardon. This may be true, but still his prayer comprehends more than pardon. He appears to charge his fall upon his innate depravity, which still remained in him, and now he prays for a more thorough work. He asks for a clean heart, and no heart is clean where any degree of sin remains.

Col. 4: 12: " Epaphras, who *is* one of you a servant of Christ, saluteth you, always laboring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God."

The object of his prayers was that they might enjoy and maintain perfection and completeness in all the will of God. This certainly must exclude all sin.

1 Thes. 5: 23: "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Here Paul clearly prayed for entire sanctification on behalf of his brethren at Thessalonica.

Heb. 13: 20, 21: " Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant. Make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ: to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen."

Such a text needs no comment to make it express the doctrine of entire consecration to God. The state of Christian attainment prayed for, is looked for as the result of the work of God within.

It will hardly be affirmed that we are thus encouraged to pray for what is not attainable.

Mark 11: 24: " What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye [will] receive them, and ye shall have them."

This text is a sufficient comment upon all the prayers offered up for entire sanctification.

5. The Scriptures teach us that some did attain to a state of entire sanctification in olden times.

Gen. 5: 24: " And Enoch walked with God, and he was not: for God took him." It would be a fair inference to conclude that he was wholly consecrated to God. We are told in verse 22, " that Enoch walked with God three hundred years."

2 Kings 2:11: " And it came to pass, as they still went on, and talked, that, behold, there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven."

It would not be an unwarrantable inference to conclude that Elijah was sanctified wholly on earth.

Job 1: 1, 8: " There was a man in the land of Uz, whose name was Job; and that man was perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and eschewed evil. And the Lord said unto Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil?"

It is certain that God found no fault with Job. How much remaining sin would be found, if one like Job was put in the crucible of modern theology and tested?

Luke 1: 6: " And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless."

This is said of Zacharias and Elizabeth. Some have supposed that Zacharias could not have been perfect, because he did not believe the angel as described in verse 20. If it be allowed that moral dereliction is involved, it does not prove that they were not perfect prior to that interview with the angel. The doctrine of perfection under consideration does not pretend to secure the perfect against the possibility of a relapse.

But the Scriptures teach that some have been perfect in the sense of entire consecration to God, in another and more general manner. It is by referring to unnamed persons as perfect, as though the fact that there is such a class, were understood.

Psalm 37: 37: " Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright: for the end of that man is peace."

Psalm 119: 2, 3: " Blessed are they that keep his testimonies, and that seek him with the whole heart. They also do no iniquity: they walk in his ways,"

Prov. 2: 21: " For the upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it."
Chap. 11: 5: "The righteousness of the perfect shall direct his way; but the wicked shall fall by his own wickedness."

1 Cor. 2: 6: " Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect: yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world that come to naught."

Phil. 3: 15: " Let us therefore, as many as "be perfect, be thus minded: and if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you."

1 John 1: 7: " But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

Chap. 2: 5: " But whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in him."

Chap. 3: 3: " And every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself, even as he is pure."

Chap. 4: 17, 18: " Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment: because as he is, so are we in this world. There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear; because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love."

A special comment upon each of the above texts is unnecessary; they clearly teach that there were persons in the times of the writers who were perfect, in the Bible sense of perfection as applied to the children of God. This perfection was a perfection in obedience, a perfection in love, a being " cleansed from all unrighteousness, and from all sin." This is all that is claimed, and at this state let both writer and reader aim, and never rest satisfied short of its full enjoyment. Amen.

SECTION VI.

The case of Infants and the Heathen considered.

The Gospel offers salvation, through Jesus Christ, to those to whom it is preached, upon its own peculiar terms, which have been considered in preceding sections. But it is perfectly plain that infants and the heathen, who never hear the Gospel, constitute exceptions to the conditions and manner of salvation, as they have been exhibited in the preceding part of this chapter. All that has been said, beginning with justification by faith, and closing with entire sanctification, has reference to those who hear the Gospel, and who are capable of believing or rejecting it. Infants are incapable of complying with any conditions, and heathens cannot comply with the conditions of the Gospel, as such, until the Gospel is made known to them. The case of both these must be met in some way other than upon the principle of the Gospel commission, " He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." Reason and revelation agree, that the atonement is an adequate remedy for the fall of all men, and so far as its consequences have come upon all men, so far must the atonement reach. So far as men are injured by the fall, without their personal crime, and under circumstances which do not admit of their complying with the conditions of the Gospel, as presented to those to whom it is preached, so far must the atonement unconditionally remove those consequences. The thought is, that the atonement will secure for every human being a final destiny, not less advantageous than would have been the result had Adam not sinned, unless the failure be the consequence of personal neglect or crime.

Rom. 5: 18, 20: " Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life, Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound."

I. The salvation of all such as die before they have intelligence enough to render them morally accountable agents is secured by the atonement. That all infants are saved, we have the highest authority.

Matt. 19: 14: " But Jesus said, suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

This text is also found, Mark 10: 14, and Luke 18: 16. It clearly asserts the salvation of infants. It is not necessary to settle the question, whether we are to understand the Christian church, or heaven, by the term " Kingdom of Heaven." One or the other is certainly meant, and the consequence is the same in either case, so far as the destiny of infants is concerned.

If we understand Christ's spiritual kingdom on earth, which is his church, then infants must share in the spiritual benefits of his atonement, and as they belong to his kingdom here, they will certainly belong to it in the future state, if they die before they commit sin, and must be eternally saved. If by the Kingdom of Heaven we understand the kingdom of glory, heaven in the future state, then the declaration, " of such is the Kingdom of Heaven," affirms their eternal salvation.

It is truly wonderful that any class of Christians should ever have believed that there are probate infants, or that infants are doomed to eternal woe by a just, good and holy God,

yet, such a sentiment appears to have been held by some. In the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian church, in the United States, chap. x. sec. 3, we find these words: " Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth."

These words clearly imply that there are non-elect, or reprobate infants, and that they are not regenerated and saved by Christ. It has, of course, always been a difficult task for those who hold the doctrine of infant damnation, to dispose of the text above quoted, and their efforts have only exposed the weakness of their cause.

The only attempt which has been made to evade the force of the text in proof of infant salvation worthy of notice, is based upon the assumption that the expression, "of such is the kingdom of heaven," does not include infants. The sense, in the hands of these critics is, infants form no part of the kingdom of heaven, but the kingdom of heaven is composed of such as are like these infants. "Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven," that is, persons like these infants. Even the Rev. Albert Barnes, in his note on the text, has adopted this construction, by which he has left a chance for infant damnation, a doctrine which he does not avow.

That the language would bear this construction, if the connection required it to make good sense, need not be denied, but such is not the case. The language will bear equally well the sense we give it, and the connection absolutely requires it. The words were spoken as a reason for allowing children to be brought to him, but it would be no reason at all, to affirm that others, not children, who composed the Kingdom of Heaven, were in some respects like these children. The sense clearly is, the Kingdom of Heaven is composed of such. Children, is understood. Of such children is the Kingdom of Heaven. If they belonged to the Kingdom of God, it was a good reason why they should be allowed to be brought to Christ, but because some other class of persons composed the Kingdom of Heaven, who were like them, in some particulars, would not be a good reason. It is then clear that Christ asserts that infants belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, and it follows that all who die before they have light enough to become personally guilty, are saved.

This, viewed in connection with Paul's parallel between Adam and Christ, noticed above, must be entirely conclusive. Speculations as to the manner in which infants are saved, can be of no practical use, the fact is plain, and that is enough. The Gospel is addressed to adults, and not to infants, and hence it proposes to them no terms, and gives no explanation of the manner of their salvation. It leaves their salvation with the simple statement of the fact, that " of such is the Kingdom of Heaven," to rest upon the general principles of the Gospel. If we had a Gospel for infants, that Gospel would, doubtless, explain their case.

It has been asked, in what moral condition infants are born. The answer is, they are born with natural, inherited propensities, which, if developed in connection with sufficient understanding and light to constitute moral accountability, would declare them depraved and guilty. That they are depraved, so far as the possession of the propensity to evil

constitutes depravity, there can be no doubt; but that they are depraved, in the sense of being guilty, is not true.

Upon this state of facts it has often been asked, are infants born in a justified state? It is certain that they are not, in a strict Gospel sense, for the simple reason that they were never guilty or condemned. Gospel justification is a pardon, a remission of deserved punishment, but infants cannot be born justified in this sense, because they never sinned, and never had any personal guilt to remove, or deserved punishment to have remitted. They are born justified only in the general sense of not being born guilty.

Upon the state of facts now spread before the reader, it has been asked, are infants born holy? They certainly do not possess active holiness, for they can neither comprehend a moral law, or feel the force of moral obligation. But have they not a kind of passive holiness, consisting in the purity of their nature, as a sheet of white paper is pure, though it is liable to have either good or bad sentiments written upon its page. Certainly not, if as has been remarked, the soul inherits propensities to evil, which develop depravity so soon as there is light enough to involve moral accountability. It is then asked, are infants born fit for heaven? It must follow, from the above, that they are not. A soul possessed of propensities to evil, cannot be fit for heaven, without a change, just such a change as the Holy Ghost alone can effect. How, or at what moment this change takes place, God has never revealed to us, inasmuch as he has given us no gospel for infants. The fact being clear that they are saved, it follows as a necessary consequence, that when they die in infancy, God does, at some point of time, in some way, fit them for heaven. If the elect infants, as Calvinists suppose, can be fitted for heaven, the same process may answer for all, and I will adopt the language of the Presbyterian Articles of Faith, quoted above, concerning "elect infants," only understanding it as applying to all that die in infancy. It reads thus, "Those dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth." This is all the explanation that can be given of the subject, and it is enough, and here let it rest.

II. The atonement of Christ so reaches the case of heathen, as to save such as live up to the light they have, if any such there are.

It is not affirmed that heathen who never hear the Gospel, are as likely to be saved as those to whom the Gospel is preached, nor is it affirmed that heathen are saved, but only that the atonement so far reaches their case, as to secure the light of the Spirit, to some extent at least, and to save them if they act perfectly honest and conscientious, in view of the light they have. The heathen that are lost, are not lost as a necessary consequence of the sin of Adam, nor yet as a necessary consequence of not hearing the Gospel, which they never had an opportunity to hear, but for acting contrary to their own convictions of right. This theory is not only based upon common sense, and the most simple notions of justice, but it is most clearly asserted by St. Paul, upon whose authority it shall be left to repose.

Rom. 2: 11-15: "For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law, shall

be judged by the law; for not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another."

All that is asked for this remarkable text, is that it be understood in its most obvious sense, and not explained away, or darkened by words without knowledge. Thus understood, it clearly proves that those who have no written law, have light enough to make them responsible for their conduct, and consequently light enough to lead them to salvation, if they were to follow it with an honest purpose of heart. If any of the heathen do according to their honest convictions of right, they will be saved. But it does not follow that the heathen nations will be saved, nor that they are as likely to be saved without the Gospel as with it. If any are saved, as there may be some, the number is very small, in comparison with the results that follow the faithful preaching of the Gospel.

CHAPTER IX.

THE WORLD OF SPIRITS. —THE FUTURE STATE.

SECTION I.

The Existence and Employment of Angels.

I. There is a class of created intelligences, who inhabit the Spirit world, and who have often been sent with messages to this world, from God, their Creator. The common Scriptural name of this class of beings is angels.

The necessity of proving this fact would never have occurred, had it not been positively denied, by those who profess to believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. The obvious connection between good and evil spirits, the existence of holy and fallen angels, or devils, and the manifest bearing which the existence of devils, has upon the question of the punishment of sinners, has led one class of Universalists to deny the existence of angels. This they do to blot out all proof derived from this source, in support of the doctrine that sin will be punished in a future state. These facts render it proper to commence what is designed to be a thorough examination of all the questions connected with a future state, with a brief demonstration of the existence of angels. It will be necessary to notice but a few of the many texts which refer to angels. They are found scattered through the Old and New Testaments, and a selection shall be made from both.

The Hebrew word translated angel, in the Old Testament, is *malach*. It comes from *laach*, which signifies to send forth; hence, *malach*, angel, signifies a messenger, one sent. Angels are so called, because they were first revealed to man, as the messengers of God. A few texts may now be introduced, in which the word occurs and is rendered angel.

Gen. 22: 11: " And the angel of the Lord called unto him out of heaven, and said, Abraham, Abraham: and he said, here am I."

This transpired when Abraham held the lifted knife in his hand to sacrifice his son Isaac, and the angel could have been no man, no human messenger.

Gen. 24: 7: " The Lord God of heaven, which took me from my father's house, and from the land of my kindred, and which spake unto me, and that sware unto me, saying, Unto thy seed will I give this land, he shall send his angel before thee; and thou shalt take a wife unto my son from thence."

Nothing but a belief, on the part of Abraham, in the existence of angels, and that God employs them as human guides, could have justified the patriarch in the use of such language. He could not have referred to any man or human messenger.

Exo. 23: 20: " Behold, I send an angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared."

In the Book of Judges, 13: 3-20, we have an account of an angel, which appeared to Manoah and his wife, which can leave no room to doubt that it was a being from the spirit world. He is several times called a man of God, but it was while they were in doubt as to his real character.

The writer of the Book of Judges commences, by affirming that " the angel of the Lord appeared unto the woman." Verse 3.

In verse 6, she calls him " a man of God," but says, " his countenance was like the countenance of an angel of God."

In verse 9, the writer calls him the angel of God."

In verse 15, Manoah proposed to prepare food for the angel, for it is said, verse 16 that " Manoah knew not that he was an angel of God." Then comes the closing scene, as follows:

Verses 19, 20: " So Manoah took a kid with a meat-offering, and offered it upon a rock unto the Lord: and the angel did wondrously; and Manoah and his wife looked on. For it came to pass, when the flame went up toward heaven from off the altar, that the angel of the Lord ascended In the flame of the altar: and Manoah and his wife looked on it, and fell on their faces to the ground. (But the angel of the Lord did no more appear to Manoah and to his wife.) Then Manoah knew that he was an angel of the Lord."

The being here described as ascending in the flame of the altar, cannot have been a human being, an inhabitant of this world.

In 2 Sam. 24: 15-17, we have a case recorded; where God used an angel as a minister of his wrath, as follows:

"So the Lord sent a pestilence upon Israel, from the morning even to the time appointed: and there died of the people, from Dan even to Beersheba, seventy thousand men. And when the angel stretched out his hand upon Jerusalem to destroy it, the Lord repented him of the evil, and said to the angel that destroyed the people, It is enough; stay now thine hand. And the angel of the Lord was by the threshing-place of Araunah the Jebusite. And David spake unto the Lord, when he saw the angel that smote the people, and said, Lo, I have sinned, and I have done wickedly: but these sheep, what have they done? Let thine hand, I pray thee, be against me, and against my father's house."

It cannot be pretended that it was a man that smote the whole land with pestilence, who also stretched out his hand over Jerusalem to smite it also; yet was it an angel that smote the people, and David saw him.

We have another undeniable case recorded in Isa. 37: 36: " Then the angel of the Lord went forth, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred and fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses."

The sense of the last clause is, that when the remainder of the army, not slain, arose early in the morning, the number mentioned as slain, were all dead corpses. The number slain, one hundred and eighty-five thousand, proves that it was not effected by human agency, and that the angel must have been a being of great power from the spirit world.

Dan. 6: 22: " My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me: forasmuch as before him innocency was found in me; and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt."

This could have been nothing but a spiritual being, no other being could have entered the den of lions; no human agency could have been available against the lions. One more text from the Old Testament must suffice on this point, and it is,

Dan. 9: 20, 21: " And while I was speaking, and praying, and confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel, and presenting my supplication before the Lord my God for the holy mountain of my God; Yea, while I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation."

It is true; Daniel calls him "the man Gabriel," yet the person was an angel beyond doubt. Daniel calls his name Gabriel, and when we come to examine the New Testament, we shall find an angel announcing himself to Zechariahs by the same name.

The reader's attention is now invited to the use of the word in the New Testament, and to some of the accounts given of the appearance of angels.

The word in Greek is *angelos*, and corresponds in sense to the Hebrew word already noticed. It signifies a messenger, but is almost exclusively used in the New Testament to denote angels, as messengers from the spirit world. It occurs in one hundred and eighty texts, and is translated messenger eight times, and in every other case it is translated angel. A few only of the many texts need be noticed.

When Christ had been tempted forty days in the wilderness, it is said, "angels came and ministered unto him." Matt. 4: 11. Had it been men or women, they would not have been called angels. An angel appeared to Zechariah in the temple, and that it was no human angel is certain, from his own declaration.

Luke 1: 19: "And the angel answering, said unto him, I am Gabriel that stand in the presence of God."

From the 26th verse, we learn that the same angel was sent to Mary, the mother of Jesus, and the language is too expressive to be explained away. It is said, "the angel Gabriel was sent from God."

Luke 2: 8-15, furnishes the most conclusive proof of angels, who sometimes visit earth as messengers from the spirit world. An angel was sent to the shepherds at night, to inform them of the birth of Christ. It is said, verse 9: "the angel of the Lord came upon them and the glory of the Lord shone round about them; and they were sore afraid." Here is clear proof that it was not a fellow man, but a messenger from the world of spirits that appeared to them.

When the angel had delivered his message, it is declared, verse 13: "Suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God." These were a band of angels, because it is said, verse 15: "It came to pass as the angels were gone away from them into heaven." But one angel is named as first appearing; hence, the angels that went away were the multitude of the heavenly host. And, observe, they did not go away to their homes in the city, or town, or country, but they went away into heaven; they were, therefore, not of this world, but messengers from the spirit world.

In connection with the resurrection of Christ, we have the following scene:

Matt. 28: 2-4: "And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead."

There is no possible ground to doubt that this angel was a messenger from the throne of God. That he was no human being is very certain. He was "the angel of the Lord from heaven." "His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow."

When the Apostles were in prison, it is said, Acts 5: 19, 20: " But the angel of the Lord by night opened the prison-doors, and brought them forth, and said, Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life."

To suppose that this was the work of a man, called the angel of the Lord, would be to suppose that there were human Christian agencies at work superior to the apostles, which cannot be true, as they were the head of all human authority.

The vision of Cornelius, recorded, Acts 10: 3, is another clear case.

The case of Peter, recorded, Acts 12: 7-11, is a perfectly clear case. Peter was in prison, sleeping between two soldiers, bound with two chains. The angel of the Lord came upon him, and a light shone in the prison, his chains fell off, and the iron gate opened to them of his own accord. All the circumstances prove that it was no human agency, or human messenger, that is called the angel of the Lord. A man entering a prison with false keys to deliver his friend, would not display a light in the prison; he could not speak to his friend without being heard by the soldiers, between whom he was sleeping, and the iron gate would not open of his own accord. It is clear, then, that this must have been an angel from the spirit world. One reference more shall close this aspect of the subject.

Rev. 10: 1, 2, 5: "And I saw another mighty angel come down from "heaven, clothed with a cloud: and a rainbow was upon his head, and his face was as it were the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire. And he set his right foot upon the sea, and his left foot on the earth, and lifted up his hand to heaven."

It will not be pretended that this was a man, a human messenger, or minister called an angel.

The reader will bear in mind that the above texts are only a few selected from a vast number of equal clearness and force, They are, however, sufficient to prove the point, beyond a doubt, that there is a class of created intelligences called angels, who inhabit the spirit world, and who are often sent by God to execute his will in this world.

II. At what date were angels created, is a question about which there has been a great difference of opinion. To review the various opinions, and arguments for each would be a waste of time. The question is of little or no practical importance, and the true answer is obviously not very clearly revealed. Some have held that angels were created at a date far back of the creation of this world and the dawn of time. Others have supposed that angels were created at the time this world was made, and that they were a part of what is described as the six days' work of God. A third class have supposed that angels were created at a later date than the heavens and the earth, as described by Moses. The first of these opinions appears to be the true one.

1. The opinion that angels were created subsequently to the creation described by Moses, is based upon the fact that he gives no account of, and makes no allusion to any prior creation, or to any created intelligences as previously existing. This is not sufficient

proof, for the Scriptures, as a whole, were not given to teach us the doctrine of angels, but the origin, duty and destiny of humanity, and angels are only incidentally alluded to as their destiny reflects light upon ours, or as they have been employed by God to act in the affairs of men. Moreover, the Mosaic account of creation was doubtless designed to give the origin of this visible state of things, and hence it is limited to the system of which this world is a part. Moses, in his account of the creation of the heavens and the earth, does not even affirm the previous existence of God, but takes it for granted, for, when he says, " In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," it is implied that God was.

2. The opinion that angels were created at the time this world was formed, and constituted a part of the six days' work, is founded upon the fact that it is declared, Exo. 20: 11, that " in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is."

If it were true that the heaven of which Moses speaks, embraces the sphere of angels, it would follow that their creation was a part of the six days' work, but such does not appear to be the fact. The heaven which Moses affirms God created within the six days, is no more than the system of worlds of which this earth is a part, while angels have their abode beyond these spheres, in that world where God has his throne. If the heaven of which Moses speaks included the abode of angels, and if they were created at the same time, he would doubtless have named the creation of the angels of heaven, as well as the fowls of heaven.

3. The opinion that angels were created at some period prior to the creation described by Moses, is based partly upon the deductions of reason, and partly upon some texts of Scripture which appear to imply or allude to the fact.

As God is necessarily eternal, possessed of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, it is thought unreasonable that he should let infinite ages pass without putting forth his creative power, that it was not until within about six thousand years that he began to produce intelligent beings. This may have some force, but it is not conclusive, for human reason is too short sighted to see what is proper for infinite wisdom to do.

A more conclusive reason is found in the Scriptures. It is pretty clear upon the face of the record, that Adam and Eve did not remain long in their pristine state before the fall. After the fall, Cain and Abel were born, both grew to be men, and one was " a tiller of the ground," and the other, " a keeper of sheep," and Cain killed Abel and was banished, before Seth was born; yet the birth of Seth was only one hundred and thirty years after Adam was created. Now, as " Seth lived a hundred and five years" before he begat his first born, it is probable that Cain and Abel were of like age at the time of the murder and banishment, which leaves but little or no time to have elapsed between the creation of Adam, and the fall. Yet prior to the fall there were good angels, for God placed cherubims to keep the way of the tree of life when he drove Adam out of the garden. It is also very clear that there were fallen angels, and that they existed in a fallen state before Adam fell. It is generally held by Christians that the devil, or an evil spirit was concerned in the temptation and fall of Adam and Eve. If so, there were fallen angels before Adam

fell, and as he fell soon after his creation, the presumption is that angels were created prior to the creation of man.

There is however, one text which clearly implies that there were intelligent beings at the time when God commenced the creation of this world. It is the words of Jehovah himself.

Job. 38: 4-7: " Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding. Who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest? or who hath stretched the line upon it? Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened? or who laid the cornerstone thereof. When the morning-stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?"

This supposes that there were morning-stars to sing, and sons of God to shout, when the foundation of this world was laid, or in other words, when this creation was commenced. By these morning-stars and sons of God, angels must be meant.

III. Angels are represented in Scripture as a class of beings superior to humanity, and as possessed of great power.

Psalm. 103: 20: " Bless the Lord, ye his angels that excel in strength."

Heb. 1: 7: " Who maketh his angels spirits and his ministers a flame of fire." By ministers angels are meant. They are spirits, and as God's ministers they are a flame of fire. The few developments of their power, which are recorded, prove them to possess great power.

The two angels that came to Sodom smote the men around Lot's door with blindness. Gen. 19: 11.

The angel with whom Jacob wrestled but touched the hollow of his thigh, and it was out of joint. Gen. 32: 25.

One angel, as God's minister of wrath, smote the people of Israel from Dan to Beersheba, and laid seventy thousand low in death by the fell sweep of his arm, and then stretched out his hand upon Jerusalem to destroy it, when God said, "stay now thy hand." 2 Sam. 24: 15, 16.

One angel slew one hundred and eighty-five thousand in the Assyrian camp in one night. Isa. 37: 36.

Other cases might be named, but these are sufficient to show that angels possess great power.

IV. Angels are very numerous.

The exact number of angels is not revealed, but that they are very numerous is rendered certain.

When the eyes of the servant of Elisha were opened, he saw the mountain full of horses and chariots of fire round about his master. 2 Kings 6: 17.

Psalm. 68: 17: " The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels."

Daniel, in describing the appearance of the " Ancient of days," says, " thousands ministered unto him." Chap. 7: 10.

When Peter stretched out his hand and smote the servant of the high priest, Jesus said, put up again thy sword into his place. Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels." Matt. 26: 52, 53.

Paul speaks of Christians as being allied "to an innumerable company of angels." Heb. 12: 22.

Rev. 5: 11: " And I beheld and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands."

It is worthy of remark, that angels are often classified as divided into different orders, and this leaves an impression on the mind that they are numerous.

Paul, in speaking of Christ, Col. 1: 16, says, " For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him."

Thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers, are supposed to denote four distinct orders or classifications of angels.

Peter alludes to a similar classification.

1 Peter 3: 22: In speaking of Christ, the Apostle says, " Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels, and authorities, and powers, being made subject unto him."

Here are only three classes or orders named —" angels, authorities and powers."

V. Angels are often employed with, and are interested in the affairs of this world.

These facts have appeared, incidentally, in discussing the points already considered. It may be proper, however, to note the facts a little more distinctly. It has been seen that angels have been employed both as messengers of wrath and of mercy, as in the destruction of the Assyrian army, and in the deliverance of the apostles out of prison. The Scriptures give an account of various other acts performed and messages delivered by angels, which need not be particularly mentioned.

Paul asks this significant question, Heb. 1: 14: " Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation!"

This has the force of an affirmation, that they are all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for those who shall be heirs of salvation. The manner in which a multitude of them sang when Christ was born, Luke 2: 14, shows that they felt a deep interest in the subject of the world's redemption.

Christ says, Luke 15: 10, " There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." 1 Peter 1: 12, in speaking of the death of Christ, and the glory that should follow, says, " which things the angels desire to look into."

The doctrine that every person has a particular guardian angel, may be true, but it does not appear to be revealed sufficiently clear to be classed among the doctrines to be embodied in a system of theology.

VI. Angels are immortal spirits.

Some have supposed that angels have bodies, but the discussion of this question is unnecessary, for if they have bodies, they are spiritual bodies, and can in no degree be analogous to our material bodies. We are now utterly incapable of comprehending our own future resurrection bodies, of which Paul says, 1 Cor. 15: 44: " It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body."

"What Paul here calls a spiritual body, may be no body at all, if tested by our present material organism. It may be neither ponderous, tangible, or visible to our present senses. It must then appear mere speculation to discuss the question, whether or not angels have bodies. We know they are immortal spirits, and that is all that is certainly revealed. The words of our Savior in reply to the Sadducees in regard to the resurrection of the dead, settles this question.

Luke 20: 35, 36: " But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

Here we have the fact distinctly brought to light, that angels cannot die, and if they have bodies, they are spiritual and immortal bodies.

There is one other question, which is connected with the subject under consideration, and that is the fall of angels; but this will be made the subject of the next section, to be discussed in connection with the existence of devils.

SECTION II.

The Existence and Evil Influence of Devils.

The existence of evil spirits is most clearly taught in the Scriptures, and yet it has often been denied. Those who seek to divest religion of all supernatural influence, find it necessary to dispose of this class of influences also. When Christ has been divested of all divine attributes, and reduced to the level of a very good man; when the miracles he wrought have been explained away; when the direct influence of the Holy Spirit is denied, and regeneration is made to consist of a mere change of opinion, followed by a correction of some of the habits of life; and when all future punishment is denied, and hell is converted into the grave, or is made to exist only in the human mind, composed of the elements of a guilty conscience, then there is little room left in the system, for the existence and influence of devils or evil spirits, and they are easily reduced to the fleshy element in every man, to some bodily disease, or to some personal human adversary, as the exegesis of different texts may require. The question of the existence of devils, is so intimately connected with various other parts of the Christian system, as to render it a matter of importance, and it is proposed to devote a brief section to the subject. The main effort will be to prove the existence of devils, or evil spirits, which are tempters of men, and promoters of evil. Let it be remarked, before commencing the argument, that devils are believed to be fallen angels, that there are many of them, and that when *the devil* is mentioned, the leader of the apostate host is meant.

I. The demoniac possessions described in the New Testament, and said to have been relieved by Christ and his Apostles, are urged in proof of the existence of devils. The account given of Christ's casting out devils, most clearly implies, upon its face, that the devils said to be cast out were real beings, evil spirits. This is so obviously the sense of the language used, that it is only by a forced and unnatural construction, which violates all just rules of interpretation, that it is made to bear any other sense.

Among those, therefore, who deny the existence of devils, there is no uniform method of interpretation; in one text a devil is the personified principle of evil; in another text the devil is the evil propensity of human nature; in another, the devil is some personal enemy or adversary, a human enemy, a man of course; and in yet another text, the devil is a disease, madness, or violent insanity. That the inspired writers should have used language so vaguely is not possible. But the absurdity of all these interpretations will appear in the course of the investigation.

1. There are cases recorded, where one person was possessed of many devils. Two cases are distinctly recorded. The case of the man that dwelt among the tombs is very decisive.

Mark 5: 2-16, and Luke 8: 27-38: This man was possessed of many devils. Jesus asked the man his name, " and he said Legion, because many devils were entered into him." From this point the conversation was carried on in the plural form, as with a company. " They besought him that he would not command them to go out into the deep." " They besought him that he would suffer them," &c. " Then the devils went out of the man." "The man, out of whom the devils were departed." Here, devils, they, and them, are so employed as to denote a company of devils.

Also, it is said, " there was a great herd of swine," and "a herd of many swine." As two or more devils might enter into one of the swine, there may have been more devils than swine; but as it does not appear that one devil could enter into two of the swine at the same time, there could not have been less devils in number, than there were swine.

In Mark 16: 9, and Luke 8: 2, we are told that Christ cast seven devils out of Mary Magdalene. A legion of what were cast out of the man? Seven of what were cast out of Mary? No one can answer these questions, who denies the existence of devils, as personal evil spirits.

2. The devils which Christ cast out, had a personal existence, separate and distinct from those men and women, out of whom they were cast.

This point is clearly proved by the case cited above, of the man out of whom a legion was cast. It is said, " many devils were entered into him." They were some-thing that entered into the man from without, and must have existed before they entered into him.

Again, it is said, " then went the devils out of the man, and entered into the swine." As they existed before they entered into the man, so they existed after they came out of him. They passed from the man to the swine, and must have maintained a distinct existence and identity, from both the man and the swine. They entered into the swine, and still existed, and in them passed away into the deep. The same is implied in their request " that he would not send them away out of the country." Mark 5: 10. Nothing but personal beings, possessing distinct existence and identity, could be sent away out of the country. It was not the man that desired not to be sent out of the country, but the devils. If it were the man, then as they were sent into the swine, instead of being sent out of the country, it would follow that the man went into the swine, which is false upon its face, for when they were gone into the swine, the man was there clothed, and in his right mind.

Another very clear case is recorded, Mark 9: 17-27: In this case the distinction is made very plain, between the man and the spirit, or devil, that was in him. When they brought the person to Jesus, it is said, "when he saw him, straightway the spirit tore him, and he fell on the ground." Note, it was the spirit that was in the person, that tore the person, not that the person tore himself, or that the spirit tore itself; the spirit in the person, tore the person in which it was. Then Jesus " rebuked the foul spirit," not the person, " saying unto him thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him and enter no more into him." Christ here commanded the spirit to come out of the person, which proves that it was not the man, but something in him, yet no part of him, but a distinct, rational, personality.

Again, Jesus commanded the spirit to " enter no more into him," which proves that it was a living, rational, active being, after it came out of him, capable, in itself of going back, but for this charge. Once more. Under this charge, the spirit cried and rent him [the person] sore, and came out of him." The spirit came out, which a distinct personality alone could do.

Many other similar cases might be adduced, but enough has been said to prove that the devils which were cast out by Christ, were distinct beings, distinct from those in whom they were, and out of whom they were cast.

3. The devils of the New Testament have the attributes and actions ascribed to them, which belong only to real personal beings.

Matt. 8: 29: " And, behold, they cried out, saying, what have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?"

Here is intelligence. The intelligence is superior in degree to any man, much more a lunatic. They knew more than the multitude, for they had not yet learned that he was Jesus, the Son of God. They also looked into the future and saw there was a time of punishment coming, and demanded if he had come to torment them before that time. They also possessed the passion of fear, and showed that it was roused by the approaching footsteps of the Redeemer.

Verse 31: " So the devils besought him, saying, if thou cast us out, suffer us to go away into the herd of swine."

Here is not only intelligence but desire, choice, and volition. It will not do to say that it was the man that did this, and not the devils that were in him, for it would make man ask to go into the swine, and the request was granted, and the same that asked to be allowed to go into the swine, went into them, but it was not the man.

Mark 1: 23-27: " And there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out, Saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? Art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the unclean spirit had torn him, and cried with a loud voice, he came out of him. And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying. What thing is this? What new doctrine is this? For with authority commandeth he even the unclean spirits, and they do obey him."

Here is every mark of an intelligent being, described as in the man, yet not the man, but distinct from him. The spirit cried out; the spirit tore him and cried with a loud voice. It is allowed that the devil used the man's vocal organs to cry, yet it was the devil and not the man that cried. There was but one man, but the spirit said, let us alone, what have we to do with thee? Jesus rebuked him, the spirit that talked, and said come out of him, the man, and he, the spirit came out of him, the man. The people understood it to be an intelligent being, for they said, " with authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits and they obey him." But it is clear that the spirit developed a knowledge above that of the most wise of the multitude, by declaring that Christ was the holy one of God. The people had not yet learned that fact.

Luke 4: 41: " And devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And he rebuking them, suffered them not to speak: for they knew that he was Christ."

It is perfectly clear that it was not the persons that knew Christ, but the devils that were in them, and that came out of them. It is also clear that it was the devils and not the persons that Christ rebuked and suffered not to speak, for it was that which came out of the persons which were rebuked, and to say it was the persons, is to make the Scriptures say that the persons came out of themselves. But Christ suffered them not to speak because they knew him. But the people did not yet know him, and to suppose that all these demoniac possessions were merely cases of insanity, is to say that the madmen of Judea, at our Saviour's time, had more real religious knowledge than all the sane people of the land, learned and unlearned together.

4. It was clearly the opinion of the Jews that there were devils, and that it was real devils that Christ cast out.

It is not only known that the Jews believed in the existence of devils as a matter of history, but it is clear from the facts recorded in the New Testament. They repeatedly charged Christ with having a devil, which they would not have done if diabolism had not been a common doctrine among the people. See Matt. 11: 18; Luke, 7: 33; and John 7: 20, and 10: 20. In all these texts they charged Christ with having a devil.

But what most positively settles this question is the manner in which they accounted for the fact that he cast out devils. This we have recorded in four places, as follows: —

Matt. 9: 34: " But the Pharisees said, He casteth out devils through the prince of the devils." Mat. 12: 24: " But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, this fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils." Mark 3: 22: " And the scribes which came down from Jerusalem said, he hath Beelzebub, and by the prince of the devils casteth he out devils." Luke 11: 15: " But some of them said, He casteth out devils through Beelzebub the chief of the devils."

Here is a clear admission that devils were cast out. There is also a clearly implied admission that the work done, the act of casting out these devils, required more than ordinary human power. Had it been only the work of the common powers of man, they would have had no occasion to account for it, as it would have furnished no proof in favor of Jesus Christ. These facts being admitted, as they must be, they necessarily draw after them an admission that real devils were cast out. Could the Jews have denied the existence of devils, that would have been a better reply, but they could not, for diabolism was a common belief. Could they have admitted the existence of devils, yet denied that he cast them out, that would have been their best defense, but that they could not do, for all the people knew that he cast them out. They were therefore driven to the necessity of accounting for it upon the ground of diabolism itself. " He casteth out devils through the prince of the devils." And again, " He casteth out devils through Beelzebub the chief of the devils." This is a clear admission that there are devils, and there is a chief or head

devil over them. If it be denied that the Jews believed in the existence of devils, and in a prince or chief who is their leader, whom they called Beelzebub, there was no sense in their reply. Call the devils cast out anything else, than real evil spirits and the whole controversy between the Jews and Christ loses its point and its sense.

5. Christ pursued a course which could but confirm the common belief in the existence of devils, and leave the impression that they were real devils which he cast out, the manner in which Christ replied to the Jews when they accused him of casting out devils by Beelzebub the prince of the devils, is quite conclusive. The Savior did what is called casting out devils, and so great and astonishing was the performance, that the people were rapidly believing on him in consequence. To destroy his influence, they charged that he did it by the chief of the devils. This explanation, as has been seen, took for granted that real devils were cast out, and our Lord's defense proceeded upon the same principle, that real devils were cast out. Christ did not intimate that they had mistaken the nature of the work he had performed, but only that it was not performed through the agency which they charged. The illustration of a kingdom divided against itself met the case if real devils were involved in the discussion, but if anything else was meant, it had neither point nor meaning. It was just the thing to confirm all who heard the discussion, in the common belief that they were real demoniac possessions. But there are other cases where Christ pursued a course to confirm this belief, or even to produce it, had it not existed, a few of which shall be noticed. Christ sent out his ministers to preach and work miracles, among which casting out devils is classed. In the following text we have the result stated.

Luke 10: 17,18: " And the seventy returned, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name; and he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven." If they believed in devils, this reply was calculated to confirm them in that belief; and if they did not believe in devils, what would Christ have the disciples believe it was that he saw fall from heaven?

Luke 4: 35: " And Jesus rebuked him saying, hold thy peace and come out of him." Here Christ, in casting out what is called a devil, speaks with authority, not to the man, but to the devil he was casting out of the man. " And Jesus rebuked him, [the devil] and said, come out of him," [the man.] Did they believe in the existence of real demoniac possessions, the solemn and direct address of our Lord, to their imaginary demons was certainly calculated to confirm them in their error, if it be an error; and if they did not believe in the existence of devils, to whom would Jesus have had the by-stander suppose he was addressing himself, with such commanding authority?

6. The integrity and inspiration of the writers of the New Testament cannot be maintained, if the existence of devils were denied. They have given descriptions and used such words in regard to demoniac possessions, as to involve either the real existence of devils, the ignorance of the writers, or their willful prevarication. A few general descriptions may be first alluded to.

Matt. 4: 24: " And his fame went throughout all Syria: and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were

possessed with devils, and those which were lunatic, and those that had the palsy; and he healed them."

Let it be remarked, that the Evangelist does not give the words of Christ in this text, but describes what Christ did, as he understood it, in his own words. He distinguishes demoniac possessions from all kinds of diseases, from all sick people. He distinguishes in particular, between being possessed of devils, and being lunatic. This proves, beyond a doubt, that lunatics are not meant where persons are said to be possessed of devils. The language is directly calculated to confirm the common opinion that existed in regard to demoniac possessions; indeed it would have given origin to such an opinion, had it not already existed; yea, more, it is clearly based upon that opinion. No man would use such language, unless he believed in real devils, or meant to countenance that belief in others. The conclusion is, that Matthew believed in demoniac possessions, or meant falsely to produce that belief in others. If he did not believe in devils, he was false. If he did believe in devils, then is the doctrine of diabolism true, or he was ignorant and not inspired.

St. Mark must fall into the same dilemma.

Mark 1: 34: *' And he healed many that were sick of divers diseases, and cast out many devils; and suffered not the devils to speak, because they knew him."

Here again the writer does not repeat the words of Christ, but gives his own opinion, in his own words, of what Christ did. Nearly, or quite all, that was said on the text last quoted, is applicable to this, and need not be repeated. Mark, like Matthew, distinguishes between being sick and being possessed of devils. But he adds, that Christ suffered not the devils to speak, as though he really believed that the devils thus cast out were beings capable of speaking, and understanding the character and mission of the Son of God. What cried out if there are no devils that are personal beings? And who did St. Mark suppose cried out if he did not believe in real demoniac possessions?

St. Luke has also fallen into the same error, if an error it be.

Luke 4: 41: " And devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And he, rebuking them, suffered them not to speak: for they knew that he was Christ."

Can any one believe that a man of common sense, would give such a description of the cure of sick persons, or of the restoration of insane persons to their right minds? Much less, can any one believe that such a description was given by the spirit of inspiration, without believing in the existence of demoniac possessions. But take one other case.

Luke 11: 14: " And he was casting out a devil, and it was dumb. And it came to pass, when the devil was gone out, the dumb spake; and the people wondered."

One of two things is true in this case, there was a real devil in the person, and that devil rendered the person dumb, and hence, was called a dumb devil; or the person was simply

dumb, and Christ simply cured some natural defect in the vocal organs. It is not possible that a man should give such a description of the simple cure of a dumb person, unless he was ignorant of the fact himself, and supposed there was a devil in the person, or wished to deceive and induce such a belief on the part of others. Note the language. " He was casting out a devil, and it [the devil] was dumb. And it came to pass, when the devil was gone out, the dumb spake;" that is, the person who was dumb, while the dumb devil was in him spake when the devil was gone out of him. What went out? Surely, nothing, if the person was simply dumb from defective vocal organs, and if there was no devil or evil spirit concerned in it. In the light of the description here given of Christ's performance, the existence of real devils cannot be denied, without impeaching, either the intelligence or integrity of St. Luke.

After these general descriptions, it is proper to look more critically at the names; used by the sacred writers, to designate these devils.

There are four words used in the New Testament to denote the evil spirits, commonly called devils.

Diabolos is the first to be named. This word signifies a slanderer, a traducer, a backbiter, an informer, a spy, and the devil; that is, the chief of devils. It occurs thirty-eight times in the New Testament, and is clearly applied to human beings only four times. It is applied to Judas, John 6: 70; "One of you is a devil."

1 Tim. 3: 11, it is rendered slanderers; and 2 Tim. 3: 3, and Titus 2: 3, it is rendered false accusers. In all the other thirty-four cases, it refers to the devil, beyond all doubt, if there is any such being, and if there is not, it cannot be known what or who it does mean. It cannot be possible that inspired writers have used one word thirty-eight times, and so used it only four times out of the whole, as to enable the reader to know what it means, which must be the case, if there is no devil. A few only of the texts need be referred to.

This is the word used where Christ is said to have been tempted of the devil. Matt, 4: 1, 5, 8, 11; Luke 4: 2, 3, 5, 6, 13.

It is the word used by our Lord in the parable. Matt. 13: 39: " The enemy that sowed them is the devil."

It is the word used, Matt. 25: 41: "The devil and his angels."

It is used in James, 4: 7: " Resist the devil and he will flee from you."

It is used, 1 Peter 5: 8: "Your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion walketh about."

It is used, 1 John 3: 8: "He that committeth sin is of the devil, for the devil sinneth from the beginning."

It is used, Rev. 20: 10: " The devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire."

These cases are referred to as specimens of the use of the word.

Daimonion is the next word to be noticed, which is translated devil, this word is used sixty times in the New Testament, and is rendered devil in every case save one, and in that it is rendered gods.

Acts 17: 18: " He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods."

Here *daimonion*, in its plural form, is rendered gods. It is so rendered because it was used by the heathen Greeks, and they used the word to denote a divinity or any spirit good or bad.

The word, as used by the Greeks, signifies a divinity, a spirit, a specter or ghost, a demon, an evil spirit, the devil. In no one case, is it applied to man in the New Testament, and if it does not mean an evil spirit or spirits, in every one of the fifty-nine cases in which it is used and rendered devil, no one can tell what it does mean. A few of these cases will be noticed as mere specimens.

This is the word used where devils are said to have been cast out.

Matt. 9: 33: " When the devil was cast out."

Verse 34: " He casteth out devils through the prince of the devils."

Chap. 10: 8: " Raise the dead, cast out devils."

Mark 1: 34: " Cast out many devils."

Luke 4: 41: " Devils also came out of many."

John 10: 20: " Can a devil open the eyes of the blind."

1 Cor. 10: 20: " They sacrifice to devils and not to God."

James 2: 19: " The devils also believe and tremble."

Daimon, is the third word used to denote the devil, or evil spirits. From this word, the last mentioned is said to be derived, and its signification is the same as it is used in the New Testament. It occurs only five times, and appears to be used in the place of the other word. The texts are, Matt. 8: 31; Mark 5: 12; Luke 8: 29; Rev. 16: 14; and 18: 2,

Among the Greeks this word signifies a god or goddess, but was commonly used to signify an evil deity.

Satan, or *Satanas*, is the fourth and final word used to denote the devil. This is a Hebrew word, and is found in Greek composition, only in the New Testament. In Hebrew it signifies an adversary, an enemy an oppressor, a persecutor, and is used to denote the devil as the great enemy of man-kind. It is clearly used to denote the chief of evil spirits or devils, as it never occurs in the plural. We read of devils, but not of Satans. It occurs about thirty times in the New Testament, and is used in the same sense as the other words, save that it is used only where the head or chief of evil spirits is meant.

A few texts will serve as examples to show the sense in which it is used.

Matt. 4: 1-10. Here the being who is called the devil in the 1st, 5th, and 8th verses, Christ, in the 10th verse, calls Satan.

In Matt. 12: 24, 26, where the Pharisees said, that Christ cast out devils by Beelzebub the prince of the [daimonian] devils, he replied, " And if [Satanas] Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself,"

Here, what the Pharisees called the prince of the devils, Christ called Satan.

Mark 4: 15: " Satan cometh and taketh away the word that was sown in their hearts."

Luke 10: 18: " I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven,"

In John 13: 2, it is said that the devil put it into the heart of Judas to betray Christ, but in 27, it is said Satan entered into him.

Acts 5: 3: " Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie?"

Chap. 26: 18: "To turn them from the power of Satan unto God."

2 Cor. 11: 14: " Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light."

The above are sufficient to show how the word is used by the inspired writers. It must now appear, that if we deny the existence of devils, no explanation can be given of the description of demoniac possessions, and the manner in which the terms are used which denote evil spirits, that will vindicate the writers of the New Testament. If they believed in such spirits, and yet if diabolism be not true, they were ignorant and could not have been inspired; and if they did not believe in the existence of evil spirits, they could not have been justified in writing on the subject as they did.

7. The devils which were cast out are called spirits. This of itself is sufficient to settle the question. Let the fact be first settled, and then the meaning of the word spirit be determined.

Matt. 8: 16: "When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with Devils: and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick."

Chap. 10: 1: "And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease."

Mark 1: 25, 26 " And Jesus rebuked him, saying. Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the unclean spirit had torn him, and cried with a loud voice, he came out of him.

Luke 6: 36: " And they were all amazed, and spake among themselves, saying, what a word is this! For with authority and power he commandeth the unclean spirits, and they come out."

In all the above texts, and in more which might be adduced, devils are called spirits. The reader's attention is now invited to two remarkable cases which have not yet been alluded to. As they are important, the brief history is quoted.

Acts 16: 16-18: " And it came to pass as we went to prayer, a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination met us, which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying. The same followed Paul and us, and cried, saying, these men are the servants of the most high God, which show unto us the way of salvation. And this did she many days. But Paul being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ, to come out of her. And he came out the same hour."

Here what is called a spirit was ejected from a damsel, by Paul. Paul addressed the spirit, and said, " come out of her." Then the writer says, he [the spirit] came out of her, [the damsel] the same hour." The use of the pronouns *he*, and *her*, shows that two distinct personalities were there.

The damsel is said to have had a spirit of divination; that is a spirit by which she divined. The word in Greek is *python*, python, or Apollo, and signifies a diviner or soothsayer, one that tells fortunes.

Acts 19: 11-17: " And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul; so that from his body were brought unto the sick, handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them. Then certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits, the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, We adjure you by Jesus, whom Paul preacheth. And there were seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew, and chief of the priests, which did so. And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye? And the man in whom the evil spirit was, leaped on them, and overcame them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded. And this was known to all the Jews and Greeks also dwelling at Ephesus; and fear fell on them all, and the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified."

This account could never have been written by a person, who disbelieved in the existence of evil spirits, unless he meant to deceive. But the main point now is that the devils, said to have been cast out, are called spirits. The evil spirits which went out of many through Paul's influence, doubtless were cases like those where Christ is said to have cast out devils, also called spirits.

The case then being settled, that the devils cast out were called spirits, let an inquiry be made into the meaning of the word. The Greek word rendered Spirit, is *pneuma*. It occurs about three hundred and eighty times in the New Testament, and is translated spirit in every case except three. In John 3: 8, it is rendered *wind*; in 1 Cor. 14: 12, it is rendered *spiritual*; and in Rev. 13: 15, it is rendered *life*. In every other case it is rendered spirit.

The word *pneuma*, signifies wind, breath, air, life, soul; a spiritual being, good or bad; the Holy Ghost or Spirit. It is the only word used in the New Testament to denote the Spirit of God. The word has no signification in Greek, which it can be made to bear in the demoniac possessions described, which will give to the texts a clear sense, which will not include the common idea of the existence of devils or evil spirits. The word can mean nothing else in the connections in which it is used. This last remark is true of all the words used to denote these evil spirits, devil, Satan, and spirit. A few illustrations will show this, with which this branch of the argument will close. Please read a few of the texts where Christ is said to have cast out devils, making the necessary substitution for the word devil, and see what will be the sense. Begin with the man that dwelt among the tombs. Luke 8: 27-28. What word, then, will you substitute for devil, that will give the sense? Will you call it the corrupt principle in man, depravity? That will do, only you must then admit that one man had a legion of corrupt principles, or depravities, and that they went out of the man into a herd of swine, and that hogs were, once at least, actually possessed human depravity.

Will you call it a personified principle? Then you will have to allow that one man had a legion of personified principles of evil in him, and that they actually made him furious, and that Christ sent them out of the man into the swine, and that these personified principles of evil made the swine as furious as they had made the man. It may be a little difficult to see how a mere personified principle could be so powerful.

Will you call it a disease, some kind of sickness, then you must admit that many sicknesses had " entered into him," and that those sicknesses desired not to be sent out of the country, but preferred going into the swine, and that they actually went into the swine, so that there was a transfer of sickness from the man to the hogs.

Will you say that insanity is meant by the devil. This the skeptic is most likely to say, but then he must read the story after this manner: " There met him a man which had insanities, and he cried out and fell down before him, and with a loud voice said, what have I to do with thee, Jesus thou Son of God? I beseech thee torment me not. For he had commanded the unclean insanity to come out of him. And Jesus asked him, what is thy name? And he said Legion, for many insanities were entered into him. And the insanities besought him that he would not command them to go out into the deep. And there was

there a herd of swine feeding on the mountain; and they besought him that he would suffer them to enter into them, and he suffered them. Then went the insanities out of the man, and entered into the swine, and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the lake, and were choked."

An appeal may be made to common sense, that the insanity, if there be any insanity in the case, must be with the writer, he who gave such an account of the cure of an insane person, or with the reader, who understands the history of the case to be an account of the cure of an insane man. Exclude the idea of devils from it, and there is no sense in the narrative.

Try one other text. Luke 9: 1: " Then he called his twelve disciples together and gave them power and authority over all devils and to cure diseases."

What will you please to substitute for all devils in this text? Will you call it all kinds of evil propensities? That power they never had, or they would have converted the world.

Will you call it, " all personified principles of evil?" That will not make sense. To talk of giving power over all mere personifications of evil, is to talk without sense. Will you call it all diseases? That will not answer, for diseases are named in the latter member of the text. Devils are clearly distinguished from diseases.

If you call it all enemies, adversaries, opposers, slanderers, false accusers, each and all of these will render the text false, for they never had power over all these; but they had power to cast out devils in cases of demoniac possessions, and this is what is meant, and nothing else can be meant.

II. The existence of devils or evil spirits, is proved by the Scriptural history of temptation, and by their repeated cautions and warnings against being tempted.

The temptation of our first parents is a case which has proved fearful in its consequences. It is true something called " the serpent," is said to have been the tempter, yet, if it were a serpent or an animal, it was doubtless used by the devil to accomplish his design. The repeated allusions to the transaction confirms this view. The literality of the temptation and fall was sustained, chap. 5. sec. 2. That the devil was instrumental in that transaction is now the only point. That is clear from the fact that the devil is represented as the author of sin, and in that transaction it had its origin, so far as man is concerned

John 8: 44: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it."

Here the devil is represented as the first offender. And as the sin of Adam was the first human offence, he must have been the instigator of that, to justify the language. But he is

represented as the father of lies, and hence must have been the author of the first great lie that was told in this world. That lie was the one which the serpent told to Eve.

In perfect harmony with this, is the text which follows.

1 John 3: 8: " He that committeth sin, is of the devil: for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil."

Here it is said that the devil sinneth from the beginning. But the sin of Adam and Eve was the first sin of the class of which John is treating, and hence the devil must have sinned in their sin, to have sinned from the beginning. From that sin all sin has flowed as a direct or indirect consequence. Hence the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. The devil must have been concerned in the sin of Adam and Eve, or sin would not be his work.

It was proved in chap. 4. sec. 2, that by the sin of Adam and Eve, death was introduced into our world. As the devil was the instigator and father of that crime, he is represented as having the power of death. Taking this view, how clearly does the following text connect the devil with that transaction?

Heb. 2: 14,15: " Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; And deliver them who through fear of death were all their life time subject to bondage."

There can be no doubt that the devil obtained the power of death through the fall which brought death into the world; and as he was the principal actor in it, he is destroyed or overthrown when it is counteracted by the death and resurrection of Christ.

God said to the serpent, Gen. 3: 15 "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

That Christ is here meant by the seed of the woman, is clear.

Paul says, Gal. 4: 4: " God sent forth His Son made of a woman," and hence he was the woman's seed. He was the seed of a woman in a sense in which no other man ever was, as he had no human father. If then Christ is meant by the seed of the woman, the devil must be the principal in the transaction, as it is his head that Christ bruises, and it was his works that Christ came to destroy. To this Paul very clearly alludes, Rom. 16: 20: " And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly."

The temptation of the Savior is another clearly marked case. We are told by Matthew, Mark and Luke, that Christ was tempted of the devil. There was no evil propensity in

Christ to tempt him. In him there was no principle of evil to personify by a beautiful figure. He was born holy. Luke 1: 35.

"He was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners." Heb. 7: 26.

And though he "was in all points tempted like as we are," yet it was "without sin." Heb. 4: 15.

This temptation did not originate within him. Moreover, the tempter came to him and departed from him. Matt. 4: 3, 11.

This being which tempted Christ is called the tempter, the devil, and Satan. "Who was he, where did he come from, and where did he go to, if there is no devil?"

It could have been none of the men of that community, for then it would have been told who he was, his name, the city or town in which he lived, and the office he held would have been given; in a word, he would have been called a man and not the devil.

One text has been urged against this theory of the Saviour's temptation. It is James 1: 14: "Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed."

This text speaks of such temptation as results in sin. To be drawn away by our lust is a crime. Christ was not so tempted he resisted the temptation and was not drawn away, and though he was tempted "in all points," at every weak spot in humanity, it was "without sin," he not being drawn away. Moreover he had not the lusts by which other men are drawn away. His temptation was wholly from the devil, no part of it from within. The devil came and found nothing in him which he could excite to evil.

Nor can the force of this argument be turned away by calling it a mystery. The temptation of Christ was necessary to perfect him as our pattern, our leader, and captain of our salvation. It was necessary that he should meet, in his own person, and subdue every foe of humanity which is found between the cradle and the grave.

The many warnings and cautions of the inspired writers against the temptation of the devil, furnish clear proof of his existence.

Luke 8: 12: "Those by the wayside are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved."

What is meant by the devil in this text? Not the world or lust, for they are comprehended in other parts of the parable.

Luke 22: 31: "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat."

No particular person can be meant by the devil in this text, and it undoubtedly refers to the fact that the devil was the principal power concerned in the terrible temptation which Peter soon met, and under which he so ingloriously fell.

John 13: 2: " And supper being ended, (the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him."

Acts 5: 3: " But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land?"

2 Cor. 2: 11: " Lest Satan should get an advantage of us, for we are not ignorant of his devices."

2 Cor. 4: 4: "In whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God. should shine unto them."

2 Tim. 2: 26: " And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will"

1 Peter 5: 8: " Be sober, be vigilant: because your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour."

In all those texts it is implied that there is danger, that a common foe is in the field, and that the danger is from one and the same enemy in all these cases, which proves that whatever modern refinement may have done for humanity, the inspired writers believed there was a common, invisible spiritual foe, whom they called the devil.

III. A brief allusion to the origin and history of devils, or the devil and his angels, will close this argument.

Devils are believed to be fallen angels. This appears to be the doctrine of the Bible. There is nothing more absurd or unphilosophic in the existence of fallen angels than there is in the existence of fallen men, who were created in the image of God. Wicked angels may be as consistent with God's government as wicked men. As the Scriptures were not given us to teach us the history of the spirit world, but to teach us the origin, duty and destiny of humanity, allusions to the fall of angels are only few and incidentally made. Yet they are sufficient to settle the question. The following texts are believed to refer to the fall of angels.

Job. 4: 18,19: " Behold, he put no trust in his servants and his angels he charged with folly, how much less in them that dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust." Here is an allusion to the fall of angels too plain to be overlooked. The text says expressly, that " he charged his angels with folly;" and what clearly proves that the inhabitants of the world of spirits is meant by angels is, the comparison which is instituted between these angels and men whom the writer distinguishes by the expression,

" *them that dwell in houses of clay* " The meaning appears to be this. If he put no trust in his servants, the angels, who are disembodied, but charged them with folly, how much less shall he put confidence in men, who are embodied or dwell in houses of clay.

Fallen angels, of course, are the subject of this allusion, for we cannot suppose God ever charged the holy angels with folly.

Luke 10: 18: " And he said unto them I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven."

If this does not teach the doctrine of Satan's fall, it must be hard to conceive in what language it could be taught.

2 Peter 2: 4: " God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment."

Jude 6: " And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day."

Here are two direct references to the fall of angels, for the purpose of illustrating the dealings of God with men. The argument is that of induction, in which it is shown that certain false teachers cannot escape punishment, from the fact of the punishment which God inflicted upon transgressors in past time. To show this, that God has heretofore punished the rebellious, three cases are adduced, viz., the angels that sinned were cast down to hell; the inhabitants of the old world were destroyed by a flood brought in upon the ungodly; and the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah were condemned with an overthrow, turned into ashes, and made an example unto those who should after live ungodly. The fall of angels is not only referred to, but is classed with those awful events, the drowning of the old world by a flood, and the consuming of Sodom and Gomorrah by a storm of fire; and it is worthy of remark that St. Peter notices these events in the order of time in which, they occurred. Here, then, is an event, the sin and punishment of angels, awful from the very association in which inspiration has placed it, as well as from the description given of it. What event, then, is here described, and who are the beings here called angels? That some rational accountable beings are intended by "*the, angels that sinned,*" no one can doubt, for none but rational accountable beings can sin and become subjects of punishment. Men cannot be meant, and the fall of angels is the subject of the text. It has sometimes been affirmed as an objection to the doctrine of fallen angels, that Peter and Jude borrowed their imagery from the heathen writers. If this were admitted, it would not weaken the argument, but if the heathen got their notions on the subject from early revelations, it would render the argument conclusive. The ancient Greeks appear to have received by tradition, an account of the punishment of the fallen angels, and of bad men after death; and their poets did, in conformity with that account, make *tartarus* the place where the giants who rebelled against Jupiter, and the souls of the wicked were confined. " Here," said Hesiod, " the rebellious Titans were bound in penal chains,

*"As far beneath the earth,
as earth from heaven,*

For such the distance thence to tartarus."

And Homer, Iliad 8, line 13, introduces Jupiter threatening any of the gods who should presume to assist either the Greeks or the Trojans, that he should either come back wounded to heaven, or be sent to *tartarus*.

*"Or far, O far from steep Olympus thrown;
Low in the deep tartarean gulf shall groan.
That gulf which iron gates and brazen ground
Within the earth inexorable bound;
As deep beneath the infernal centre hurled
As from that centre to the ethereal world."*

If it were true that the apostles adopted the imagery used by the heathen poets, it was adopted because it was true to fact, and coming to us from them, it has the endorsement of inspiration, yet it is more probable that the heathen obtained their ideas of fallen angels by tradition, from the early people of God.

Before closing this section, it is proper to notice some of the principal objections which have been urged against the existence of devils.

I. It has been objected that if the devils or fallen angels are chained, as represented in the texts that have been quoted, then they cannot be the tempters of men on this earth.

Now, to reply to this, it is only necessary to enquire what is meant by the fallen angels being chained. It is presumed that no one supposes that the devil is chained literally, with a material chain, as we hand-cuff a criminal; and chain him down to the floor of his prison; such a notion, when applied to spirits, is too absurd to be indulged by the most superstitious and vulgar. What then is meant by the fallen angels being chained? Their chains may signify their hopeless despair, there being with them no hope or prospect of ever escaping from their wretched condition. Or their being chained may denote that they are so held in on all sides, by the divine power as not to be able to go beyond certain limits in their work of malevolence, temptation and ruin. Had not Satan his chain in this respect, beyond the length of which he cannot go, we should, no doubt, see other marks of his goings than those that now appear. Now, what is there in all this contrary to the common belief in satanic influence in this world. Should it be thought absurd to suppose that God can lay any restraint upon Satan, and yet not confine him entirely, so as altogether to prevent his evil influence in this world, a sufficient answer will be found in the reply to the following objection.

II. It has sometimes been objected that it is inconsistent with the divine power and goodness that such a satanic majesty, as the devil is supposed to be, should exist and be permitted to roam with such destroying influence through the world and church of God. This argument is sometimes stated thus: God has power to destroy or control the devil, or he has not; if he has not the power, he cannot be omnipotent, and the devil becomes a kind of omnipotent being, at least equal with God; and if God has power to destroy or

control the devil, and will not do it, he becomes accessory to his deeds, and can be but little better than the devil himself. That this argument is fallacious is evident from the circumstance that it may be applied to disprove what is plain matter of fact. It proves just as much against the existence of wicked men, as it does against the existence of devils. It is said, Eccl. 9: 18: " One sinner destroyeth much good." Now, God has power to destroy or control this sinner, so as to prevent his destroying much good, or he has not. If God cannot destroy or control the sinner he cannot be omnipotent, and the sinner becomes a kind of omnipotent being, at least equal with God; and if God can destroy or control the sinner, so as to prevent his destroying much good, and will not, he becomes accessory to his deeds and can be but little better than the sinner himself.

It is seen, then, that this argument proves just as much against the existence of wicked men as it does against the existence of devils; and the existence and evil influence of wicked men it can never disprove, since these are plain matters of fact; therefore it can never disprove the existence of devils. What God has power to do, and what he may see it proper to do, are two things quite distinct from each other. We know not but God may have the power to annihilate the devil by one look from off his throne; but if it be so it cannot prove that it is consistent for him so to do. That God's peculiar people are sometimes tempted and led astray by wicked men, is a fact too plain to be denied, and it can detract no more from the power or goodness of God to suppose that a similar evil influence is exerted by the devil.

III. It has been objected to the doctrine of satanic influence, that if the devil tempts men as generally, and in all parts of the world as is believed, he must be capable of being in many places at the same time, or he must be omnipresent, which can never be ceded to any created being. The fallacy of this objection consists in supposing that absolute ubiquity is essential to satanic influence as generally as believed. On this subject we beg leave to remark.

1. That every created being has his own sphere of being, which he is capable of filling; more than which he cannot fill, beyond which he cannot go, and out of which he cannot act: as no being can act where he is not. Some beings, however, may fill a larger sphere than others.
2. Spiritual or disembodied beings may, no doubt, convey themselves from one place to another with great facility, which unquestionably is the case with the devil. We know not but he can pass around the globe quick as the motion of light. The movements of disembodied spirits, for aught we can know, are as easy as our thoughts which pass to the most distant orb in the smallest imaginable period of time.
3. To the above let it be added, that there may be more devils than there are men in the world. The apostle informs us that angels sinned; but how many sinned and fell we are not told. We also read of the devil and his angels; while we are informed that seven devils were cast out of one individual, and a legion out of another. These circumstances render it more than probable that devils are more numerous than human beings, and that where we read of the devil, reference is had to the chief, prince, or leader of the infernal host;

hence, to him so much wickedness is attributed, though he has myriads under his command in its accomplishment.

At this point the reader's attention is dismissed from the subject of devils.

SECTION III.

The Immortality of the Human Soul.

The doctrine of the immortality of the soul of man, is of vast importance. Have I a soul, which is no part of my body, and which will live, and think, and act, when my body shall be dead? or have I no soul, and when I die, shall I cease to think? are questions which are calculated to awaken the deepest solicitude, and lead to the most profound research, if there be any doubt on the subject. With men, who in the midst of life are in death, it is a question of vital importance, whether death sends them into a dark dreamless sleep, or wakes them up to real existence, in comparison with which this life is but a dream. The doctrine maintained in the following arguments, is that the soul is a spirit, and that it does not die nor go to sleep, when the body dies, but exists, and thinks, and acts, in a separate state.

I. The Scriptures, in a most direct and clear manner, teach that the human soul is immortal, and does not die with the body.

Eccl. 3: 21: " Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" Dr. Clark, whose knowledge of Hebrew will not be questioned, says the literal translation of this text, is thus: " Who considereth the immortal spirit of the sons of Adam, which ascendeth. It is from above: and the spirit or breath of the cattle, which descendeth? It is downwards unto the earth, that is, it tends to the earth only."

The following is from Prof. Roy, author of Roy's Hebrew and English Dictionary which he affirms to be a true and literal translation of the text:

"Who knoweth the spirit of the sons of Adam, that ascends upwards to the highest place; or even the spirit of the cattle, which descends downwards into the low at part of the earth?"

It will be seen that these translations essentially agree, and the text as it stands in our own common translation, or as here rendered, contains the following points:

1. The spirit of a man and the spirit of a brute are distinguished the one from the other, and are particularly marked as tending in different directions, so that the destiny of the one cannot be inferred from the destiny of the other.

2. The expression, " the spirit of a man that goeth upward," clearly denotes, not only continued, but more elevated existence, and hence it may be regarded as a proof that the spirit survives the death of the body.

Eccl. 12: 7: " Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

We may test this text by a common sense rule, and learn its meaning, as we may most other texts. Suppose the text was not in the Bible; and suppose further, that the community were divided in opinion, some believing that the soul dies with the body, and others that it lives in the spirit world after the body is dead; and suppose still further, that a person whose opinion was unknown, should address this divided community, and should say, " Friends, you must all die, and then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the Spirit shall return unto God, who gave it," would any one doubt that he took sides with those who hold that the soul lives after the body is dead? No one can doubt it; yea, the language would be offensive, under such circumstances, to those who deny that the soul lives after the body is dead; they would feel that the declaration was made against their views. Then are we sure that the writer of the text, believed that the soul lives after the body is dead. The writer is clearly speaking of death, and when it shall take place he declares; " then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, the spirit shall return unto God who gave it," which proves that the soul does- not return to the earth with the body, as clearly as words can prove it.

Psalms. 90: 10: " The days of our years are three score years and ten; and, if by reason of strength, they be four-score years, yet is their strength labor and sorrow; for it is soon cut off and we fly away."

The argument hangs upon the last clause of this text: " We fly away." No man of sense and taste would use such language, with reference to death, who believes that there is in man no living soul, which continues to live after the body is dead. Suppose the doctrine to prevail that when the body dies, the whole man dies, and that all there is of the man is laid in the grave, would any one, even by any rhetorical flourish, call dying, flying away? Never; the very figure, if it be called a figure, is borrowed from the belief that man has a soul, which departs to the spirit world when the body dies; this belief alone, could suggest the idea of saying that men fly away when they die.

Matt. 10: 28: " And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.

Luke 12: 4, 5: " Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more than they can do; but I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; fear him, which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell."

These texts are sufficient to settle the question, if we put a plain common sense construction upon the language. The following points are perfectly clear:

1. The body and soul are not the same. They are spoken of as distinct matters.
2. Men are capable of killing the body. This refers to the persecutions which were to come, in which they should be put to death. Men did kill their bodies.
3. Men are not able to kill the soul. This is most clearly asserted. The first text asserts that they "are not able to kill the soul," and the second asserts that, "them that kill the body have nothing more that they can do;" which is the same as to assert that they cannot kill the soul.
4. From the above, it follows that the soul does not die with the body. If the soul does not live without the body, or after the body is dead, then persecutors could kill the soul, the very thing which Christ affirmed they could not do. If the soul dies with the body, then to kill the body is to kill the soul; but men can kill the body, but cannot kill the soul; and, therefore, the soul does not die with the body. We are certainly unable to see how this argument can be answered with any show of plausibility.

Matt. 17: 3: "And behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias, talking with him."

The force of the argument drawn from this text depends upon the circumstance that those who had been long dead, appeared on this occasion. So far as Elias is concerned, it is admitted that there is little or no force in it, since he was translated, and did not die, but so far as Moses is concerned, the argument is conclusive. The death of Moses is described in Deut. 34: 5, 6: "So Moses, the servant of the Lord, died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord. And he buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Bethpeor: but no man knoweth of his sepulcher unto this day."

Moses then died, and was buried, and yet he appeared upon the mount, and talked with Christ, nearly fifteen hundred years afterwards. To assume, as some have, that the soul of Moses died with his body, and that he was raised again, as all will be, at the resurrection, is without foundation. There is not the slightest proof to sustain the assumption. The fact, then, that one whose body is proved to have been dead and buried, afterwards appeared and conversed, is clear proof that the soul lives after the body is dead.

Matt. 22: 31, 32: "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." See also Mark 12: 27, and Exodus 3: 6, from whence the quotation is made. It will be said that this text speaks only of the resurrection of the body and not of the conscious existence of the soul while the body is dead. This is not true, the expression, "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," clearly refers to the life of the soul after the death of the body; because it is applied to those whose bodies were, at the time, dead. The argument may be stated thus: God is not the God of the dead, but of the living; but God is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and therefore they must be living. But the bodies of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were dead, and therefore it must have been their souls that were living. This certainly is the most rational construction which can be put upon the

language; and that it is most in harmony with the grand design of our Lord, which was to refute the Sadducees, and establish the doctrine of the resurrection, will appear from the following considerations:

1. The Sadducees were materialists, and denied the existence of spirits, as well as the resurrection of the body. These two ideas were linked together in their views, to stand or fall together. To sweep their theory away, Christ included both branches, but more particularly the existence of the soul after the death of the body, by which he removed their greatest objection to the resurrection of the body, and laid the foundation for it, by establishing the separate existence of the soul.

2. It was necessary for Christ to establish the separate existence of the soul, as he did, in order to prove the resurrection of the body, in a discussion with the Sadducees. There can be no resurrection, unless the soul maintains its conscious existence during the interim, and, as the Sadducees denied this, he had to prove it, to lay the foundation on which to build the resurrection of the body. The identity of man is to be looked for in the soul, and not in the matter that composes the body, and the only reliable evidence of identity, is our own consciousness; hence, if consciousness cease at death, upon the principle that the mind dies with the body, and returns to dust with it, a link is broken in the chain of our existence, and the man this side of death, can never be joined to the man beyond the resurrection. The mind ceases to exist, upon the principle we oppose. When a person dies, if the mind is only the brain, or a function of the brain, as an individual once said to the writer, then it dies and ceases to exist. There is then no mind after the person is dead. The brains may be taken out and the watery part be evaporated, and the solid reduced to powder and preserved, or thrown to the winds, but no one would say that what had been evaporated and lost amid the world of waters is the mind. Nor will any one pretend that the powder preserved or thrown to the winds, is mind, or that it approaches to mind, any more than any other dust of the same amount, which may be taken from the earth anywhere between the poles. There is then no mind after the person is dead, and the mind having ceased to exist, there can be no resurrection of mind; if mind exists again it must be a new mind, a new creation, and not a resurrection, and such a being must date his existence from such re-production, and can never be linked with some other mind that once existed, but which ceased to exist. The theory we oppose asserts that mind or intelligence is the result of organization, and hence, when the organization ceases, the mind must cease to exist. Should the same particles of matter be organized into a thinking machine, a thousand years afterwards, it would not, it could not be the same mind, for identity does not lie in the particles of matter, but in the conscious mind; and this new mind cannot, by memory or consciousness, ally itself to the former being which was, and which ceased to be, a thousand years before.

Let us take another view of the same point. Some of the martyrs were burned to ashes, and the ashes were then gathered up and scattered upon the waters of the rivers or ocean, so as to prevent a resurrection, as the heathen persecutors supposed. Now, upon the supposition that the mind is a property of matter, the mere result of organization, where is the mind of one of those martyrs now. It has no existence, and has had none since the hour when the body was burned. The fluid of the body that was burned exists somewhere

in the universe of waters; it may have a thousand times ascended in vapor, and fallen in dew and rain; it may have floated in the clouds, it may have flowed from the fountain, run in the stream, and mingled in the ocean; it may have formed the sap of trees and plants, and it may have been repeatedly drunk by men and beasts. So with the solid part of the body that was thus burned; the ashes may have been washed away by ten thousand waters, and blown away by ten thousand winds; it may have fattened the soil, been absorbed in growing plants, and entered into the composition of other animal bodies. In this state of things the particles of matter are not the mind of the person that was burned. Nor are these floating particles of matter the body of the martyr that was burned. The human body is an organism, but these particles of matter are not an organism, any more than the dew drop that trembles upon the spray, or the dust that cleaves to our feet. These particles of matter are no more a man, than the dust of the ground out of which God formed the body of Adam, was a man, before God laid his plastic hand upon that dust. "When the martyr was burned, the man ceased to be, according to the theory we oppose, and everything pertaining to man, which distinguishes him from the common dust of earth and the common water of the ocean, ceased to be; certainly so, unless his soul lives in the spirit world, as we suppose. These facts are so plain, that it is folly for any one, Christian or Infidel, to pretend to deny them. We insist, then, that there can be no resurrection, if the mind does not live after the death of the body, to preserve a continuous being, whose consciousness shall extend back to the commencement of being. God can at the end of the world, produce as many beings as have been, and as have died, but they will not be the same beings. As there was no man, no mind, during the interim between the burning of the martyr and this re-production of being, consciousness cannot extend back beyond this reproduction, or commencement of this new being. To say that consciousness can extend through these thousands of years of non-existence, and identify itself with some one that once existed, but which ceased to exist, is to say that the mind can be conscious of time during which it does not itself exist, which is the same as to say that nothing can be conscious of something or that something can be conscious of nothing. If the new organism be composed of the same particles of matter, admitting this to be possible with God, it will not relieve the difficulty, for conscious identity and responsibility do not depend upon the presence of the same particles of matter, but upon the sameness of mind; it is the mind that constitutes the man, and not the bones and fat, and the lean flesh, which are ever varying; and the mind has ceased to be, as has been shown. The mind is not, and cannot be conscious of the presence of the same particles of matter at different periods, and hence the presence of the same particles of matter in the new organism, cannot, through the consciousness of the mind, prove identity with some being that once existed, and ceased to exist five thousand years ago. Nothing, is, therefore, gained by supposing the presence of the same particles of matter in the resurrection body. As identity or personal sameness does not depend on the presence of the same particles of matter, but upon the sameness of mind, there can be no resurrection which will link the post mortem being onto the ante mortem being, without preserving consciousness during the period that elapses between death and the resurrection. This state of facts rendered it necessary for Christ to prove that the soul lives after the body is dead, in order to refute the Sadducees, which he did by showing that God was the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who were dead, and then affirming that he is not the God of the dead but of the living; per-consequence, though the bodies of the patriarchs were

dead, their souls were alive. This maintenance of conscious being during the intermediate state, linked Abraham beyond the resurrection, with Abraham dwelling in tents and tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, heirs of the same promise, and laid the foundation for the resurrection, and refuted the Sadducees beyond their power to reply. We have elaborated this subject at this point, because it is important to the general subject, and because it essentially belongs to a clear and full exposition of the text under consideration. We will now sum up our argument based upon the text by stating the following points, which we claim to have made plain:

1. The Sadducees not only denied the resurrection of the body, but the existence of spirits, insisting that death is the utter extinction of being.
2. To refute this denial of the resurrection of the body, and establish the fact of a future existence, which shall involve the responsibilities of this life, the chain of consciousness, which is the only sure proof of identity, must be maintained unbroken between our present and future existence.
3. To maintain, this connecting link of conscious identity between our present and future existence, the soul or mind must maintain a conscious existence after the body is dead, and during the whole period of the intermediate state.
4. To prove this vital point of unbroken consciousness, connecting our present with our future being, Christ quoted the words of Jehovah: " I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," and then added on his own authority: " God is not the God of the dead but of the living;" per-consequence, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are living, though their bodies are dead, and the only, and irresistible conclusion, is, that the soul or mind does not die with the body, but lives after the body is dead.

Luke 16: 22, 23: " And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died, and was buried: And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom."

It is not necessary to discuss the question, whether this is a literal narrative, or a parable, as it fully answers the purpose of our argument in either case. If it be a literal narrative, it clearly proves that the soul lives after the body is dead. If it be a parable, it must still be founded upon the fact that the human soul does live after the body is dead, otherwise it would be false and deceptive. When a parable has the form of a narrative, though the narrative may not have transpired, it must be what is likely to take place, otherwise it will have no force, or it will mislead. This representation of the rich man and Lazarus, be it parable or fact, clearly inculcates the doctrine that souls live after the body is dead. This it does in three particulars.

1. It represents Lazarus as having a conscious existence after he died; he died, and his soul doubtless " was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom."

2. " The rich man also died, and was buried: And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments." He then had a conscious existence after he was dead and buried.

3. The text represents Abraham also, as alive in the spirit world, where good people go when they die. This makes a clear case that Christ taught the doctrine that death is not the extinction of conscious existence. It is worthy of remark, that the word rendered hell in this text, is not *gehenna*, which is used to denote the final place of punishment for the wicked, but *hades*, which denotes the place of separate spirits, good or bad, during the intermediate state.

Luke 23: 42, 43: " And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom! And Jesus said unto him, verily I say unto thee, to-day shall thou be with me in paradise."

Verse 46: " Father into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said this, he gave up the ghost." "We consider these two texts together, because we believe they have a mutual bearing upon each other. This text is as clear a proof of the conscious existence of the soul, after the death of the body, as could well be furnished in the use of language. A few remarks will be sufficient on this plain subject.

1. It cannot be pretended that Christ labored under any mistaken views, as to the prospective condition of himself, or that of his petitioner, nor of the state of the dead in general.

2. They were at the time about to die, and both did die in a few moments after.

3. At this moment of death, the petitioner asked to be remembered, and Jesus answered, " To-day shall thou be with me in paradise." This, under the circumstances, was clearly a promise of being with Christ in paradise after death, and on that same day. This promise did not relate to their bodies, for they did not both go to the same burial place. And if the soul dies with the body, it could not relate to the soul. Paradise, in this text, can mean nothing more nor less than a place of happiness, and here it necessarily means happiness after death. What else can it mean in this connection? In the Greek, it signifies a garden, or a place enclosed for pleasure, hence, in the Greek version of the Old Testament, the Garden of Eden is rendered Paradise. But it can mean no literal garden here, for the thief was conveyed to no garden, nor can we suppose that his petition concerned the disposition to be made of his body after he was dead, and hence the promise did not relate to the place of his burial, but to the state of his soul, which did not die. " To-day shall thou be with me in paradise." Here was the promise of being with Christ, as well as being in paradise; and having made the promise, Christ said.

" Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit, and gave up the ghost." Christ's soul, or ghost, which he commended into the hands of his Father and gave up, did not die with his body, and hence, it was with it that the thief had the promise of being in paradise. It must mean, therefore, a place, of happiness after death. That the New Testament writers use the word paradise in the sense of heaven is too plain to be disputed. The word occurs, we

believe, only three times, including the text under consideration. The next place is 2. Cor. 12: 4: " How that he was caught up into paradise." In the second verse, what is here called paradise, is called " the third heaven." This leaves no doubt that the word paradise is used in the sense of heaven. The other text in which the word occurs, is Rev. 2: 7: " To him that overcometh, will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." Here again the word paradise is used in the sense of heaven. We have, then, a clear case before us; Christ promised the dying thief that he should be with him in paradise on that same day, but after death; and as the word signifies a place of happiness, it is certain that both the mind of Christ and the pardoned thief lived after the body was dead.

Acts 7: 59: " And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus receive my spirit." There can be no question that Stephen was under the influence of inspiration at the time he commended his spirit to Christ, for in the 56th verse he said, " I see the heavens opened, and the son of man standing on the right hand of God." Thus did the martyr, with heaven full in view, commend his spirit to Christ, saying, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." A clearer proof could not be offered of the existence of the spirit after the death of the body. Mr. Grew, in a pamphlet in which he labors to prove the death sleep of the soul by " spirit" in this text, understands life, and urges that Stephen committed his life to Christ, to be restored at the resurrection, and then affirms that it does not prove " that the life is a distinct substance, susceptible of consciousness without the material organization." Such reasoning can only prove the weakness of the cause it is designed to sustain. In the first place, it is a violation of common sense, to render the text life instead of spirit, in the common meaning of the word life as applied to the body; for if there is no life in man, except what belongs to the material organization, and what can have no separate existence from the body, there was nothing to commend to Christ, nothing for Christ to receive. When the body died, life became extinct, it was not taken by Christ, nor was it preserved anywhere, it ceased to exist, upon Mr. Grew's theory, and hence his own theory renders the prayer of Stephen an absurdity. How could the martyr say, " Lord Jesus receive my spirit," if he had no spirit, which did or could exist separate from the body? The language implies, first, an act of reception on the part of Christ, and secondly, something to be received and preserved; but if the whole man perishes at death, no act could be required at death, on the part of Christ, and there could be nothing to receive, either life or spirit.

Rom. 8: 35, 38, 39: " Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." The simple point in this text is, that death cannot separate Christians from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus. This proves, beyond the reach of contradiction, that death is not the extinction of conscious existence. Love towards God cannot be exercised, neither can the love of God be enjoyed, only by a rational being, possessing reason, affections, and consciousness. If, therefore, death be the extinction of the mind, as clearly as it is of the organism of the body—if the soul dies, involving a loss of mental and moral life, as clearly as the death of

the body involves a loss of animal life, death does separate from the love of God, and Paul, who perpetrated the declaration, has himself already been separated from the love of God for almost two thousand years, and righteous Abel has been separated from the love of God nearly six thousand years. It will avail nothing, to pretend in reply, that the dust of the saint may be the subject of Divine love, in some sense which will reconcile the apostle's declaration with the death-sleep of the soul, for the following reasons:

1" The love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord," of which the apostle speaks, is no doubt reciprocal, acting upon a rational soul, with affections capable of receiving and returning love. But the theory we oppose allows of nothing, after death capable of receiving, or enjoying, or returning love.

2. There is nothing, worthy of the love of God in Christ Jesus, remaining of the brightest saint on earth, after death, if the soul dies with the body. It is important to understand what there is for God to love after death, according to the theory we oppose. We insist there is nothing, but common earth, water and air, which mingles with the other earth, water and air of this creation. The theory denies that man has a soul, which is distinct from, and which forms no part of his body; and, of course, it assumes that mind is the result of organization, and that intelligence is a property of matter, a function of the brain. This being the case when organization ceases, as it does in decomposition, the mind ceases to exist, is annihilated. If it be a function of the brain, it must cease to exist at death, for the brain has no function after death. As shown in remarks upon Matt. 10: 28, man ceases to be man at death, the body ceases to be a human body, it is no more a human body than any other matter, and the mind has no existence. There is nothing for God to love more than any dust of the street, or any water of the ocean. The love of God must pertain to mental and moral qualities, but the theory we oppose allows of no mental or moral qualities after death, and of course there can be nothing after death, which can be the object of the love of God in Christ Jesus, and the conclusion is irresistible, that death does separate from the love of God. But the apostle affirms that death cannot separate us from the love of God, and therefore, death does not dissolve our intellectual and moral nature.

It only remains to apply the words of the apostle, and show by what a variety of forms of expression he sets forth the main truth upon which our argument depends. He enumerates "tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril and the sword." These are only so many forms of death. Famine kills and the sword kills, and yet these cannot separate from the love of God. He then declares his persuasion, that neither life nor death can separate us from the love of God. To this he adds, "angels, principalities and powers," by which he includes the inhabitants or agencies of both worlds, comprehending what is after death as well as what is before death. He then adds, "things present, and things to come," including all before death, and all after death. He then adds, "nor height nor depth," by which he includes all space, showing that there is no place above or below, in time or in eternity, which can separate Christians from the love of God. And finally, lest some conceivable power, agency or being, should be thought not to be included, he says, "nor any other creature," which includes every possible being or agency except God, since everything, but God, must be a creature. The argument, then, is conclusive, for as the Christian cannot, by any time, place, agency or power, be separated "from the

love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord;" and as to be the object of the love of God involves conscious existence, it follows that Christian men at least will not lose their conscious existence through death or any other means; the mind, therefore, must live after the body is dead.

2. Cor. 5: 1, 6, 8: "For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that while we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord; we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord." The whole of the apostle's reasoning from the first to the ninth verse appears designed to prove and illustrate the future conscious existence of the human soul, in a disembodied state; but the three verses quoted, are sufficient to answer the purpose of the argument. In these verses the apostle sets forth the doctrine in question in several different forms.

1. He asserts the grand fact, that after death we have a building, a house; that is, a home in heaven. "Our earthly house of this tabernacle," means the body, for in the sixth verse, dwelling in it is called being "at home in the body." By this tabernacle being "dissolved," we can understand nothing more nor less than death. The force of the apostle's language then, is this, when we die, when the body is dissolved in which the soul now lives, it will live without the body in heaven. Thus does the apostle most clearly teach, that the soul does not die with the body.

2. The apostle asserts the same doctrine, by asserting that, to be "at home in the body," is to be "absent from the Lord." That the apostle enjoyed the presence of the Lord, in some sense, cannot be denied; but it came so far short of what he expected when he left the body, that he called it absence from the Lord. While the earthly tabernacle of the body stood, and he was at home in it, it shrouded the soul and prevented it from entering into that visible and sensible presence of the Lord, which it would enjoy when the tabernacle should dissolve, and leave the soul unencumbered amid the scenes of the spirit world. If the soul dies with the body, then to be at home in the body, would not be absence from the Lord, but the only possible means of enjoying any degree of the divine presence.

3. The apostle more directly and fully asserts the conscious existence of the soul after death, by asserting, that to be "absent from the body," is to be "present with the Lord." This he asserts as a matter of choice, as a preferable state, to be absent from the body, and be present with the Lord. This language cannot be explained on any other principle than that the apostle believed and taught that when Christians die, they enter more fully into the presence of God than while they live. If the doctrine of the death-sleep of the soul be true, if death be the extinction of conscious existence, there is no such thing as being absent from the body about which the apostle talks; and considering the expression figuratively, as denoting death—and it can refer to nothing else—being absent from the body, is so far from being present with the Lord, that it cuts us off from all communion with God, and throws us beyond the jurisdiction of his moral government. Paul must have been a strange reasoner to have called this being with the Lord.

2. Cor. 12: 2, 3, 4: "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth ;) such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth ;) how that he was caught up into paradise."

A few remarks only, will be necessary on this text. We believe it is agreed, by common consent, that Paul here speaks of himself. Nor can there be any doubt as to the reality of the vision; the apostle expresses no doubt on this point, but speaks of it as certain. But there is a point upon which he has doubts, and that is, whether it was in the body, or out of the body, that he was caught up to paradise, which was the fact, he could not tell. From this we learn two important facts.

1. The body and mind are two distinct things. If there is no soul, no mind, no conscious existence, only what is a part of and inseparable from the body, Paul must have known that it was in the body, and not out of the body, that he was caught up to the third heaven.

2. We are sure that the soul or mind is capable of existing, of going to heaven, and of hearing unspeakable words without the body. No one can doubt that Paul understood the truth on the subject; if the soul cannot subsist as a rational being, without the body, he must have known it: but he did not know that it could not, or he would have known that it was not out of the body that he went to paradise and heard what he did. If, then, Paul anywhere and at any time, taught that the soul cannot live without the body, he taught what he did not know, for if he had known it, he would have known that he did not go to heaven without his body. Assuming that Paul did understand the truth concerning the soul, as he did not know that the soul cannot subsist without the body, he must have known that it could, for the one or the other must be true. If, then, he knew that the soul could sustain a conscious existence without the body, this is what he taught, so far as he taught anything on the subject, and this accounts for the many allusions to the subject in his writings. Those who deny that man has any mind or soul which can exist without the body, assume to know more than Paul did, for if they know the truth of their doctrine, they know that it was in the body, and not out of the body, that Paul was caught up to heaven, a thing which he declares he could not tell. What a pity some of our modern divines, with their new doctrines concerning the soul, had not been there to have instructed the apostle, and solved his doubt!

Eph. 3: 15: " Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named."

This clearly makes one family of those in heaven and those on earth, and if a part of the common family to which we belong, have already got to heaven, or have become inhabitants of the spirit world, the question is settled, that death is not the extinction of conscious existence.

Phil. 1: 21, 23, 24: "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ; which is far better: nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you."

In this text the apostle assumes, that immediately after death he should be with Christ. He represents himself as under the influence of two conflicting motives, drawing him in different directions, or producing different desires. These are, first, a desire to depart at once and be with Christ, which he considered far better for himself, by which death would be rendered gain; and secondly, a desire to live longer in the world, for the sake of the benefit he might be to the church, which was needful for them. Between these two, he was in a strait, which supposes but one of the two things in the alternative can be obtained; but if the apostle had believed that the soul dies with the body, there could have been no such alternative presented to his mind. His choice was between dying then and being with Christ, and living longer to serve the church; but if the soul dies with the body, Paul is not with Christ yet, and hence there could have been no possibility of such a strait as he represents, for, in that case, abiding in the flesh for the good of the church, could not have delayed the period when he should be with Christ, one hour. He could have lived and labored a hundred years longer, and then have been with Christ just as soon as though he had died that moment. There can be no doubt, then, that Paul really expected to be immediately with Christ when he died; that in proportion as his labors were protracted before death, would the time be put off when he should be with Christ, and that as his period of labor was cut short by an earlier death, would the period be shortened which intervened between him and Christ; and yet this could not have been the case, had he believed that the soul died with the body. Mr. Grew says, upon this passage: "The apostle does not say, that he expected to be with Christ immediately on his departure." We reply, the apostle most certainly does say that very thing in effect. He says he has "a desire to depart and to be with Christ." He has a desire to depart, as a means, to be with Christ, as an end. Now he could not have had a desire to depart for the sake of being with Christ, unless he "expected to be with Christ," in consequence of, or as a result of his departure. Such effort to turn aside texts from their natural force and meaning, only prove how hard the theory sought to be sustained is pressed by them.

Rev. 6: 9: "I saw under the altar, the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and they cried with a loud voice."

This text is sufficient of itself to prove the conscious existence of the soul after the death of the body. There is no way to evade the conclusion. The most likely way to be attempted, is, by saying that it was only a vision, and therefore does not describe literal facts. We admit that it was a vision, and this only can make the fact a literal one. There is no way in which souls can be seen only by some spiritual vision. The writer says at the commencement: "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." And again, he says: "I looked, and behold a door was opened in heaven." He then heard a voice saying: "come up hither and I will show you things which must be hereafter." And adds immediately, "I was in the spirit." Here commenced the vision in which he saw the souls of the martyrs. If the vision did not give him a matter of fact view of the souls of such as had been slain, it was a false vision, and none of the representations can be relied upon. But the subject is perfectly free from the obscurity which hangs over most of this book.

1. The subject is a plain one, it being well understood that many had been slain for the word of God.

2. The vision upon its very face, professes to bring John within view of the scenes of the spirit world. He saw a door open in heaven, and was called up to receive representations of things yet to come.

3. In this state he " saw the souls of those who had been slain for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus." After all this, shall we be told that the martyrs had no souls, which existed separate from their bodies, and after their bodies had been devoured by wild beasts, or consumed in the fire? We may be so told; we have been; but before we can believe it, we must have far less confidence in the teachings of the Scriptures than we have at present. No construction can be put upon the passage, which will invalidate its evidence in support of an intermediate state, in which the souls or spirits of those who have died, live without their bodies. The vision itself is based upon the fact that souls exist in a disembodied state. Admit the truth of this doctrine, and you may even conceive of a vision, for some wise purpose, in which such souls are exhibited as representatives or symbols, when no real souls are present; but deny the existence of souls, and such a vision becomes false and deceptive. The vision was from God, and there can be no doubt that John saw something which he calls the souls of the martyrs. If there were no real souls there, what did he see? What did God show him, which he calls souls, if there are no such things as souls? Does some one say that it was a mere representation of souls? But what could be a representation of souls, if there are no such things as souls? What form or figure would represent that which has no existence? There must have been a design in the vision, and as John most clearly saw something which he calls souls, if we deny the existence of souls, we must suppose that God introduced the mere appearance or image of nothing, and that this form of nothing was introduced to represent something. Such is the absurdity in which those must be involved, who deny the existence of souls in a disembodied state. In every instance of symbolical representations found in the Scriptures, real existences are employed as symbols, as beasts are introduced to represent kings and governments, and hence, to make a symbolical representation of what John saw, we must admit the existence of souls in a disembodied state.

Here the direct Scriptural argument closes.

II. The Scriptures teach the immortality of the human soul indirectly, by employing language which implies it, and by recognizing a distinction between the soul and the body. In the preceding argument those Scriptures have been considered, in which the soul is, in some form, the principal subject of consideration. In the argument that follows, those texts are considered in which the soul is not usually the principal subject of consideration, but incidentally referred to, while treating of something else. In these texts it is taken for granted that the soul is not matter, but spirit, that it is not the body, but something distinct from the body, living in it, yet capable of living without it.

The Bible usually assumes the doctrine of the distinction between soul and body, and speaks in a manner which takes it for granted that this distinction is understood and believed. Gen. 35: 18: "And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing (for she died,) that she called his name Benoni." This text clearly takes it for granted, that man is

composed of a body, and a soul, and that what is called death, or dying, is their separation, or the departure of the soul. Dr. Clarke renders the Hebrew of this text, "in the going away of her soul." If man has no immaterial soul, if materialism be true, what went away, or what departed? Her body did not depart. Her brains did not depart. There was nothing which departed, which could consistently be called "her soul," only upon the supposition that there is in man an immaterial spirit, which leaves the body at death. The language is just such as a believer in the common doctrine of the soul would be likely to use, and just such, as none but such a believer would employ. Put the words into the mouth of one who holds the doctrine for which we contend, and they are clear and forcible; but put them into the mouth of a materialist, and they either express a falsehood, or mean nothing. It is then pretty clear, that whoever wrote the book of Genesis, was not a materialist.

Numbers 16: 22: " And they fell upon their faces, and said, O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh."

This text clearly takes for granted, that man is a compound of flesh and spirit. " All flesh," clearly means all mankind, or all human flesh, and " the spirits of all flesh," clearly implies that to each body of flesh, there is a spirit. It must appear clear, that no rational person would ever employ such language, who did not believe in the common doctrine of the human soul. It is then clear that these praying Jews, together with their inspired historian, were not materialists. They believed that in man is united a body and a spirit. No other meaning can be given to the word spirits, in this text, which will even weaken the argument. The word sometimes signifies wind or breath, but give it either of these significations here, and you will destroy a clear sense, and turn their solemn prayer into mockery. How would it sound to pray, " O God, the God of the winds of all flesh;" or, " the God of the breaths of all flesh?" It would spoil both the beauty and the sense, and turn that which is truly sublime, into that which would approach very nearly to the ridiculous.

Num. 27: 15, 16: " And Moses spake unto the Lord, saying, let the Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh, set a man over the congregation." What has been remarked upon the preceding text is equally true of this, and need not be repeated. Moses must have believed in the common doctrine of man's compound nature, consisting of flesh and spirit.

Job 14: 22:" But his flesh upon him shall have pain, and his soul within him shall mourn."

This text, like the former, does not assert the fact that man is composed of a body and soul, but like them, clearly takes it for granted, that this is a doctrine believed and understood. It clearly distinguishes between the flesh and soul, and affirms that his soul shall mourn within him. Upon the supposition of the materialist, what does Job mean by the soul? It is not the flesh, for he names that as something different from the soul; his flesh is on him, his soul is in him. Does he mean that his brains shall mourn within him? Does he mean that his wind or breath shall mourn within him? Certainly none of these

can be his meaning. Surely Job talked as though he believed the human mind to be something different from the body.

Chap. 31: 30: " Neither have I suffered my mouth to sin, by wishing a curse to his soul."

Job is here speaking of his enemy, and by the expression, " his soul," he clearly distinguished between his soul and body. The body, the visible, tangible man, he represented as the person, and the soul as belonging to it. The language clearly implies a distinction between body and soul.

Chap. 32: 8: " But there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding."

This text appears to be an allusion to God's breathing into man the breath of life, after he had formed him of the dust of the ground, by which he " became a living soul." The only use we make of it now, is to prove that the mind is spirit and not matter. " There is a spirit in man." Man here denotes the visible, tangible frame, the body; in this there is a spirit. This spirit is doubtless the intelligent part, as it is said, " the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." The spirit is not only what God infused at first, but upon this same spirit God operates, when by inspiration, he giveth him understanding.
Prov. 19: 2: " That the soul be without knowledge is not good."

This text clearly implies the existence of an intelligent soul, distinct from the body. What does the inspired writer mean by soul, in this text. The word soul is some-times used to denote man as a whole, or personal being, but the definite article " the," attached to it, will not allow it to have this meaning. No particular person is spoken of, and hence, soul cannot mean man as an entire personal being. We cannot say, " that the man be without knowledge is not good," when no particular man is intended. Soul cannot here mean wind or breath. There is no sense in saying, " That the wind or breath be without knowledge is not good." It will not better it to substitute brains, for soul. Nothing then can be meant by soul, unless it be the rational spirit in man, according to the common doctrine.

Ezek. 18: 4: "Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine."

In this text it is certainly taken for granted that man has a soul, which forms no part of his body. What else can soul mean but the spirit that is in man, in contradistinction from his body? It cannot mean the breath, or wind, in this text, as it sometimes does. God does not mean to say that the air which the father breathes, and which the son breathes, is alike his. It cannot mean the person or whole man. To mean that, it should read, " all souls are mine; as the father is mine so also the son is mine." The expressions "soul of the father," and " soul of the son," prove that the whole man is not meant. The preposition "of," is equivalent to the possessive case, and whether we say " soul of the father," or father's soul, the sense is the same. The language is then in perfect accordance with the common belief that man is composed of a body and a soul, but deny this doctrine and the sense of the text is destroyed.

Zech. 12: 1: " The Lord, which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him." This text is clearly founded upon the belief, that man consists of a body with a spirit in it, nor can it be made to express good sense, without admitting this doctrine, as a truth understood and believed at the time it was uttered. The spirit of man is the subject of remark, and this spirit, God is represented as forming within him. The mind, or immaterial soul, according to the common belief, is the only spirit that God can be supposed to form within man.

Rom. 8: 16: "The spirit itself bear-eth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Here are two spirits named. The first, called " the Spirit," is, no doubt, the Holy Ghost; the second, called " our spirit," is the intelligent mind or soul of man. This proves the human mind to be an immaterial spirit, for the word spirit can mean nothing else in this text. What is it with which the Holy Spirit bears witness? It is not our body, or any part of it; it is not even our brains. It is not wind, or our breath. It is not our life. Indeed there is nothing which can be understood by " our spirit," in this text, but the immaterial, intelligent nature of man, according to the common belief of Christians.

1. Cor. 2: 11: " For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God."

The design of this text is to affirm that, as the spirit of man searches the things of a man, so the Spirit of God searches the things of God, and it proves as clearly that the intelligent principle in man is spirit, as it does that what is called the Spirit of God, is spirit, that is, an immaterial essence.

Chap. 6: 20: " For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and your spirit, which are God's."

This text, as clearly as it possibly could, takes it for granted that man is composed of a body and a spirit, and that the body is not the spirit, and that the spirit is not the body, and that they both constitute the man. It is not possible to conceive that any well informed man, not believing in the common doctrine of body and soul, would employ such language. Paul, then, clearly believed the common doctrine. It was undoubtedly this belief, that suggested the mode of expression adopted in the text.

2 Cor. 4: 16: "But though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day."

In this text there is a clear distinction made between the body and soul. The body is called the outward man; the soul is called the inward man.

Chap. 7: 1: " Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit."

Here again the distinction is made between the material and spiritual part of man, and the Apostle takes it for granted that this distinction is understood.

James 2: 26: " For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also."

This text is sufficient of itself to settle the question, if there was not another to be quoted. The Apostle not only assumes that man is composed of a body and a spirit but supposes the fact to be plainer and better understood, than the connection between faith and works. He is laboring to prove that faith is not vital and saving unless it produces good works, and to make it plainer he introduces as an illustration, the better understood fact of the union of a spirit and body in man, and that the body is dead without the spirit. The remark is founded upon the common belief that the body lives only while the soul remains in it, and that death is a separation between them. The above texts, gathered from the whole face of the Bible, as they have been, are sufficient to establish the truth of the existence of the human mind, as an intelligent, immaterial spirit, distinct from matter.

The Scriptures furnish the same evidence of the spiritual nature of the human soul, that they do that God is a Spirit

The same words which are applied to man, to describe his spiritual nature, are applied to God. It is admitted that these words are indefinite in the original Hebrew and Greek, insomuch that no argument, can be based upon any supposed necessary meaning, but must depend for its force upon the connection and other circumstances; and any criticism which will invalidate the evidence in proof that the human soul is spirit and not matter, will equally weaken the argument in support of the idea that God is a spirit. A few illustrations will make this plain. Let there be placed a few texts in juxtaposition, that the eye of the reader may rest upon both classes at the same moment:

SPOKEN OF GOD.

Isa. 1: 14: "Your new moons and your appointed feasts, my SOUL hateth."

In this text God represents his own soul as being the subject of hatred.

If the word soul in this text means a spirit, it must mean a spirit in the opposite column, for as it is here the subject of hatred, it is there the subject of love.

Isa. 42: 1: "Behold mine elect in whom my SOUL delighteth."

In this text the same term is used to denote the mind of God, that is used to denote the mind of man in the opposite column, and both are represented as the subjects of a like affection.

Job. 23: 13: — "What his SOUL desireth, even that he doeth."

Jer. 5: 9: "Shall I not visit for these things? saith the Lord: and shall not my SOUL be avenged on such a nation as this?"

Jer. 6: 8: "Be thou instructed, O Jerusalem, lest my SOUL depart from thee."

SPOKEN OF MAN.

Deut. 11: 13: "Love the Lord your God with all your SOUL."

In this text God represents the soul of man as being the subject of love.

If the word soul in this text does not mean a spirit, it cannot mean a spirit in the opposite column, for as it here is the subject of love, it is there the subject of hatred.

Isa. 55: 2: "Let your SOUL delight itself in fatness."

In this text the same word is used to denote the mind of man, that denotes the mind of God in the opposite column, and both are represented as the subjects of a like affection.

Prov. 21: 10: "The SOUL of the wicked desireth evil."

Lev. 26: 15: "If your SOUL abhor my judgments, so that ye will not do all my commandments, I also will do this unto you."

Isa. 55: 3: "Come unto me, and hear, and your SOUL shall live."

In the above texts, the word soul, in the left hand column, is applied to God, to denote his Spirit, or the Holy Ghost; and in the right hand column the same word is used to denote the mind, or intellectual and moral nature of man. If then, the one is not spirit, there is no proof that the other is. Any criticism upon the word, where it is applied to man in the right hand column, by which it may be rendered life, disposition, temper of mind, breath, wind or air, must be equally applicable to the word in the left hand column, where it is applied to God; as effectually overturning the proof that God is a spirit, as that the soul of man is a spirit.

We will now consider the word spirit, which is more clearly employed to denote the nature or essence of God, and will show that its use proves that man has a spiritual nature, as clearly as it does that God is a Spirit.

APPLIED TO GOD.

Gen. 1: 2: "The SPIRIT of God moved upon the face of the waters."

Job. 26: 13: "By his SPIRIT he hath garnished the heavens; his hand hath formed the crooked serpent."

Ps. 139: 7-10: "Whither shall I go from thy SPIRIT? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, beholding,

thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me."

John 4: 24: "God is a SPIRIT."

1 Cor. 2: 11: "Even so the things of God knoweth no man but the SPIRIT of God."

APPLIED TO MAN.

Prov. 20: 27: — "The SPIRIT of a man is the candle of the Lord, searching all the inward parts of the belly."

Job 32: 8: "But there is a SPIRIT in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding."

Ecc. 3: 21, and 12: 7: "Who knoweth the SPIRIT of a man that goeth upward?

"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the SPIRIT shall return unto God, who gave it."

Acts 7: 59: "Lord Jesus receive my SPIRIT."

Heb. 12: 23: "The SPIRITS of just men made perfect."

1 Cor. 2: 11: "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the SPIRIT of man, which is in him?"

There are quoted above, the principal texts which affirm that God is a Spirit, and directly opposite to them, in the right hand column, are other texts, which just as clearly prove that the intellectual part of man is a spirit. Any criticism which will make the one class of texts harmonize with the materiality of the human mind or soul, will no less make the other class harmonize with the materiality of God.

But the connection in which the sacred writers use the word spirit, applying it to God and to man in the same sentence, proves that by it they mean the same thing in the one case as in the other. We will give a few examples.

John 4: 24: "God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship in spirit and in truth."

Here the word spirit is applied to God and man, in a manner which proves beyond a doubt, that the word means the same thing in both instances. If any text in the Bible proves that God is a Spirit, this is the very text, and if this text proves that God is a Spirit and not matter, it must follow that man has a spiritual nature, which is not matter. The text affirms that God is a Spirit, and then announces as a consequence, that is, because God is a Spirit, " they that worship him must worship in spirit," using the same term

spirit, to denote the spirit in which man must worship, that is used to express the divine essence which is to be worshipped. God is a Spirit, but man is matter and spirit, having a body and soul. The material body may be made to perform certain acts, and assume certain attitudes of worship, in which the mind, the spirit, is not engaged; this is not acceptable. As God is a Spirit, no worship can be acceptable to him, which is not performed by the spirit, the soul as well as the body. Indeed, as God is a Spirit, we may regard the text as affirming that it requires a being of like nature to worship him; that he can be worshipped by spirits only. If the mind of man is not spirit, but matter, how he can worship God in spirit, or *with* spirit, as the Greek particle signifies, is not possible for ordinary minds to comprehend. Adopt the common theory of the spiritual nature of the human soul, and the text becomes plain; and the doctrine is that a spirit God can be worshipped only by spirit worshippers, and hence man, to worship acceptably, must worship with his spiritual nature—with his soul and not merely with his body.

Rom. 8: 16: "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God."

In this text there is no doubt that we are to understand, by " the Spirit," the Holy Ghost, and by " our spirit," the intellectual nature of man. The same word is used to denote spirit in both cases in the original, and must be intended to describe a similar essence. If " our spirit," means our body, our matter, or anything about us that is material, then " the Spirit," may mean the material substance of divinity, and the criticism which will make the one conclusion plain, will remove all the difficulties out of the way of the other.

III. The immateriality of the mind is proved by various mental phenomena.

The soul or mind is not matter but spirit, and of course forms no part of the body. This raises an important issue with one class, who deny the immortality of the soul. There are some who deny the existence of a soul or spirit in man, to be contradistinguished from the body, and insist that what we call the mind is a mere function of the brain, and that the brain itself is intelligent.

So far as the researches of philosophy extend, there are but two primary substances in the universe, and these are MATTER and SPIRIT. All we know of these substances is certain properties and phenomena which they exhibit. Matter is known to possess the properties of Impenetrability, Extension, Figure, Divisibility, Indestructibility, Inertia, Attraction. Spirit is that which thinks, perceives, remembers, reasons, wills, and is susceptible of love, hatred, joy, and grief. The former of these properties are found in our bodies, in common with all other matter; the latter constitute the phenomena of the mind. It is not reasonable to suppose that properties so opposite to each other, inhere in the same substance, and the only rational conclusion is that matter is not mind, and that mind is not matter. There must therefore be in man an intelligent spirit, which forms no part of the body, and this is what we call the soul. We reason upon the modern and generally admitted principles of natural philosophy, and unless we are greatly mistaken, the whole system of philosophy will have to be exploded, to invalidate our arguments.

The admitted properties of matter, and the admitted properties of mind, cannot inhere in, and be essential properties of the same substance. A few illustrations will make this plain.

1. The phenomenon of volition, self-determination, and self-action, proves the immateriality of the mind.

Inertia, which is an essential property of matter, cannot inhere in the same substance with will or volition, which is an essential property of mind. Inertia is that property in matter, which renders it incapable of self-motion, or self-action; matter acting only as it is acted upon; will or volition, is that property of mind which renders it capable of self-determination and self-action. Now as matter can act only as it is acted upon, and as mind has the power of self-action, they cannot be the same substance, —matter cannot be mind, and mind cannot be matter.

Again, matter can be moved only by extrinsic force; matter acts upon matter by contact, and one material body has no power to act on another material body, only as their surfaces come in contact; but mind is acted upon by motives, and acts from motives, and mind acts on mind through the medium of motives, without physical contact, This proves as clear as a sun-beam that matter and mind are not the same.

To insist in opposition to the above view, that mind is matter; that intelligence and volition are its inherent properties, and consequently that man has no soul, which forms no part of his body, must subvert the admitted principles of philosophy. Philosophy insists that inertia is an essential property of matter; man's body is matter, as shown above, and yet it exhibits locomotive powers, and is seen acting without any visible agent acting upon it, and hence the doctrine of the inertia of matter must be given up, or we must admit that there is a rational soul inhabiting the body, which controls it, moves it, and guides it. We see a steam engine in motion, and we know that the power of motion does not reside in any part of the machine; that it acts only as it is acted upon. "We know that the steam propels it, but we know at the same time, that the steam acts only as it is acted upon; that there is an intelligent, reasonable agent that directs the whole.

So with the body; it is an animal machine, the bones are studs and braces to support the frame, and are levers for the purpose of mechanical action; the muscles, by their contractions and distentions, operate on the bones and set the machinery in motion; but the muscles have no intelligence, or volition, and when the machine is in order, they are under the control of and are guided by the mind. The foot or hand cannot will to move; the eye cannot will to open or shut. This our own consciousness proves. Let any man try to will with his foot or hand, and his own consciousness, which is the highest proof possible, will tell him that there is no power to will in his foot or hand. Man can will, and may be conscious of willing to move his foot, but at the same time he is conscious that his foot does not will, and that he does not will with his foot, but that he, his mind, wills concerning it. The muscles are put in motion by a power superior to themselves, which must be intelligent. Now what is this power? Those who deny that man has a soul, which is no part of the body, and which is an immaterial spirit, say that the brain is this self-determining, controlling and guiding power. This we deny, on the ground, that it is matter,

and only matter, and possesses only the properties and powers of matter. If it be said that there is something in, or associated with the brain which is not matter, which is superior to matter, the whole argument is given up for that is just what we contend for, and that superior something which is not matter, we call the soul. If it be said that the brain is only matter, then however refined it may be, it possesses only the properties of matter, one of which is inertia, directly the reverse of self-operation. The brain then cannot act only as it is acted upon, and we come back to the question, what is this superior power that sets the muscles in motion, when we will to move the foot or the hand? If it now be said that it is the brain, we ask what power acts upon the brain, causing it to act on the muscles? The brain being matter, can act only as acted upon. We have then got to give up the first principles of Natural Philosophy, or seek for some higher cause of the phenomenon of motion. We allow that the muscles operate on the bones, that the brain operates on the muscles, through the nerves, all the nerves and spinal marrow terminating in the brain; but we insist at the same time, that there is an intelligent soul which acts on the brain, or it would never act. This doctrine being admitted, the phenomena of matter and mind are made to harmonize without involving any philosophical contradiction, or absurdity; deny it, and the principles of Natural Philosophy, which past ages have developed and matured, are thrown back into chaos, and we have got to begin, de novo, and grope our way in search of first principles.

The above view accords with our own consciousness. Every man is conscious of willing, but we are not conscious of willing with any part of our body, not even the brain. That the head is the seat of the intelligence, no rational man can doubt; we are conscious that the thinking operation is carried on within the head, but no man is conscious that his brains think or will. The rational soul is mysteriously united to the body, and the brain is doubtless the point of union, and constitutes the medium through which the soul holds communion with the physical world without. The fact that this union is mysterious, constitutes no objection, for if we deny it, there will be as great a mystery involved in the idea that the whole mental phenomena is the result of properties inherent in matter, and found only in the brain, in contradistinction from all other matter.

2. The phenomenon of intelligence furnishes clear proof that the mind is not matter, that it is immaterial.

If matter be intelligent and can think, thought must be an essential property of matter, or it must be the result of some peculiar modification of matter; neither of which can be maintained. If thought be an essential property of matter, every part and particle of matter must think. If thought be essential to matter, what does not think, is not matter.

Is thought, then, the result of some modification of matter? Certainly not, for thought is now admitted not to be an essential property of matter, and no modification or refinement can add to any substance more than its essential qualities. Matter under every modification is no more than matter, and of course can possess only the properties of matter. Matter is known by the phenomena it exhibits, and all modifications and refinements are but modifications and refinements of these phenomena, without increasing or diminishing their number, and as it is destitute of thought at the com-

mencement, it must remain destitute of thought through every change and modification. If anything essential to matter be taken away, it must cease to be matter, and if something be added which is not essential, that something must have its own essential properties as a separate identity or substance, and can form no part of matter; and if that something which is supposed to be added, be thought, it is not matter that thinks, but something that is added to it. This is just what we hold; that in the composition of man, a rational soul is joined to matter, and that it is the soul that thinks, and not the matter. Whatever is essential to matter must be matter, and hence, to say that something not essential to matter, is added to it, so as to become a property of matter, is to say that something is matter which is not matter. This shows that thought, not being a property of matter, cannot become such, otherwise matter without thought would be less than matter, or matter with thought would be more than matter.

The admission that matter is or can be intelligent, must draw after it consequences startling in their nature, if not fatal to our common religion. The intelligence of matter has heretofore been contended for, only by Infidels; and is in fact the doctrine of Atheism. To meet the argument in favor of the existence of God, drawn from the marks of intelligence everywhere impressed upon the visible creation, they have asserted that matter is intelligent. Those who deny the immateriality of the human soul, join the Infidel, and maintain that matter may possess a very superior degree of intelligence. If this be so, who can prove that there is anything but matter in the universe, and that what has been deemed the spiritual world is, after all, only a world of materiality? There are the same proofs that the human soul is a spirit, that there are that God is a Spirit. Let us look at this point in the light of reason. Atheism admits the existence of matter, but denies the existence of spirit, while Christianity insists that "God is a Spirit," not matter, but above matter, who created matter, and gave to it its modifications. Now the point is, that every argument which is commonly resorted to, to prove the existence of God, will prove the immateriality of the human soul. To show this let us suppose a conversation between an Atheist and a Christian, who holds to the materiality of the human soul.

Christian. — "There must be a God, for as nothing can never produce something, the visible creation proves that there must be a Creator who made all these things."

Atheist. — "It is as easy for me to conceive that nature, or what you call the visible creation, is eternal, and that it contains within itself the cause of all the phenomena which it exhibits, as it is to suppose there is another being which is eternal, whom you call God, or a spirit, but whom I never saw and never expect to see."

Christian. — "It is not possible for us to comprehend eternal existence, yet reason tells us that something must be eternal, and that it is not the visible universe that is eternal, as you suppose; but God who is a Spirit, is proved to be the Creator by the signs of intelligence and marks of design everywhere to be seen upon the very face of creation."

Atheist. — "Matter itself is intelligent under some of its modifications, as you admit and hence, all the phenomena of the universe may be accounted for without supposing anything superior to matter. If matter may possess one degree of intelligence, it may

possess a still greater degree, even perfection of knowledge, which you attribute to your supposed God. The human mind presents the highest degree of intelligence of which we have any personal knowledge; it presents the phenomena of thought, feeling, reason, volition, self-determination, self-action, moral sentiments, love and hatred. These, in kind, are all that you pretend to claim for your supposed God; you only insist that he possesses them in a higher degree, and as you contend that all these are possessed by matter, the human mind being only matter, the marks of intelligence which the visible universe exhibits are no proof of an intelligent Spirit, prior and superior to matter, whom you call God. Take an illustration: suppose you refer me to the solar system with the sun for its centre, and all the planets revolving around it with the regularity of a well adjusted clock, with comets to note the centuries and other periods, and tell me there must be a Creator who made this machine of the universe, who cannot be matter, but who must be spirit. In reply, I exhibit to you a time-piece, and tell you that it is a model of the solar system; it has various and complicated wheels, all moving with perfect order, with the moving power so encased as to be hid from your view; one pointer tells the lapse of every second; another points out the flight of minutes as they depart one by one; a third, notes the lapse of hours, and still another, counts the days as they pass one after another, so that by looking upon its face, you can read the second of the minute, the minute of the hour, the hour of the day, and the day of the month. This curious machine which gives the most clear proof of intelligence and design, is not only matter itself, but the designer and artificer were matter and nothing but matter, .as you insist that 'the human mind is not spirit but matter. If, then, matter compressed into so small a compass as the human brain, can design and execute after such a manner, it only requires an organization of this matter, on a larger scale, which may exist somewhere as the great soul of the universe, to account for all the phenomena which you consider proof of the existence of a Spirit-God."

It is seen from the above, that when we, as Christians, deny that man has a soul which is not matter, but which is an immaterial spirit, we break down the great dividing line between Christianity and skepticism. How a man can prove the existence of God from the works of creation, when he attributes to matter, wrapt up in the small compass of the human brain, every essential attribute in kind, which he attributes to his God, we need more light to understand. It appears to us that we must admit the immateriality of the human mind, or be driven by Infidelity to adopt its theory of a material universe, with a material God, mysteriously folded up in its bosom, or equally mysteriously diffused among its living orbs. He, who contends for the materiality of the human soul, may say that he relies upon none of these proofs to support his belief in the existence of God, but relies wholly upon the Scriptures. Well, this issue has been met, and it has been proved that the Scriptures as clearly teach that the human soul is a spirit, as they do that God is a spirit.

3. The phenomenon of memory proves the immateriality of the mind.

That which remembers must be spirit and not matter. It is not possible for us to conceive how memory can be a property of, or be exercised by matter. Memory lies at the foundation of all improvement—without it we could make no progress If the ideas we

derive through the medium of the senses, were to pass away with the objects that produce the sensation, the whole of life would be a mere succession of ideas, or mental states, without any accumulation of knowledge; to prevent which, we are endowed with the power of remembering—so that instead of leaving the past a blank, the mind can trace its own history, and view from any point of its journey, all the principal events that have transpired, the objects that it has viewed, the feelings it has experienced, and the thoughts it has entertained, from the twilight dawn of childhood to the present moment. Take, for example, such minds as Bacon, Locke and Newton, and how powerful must be memory, to treasure a knowledge of almost universal nature— surveying the highway of worlds, and gathering, retaining, and unfolding to the mental vision of others, the numberless laws by which their phenomena are produced, and their motions directed? How vast must be the number of ideas which such minds are capable of retaining? It is not possible to see how matter, in the shape and compass of the human brain, can gather, receive, and retain all these ideas, the originals of which, fill earth and heaven-wide space. Assume that the human mind is material, and there is no known principle of philosophy upon which the phenomena of memory can be explained.

Ideas are immaterial, knowledge is immaterial, thoughts are immaterial, and how they can impress themselves upon matter, so as to be retained for fifty years, and be now and then called up and exhibited, as occasion requires, cannot be explained by the known laws and properties of matter. Let us suppose a case: —A person hears his friend narrate the scenes and incidents of his travels in a foreign land—he describes the general face of the country, its productions, the size, complexion and habits of the people, together with all the principal mountains, lakes and rivers. The listener forms ideas in his mind of all these things, so that he is able to take a mental view of the whole country, and can even describe it to others. Now what is in his mind? Not the country, not its people, mountains, lakes and rivers, they are not in the mind. Nor can there be even the figure or picture of the variegated scenery impressed upon the mind, if it be matter. There has been no contact to impress the brain with the outline of the country. He never saw it—he never saw a map or picture of it. He has only heard certain words, and there is no natural adaptation in those words to impress the mind with the various forms, colors and motions, which a view of the country presents. As matter can be impressed only by matter, to produce this result, the words must not only be material, but must have figure and color, and must be harder than the mind, as the softer always receives the impression of the harder, when material bodies come in contact. One word must have the form of a man, and another the form of a mountain, and another the form of a landscape, and another of a lake, and another of a river, for matter can only receive the form of the object by which it is impressed. But there is another difficulty; motion has no form which can be impressed, engraved, or painted upon matter. Motion cannot be represented by any image; it cannot be represented upon matter, but by the actual motion of the matter. But in the outline of the country impressed upon the mind, as supposed above, there must be a conception of a flowing river, which could never be impressed upon the mind, if it were a material substance, unless the words themselves have the motion of the river, or give to the mind such motion, neither of which can be true upon the supposition that mind is matter. The mind does receive ideas from various sources and through various mediums, and retain them through the whole period of life: and though they are not always in the mind, or, at

least, are not always recognized by the mind as a present mental state, yet the mind can recall them at pleasure. The fact that a man having learned any art, or acquired any information, can afterwards occupy his mind with other matters, not even thinking of the same for years, and then recall the whole on a moment's notice, when occasion shall require, proves, beyond a doubt, that ideas do, in some way, impress themselves upon the mind, or, in some sense, remain in the mind; otherwise an idea, or an art learned, having once occupied the mind, then ceasing to occupy it as a subject of present thought, or a present mental state, could not be recalled with any more facility, than a new thought could be conceived, or a new art learned, which every rational mind knows is not true. To assert it would be to assert that there is no such thing as memory. Thus the phenomena of memory proves, that the mind cannot be a material substance.

Should we go back to the old theory of memory, found in the exploded philosophy of a departed age, we should not be able to reconcile memory with the idea of the materiality of the mind. The theory to which we allude is, that ideas are images of things which are presented to the mind in perception, and that these images are recalled in the act of memory. This would render it necessary to have some place to store them between the primary act of perception, and the subsequent act of memory. This must convert the mind, yea, the brain, if the brain be the mind, into a vast lumber-room, where are stored images of more things than Noah had creatures in the ark. These must be packed away in boxes, laid away upon shelves, or hung up as maps upon a wall; and from among the millions, one after another must come forward from its concealment, and then retire into its hiding place, as one thing after another is recalled by memory. It appears to us, that this philosophy must be adopted by those who hold that the mind is matter, that the brain is the mind; for it is not possible to conceive how forms of material things, and ideas of things in general, can be impressed upon the brain, or any material substance, though it be called mind, so as to be retained and viewed at pleasure. But if this philosophy be once adopted by the materialist, another difficulty will arise, which must utterly confound his whole theory. It is this: Images sketched in any manner upon a material substance, must occupy space; and, as we cannot conceive that the brain is divided into as many apartments as there are ideas, each occupying a distinct place by itself, they must be piled one upon the other, thousands upon thousands, on precisely the same portion of matter, if the mind be matter. This is absolutely impossible, according to all the known laws of matter; matter must fill its own space, can fill no more than its space, and nothing else can occupy the same space at the same time, which any given portion of matter does fill. If, then, the mind be matter, you can only cover its surface with the impressions or images of ideas; and, of course, the number of ideas which the mind is capable of receiving and retaining, must be limited according to the proportion of space which each occupies compared with the dimensions of the whole mind. This, every reflecting mind knows cannot be true; for no person ever knew so much that he could learn no more—no person ever found his mind so full, or so entirely occupied, with ideas, that there was no room for more. Keeping in view the fact, that every portion of matter presents a surface of limited and definite extent, we remark that, no more ideas can be impressed upon the mind, if it be matter, than will cover its surface; for a number of impressions, or images, cannot occupy the same space upon the surface of any material body, without defacing each other. If the mind be matter, then each idea must occupy a definite portion of its

surface, which must sustain a proportion to the whole mind, or else each idea must occupy the whole mind. If each idea occupies a part of the mind, which sustains a proportion to the whole, then it follows, that the mind can receive and retain but a definite number of ideas, according to the size of each compared with the size of the whole mind. This, no one will pretend. But on the other hand, if each idea occupies the whole mind, there must be as many impressions, one upon the other, as the mind receives and retains ideas, a thing absolutely impossible, upon the surface of matter. This has great force in connection with the phenomenon of memory, for, if the mind be matter, all the ideas of a whole life must be impressed upon it, one upon the other, so as to be called up as occasions require, which is impossible; for, in making a second impression upon matter, you necessarily obliterate the first.

In materializing the mind, and then storing it with the impressions, or images of things, or ideas, of half a century's accumulation, another difficulty is involved. Keeping in view the fact, that every portion of matter possesses form and fills space, these images, or ideas, adhering to the mind in any form or manner, must also, each for itself, occupy a portion of the physical dimensions of the mind, as shown above; and if these thoughts, ideas, or images of things, occupy space, their size, compared with each other, must necessarily be proportioned to the relative sizes of things they represent. Assuming this, it follows that the idea of a mountain, must necessarily, occupy more space in the mind than a pebble, and the thought of an elephant must fill more space in the mind than the thought of an ant. This, our own consciousness contradicts, and, of course, it cannot be true, and, per consequence, the mind cannot be material.

We believe these difficulties cannot be obviated, only by a process of reasoning, applicable alone to spirit and not to matter; and this will be to abandon the whole ground of the mind's materiality, for it will not do to assume that the mind is matter, and then reason as though it were spirit. Those who assert that mind is matter, are bound to admit that it possesses all the known and essential properties of matter, and that it is governed by all the essential laws known to govern matter; and, admitting these, the above reasoning stands in full force against the materiality of the human mind. But only admit the common theory, that the mind is spirit and not matter, and the above reasoning becomes totally inapplicable, and all the difficulties disappear. Suppose that the mind is immaterial, a spirit, constituting no part of the body; that it is that which thinks and remembers, being a living soul, without figure, form, color, impenetrability, extension, divisibility, gravitation, attraction or repulsion, and not one of the arguments, urged above, against the materiality of the mind can be brought to bear on the subject.

4. The phenomenon of conscious identity and responsibility, proves the immateriality of the mind.

The soul, the rational man, cannot be the body, nor any part of it, as is proved from the identity which the mind is conscious of maintaining from the dawn of existence to life's final close. There is no room for dispute about the fact of this consciousness; it is the same in all, as all will admit. The man of three score and ten years, can look back to the hour of childhood, and trace his history through every intervening period, and is

conscious that he has preserved his identity through the whole, and is now the same person that he was at the commencement of life's journey. Consciousness is that notice which the mind takes of its own operations and modes of existence. Now, allow for a moment, that the mind is material, that the body, or some part of it, is the mind, and see what can be made out of this consciousness of- identity. In such case, it is matter, the body, or some part of it, that is conscious of its identity, which must involve the greatest absurdities.

(1.) Substitute the body, or that part of it which may be supposed to constitute the mind, for the term mind, and the absurdity will be seen at once. Consciousness is that notice which the *body* takes of its own operations and modes of existence. This, every one knows is not true—the body is not conscious. Suppose the brain to be the mind, and it will not be true. We cannot say, consciousness is that notice which the brain takes of its own operations and modes of existence. The brain is not the subject of this consciousness of identity; every man is conscious that it was the same mind that thought, loved, hated, rejoiced, and sorrowed in time past, —that thinks, loves, hates, rejoices and sorrows now; but no man is or can be conscious that he has the same brains now that he had in time past. It is then clear, that the mind is something distinct from the brain, and every other part of the body, as no part of the body is conscious, or the subject of consciousness. We can say that consciousness is that notice which the mind takes of its own operations, and every man's internal convictions tell him it is so; but if we say that consciousness is that notice which the brain takes of its own operations, no man feels any internal conviction of the truth of what we affirm.

(2.) To make the brain, or any other part of the body, both the actor and the subject of this conscious identity, is to make consciousness utter a falsehood. It is not true that the body preserves its identity; it is the perpetual subject of waste and renovation, keeping up a perpetual change of the particles of matter that compose every part of the body, even the brain itself. According to the admitted principles of physiology, a person at the age of seventy must have changed every particle of matter composing his body, some ten times. *The* system is calculated for reception and discharge, and this is the operation perpetually going on through life. This may be seen by the unlettered reader who has never studied physiology. He knows that he must take food every day to supply the perpetual waste of his system—that what he eats forms blood, and flesh, and bones. This could not be necessary, were there not a perpetual waste. This is further proved from the fact that the moment we cease to receive a sufficient degree of nutriment, the body begins to waste and become thinner; as the saying is, it grows poor. A person may be nearly starved to death, or emaciated with sickness, until reduced to one quarter the usual weight, and then in a few weeks recover, and be as full and heavy as before. Does the body consist of the same particles of matter now that it did before? Certainly not; the waste has been supplied with new matter, and yet the person is conscious of having preserved his identity through all these changes; he is certain that he that thinks and feels now, is he that thought and felt before these changes took place. This proves that the conscious mind, which preserves its identity amid all the changes of the body, is not the body; it is a distinct substance from the body, remaining unchanged. The body is not the subject of conscious identity; this every rational person must know for himself, if he will reflect

upon his own mental states. No man is or can be conscious that he has the same hands, feet or head, that he had ten years ago. He knows that they are the same from the impossibility of having changed them; but this is not consciousness. Could his hands, feet or head be exchanged while asleep, for others just like them, consciousness would not detect the change; there would be the same consciousness of identity or continued self as before. This shows that it is not the identity of the body of which we are conscious. A man is conscious that he is the same thinking, morally responsible being now, that he was ten years ago; but he is not and cannot be conscious that he has even the same brains now that he had ten years ago. This proves that the conscious mind is something distinct from the body.

Nearly allied to this consciousness of identity, is consciousness of responsibility; in view of which conscience approves or condemns us for what we have done. It is the office of conscience to approve when we do right, and to condemn when we do wrong—if we can then determine upon what our conscious guilt falls, when conscience condemns us, we shall find the morally responsible man, whether it be the body, or the soul, as distinct from the body. Suppose a man to have committed murder twenty years ago, and no one will doubt that he has carried in his bosom, the canker worm of a guilty conscience; his consciousness tells him that it was he that committed the murder, and not another, while his conscience tells him that he is guilty in view of the offence. What then is guilty? On what does the condemnation rest?

Does the murderer feel that it is his feet that are in fault, that his hands are to blame, that his brains are guilty? Surely not; conscience never told a man that his brains were guilty in view of his wrong acts, and this simple fact proves that the brains do not constitute the intellectual and moral man; if they did, our conscience would condemn our brains when we do wrong. Let the conscience-smitten sinner philosophize upon the operations of his own mind, and he will come to a right conclusion on this subject.

5. The phenomenon of desire proves the mind to be spirit and not matter.

The spirituality of the human soul may be inferred from the nature of its desires; from its thirst for happiness, which can be slaked only by drinking at the fountain of spiritual bliss. That all men desire happiness will not be denied; and that the greater portion seek it where it is not to be found, must also be admitted. The reason is, they seek it in the gratification of their animal propensities, and in the enjoyment of material objects, which can never feed and satisfy a spirit-soul. If the mind was material, right reason must teach us, that matter could answer all the demands of its nature, and satisfy its most capacious desires. Nothing can be more reasonable, than that all beings should find the centre of their happiness, in the perfection and fullness of the elements of their own natures. If man were only matter, if his soul were only matter compounded of the elements of the material world, in the material world would exist his centre of attraction, and the fountain of his highest enjoyment. That matter should seek an alliance with the spiritual world, and seek for fountains of spiritual bliss, and pant for spiritual joys, is as absurd and unphilosophical, as to suppose it to be governed by other than its own essential laws, and, to act in violation of the essential properties of its own nature. The fact that the world of

matter, never did, and never can satisfy the desires of the human soul, is one of the clearest proofs that the soul is not itself matter. The world in any and all its forms, cannot satisfy the desires of one human soul; give it all the elements of earth, sea and air, molded into every possible form, and it will grasp the whole, and thirst and famish still, and pant for higher bliss; there is still an aching void which God and love can fill. The reason of this is, the soul is not matter but spirit; were it matter, in matter would it find the element of its own nature, and the fullness of its own happiness; but it is a spirit, and in this respect like God. It originally came from God, and hence can be happy in God alone, as God dwells in us and we in God. But does God dwell in matter and matter in God? Can matter have fellowship with the Father and the Son? Can matter have communion with the Eternal Spirit? Can matter drink joys from the fountains of the Godhead?

The desire of knowledge, taken in connection with the capacity of the mind to improve, with the comparative progress of the body and mind, furnishes another argument in proof of its immateriality or spiritual nature. That the soul commences its career without knowledge is admitted; it has all to learn, but its capacity to learn furnishes the basis of the argument. The human mind is endowed with reason, which enables it to discover resemblances and differences, compare, judge, and deduce conclusions. This is the foundation of improvement, and distinguishes the human soul from the most intelligent of brutes, as well as from the material body in which it dwells. The mind in its present state is dependent upon the bodily organs for primary ideas; that is, the knowledge derived from seeing is received through the medium of the eyes, and the knowledge derived from hearing is received through the medium of the ears; yet such is the capacity of the mind, and such the manner of its improvement, as to furnish clear evidence that it is not one with the body, but in its nature, a distinct and spiritual element.

(1.) Its improvement is a distinct matter from the improvement of the body. The health of the body and mind frequently mutually effect each other, yet they are clearly distinct in their elemental nature. The body may grow and flourish in all the perfection of health, and the mind make little or no progress. Again, the body may be of exceedingly frail structure, pale and wan, and yet a giant mind may develop itself from within. Some of the greatest geniuses the world has ever produced, have had but just body enough to hold the soul. These facts certainly indicate that the soul and the body are not one and the same thing.

(2.) The body comes to maturity and begins to decline, at an age when the mind has but just commenced its career of improvement. The mind often makes its greatest advancement, after the body has commenced its downward course in the scale of being. The body usually possesses its greatest power and activity at twenty-five; at thirty it is in its full strength, but its activity begins to fail; at forty the whole physical system enters upon the downward course of life, and from sixty to seventy, it is generally superannuated. But it is otherwise with the mind; at twenty-five it has usually but begun to learn, its judgment is very far from being mature; from thirty to forty it begins to develop its powers; at fifty, sixty, and even seventy, the body being comparatively worn out, the mind is in its full strength and glory. This clearly proves, that the mind is not the

body, that the growth of the one is not the growth of the other, and that the decay of the one is not the decay of the other.

(3.) The phenomenon of what is called dotage, or second childhood, which some may regard as overthrowing the above view, when examined, will be found actually to support it. The apparent decay of the mind in cases of second childhood, by their want of uniformity, proves that the body and the soul are not one and the same thing, and that the decay of the one is not necessarily the decay of the other. If the mind were material—if it were not distinguished in the elements of its nature from the material body, then would the intellect necessarily and uniformly grow with the growth, and decay with the decay of the body. This is not the case; mental imbecility is often discovered in those whose bodies are less impaired, and whose general health and: vigor of body is far superior to others whose minds appear in their full strength. This could not be the case, if the mind did actually decay with the decay of the body.

(4.) The doctrine of phrenology, makes the size of the brain the measure of mental power, and the comparative size of its parts an index to the prevailing mental propensities; if admitted, would not prove the mind to be matter, or the brain to be the mind. The advocates of phrenology will not make this the issue, and base their science on the doctrine of materialism, to stand or fall with it. All that can be claimed for phrenology, is, that the brain is the material organ through which the mind acts, and develops itself in its incarnate state, and that it will, of course, develop a power proportioned to the size or strength of the brain; and, that the prevailing direction of the mind will be indicated by the comparative size of the phrenological divisions of the brain. Admitting all this to be true, it does not, in itself, tend to materialism, since it supposes the brain to be only the organ of the mind, and not the mind itself.

(5.) The mind often develops itself in its greatest power and glory, just at the moment of death, shining out from an emaciated body, already wan and cold. These cases, of very frequent occurrence, clearly indicate that the mind is not the body: that it does not waste with it, and does not die with it. It is true that in some cases, the mind appears to decay with the decaying body, but to prove that it is the body or any part of it, this would have to be always so without exception, which is not the case. To make the argument plain, we say that a single instance in which the mind kindles up at the moment of death, and blazes out with unwonted intellectual fires, while the body is wan, cold and helpless, cannot be reconciled with the idea that the mind is any part of the material body, and that it wastes and dies with it. On the other hand, those cases in which the mind appears to waste with the body and go out like the sun, passing gradually behind a cloud, deeper and darker, until its last ray is lost, can be explained in perfect harmony with the theory of the immateriality of the mind, and even its immortality. Does the mind fail, as in second childhood—or does it grow gradually dim as the body wastes under the influence of disease? The explanation is this: the bodily organs through which the mind communicates with the material world, in these particular cases, are impaired by age or disease. In many cases of death from sickness, the mind appears to waste away, or gradually sink into a state of sleep, merely because the will does not determine it in a direction to develop itself to the world without. But that the mind is there, distinct from the wasting, dying

body, is clear from the many cases already referred to, in which the mind, being roused by the prospect of heaven, or seized with the terror of impending perdition, flashes with the fires of immortality, and sheds a living glare as it quits its house of clay, and enters upon the destinies of the spirit world.

This has often been witnessed in the dying moments of both the Christian and the sinner. There are but few Christian pastors who have been long devoted to their work, that have not in their visits among the sick and dying, more than once stood by the bedside of those whose last moments left upon their minds a vivid impression of the undying nature of the human soul.

IV. A principal objection answered, which may be urged against the preceding arguments.

The objection is that if the arguments in support of the spirituality and immortality of the human soul, based upon mental phenomena are sound, they must prove with equal certainty that brutes have immaterial minds. In reply to the objection, it may be urged.

1. If the objection be well founded, it does not prove the arguments unsound. Will a man deny himself a soul, lest he should give one to his faithful dog? Will men reason their own souls out of existence, lest they should reason one into brutes? Who would not sooner embrace a theory which would elevate brutes to men, by giving them souls, than one which would degrade men to brutes, by taking away their souls. Is there anything more alarming in supposing that brutes are so much like men as to have souls, than there is in supposing that men are so much like brutes as to have no souls. The objection supposes there is a difficulty in allowing that a horse is so much like a man as to have a soul, and yet he appears to see no difficulty in supposing a man is so much like a horse as to have no soul. Most men would rather a horse should have a soul, than not to have one themselves. The arguments in question appear to prove the immateriality and immortality of the human soul, and if any one fancies that he can prove from them that brutes have souls, let him do it; that is no reason why we should do violence to the reason which God has given us, to escape the conclusion. But it will be made to appear that, while the arguments prove the immateriality of the human mind, without proving that brutes have souls, such souls as men have, yet if the consequence followed, there would be no occasion to abandon the arguments. Some eminent divines have held that brutes have immortal souls, and that they will have a future existence, yet their opinion appears to rest upon insufficient proof.

2. The objection, if admitted, would involve the objector in precisely the same difficulty, in relation to his own theory, which he charges upon the arguments above advanced.

It is supposed that the objection to admitting that brutes have souls, is on the ground that it would give them a relation to the spirit world, and a future existence.

This may be charged back upon himself for whether you raise brutes to a level with men, by giving them souls, or degrade men to a level with brutes, by denying that they have

souls, the result, in this particular, is the same, as it is admitted on both sides, that men do sustain a relation to the future world. Let it be noted that the objection is not founded upon a denial of the powers and susceptibilities of the human mind, upon which the preceding arguments rest, but upon the assumption that brutes possess the same powers and susceptibilities, or that they exhibit the same mental phenomena. If brutes do not exhibit the same mental phenomena as that upon which the arguments rest, then they prove nothing concerning brutes, and the objection falls to the ground. If beasts do exhibit the same mental phenomena, then they must possess the same intellectual and moral character, sustain the same relation to God's moral government, and be equally entitled to a resurrection and a future existence. The objector may take which horn of the dilemma he pleases; if he takes the former, his objection falls; if he takes the latter, he involves himself in it, and must fall under it.

3. It is denied that brutes ever exhibit those mental phenomena upon which the arguments mainly rest. If this can be sustained, the objection falls, and the arguments will bear the souls of men upward to the immortal world, without carrying with them the spirits of brutes that go downward to the earth. The arguments are founded exclusively upon the intellectual and moral phenomena of the human mind, which brutes never exhibit.

That brutes have some sort of mind there can be no doubt, and where there is mind, there is something besides matter. Brutes may have an immaterial element without having an immortal element. Man may have an animal nature in common with brutes, and that spiritual element in brutes, from which their mental phenomena results, may be, in man, the element which connects his material nature with the higher element of his spiritual and immortal nature. Be this as it may, it is certain that brutes never exhibit the essential elements, of an intellectual and moral nature, by which it can be made to appear that they sustain a relation to a future destiny. The elements of such a nature man does manifest. Some spirits are of a higher order than others, and hence the fact that brutes have minds, and per-consequence have associated with their material organization an inferior spiritual nature, neither proves them to be immortal, or invalidates the arguments by which man's spiritual and immortal nature has been proved from his mental phenomena.

The argument turns on this one point; do brutes exhibit all the mental phenomena, in kind, that men do, the difference being only in the degree of mental power? or do men exhibit some mental qualities, of which brutes give no signs. The latter is the position taken, and if it can be maintained, the objection must fall.

It is not denied that men and brutes have some things in common. They both possess sensation and perception, and brutes possess the first of these in as high a state of perfection as man; they can feel, see, hear, taste, and smell, as acutely as men. But these constitute their entire mental powers and susceptibilities, and are the basis of all the mental phenomena they exhibit. To these man has added reason, involving consciousness, will, memory, conscience, hopes and fears, which brutes have not; and these alone can constitute a moral agent, sustaining a relation to the retributions of a future state.

Sensation and perception, without reason amount only to instinct, which brutes have. Instinct is that power and disposition of mind by which animals are spontaneously led to do whatever is necessary for their preservation, and the continuance of their kind, independent of instruction and experience. This, and not reason, leads the bee to form her comb, the spider to weave his web, and the beaver to build his house; it is this that impels the infant, in whom reason is not yet developed, to draw its first nutriment with as perfect skill as it ever can, and with a skill which, in nine cases out of ten, is lost in after years beyond the power of reason to recall. But all this differs widely from reason, which distinguishes men from brutes. Some of the principal points of difference shall now be stated.

(1.) Instinct never improves, while it is the very nature of reason to progress. Animals acting from instinct, perform the same acts in the same way for ten thousand generations in succession; while men, acting from reason, vary their plans, improve their skill, and push their results onward toward perfection. Reason is that faculty which discovers resemblances, compares, judges and deduces conclusions. This results from what some call apperception, that is, pure thought. Animals have sensation and perception, but they never think; their mental operations are limited to the sphere of sensation and perception, while men abstract themselves from all that is external, and operate within by what is purely a thinking process; they think of things far away, of things they never saw, heard, felt, tasted or smelt; they think of thoughts, and compare thought with thought, and thing with thing. This is a mental process of which animals are clearly incapable; and it is this that lays the foundation of improvement; hence, men progress onward, and still onward to a higher destiny, while animals remain the same from age to age. Again, animal instinct never imparts to its fellow animal, the limited education it is capable of receiving from the more skilful hand of man. Some years since, the gullible portions of community, gaped with wonder at the performance of a learned pig, but one learned pig never educated his fellow pig in the arts of his profession, but the human mind under the influence of the higher endowments of reason, imparts its acquisitions to fellow minds. Thus the human mind is capable of improving itself, while each can impart its own acquisitions, and receive the acquisitions of others, marking the race distinctly and undeniably as destined for, and capable of perpetual improvement, which indicates a preparation for a higher state of existence, and allies the race to some future destiny. On the other hand, as animals have not the mental elements of intellectual improvement, as none have conceived and developed philanthropic schemes for the improvement of their respective species, and as none ever have improved and broken the chain which bound them to the sphere and destiny of an instinctive brute ancestry; they are not only separated from man by a chasm, so wide that no art of reasoning can link them on to human destiny, but they are distinctly marked as designed only for their present sphere, exhibiting no elements, suited to, and making no preparation for a higher destiny.

(2.) Men possess consciousness; brutes do not. As consciousness is that notice which the mind takes of itself, of its own operations and modes of existence, it involves a purely thinking process or reflection, which brutes cannot perform, they being only capable of sensation and perception as shown above. To explain, you may throw hot water upon a man, and a brute, and they both experience pain; this pain is called sensation. But at the

same time, both learn that hot water will produce pain, and both the man and the brute will be afraid of hot water in future; wherever they meet with it. This knowledge or idea which they obtain of the quality of hot water is called perception; that is, they perceive the relation between the sensation, the pain, and the external object, hot water, that produced the sensation, otherwise they would not avoid hot water the next time they met with it. But here the brute stops, never thinking about the sensation, or perception, only as they are revived by the presence of hot water; while the man will a thousand times call them up, and spend seasons in thinking about them, will review all the circumstances a thousand miles from the place where it happened, and without the presence of hot water to revive the sensation and perception. This is thought or reflection, and here comes in what is called consciousness of identity. While the brute never thinks of the sensation in the absence of the place and agent that produced it, nor of the perception of the quality of hot water, only when it is present; the man reflects on the whole matter away from the place, and in the absence of the agent that produced the sensation, and is conscious of his own identity; that is, he takes notice that the mind that now thinks, is the same mind that, so many years ago, in such a place, by contact with hot water received such a sensation, and obtained such a perception of the quality of the external object that produced the sensation. This is absolutely essential to a moral nature, and future accountability for present or past conduct, and as men possess it, they are allied to a future retribution; and as brutes have it not, they cannot be allied to a future retribution.

(3.) Men possess volition and will; brutes do not. Brutes exercise a kind of choice, as a horse prefers fresh grass to dry hay, and as an animal often exhibits obstinacy by preferring to go in one direction, rather than to be driven in another, but these are only the impulses of instinct. The will of man, which involves accountability, is a very different thing. A rational will supposes judgment, a power to compare different objects which operate as motives, and to determine their comparative value. Brutes are never influenced by motives addressed to the understanding. An ox will make a choice of two bundles of hay, founded upon the sense of smell or taste; but not upon a comparison of their relative nutriment or power to sustain life, nor even upon their comparative size, for this would require reflection, comparison and judgment which constitute the elements of reason, which brutes never exhibit.

(4.) Men possess the power of memory, which brutes have not. It is known that superficial observers often affirm that animals have memory, but it is for want of discrimination that they affirm this. They mistake mere sensation and perception for memory. A horse may fall through a bridge, and when he approaches that bridge again, or perhaps some other bridge, he will be alarmed; but this is not memory; the philosophy is this, the presence of the bridge revives the painful sensation and the perception, that the bridge produced the sensation. To remember it, would be to retain a knowledge of it, and to make it a subject of thought and reflection ten years afterwards, a hundred miles from the place and object that produced the sensation. This men do, but horses never.

A dog maybe in the habit of committing depredations in the cellar, and you will not cure him by punishing him in the barn. To render punishment effectual, it must be inflicted in connection with the place where the mischief is done, or in connection with the thing

injured, and then, though the animal has no memory of the transactions, beyond the mere sensation and perception, their presence revives them, and prevents a repetition of the fault.

(5.) Men have conscience, but brutes have none. Some may have supposed that they have seen animals exhibit signs of conscience, upon the same principle that they have attributed to them the faculty of memory. The signs of compunction which they have thought them to exhibit, have grown out of the painful sensations of punishment for the same or similar offences, which have been revived by the sameness of the present offence or contiguity of place. This is clear from two circumstances. First, animals never exhibit what are called signs of conscious guilt, for offences for which they have never been punished. Secondly, these signs, when they appear, are never increased but uniformly disappear under the influence of kind treatment. Kind treatment often awakens compunction in man, but never in an animal.

(6.) Men are the subjects of hopes and fears, joys and sorrows, beyond the influence of their present sensations, but brutes are not. Man looks back to the dawn of his being, and sorrows, and rejoices over what is past, while, to the brute, the past has no existence, only so much as lives in present sensations. Man looks forward and experiences the joy of hope, and the torment of fear, gathered from periods far distant in the future, while, with brutes, futurity is all a blank, beyond what is connected with their present sensations.

V. The opinion of the Jews is clear on the subject.

The first witness to be introduced is Josephus, who is the first authority in matters relating to the Jews.

"The Jews had for a great while, three sects of philosophers, peculiar to themselves; the sect of the Essenes, and the sect of the Sadducees, and the third sort of opinions was that of those called Pharisees.

"Now the Pharisees believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them, and that under the earth there will be rewards and punishments, accordingly as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life.

"But the doctrine of the Sadducees is this, that souls die with the body. But this doctrine is received but by a few, yet by those of the greatest dignity. But they are able almost to do nothing of themselves; for when they become magistrates, as they are unwillingly and by force sometimes obliged to be, they addict themselves to the notions of the Pharisees, because the multitude would not otherwise hear them.

"The doctrine of the Essenes is this, that all things are best ascribed to God. They teach the immortality of souls, and esteem that the rewards of righteousness are to be earnestly striven for."—[Josephus, Book 18, Chap. 1.

It is worthy of remark, that of the three sects into which the Jews were divided, two clearly believed in the immortality of the soul. Further, the Sadducees, who alone believed that the soul dies with the body, were very few in number, and had no influence with the common people. This proves that theirs was not the doctrine of the Jews, but an exception to it. They were composed of a few of the wealthy high-livers, and were clearly a set of Jewish heretics, as is proved from the fact that Christ so clearly condemned their doctrine.

The next witness we will introduce is the Jews' service book, containing their creed and prayers.

The seventh article of their creed runs thus: —" I believe with a perfect faith that the prophecy of Moses, our instructor, (may his soul rest in peace) was true." In one of their Sabbath morning prayers, we find the following expression: "Therefore, the members of which thou hast formed us, the spirit and soul which thou hast breathed into us."

In an evening prayer we find the following: —" Blessed be the Lord when we lie down, and blessed be the Lord when we rise up; for in thy hand are the souls of the quick and the dead."

The following is taken from a prayer which they read at funerals. After the lecture or discourse, the prayer is read, as follows: —" We beseech thee, O Lord, most merciful King in whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all flesh; let it be willed before thy presence that the lecture and our prayer be in behalf of [here the name of the dead person is pronounced] and be bountiful to her [or him] according to thy great mercy; O unfold for her [or him] the gate of mercy, compassion, and the garden of Eden; and receive her [or him] with love and favor. Send unto her [or him] thy holy angels, to direct and to place her [or him] beneath the tree of life, near the souls of the righteous, virtuous and pious saints."

The above extracts are sufficient to prove that the immortality of the soul is clearly recognized in the Jewish religion. The question here is not, are they right, but do they believe in the immortality of the soul?

The third witness which we produce, is the Apocrypha. These writings are not quoted as Bible, but as history; and though they are not regarded as being divinely inspired, they are Jewish writings, and are good authority in proof of the opinions that prevailed at the time they were written. A few plain texts will settle this question.

2 Esdras 9: 11,12: "And they that loathed my law, while they had yet liberty, and when as yet place of repentance was open unto them, understood, but despised it, the same must know it after death by pain."

This certainly looks like a belief in the conscious existence of the soul after the body is dead.

Wisdom 9: 15: "The corruptible body presseth down the soul, and the earthly tabernacle weigheth down the mind that museth upon many things."

This makes a clear distinction between the body and soul. The expression, corruptible body in contradistinction from soul, implies that the soul is not corruptible; and earthly tabernacle, in contradistinction from the mind, that inhabits it, implies that the mind is not earthly. But there are more distinct proofs.

Chap. 16: 14: "A man indeed killeth through his malice; and the spirit, when it is gone forth, returneth not; neither the soul received up cometh again."

This cannot be made plainer by comment.

Chap. 3: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; 6, 10, 17, 18, 19: "But the souls of the righteous are in the band of God, and there shall no torment touch them. In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die, and their departure is taken for misery, and their going from us to be utter destruction; but they are in peace. For though they be punished in the sight of men, yet is their hope full of immortality. And having been a little chastised, for God proved them and found them worthy for himself. As gold in the furnace hath he tried them, and received them as a burnt offering. But the ungodly shall be punished according to their own imaginations, which have neglected the righteous and forsaken the Lord. For though they live long, yet shall they be nothing regarded, and their last age shall be without honor; or, if they die, they have no hope, neither comfort in the day of trial, for horrible is the end of the unrighteous generation."

The above quotations are sufficient to prove that the writers of the Apocrypha, were believers in the immortality of the soul. It is said of the souls of the righteous, that "in the sight of the unwise they seem to die," that "their going from us is taken to be utter destruction; but they are in peace, —their hope is full of immortality." Nothing could be more to the point. The above is not quoted as inspiration, but only as any other writings would be quoted, to prove what were the opinions that prevailed at the time and place when the authors wrote. The books of the Apocrypha are supposed to have been written before the commencement of the Christian era, and were clearly written by Jews, who were familiar with the Jewish religion, and are therefore good authority, in proof that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul prevailed at that time.

The final witness on this point is the Bible. The Bible argument has been advanced, and will not be repeated, but a few texts will be introduced, to show what was the prevailing belief of the Jews. The Jews held the common doctrine of the appearance of ghosts or spirits, which is inseparable from a belief in the existence of the soul after death. A few texts will settle this point.

Matt. 14: 26: "And when the disciples saw him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, it is a spirit: and they cried out for fear."

Mark 6: 49: "But when they saw him walking upon the sea, they supposed it had been a spirit, and cried out."

Luke 24: 36-39: "And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them, why are ye troubled, and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me have."

These texts not only prove that the Jews believed in the existence of departed spirits, but they appear to give it the sanction of Christ. He did not even give them the slightest hint that they were in error in believing in the existence of spirits. The fact that he was tangible, he appears to consider sufficient proof that he was not a spirit.

Acts 23: 8: "For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit: but the Pharisees confess both." This text taken in connection with other well understood facts, most clearly proves what was the general doctrine of the Jews. The Sadducees were few in number, while the Pharisees were numerous, and lead the masses. Again, Christ condemned the doctrine of the Sadducees, and approved of that held by the Pharisees. See Matt. 22: 23; Mark 12: 18; and Luke 20: 27. The Sadducees were clearly a set of heretics, and the Pharisees held the true doctrine on the subject. What then did the Pharisees believe? Just what the Sadducees denied, which was the resurrection of the dead, and the existence of disembodied or immaterial beings in the form of angels or departed spirits. "The Pharisees confess both."

Both denotes two things, viz: the resurrection of the dead, which is the first thing denied by the Sadducees, and the existence of angels and disembodied spirits, which is the second thing denied by the Sadducees; the existence of angels and spirits being classed together as one article of faith. The Pharisees were the orthodox Jews, and were the representatives of the national doctrine, and they confessed both; that is, they confessed, first, that the dead would be raised, and, secondly, that there are angels and disembodied spirits. This clearly proves the point, that they believed that the soul exists after the death of the body.

VI. The Primitive Church believed that the soul maintained a conscious existence after the death of the body. The following quotations are from Arch-bishop Wake's Apostolic Father's, London edition, 1840.

The following, from the first epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians, clearly contains the doctrine for which we contend:

"Let us set before our eyes the holy apostle; Peter, by unjust envy, underwent, not one or two, but many sufferings; till at last, being martyred, he went to the place of glory that was due unto him. For the same cause did Paul in like manner receive the reward of his patience. Seven times he was in bonds; he was whipped, was stoned; he preached both in the east and in the west, leaving behind him the glorious report of his faith; and so having

taught the whole world righteousness, and for that end traveled even to the utmost bounds of the west, he at last suffered martyrdom, by the command of the governors, and departed out of the world, and went unto his holy place, being become a most eminent pattern of patience unto all ages.

"To these holy apostles were joined a very great number of others, who, having through envy undergone, in like manner, many pains and torments, have left a glorious example to us. For this, not only men, but women, have been persecuted, and, having suffered very grievous and cruel punishments, have finished the course of their faith with firmness, and, though weak in body, yet received a glorious reward."—[P, 60.

The above speaks too plainly to be misunderstood. Of Paul it is said, he "departed out of this world and went to his holy place." If Paul's soul died with his body, and both sleep until now; if his great mind was only his brains, which were decomposed after his death, the fluids evaporated, and the solids returned to dust, to be blown in ten thousand directions; in the name of common sense, to what holy place did he go? So of all the Martyrs, it is said, they "received a glorious reward."

The following is from the Epistle of St. Polycarp to the Philippians:

"Wherefore I exhort all of ye that ye obey the word of righteousness, and exercise all patience, which ye have seen set forth before your eyes, not only in the blessed Ignatius, and Zozimus, and Rufus, but in others among yourselves, and in Paul himself, and the rest of the apostles. Being confident of this, that all these have not run in vain, but in faith and righteousness, and are gone to the place that was due to them from the Lord, with whom also they suffered; for they loved not this present world, but him who died, and was raised again by God for us."— [P. 109.

Here it is declared that those who were dead "are gone to the place that was due to them from the Lord." Was that place non-existence? Surely not, for he said, "I go to prepare a place for you." "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory."

The following is from the Epistle of Ignatius to the Trallians:

"Stop your ears therefore, as often as any one shall speak contrary to Jesus Christ, who was of the race of David, of the Virgin Mary; who was truly born, and did eat and drink; and was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate; was truly crucified and dead, both those in heaven and on earth, and under the earth, being spectators of it. Who was also truly raised from the dead by his Father, after the manner as He will also raise up us who believe in him, by Christ Jesus, without whom we have no true life." —[P. 142.

The strong point in this extract is the assertion that, "those in heaven and on earth, and under the earth," were spectators of Christ's death and resurrection. This threefold

expression includes the living, the saved and the lost, and of course death was not, in the mind, of the writer, the extinction of being.

The following is from the Epistle of St. Ignatius to the Romans.

"But I would not that ye should please men, but God; whom also ye do please. For neither shall I ever hereafter have such an opportunity of going unto God; nor will you, if ye shall now be silent, ever be entitled to a better work. For if you shall be silent in my behalf, I shall be made a partaker of God; but if you shall love my body, I shall have my course again to run."

—[Pages 146,147.

Again, he says:

"All the ends of the world, and the kingdoms of it, will profit me nothing; I would rather die for Jesus Christ, than rule to the utmost ends of the earth. Him I seek who died for us; Him I desire who rose again for us. This is the gain that is laid up for me. Pardon me, my brethren; ye shall not hinder me from living: [nor, seeing I desire to go to God, may you separate me from him for the sake of this world; nor seduce me by any of the desires of it]. Suffer me to enter into pure light; where being come, I shall be indeed the servant of God."

— [Pages 148, 149.

In the above extracts, the writer is speaking of his impending martyrdom, and requests them not to interfere to prevent it. He calls it, "going to God," and being "made partaker of God." He represents their preventing his martyrdom, as hindering him "from living;" and separating him "from God for the sake of the world;" and finally, he represents his suffering martyrdom, the same as to "enter into pure light; where being come," he says, "I shall be the servant of God." Surely, he did not believe his material brains were all the mind he had, nor could he have embraced the cold, dark doctrine of the death-sleep of the soul.

The following is from the same author's epistle to the Smyrneans:

"Now all these things he suffered for us, that we might be saved. And he suffered truly, as he also truly raised up himself; and not, as some unbelievers say, that he only seemed to suffer, they themselves only seeming to be. And as they believe, so it shall happen unto them; when being divested of the body, they shall become mere spirits."—[Pages 158,159.

"Being brought to him, and communicating to him some spiritual gifts, and glorying in his bonds, he entreated, first of all, the whole church (for the churches and cities of Asia attended this holy man by their bishops, and priests, and deacons, all hastening to him, if by any means they might receive some part of his spiritual gift), but more particularly Polycarp, to contend with God in his behalf; that being suddenly taken by the beasts from the world, he might appear before the face of Christ. And this he thus spake, and testified,

extending so much his love for Christ as one who was about to receive heaven through his own good confession, and the earnest contention of those who prayed together with him. —[Pp. 179, 180.

The following is from the account of the martyrdom of St. Ignatius:

"Wherefore with much readiness and joy out of his desire to suffer, he left Antioch and came to Seleucia; from whence he was to sail. And after a great deal of toil, being come to Smyrna, he left the ship with great gladness and hastened to see the holy Polycarp, his fellow scholar, who was bishop there; for they had both of them been formerly the disciples of St. John.

"Wherefore being supported by the grace of Christ, they despised all the torments of the world; by the sufferings of an hour redeeming themselves from everlasting punishment. For this cause, even the fire of their cruel and barbarous executioners seemed cold to them; whilst they hoped thereby to escape that fire which is eternal, and shall never be extinguished; and beheld with the eyes of faith, those good things which are reserved for them that endure to the end; which neither ear has heard, nor eye seen, nor have they entered into the heart of man.' But to them they were now revealed by the Lord; as being no longer men, but already become angels."—[P. 193.

"But when the emulous, and envious, and wicked adversary of the race of the just, saw the greatness of his martyrdom, and considered how irreprehensible his conversation had been from the beginning, and how he was now to be crowned with the crown of immortality, having without all controversy received his reward, he took all possible care that not the least remainder of his body should be taken away by us, although many desired to do it, and to be made partakers of his holy flesh. And to that end, he suggested it to Niceties, the father of Herod and brother of Alcee, to go to the governor, and hinder him from giving us his body to be buried."—[P. 200.

Ignatius suffered martyrdom in the 147th year of the Christian era.

The next work we will introduce, is the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius. Eusebius wrote the first history of the Christian Church, that was ever written, excepting the Acts of the Apostles, and his work is the best authority concerning the first three centuries of the Christian era, which we have, after the New Testament itself. A few extracts will be sufficient. We quote by page, from the Philadelphia edition, 1833. It will be seen that Eusebius speaks of some of the same transactions as those described by some of the other writers previously quoted. In speaking of the martyrdom of Polycarp, he makes the following remark concerning him, after he was dead: "But that envious and malignant adversary, that wicked enemy of all the righteous, seeing the luster of his martyrdom, and his uniform walk and conversation, and him now crowned with the crown of immortality, and bearing off the indisputable prize, had provided that not even his corpse could be obtained by us."—[P. 148.

This clearly speaks of his having been already crowned with the crown of immortality, while his corpse was yet with them unburied. A clearer proof could hardly be given, of the writer's belief in the immortality of the soul.

In giving an account of the martyrdom of Lucius, he represents him as saying to his judge, "I thank thee, for now I am liberated from wicked masters, and am going to God."—[P. 154.

In speaking of the martyrs that suffered in Gaul, he says: "The firmness of the champions for the true religion, their fortitude in the endurance of numberless trials, their trophies erected over demoniacal agency, and their victories over their invisible antagonists, and the crowns that have been placed upon all these; it would proclaim and perpetuate by an everlasting remembrance."—[P. 168.

In speaking of the martyrdom of Blandina, he says: "Thus she overcame the enemy, in many trials, and in the conflict received the crown of immortality."—[P. 176.

Again it is said: "But the blessed Blandina, last of all, as a noble mother that had animated her children and sent them as victors "to the king, herself with joy hastened to them, as if she were invited to a marriage feast, and not to be cast to wild beasts."--[P. 179.

Of the martyrs in general, he says: "Always lovers of peace, they always recommended peace, and with peace they departed to God."—[P. 182.

All these passages contain clear evidence of a belief in the doctrine of an intermediate state, on the part of the martyrs. Lucius said, when suffering martyrdom, "I am going to God." The expression, "the crowns that have been placed upon all these," when applied to the dead, proves a belief in the life of the soul after the death of the body. "She received the crown of immortality," spoken of one already dead, proves the point. The martyrs are said to have been sent away to the king, and then Blandina is said to have hastened to them, when she was martyred. In the face of these proofs, are we to be told that the early Christians believed that soul and body die together, and must sleep together until the end of the world.

When Basilides, an officer, was leading Potamiaena to execution, he protected her against the insults of the multitude, in view of which, it is said of her, "Perceiving the man's sympathy, she exhorted him to be of good cheer, for that after she was gone, she would intercede for him with her Lord, and it would not be long before she would reward him for his kind deeds towards her." —[P. 224.

Soon after the above occurrence, Basilides himself was committed to prison, on his own declaration that he was a Christian; and when some of the brethren called upon him to learn the ground of his sudden change, "he is said to have declared that Potamiaena, three days after her martyrdom, standing before him at night, placed a crown upon his head,

and said that she had entreated the Lord on his account, and that she had obtained her prayer, and that ere long she would take him to her."—[Ib.]

The reader may abate what he pleases for the vision part of this extract, and still it will prove all that we claim to prove by it, viz: what was the belief, at that time, concerning the life of the soul after the death of the body. If the vision was a reality, our doctrine has the proof of a miracle; but suppose it to have been a creature of the fancy, it still contains the following facts: First, the martyr, while being led to execution, instead of supposing her soul was about to die with her body, she believed it would live, and so enter into the presence of Christ, as to enable her to intercede with him for her sympathizing executioner. Secondly, this was also believed by the executioner, a military officer, making such an impression on his mind, that he fancied he saw her in a vision, unless she did really appear to him; and so strong was his belief that the martyr's soul was alive after her body had been burned to ashes, and that he had seen her, that he submitted to be beheaded for the sake of the faith. Thirdly, the most learned and pious Christian writers of those times, recorded these things, most clearly, in full faith that they were true. This proves beyond a doubt, that Christians generally, at that time, must have held that the soul lives after the body is dead.

On one occasion, when the judge had condemned one to martyrdom, and he had been executed, another was seized and brought before him, and then it is said, that the judge, "as if to urge him to attach himself to the former as his companion on the way to heaven, commanded him immediately to be put to death."—P. 372. This clearly shows that the death sleep of the soul was unknown to the faith and language of those times.

Of this same martyr, it is said again, "He was the tenth after those wrestlers mentioned, that were perfected on one and the same day, on which, as is probable, the mighty portals of eternal life were opened to Pamphilus, in a manner worthy of the man, and presented to him and to others, a ready entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven."—Ib.

Such expressions, as the portals of eternal life being open to men when they die, giving a "ready entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven," clearly prove that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, was held by the writers. One John, an Egyptian Christian, is said to have lost his eyes, and to have been crippled in his limbs, by the tortures he endured; yet such was his memory, that he could repeat whole books of the sacred Scriptures. In speaking of having seen him and heard him address an assembly, our author says: "I seemed to behold an evidence, and solid proof in facts, that not he who appears in the external form is the real man, but in truth that which is in the soul and mind. For he, though mutilated in body, exhibited the greater power." —[P. 177.]

On the subject of the errors of the times, Eusebius says: "But about this time, other men sprung up in Arabia, as the propagators of false opinions. These asserted, that the human soul, as long as the present state of the world exists, perished at death and died with the body, but that it would be raised again with the body at the time of the resurrection. And as a considerable council was held on account of this, Origen, being again requested,

likewise here discussed the point in question, with so much force, that those who had before been led astray, completely changed their opinions. "-[P. 253.

Enough has been said on the subject, and here the argument for the immortality of the soul is closed.

SECTION IV.

The Intermediate State.

By the Intermediate state, is meant the state of human souls between death and the resurrection.

The fact of such a state depends in part, upon the fact that there is to be a general resurrection and judgment, yet as the immortality of the soul has been demonstrated, this appears to be the proper place to consider the state of the soul, immediately after death.

The fact of a general resurrection and final judgment, will be the next points for consideration, but before entering upon them, let the condition of the soul in its separate state be noticed. That the human soul maintains a conscious existence after the body is dead, was demonstrated in the preceding section. The fundamental truth to be maintained, is that the intermediate state embraces both a state of happiness and misery, the one enjoyed by the saved, and the other endured by the lost.

These points have been proved in fact, by the arguments by which the immortality of the soul has been established, but they need to be more distinctly stated.

THE RIGHTEOUS ENTER UPON A STATE OF HAPPINESS, AT OR IMMEDIATELY AFTER DEATH.

This point need not be proved as a simple truth, as all who admit the immortality of the soul, believe it, and those who do not admit the immortality of the soul, are referred to the preceding section. The only point of discussion in regard to the question, is, whether the souls of the righteous enter heaven at once, or whether they occupy an intermediate place, between death and the resurrection. On this point there has been a difference of opinion among learned and able writers, in regard to which Dr. Dwight says, "There has been no small debate among Divines; and those also of great reputation; concerning the place, where the dead will reside, between their departure from this world, and the final judgment. It must be acknowledged that the language of the Scriptures, furnishes a foundation for some difference of opinion concerning it. Several expressions, found in both Testaments, seem to indicate an intermediate place, as well as an intermediate state of existence, between this world and the final scenes of retribution. After a considerable examination of this subject, and an examination of several able commentators, who have handled it to some extent, I am obliged to confess myself not altogether satisfied; and to say, that, hitherto I have found difficulties on both sides. It is undoubtedly true that the Hebrew Sheol and the Greek Hades, commonly rendered *hell*, or the *grave*, in our

Translation, do not properly signify either, but always, *the world of departed spirits*. But whatever may be true concerning an intermediate place of existence, there can, I apprehend, be no reasonable doubt concerning an intermediate state."—[Dwight's Theology, Sermon 159. The last remark of Dr. Dwight is no doubt true; there must be an intermediate state and this is all that it is necessary to maintain.

I. A distinct place, as the abode of the souls of the righteous, between death and the final judgment, cannot be maintained.

1. The righteous dead are clearly represented as being with Christ. Paul had a desire to depart and to be with Christ; Phil. 1: 23. Again he taught the Corinthians that to be at home in the body, that is to live, is to be absent from the Lord; and to be absent from the body, that is to die, is to be present with the Lord; 2 Cor. 5: 6, 8. So Stephen saw the heavens open, and saw Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit;" Acts 7: 55-59. These texts are sufficient to prove that the pious dead are with Christ where he is, and that is heaven. They all refer to a period between death and the General Judgment.

Whatever difference there may be between the condition of the saints before and after the judgment; does not arise out of a difference of locality, but from other circumstances. What ideas of locality exist in the spirit world we know not, nor do we know the relation which this material world sustains to the world of spirits. The spirit world may be here, and angels and disembodied human souls, and God and Christ, might all appear present to us, if we were freed from our material organism. Yet there is clearly a place which is called heaven, which is in some way distinguished from other places, and to that abode of the blessed there can be no doubt departed saints have access, even before the final judgment.

2. The idea of an intermediate place may have grown out of the fact of an intermediate state, or out of the fact that Inspiration has used terms to describe the intermediate state, which are never used to express the final state of the saints after the judgment.

As remarked by Dr. Dwight, the Hebrew word *sheol*, and the Greek word *hades*, are used to express the place of the spirits of the dead, and in this sense they include both the world of happiness and of misery, but only the state of the dead this side of the judgment. It may be affirmed that the words are never used to denote the place or state of the righteous beyond the judgment.

Ps. 16: 10: "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption."

These words were spoken of Christ and have reference to the state or place he was in between his death and resurrection.

They are thus applied by Peter. Acts 2: 27: "Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption."

Peter affirms that David spake concerning Christ before quoting the above words, and then adds, in the 31st verse, that he spake those words, "of the resurrection of Christ that his soul was not left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption." In the Hebrew text *sheol* is the word rendered *hell*, and in the Greek text the word is *hades*. It is then clear that the soul of Christ went to hell, in the sense in which those words are sometimes used. On this the Romish doctrine is based, that Christ actually descended into the place of the damned, but the error arises from overlooking the fact that the words are sometimes used to denote the place of the dead in general, whether happy or miserable.

But where did Christ go. He went into the place of departed spirits, but his soul was not left there because his body did not see corruption, but was raised again. But what David called sheol, hell, and Peter called hades, hell, Christ himself called paradise. Luke 23: 43. Christ said to the dying malefactor, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Christ then went to paradise, and Paul uses the word paradise to denote the third heaven. 2 Cor. 12: 2,4. The explanation of all this is, the words sheol and hades, commonly rendered hell, are used, sometimes at least, to denote the world of departed spirits, and within the general sense of the word is found, the hades, hell, where the rich man lifted up his eyes being in torment, (Luke xvi. 23,) and the hades, where Christ and the dying penitent went, which is called, also, paradise. The word hades, hell, is not applied to the condition of men, good or bad, after the final judgment. Where the word hell occurs in the New Testament, to denote the place of the final punishment, the word in the Greek is not *hades*, but *Gehenna*. If these facts are well considered, some of the obscurity which has been thrown over the subject will be removed, and there will be but little left which will require an intermediate place for the righteous dead, or but little foundation upon which to build one, but it may be otherwise with regard to an intermediate state.

II. There is clearly an intermediate state, in which the souls of the righteous repose between death, and the resurrection and general judgment.

It has been seen that the souls of the good go to a place of happiness when they die, and that they are "with Christ," in Paul's language, but it does not follow that their happiness is, in every particular, the same in kind and as great in degree, as it will be after the resurrection and the final judgment.

1. If the resurrection body is to be a source of happiness to the soul, which cannot be doubted, all that amount will be added to the happiness enjoyed in the intermediate state.

This must render the state after the resurrection, very different from the intermediate state, during which the soul exists without a body. We cannot comprehend this difference now, yet we know it must be great. The difference cannot fail to be marked by all the glory ascribed to the resurrection body. The Apostle Paul tells us, 1 Cor. 15: 43, 44, that at the resurrection, the bodies of the saints will be raised spiritual bodies, in incorruption, glory and power, and such a body joined to the soul, cannot fail to render the final state very different from the intermediate state.

2. The solemnities of the day of judgment, embracing the investigation of the case of the righteous, and the decision and reward pronounced, appear to imply more, yea, much more than is possessed and enjoyed during the intermediate state. An allusion to a few of these representations will suffice.

"Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom, prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Again, the righteous are said, then, to "go into life eternal." Matt. 25: 31, 46. This language appears to imply, that during the intermediate state however happy and glorified they may be, they do not fully inherit the kingdom, and that then, on the rendition of the final decision, they, for the first time, enter upon the full beatitude of life eternal.

Paul, in summing up his life with reference to his final destiny, says, 2 Tim. 4: 8: "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing."

From the naming of the Judge, and the time, "at his appearing," the reference is clear to the final judgment, and hence, though Paul expected to be with Christ as soon as he died, which he declared was far better than to live, yet he did not expect to enjoy his crown until the final judgment.

So Peter wrote to the faithful ministers of his time, 1 Peter 5: 4: "When the chief shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away."

The appearing of the chief shepherd, doubtless; refers to the coming of Christ at the day of judgment.

All the happiness that virtue and holiness produce of themselves, in the human soul, and what will necessarily arise from its place and associations, will be enjoyed by the saints in the intermediate state, and it may be very great, but the reward pronounced and bestowed, will not be enjoyed until the judgment of the last day. There is then an intermediate state of happiness, distinguished from what will be the state of the saved after the resurrection and final judgment.

THE WICKED ENTER UPON A STATE OF PUNISHMENT OR SUFFERING AT OR IMMEDIATELY AFTER DEATH.

It is proper to devote full attention to this point, in view of the fact that some persons deny all suffering in the future state. They maintain that all punishment for sin and all suffering are confined to this life, and that when men die, their souls enter at once upon a state of eternal blessedness. In opposition to this view, the point to be proved is, that all who pass impenitent and unsaved from this world, will be the subjects of sin and suffering in the future state. The duration of suffering, whether it will be endless or not, is not in issue here, the argument comprehends only the period which lies between death and the resurrection and final judgment.

So the argument takes for granted, that the soul will maintain a conscious existence after death; the argument is not with those who maintain the death sleep of the soul, but with those who maintain the universal happiness of souls immediately after death. The former class were attended to in the preceding section; the latter are to be attended to in this.

The argument also takes for granted, that sin, and a sense of personal guilt, associated with the conscious existence of the soul after death, will necessarily render it the subject of misery in a greater or less degree. This will not be denied, for, to suppose that future happiness and sin will be associated in the same human soul, is subversive of the entire Gospel economy of salvation. There can be no way of escaping the idea of suffering between death and the resurrection, but by denying the conscious existence of the soul, or by denying the existence of sin after death, and maintaining that all human souls are free from sin and guilt so soon as they leave the body. The conscious existence of the soul was proved in the preceding section, and now it is only required to prove that sin will exist, that the soul will be guilty after death, and future suffering will follow as a necessary consequence. This gives great scope to the argument, and renders any text, or any fact which establishes the existence of either sin or misery after death, proof positive of the main proposition; that is, that all who pass impenitent and unsaved from this world, will be the subjects of sin and suffering in the next. Keeping the conscious existence of the soul after death before the mind, the reader's attention is now invited to the following arguments.

I. The Scriptures teach in the most direct and positive manner, that sinners are the subjects of suffering after death. This they do by affirming the existence of punishment after death, and by teaching that sinners will possess the moral character there with which they leave this world.

Psa. 9: 17: "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God."

Hell, here means the place of departed spirits, and as the wicked are to be turned into it, they will be wicked still, and hell will be to them what it was to the rich man, who lifted up his eyes being in torment. It will not do to render *sheol*, grave, in this text, because it would not then distinguish the wicked from the righteous, for they too, are turned into the grave, but hell, or the place of spirits, does distinguish them, because the fact of their wickedness renders *sheol* to them, a different place from what it is to the righteous. Hell does not mean a guilty conscience, for the wicked are turned into hell; not hell into the wicked.

Psa. 116: 3: "The sorrows of death compassed me, and the pains of hell gat hold upon me: I found trouble and sorrow."

Hell is here contemplated as a place of suffering, and the writer, in his guilt, anticipated its pain and anguish as many sinners have, and hence, he says, in the next verse, "Then called I upon the name of the Lord: O Lord, I beseech thee, deliver my soul."

Prov. 14: 32: " The wicked is driven away in his wickedness, but the righteous hath hope in his death."

In this text, being driven away in wickedness, stands opposed to hope in death. It follows, then, that the righteous have hope in their death, and that the wicked are without hope in death. Now, hope always relates to the future; hence, in death, amid the pangs of dissolving nature, as the world recedes from our vision, hope must take hold of the realities of a future state; and as the wicked are driven away in their wickedness, in distinction from the righteous who have hope in their death, their states must be different in the future world. If sin only affects the sinner in this life, he must have as much hope in his death as the expiring saint; and certainly he has more reason to appreciate that hope, if his punishment is all this side of death, and all is happiness beyond. The peculiar phraseology of the text shows that the sinner's guilt will cleave to him in a future state. The wicked is driven away *in* his wickedness, not driven away *from* it: hence, his wickedness goes with him into the future world.

Ezek. 18: 26: "When the righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them, for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die."

This text teaches that men will possess the same moral character in a future state with which they leave this; but it proves directly, that moral death will exist after the death of the body. Mark the peculiar language: the apostate is here said, first, to die in his iniquity, and then to die for it. This clearly proves that he who dies a sinner, will be a sinner in the future state, and will there experience that death which is the wages of sin, (see Rom. 6: 23.) That men will possess the same moral character in a future state, with which they leave this, farther appears from the fact that sin attaches itself to the soul. If sin attached itself to the body only, it might be contended that it dies with the body; but having its seat in the soul, it will live with it when the body dies.

Dan. 12: 2: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, gone to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

This text clearly recognizes a distinction in the moral character of men beyond the grave; and though it speaks more directly of the resurrection of the body, as the conscious existence of the soul is admitted, its moral character must remain the same during the intermediate state, in its sin and guilt, to join the body on the shore of the resurrection world in shame and everlasting contempt. Such is the light reflected from the pages of the Old Testament, on the condition of sinners after death. If the reader will now direct his attention to the New Testament, he will find the subject brought more fully to view, A few clear texts will settle the question.

Matt. 10: 28: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

Luke 12: 4, 5: "And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom you shall

fear: Fear him which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him."

These texts leave no room to cavil or to doubt, for here is a punishment set forth as occurring after the death of the body. The original word here rendered hell, is *gehenna*, which refers to the final place of punishment after the judgment, but this does not weaken the proof of suffering, during the intermediate state, as it involves the continued sin and guilt of the soul, from death to the time of the judgment, as its conscious existence is admitted.

Luke 16: 22, 23: "And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom."

This appears to be a simple statement of what actually took place, and if it be viewed in this point of light, it proves that sinners enter immediately upon a state of suffering when they die. In view of the clearness of the proof, if it be understood as a literal narrative, desperate efforts have been made to explain it away by calling it a parable. But it is not necessary to maintain the literality, to derive all the proof possible in support of punishment after death.

The object is clearly to teach men the danger of perdition, and if it be a parable, it must be what may take place. A parable is founded upon something real, which is understood, and which is employed because it is understood, to illustrate and explain some other subject, which is not so well understood as the subject of the parable. If it were not so, parables would serve to obscure, rather than to illustrate subjects. This view shows that if the case of the rich man be a parable, hell must have a real existence as a place of torment, and must have been understood by the Jews. Let this position be tested by an appeal to a few of the other parables of our Lord. The parable of the mustard seed is to the point. Matt. 13: 31. But deny that there is any such thing as a mustard plant, and you will ruin the parable. The parable of the sower is instructive, but if you deny that there is any such thing as a literal sowing of seed, you ruin the parable. The parable of the tares is also instructive, but deny that there is any such thing as literal wheat and tares, and the parable loses its beauty, force and truth. The parable of the leaven hid in three measures of meal, well illustrates the operation of truth, but if the literal operation of leaven in meal is denied, it is ruined. The parable of the net cast into the sea is a fine one, but if there were no sea and no fish, it would be no parable. The parable of the marriage supper, and of the prodigal son, both have a literal basis. So with the rich man and Lazarus, it is ruined as a parable, if there be no hell after death.

But for the sake of the argument, let it be allowed for a moment that it is a parable, designed to represent the Jews and Gentiles, as some have affirmed.

1. In this point of light it misrepresents the subject instead of illustrating it. It is not true that the Gentiles are in the Gospel church as a whole, as represented by Lazarus in Abraham's bosom. Nor is it true that all the Jews are excluded from the Gospel church, as

represented by the rich man in hell. The Gospel church was not organized by rejecting all the Jews, and receiving all the Gentiles, but by breaking down the middle wall of partition between them, and receiving all that believed of both Jews and Gentiles.

It is not true that the Jews are excluded from the Gospel church by any impassable gulf; the door of the Gospel church, and the door of salvation, is open for them to enter when they will. It is not true that the Jews have even sought an admission to the Gospel church, as represented by the rich man pleading with Abraham. But how could it illustrate the prospective condition of the Jews and Gentiles, if there is no hell of torment beyond death. There is nothing to illustrate by; hell, which is not, is used to illustrate the case of the Jews and Gentiles, which is. That which is not, is used to illustrate that which is; nothing is used to illustrate something. Did the Jews believe in a hell beyond death, the illustration must have confirmed them in that belief. Did the Jews not believe in the existence of such a hell, the illustration must have been darker than the subject sought to be illustrated. An illustration must be better understood than the subject illustrated, that we may apply the knowledge we have of it, to the subject, to make that plainer. What then is hell in the parable, if the common notion of hell is a fiction, that we may apply our knowledge of it, to the relation and condition of the Jews and Gentiles, in order to a better understanding of that subject?

2. As a mere parable it is defective in its parts, upon the supposition that there is no hell. Suppose we understand the Jews by the rich man, and the Gentiles by Lazarus, then it may be asked, who are to be understood by the father's house, to which the rich man, that is, the Jews, desired Lazarus, that is, the Gentiles, to be sent? Again, it may be inquired, who are represented by the five brethren, for whom the rich man, that is, the Jews, manifest so much solicitude, lest they should come to the same condition in which the Jews are involved. It must appear from the above remarks, that the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus, is based upon the fact that there is a hell of misery, into which wicked men enter when they die, and that to deny the existence of such a place, is to rob the remarks of Christ of all force and all sense.

II. All professed believers in the Christian Religion, who deny that there is any suffering after death, hold principles, which, if carried out, must prove the very doctrine they deny. Indeed, their denial is based upon an assumption, which, if it were true, would involve the very thing they deny, namely, that sin will be punished after death. They contend that the object of all divine punishment, is to reform the sufferer. This appears to be a fundamental principle in their theory; it is advanced by every writer, and reiterated by every pulpit declaimer on the subject. If all divine punishment be designed to reform the sufferer, as Universalists contend, one of three consequences must follow, viz: every sinner must be *reformed in this life*, or punishment must *fail to effect the reformation of the sinner*, for which it is designed, or else it must be *continued in a future state*, until it effect there, what it fails to accomplish in this world.

1. All sinners are not reformed in this life, as Scripture and matter of fact abundantly declare. It is said Prov. 14: 32: "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness, but the righteous hath hope in his death." If then the wicked are driven away *in* their wickedness,

in opposition to the hopeful death of the righteous, it is clear that they are not reformed and saved from their sins before death. Indeed, it cannot be denied that some men sin on life's most extended verge, and blaspheme with their last breath; it is certain, therefore, that all men are not reformed in this life.

2. Will it be said that punishment fails to effect its designed object, in those cases in which men are not reformed in this life? The answer is, such a concession must be fatal to the argument drawn from the corrective design of punishment; for what does it avail to contend that punishment is designed to reform the sinner, if it be admitted, at the same time, that it may fail to produce the designed effect? If it be admitted that God does inflict punishment, which does not reform the sufferer, the fact that endless punishment cannot reform its subjects, forms no argument against it. Not only so, but if it be contended that punishment be designed to reform the sinner, and admitted at the same time, that it may fail to effect this design, it must follow that the means which God employs to reform sinners fail of their object. Now, if sinners can and do resist and render ineffectual the means which God employs to bring them to repentance and salvation, the final salvation of all men, to say the least, must be doubtful, and the conclusion is more than probable, that there will be sin and punishment after death.

3. As the object of denying all punishment after death, is to establish the doctrine of the final salvation of all men, and as those who deny future punishment, contend that all punishment is designed to reform the sinner, and as it is fatal to their cause to admit that it may fail in its design, they must allow that it will be continued in a future state, since it is manifest that it does not effect its intended object in this life. There is no way to escape the force of this conclusion. There are three alternatives between which they may choose, viz: they may admit that all punishment is not designed to reform the sufferer, or they may hold on to the corrective design of punishment, and admit that it sometimes fails to effect its intended object; or they may contend that it will effect the reformation of the sinner, and admit that for this purpose it will be continued in a future state. But as it would be fatal for them to admit either of the two former propositions, they must accept of the latter, and admit the doctrine of punishment after death.

III. There are some sins which will not admit of punishment in this life. In all cases where life is ended in sin, the subject cannot receive all the punishment he deserves before death, and therefore must be punished in a future state.

When we look into this world of wickedness and death, we see one man die in a drunken fit; another fall by the hand of his intended victim whom he was about to murder and rob—falling with the instrument of death in his hand, and murder in his heart; another has his head shot off in the field of battle; another is struck dead by lightning from the clouds, when in the act of blaspheming the name of God; and another perishes by his own hand—blowing out his own brains, and sending his soul into the future world, "as sudden as the spark from the smitten steel," stained with his own blood. Nothing can be more clear, than that sinners, dying under the above circumstances, cannot receive their full punishment in this world. If sinners are punished all they deserve in this life, under these circumstances, at what time do they receive it, and in what does it consist? Is it said that it

is inflicted prior to the commission of the crime? The notion is too absurd to be indulged for a moment.

1. If sin be punished before it is committed, then the innocent receive the punishment: before sin is committed man is innocent; he is then punished, if the punishment is prior to the sin for which it is inflicted; after that he commits sin; he is then guilty and receives no punishment on the above principle.

2. If sin be punished before it is committed, it must follow that sinners do not render themselves liable to punishment, by the commission of their crimes. On this principle, when a man has an opportunity to commit sin, and is disposed to do it, he may take it for granted that the punishment is past and commit the act with impunity.

Will it then be said that sin is punished at the time it is committed? This would imply that sin deserves no more punishment than is endured while the sinner is engaged in the crime, which in some of the above supposed cases can be but a moment.

1. To say that sin receives its punishment at the time of its commission, so that it is fully punished by the time the act is finished, is to encourage sin. Sin is often committed with no other object than the gratification which the act itself affords; now, if the punishment is received at the same time, it must be overbalanced by the gratification, making the pleasure of sin greater than its punishment; thus, the scale must preponderate in favor of sin.

2. The above notion is contradicted by plain matter of fact. Did Cain receive all the punishment his wicked murder deserved while he was slaying his righteous brother; or was he punished after the act was committed? The same inquiry might be made of every case of divine punishment recorded in the Bible. The same inquiry also may be made of every penalty inflicted by courts of justice, at the present day. If theft be punished all it deserves while the thief is in the act of stealing, imprisonment for the same act must be over and above justice.

But if sin receives all its punishment while the sinner is committing the act, in what does the punishment of sin consist? Suppose a man takes his own life by blowing out his own brains in an instant, or is shot dead in the act of attempting to kill another, does his punishment consist in the pain he endures? This cannot be.

(1.) This would make the punishment of murder consist in the pang of an instant, of which we can scarcely have any perception. Murder, in such case, is punished with less smart than good parents often inflict on their children for a much less offence.

(2) The pain of dying in such case cannot be greater than men generally endure in death, whether they save life or take it; for all must die, and generally suffer more than the man whose existence is ended in an instant as above supposed.

(3.) To suppose that the punishment of suicide consists in the pain of dying, would be to suppose that the man punishes himself for his own sin, and that the act which constitutes the sin, and the act which inflicts the punishment are the same. From this, one of two fatal consequences must follow, viz: as the same act produces both the sin and the punishment, it must follow that God is the author of the sin, or else that he is not the author of the punishment. Now, if it be said that God is the author of both the sin and the punishment, then he punishes for that of which he is the author; and if it be said that God is not the author of the punishment, then the sin is not punished by God, and the pain of dying is proved not to be the punishment of suicide.

"Will it be said that the punishment of suicide, or the punishment of a man who is shot dead in an attempt to murder another, consists in the loss of life? If so, then,

1. The loss of life cannot be greater to the highway robber, or to the poor wretch, who is so tired of life as to commit suicide, than it was to righteous Abel or St. Stephen. The loss of life must be as great to the man who loses it in attempting to save the life of another, as it is to the man who loses it in an attempt to kill another.

2. On the supposition that there is no punishment after death, the loss of life, is in fact, no loss, but a great gain, just in proportion as heaven is to be preferred to earth!

3. To suppose that the punishment of suicide consists in the loss of life, confounds sin with its punishment, and destroys all distinction between them. Suppose a man to hang himself, in what does the sin consist? It must be acknowledged that the sin consists in the sacrifice of life, while it is said that the punishment consists in the loss of life, which amounts to the same thing: a man sins by hanging himself, and he is punished for it by hanging; or a man is guilty for the loss of life, and he is punished by the loss of life, for which he is guilty. It must be clear that this makes sin and its punishment the same; the sin consists in the punishment and the punishment consists in the sin. Now, if this be granted, there are some sins for which many persons would esteem it a privilege to be punished.

It must appear conclusive from the above reasoning, that there are many sins which are not, and which cannot be punished in this life; they will therefore be punished in a future state.

IV. To suppose that sin receives its full punishment in this world, must defeat every object of punishment which can be considered worthy the divine administration. If the full penalty of the law be inflicted, and endured by the offender in this life, it cannot be known what the punishment of sin is, how much of it the transgressor must endure, on whom the weight of the divine penalty falls, nor for what purpose it is inflicted.

1. If sinners are punished in this life all their sins deserve, it cannot be known in what their punishment consists. Do different sins receive the same punishment, in kind? Or are profane swearers punished in one way and liars in another? Do the same acts of transgression always receive the same punishment, in kind, or are the violations of the

same command punished sometimes in one way and sometimes in another? There is no suffering which sinners endure in this life, that we can recognize as the full penalty of the law. The punishment cannot consist in the misfortunes, sufferings, and death common to human beings; for we see good men suffer and die as well as bad men. The punishment of sin cannot consist in the penalties inflicted by the laws of the land; for the laws enacted by men are sometimes unjust and oppressive, punishing virtue and rewarding vice. Different governments annex different penalties to the same prohibition, and all often change, while many sins are beyond the reach of the best civil authorities. Nor can the punishment of sin consist in mental anguish, or remorse of conscience. If the punishment of sin consisted in guilt of conscience, it would appear that the moral sensibility of the soul must be waked up in proportion to its progress in sin and guilt, which is not the case. Progress in sin is attended with greater and greater insensibility, until every moral feeling of the soul is so blunted that the sinner can sport in the midst of those scenes of enormity, which would have shocked his soul and struck him dumb in the commencement of his vicious career. The man of general good life and upright intentions, feels much more distress at the slightest deviation from moral rectitude than the most abandoned libertine careering in his licentious course, who has given himself up to work all manner of filthiness with greediness. The first deviation from probity is attended by a keen sense of guilt; conscience is on the alert. On a second offence conscience feels less, and so, until she is lulled to sleep, and sin is punished with little or no remorse. With this view; the testimony of Scripture accords. We read of some who have "their conscience seared as with a hot iron." 1 Tim. 4: 2. We read of others, "who being past feeling, have given themselves over unto lascivious-ness to work all manner of uncleanness with greediness." Eph 4: 19.

2. On the supposition that the sinner receives his full punishment in this life, it cannot be known how great, or how small an evil the punishment of sin is. We may tell sinners that for their transgression they must be punished, and that except they repent they will perish, but how much they must suffer we cannot inform them; we cannot threaten them with an hour's punishment, for the worst of crimes; for we know not that they will live an hour. The law of God does not inform its subjects how much they must suffer if they incur its penalty, if there is no punishment after death. The sinner knows he cannot suffer long, but does not know that he shall suffer another day or hour; for the law, with all its threatened penalties, does not give assurance that we shall survive that length of time; therefore God's law does not positively threaten the sinner with an hour's punishment, unless it threatens punishment after death. How long the sinner must suffer for his sin is therefore as uncertain as the day of his death; and more so, for while it is asserted that punishment shall not exist after death, it is not contended that the sinner will certainly be punished up to that period.

3. It cannot be known who suffer for sin, if its punishment be all endured in this life. We cannot know who are the subjects of divine punishment, by the sins of which those around us are guilty; for some commit their deeds in darkness, and others conceal the heart of a hypocrite under an external appearance of sanctity. Nor can we discover who are the objects of divine punishment by the suffering we see men endure, for there is no visible suffering endured by the wicked to which the righteous are not exposed, and

sometimes actually endure. It is clear then that we cannot know in this world who suffer for their sins.

4. If sin receives its full punishment in this world, we can see no important object to be secured by it; no object worthy of the divine administration. It cannot be to make an exhibition of the divine justice, nor to vindicate the divine law and government; for no exhibition is made of the punishment inflicted, nor of the subjects on whom it falls. It cannot be to make the sufferer an example to others; for neither the sufferers nor the punishment they endure is known as above stated. Nor can punishment be designed to reclaim the sufferer if it be confined to this world; for if there is no punishment after death, all will, of necessity, be reformed when they die; hence, if reformation be the end of punishment, such reformation must be confined to this life. To say men are punished in this life to reform them after death, would be to admit that they will be sinners in a future state, and consequently subject to punishment. If punishment, then, is designed to reform the sinner, it must reform him in this world, or be continued after death, or fail of its design, as was shown in a preceding argument. Now, it is notorious, that all sinners are not reformed in this life; some sin and blaspheme with their last breath. This leaves no motive to punish the sinner for sins committed just as he is leaving the world; for, as the reformation which punishment is designed to effect has exclusive reference to this life, it can be of little consequence just as the sinner is entering eternity. To punish a dying sinner to reform him, with exclusive reference to this world, when in a week, a day or an hour, he will certainly be conveyed by death, where his sin cannot follow him, and where he will need no reform, appears un-worthy of the divine administration.

That punishment is not designed to reform, and that it does not result in reformation, on the supposition that it is confined to this life, is farther evident from the fact, that sinners themselves do not always know when they are punished, or that they are punished at all for sin in this life. We are liable to suffering here whether we sin or not; and who can tell which of his trials and sufferings are to punish him for his sins, and which are his natural inheritance, as a citizen of this world of sorrow? Not only so, but some have lived and died in a belief that God never punishes sin, in this world, or in the world to come. Such persons are not only without reformation by their punishment, but on the supposition that sin is fully punished in this world, they receive the whole penalty of Jehovah's law, without knowing that they are punished for sin.

It is clear then, if sinners are punished in this life all they deserve, their punishment cannot be designed to display the divine justice, nor to vindicate the divine government and authority. It cannot be to make the punished an example to others, nor can it be to reform the sufferer; to which it may be added, therefore it can reflect no glory upon the divine attributes, nor upon the divine administration. It must therefore follow that sinners go unpunished, or endure a punishment which can answer no important end to the punished, to others, nor to the divine government, or else they must be punished in a future state; and the latter appears most consistent.

V. It does not appear that wicked men suffer more in this life than many of the most pious.

It has been shown in a preceding argument that it cannot be known in what the punishment of sin consists, nor on whom it is inflicted, if it be confined to this world. This certainly goes far towards proving that the wicked do not suffer more in this life, than those whom the Scriptures denominate righteous; for if we cannot know what, and how much punishment the sinner endures in this life, it must be difficult to, prove that he suffers more than the good man, around whom wants and sorrows often gather, and storms of adversity and persecution howl. But the argument need not rest on a supposed impossibility of proving that sinners suffer more in this life than the righteous, for it is easy to prove that they do not. The righteous have sometimes endured all that men are capable of suffering in the flesh. They have endured cold and hunger, nakedness, famine, prisons, racks, fire, and sword. Many devoted Christians have closed their eyes amid the hellish tortures of an inquisition. Now what more than all these have wicked men suffered? Some, it is true have endured the same or similar trials; but many others who have been very wicked, have endured none of them, but have walked through life in paths perpetually cheered by the sunshine of prosperity.

Should it be said that sinners suffer from a guilty conscience, what amounts to more than all the evils which the righteous some-times endure? It may be replied,

1. That is what can never be proved.
2. It is what the sinner will not himself admit. What sinner will say that he suffers more than would equal the afflictions of Job, the trials of Jeremiah, or the labors and sufferings of Paul?
3. It is what no man of sober thought will believe. Who will believe that the wicked men of their acquaintance, who are surrounded by all the good things of this world, and appear sportfully merry, actually suffer more than the devoted Christian, whose sighs escape from his dungeon through iron grates, or whose groans tell the deadly work of the instrument of torture? If it be said that the righteous have the support of religion amid all these trials, it is granted; but it is likewise affirmed,

1. The wicked have many blessings, such as health, peace, and plenty, of which many of the godly have not been permitted to taste; and these mercies must serve much to mitigate their sorrow, admitting that they are punished here.

2. The righteous, amid all the supports which religion affords, endure much mental distress to which the ungodly are strangers; the best men often sorrow and weep, while wicked men rejoice. Hear the prophet exclaim, "O that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night." Here an apostle declare, "I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart." Consider that these are exercises which sinners never feel, and it will appear that wicked men do not always suffer more in this life than good men. Indeed, if the "tears of both were numbered, no doubt it would appear that the man of God sheds the most. This argument may be thus stated: If sinners are punished in this life all their sins deserve, they must suffer more than the righteous.

But sinners do not always suffer more in this life than the righteous, therefore they are not punished in this life all their sins deserve, and consequently must be punished in a future state.

VI. If there is no punishment after death, it must follow that the piety of the pious, and the wickedness of the wicked can affect them only in this life; all the consequences of virtue and vice, here must cease at death. To say that the virtue of good men, or the vice of bad men, will affect them after death, would be to admit the doctrine of future punishment. Taking this view of the subject, it is obvious that to deny future punishment is to dispossess religion, at least, of most of its motive influence with which it addresses itself to the better interests of mankind.

1. The pious have no object to secure by their fidelity in religion, only what they enjoy in this life. Suppose then that prophets, apostles, confessors and martyrs, knew that their profession of the truth which brought upon them the contempt of the world, the frown of kings, and prepared the rack to torture them, and the fiery fagot to burn them; suppose that they knew the benefits of their profession would last no longer than the sufferings which they endured for its sake, and can any one believe that they would have braved all the storm of persecution that fell upon them with such undying fortitude as marked their career? Would Moses have chosen to suffer affliction with the people of God on earth, if he had believed that he could enjoy the splendor of the Egyptian throne and heaven too? Would Paul have endured what he did for the sake of the Gospel, had he believed that himself and all others would be just as well off at death without the Gospel as with it? Would he have warned every one, night and day, with tears, "if he had known that all distinction between the righteous and the wicked would cease at death? It is clear then that the course pursued by the prophets, apostles, and fathers, was such as would not have resulted from a belief that the conduct of the present life has nothing to do with our future destiny. Had they believed that their perseverance in the truth would not benefit them after death, their blood would never have stained the ground, nor would Nero's garden have been lighted with their funeral piles. If it be said that religion yields a present comfort to the believer sufficient to support him under all these trials, the appeal is made to the Christian world, and it is asked what Christian there is who will say that he enjoys comfort enough in religion, aside from any hope or fear respecting a future state, to support him in the dungeon, loaded with chains, or to carry him to the stake? There is comfort in religion, and joy in believing, but take away that joy which springs from a hope that takes hold on a future reward, and remove that faith which connects present fidelity with future happiness, and what remains will be dissipated at the first motion of the wheel, or at the first touch of the fiery fagot.

2. The wicked have nothing to fear in consequence of their sins, only what befalls them in this life. This certainly leaves sinners with as little to fear, in view of their wickedness, as the righteous have to hope for in consequence of their piety.

Some men who are notoriously wicked pass through life as smoothly as the devoted Christian, or the zealous minister, who like Paul, warns all, night and day, with tears. If it be said that sinners suffer some unseen punishment, which is designed to operate as a

restraint upon them to deter them from transgression, the absurdity of such a hypothesis has already been shown, in addition to which an appeal may be taken to the sinner, by asking him what he has suffered as a punishment for sin, calculated to restrain him in future? It must be seen then that to deny future punishment, is to remove all the terror from the divine law, by nullifying its threatened penalty, and leave the sinner to act without fear of punishment. Is it said that those who deny punishment after death, assert, that if men sin they must be punished for it in this life, and that there is no possibility of escaping it by repentance and faith? It is clear that sinners have no reason much to fear a mundane hell; for that sentiment which denies a future hell, teaches them that they have been in hell ever since they began to sin; and having found it supportable, and in general quite comfortable, they can have but little to fear for the future.

There are other arguments which might be urged in proof of the position that sinners will suffer after death for sins committed in this life, but they are so involved in other points discussed in this chapter, as to render it unnecessary to press them in this place.

SECTION V.

The Resurrection.

The doctrine of the resurrection of the human body, is exclusively a matter of revelation. When once we have got the conception, and the belief of the resurrection of the dead, we may find analogies in nature to illustrate the subject, and may reason concerning it, but the first idea must come from God by revelation, or be suggested by seeing dead people rise up. The thought of a general resurrection lies beyond the power of human reason to conceive or demonstrate, and our faith in it must rest upon the authority of the word of God, or it must fall. So, as reason cannot demonstrate the truth that there will be a resurrection, neither can it refute it, and none of its philosophical difficulties and objections can be admitted as proving anything against what is clearly set forth in the Scriptures concerning the resurrection of the human body. What, then, does the word of God teach on the subject?

I. The Scriptures teach that there will be a resurrection of all the dead. It is not necessary to spread an argument over several pages to prove that the saints and prophets of the Old Testament had some light on the subject of the resurrection. It is believed that point might be proved, yet the New Testament is so clear that the end may be gained without that labor.

There were among the Jews a sect called Sadducees, who denied that there is to be any resurrection, neither did they believe in angels or spirits. In this they differed from the Pharisees and the rest of the Jews. These Sadducees came to Christ with their scepticism, and he contradicted and refuted them. This conversation is recorded by Matthew, Mark and Luke. It will be sufficient to quote one of the conversations.

Matt. 22: 23-32: "The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him, Saying, Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no

children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. Now there were with us seven brethren: and the first, when he had married a wife, deceased, and, having no issue, left his wife unto his brother: Likewise the second also, and the third, unto the seventh. And last of all, the woman died also. Therefore, in the resurrection, whose wife shall she be of the seven for they all had her. Jesus answered and said unto them, ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."

On this important passage it may be remarked,

1. There can be no mistake in regard to the question; the issue was clearly the resurrection of the dead. This is made clear by the Evangelist, in stating, that the Sadducees deny the resurrection. It is further evident by their own statement of the question. It regarded the relation of seven brothers to one woman, and they state distinctly that the brothers all died, and that the woman also died, and then, upon this state of things, they base their question. The question, therefore, must have regarded a state of things beyond death and the grave. By the resurrection, they must have meant life in some form after death. They appear to have assumed that the same relations must exist in the future state that exist in this, if there be such a state, and hence, that if there be a resurrection of the dead, the one woman would have seven husbands in the future state, and hence, that the doctrine of the resurrection involved an insurmountable absurdity.
2. Christ answered their question by affirming, virtually, that the woman would be the wife of neither of the seven brothers; that the relation does not exist in the resurrection state, because they are like the angels, spiritual and immortal. Thus he removed their entire objection to the doctrine of the resurrection.
3. Christ asserted directly, that they were in error, and that their error was the result of not knowing the power of God and the Scriptures. We here have the authority of Christ's word, that it is an error to deny the doctrine of the resurrection.
4. Christ asserts the truth of the doctrine of the resurrection, by advancing an unanswerable argument in its support. For a more extended comment upon this text, the reader is referred to the argument on the immortality of the soul, where it is more fully explained.

The text as here presented, is entirely conclusive, in proof of the fact that there will be a resurrection of the dead.

It has been shown above that Christ pronounced the Sadducees in error, and with this fact before his mind, the reader is requested to consider, Acts 23: 6, 8: "But when Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the Son of a Pharisee: of the hope and

resurrection of the dead I am called in question. For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit: but the Pharisees confess both."

Here Paul asserts his belief in the resurrection of the dead, as plainly as he could have done it. This doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, was an inspiring theme with Paul; he preached it in Athens, to the philosophers, Acts 17: 18, and gloriously wove it into his defense before Agrippa, Acts 26: 8, and demanded of the king, "why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?"

But Paul's master piece on the resurrection, is found in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. 15. No single verse can be quoted which will do justice to the subject, or to Paul; the whole chapter must be considered to appreciate the effort. He not only asserts the doctrine of the resurrection, but demonstrates it by a power of argument which is only like Paul.

He declares that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures: And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one bore out of due time."

After all this demonstration of the resurrection of Christ, the Apostle adds, "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins."

After this and the statement of some additional consequences which would follow, if the resurrection of Christ be denied, Paul re-affirms that fact thus: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

Paul next answers objections to his doctrine, and shows with what body the dead will be raised. He then connects the resurrection of the dead with the change of those who shall be alive on the earth when the resurrection shall take place, and shows how it will be effected, as follows:

"Behold, I show you a mystery: We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."

Paul then concludes the whole with the song which will be sung on the immortal side of the grave, when these things shall be accomplished.

"So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

It must appear that no further proof need be adduced, to satisfy those who have any confidence in the inspiration of the Scriptures, and especially in the inspiration of St. Paul. But so generally was the doctrine of the resurrection believed, and so important was it regarded by the ancient people of God, that Paul affirms of the martyrs, that they "were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection." Heb. 11: 35.

II. The Scriptures teach that it will be a resurrection of the same body, though greatly changed, spiritualized, and glorified.

1. It is perfectly certain that in the case of Christ's resurrection, the same body that died on the cross, and that was laid in the tomb, was raised again. It is certain from the repeated declarations that he did not see corruption. It is also certain from the fact, that the body with which he appeared to his disciples, bore the marks of the nails and of the soldier's spear. Jesus said to them, to quiet their fears, Luke 24: 39, 40: "Be-hold, my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet."

But John says, "He showed unto them his hands and his side." Chap. 20: 20. At this meeting Thomas was not present, and the following is the record in regard to it.

Verses 24-27: "But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came. The other disciples therefore said unto him, we have seen the Lord. But he said unto them, except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe. And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them. Then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you. Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing." After consulting this record, it is not possible that those who have full confidence in its correctness, can doubt that the same body was raised, which was nailed to the cross, and which was laid in the tomb. But what further confirms the same truth, is the fact, that was it not the real body of Christ with which he appeared, it was never accounted for, and no one could ever tell what become of it. It was not in the tomb, for all the witnesses agree that it was not found there. The disciples had not got it, as the whole account shows. Moreover, for them to have concealed it, would have been to have practiced deception, under the circumstances, of which they were incapable. The Jews did not have the body, for if it had been in their

possession, they would have produced it, and have saved themselves the necessity of inventing the lie that his disciples stole him away, and saved the money with which they hired the soldiers to report their absurd falsehood.

It is certain then that the same body of Christ was raised, which died and was buried. Now, the resurrection of Christ is affirmed, not only as a proof of a general resurrection, but is presented as a pattern after which the saints shall be raised.

Phil. 3: 21: "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working, whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself."

2. The Scriptures most clearly affirm the resurrection of the same body that dies.

John 5: 28: "All that are in their graves shall come forth."

The soul is not in the grave, and there is nothing in the grave but the body, nothing but the body that was put there, and if that comes forth, as the text affirms, it is a resurrection of the same body.

Rom. 8: 23: "Even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our bodies."

But if the same body is not raised up, there will be no redemption of our bodies.

Verse 11: "He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you."

Paul says of the body, 1 Cor. 15: 42, 43, 44: "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body."

It is clear that Paul here speaks of the body that is sown as the same that is raised. The repetition of the pronoun, it, preserves the identity of the body which is the subject of remark, so that the affirmation, "it is raised," relates to the same body that does the affirmation, "it is sown," so that in fact, the apostle affirms, that the same body which is sown, is raised. It is now settled, that the Scriptures teach that there is to be a resurrection of the same body, but this must not be regarded as committing the author to any peculiar views the reader may entertain, in regard to what constitutes sameness. This is a distinct question, and must be separately considered.

III. The Scriptures teach that very great changes are consistent with sameness, that even a change from corruptibility to incorruptibility, from dishonor to glory, from weakness to power, and from neutrality to spirituality, is possible without loss of identity.

If this proposition be well elaborated, and carefully considered, it will obviate all the philosophical, and metaphysical objections which have been urged against the doctrine of the resurrection.

There is one principal objection which had better be met at this point. It has been often asserted that a resurrection of the same body is impossible, on the ground that there is a constant change going on in the material organism, by which the whole body is repeatedly renewed and becomes composed of new particles of matter during life; and that after death, the matter may become parts of other human bodies. There may appear to be two objections embodied in one, in the above statement, but a refutation of one, will be a refutation of both, as the argument shall be constructed.

1. The objection cannot be allowed, because it assumes to place human philosophy and knowledge, in direct contradiction of the most clear teachings of the word of God, and grounds its conclusions upon the assumption that God cannot do what his word declares he will do. As remarked in the opening of the subject, the doctrine of the resurrection is not a doctrine of reason, but exclusively a doctrine of revelation, and hence, human reason and philosophy cannot be allowed to disprove or modify it. The resurrection of the dead, in any manner, can be regarded only as one of God's most stupendous miracles, and viewed in this light, as a work of Omnipotence alone, human reason cannot be allowed to pronounce it impossible, or to modify it, by affirming that God cannot effect it in this way or in that. Who can say that God who is Almighty, All-wise, and Omnipotent, cannot preserve distinct, every particle of every human organism, which is essential to its identity? If no other reply could be offered, this would be sufficient. But this is not all that can be said in reply. The objection can be shown to be unsound and self-destructive.

2. The objection assumes that all the gross and ever changing particles of matter which compose at any time, the material organism, are essential to the identity of the body, or to its sameness. If the supposed change of particles which compose the body be not real, the objection falls. So if the discarded and scattered particles which at different periods compose the body, are not essential to the identity or sameness of the body, the objection falls. But allow both these, and the objection destroys itself, and he who urges it, contradicts his own knowledge and his own common sense. Every man who is now fifty years old, knows that his is the same body which it was when he was ten years old, and yet, according to the objection, it has undergone several entire changes of all its gross and changeable particles. His own judgment affirms he is the same person that he was forty years ago, and yet he affirms that there has been several changes of all the gross particles that compose his body, and therefore it must be absolutely certain to himself, that the continued presence of the same particles of matter is not essential to his identity or sameness. Take an illustration. Here is a man whose weight is two hundred pounds. He is laid upon a bed of sickness, and brought near to death. He becomes so emaciated that he weighs but one hundred pounds, yet he and his friends know that he is the same person, with the same body, though greatly changed. He recovers, and becomes very fleshy, so that his weight is two hundred and fifty pounds. Now, it is certain one hundred and fifty pounds of the gross particles of his body, three fifths of the entire bulk, were never before attached to him, and yet, he and his friends affirm that he is the same person, and has the

same body. And to prove the fact, they appeal to some mark or scar which he is known to have had even when a child, and finding the same mark or scar, his identity is made certain. It is perfectly clear then, that the presence of the same gross particles of matter are not essential to the identity or sameness of the body, and the foundation of the objection swallows up the conclusion attempted to be built upon it.

3. An inquiry into what constitutes identity or sameness of body, is all that remains in order to finish the objection, and clear up this part of the subject.

Personal identity lies in the mind, and not in the presence of the same gross particles of matter, which compose the body. Consciousness and memory are the only certain proofs of identity, and these are operations of the mind, and not of the body; and they prove only the identity of mind, and not the identity of matter. The mind cannot be conscious of the presence of the same particles of matter in the material organism. The mind and not the body, is really the person, and alone is conscious of personal identity, and accountability. The mind is not conscious of the identity of the body, as its own material organism, but only conscious of its own act in recognizing the body as the same. The identity of the body is not a matter of consciousness with the mind, but a matter of recognition. The mind recognizes the body as the same, and when it does this, the mind is conscious of its own act that it does it. This is all that consciousness has to do with the identity of the body.

The way is now prepared to ask the question, what constitutes identity or sameness of body? It has been seen that it does not consist in the presence of the same particles of matter that composed the body forty years ago, because the mind does recognize the body, as the same body, without the presence of one of those original particles of matter, if the assumed changes of the objection are real. The identity of the body depends wholly upon the fact that it is the same to the mind; and that is the same body to the mind which the mind recognizes as the same. Now, as the Scriptures are in general, neither philosophical or scientific in their language, but adapted to express the real facts which have a practical bearing upon human duty and destiny, it is reasonable to suppose that when they so repeatedly and clearly assert the resurrection of the same body, all they teach is that the body which will be raised, will be to the soul the same body that it once inhabited, it will be recognized by the soul as its body. The saints will recognize their resurrection bodies as theirs; these are the knees I used to bow before God, and these are the hands I used to lift up in prayer. A great change will be effected, but still it will be to the soul the same body. So will it be with sinners, they will recognize their bodies in the resurrection as their own; the soul will feel, this is the body in which I served sin, these are the feet which were swift to do evil, and these are the hands which shed innocent blood. Such recognition of the body by the soul in the resurrection, is all that can now appear to answer any practical purpose, and if we allow this to be what the Scriptures mean by the resurrection of the same body, without mooting the question of the presence of the same particles of matter, the subject is relieved of all difficulty. This view of identity or sameness alone leaves room for those great and glorious changes which it is affirmed will take place in the bodies of the saints. Our bodies are to be changed from corruption to incorruption, from dishonor to glory, from weakness to power, and from

natural bodies to spiritual bodies, and when all this shall have been wrought by the mighty power of God, "whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself," it must appear a matter of very small consequence to inquire in regard to the presence of the gross and floating particles of matter that composed it, when it lived, or when it died; but that the soul should recognize it as its body, is a vital point, and this doubtless is the fact which the Scriptures teach when they affirm the resurrection of the same body.

IV. The Scriptures teach that the resurrection is a future event, and that it will take place, suddenly and universally, at the end of this world.

This point has been virtually proved while proving the fact of a resurrection of the same body, but it is proper to notice it as a distinct point, and lay before the reader a brief outline of the evidence.

Some have taught that man has some sort of a Spiritual resurrection which takes place at death or soon after death, and hence that the resurrection is a continuous work now going on, and that there will be no general and sudden resurrection of all the dead at any given time. This is certainly not the doctrine of the Scriptures.

1. The Scriptures clearly and forcibly represent the resurrection to be a future event. Dan. 12: 2, 3: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that, be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever."

This chapter, no doubt, as a prophecy, extends to the end of time, it is then, that, the verse quoted, will be fulfilled. To this exposition there is but one objection which can be argued, and that is the use of the word many; "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." This is an objection, but it is a less one than we shall meet with, if we attempt any other exposition.

(1.) Many, is used in other texts where it is admitted that all are included.

Matt. 20: 28: "The Son of man is come to give his life a ransom for many." But Paul says, 1 Tim. 2: 6, that Christ "gave himself a ransom for all!"

Rom. 5: 19: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners."

But there is a better reason for the use of the word many in the place of all by Daniel; all do not sleep in the dust of the earth, and will not at the time, and the prophet may have had his eye upon the world full of living inhabitants who will not be raised but changed, and applied the word many to all the dead to distinguish them from the living.

(2.) It cannot be explained to mean a first resurrection, embracing only the righteous, for it clearly embraces both classes. They awake, "some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

(3.) It clearly embraces the final retribution awarded to both classes. The states are both everlasting.

The concluding verse of the chapter adds to the force of this view. The last words are addressed to Daniel.

"But go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days."

The end of the days no doubt is the end of the world; until then Daniel should rest, and then stand in his lot, that is, be raised with those which with him should sleep in the dust of the earth and wake to everlasting life. If this exposition be right, it places the resurrection of the dead at the consummation of this world.

Luke 14: 13,14: "But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: And thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just."

This places the resurrection in the future, and "the resurrection of the just," implies that all the just will be raised together at the same time. Nor does this imply in the least degree that the unjust will not be raised at the same time.

John 5: 28, 29: "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

This text is very conclusive. It includes all that are in their graves. And if we understand the hour not in its restricted sense, of the twenty-fourth part of a day, but in its general sense of a time or period, still it will teach that there is a time coming when all that are in the graves shall come forth, and the conclusion is that the dead will all be raised at one time. This text also includes both classes, the good and bad, and represents them all as being raised in one general resurrection. The representation of the text is that in the hour which is coming, that is, the time when the resurrection shall take place, the saint and the sinner, the saved and the lost, will all rise together, the one to life, and the other to damnation. In this it agrees perfectly with the text quoted above from the prophet Daniel.

Acts 24: 14,15: "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my father, believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets: And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust."

Here is a clear declaration by Paul, that he, in common with the Jews, believed in a resurrection, both of the just and the unjust. It is also implied that this belief was based upon what was written in the law and the prophets. This resurrection, Paul contemplated as a future event; "there shall be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust." This

expression, "shall be," proves that Paul regarded the resurrection as entirely a future event. If it had taken place in part, was progressing, and yet to go on, he could not have said, "there shall be," but should have said, there is a resurrection.

2 Tim. 2: 18: "Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is passed already; and overthrow the faith of some."

This declaration is made concerning Hymeneus and Philetus. Their declaration that the resurrection was past already, must have related to those only who were already dead; for they could not pretend that the resurrection of the living, much less the resurrection of the yet unborn, had already taken place. The doctrine they must have taught then, was that the dead rise at the time of, or soon after death, and hence that the resurrection of the then dead was past. It is not possible to see how otherwise they could say that the resurrection was already past, unless we suppose they affirmed that men were raised from the dead a thousand years before they existed, and such a declaration would not be likely to overthrow the faith of many. This view of a past and continuous resurrection, Paul pronounces an error, because he regarded the resurrection as a future event, and taught that it would be sudden and universally simultaneous. This argument of itself is sufficient to overthrow the dreams of Swedenborg, and the more recent speculations of Mr. Bush. But there are other arguments yet to be pressed.

2. The Scriptures clearly teach that the resurrection will take place at the end of time, when this mundane system will be dissolved and terminated.

This appears to be implied in some of the texts already quoted, but others shall be adduced clear and direct.

John 6: 39, 40, 44: "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, That of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day. No man can come to me, except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day."

Here Jesus asserts three times, of those who believed in him, that he will raise them up at the last day. The expression "last day," is too plain and definite to be misunderstood; it means the end of time, the Day of Judgment. It is true, Christ speaks of raising up believers only, but this does not weaken the argument. The fact that it is at the last day that he will raise the righteous, necessarily connects their resurrection with the resurrection of the wicked, as their resurrection cannot be deferred beyond the last day. This makes the resurrection general and universally simultaneous at the last day, or at the end of time. Moreover, in chap. 12: 48, Christ fixes the judgment of unbelievers upon this same last day, upon which he promises to raise up believers.

"He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day."

That Christ means the same time by the last day, in both these texts, cannot be doubted. This sense is further confirmed by the text that follows.

John 11: 23, 24: "Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day."

There can be no doubt in regard to what Martha meant by the words, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." She clearly believed in the doctrine of a general resurrection at the end of time, and then she knew her brother would rise. This was not only the common belief of the orthodox Jews, but it is quite probable she was present, and marked the words of Christ when he said of the believer, "I will raise him up at the last day, and she could but understand his words in the light of the common belief. Christ did not intimate that she had mistaken the truth, but only affirmed what was true in addition, in effect, that he was the resurrection power and that her brother should be raised then and there by him, leaving her in full possession of her faith, in the doctrine of a general resurrection at the last day.

Rev. 20: 11-13: "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God: and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the *book* of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works."

That this text refers to the closing up of the affairs of time, and the final judgment, no one doubts who believes in any such event. The reader will please to note the points involved.

(1.) The heavens and the earth pass away, by which this world is meant. This involves the end of time.

(2.) The dead are raised. All the dead are raised at this time. "I saw the dead small and great stand before God." This includes all the dead. It is next told where they came from, or how they came before God. "The sea gave up the dead which were in it." These may be referred to as the most unlikely subjects of a resurrection. "And death and hell delivered up the dead that were in them." This includes all the dead, those of the sea and land. Death has had dominion over the bodies only, the soul does not die, hence death as the keeper of the bodies of all the dead, is represented as giving up its dead. Hell, *hades*, the place of departed spirits, as the keeper of the souls of the dead, is represented as giving them up; hence, all the dead were seen, "small and great."

(3.) The judgment proceeds. And this judgment includes the case of both the righteous and the wicked. The books are opened, and the dead are judged out of the things written in the books, "every man according to his works." This makes the judgment include both classes, saint and sinner. The Book of life was also open, which proves that the righteous, as well as the wicked, were judged. Once more, "whosoever was not found written in the

book of life, was cast into the lake of fire." Verse 15. This implies that some were found written in the book of life in that judgment, which makes it sure that the righteous were judged at the same time.

3. The Scriptures teach that the resurrection will take place at the second coming of Christ.

The fact of the second coming of Christ will be involved in the next section, and more fully established in connection with the general judgment. In this place it is treated only as connected with the resurrection.

1 Cor. 15: 24-26: "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority, and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

This whole chapter treats of the resurrection of the dead, and the above, is said by Paul, by way of showing when the dead will be raised. It will be when the end shall come, the end of the world, the end of the Gospel dispensation, the close of Christ's mediatorial kingdom and reign; then, when this end comes, the resurrection shall take place. The raising of the dead, and the judging of the world, are described as his last official acts as mediator, when he shall have finished which, he will deliver up the kingdom to God." Now as Paul treats of the resurrection of the righteous in particular, in connection with this subject, it defers their resurrection to the close of his mediatorial reign, and as it is not pretended that the wicked will be raised before the righteous, the resurrection must be general in connection with Christ's second coming.

Phil. 3: 20, 21: "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself."

Here the changing of our bodies is connected with the appearing of Jesus Christ from heaven. This change is beyond all doubt, the same as that mentioned, 1 Cor. 15: 51-53. It is clear therefore, that the resurrection stands connected with the second coming of Christ.

Col. 3: 4: "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory."

The soul appears in glory with Christ when it leaves the body, as was shown in sections three and four, and hence this must refer to the resurrection at the Second advent.

1 Thes. 4: 13-17: "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God

bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: Then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

Here is described the resurrection of all the saints, as to take place at the coming of Christ.

By those who are asleep, the dead are meant. "We which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord," refers to those who shall be alive at the time when Christ shall come. By their not preventing those which are asleep." is meant that the living shall not go before the dead, in the order of the ascension. The expression, "the dead in Christ shall rise first," does not mean that the dead in Christ shall rise before the dead out of Christ, or the wicked dead, but that the pious dead shall rise before the ascension shall take place.

The expression, "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the arch angel, and with the trump of God," proves that it is really the second coming of Christ, and the general resurrection, of which the Apostle is speaking. "The trump of God," is doubtless the same as that spoken of 1 Cor. 15: 51, 52: "We shall be changed in a moment, at the sound of the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised." Here all admit that Paul treats of the general resurrection. In these texts Paul treats specifically only of the resurrection of the pious, but in his second epistle to the Thessalonians, he connects the wicked with the, same event. It appears that they so mistook his meaning in the passage quoted above, as to infer that the Second Advent was nigh at hand; this he corrected at the opening of the second chapter. But he introduces the event in the first chapter as follows:

2 Thes. 1: 6-10: "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; And to you who are troubled, rest with us; when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, In flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with ever-lasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe."

This clearly relates to the same event and necessarily includes the resurrection of the wicked, as well as the resurrection of the righteous. The Apostle tells them that God will recompense tribulation to those who then troubled them, when the Lord Jesus should be revealed from heaven. But this could be only at the resurrection of those wicked troublemakers, for he told them in the next chapter, that the coming of Christ was not at hand. It also includes all "that know not God and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." This must be the final punishment of the wicked, and the blessing conferred upon believers, named as being bestowed at the same time, must be

their final reward. These are both named, the punishment and the blessing, as transpiring at the time of the resurrection, and in connection with the second coming of Christ, and the conclusion is irresistible, that the resurrection of the dead will transpire suddenly and universally at the end of this world, as a preparatory work for a universal judgment, which will be the theme of the next section.

SECTION VI.

The Judgment of the Last Day.

The Scriptures clearly teach that there will be, at the end of this world, and at the time of the resurrection of the dead, a general judgment, at which all men will be called to give an account for their conduct in this life. This doctrine is so plainly taught, that it is really wonderful that any one pretending to believe the Scriptures should deny it, yet it has often been denied, and it is proper to present a brief outline of the proof of this important truth.

1. It is worthy of notice, that the Scriptures speak of the judgment as an event yet future, and not as though it had taken place, or as though it were now transpiring every day.

Eccl. 12: 14: "For God shall bring every work into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil."

Mark the expression, God *shall bring*, not has brought, nor does bring, every work into judgment.

Rom. 14: 10: "For we shall," not do, "all stand before the judgment seat of Christ."

2 Cor. 5: 10: "For we must," not do, "all appear before the judgment seat of Christ,"

2. Another class of Scriptures fix the judgment at a set time, or on an appointed day.

Acts 17: 31: "He hath *appointed a day* in the which he will judge the world in righteousness."

Rom. 2: 16: "In *the day* when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ."

Jude 6: "The judgment of the *great day*."

2. Pet. 2: 9: "The day of judgment."

John 12: 48: "He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words hath one that judgeth him. The word that I speak, the same shall judge him in the *last day*."

These expressions, "the day of judgment," "the day when God shall judge the secrets of men," "the judgment of the great day," "that day," "the last day," &c., were common

among the Jews; and how they understood them, and consequently how they are to be understood when they occur in the Scriptures, may be seen by the following extract from Josephus. "For all men, the just as well as the unjust, shall be brought before *God the word*, for to him hath the *Father committed all judgment*. This person, exercising a righteous judgment of the Father towards all men, hath prepared a just sentence for every one according to his works; at whose judgment seat when all men and angels, and demons shall stand, they will send forth one voice, and say, JUST IS THE JUDGMENT."— [See Discourse on Hades.

3. The Scriptures speak of the judgment of former generations as yet to come.

Matt. 10: 15: "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city;" 11: 23, 24: "And thou Capernaum, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom, in the day of judgment than for thee."

Luke 11: 31,32: "The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and condemn them. The men of Nineveh shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it."

It is here declared that it shall be more tolerable, in the day of judgment, for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, than for those cities where Jesus preached and wrought miracles without effecting their moral reform. Mark the peculiar language; Christ does not say *it was more tolerable* for the land of Sodom than it *shall be* for thee, in the day of judgment, but *it shall be more tolerable*, &c., referring the whole to the future, clearly implying that those ancient cities, which in ages past had withered from existence under the divine displeasure, had not yet received their final judgment, and that they were yet to be judged together with the unbelieving Jews of our Lord's time. This clearly shows that the final judgment and punishment of sinners are matters which belong to the future world.

Again, it is said in the above quotations that the queen of the south, and the men of Nineveh, shall rise in judgment with those to whom Christ preached, and condemn them. Now, the Ninevites, here referred to, lived eight hundred and sixty-two years before Christ, and the queen of the south made her visit to see the wisdom of Solomon, about one thousand years before Christ; and yet these are said to rise up in the judgment with the Jews of our Lord's day. And how can this be unless a general judgment is referred to? Surely, generations so remote from each other in point of time, between whose earthly allotments, nations rose and fell, and millions came and went on the waves of intervening ages, cannot rise together in judgment, only upon the supposition of a general judgment at the end of time.

4. Another class of texts speak of the judgment as after death.

Acts 10: 42: "And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be judge of quick and dead."

2 Tim. 4: 1: "I charge thee therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing."

1 Peter 4: 5: "Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead."

In these texts, by the quick, we are to understand those who shall be alive upon the earth when the judgment shall sit; and by the dead, we are to understand such as die previously to the judgment, who will be raised from the dead.

"What most clearly confirms the point, that these Scriptures relate to a judgment after death, and at the general resurrection, is the circumstance that Christ is declared to be the judge. There can be no doubt but it is in the Redeemer's glorified character that he will judge the world; and if so, it follows that the judgment must be after death, and at the general resurrection; otherwise all those generations and nations of men, who had their being, and passed into the future world before the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, have no part in the judgment; whereas, Christ, in his glorified character, is constituted judge of the world, of the " quick and dead." If Christ is the judge of all men in his glorified character, the judgment must be subsequent to his resurrection and exaltation, which proves beyond the possibility of doubt, that men are judged after death; for the inhabitants of four thousand years had lived and were dead before this event. This view is sustained by the Apostle, Acts 17: 31: "He hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."

Heb. 9: 27: "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment."

This text is so plain as not to need comment, had not Universalists belabored it. As men are subject to one temporal death, and one only, so it was necessary for Christ to die once and once only, as their substitute to redeem them; and as men are accountable for the improvement they make upon his grace, and hence must be judged after death, after the opportunity for such improvement is past, so Christ must appear a second time to judge them. As men die once, so Christ died once to redeem them, and as men are to be judged after death, so Christ is to come as judge subsequently to his death; and as he came at the end of the Mosaic dispensation as Redeemer, so will he come at the end of the Gospel dispensation, that is, the end of the world, as judge.

Rev. 20: 12,13: "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God, and the books were opened, and the dead were judged out of the things which were written in the books, according to their works; and the sea gave up the dead that were in it."

This text speaks of all the dead, of their standing before God, and of their being judged; and to render it more certain if possible, the judgment of the dead is connected with the resurrection of the body; "and the sea gave up the dead that were in it." This shows, that by the dead, those who have died the death of the body, are intended.

5. Another class of texts speak of the judgment, as taking place at the time of the second appearing of Christ.

Matt. 25: 31, 32: "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all nations."

This is a very important text, and is entitled to a thorough investigation. There are but two leading opinions held in regard to it. All who believe that there will be a general judgment, have no doubt that it refers to that event. Those who deny that there is to be a general judgment, insist that it refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, and that it was fulfilled in that event. The text is so clear as to render it decisive; if it relates to a general judgment it settles the question on that side; if it had its entire fulfillment in the destruction of Jerusalem, the doctrine of a general judgment can hardly be maintained, for no texts appear more decisive on that side. Those who maintain that this text speaks of the destruction of Jerusalem, explain it by the preceding chapter, and by Luke 21. This is an error. While those chapters treat of several things, embracing the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world. Matt. 25: 31-46, treats exclusively of the second coming of Christ and of the general judgment. To establish this position let the text first be examined, and then let it be compared with other texts, which are supposed to relate to the same subject.

1. Christ is here said to come in his glory: which cannot relate to the destruction of Jerusalem. We often read of the appearances of the divine glory, as when the angel of God appeared to the shepherds on Judah's hills, Luke 2: 9. Christ also speaks of the glory he had with the Father "before the world was," John 17: 5. But in no sense did Christ come in his glory when Jerusalem fell under the pressure of Roman arms. Let the Christian look upon the record of that event, and fancy that he hears the clangor of swords and shields, the shouts of the victors and the groans of the wounded and dying, and that he sees the flames and rising columns of smoke from the dissolving city, and then ask himself if this is the glory of the Son of Man. Is this the glory he hopes to enjoy with his divine Lord? Christ prayed, "Father, glorify thou me with the glory I had with thee before the world was;" and St. Paul, in speaking of the high calling of the Christian, says, Rom. 8: 17: "If children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ, if so be we suffer with him that we may be *glorified together*." But if Christ came in his glory at the destruction of Jerusalem, we should pray, Lord, save us from thy glory.

2. In the text Christ is said to come with all the holy angels; which was not the case at the destruction of Jerusalem. Some in their desperation on this point, have affirmed that the Roman army were the holy angels spoken of. But the Roman army was composed of heathen, who are never called holy in Scriptural language. This very army was called the abomination of desolation, in the words of Daniel, as quoted and applied by Christ, Matt. 24: 15, 16: "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, then let them that be in Judea, flee into the mountains."

3. It is declared in the text that Christ shall sit upon the throne of his glory, at his coming here referred to, which was not the case at the destruction of Jerusalem. Wherein did Christ sit upon the throne of his glory at the destruction of Jerusalem, any more than at the fall of Babylon, or at the dissolution of the Roman Empire?

4. In the text it is said that all nations shall be gathered before Christ at his coming here referred to. Now there was no gathering of nations at the destruction of Jerusalem, but rather a scattering: the Christians and all strangers fled on the approach of the Roman army.

5. It is said in the text, that Christ shall separate them, (nations,) one from another. Now what nations were separated at the destruction of Jerusalem, by being parted from each other, or by each being severed in its own members? It is clear that no such separation took place. The Jews only were overthrown and scattered among all nations.

6. When Christ shall come, as predicted in this text, the obedient are to be rewarded or blessed, upon consideration of their former good character. "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world, for I was a hungered and ye gave me meat." What is this kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world, which the righteous now inherit? It cannot mean the gospel kingdom on earth, to which the Gentiles were then called; for the call of the Gentiles took place long before this period: it being an acknowledged fact, that the Gospel had been preached throughout the Roman empire before the fall of Jerusalem. Again, the righteous, in this text, are rewarded for what they had done, or on the ground of their former good conduct, which was not the case in the call of the Gentiles; for they were received into the Gospel church on condition of their present repentance and faith, and not on account of what they had been or had done. It will be equally futile to say that by the reward here promised to the faithful, we are to understand their preservation amid the ruins of that bloody siege. A temporal deliverance, or a deliverance from temporal death, is not well described by "a kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world." As well might it be said that the same reward was extended to the three worthies on their coming forth from the fiery furnace, or to Daniel, on his deliverance from the den of lions. As well might every Christian be said to inherit a kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world, when he is in any way delivered from impending danger.

7. At the coming of Christ, described in the text, the wicked will be punished with a punishment prepared for the devil and his angels. It was proved in section second of this chapter, that devils are fallen spirits, who inhabit the invisible world, from which it must follow that the calamities which befell the Jews cannot be intended, by a punishment prepared for the devil and his angels.

Having examined this very important text, and drawn out of it, the leading facts which point to a general judgment in connection with a second coming of Christ, it is proper to compare it with other texts which relate to the same event.

1 Thess. 4: 15: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first." This text speaks of Christ's coming at the resurrection of the dead, which proves that he will come at the end of the world, when all the dead will be raised. That the resurrection here referred to, is the resurrection of the body, is certain, from the reference which the text contains, to the manner of the general resurrection, by the sounding of the last trump. It must be admitted that the same writer is to be understood to mean the same thing, when he uses similar expressions in different places, unless the nature of the subject absolutely requires a different construction. All admit that 1 Cor. 15, contains an account of the resurrection of the dead; and in this chapter, verse 52, the apostle describes the manner in which the resurrection will be effected, viz., by sounding the trumpet—"for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised." If this then refers to the general resurrection, how clear must it be that the same writer refers to the same event when he says, "The Lord shall descend from heaven with the trump of God, and the dead shall rise." Having shown that 1 Thess 4: 16. speaks of Christ's coming at the general resurrection, it is proper to proceed to compare it with Matt. 25: 31-46, in farther proof that it relates to the same event. Please mark the points of resemblance between the language of Christ in Matthew and St. Paul in Thessalonians.

(1.) Christ says, "The Son of Man shall come in his glory;" Paul says, "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel and the trump of God."

(2.) Christ says, "The Son of Man shall come, and *all the holy angels with him*;" Paul says, as above, that he "shall descend *with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel*. His coming with a shout, answers to his coming with all the holy angels, for a shout supposes that he will have attendants who will give the shout.

(3.) Christ says, "All nations shall be gathered before him;" Paul says, "The dead shall rise."

(4.) Christ speaks to the faithful, "come ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." These shall go "into life eternal." Paul says, of the righteous, "they shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, so shall they ever be with the Lord."

Nothing but a determination to support an opinion, at all hazards, could lead the mind to apply these texts to different events. They seem to refer to the same event, with this difference only—Christ treats of both the righteous and the wicked, while St. Paul speaks of the righteous only. But the apostle, in his second letter to the same people, treats of both the righteous and the wicked. 2. Thess. 1: 7-10: "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, *when* he shall come to be glorified in his saints." That this text relates to the same event described in the former one, must appear, when we consider,

(1.) That they were both penned by the same hand.

(2.) That they were both directed to the same people.

(3.) They resemble each other so nearly as not to admit of an application to different events without an express warrant from the author. Note, the first of these texts says, "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven." The second says, "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven." One says, "He shall descend with the voice of the archangel." The other says, "He shall be revealed with his mighty angels." Now, that 2 Thess. 1: 7-10, does not relate to the destruction of Jerusalem must appear from a consideration of the people to whom it was addressed.

(1.) The church at Thessalonica was not composed of Jews, but principally of devout Greeks and converted heathen. "Hence," says Dr. Clarke, "we find in the epistle but few allusions to the Jews, and but few references to the peculiarities of their religious or civil institutions."

(2.) The Thessalonians were too remote from Jerusalem to be materially affected by the judgments which befell this devoted city. Thessalonica was a city of Europe distant nearly one thousand miles from the noise and blood of the siege and fall of Jerusalem. In view of these circumstances, to suppose that St. Paul appealed to their hopes and fears on the ground of the fall of Jerusalem describing the event by a revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven, with his mighty angels in flaming fire, is too absurd to be believed

There are other texts which connect the judgment with the second coming of Christ but what has been said must suffice. It is the almost universal faith of Christians that Christ will come again, and the judgment being so clearly connected with the Second Advent, the proof is conclusive in support of a future general judgment.

8. The Scriptures connect the judgment of which they speak with the end of the world.

Some few may deny that the end of this world is foretold in the Scriptures, but whether it be denied or not, it is clearly taught in the Bible.

Heb. 1: 10-12: "Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth and the heavens are the work of thine hands they shall perish, but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; "but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." That the literal heavens and earth are in-tended in this text is evident from the plain reference to the Mosaic account of the creation which it contains. Gen. 1: 1: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Now, it is clear that the same beginning is referred to in the text above quoted. "Thou, Lord *in the beginning* hast laid the foundations of the earth and the heavens are the work of thy hands;" and if the same beginning is referred to in both texts, it must follow that the same heavens and earth are also intended. It is then clear that the

literal heavens and earth, which God created in the beginning are to perish, wax old, as doth a garment, and as a vesture be folded up.

It being proved that the world will have an end, it only remains to be proved that with that end the general judgment stands connected.

2 Pet. 3: 7,10, 12: "But the heavens and the earth that are now, are kept in store, reserved unto fire, against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Looking for, and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat."

Rev. 20: 11,12: "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat upon it, from whose face the earth and heavens fled away, and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God, and the dead were judged."

These Scriptures connect the general judgment with the end of time, or with the dissolution of this whole mundane system, and as a necessary consequence, the judgment must be future and general.

SECTION VII.

The Final State of the Righteous

It has been implied in preceding sections, that the righteous will enter upon an endless state of happiness at the time of the general judgment, yet this point is worthy of more special attention. There is a place in the future spirit world, beyond the limits of this life, called heaven, where the righteous will find a happy and an eternal home.

I. Heaven is a place.

In affirming that heaven is a place, it is not designed to deny what others affirm, that it is a state.

1. The names which are employed to designate the future abode of the saints, necessarily involve the idea of a local habitation. "Jesus said unto him, Verily, I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Luke 3: 43. The word Paradise occurs three times only, in the New Testament, twice besides the text under consideration, and in each case it expresses a place, as will be seen. The word means a garden, and is particularly used to denote a garden of pleasure. The word Eden denotes pleasure, hence, the Garden of Eden means the garden of pleasure, and in Gen. 2: 8, it is rendered Paradise, in the Septuagint.

The word is used, 2 Cor. 12: 4. Paul here, no doubt, speaks of himself, and what he here calls paradise, in the second verse, he calls "the third heaven." Paradise here must mean a place of happiness in the spirit world.

Rev. 2: 7: "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God."

This text must be absolutely void of sense, and can convey no idea to the mind, unless the idea of place be first allowed as the basis of whatever else the text may teach.

Heaven is also represented as a country, a city, a building, a mansion, a kingdom, a crown, and glory, all of which imply a place. "But now they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; for he hath prepared for them a city." Heb. 11: 16. Of Abraham it is said, "he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." "In my Father's house are many mansions: I go to prepare a place for you." John 14: 2. This text not only speaks of a future abode of saints as a place, by calling it a house with many mansions, but it affirms it to be a place in words. "I go to prepare a place for you." The word here rendered place, used in connection with house and mansions, can mean nothing but a local position, as a place of abode. "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." 2 Cor. 5: 1. "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Matt. 25: 34. "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness." 2 Tim. 4: 8. "Be thou faithful unto death and I will give you a crown of life." Rev. 2: 10. "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterwards receive me to glory." Psa. 73: 24. "To an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you." 1 Peter 1: 4.

The above texts all imply a place, some local habitation, where saints will find a final happy home.

2. The typical character of the Jewish tabernacle, with its holy of holies, its mercy seat, its cherubims of glory, and the visible emblem of the divine presence, constitutes strong evidence of a local heaven.

"We have such a high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man." Heb. 8: 1,2.

Heb. 9: 11, 12: "But Christ having come, an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us."

Here the tabernacle of the Jews is clearly represented as significant of heaven which is the "greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands," into which Christ has

entered "by his own blood." We read of the "heaven of heavens," which implies at least three heavens. Paul also speaks of "the third heavens." The first heaven is the atmosphere that surrounds this earth; the second heaven is the space occupied by the stars, as we read of the stars of heaven; and the third heaven is the place where God is represented as having his throne, and where Christ is said to be "on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens," and which shall be the future abode of the saints. After this pattern was the tabernacle constructed. There was the outer covering, within which was the tabernacle of the congregation, where any Jew might enter and worship; next came the first veil, through which none were permitted to pass but the priests, into what was called the holy place; and then came the second veil, through which none passed but the high priest, into what was called the holiest of all, where was the mercy seat and the visible emblem of the divine presence. Thus does it appear from the structure and typical character of the Jewish sanctuary, that heaven is a place. Indeed, it is the fact that there is such a place, and that Christ is there, having already entered "to appear before God for us," that constitutes the only basis of that faith which is essential to true Christian worship, and only ground of that hope which is saving in its influence; "which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus made a high priest forever after the order of Melchisedek." Heb. 6: 19, 20.

3. The oft-repeated declaration, in various forms, that Christ has gone to heaven, and is in heaven, is conclusive proof of its existence as a place. This position has been so clearly involved in the preceding argument, as to render it necessary to add but little more than a mere citation of a few of the leading proof texts.

"And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly towards heaven, as he went up, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Acts 1: 9-11. That body with which Christ ascended exists somewhere now, and other Scriptures clearly teach that it is in heaven. "It is Christ that died, yea, rather that has risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." Rom. 8: 34. "Which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand." Eph. 1: 20. "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God." Col. 3: 1. "When he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." Heb. 1: 3. "We have a great High Priest that is passed into the heavens." Heb. 4: 14. "We have such a High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens." Heb. 8: 1. "But Christ is not entered the holy place made with hands, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." Heb. 9: 24. "But this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God." Heb. 10: 12. "Looking unto Jesus, who, for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despised the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God," Heb. 12: 2.

The words of the Master are very significant. "I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am there ye may be also." John 14: 2, 3. "Father, I will that those thou hast given me be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory." John 17: 24.

4. The heavenly vision which burst upon the mind of Stephen when his life was about to be sacrificed for the truth, is proof positive of the existence of heaven as a place. "But he being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." Acts 7: 55, 56. This is certainly conclusive, for if there is no heaven, Stephen could not have seen the heavens opened; and if there is not a place where God resides in his visible glory, he could not have seen the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God.

5. The vision of Paul is equally conclusive. He tells us of one who was caught up into the third heavens, speaking no doubt of himself, where he "heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter." 2 Cor. 12: If then, heaven is not a place, Paul was terribly deceived, or else he has attempted to deceive the world, for no form of words could more clearly involve the idea of a place, than does his account of his vision.

6. There are frequent allusions to heaven, and descriptions of the happiness of its inhabitants, which most clearly imply that it is a place. The texts referred to in this proposition are miscellaneous and numerous, and but few of them need be cited.

Matt. 8: 11:" And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven."

Luke 13: 28: "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out."

"For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known." 1 Cor. 13: 12. This text clearly speaks of a future state, and seeing face to face, implies contiguity and locality. "For our light affliction which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." 2 Cor. 4: 17. An eternal weight of glory, carries with it the idea of place where such glory is seen, known and enjoyed. "And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." 1 Peter 5: 4.

"After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb.

And all the angels stood round about the throne, and about the elders and the four beasts, and fell before the throne on their faces, and worshipped God, saying, Amen: Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might, be unto our

God forever and ever. Amen. And one of the elders answered, saying unto me. What are these which are arrayed in white robes and whence came they? And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, these are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore, are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple: and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more: neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne, shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of water: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes." Rev. 7: 9-17.

Heaven is then clearly a place where the saints shall find a future abode.

II. Heaven, the city which hath foundations, may be supposed to be located in the centre of God's material or created universe. A very natural inquiry is, where is our future home located? Where is the city for which Abraham looked, whose builder and maker is God. If it be a place, it must be located somewhere, in some part of God's universe.

God has not, it is true, clearly revealed to us where heaven is, nor do I suppose he could so reveal its locality, as to enable us to understand it as we may understand where some distant city of this world is which we have never seen. We have no geography of the Spirit world and cannot comprehend localities within its bounds. This globe is but a spec amid the vast works of God, an opaque atom compared with the glittering host that bestud the sky. The sun is the centre of a system, around which there are thirteen planets constantly revolving, of which this earth is one. The nearest of these planets to the sun is Mercury, and it is distant thirty-seven millions of miles. This earth is ninety-five millions of miles from the sun, the most distant planet from the sun is Le Verrier, and it is distant 2,800,000,000 of miles. As the diameter of a planet's orbit is double its distance from the sun, the system to which this world belongs, must occupy a space of 5,600,000,000 of miles from side to side, supposing a straight line to pass through the centre.

As there are many fixed stars far in the distance beyond our solar system, it is more than probable that they are centers to other systems, and in the centre of all these systems, we may suppose God has his throne, and that there is heaven. It is not an unreasonable hypothesis, that God, in creating worlds on world, and vast systems of worlds, should rear them in all directions and at a suitable distance to produce a circumambient glory around his own eternal throne within which he has his own habitation, where angels dwell, and where saints shall find their future home. And what a heaven to contemplate! What a city to look for must that be, located in the centre of thousands of such systems of worlds as our own solar system, each and all vocal to the ear of intelligence with the music of chiming orbs, and radiant with the wisdom and goodness and power of the hand that created them all, forming an outer circumambient wall of glory to Jehovah's own habitation!

III. Heaven will be a place of unmingled and full enjoyment.

It is not possible to describe the joys of heaven, yet we may know what will constitute some of the elements of heavenly joy.

1. Heaven will be free from all evil of every kind and degree. There will be no disquietude of mind there, no sickening of the heart through deferred hope, no sense of insecurity, no fear. The empty hand of poverty will never stretch itself out there; and famine with its skinny form and hollow, empty jaws will never show itself within the walls of that celestial city. There will be no sickness there, no bodily pain, no sorrow of heart, no parting of friends, no lonely feelings, no desolate hours. There will be no wasting of strength there, no withered forms, no wrinkled brows, no growing old, no dying. There will be no moral evil there, no sin, and of course no curse.

2. The associations of heaven will render it a place of happiness. In this world our associations are all imperfect, and many with whom we are often compelled to mingle, are absolutely wicked. There will be no evil persons there; no unholy thoughts breathed, no profane words uttered, and no painful or corrupting examples witnessed.

All the good of all ages, "the spirits of just men made perfect," and holy angels, will constitute the society of heaven.

3. The employments of heaven may be supposed to contribute to its felicity. There will be no unoccupied time there hanging heavily upon us, and passing too slowly away. There will be no exhausting and unpleasant duties to perform there. The very labor of transporting our bodies from one point of duty to another, in this world, renders life a scene of toil, and the mind often becomes weary from the burden of its own continued thoughts; but in heaven it will be otherwise. The body will be renewed in spirituality, power and glory, and rendered all immortal; and the mind, no longer fettered and loaded with gross materiality, will be as free, and light-winged, and tireless as thought itself. Deep and intense contemplation, the most rapturous adoration, and the most delightfully active and vigorous service, will follow in succession and degrees so suited to our enlarged capacity, as to leave no vacant moment unfilled with joy.

"Then shall I see, and hear, and know
All I desir'd or wished below;
And every hour find sweet employ,
In that eternal world of joy."

4. Nearness to, and communion with God, and Jesus Christ our Redeemer, will fill up the measure of heavenly felicity. The vision which the saints will enjoy of God and of Christ, is represented as constituting at least a portion of their future happiness. Christ prayed, "O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." And then he prayed again, "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory." John 17: 5, 24. The peculiar aspect of this vision cannot now be conceived, but to look upon the Eternal, and to gaze on him in his glory, who was once crucified for our redemption, must be heaven itself. But to look upon God the Father, and upon the Redeemer, will be

to drink into their fellowship and communion, and become like them. John appears to have had this principle in view when he said, "We know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." 1 John 3: 2.

To the extent of our then improved capacity, his thoughts will become our thoughts, his holiness will become our holiness, his love will become our love, his happiness will become our happiness, and his glory will become our glory. And what less than this does Paul mean, when he says, 2 Cor. 3: 18, "But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory." This text also appears to involve the law of progress, for it must follow that the change from glory to glory, will proceed onward as we continue to behold the glory of the Lord, and knowledge will flash clearer upon knowledge, and glory beam brighter upon glory, and each wave of joy will be seen rolling in upon the soul higher and deeper than that which preceded.

IV. Heaven will be a final state, eternal and changeless, only so far as change is implied in progress, in happiness and glory.

No effort need be made to prove that heaven will be an eternal abiding home to the redeemed and saved.

Paul declares it to be "a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." 2 Cor. 5: 1. Peter calls it "an inheritance, incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away." 1 Peter 1: 4.

The subject cannot be better closed than in the concluding vision of John.

"And there shall be no more curse: but the throne of God and the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him. And they shall see his face, and his name shall be in their foreheads. And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle; neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light: and they shall reign forever and ever." Rev. 22: 3-5. The concluding words of this text are emphatic; "and they shall reign forever and ever." This settles the question, that heaven will be an abiding home.

SECTION VIII.

The final Destiny of the Wicked.

Those who do not repent and believe the Gospel in this life, but live and die unpardoned and unregenerated sinners, will be judged, condemned, and sentenced to endless' punishment in hell.

The main point to be proved is, that the punishment of the wicked in the future world will be endless. All the arguments that might be urged will not be brought forward, but some of the principal ones shall be adduced.

I. The Scriptures most clearly and positively assert the punishment of sinners to be everlasting.

Matt. 25: 46: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal."

The word here used to express the duration of punishment, by its own proper signification, proves it to be endless. It will not be denied that the English word signifies endless. Everlasting, in its true sense, expresses endless duration.

The defense is that it does not fairly represent the sense of the original word in the Greek, from which it is translated. This presents the only real issue.

The word used in the text is *aionios*.

1. This word expresses endless duration in its own grammatical sense.

It is an adjective from the noun *aion*. This noun *aion* is compounded of *aei*, ever, and *on*, being, literally, making *ever-being*.

The etymological sense of the word could not more certainly be endless than it is.

The adjective which is used in the text, and translated, everlasting, signifies, unlimited as to duration, eternal, everlasting. Every Greek author that has been consulted, agrees in giving this sense to the word. Among them, are Donagan, Groves, Greenfield, Liddell and Scott

I may safely affirm, that there is no Greek author who does not so understand and define the word. This, of itself, ought to settle the question.

2. This word *aionios*, expresses endless duration more positively than any other word in the Greek language.

It is the word which is uniformly employed in the New Testament, when the writers wish to express absolute endless duration. This will be made plain by referring to a few of the texts in which it is used to express endless duration.

Matt. 19: 16: "What good thing shall I do that I may have *eternal* life."

That this young man inquired after endless life or happiness, there can be no doubt.

Mark 10: 30: " But he shall receive a hundred-fold now in this time, and in the world to come, *eternal* life."

That our Savior meant to express the idea of a life which should always live, life absolutely endless, there can be no doubt.

Luke 10: 25: "A certain lawyer stood up and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit *eternal* life?"

That this lawyer made his hypocritical inquiry in regard to *endless* life, there can be no doubt. To this our Saviour's answer agrees. "What is written in the law, how readest thou, this do, and thou shalt live."

John 3: 16: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have *everlasting* life."

If it be denied that endless life is meant here, it must be difficult to prove that the Gospel treats of, or promises endless life. The same word is used in the preceding verse, and is translated *eternal* life; *zoeen aionion*, eternal life.

John 6: 27: "Labor not for that meat which perisheth, but for that which endureth unto *everlasting* life, which the Son of man shall give unto you."

If this does not mean endless life, it cannot be proved that Christ ever attempted to lift the hopes and aspirations of his disciples to interests that have no end.

John 10: 28: "I give unto them *eternal* life; and they shall never perish."

Here eternal life stands opposed to perishing, and its endless sense is supported by the affirmation, that they shall never perish. There is not a promise in the Gospel, which fell from our Saviour's lips, that ensures an endless blessing, if this does not. The word occurs but twice in the Acts of the Apostles as follows:

Chap. 13: 46: "It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken unto you: but seeing you put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of *everlasting* life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles."

Verse 48: "As many as were ordained to *eternal* life believed."

Rom. 6: 23: "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is *eternal* life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

If there is any such gift of absolute endless life and happiness, as Christians hope for in the future world, this text must refer to it, and its sense must be endless.

Rom. 16: 26: "According to the commandment of the everlasting God."

2 Cor. 4: 17, 18: "Our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and *eternal* weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are *eternal*"

Here we have the same word in the original, used twice to express endless duration. An *eternal* weight of glory is, no doubt, *endless* glory; and the things which are not seen, but are *eternal*, are, no doubt, *endless* things. Paul clearly designed to express the endless duration of the things of heaven, in contradistinction from earthly things, which have an end.

2 Cor. 5: 1: "If our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a house not made with hands, *eternal* in the heavens."

It cannot be doubted that Paul designed to express endless existence and happiness in the future state, by the word *aionion*, here rendered *eternal*.

1 Tim. 6: 16: "Who only hath immortality, dwelling in light, which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen nor can see: to whom be honor and power *everlasting*."

It will not be denied that the honor and power of God are endless, here expressed by the word *aionion* rendered everlasting.

Titus 1: 2: " In hope of *eternal* life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began."

Heb. 9: 14: "Who through the *eternal* Spirit offered himself without spot to God."

2 Peter 1: 11: "The *everlasting* kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ."

1 John 5: 11: "And this is the record, that God hath given to us *eternal* life, and this life is in his Son."

In all of the above texts, endless duration is clearly intended to be expressed, and they embrace nearly all the passages of the class, so that it is plain that it is the word which the inspired writers employed, when they intended to affirm duration without end. Indeed, it is the strongest term found in the Greek language, so that they could not have expressed endless happiness and misery, more forcibly than they have.

Besides this word, the noun *aion*, from which this word is derived, is sometimes used to express endless duration, but it is not used so uniformly in this sense.

Then there is the word *aidios*, which is of the same import, being derived from the same root, but nothing would be gained to an opponent, by contending that this is a stronger word. It is used but twice in the New Testament, as follows:

Rom. 1: 20: "His *eternal* power and Godhead."

I admit that absolute eternity is here expressed, but no more so than in Rom. 16: 26, "the everlasting God," in which the other word is used.

The other ease in which *aidios* occurs, is Jude 6, "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in *everlasting* chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day."

If it were insisted that this was a stronger term to express endless duration, it would prove the eternity of the punishment of fallen angels.

Then we have the word *akatalutos*, which occurs but once in the New Testament.

Heb. 7: 16: "Who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an *endless* life."

This word is not used in the Greek language to express time, or lapse of time, or duration limited or endless, but the quality of a thing. Its meaning is, indissoluble, indestructible, hence a better translation would have been, "after the power of an indissoluble or indestructible life." The idea of perpetuity is necessarily involved, for that which is indissoluble and indestructible, must be endless. The point is, Christ is a priest forever, and to prove it, the writer asserts, that he is made a priest after the power of an indissoluble life, but in the next verse when he asserts, that he is a priest *forever*, he uses the word *aiona*, which relates to time or duration.

There is no other word in the Greek language, which is used to express endless duration, besides the words already examined. Of these terms *aionios* is the strongest, and is the word generally employed by the writers of the New Testament, when they, beyond doubt, meant to express endless duration. Now, this is the word used by our Savior in the text, "these shall go away into everlasting punishment."

Please keep the point under consideration, in view. The point is not that the word is never applied to express a limited period, or to things which have an end. This point shall be attended to in its proper place. The points thus far proved are, the word properly signifies endless, is the strongest word in the Greek language which can be employed to express the idea of endless duration, and is the one generally used by the inspired writers, when they clearly designed to express that idea.

3. There is nothing in the manner or the connection to limit the sense of the word when it is applied to the punishment of sinners.

The text, Matt. 25: 46, presents a clear illustration of this proposition.

"These shall go away into *everlasting* punishment; but the righteous into life *eternal*."

Here the word *everlasting*, qualifying the punishment of the wicked, and the word *eternal*, qualifying the life of the righteous, are both translated from the same word in the original; *kolasin aionion*, punishment everlasting, and *zoeen aionion*, life eternal, or just as correctly, everlasting.

The punishment of the wicked, so far as the force of the language employed is concerned, is just as certainly endless as is the happiness of the righteous.

If we push this investigation into an examination of all the principal texts, in which the punishment of the wicked is described, we shall find that the connection strengthens rather than weakens the idea of its endless duration.

Matt 18: 8: "If thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands, or two feet, to be cast into *everlasting* fire."

Matt. 25: 41: "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

In this last text, the sending away of the wicked into everlasting fire, stands connected with the reception of the righteous to heaven; "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

But both texts declare that the wicked will be punished with *everlasting fire*. Whatever this fire is in kind or degree, it is *everlasting*. That everlasting here means endless, must appear from another text, which speaks of the same fire, describing its duration by another form of expression.

"If thy hand offend thee cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched; where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." Mark 9: 43, 44.

What the two former texts call everlasting fire, this calls, "the fire that never shall be quenched," showing that everlasting has the sense of endless, for fire which never shall be quenched must be endless.

This is still further confirmed, by the additional description of the punishment as a worm that dieth not. The only object of this expressive figure, must be to represent the punishment as endless. The fire and the worm are terms used to express the punishment of sinners, and it makes no difference in this argument, whether or not we understand what they are, no matter whether they are material or immaterial, they are endless.

"Verily I say unto you, all sins shall be forgiven unto men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation. Mark 3: 28, 29.

Here the sinner is threatened with *eternal* damnation, *aionion kriseos*, eternal condemnation or punishment. The sinner has never forgiveness, which makes his guilt and condemnation endless.

A parallel text makes it yet stronger if possible.

"And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh a word against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Matt. 12: 32.

In the preceding text it is affirmed that the sinner "hath never forgiveness;" in this it is said his sin "shall not be forgiven him." In the former he is declared to be "in danger of *eternal* damnation; "in this his pardon is denied through all future time, which makes his guilt and condemnation eternal. "Neither in this world, neither in the world to come," includes all duration.

2 Thes. 1: 6-10: "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; And to you who are troubled, rest with us; when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, In flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe."

Here sinners are threatened with a punishment which is called *everlasting* destruction. The word everlasting can be applied to it for no purpose but to describe its duration; and the connection, and all the circumstances, go to show that it is used in no qualified or limited sense, as a slight view of the subject will demonstrate. It is to be inflicted when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, with his mighty angels.

It will be inflicted when the Lord Jesus shall come to be glorified in his saints, by which it is connected in point of time, with the final salvation of believers.

Jude 7: "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, in like manner giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire,"

Here the same word is rendered *eternal*, and sinners, who were consumed out of the earth, about two thousand years before, are said to be still suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. The words "are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire," includes their present position, at the time the Apostle wrote.

If it be said that it is termed eternal fire, because the destruction of the cities was final, they never being rebuilt, then to make the punishment of the wicked by eternal fire, in the same sense, it must inflict on them endless ruin.

4. A general analysis of the use of the word in the New Testament will show that it is employed almost exclusively to express endless duration.

The word *aionios* is found seventy-one times in the Greek Testament.

In forty-four cases out of the seventy-one, it is joined with *zoe*, life, *zoeen aionion*, literally, life eternal, but is sometimes rendered everlasting, making life everlasting.

In thirty of the forty-four texts, it is translated *eternal*, making eternal life, and life eternal; and in fourteen it is rendered *everlasting*, making everlasting life, and life everlasting. In all of these forty-four cases it is clearly used to express endless duration. If it does not express endless duration in these texts, there is no promise of eternal life in the New Testament.

In three texts it is joined with *doxa*, glory, and is rendered *eternal*, making eternal glory. These texts are as follows:

"A far more exceeding and *eternal* weight of glory." 2 Cor. 4: 17.

"That they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus, with *eternal* glory." 2 Tim. 2: 10.

"The God of grace hath called us unto *eternal* glory by Christ Jesus," 1 Peter 5: 10.

In these three texts the word clearly means endless.

In two texts the word is applied to God, as follows:

"According to the commandment of the *everlasting* God." Rom. 16: 26.

"Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen or can see, to him be honor and power *everlasting*." 1 Tim. 6: 16.

In these two texts it will not be pretended that the word is used in a limited sense.

Once it is applied to the Spirit, in which it is affirmed that "Christ through the *eternal* Spirit offered himself without spot to God." Heb. 9: 14.

Once it is applied to the kingdom of Christ, thus:

" The *everlasting* kingdom of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ." 2 Peter 1: 11.

Once it is applied to redemption, thus:

"By his own blood he entered into the holy place, having obtained *eternal* redemption for us." Heb. 9: 12.

Once it is applied to salvation, thus:

"He became the author of *eternal* salvation to all them that obey him." Heb. 5: 9. Once it is applied to inheritance, thus:

Heb. 9: 15: "And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the promise of *eternal* inheritance."

Once it is applied to covenant, thus:

Heb. 13: 20: "Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the *everlasting* covenant."

Once it is applied to things unseen, thus:

2 Cor. 4: 18: "While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are *eternal*."

Once it is applied to house as the saints future home, thus:

2 Cor. 5: 1: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, *eternal* in the heavens."

Once it is applied to consolation, thus:

2 Thes. 2: 16: "Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and, God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us *everlasting* consolation and good hope through grace."

Once it is applied to the Gospel, thus: Rev. 14: 6: "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the *everlasting* Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people."

In these last fifteen texts, the sense is endless. These fifteen added to the former forty-four, make fifty-nine cases out of seventy-one, in which the word is used to express endless duration.

This leaves but twelve cases to be examined, which may soon be disposed of.

In seven of the remaining twelve texts, it is applied to the punishment of the wicked, and these are the texts which have already been examined, save one of them, which was not quoted.

For the sake of making the analysis perfect, all the texts shall be here repeated, in which the word *aionios* is applied to the punishment of the wicked.

Matt. 18: 8: "Wherefore, If thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands, or two feet, to be cast into everlasting fire."

Matt. 15: 41: "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

Verse 46: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal."

Mark 3: 29: "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation."

2 Thes. 1: 9: "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power."

Heb. 6: 2: "Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment."

This last text is the only one which has not already been examined, which may be properly noticed at this point. There is nothing in the connection to limit the meaning of the word rendered eternal.

This eternal judgment, is placed after the resurrection of the dead, which throws the time of judgment into the eternal world.

But the connection with judgment, which the word here sustains, does not weaken, but; rather strengthens its force. The original is, *krimatos aionion*, literally, judgment eternal.

The word *krima* or *krimatos*, in the form it is used in the text, occurs twenty-nine times in the New Testament, and is translated as follows:

Sixteen times it is translated judgment. Of the other thirteen texts, in six it is translated damnation, in six it is translated condemnation, and in one it is translated condemned.

From this analysis of the use of the word, it is seen that eternal judgment, is equal to eternal damnation, or eternal condemnation.

The remaining text of the seven in which *aionios* is applied to the punishment of sinners, is Jude 7: "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, in like manner giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire."

This has been examined, and it has been shown that in the seven texts, in which the word is applied to punishment, there is nothing to limit its meaning, and that upon the face of these texts, it appears to be used in its full signification of endless. The only pretended

defense against all this, is, that the word is sometimes applied to things which are not endless. Let the reader now give his attention to this defense, as a closing point of the argument.

The defense necessarily rests upon five instances of the use of the word, for there are only five texts left, in which it occurs in the New Testament, out of seventy-one, which presents a proportion of sixty-six to five.

Suppose then we admit the entire ground of the defense, and the case will stand thus:

The word, *aiionios*, rendered eternal, and everlasting, is used seventy-one times in the New Testament. In fifty-nine texts it is used to express the endless happiness of the saints, the endless duration of the heavenly world, and the eternity of God, and such like endless objects, in every one of which fifty-nine texts it clearly expresses endless duration. In seven texts it is used to express the duration of punishment, with nothing in the connection to limit its sense, but much which requires that it be understood in its full sense of endless. But there are five texts in which it is used in a restricted sense, being applied to what is not endless. Now, an appeal is taken to your good sense, if the fact that the word is used in a limited sense, five times, while it is used sixty-six times in an endless sense, can justify humanity in grounding its eternal interests upon the assumption that the word *aiionios*, eternal and everlasting, does not express endless duration? But let us examine the five texts.

If it should yet appear that the remaining five texts, are not clearly limited in their sense, the defense on the negative will cease to exist.

These texts are as follows: —

Luke 16: 9: "And I say unto you, make to yourselves friends of the mammon of un-righteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into *everlasting* habitations."

This text most probably refers to the future state, and if so, everlasting habitations, means heaven. It is so understood by the best critics who regard the expression "they may receive you into everlasting habitations," as a mere Hebraism, for ye shall be received. To say the least, it is very far from being clear that the word is here used in a limited sense.

Rom. 16: 25. 26: "Now to him that is of power to establish you according to my Gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, (according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the *world* began, But now is made manifest, and by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith.")

In this text *aiionios*, is rendered *world*, in the expression, "which was kept secret since the world began," It is admitted that the word is here used in a limited sense, yet here some may doubt. Dr. McKnight renders, "since the world began," "in the times of the ages." Such a use of the word cannot be relied upon to determine the true sense to be limited,

when it is used in the same connection, to express the eternity of God, as it is in the expression, according to the commandment of the everlasting God."

2 Tim. 1: 9: "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began."

Here the word is again translated world, in the expression, "before the world began." If world be understood here, to be this material creation, before the world, must have been in eternity, and the allusion is to God's eternal purpose. Dr. McKnight renders it, "before the times of the ages." It may signify the Jewish dispensation, in which case it is used in a limited sense, but it is too uncertain, and too far aside from the common use of the term, to settle its limited sense firm enough to venture eternal interests upon it.

Titus 1: 2: "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the *world* began."

The sense of this text is doubtless the same as the preceding. Both are a departure from the general usage of the Greek language. This is clearly stated by Dr. McKnight, in his note on the passage. His language is as follows: "Suppose the word in this clause, to signify eternal, the literal translation of the passage would be, before eternal times. But this being a contradiction in terms, our translators, contrary to the propriety of the Greek language, have rendered it, "before the world began." It is clear that such exceptions to the general rules of a language, cannot be relied upon, as establishing a sense contrary to the sense in which words are so generally used, as this word has been pronounced to be used to express endless duration, namely, in a proportion of sixty-six to five. There is but one more text and the analysis will be finished.

Phile. 15: "For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldst receive him forever."

Some may understand this in a limited sense. It will admit of but two constructions. If it be used in a limited sense, it must denote the period of their natural lives. That thou shouldst receive him while you shall both live. If this is not the sense, then it must be used in an unlimited sense and refer to the conversion and salvation of Onesimus as an everlasting benefit. He received him as a Christian brother in the fellowship and communion of the Gospel *forever*, which shall last, world without end. This appears to be the more reasonable construction.

The argument has now reached its close and may be summed up thus:

1. The word used to express the duration of punishment, expresses endless duration by its own proper grammatical sense.

2. This word expresses endless duration more forcibly than any other word in the Greek language, it being the strongest word that language has to express absolute eternal duration.

3. There is nothing in the connection when it is used to express the duration of punishment, which limits its sense, or in the slightest degree proves that it is not used in its strongest sense of endless.

4. An analysis of the use of the word in the New Testament, shows that it is the word used almost exclusively by the inspired writers when they wished to express endless duration, and that it is very rarely, if ever, used in any other sense. In seventy-one cases, it is used clearly and undeniably to express endless duration, fifty-nine times; in seven instances it is applied to the punishment of sinners, with nothing which requires a limited construction, but much which demands that it be understood in the sense of endless; and in the five remaining cases the sense may be regarded as doubtful, and may signify a limited or unlimited period. Upon this state of the argument, an appeal is made to the common sense of mankind, if it be wise and safe to rest an eternal interest upon the assumption that *aionios*, rendered eternal, and everlasting, does not express endless duration.

II. The Scriptures describe the punishment of the wicked, so in contrast with the salvation of the righteous as to prove that those who are punished cannot be saved, and the conclusion is that their punishment must be endless.

Matt. 25: 46: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." Do those who are said to go into everlasting punishment, go also into life eternal? Just as consistently might it be argued that those who go into life eternal, will also go into everlasting punishment. If then those who go away into everlasting punishment, do not go into everlasting life, the contrast between the respective dooms of the righteous and wicked, is marked as wide as the space between heaven and hell, and the punishment of the one will be as lasting as the eternal life of the other.

John 3: 16: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." Here perishing stands opposed to everlasting life, in a manner which clearly proves that those who perish do not have everlasting life.

Rom. 2: 6, 7, 8: "Who will render to every man according to his deeds; to them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life. But unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath."

1. A contrast is clearly drawn between the respective rewards of the saint and sinner: God "will render to every man according to his deeds;" and this reward will be to the righteous, "*eternal life*" and to the wicked, "*indignation and wrath*" Now it cannot with

any degree of propriety be maintained that those who are rewarded with *indignation and wrath* will also be rewarded with *eternal life*.

2. That this whole subject relates to the future destinies of men appears, from the phraseology of the text itself. To whom will God render eternal life? "To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality. But it cannot be supposed that any enlightened Christian seeks for immortality as a portion attainable in this world, and as they seek for glory and honor and immortality in the world to come, it must be there also that the wicked will receive indignation and wrath, and of course they cannot have the eternal life.

Rom. 6: 23: "The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." It is not necessary to pause to discuss the question what is meant by death, it is opposed to eternal life, which is salvation, and those who enjoy the life will not suffer the death, and those who suffer the death, cannot enjoy the life, and their loss must be endless.

Many more Scriptures might be quoted to the same effect, but it is not necessary. As the salvation of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked are presented in contrast, the saved cannot bear the punishment, and the punished cannot be saved, and those who are not saved must endure endless punishment. There is no possible manner of escaping this conclusion, only by saying, as some have, that sinners are punished and saved too. This is impossible.

Salvation implies a time of salvation, in which it is enjoyed, and punishment supposes a time of punishment, in which it is endured. Now as salvation and punishment are both states which imply lapse of time, it must follow that if sinners are saved and punished too, they must be saved before they are punished, at the time they are punished, or after they are punished; neither of which can be true.

1. The sinner cannot be saved and then punished. If the sinner can be first saved and then punished, it follows that salvation is no preventive of damnation, or security against it.

2. The sinner cannot be saved and punished at the same time. If the sinner be saved and punished at the same time, then salvation and damnation are made to meet, at the same time, in the same subject, and exist together. Salvation in such case, as before remarked, can be no security against damnation, and damnation, in turn, can be no preventive of salvation.

3. The sinner cannot receive all the punishment he deserves first, and then be saved.

That sinners cannot be punished all they deserve, and then be saved, must appear from the following considerations:

(1.) The sinner cannot receive all the punishment he deserves until a space of time shall have elapsed, after he shall have ceased to commit sin, and can never cease to commit sin

while he is in a state of condemnation and punishment; he cannot, therefore, receive all the punishment he deserves prior to his being saved.

(2.) If it were possible for man to suffer all that his sins deserve, he would then stand in no need of salvation, in any consistent sense of the term. From what can men be saved, after they have suffered all the punishment they deserve? When the last thunderbolt of wrath divine shall have spent its force, and the storm of vengeance shall have gone by, will men still be lost? When the consequence of man's own misconduct shall have entirely subsided, will he still be lost so as to need salvation? As well might it be said that man was created lost! That he came lost from the hands of his divine author.

III. The Scriptures teach that salvation is conditional, and therefore may be lost, by a non-compliance with the terms on which it is proffered. It cannot be denied that whatever is conditional may be lost, and the loss of salvation, in view of the immortality of the soul, involves endless punishment.

1. The Scriptures speak on this subject too plain to be misunderstood or misapplied. A few quotations, however, must suffice.

Matt. 19: 16, 17: "And behold one came and said unto him, good master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, if thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments." Mark 16: 16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." John 3: 36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." John 6: 40: "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one, which seeth the Son and believeth on him may have everlasting life." Verse 47: "Verily, verily I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life." John 5: 40: "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." Rev. 2: 10: "Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee a crown of life." Rev. 3: 5: "He that over-cometh shall be clothed in white raiment, and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father and before his angels." Verse 21: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne."

These texts, with many more which might be quoted, prove beyond a doubt, that salvation is conditional.

2. If salvation is not conditional, then it cannot be the sinner's own fault that he is not saved now, nor can any reason be given why he is not now saved, unless it be said that God is not able or willing to save him. If salvation is not conditional, it follows that the sinner can do nothing to induce salvation, on one hand, or to prevent it on the other; it cannot therefore be his fault that he does not now enjoy the salvation of God.

3. If salvation is not conditional, and yet certain, it follows, that to be the greatest ginner, is to secure the greatest salvation.

IV. The Scriptures teach that there is a possibility and even danger of coming short of salvation.

Matt. 7: 13, 14: "Enter ye in at the straight gate, for wide is the gate and I broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereat; because straight is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." 2 Cor. 6: 1: "We then as workers together with him, beseech you also that ye receive *not* the grace of God in vain," 1 Cor. 9: 27: "But I keep under my body and bring it into subjection, lest after I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." Heb. 4: 1: "Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it."

These texts teach beyond a doubt that there is danger of coming short of salvation, and to come short of salvation, involves the idea of endless punishment.

V. The Scriptures teach that sinners can and do actually resist the means which God employs to bring them to repentance and salvation, and if the means of salvation are resisted, their object is defeated and the unyielding soul cannot be saved, and endless punishment is the necessary consequence.

1. The sinner resists the force of truth, and thereby renders the word preached ineffectual, so far as any saving benefit accruing to himself, is concerned. The prophet exclaims,

Isa. 53: 1: "Who hath believed our report, and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?" Matt. 13: 58: "And he did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief." Matt. 23: 37: "How often would I have gathered thy children together but ye would not." The Apostle declares, Heb. 4: 2: "The word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it." 3: 16: "For some when they had heard did provoke." Acts 13: 46: "Then Paul and Barnabas said, it was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you, but seeing yon put it from you and judge your selves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." Here the unbelieving Jews are said to put the word of God from them, which clearly proves that they resisted its influence. 2 Tim. 3: 8: "Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses so do these resist the truth."

These quotations clearly show that sinners do resist the force of divine truth as brought to view in the Gospel of the Son of God.

2. Men resist the strivings of the Holy Spirit. Isa. 63: 10: "But they rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit."

1 Thes. 5: 19: Quench not the spirit."

Eph. 4: 30: "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God."

Acts 7: 51: "Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost."

These quotations show that men vex, quench, grieve, and resist the Holy Spirit.

3. Men resist the influence of divine mercy. This is implied in the preceding remarks, for as men resist the force of truth and the influence of the Spirit, in so doing, they resist the influence of divine mercy; for the Gospel, and the influence of the Spirit are mercy's own gifts. But a few other instances shall be adduced. Isa. 5: 4: "What could have been done more to my vineyard that I have not done in it? Wherefore when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes." The dying prayer of our crucified Redeemer for his wicked murderers, Luke 23: 34, was a most striking display of divine mercy and compassion, and yet it failed to melt down their hard hearts.

That sinners do resist the influence of divine mercy, and rebel against the filial regard of the hand that formed them, God himself bears testimony while he calls heaven and earth to witness the astonishing fact. Isa. 1: 2: "Hear, O heavens and give ear, O earth for the Lord hath spoken; I have nourished and brought up children and they have rebelled against me."

4. Sinners sometimes resist and harden themselves under the dispensation of divine punishment. Rev. 16: 9: "And men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God which hath power over these plagues, and they repented not to give him glory." Verse 11: "And men blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains, and repented not of their deeds." Verse 21: "And men blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail, for the plague thereof was exceeding great."

VI. The Scriptures teach that there will come a time when it will be too late to seek and obtain salvation. Gen. 6: 3: "And the Lord said, my Spirit shall not always strive with man." Psa. 32: 6: "For this shall every one that is godly pray unto thee in a time when thou mayest be found." This text clearly implies that there will come a time when God will not be found; hence, we read, Isa. 55: 6: "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near." An exhortation to seek God, "*while he may be found,*" most clearly supposes that a time is coming when he will not be found; and to "*call while he is near*" supposes that a time is coming when he will not be near. In accordance with this we read, Prov. 1:24, 26, 28: "Because I have called and ye refused, I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded; I also will laugh at your calamity, I will mock when your fear cometh; then shall they call upon me but I will not answer they shall seek me early but shall not find me." Chap. 5: 11: "And thou mourn at the last, when thy flesh and thy body are consumed." Isa. 38: 18: "For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." Matt. 25: 11, 12: "Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But he answered and said, verily I say unto you, I know you not." Luke 13: 25: "When once the master of the house is risen up and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand with out and to knock at the door, saying Lord, Lord, open unto us, and he shall say unto you, I know ye not whence ye are." 2. Cor. 6: 2: " For he saith, I have heard thee in a time acceptable, and in the day of salvation have I succored thee; behold, now is the accepted time, behold, now is the day of salvation." This most clearly implies that the

accepted time and day of salvation are limited, and that a time is coming which will not be accepted, and which will not be a day of salvation." Heb. 3: 13: "But exhort one another while it is called to-day, lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin."

Verse 15: "While it is said, to-day, if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts as in the provocation,"

By the expression "*to-day*" in these passages, is understood the present state of Gospel privileges and gracious overtures, in opposition to the state which is to succeed.

VII. The Scriptures absolutely deny salvation to certain persons and characters.

Matt. 5: 20: "For I say unto you, that except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven."

It is clear that some may not exceed the Scribes and Pharisees in righteousness, or this text never would have been uttered, and to such the text absolutely denies salvation.

Matt. 8: 11: "Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the Kingdom of Heaven, but the children of the Kingdom shall be cast out."

This text was spoken hundreds of years after Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were dead, after they had dwelt for ages in the future world, while the collection from the east and west to sit down with the Patriarchs in the Kingdom of Heaven, is described as an event yet to take place; therefore, the Kingdom of Heaven in this text must refer to the future world.

Matt. 12: 32: "And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the *world* to come."

Mark 3: 29: "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation."

Let it be remarked that the sin here spoken of, by some called the unpardonable sin, consisted in attributing to the agency of the devil, the miracles which Jesus Christ wrought by the power of the Holy Ghost. That this sin was committed by some of the Jews, there can be no doubt. Of these it is said, they shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come. Now, without forgiveness, there can be no salvation.

Luke 14: 24: "For I say unto you, that none of those men which were bidden, shall taste of my supper."

This relates to the Gospel supper, or provision which the Gospel contains for the salvation of sinners. This supper is a feast, consisting of the blessings which the Gospel

proffers to all. Now, of certain persons it is said, " none of these men which were bidden shall taste of my supper."

John 3: 3: "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God."

This text absolutely denies salvation to all such as are not born again. The text clearly implies that men may, or may not be born again; and that if they are not, they cannot see the kingdom of God, in which case they cannot be saved.

John 3: 36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life."

The unqualified declaration that certain characters *shall not see life*, forever and eternally seals them with the seal of death.

John 8: 21; "Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins; whither I go ye cannot come."

Where did Jesus Christ go? He went to Heaven, there can be no doubt in the mind of any; hence unbelievers who die in their sins, can never go to Heaven, for to such Christ says, "whither I go ye cannot come."

Gal. 5: 21: "Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like, of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things, shall not inherit the kingdom of God."

It is worthy of remark, that, in this text, the verb which expresses the forbidden conduct, is in the present tense, "they which *do* such things," while the verb which expresses the punishment, is in the future tense, "*shall not inherit*;" not, do not inherit. This clearly marks the sense thus: those who do such things *here* shall not inherit the kingdom of God *hereafter*.

Eph. 5: 5: "For this ye know that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of God."

VIII. The Scriptures represent the punishment of the wicked as their end, their last state, and their portion.

Ps. 73: 12: "Behold these are the ungodly, who prosper in the world." Of these characters the Psalmist adds, verse 18,19, "Thou casteth them down into destruction—they are utterly consumed with terrors." Note, this is their *end* which the Psalmist learned in the sanctuary of God, and if their end is to be cast down into destruction, and to be utterly consumed with terrors, they cannot be saved.

Psa. 17: 14: "Men of the world which have their portion in this life."

If then certain of the wicked have their portion in this life, in distinction from others who do not have their portion in this life, they can have no part in the inheritance that is incorruptible. If these persons are to have eternal life, then, that would be their portion, in which case they would not have their portion in this world.

Jer. 17: 11: "He that getteth riches and not by right, shall leave them in the midst of his days, and at his end shall be a fool."

If he is saved at last he will not be a fool at his *end*, but will be "wise unto salvation." To him are applicable those strong words of the poet:

"O cursed lust of gold, when for thy sake the wretch throws up his interests in both worlds, First starved in this, then damned in that to come."

Matt. 24: 51: "And shall appoint him his portion with the hypocrites."

Luke 12: 46: "And will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers."

Here the punishment of the unfaithful is said to be their *portion*; and hence they cannot be heir to eternal life.

2 Cor. 11: 13, 15: "For such are false Apostles, deceitful workers, whose *end* shall be according to their works."

This text certainly predicts no good of these false teachers, but evil. Their works are bad, and their *end* is to be according to their works; their end therefore must be bad, hence, they cannot be saved, for salvation would be a good and glorious end.

Phil. 3: 18, 19: " Enemies of the cross of Christ, whose *end is destruction*"

No man, made finally holy and happy, can have his end in destruction.

Heb. 6: 8: "But that which beareth thorns and briers is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned."

This was spoken of apostates, who should fall away after they had been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and if their end is to be burned, salvation cannot be their end.

IX. The Scriptures speak of rewards and punishment, in a manner which implies that the final punishment of the wicked will be endless.

Matt. 5: 8: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

This text most clearly speaks of the future blessedness of the saints. Note, the condition, purity of heart, is in the *present tense*, and the blessing is in *the future tense*. "Blessed are the pure in heart," *those who are now pure in heart*, "for they shall see God," *hereafter*,

not, do now see God. This implies that the impure in heart will not see God. Matt. 10: 39: "He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it."

Mark 8: 35: "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life, for my sake and the Gospel's the same shall save it."

Luke 9: 24: "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it."

John 12: 25: "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."

Here are two kinds of life and death referred to; the first is the life and death of the body, or natural life and death; the second is the life and death of the soul, or moral or spiritual life and death. Here then are two cases; one person thinks more of this life than he does of the life to come, and the other thinks more of the life to come than he does of the present life. One man is said to preserve his life unto life eternal, and another, is said to lose his life, the same which the other preserves unto life eternal, by endeavoring to save his present life.

Matt. 13: 47,48, 49: "Again the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind, which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away; so shall it be at the end of the world."

This certainly implies the doctrine in question. Note, some are good and others are bad, the good are saved, and the bad cast away; and all this is to take place at the end of the world. Now, unless being cast away, and being saved, mean the same thing, all cannot be saved.

Matt. 26: 24: "Woe unto the man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed; it had been good for that man if he had not been born." The expression, "it had been good for that man if he had not been born," can mean nothing more nor less, than that it would have been better to have had no existence, than to exist under the circumstances of him by whom the Son of Man was betrayed; which cannot be true of any one who shall be finally and eternally saved.

Prov. 29: 1: "He that being often reprov'd, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy."

If irremediable destruction implies endless punishment, then it is implied in this text.

2. Tim. 4: 7, 8: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which, the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me, only, but unto all them also that love his appearing."

1. Tim. 4: 12: "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life."

Here eternal life is represented as taken by the good fight of faith; and yet it cannot be contended that all fight this good fight, for " all men have not faith."

James 2: 13: "He shall have judgment without mercy, that hath showed no mercy."

If judgment *without mercy* implies the doctrine of endless punishment, then it is implied in this text.

Rev. 22: 19: "And if any man shall away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the Book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

It must have been a possible case to "take away from the words of the book of this prophecy," or the individual who should do it would not have been threatened. Now, the person who should do this, is threatened with three evils, either of which implies endless punishment.

1. "God shall take away his part out of the book of life." God is represented as having a book of life, in which the names of all his children are written, by which circumstance, of having the name written or not written in this book, the future destinies of all will be determined. In chap. 20: .5, it is said, "whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire."

2. "God shall take his part out of the holy city." The holy city here is the same as that mentioned, chap. 21: 1, and 2: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth."

Whether this means the future abode of the saints, or the Gospel church, the result must be the same. He whose entire interest is taken out of either must be lost.

3. "God shall take away his part out of the things which are written in this book." As this is a threatening, it relates to all the promissory portions of the book. Now, if salvation, heaven and eternal life, are written in this book, from all these the individual has his part taken, and must be forever lost.

X. The nature of punishment, viewed in connection with the immutability of God, must render all punishment, inflicted by the decision of the last judgment, endless.

1. The penalty of the divine law is, in itself, an endless curse. Death was the penal sanction of the first precept given to man, Gen. 2: 17: "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die."

Ezek. 18: 20: "The soul that sinneth it shall die."

Rom. 6: 23: "The wages of sin is death."

Rom. 8: 6: "To be carnally minded is death."

James 1: 15: "Sin when it is finished bringeth forth death."

Now death, whether natural or moral, must be in its own nature endless. What is death? It is the negation of life, the absence of that life to which it stands opposed. If death is made to consist in moral depravity, it is the negation of that holiness, that conformity to the divine will and likeness, which constitutes moral or spiritual life. If death is made to consist in the dissolution of the body, it is the negation of those vital energies which constitute natural or animal life. When a person dies morally or naturally, it is the principle or power of the opposite life that is overcome; life becomes extinct and death reigns. Now, when a person is dead, on this principle, self-resuscitation is utterly impossible; life has become extinct, and nothing but death reigns and pervades the whole system; hence, death left to the tendency of its own nature, must hold on to its subjects with an eternal grasp, unless it be said that death can produce life, or that inertia can produce animation; for as there is nothing but death now pervading the once animated sphere of the fallen, the energies of life can move there no more forever, unless they can spring from death, or out of nothing rise! We see then, that there is no way of being delivered from the penalty of the law, but by a pardon; for when the penalty of the law takes effect in the death of the sinner, as death is in its own nature endless, holding the criminal under its dominion, any subsequent deliverance by the communication of life by God, from whom it must proceed, must be regarded in the light of a pardon, since in such case the offender does not endure all that the sentence imports; death being endless of itself.

2. The sentence which will be passed upon sinners, by the righteous judgment of God, at the last day, will be irrevocable. This must appear from a consideration of the immutability of God, the judge. Immutability is that perfection of God, which renders him eternally unchangeable. The force of this is plain. No change by way of repentance and regeneration can take place in a sinner, after being condemned at the last judgment and sent to hell. The atonement or merits of Christ's death, and the advantages of his intercession, will, after the Day of Judgment, no longer be available, and hence, all the benefits of the same, including the efficacy of prayer, and the agency of the Holy Ghost, will be forever lost. For God to condemn a sinner and send him to hell, at one time, and then revoke the sentence and recall him from his infernal prison, while he is yet the same in moral character, is to act differently at different times, in view of the same moral principles; which implies change or mutability.

The argument then stands thus:

1st. That the penalty of the divine law which is death, is in itself an endless curse so as never to terminate of itself, but being left to its own tendency will hold on upon its subjects with an eternal grasp.

2nd. That the immutability of God, the judge of all, forbids the thought that the sentence will ever be revoked by the act of him whose word inflicted it. From these two points the conclusion is irresistible, that the sinner if condemned when judged at the last day, must remain under condemnation forever, world without end.

SECTION IX.

The Final Destiny of the Wicked continued. — They will not be Annihilated.

The real question at issue is, what is the penalty of the law? Or, in other words, what is the punishment which the law of God inflicts for sin? If we can obtain the right answer to this question, we shall know whether or not the wicked will be annihilated; for it may be presumed that no one will contend for annihilation, only upon the supposition that the loss of existence is the penalty of the law. If annihilation is the penalty which the law inflicts for sin, then those who are not saved by Christ will be annihilated; but if the penalty of the law is not annihilation, then it cannot be maintained that sinners will be annihilated. "What then is the penalty of the law? It must be one of the three following things:

First, annihilation without conscious suffering: or, secondly, it must be conscious suffering and annihilation combined, consisting in part of both; or, thirdly, it must be conscious suffering without annihilation.

It will not be denied that the penalty of the law must be found in one or the other of these propositions; and if it can be proved not to be either the first or the second, it must follow that it is contained in the third.

I. The penalty of the law is not annihilation without suffering, or the endurance of other evil than the simple loss of existence.

1. The simple loss of existence cannot be a penalty or punishment, in the circumstances of the sinner after the general resurrection. All punishment must consist of pain or loss; but the proposition that the penalty of the law is annihilation without conscious suffering, excludes the idea of pain, and the penalty is made to consist of loss only, the loss of existence. This, in the circumstances of the sinner, is not, and cannot be a punishment. Punishment is an evil, but to have existence taken away is not an evil, in the circumstances of the sinner. The punishment of loss supposes deprivation of something valuable, but existence is not valuable in the circumstances of the sinner, and, therefore, deprivation of existence cannot be a punishment. To cease to exist, cannot be a punishment of loss, only so far as the existence taken away involves happiness, but the existence of sinners, who shall be such after the general resurrection, will not involve happiness, but misery, and, therefore, to cease to exist will not involve a loss of happiness, but an exemption from suffering, and cannot be a penalty or punishment.

2. To suppose that the penalty of the law is annihilation without conscious suffering, would not admit of any degrees of punishment. There can be no degrees in annihilation;

each and all who are annihilated, must be punished, if it be called punishment, precisely with the same amount or degree of punishment. If the penalty be annihilation, none can be punished less than what amounts to annihilation, and none can be punished more than what amounts to annihilation, and annihilation admits of no degrees.

Some have sought to avoid this difficulty by making the degrees of punishment, consist in the different degrees of loss sustained by different persons, according to their respective degrees of capacity to enjoy happiness. This would have some force in it, did annihilation stand opposed to a happy existence, but it does not, but is urged only in opposition to endless suffering, as shown above. Taking this view, as the mind that is capable of a larger degree of happiness, must also be capable of a greater degree of misery, instead of sustaining a greater loss by annihilation, he is only saved from a greater amount of suffering.

It is clear, then, that there can be no degrees in punishment, if it be annihilation without conscious suffering, and this must of itself be fatal to the theory. Reason teaches us that some are greater sinners than others, and justly deserve more punishment, and hence, if annihilation be the punishment, some must suffer more than they deserve, and others must suffer less than they deserve. Moreover, the Scriptures teach that there will be degrees of punishment. Christ said to the Scribes and Pharisees, for a certain cause, "Therefore shall ye receive the greater damnation." Matt. 23: 14.

"So he that knows his Master's will and does it not, shall be beaten with many stripes, while he that knows not his Master's will and does it not, shall be beaten with few stripes." See Luke 12: 47, 48.

3. That the penalty of the law is not annihilation without suffering, is further proved by those Scriptures which teach directly that sin is punished by suffering, or conscious pain. These constitute a numerous class, but we need quote but a few.

Matt. 25: 30: "And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

Luke 13: 28: "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you your selves thrust out."

Luke 16: 23: "And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments."

Rom. 2: 8, 9: "Indignation and wrath tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile."

Luke 12: 47: " And that servant which knew his Lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes."

These texts prove beyond a doubt, that sin is punished with positive inflictions, and hence, the penalty of the law cannot be annihilation without conscious suffering.

II. The penalty of the law is not annihilation with suffering as a part of the same.

1. It is liable to the first objection urged against the former position, that annihilation, under the circumstances, cannot be a punishment. The object of the annihilationist, in combining suffering with annihilation, is to escape the two objections urged above, viz: first, that annihilation without suffering does not admit of degrees, and, secondly, that the Scriptures teach the doctrine of positive conscious suffering as a punishment for sin. If, then, the law inflicts pain, fitly represented by "the worm that dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched," and which produces "weeping and wailing, and gnashing of teeth," annihilation must be a relief, and cannot be a punishment; it must be an advantage, and cannot be an evil under the circumstances.

2. To suppose that the punishment of sin consists of suffering in part, and of annihilation in part, renders annihilation exceedingly insignificant as a punishment, supposing it to be a punishment in any degree. Supposing it to be, in part, the penalty of the law, it follows that it must be inflicted upon all who are punished in any degree. We cannot suppose a sinner to be half annihilated; hence, he must be absolutely and entirely annihilated, if annihilation be any part of the penalty of the Divine law. Take the case of two sinners, one guilty in the least degree that a person can be, and still deserve punishment, and the other guilty to the greatest extent that a sinner can be, and, so far as annihilation is concerned, they must both be punished alike. The excess of punishment which the greater sinner receives over the less guilty sinner, must be made up in actual suffering, and this must constitute its principal portion, so that annihilation is a mere title. One dies so soon as he is capable of knowing right from wrong—his first act of sin is his only one, and that involves as little guilt as any wrong act can, and yet for this he must be annihilated. Another lives to be a hundred years old, and fills up the entire period with crimes of the deepest dye, and goes to his retribution as guilty as a sinner can make himself in one hundred years, and he can be no more than annihilated. It is said that he suffers for his greater guilt before he is annihilated. Granted: but as there is almost no comparison between his guilt, and that of the one less guilty, who is also annihilated, so there is almost no comparison between the suffering he must endure, and annihilation; his suffering constitutes nearly the whole of his punishment. In proportion to the amount of suffering a sinner has to endure, is annihilation rendered less fearful, or rather more to be desired; and the more guilty a sinner renders himself, the less does he lose, or the more does he gain by annihilation; and the less guilty a sinner is, the more does he lose, or the less does he gain by annihilation. Such absurdities and contradictions are involved by supposing the penalty of the Divine law to be composed, part of suffering, and part of annihilation. The penalty of the law is an evil, a curse, and yet this view supposes that one part of the curse of the Divine law renders the other portion desirable.

3. To suppose that the punishment of sin consists of suffering in part, and of annihilation in part, represents the penalty of the Divine law to be indefinite, confused and heterogeneous. If annihilation be the penalty of the law, even in part, it must be inflicted in every case of punishment. As shown above, the least of sinners must deserve annihilation, if it be the penalty of the law, for less cannot be deserved or received in

kind, and it must be inflicted on the smallest sinner; otherwise he cannot receive all his sins deserve. This being the case, annihilation must be threatened in the Scriptures, in every text, where any degree of punishment is threatened. If the Scriptures are true in fact, when they threaten sinners with punishment, they threaten just what they deserve, both in kind and degree. If, then, the Scriptures, in any case, threaten punishment without threatening annihilation, sinners may deserve and receive punishment for sin without deserving or receiving annihilation, and the conclusion must be irresistible, that annihilation is no part of the penalty of the law. What confusion must it introduce, to be compelled to understand annihilation in every denunciation against sin. A few examples will be sufficient to show the absurdity of the thing.

Matt. 8: 11, 12: "Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and with Isaac, and with Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

This text must mean annihilation, if that be the final punishment for sinners. And yet every one knows that there is not a word in it that suggests the thought of annihilation. Nor does it express two things, suffering and annihilation, but one thing, being cast, into outer darkness. This expression cannot mean both suffering and annihilation.

Matt. 22: 13: "Take him away, and cast him into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

This must mean annihilation, if that be the final punishment of the wicked, and yet, like the former text, it expresses but one thing, and that has no relation to annihilation.

Matt. 25: 46: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

Here are two words used to express the entire punishment of sinners, "everlasting," and "punishment." These two words must express the whole penalty of the Divine law in this instance. Does either of them express annihilation by itself, or do they both together express it? Let us see. This is a proper text on which to test this question, as it relates most clearly to the final punishment of the wicked.

(1.) Is the idea of annihilation, or non-existence, contained in the word "punishment?" As an English word it certainly does not mean annihilation. Dr. Webster defines it thus: "Any pain or suffering inflicted on a person for a crime or offence, by the authority to which the offender is subject, either by the constitution of God or of civil society." This settles it so far as this word is concerned. But Dr. Webster derives it from the verb, to punish, and this he defines, "to pain, to afflict with pain, loss or calamity, for a crime or fault. To chastise, to reward with pain or suffering inflicted on the offender." There is, then, nothing in the English word punishment, to denote annihilation or loss of existence. "To afflict with loss," does not imply the loss of existence, but the loss of possession or privilege. A person annihilated, would not, in any proper sense, lose his possessions, but

his possessions would lose him. The very idea of loss supposes the existence of the loser. Suppose a person to possess much property, wife, children, friends, and everything that can make a man happy, but he meets the fate of all men; he dies. And in reporting his death, will you say that the man has lost his property, his wife, children, and all his friends? Surely not; the term loss, is applied only to those who survive; they have lost him who is now dead.

Let us then look at the Greek word which is here rendered punishment, and see if that conveys the idea of annihilation. The Greek word here used is *kolasin*, and is defined thus, "Punishment; chastisement, torture, the rack; a punishing or infliction of punishment; a check, restraint, hindrance; pruning, lopping." Here it is seen that the word has no signification which indicates annihilation or loss of existence.

(2.) Is the idea of annihilation or non-existence found in the word "everlasting?" This cannot be, for more reasons than one. First; the word expresses perpetual duration; hence, it proves the endless existence of whatever it is applied to, rather than its annihilation or non-existence. Secondly, the same word is applied, to the life of the righteous in the same verse, rendered, eternal. The word in the original, is *aionion* in both cases. "These shall go away into [*kolasin aionion*,] everlasting punishment, but the righteous into [*zoen aionion*,] eternal life." Everlasting, and eternal, then, mean the same thing in this text, and hence, if the word everlasting, as applied to the punishment of the wicked, contains the idea of annihilation, the same word applied to the righteous would make an end of their hope. Thirdly, if the punishment be annihilation, then the word everlasting, applied to it, cannot express annihilation. If the punishment is merely ceasing to exist, it is necessarily everlasting, for when a being has ceased to exist, is not, such state of non-existence is necessarily endless, unless existence can spring from non-existence; and hence, to apply the word everlasting to non-existence is to talk of everlasting nothing; for there is naught but nothing to be everlasting after annihilation. We see then, that the word everlasting does not express annihilation.

(3) Do the words "everlasting" and "punishment," associated as in the text, express annihilation? Certainly they do not, and cannot. Keep in mind, that "everlasting punishment," in this text, expresses the entire penalty of the law, involving all the punishment that sinners will ever receive under the Divine government. The word everlasting is an adjective, and punishment is a noun, and the adjective expresses nothing concerning the nature or quality of the punishment, more than its simple duration. It simply determines that the punishment will be everlasting in point of duration, whatever it be in kind and degree.

Everlasting punishment here expresses the whole penalty of the law, the entire punishment inflicted for sin; and if punishment includes suffering and annihilation, then the word everlasting, being applied to the punishment, must qualify the suffering as much as it does the annihilation, but it has been shown that if it be so, the suffering must constitute far the largest portion of the sum total, as the punishment for all sin, beyond the smallest offence, must consist of suffering, since the smallest offence involves annihilation, if it be the penalty of the law in part or in whole. Now, this punishment, not

this annihilation, but the punishment, the greater part of which is suffering, is declared to be everlasting, which involves an absolute contradiction and impossibility. This is making confusion confounded out of the penalty of the divine law.

4. To maintain that the penalty of the law or proper punishment of sin is both suffering and annihilation, consisting in part of each, must either fritter away the penalty of the divine law to the mere pangs of a common death, a moment's pain, or represent God unnecessarily severe and cruel, and as punishing for the sake of punishing. If loss of existence be the penalty of the law, then does reason say it involves only so much suffering as is necessary to dissolve our being. It may be presumed, that if God annihilates, or takes away the existence of the wicked as a punishment for their sin, he will have some uniform method of executing the sentence. This is believed to be by fire. All who hold that the wicked will cease to exist, insist that God will burn them up. Admitting this, the portion of suffering must be so much, and should be only so much as a person endures while he is burning to death. Understand—the theory is that the wicked will not be raised immortal, with undeceiving natures, but that they will be raised as they now are, mortal, subject to the action of fire. Admitting then that they are to be burned up, it is not possible to see how they can suffer more than an ordinary death by fire. The pains of hell, according to this view, are less than many good people have endured in this life, for they have been roasted by a slow fire, which did not burn them up as quick as the fire of the last judgment will, when the heavens shall be on fire and the elements melt with fervent heat. Some have had their flesh picked from their limbs in small pieces with hot pinchers, which must cause more pain than to be burned up in a very hot fire. All this follows from the frailty of our being, on the supposition that sinners are to be raised as we now are, a material organism, subject to the action of fire and death; and unless sinners are thus raised, fire will not burn them up, and the argument is at an end. A material organism like the human body can endure but a limited amount of heat and pain without dissolving, and that amount must fix a limit to the pains of hell. Thus is the penalty of the divine law frittered away to even less than many of the martyrs endured in this world.

To escape this aspect of the subject, our annihilationists insist that the suffering of the wicked will be long and fearfully great before they cease to exist. This is not possible, unless God in the resurrection should constitute man a different being from what he is in this world, so as to require the action of five, ten, fifty, a hundred, five hundred, or a thousand years to burn him up. To say the least of this, it is without proof. There is not the slightest evidence or shadow of proof, upon the supposition that man is to be raised mortal, and capable of being burned up. Upon this principle, this semi-immortal nature which is to resist the action of fire for a thousand years, or for one whole year, is a mere chimera of the brain. But we are not prepared to say that God cannot produce an organization, just such as this theory supposes, or that he could not suspend the laws of nature, so as, by his power, to hold a sinner in existence with his present organization, under the tortures of fire for a thousand years, but very strong considerations go to show that he will not do it.

(1.) It does not appear that any important end would be secured by it. It is not necessary to dispose of sinners, and put them beyond the power of committing further wrongs, for that end would be gained by letting them die at once.

(2.) It represents suffering as expiating guilt, which must do away the necessity of annihilation. If God be not cruel, and inflict suffering for its own sake, why does he not annihilate sinners at a blow, and not hold them in being for ages? The only valid reason that can be given, is, that justice demands that the sinner should suffer so much, according to the degree of his guilt, before God can send him into non-existence. This implies that the suffering expiates the sinner's guilt, otherwise justice will always require him to remain under the same degree of suffering. If when the sinner has suffered a hundred years, he is just as guilty as he was when he commenced, he deserves just as much punishment as he did at the commencement, and he is no nearer the point when justice can allow of his annihilation, if it cannot allow of it at once. If the sinner is at the commencement so guilty that it would be unjust to annihilate him, then if he remains just so guilty, it will always remain unjust to annihilate him; and he must always remain just so guilty, unless his sufferings expiate his guilt, rendering him less guilty as he continues to suffer. But if suffering does expiate the sinner's guilt, rendering him less deserving of punishment as he suffers, when he has reached a point where it becomes just to annihilate him, God might, by causing him to suffer a little longer, expiate the remainder of his guilt, and render his annihilation unnecessary. If suffering does not remove the sinner's guilt, God could dispense with it by annihilating him at once, and inflicts unnecessary tortures by not doing it; and if it does remove the sinner's guilt, a little more of it can remove the whole of it, and God is represented as unnecessarily taking away his existence. The annihilationist may take which horn of the dilemma he pleases, either will gore his theory to death.

(3.) To suppose God to give to sinners an organization capable of enduring a thousand times as much suffering as his present organization, or that he will support, by his direct power, the sinner's present organization, for the express purpose of having him endure a thousand times as much suffering as he could otherwise bear, will overthrow the entire foundation on which annihilationist build their theory. They always urge their theory in opposition to endless suffering, and insist that it is the only theory which will carry them clear of this terrible doctrine. But here God is represented as supporting man's frail organization for the purpose of causing it to suffer a thousand times more anguish than it could otherwise bear.

III. As it has been proved that the penalty of the law is not annihilation without suffering, nor yet annihilation and suffering, consisting in part of both, it must be suffering without annihilation, and the conclusion is that sinners will not be annihilated.

The point now being proved, that sinners will not be annihilated, it must follow that the doctrine of endless punishment is true, as proved in the preceding section.

BOOK III.

CHRISTIANITY CONSIDERED AS A SYSTEM OF MORAL GOVERNMENT.

CHAPTER I.

THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF GOD'S MORAL GOVERNMENT AS THEY ARE TAUGHT IN THE SCRIPTURES.

SECTION I.

The Scriptures teach that God is a Supreme, Universal Moral Governor.

All government, of whatever kind or nature, supposes a governor. The first and great fundamental truth therefore which the Scriptures teach in regard to government, is that God is Governor of the universe.

It should be observed that the Scriptures are not devoted exclusively to a development of a system of moral Government, nor do they teach it on the scientific plan of one of our modern writers on the subject of Moral Philosophy. But all the principles are taught in the inspired writings, and so plainly and forcibly asserted as to make the principles and facts much more readily comprehended by an unlettered and unsophisticated mind, than the best written modern volume on the subject of moral science.

The fundamental principles of God's moral Government, have been more or less involved and exhibited, while discussing the questions of the inspiration of the Scriptures, and the doctrines they teach, yet it is proper to present an outline view of these principles at this point, that they may be seen distinctly unencumbered by other subjects.

I. The Scriptures assert that God is a universal Governor, and that he does govern the universe of both matter and mind. A few only of the many texts of the class need be produced.

Psa. 147: 5-18: "Great is our Lord, and of great power: his understanding is infinite. The Lord lifteth up the meek: he casteth the wicked down to the ground. Who covereth the heaven with clouds, who prepareth rain for the earth, who maketh grass to grow upon the mountains. He giveth to the beast his food, and to the young ravens which cry. He delighteth, not in the strength of the horse; he taketh not pleasure in the legs of a man. The Lord taketh pleasure in them that fear him, in those that hope in his mercy. Praise the Lord, O Jerusalem; praise thy God, O Zion. For he hath strengthened the bars of thy gates; he hath blessed thy children within thee. He maketh peace in thy borders, and filleth thee with the finest of the wheat. He sendeth forth his commandment upon earth: his word runneth very swiftly. He giveth snow like wool: he scattereth the hoar-frost like ashes. He casteth forth his ice like morsels; who can stand before his cold? He sendeth out his word, and melt-eth them: he causeth his wind to blow, and the waters flow."

Psa. 135: 5, 6: "For I know that the Lord is great, and that our Lord is above all gods. Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did he in heaven, and in earth, in the seas, and all deep places."

Psa. 33: 6-11: "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made: and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth. He gathereth the waters of the sea together as a heap: he layeth up the depth in store-houses. Let all the earth fear the Lord; let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him. For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast. The Lord bringeth the counsel of the heathen to naught: he maketh the devices of the people of none effect. The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations.

Psa. 103: 19: "The Lord hath prepared his throne in the heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all."

Psa. 22: 28: "For the kingdom is the Lord's; and he is the governor among the nations."

Psa. 75: 6,7: "For promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south. But God is the judge; he putteth down one, and setteth up another."

Job 12: 10: "In whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind."

Isa. 45: 57: "I am the Lord and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things."

Matt. 6: 26: "Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?"

Matt. 10: 29: "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing, and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered."

Acts 17: 24-28: "God that made the world, and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; Neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though he needed anything; seeing he giveth to all, life, and breath, and all things. And hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth; and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation. That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us. For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, for we are also his offspring."

On these texts, it may be remarked, that they assert the doctrine of a universal Providence, and clearly represent God as a free and independent Governor of the universe.

1. They assert a physical government over the universe of matter. They represent the operations of what we call nature, as under his immediate control, and the various phenomena exhibited as the effect of his everywhere present operative power. He is represented as causing the vapors to ascend, and the clouds to gather, and the rain to fall. The frost and snow are represented as coming at his call, and as melting away at his command.

2. His guardian care is represented as universal, and as extending to man and beast. It is made to comprehend every sparrow, and every hair of every human head. God's government and Providence are at the same time represented as so wide and comprehensive, as to contain within their designs and operations all nations of men that dwell on all the face of the earth making them all so exclusively the creatures of his power, that in him alone they live, and move, and have their being.

3. God is represented as having special regard for right moral character. It is not the strength of a horse in which God delighteth; it is not the legs of a man in which he taketh pleasure; but "he taketh pleasure in them that fear him, in all those that hope in his mercy." He calls on all the earth to fear him, and commands all the inhabitants of the world to stand in awe of him, and yet he invites the most distant and dark to seek him, "if haply they may feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us."

One of our modern writers on the subjects of physics and ethics, would no doubt attempt to discriminate closer, and to give a more perfect analysis, and to exhibit a more marked distinction between physical and moral government, yet it is doubtful whether it would make a stronger impression on unlettered minds, of all-pervading Divinity, acting in us and all around us, which is one of the first and greatest truths connected with the government of God.

II. The Scriptures most clearly teach, that God administers a moral government over the universe of moral agents.

1. A moral government is a government based upon a distinction between right and wrong. The Scriptures always assume that there is a distinction between right and wrong, that some voluntary acts of men are right, and that others are wrong. The question with them is not so much, why a given voluntary act is right or wrong, as which are right and which are wrong? Nor are we so much concerned at this point in the discussion, to point out why that course of action commanded in the Scriptures is right, and why the course forbidden is wrong, as we are with the fundamental truth that there is a distinction between right and wrong prior to all written laws, human or divine. As moral government is based upon a distinction between right and wrong, right and wrong must be antecedent to moral government. As it is and must be the object of all right government to promote right, and to prevent wrong, right and wrong must first exist to render a moral government desirable or necessary. Law is based upon right, not right upon law, in the order of antecedent and sequence; law springs from right, not right from law. Laws are enacted to secure what is already right, and to prevent what is already wrong; not to create right and wrong which did not before exist. Were it not so, there would be no

reason for enacting the law. It is an undeniable fact that God's law does pronounce some actions of moral agents right and other actions wrong. This right and wrong of the actions of moral agents, must be original, actions being right or wrong in themselves, or it must be given them by the law as a result of pronouncing one class of actions right and another class wrong. If the latter position be true, then there was not only no reason why the one class of actions should be pronounced right and the other wrong, prior to the announcement itself, but all the wrong that exists is the result of the law and could not have existed without the law. This view would also make God's moral government, wholly an arbitrary matter, and render it responsible for all the moral wrong that exists. If right and wrong be based upon God's moral government, then it must sustain the load and bear the wrong as well as the right; but if, as the proposition affirms, God's moral government is based upon a distinction between right and wrong, then the subject is freed from all these difficulties.

It is upon the mistaken view above exposed, that sinners war with the moral government of God as arbitrary and injurious to their interests. They talk of the law of God as arbitrary, and its penalty as severe, whereas the law only asserts the truth and the moral necessity which exists in the nature of things. Moral government is a moral necessity, where moral agents exist. As God has produced the moral universe, he is bound by the law of his own nature to exercise over it a moral government; he can do no less. Nor could God institute a more lax moral government, one that would be less severe on offenders, as sinners judge of severity. If God were to require less of moral agents, it would be to abandon them to everlasting ruin, and if he were to enforce his law by a less fearful sanction, it would be to subvert the necessary moral relations between moral causes and effects, and dissolve the moral universe. The moral law is a barrier thrown between moral agents and ruin, and if they so pervert their agency as to dash upon it and perish, it will not disprove the fact that moral necessity placed it there under the sanction of infinite wisdom, goodness and justice. It is clear from what has been said that a moral government is based upon a distinction between right and wrong, and that right and wrong necessarily exist in the nature of the actions of moral agents.

2. Moral Government is a government of mind by mind, of intelligence by intelligence, and of moral agency by moral agency. God the moral governor is the great presiding moral agent of the universe. None but a moral agent could administer a moral government. A government administered by any being but a moral agent, would not be a moral government, but a government of force or necessity.

So none but moral agents can be the subjects of a moral government. It is a government of free will. There can be no moral rebellion or obedience which is not voluntary, the act of a free will. It is a government of reason by motives or moral influence. Motives may be gathered from heaven, earth and hell, they may be addressed to the understanding and the sensibility, and they may be pressed home by the eloquence of human oratory, and the eloquence of the Holy Ghost, and it is but motive or moral influence after all, under which the will acts freely.

The freedom of the human will was established in the preceding book, and the arguments need not be repeated. The freedom of the will is everywhere assumed upon the very face of the record, and the very annunciation of a revelation of the will of God, as a rule of duty, implies it. If the will is not free, there is no more propriety in addressing moral laws to man, than there would be in addressing moral laws to the trees to guide their growth, to the winds to govern their blowing, and to waves to control the manner in which they break upon the shore.

III. The Scriptures teach that God has a right to govern the universe, and especially to administer a moral government over the moral agents he has created. This the Scriptures teach in various ways.

1. God clearly and directly asserts his own right to govern. He asserted his right on Sinai, when he said, "thou shalt have no other Gods before me."

Deut. 6: 1-5: "Now these are the commandments, the statutes, and the judgments which the Lord your God commanded to teach you, that ye might do them in the land whither ye go to possess it: That thou mightest fear the Lord thy God, to keep all his statutes and his commandments which I command thee; thou, and thy son, and thy son's son all the days of thy life; and that thy days may be prolonged. Hear therefore, O Israel, and observe to do it that it may be well with thee, and that ye may increase mightily, as the Lord God of thy fathers hath promised thee, in the land that floweth with milk and honey. Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart' and with all thy soul, and with all thy might."

2. The Scriptures assert God's right to govern when they assert his relation to the universe, as creator and preserver. As moral government is a moral necessity, a necessary thing, and God having created and upholding the universe, he has a right to govern it.

3. The Scriptures assert God's right to govern, when they assert his fitness as moral governor. His attributes have been exhibited in the light of the Scriptures. He is a Spirit, and is eternal, omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient, immutable, just, good and holy. These perfections of his nature perfectly fit him for a moral Governor. They are possessed by no other being in the universe, and God, and God alone, must have a right to reign and govern the universe.

SECTION II.

The Scriptures teach that man is a Subject of God's Moral Government.

The Scriptures go beyond the above proposition, and teach that angels are subjects of God's moral government, but the moral relations and responsibilities of man embrace all that need be discussed. The fact that man is a subject of God's moral government has already been made to appear, for it is clearly implied in the subject of the last section. It were impossible to demonstrate the fundamental truth that God is a universal moral governor, as was there done, without involving the fact that man is a subject of his

government. So have all the essential elements of man which necessarily render him a fit subject of moral government been discussed and fully made to appear, while exhibiting the various doctrines of the Scriptures. Yet, while discussing the fundamental principles of God's moral government, it is better to present all the essential points in a brief summary, than to leave the reader to gather them from the pages over which he has passed, and collate them for himself. The Scriptures teach that man is a subject of God's moral government in various ways.

I. The Scriptures teach that man is a subject of God's moral government, by teaching what was demonstrated in the preceding section, namely, that God is his rightful moral governor.

The right of God to administer a moral government over man, implies the fact that man is his rightful moral subject, and is bound to obey God's moral law. Thus does all the proof adduced on the former point, apply with equal force on this,

1. When the Scriptures affirm the fact, that God is a moral governor, they, in effect, assert that man is a subject of his moral government.
2. When the Scriptures affirm God's right to govern, they, in effect, assert man's obligation to obey.
3. When the Scriptures assert God's relation to the universe as Creator and preserver, as involving his right to govern, by implication, they assert that man's relation to God, as created and upheld by him, brings him within the divine jurisdiction, as a subject of his government.
4. When the Scriptures assert God's fitness as a moral Governor, they, in effect, assert that man is under the highest possible obligation to turn his eyes and his heart to him, be governed by his will, and to trust to the outstretched arm of his governmental power for protection.

II. The Scriptures teach that man is a subject of God's moral government, by affirming of him, that he possesses all those elements which are essential to moral obligation and accountability. There are certain mental and moral attributes without which no being can be the subject of moral government; and in the possession of which, no being can be without moral government. These are seen in the three divisions of the mental phenomena, intelligence, sensibility, and free will.

But the reader will excuse an omission of the order in which philosophers describe mental phenomena, and allow the points to be stated to suit the present argument.

1. There must be knowledge, and, of course, a capacity to know. Man is endowed with intelligence. This enables him to reason. He can see moral relations, note resemblances, and judge, and thus distinguish between right and wrong,

It is this mental power which God calls upon man to exercise when he says, "Come now and let us reason together." Isa. 1: 18.

2. Man has a conscience, which some have called the moral sense, but which is, to say the least, a moral emotion. When the judgment decides what is right and what is wrong, which it does and cannot help doing, and the will determines in favor of the right or the wrong, then conscience, by this moral emotion, speaks within, and the will can no more suppress its voice than it can suppress the voice of God.

When the will determines in favor of what the intellect declares to be right, there arises an emotion of approbation of self-complacency; when the will determines in favor of what is wrong, there arises an emotion of self-condemnation, a feeling of guilt.

This moral feeling, this sense of right and wrong is universal, all men feel it, all men acknowledge it. Without it there could be no sense of moral obligation, with it, man can but feel a sense of moral obligation, and acknowledge himself a subject of moral government. This mental phenomenon is most distinctly noted in the Scriptures, as a condition of moral obligation. It is particularly noted in regard to those who have not God's written law, and hence, it is proved to be innate and universal in the human mind.

Rom. 2: 11-15: "For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law; For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing, or else excusing one another."

3. Man has consciousness, which is the knowledge which the mind has of its own states. A man is conscious of what passes within his own mind, and hence, every man is conscious of the fact that his mind does perceive a distinction between right and wrong, that conscience does approve the right and condemn the wrong, that he does feel bound to do right, and to refrain from the wrong; that is, that he feels the claim of moral obligation, and that he is the subject of moral government.

4. Man has the power or faculty of memory, which allies him to the past, and by the aid of ever present consciousness of personal identity, holds him accountable for all the acts of the past, and these render him the proper subject of the just retributions, which it is the end of moral government to bestow. These mental powers taken together constitute man the proper subject of moral government. It may be said they render him the necessary subject of moral government, connected with the voluntary faculty. These elements are all found in the mind itself, they are common to the race, every man is conscious of them, and feels a sense of moral obligation, and hears a voice within, speaking in the elements of his own internal self; speaking with a voice which no clamor of the passions can silence, and no sophistry of the intellect refute, pronouncing a sentence of approbation when the will executes what the judgment determines is right, and a sentence of

condemnation when the will executes what the intelligence decides is wrong. Such a being must necessarily be the subject of moral government, and though the Scriptures do not discuss and classify the mental phenomena involved, upon the principles of modern mental science, they teach the whole truth in the premises, and sum up the result in a single declaration, that "The wicked flee when no man pursueth, but the righteous are bold as a lion." Prov. 28: 1. This text itself implies conscious guilt and conscious innocence, which involves moral responsibility, and this renders the man subject of a moral government.

5. Man has the power of volition or free will. This point has been abundantly proved, but as it is a vital point, and is here laid down as essential to the very existence of moral government, it is proper to note a few of the strong points involved.

(1.) If man does not possess the power of free will, it is not possible to see how he can be the subject of moral government. None but free will actions, or free volitions can be recognized by a righteous moral government, for none other can be moral actions. And if this be true, man must be free in the exercise of willing, or, so far as he is concerned, there can be no moral government.

(2.) If man has not the power of free will, he cannot be accountable, and is not and cannot be the subject of either reward or punishment.

(3.) If man has not the power of free will, he is not and cannot be a sinner. "Sin is the transgression of the law," but to convict a man of a violation of a moral law, it must be made to appear that he has power to keep the law. The will of God must be the highest law in the universe to which man can stand related, hence, there can be no sin without a violation of this supreme law, as understood by the mind. It is clear that man's will must be free, or it must be governed by a law of necessity, in some way derived from the Creator. If the latter be true, man's actions sustain the same relation to the Infinite mind as do the rush of waters or the flight of clouds, and man is not and cannot be a sinner.

(4.) If man has not the power of free will, all the precepts, promises, and threatenings, which the Scriptures address to him, have no more applicability, than they would if addressed to winds and waves.

(5.) To deny that man has the power of free will, is to divide God in his own councils, and set him at variance with himself.

It has been proved that the Scriptures were given by inspiration of God, and of course they express the will of God. The determinations of the human will must be free or necessary; but if they are necessary, the law of that necessity, must be derived from the Creator, and the results must be in exact accordance with the will of God who created the law of necessity which produces those necessary determinations. If the determinations of the human will are not free, then they must be in exact harmony with the will of God. But God says in his word, "thou shalt have no other Gods before me;" but the determination of the human will is often in favor of other Gods. Here are two distinct expressions of the

will of God in direct conflict with each other, and God is divided in his own council, and at variance with himself. There is no way to escape this, but to deny the inspiration of the Scriptures, or to admit that the determinations of the human will are free, and not governed by any law of necessity. God vindicated himself against all such imputations, when he demanded through his prophet, as follows:

Jer. 7: 9, 10: "Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods whom ye know not: and come and stand before me in this house, which is called by my name, and say, We are delivered to do all these abominations?"

(6.) Every man is conscious of acting, willing freely, and every man's conscience tells him that he wills freely. It may be possible for men to fancy themselves governed by some unseen hand of fate, some hidden destiny, some secret law of necessity, but it is only fancy; if they will look at their own internal consciousness, they will see the free action of their wills; if they will listen to the voice of their conscience, they will hear the doctrine of free will proclaimed from the very throne of the human soul. Did the reader ever hear the soul-cheering whisper of an approving conscience, for having done his duty; for having performed an act of virtue or benevolence? Why this placid smile of the soul? Why this internal pleasure? Why does the soul smile on herself when acts are performed which the judgment approves, if she does not consider herself the author of her own conduct? Did the reader ever feel the sting of a guilty conscience for having done wrong? Why this sense of guilt? Why does the soul turn and goad herself, and obscure her light by the darkness of her own Town, when something has been done which the judgment pronounces wrong, if she does not consider herself the author of her own deeds?

(7.) All men confirm the doctrine of the freedom of the will, by their plaudits and censure which they bestow upon each other. All men have their notions of right and wrong; the one they applaud, and the other they censure; and this is common to all ranks, from the throne to the humble seat of the beggar. Why do kings complain of each other; and from off their thrones hurl the thunderbolts of war, if they do not consider each other free in their actions? Why does neighbor complain of neighbor for his conduct? Why do the purse-proud gentry complain that so many beggars are among them, and why do beggars complain that men of means are so scanty in, their bestowments upon the needy? The only answer to these questions is, all men feel that man possesses the power of free will, and in practice proclaim their belief to the world.

SECTION III.

The Scriptures contain God's Moral Code, for the Government of Man.

The inspiration of the Scriptures has been proved, from which the fact of the present proposition follows, so that the principal work which remains to be performed, is to explain the subject.

When it is said that the Scriptures contain God's moral code, it is not meant that they contain nothing but moral law. Much of the Bible is mere history, containing nothing of the nature of law. Another large portion of the Bible contains positive laws, establishing positive institutions, with their rituals and forms, which cannot be classed with moral law. Making these abatements, it is still insisted that the Scriptures contain all moral law for the government of man.

I. The nature of moral law, as distinguished from positive law.

1. Moral law has its foundation in a difference in the quality of the actions of moral agents, while positive law is the simple expression of the will of the law-giver. Some states of the human will are in harmony with the various relations in which man is placed to his Creator and to his fellow beings, and some are not, and herein is found the difference between right and wrong.

2. Moral law is universal, because it has its foundation in a difference in the nature of things, or in a difference in the quality of the actions of moral agents; but positive law is not necessarily universal, but may be local, restricted or extended according to the will of the law-giver.

3. Moral law, for reasons above given, must be uniform, the circumstances being the same, its claims are the same; but this is not the case, necessarily, with positive law.

4. Moral law, having its foundation as above described, must be immutable; while positive law may be enacted, altered or abolished, as the law giver may determine.

5. Moral law being based upon a difference in the quality of the actions of moral agents, it contains in itself its own power of imposing moral obligation, moral agents being bound to obey moral law, because the thing required is right in itself. But positive law depending upon the will of the law-giver, does not necessarily contain in itself the power to impose moral obligation, but the reason of its obligation is found, not in the nature of the thing required, but in the fact that it is commanded.

Should it be supposed that the above view of the distinction between moral and positive law, leaves men free to violate the positive laws found in the Scriptures, without a violation of moral obligation, the reply is,

(1.) Moral law, being the dictate of eternal reason, and founded upon a distinction between right and wrong, back of all positive enactments, may be enacted or commanded by God, and assume the external form of positive law. "When this is the case, it loses none of its intrinsic nature and force as moral law, and men are just as much morally bound to obey it, as moral law, as they were before it received the external form as a statute or positive law. Such is the fact in regard to the first commandment of the Decalogue. It is a dictate of eternal reason that man should have no God before the Lord Jehovah, his Creator, it is right in itself, it was moral law and binding on universal humanity before it was spoken on Sinai, or written on the table of stone. And now it is

moral law still, clothed with the external form of statute or positive law, and it is no less binding as moral law than it was before it received this form.

(2.) Moral law imposes the obligation of obeying all positive laws enacted by the rightful moral Governor of the universe. If the reader will turn back and consider what was said on the subject of God's right to govern the universe, there will be found in the reasons assigned, sufficient proof that man is under moral obligation to obey God. The fact that God is the Creator and man the created, that God is infinitely wise, good and just, and that man is very limited in his knowledge, of itself furnishes sufficient ground for declaring man under moral obligation to obey God. If then man is under moral obligation to obey God, he is morally bound to obey all the positive laws God enacts, for though the nature of the thing commanded does not contain in itself, what imposes moral obligation, yet the mind apprehending a positive law as the command of God, and at the same time apprehending a moral obligation to obey God, arising out of the relation he sustains to him, the moral obligation to obey God which the mind acknowledges, requires obedience to the positive law, without going behind the record of the command to find a reason in the nature of things.

The view that has now been taken leads us to the conclusion that we are morally bound to obey all the commands of the Bible, according to their true intention and designed application. It has been remarked, that much of the Scriptures is not law, and much of what is law, is positive law, and was local and circumscribed in its intended force and application, and was temporary in its object, and has not come down to us with its obligations as a part of the Gospel dispensation. The whole Jewish ceremonial law was binding on them, because it was commanded by God, and being commanded it must have had a sufficient reason in his perfect mind, though man could see and feel no reason for it beyond the simple fact that God commanded it. But this law with its rights and forms; was typical of the person, office, and work of Christ, and was fulfilled in and by him, and passed away, with its binding obligation. It remains as an essential branch of the economy of salvation by Christ, but it has been fulfilled, it has done its work, and has become a thing for which there is no more practical use, only as a record, and a history, through which we trace the progressive developments of the plan of redemption, and derive proofs of the validity of the better things that remain under the gospel. But none of the positive enactments of the Old Testament, which were based upon moral principle, have been repealed or expired by limitation. They are binding still, as is also all positive laws in the New Testament, which the Gospel has added to what may be found in the Old Testament. As the Scriptures have been proved to have been given by inspiration of God, all they command as from God, are the commands of God, and as moral obligation requires us to obey all the positive laws God enacts, abating what of the Old Testament has been fulfilled by Christ, and passed away, as a type ceases when the thing typified is come, and what may have been repealed by the Gospel, if any such part there be, the whole of the sacred volume becomes the Christian's code of laws.

II. The Scriptures contain an entire and perfect code for the moral government of man. By this is meant, that when the Scriptures are understood, according to the sense intended

by the author, they teach and command the whole duty of man, and no more than the whole duty of man.

1. It is important at this point, to distinguish between the ground of moral obligation, and the rule of moral obligation. The Scriptures, allowing them to be an expression of the will of God concerning us, are not the ground of moral obligation, yet are they the rule of moral obligation. The fact that the will of God, or the Scriptures rightly understood, is an absolute law to us, is one thing, but the reason why it is such absolute law, is another thing. In the light of what has been said on the subject of the relation subsisting between God and man, as Moral Governor, and the subject of a moral government, including God's right to govern and man's duty to obey, it must appear plain, that the ascertained will of God is our absolute rule of duty, and that we may not go behind the record of God's command, to settle the question of our obligation to obey. But there may be a reason behind the record, why God commands what he has, and that reason doubtless is, that the thing commanded is a moral good, is right in itself. The point is, the will or command of God reveals and declares what is right, but it does not constitute the right. This point was considered, while explaining the characteristics of moral government, under the second general head of section one of this chapter, to which the reader is referred.

We may comprehend, to some extent, the reason for some of God's commands, which reasons are clearly antecedent to, and exist independently of the command itself, and in such case, such reasons for such acts, become to the mind that apprehends them, a ground of moral obligation. It is only on this ground that men can, to any extent, be the subjects of moral obligation, without a direct revelation from God, but it has been shown that they are; in the language of Paul, that "those who have not the law are a law unto themselves."

If the command of God created the right of the thing commanded, there could be nothing right until the commandment was issued, and there could be no moral obligation, beyond a knowledge of the command

2. The manner in which the Scriptures teach the whole duty of man, needs explanation. If we look into the Scriptures, expecting to find a specific rule for the guidance of our conduct in every particular relation, and all the circumstances in which we may be placed, we shall be disappointed. But, if we search the Scriptures, with a view of learning what God declares on the subject of many specific actions of leading importance, and with a view of finding general rules, by an honest application of which we can determine our duty in all cases, we shall find them sufficient, and learn that they teach the whole duty of man. The Scriptures make us acquainted with our duty in two leading methods.

(1.) By formal rules, which command or forbid specific acts, which are liable to arise in our progress in moral existence. There are many such rules. As an example, the eighth commandment. "Thou shalt not steal." Here is a specific prohibition. Take as an affirmative example, our Saviour's last command. "This do in remembrance of me." But it must be obvious that this cannot be the only method in which duty is revealed in the Scriptures. To reveal all of human duty, as it may be involved in the numberless and

complicated relations and ever changing circumstances of our moral being, by this method, would be impossible. Man could never write so large and complicated a work as it would have to be. If it could be written, no man could ever read it, if he did nothing else between the cradle and the grave.

If it could be read, no human mind could comprehend it for practical use. It would require the Infinite mind to comprehend it. Indeed, St. John says of the acts of Christ, over and above what is recorded of them, "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written."

(2.) The Scriptures reveal our duty by asserting general principles, which include and clearly imply, every particular duty which can occur in our experience in moral life, so that by making an intelligent and honest application of these universal principles, to our particular exigencies as they arise, we may always learn the path of duty. A man has a complicated partnership account with his neighbor, there was so much capital invested by each party, so much loss here, and so much gain there, and the operation has gone on so long. Now the account is to be settled and closed. The parties are honest, and wish to make a just division of what there is to divide. If they go to a book professedly teaching how to settle such accounts, a treatise on arithmetic, if they have not studied the principles and learned how to apply them, the book sheds not the slightest light on the subject. Yet that book contains all the principles by which they can, by applying them to the case, determine within the smallest fraction, how the matter of their complicated account stands. Such, a book, in morals, is the Bible. Certain moral questions are worked out and demonstrated, which serve as examples, and principles are contained for working all the other cases that may arise.

In the above aspect of the subject, the specific rules, which in the letter and form, regard only specific acts or cases of duty, furnish general principles capable of being applied to other cases. And in addition to these, there are universal principles laid down, which, like the simple rules in arithmetic, which, though few in number, can be so applied as to solve all questions which come under that branch of science. It is upon this principle that Christ declares that upon two commandments, hang all the law and the prophets. Those two commandments contain principles, which, if applied, reach to the end of the entire law. It is on the same principle that it is affirmed that all the law is fulfilled in love. "Let us not be weary in well doing," is a very general rule which specifies no one act of duty, but comprehends all. "Abstain from all appearance of evil," names no one specific vice, yet clearly interdicts all. A better illustration of a universal principle, contained in a specific direction, cannot be found, than what is called the golden rule. "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them."

III. The Decalogue or Ten Commandments, contains the foundation principles of our entire duty, as comprehended in our relations to God and man.

Whatever other commands may be found in the Scriptures, they are all but repetitions, expositions, or applications of the principles contained in the Decalogue. Even whatever

positive rules and ordinances may be found upon the record, the principle which obligates us to obey them, may be found in the first commandment, and the relation upon which it is there declaratory based.

1. The moral code of the Old Testament has been transmitted to the New, and is found in full force in the Gospel. This is most clearly taught. When Christ, at the opening of his ministry, was about to give an exposition of important portions of the law, the sense of which had been most perverted; such an exposition as man had never given; an exposition which brought man's very heart of hearts under its claim, he prefaced his exposition with the following declaration of its continued binding force.

Matt. 5: 17-20: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the Kingdom of Heaven. For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven."

Again, the answer which Jesus gave to the lawyer, who inquired "which is the greatest commandment," proves that the law continues in force under the Gospel.

Matt. 22: 37-40: "Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

Here Christ not only affirmed the binding force of the two commandments named, but by saying that, "on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets," he by undeniable implication, affirmed the binding force of the whole law, and all the moral precepts found in the prophets. If the two commandments are transmitted to the Gospel, as is certain, then all that hangs upon them must come with them, and that is all the law and the prophets. So we read the words of Paul, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid, yea we establish the law. Rom. 3: 31.

Other proofs might be given, but this is sufficient it is seen from this view of the subject, that the objection urged by some, that no writer of the New Testament names all the commandments of the Decalogue, when referring to it, possesses no force. The expression, "the law," and "all the commandments," in the words of Christ, necessarily comprehends the whole code.

2. The moral code of the Old Testament, in passing into the New, has become more fully developed in its principles, and more widely, and clearly, and forcibly applied to the states of the heart, so that the Gospel is a more perfect system of morality than was the Jewish code. To be satisfied of this, it is only necessary to read Christ's exposition of the

moral code, contained in his sermon on the mount. They also have added to them, the living illustration of Christ's perfect example, and higher sanctions, by means of the clearer development, which the Gospel makes of a future state of eternal retributions.

3. The moral code of the Scriptures is an exclusive rule of duty. What the Scriptures teach, being understood, is the supreme and exclusive law of man, insomuch that it admits of no other conflicting rule of any kind, or from any source, and allows of no exceptions in obedience. When the conception of duty as taught in the Scriptures, is clear, it must be performed; when the sense of the command is clear to our own minds, the word must be obeyed, cost what it may. Sooner than disobey an understood command contained in the Scriptures, we must sacrifice all supposed interests, honor, liberty, and even life itself. The words of the blessed Jesus are, Matt. 16: 25: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it."

We have also the example of prophets and Apostles, who endured imprisonments, tortures, and death itself, when they might have escaped the whole, by a single act of disobedience to the command of God. Daniel and his companions present heroic examples. When Peter and John were called before the rulers, it is said Acts 4: 18-20, that they "commanded them not to speak at all, nor teach in the name of Jesus. But Peter and John answered and said unto them, whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard."

After this, chap. 5: 28, 29, when they had brought them before the council again, they demand of them, "Did not we straightly command you that you should not teach in this name, and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us. Then Peter and the other Apostles answered and said, we ought to obey God rather than men."

Here the claim is set up, that no human authority can lay us under obligation to disobey God.

4. The moral code of the Old Testament consisted of two tables, upon which was written the two great and distinct classes of duty. The first table contains the four first commandments, embracing in principle all the duties we owe to God. The second table contains the remaining six commandments, embracing all the duties we owe to our fellow beings. This distinction between the two tables of the law, was clearly recognized by our Savior, when he declared the whole law to be summed up in two commands, love to God and man. Having briefly stated the fundamental principles of God's moral government, as they are taught in the Scriptures, the way is prepared to examine more particularly into specific duties, which the Scriptures enjoin towards God and man. This will be done in subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER II.

THE DUTIES WE OWE TO GOD.

The duties which we owe to God, are such as are suited to the relation we sustain to him, and such as also regard him directly, and terminate on him as their object. It was shown in the preceding chapter, that the Decalogue contains a summary of the whole duty of man, and that the first table contains a summary of all the duties we owe to God. It will not, however, be the most convenient method of exhibiting these duties, to attempt to bring them out of the Decalogue, by an inductive process. The comments of our Savior, and the Gospel in general, shed so much additional light on the subject, that a better process will be, to consider the several duties in the order of their importance, and illustrate and enforce them by such Scriptures as appear best suited to accomplish that end.

SECTION I.

Love to God.

Our Savior declares love to God, to be the first and great duty of man, and that it involves all other duties. It is, no doubt, demanded by the first commandment of the Decalogue, which is, "Thou shalt have no other God before me." It is worthy of remark, that this commandment, in form, is purely prohibitory. This, indeed, is the case with all the commandments, except the fourth and fifth, which are mandatory. The reason of this may be found in the fact that man is naturally a religious being, and must and will have his God, and his religion, and render the devotion of his heart somewhere. When, therefore, all other gods are interdicted, and excluded from the human heart, it will as certainly find its centre in the true God, as moral causes produce moral effects. In this point of light, the command, though prohibitory in form, is mandatory by implication, and implies positive duty. This conclusion is not left to rest upon mere inference, but has been affirmed by our Lord. He gave the following as the sense of this commandment: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first commandment."

It is true that Christ quoted from Deuteronomy, yet that must be regarded as a statement of the same principle in another form. To have no other God before Jehovah our God, in result, must be equal to loving the Lord our God with all our hearts.

According to our Lord's exposition, of this commandment, all the other commandments of the first table hang upon it. This is not because love includes the forms of the other commandments, but because it is the substance of all obedience. He who loves God with all his heart, will not only feel it his duty to obey God, but will find it his highest pleasure. Supreme love to God will induce obedience to all God's known commands. The way is now prepared for an inquiry into what this first and great commandment requires. This inquiry must be started with the question, what is love to God? Love to God is a complex mental state, including several exercises and emotions of the soul.

I. It is an emotion of admiration, which is produced when the intelligence conceives of God's intrinsic and eternal excellence, It is not affirmed that a lone cold view of intelligence, however clear it may be, will produce this emotion; there must be something more, as will soon be seen, but it is insisted that it is never produced without it. If it were otherwise, love would be blind, and one could love the devil as well as God, if no conception of intrinsic moral worth were necessary in order to the required love. Intelligence cannot love what is not, or does not appear, in its view, to be excellent. How can an intelligent mind love what does not appear, in its view, to be good and lovely? From this it follows.

1. That love to God implies some knowledge of his perfections, some appreciation of the intrinsic excellence of his character. This view of the divine excellence is doubtless very limited in the wisest and best of men, yet it is clear enough, or may be so rendered, as to lay universal humanity under obligation to love God. Paul and Barnabas, Acts 14: 16, 17, while persuading the heathen, who had no written law, not to sacrifice to them, speak as follows, of God and his universal Providence: "Who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways. Nevertheless, he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness."

The idea of God, once existing in the mind, all the current blessings of life must be regarded as bounties distributed by his liberal hand, and as proofs of his goodness. Be this as it may, love to God cannot exist without some knowledge of his character.

2. Love to God, both as a duty, and as a felicitous exercise of mind, implies the duty of seeking to know God. As love to God depends upon an appreciation, to some extent at least, of his perfect character, and can exist only so far as we know God, the duty to love God implies the duty of seeking to know him. This then is one of the first duties we owe to God, to inquire after him, and in the use of all the means and powers we possess, to make ourselves acquainted with him, and to learn his character and his will. One of the most terrible crimes that was ever charged upon erratic humanity, is set forth, when Paul says of the corrupt heathen, "they did not like to retain God in their knowledge." The love of God depending upon our conception of his goodness or excellence in himself, love will beget a desire to know more of him, and increased knowledge of him will awaken a deeper and stronger emotion of admiration which has been affirmed to be one of the essential elements of love to God. It is our duty to study to know God, to know more of God. Think of God; think of his attributes and his character. Study them. Study them in the light of his works; "the heavens declare his glory; study them in the light of his Providence; study them in the light of his word. Behold divinity developing its attributes, in the redemption of a lost world by Jesus Christ:

"Here the whole Deity is known—
Nor dares a creature guess,
Which of the glories brightest shone,
The justice or the grace."

3. From the above it must follow, that if we love God at all, we shall love him with an intensity proportioned to our knowledge of his character, and the clearness of our conception of his absolute perfection. We are therefore bound to seek to know God as a means of loving him, and of becoming like him. Love has a reflex action upon the heart that loves. Love being what it has thus far been described to be, will be felt in proportion to the clearness of our conception of God's eternal excellence which awakens the emotion, and the reflex action upon the heart will be in proportion to the intensity of the love, or the emotion of admiration awakened. If the light be clear, the emotion deep, and the soul's moral eye be fixed steadily and intensely on God, the divine image will be more clearly and perfectly daguerreotyped upon the heart.

4. The view already taken of love includes the idea of approval. Some make this a distinct point, but it is certain that admiration includes the act of approval. This approval is not a mere sanction of the divine character in the abstract, but regards the developments of that character, as seen in the principles and administration of his government. The soul that truly loves God approves of the character of God, of his Providence, of his plan of salvation, and of its conditions and entire economy. So far as the intelligence can comprehend the ways of God, the one undivided feeling of the soul is, " he hath done all things well."

5. Love to God also includes the feeling of delight. This has been made a distinct element of love by some writers, but it is clearly comprehended in admiration, which is the first leading attribute of love. Take from admiration the feeling of approval and delight, and it will degenerate into mere wonder. This delight which is involved in the act of loving God, renders the soul that loves, happy in proportion to the intensity of the love exercised. This will produce a desire for communion with God, and lead to a use of all the means to promote it.

II. Love to God is a feeling and sentiment of good will, commonly expressed by the word, benevolence. Some writers contend that we are to love God with the love of complacence only, and not with the love of benevolence, but this appears to result from their confounding the principle and feeling of benevolence with the more common circumstances among men which call for its practical development. Men are accustomed to contemplate benevolence in connection with want and suffering to be relieved, and so to associate it with the exercise of compassion, that it is difficult for them to conceive of the exercise of benevolence towards God, who is infinitely and eternally happy and glorious in himself. It is admitted that we cannot exercise benevolence towards God, as we do towards men when we are moved by a feeling of pity to relieve their suffering, but the principle of benevolence has a deeper and more abiding place in the heart than these mere ebullitions of pity at the sight of human misery. It cannot be denied that benevolence, as a principle, may exist in the heart, where there is neither means or occasion for its practical development. The heart of a man of means may be full of benevolence, when there are none within his reach who need relief; and the heart of the destitute may be full of benevolence when they have no means to relieve the suffering, Nor can it be denied that the most destitute and helpless man can exercise a feeling of good will towards his good, wealthy and prosperous neighbor, whom he has no power to

benefit or injure. So far as God's unchangeable character, happiness and essential glory are concerned, it is not so clear that we can exercise benevolence towards him, beyond a mere approval which has been included under another head. It may appear reasonable that our obligation to exercise benevolence, is limited to our sphere as moral instrumentalities for good, but in this aspect; we sustain a relation to God, and to the development of his glory, and the success of his scheme of schemes for redeeming and saving the world. We cannot add to God's essential glory, but we make that glory known, and thereby add to what has been called his declarative glory. God's heart of hearts is engaged in his great enterprise of redeeming and renovating the world, and we have it in our power to act as co-workers with God, in the accomplishment of his benevolent plan.

To exercise benevolence towards God, is, then, to wish well, to wish success to all his plans, because they are his plans, emanating from his allwise and benevolent mind, and not merely for the sake of man, whose happiness they regard. In view of what has been said, two remarks appear called for.

1. The above described element of love to God, appears to be the life and power of Christian zeal.

Some Christians may pray and sing because it makes them feel happy, nor may any one affirm that it is wrong to desire to be happy, or to enjoy happiness in devotion; yet the love of present happiness is not the highest motive to Christian zeal. Some may give, and pray, and labor to save souls, and it is right so to do, but the salvation of souls, important as it is, considered only as a good to the saved, is not the only motive to Christian zeal. The feeling of benevolence towards God, which has been described as included in love to God, brings us into sympathy with his mind, his will, his purposes, and his zeal, and makes the soul pant for the extension of his glory, the success of his plans, and the subjugation of the world to his moral scepter. It is not easy to see from what other view of love to God, the highest degree of intelligent Christian zeal can arise.

2. This benevolence or good will toward God, will show itself in the use of all appropriate means within our power to promote his cause.

III. Love to God incites gratitude. But what is gratitude? It is the pleasing emotion which is awakened by some benefit bestowed. It includes three things.

1. A belief in the good design, the benevolent intention of the giver. A gift ever so valuable in itself, would not excite the slightest degree of gratitude, if believed to be bestowed from an evil intention.

2. A proper appreciation of the gift. It must be conceived of as valuable in fact, or as adapted to promote our happiness.

3. Joy at the reception of the gift. This last emotion appears to be a necessary attendant of the two former.

Such being the nature of gratitude, and it being a fundamental element of love to God it follows:

1. That love to God is a sequence of God's apprehended love to us. It supposes a sense of God's goodness to us personally. It does not arise on any general view of God's goodness to the universe, or to our race, only as we feel ourselves to be personal partakers of the benefit. It is not necessary to discuss the question, whether or not any being, in any circumstances, can feel the emotion of love without a sense of benefit received from the object to be loved; we know that in the case of fallen men, they do not. It may be affirmed with the greatest certainty that a sinner was never conscious of exercising true love to God, until he first felt God's pardoning mercy exercised towards him, and his love shed abroad in his heart. Then and not till then he is conscious of loving God. This is settled by an inspired apostle, 1 John 4: 19. "We love him because he first loved us; "not that we first love him, as a means of exciting his love towards us.

2. Love to God, including as it does, the emotion of gratitude, must necessarily prompt us to all obedience. Gratitude disposes the mind exercised by it, to make all possible return for benefits received. Here it is that love becomes the moving power of all obedience. It is true that man cannot bestow upon God, a benefit proportioned to the blessings received, yet he can feel his obligation of gratitude, and acknowledge it by devoting his ransomed powers to God, his Creator and Redeemer. As the benefit received is the value of his existence twice told, bestowed, first, in creation, and secondly, in his redemption, the impulse of gratitude, when once awakened, must impel us to consecrate ourselves entirely to God, now and forever. Thus is it seen that love to God is the moving power of all obedience.

IV. Love to God, includes trust in him, which never exists, only in connection with absolute submission to God. These may appear to some minds to be distinct duties, but it appears that submission is an essential element of that trust which we are required to repose in God. If it were affirmed that submission is possible without trust, it would then only be the submission of despair; but it cannot be affirmed that trust in God is possible without submission.

To trust in God is to repose confidence in him, confidence in his goodness to provide, in his wisdom to guide, and in his power to defend, and to feel safe in so doing. But this necessarily includes submission, the entire and absolute surrender of the heart to him. How can we trust him, unless we surrender ourselves into his hands? It is written, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me. "All other gods, powers, influences and trusts, must be renounced and shaken off, and the heart must give up everything which would hold it back from God; the heart must yield everything which God forbids, and purpose everything which God commands. The heart cannot be said to trust God while anything is kept back, while its affections run in another direction. The thought is well expressed by the apostle, when he says, "Let them that suffer according to the will of God, commit the keeping of their souls to him in well doing, as unto a faithful Creator." 1. Peter 4: 19. That this trust is implied in loving God, cannot be denied. In view of the divine attributes,

love to God, necessarily includes this trust in him; to feel a want of trust, would be to feel a want of love.

V. Love to God necessarily inspires devotion; it includes the heart exercise of worship. It will not be pretended that acceptable worship can be rendered to God, without having the heart under the controlling influence of love to him. Nor will it be maintained that there are any who love God who do not worship him in some form. But what is worship? Christian worship is the heart engaged, making expression of its love to God, through appropriate forms of adoration, homage, reverence, prayer, thanksgiving and praise.

There can be no doubt that the first commandment imposes the obligation of worship, yet as it has its visible forms, and demands that there be seasons set apart for exercise therein, it will be necessary to devote more particular attention to it as a distinct duty.

The first commandment has now been examined, and it has been seen in what sense the other commandments hang upon it. If it were carried out in the exercise of supreme love to God, it would necessarily secure obedience to all the other commandments. Love to God is a duty which must pervade and enter into the performance of every other duty, and having discussed this universal all comprehensive duty, the way is prepared to consider some of the more particular and formal duties which we owe to God.

SECTION II.

Reverence and fear of God.

Reverence and fear are joined in the title of this section, because they are so connected as to require them to be considered together. There may be fear without reverence, but there can be no reverence without fear. True reverence is fear tempered and softened by love; or fear mingled with respect and esteem. It is our duty to fear God. But before proceeding further to explain the duty of fearing God, it is proper to notice a text which some have supposed entirely contradicts and subverts the doctrine of fear. It is 1 John 4: 18: "There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear; because fear hath torment. He that feareth, is not made perfect in love. "

There can be no doubt that perfect love casts out fear, and it may be true as some quote the text, erroneously, perfect love casteth out all fear; but it is true, only of the kind of fear of which the apostle was speaking. What this fear was may be learned from the preceding verse.

"Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the Day of judgment: because as he is, so are we in this world."

Boldness in the Day of Judgment stands opposed to the fear which is cast out by perfect love. It is, then, the fear of being condemned in the Day of Judgment that love casts out. This fear is the result of a want of sufficient evidence of our acceptance with God, but perfect love will give the clearest evidence of this important fact, and hence, it will

remove all fear of the judgment, but it will not remove that virtuous fear of God which the Scriptures everywhere teach.

That it is our duty to fear God, with a submissive, holy, reverential awe, cannot be doubted by those who read the Scriptures. It will require but a few texts to prove that God has commanded mankind to stand in fear of him. Moses told the Israelites, Deut. 4: 10: "The Lord said unto me, Gather me the people together, and I will make them hear my words, that they may learn to fear me all the days that they shall live upon the earth, and that they may teach their children."

Deut. 28: 58: "If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD; Then the Lord will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plagues of thy seed, even great plagues, and of long continuance, and sore sicknesses, and of long continuance."

Prov. 1: 7: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge: but fools despise wisdom and instruction."

Chap. 8: 13: "The fear of the Lord is to hate evil: pride, and arrogancy, and the evil way, and the froward mouth, do hate."

Chap. 16: 6: "By mercy and truth iniquity is purged; and by the fear of the Lord men depart from evil."

Eccle. 8: 12: "Though a sinner do evil a hundred times, and his days be prolonged, yet surely, I know that it shall be well with them that fear God, which fear before him"

Mall. 3: 16, 17: "Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another; and the Lord hearkened, and heard it: and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name. And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels: and I will spare them, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him."

Jesus Christ taught men to fear God.

Luke 12: 4, 5: "And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom you shall fear: Fear him which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him."

2 Cor. 7: 1: "Having, therefore, these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

Acts 9: 31: "Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria, and were edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied."

Heb. 12: 28, 29: "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear: For our God is a consuming fire."

The above are only a part of the texts which teach that it is our duty to fear God and that the fear of God exerts a salutary influence upon the lives of men. The proof is clear, and it is only necessary to add a brief explanation of the subject.

1. This fear of God, which is commanded, and which is a virtue, should be distinguished from the fear which the wicked feel.

The wicked are often in great fear of God, but their fear is a very different thing from that which God requires, and which the pious feel. The fear which the wicked have of God, is connected with hatred of God. Yes, Paul calls sinners, "haters of God." But the fear which the pious feel, is connected with love, which tempers it, and softens it into a deep reverential awe.

The fear which the wicked feel, is connected with a sense of guilt, which awakens a dread of punishment. They fear God because they know that they are guilty and deserve to be punished, and know that "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness, and all unrighteousness of men." (Rom. 1: 18.) But the fear which the pious feel, is connected with such a view of his character as a moral governor, such a sense of his eternal excellence and infinite perfection, that they fear to offend him, as a just being fears to do wrong. The fear which the wicked feel is like that which is felt for an enemy, who is able to crush us with his power; for the wicked feel that God is their foe. But the fear which the pious feel, is like that which a devoted child feels for a wise, tender and beloved parent it is a deep veneration, which is a happy compound of fear, affection, and confidence. The fear of the wicked is that which hath torment; but the fear of the pious is connected with peace, joy and assurance. These commingled emotions constituting the fear of God which Christians feel, do not at all times maintain the same equilibrium; when a clear view is obtained of God's infinite love to humanity and the realities of redemption, and assurance of acceptance with God, are realized in the soul, the impulse of love appears to break through the limit: fixed around the mount upon which God descends, and the soul basks in the sunshine of his unclouded favor. At another time, when a stronger view is obtained of God's infinite greatness and awful majesty, the soul seeks a back ground position to enjoy the opening vision of the throne, and the song of praise trembles upon the lips of devotion. It is, then, that the soul looks back from God upon itself and sings,

"Earth from afar hath heard thy fame, and worms have learnt to lisp thy name, But oh! the glories of thy mind leave all our soaring thoughts behind!

"God is in heaven, and men below:
Be short our tunes; our words be few!
A solemn reverence checks our songs.

And praise sits silent on our tongues."

2. The fear of God, as it has been described, is most obviously suited to our relation to him, and should be constantly and earnestly cultivated.

God is eternal and infinite in all his attributes, and awful in majesty. It is not possible for man's finite mind to conceive of infinite greatness, power, wisdom and majesty. God cannot communicate an idea of his own infinity, because it would require an infinite capacity to receive it, which is impossible. Some of the most sublime and awful descriptions of the divine majesty are found in the Scriptures, yet these are only the measure of finite minds, for God cannot reveal himself beyond the capacity of man to receive and communicate. It may help our views of God to look at some of these outbeamings of inspired eloquence.

"Blessed be thy glorious name, which is exalted above all blessing and praise. Thou, even thou, art Lord alone: thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all things that are therein, the seas, and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all; and the host of heaven worshippeth thee."

"Canst thou by searching find out God, canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do, deeper than hell; what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea. If he cut off, and shut up, or gather together, then who can hinder him? Hell is naked before him, and destruction hath no covering. He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing. He bindeth up the waters in his thick clouds; and the cloud is not rent under them. He holdeth back the face of his throne, and spreadeth his cloud upon it. He hath compassed the waters with bounds, until the day and night come to an end. The pillars of heaven tremble, and are astonished at his reproof. He divideth the sea with, his power, and by his understanding he smiteth through the proud. By his spirit he hath garnished the heavens; his hand hath formed the crooked serpent. Lo, these are parts of his ways; but how little a portion is heard of him; but the thunder of his power who can understand."

"Bless the Lord, O my soul. O Lord my God, thou art very great; thou art clothed with honor and majesty: Who coverest thyself with light as with a garment; who stretcheth out the heavens like a curtain; Who layeth the beams of his chambers in the waters; who maketh the clouds his chariot; who walketh upon the wings of the wind; Who maketh his angels spirits; his ministers a flaming fire."

"Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance? Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or, being his counselor, hath taught him? With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and showed to him the way of understanding? Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance: behold, he taketh up the isles as a very little thing. And

Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt-offering. All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing and vanity. To whom then will ye liken God, or what likeness will ye compare unto him?"

"God is jealous, and the Lord revengeth; the Lord revengeth, and is furious: the Lord will take vengeance on his adversaries, and he reserveth wrath for his enemies. The Lord is slow to anger, and great in power, and will not at all acquit the wicked: the Lord hath his way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet. He rebuketh the sea, and maketh it dry, and drieth up all the rivers: Bashan languisheth, and Carmel, and the flower of Lebanon languisheth. The mountains quake at him, and the hills melt, and the earth is burnt at his presence, yea, the world, and all that dwell therein. Who can stand before his indignation, and who can abide in the fierceness of his anger, his fury is poured out like fire, and the rocks are thrown down by him."

"God came from Teman, and the Holy One from mount Paran. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. Before him went the pestilence, and burning coals went forth at his feet. He stood and measured the earth: he beheld, and drove asunder the nations; and the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow: his ways are everlasting. I saw the tents of Cushan in affliction: and the curtains of the land of Midian did tremble. The mountains saw thee, and they trembled; the overflowing of the water passed by: the deep uttered his voice, and lifted up his hands on high. The sun and moon stood still in their habitation: at the light of thine arrows they went, and at the shining of thy glittering spear."

The above are six extracts from six different pens, the oldest of which was written more than three thousand years ago. They come infinitely short of impressing our minds with a true sense of the attributes of the Eternal God, yet are they calculated to excite a reverential awe.

When we have arrived at as clear, and enlarged views of God as we can, let us think of ourselves as sustaining a relation to this infinite Jehovah. And what is a man amid all the works of God? A mere speck of existence amid universal being, floating upon the surface of an hour. To God are we indebted for the existence we have, and all the blessings we enjoy. The relation of man to God is not only that of creature to Creator, but that of weakness, ignorance and unworthiness, to infinite power wisdom and holiness. Again, man sustains the relation of accountability to God, as his moral Governor. For every thought, feeling, word and act, he has to render an account. The omniscient eye of God is upon him every moment, in every place, noting every foot-step, and every thought, and every emotion of his heart. If we could keep these thoughts constantly in our minds it would suppress all irreverence and profanity, and inspire the most profound reverential awe. Such a constant sense of the divine presence and of accountability to him, appears to be what Paul attributed to Moses, when he says, "he endured as seeing him who is invisible. "

3. It should be remarked in conclusion, that the fear of God, as it has been described, stands opposed to irreverence and profanity, which is interdicted by the third

commandment. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain: for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain. "If men feared God, as the Bible requires, there would be no profane swearing, no unhallowed use of the name of their Maker. As the fear of God is a solemn duty, so is profanity a fearful crime.

SECTION III.

The Duty of Prayer.

Prayer to God is one of the most solemn and important duties commanded in the Scriptures, and demands a serious and careful investigation. There are a number of questions involved, which must be noticed, to give a full and clear view of the subject.

I. What is prayer?

Prayer is the act of asking God for such things as we desire for ourselves and others, which are according to his will. Dr. Dwight says prayer is composed of "Adoration, Confession, Petition, and Thanksgiving." It is true that these are likely to be embraced in the form of all extended prayers, and it is most natural that they should. It is in the highest degree appropriate to employ them all when we address the Supreme Being on all occasions of formal worship.

In attempting to present our desires to God, in the form of a request or petition, God is brought directly before the mind, and how natural, how appropriate is it, on attempting to bring the eye of the mind to look God in the face, that the attempt be made with a deep feeling, and some form of adoration? So if we ask God to forgive our sins, and pardon our short comings, it appears almost impossible that it should be done, without confessing them, even beyond the confession which is implied in the petition for a pardon. In like manner, if we ask God for continued or increased grace, in any form of a blessing, how natural and how appropriate to accompany the petition with thanks for the blessings which we have already received at his hand. This is all true, and all admitted, but it still appears that it is what Dr. Dwight calls "petition," asking, that constitutes the prayer. It must appear that prayer is offered, under some circumstances, in which the mind is not conscious of any exercise or emotion of either adoration or thanksgiving, and in such case, it is the asking that constitutes the prayer. Prayer, then, may exist without being accompanied by any conscious adoration or thanksgiving, but adoration and thanksgiving, in ever so lively exercise, do not constitute prayer, without petition or asking God for what we desire. When Peter found himself sinking, and cried out, "Lord save or I perish," his mind did not go through any formal states of adoration and thanksgiving. This remark will apply to a large number of occasions for ejaculatory prayer. It is also true that prayer is, in Scripture language, expressed by the terms, calling upon God, but it is never described by the expression, adoring God.

Gen. 4: 26: "Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord." Chap. 21: 33: "And Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba, and called there on the name of the Lord, the everlasting God."

Rom. 10: 13: "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."

1 Cor. 1: 2: "All that in every place call upon Jesus Christ our Lord."

Prayer is also called asking. Christ says, " Matt. 7: 7: "Ask, and it shall be given you." Again, in giving directions in regard to prayer, he said, chap. 6: 8: "Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask him." Chap. 21: 22: "All things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall have."

Luke 11: 13: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your if children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" John 14: 14; "If ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it." Chap. 16: 24; "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full."

James 1: 5; "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him."

1 John 5: 14; "And this is the confidence that we have in him, that, if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us."

The above Scriptures have been adduced for the simple purpose of presenting prayer in its true light; it is calling upon God, it is asking God for such things as we need, and as he has promised to give. It is not promised that if we adore, or if we render thanks, we "shall be saved," or that we "shall receive," but to such as "call," or "ask," is the promise made. Adoration and thanksgiving are usually joined with prayer, but they appear to be distinct acts of worship, which may be performed without prayer, and it is the calling, and the asking which constitutes the prayer. That adoration and thanksgiving will be rendered to God in heaven, after our prayers shall be exchanged for praise, and our complaints, for songs of joy, there can be no doubt. But it is evident that prayer, that is, calling upon God, asking God for favors, implies something more than merely asking in a form of words. There have, no doubt, been many forms of words addressed to God, asking for the most appropriate things, in most appropriate words, in which there was no prayer, for want of the mental and moral element of prayer. This renders it necessary to point out more particularly the nature of acceptable prayer, which is acceptable to God, such as God will answer.

1. There must be a true and deep sense of our want, our spiritual poverty and helplessness. Calling upon God, asking God for gifts without a sense of needing them, without feeling that we must have them or perish, would be mockery. Such prayers in the ear of God would be empty words, and our hearts must remain just as empty after repeating them as before.

2. There must be a clear apprehension of God's universal presence and everywhere operating Providence. This thought is of more importance than some may be willing to allow on first thought. If men call under the impression that God is somewhere else, they

may call as loud as the priests of Baal, and with no better success. True prayer contains the idea of a present God of infinite fullness.

3. Calling upon God must be accompanied by a heart abandonment of all sin. There must be such a submission to God as is implied in a purpose of heart to forsake every sin, and do every duty. Without this state of mind, no prayer can be offered that will reach the ear of God. This is settled by inspiration.

Psa. 66: 18; "If I regard iniquity in my heart the Lord will not hear me."

By iniquity, is meant sin of any kind and degree. No matter how great or how small, how many or how few, where there is sin there is iniquity. To regard iniquity in the heart, is to cherish it, by a consent to its existence, by a purpose to practice it, or a desire for its indulgence. We may regard iniquity in our hearts in various ways.

(1) We may regard iniquity in our hearts by a simple want of effort to search it out and expel it. Indifference is a crime; not to search the heart and war against all sin in it, is to give it aid and comfort, to cherish it.

(2.) We may regard iniquity in our hearts, by a consent of the will that it remain there. The consent of the will may be a tacit consent—consent by silence. We may know that sin is at work in our hearts, and not cry out to God against it, and oppose it.

(3.) We may regard iniquity in our hearts by a direct purpose to practice it, as occasion or opportunity may offer. No doubt many have lived for years in the indulgence of a secret purpose to commit particular sins, which they never committed only in heart, for want of an occasion or opportunity.

(4.) We may regard iniquity in our hearts by cherishing a desire for the indulgence of sin, and by even regarding it as desirable, without committing the act. There are many whose principles, whose love of virtue or hatred of vice, do not restrain them, who are restrained by the fear of detection and the dread of consequences. Such are like the boy who looks wishfully over the fence as he passes the fruit garden, and would rob it, if he dared so to do.

(5.) We may regard iniquity in our hearts by a deliberate purpose of neglecting duty. We may sin by omitting what we ought to do, as well as by doing what we ought not to do.

4. To pray acceptably, and to receive an answer to prayer, we must ask for such things only as are according to the will of God. The fact that we may err on this point, renders it important to offer our prayers on all subjects where there is a possibility of erring, with the expressed or implied submission, "not my will, but thine be done." Some things we know are according to the will of God; we know that it is God's will to grant personal salvation to all who pray for it in sincerity. No man, when he prays in sincerity for personal salvation, prays against sin, and for preservation from perdition, can with propriety say, "not my will, but thine be done." In such a case, such words would be the very

language of unbelief, or strong doubt, to say the least. But in regard to many things for which it is proper to pray, as a general principle, it may not be consistent in particular cases that God should hear the prayer. So all prayers must come within the general rules which God has given us to guide our conduct. The condition of successful prayer, is stated thus by St. John.

1. John 5: 14; "And this is the confidence we have in him, that if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us." What then are the general rules for asking according to his will?

(1.) The will of God must restrict answer to prayer to what is for our good. What is for our good God is the best judge. We ought not to desire the privilege of asking what God sees is not for our good. Persons often honestly desire what would ruin them. We cannot tell, in advance, the influence, which certain possessions, positions and attainments, would have upon our piety.

(2.) The will of God must limit answers to prayer to what is in harmony with the laws, moral and physical, which he has established for the government of the universe. It is better that a person who violates the laws of his nature, should be sick, than that God should keep him well in answer to prayer by suspending those laws, and thus indulging him in their willful violation. It is better that an idle man should have no harvest, than for God to give him one in answer to prayer, without labor. It is better that a soul should perish, than that God should save it in answer to prayer in violation of one of the principles of his moral government.

(3.) The will of God must restrict answers to prayer to what is in harmony with the good of the whole moral universe. God is the righteous moral governor of the whole. If God should save one soul in answer to prayer, in violation of the moral law which he has established for the government of mind, it would subvert his government. If God should go outside of the plan of redemption to grasp and save a soul, in answer to our prayers, it would not only subvert the plan, but might throw the moral universe into confusion. If angels see us, and know when one sinner repents, as they clearly do, the eyes of a thousand worlds may be on us.

But some things are according to his will, and these we may ask for and receive. To earn what they are, we must go to his word, and consult the record of his will, and of his promises the following items are named.

(1.) The forgiveness of our own sins. It is the will of God to pardon every sinner of every class and degree, if they ask through faith in Jesus Christ. "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." Isa. 55: 7.

(2.) The sanctification of the soul is according to the will of God.

"This is the will of God, even your sanctification." 1 Thes. 4: 3.

"And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it." 1 Thes. 5: 23, 24.

(3.) Temporal blessings, as food and raiment. " Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you." Matt. 6: 33. "Give us this day our daily bread." Matt. 6: 11.

(4.) Comfort and support under all our trials.

"As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing." 2 Cor. 6: 10.

"Is any among you afflicted, let him pray." James 5: 13.

(5.) Wisdom, grace and strength to do our duty. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him." James 1: 5.

(6.) Success in our efforts to promote the work of God, in the salvation of others, so far as God can save others, consistently with the terms of the Gospel, and the freedom of the human will. God will move upon the minds of sinners in answer to the prayers of his saints, if they have faith. Sinners can and often do resist, but some will yield when God moves. These are but some of the things included within the will of God in regard to prayer.

5. Prayer must have the crowning virtue of faith. Faith was so fully explained under the head of justification by faith, that but little need be said in this place.

An experienced Christian's faith ought to rise higher in degree, and comprehend a wider range of objects than simple justifying faith, exercised at the time of conversion. Its principle element of power is strong confidence in God, in his promises made in Christ Jesus, and this is attained by living near to God, walking with God, communing with him in prayer.

II. The obligation to pray is clear and universal. All mankind are required to pray.

1. God has commanded us to pray in his word. To adduce all the proof texts on this point, would be to transcribe a large portion of the Scriptures. A few decisive passages will be sufficient.

Isa. 56: 7; "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all people."

Psa. 65: 2; "O thou that hearest prayer, unto thee shall all flesh come."

Isa. 55: 6; "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near."

Matt. 6: 9; "After this manner therefore pray ye."

Luke 18: 1; "He spake a parable unto them to this end, that men ought always to pray and not to faint."

Eph. 6: 18, 19; "Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints; and for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the Gospel."

Phil. 4: 6; "Be careful for nothing; but in everything by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your request be made known unto God."

Col. 4: 2; "Continue in prayer, and watch in the same with thanksgiving."

1. Thes. 5: 17; "Pray without ceasing."

1 Tim. 2: 1, 2, 3, 8; "I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men. For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior. I will therefore that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting."

The above texts are sufficient to prove, beyond a doubt, that the duty of prayer is enjoined in the Scriptures.

2. We have the example of the pious of all ages to enforce the duty of prayer, and to stimulate us in its performance. A few examples from the patriarchs will be in place. These are important, as they are gathered from a period when there was no written law as is supposed, but when God talked with men.

Gen. 12: 7, 8; "And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, unto thy seed will I give this land: and there builded he an altar unto the Lord, who appeared unto him. And he removed from thence unto a mountain on the east of Bethel, and pitched his tent, having Bethel on the west, and Hai on the east; and there he builded an altar unto the Lord, and called upon the name of the Lord."

Gen. 13: 3, 4; "And he went on his journeys from the south, even to Beth-el, unto the place where his tent had been at the beginning, between Bethel and Hai. Unto the place of the altar, which he had made there at the first: and there Abram called on the name of the Lord."

From the above it appears that Abram was a man of prayer. Let us now look at the life of Isaac. It is said of him when he removed to Beersheba, Gen. 26: 25; "And he builded an

altar there, and called upon the name of the Lord, and pitched his tent there: and there Isaac's servants digged a well."

Jacob pursued the same course of building altars and of calling upon God, as will be seen by referring to Gen. 33: 18-20, and 35: 1-7.

That David and Solomon, Elijah and all the prophets were men of prayer, no one can doubt who consults the sacred record. That John the Baptist taught his disciples to pray we have undoubted proof, Luke 11: 1; and that Christ led a life of prayer, is equally plain.

If an apostolic example needs to be added, we have it set forth in the words of Paul. 1 Thes. 3: 10; "Night and day praying exceedingly that we might see your face, and might perfect that which is lacking in your faith?"

At the present day, those who maintain prayer, as a habit of life, and those alone, are admitted by common consent to be the pious of earth.

3. The duty of prayer has its foundation in reason, and may be seen to be suited to our relation to God, and wonderfully adapted to the other parts of the economy of Gospel salvation, and suited to promote piety and devotion.

(1.) Prayer is suited to the relation we sustain to God. God is the author of all being, and the source of all blessedness; while we are his creatures, receiving all the good we enjoy, from him. He is independent, possessing all fullness in himself; while we are dependent, helpless, destitute, and unworthy of the least of his favors, rendering every good we receive at his hand, a mercy unmerited by us.

2.) Prayer, in its very exercise, is admirably adapted to preserve a knowledge of the true God, and to keep man's erratic mind from running into idolatry. It has been seen that prayer implies an apprehension of God's universal presence and everywhere operative power. To pray is to bring God directly before the mind, in all the infinity of his attributes, so far as the human mind can grasp an idea of the infinite God. Assign to prayer no higher sphere than a simple mental exercise, and it must be clear that the mind could not exercise itself in any more effectual way, to preserve its own right idea and feeling of the eternal God. Some writers object to allowing that prayer has any efficiency in itself, to improve the moral condition of the mind, and yet they would not hesitate to recommend contemplation, as a means of promoting a right state of mind. On the same principle may an honest effort to bring the mind into sympathy with God in prayer, tend to shut out an intrusive world, and quicken our apprehension of God, aside from any direct answer to our petitions.

(3.) The exercise of prayer must promote a sense of our dependence upon God, which it is all important to keep fully awake in the mind. It has been seen that prayer implies this sense of dependence, that there is no true prayer without it. This being the case, it must follow, upon the principles of mental philosophy, that to give expression to this sense of dependence in prayer, will tend to preserve and even increase this feeling of dependence;

while to restrain it, by allowing it no practical expression, will tend to cause it to die away.

(4.) Prayer, upon the principles advanced above, must tend to promote devotion. It will produce this result as a mere mental habit, allowing it to be performed with honesty of intention. Devotion to the world and constantly occupying the mind with worldly matters, will increase worldly mindedness; and so the constant habit of abstracting the mind from the matters of the world, and the putting forth of an effort to concentrate the thoughts and desires on God in prayer, must tend to lessen worldly mindedness, and increase a disposition to worship and a deeper feeling of devotion, when we attempt it.

(5.) Prayer, as a required duty, is peculiarly adapted to help the exercise of faith which, in the Gospel, is the fundamental condition of salvation. God has seen proper to offer salvation to sinners, in the Gospel through Jesus Christ, only on condition of faith. The exercise of prayer is the most suitable method of which the human mind can conceive, for the development of faith this, it would seem, the mind must apprehend, and feel in its own exercise, in attempting to believe unto righteousness.

It will be found a difficult matter to exercise saving faith in God through Jesus Christ, in the cool silent view which intelligence may take of the facts and interests involved, however clear that view may be. The mind feels the need of some exercise beyond an abstract effort to believe; it feels the want of some exercise, method, or form through which to put forth its effort to believe unto righteousness. This want is met in the required duty of prayer. Aside from the fact that it is a form and an exercise, in connection with which the mind puts forth its effort of faith, it is a bringing together in the mind, a view of God, to whom we pray; of Christ and his atonement, in whose name we pray; and the Holy Ghost, through whose assistance we pray; and our own un-worthiness, weakness and wants, in view of which we plead, all seen through the light of God's gracious promises. If we view prayer in this point of light, it is not possible for the mind to conceive of a more appropriate and powerful help to the exercise of faith.

(6.) The mental and moral state of the soul, which is necessary in order to offer acceptable prayer to God, as required in the Scriptures, is just that state which renders us proper recipients of his saving grace. Prayer is not designed to make God acquainted with our necessities; he knows what we need before we ask him. Prayer is not designed to persuade God, in a manner to induce a willingness on his part to have mercy upon us and bless us; he is already willing, or he would not have said to us, "ask and it shall be given you; ask, and receive, that your joy may be full." The reason why men are not blessed and saved, is, they refuse to let God bless and save them. They will not put themselves in a position before God so that he can save them, consistently with his moral government. God can no more save a sinner without the sinners own act of willing to be saved, and in the absence of a deep sense of the necessity of salvation, than he can dissolve the laws of his own moral universe, When the sinner comes within reach of God's economy, by willing to be saved in God's way, and by feeling a deep sense of the necessity of salvation, he will pray to God for it, and praying he will be saved, for " whosoever calleth upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."

God can no more save a prayerless soul, than a soul willing to be saved, feeling the necessity of salvation, deeply impressed with the guilt of sin, and groaning for deliverance, could live in that state without prayer.

These remarks have not been made because it is believed that the simple fact that God has commanded us to pray, is not sufficient, of itself, to make it our absolute duty so to do. In view of the established inspiration of the Scriptures, when a command is clear, as is the command to pray, there is no need of going behind the record of the command, to look for a binding obligation; yet, as there is an admitted difference between the fact that God has commanded a given act, and the reason for which he has commanded it, men will go behind the command and inquire after the reason. It may be right so to do, if it be conducted with proper respect for the authority of the written word, and so as not to lessen confidence in it, and to gratify this disposition to inquire into the reason of things, the above remarks have been made. It is believed the reasons given are true in themselves, whether they are the true reasons why God has commanded us to pray or not.

The reasons which have been assigned for the institution of prayer, must also serve as a sufficient answer to the objections which have sometimes been urged against prayer. These objections are based upon the fact that God is infinitely wise and good, and being so, will bestow upon us what is proper for us. If the preceding views are correct, no such objection can stand. They annihilate every objection of the class.

III. The times, seasons, and occasions for prayer demand attention.

The general duty of prayer, as urged in the Scriptures, must imply the obligation of maintaining a state of mind, at all times consistent with the exercise of prayer. Some express this idea by calling it "a praying frame of mind." Others denote it by the expression, "spirit of prayer." We ought so to live, and so to keep our minds, as to be able to engage in prayer at every moment. This may be what Paul means by the command to "pray without ceasing," beyond an injunction to attend to prayer at all appropriate set times. It may be regarded as a fixed principle, that he who goes where he cannot pray, goes where he has no business, and that he who allows himself to get into a mental state, in which he cannot bring his mind at once into the exercise of prayer, is in a position false to himself, and false to God. With the idea of the spirit prayer, perpetually pervading the mind, let us proceed to point out the seasons and occasions for its practical development.

1. There will arise in the experience of life, numberless times and occasions for momentary prayer, which cannot be arranged under any specific rule or division of time. When about our labor, when walking by the way, when sitting in our domestic circle, in the assembly of saints or of sinners, in the moment of surprise or danger, or in the moment of a happy occurrence or thought, we can send up our prayer to God. Prayers thus uttered, or thought without utterance, have been called "ejaculatory prayers." If the heart be kept right, such prayers may be kept playing upon the ear of God every minute in the day, without interfering with any of the lawful transactions of life:

"Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,
Utter'd, or unexpressed;
The motion of a hidden fire,
That trembles in the breast."

There are a number of examples of these ejaculatory prayers found in the Scriptures. A beautiful example is recorded of Joseph. When he saw his brother Benjamin, he said, "God be gracious to thee, my son."

2. Private or secret prayer is enjoined in the Scriptures. It is sufficient to appeal to Christ on this subject.

Matt. 6: 5, 6; "And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites *are*: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, they have their reward. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and, when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly."

On this important text it should be remarked,

(1.) It does not forbid public prayer, as some have pretended to understand it. It affirms only of those prayers which men offer to God by themselves, as individual acts of worship, without joining with others. It condemns the habit of selecting a public place for offering such prayers to God. It requires that all such prayers so far as may be, should be offered in seclusion.

(2.) It does not institute such prayers as a new thing, but takes it for granted that the practice of offering such prayers was common, and would continue so. At the same time, it adds to the custom the sanction and authority of Christ.

To the above may be added, the authority of Christ's example. At one time it is said, Matt. 14: 23; "When he had sent the multitude away, he went up into a mountain apart to pray."

At another time it is said, Mark. 1: 35; "In the morning, rising up a great while before day, he went out and departed into a solitary place, and there prayed."

Again, it is said, Luke 5: 16; "He withdrew himself into the wilderness and prayed." And in Chap. 6: 12; it is said, "It came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God. "

Other Scriptural authority might be adduced, but the above is sufficient to settle the question of the duty of secret prayer.

On the general duty of secret prayer, it may be remarked,

(1.) Every person, so far as circumstances will allow, should have some place which is to him his closet of prayer. The spirit of the command requires this. "Without it, prayer will be likely to be neglected.

(2.) As no time is settled by the word, for the performance of this duty, it demands a reasonable construction and application, in this particular, on the part of Christians. The fact that no law prescribes how many times, and at what hours secret prayer shall be performed, shows the wisdom of the Lawgiver. No rule could settle these points, which would not be impossible to some, or diminish devotion with others. These points are settled specifically by the law of Mahomet, and the result is, prayer with them, has become a mere form. It being left by Christ to be settled by the enlightened judgment, under a sense of accountability to God, and a general rule requiring secret prayer, which judgment will be made in view of surrounding circumstances, and the strength of the feeling of piety, the tendency is to promote the spirit of devotion more than any specific rule could do.

3. Family prayer demands attention. The obligation to maintain family prayer has been denied by some, on the ground of a want of an express command. To give force to the objection, it must be maintained that nothing is of binding obligation, for which an express command cannot be cited, This simple thought is sufficient to show that whether family prayer be obligatory or not, the objection does not prove that it is not, and that it is not safe to rely upon it as a justification for neglecting it. Many things are admitted to be duties, for which no specific command can be found. There is no explicit command for observing the Christian Sabbath, yet it will be made to appear that there is no want of obligation in regard to it. It is admitted that there is no command which says in so many words "thou shalt pray in thy family, in the morning and at evening." But the obligation so to do, is as certain and binding as it would be, if we had such command. But the reader, no doubt, is more anxious to see the proof than to hear it affirmed that it exists. The proof must be stated briefly.

(1.) Family worship is the original form of worship, was instituted before any written law was given, when God talked with men, and gave them oral directions, and it has never been repealed by any written law which ever has, or now exists. The worship of Abel could have been nothing more than family worship. During the entire patriarchal age, there is no distinct law found for public worship. Nor is there any very clear proof that it was maintained, while there is no want of proof that family worship was maintained in all the pious families of which we have any history.

Noah built an altar and worshipped God when he came out of the Ark. That was family worship. It was shown that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob built altars, and called upon the name of the Lord, in all places where they pitched their tents. These facts were noticed in the second division of the argument, in proof of the general duty of prayer, to which the reader is referred without repeating them. Those were all cases of family worship.

It is equally plain that Job had his family altar.

Job. 1: 4, 5; "And his sons went and feasted in their houses, every one his day; and sent and called for their three sisters, to eat and to drink with them. And it was so, when the days of their feasting were gone about, that Job sent and sanctified them, and rose up early in the morning, and officered burnt-offerings according to the number of them all: for Job said, It may be that my sons have sinned, and cursed God in their hearts. Thus did Job continually."

This was purely a family concern; the offerings were for his own family, and for no others. It is said that Job did this continually. If it should be supposed that verse 6, refers to a public assembly of good people to worship, it only strengthens the argument, by proving that Job had a family altar at the same time, when a public altar was maintained in the community. Be that as it may, it is certain that Job had his family altar, at which he and his sons worshipped, and where he is said to have sanctified them. It is clear then, beyond a doubt, that the worship of God, was, originally, family worship only. There was no law for public worship until the tabernacle was built. It must be plain that worship in the families of the patriarchs, was conducted under divine sanction, and authority, for God communed with them. But the establishment of public worship in the tabernacle, did not annul family worship. There is no such intimation upon the record, and the conclusion is, the duty to maintain family devotion, is just as binding on the head of every family now, as it ever was. This view, and the whole argument is strengthened, by the fact that the establishment of public worship in the tabernacle, and after-wards, in the temple, furnished only a single place of worship for a whole nation.

The Scriptures of the Old Testament contain no express law for public worship, except at the tabernacle and the temple. All the males were required to go to Jerusalem three times to worship during each year, but this cannot be supposed to be all the worship they performed. Synagogues are believed, not to have been opened in different cities and towns for instruction and worship, until after the return of the Jews from their captivity in Babylon, which was almost a thousand years after the erection of the tabernacle. Had they no forms and occasions of worship during this period, only what transpired at the national altar? It cannot be. Their worship must have been eminently a family worship, after the pattern of the patriarchs, which was its original character, and which has never been repealed. And it having been instituted among the patriarchs, by God himself, as may be presumed, and always having been practiced by pious families, it never needed any express command to institute it.

(2.) Family religion is most distinctly marked in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, as an essential part of the duties which humanity owes to God. God gives the following testimony to the good character of Abraham.

Gen. 18: 19; "For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him."

What is here affirmed Abraham would do, includes the worship of God. No man can be said to keep the way of the Lord who does not worship him. At that time there was no

house of God, no public altar, and that Abraham could do what it is affirmed he would do, without a domestic altar, and family worship, is impossible.

When God had given the Israelites a written law, and a formal religion, he at once impressed it upon the family institution, the fountain of public morals. Keep in mind the fact that the family was the only school, and the only place for religious instruction, that was or could be available to any considerable extent, and that instruction was oral, there being no books for the family, not even copies of the law, and there will be great force in the following command and directions.

Deut. 6: 1-9; "Now these are the commandments, the statutes, and the judgments, which the Lord your God commanded to teach you, that ye might do them in the land whither ye go to possess it: That thou mightest fear the Lord thy God, to keep all his statutes and his commandments which I command thee; thou, and thy son, and thy son's son, all the days of thy life; and that thy days may be prolonged. Hear therefore, O Israel, and observe to do it, that it may be well with thee, and that ye may increase mightily, as the Lord God of thy fathers hath promised thee, in the land that floweth with milk and honey. Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes, and thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates."

The worship of God is, beyond all doubt, included in what is here commanded. They were to teach their children God's law, even to love God with all their hearts. That could not be done without teaching them to worship God. Worship includes prayer, as one of its essential parts.

Again, they were to teach, and religious instruction should never be separated from prayer. This whole business is limited to the family, and that all this could be done without a family altar, and family prayer, is impossible. The command therefore, clearly contains what absolutely imposes the obligation to maintain family worship, as would a specific command.

The Passover was strictly a family institution, and was eaten by families, and not as a common public feast. Here then is a solemn religious rite, impressed upon the family as such, and every member of the family was required to take part in it. There are also incidental allusions to family religion. The family of Jesse had a family sacrifice yearly, as we learn from 1 Sam. 20: 6. So we read, 2 Sam. 6: 20, that "David returned to bless his household," after the performance of important public duties. This was a development of family religion. The history of the family transactions of Micah, recorded Judges, 17: is a dear exhibition of family religion. It is true it was a corrupt religion, but it proves the custom of maintaining family religion, and its corruption did not consist in its domestic character.

So when the prophet, Jeremiah 10: 25, cries to God, "Pour out thy fury upon the heathen that know thee not, and upon the families that call not on thy name," the language is clearly borrowed from the understood habit, of calling upon God in the family circle. In the light of these facts, it cannot be supposed that Christianity is divorced from the family institution, and that household worship may be wholly neglected, without any violation of its principles and spirit.

The Jewish religion was national, and comprehended every family of the nation in its sacrifices upon its national altar, but Christianity has no such central worship, to which all families sustain an equal relation. The sacrifices offered upon the altar at Jerusalem, were the sacrifices of every member of the nation, and the worship there offered, was on behalf of the whole nation, but there is no Christian worship of which this can be affirmed. Consider in the light of this fact, that the Jewish religion provided for daily worship. There was the morning and evening sacrifice, day by day continually. But Christians have no daily worship, unless it be celebrated at the altar of each family. When Christianity came and abolished the national altar, by which every family, and every individual was held in sympathy with daily devotion, it cannot be supposed that it repealed the obligation to worship God by families, and put out the fires that burned on family altars, or left the heads of families free to let them go out by neglect.

(3.) There are general principles asserted in the New Testament which imply the obligation to maintain family worship. The general duty of prayer is clear and is admitted. Some of the forms in which this general duty is asserted imply family prayer.

1 Tim. 2: 8; "I will therefore that men pray everywhere lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting.

The expression "lifting up holy hands," is clear proof that formal prayers are meant in contradistinction from mere ejaculations. The expression "everywhere," means, in every proper place. It may be affirmed that there is no place more appropriate for offering prayer, than in the family circle. This cannot be denied. The text therefore imposes an obligation to pray in our families, as clearly as it would if it named the family. If it does not command family prayer, it does not command prayer any where.

Eph. 6: 18; "Praying always with all prayer and supplication."

As the family prayer must be admitted to be appropriate in itself, the expression, "all prayer," must command it, or it commands no prayer. All prayer must mean all right and appropriate prayer, and family prayer is right and appropriate.

Phil. 4: 8; "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things."

Family prayer is true, honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report, and calculated to promote virtue of every kind.

Eph. 6: 4; "And, ye fathers provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

The nurture and admonition of the Lord must include worship. This command is not complied with, unless children are brought up in the habit of worshipping God. Moreover, a command to do a thing, includes the use of the best means to accomplish the end. But there is no one thing which parents can do, which will contribute so much in, the work of bringing up their children, in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, as to maintain daily family worship with them. It may be doubted, if parents can bring up their children, as required, without a family altar.

This argument might be much extended, but it is not necessary. The general usefulness of family prayer need not be argued for it will not be denied by Christians.

If the reader will consult Acts 10: 1, 2, 30, he will learn that there was in Cesarea, a pious Gentile, who feared God with all his house, and that he prayed in his house. Now if one who could have had no more light than the Jewish religion furnished, could have as much family religion, as appears to have been in the family of Cornelius, should not a Christian have enough to keep the form of family prayer?

4. Public prayer is most clearly enjoined. Public prayers have constituted a part of all religions always. It was common among the Jews, and was incorporated by the Apostles, as a part of Christian worship. It is agreed by all writers on the worship of the early Christians, that their meetings were commenced by offering prayers to God. It is also clear from some remarks made by Paul, that prayer constituted a considerable portion of public worship, and that the membership were accustomed to participate in it generally. 1 Cor. 11: 4, 5, and 14: 14-17.

As prayer is admitted to be a part of public worship, it need not be enlarged upon as a distinct duty, as public worship itself is of sufficient importance to entitle it to a separate consideration.

SECTION IV.

The Duty of Maintaining the Public Worship of God.

I. What is worship?

1. Worship, in its most restricted, and sacred sense, is the devotion of the heart to God. It includes the emotions of admiration, thanksgiving and praise. It is usually, if not always, accompanied with confession and prayer. In formal worship these are all blended. When the heart worships it will at proper times and places, find expression through external and visible forms and signs, such as attitudes of body and verbal expressions and songs. Yet it

should never be forgotten, that it is the emotion of the soul that renders worship acceptable to God.

Jesus said to the woman of Samaria, John 4: 23, 24; "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusalem, worship the Father. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

To say the least, worship is an exercise of the mind, requiring entire sincerity and pure and warm affection.

2. Worship, in a more general sense, is, the assembling of a professed Christian congregation for the purpose of giving and receiving religious instruction, and offering prayers, homage, thanksgiving and praise to God.

The usual exercises of such an assembly, in popular language, is called public worship. It may not be worship with all, but with some it is real worship. Preaching and hearing the Gospel is not worship in it self, in a strict sense, yet it may be rendered a help to worship, and we may worship God while preaching and hearing. In popular language, preaching the Gospel is included as a part of public worship, and there can be no doubt that religious instruction is one of the leading objects which Divine wisdom had in view in commanding public worship. Public instruction is connected with the worship of God in both the Old and New Testaments.

II. The obligation to maintain public worship, as above described.

The duty of maintaining public Christian assemblies is learned from various sources.

1. It was a settled principle in the Jewish economy, and it never has been repealed
2. The practice of weekly assemblies had the sanction of Christ's example.

It is said of him, Luke 4: 16; "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as the custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and stood up for to read."

He was always found in the public assemblies on the Jewish Sabbath.

3. The commission which he gave to his ministers, to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, implies an obligation to maintain public assemblies to hear it. The very men to whom this commission was given, availed themselves of all public assemblies, as far as they could, to execute their Lord's command, and they gathered congregations wherever they could, for the same purpose. It is not easy to see how the ministerial office can be made fully available, and its commission be fulfilled without public assemblies.

4. It is perfectly certain that the first Christians were in the habit of assembling for instruction and devotion, at least as often as once a week. This is clear from the Acts of the Apostles, and from various directions given in the Epistles. Indeed, the very name by which Christian communities are called, is derived from the fact of their coming together. The word church means congregation.

It is said of Paul and Barnabas, Acts 11: 26; "that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people."

5. Paul has, in one case, commanded public assemblies to be maintained.

Heb. 10: 25; "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is: but exhorting one another: and so much the more as ye see the day approaching."

As public worship came down from the preceding dispensation, and was never interrupted, as a general practice, specific commands to maintain it were not called for, but the faltering of some, under a storm of persecution which rendered attendance dangerous to liberty and life, called out a command in the above text.

6. Public worship might be urged from its influence upon public morals. There can be no doubt that a well sustained Christian temple in any community, will do more to suppress vice, than the so called temple of civil justice.

An enlightened and faithful ministry, with the occurring weekly Sabbath, will do more to diffuse correct religious principles and morals, than can be done in any other way with the same outlay of means.

As crippled as the Christian pulpit is, in these times, from its own defects, its power is felt and acknowledged. This is only a brief outline of the ground of our obligation to maintain public worship.

III. The mode of conducting public worship is worthy of consideration.

It is admitted that there are no specific rules for the regulation of public worship, in every particular. Nor may we be able to determine, in every particular, how it was conducted by the Apostles and their immediate successors. And if we could so ascertain the apostolic mode, it is not clear that we should be bound to follow it in every particular. They may have pursued a particular course, in regard to matters of no vital importance, which was dictated by the peculiar circumstances that surrounded them, when, had they been surrounded by our circumstances, they would have pursued a different course. Yet it must be admitted that the Scriptures contain general rules, and that apostolic example, on all fundamental matters, should be followed, so far as it can be ascertained.

1. Worship should at all times be so conducted as to render it solemn. The state of mind necessary to worship God, is inconsistent with rudeness or levity. These should never be indulged in the sanctuary.

2. Worship should always be conducted orderly. "God is a God of order, and not of confusion." It is true we may differ in regard to what true order demands, yet what is admitted to be disorder, should never be allowed in the house of God. In order to prevent confusion, there must be a head to preside over the worshipping assembly, and to conduct the exercise. Without this, but few if any Christian assemblies would be able to proceed long without falling into more or less disorder.

3. Worship should be conducted upon the most free and simple plan. The worship of the early Christians is said to have been very simple and unrestrained, all being allowed to occupy their gifts as time and circumstances permitted. It is very plain that the membership generally took part in the public exercises of ordinary Christian worship in the times of the Apostles. The manner in which Paul reprov'd the Corinthian church, renders it certain that their meetings were free and open to all.

1 Cor. 14: 26-32; "How is it then, brethren, when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying. If any man speak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course; and let one interpret. But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church: and let him speak to himself, and to God. Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge. If anything be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace. For ye may all prophecy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted. And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets."

It is certain that the evil of which the Apostle complains, could not have existed had not their meetings been conducted upon a perfectly free principle. It is also clear that he did not condemn the principle, but only the abuse of it. Had Paul held that the freedom of their meetings was wrong, he would have put that under the ban of his authority, which would have been the most effectual remedy, but he did no such thing, but told them, they might all prophecy one by one, that all might learn and all be comforted.

Prophesying denoted teaching, as well as foretelling. As religious instruction is one leading object of maintaining public assemblies, provision should be made for it, according to the state of general intelligence in the community, and the service should be conducted in accordance with such provision. Yet the people should never suppose that they can hire a minister to worship God for them. Every Christian must do his own praying, and if a church would maintain its vitality, it should so far adhere to primitive usage, as to have at least, one free service every Sunday, in which the membership generally may take a part.

4. Prayer was a leading part in the worship of the primitive church, and should be now, and always. Dr. Mosheim, says that the worship of the primitive churches was

commenced with prayer, and that other general prayers were offered, after the lesson of instruction, which consisted of the reading of a portion from the Scriptures, and a discourse from some preacher present. Of the character of the prayers offered, he says they were "the extemporaneous effusions of a mind glowing with divine love." — [Commentary, Vol. I. page 185.

Forms of prayer may, doubtless, be used under some circumstances, but it is very clear they were not in use in the first Christian churches, and their general use must tend to check the ardor of the heart, and render devotion formal.

5. Singing was doubtless employed in the worship of the early churches. There is no want of Scriptural sanction for the practice of singing, as a part of divine worship, and as it is practiced by all, except a few Friend Quakers, there is no need of an effort to prove it proper. It is a method of praising God, and is a great help to the spirit of worship. It may be employed as a medium of instruction, prayer and praise, and if well performed, may be rendered powerfully impressive to the human mind. Those who have the gift of song, are just as much bound to cultivate it, as they are to cultivate any other natural endowment.

SECTION V.

The Christian Sabbath.

As the subject of the Christian Sabbath is an important one, and one too, about which the Christian world has been divided, it will require to be noticed to some extent, and with a good degree of particularity.

Professed Christians are divided into four classes in regard to the Sabbath question.

1. Those who believe we are bound to observe the seventh day as a Sabbath, according to the law given by Moses. Those holding this view are a small, but respectable denomination of Christians.
2. Those who believe that Christianity has abolished the Jewish Sabbath, and that now there is no day designated by divine authority as a Sabbath.
3. Those who hold that a Sabbath is necessary, very important, and that the first day of the week is a very proper day to observe as a Sabbath, and that we ought to observe it, yet place it wholly upon the ground of expediency, and do not allow that it has been designated by divine authority.
4. Those who hold that the Sabbath, as an institution, exists, and is of moral obligation, but the day on which it is to be observed, has been changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, by divine authority.

This last, is the view taken by the great body of professed Christians, and is the view which is maintained in the arguments that follow. To do anything like justice to the subject, several points will have to be considered.

I. The Sabbath, as an institution, is based upon moral principle, which lies back of all positive law. This may be maintained, as a dictate of reason, and as an undeniable consequence of other established duties.

1. Man is naturally a religious being, and needs to worship God to meet the wants of his moral nature. This want of man's moral nature corresponds to God's claim upon him as his Creator. God demands of him religious service, and worship, in particular. This religious element in man's moral nature, is inseparable from his social nature, rendering the association of kindred minds necessary in worship to secure the highest ends of devotion; while the discharge of the obligation we are under to God to worship him, concerns his declarative glory, and the visible interests of his moral government. From these facts it is clear that moral obligation requires a public religion, public altars, and public prayers. In addition to this, it has been demonstrated, in the preceding section, that we are under obligation to maintain the worship of God.

2. The obligation, set forth above, requires time to discharge it. The point is not, how large a portion, or which portion of time, but the simple fact that we are morally bound to devote a portion of our time to the worship of God, and the public interests of religion. That some particular portion needs to be designated, either by the appointment of God, or in some other way, to render the obligation practicable, and secure the end, is too plain to be denied. Social and public worship cannot be maintained without a particular time set apart for it, by the appointment of God, by common consent, or otherwise. So far man's way is clear in the light of his own reason. But when the question is raised, how large a portion of time we are bound to devote to religion, reason fails us. This the mind of God alone can determine. It is claimed in the argument, that God has settled this point, by demanding one seventh.

It is now clear that we are under moral obligation to devote a portion of our time to God, in the shape of a religious Sabbath. On this moral obligation the Sabbath is based. The obligation arises out of our own moral natures, and the relation we sustain to God, and would remain if all positive laws were repealed.

Reason cannot see any natural difference in days, so as to involve a moral obligation to keep any particular day as a Sabbath, more than any other day. This depends upon the appointment of God. It is seen, then, that the fact of a Sabbath depends upon moral obligation, and cannot be repealed, but that the particular day upon which it is celebrated, depends upon positive law, and may be changed as often as may suit the will of the Lawgiver. It may be presumed, however, that God, in making such appointment would be governed by the principle of utility, and would select such day as would be most impressive, and suggestive of the greatest number of the most important truths. It will be seen in the process of the investigation that God has made just such a choice of a day.

II. The Sabbath was instituted at the beginning, and existed during the patriarchal age, from Adam to Moses.

The first account we have of the Sabbath is as follows.

Gen. 2: 2; "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made."

In regard to this text there are two opinions entertained. Dr. Paley and others, contend that no Sabbath was given to man until the Israelites came out of Egypt, when, in the wilderness, the subject was first introduced. This class of opinionists, of course, maintain that the above text was written after the Sabbath was given through Moses, and describes what was done at the appointment of the Sabbath in the wilderness, and not what was done at the time of finishing the Creation, so far as blessing and sanctifying the seventh day are concerned. Of this there is no proof in the text; upon its face, it appears to state what was done at the time of the completion of the work of creation, and no one would have ever thought of putting any other construction upon it, had not a theory first been adopted which required it. If it were admitted that Noah and Abraham had the Sabbath, no one would find any occasion to understand the text other wise than as affirming that God actually instituted the Sabbath at the beginning, and gave it to Adam. The other opinion is that the text describes what God did at the completion of his work of Creation, and that the Sabbath existed from Adam to Moses. This is the view proposed to be defended.

The argument naturally divides itself in to two parts, embracing the reasons for denying it, and the reasons for believing it.

1. What proof is there that there was no Sabbath known to men until the days of Moses? The only argument that has any force in it, is founded upon the fact that no mention is made of the Sabbath, from the time of creation, until the time of Moses. It is seen that the evidence is wholly negative, it is a want of knowledge, rather than knowledge itself that is relied upon. It is admitted that the Sabbath is not mentioned by name, during that period, but this does not prove that there was no Sabbath.

(1.) The history of the whole period is too short to allow of the mention of particulars. A period of three hundred years in the religious history of one of the most remarkable men that ever lived is given in four words; three besides the name of the person. "Enoch walked with God."

(2.) After the Sabbath had been proclaimed from Sinai, by the trump of God, and written upon a table of stone, no mention of it is made in the book of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, and first Kings. Here is a period of about five hundred years, covered

by public record written at the time, containing no mention of the Sabbath. This period commences within forty years from the giving of the law of the Sabbath on Sinai.

(3.) Circumcision is not once mentioned from Joshua to Jeremiah, a period of eight hundred years, yet there can be no doubt it was practiced. These remarks show how little reliance can be placed upon the fact that no direct mention is made of the Sabbath previous to Moses.

2. What are the reasons for believing that the Sabbath did exist in the patriarchal age?

It is maintained that there are such incidental allusions to the Sabbath, as to leave no doubt of its existence.

(1.) Cain and Abel are said to have brought their offerings unto the Lord, "at the end of days." Gen. 4: 3, 4.

The common rendering is "in process of time," but the literal sense of the Hebrew is, "at the end of days." The allusion is plain to the periodical Sabbath. Without reference to some particular number or measurement of periods by days, no particular sense is communicated. But there is no other division of time to which it can go appropriately refer. This mode of reckoning is distinctly marked upon the record in the appointment of the Sabbath. It is also in accordance with the declared sanctification of the day, that they should bring their offerings to God upon it. Understand the words, "at the end of days," to refer to the return of the Sabbath at the end of seven days, and the sense is clear, the language beautiful and expressive.

(2.) The early establishment of worship upon the social principle, implies the Sabbath as worship implies a time of worship.

Gen. 4: 26; "Then began men to call: upon the name of the Lord." This must refer to the commencement of social or public worship. There must have been worship before this in Eden. Cain and Abel worshipped, and no doubt Seth had worshipped. But after the birth of Enos public worship was established. Then, when men began to multiply so as to form a community, is the sense. Before this it was family worship, as it was afterwards reduced to family worship again, by the waters of destruction. The following was given by the late professor Stewart of Andover, as a true translation of the text.

"Gen. 4: 26; "Then began men to call," or, "Then was a commencement made of calling," is rightly translated. The phrase, *liqra beshem Yehovah*, means, invocation upon the name of God, and this in a social and public manner, (Compare Gen. 12: 8; 13: 4; 22: 33; 26: 25. Ps. 105: 1. Isa. 12: 4; 41: 25.) It can mean neither less nor more here, as I think, than that public social worship then commenced, i. e. so soon as men began to multiply. The writer does not mean to intimate that the pious Seth did not pray, before his son was born to him; what can he intimate but social worship? When—is not said,"

(3.) The early division of time into weeks or seven day periods, is a very clear proof of the existence of the Sabbath. It is not easy to conceive from what other fact or circumstance it could have arisen.

When God threatened the flood, (Gen. 7: 4,) the language is, "For yet seven days, and I will cause it to rain." When Noah had entered the ark, and all was ready, (5: 10,) "it came to pass, after seven days, that the waters," &c. When the flood had abated, and Noah had sent out the dove, and she returned, (8:10,) "he staid yet other seven days," and sent her out again. And when she returned, (5: 12,) "he staid yet other seven days," and sent her out again. When Jacob negotiated for his wife, the stipulation of Laban (Gen. 29: 27) was "Fulfill her week" of years; and (v 28) Jacob did so, and fulfilled her week." When Jacob died and Joseph, with his brethren, went up to the burial, (Gen. 50: 10,) "he made a mourning for his father seven days." When Job's friends came to sympathize with him in his afflictions, (Job 2: 13,) "they sat down with him upon the ground seven days and seven nights." When God sent the plague of blood on Egypt, (Ex. 7: 25,) "seven days were fulfilled," and then it was removed. Can it be doubted, then, that during the period in question, there was the division of time into weeks, or periods of seven days? But how came this division? It was not a natural one, like that of months or years, but purely an artificial or conventional one. How came it then? What gave it being? What kept it in existence? How can it be explained, except on the theory of an existing and regularly returning Sabbath? Is not this, then, the true theory?

(4.) The manner in which the number seven was stamped upon almost every important transaction, finds no explanation except in the existence of the Sabbath. There is no conceivable virtue of binding influence in that, more than in any other number, and no fact is known to which it can be referred, except the Sabbath, by which time was divided into periods of seven days, the seventh being sacred by the appointment of God. Thus, when Noah was about to go into the Ark, the direction (Gen. 7: 2) was, "Of every clean beast," which were the beasts for sacrifice, "thou shalt take to thee by sevens." The mourning for Jacob was a mourning of seven days. That of Job's friends with him was seven days. The token or seal of Abraham's covenant with Abimelech was (Gen. 21: 30) "seven ewe lambs." The sacrifice that Job offered for his friends when the days of his trial were ended, (Job 42: 8,) was "seven bullocks and seven rams." And in latter periods especially, almost everything had the impress of seven upon it.

(5.) The manner in which the Sabbath is first named by Moses, most clearly implies its previous existence. It is introduced as follows. God had sent them manna from heaven, and Moses commanded them to gather only what they needed for the day, and to leave none for the morrow. Then comes the allusion to the Sabbath.

Exo. 16: 22, 23; "And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, this is that which the Lord hath said, tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which you will bake to day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you, to be kept until the morning."

The strong point in this history, is the fact that the people understood the Sabbath and gathered twice as much manna on the previous day. Not a word had been said to the people about the Sabbath in connection with the manna, and yet they commenced, of their own accord, to prepare for it by gathering a double portion of manna. It is clear that it was not the result of any general order issued by Moses, because the rulers of the congregation did not understand it, which they must have done, had there been any such order given. The rulers came to Moses, and he answered them by making the first allusion to the Sabbath, by name.

Again, the manner in which he refers to it implies its existence prior to this time. "Tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." "The holy Sabbath," clearly refers to a Sabbath known and understood. The declaration was not made to communicate to them a new truth in the existence of the Sabbath, this they clearly knew, for all the people knew it; but to give an explanation of the matter of gathering twice as much manna as on other.

This appears to be the only point they did not understand.

Nor is there any intimation that God had made any communication to Moses concerning the Sabbath before this. When he says, "this is the thing which the Lord hath said," he does not refer to any command appointing the Sabbath, but to the manna "bake to-day." So when the command to keep the Sabbath is given, as a part of the Decalogue, the manner of expression implies its previous existence.

Exo. 20: 8-11; "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.

Here the word, "remember," implies a pre-existing knowledge of the thing. But the reason assigned is perfectly conclusive. God made the world in six days, and rested on the seventh, and hallowed it. This had been just as good a reason for a Sabbath during all past time, as it was then. It also clearly speaks of what God did at the time of creation. God then blessed and hallowed the seventh day; not does now bless and hallow, nor, now blesseth and halloweth.

Moses repeats the command in a manner which some have supposed makes it depend upon their rest from Egyptian servitude, as its ground and origin, but it is clearly a mistaken idea.

Deut. 5: 12-15. "Keep the Sabbath-day to sanctify it, as Jehovah thy God hath commanded thee. Six days thou shalt labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of Jehovah thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor

any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou. And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that Jehovah thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm: therefore Jehovah thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day."

This certainly cannot disannul the declaration proclaimed upon Sinai with the trump of God, and written with his own finger upon tables of stone, that in six days he made the world and rested on the seventh and that therefore they should keep the seventh day holy. But why is it connected with their deliverance from Egyptian servitude, and why is that a reason for keeping the Sabbath. There are two plain reasons.

First, the fact that they had been servants in Egypt and suffered for want of rest, made a strong appeal to them to grant the rest of the Sabbath to their servants and even their beasts of burden.

Secondly, the fact that they were denied the rest of the Sabbath, and its consequent religious advantages in Egypt, by which God was provoked to bring them out amid his scathing thunders upon their oppressors, could not fail to be a powerful reason why they should now keep his Sabbaths. This exposition, which must be the true one, strengthens the opinion that the Sabbath existed from the beginning.

(6.) Some of the best writers upon antiquity, confirm the doctrine that the Sabbath was instituted at creation. Some of these writers flourished more than a thousand years before the Christian era. The following will answer as specimens.

HOMER says, "Afterwards came the seventh, the sacred day."

HESIOD says, "The seventh day is holy."

CALLIMACHUS speaks of the seventh day as holy.

LUCIAN says, "The seventh day is given to school-boys as a holiday."

PORPHYRY says, "The Phoenicians consecrated one day in seven as holy."

JOSEPHUS says, "There is no city, either of Greeks or barbarians, or any other nation, where the religion of the Sabbath is not known."

GROTIUS says, "That the memory of the creation being performed in seven days, was preserved not only among the Greeks and Italians, but among the Celts and Indians, all of whom divided their time into weeks."

EUSEBIUS says, "Almost all the philosophers and poets acknowledge the seventh day as holy."

III. The Sabbath is perpetual and universally binding.

This follows from what has already been demonstrated, as well as from other reasons.

1. The Sabbath was instituted for the whole human family. It has been proved that it was instituted at the completion of creation, when Adam was the only man, and what was instituted for him was for the whole race.

2. The Sabbath, having been instituted at creation, formed no part of that typical and ceremonial religion which was afterwards given to the Jews. It was only joined to it, as a part of its moral code, but existed before, and remains since that has been removed.

3. It was distinguished from the entire ceremonial law, by being made a part of the Decalogue, all the other parts of which it is admitted remain unrepealed under the Gospel, and are perpetually binding. It was written upon stone with the other nine commandments, as an emblem of its durability.

4. It has been proved to be based upon a moral obligation, and therefore must be perpetually binding.

5. All the reasons which ever existed for a Sabbath, still exist. Was it given to commemorate the work of God, there has since been added to the work of creation the work of redemption. Was it given to promote worship, it is as needful now as it ever was. Was it provided to meet the wants of our moral natures, it is needed to meet those wants as much now as it ever was. Was it given to meet the wants of our physical natures, as a day of rest we need it as much now as did those who lived in days of yore.

6. The typical character of the Sabbath is proof of its perpetuity. It is a type of the rest of heaven, and of course must be continued to the end of time. This is clearly proved by what is said in the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The points are as follows:

(1.) The Apostle gives us to understand that we have a promise of rest, and exhorts us to labor to enter into it.

Verse 1: "Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it."

(2.) The Apostle informs us that this promise of rest is as old as creation, and that it was signified by the Sabbath which was instituted at creation.

Verse 3, 4: "For we which have believed do enter into rest; as he said, as I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest: although the works were finished from the foundation of the world. For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works."

This makes it clear that the rest of which the Apostle was speaking, was, in his mind, connected with the seventh day rest, and that he regarded the Sabbath rest instituted at

creation, as emblematic of the rest of which he spake, and for which he exhorted the Hebrews to labor.

(3.) The Apostle shows that the rest in question is yet future, that it was not fully realized by the Israelites in the rest of the land of Canaan, and that it does not have its full accomplishment, in the rest of the Gospel, which those enter into who believe.

In verse 3, quoted above, he refers to the Gospel rest, "we which have believed do enter into rest." This is shown not to be the ultimate rest signified.

He shows in verse 8, that Canaan did not meet the promise of rest. "For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day."

Joshua is the person here called Jesus. The names are the same in the original. Then comes the conclusion, that the rest is yet future, verse 9-11, "There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his. Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief."

The Sabbath is then clearly emblematic of the final rest of the saints in heaven; and must remain until that rest is gained.

7. It has been proved to be our duty to maintain public worship, which cannot be done, without a Sabbath.

8. It has been demonstrated, so far as it can be, by the most extensive observation and experience, that a seventh day rest is demanded by our moral and physical constitution.

9. A comparison between those communities who religiously regard the Sabbath, and those who do not, will show, as far as that kind of proof can go, that God, by his Providence, sets his seal upon the institution.

These arguments might have been extended to greater length; they have been but briefly stated.

IV. The day for celebrating the Sabbath has been changed from the seventh, to the first day of the week.

Before entering upon the argument, it is proper to remark, that it has already been shown that the obligation to devote a portion of our time to God and religion, is based upon moral and unchangeable right, while the particular day to be thus devoted, is a matter of appointment, and may be changed at the will of the Lawgiver. We are bound to keep a Sabbath to the Lord, because it is right, because moral obligation requires it, back of all positive law, but we are bound to observe one day as a Sabbath, rather than any other day, because God has designated that particular day as the one to be observed. Thus it is

seen that there may have been a change of the day, without affecting the perpetuity of the institution, or our obligation to observe the Sabbath.

It is a fact that the day has been changed in practice. Christians generally observe the first day of the week, in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ, in the place of the seventh day Sabbath, which was instituted to commemorate the work of creation. It is claimed that this change was made by divine authority. The way is now prepared for the argument.

1. This change was clearly foretold as connected with the resurrection of Christ.

Psa. 118: 22-24; "The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doings: it is marvelous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it."

If the above text does prophetically refer to the Christian Sabbath; if by "the day the Lord hath made," is meant the Christian Sabbath, set apart in commemoration of the resurrection of our Lord, which occurred thereon; and if by rejoicing and being glad in it, is meant the joy and gladness of Christian worship, the argument must prove conclusive in support of the divine appointment of the Christian Sabbath. Now, how any one can fail to see all this in the prophecy under consideration, must be very difficult for an unsophisticated mind to understand.

(1.) The text cannot be applied to any other event of sufficient importance to entitle it to occupy so lofty a note in the song of the Prophet. Some remarkable day or event must be intended; something worthy to be noted upon the chart of the divine administration; something worthy to be celebrated in anticipation, by an inspired prophetic song, breathed through the Seer by the Holy Ghost. On geographical maps and charts, principal cities, towns, rivers and mountains are marked; and so God has distinguished great events upon the prophetic chart, and upon the record of his administration. The creation of the world was deemed worthy of a monument which was the seventh day rest. The destruction of the world by water was a marked event. The deliverance of the Children of Israel out of Egyptian bondage, and the institution of the Mosaic system constitute another important era. So was the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ an important event in the history of the world; and his death and resurrection, whereby he triumphed over death and the grave, and brought the light of immortality to dawn upon human destiny, constitute the great central and radiant epoch in the divine administration, and in the history of the world. It is not only clear that the prediction cannot be applied to any other event, but that it is appropriate, expressive, commemorative and gloriously radiant when applied to the day of the Saviour's triumph over death and the grave. "This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." What day is so well calculated to awaken joy and gladness as that on which the Savior arose?

'The theme, the joy, how then shall man sustain?
O the burst gates! crush'd sting! Demolished throne!
Last gasp of vanquished death—shout earth and heaven,

This sum of good to man! whose nature then
Took wing and mounted with him from the tomb.
Then, then, I rose; then first humanity
Triumphant past the crystal ports of light—
Stupendous guest! and seized eternal youth."

Indeed, the resurrection of Christ is more worthy of a monument than creation itself; more worthy to be commemorated on its weekly return, with ardent devotion, rejoicing with hope and glad songs of praise. There is no other day on which we have so much cause to rejoice as that on which our Lord arose, and to this the prophetic song must refer, and to it the Christian poet has added,

"On this glad day a brighter scene
Of glory was display'd,
By God, th' eternal Word, than when,
This universe was made.

"He rises, who mankind has bought,
With grief and pain extreme;
'Twas great to speak the world from naught;
'Twas greater to redeem."

If, then, the prediction cannot be applied to any other event or day with any degree of propriety, and if it does apply with clearness, propriety and force to the resurrection of Christ, it prophetically points out the Christian Sabbath as a day for celebrating the Redeemer's triumph over death by the joy and gladness of Christian worship.

(2.) The prophecy clearly, upon its face refers to the death and resurrection of Christ, and has been so applied to Jesus Christ and his apostles.

The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner," is an expression which can be applied to nothing else but the rejection of Christ and his triumph. "Jesus said unto them, did ye never read in the Scriptures, the stone which he builders rejected, the same is become he head stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doings and it is marvelous in our eyes." Matt. 21:42.

"Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner." Acts 9: 10, 11.

"Unto you therefore which believe, he is precious; but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner." 1 Peter 2: 7.

It is perfectly plain from the above Scriptures, that the Prophet was speaking of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, when he exclaimed, "This is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it." The day referred to, "which the Lord hath made," is clearly the day on which the rejected stone became the head stone of the corner, and that was the day when Christ arose from the dead. He was rejected by the Jews and put to death; but he "was declared to be the Son of God by the resurrection from the dead." Rom. 1: 4. Then the rejected stone became the head stone of the corner. The Prophet clearly had his eye on the triumph of the resurrection, and the subsequent joy of Christian worship, when he sung, "this is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it," to which every true Christian heart responds,

"Welcome sweet day of rest,
That saw the Lord arise,
Welcome to this reviving breast,
And these rejoicing eyes."

If then it is clear, as has been shown, that the observance of the Christian Sabbath was predicted, as connected with and following the resurrection of Jesus Christ, it follows that the institution is not only a commemorative monument of that event, but that it constitutes a part of the divine economy.

2. The history of the Christian Sabbath clearly proves it to be of Divine appointment, binding upon all Christians.

In discussing this proposition several points must be examined.

(1.) The day on which Christ arose, began to be observed immediately by the apostles and their associates, and has clearly been observed ever since. It gives force to this fact that the first meetings were honored by the presence of Jesus Christ. The following is the record of the first meeting:

"Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and saith unto them peace be unto you." John 20: 19.

The following is the record of the second meeting:

"And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them. Then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you." John 20: 26.

In the expression, "after eight days," the day of the first meeting is reckoned as one, which brings the next first day, the eighth; it was therefore on the resurrection day that he appeared to them the second time, they being assembled in their private room. That from these first meetings with the Savior, the practice of observing the first day of the week for

the celebration of Christian worship, followed and increased until it entirely superceded the Jewish Sabbath among all Christians, there can be no doubt.

Twenty-five years after the above transactions, we have the following record:

"And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his speech until midnight." Acts 20: 7.

This all looks very natural, upon the sup position that the first day of the week was the day on which Christian worship was regularly celebrated. Observe, first, the disciples came together to break bread on the first day of the week. This was doubt less the celebration of the Lord's supper, and it is clear that this was the day set apart for its observance. They came together for this very purpose. Observe, secondly, that Paul availed himself of this meeting to preach his farewell sermon to them, "ready to depart on the morrow." Thus was he to commence his journey on the first day, after the Christian Sabbath, allowing this to have been their regular day for celebrating Christian worship, as it clearly was. Understanding it thus, the whole is a very natural transaction. This transaction was at Troas.

One year later, the apostle wrote the following to the Corinthian Church:

Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2.

From this it is plain that the Christian assemblies were convened on the first day of the week, and that such observance of the day had the apostle's sanction. On these last two texts, Dr. Clarke has given significant comments. On the former he says, that the first day of the week was "what was called the Lord's day, the Christian Sabbath in which they commemorated the resurrection of our Lord, and which among all Christians afterwards took the place of the Jewish Sabbath." On the latter text he remarks, "It appears that the first day of the week, which is the Christian Sabbath, was the day on which their principal religious meetings were held in Corinth and the churches of Galatia; and, consequently, in all other places where Christianity had prevailed. This is a strong argument for keeping the Christian Sabbath."

(2.) It is a significant fact that, as the observance of the first day of the week increased by the increase of Christianity, the observance of the Jewish Sabbath declined, until it wholly ceased where Christianity prevailed. It is no objection that the change was not sudden and entire, it could not be in the nature of things. All minds are not affected alike by the presentation of the same truths and evidences. Some are suddenly and entirely convinced, and by a single mental operation grasp the entire conclusion resulting from the premises presented. Others go through a slow mental process to reach the same results, and embrace the truth, and see and admit conclusions, item, by item; hence some

embrace parts of a theory before they embrace the whole. Some would naturally take up the Christian Sabbath and at once drop the Jewish Sabbath on the first presentation of the idea, while others would fall in with them so far as to observe the Christian Sabbath, and still continue to observe the Jewish Sabbath. The exceeding tenacity of the Jews on the subject of the seventh day Sabbath, may have rendered it necessary for the first Christians among them, to observe it as a matter of personal safety, nor can it be maintained that they necessarily violated any moral principle in so doing. It would not even be strange that many Jews, who became devoted Christians, should have, from the power of their education, continued to observe the seventh day Sabbath, observing both days.

Another consideration is, that up to the time of the destruction of the Jewish nation, which took place about A. D. 90, the apostles and all Christian ministers of Jewish origin, must have found it advantageous to observe the Jewish Sabbath, by attending their service, for the purpose of preaching the Gospel to them. The only means of reaching them with the truth, generally, was to attend in the temple and in the Synagogues, on the seventh day. This accounts for the fact that the apostles appear to have so frequently attended the Jewish assemblies on the Sabbath day. It is also a sufficient answer to the objection, that the first Christians worshipped more frequently on the seventh, than on the first day of the week. They doubtless maintained their own peculiar Christian assemblies on the first day of the week, and on the Jewish Sabbath mingled in their assemblies with a view to their conversion.

But it is clear, as asserted in the proposition under consideration, that the first day of the week came to be generally observed by all Christians, and that the Jewish Sabbath sunk gradually into disuse, as Christianity prevailed. The following text is sufficient to prove this point:

"Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days." Col. 2: 16.

To what Sabbath does the apostle refer? It cannot be the Christian Sabbath, for he was speaking of what was enjoined by the law, and that never was. Moreover, the Christian Sabbath was called the Lord's day, and not the Sabbath.

It must be, then, that the apostle refers to the Seventh day Sabbath, and he gives them clearly to understand that they are not morally bound to observe it. Nor can it be maintained with any degree of plausibility, that the apostle speaks of other days as feast days called Sabbaths. He uses the Greek word, *Sabbaton*, which is every where used to denote the seventh day Sabbath, without giving any notice that he means anything else; and while, by "a holy day" and the "new moon," he includes all other feasts and rests which might be called Sabbaths, leaving nothing but the seventh day Sabbath to be meant by the Sabbath days.

Dr. McKnight has given the following comment on the text, "The whole of the law of Moses being abrogated by Christ, Col. 2: 14, Christians are under no obligations to observe any of the Jewish holidays, not even the seventh day Sabbath. Wherefore, if any

teacher made the observance of the seventh day a necessary duty, the Colossians were to resist it. But though the brethren, in the first age, paid no regard to the Jewish seventh day Sabbath, they set apart the first day of the week for public worship, and for commemorating the death and resurrection of their master, by eating the supper on that day; also for the private exercise of devotion. This they did either by the precept or the example of the apostles, and not by virtue of any injunction in the Law of Moses. "This comment of Dr. McKnight, is not to be construed as implying the abrogation of any part of the moral law; the obligation of the fourth commandment is continued in our obligation to observe the Christian Sabbath, the change of the institution from one day to another, in no sense involves the abrogation of the essential law of the institution. From the text under consideration two points are clear. First, some were disposed to censure the brethren for not observing the Sabbath days. Let no man judge you in respect to the Sabbath days," implies that they were assailed on this ground. The second point is, that the apostle clearly protects them against all such censures. Under such authority and influences the Jewish Sabbath gradually sunk into disuse. Thus it has been shown that the first day of the week gradually came to be observed, and the seventh day was gradually neglected, as Christianity gained, until the change became complete.

(3.) This change took place under the eye of the apostles, who were inspired, and must have been with their sanction, if not their command. Their example doubtless led the way, as it has been seen that they were the first to assemble on the first day of the week, the day on which the Master rose from the dead. This argument, when properly presented, must prove conclusive. Observe,

First, The apostles were clothed with divine authority to organize and settle the Gospel church.

"Verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Matt. 18: 18.

This is a commission with plenary power to organize the Gospel church, and to settle its laws and rules of government. To secure them from error in this important work, they had.

Secondly, The promise of divine direction.

"But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John 14: 26.

Take the above two points together, and the argument must be conclusive. They were clothed with authority, and therefore what they did is binding; and they were divinely guided, and therefore what they did was right—was in accordance with the will of God. What they bound on earth was to be bound (ratified) in heaven; and they bound (established) the first day of the week as a day for Christian worship in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ, and therefore this must be bound in heaven, and is of divine

authority. They loosed the observance of the seventh day Sabbath on earth, as shown above, and therefore it is loosed in heaven, and is no more binding.

(4.) What greatly adds to the force of this historical sketch of the Christian Sabbath, is, that no other account can be given of it. If the change was not effected at the time and under the circumstances above supposed, when and under what circumstances was the change made? The change could not have been made at any other time, and the fact not be known. Could the day be now changed from Sunday to Monday, and not awaken a discussion which would leave its traces upon the record of the age to be seen in future centuries? Certainly not, if the Christian Sabbath had been commenced at any other period than, as is supposed, immediately after the resurrection of Christ, it would be told when and under what circumstances the change was made. If the change was made, as has been supposed, under the eye of the apostles, it must be authoritative and binding on all Christians.

3. The earliest ecclesiastical authority confirms the whole of the preceding argument. Before quoting authorities, it is proper to introduce one text from the Scriptures. John says, "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day," Rev. 1: 10. By the Lord's Day is meant the day on which Christ rose from the dead. This proves that the day was distinguished, and it is a significant fact that upon this day Jesus Christ opened the vision, and commenced the revelations of this remarkable book. The name itself is significant. "The Lord's day" corresponds with the words of the prophecy upon which this whole argument is based. "This is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it." Now, what is the "Lord's day," but "the day which the Lord hath made?" and what is "the day which the Lord hath made," but "the Lord's day?" The prophecy is clearly seen to receive its fulfillment, not only in the observance of the Christian Sabbath, but also in the very name by which the day was so early distinguished. This name has been introduced at this point, because, if any are disposed to question the fact that the first day of the week is meant by the Lord's day, the authorities about to be quoted will settle the question beyond a doubt.

Ignatius was a disciple of St. John, and is said to have been constituted the bishop of the church at Antioch, by that apostle. This is coming as near to apostolic authority as we can get outside of the Scriptures themselves. In the epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, section 1, he makes the following remark in speaking of the Jews and of their laws:

"Wherefore, if they who were brought up in these ancient laws, come nevertheless to the newness of hope, no longer observing Sabbaths, but keeping the Lord's day, in which our life is sprung up by him."

This clause proves, first, that Christians did not at that time observe Sabbaths; secondly, that they did keep "the Lord's day," and thirdly, that the Lord's day was the day on which he rose from the dead. The expression, "in which our life is sprung up by him," is a clear allusion to his resurrection.

In the epistle of Barnabas, who is believed to have been the companion of St. Paul, named in the Acts of the Apostles, we find the following remark, section 15. He

commences with a quotation from the prophet, "Your new moons and your Sabbaths, I cannot bear them. Consider what he means by it. The Sabbaths saith he, which ye now keep are not acceptable to me, but those which I have made; when resting from all things, I shall begin the eighth day, that is, the beginning of the other world. For which cause we observe the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus rose from the dead, and having manifested himself to his disciples, he ascended into heaven."

Whatever else this quotation may contain, it contains very strong presumptive evidence that Christians had ceased to observe the Jewish Sabbath, while it positively proves that they did observe, with gladness, the day on which Christ rose from the dead. The prophet said, "this is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it;" and Barnabas tells us that they observed the day of Christ's resurrection with gladness." Here, then, is a fulfillment of the prophecy.

Eusebius was born A. D. 267, and died 339. He was the author of the oldest ecclesiastical history now extant, and has been, consequently, called the father of ecclesiastical history. He wrote from such documents and facts as he could possess himself of, at a period of about two hundred years after the death of the Apostles. A few extracts from his history follow. In speaking of the lives of the pious prior to the covenant with Abraham, he says, "They did not therefore regard circumcision, nor observe the Sabbath, neither do we."— [Book 1, chap. 4, p. 26.

The single point in this extract is, the early Christians did not observe the Jewish Sabbath.

In speaking of "the heresy of the Ebion-ites," an early sect, he says, "They also observe the Sabbath and other discipline of the Jews, but on the other hand, they also celebrate the Lord's Day very much like us, in commemoration of his resurrection."— [Book 3, ch. 27, p. 113.

This clearly proves that, at that time, orthodox Christians did not observe the Jewish Sabbath, and that they did observe the Lord's day, in commemoration of his resurrection, and that the Lord's day was the first day of the week, for it was on this day that he rose.

In speaking of Dionysius, he quotes from his epistle to Soter, as follows:

"To-day, we have passed the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your epistle."— [Book 4, chap. 24, p. 160.

This shows that they were in the habit of meeting on the Lord's Day, and that they regarded it as in some sense holier than other days.

Eusebius states, book 4, chap. 26, page 162, that there was then extant a discourse of Melito, "on the Lord's day."

4. The Sabbatical institution, by being changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, secures all the advantages derived from the Jewish Sabbath, while it

commemorates a greater event than the creation of the world, and tends to elevate and point human minds to higher interests than the setting up of the mountains or the lighting up of the sun.

As a day of rest, it secures all that could be secured by the seventh day Sabbath. As a means of religious instruction, it cannot be denied that the first day of the week can be rendered as efficient as the seventh.

As a type of that eternal rest that "remaineth to the people of God," it is just as significant as the Jewish Sabbath. But when we look at its commemorative character, we see a reason for the change as much greater than existed for the appointment of the Sabbath at the finishing of God's six days' work, as redemption is greater and more glorious than creation. If creation shone resplendent with the glory of God, and the young orbs sung of the power of the hand that made them, of redemption it may be sung,

"Here the whole Deity is known,
Nor dares a creature guess
Which of the glories brightest shone,
The justice or the grace."

Redemption transcends creation, in proportion as an eternal weight of woe is a greater evil than simple non-existence, and as relationship to God, through the incarnation of divinity, and heirship to Jehovah securing eternal life and glory in heaven, involve higher interests than Adam's position amid Eden's earthly bowers. If, then, creation was worthy of such a monument as is seen in the hallowing of the seventh day, much more is redemption worthy of a like monument, and on what day can it be so appropriately set up, as upon the first day of the week, upon which the Savior rose from the dead?

The seventh day Sabbath celebrated the work of creation, and for four thousand years did its weekly return talk of the day when God ceased from his works, when he had made the worlds and lit up the sun and the stars. The Christian Sabbath celebrates the world's redemption, and comes to us in its weekly return to remind us that we are lost in sin, and that we have been redeemed; it comes to awaken our songs of gladness, and to inspire our devotions. What deep and everlasting interests were involved in the resurrection of Christ? What dismay did it send through all the ranks of the foes of God and man, and how did the gates of hell tremble under its power? What hopes and songs did it inspire in human hearts? How did it dispel the horrors of death, and let in the light of immortality upon the darkness of the grave, and upon the contents of the moldering urn? Such an event was truly worthy of such a monument.

From all that has been said it must appear that the Christian Sabbath is of divine appointment, a part of the divine economy, and of binding obligation. The observance of the Christian Sabbath was foretold in a remarkable prediction, as has been shown; it commenced from the very day on which Christ rose from the dead, and was observed by the early Christians in commemoration of the Saviour's resurrection, and has been observed ever since for nearly two thousand years, in every land and during every

century where Christianity has prevailed. Can any one suppose that mere accident or caprice produced this array of combined facts? It is impossible.

To the above, add that a Sabbath is essential to the carrying out of the Gospel, as it stands and is admitted upon the face of the record, and the argument for the Sabbath by divine right, will be conclusive. Christianity could not be maintained in life and activity without a Sabbath, hence, many who yield the point of divine authority, contend for the Sabbath on the ground of expediency. How absurd is this? It is to say that God has left what is essential to the success of the Gospel, unsecured by divine obligation; that we may omit what is essential to the efficient carrying out of the Gospel plan, without violating any divine law or obligation. It is to say that man, seeing a Sabbath to be necessary, sees clearer than God did when he planned the Gospel, or that God, seeing a Sabbath necessary, has omitted to insert in the Gospel, what he saw essential to its efficiency. It cannot be! It is therefore concluded that the view taken of the subject above is correct, and that the Christian Sabbath is a part of the divine economy, and of binding obligation.

CHAPTER III.

THE DUTIES WE OWE TO OUR FELLOW-BEINGS.

The duties we owe to our fellow-beings, are such as are suited to the relations we sustain to each other, as man to man, neighbor to neighbor, brother to brother, parent to child, and child to parent, husband to wife, and wife to husband. Each of these relations involve an obligation of duty corresponding to the same. These relations are all recognized in the Scriptures, and they contain, at least general rules, in regard to the duties that pertain to each. To point out these duties briefly, in the light of the Scriptures shall now be attempted.

SECTION I.

The Duty of Universal Love to Humanity.

As we have seen that Christ summed up the whole of the first table of the law, in one commandment, so hath he done by the second table, which concerns the duties we owe to our fellow beings. To open the subject fairly, let the whole text be again spread before the reader.

Matt. 22: 37-40; "Jesus said unto him, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

The first of the two commandments has already been considered, and the second now demands attention.

I. To whom does this command relate? Who is a neighbor in the sense of this law?

In principle it is any member of the human family, any son or daughter of Adam and Eve. Practically, it is every fellow-being, to whom we come into such relation as to have it in our power to do them good or evil.

We are bound to wish no evil to any portion of humanity, but are bound to wish well to our race, to love man as man, but it calls for a practical development when we are brought into such relation to our fellow-beings as supposed above. The reasons for giving it this broad exposition are as follows.

1. Our Saviour's answer to the question, "who is my neighbor?" involves the doctrine that holds us in relation to universal humanity, and requires a practical development of love to each and all as we have opportunity and as occasion calls.

Luke 10: 30-36; "And Jesus answering said, A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves which stripped him of his raiment, and wounded him, and departed, leaving him half dead. And by chance there came down a certain priest that way: and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. And likewise a Levite when he was at the place, came and looked on him, and passed by on the other side. But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: and when he saw him, he had compassion on him, And went to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care him. And on the morrow when he departed, he took out two pence, and gave them to the host, and said unto him, Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again I will repay thee. Which now of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbor unto him that fell among the thieves?"

On this interesting narrative it may be remarked,

(1.) Christ clearly intended it as a development of the principle of the law which requires us to love our neighbor as ourselves. He gave it as a practical exhibition of what the law requires. It could not have been what the law did not require, but what it did require, or it would have been no answer.

(2.) The two men selected for the illustration, had as little interest in each other, and were under as little obligation to each other as is possible for any two human beings. They were strangers to each other; they were members of different nations, and of hostile nations, both having cherished a national enmity towards each other many centuries. Now, as the law which requires us to love our neighbor as ourselves, held two such men bound to perform mutual acts of kindness, it makes a neighbor of any specimen of humanity.

2. Other Scriptures confirm this view. As our Savior affirms that the whole of the second table of the law hangs upon this commandment, there can be no obligation binding us in regard to men beyond what this requires. If there are obligations imposed upon us which

this does not require, then it does not comprehend the whole law. Just at this point, read from Christ's sermon on the Mount.

Matt. 5: 44-46; "But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you; That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil of and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye, do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do you more than others, do not even the publicans so?"

If, then, we are to love our enemies, it follows that enemies are our neighbors in the sense of the all comprehensive law of love, since that is the substance of the whole law.

3. There is no higher law, and broader in its claims, than the law of love. It comprehends more than simple justice, and requires of us, in regard to our fellow-beings, what strict justice does not require. If, therefore, this law which requires us to love our neighbor as ourselves, does not bind us in regard to all men and every man, as we are brought into such relation to them as to have it in our power to do them good or evil, there is no law that does. The conclusion is that this law binds us in regard to all men, for to suppose that some men may be outlaws in regard to us cannot be admitted.

II. What is the love which we are required to feel towards our neighbor, that is, our fellow-being.

It is not pretended that we are bound to love all men alike, irrespective of their character, and without regard to the relation that we sustain to them. This cannot be, it would be, to be unlike God, and unlike Christ. There was one disciple whom Jesus loved in contradistinction from the rest, though he loved them all. How then are we to understand the words of Christ? Christ is his own best interpreter. He says,

Matt. 7: 12; "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets."

This is precisely the sense of the other. Of the other, Christ said, on this "hangs all the law and the prophets;" and this he says, "is the law and the prophets." The meaning is that both contain the substance of all that is required by the law and teachings of the prophets, in regard to our duties to our fellow-men. If, then, what we would that men should do to us in like circumstances, is the measure of our duty to our neighbor, it cannot require the same in regard to all men, and under all circumstances, for that is not what we should require our fellow creatures to do to us.

The love of our neighbor comprehends all social affections which have our fellow-men for their objects. Conjugal, parental, and filial love, and friendship in its several varieties, are all modifications of the love of our neighbor, and are comprehended under the general

law of loving him as ourselves. The same principle is involved in the golden rule, which requires us to do to others, in all respects, as we would have them do to us.

This law of equal love to men is to be interpreted in consistency with all our manifest personal and domestic duties. Any other interpretation of it is wrong. In this view the subject is plain. Are you a husband, treat your wife, as you would like to be treated if you were a wife. Are you a wife, treat your husband, as you would like to be treated, if you were a husband. Are you a parent, treat your child, as you would like to be treated were you a child. Are you a child, treat your parents, as you would like to be treated were you a parent. Are you a brother or sister, treat your brother or sister as you like to have them treat you under like circumstances. Are you a ruler, treat your subjects as you would like to be treated were you in their place and they in yours. Are you a fellow citizen, treat your fellow citizens as you like to have them treat you. Does a stranger cross your path, treat him as you would like to be treated, were you a stranger. Do you find a fellow-being in distress, treat him just as you would like to be treated were you in distress. In all this, the thing supposed is what you would require of your fellow-being in perfect honesty.

Dropping the more circumscribed relations, and looking at man as man, the law of love requires of us to love men in some respects according to their character or moral goodness. We do not, and cannot love all persons alike.

1. We are required to love all men, with the love of good will. We must wish no real ill to any man, no, not to the worst and the vilest of the race. We wish none to ourselves, and if we wish ill to another, we do not love him as ourselves. We must wish good to all. We must have a desire for universal happiness, and wish happiness to the worst of men. Of course, a wish for the happiness of bad men, includes a wish that they may become good. It is in this sense that we must love all men as our-selves. All men desire happiness themselves, and are bound to desire it for others. This necessarily includes all reasonable efforts to promote the happiness of our fellow creatures, in view of our means and opportunities.

2. We are bound to love all unfortunate and distressed human beings with the love of pity. There is no duty more fully insisted upon than this. As a case of the most unquestionable authority and of thrilling interest, in regard to this duty, we may read Christ's description of the scene of the last judgment. Christ declares that what we do to suffering humanity shall be regarded as done to himself. So Paul has a most direct command requiring acts of charity to our enemies.

Rom. 12: 20; "Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head."

If we are required to relieve the distress of an enemy, surely we must be under the same obligation to all other persons, as their necessities may demand, and our means may allow. It is clear that we are to love all men with the love of pity, so far as their circumstances call for it.

3. We are bound to love good people, possessed of right moral character, with the love of complacency. This is Christian love, and can be felt toward none, save such as we regard as Christians. It is not transcending the teaching of Christ to say that Christians are under obligations to each other, which do not bind them in regard to other men. This obligation is imposed by the "new commandment" which Christ gave. Christ said, "A new commandment give I unto you that ye love one another." This would not be new if it did not demand more than the universal love required by the command, which Christ called the second like unto the first. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," was in the Old Testament, but this is distinguished from that, and is new.

(1.) That required the love of benevolence as has been explained; this requires the love of complacency.

(2.) That old commandment required the love of our kind, the love of man as man; this new commandment requires the love of character, of virtue, of Christians as Christians.

(3.) The old commandment was based upon the relation man sustains to man; but the new commandment is based on the example of the Redeemer, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another: as I have loved you, that ye also love one another."

The following from the pen of the late Richard Watson, is a good general statement of the law of love.

"It excludes all anger, beyond that degree of resentment a culpable action in another may call forth, in order to mark the sense we entertain of its evil, and to impress that evil upon the offender, so that we may lead him to repent of it, and forsake it. This seems the proper rule by which to distinguish lawful anger from that which is contrary to charity, and, therefore, malevolent and sinful. It excludes *implacability*; for if we do not promptly and generously forgive others their trespasses, this is deemed to be so great a violation of that law of love which ought to bind men together, that our heavenly Father will not forgive us. It excludes all *revenge*; so that we are to exact no punishment of another for offences against ourselves: and though it be lawful to call in the penalties of the laws for crimes against society, yet this is never to be done on the principle of private revenge; but on the public ground, that law and government are ordained of God, which produces a case that comes under the inspired rule, 'Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.' It excludes all *prejudice*; by which is meant a harsh construction of men's motives and characters upon surmise, or partial knowledge of the facts, accompanied with an inclination to form an ill opinion of them in the absence of proper evidence. This appears to be what the Apostle Paul means, when he says, 'Charity thinketh no evil.' It excludes all *censoriousness* or *evil speaking*, when the end is not the correction of the offender, or when a declaration of the truth as to one person is not required by our love and duty to another; for whenever the end is merely to lower a person in the estimation of others, it is resolvable solely into a splenetic and immoral feeling. It excludes all those *aggressions*, whether petty or more weighty, which may be made upon the interests of another, when the law of the case, or even the abstract right, might not be against our claim. These are always complex cases, and can but occasionally occur; but the rule which binds us to do

unto others as we would they should do unto us, binds us to act upon the benevolent view of the case, and to forego the rigidity of right. Finally, it excludes, as limitations to its exercise, all those *artificial distinctions* which have been created by men, or by providential arrangements, or by accidental circumstances. Men of all nations, of all colors, of all conditions, are the objects of the unlimited precept, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' Kind feelings produced by natural instincts, by intercourse, by country, may call the love of our neighbor into warmer exercise as to individuals or classes of men, or these may be considered as distinct and special, though similar affections superadded to this universal charity; but as to all men, this charity is an efficient affection, excluding all ill will, and all injury.

" But its ACTIVE EXPRESSION remains to be considered.

"It is not a merely negative affection but it brings forth rich and varied fruit. It produces a feeling of *delight* in the happiness of others, and thus destroys envy; it is the source of *sympathy* and *compassion*; it opens the hand in *liberality* for the supply of the wants of others; it gives *cheerfulness* to every service undertaken in the cause of others; it resists the wrong which may be inflicted upon them; and it will run hazards of health and life for their sakes. It has special respect to the *spiritual interests and salvation* of men; and thus it instructs, persuades, reproves the ignorant and vicious; counsels the simple; comforts the doubting and perplexed; and rejoices in those gifts and graces of others, by which society may be enlightened and purified. The zeal of Apostles, the patience of Martyrs, the travels and labors of Evangelists in the first ages, were all animated by this affection; and the earnestness of Preachers in all ages, and the more private labors of Christians for the benefit of the souls of men, with the operations of those voluntary associations which send forth Missionaries to the heathen, or distribute Bibles and Tracts, or conduct schools, are all its visible expressions before the world. A principle of philanthropy may be conceived to exist independent of the influence of active and efficient Christianity; but it has always expended itself either in good wishes, or at most, in feeble efforts, chiefly directed to the mitigation of a little temporary external evil. Except in connection with religion, and that the religion of the heart, wrought and maintained there, by the acknowledged influences of the Holy Spirit, the love of mankind has never exhibited itself under such views and acts as those we have just referred to. It has never been found in characters *naturally* selfish and obdurate; has never disposed men to make great and painful sacrifices for others; never sympathized with spiritual wretchedness; never been called forth into its highest exercises by considerations drawn from the immortal relations of man to eternity; never originated large plans for the illumination and moral culture of society; never fixed upon the grand object to which it is now bending the hearts, the interests, and the hopes of the universal Church, the conversion of the world. Philanthropy, in systems of mere ethics, like their love of God, is a greatly *inferior* principle to that which is enjoined by Christianity, and infused by its influence; —another proof of the folly of separating moral from revealed truth, and of the necessity of cultivating them upon evangelical principles."

Having discussed the general principle of love to our neighbor as the substance of the whole law, we are prepared to look at its particular applications as they are called for in

the various relations of life. It is agreed by all, that man's rights and obligations are to be examined and settled in view of the various relations in which he is placed to his fellow-beings. Now, as this is emphatically a Biblical investigation, let all philosophical and scholastic classifications be overlooked, by way of dividing rights into natural and acquired, and then discussing them under the heads of ethical, economical and political justice, and let us inquire after his rights and obligations in the light of the Scriptures, in connection with his relations, as they are revealed in the unfolding volume of his progressive experience and history, as he started off in the pathway of his existence from the hand of his Creator. This will be considering them in the order in which they rose in the experience of life. This suggests the following order:

Husband and wife, as seen in the first man and woman; then parents and children; then a community or nation; then nations; and then the world of humanity, many of whom sustain no relation to each other, only by sustaining a common relation to Adam and Eve, and to God the Creator. This division is natural, if not scientific.

SECTION II.

Husband and Wife.

The relation of husband and wife, is the first relation which humanity sustained to humanity, and is the source and fountain of all other relations. This relation we designate by the term, marriage.

I. Marriage was instituted by God himself in the Garden of Eden, for the whole race of humanity.

1. This is clear from the distinction of sex which he made in the work of creation.

Gen. 1: 27; "So God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." This division of humanity into male and female, lays the foundation of marriage, and the relation of husband and wife, and it must appear clear to any reasonable mind, that the constitution of the sex is a clear indication of the will of God in regard to the institution of marriage.

2. The Divine declaration in regard to the matter, after he had created man, is clear and certain.

Gen. 2: 18; "And the Lord God said, it is not good, that the man should be alone: I will make him a help meet for him."

"Meet," that is suitable, proper, and God in making such a help for man, made a woman, and, of course, it is proper that a man and a woman should dwell together, in the opinion of the all-wise God.

3. Adam's account of the matter confirms the same view, that marriage was designed for the race generally. When God brought the woman to Adam, Gen. 2: 22-24, he said, "This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh."

In view of the time and circumstances of this declaration, it must be regarded as expressing the will of God, and as having been prophetic.

4. The manner in which the whole transaction is quoted and commented upon by Christ, is clear proof that marriage was designed by God for the race.

Matt. 19: 5, 6; "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

Other proofs might be introduced, but they are not necessary. From the fact that marriage was designed for the race, it must follow that it is the general duty of man-kind to live in the marriage state. The law itself is general, leaving room for exceptions, but still the rule is that men and women shall marry. In regard to the duty of every person to marry, Mr. Watson says, "There was no need of the law being directed to each individual as such, since the instincts of nature and the affection of love planted in human beings were sufficient to guarantee its general observance. The very bond of marriage too being the preference founded upon love, rendered the act one in which choice and feeling were to have great influence; nor could a prudent regard to circumstances be excluded. Cases were possible in which such a preference as is essential to the felicity and advantages of that state might not be excited, nor the due degree of affection to warrant the union called forth, There might be cases in which circumstances might be inimical to the full discharge of some of the duties of that state; as the comfortable maintenance of a wife, and a proper provision for children. Some individuals would also be called by Providence to duties in the church and in the world, which might better be performed in a single and unfettered life; and seasons of persecution, as we are taught by St. Paul, have rendered it an act of Christian prudence to abstain even from this honorable estate. The general rule, however, is in favor of marriage; and all exceptions seem to require justification on some principle grounded upon an *equal* or a *paramount* obligation."

II. Marriage is the union of one man with one woman, hence it forbids Polygamy.

That marriage, as designed by God, is the union of one man with one woman, is clear from the following considerations.

1. God made but one man, at the commencement, and for him he made but one woman or wife.

Adam and Eve were the father and mother of the race, and, no doubt, were designed to represent a model family. If God had designed that one man should have two, five or ten wives, he would, doubtless, have made what would have been a model number for Adam.

2. Adam appears to have taken this view of the subject, by his connecting one man with one woman only, in his predictions of all prospective marriages.

Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh."

Note, man is to cleave to his wife, not his wives. Again, they are to be "one flesh." The parties to a marriage cannot be one flesh, if one man and six women be embraced in the compact.

3. Christ renders this view still more clear, by his manner of quoting and explaining the original text. Matt. 19, He uses the same expression, "a man shall leave his father and his mother and shall cleave to his wife," not his wives. Again, he says, "they twain," not they six or ten, "shall be one flesh." This is proof positive that the marriage union can embrace but two persons, one man and one woman.

Christ was treating of divorce, and added, "And I say unto you, whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery."

Here our Savior makes the evil lie in the second marriage, which could not be, if a man may marry more wives than one. Putting the wife away might be a wrong done to her, but marrying another could be no wrong, upon the principle that a man may have two living wives. If he would have had a right to marry a second wife while retaining the first, he must have that right after having put her away, and the wrong could not lie in the second marriage, where Christ placed it. If a man may rightfully have a plurality of wives, the fact that he may have put away one, cannot render it adultery to marry another. Thus does the comment of our Savior prove positively, that a man can have but one lawful wife at the same time.

4. Nature itself comes in also as a con-formation of this original law. In births, there is a small surplusage of males over females; which, being reduced by the more precarious life of males, and by the accidents to which, more than females, they are exposed, from wars and dangerous employments, brings the number of males and females to a par, and shows that in the order of Providence, a man ought to have but one wife; and that, where Polygamy is not allowed, every woman may have a husband. This equality, too, is found in all countries; although some licentious writers have attempted to deny it upon unsound evidence.

Much more proof might be urged, and many more texts might be quoted, equally clear, but it is not necessary to press the point further, to prove that marriage is a union between one man and one woman.

It is admitted that Polygamy existed very early in the history of our race, and that it was practiced among the Israelites to some extent, but the Scriptures nowhere sanction it, and it was always wrong.

III. Marriage is a permanent union, and cannot be dissolved but by death.

The proof upon this point, is so direct that but little need be said. It is settled by the most undoubted authority of Christ.

Matt. 5: 31, 32; "It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced, committeth adultery."

This is clear and must settle the question, that the Gospel does not allow of divorce, only in a single case, which shall soon be noticed. This same subject was afterwards brought before Christ by the Pharisees, no doubt with a view of obtaining some advantage of him, by the explanation he would give. The following is the record of the conversation.

Matt. 19: 3-9; "The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning, made them male and female; And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him, why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery."

In this text Christ clearly teaches that the provision in the Law of Moses for divorce, was a departure from the law of marriage, as it was originally established. "From the beginning it was not so," that a man might put away his wife.

The Savior also teaches that an innocent party is freed from the marriage obligation, by the commission of adultery by the other party. The word used in the original, and translated, fornication, is a general term, denoting any kind of lewdness; it corresponds to our English word, whoredom, hence it includes both adultery and fornication, in our restricted sense of those words. In the text it clearly means adultery. For this, and this alone, therefore, may a man put away his wife, or a woman leave her husband. Christ takes upon himself to annul the provision of the Law of Moses for divorce, and to restore marriage to its original character, by making it a permanent and binding union, between one man and one woman.

The right of divorce in case either party is guilty of adultery, is undoubted, yet this needs to be guarded against abuse. It would not do to allow the husband or wife to repudiate the marriage contract, and marry again, upon their assumption that adultery had been committed, as it might lead to great abuse and wrong. The facts should therefore be proved and decided upon by some competent court, before the parties should be allowed to marry a second time. The Gospel appoints no such court, but has wisely left it to the civil authorities to regulate. The right of second marriages, after the death of one party, is clearly taught in the Scriptures. It is so universally admitted, that it is only necessary to refer to a single text.

Rom. 7: 2, 3; "For the woman which hath a husband is bound by the law to her husband, so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of the husband. So then, if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man."

This text so clearly teaches the right of second marriages, as to need no comment.

IV. The object of marriage is worthy of consideration.

1. One intention of marriage in its original institution was, the production of the greatest number of healthy children; and that it secures this object, is proved from the universal fact, that population increases more, and is of better quality where marriage is established and its sacred laws are observed, than where the intercourse of the sexes is promiscuous.

2. Marriage was also, no doubt, designed to promote chastity. There can be no doubt that it has this effect. Man was not created for sensualism. His constitution is not adapted to it. He cannot endure it without injury. Marriage was not appointed for the gratification of sensuality. All its main ends are moral, intellectual, and economical. Its gratifications of sense are entirely subordinate to those of higher dignity and greater value.

Marriage promotes chastity.

(1.) By providing for the lawful indulgence of the sexual appetite.

(2.) By promoting that mutual affection, upon which marriage should depend, and which, when it exists in its proper degree, leads the parties to prefer each other to all others. Under any other arrangement this affection cannot have the same growing and permanent existence, and intercourse becomes a matter of mere animal instinct. In the marriage state, the intercourse of the sexes is laid under its natural restrictions, and allowed its appropriate liberties. The promiscuous intercourse of the sexes is so brutal, and contrary to the true interests of mankind, that it cannot generally prevail, even in the rudest and most savage states of society. Nature and experience concur with the Scriptures, in demanding the marriage state as the proper and only proper condition for this intercourse.

(3.) Marriage promotes chastity, by presenting a system of intercourse, under the controlling influence of mutual affections and interests, and under the sanction of right, in opposition to an intercourse outside of these advantages, and under the ban of the moral law, which declares that all fornicators, adulterers and whoremongers, have no inheritance in the kingdom of God. It stands opposed to Polygamy and promiscuous intercourse, and lays the thoughts of the heart under its law of purity. The upright man never loves the wife of his friend, or women known to be engaged, any more than he entertains similar affections for his mother or sister.

3. Marriage is designed to secure, through the establishment of the family relation, the highest interests of our offspring, domestic peace, industry, economy, and the general happiness of the community.

Permanent unions of the sexes are necessary, to give proper support and extend proper sympathy to mothers in the care of the young. The infant is committed by Providence directly to the mother, but the father is the natural and divinely-appointed protector of both. The infant is his as much as it is the mother's. Having given it existence, he has no right to desert it, or to devolve the responsibility and burden of its support and care on the mother. He is bound in justice to stand by it and its female parent to the last. This can be effectually done in married life; but in no other way.

Mr. Watson has well said of marriage, "It is indeed scarcely possible even to sketch the numerous and important effects of this sacred institution, which at once displays, in the most affecting manner, the Divine benevolence and the Divine wisdom. It secures the preservation and tender nature of children, by concentrating an affection upon them, which is dissipated and lost wherever fornication prevails. It creates conjugal tenderness, filial piety, the attachment of brothers and sisters, and of collateral relations. It softens the feelings, and increases the benevolence of society at large, by bringing all these affections to operate powerfully within each of those domestic and family circles of which society is composed. It excites industry and economy; and secures the communication of moral knowledge, and the inculcation of civility, and early habits of submission to authority by which men are fitted to become the subjects of a public government, and without which, perhaps, no government could be sustained but by brute force, or it may be, not sustained at all. These are some of the innumerable benefits, by which marriage promotes human happiness, and the peace and strength of the community at large."

V. The mutual obligations which the marriage relation imposes upon the parties, in regard to each other, is the last point to be considered.

1. The main duty of married life is love. This is so obvious and important, that it is generally reckoned essential to the formation of the marriage contract, that the parties should entertain for each other, a superior affection to that which they cherish for any other persons, or any other earthly objects. This love, where it is properly cultivated will render all particular duties pleasure, and all mutual burdens light. Married companions are partners in domestic life, for the joint prosecution of all the great ends of life. The

terms of their partnership are all founded in equal love. Each is under the most sacred obligation to cultivate and preserve inviolate towards each other, that exclusive affection which is implied in conjugal fidelity and chastity.

2. The marriage relation imposes an obligation upon the parties, to do all in their power, in the use of means consistent with their duty to God, to promote each other's happiness. The party which does what he or she knows will cause the other pain or unhappiness, which is not demanded by his or her duty, or greater rightful enjoyment, violates the obligation of the marriage relation. This is very general, but good sense and an honest desire to do right, will seldom find it difficult to apply it to all particular cases.

This general rule imposes upon the parties, mutual assistance in the performance of the duties of each, mutual industry and economy, mutual fortitude and cheerfulness under all the burdens and misfortunes of life, and mutual forbearance in view of each other's weaknesses and errors. To attempt to give more specific rules on the points here involved, would be not only useless, but destroy the force of the whole, at least in many cases.

3. The rights and obligations of the married relation, constitute the husband the head of the family, and hold him responsible for its protection, government and support. In doing so, it regards the wife as the second in authority, and as a helper in all things, as her abilities may qualify her to do, and as the circumstances of their condition may call for her exertions. This is, beyond all question, the doctrine of the Bible in regard to the subject. In support of this view it may be remarked,

(1.) That it is in harmony with the order God pursued in the work of Creation. The man was first created, and then the woman was formed as a helpmeet for him. The man was not formed as a help for the woman, but woman was formed as a help for the man. The man therefore is the principal, and the woman is the helper, when their interests are blended in the marriage relation.

(2.) This doctrine in question is most clearly and positively asserted in the Scriptures.

Eph. 5: 22-33; "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the Savior of the body. Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing. Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word: That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies: he that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourished and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church: For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the

church. Nevertheless, let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband."

1 Peter 3: 1-7; "Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives; While they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear. Whose adorning, let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; But let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price. For after this manner, in the old time, the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands: Even as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement. Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered."

Paul gave to Titus direction, Tit. 2: 3-5, to instruct, "The aged women likewise, that they be in behavior as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things; That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed."

Col. 3:18, 19; "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord. Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them."

The above Scriptures clearly teach the doctrine in question, that the husband is the head of the family, and first in authority. Other remarks, upon them are reserved until the conclusion of the argument.

3. The voice of nature is as distinct and decisive as the voice of revelation.

Nature has given to woman the domestic empire as the principal sphere of her duties and honors. It is not that there is any law against her performing any duty or good work which the interests of humanity demand, and to which a benevolent heart may prompt, so far as may be consistent with the duties demanded to make her own home happy, of which she is mistress, and of which she should be the central object of attraction. These remarks relate to the marriage relation and not to woman in single life, and nature has directed by a changeless law, that the duties of wives shall ever be inseparable from the duties of mothers. This points to the domestic circle as the principal field of woman's labor and woman's glory. The husband is better fitted for the more public and harder pursuits of life. Aside from all influence arising from habits, man is stronger made physically, and better qualified to be the leader, supporter and defender. The woman is the weaker vessel, and nature has made the husband the natural protector of the wife. The husband is held responsible by the laws of God and man to provide for his wife and children. It is written that "if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

2. Tim. 2: 6. When Paul says, "The husbandman that laboreth must be first partaker of the fruits." He takes it for granted that the labors of the field will be principally performed by the harder sex. Man is better qualified for it, while the woman is better qualified for the duties required in the domestic circle, and nature by assigning to her the office and duties of a mother, has fixed the field of her principal responsibilities.

Some may talk of man's superiority by nature, but that is only a dream of the imagination. The doctrine here advocated, is not based upon man's supposed superiority, but upon nature's law of adaptation. Man is doubtless superior to woman in some respects; as a general rule, he can stand under a greater weight, run with greater speed, and clamber over rocks and mountains with greater ease, but in point of all that can delight the eye of God and holy angels, he is not woman's superior. But he is better adapted to the sphere our doctrine assigns him, and she is better adapted to the sphere assigned her by the same doctrine. The natural qualities of women, aided by their position in society, tend powerfully to develop correct moral and religious principles; and immorality is less frequent, and piety more common among them than among men.

The position of woman as the subject of the conjugal and maternal relations, gives her the almost entire control of the young, and makes her to a great extent the arbiter of their destinies. To her keeping and care each successive generation is intrusted in the earliest periods of its existence. From her the first impressions on the susceptible mind of infancy are received. The infant character is moulded and modified in many respects by her hand. Her gentleness, her affection, her patience, her unwearied industry, her incessant care, her principles, whether exalted or groveling, are the school of childhood. In this maternal school we take our lessons; under this discipline we form our characters for time and eternity. The maternal office is, therefore, an office of the greatest dignity and usefulness, and challenges our highest admiration and esteem.

Before closing on this subject, it may be well to offer a few remarks by way of guarding the doctrine that has been advocated above, against abuse. On this subject let it be remarked, that,

(1.) There is nothing in the doctrine of the wife's subordination, as taught in the Gospel, that justifies the thought of servile subjection or degradation. That is inconsistent with the ardent love which is so strongly urged upon the husband as his Christian duty. The husband is required to love his wife as his own body, and also to give "honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel." The Scriptures which have been quoted are not to be understood as enjoining servile submission, but that yielding to the husband's authority which is necessary to preserve peace and secure good order in the domestic circle. The husband is bound by the law of love to consult his wife in regard to everything which concerns her peace and happiness, and to yield to her wishes so far as he can, in view of his best sense of right and duty, but where there is a difference of opinion, which cannot be removed by a comparison of views, the wife is bound to yield to the authority of the husband. She must, or he must yield to her, or there must be a want of union in feeling and action. It is not degrading for the wife to be in subordination in this sense.

(2.) A good and intelligent wife, will not feel it degrading to be subordinate to her husband, but if she loves him, and respects him as she ought, she will feel it a greater honor to look to him as the head and guide of the family, than she would to hold the principal authority in her own hands. The clear headed and right minded will see that there is a natural reason for their subordination, which does not imply inferiority. One must be subordinate, the other superior. The superior station naturally belongs to the husband, and the inferior to the wife. No woman ought to marry a man who is not supposed to be equal to the station which naturally belongs to him as superior partner in the joint family establishment. If she is disappointed, and finds him to be incompetent, she must still give him his place, and assist and sustain him by her counsel and co-operation to the best of her ability.

Nor is there anything in the doctrine which can throw the slightest difficulty in the way of the wife, if the husband be absent or incapacitated by any means. She is second in command, and in such case, she is bound to take his place and represent and execute his authority to the best of her ability.

(3.) Least of all is there anything in the doctrine of the wife's subordination, which can justify conjugal oppression. None but an ignorant and mean spirit will make an unnecessary use of a husband's superior authority. Good wives are often oppressed but it is wicked and destructive to the happiness of the domestic circle. A wife has rights which belong to her, reserved right which remain untouched by the marriage relation. Among these are the right of conscience, right to enjoy the advantages of religion, and to lead a religious life. One of the texts quoted above says, "wives submit yourselves unto your husbands, as it is fit in the Lord." Beyond this no wife is bound to go, and no husband has a right to require it.

SECTION III.

Parents and Children.

The parental and filial relations constitute the second stage in the progress of human society. By this relation duties are first devolved upon the parents, before children become subjects of moral obligation. But as children increase in years and understanding, they become involved in the obligation of duties to their parents. And as parents reach advanced years, and children come to years of maturity, the active duties of the former relax and the duties of the latter increase.

I. "What are the duties of parents? Only general answers of course can be given to this question.

1. Parents are under obligation to nurture, protect and rear the children they are instrumental in bringing into existence.

Children are committed to the care of their parents in a state of helpless dependence, from whom they must receive every care, and be nurtured by the most tender hand, to keep alive the feeble vital spark with which their existence is first kindled, until the fires of life shall burn stronger. Each of the parents has an appropriate work to perform, but the mother's gentle hand and heart of love are put in immediate requisition, and have most important purposes to answer. An immortal being is in her arms and on her bosom; a soul with boundless faculties of thought and feeling hangs upon her lips of tenderness, and drinks intelligence from her kindling eye. Faculties capable of angelic intelligence, and heavenly virtue are slumbering in her arms and reposing on her breast. She must first call them into exercise, and give them impulses which they will never cease to feel. By the kindness of her heart, by the delicacy of her feelings and sentiments, and by her nice discrimination and accurate judgment, she is well fitted for her task. She plies her labors with unwearied assiduity. As months roll away, her immortal charge improves under her care, till the laughing lips and kindling eye respond to her own deep sympathies, and love and happiness fill the soul and expand its powers.

This tender and watchful care has to be continued for years, but it is soon merged in other and sterner duties, as the infant becomes a prattling child, and as a child becomes a youth. This prepares the way for a second branch of duty.

2. It is the duty of parents to govern their children. This is a work of great importance, and often of great difficulty. It is a work in which both parents must take a part, and cooperate to sustain each other's influence and authority. After the mother's tuition has been in progress for some time, the child comes under the sterner authority and the severer influence of the father. The mother's tenderness and exquisite sensibility are necessary in the earlier stages of its improvement; but, at a later period, the more vigorous modes of paternal discipline are equally requisite to a proper formation of character. The mother operates earliest, and continues her kind and sympathizing attentions to the last. The father commences his appropriate influences after a certain degree of progress has been attained, and contributes to give manliness and energy to the character.

Children should very early be taught the duty of submission to wholesome authority. Authority must be enforced, or the ends of family government will be defeated, and ruin will in most cases be the result. To govern children well, the parent must understand that the child is to be governed for its good. Even parental authority is not to be maintained as an end, but as a means to an end and that end is the benefit of the governed. Example goes farther than precept, hence parents should set good examples before their children, and be careful of their words and of the temper and spirit with which they attempt to enforce their commands.

Government should be firm, but mild, kind and liberal. This is implied in the words of Paul, Eph. 6: 4; "And ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath." This undoubtedly forbids parents to be too exacting and too harsh and severe. So we read Col. 3: 21; "Father's, provoke not your children to anger, lest they be discouraged." Too great severity, and especially fault-finding disposition, would have a tendency to produce the effect described. When children feel that they have made a fair attempt to do well, and

please their parents, and are then treated severely and found fault with, they will be provoked to wrath, or discouraged, or both.

A wise administration of family government requires as its fundamental condition a complete and just system of family laws. Whatever rules of action are necessary, ought to be adopted and no others. It is equally a fault not to adopt necessary rules, and to adopt unnecessary ones. A careful distinction ought to be made between the appropriate sphere of family government and that of advice. Many actions may be appropriate matters of advice, which it is not expedient to enforce. Actions necessary to be enforced, we should enforce; those proper to be matters of advice, we should make matters of advice only.

3. Parents are under obligation to educate their children to the best of their means and opportunity. The first, and most important of all, is a religious education. This is expressly commanded. Paul commands parents to bring up their children "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Eph. 6: 4.

This clearly comprehends a religious, education. To bring up children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, is to give them a religious education. It is to teach them the doctrines and duties of Christianity. Parents commit a great error when they propose to allow their children to grow up without any bias in favor of any particular religion, that they may the more freely choose for themselves when they come to years of understanding. The absurdity of such a course is plain.

(1.) Parents have no right to leave their children to grow up to choose their religious views and habits, without doing all in their power to impress right views and habits upon them. "Thou shalt teach them diligently to thy children," was the command of God to the Israelites.

Prov. 22: 6; "Train up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it."

A child should go in the way of the belief and practice of religion, and as he is to be trained up in the way he should go, the duty of parents is to train up their children in the belief and practice of religion as they understand it.

(2.) Parents do educate their children, to a great extent, whether they aim it or not. Education begins very early; it is always commenced in the nursery. Education commences as soon as the infant becomes sensible of surrounding objects, and continues through every period of childhood and youth till the character is fully formed and established.

Parents educate their children by their conversation with them and with others in their presence, by the provisions which they make for their comfort, by their examples, temper, dispositions, and conduct. They are teachers by necessity, and their children are pupils who must receive their lessons. The principles and prejudices, virtues and vices, and intellectual peculiarities of parents, are generally transmitted by domestic education

to their children. Suppose then, that parents adopt the plan of teaching their children no particular religion: that of itself will educate the children in the belief that religion is of less importance than the common matters of the world, in regard to which parents labor to impart their own views and habits to their children. The result will probably be, that by the time the children are old enough to think for themselves, as it is called, they will be so thoroughly educated in the system of indifference to religion, that they are likely to live and die in a state of indifference.

Parents, in order to give their children a religious education, should teach them at home, live religion before them, and lead them to the sanctuary and bring them up under the influence of a sound Gospel ministry. Parents are also under obligation to give their children such a literary and scientific education as their circumstances will allow, and as will qualify them to be respectable and useful in the community in which they are expected to live, and act.

4. Parents are bound to do what they can to procure for their children a respectable, useful and happy settlement in life. This is so universally desired on the part of parents, that an elaboration of the obligation is uncalled for. The measures parents often employ, however, are very erroneous, and ill adapted to secure the end. Yet a detailed directory on the subject, would be out of place here.

In conclusion, if parents would succeed, they must keep before their mind the fact of their own accountability to God, on one hand, and the immortality of their children on the other, and ever act in view of these two fundamental truths.

II. The duty of children to parents.

The duties of children are so numerous, and the forms of the same so varied, that but a mere sketch can be given. A few general principles may be laid down with great certainty.

1. It is the duty of children to love their parents.

The claim of parents to the love of their children as men and women, is based on the same principle as that of other men and women. Their claim to peculiar and distinguishing affections depends on their peculiar relations and offices. They are to be loved as men and women in proportion to their virtues and accomplishments. Every additional virtue is an additional charm; every accomplishment an appeal to the heart, and a demand of its affection and interest. They are to be loved as parents on account of their parental offices and services. To them we are indebted, under God, for our existence. They have kindly received us from the hand of the Creator; watched over our infancy with unsleeping care, and untiring assiduity; have grieved at our grief, and rejoiced at our joys, more than at their own personal inconveniences and gratifications; and have loved and served us as themselves. Their main anxieties have been for us; and their greatest earthly enjoyments have been to contribute to our happiness. This is not a rare case. It is the parental character in its usual development. Anything less than this is singular and

unnatural. All this devotion and these services create a demand for filial love. They are so many appeals to the hearts of children in favor of their parents; and not to respond to them with prompt and generous affections, is both unjust and cruel. The peculiarity of the parental offices requires corresponding peculiarities in the affection due. They are not only to be loved, but to be loved as parents, with a due sense of their parental offices and services.

2. Children are bound to reverence their parents. The reverence due to parents, says Mr. Watson, "consists in that honorable esteem of parents which children ought to cherish in their hearts, and from which springs, on the one hand the desire to please, and on the other the fear to offend. The fear of a child is, however, opposed to the fear of a slave; the latter has respect chiefly to the punishment which may be inflicted; but the other being mixed with love, and the desire to be loved, has respect to the offence which may be taken by a parent, his grief and his displeasure. Hence the fear of God, as a grace of the Spirit in the regenerate, is compared to the fear of children. This reverential regard due to parents has its external expression in all honor and civility, whether in words or actions. The behavior is to be submissive, the speech respectful, reproof is to be borne by them with meekness, and the impatience of parents sustained in silence. Children are bound to close their eyes as much as possible upon the failings and infirmities of the authors of their being, and always to speak of them honorably among themselves, and in the presence of others. "The hearts of all men go along with Noah in laying punishment upon Ham for his unnatural and profane derision, and love the memory of those sons that would not allow themselves to be the witnesses of the miscarriages of their father."

It appears necessary only to add to the above, a few confirmatory declarations from the word of God.

Exod. 20: 12; "Honor thy father and thy mother; that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

Deut. 22: 16; "Cursed be he that setteth light by his father or his mother. And all the people shall say, Amen."

Prov. 15: 5; "A fool despiseth his father's instruction: but he that regardeth reproof is prudent."

3. Children are under obligation to obey their parents. In childhood, the obligation is absolute, as the parents are the only competent judges in the case, what is proper and what is not, unless so far as the civil law may come in to protect children from the abuse of inhuman parents. God has made parents the judges of the conduct of their children, and holds them to a strict account for the manner in which they discharge the functions of their office, and for the conduct of their children, while under their control. When children get old enough to understand their relation to God, as well as to their parents, and to be the subjects of moral obligation and of an enlightened conscience, the case is a little different. Still while they remain under the control and jurisdiction of the family government, children are bound to obey their parents in everything, except so far, as they

may be required to do or not do, what, in their honest conviction, would be a sin against God. This no obligation can require and no law justify, under any circumstances whatsoever.

The parental office is necessarily one of authority. Parents are charged with responsibilities which cannot be met without the exercise of authority. They must control their children in order to take care of them, as well as from a due regard to their own comfort. Families are provinces in God's kingdom, and family government a branch of the Divine government, Parents are God's officers to administer the government of their respective families according to his laws, and in subordination to the great ends of his more general government. As such they have their legitimate sphere, within which their law is God's law; and their will, God's will. To obey them, therefore, in the exercise of their legitimate authority, is to obey God; and to disobey them, to disobey him. Parents must be obeyed. They occupy a position in which they must rule, and their children must, to a great extent, submit. They are responsible for exercising their authority with justice, and children are responsible for obedience.

Like other rulers, parents may abuse their power. When they command things which are lawful and right, resistance is sin. Within those limits they have their province. When, however, they command things unlawful and wrong, obedience is a sin, and disobedience a virtue. They have exceeded the limits of their province, and have entrenched on the rights of God. With this accords the word of God.

Prov. 30: 17; "The eye that mocketh at his father, and despiseth to obey his mother, the ravens of the valley shall pick it out, and the young eagles shall eat it."

Eph. 6: 1; "Children obey your parents in the Lord: for that is right."

Col. 3: 20; "Children, obey your parents in all things: for this is well-pleasing unto the Lord."

4. Children are bound to nourish and support their parents in old age, if their circumstances require it.

Unfortunately, too many children never have this duty to perform, having never themselves enjoyed a parent's love and a parent's care. But in the case of those whose parents are spared to bring them up, and who advance on into a second childhood, the children of such parents should regard it, not merely as a duty, but as the highest privilege to give them shelter under their roof, and nurture them with the tenderest hand of affection. No claim of right in parents, and no obligation of duty on the child should be felt as more binding and sacred than this. Here the Spirit of Christianity triumphs over all other religions.

SECTION II.

Masters and Servants.

By masters and servants, in this section, no reference is had to what is called slavery. That system of chattelizing humanity, cannot be arranged under the law of reciprocity, which governs all legitimate relations, and therefore cannot be discussed as a system to be regulated by the law of morality. It will require a separate examination as an outlaw.

By servants and masters is meant the relation under which the several forms of voluntary labor is performed for a consideration. The parties in such cases are described, in Scripture language, as masters and servants. The same idea is expressed among us by the terms, employers and employed. The disuse of the terms, master and servant to express the relation between an employer and a person voluntarily employed, has doubtless, in this country, resulted from the existence of chattel slavery. As slave owners apply the term servant to their human chattels, and are called masters by them, free laborers revolt at the use of the same terms to express the relation which subsists between them and their employers. But in England, and other countries where chattel slavery has no existence, the old Bible terms, master and servants, are used to denote the relation between free laborers and their employers. This is a relation which always has existed, and doubtless will continue to exist. It is provided for and regulated in the Scriptures It is the next relation which arises in the progress of human society, after that of parents and children, and requires to be considered in this place. For a writer in this country, and living in a free state, and having made himself a little notorious by his opposition to chattel slavery, to treat of the duties of masters and servants, by applying those Scriptures which speak of their duties, to free laborers and their employers, will be liable to be regarded by all pro-slavery minds as a perversion of the sacred text. To regard the very texts which have been relied upon to support chattel slavery, as the law regulating free labor, involves a manifest absurdity, either on the part of those who apply them to the support of slavery, or on the part of the writer who regards them as furnishing the law regulating free labor. One thing is certain, that is, if these Scriptures which treat of the duties of masters and servants, do not furnish the law for the government of free employers and free laborers, we have no such law.

It is held that these Scriptures relate to the duties of employers and free laborers, and that the writer may not appear to be influenced by his peculiar relation and attitude of hostility to chattel slavery, the subject shall be presented principally, in the language of the Rev. Richard Watson, who wrote on the subject where no slavery exists, but where these terms, servant and master, are still applied to a system of free labor. Mr. Watson includes all classes of servants in his argument, and hence, he adapts his remarks more to those apprentices bound for a term of years, and such as may be permanently employed, than to mere transient laborers, who may be employed for a few days or weeks.

1. Of the duties of servants Mr. Watson says,

"Government in masters, as well as in fathers, is an appointment of God, though differing in circumstances; and it is, therefore, to be honored. 'Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all *honor*,' a direction which enjoins both respectful thoughts, and humility and propriety of external demeanor towards them.

Obedience to their commands in all things lawful is next enforced: which obedience is to be grounded on principle and conscience; on 'singleness of heart, as unto Christ;' thus serving a master with the same sincerity, the same desire to do the appointed work well, as is required of us by Christ. This service is also to be *cheerful*, and not wrung out merely by a sense of duty; 'Not with eye service, as men pleasers;' not having respect simply to the approbation of the master, but 'as the servants of Christ,' making profession of his religion, 'doing the will of God,' in this branch of duty, 'from the *heart*,' with alacrity and good feeling. The duties of servants, stated in these brief precepts, might easily be shown to comprehend every particular which can be justly required of persons in this station; and the whole is enforced by a sanction which could have no place but in a revelation from God, —'knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free.' Eph. 6: 5. In other words, even the common duties of servants, when faithfully, cheerfully, and piously performed, are by Christianity made rewardable actions; 'Of the Lord ye shall receive a reward,' "

2. Of the duties of masters, Mr. Watson continues,

The duties of servants and masters are, however, strictly reciprocal. Hence the Apostle continues his injunctions as to the right discharge of these relations, by saying, immediately after he had prescribed the conduct of servants, 'And ye masters, do the *same things* unto them;' that is, act towards them upon the same equitable conscientious, and benevolent principles, as you exact from them. He then grounds his rules, as to masters, upon the great and influential principle, 'Knowing that your Master is in heaven;' that you are under authority, and are accountable to him for your conduct to your servants. Thus masters are put under the eye of God, who not only maintains their authority, when properly exercised, by making their servants accountable for any contempt of it, and for every other failure of duty, but also holds the master himself responsible for its just and mild exercise. A solemn and religious aspect is thus at once given to a relation, which by many is considered as one merely of interest. When the Apostle enjoins it on masters to 'forbear threatening,' he inculcates the treatment of servants with kindness of manner, with humanity, and good nature; and, by consequence also, the cultivation of that benevolent feeling towards persons in this condition, which in all rightly influenced minds, will flow from the consideration of their equality with themselves in the sight of God: their equal share in the benefits of redemption; their relation to us as brethren in Christ, if they are 'partakers of like precious faith;' and their title to the common inheritance of heaven, where all those temporary distinctions on which human vanity is so apt to fasten shall be done away. There will also not be wanting, in such minds, a consideration of the service rendered (for the benefit is mutual); and a feeling of gratitude for service faithfully performed, although it is compensated by wages or hire.

"To benevolent sentiment the Apostle, however, adds the principles of justice and equity; 'Masters, give to your servants that which is *just* and *equal*, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven,' who is the avenger of injustice. The terms *just* and *equal*, though terms of near affinity, have a somewhat different signification. To give that which is *just* to a servant, is to deal with him according to an agreement made, but to give him what is *equal*, is to deal fairly and honestly with him, and to return what is his due in reason and

conscience, even when there are circumstances in the case which strict law would not oblige us to take into the account. 'Justice makes our *contracts* the measure of our dealings with others, and equity our *consciences*. 'Equity here may also have respect particularly to that important rule which obliges us to do to others what we would, in the same circumstances, have them to do to us. This rule of equity has a large range in the treatment of servants. It excludes all arbitrary and tyrannical government; it teaches masters to respect the strength and capacity of their servants; it represses rage and passion, contumely and insult; and it directs that their labor shall not be so extended as not to leave proper time for rest, for attendance on God's worship, and, at proper seasons, for recreation.

"The *religious* duties of masters are also of great importance.

"Under the Old Testament, the servants of a house partook of the common benefit of the true religion, as appears from the case of the servants of Abraham, who were all brought into the covenant of circumcision; and from the early prohibition of idolatrous practices in families, and, consequently, the maintenance of the common worship of God. The same consecration of whole families to God we see in the New Testament; in the baptism of 'houses,' and the existence of domestic Churches. The practice of inculcating the true religion upon servants, passed from the Jews to the first Christians, and followed indeed from the conscientious employment of the master's *influence* in favor of piety; a point to which we shall again advert.

"From all this arises the duty of instructing servants in the principles of religion; of teaching them to read, and furnishing them with the Scriptures; of having them present at family worship; and of conversing with them faithfully and affectionately respecting their best interests. In particular, it is to be observed, that servants have by the law of God a right to the Sabbath, of which no master can, without sin, deprive them. They are entitled under that law to rest on that day; and that not only for the recreation of their strength and spirits, but, especially, to enable them to attend public worship, and to read the Scriptures, and pray in private. Against this duty all those offend who employ servants in works of gain: and also those who do not so arrange the affairs of their households, that domestic servants may be as little occupied as possible with the affairs of the house, in order that they may be able religiously to use a day which is made as much theirs as their masters', by the express letter of the law of God; nor can the blessing of God be expected to rest upon families where this shocking indifference to the religious interests of domestics, and this open disregard the Divine command prevail. A Jewish strictness in some particulars is not bound upon Christians: as for example, the prohibition against lighting fires. These were parts of the municipal, not the moral law of the Jews; and they have respect to a people living in a certain climate, and in peculiar circumstances. But even these prohibitions are of use as teaching us self-denial, and that in all cases we ought to keep within the rules of necessity. Unnecessary occupations are clearly forbidden even when they do not come under the description of *work* for gain; and when they are avoided, there will be sufficient leisure for every part of a family to enjoy the Sabbath as a day of rest, and as a day of undistracted devotion."

In the above, not the slightest reference is had to the system of chattel slavery, and yet it makes an application of the texts which some have supposed could find no explanation, only in the relation of man-owner and man owned.

CHAPTER IV.

THE DUTIES WE OWE TO OUR FELLOW-BEINGS CONTINUED—CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

Civil government is an ordinance of God, designed to meet the necessities of mankind, who always have, always will, and always must live in society.

The time never came, until recently, when a writer on revealed religion, would have found it necessary to institute an argument to prove that what is called civil government, may rightfully exist. That time appears to have come, for there has risen among us a class of persons who profess to have discovered that civil government, and all civil institutions are, *per se*, rebellion against God.

The argument in support of the fact that civil government may rightfully exist, need not be extended in a direct form, for the reason that all the arguments that are drawn from the Scriptures, to prove what of are the duties of civil rulers, and of the people in regard to civil government, will equally establish the rightful existence of the institution of government.

SECTION I.

The Rightful Existence of Civil Government.

In support of the doctrine of the rightful existence of civil government, the following considerations are urged.

I. The origin of the institution.

As it is too plain to be controverted, that God did give his sanction to civil government and penal laws, in Old Testament times, the advocates of the no-government theory have to assume that the governments which God sanctioned were parts of a temporary system, which is repealed and superseded by the Gospel. This position renders an inquiry into the origin of civil government of the first importance; for if it can be proved that the institution existed, with *the divine approbation*, from the commencement of human society, before any written law was given, it must follow that it is right in itself, and was not made right by the positive precepts of a law or system subsequently given; and hence, could it be proved that every part of the Mosaic system was repealed by Christ, which, how ever, is not admitted, it would not follow that civil government is therefore repealed. As it was right before the Mosaic system was introduced, so it may remain right since its repeal.

Let us now attempt to collect what little light may be gathered from times so remote as when the world was new, and when towns and cities were built by the sons of the first man.

1. Human government has existed in some form ever since man began to multiply upon the earth. This position certainly cannot be disproved, for we have no account of any nation, on the face of the whole earth, at any time during all past ages, which did not exist under some kind of civil government. This does not prove necessarily that government is right, but it proves that all nations have thought it necessary, and that they have thought it right to have government and laws, or else, believing it to be wrong, no nation ever had faith enough in their own principles to put them in practice. However old in theory the no-government system may claim to be it is untried in practice, for no nation ever ventured upon the experiment.

2. Government has become refined, improved and strengthened, just in proportion as the people have become enlightened and brought under the influence of civilization. Light and civilization have at no time tended to the overthrow of civil institutions, but to their improvement and establishment upon a firmer basis, while they have declined and been perverted or overthrown, when darkness and superstition have gained the ascendancy. This remark is made because it is not pretended that governments are always right, but that it is always right that there should be governments. Nor is it contended that governments, in order to be right, must be the same in form, in every age and country; the advance and retrograde of civilization and refinement, which mark the progress of human society, in different ages and countries, must modify civil governments and all civil institutions.

The first governments were patriarchal in form, in which the father governed his family, upon whose death, the oldest son succeeded in the government, until a division took place, and separate families and tribes were formed. The father governed his family, but when his children formed families of their own, each governed his own family, in such matters as concerned their domestic interests, and the father became a governor of all the families in those matters which concerned the intercourse of one family with another, and when the father died the oldest son took the general government. In this way it is easy to see how an empire might grow out of a single family, or how different tribes and nations came into being; for as a family or tribe should become numerous, it might send out a colony, or a single family might depart beyond the influence of the association, and proceed, upon the same principles, to raise up another tribe or nation. Such is not only the origin of civil government, but it resulted from the necessity of the case. As a family could not exist without a head, to decide questions of right and order, which must arise between the members of every family, so a collection or combination of families, as the tide of humanity should roll on, would need a government and general rules to regulate all these families in their intercourse with each other. As questions would rise between the members of the same family, so would questions rise between different families, which could be settled only by a general government, the authority of which should be admitted by all. This view of the origin of civil government, shows that it naturally

results from the social nature which we have received from the hand that made us, and furnishes a strong argument in support of its rightful existence.

But it may be said, that we are not to reason from our views of necessity, but from God's revealed will. This is admitted, but as we are inquiring what the Bible does teach on the subject, it is proper to avail ourselves of every help within our reach; it is perfectly in point, therefore, to show the origin and nature of the institution, and its adaptation to the wants of the human family. It has been urged with great power, in support of the divine authenticity of the Scriptures, that they are suited to the absolute wants of the human family, and if this argument be sound, which falls from the lips and flows from the pen of every theologian, in support of the claims of the Scriptures, it must be equally sound, to argue from the necessity of civil government, in support of the proposition that the Bible sanctions it; it being admitted that the Bible, when understood, is a perfect system of morality, containing all that is necessary to set our footsteps in the right way. This presents a strong argument in support of civil government, which is rendered still stronger by the following consideration.

3. The origin of civil government, above pointed out, was in accordance with the purpose of God when he sent man into the world to people and subdue it. God evidently designed that men should organize themselves into civil compacts, under such rules as should be required by the various circumstances, growing out of their increase in numbers, and their dispersion over the earth. Of course, a volume of testimony will not be expected on this point, since there was no record preserved, written at the time, of the dispensations of God, or the transactions of men, during the first two thousand five hundred years of the world's existence; all the knowledge we have of these obscure ages, upon which we can rely, is derived from the few oral conversations, afterwards recorded, as having taken place between God and his creature man, during the lapse of so many departed centuries. We have, however, some light on this subject, and what we have is so direct as to leave no doubt that God designed that there should exist, among men, authority and subordination.

Gen. 4: 7; "Unto thee shall be his desires and thou shalt rule over him."

On this text Dr. Clarke remarks: "These words are spoken of Abel's submission to Cain, his superior." This perfectly accords with the view already given, of the form of the first government. The father ruled his family, and the first-born son followed him in the government of the tribe. Cain was the first-born, and Abel the younger, and hence, God says to Cain, "if thou doest well shalt thou not be accepted? * * * And unto thee shall be his desire and thou shalt rule over him." God says to the first-born of the human family, that he shall rule over his younger brother, upon which principle the patriarchal governments immediately after sprung into being, and existed during the first ages of the world.

It has now been shown that civil government is as old as human society, and that it came into being in accordance with the will of God. Now as civil government was right before any written law was given, it was not made right by the law, and hence, it cannot have

been made wrong by the simple repeal of the law, could it be proved that the whole Mosaic system has been abolished. This remark is made of the right of human government, and not its form. It is easy to see that its right and leading principles might be understood, while its form, or the mode of carrying out these principles, could be left to the judgment of the various civil compacts, in view of the circumstances under which they may be called to act; hence, the Mosaic system could give form and shape to all the civil institutions which existed under it, while its repeal would be only a repeal of such forms and modes as it prescribed, leaving the right of the institution unimpaired, the same as it existed from the beginning before any written law was given.

II. There are, in the Old Testament, predictions which speak of the existence of civil government in a manner to prove that it may rightfully exist.

If it can be shown that the kingdoms of the world are not to be overthrown, but only purified and made righteous by the Gospel, when it shall fill the world, and bless all nations, it will fully settle the question under consideration, by proving first, that government is morally lawful, and secondly, that it will always exist, maugre the opposition of certain modern reformers, who are aiming their blows at its very foundations.

Ps. 138: 4, 5; "All the kings of the earth shall praise thee, O Lord, when they hear the words of thy mouth. Yea they shall sing in the ways of the Lord: for great is the glory of the Lord."

This text proves that the exercise of regal authority is consistent with the most ardent piety, and the time is contemplated as a brighter age of the church, when "all the kings of the earth" shall hear the word of God, praise him, and sing in his ways, which, to us, appears utterly inconsistent with the belief that all civil government is necessarily wrong.

Isa. 49: 6, 7; "I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth; * * * kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, because of the Lord that is faithful, and the Holy One of Israel."

Verses 22,23; "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gen tiles, and set up my standard to the people, and they shall bring thy sons in their arms and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers."

That this text relates to the success of the Gospel there can be no doubt, from the fact that it speaks of the call of the Gentiles; and it not only clearly predicts the existence of civil government under the Gospel, but it predicts it in a way which seals it with the divine approbation. God promises it as a great blessing, that kings and queens shall watch over the interests of the church, as affectionate fathers and mothers watch over the children of their solicitude, and can any one believe that such kings and queens will, at the same time, be usurpers, oppressors, and rebels against God, which must be the case if the modern theory of non-resistance be true.

Isa. 60: 3, 11,16; "And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought. Thou shalt also suck the milk of the Gentiles, and shall suck the breasts of kings." Suppose all civil rulers to be oppressors and rebels against God, and the church is here comforted with God's most gracious promise, that she shall be nourished at the breast of enthroned tyranny and bloody crime!

Rev. 21: 24, 27; "And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it; and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honor into it. And there shall in nowise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination."

Of the city of which this is spoken, Dr. Clarke says, "This doubtless means the Christian church in a state of great prosperity and purity." [See notes on verse 2.] Two things are to be noted here.

1. The nations and kings are to come in with all their glory.
2. Nothing is to enter in which defileth or worketh abomination.

Therefore it is certain that the reign and glory of nations and kings is consistent with the purity of the Gospel church, and those who assert that no civil government can rightfully exist under the Gospel, must be wrong.

It is worthy of remark that the above texts, and many more which might be quoted of a similar character, being prophetic, looked forward to the end of time, must render the task of overthrowing all civil government, an attempt to prove the prophetic portions of the Bible untrue.

III. The Scriptures attribute civil government, in certain cases, to God.

1 Sam. 10: 24; "And Samuel said to all the people, See ye him whom the Lord hath chosen, that there is none like him among all the people? And all the people shouted and said, God save the king."

2 Sam. 7: 8; "Now therefore, so shalt thou say unto my servant David, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I took thee from the sheep-cote, from following the sheep, to, be ruler over my people, Israel."

Acts 13: 20, 21, 22; "And after that he gave unto them judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years, until Samuel the prophet. And afterward they desired a king: and God gave unto them Saul; and when he had removed him, he raised up unto them David to be their king."

Dan. 2: 37, 38; "Thou O king, art a king of kings: for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beast of the field, and the fowls of heaven, hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all."

Rom. 13: 1, 2; "The powers that be are ordained of God; whosoever therefore resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God."

These texts as clearly teach that God is the author of civil government as it could be taught in the use of words. It must be difficult to understand what clearer proof any one can ask, than the above furnishes. The first text declares that the Lord chose Saul to be king; the second affirms that the Lord took David to be king; the third asserts that the Lord gave them both judges and kings; the fourth declares that God gave to Nebuchadnezzar a kingdom, and strength, and glory; and wheresoever the children of men dwelt, he gave into his hand, and made him ruler over them all; while the fifth and last text asserts that civil authorities are ordained of God, and that whosoever resists them, resists the ordinance of God. If the point is not proved by the above, a man could not prove it, if he were allowed to write a text in the Bible to suit himself, for the express purpose of proving it. Will it be said that God condemns the very existence of civil government, after all these facts have been produced? As well might it be said that God condemns his own conduct, and disapproves of his own administration.

IV. God holds nations accountable for their conduct in their collective capacity.

If it can be shown that God does recognize the existence of nations, in their civil organizations, and hold them responsible, collectively, for their actions, the proof will be conclusive that it is right that such national establishments should exist. Let us then see what the doctrine of the Bible is on this subject.

Ps. 9: 17; "The wicked shall be turned into hell and *all the nations* that forget God."

It is not necessary to raise the question what is meant by being turned into hell, in this text, whether it relates to the present or future world, as all will doubtless agree that some kind of punishment for sin is intended, and in either case the argument will be the same, in proof of national accountability. The text is clear proof that God holds both wicked persons and wicked nations, accountable to him for their conduct.

Isa. 60: 12; "For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted."

This undoubtedly relates to the Gospel church, and hence it is seen that nations, as such, are held responsible for their conduct in rejecting or receiving the Gospel.

Jer. 12: 17; "But if they will not obey, I will utterly pluck up and destroy that nation."

This is spoken of the nations that surrounded the Israelites, and God says, "if they will diligently learn the ways of my people, then shall they be built in the midst of my people,

but if they will not obey, I will utterly pluck them up and destroy that nation." A plainer illustration of the doctrine of national responsibility could hardly be given.

Chap. 18: 7,8,9,10; "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down and to destroy it; If that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation or concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit it."

In this text God speaks of building up nations and of pulling down nations, just as they obey or disobey his voice. It is worthy of remark that God speaks of a nation as one indivisible accountable agent, by using the pronoun *it*, thus: "If *it* do evil in my sight, that *it* obey not my voice." Such language would not be correct if God did not recognize the nation as a whole, in its collective capacity, as a subject of his government.

This class of texts might be increased to almost any amount, but the above is sufficient to prove the point, that God governs nations as responsible agents in their collective capacity, and from this must follow the rightful existence of such national compacts, If all such civil associations were wrong in themselves, God would not treat with them in this capacity as acknowledged subjects of his government, promising to bless and build up the good and virtuous, and threatening to overthrow the bad. God speaks in the above text of a nation's turning from their evil, which is impossible, if to exist in a national capacity is evil in itself. If all civil government is a crime, a nation can turn away from their evil only by dissolving their civil relations, and ceasing to exist as a nation, which is certainly inconsistent with the promise of God, to plant them and to build them up as a nation, on condition that they will obey him.

V. Some of the best of men have held and discharged the functions of rulers and officers, under both the old and new dispensations.

Gen. 19: 18, 19; " And Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was priest of the most high God. And he blessed him, and said blessed be Abram of the most high God."

Heb. 7: 1, 2; "For this Melchisedek, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, first being, by interpretation, King of righteousness, and after that also king of Salem, which is king of peace."

Here we have an account of a king, who was by name, king of righteousness and peace, and who was also priest of the most high God, This man lived, so far as we know, under no written law, and long before the Mosaic institutions had an existence, and hence, it is clear that he did not derive his authority and kingly rights from the Mosaic system, or from any known positive law, and as he was obviously a king *by right*, and such without reference to any positive law, it must be right in itself that there should be government, and as it was right without reference to any positive law, and before any positive laws

were given, it follows that it would remain right though every positive law should be repealed. This view silences the oft-repeated assertion that Christ has repealed those parts of the Old Testament which made civil government right, for the repeal of a law could make nothing wrong, only what depended upon such law for its rightful existence, but civil government did not depend upon any part of the written law of the Old Testament, for its rightful existence, for it was right before the law existed, and therefore it may be right after the law is repealed.

Job 29: 25; "I chose out their way and sat chief, and dwelt as a king in the army."

Job was a perfect man, yet he was a ruler, as is obvious from the above text.

Ezra 7: 25, 26, 27; "And thou, Ezra, after the wisdom of thy God, that is in thine hand, set magistrates and judges which may judge all the people that are beyond the river, all such as know the laws of thy God; and teach ye them that know them not. And whosoever will not do the law of thy God, and the law of the king, let judgment be executed speedily upon him, whether it be unto death, or to banishment, or to confiscation of goods, or to imprisonment. Blessed be the Lord God of our fathers, which hath put such a thing as this in the king's heart."

Ezra was of the tribe of Levi, and a most holy and devoted servant of God, yet he was appointed by and acted under the authority of Artaxerxes, king of Persia, in the performance of the great work assigned him in the text. Though he was the servant of God, and did nothing but what the law of God directed, yet in doing this, he also acted as the officer of the king of Persia, and not only acknowledged the king's authority, but even *asserted the king's authority*, as the ground of his right to govern the province, and for re-establishing the Jewish law and worship. The last of the three verses above quoted, is a strain of thanksgiving to God, for having "put such a thing in the king's heart." This proves beyond all doubt that this man of God did acknowledge the rightful existence of other governments besides that of the Jewish nation. This is an important consideration, as those who deny the right of civil government assert that the Jewish government was a positive institution, established for that particular people, and does not prove government in general to be right; but as there is here a clear acknowledgement of the rightful existence of another government, this cavil falls to the ground. Ezra, Daniel, and other holy men of God, held offices under, and exercised the authority of other governments than that which was established directly by God over the Jews.

Let us now come down to the days of the Gospel, and show that no change appears to have taken place at or subsequently to its introduction, in the conduct of good men with reference to the rightful existence of civil government. If Jesus Christ did repeal and condemn all civil government, then no good man, under the light of the Gospel, could support civil government, or exercise any of the peculiar functions of a civil officer. This must be absolutely true of those who acted under the personal ministry of Jesus Christ, or that of his inspired Apostles, for there could be no doubt on the subject, while the light of inspiration shone through the minds of the ministry. Let us then see if good men and

believers ever held offices after that unearthly sermon which the Savior preached upon the mount, in which it is claimed that he repealed all civil institutions.

Luke 7: 2, 9; "A certain Centurion's servant was sick, and when he heard of Jesus he sent unto him the elders of the Jews. And when they came to Jesus, they besought him, saying that he was worthy for whom he should do this, for he loveth our nation. And when he was not far from the house, the Centurion sent friends to him, saying Lord trouble not thyself; for I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter under my roof, but say in a word and my servant shall be healed. When Jesus heard these things he marveled at him, and turned him about and said unto the people that followed him, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." Of this man it may be remarked,

1. That he was a believer in the Jewish religion, having built the Jews a synagogue, and was regarded by the Jews as pious.
2. He now believed in Jesus Christ, with a faith which made the Savior marvel, and which he declared to be greater than any that he had found among the Jews.
3. This man was a Roman officer, which proves that it was not necessary to abandon all office holding and all government, in order to true piety under the personal ministry of Christ, and of course he did not preach against civil governments as non-resistants contend.

Acts 10: 1, 2; "There was a certain man in Cesarea, called Cornelius, a centurion of the band called the Italian band. A devout man and one that feared God with all his house, and gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always."

1. This man was a Roman officer.
2. He was a very devout man, praying to God always. He had already learned, at least, a general outline of the Gospel, for Peter said, in addressing him, The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; That word I say ye know, which was published throughout all Judea."
3. Peter more fully explained the mission and doctrine of Christ to him, and then commanded him to be baptized, without even giving one intimation that he must give up all connection with civil government, nor is there any intimation that he in the least changed his course of life in this respect; all of which is wholly irreconcilable with the idea that Christ taught the sinful-ness of civil government *per se*, and that the apostles understood it and preached the same doctrine. Acts 13: 7-12, we have an account of the conversion of a Roman deputy to the faith of Christ, but there is no mention of his giving up the government of the province, as we might reasonably expect had such been the case.

Titus 3: 13; " Bring Zenas the lawyer. "Though this person is not mentioned elsewhere, and though it is not known whether he was a Jew or a Roman, yet two things are certain from this brief notice of him, viz:

1. He was a Christian, living in, or at this time, passing through the Island of Crete.
2. He was a *lawyer*, and as no one will contend that he is called a lawyer with reference to his having studied the Gospel, he must have been a Jewish or Roman lawyer either of which is in consistent with the non resistant notions of Christianity.

It is very singular indeed that no direct precept is given, and no one instance of abjuration of civil government, or resignation of office by the converts to Christianity is recorded if, as is now contended by non-resistants, Christ did forbid all participation in civil government. It is not so in these days; Mr. J. has renounced the church and published his withdrawment to the world; and Mr. Q. Esq. has resigned the office of justice of the peace, and renounced and abjured forever all connection with and all participation in, civil government, in a letter addressed to His Excellency the Governor, and has caused such letter to be published. Such is the notoriety which is sought for the principles of non-resistance in these days of reform, and if the Gospel, in the days of its purity, spreading under the eye of inspiration over provinces, kingdoms and empires, did actually require all who embraced it to renounce and abjure forever all civil government, it is incredible that there should have been no one instance handed down to us in these latter times, upon the pages of sacred or profane history.

VI. There are a great number and variety of texts which teach the rightfulness of civil government by implication.

Among the texts referred to are the following.

Ps. 2: 10-12; "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, all ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little." Dr. Clarke's notes on this text are directly to the point, as follows:

"Be wise, O ye kings. An exhortation of the Gospel to the rulers and to all kingdoms, nations, and states, to whom it may be sent. All these should listen to its maxims, be governed by its precepts, and rule their subjects according to its dictates.

"Be instructed, ye judges. Rather, *be ye reformed.* Cast away all your idolatrous maxims, and receive the Gospel as the law, or the basis of the law of the land."

That the text refers to the reign of Christ, or the Gospel dispensation, there can be no doubt, and yet it clearly implies the existence of kings and judges of the earth, who are called upon to serve the Lord, and to kiss the Son lest he be angry with them, and destroy them, i. e. cast them down from their rank and overturn their authority. This

implies that kings and judges may do right under the Gospel, and please God, as such, and therefore it is not wrong in itself to be a king or a judge.

Prov. 16: 12; "It is an abomination for kings to commit wickedness: for the throne is established by righteousness."

This text certainly takes it for granted that it is right that there should be kings, for,

1. If it were true that it is wickedness itself to be a king, there would be no good sense in the language; it would be to talk about its being wrong for a man to commit wickedness, while holding a certain position, when the very act of holding that position is wickedness, itself.

2. If it is necessarily wrong to rule as a king, the text is not true, when it says, "the throne is established by righteousness," for in such case, wickedness and wickedness only could establish the throne of a king.

Prov. 20: 28; "Mercy and truth preserve the king; and his throne is established by mercy."

This cannot be true, if there is no justice and mercy in the exercise of regal functions, and if the exercise of regal authority is consistent with justice and mercy, it must be right. If the throne of a king be established by mercy, as the text asserts, then the establishment of kings upon thrones must be right.

Matt. 22: 17; Mark 12: 14; Luke 20: 22; "Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar or not?"

This question, taken in connection with our Saviour's answer, clearly implies the right of civil government.

Matt. 5: 24-26; Luke 12: 58-9; "When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, as thou art in the way, give diligence that thou mayest be delivered from him, lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison. I tell thee thou shalt not depart thence, till thou hast paid the very last mite."

On this text, Dr. Clarke has made the following remarks:

"Agree with thine adversary quickly. Adversary, properly a plaintiff in law—a perfect law term. Our Lord enforces the exhortation given in the preceding verses from the consideration of what was deemed prudent in ordinary law suits."

This text most clearly contemplates the existence of law, and of magistrates to administer such law, and that cases will arise in which even brethren will resort to the law for the settlement of difficulties, or the redress of injuries. In Matt., the Savior is speaking of *brethren*, when he introduces the subject of legal proceedings. "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; leave there thy

gift before the altar and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother. Agree with thine adversary quickly, while thou art in the way with him." From this subject we learn,

1. That a brother is here termed an adversary, i. e., a plaintiff in law.

2. Christ speaks of these two brethren as going together to the magistrate to settle their differences, by a regular process" of law: "*When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate,*" are words which imply that we may go to a magistrate to settle difficulties. If Christ intended to condemn all law, and all magistrates, and to prohibit Christians from giving any countenance to law and legal proceedings, he would not have used such language. Instead of saying, "WHEN THOU GOEST *with thine adversary to the magistrate,*" he would have said, NEVER GO *with thine adversary to the magistrate.* This is a clear acknowledgment, on the part of our Savior, of the rightful existence of government, and of the rightful use of the law, when a party cannot obtain justice without. But while the text proves the right of legal proceedings, it gives no countenance to unnecessary litigations, as it exhorts the parties, and especially the one in the wrong, to "*give all diligence*" to have the matter settled between themselves before it is pressed through a course of law.

Acts 16: 37; "But Paul said unto them, they have beaten us openly, uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily, nay, verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out."

Here St. Paul clearly asserts his rights as a Roman citizen, and charges the magistrates with having violated the Roman law, in beating and imprisoning them uncondemned, which he could not consistently have done, if he had believed that there is no binding force in law, and that neither himself nor his accusers owed any allegiance to the government or to its laws. His complaint is not that they had been *beaten and imprisoned*, but that it had been done *contrary to the Roman law*. Some may say that the Apostle might do all this, without admitting the rightful existence of the law. We admit he might, if he could be inconsistent, but not without. The whole force of his conduct went to make an impression upon the minds of all concerned, that he believed in the rightful existence of the law and that he would avail himself of the power of the law, in self-defense. It must have made this impression on the minds of the disciples, and it certainly made such an impression on the minds of the magistrates, for they were *afraid* when they heard of his remark. To make the least possible of this case, Paul did acknowledge himself to be a Roman citizen, in a legal sense, but our non-resistants of these times will not acknowledge that they are citizens in the sense of claiming or exercising civil immunities and hence it follows that they hold different principles from St. Paul, or that they adhere closer to their principles than he did to his.

Acts 22: 25; " And as they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by, is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned?"

As this text is so nearly of the character of the one quoted above, the remarks made upon that are equally applicable to this; hence, it is not necessary to extend the argument here.

It is worthy of notice, however, that it would be inconsistent for a man to appeal to the law as St. Paul did, in view of a given transaction, unless he admitted the law to be a proper rule of action in the case. Had St. Paul abjured all human government, as modern non-resistants have, the centurion might have put him to the blush, by replying, It is perfectly immaterial to you what is right or wrong by the Roman law, since you condemn all law as wrong, and what better than mockery is it for you to talk about being a Roman citizen, *free born*, since you deny that you owe any allegiance to Rome, and have abjured and renounced all human governments forever?

In chap. 23: 20-22, we have another account of the Apostle's making an appeal to the existing authorities, in self-defense, the result of which was, the employment of nearly five hundred armed Roman soldiers to defend him from the malice and rage of the Jews, under the protection of whose swords and shields and spears, flashing in the moonbeams of night, he was borne away, from the scene of their rancor and bloody hate. When the Apostle knew that the Jews were lying in wait to kill him, he sent his sister's son to the chief captain, to inform him of the fact, and no one can doubt that his object was to secure himself through the authority of the chief captain. It is clear then that St. Paul did avail himself of the rights of a Roman citizen, Roman laws, Roman officers, and of the power of a Roman army, against the lawless violence of the Jews, which did amount to a countenancing of these things, for a man may not in this sense employ for his own advantage, what he condemns as necessarily and perpetually wrong.

Chap. 25: 11; "For if I be an offender, or have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die: but if there be none of those things whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them. I appeal unto Caesar." In this text there are two points, which clearly imply the right of civil government.

The Apostle's declaration of his own willingness to abide by the law, proves the point. "For if I be an offender, or have done anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die." The Apostle could have had no right to consent to be tried and judged, by the law, if the very existence of that law involved crime, and if the very act of judging him according to that law, was a criminal act. That he did consent to be tried and judged by the Roman law, cannot be denied, for he said, verse 10, "I stand at Caesar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged." If then, the act of holding courts and judging men, is sinful in itself, as our reformers of these times assert, St. Paul, by consenting to be tried by the Roman law, became a party to a sinful transaction. The Apostle not only consented to be tried by the law, but consented to abide the penalty of the law if he should be found guilty of having violated it. "If I be an offender, or have done anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die!" A very strange proposition this, for one who believed that *no crime* could justify the taking away of human life. If no offence can justify taking life, what right had St. Paul to say "I refuse not to die, if I have committed anything worthy of death?" If it be the doctrine of the Gospel, that corporeal punishment is never, under any circumstances, to be inflicted upon man, by man, for his crimes, St Paul should never have consented to die at the decision of any court, but should, as the minister of such a Gospel, instead of making them the offer of being tried by the law, and dying under the law, if found guilty,

protested against the whole procedure, and if condemned and put to death, died bearing testimony against their right to take away a man's life for any offence whatever.

VII. A denial of the rightful existence of civil government involves great absurdities.

It is a common remark that it is easier to pull down than to build up, and easier to find fault than to improve. Those who assail the rightful existence of civil government, would do well to point out some better plan of regulating society, and of sustaining a peaceful and healthy intercourse between men and nations. It is common for those who assail existing establishments, to dwell wholly upon the absurdities and wrongs of what they would destroy, while they are very careful not to give a full and distinct view of what is to take its place, or of what will be the result of its removal. Such appears to us to be the case of those who have, for the last few years, been making what they would have us understand to be, an exterminating war upon civil government. They have said many and grievous things against government, while they have said but little of the blessings that have resulted from it, and less of the evils which would necessarily result from their no-government theory. To these let the reader's attention now be directed.

It should be borne in mind that we have to take human nature as it is, and not as it should be. If all men were perfectly honest, and sufficiently wise, always to know what is right between man and man, family and family, and nation and nation, we should see much less difficulty in the way of doing without civil government than we now do. There are now many difficulties in the way, some of which we will now notice.

It will obviously expose the honest and virtuous to the assaults of the vicious and lawless. As the Apostle said " All men have not faith," so we may now say, all men are not honest, are not disposed to do right. There has never been a time yet, since the first-born of our race stained his hands with his brother's blood, when there were not those who were disposed to riot upon the spoils of the innocent, and there is no prospect of an immediate and thorough reformation of the world in this respect. With these facts before us, we cannot fail to see that fatal consequences must follow the non-resistant theory.

1. Government will be left in the hands of the ungodly, on the supposition that non-resistance is to prevail as a moral and religious question. It cannot be denied that the good and well-disposed will be first to embrace the no-government doctrine, *on the supposition that it is the doctrine of Christianity*; hence, as men embrace the system, they will retire from all civil matters and refuse to hold any office, and refuse to vote for any man in view of his election to office, and the result will be to leave the wicked and ill-disposed to mould and manage the government to suit themselves. We cannot expect that government will be abandoned, so long as there shall be any considerable party to adhere to it, and hence, the increase of non-resistant principles will not tend to prevent the exercise of governmental functions, but only tend to lessen the number of those who discharge these functions, without lessening the number of the governed, as non-resistants must always be numbered with the governed, so long as government shall exist, while they cannot be numbered with the governors. If non-resistance shall ever make sufficient progress, the time will come when this whole nation will be governed by one tenth part of the

population, and upon the supposition that non-resistance is the true doctrine of Christianity, this tenth will be made up of the worst and most incorrigible to be found among the whole. This appears to be rather unpromising. It will hardly be said in view of it, "there is a good time coming;"

2. When the laws shall be made and administered by wicked men exclusively, without the restraints which are now exerted by the commingling of the best of men in the affairs of state, there will be no security for the virtuous and defenseless, or such as might refuse to defend themselves. There are not wanting now, men who would hasten to plunder the innocent and spoil the virtuous, were it not for the strong arm of the law, and such we must expect there will be, until the last sinner shall be converted from the error of his way, and what will protect the innocent when these shall have the law in their own hands, to administer it to suit themselves? And yet such a state of things must come, according to the natural course of things, if non-resistance is to progress gradually until it shall finally become universal. Those who profess the no-government doctrine, may say they feel perfectly safe, though they publicly proclaim that they will not resort to violence or law in self-defense. They may well feel themselves secure, with all the virtuous in the land to defend them. Though they will not resort to the law for protection, yet every one who might be disposed to injure them, would feel no more security in so doing than though they were not non-resistants, because they would be brought to justice by those whose duty it is to see the law enforced. Taking this view, it may be seen that they are indebted to the influence of civil government for the security which they attribute to the charm of their non-resistance. That the existence of penal laws tends to prevent crime cannot be doubted, from this circumstance; those who commit crime, rarely if ever do it only with a view of escaping the penalty of the law. If human laws could be perfectly enforced, so as to make every one *know* that if he offended he would be sure to be detected and brought to justice, there would be but little crime committed, if any. Those crimes which may be committed with the greatest security, are most frequent, which proves, beyond all doubt, that law tends to diminish crime. To pretend that law does not diminish crime, while we see the evil disposed exerting their ingenuity to the utmost, so to commit offences as not to be detected, and then committing crime only when they suppose there is a fair probability of escape, and then, after they are detected, making every possible effort to evade the law, we say to pretend that law does not diminish crime, in view of these facts, borders so nearly upon insanity as not to be worthy of a serious refutation. Who indeed can believe for a moment that there are not less insulted and outraged females in our country, than there would be if there was no law against assaults and rapes? Who believes that there are now as many dishonest insolvencies, as many forgeries, as many counterfeiters of the currency, and as many robbers upon the highways, as there would be if there were no punishments provided for such crimes? Who believes that there are now as many murders committed as there would be if the murderer was not pursued by the vengeance of an insulted law? Let it not be said that the force of opinion will prevent crime, for if there were no penal laws, and no officers of justice, the offender would only have to change his residence, and in some cases his name, to be a gentleman at large, ready for further depredations upon the honest and defenseless. In further proof that the force of opinion cannot be sufficient to restrain the vicious, so long as there shall be vicious men in the world, we have the fact that it does

not now prove sufficient, on those points, where it is brought up to the full extent. Can public opinion be made any stronger against willful murder, horse stealing, or house burning, than it now is? We think not, for there is no one who in the least justifies them, even those who commit them *despise* them in all others, and *condemn* them in themselves.

It is clear then that in the progress of the no-government theory, on the supposition that it is to prevail, there must come a time when the government will be in the hands of the evil disposed, and that then there will be no protection for the innocent and helpless.

3. Such a state of things would tend to corrupt rather than to reform the community. As punishment for crime has always been, and always must be a disgrace, when it shall come to the point where punishment shall cease, crime will lose half of its deformity in the view of those whose rule of action is popular opinion, without reference to what is right in itself, and the result must that though there may be a less number of persons disposed to commit crime, these will feel less restraint, and crime will become much more open and bold. This will tend to the re-production of general corruption, as evil examples have always been more efficient in this perverse world than good ones, and as it is written by the pen of inspiration that "one sinner destroyeth much good." It has been said that men, restrained from vice by the fear of punishment, are not made better, but nothing can be more false than this. Two essential benefits result from restraining men from vicious practices by the power of law, and the fear of punishment.

(1.) Persons thus restrained, if not made positively good, are made comparatively better, i. e. they are prevented from being as bad as they otherwise would be. Suppose a person has it in his heart to commit a crime, and is restrained only by the fear of being punished, he is saved from that additional hardness of heart, which would be the result of the commission of such crime, and from all other crimes which might result from the commission of that one, as one crime often leads to another. He would also be saved from the influence of evil practices, and who that knows anything of the power of evil habits once formed, will undervalue this advantage? All this leaves him more within the influence of truth and moral principle, and renders his case much more hopeful than it would have been if he had not been restrained from the commission of crime, by the fear of being hanged or sent to prison.

2.) The individual restrained by the fear of punishment, is not only benefited himself, but others are benefited by being saved from the bad influence of his example, which is a matter of no small moment to the community. Taking this view, it must appear obvious that when the no-government doctrine shall have gained influence enough to prevent the operation of civil law, if ever it shall proceed so far, it must react, and this great moral reform, so *called*, will find itself laid waste by the consequences of its own operations. Non-resistance may operate very well, and appear to produce happy results, while its movements are under the healing influence of law, in the hands of the virtuous part of community, but let the honest and well-disposed be converted, let them once make a breach in the barriers of civil law, which now surround themselves as well as the other classes of the community, and they will find the dark waters of crime and general

corruption pouring in upon them, in a torrent not to be restrained by a mere reproof in soft words.

SECTION II.

The Rights and Duties of Civil Government.

Having proved at so great length, in the preceding section, the rightful existence of civil government, the question of its rights and duties, may be disposed of in less space.

It is the appointed instrument of God for a specific purpose, and if we can ascertain what that purpose is, it will be easy to infer its rights and duties there from.

I. Government is ordained of God for the good of the governed. By this is not meant that God has ordained the detail of government, but only that he has ordained that government shall exist for the good of the governed. The form of civil polity and the branches into which it may be divided, and the number and classification of officers, are matters not settled by the word of God, but are left to be regulated by man as times and circumstances may demand. That this is the right view of government is plain from the following considerations

1. Government arises out of the necessity of human society. It is ordained or appointed by God, but there is a reason for it back of that appointment. There is a necessity of government; social life and order cannot be maintained without it, and to meet this want, God has appointed civil government. As it is then ordained to meet a necessity, for the good of the governed, it must be limited to that object, and is not called for and can have no rightful existence, beyond the point where it is beneficial to mankind, to the governed as a whole.

2. God's government is for the good of the governed. This has been seen in previous discussions. It is clear that the government of God is administered for the good of the whole moral universe, and so all subordinate governments, which he has ordained, must be for the good of all the governed.

In consequence of the liability of man to err, and the imperfection of everything that is human, government often operates unequally. But its design is the good of the whole, and must be, since it has been appointed by an impartial God.

3. There is no other reason which can be assigned for the existence of Government, but the good of the governed. To suppose that the whole are to be governed for the benefit of a part, or for the benefit of the government, is too absurd to be entertained by common sense. It would be well illustrated in this aspect, by Dr. Paley's pigeon story.

"If you should see a flock of pigeons in a field of corn, and if (instead of each picking when and where it liked, taking just as much as it wanted and no more) you should see ninety-nine of them gathering all they got into a heap, reserving nothing for themselves

but the chaff and refuse, keeping this heap for one, and that the weakest, perhaps, and worst pigeon of the flock, sitting round and looking on all the while, whilst this one was devouring, throwing about, and wasting it; and if a pigeon more hungry or hardy than the rest touched a grain of the hoard, all the others instantly flying upon it and tearing it to pieces. If you should see this you would see nothing more than is practiced every day, and established among men."

Governments have often been administered for their own benefit, and to the injury of the million, but it is a perversion of the institution.

II. The rights and powers of civil government are equal to the duty of the same, and no more.

1. Government has a right to do just what duty demands, and no more. As government is instituted for the good of the governed, governors must be bound to govern for their good, and that is to perform all the governmental acts which the good of all the governed requires. When that is done, the whole design of government is reached, and here, at the full end for which it is appointed, its rights cease, nor can it have any right beyond. It is certain therefore that the rights of government cannot go beyond the right of doing all that is for the good of all the governed.

2. Government must have a right to employ all the means, and use all the force which is necessary to the entire performance of its duties, as above defined. Whatever is for the general good, government is bound to do, and what government is bound to do, it must have a right to do, by using all the means and force which is necessary to its performance. These points are so plain and so inevitable that they need not be further elaborated.

III. The duty of civil government, as viewed in the light of the preceding, may be summed up under four heads.

1. The duty of legislation.

This is the work of providing such rules or laws as are necessary to guide the more enlightened, and to protect all in their rights. These laws must all be conformed to right. Nothing must be enacted which is wrong, they must be conformed to the requirements of the Scriptures. There must be no law enacted which conflicts with any of the teachings of the Scriptures. The main end of legislation is to provide rules to carry out the principles taught in the Scriptures, in rules too general for particular application. This finds an illustration in a case already considered. It was shown that our Savior taught that the marriage contract is dissolved by adultery, but no rule is found in the Scriptures for proving it, and declaring a divorce, in a manner to protect the innocent. Here civil government comes in, and enacts a law providing for the carrying out the right of divorce in case of adultery, in a manner to prevent abuse of the principle. There are many such cases. The golden rule requires two men, meeting upon the public road, under equal circumstances, each to give half the road, but it does not determine whether they shall give the right hand or the left hand half. Yet such a rule as will determine that question is

necessary, and government has the right of deciding all such questions, and of providing rules accordingly.

2. Government is charged with the duty, and hence has the right of rendering righteous judgments in all litigated cases between its subjects. This is so plain as to need but few remarks. That questions will arise requiring such action, every man knows.

3. Government is bound to defend and protect its citizens from violence, and to secure to them the peaceable enjoyment of all their rights, to the best of its ability. Of course, government has right to use all the force necessary to accomplish it, so far as force can secure the end.

4. Government has a right, and is bound to provide such penalties against crime, and to inflict those penalties, when the law is violated, as are proportioned to the several crimes, and as are necessary to prevent crime, and promote the good order and general interests of the whole community.

That the above views are sustained by the Scriptures, but few will deny. The following Scriptures are cited as belonging to the general class which support the views that have been advanced.

Ps. 72: 2, 4, 12,14; "He shall judge thy people with righteousness and thy poor with judgment, he shall save the children of the needy, and shall break in pieces the oppressor. For he shall deliver the needy when he crieth; the poor also and him that hath no helper. He shall redeem their soul from deceit and violence."

This refers to Solomon as the prospective king of Israel. Three principal things are here affirmed of this distinguished prince.

1. The work of judgment. "He shall judge thy people with righteousness;" that is, he shall give righteous decisions, in all cases between man and man, when parties come to him to be judged. This is one important end of civil government, viz., to furnish a uniform method of settling disputes and differences among men, which the parties cannot settle themselves, and which will always exist, to a greater or less extent, in every community.

2. The work of protecting the weak against the aggressions of the strong, is another important object of civil government. "He shall save the children of the needy. For he shall deliver the needy when he crieth, the poor also, and him that hath no helper. He shall redeem their soul from deceit and violence." It has always been the case that some have been disposed to trample upon the rights of others, and to live upon the spoils of the innocent, and to protect them in the enjoyment of their rights, is the appropriate work of government.

3. To inflict proper chastisement upon the wrong doer, is another object of civil government. "He shall save the children of the needy, and shall *break in pieces the oppressor.*"

Prov. 8: 15, 16; "By me kings reign and princes decree justice. By me princes rule and nobles, even all the judges of the earth." Killing and decreeing justice are here pointed out as the proper work of kings, princes and judges.

Jer. 21: 12; "O house of David, thus saith the Lord, Execute judgment in the morning, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go out like fire, and burn that none can quench it." The same sentiment is repeated in chap, 22: 1, 3. On this it may be remarked,

1. The command relates principally to those in authority, who are charged with the administration of law and justice.
2. The text requires those concerned to execute judgment in the morning. That is, to be prompt in the administration of justice, that the injured are not left to suffer long without redress.
3. They are required to execute judgment by delivering "the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor," which cannot be done, only by the power of law, supported by physical force. To deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, supposes that the oppressor is using physical force for the spoiling of his neighbor, and that government puts forth a greater physical force, in delivering the spoiled, than is exerted by the oppressor to retain his unlawful prey. Something more than moral suasion is evidently meant in this text.

Rom. 13: 3, 4; "For rulers are not a terror to good works but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power, do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same, for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou doest that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

1. This text most clearly relates to civil rulers. This point is so plain that, it is presumed, no one will pretend to deny it.
2. The text points out the duty of civil rulers. They are to protect the innocent and virtuous citizens in their persons, their property, and their characters. "Wilt thou not be afraid of the power, [the ruler or officer] do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same; for he is the minister of God to thee for good." Rulers are also appointed for the punishment of evil doers. "If thou do that which is evil, be afraid for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that do-eth evil." If there was not another text in all the Bible to prove the right of government, and the right of magistrates to enforce laws, even in the punishment of evil doers, this would be sufficient.

This class of texts might be enlarged to almost any extent, but the above are sufficient.

SECTION III

Objections to the preceding views of Civil Government Answered.

I. An objection is founded upon those Scriptures which are supposed by the objector, to forbid all resistance of personal wrongs. These are found principally in the teachings of Christ, and shall be examined.

Matt. 5: 38, 39; "Ye have heard that it hath been said an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you that ye resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also."

It is presumed that there is no one text in all the Bible upon which more dependence is placed than upon this; indeed, it appears to have suggested the very name by which those who condemn human governments, wish to be called, as they have taken the title of "*non-resistants*" I trust, however, to be able to make it appear that it is no more a repeal or condemnation of civil government than it is of the war of tongues which non-resistants wage against it. This strain of our Lord's sermon commences at the 17th verse, which reads as follows: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets, I am not come to destroy but to fulfill."

From this it is obvious that the Savior did not repeal the law or annul any essential principle contained in it, but only explained it, in its heart-searching and spiritual character, and corrected certain misapplications of its principles. Taking this view, it will be seen that he condemns that construction of the law which made it an instrument of private and personal revenge. The Jewish law which required "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," was intended as a rule for the judges by which they were to be governed in the administration of even handed justice, but it appears that it was so construed and practiced upon as to authorize the injured party to take the execution of the law into his own hands, making himself the judge in his own case, and this, and this only, is what the Savior condemned and forbade in this text. No man has a right to resist evil in this sense; because a man knocks out my tooth, or puts out my eye, I may not therefore knock out his tooth, or put out his eye, but this is very far from proving that I may not claim and receive damage at the hands of the regularly constituted authorities, whose business it is to judge between the wrong doer and the wrong sufferer.

That personal violence, by way of revenge or retaliation, is what is here forbidden, is obvious from the last clause of the text, "but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Here turning the other cheek, when we are smitten on one, means no more than that we are not to return the blow. No man with a sane mind will contend that this is to be literally understood, that a man is actually bound, when he is smitten on one cheek, to turn the other to be also smitten, instead of getting out of the way, if he has an opportunity. If a man should smite me on one cheek, and I had any reason to believe he would repeat the blow, instead of turning the other to have him strike again, I should feel it my most solemn duty to exert myself to get out of his reach before the second blow should come. If I supposed a man intended to strike me, and I could keep out of his way, I would do it, and so would every man, who would not fight, and it

would be a strange doctrine indeed that a man may run at any time before he has received the first blow, but that if his enemy can only manage to give him one blow on the cheek, he is thereby laid under obligations to stand and take the rest. It is clear then that by turning the other cheek, nothing is meant more than that we are not to return blow for blow, that we may not smite a man because he has smitten us, and this explains the whole subject, by showing; the nature of the evil not to be resisted, and the nature of the resistance that is forbidden.

"I say unto you that ye resist not evil." What evil? Personal violence; "whosoever shall smite thee." The evil then is that of being smitten. But how are we forbidden to resist this evil? By not returning the blow. "If smitten on the right cheek, turn to him the other also," which has been shown above to mean nothing more than that we are not to smite in return, or in any way injure a man *because* he has injured us. This appears to be the plain and simple doctrine of the text, and it is no more than every professed Christian believes; and it is as far from proving the theory of what is now called non-resistance as personal violence and mobocracy is from the administration of just laws by regularly constituted authorities. To resist evil, in the sense of the text, is to take law and judgment into our own hands, and to decide for ourselves what injury has been done to us, and how much shall be repaid, while to maintain civil government, is to say we will not execute judgment for ourselves, but submit it to others to say what injury has been done to us, and what punishment shall be awarded the evil doer; hence, civil government is directly the opposite of what is forbidden in the text, and is both designed and calculated to secure a compliance with this most important precept of our Lord. It is among the greatest wonders of the age that a precept of the Gospel, so obviously forbidding personal strife, retaliation and revenge, should be construed into a prohibition of civil government, which forbids the same thing, which the divine precept forbids, and which provides for the settlement of difficulties without a resort to the forbidden personal encounter, but such are the conclusions to which non-resistants must arrive in order to support their theory from this text.

The above exposition is strengthened by the 40th verse; "And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." On this text it may be remarked.

1. That it contemplates the existence of law, as a means of compelling men to pay their debts, holding their property liable to a lawful seizure in case of non-payment. Without this there could be no such thing as suing a man at the law and taking away his coat.
2. There is not the least intimation in the text that the existence of such law is wrong, or that it is wrong for us to avail ourselves of it in a proper way for a proper object. Suing a man at the law and taking away his coat, is here used to denote all oppressive use of law, which is inconsistent with justice and benevolence. To sue a man at the law and take away his last bushel of bread corn, or anything else which is essential to his life and comfort, would come within the sense of this text, as much as taking away his coat. The coat is merely put for any extreme case. It would be a very different thing to sue a man at the law and take from his abundance what is our due, and what we absolutely need, from

taking away his coat or what he cannot part with without suffering, and what we do not really need.

3. While the text does not forbid resorting to the law, or even directly forbid taking away a man's coat by law, it requires us to give our cloak also if the coat be taken. "If any man will sue thee at the law and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." Now, will any one say that this is to be literally understood? If a man should sue any non-resistant and take away one of his garments, would he pursue him to urge upon him the other? Surely not, unless he should be more void of common sense than I have supposed them to be generally.

What then does the text mean? I answer, it means just this, and no more, that we are not even to seek legal revenge, i. e. we must not sue a man at the law, because he has sued us. If a man takes any legal advantage of us, we are not therefore to take lawful revenge on him, but rather bear the injury. This makes the text harmonize with the one considered above. That forbids unlawful revenge of unlawful injuries; this forbids lawful revenge of lawful injuries. If a man smite us on one cheek contrary to law, we are to turn the other also, i. e. not smite back again contrary to law; and if a man sue us at the law and take away our coat, we are to let him have our cloak also, i. e. not sue him at the law because he has sued us at the law.

The same principle is continued in the 41st verse. "And whosoever will compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain."

No one will contend that we are to understand this as laying us under obligation to go two miles, because we have been compelled to go one. It can mean no more than that we ought to suffer wrong rather than to resort to strife and conflict, where the wrong inflicted is such as may be borne without any violation of moral principle. If a man requires me to go a mile with him, I may do it, but if he requires me to worship an idol, I must resist unto death, and suffer my life to be taken, rather than comply. To contend that this last text is to be literally carried out in practice, would overthrow the whole system of non-resistance. Being compelled to go a mile relates to the custom of transmitting intelligence by couriers placed at regular distances, first practiced among the Persians, from whose language the original word, *angarvo*, in this text is derived. They might seize on men, their horses or vessels for public service, while on their progress. This practice was common among the Romans at our Saviour's time, and to this he doubtless alludes. This being the case, to suppose we are literally commanded to go only one mile, would be to suppose the whole system of civil government is right.

The above appears sufficient to show that non-resistance can derive no support from our Lord's sermon on the mount, but still before I dismiss the subject, I will devote a few observations to the difficulties which must attend the non-resistant interpretation of the subject. It will be agreed on all hands that non-resistance must depend wholly upon a strictly literal interpretation of the text for whatever support it derives from the subject. "I say unto you, that ye resist not evil:" This cannot prove the duty of absolute non-resistance, only by a strict literal construction, which, as has been shown above, it will

not bear. But let us here look at the consequences that will follow from such a construction. If the text forbids resistance at all in this sense, it forbids all resistance of every kind and degree, and hence it will follow,

1. That we are forbidden to correct or restrain our children. "I say unto you that ye resist not evil, means as clearly that we are not to correct a disobedient child as it does that we are not to confine a horse thief in prison, and a literal interpretation will render it as applicable to the one as the other.

2. It will prohibit our making any physical effort to prevent others from doing evil. Suppose the assassin holds the uplifted dagger ready to plunge it into the heart of a fellow being, am I to say stop, stop, it is wicked to kill, and if I cannot persuade him to desist, am I to let him execute the deed, or am I to seize the wretch by force and disarm him of his fatal weapon? If I do the latter, I shall resist evil, and hence, if the text under consideration is to have a literal construction, I must look on and see one man, murder another, if I cannot persuade him not to do it, though I may have physical strength enough to prevent it. Can any man believe this?

3. Persons must not resist assaults upon themselves, nor even run to escape them, if the text is to be literally understood, but the assaulted person must stand and yield everything to the assailant, even female purity. Suppose a female to be assaulted by a person of base intentions, it may be a wife as she is walking by her husband's side, and nothing but physical resistance will prevent the commission of the basest crime. Is she to endure the monster's assault without resistance, and is the husband, pledged for her protection, to look on and see the deed accomplished, interposing nothing but soft words? If indeed she could tear from his grasp and fly for safety, what could she do with that clause of the text which says "Whosoever shall smite thee on one cheek, turn to him the other also?" And if she with physical strength repels the base attempt upon her purity, what will she do with that part of the text which says, "resist not evil?" I need not push this train of thought further, for enough has been said to show that consequences must follow both fatal and ridiculous from that exposition of the text which is essential to make it favor non-resistance, and I will leave it to the candid reader to judge for himself, whether he will adopt the exposition which has such consequences attached to it, or take the exposition which I have given above, which appears to be plain, consistent and unembarrassed.

It may be said in opposition to all this, that no such consequences are to be apprehended, for when non-resistance shall prevail, there will be no violence to fear. That is true, but it would be a manifest absurdity to apply the text to such a state; the expression "whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek," is applicable only to a state of things in which there is a liability to be smitten, and we cannot be called upon to practice upon this precept until we are smitten. With these remarks I will leave this portion of divine truth to the consideration of the reader.

Another text which has sometimes been urged against government and law, is found in 1. Cor. 6: 1. "Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?" This text does not in the least object to going to law, but to the

selection of an unjust court, instead of bringing it before the saints. In Corinth the judges were heathens and unjust, as we learn from the text, and of course difficulties among the Christians would not be likely to be judged according to Christian principles, it was therefore improper for the disciples to bring their differences before such a court. This accounts for the language of the 7th verse: "Why do ye not rather take wrong, why do ye not suffer yourselves to be defrauded?" An honest man is most likely to be injured by the decision of an unjust court, and hence he had far better suffer himself to be defrauded in the first instance, than to bring his case before an unjust court, to incur a bill of cost and then be defrauded at last.

It is worthy of remark also, that the apostle is here speaking of the intercourse of Christians with each other. It is well understood that some denominations at this day do not allow their members to go to law with each other. But suppose the church can decide all matters between her members, there will still arise cases enough to be referred to civil magistrates which the church cannot settle. Situated as we are from the very circumstances of our community, we cannot fail to see the inapplicability of the rule of the church in the following cases:

1. Differences between persons who are not members of the church.
2. Differences between a member of the church, and a person who is not a member of the church; if the wrong is on the part of him who does not belong to the church, the church, as such, has no power over the case.
3. Sad experience has taught us that professed Christians sometimes get so far out of the way as to refuse to comply with the judgment of the church, and hence, have to be expelled. Such a procedure is only a vindication of the character of the rules, and the purity of the church; it does not procure personal justice for the injured party, and then he is at liberty to seek his due, if he can find an impartial court, for the text only forbids law suits between members of the church before an unjust court, which, in the case in the Apostle's eye, was a corrupt heathen court, as shown above. Because we are told that two members of the church ought not to go to law before an unjust heathen court, to infer that all civil government is therefore wrong is a conclusion so far from the premises, that I am sure no ordinary mind could reach it.

Another text, upon which much reliance is placed to prove the no-government theory, is found in Rom. 12: 17,19; "Recompense to no man evil for evil. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written, vengeance is mine; and I will repay it saith the Lord." Nothing can be plainer than that this text refers to personal revenge, and not to punishment inflicted by civil government.

Dr. Clarke understands by giving place unto wrath, forbearing to punish on our own responsibility, leaving it to be done by the civil magistrate; by wrath he understands the punishment which the civil law inflicts upon criminals, and by giving place to this wrath, he understands forbearing to avenge a wrong committed upon us, that it may be done by the proper authority. [*See his notes on the text.*] This exposition certainly accords well

with the 4th verse of the following chapter: "But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." Take the two verses together, and the sentiment will be as follows: Dearly beloved, if any one injures you, "avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written, vengeance is mine and I will repay it, saith the Lord;" for the civil magistrate "bear-eth not the sword in vain, for he is the minister of God to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." If, then, we are not to avenge ourselves, because vengeance belongs to God, and if the civil magistrate be God's minister to "execute wrath upon him that doeth evil," the case is a very plain one, but it is one which, instead of supporting the no-government theory, overthrows it forever.

There are, perhaps, some other texts that may be quoted in favor of the non-resistant theory, but the passages above examined, are among those most relied upon, and hence, are sufficient to test the strength of the system, when an appeal is made to the Bible in its behalf. I have only attempted to consider some of those passages which are supposed to teach the doctrine of non-resistance directly, but those which are supposed to teach it, indirectly, by inculcating certain principles and duties, which are supposed to be inconsistent with civil government, and all physical resistance, will be considered in future.

II. It has been objected to the views of civil government and its functions which have been maintained, that they are inconsistent with the duty of forgiveness as taught by Christ.

The doctrine of forgiveness, as taught in the Bible, has no direct bearing upon the simple question of the validity of human government, for if we were not required to forgive our enemies, it would not follow, as a consequence, that human government is therefore right; while, on the other hand, it being admitted that we are required to forgive our enemies, it does not follow, as a consequence, that human government is therefore wrong. The non-resistant must first take an important point for granted, before he can make any capital out of the doctrine of forgiveness in favor of his theory. He first assumes that punishment of some sort is essential to the existence of civil government, and then that punishment of every degree is inconsistent with forgiveness, and then concludes that all government is wrong. That the reader may have the argument clearly before him, and be the better able to judge whether it be fairly met in what follows, I will state it to the best advantage I can, as follows:

The Bible requires us to forgive our enemies:

Forgiveness is inconsistent with the infliction of punishment for crime, it is therefore wrong to punish men for crime:

Civil government cannot be maintained without inflicting punishment upon those who violate its laws and regulations:

Therefore civil government cannot be rightfully maintained.

As plausible as this argument may appear at first view, it is unsound in all its propositions save one, as a little examination will show. It is freely admitted that we are required to forgive our enemies; about this, therefore, there need be no dispute. Now let us examine the remainder of the argument, and see how it will stand the test.

It is not true that forgiveness is inconsistent with punishment, as the argument asserts. This, indeed, would be true if the duty of forgiveness, and the work of punishment were to be performed by the same person, acting in his own individual right; but such is not the case. Those Scriptures which command us to forgive our enemies, impose upon us a duty as private individuals, which duty is inconsistent with private revenge, so that personal forgiveness stands opposed to the personal rendering of evil for evil, but to apply these Scriptures to arrest the administration of public justice is manifestly absurd. If a text can be produced, which requires the administrators of public justice to forgive all wrong doers in their official capacity, the work of civil government will be done up, so far as its right to punish offenders is concerned, but no such text is contained within the lids of the sacred volume. So far from this is the fact, that civil magistrates are declared to be "the ministers of God to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." Rom. 13: 4. Taking this view, all difficulty vanishes, and the fallacy of the argument, consists in applying to civil government, what relates to private individuals. The argument amounts to this, persons are forbidden to punish their enemies, on *their own individual authority*, but are required to forgive them; therefore civil magistrates are forbidden to punish offenders in their official capacity.

But it will be said in reply to this, that governments are composed of a number of individuals associated together, and that the rights and powers of the whole are no more than the associated rights and powers of each, so that the whole cannot have a right to do what each would not have a right to do for himself without the association. To this I reply,

1. Were it admitted that an individual, considered aside from all civil society—a thing impossible in itself—would have a right to do for himself all that government has right to do for him in a state of society, still it would not follow that he could retain the right of doing the same things for himself, when brought in contact with society, and when his interests should become associated with the interests of others. Could we conceive of a number of human beings standing alone, each possessing all the rights that are exercised by a well-regulated government, still, when these beings should be brought together it would not follow that each would retain the right of doing for himself all that might be necessary to be done, for owing to the imperfection of the human judgment, to say nothing about intentional wrong, their interests would clash with each other, and here government would come in to do for them what each could not under the circumstance, have the right of doing for himself.

2. It is not admitted that government is a voluntary association as the objection supposes. An association purely voluntary could not possess powers and rights, only what should grow out of the powers and rights of each individual, which he possessed before he

joined the association, and which he brought with him into the association when he joined it: but civil government is not such an association; it does not depend upon the associated rights of its members for its rightful existence and power to do its appropriate work, but upon the will of God, who has ordained its existence. If, then, government does not depend upon the voluntary agreement of men, for its rightful existence, but upon the will of God, it is very fallacious to reason that it cannot do certain things, because men have not a right to do those things in their individual capacity, for, in such case, the question is not, what have men a right to do as individuals, but for what purpose has God ordained government, and with what rights has he clothed it? If government be an ordinance of God, as has been shown, the rights and powers of government cannot be limited by the rights and powers of individuals, but depend wholly upon the will of God, who has ordained it, for an important end, and clothed it with all the rights and powers necessary to enable it to secure that end. To argue that government cannot punish transgressors, because individual Christians are forbidden to punish them on their individual responsibility, is to beg the whole question in debate. The question that is affirmed on one hand, and denied on the other, may be thus stated:

Civil government is authorized by God. This the non-resistant denies. But what is his proof? His answer is that God commands us as individuals, to forgive our enemies, and not to punish them, and government can have no right to do what the individuals of which it is composed may not do. But where is his proof that government may not do what individuals have not a right to do? The only proof of this is, that civil government is unauthorized. Thus a principle is adduced in proof of a position, when that principle depends for its own truth upon the truth of the very position it is designed to prove true.

III. It has been objected to the views of civil government, that they are inconsistent with the command to love our enemies.

Non-resistants lay great stress upon those Scriptures which require us to love our enemies, inferring that punishment is inconsistent with love, and that it is also inseparable from the existence of civil government. This is fully met in the preceding section, for all that has there been said is equally applicable here, yet this position is liable to some other objections not there stated, which I will briefly notice.

1. Our love for our enemies cannot be required to be greater than our love for our friends, so as to shrink from even-handed justice when called to act between our friends and enemies. It should be borne in mind, that the administrators of civil government do not act in their own cases, and hence do not act from personal or selfish feelings; they judge between their fellow-men and dispense justice between man and man. Those between whom they judge must fall under one or the other of the following classes, viz: friends, enemies, or neither. Consider further that government is called to act principally in those cases where one party is supposed to do to the other wrong. Suppose a case then, in which one of the contending parties is a friend and the other is an enemy to the civil magistrate, who is called upon to set the matter right between them. The non-resistant says it is wrong to punish the wrong doer, or to spoil him of his ill-gotten goods, because we are required to love our enemies. But are we not required to love our friends, and

were we to suffer the enemy to trample upon the friend, should we not be as much wanting in love to that friend, as we should be wanting in love to the enemy, should we inflict on him so much penalty as would secure justice to the injured party? There are two sides to the question, and it would be a strange doctrine that we are so to love our enemies as to spare them to the injury of our friends. To suffer a murderer to run at large because we are required to love our enemies, would be to suppose that we are bound to love an enemy so well as to hate all the rest of the community for his sake, whose lives might be endangered by his liberty. The truth is, we are not required to love any person, friend or enemy, with any love, or in any degree, which is inconsistent with a proper regard for the security, rights and interests of all the rest of the community.

2. That love may be consistent with the administration of justice, is obvious from the fact that God loves his enemies, and yet he punishes them for their crimes. Now, if punishment may be consistent with love, it cannot follow that all punishment is wrong because we are required to love our enemies; and if it be wrong to punish transgressors, it must be wrong for some other cause than the reason that we are required to love those who injure us. Let such other reason then be adduced.

But it may be asked, what is meant by our Saviour's command where he says, "Love your enemies?" It, no doubt, means just what it says, but this love is to be regulated by the principles of eternal truth and justice. It may be well to inquire what love is which we are to exercise towards all men. "Love," says Mr. Buck, "has been distinguished into 1, *Love of esteem*, which arises from the mere consideration of some Excellency in an object, and belongs either to persons or things; 2, *Love of benevolence*, which is an inclination to seek the happiness or welfare of anything; 3, *Love of complacence*, which arises from the consideration of any object agreeable to us, and calculated to afford us pleasure." — [Buck's Theological Dictionary, article Love.

Admitting this division of the affection of the mind called love, there can be no doubt that it is the love of benevolence which we are required to exercise towards our enemies; indeed, it could be no virtue in a Christian to love his enemies with the love of esteem or the love of complacence; benevolence therefore is all that we are required to exercise towards our enemies by the command of Christ, when he says, "love your enemies. "This love must prompt us to do good to our enemies, so far as we can consistently with the principles of truth and justice, and the exercise of the same degree of benevolence towards the rest of our fellow-beings. Taking this view, the simple question is a very plain one, and may be thus stated: —Can we, consistently with the obligations we owe to ourselves and to the community in which we live, suffer criminals to run at large unrestrained by civil government, and unpunished in conformity with penal law? "As it is simple benevolence which we are required to exercise towards our enemies, which is to be limited by the principles of righteousness, and the obligations we owe to ourselves and all others, we cannot be bound to exercise that benevolence towards our enemies in any way which involves a want of benevolence towards others; if therefore, the obligation which we are under to love our enemies, is inconsistent with the infliction of punishment for crime, it must be solely because justice and benevolence towards our fellow creatures, does not require us to protect the weak against the strong, and to "exercise judgment and

deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor," which is the very point to be proved. To say that justice and benevolence towards the community at large, does not require that the wicked be restrained by penal law, is to beg the whole question in debate, and yet until this point is proved or assumed, it cannot appear that the love which we are required to exercise towards our enemies, forbids a proper punishment for outrages committed upon the community.

3. If, because we are required to love our enemies, we cannot punish them for crime, for the same reason parents may not correct their children, for they are required to *love* them. We are absolutely required to correct our children, and yet we are required to love them, and if we may punish a child, and love him at the same time, then we may punish an enemy and love him too, and so fulfill the law of Christ. On this point the Bible is perfectly clear. Take the case of Eli, 1 Sam. 3: 13. "For I have told him that I will judge his house forever, for the iniquity which he knoweth, because his sons made themselves vile and he restrained them not." God here clearly threatens Eli for not having restrained his sons. That something more is here meant than non-resistant restraint is too plain to be denied. We read Chap. 2: 22, 23, 24. "Now Eli was very old, and heard all that his sons did unto all Israel, and he said unto them, why do ye such things, for I hear of your evil doings by all this people. Nay, my sons: for it is no good report that I hear: ye make the Lord's people to transgress. "Here it is seen that Eli practiced upon the principle of non-resistance, but God required him to go farther and to restrain his sons, and yet no one will pretend that God required him to hate his sons, but rather to love them, and hence the exercise of compulsory restraint is consistent with love, and as this is true in relation to children, so is it true in relation to friends, enemies, and our fellow-beings generally. If we may punish our children and love them at the same time, then may we punish an enemy and love him at the same time, as remarked above. The following are selected from the many Scriptures which refer to this subject. Prov. 13: 24; "He that spareth his rod hateth his son: but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes."

Prov. 22: 15; "Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him."

Prov. 23: 13, 14; "Withhold not correction from the child: for if thou beatest him with a rod, he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell."

Prov. 29: 15, 17; "The rod and reproof give wisdom: but a child left to himself bringeth his mother to shame. Correct thy son and he shall give thee rest; yea, he shall give delight unto thy soul."

The above quotations place the duty of correcting our children, as their conduct may require, beyond a doubt; nor can all this be disposed of by simply saying that it is Old Testament doctrine, for the whole system of parental government, here taught, is referred to and sanctioned in the New Testament.

Heb. 12: 5-11; "And ye have forgotten the exhortation, which speaketh unto you as unto children, My son despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him: For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons, for *what son is he whom the father chasteneth not?*" But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards and not sons. Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh, which corrected us; and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits and live. For they, verily, for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous, nevertheless, afterwards it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby." It has now been shown that physical resistance, and even corporal punishment, is consistent with love, even with the tender regard which a father feels for his son, and if so, how absurd must it appear to argue that the love which we are required to exercise towards our enemies, forbids all such correction?

IV. It has been objected that the views of civil government which have been advocated are inconsistent with the supposed inviolability of human life, which the objector assumes. This argument, like those already noticed, takes one important point for granted, viz: that the sacrifice of human life, is essential to the maintenance of civil government. To make the argument good, two points must be proved, viz: first, that civil government cannot be right without involving the right of taking human life, and secondly, that the right of taking human life can in no case exist. If these two points can both be proved, the argument will be conclusive, but it appears to me that they are both untenable, as I will attempt to show.

1. It is not true that civil government *cannot be right*, without involving the right to take human life.

Those who deny the right of human government, will no doubt admit, that family government should exist, that parents should stand at the head of their families, and train up their children "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," and that children should obey all righteous commands; this, I say, no doubt they will admit to be both right in itself, and of binding obligation, but still they will deny that it is right to maintain it by personal violence, and at the expense of life. Now the same thing might be true of civil government, it might be the duty of the people to have a government, and to submit to equal laws formed in accordance with the will of the majority, and yet it might not be right to maintain such a state of things at the sacrifice of life. The fallacy consists in confounding the *rightful existence of civil government*, with the *right of resorting to certain measures to maintain it*, which are distinct points.

2. Were it admitted that the right of civil government cannot exist without the right of taking human life in certain cases, it would not prove human government wrong, but only strengthen the argument by which it is proved right to take human life in certain cases. It has been proved that civil government is right; and the arguments by which this has been done stand independently of the right of taking human life, and hence, if non-resistants

can prove that the right of human government necessarily involves the right of taking human life, it will follow that it is right to take human life.

3. It is denied that human life is inviolate, *in the sense in which non-resistants assert it to be*. That one man has not a right to take the life of another, on his own responsibility, or by way of personal revenge, I admit. I admit that human life is so far inviolate that no man's life can be rightfully taken, unless it be forfeited by the law of God, who is the author of life. On this point, however, I shall not attempt a labored argument, but only adduce a few plain portions of Scripture.

Gen. 9: 5, 6; " And surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."

This text is perfectly plain, and fully sustains the position that the life of man may be taken for willful murder. It appears to be a principle settled by God himself, that he who willfully takes away the life of his fellow-being, by that act forfeits his own life. So far as my information extends, there are but two methods of explaining this text, with a view to evade its force in proof of the right of inflicting capital punishment, both of which I will examine. No effort is necessary to explain or prove what the text means, it is so plain and direct of itself; if it can be shown that the methods referred to, of attempting to explain away its force are fallacious, the text itself will stand forth as incontrovertible evidence.

It is contended by some that the text is a mere prediction, that it does not declare the right of shedding the blood of him who first sheds blood, as a principle, but only asserts the fact that if one man should kill another, some other wicked man would kill him. This exposition is so far-fetched as hardly to deserve a serious reply, but for the sake of meeting every argument, I offer the following observations.

1. In this sense the text is not true. The text came directly from the mouth of God, and hence, is a *divine prediction*, if a prediction at all, and must be strictly and fully true. Now, though it is admitted that it sometimes happens that a murderer is murdered, yet it is not generally true, and therefore such an exposition must prove fatal to the inspiration of the Scriptures. Prophecy has been relied upon as one of the clearest evidences of the divine authority of the Bible, but suppose prophecy failed in as great a number of cases in proportion to the whole, on other subjects, as it does in this case, on the supposition that the text is a prediction, foretelling that those who commit murder will in turn be murdered, and who could look an Infidel in the face and argue that the fulfillment of prophecy furnishes any special evidence that the prophets wrote and spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost?" It will not do to say that it is true as a general principle, that he that sheddeth man's blood does in turn have his own blood shed by man, for if prophecy is admitted to be true only as a general principle, there is no evidence of divine inspiration, since uninspired men may assert general principles without danger to their reputation. But it is not true as a general principle that those who shed blood, have their blood shed in turn, as a consequence of their misconduct. How few of all the number of murderers and assassins, who have stained their hands in human blood, have been made

victims, and in turn, poured out their blood to stain the hands of others? Should it be said that all taking of human life is included in the text, and that taking into the account all executions for murder in compliance with civil law, it will appear true that those who shed man's blood, do generally have their blood shed by man, it would only involve the theory in greater difficulty. In such case it would follow that the sheriff who hangs a man for murder, in compliance with the law of the land, is a murderer, or that he sheds man's blood as much as Cain did when he slew his brother. This I believe is the theory of non-resistants generally, that to hang a man for murder is itself murder. If this be so, to make the text true as a prediction, it must be shown that sheriffs or hangmen are generally hung in turn, or in some other way have their blood shed by man. This every one knows is not true, and hence, the text cannot be a prediction if all taking of life for crime is shedding blood in the sense of the first clause. How few of all that have taken life by way of executing the laws throughout the world, have themselves been in any way put to death? If then all taking of life is murder, the text is not true as a prediction.

Should it be said that the hangman is not the murderer in fact, as he only executes the will of the law-makers, the case will be still worse for non-resistance, for in such case, every freeman in this land will find his hands stained with the blood of his fellow-beings. If there is no case in which it is right to take life, and if all legal executions are legal murders, as non-resistance teaches, in our republican government every man who votes for law-makers, is verily guilty of his brother's blood. The people in this country are responsible for the laws, and if legal executions are murders, the people are responsible for murder, nor does it in the least lessen the guilt of each, that there are so many involved in the crime, for if ten men unite in the crime of murdering one, each is just as guilty as though he did the act alone, and the same is equally true of any greater number.

Taking this view, it follows that if it is shedding man's blood, in the sense of the first clause in the text, to execute a man according to law for the crime of murder, all who participate in the government and in any way sustain it, are guilty of shedding man's blood, and to make it true that "he that sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed," it must be made to appear that all in the nation, except non-resistants have their blood shed by man. This every one knows is not true, and hence it cannot be true that the text is to be understood in the sense of a prediction.

2. To understand the text as a prediction asserting it as a fact to be fulfilled in the history of man, that he that sheddeth man's blood, shall have his blood shed by man, would be fatal to the non-resistance theory, and render their efforts at reform perfectly hopeless. If it be true, as a fact to be fulfilled in the history of society, non-resistance can never prevail, for as blood has been shed, it must come to pass that somebody will shed the blood of those by whom blood has already been shed; and then it will be equally true that somebody else will shed their blood in turn, and so bloodshed must succeed bloodshed, *ad infinitum*. On this principle murders may multiply but they can never diminish; they may increase because a man may shed the blood of one who never shed blood, which would constitute a new case, but to suppose that murders may grow less in number is to deny the exposition of the text, which makes it assert as a fact to be fulfilled in the course of human events, that "he that sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."

But if we understand the text, not in the light of a prediction, but as a declaration of a principle of right, an assertion of the divine will that he that sheddeth man's blood, forfeits his own life, and that it may be taken by man, the above difficulties all vanish.

Another method of explaining away the force of this text, is to consider it a part of the Old Testament system, which has been repealed by Christ, and superseded by the Gospel, but this is without force for two reasons.

1. It was no part of what was peculiar to the Jews, but what is common to all men, as it was spoken to the father of all nations before there was any distinction of races. The text was spoken to Noah on his coming forth from the ark, when there were but eight souls on the face of the whole earth, before God selected a particular people, before he separated Abraham from his kindred to make of his posterity a chosen people, and hence, the text has no more reference to the Jews than it has to any other nation. Now, suppose it be admitted that Christ repealed all that was peculiar to the Jews—and no one will pretend that he repealed what was not peculiar to them—it will follow that this text remains untouched, by such supposed repeal of what was peculiar to the Jewish economy.

2. As the text under consideration existed prior to everything which was peculiar to the Jews, and formed no part of their peculiarities, it cannot be pretended that it has been repealed with their system *en masse*, and hence it cannot be pretended that it has been repealed at all, unless it has been done by some special reference to the text by Christ or his apostles, which does not exist, and which no one pretends to produce. It is perfectly plain that whatever the text meant in the days of Noah, it means now, and whatever principle it inculcated when it fell from the lips of Jehovah, as he sent man forth to people the earth a second time, it inculcates now, and its plain and most obvious meaning is that he that sheddeth man's blood, forfeits his own life, and renders himself liable to have his blood rightfully shed by man. The very phraseology of the text confirms this view. God says, "your blood of your lives will I require." God is not speaking of what men will do, but of what he will require. "At the hand of every beast will I require it;" the beast that destroys the life of a man shall be slain, it being unsafe for him to be suffered to live, which was afterwards enacted in the law of Moses. "At the hand of man; and at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man;" that is, he who takes away the life of man shall have the life he has destroyed required by God at his hand, and as he cannot render up the life he has destroyed, God will require his own life in place of it, hence, "He that sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." Should it be said that the fact that God requires life for life, does not authorize man to take the life of the murderer, the reply is, that the last clause of the text, "by man shall his blood be shed," clearly makes man the agent to execute the divine penalty as is fully confirmed by Rom. 13:4, where it is said of the civil magistrate, "He is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." I think it has now been shown that the text upon which the above remarks, have been offered, is not to be regarded as a prediction, but as a declaration of the; principle, that the person who willfully sheds man's blood, forfeits his life, and renders himself liable to have his blood rightfully shed by man.

Exo. 21: 12,14; "He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall surely be put to death. If a man come presumptuously upon his neighbor, to slay him with guile; thou shalt take him from mine altar that he may die."

Lev. 24: 17; "He that killeth any man shall surely be put to death."

These texts show that the law given by God himself to Noah, noticed above, was incorporated into the Mosaic system by which it again received the divine sanction, and though it may be argued that this system is not now in force, it does not affect the principle, inasmuch as it existed before the Mosaic law was given, and hence, it must remain even were it admitted that the whole Mosaic economy were replaced by Christ. But these texts also prove that the argument to which we are replying, is fallacious, so far as it is founded upon the supposed inviolability of human life. Human life can be no more inviolable now, in itself considered, than it was in the days of Moses, and as God did then authorize the taking of human life for crime, it is clear that human life is not absolutely inviolable, so that God cannot authorize man to take it away. If then, human life is inviolable, it is because God has made it so by law, and not because it is so in itself, as it was once right to take life in certain cases. Now, whether or not God has forbidden the taking of human life in any case, is the question at issue, and to argue that he has so forbidden is to beg the whole question. To argue that human life may be taken in no case because it is absolutely inviolable in itself, is false because God did once authorize the taking of life, and to argue from the inviolability of human life, on the ground that God has made it so by command, is to rest the argument on the command of God, in which case, let the command of God be plead directly.

As it is perfectly plain that the Jews were not only authorized to take life, in certain cases, but were commanded so to do, being forbidden to suffer a murderer to live. It must require some positive interdiction on the part of Christ or his apostles to change the order of things in this respect, and render it wrong to do what they had been **in** the habit of practicing for ages under the divine sanction, and as I have already shown that no such direct prohibition or repeal of the previous laws is found in the New Testament, it appears to furnish a conclusive argument. But I will not leave it here, but show that there are some allusions to the infliction of capital punishment in the New Testament, which very much strengthen the argument above drawn from the Old Testament. Some of these passages have already been introduced in other parts of the argument, but for the sake of the bearing they have upon this point, they may be again alluded to.

Matt. 26: 52; "Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

This text is true as a general principle, so far as this, those who take the sword are, as a general thing, as likely to be slain themselves as they are to slay their enemy; it may also be true that by taking the sword, we may rouse others to take the sword against us; it may be true still further, that a warlike nation may be more likely to be overcome and fall by war at last, but it cannot be strictly and universally true that those who take the sword fall by the sword. As has been remarked on another text, such a construction would involve

the world in one continual scene of bloodshed to the end of time. When a man or nation has taken the sword, to fall by it, some other man or nation must take it, and that second man or nation, having taken the sword, a third must take it that the second may fall by it, and so we must go on to the end of time, to make the text strictly true in this sense. But there is a sense in which the text is true, if we only view it in connection with the circumstance which called it forth. Jesus Christ was about being apprehended by a band sent by the constituted authorities for that purpose, and though he was innocent of the crimes laid to his charge, yet he was arrested on the ground that he was a wrong doer, and was taken by the authority constituted for the purpose of apprehending wrong doers, and as it would be subversive of all lawful authority, to resist the officer in the discharge of his duty in attempting to apprehend a supposed criminal, on the ground of his innocence, before he had been tried to see whether he was guilty or not, the resistance which Peter engaged in, to defend his innocent master, was unlawful; it was a resistance of lawful authority, and had any fallen by his sword, he would have been guilty of murder of an aggravated character, murder committed upon an officer while discharging the functions of his office. Thus it is plain that Peter's conduct was a violation of the civil law under which he lived, that if he had killed any, he would have been liable to be put to death for murder under the law he had violated, in accordance with the word of God. "He that sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." Taking this view, there is not only great propriety, but also great force in the words of Christ. "Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword." In accordance with this is John 18: 36; "Jesus answered, my kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews." Because Christ's kingdom was not of this world, it did not take the place of, or supersede the constituted civil authorities which already existed under the divine sanction, and therefore it was wrong for Peter to fight against those authorities in defense of Christ. "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered unto the Jews;" that is, if Christ's kingdom were of this world, it would nullify the authority and laws of all other kingdoms and governments, in which case he would have had the true civil authority on his side, and then it would have been right for Peter to use the sword in defense of rightful authority against unlawful violence—" then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews," who could have had no authority to apprehend him or any one else, had his kingdom been of this world. This certainly looks like a sanction for forcibly maintaining law and government against lawless violence.

Acts 13: 28: "And though they found no cause of death in him, yet desired they Pilate that he should be slain."

This is said of Christ, and while it asserts his innocence, it clearly supposes there may be a cause which would justify putting a man to death. "They found no cause of death in him," is an expression which inspiration would never use if there could be no such thing as a cause of death; it clearly implies, therefore, that such a cause may exist.

Acts 25: 11; "For if I be an offender, or have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die."

These words were spoken by St. Paul in self-defense, and clearly imply that he might have committed crimes for which it would have been right to put him to death. If no crime could justify the taking away of life, how could a holy Apostle say, " if I have done anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die?" If all taking of life is wrong, he was bound to refuse to die under any circumstances, by the hand of the executioner.

It has sometimes been said that Christ never referred to any of the laws of the Old Testament having a death penalty, in a manner to endorse them as the laws of God. This is a mistake. He clearly did this very thing in the following text.

Matt. 15: 4-6; "For God commanded, saying, Honor thy father and mother: And he that curseth father or mother, let him die the death. But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother. It is a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; and honor not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition."

SECTION IV.

The Duties of the People in regard to Civil Government.

I. It is the duty of all men to submit to civil government.

It can hardly be necessary to say that it is the duty of the people to create or institute civil government. They are never found without it in some form. It is a necessity, and always has and always will exist, where there are people to be governed. They may find it necessary to change or modify government, but never to institute it, as a new thing. The people of this country, once found it necessary to revolutionize, as it was called, but they only substituted one government for another. They were not in want of government, they had too much of it. If a people exists anywhere, who are not capable of instituting a government for themselves, and maintaining it, somebody will institute and maintain it for them, for it is man's destiny to be governed. This has always been true. When it is said above, that it is the duty of all men to submit to civil government, it is not meant that a community is bound to submit to whatever may call itself civil government, and assume to exercise a civil jurisdiction over them. Nor is it meant that they are bound to submit to all that a rightfully existing civil government may demand. Governments may do wrong like individuals. A father may abuse his child in some particular, and so may a servant do wrong by his master, without a rupture of the relations. Government may answer the ends of its existence very well, as a general rule, and yet fail in some particulars. In such case it is to be borne with, and corrected and made right. Nor is it meant that the people are to submit to anything which requires of them moral wrong. They cannot submit to any such oppression. Submission to it, would be rebellion against God. This has been sufficiently proved under a preceding head. If government does not answer its designs, it must be reformed, and if it will not be reformed, when the evil is felt by the people, and pointed out, and redress demanded, it should be annihilated and another put in its place.

What, then, is meant by the duty of all men to submit to civil government?

1. All men should live in a state of society, and under a well regulated civil government.

2. All men living under such government, should obey all its rightful laws. All laws are better obeyed than broken, which do not fall under one or the other of the following classifications.

(1.) All such laws as would involve sin on our part to obey, are to be repudiated, for no man can be bound to sin.

(2.) All such laws as would be of greater general evil to the governed, if obeyed, than would be the evil of disobeying them. Every such law should be resisted.

All other laws should be obeyed.

3. All men are bound to sustain government; to submit to it, by rendering to it their proportion of support, in money, influence and personal effort when necessary.

II. The people are all bound to do all they can to render government what it should be, in form, character, measures and results.

1, It is clear that God has not given us any specific form of civil polity This leaves room for government to be varied to suit the intelligence and condition of the people for whose good it is instituted. It is an undeniable fact, that some communities of men have showed themselves too ignorant and degraded to be capable of self-government. It is a blessing to such a people to be well governed by another, or others more skilful than themselves. As every man is bound to do what he can, in his circumstances, to secure good government, if there are a few men, or one man in the community above supposed, capable of governing for the good of the whole, it cannot be proved that such persons or person may not, yea, ought not to step forward and take the reins of government, and administer for the good of all. Such government would be an invasion of no man's rights. All are bound to submit to government, and no man could have a better right to govern. As governments are instituted for the benefit of the governed, they ought to submit to the government of such as are capable of governing for the greatest good of the whole. The same government which would be the best for one people, might not answer the necessities of another people. Let it be remarked, then,

1. That the best form of government for a people, is that form which is best adapted to their condition, and which, in their circumstances, will be productive of the greatest good to the whole. There are, no doubt, nations now, who could not sustain an elective government like ours of the United States. For such a nation our form of government would not be the best, though it may be the best in the world for us.

2. As the tendency of power is to accumulation, and as it is more liable to be abused in individual hands, than in the hands of many, the people should always have so much

control in giving form and direction to government, as they are capable of exercising for their own good. Where the masses are very ignorant and degraded, they must have less hold upon the reins of government in order to be governed to their own best good, as a whole. Where they are more enlightened, or where a greater proportion are enlightened, the power of government will admit of being more diffused. In a country like the United States, where a very large majority are enlightened and refined, there is no danger to the government, from admitting all the ignorant to the full rights of suffrage under our free institutions.

3. In an enlightened community, a republic is, beyond all doubt, the model form of civil polity. In support of this no extended argument is necessary. A republic has its difficulties, and its disadvantages, but where the community is enlightened sufficiently to sustain a free government, it creates such a common interest in the government, throws open such equal facilities to all, and wakes up such a public spirit, as well as individual enterprise, as to place such a people, in point of progress, beyond comparison with any of the nations living under any of the more concentrated and despotic forms of civil government.

It has been thought by some, that republics are necessarily unstable, and are not likely to stand long. It is true, there are a few dots on the chart of time, where republics have been overthrown, but where there is one such dot, indicating where there was once a republic, there are hundreds of places, scattered over with the ruins of demolished thrones and dissolved kingdoms and empires. The republics of the old world wanted two things; viz., intelligence among the masses, and the Christian Religion.

4. In a republic like the United States, a very great responsibility rests upon the governed, and the sphere of the citizen's duty is greatly enlarged. Every man is a legislator in fact, and if he is not a governor, he is a government maker. The people are responsible for the character of the government; its virtues, and its crimes are really their's. Men, under such responsibilities, ought to exercise the elective franchise in the fear of God, and vote with the greatest religious scrupulosity.

III. The above views are sustained by the general declarations of the Scriptures.

It is worthy of remark, that a free government renders those Scriptures which describe the character of civil rulers, applicable to the people, as well as those which refer to their own actions. The following texts are presented as relating to the subject.

Exo. 18: 21; "Moreover thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetous-ness; and place such over them to be rulers."

This plan of government, and of judging the people, was suggested to Moses by Jethro, the priest of Midian, Moses' father-in-law, and on this ground some may be disposed to dispute its authority, but nothing can be gained by such a position. As Moses fell in with the plan, it must follow that he supposed that he had a warrant from God for it, or else, that it was his opinion that the people had a right to put themselves under a government of such form, as they believed best calculated to secure their interests, so that they did not

violate any express law of God, and either of these consequences is sufficient to sustain the argument. Rulers then must have the following qualifications.

1. "They must be able men," what we call men of talent. A ruler needs a sound mind, well informed mind.
2. Rulers must be "men that fear God." And how strange it is to talk of selecting a man who fears God for a ruler, if he who rules over men is, *ipso facto*, a rebel against God?
3. Rulers must be men that hate covetousness. These qualifications are utterly inconsistent with the idea that government is wrong in itself.

Deut. 17: 14,16; "When thou art come unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt say I will set a king over me, like as the nations that are about me; thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose; one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee; thou mayest not set a stranger over thee which is not thy brother."

Here rules are given to the people by which they should be governed in the choice of a king.

Exo. 22: 28; "Thou shalt not curse the ruler of thy people."

It may be wrong to curse any man, but as we are here particularly forbidden to curse the ruler, it follows that we owe to a ruler an additional respect in consequence of his office, and hence, to curse a ruler, is a higher offence than to curse a man.

Job 34: 18; "Is it fit to say to a king, Thou art wicked, and to princes, ye are ungodly?"

Prov. 24: 21; "My son, fear thou the Lord and the king."

Fear is here enjoined as a matter of moral obligation, and not as mere worldly policy, for it respects both God and the king.

Eccle. 8: 2; "I counsel thee to keep the king's commandment, and that in regard to the oath of God."

This text clearly involves the duty of obedience to rulers.

1 Tim. 2: 1. 2; "I exhort therefore, that first of all supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men; for kings and for all in authority."

We are here first, required to pray for all men; now, as kings are comprehended in the term *all men*, and as the Apostle enjoins prayer for kings and all in authority after enjoining prayer for all men, it follows that Christians are under a special obligation to pray for kings and rulers, aside from the obligation which requires them to pray for all

men. This proves that the Bible recognizes the relation between rulers and subjects, and that, like every other authorized relation, it lays the parties under corresponding obligations, from which the right of civil government must follow as a matter of course.

Titus 3: 1; "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates."

This text most clearly teaches that Christians are under obligation to obey magistrates. Now, right and obligation are always reciprocal; hence the *obligation to obey* magistrates, necessarily implies the *right* of magistrates to *command*, which is the very point at issue; this argument therefore must be conclusive.

1 Peter 2: 13,14,17; "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king as supreme, or to governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well. Honor all men, love the brotherhood, honor the king."

This text is too plain to need comment, after what has been said above. We are not only required to submit to the authority of civil rulers "for the Lord's sake," but the design of their appointment is shown to *be, first*, "for the punishment of evil doers," and *secondly*, "for the praise of them that do well." In this instance the Apostle clearly recognizes, not only the right of government, but the right of punishment. We are also required to "honor all men," upon the back of which we are required to "honor the king," which shows that civil rulers are entitled to a respect not due to other men, which could not be the case if the very holding of an office were a crime.

2. Peter 2: 9, 10; "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished. But chiefly them that walk after the flesh, in the lust of un-cleanness, and *despise government*; presumptuous are they, self-willed; *they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities*" See also Jude 8.

This represents the want of proper respect for government as a crime, for which the offender is to be reserved unto the Day of Judgment to be punished.

CHAPTER V.

THE DUTIES WE OWE TO OUR FELLOW-BEINGS CONCLUDED—THE DUTIES OF MAN TO MAN, AS MAN.

We now come to the last and most extended relation, that man can sustain to his fellow-man. The relation which man sustains to universal humanity, like every other relation, involves its rights and duties peculiar to itself. We have seen humanity in the relation of husband and wife, then in the relation of parents and children, then in the relation of masters and servants, or employers and employed, then in the relation of governors and governed, and now we reach the widest circle of human brotherhood, the relation of man to man.

Several bands of human beings meet along the way, in life's pilgrimage, sustaining no relation to each other, beyond the facts that they are all the creatures of the same God, and have all descended from Adam and Eve. They are all strangers, they all belong to different nations, speak different languages, and wear different complex-tions, but it so happens that they pitch their tents for a night, upon the same oasis in the desert, and beside the same water fountain. Now what are the duties and obligations binding them in regard to each other? Or, in other words, what are the rights of each, which the others are bound to respect? The answer is,

1. Each has a right to life, so that neither may take the life of his neighbor.
2. Each has the right of property, so that neither may rob the other.
3. Each has a right to liberty, so that neither may arrest and detain the other, but all must be left free to pursue their journey.

A brief discussion of these three points will close this Book, on the rights and duties of humanity, or on the morals of Christianity.

SECTION I.

Man has an Inalienable Right to Life.

When it is said that every man has an inalienable right to life, it is meant that no man has a right to deprive him of his life, unforfeited by crime, and that he has no right to destroy his own life, but is bound to live as long as he can.

No man has a right to take the life of his fellow-being, unforfeited by crime. It is not pretended, that in the case of the travelers in life's journey, above supposed, should one undertake to kill all the rest, it would not justify the others in uniting their strength and taking away his life, as the only means of saving their own.

This is what is meant, suppose the pilgrim to pursue his journey in peace, and harming no one else, no man may take his life away. God has guarded it. "Thou shalt not kill," is one of the commandments of his law. In addition to this command in the Decalogue, God has showed his abhorrence of the crime involved in the destruction of the life of man, by the hand of his equal brother man, by guarding human life by the most awful sanctions, in the pouring out of the blood of the murderer, and in exclusion from the beatitudes of his kingdom. Gen. 9: 5, 6; 1 John 3 15.

Murder, so called, is universally condemned, and to prevent and suppress it, has been a prominent object of civil government, in all ages and countries.

The murderer's own conscience is, doubtless, one of the most powerful and ever-present witnesses to the enormity of the crime. While judgment lingers, an awful sound is in the

ears of the murderer, and an oppressive load is on his heart. Conscience ever and anon awakes and excites awful forebodings of coming wrath. Blood-guiltiness presses heavily on him, and clouds with gloom his sunshine and his shade. It glares upon him like a fury, and overwhelms him with torture and distress. Detection and punishment by the hand of man perpetually stare him in the face, and distract his mind with terrors. Once he could enjoy repose and be at rest. He can enjoy it no more. Thoughts of the murdered which are ever with him, throng his solitudes, and invest them with awful terrors. Darkness, silence, and retirement, so refreshing to the good, so replete with interesting ideas and tranquil pleasures, are to him the gates of hell and the anguish of despair.

But in how many forms has real murder become fashionable, and lost its horror in public estimation, and even entitling its perpetrators to the highest honors, as the benefactors of mankind. That a concise view may be taken of the subject, let the leading forms in which the sixth commandment is violated, be considered.

1. That willful killing of a human being, which is regarded as murder by the common law of all nations. On this no comment need be offered.
2. The destruction of the unborn, with a view to conceal crime, and avert shame, or for other purposes. This is none the less a crime, because it is most practiced among what are called, the refined classes of community.
3. Suicide, which is the willful destruction of one's own life. Suicide was not regarded as a crime by many of the ancient nations, but they were heathen. David Hume, the great infidel, was one of its more modern advocates.

That suicide is a crime, may be inferred from the following considerations:

(1.) It is clearly a violation of the command, "thou shalt not kill." It is admitted that this command, in its direct application, refers to the killing of others, yet it includes the killing of one's self. To deny this, would involve the right to kill others, under some circumstances. This law is comprehended in the command, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is then no violation of the law, "thou shalt not kill," where there is not a violation of the command, "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." A man's love to himself is the measure of his duty to his neighbor. If then a man may rightfully kill himself, he may rightfully kill his neighbor, who is in the circumstances which would justify self-destruction.

(2.) All examples of suicide recorded in the Bible, are those of bad men. The Scriptural examples of suicide are those of Saul, Ahithophel, and Judas. The characters of these men are not such as to give their examples authority, or render them fit for imitation. Saul and Judas were the worst of men. Ahithophel deserted his sovereign in affliction, and participated in a wicked conspiracy formed against his kingdom and life. Judas sold his Lord for thirty pieces of silver.

(3.) Many good men of the Scriptures, the patriarchs and prophets, and the Apostles, endured reproach and distress, and had experience of manifold sufferings; but they did not think proper to relieve themselves by suicide.

(4.) God has placed us here to be the subjects of discipline adapted to our improvement. We are not at liberty to desert our post till called away by him. Men have no right to commit suicide to escape from afflictions, from shame and other evil consequences of their indiscretions, or from any class of trials. The good should live to improve by their afflictions, and to be useful; and the wicked to repent and make amends to society for their crimes.

4. Dueling is another form of murder. As no man has a right to take his own life, he can have no right to consent to its being taken by another. If I have not a right to take my own life, I have no right to consent that you may take it, and my consent gives you no right to take it. If then we agree to fight a duel, I attempt to take your life, and you attempt to take my life, without a right so to do on either side, my consenting that you may take my life is equal to my taking my own life, involving the crime of suicide; and my attempt to take your life is an attempt to assassinate you, and the same is true of you in regard to me. It is therefore certain, that dueling involves the double crime of suicide and assassination.

5. All wars, instituted for conquest and plunder, are systems of wholesale murders, If one man has not a right to kill his neighbor, because he hates him, or for the selfish purpose of obtaining his money, or taking possession of his house and lands, the same man can not have the right of associating with himself, a thousand or ten thousand and killing as many for the same or no better ends. No war can be justified on any principle which would not justify an individual in taking the life of a neighbor on the ground of the right of self-defense.

The right of life, or the right to live, involves the right to defend life against wicked attempts to rob us of it. Under the head of the right of civil government, those Scriptures were considered, which have been supposed to forbid self-defense. From the view there given, it will follow that there is no Scripture command for-bidding self-defense. In support of it, as a natural and universal right, the following remarks are introduced, from president Mahan.

"1. It is a principle of our nature absolutely universal, a principle which we possess in common with all sentient existences, rational and irrational, existences capable of perceiving themselves the objects of violent assaults from other beings. This fact none will deny.

2. This principle differs wholly and fundamentally from *revenge*, which is evil intentionally inflicted, *after* an injury real or supposed has been received, or inflicted, not at all as a means of self-protection, but to gratify feelings and sentiments of hate and ill will, which the remembrance of the injury excites. Revenge, according to this sense of the term, is, in all circumstances actual or conceivable, morally wrong and wholly so.

3. All Scripture prohibitions pertaining to revenge, such as "avenge not yourselves," "resist not evil," "be not overcome of evil," have no reference whatever to self-defense. They refer to an entirely distinct and opposite thing, and are wholly misapplied when adduced against the principle of self-defense. It is also very singular that they should ever be so applied, when they are presented by Christ and by His apostles, in almost every instance, as literal quotations from the Old Testament in which the right of self-defense is expressly sanctioned. As they stand in that portion of holy writ, they certainly do not contradict this right. How can they contradict it then, when quoted in the New Testament, as having authority in consequence of being found in the Old?

4. It follows, as a necessary consequence, from the universal fact above stated, that self-defense, to wit, the repelling of force by force, when violently assaulted, is a sacred right of man. If the existence of a universal principle, in all sentient beings rational or irrational, indicates a universal right, (and if this does not indicate it, nothing does or can do it,) then does the right under consideration pertain to man, in the circumstances supposed.

5. The question, and the only one arising out of this subject, pertaining to the idea or law of duty, is this. What are the *extent* and *limits* of this right? What is the law which morally binds us under the circumstances supposed? I lay it down, as a necessary intuition of the universal intelligence, that whenever a propensity absolutely universal exists, as it truly and undeniably is in the present case, action in harmony with that propensity, within certain limits, is lawful and right. The existence of the propensity determines the right itself. It is the business of the moral philosopher to determine its extent and limits. What, then, are the extent and limits of the right of self-defense? The principle which I lay down as law universal on this subject is this. *Never intentionally put in jeopardy, for self-protection, higher interests than those assailed.* Any injury within these limits, intentionally inflicted upon an assailant, who unlawfully and violently assaults us, is right and proper, when this is done strictly and exclusively, as a means of self-protection. This is the true and the only true principle."

SECTION II.

The Right of Property.

The right to acquire and possess property, is an original right, and is inalienable. Property itself is alienable, but the right to acquire, and have and hold, is inalienable.

This right was conferred upon man at the time of his creation, and, of course, it belongs to the race. God said to Adam, "have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."

This gives to man a right to fish, and fowl, and ox, and horse, and sheep, and land, so far as he can get them into his possession, and bring them under his control, without invading any of the rights previously acquired by his fellow-beings.

The right of property being so clear, it is only necessary to advert to the modes in which it is most commonly violated.

It is not violated by such a public tax, as is necessary for the support of government. The existence of government is essential to the peaceable and safe enjoyment of the right of property. To tax property to support government, is, therefore, only to make property pay the expense of its own protection, and this may be done more securely and cheaper through a well arranged government, than by each individual attempting to protect his own property. All governmental taxes, however, should be limited to what is for the general good, and to the amount which is strictly necessary. All beyond this point, is oppression.

The right of property is violated in the following methods.

1. By theft. This is forbidden by the eighth commandment. "Thou shalt not steal." It is not necessary to labor to prove the propriety of such a command, or to prove the evil of stealing. It is an invasion of the right of property, which, in its extreme aspects, is as sacred as life itself. A right to acquire, and have, and use property, is included in the right to live, for without it men could not live. Stealing, therefore, though the actual consequences to the injured party may be very trifling, is a violation of a sacred and all important principle.
2. What is called robbery, is a violation of the right of property. It contains all the evil elements of stealing, with the additional crime of personal violence, often, if not always, endangering life itself.
3. The right of property is invaded by cheating, in all forms of dishonest deal, or by any method by which one man obtains the money or goods of another, without a just compensation. The honesty of traffic, depends upon the fact that it is reciprocal, or mutually beneficial to both parties. The forms of dishonest deal are too numerous to be named.
4. The right of property is invaded, when one man takes advantage of another man's necessity. The forms of this species of dishonesty, are too numerous to allow of their being detailed.
5. The right of property is invaded when a man's honest means of acquiring property are wrongfully impaired. This method is often resorted to by dishonest competitors in business. Any false report or slander which injures a man's honest business is an invasion of his right of property.
6. The right of property is virtually violated, whenever property is misapplied or used for bad purposes. This last remark covers a numerous class of evils, against which human law can provide to a very limited extent only, but the eye of God is upon them all, and he will hold every man to a strict account for the use he makes of the property he acquires.

As this is a very important matter, the following very just remarks are introduced upon the subject, from Mr. Watson.

"Property is not disposable at the option of man, without respect to the rules of the Divine law; and here, too, we shall perceive the feebleness of the consideration urged, in merely moral systems, to restrain prodigal and wasteful expenditure, hazardous speculations, and even the obvious evil of gambling. Many weighty arguments, we grant, may be drawn against all these from the claims of children, and near relations, whose interests we are bound to regard, and whom we can have no right to expose even to the chance of being involved in the same ruin with ourselves. But these reasons can have little sway with those who fancy that they can keep within the verge of extreme danger, and who will plead their 'natural right' to do what they will with their own. In cases, too, where there may be no children or dependent relatives, the individual would feel less disposed to acknowledge the force of this class of reasons, or think them quite inapplicable to his case. But Christianity enjoins 'moderation' of the desires, and temperance in the gratification of the appetites, and in the show and splendor of life, even where a state of opulence can command them. It has its admonitions against the 'love of money;' against 'willing to be rich,' except as the Lord may prosper a man' in the usual track and course of honest industry—authoritative cautions which lie directly against hazardous speculations; and it warns such as despise them of the consequent 'temptations' and spiritual 'snares' destructive to habits of piety, and ultimately to the soul, into which they must fall—considerations of vast moment, but peculiar to itself, and quite out of the range of those moral systems which have no respect to its authority. Against gambling, in its most innocent forms, it sets its injunction, 'Redeeming the time;' and in its more aggravated cases, it opposes to it not only the above considerations, as it springs from an unhallowed 'love of money;' but the whole of that spirit and temper which it makes to be obligatory upon us, and which those evil and often diabolical excitements, produced by this habit, so fearfully violate. Above all, it makes property a trust, to be employed under the rules prescribed by Him who, as Sovereign Proprietor, has deposited it with us, which rules require its use certainly (for the covetous are excluded from the kingdom of God;) but its use, first, for the supply of our wants, according to our station, with moderation; then, as a provision for children, and dependent relatives; finally, for purposes of charity and religion, in which 'grace,' as before stated, it requires us 'to abound;' and it enforces all these by placing us under the responsibility of accounting to God himself, in person, for the abuse or neglect of this trust, at the general judgment."

SECTION III.

Man's Right to Liberty.

Liberty is the natural right of every human being and no human being can be rightfully deprived of it, only so far as his liberty becomes dangerous to the safety and well being of others. That a criminal, who lives by plundering others may be rightfully deprived of his liberty, and that a mad man may be confined, is admitted; but that rational and innocent men and women can be rightfully deprived of their liberty, and held in bondage, under any pretence, is denied. This opens the question of chattel slavery; to a consideration of it

shall this closing section on the rights of humanity, and the duties of man, to man be devoted. Slavery violates all the rights of humanity, as will be made to appear, as it also intercepts every path of duty which the Creator has marked out, regarding God and man.

Before opening the argument, it is proper to define what is meant by slavery.

By slavery is meant, the system which reduces man to a chattel, and buys and sells him, and subjects him to the liabilities of other property, claiming the same right of property in the offspring by virtue of the right previously asserted to the parent. This is the system of American Slavery, and against it and all other slavery involving the same principles, the following arguments are directed.

Slavery consisting in the right of property in man, with the usual incidents of that right must be morally wrong, and sin in itself, for the following reasons.

I. Slavery is inconsistent with man's accountability to God as a subject of his moral government.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." This commandment clearly lays such a claim to the affections of the heart, and demands such an entire devotion of the soul (*Psukee Life*) as gives tone to, and controls the actions; it therefore contains the foundation of absolute obedience to God. This is seen in the expression, "with all thy strength." This requires a consecration of the physical powers in obedience to God, under the control of the affections of the heart.

There is but one question more to settle, which is, can these affections and *actions* exist in the same heart and life, at the same time with those affections and *actions* which are consonant with the relation of a piece of property to its owner, a personal chattel to a chattel holder? Slavery may say what it pleases; common sense says no.

To be under obligation to obey God, there must exist the right and power of devoting our lives to God, for there can be no obligation where there is not both *right* and *power* to respond to that obligation. But the slave, who is the property of man, has not and *cannot have* the power of devoting his life to God, because his life is not at his own disposal, according to the dictates of his own understanding of right; he cannot do what *God requires*, but must do what *men require*, and wicked men too, who fear not God and regard not his law. Should it be said that slave owners do not interfere with the slave's right to obey God, and liberty of conscience, every one must know that such an assumption would be false, for the extension of the right to slaves, to obey God, as free men professing the religion of the Bible deem it their duty to obey God, would overthrow the system of slavery.

Further, if it were admitted that slave owners grant their slaves the privilege of obeying God, it would not relieve the difficulty, for it would still follow that the system of property in man, takes away from the human chattel the right to obey God, and puts it

into the hand of the owner, who has the power to close up before the chattelized traveler to eternity, the path of obedience, and with authority direct his footsteps in the way of sin and death. Man cannot sustain the relation of property to man, without an infraction of the relation that he sustains to God, and of the rights and powers essential to the conformity of his affections and actions to this relation, hence, the right of property in man cannot exist.

The assumption of the relation of a chattel holder to a subject of God's moral government, is to step in between such subject and God, and disannul man's relation to his Maker, and absolve him from his allegiance to Jehovah's throne.

II. Slavery conflicts with man's specific duties, required in the Scriptures.

It is the duty of all intelligent beings to use all the means within their reach to acquire a knowledge of God and his will. To remain ignorant of God and his will concerning us through neglect of the means within our reach, is of itself a sin of the darkest shade. But from what source is the knowledge of God to be derived? The answer is plain, the *Scriptures*. "To the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them."

It is clear that if the Scriptures are an expression of the mind of God, and have been inspired by his spirit, all must possess a common right of direct access to this fountain of moral light.

But God has made it our duty to know him, and to know him through this medium.

Luke 16: 29; "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them."

John 5: 39; "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life."

Acts 17: 11; "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so."

The right and duty of all men to possess themselves of the Scriptures, and to read and study the same being established, it only remains to show that slavery is of necessity and forever inimical to this right and duty; taking away the one, and nullifying the other. The right of property in man cannot exist co-ordinate with the right and obligation to "search the Scriptures."

1. The right and obligation to search the Scriptures necessarily includes the right of acquiring property, first in money or money's value with which to procure the Scriptures to be read: and secondly, in the Scriptures, which will overthrow the whole system of slavery. This view shows that the slave, as property, cannot possess, in his own right, a Bible or the value of a Bible in any form, and, therefore, the command of God to "search the Scriptures," and the assumed right of property in man, are totally and irreconcilably

opposed to each other, so that while God requires all men to search the Scriptures, no man can rightfully be reduced to a chattel. With this agrees the law of slavery which says that a slave "an do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything but what must belong to their master."

2. The right and obligation to search the Scriptures, includes the right to devote sufficient time to the pursuits of religious knowledge. But the right of property in a man includes the right to monopolize and dispose of his whole time, so that he cannot possess the right of devoting his time or any part of it to the study of the Scriptures, from which it follows again that the right of slavery is at war with the duties which God has commanded. If the right of property in man includes the right of controlling his time, it conflicts with duties which God requires and must be wrong; and if it does not give the master the right to control the time of the slave, the whole practical system of slavery is a violation of right.

In showing that slavery conflicts with certain specified duties, it is proper to notice the duty of publicly worshipping God. On this point we will quote but one text.

Heb. 10: 25; "Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is. " This text clearly teaches the duty of meeting together in Christian assembles for religious purposes, while slavery declares that the right of slaves so to assemble cannot be admitted with safety to the system.

To conclude this argument, we say that to grant the slaves the simple *right of obeying the Gospel*, by attending to all its devotional and social *duties as they are commanded and understood by Christians generally*, would *overthrow the entire system*.

III. Slavery subverts the marriage institution, and annuls the relation of husband and wife.

Man is a social being, and has received a social nature from the hand which formed him; which seeks intercourse, sympathy, and reciprocal enjoyments from kindred spirits. The various relations into which we are thrown by the current of our social nature, have been provided for by God in his word, where he has prescribed the circumstances, conditions and obligations of our social and domestic relations, and has thrown around them the protection of his law.

"We will commence with the institution of marriage. This of course was provided for by the hand of God when he originally created man, and is the first institution in the chain of social relations; first in the order of nature, and first in the order of the positive institutions of the divine law.

Matt. 19: 4-6; "Have ye not read that he which made them at the beginning, made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain but one flesh, what therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder."

Heb. 13: 4; "Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled; but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge."

On these texts it may be remarked, that God obviously designed marriage for all nations, races and classes of men. To say that God does not require marriage on the part of the African race, would be to say that he designs the extinction of the race, for all such perpetuation of the race out of wedlock is condemned and denounced by God himself. We are now prepared to show wherein slavery conflicts with the institution, and rights and obligations of marriage.

1. The right of property in man is inconsistent with the rights of the parties who lawfully enter into the marriage relation.

The husband has a monopoly of right in his wife. A wife belongs to her husband, in a sense which renders it impossible that she should be the property of another at the same time; if she is the wife of one, she cannot be the property of another; if she is the property of one she cannot be the wife of another. It is impossible from the nature of the two things that a woman should hold out the attributes of a wife to one man, and the attributes of property to another, at the same time. The husband has an exclusive right in his wife, and the owner has an exclusive right in his property; hence, a woman cannot sustain the relation of a wife to one man, and the relation of property to another. In the same manner the rights of the wife forever forbid the right of property in the husband. The man is not alone in securing rights to himself when he enters into the marriage relation; corresponding to his rights are the rights of the wife; if they are not in every respect the same, they are nevertheless equal in number and importance. The husband is bound no less to devote himself for the promotion of the happiness of the wife than she is to promote his happiness. This right of the wife to the love, the protection, the support, and entire devotedness of the husband to promote her happiness must forever preclude the right of property to such husband vesting itself in the hands of another.

2. The right of property in man is inconsistent with the obligations resting upon the parties to the marriage relations. Rights and obligations are always reciprocal; hence, in treating of the rights of the parties, the corresponding obligations have been implied, but we wish to bring them out a little more distinctly. The right of the husband to the due regard and proper submission of the wife, involves an obligation on her part to render these things; the right of the wife to the love and protection of the husband, involves an obligation on his part to love and protect her. We will now present a few plain declarations of Scripture on this subject, and see how effectually they overthrow the assumed right of property in man.

1. Cor. 7: 2; "Nevertheless, *to avoid* fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband."

The system of property in man, making them personal chattels, to be bought and sold in the market, cannot be reconciled with the above text. To let every man have his own

wife, and every woman her own husband, in the apostle's sense, would overthrow the whole system of slavery.

Eph. 5: 21, 23; "Wives submit yourselves unto you own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the Savior of the body."

Can wives, who are the personal chattels of men not their husbands, comply with the above text? When the husband is sent to one market and the wife to another, can the wife obey the Scriptures? Can the wife who is in the power, the absolute power of a man who is not her husband, and who can enforce his will in all things without let or hindrance by flattery, bribes, strength, prisons, whips and tortures; can such a wife submit herself to her husband as unto the Lord, and can a husband, who is under the same absolute control of another, be the head of such a wife, as Christ is the head of the church? Answer, common sense!

1. Cor. 7: 10; "And unto the married I command, *yet* not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband?"

Eph. 5: 28, 29; " So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourish-eth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church?"

1. Peter 3 7; "Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with *them* according to know-ledge, giving honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered."

How can a man, who may be sold and driven away at any moment, be under obligation to dwell with his wife? We will not multiply quotations or remarks; enough has been said to show that slavery and the marriage institution cannot exist together. Slavery takes away the power of the wife to preserve her own purity, and this is true of married and unmarried females.

To settle the question, we say that matrimony exists among slaves or it does not. The one or the other of these positions must be true. Which is true, we care not, so far as this argument is concerned.

1. If matrimony does exist in moral right among slaves, the parties are joined together by God, and Christ says, "what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." But slavery does sunder them, and the right of property includes the right of sundering them. If therefore slaves are married in moral right, slavery is guilty of parting those whom God had joined together, and drags after it the crime of adultery. The slave system separates the parties and joins them in other connections, so that within a few years the same man may have several wives, and the same woman several husbands, and all living at the same time.

2. If slaves are not married in moral right, as they are not and cannot be in the eyes of the civil law, slavery stands charged with breaking up this heaven appointed institution, and of involving the slave population in the crime of general whoredom. There is so far as we can see, no way to escape these conclusions; if the advocate of slavery allows that slaves are brought within the marriage institution, he assumes that the power to separate those whom God hath joined together can rightfully exist; a thing, in our view, impossible. If he admits that slaves are not brought within the marriage institution, he assumes the rightfulness of general sexual intercourse without the bans of matrimony. Such is slavery, consisting in the assumed right of property in human beings, wherever it is found, in the church or out of the church. We speak as to wise men; judge of what we say.

IV. Slavery subverts the relation of parents and children.

That there are rights and obligations connected with this relation, around which God has thrown the protection of his law, armed with the arrows of his lightnings, and the voice of his thunders, cannot be denied; and that slavery disregards them and tramples them under foot, if not admitted shall be proved.

When God descended upon Mount Sinai and gave his law amid the dreadful lightnings that blazed and glared, and shot their fiery arrows athwart the smoke and gloom that mantled the Eternal upon the mount, and amid the thunders that bellowed terrors and poured the voice of condemnation in the ear of sin; He then wrote with his own finger upon a table of stone, as the fifth of the ten commandments, the following words: "Honor thy father and mother, that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

The duty of the child to honor his father and mother, clearly implies the obligation of the parents so to teach and so to behave towards the child, as is calculated to inspire the feelings and write upon the heart of the child what God wrote in the book of his law. This sentiment is clearly brought out in the comment of St. Paul.

The duties of parents and children have been exhibited in a preceding chapter, to which the reader is referred.

1. Can parents, who are subject to all the liabilities of property, and whose children are also property in the same full sense, bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? This cannot be pretended.

2. Can children who are "personal chattels to all intents and purposes and constructions whatsoever," honor their fathers and mothers? Can they "obey their parents in the Lord?" Most certainly not.

V. Slavery is man-stealing.

It would be a waste of time to attempt to prove that man-stealing is a crime. It is universally admitted that all stealing is wrong, and it follows that man stealing is the most

sinful of all theft. It cannot be maintained that to steal the horse under the rider would be a sin, while to steal the rider off the horse would be a justifiable act.

That man stealing is condemned in the Bible will not be denied.

Exo. 21: 16; " He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, shall surely be put to death."

St. Paul tells us, 1 Tim. 1: 10, that the law of God "is made for men stealers."

The only question about which there can be any dispute is this; is American Slavery, as it now exists, man-stealing?

1. American Slavery had its origin in man-stealing.

(1.) The facts, as generally understood, are such as to stamp the whole business of the foreign slave trade with the odious name of man-stealing. No matter who was engaged in it, saint or devil, it was nevertheless man-stealing. The business commenced by stealing such persons as they could catch along the coast, and force away from country, home and friends, to live, suffer and die, in bondage among strangers. When the increasing market could not be supplied in this way, other means were resorted to. The kidnappers would land for purposes of trade, and while trading, would pour out to their unsuspecting customers the intoxicating drink, who, not being acquainted with the power of ardent spirits, would soon become helpless, and then while drunk the pale-faced demons would secure them. When they awoke from their drunkenness, they found themselves, not like Noah under the protection of affectionate sons, but in chains and in the hell of the slave ship. But at last, to supply the increasing demand, war was resorted to, which was no less man-stealing. The wars, it should be understood, were commenced for the express purpose of ob-taming slaves, hence, it was stealing on a larger scale. If two men go and take one, it is stealing; if ten go and take five, it is stealing; if one hundred go and take fifty, it is stealing; and if one thousand go and take five hundred, it is no less man-stealing.

(2.) The law of our country deems it man-stealing. It is pronounced piracy, and punished by death by the laws of the United States. It is no more morally wrong now, than when it was tolerated: hence, it was always wrong.

2. The present race or generation of slaves can be held by no better title or authority than that by which their stolen fathers and mothers were held. They were originally stolen, and, of course there was no valid title to them; if, therefore, there is now a title to those bondmen and bondwomen, it has been obtained or originated since their fathers and mothers were stolen. We demand at what period in the dark history of slavery, this supposed title to these human beings began to exist. As there was no title at first, they being stolen, it follows that there can be no title now, that they are stolen persons still, unless it can be shown when, under what circumstances, and upon what principles the title originated, and began to exist.

By the law of Slavery, the condition of the offspring follows, the condition of the mother. Let us then suppose what is the fact in the case, —some men-stealers, for whom the law of God was made, went to Africa, and stole a helpless female. Had he any right or title to her? Certainly not. The next step in this infamous business was, the man thief sold this stolen female to a Southern planter. Had the planter any title to her? Certainly not; for he could have none only what he bought; and he could buy none only what the thief had to sell, and he had no title to sell, and therefore he could sell none; and therefore the planter could buy none of him; and therefore the planter could have no title. This is all just as certain as it is that one man cannot communicate to another what he has not. As the thief had no title to his stolen victim, he could communicate no title to the man to whom he sold.

The third step in the progress of slavery is, this enslaved female had an offspring in her bonds. Had the planter, who held her without title, a title to her child as his property? Slavery itself does not pretend to any title to the children which is not founded upon a supposed title to the mother; hence, as there was no title to the mother, there can be none to the child. As the mother was a stolen person in his hands, so is the child a stolen person in his hands if he retains it as his property. Slavery, therefore, is man-stealing, and must remain man-stealing, so long as it shall be continued.

It can make no difference in moral principle, from what particular place we steal a human being, whether from Africa or in America. Now, it appears, from the boasted chart of the nation's rights, that every child, born in this land, has an inalienable right to liberty, as much so as children now born in Africa or in any other country. Where, then, is the difference in moral principle, whether we go to Africa and take a child, and bring it here for a slave, or take one born here? The child, born of the enslaved mother in South Carolina, has the same inalienable right to liberty, the gift of God, as the child born in Africa. Where is the justice? Where is the consistency? If the law of the nation, which declares that he who brings children from Africa to make slaves of them, shall be hanged as a pirate upon the high seas, be right, then he who takes children born in this land, and holds them as property and as slaves, ought to be hanged as a land pirate; for the one has the same inalienable right to liberty as the other.

To invalidate these arguments, we must deny the truth of the Declaration of American Independence, we must disprove the unity of human nature, that "God has made of one blood all nations of men," equal in natural rights; and we must falsify the universal conviction of mankind, which each feels, that he was born free, and has a right to himself.

We will close this argument by saying that American Slavery is essentially man-stealing; that the Bible condemns man-stealing, and therefore the Bible condemns slavery.

VI. The Bible condemns Slavery specifically by condemning the traffic in human beings.

Deut. 24: 7; "If a man be found stealing any of his brethren of the children of Israel, and maketh merchandise of him, or selleth him; then that thief shall die; and thou shalt put evil away from among you."

This text most clearly condemns, not only the act of stealing men, but the act of making merchandize of men. The principle of traffic in human beings is condemned. There is only one point on which the advocate of slavery can hang an objection and that is the fact that it simply condemns, making merchandise of the children of Israel. This is fully answered by the remark that Israel after the flesh, cannot be more sacred in the eye of God, than Israel, after the Spirit. If it was wrong to make merchandise of a Jew, because he was a Jew, it must be wrong to make merchandise of a Christian, because he is a Christian.

Chap. 21: 14; "And it shall be, if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her."

This is spoken of a female captive taken in war, it fully condemns the idea of selling human beings.

Amos 2: 6; "Thus saith the Lord; For three transgressions of Israel, and for four, I will not turn away *the punishment* thereof; because they sold the righteous for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes."

On this text it may be remarked,

1. The slaves are often *righteous*, so that it is true to the very letter, that the righteous are sold for silver.
2. The slaves are all *poor* and are often bartered and gambled away for a consideration as small as a pair of shoes.

Zech. 11: 4, 5; "Thus saith the Lord my God; Feed the flock of the slaughter, whose possessors slay them, and hold themselves not guilty: and they that sell them say, Blessed *be* the Lord; for I am rich: and their own shepherds pity them not."

If there was ever a true picture, this is a true picture of slavery. The members of the flock of Jesus Christ are sold, "and they that sell them say blessed be the Lord, for I am rich; and their own shepherds pity them not."

Joel 3: 3; " And they have cast lots for my people; and have given a boy for a harlot, and sold a girl for wine, that they might drink."

That every crime here condemned is part and parcel of American Slavery, cannot be denied. The right of property in man is the foundation of these crimes. How often are slaves exchanged one for another, so that it is literally true that a boy is given for a harlot.

Again, how often is it the case in their gambling and drinking revels, that slaveholders pawn their servants for their bills, or gamble them away, so that it is literally true that a girl is sold for wine that they may drink.

In concluding this argument, two things are to be noticed.

1. The Bible, as has been shown, clearly condemns the traffic in human beings.
2. American slavery assumes the right of buying and selling human beings as personal chattels.

From the above propositions it follows that the Bible condemns slavery.

VII. Slavery is involuntary servitude, which the Bible condemns. The only question that needs to be settled in this argument, is the wrong of forcing one man to serve another against his will. We know of no Scriptures, which, by any fair construction can be made to justify compulsory service. But we will quote a few texts which, in our own mind, condemn it.

Deut. 23: 15, 16; "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee; He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him."

This text most clearly condemns involuntary service, for it most clearly justifies the servant in leaving his master and protects him in it against the pursuits of his master, and even forbids the people among whom he may go to deliver him up. It appears from this text that there was such a thing as involuntary servitude, and in this text it is effectually condemned. It is clear that the Jews were forbidden to compel service against the will of the servant. This will appear still more certain from another text. This subject is treated at large by the prophet, and to save the reader the trouble of turning to the Bible, while reading this argument, we quote the prophet at length.

Jer. 34: 6; "Then Jeremiah the prophet spake all these words unto Zedekiah king of Judah in Jerusalem:

"7. When the king of Babylon's army fought against Jerusalem, and against all the cities of Judah that were left, against Lachish, and Against Azekah; for these defenses cities remained of the cities of Judah.

"8. This is the word that came unto Jeremiah from the Lord, after that the king Zedekiah had made a covenant with all the people which were at Jerusalem, to proclaim liberty unto them:

"9. That every man should let his man servant, being a Hebrew or a Hebrewess, go free; that none should serve himself of them; and to wit, of a Jew his brother.

"10. Now when all the princes and all the people, which had entered into the covenant, heard that every one should let his man servant, and every one his maid servant, go free that none should serve themselves of them any more, then they obeyed, and let them go.

"11. But afterwards they turned and caused the servants and hand maids, whom they had let go free, to return, and brought them into subjection for servants and for hand maids.

"12. Therefore the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, from the Lord, saying,

"13. Thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel; I made a covenant with your fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the house of bondmen, saying,

"14. At the end of seven years let ye go every man his brother a Hebrew, which hath been sold unto thee; and when he hath served thee six years, thou shalt let him go free from thee: but your fathers hearkened not unto me, neither inclined their ear.

"15. And ye were now turned, and had done right in my sight, in proclaiming liberty every man to his neighbor; and ye had made a covenant before me in the house which is called by my name:

"16. But ye turned and polluted my name, and caused every man his servant, and every man his hand maid, whom he had set at liberty at their pleasure, to return, and brought them into subjection, to be unto you for servants and for hand maids.

"17. Therefore, thus saith the Lord; ye have not hearkened unto me, in proclaiming liberty every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor: behold, I proclaim a liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine; and I will make you to be removed unto all the kingdoms of the earth."

The fourteenth verse speaks of being sold for seven years, but it is obvious the price for which a man was sold was his own, and went into his own pocket, for the benefit of his family, or at most to pay his debts, the amount of which he had previously enjoyed and consumed. "What is here called selling, was obviously nothing more than a contract for service with pay in advance; and hence the law was like our statute of limitation. It forbade men to make a contract for service for more than seven years. The seven years' service was voluntary, because agreed upon by the parties, and paid for in advance; but when they kept the servant beyond that time, it became involuntary, and God condemned it, and punished them for it.

Isa. 58: 6; "Is not this the fast, that I have chosen, to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free?"

The expression, "let the oppressed *go free*" is a full condemnation of involuntary servitude. To compel any man to serve another against his will, who is out of his minority and uncondemned for crime, is to oppress him; and the command to let the oppressed go *free*, condemns such forced service.

American Slavery is a system of force and violence, and cannot be maintained for a day, only by a constant war upon the very life of the slaves. For all this there is no warrant in the Bible, but much against it. Involuntary service must be wrong, from the fact that the violence necessary to maintain it is wrong. "Whips for the naked back, thumb-screws, chains, prisons, and other modes of torture, to subdue persons unconvicted of crime, have no warrant in the Gospel, and cannot be justified, only upon a principle which will justify every species of violence men may choose to practice one upon another.

VIII. Slavery Is a work without wages, which is condemned in the Bible.

Deut. 24: 14,15; "Thou shalt not oppress a hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren or of thy strangers that be in thy land within thy gates. At his day thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it; for he is poor, and setteth his heart upon it; lest he cry against thee unto the Lord, and it be sin unto thee."

It may be said that this text does not meet the case, because it speaks of hired servants, but this cannot alter the principle involved. The text condemns the act of withholding what is a man's due for his labor, and this every slaveholder does. One man voluntarily goes to work with the expectation of wages, while the employer seizes upon another and compels him to work, *nolens volens*. We ask is not the man who is compelled to work as much entitled to pay as he who works voluntarily? Certainly he is. This is kept back, and in this the slave is oppressed.

Jer. 22: 13,14; "Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work; that saith, I will build me a wide house and large chambers, and cutteth him out windows; and it is ceiled with cedar, and painted with vermilion."

This most certainly meets the case exactly; nothing is said about hiring men, but simply using their service without wages, which every slaveholder does. Men are here absolutely forbidden to use their neighbor's service without wages, and as slavery is a system of work without wages, it is here forbidden.

Hab. 2: 9, 10,11, 12; "Woe to him that coveteth an evil covetousness to his house, that he may set his nest on high, that he may be delivered from the power of evil! Thou hast consulted shame to thy house by cutting off many people, and hast sinned against thy soul. For the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it. Woe to him that buildeth a town with blood, and established a city by iniquity."

Mal. 3: 5; "And I will come near to you to judgment: and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against adulterers, and against false swearers, and against those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger from his right, and fear not me saith the Lord of hosts."

James 5: 4; "Behold, the hire of the laborers which have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth; and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabbath."

The above texts are sufficient to prove that the Bible forbids one class of men to use the labor of another class, without paying them for their work, and in forbidding this, it forbids slavery. Some may say that slaves are paid in food and raiment. These are bestowed only so far as they promote the master's interest, and they are not wages any more than the oats a man feeds his horse.

IX. Slavery is oppression which the Scriptures condemn.

Two points are to be settled, viz: that slavery is identical with oppression, and how the Bible treats oppression.

What is oppression? According to Dr. Webster, oppression is "the imposition of unreasonable burdens, either in taxes or service." An oppressor, according to the same authority, is "one that imposes unjust burdens on others; one that harasses others, with unjust laws or unreasonable severity." This is a life like picture of slavery and slaveholders. It must be the extreme of oppression. For one man, because he has the power so to do, to compel his neighbor to work for him twenty-five days in a year, without his consent, would be oppression, and will it not be oppression to compel him to work the whole year? If slavery be not oppression, then may an evil be changed to a virtue by increasing it in magnitude. To compel a man to work without wages every tenth year of his life, would be oppression by universal consent, but to compel him to work life-long, commencing his toils at the misty dawn of existence, and closing them amid the gathering shadows of its dark going down, is no oppression! According to this logic, to rob a man of a part of his labor would be wrong, but to take the whole would make it right! To rob a man of a part of his time, would be a crime, but to rob him of all his time, of himself, his head and heart, his body and limbs, his mind and will, and all he can do, possess and acquire, renders it an act of righteousness!

But the Bible will settle the question of oppression.

Ex. 3: 9; "Now therefore, behold, the cry of the children of Israel is come unto me: and I have also seen the oppression wherewith the Egyptians oppress them."

What then did the Egyptians do to the Israelites? They compelled them to work for the government.

Here we have the history of the matter, as follows: —Ex. 1: 8-11. "Now there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph. And he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel *are* more and mightier than we: Come on, let us deal wisely with them; lest they multiply, and it come to pass, that, when there falleth out any war, they join also unto our enemies, and fight against us, and so get them up out of the

land. Therefore they did set over them task-masters, to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure-cities, Pithom and Raamses."

This was oppression which awakened the sympathies of Jehovah, and brought out the thickest and heaviest of his thunders. Yet he bore it longer than American Slavery has existed. But what was there in that more enormous than American Slavery?

Lev. 25: 17; ye shall not therefore oppress one another; but thou shalt fear thy God: for I *am* the LORD thy God."

Here oppression is not only forbidden, but it is done in a manner which implies that it is inconsistent with the fear of God.

Deut. 23: 15,16; Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: He shall dwell with thee, *even* among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him." This clearly forbids the oppression of a self emancipated servant.

Deut. 24: 14; Thou shalt not oppress a hired servant that *is* poor and needy, *whether he be* of thy brethren, or of thy strangers that *are* in thy land within thy gates:"

Psalms. 10: 17, 18; "Lord, thou hast heard the desire of the humble, thou wilt prepare their heart, thou wilt cause thine ear to hear. To judge the fatherless and the oppressed, that the man of the earth may no more oppress." This appears to look forward to a day when oppression shall cease from the earth. Will there be any slavery then?

Psa. 73: 8,9; "They are corrupt and speak wickedly *concerning* oppression: they speak loftily. They set their mouth against the heavens: and their tongue walk-eth through the earth," A clearer description could not well be given of modern slave-holders, and their abettors; they speak wickedly concerning oppression. They invade the rights and government of God; they set their mouth against the heavens.

Psa. 12: 5; " For the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy, now will I arise saith the Lord; I will set *him* in safety *from him that* puffeth at him."

Psa. 72: 4; "He shall judge the poor of the people, he shall save the children of the needy, and shall break in pieces the oppressor."

Isa 1: 17; Learn to do well: seek judgment, relieve the oppressed; judge the fatherless; plead for the widow."

Isa. 58: 6; "Is not this the fast that I have chosen? To loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke?"

Prov. 3: 31; "Envy thou not the oppressor, and choose none of his ways."

This clearly forbids oppression in all its practical aspects.

Prov. 14: 31; "He that oppressteth the poor reproacheth his maker: but he that honoreth him hath mercy on the poor."

All slaveholders oppress the poor, and of course reproach their maker.

Prov. 22: 22; " Rob not the poor because he *is* poor; neither oppress the afflicted in the gate."

The afflicted are oppressed in the gates of every slaveholding city in this nation.

Jer. 7: 5-7; "For if ye thoroughly amend your ways and your doings; if ye thoroughly execute judgment between a man and his neighbor; If ye oppress not the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, and shed not innocent blood in this place, neither walk after other gods to your hurt: then will I cause you to dwell in this place, in the land that I gave to your fathers, for ever and ever."

Jer. 21: 12; "O house of David, thus saith the Lord; execute judgment in the morning, and deliver *him that is* spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go out like fire, and burn that none can quench *it*, because of the evil of your doings. Behold, I *am* against thee, O, inhabitant of the valley, *and* rock of the plain saith the Lord; which say, who shall come down against us, or, who shall enter into our habitations?"

Eccle. 4: 1; "So I returned, and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun: and, behold, the tears of *such as were* oppressed, and they had no comforter; and on the side of their oppressors *there was* power; but they had no comforter.

Eccle. 7: 7; "Surely oppression maketh a wise man mad."

Ezek. 22: 7; "In thee have they set of light by father and mother; in the midst of thee have they dealt by oppression with the stranger; in thee have they vexed the fatherless and the widow."

Every word of this is true of slavery.

Verse 29: " The people of the land have used oppression, and exercised robbery, and have vexed the poor and needy; yea, they have oppressed the stranger wrongfully."

Zeph. 3: 1; "Woe to her that is filthy and polluted, to the oppressing city!"

This is applicable to any and every slave-holding city.

Mal. 3: 5; "And I will come near to you to judgment; and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and against false swearers, and against those that

oppress the hireling in *his* wages, the widow and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger *from his right*, and fear not me, saith the Lord of hosts."

If a man were to stand up in any of the slaveholding cities or towns in the southern states, and proclaim the above as a communication from himself, and as expressive of his views of the manner in which God will deal with the people, he would be understood to speak of slavery, and arrested for the same. How clear is it then that the text comprehends slavery and denounces it.

It follows that man's right to liberty is universal and inalienable.

SECTION IV.

The Scriptures of the Old Testament do not teach that Chattel Slavery can rightfully exist.

The Bible does not and cannot be made to justify slavery in practice, even if the principle of slavery be found in it, for want of a specific rule to govern the application of the principle in reducing it to practice. If the Bible justifies slavery, it must be as a general principle, without restrictions in regard to the persons or classes to whom pertains the rights of slavery, on one hand and the obligations of slavery on the other or it must be in view of some specific rule which defines who shall be the master and who shall be the slave. If the Bible does not justify slavery in one or the other of these aspects, it does not and cannot justify it in any sense. On the first of these positions, but little need be said. But a few if any will contend that slavery is right as a general principle, without reference to race, class, condition or distinction of persons, who possess the right to hold, slaves, and upon whom rests the obligation to submit to slavery. If slavery be right, as a general principle, in the absence of a specific rule, defining who shall be the master and who shall be the slave, every man must be at liberty to enslave whom he can. To insist that slavery is right in the absence of any specific divine law, which clearly defines who shall be the master and who shall be the slave, is to say that the right to hold slaves is inherent in all men, and that each man is at liberty to exercise the right when-ever he finds himself in possession of the power to seize upon, hold and control his fellow being. It is also to say that the obligation to submit to be a slave pertains equally to all men, and that each is bound to respond to it the moment a hand is laid upon him sufficiently strong to hold him. If this be so, a man can have a right to liberty only so long as he possesses sufficient power to maintain it against all aggression. This makes right depend upon might. For a man to contend that slavery is or can be right upon such a principle, is to say that it would be right to make him a slave if a party could be found, possessing the requisite power. But the theory is too absurd to need a refutation. All acts and conditions are determined to be right or wrong by some rule or law, which relates to the subject. In this case, the Bible is that rule or law, for the question is, does the Bible justify slavery? The rule must then be produced from the Bible, and it must be so clear and specific as to determine who shall be the slave and who the master. Suppose the Bible said, one man may hold his fellow man as a slave; one man can acquire the right of property in his fellow man; it could not justify slaveholding in any given case, unless it should at the same time point out the person who might hold slaves, and the persons whom he might

hold. A man, with his Bible in one hand, lays his other hand upon his fellow, and says, you are my slave. Not so fast, says the other; where is your authority for claiming me as a slave? The first opening his Bible, reads the text which affirms that man can hold property in man, supposing there were such a text. The other replies, the law does not name you sir, as the man owner, nor me as the man owned; if it justifies slave owning and holding, it will as clearly justify me in owning and holding you, as it will you in holding me. There is no way to settle the dispute but by the law of force, the stronger will prove himself to be the slaveholder.

There can then be no sanction of slavery, found in the Bible, in the absence of a specific rule, defining clearly and certainly who shall be the master and who shall be the slave, and appropriating to one his rights, and to the other his obligations. Now, it is denied that any such rule exists, and it is believed that no sane mind will attempt to point out such a rule upon the sacred page. It is proposed to examine the several texts supposed to support slavery, in which examination, two points will be kept distinctly in view; first, none of the texts furnish the above rule; and, secondly, they do not even sanction the principle of American Slavery.

I. The curse that was pronounced upon Canaan is the oldest bill of rights slaveholders are wont to plead.

"Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant," Gen. 9: 25. 26.

If I had not heard Rev. Divines quote the above curse pronounced upon Canaan, in support of slavery, I should never have thought of replying to arguments founded upon it. As it is, I reply as follows: —

1. The colored race which are the victims of slavery in this country, are not the descendants of cursed Canaan. It must be admitted by all that the curse did not fall upon Canaan in his own person, but that it was prophetic of the condition of the descendants of Canaan, and of them alone; if, therefore, the colored race are not the descendants of Canaan, it cannot justify their enslavement. The colored race have descended from Ham, through Cush, and not through Canaan. The name, Ham, signifies heat, hot, brown; and the name, Cush, signifies black; while Canaan, signifies a merchant or trader. When it is considered that Hebrew names were descriptive of actions, quality or character, and that they were often prophetically given, there is force in these names as above defined.

It is further proved that the colored race are not the descendants of cursed Canaan, by the only history we have of the family of Noah. The descendants of Canaan first settled the following countries, as is recorded, Genesis 10: 15-19.

"And Canaan begat Sidon his first born, and Heth, and the Jebusite, and the Amonnite, and the Girgasite, and the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite, and the Arvadite, and the Zemarite, and the Hamathite; and afterward were the families of the Canaanites, spread abroad. And the border of the Canaanites was from Sidon, as thou comest to Gerar unto

Gaza; and as thou goest unto Sodom and Gomorrah, and Admah, and Zeboim, even unto Lasha."

This clearly points out the nations that were dispossessed by the Israelites, when they came out of Egypt and took possession of the Land of Canaan; and in this transaction was fulfilled the curse pronounced upon Canaan.

The Cushites, the other branch of Ham's family, from whom descended the colored race, settled another section of the country. Like the Canaanites, they were a seafaring people, and sooner arrived at civilization than did the other branches of Noah's family. The first great empires of Assyria and Egypt were founded by them, and were also the republics of Sidon, Tyre and Carthage. Our colored race are the descendants of the people who founded and sustained those early empires and republics. But the point in this argument is, the race now in slavery, are not the descendants of Canaan, upon whom the curse of servitude was pronounced, and, of course, that curse is no justification of slavery as now existing.

2. The present slaveholding race are not the descendants of Shem, to whom was appropriated the service of Canaan. "Canaan shall be his servant;" not the servant of some other race. If the text authorizes anything, it authorizes the descendants of Shem to use the service of the descendants of Canaan; it does not authorize any other race to enslave them; nor does it authorize the Canaanites to enslave each other. Who then are the present race of slaveholders? Are they Shemites? It cannot be proved. The Jews and the Arabs or Ishmaelites, are the only people on the face of the earth who can with any certainty claim to have descended from Shem.

3. Wave the facts set forth above, and admit that the curse imposes slavery, and that it involves the colored race, and still consequences will follow sufficient to overthrow the whole argument built upon it in support of American Slavery.

(1.) In such case it would justify enslaving the whole race. If the argument proves it right to enslave any part of the race, it proves it right to enslave the whole.

(2.) It must follow that this nation is fighting against God, and legislating against the fulfillment of divine prophecy.

If the whole race were devoted to perpetual slavery by a judicial act of Jehovah, — and the whole were thus devoted if any were, — why does this nation find fault by declaring that it is piracy upon the high seas to fulfill that supposed judicial decree of Jehovah.

(3.) It was not American Slavery nor yet anything like it, that the posterity of Canaan was subjected to by the curse pronounced upon a hapless father. The curse was political subjection, political servitude and not chattel slavery.

II. The example of Abraham, and other patriarchs, is the next resort of slaveholders to obtain the sanction of American Slavery

In discussing this claim of the advocates of slavery, I shall confine myself principally to Abraham, as his case will prove decisive for or against slavery. As to the conduct of Laban, in selling his daughters to Jacob, and in giving them to Zilpah and Bilhah to be their hand maids, no effort is necessary to prove that there was nothing analogous to American slavery involved in the transactions. If it were clearly slavery itself, it would not prove that, or any other slavery to be morally right, since the transactions lack the endorsement of heaven.

But in the case of Abraham, the subject wears a different aspect, as he is clearly presented as a representative man, an example to be followed, and the friend of God. If it could be clearly proved that such a man was a slaveholder, it might have the appearance of an endorsement of slavery. Now what are the facts? They are as follows: —

"He had sheep and oxen, and he had asses, and men-servants, and maid-servants, and she-asses, and camels." Gen. 12: 16.

"And when Abraham heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his trained servants, born in his house, three hundred and eighteen." Gen. 14: 14.

"And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in your generations, he that is born in thy house, or bought with thy money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house and he that is bought with thy money must needs be circumcised." Gen. 17: 12-13.

"And Abimelech took sheep, and oxen, and men-servants, and women-servants, and gave them to Abraham." Gen. 20: 14.

We have now before us all the essential proof that Abraham was a slaveholder, for if the above texts do not prove it, it is not proved by any other circumstance that may be mentioned in his history; as the transactions in the case of Hagar, Gen 16: 1-9; and in his swearing of his servant, in relation to procuring a wife for his son Isaac. Gen. 24: 1-4.

The question is, can there be found in any or all of these facts, the slightest justification of American Slavery? No; must be the decisive answer.

1. If it were clear that Abraham was a slaveholder, which is not admitted, it would be no justification of slavery anywhere at any time, much less of American Slavery at the zenith of the nineteenth century. The argument can be conclusive in support of the right of slaveholding, only upon the supposition that everything which Abraham did, was not only right for him at the time, and in the circumstances, but also right to be followed as an example by all men, during all time, and in all circumstances. If what was right for Abraham, in his time and his circumstances, is not necessarily right for all men now, in our circumstance, the fact that Abraham held slaves, does not prove it right for us to hold slaves now. Again, if all that Abraham did was not right, the fact that he held slaves, cannot prove slaveholding right, for if he did some things which were wrong, this act of

slaveholding may have been one of those wrong things; and if he held slaves wrongfully, it cannot prove it right for us to hold slaves. It cannot be pretended that Abraham's slaveholding, allowing it, has any special endorsement by heaven, and therefore it cannot be inferred that it is right, only on the ground that everything which he did was right.

Twice did Abraham practice duplicity, if not falsehood, by saying that his wife was his sister. Gen. 12: 13; and 20: 2.

Again, Abraham, at the request of his fruitless wife, Sarah, took Hagar, a handmaid, a servant girl, to his bosom and bed, that he might have children by her.

But the above is not all, for we read that "Abraham gave all that he had to his son Isaac. But unto the sons of the concubines which Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts, and sent them away from Isaac his son, while he yet lived, eastward unto the east country." Gen. 25: 5, 6.

2. It is perfectly plain that there was nothing in the relation subsisting between Abraham and his servants, analogous to American Slavery. It has been shown that, if slavery had existed, it would be no justification of American Slavery, but it shall now be shown that there was no slavery in the case. Where is the proof that Abraham's servants were chattel slaves?

(1.) It is not found in the word *servant*, for this is applied to all classes of laborers and dependents. It is not necessary at this point to resort to criticism, but only to show how the word is used generally in the language of those times. Abraham called himself the servant of the three angels that visited him. Gen. 18: 3. He could not have designed to have expressed the idea of a slave. "Lot called himself the servant of the angels which led him out of the city." Gen. 19: 1-9. Jacob called himself the servant of Esau. Gen. 33: 5. But the reverse of this would be true if the word servant meant slave. "And Isaac answered and said unto Esau, behold, I have made him thy Lord, and all his brethren have I given to him for servants." Gen. 27: 37. The children of Esau were not given to the children of Jacob as slaves, and servant means only inferiority or political subjection. Pharaoh is said to have made a feast to all his servants, Gen. 12: 20; but it will not be pretended that slaves are intended. Kings do not make feasts to slaves upon their birthdays. All subjects were the servants of their kings, and even the highest officers of the army, were in the language of the times, the servants of the sovereigns; it is plain therefore, that the fact that Abraham had servants, does not prove that he was a slaveholder.

Abraham was a prince, and his servants were his subjects that attached themselves to his government and followed him.

(2.) The proof that Abraham was a slaveholder is not found in the fact that he had servants bought with his money. In those times all the people were the servants of their petty kings, and persons might be transferred from one prince to another for money, without supposing they were chattel slaves.

(3.) The proof that Abraham was a slaveholder is not found in the fact that he had servants born in his house. Abraham had no house, in our use of the word, but dwelt in a tent and led a wandering life. By being born in his house, is meant, born in his family or among his attendants. With attendants enough to take care of his flocks and herds, and to protect, as a guard, his person and great wealth, there must have been many servants born in his house; that is, among his attendants and followers, but where is the proof that they were his personal property, his chattel slaves?

(4.) The proof that Abraham was a slaveholder is not found in the fact that he had men servants and maid servants given to him by Abimelech, as above quoted Abimelech gave him sheep and oxen, and as Abraham probably had as many before as he had servants to watch over, the attendants were transferred, and became Abraham's followers by their own consent and as they were both kings, it was only a transfer of subjects from one government to another, and not a gift of chattel slaves.

But there is proof that Abraham was not a slaveholder.

1. His three hundred and eighteen trained servants which were born in his house could not have been slaves in the sense of American Slavery. Whatever they were their adherence to Abraham must have been voluntary. They constituted his army and a brave army were they, under a brave leader, when he led them to the rescue of Lot and the other captives, and slew the armies of four kings, and took the spoils.

2. Abraham said to God, "To me thou hast given no seed: and lo, one born in my house is mine heir." Gen. 15: 3. This was before the birth of Ishmael.

Those born in his house then, could not have been slaves, or they would not have been his heirs.

3. Once more, Abraham's oldest servant ruled over all that he had, and was charged with the important business of negotiating with his distant kindred for a wife for his son Isaac. The business was committed to him under the solemnities of an oath. Gen. 24: 1-5.

III. The Jewish polity as established by Moses, under God, is the final resort of slaveholders to find an endorsement of American Slavery within the lids of the Old Testament. That there is much legislation concerning masters and servants, and that servitude, of some sort is tolerated, modified and regulated, it would be vain to deny. But that American Slavery is found upon the record, or anything analogous to it, is denied.

1. The system introduced by Moses, whatever it was in fact, was a great improvement on all former times and organisms. If there are what may be deemed social evils in the light of the Gospel, and which the Gospel corrects, they were not introduced by Moses, but are the relic of a more barbarous state of things, which his system did not entirely blot out in its great work of reformation, though it curtailed and mitigated every evil. If any such supposed evil is found, it will be seen, not to have been introduced as a new thing, but to

be there by way of a modification of some previously existing evil, the severity of which is averted by legislative restraints and protections.

2. The above remark is peculiarly true and forcible in relation to servitude, as tolerated and limited and modified by the laws of Moses. The Law of Moses nowhere introduces a system of servitude as a new thing, or new element in society, but treats of it as a thing already existing, as an evil to be restrained, and modified.

3. When we examine more particularly into the several provisions concerning servitude, we find that every regulation concerning it, is for the protection and benefit of the servant, and not one for the benefit of the master. Not one new right or privilege is bestowed upon the master; he possessed every right, and enjoyed every privilege, before the law was given which he can claim and exercise under it, but it throws around him many restraints, and many protections around the servant, and secures to him many rights and privileges which he would not be likely to enjoy without the law. It is safe therefore to say that the whole system was designed for the benefit of the servile classes, which leaves not a single analogy between it and American Slavery.

The first allusion to servitude in the Jewish economy is as follows: " And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron, This is the ordinance of the Passover: There shall no stranger eat thereof: But every man's servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof." Exo. 12: 43-45. This text was not designed to create or justify slavery, if slavery be implied in its language. The most that can be made of it, is that it takes for granted that there will be servants bought with money, and hired servants, without instituting, providing for, or sanctioning either system of service.

The only proof that slavery existed, is found in the fact that servants were bought with money. It will not be pretended that hired servants were slaves; we have therefore only to settle the case of servants bought with money. The assumption that servants bought with money were chattel slaves is founded upon the supposition that the language of the Jewish law is to be interpreted by our usages.

The language, "servant bought with thy money," cannot prove that a chattel slave is meant, only upon the supposition that no person can be bought with money, without being a chattel slave, which is false upon the very face of the record. It is only necessary to show that things and persons were bought with money, without becoming subject to the incidents of property or chattel slavery, to settle the whole question so far as the meaning of buy and bought is concerned. The word buy, in Scripture language, means to get, gain, acquire, obtain, possess; and when bought with *money* is the expression, it denotes merely the means by which the thing was obtained. A few quotations will settle this question.

1. The Jews bought and sold their lands for money, which lands were not, and could not be permanently alienated by such a sale and purchase. They might be redeemed at any time, and if not redeemed, they must revert at the Jubilee. The price was to be according

to the number of years before the jubilee when lands were sold and bought, as the following text shows:

"And if thou sell aught unto thy neighbor, or *buyest aught* of thy neighbor's hand, ye shall not oppress one another:

"According to the number of years after the jubilee thou shalt buy of thy neighbor, *and* according unto the number of years of the fruits he shall sell unto thee:

"According to the multitude of years thou shalt increase the price thereof, and according to the fewness of years thou shalt diminish the price of it: for *according* to the number of *the years* of the fruit doth he sell unto thee." Levi. 25: 14-16.

The land was sold and bought for money, and yet no title was given or obtained to it, but only a limited possession. That possession might be for one, five, or ten years, or more, as the sale was distant from the time of the jubilee. In Scripture language it was buying and selling, yet in our language, it was no sale, but a lease for a term of years. If, then, land could be bought for money, without acquiring the right of property, but only the right of possession and increase for a time, it follows that men could be bought for money without acquiring in them the right of property, but only a right to their labor. A man gave another possession of his land, with the right of all the increase for a given number of years, when it must return to him, and this is called selling and buying it, in Scripture language. So a man agrees to serve another for a valuable consideration, paid to him in advance, and in Scripture language he is said to sell himself, and the other is said to buy him.

2. Hebrew servants were bought with money and it is admitted on all hands, that they were not chattel slaves.

"If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve; and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing." Exo. 21: 2.

The man is clearly bought in the sense of Jewish law, and yet he clearly owns himself again on the seventh year and makes his own appropriation of himself thereafter. But Jews could not be chattel slaves, for two reasons. First, the Jubilee set every one of them free. "Ye shall proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." Lev. 25: 10. "He shall be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of Jubilee, and then shall he depart from thee, both he and his children with him." Verse 40-41. Secondly, every Jew had a right in the soil, and must be returned to its possession and enjoyment at the Jubilee. "In the year of this Jubilee ye shall return every man to his possession." Verse 13. "Ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family." Verse 10.

Jews were bought and sold for money; but Jews could not be chattel slaves, after the pattern of American Slavery; and, therefore, the simple fact that servants were bought with money, does not and cannot prove the existence of chattel slavery.

3. Wives were bought for money, or in exchange for other commodities, and yet it would not be regarded as sound to argue from thence that they were chattel slaves, or the absolute property of their husbands, in our sense of property.

Jacob bought both his wives of Laban their father. Gen. 29: 18-27. David purchased Michael, Saul's daughter to be his wife. 1 Sam. 18: 27. Shechem, son of Hamor the Hivite, wished to purchase Dinah, Jacob's daughter for a wife, and offered any price they should demand. Gen. 34: 11-12. Hosea bought a wife and paid for her, part in silver and the balance in barley. Hosea 3: 2. Boaz said, "Ruth the Moabites have I purchased to be my wife." Ruth 4: 10. The word *purchased*, is rendered *bought* in the margin.

Enough has been said to show that it was a common thing to purchase wives, that they were bought with money. The evidence that slavery existed is the fact that servants were bought with money, but wives were also bought with money, from which it must follow either that the fact that servants were bought does not prove that they were slaves, or else the fact that wives were bought must prove that they were slaves.

"If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing.

"If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself: if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him.

"If his master have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters, the wife and her children shall be her master's and he shall go out by himself.

"And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free:

"Then his master shall bring him unto the judges: he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door post: and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him for ever." Exo. 21: 2-6.

On this provision I remark,

1. It was clearly instituted for the benefit and protection of the servant, and not for the master's benefit. It confers no right, no discretionary power upon the master, save the right of retaining the wife and children in a given case, but it does bestow a discretionary power upon the servant. It is this, the servant sells himself for six years, and no more—"Six years shall he serve, and in the seventh he shall go out free"—but the law gives the servant the power to extend the contract at the end of the sixth year, to, "for ever," as our translators have rendered it, but which I suppose means unto the Jubilee. The master has no power to hold him another day, if he wishes to leave at the end of the sixth year; he has no power to turn him away; if the servant wishes to stay, he is compelled to retain

him. Thus it is seen that the law is all on the side of the servant, and this does not look much like American Slavery.

2. The provision is clearly to protect the servant against being separated from his wife and children, in the case where the master has the right of retaining them. This is in case the master has given him a wife. This wife might be the master's daughter, for which the servant may be supposed not to have paid the customary dowry. Or the wife may be a Hebrew maid servant, having one, two, three or four of the six years yet to serve before she can go out. Or, what is more probable, the wife may be a servant from the Gentiles, a proselyte, bound to serve until the jubilee. In either of these cases it would be doing violence to the marriage relation to send the servant away without his wife and children, and hence the law provides that the servant may demand an extension of the contract of his servitude "for ever," that is, as I understand it, to the jubilee.

3. Whatever may be thought of the law under consideration, in all other aspects, it is certain that the service is voluntarily entered into, on the part of the servant, after trying it six years, and this destroys all analogy to American Slavery.

The next resort of Slavery is to the following provision of the law.

"If a man smite his servant or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand; he shall surely be punished. Notwithstanding if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished "for he is his money." Exo. 21: 20 21.

This law does not institute or establish slavery, or any kind of servitude. It merely refers to it, for the purpose of settling a rule of jurisprudence, applicable in peculiar cases. It assumes the fact that there are masters and servants, but it does not establish, legalize or justify the relation, but it provides for the administration of justice between the parties in a given case. The only proof which the text can be supposed to furnish in support of slavery, must depend upon two circumstances, the fact that the master presumes to smite the servant with a rod, and the fact that the servant is declared to be the master's *money*. T

These two points need examination.

Does the fact that the law presumes that a master may smite his servant with a rod that he die, prove that the servant is a chattel slave? Surely not. There is no proof that the smiting is in any sense authorized or justified by this or any other law. Smiting itself is not justified, even if it be not unto death. The laws of our slaveholding states authorize masters directly to punish their slaves, but no such liberty is given in the Scriptures. We challenge the production of the first text which authorizes a master to inflict corporeal correction upon a servant. Parents are required to correct their children. This principle is contained in all the following texts: Deut. 8: 5; Prov. 3: 12; 13: 24; 19: 18; 23: 13,14; 29: 15-17; Heb. 12: 7-9. While the Scriptures are so full and explicit on the subject of the correction of children by parents, there is not one text which requires masters, or even authorizes them to punish their servants.

But "he is his money." This doubtless is regarded as the strong hold of slavery. All that is necessary for me to prove is that it does not necessarily involve chattel slavery, and this will be easily accomplished.

1. The statute is a general one, including all classes of servants, many of whom, it has been seen, were not and could not be chattel slaves.
2. The language is most clearly figurative, and can be literally true only in a sense which divests it of all proof of chattel-ship.

"He is his money." All money in those days was gold or silver. But the servant was neither gold or silver, and was not money. A literal translation would strengthen this view. The expression, "he is his money," literally translated would read, "his silver is he." But a servant is not silver, is not money, but flesh and blood and bones, body and soul. What then is meant by the expression? Simply this, he has cost the master money, the master has the value of money in him, and loses money's value by his death. But this is true of all servants bought with money, or whose wages are paid in advance, and therefore the expression cannot prove that the servant said to be money is a chattel slave.

3. The obvious intention of the whole statute, as well as of that particular clause, requires no such construction, but the end is reached just as clearly and forcibly without involving the chattel principle.

The design of the general statute is to secure the condemnation of the master in case of willful murder, and thereby furnish greater security to the servant; as well as to secure the master against being put to death as a murderer, when no murder was intended.

It is not to be inferred that the killing is to be punished as an inferior crime, because the killed is a servant. The translation perverts the sense. The word, *nakam* translated *punished*, should be rendered *avenged*. It is not the master that is to be avenged, but the servant's death, which, under the circumstances necessarily means that the master shall be put to death as a murderer. This word, though it occurs repeatedly in the Old Testament, is translated punished in no other text, but is generally translated avenged, and in a very few instances, to take vengeance or to revenge. The word is thus defined in Roy's Hebrew and English Dictionary: "*Nakam*, 1, He recompensed or paid; 2, avenged, revenged, cut off, as murderers; 3, vindicated, advocated, as the cause of another." The object of the statute is to secure such execution in one case, and to prevent it in another.

If the master smite his servant with a rod, and he die under his hand, the death shall surely be avenged. The instrument is a rod, not an axe. A man might kill with an axe, without intending it, but not with a rod. If the servant died under his hand, and a rod only was used, the proof is positive that he meant to kill him, and must have done it willfully and by protracted torture. Though a man might be likely to take some more fatal instrument, if he meant to kill, yet the fact that he did kill with such an instrument, is proof positive that he meant to kill, and the avenger is authorized to smite him as a murderer.

But suppose the servant does not die under his hand, but continues a day or two, then his death shall not be avenged. And why? Because the evidence is not clear that he meant to kill him. He did not kill him on the spot, as he would most likely have done had he designed to take his life. Moreover it was only a rod with which he smote him, and this is presumptive evidence that he did not mean to kill him; had he designed his death, he would have been likely to select a more fatal instrument than a rod with which to smite. Finally, "he is his money;" that is, he has a moneyed interest in him, and loses the worth of money by his death, and this is an additional proof that he did not mean to kill him. The design of this statement, "he is his money," is to show that the master's moneyed interest was against his killing the servant, that he lost money by his death, and this is just as clear in the case of a Hebrew servant bought with money, who could not be a chattel slave. The moneyed argument is good in the case of any servant, whose wages is paid in advance, and as that kind of service was common, the idea of chattel slavery is not in the least involved.

I now approach the last resort of slavery within the lids of the Old Testament, to which it must be expected to cling as a man of blood to the horns of the altar, when the lifted arm of the avenger is seen near at hand, the law in question reads as follows:

"Both thy bondmen, and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, *shall be* of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids.

"Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that *are* with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession.

"And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit *them for* a possession; they shall be your bondmen forever: but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigor." Lev. 25: 44-46.

The slave trade was in the height of its progress at the time the translation took place. It had previously attracted the attention of Church and State. At first it met with opposition from both. The first grant of the privilege of bringing slaves to America was by Charles V. in 1517. This appears to have been principally secured by the representations of Las Casas, a priest, and afterwards a bishop. But after this, Charles repented of the countenance he gave the slave trade, and Pope Leo X., his contemporary, denounced the system, and declared that not only the Christian religion, but nature itself cried out against a state of slavery." About the year 1556, Queen Elizabeth was deceived into a permit granted to Sir John Hawkins, to bring negroes from Africa; and she charged him not to carry them to America without their consent. But these scruples were overcome by the false glosses put upon this and other texts by interested priests, and by the great profit of the traffic. Here the matter rested, and all took it for granted without further examination, that these pro-slavery expositions were right, and when King James' translators commenced their work in 1607, they very naturally adopted the false expositions designed to countenance the slave trade, and translated the text under con-

sideration, as well as some others, in the light of those false glosses by which they avoided coming in contact with the slave trade, then in its greatest prosperity in England.

This will account for the reading of the text under consideration. There is nothing in the original to justify the words "*bondmen and bond-maids*;" it should be manservant and woman-servant. Both are in the singular, and not plural, in the Hebrew text. The word translated *buy* is most properly translated *procure*. The word translated *heathen*, is properly rendered *Gentiles*, and might be rendered nations. The word translated *forever* cannot bear that rendering in this case; it cannot mean longer than natural life, and that is never the sense of the English word *forever*. The word rendered *forever*, is *le-o-lam*, and its proper meaning is endless, and is correctly rendered *forever*, or *to eternity*, but here it cannot be understood in its full sense. It is used to denote a long period, less even than the whole of time. Many rites of the Jews were to be observed *forever*, which forever has past and ended. A single text will serve as an illustration of the use of the word in a limited sense. "Bathsheba said let my lord king David live forever." 1 Kings 1: 31.

This can mean but a short indefinite period, for David was then old. It can mean no more than a long time, for a man in his circumstances. But in the expression, "they shall be your bond-men forever," forever can mean no more than their natural life, and yet it is never employed to express this indefinite period. Forever, therefore, does not express the sense of the text, and as the period of the jubilee was the longest time a person could be retained in service by one contract, which will hereafter be more fully shown, it is certain that forever could not extend beyond the jubilee, and it is most natural to understand it as referring to that period, or to some period to be fixed upon in the contract, but not named in the law. I will now introduce a literal translation of the text.

"And thy man servant, and thy woman servant, shall be to thee from among the Gentiles which are round about you. From them ye shall procure a man servant and a woman servant.

"And also of the children of foreigners that reside with you, from them ye may procure of their families which are with them, that were born in your land; they shall be to you for a possession (service.)

"And ye shall choose them for your children after you, to preside over them as their portion, unto the end of the time (specified.)" —*Roy*.

I think no Hebrew scholar will deny that this translation is correct in all essential particulars, and if it be so, it follows, not only that the translation in the common version perverts the sense of the original text to support slavery, but that nothing like American Slavery is found in the law of Moses, when it is correctly understood.

What then does this law mean? This is an important inquiry. Every law should be considered as designed to secure some important end, especially when God is the Legislator. This law cannot have been designed to establish a system of human bondage like American Slavery, and must have been designed to secure some other end, and not

only a benevolent end, but one consonant with the general design of the whole system of which it is a part.

1. God designed to make of the Jews a numerous, wealthy and powerful nation. To secure this they must occupy a productive country, which he gave them, described as "a land flowing with milk and honey." It was necessary also that they should be kept from being mingled with other nations, either by emigration to other countries, or by a large influx of strangers, who should not become identified with their religion and nationality. It was necessary to keep them a distinct people. Further to secure this end, their lands were secured forever, beyond their power to alienate them, so that every Jew was a freeholder in fact, or in prospect. A foreigner could not become permanently possessed of their lands, and could obtain a lasting interest in them only by becoming incorporated with some branch of the Jewish family, for which provision was made.

2. The proposed position of the Jewish nation, with the means employed to secure it the inalienability of their lands, tended to produce certain incidental evils, and a want of an element essential to the greatness and independence of any people, viz., a numerous and well sustained laboring class, beyond the actual proprietors of the soil.

The circumstances of the Jews tended to produce a want of such a laboring class. A few of the influences tending to produce this want shall be named.

(1.) They were all land owners, and none need therefore engage in other pursuits than cultivating the soil, unless reduced by misfortune or bad economy. This would produce but very few mechanics and laborers to be hired.

(2.) Such was the richness of their country, so great the productiveness of the soil, that a large amount of labor could be expended with profit to the land owner, while the fact that every one was a land owner, tended to render such labor difficult to obtain. In every prosperous community there is needed many more laborers than actual land owners, some must operate as mechanics, some as merchants, some must cultivate the lands of the unhealthy and widows, some must labor as additional helps to those who cultivate their own lands, and others will be needed as domestic help, commonly called servants.

(3.) The religion of the Jews required them to devote a large portion of their time to its special duties and exercises, rendering more laborers necessary to accomplish the same amount of labor in a given season. Every seventh year was a Sabbath the whole year. This was one seventh of all the time, and if averaged among the seven years, would be to each year just equal to the weekly Sabbath.

Next was the weekly Sabbath, every seventh day. This was another seventh of their whole time. Then there were three annual feasts; the Passover, which lasted seven days; the Pentecost or feast of weeks, which lasted seven days; and the feast of Tabernacles, which lasted eight days.

Their national feasts were held in one place, the place which the Lord chose, which was Jerusalem, and thither the tribes went up to worship.

From one third to one half of their time was occupied with religious matters. This must have required an increased number of laborers. It should be remarked that all that class of servants which some suppose to have been slaves, were required to observe all these feasts, and Sabbaths. It may be asked how it could be expected that they should become great and wealthy, with a religion laying so heavy a tax upon their time. The answer is plain, in the words of the Law Giver himself.

"And if ye shall say, what shall we eat the seventh year, behold we shall not sow nor gather our increase: then I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth year, and it shall bring forth fruit for three years." Lev. 25: 20, 21.

The system was not adapted to the whole world, embracing all countries and climates; and it was established by God only as a preparatory step, to last until the time of reformation, when they should pass away with what Peter calls "a yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." But while the system lasted, it had to be made consistent with itself, and if one part tended to produce incidental evils, they had to be overcome by the action of some other part. One evil we have seen was a want of a sufficient number of laborers. This would naturally and mainly result first, from the inalienability of their lands, making all the Jews land owners; secondly, from the same fact tending to prevent other people from settling among them on account of their not being able to obtain a freehold estate; thirdly, from their religion, which consumed so much of their time; and fourthly from the danger to their whole system, which would arise from allowing laborers from other nations in sufficient numbers to become resident among them, without being naturalized and brought under the controlling influence of their laws and religion To overcome this difficulty, the celebrated law was introduced, now under consideration, authorizing them to obtain servants from the Gentiles. "Thy man servant and thy woman servant shall be to thee from among the Gentiles. From them ye shall procure a man servant and a woman servant." The law has two faces to it, and removes two evils at once.

First, it renders the employment of Gentiles lawful, and thereby supplying the demand for laborers, and increases the population.

Secondly, it removed a temptation, to which they would otherwise have been exposed, to oppress and degrade one another.

Some in every community will be unfortunate or prodigal, and fall into decay, and become dependent. This is contemplated in the law, verses 35, 36, 39, 42. Owing to the want of laborers and domestics, resulting as above, the wealthy might have been tempted to keep the poor down, for the sake of being able to obtain their services; but this the law prevents in two ways. First, it forbids it in so many words, and secondly, it opens another door through which servants can be lawfully obtained. Such servants were, by the very operation of that law, naturalized and became finally incorporated with the Jewish nation,

and possessed in common with them all their civil and religious privileges and blessings. Thus did this law, which has been so terribly perverted and abused to make it justify American Slavery, supply the land with labor, and at the same time naturalize the laborer to the nation, and proselyte him to the faith and worship of the true God.

But how were these servants obtained? Our translation says they were bought. If it were so, it would be clear that they voluntarily sold themselves, and used the price as they saw fit for their own benefit. Of whom else could they be bought, by men whose law provided that "he that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand shall surely be put to death." Exo. 21: 16.

There is no law in all the book of God, by any provision of which, one man can get another into his possession to sell him in the market, without stealing. The law of the Jews punished the stealing and selling of men with death, and would he buy such stolen men? The right to buy involves the right to sell, on the part of him of whom the purchase is made. There being no way by which a man can obtain possession of a man to sell him but by stealing him, they could have been bought of none but themselves. It is true they might buy captives out of the hands of the heathen, but captives are stolen if held and sold as slaves. They could therefore rightfully buy captives, only to free them, for as the captor has no title to captives, so he can sell none, and the buyer can buy none. If we understand by buying, merely engaging the services of men for a specified time for a valuable consideration agreed upon between the parties, the subject is all plain. Then might the Gentiles sell themselves to the Jews, or parents might sell their children to the Jews, by which they apprenticed them to the Jewish state as prospective citizens, and to the Jewish religion. I know not how Gentile parents could have done better by their children. It presented a brighter prospect than the sale of children does now in the human markets.

But we have seen that the word buy in our sense of the term, is not in the text, that it is *procure*. Well, how were they procured? A Jew shall testify. Dr. Roy, in sending me the translation above given, accompanied it with the following:

"There is no word in the Bible for *slave*; *a ved* is the only word to be found there and means a hired man, servant, laborer, soldier, minister, magistrate, messenger, angel, prophet, priest, king, and Christ himself. Isa. 52: 13; but it never means a *slave for life*.

For *the law of the Sanhedrim* forbids slavery.

"1. The contract was to be mutual and voluntary.

"2. It was conditional that the servant should within one year become a Proselyte to the Jewish religion; if not, he was to be discharged.

"3. If he became such, he was to be governed *by the same law*, to eat at the same table, sup out of the same dish, and eat the same Passover with his master.

"4. Finally, the law allowed him to marry his master's daughter. Prov. 29: 21. Yan-hee in Sanhedrim."

This confirms the view I have given, that the law presented a system of naturalization and of proselytism. The circumstances of the case were such as to call for such a provision. In addition to what has been said of the necessity of some source whence laborers might be obtained, if we look at the condition of the Gentiles, we shall see that their circumstances pointed them out as that source, under proper regulations and restrictions. They were generally inferior to the Jews in point of intelligence and civilization, and on the subject of religion, they were in the darkest midnight, while the Jews enjoyed the light of heaven. They were divided into petty kingdoms, and were but little more than the servants of their kings, who wielded an arbitrary if not an absolute scepter over them. But moral advantages are above all other advantages, and these were found only in the land of Israel; over that land the wing of the Almighty was spread; there the Angel of the Covenant watched behind the veil, and the divine presence glowed upon the mercy seat above the ark, and from that land alone, the way shone clearly that leads to heaven. If David who had danced before the unveiled ark, could exclaim, "I had rather be a door keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness," to bring a Gentile from the darkness of idolatry to the tent service of an Israelite, where God's own institutions shone upon him must have been a transition over which angels rejoiced. A position which would have been menial to a native Jew, was honor, exultation and even salvation to a Gentile, coming from the land of shadows and death.

To this must be added what we must suppose was the case, that numbers of heathen were attracted by the Great fame of the Jews, that the report of what God had done for them, and of all the wonders he had wrought, and how he dwelled in that land, spread even among the surrounding nations, and that many resorted there, even to better their condition as servants. But it would not have been safe to have left these matters to regulate themselves, or to the will of each individual contracting party without the restraints of law, and hence all the laws regulating the subject of servitude.

The Jews were authorized to take the heathen that might come to them, on condition that they become proselytes to their religion, and then when they were fully inducted, they became citizens with all the rights of native Jews, and their children born in the land were regarded as native Jews. There can be no doubt many became proselytes by this system, which rendered the truth and altars of God accessible to the Gentiles even under the Mosaic system. And this proselyting the Gentiles was but the first fruits of their future grand gathering in Christ Jesus And that Gentile blood was introduced into Jewish veins is evident; for David, the brightest lamp of the nation, descended on the side of his mother, from a Moabitess woman, who became a proselyte to the Jewish religion.

SECTION V.

The Scriptures of the New Testament do not teach that Chattel Slavery can rightfully exist.

I. There are no terms used in the Scriptures, which necessarily mean slave, slaveholders or slavery.

In the Greek language, there are three words which may mean a slave, *andrapodon*, *arguronetos*, and *doulos*. The first of these, *andrapodon* is derived from *aneer*, a man, and *pous*, the foot, and signifies a slave and nothing but a slave. If this word had been used it would have been decisive, for it has no other signification but a slave; but this word is found nowhere in the New Testament.

The second word, *arguronetos*, is derived from *arguros*, silver, and *oneomai* to buy, and hence it signifies to buy with silver; or a slave, doubtless, from the fact that slaves were bought with silver. This word is nowhere found in the New Testament.

The third word, is *doulos*. This word occurs more than a hundred and twenty times in the New Testament, and may mean a slave, or a free person, who voluntarily serves another, or a public officer, representing the public or civil authority. As the word occurs so frequently, it will be necessary to notice only a few instances in which it is used in its several senses. If the word properly means *slave*, it would be true to the original to translate it *slave*, where it occurs. I will first give a few instances in which it cannot mean slave. "On my servants, [*doulos*] and on my hand-maidens [*doulee*] I will pour out in those days of my spirit." Acts. 2: 18.

Here the word is used to denote Christian men and women in general as the servants of God. It would read very strange to translate it slave; upon my *men slaves*, and upon my *female slaves* will I pour out in those days of my spirit.

"And now Lord, behold their threatenings: and grant unto thy *servants* that with all boldness they may speak thy word." Acts 4: 29. Here the word is used to denote the apostles or preachers. It would be no improvement to translate it, grant unto thy slaves. "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle." Rom. 1:1. Would it improve it to read, Paul the *slave* of Jesus Christ?

"We preach not ourselves but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your *servants* for Jesus sake." 2 Cor. 4: 5. We preach ourselves your *slaves* for Jesus sake, would not only be without warrant, but it would make it conflict with Paul's declaration, that he was the *slave* of Jesus Christ. To be the slave of two distinct claimants at the same time is impossible.

"James a servant [slave] of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ." James 1: 1.

"As free, and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants, [*slaves*] of God." 1 Peter 2: 16.

"Simon Peter a servant [slave] and an apostle of Jesus Christ." 2 Peter 1: 1.

"Jude the servant [slave] of Jesus." 1.

"And he sent and signified it by his angel to his servant [slave] John." Rev. 1: 1.

"Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants [*slaves*] of our God in their foreheads." Rev. 7: 3. It is not impossible but this text may be urged in justification of the practice of slaveholders, of branding their slaves with the name of the owner.

Enough has been said to show that the word *doulos*, does not necessarily mean slave, in the sense of chattel slavery. Indeed it is only in a few instances, out of the one hundred and twenty times in which it is used, that it can be pretended that it means *slave*. These cases shall be examined. But before reaching that point, the facts amount to almost a moral demonstration, that the inspired penman did not mean to spread a justification of human bondage upon the record. There was a word which appropriately expressed a chattel slave which they have never used, but have always used a word which properly expresses the condition of free persons in the voluntary service of another, whether as a common laborer, a personal attendant, an agent, or a public officer, representing some higher authority, human or divine.

Is it not clear then that they did not design to teach the rightful existence of human chattelship.

As the writers of the New Testament have not used the word *andrapodon* which most specifically signifies a slave, so have they not used the properly corresponding word, *andrapodismos*, which is the specific word for slavery. As they use the word *doulos*, for the man, the servant, which may denote a voluntary service, one employed for pay; so they use the derivative word *douloo* to denote the condition, the service, servitude or bondage, which may also be voluntary.

So, when speaking of rightful relations, they have never used the word *andrapodistees*, which signifies a slaveholder, one who reduces men to slavery, or holds them as slaves, and which corresponds to *andrapodon*, a slave; but have used the word *despotees*, which signifies lord, master, or head of a family, without at all implying a chattel slaveholder. The proper word for a slaveholder, *andrapodistees*, occurs but once in the New Testament, 1. Tim. 1: 10, where it is translated *manstealers*.

Despotees, the only word used which it can be pretended means slaveholder, occurs only in ten texts in the New Testament, in six of which it is applied to God, or to Jesus Christ, and in four to men as masters. The cases in which it is applied to God or to Jesus Christ, are as follows:

"Lord, [*Despotees*] now lettest thou thy servant, [*doulos*] depart in peace." Luke 2: 29.

"Lord, [*Despotees*] thou art God." Acts 4: 24.

"If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified, and meet for his master's [*despotees*] use." 2 Tim. 2: 21.

"Denying the Lord [*Despotees*] that bought them." 2 Peter 2: 1.

Denying the only Lord [*Despotees*] God." Jude 4.

"How long O Lord, [*Despotees,*] holy and true."

The above use of the word shows that it does not signify a slaveholder, and from the examination of the several words concerned, it appears as though the apostles were so guided as to employ none of the words which belong properly to the system of chattel slavery. The four remaining texts in which the word *despotees* occurs, are the texts which some suppose describe slavery, and these shall all be examined in their place. I have thus far proved that the inspired writers have not used one of the words which unequivocally express chattel slavery, and the fact that there were such words in the language in which they wrote, and that they always avoided them, and used words which properly denote free laborers, is very conclusive evidence that they never designed to endorse the system, if they knew anything about it, and lived and labored among it.

II. The texts in which the words above examined occur, do not teach that chattel slavery can rightfully exist.

A few of the texts need only be noticed, the strongest shall be selected, and if they do not justify slavery others cannot.

"Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Art thou called, *being* a servant? Care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free use *it* rather. For he that is called in the Lord, *being* a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called *being* free, is Christ's servant. Ye are bought with a price, be not ye the servants of men. Brethren, let every man wherein he is called, therein abide with God." 1 Cor. 7: 20-22.

This text may refer to slavery; the persons here called servants, *doulos*, may have been slaves. It is not certain that they were slaves because they are called *doulos*, for this term is often applied to free-persons who are merely in the employ of another. The fact is admitted that slavery did exist in that country, and that the word *doulos* might be applied to a slave, just as our word servant, is used to denote any one who serves, whether voluntary or involuntary, free or bond. This is all the concession candor requires me to make, and in this lies all the proof there is that slavery is involved in the case. The text upon its face contains several things which are unfavorable to the idea that the persons treated of were chattel slaves. I urge two grounds of defense against any conclusion drawn from the text, that slavery is or can be right.

I. It is not clear that the persons were slaves, to whom the apostle wrote. This is a vital point and must be positively proved; inference or mere probability will not do in such a case. Here is a great system of human bondage, sought to be justified, and of course, no

text can be admitted as proving it right, unless it be certain that it relates to the subject. Now, where is the proof that this text certainly speaks of slaves.

1. The use of the word, *doulos*, does not prove it, for that is applied to Jesus Christ, Paul and Peter, to all Christians, and to free persons who are in the employ of others, whether as public officers or mere laborers.
2. The general instruction given does not prove that the persons addressed were slaves. The general instruction is for all to abide in the same calling they were in when converted. The same principle is applied specifically to husbands and wives, as well as to servants. The general instruction therefore does not prove that slaves are meant.
3. The specific application of this instruction to servants by name, does not prove that they were slaves. It might be necessary to give such instruction to free or hired servants. The Gospel was making inroads upon a heathen community, and it may be presumed, that the greatest portion of the converts were among the lower classes and servants. If these servants were all to forsake their positions and the employ of all unconverted employers, so soon as they were converted, it would not only produce confusion and much inconvenience, but bring Christianity into discredit and provoke persecution. It would not only deprive many families of the requisite number of laborers, but would throw an equal number of laborers out of employ.
4. The exception which the apostle makes to the specific application of his general rule to servants, does not prove that they were slaves. The exception is this, "But if thou mayest be made free, use it rather." This is doubtless the strongest point in support of slavery contained in the text, for those who must find slavery in it somehow, will at once say that it supposes that they might not be able to be free, in which case they must be slaves. This is plausible, but it is not a necessary conclusion, and therefore cannot be allowed as establishing the rightfulness of slavery. It may refer to contracts and relations voluntarily entered into for a limited term of years, and for a price stipulated. Such cases exist in every community, and where a considerable portion of an entirely heathen community, should suddenly embrace Christianity, some of the converts would be found sustaining these relations, and involved in these obligations to heathen parties entirely unfriendly to the spiritual interests of such converts. Now, though it would not be proper to violently rupture all such contracts on the conversion of one of the parties, though it would be a good general rule for every man to abide in his calling or occupation, yet where a release could be peaceably obtained in any such case, it would be best to improve it. This is all that the text necessarily means, and this is rendered the more probable sense, from the fact that, if they were really slaves, and their state of slavery regarded as right in the light of the Gospel, the probability of obtaining a release would hardly be great enough to constitute the basis of a special apostolic rule. Indeed, the exposition is more consistent with the whole scope of the apostle's reasoning than any exposition that can be based upon the assumption that chattel slavery was the thing with which the apostle was dealing.

II. Allowing that the text does treat of slaves, that the person named as "called being a servant," was a personal chattel, it does not prove slavery to be right, or throw over it any sanction, not even by implication. The former exposition is doubtless the right one, upon the supposition that the persons were not slaves, but upon the supposition that they were slaves, that exposition is set aside, and one entirely different must be resorted to. No such exposition can be adopted as will make the text approve of slavery.

1. The direction, "let every man abide in the same calling wherein he is called," does not teach the duty of a voluntary submission to slavery, upon the supposition that the direction was given to slaves; and unless it teaches the duty of voluntary submission to slavery, it does not and cannot prove slavery to be right. The words, "If thou mayest be free, use it rather," are just as positive and binding as the words, "let every man abide in the same calling," and allowing the words to be addressed to slaves, they command every Christian convert, who is a slave, to obtain his freedom if he can; it leaves him no right to consent to be a slave, if he may be free; if he has power to be free.

The word here translated *mayest* is *dunamai* and is translated in this case by too soft a term to do justice to the original in this connection. It is used to express a thing possible or impossible in the most absolute sense. It occurs in about two hundred and ten texts and is uniformly translated *can* and with a negative particle *can-not*, *able* and not *able*, and in very few cases, not over five in all, it is rendered *may*; once it is rendered *might*, and in only one case besides the text, is rendered *mayest*. That is Luke 16: 2. "Thou mayest be no longer steward." Here a stronger word would do better justice to the sense. The word occurs in such texts as the following: "God is *able* of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." Matt. 3: 9.

"A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid." v. 14.

"Thou *canst* not make one hair white or black." 36.

"No man *can* serve two masters." 6: 24.

"But *are* not *able* to kill the soul." 10: 28.

"From which ye *could* not be justified by the law of Moses." Acts 13: 39.

"They that are in the flesh *cannot* please God." Rom. 8: 8.

"To him *that is of power* to establish you. 16: 25.

The word is supposed to be derived from *deinos*, powerful, and hence in the expression, "If thou *mayest* be free," the sense is, if thou hast power to be free, if thou hast strength to be free, if thou art able to be free, if thou *canst* be free, use it rather.

There can be no doubt of this position, that the text leaves those concerned no choice between slavery and liberty; if it refers to slaves, it requires them to take and use their

liberty if they can get it, leaving no right to remain in the condition of slaves any longer than up to the time they can be free. This is very important in two points of light.

1. It is a most clearly implied condemnation of slavery as unfriendly to the development of Christianity in the heart and life. This of itself proves that the text does not and cannot justify slavery.

2. This positive command requiring the slave to take and use his liberty, whenever he can get it, necessarily qualifies and limits what is said of abiding in the condition wherein they were called. "Let every man abide in the same calling where he was called. Art thou called, being a servant? Care not for it, but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather." The sense must be that the slave was to abide in slavery as a Christian, until he could be made free, rather than to give up his Christianity on the ground that a slave must first be made free before he could be a Christian. The obligation was to be a Christian while he was compelled to remain a slave, rather than to remain a slave one hour after he could be free. To abide in the same calling wherein he was called, means that he should remain a Christian in that condition, until he can get out of it rather than waiting until he can get out of it before he undertakes to be a Christian. The fact that the slave is commanded to use his freedom if he can be made free, forbids any other construction than that which I have put upon the words. The command to use his liberty if he can be made free, limits the command to abide as he was called, to the sense of submitting to slavery as an unavoidable evil, until he can get out of it in a manner consistent with the laws of Christianity. This is all the obligation that is imposed upon the slave, and this is not the slightest justification of slavery, for there is not a Christian anti-slavery man in the country, even the most ultra, who would not now give the same advice to all slaves in the land, could they speak in their ears. Advice or a command to submit to a wrong which we have not power to prevent, is no justification of that wrong, "But I say unto you that ye resist not evil," is no justification of evil. The fact that "charity beareth all things," and "endureth all things," does not prove that all things thus borne and endured are right. So no command, were it ever so plain, to submit, ever so quietly to slavery, as a condition from which we have no power to escape, could be a justification of slavery

It strikes me that we are compelled to this explanation of the text, to save the apostle from confusion and self contradiction, if we admit that he was really treating of chattel slavery. We cannot suppose that the apostle uses the same word in two or more different senses in the same most intimate connection, without giving any intimation of the fact; if therefore we render the word *doulos*, slave, instead of servant, we must preserve this rendering through the whole connection. In that case, the text will read thus: "Let every man abide in the same calling where he was called. Art thou called being a *slave* care not for it: but if thou mayest be made free use it rather. For he that is called in the Lord being a *slave* is the Lord's *freeman*: likewise, he also that is called being *free* is Christ's *slave*. Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the *slave* of men."

This makes the apostle assert that a converted slave is a slave of man, and God's freeman at the same time. This is impossible, for if the obligations of slavery are morally binding on the slave, he cannot be free to serve God; but if the slavery be an entire unmingled

moral wrong, imposing no moral obligation on the slave, but only a physical restraint, then can the slave be God's freeman, just as clearly as he whose feet and hands should be paralyzed, could still be God's freeman, his head and heart being still sound.

Again, the assumption that the apostle is treating of chattel slavery, as the text is above rendered, makes him assert that the converted *slave* is God's freeman, and that the converted freeman is God's *slave*. If by servitude a voluntary state is meant, in which case there is no chattel slavery; or if chattel slavery be understood, as a human crime, inflicted upon them by force, imposing no moral obligation, then the whole is consistent.

Finally, the idea that chattel slavery is involved, and that slaves are under moral obligation to submit to it, as per corresponding moral right on the part of the slaveholder to hold them as slaves, makes the apostle command them to abide in slavery and not to abide in it; to be slaves and not to be at the same time. The sense must run thus, "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he is called," that is, if a man is called being a slave, let him remain a slave; but as "ye are bought with a price, be not ye the slaves of men." A more direct and palpable contradiction could not be perpetrated. But allow that there is no justification of slavery, that slaves are only directed to submit to it and bear it as a physical necessity which they have no power to escape, and the whole is plain and consistent, then may they be required to abide in it, and endure all its wrongs as Christians, until providence shall open a way for them to escape from it.

I have bestowed full attention to the above text, because it is believed to be one of the strongest in support of slavery, and because it is the first of the class with which I have undertaken to grapple. In disposing of it, I have settled some principles, which can be applied in the consideration of other texts, without having to be again discussed at length. Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters, according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; not with eye-service, as men pleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will, doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men; knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the If same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free. And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him." Eph. 6: 5-9.

I. It is not certain that the persons here called servants, were chattel slaves; and that the persons called masters, were slaveholders.

1. It does not follow that slaves and slaveholders are treated of from the terms employed. The word here translated servants is *douloi*, the plural of *doulos*. That this word of itself does not prove that chattel slaves are meant, has been already sufficiently shown.

The word masters is *kurioi*, the plural of *kurios*. It has been sufficiently shown that this word does not necessarily mean a slaveholder. I will however, add two examples of its use.

"The same Lord, (*Kurios*,) over all is rich unto all that call upon him." Rom. 10: 12.

Here the word is used to denote the Supreme Ruler of all men.

"Sirs, (*Kurioi*, plural of *Kurios*,) what must I do to be saved." Here the word is used as no more than our English words, Sirs, Gentlemen, or Mister. The use of the word therefore, cannot prove that slaveholders are intended.

2. The duties enjoined upon these servants, does not prove that they were slaves. Not a word is said which will not apply as appropriately to free hired laborers as to slaves.

(1.) The command to obey them that were their masters, does not prove the existence of chattel slavery. This must follow from two considerations. First, their obedience was limited to what was morally right. This is clear from the fact that their obedience was to be rendered "as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart." This limits obedience to the will of God, and makes the actor the judge of what that will is, which is inconsistent with chattel slavery. Secondly, with this limitation, obedience is due to all employers, and all free persons who engage in the service of others, are bound to obey them, and carry out all their orders, according to the usages of the community, within the limits of the will of God, or what is morally right. Such a direction, to a community, newly converted from heathenism, and still intermingled with the unconverted heathen, must have been necessary, and its observance essential to the reputation and further success of the Gospel among them. It is clear then, that the simple command that servants obey does not prove that they were slaves.

(2.) The qualifying words added to the word masters, "according to the flesh," do not prove the existence of the relation of owner and slave. The Greek word, *sarx*, here rendered flesh, literally signifies the human body in contradistinction from the spirit or mind.

Matthew Henry construes it thus: "Who have the command of your bodies, but not of your souls: God above has dominion over these."

Dr. A. Clarke thus: "Your master in secular things; for they have no authority over your religion nor over your souls."

Rev. A. Barnes, thus: "This is designed, evidently to limit the obligation. The meaning is, that they had control over the body, the flesh. They have the power to command the service which the body could render; but they were not lords of the spirit. The soul acknowledges God as its Lord, and to the Lord they were to submit in a higher sense than to their masters." Allow either of these expositions, and there can be no slavery made out of the text. If there be a limit to the slave's obedience, and if the slave is judge of that limit, as he must be, for the language is addressed to him, to govern his conduct, then there is an end to slavery. But if we understand freemen under contract to serve others, all is plain.

(3.) The manner of rendering the obedience required, does not prove the existence of chattel slavery. The manner was "with fear and trembling."

The words, *phobou kai tromou*, fear and trembling, are capable of a great latitude of meaning, from absolute terror to a religious veneration, or the respect due to any superior. The same expression occurs in two other texts. The first is 2 Cor. 7: 15, where Paul says of Titus, "with fear and trembling, *phobou kai tromou*, ye received him."

The other text is Phil. 2: 12; "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, *phobou kai tromou*." In this text, fear and trembling means deep solicitude or apprehension.

The Greek word *phobou*, which is the genitive singular of *phobos*, is defined thus: "Fear, dread, terror, fright, apprehension, alarm, flight, rout." If it be understood in its mildest sense, as fear in the sense of anxiety, reverence or respect, or *apprehension*, in the sense of uneasiness of mind, lest by failing to obey, they should injure the reputation of the Gospel, it is all perfectly consistent with the position and duties of free hired servants. And this is all that the word necessarily means. The same word is used to express the respect which wives are required to manifest towards their husbands. "Wives be in subjection to your own husbands; that if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives; while they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear." 1 Peter 3:1, 2.

Here the same word is used in the original translated fear. If the words, *phobou kai tromou*, be understood in any higher sense, which renders it inapplicable to free hired laborers, as dread, terror, or fright, it renders the whole matter inconsistent with a Christian brotherhood, and makes the Scriptures contradict themselves.

3. The discrimination between bond and free, does not prove the existence of slavery. As an encouragement to faithful servants, Paul says, "whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be *bond or free*" This does not add the slightest force to the argument, for the word that is rendered bond, is the same that is rendered servant in the 5th verse. It is *doulos*; *doulos eite eleutheros*; bond or free.

"Whether he be servant or free, would be a translation more in accordance with common usage. The word *doulos*, servant, occurs over one hundred and twenty times in the New Testament, and in every instance is translated servant, save seven in which it is rendered bond. Four of the seven exceptions occur in the writings of Paul, and the text under consideration is the only one which can be supposed to justify slavery in any sense. The other three are as follows: "For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether *bond or free*." 1 Cor. 12: 13. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, neither *bond nor free*." Gal. 3 28. " And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him: where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision or uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, *bond nor free*." Col. 3: 10, 11.

If the word *doulos*, rendered bond in these texts, means a chattel slave, the thing cannot exist among Christians, and the Gospel abolishes the relation of master and slave, so soon as the parties are converted. The other three cases in which the word *doulos* is translated

bond, are in Revelations. They need not be examined, as they have no important bearing on the question. We see from the above the discrimination between bond and free does not prove the existence of chattel slavery, because it is perfectly appropriate to distinguish between men who are the servants of others, as hired laborers, and who are not. It only has the force of the word servant in contradistinction from one who is an employer, or who labors for himself.

4. The obligations imposed upon the masters does not prove that they were chattel slaveholders, or that their servants were their chattel slaves. I know not how to reconcile what is said to the masters with the possibility that chattel slavery is involved. This however is not my part of the enterprise, my work is to show that what is said does not prove that slavery existed, and if in doing this, I prove that it did not exist, it will be the result of the nature of the facts I have to deal with. Two things are commanded for which a reason is assigned.

(1.) Masters are commanded to "do the same things unto them," that is to their servants. What is here meant by "the same things." It certainly refers to what had been said to servants. It will not admit of a strict literal construction, for that would require the master to obey the servant with fear and trembling; it would be to put the servant and the master upon an exact equality in all things. This we know the apostle did not mean, and to attempt to ground an argument upon such a literal sense, would be to appear uncandid. "The same things," in the connection, literally means just what he had been telling the servants to do, but from this we must depart, but we are not allowed to depart from the literal sense only so far as to reach a sense which will be in harmony with the general scope of the subject. Let us try it. Suppose we understand by the same things, that Paul merely meant to command masters to act towards their servants, upon the same principles upon which he commanded the servants to act towards them; or in other words, that Paul meant to command masters to pursue a course of conduct towards their servants, which correspond to the conduct which he had commanded the servants to pursue towards them.

This strikes me as not only a fair and liberal view, but as the only true view. A slaveholder cannot deny the fairness of this construction of the words. Now let me apply the principle. It will run thus:

"Servants be obedient to them that are your masters." Masters give no oppressive, unreasonable, or morally wrong commands. Then must the servant be left free to serve his God, and discharge all the domestic duties of a husband, father, wife, mother, son or daughter. This would make an end of chattel slavery.

Servants obey with fear and tremble, that is with all due respect for superiors. Masters, treat your servants with all the gentleness and kindness that is due from a superior to an inferior. This even cannot be reconciled with chattel slavery. Servants, serve in singleness of heart, as unto Christ. Masters, conduct yourselves towards your servants with entire honesty, and pay them for their labor as doing it unto Christ.

Servants, serve "not with eye-service as man pleasers, but as the servants of Christ." Masters, do not treat your servants in the presence of others with apparent kindness to secure a good name, and then abuse them when there is no one to see or hear; but treat them with the same honesty and purity of motive with which you serve Christ.

Servants, obey as doing the will of God from the heart. Masters command and claim nothing which is contrary to the will of God.

There is certainly no slavery in all this, but much which appears inconsistent with slavery. It would not be sufficient to say that it might refer to slavery, or that it might be reconciled with slavery; it must positively mean slavery beyond a doubt, to be admitted as proof of the rightful existence of slavery in this land and age, for that is the real question.

(2. Masters are commanded to forbear threatening. This does not prove that Paul was treating of Chattel slaveholders and slaves. This forbids all punishment, all chastisement. No construction can be put upon the words which will make them less restrictive.

The Greek word *anieemi*, here rendered *forbearing*, has a variety of significations and shades of meaning, among which are the following: "To remit, forgive, forbear; to dismiss, leave, let alone; to desert, forsake to let slip, omit, neglect." The word occurs but four times in the New Testament as follows: Acts 16: 26, where it is translated *loosed*. "Every one's bands were loosed." Acts 27: 40, it is again translated *loosed*. "They committed themselves unto the sea, and *loosed* the rudder-bands, and hoisted up the mainsail to the wind." Heb. 13: 5, it is translated *will leave*, being accompanied with a negative, *never*. "He hath said, I *will never leave* thee nor forsake thee."

The only remaining case is the text under consideration, where it is translated *forbearing*, threatening. There is seen to be nothing in the use of the word in other texts, to make it mean less here than a command not to threaten at all. He who threatens in any degree does not forbear threatening.

The word, *threatening*, denotes the act of making a declaration of an intention to inflict punishment. It is used in no other sense. It occurs but four times in the New Testament. Acts 4: 17; "But that it spread no further among the people, let us straitly threaten them." The Greek words are, *apilee apilesometha*, a literal translation of which would be, "Let us threaten them with threatening." In the twenty-ninth verse it is said, "And now Lord behold their *threatenings*." The other text where the word occurs is Acts 9: 1; "And Saul yet breathing out *threatenings*," *apilees*, threatenings. It is clear then that the word *forbearing*, as used in the text, means not to do, or refrain from doing; and the word *threatening*, means the making a declaration of a purpose to inflict punishment. The two words, therefore, as connected in the text, amount to a command not to threaten punishment. This by the most certain implication forbids the punishment itself.

5. The reason assigned for the commands given to the masters is very far from proving that they were slaveholders, or that their servants were chattel slaves. This reason is thus stated, "Knowing that your Master is also in heaven; neither is there respect of persons

with him." The word, Master, here is the same as in the direction, only here it is singular, *kurios*, and there it is plural, *kurioi*. Translate it slaveholder and it would read thus: "Ye *slaveholders*, do the same things unto them; knowing that your *slaveholder* also is in heaven." Or more correctly, "ye *owners*, do the same things unto them; knowing that your *owner* also is in heaven." Every one must know that this does not express the true sense of the apostle. The meaning is, that they were to conduct themselves justly and kindly towards their servants, or inferiors, because they were the servants of God, to whom they must render an account for their conduct. Now the word *kurios* not only means God as a name of the Supreme Being, but it also signifies a ruler. It is derived from *kuros*, authority. Translate it by *ruler* and the whole connection will be consistent. "And ye *rulers* do the same things unto them; knowing that your *ruler* is in heaven."

I have now shown that the text under consideration does not contain slavery, that it is not clear that it treats of the thing at all, and I will pass to notice briefly the second point.

II. If it were admitted that the text treats of slavery, it does not follow that slavery is right, for it in no sense justifies the necessary assumptions of a chattel slaveholder.

1. The directions given to the servants is no more than might be given to chattel slaves as a means of promoting their own interests, without the slightest endorsement of the master's right to hold them. Suppose a man to be held wrongfully as a slave, without the power to escape from the grasp of his oppressor, what would a friend advise him to do? Just what the apostle has commanded in the case before us. I would say obey your master in everything that the law of Christianity will allow you to do, and obey with visible fear and trembling, for such a course is the only means of securing such treatment as will render life endurable. Self-interest would not only indicate such a course, but duty to God would demand it. Christians are bound to pursue a course, within the limits of what may be done, which will render their own lives most peaceful and comfortable, and enable them to be most useful to their fellow creatures in leading them to embrace the same blessed Christianity. With a slave, unable to escape from his chains, such a course would be just the one pointed out by the apostle in the text under consideration.

2. There is no justification of slavery found in the directions given to the masters, upon the supposition that they were chattel slaveholders. What they are commanded to do was undoubtedly right, but there is not a word said in these commands which implies that it is right to hold a fellow-being as a chattel slave. The argument for slavery does not depend so much upon what is said to the masters as upon what is not said, and upon assumed facts. The argument is this; they were slaveholders, and members of the church, and the apostle wrote to them, giving rules for the regulation of their conduct as masters, and did not command them to emancipate their slaves, or forbid them to hold slaves. This, it is insisted, is an implied endorsement of slavery. This is the strongest form that can be given to the argument, and in this shape I will meet it in this place.

(1.) The argument is unsound because it takes for granted the main point to be proved, viz: that they were really chattel slaveholders. The words do not prove that to be a fact. It is first taken for granted that slavery existed, and then the words are construed in the light

of this assumption. As the words do not prove the existence of chattel slavery, it should be proved that it did exist, before it can be affirmed that the apostle did treat of slavery, or that slaveholders were members of the church.

(2.) If it be admitted that slaveholders were members of the church at the time this epistle was written, it will not follow that it is right. Many wrong practices found their way into the church, and many persons were acknowledged members of the church who did not conform in all matters to the doctrines and precepts of Christianity. It is to be borne in mind that the best of the members were fresh converts from heathenism; with all its darkness and corruptions; that there was not pervading the community outside of the church, that general religious light that now pervades the community outside of the church in this country, and that there were not there as many sources of light as there is now among us, and not the same general prevalence of education, and Christian libraries containing the well defined fundamental principles of morality and human duty. Under such circumstances, the church drawing her recruits from amid the dark corruptions of heathenism, by sudden conversions, she could not but be liable to a constant influx of darkness to be enlightened, and corruption to be purged out.

In writing to the Corinthian church, "unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus;" Paul said, "Awake to righteousness and sin not; for some have not the knowledge of God: I speak this to your shame." 1 Cor. 15: 34

The fact, then, that a slaveholder should be found in connection with such a church, would not prove slaveholding to be right without a specific endorsement. This compels the advocate of slavery to fall back upon the actual words of the apostle for proof that slavery is right, leaving no ground to infer that it is right, because he finds it in the church. But I have already proved that the words of the apostle contain no endorsement of slavery; that in addressing servants concerning their duty, he sets up no claim of rights on behalf of the master, and that he only urges the rights of God; and that in addressing masters, he makes no allusion to their rights as masters, but urges, on the ground of their accountability to God, a course of conduct entirely inconsistent with chattel slavery. If these slaveholders got into the church, so did other wrong doers get into the church, while Paul, in addressing these slaveholders as a specific class, commanded them to pursue a course which amounted to an entire abolition of chattel slavery. Where, then, is the proof that slavery is right, upon the supposition that slaveholders were in the church?

If then slavery is not proved to be right by the fact that it was in the church, nor yet by the apostles' directions on the subject, there is no proof in the text that it is right, allowing slavery to be the subject treated.

"Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye service as men pleasers; but in singleness of heart fearing God; and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance; for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons." Col. 3: 22-25.

"Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a master in heaven." Col. 4: 3.

These texts, though quoted from different chapters, constitute but one subject. The first verse of the fourth chapter belongs to the third chapter, and should not have been separated from it.

This text is so nearly like Eph. 6: 5-9, in its language, which has already been examined, that on several points it will only be necessary to refer the reader to what was said upon that text. There can be no doubt from the similarity of the two passages, both being written by the same hand, that they both relate to the same class of persons.

I. It is not clear that the text was addressed to slaves and slaveholders.

1. It is not proved by the direction given to the servants. "Servants obey in all things your masters according to the flesh." This is the only point of difference between this and the former text, and it adds no force to the argument in support of slavery. To obey "in all things" can mean no more than to do everything which is commanded, which does not conflict with the law of God, which is not a violation of the rules of the Gospel.

This limitation of the servant's obligation to obey must destroy chattel slavery. The smallest reserve of the right of judgment, on the part of slaves, must destroy the foundation work of slavery. This was shown in the examination of the preceding text, and need not be further pressed in this place. It is clearly seen that no command to servants, to obey their masters, can prove the existence of chattel slavery, which is not absolute, and without any reserve on the part of the servant, of the right of judging for himself what he may do, and what he may not do. If the servant may say, I will not sin when my master commands me to or I will pray to God when my master commands me not to, there is an end of chattel slavery.

2. The existence of slavery is not proved by what the apostle commands masters to do, "Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal." This does not prove that the apostle was addressing slaveholders. Here are persons called masters, and the first question in issue is, were they chattel slaveholders? but a command to give to their servants "that which is just and equal," cannot prove it, for the same thing is required of all men towards all other men, with whom they have any deal or intercourse. It is only an application of a universal principle to a specific class, and it is just as applicable to hired laborers and apprentices, as it is to bond slaves. The very thing required does not and cannot exist in a state of chattel slavery. Justice and equality are required, and they cannot exist in harmony with slavery, as will fully appear under my next argument.

II. If it were admitted that the text was addressed specifically to slaves and slaveholders, it would not follow that slavery is right, inasmuch as it contains no justification of slavery.

Waving all that has been said, let me now examine the text upon the supposition, it was addressed to men owners and men owned, and see if there is anything in it which can be tortured into a justification of the system.

1. The justification is not found in the command to obey. This has been fully explained and demonstrated in preceding arguments. It might just as well be argued that when Christ says, "If any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also," he justifies the suing, and the taking of both, the coat and the cloak.

2. The justification is not found in what the masters are commanded to do. Here I meet the point, effectually. If real slavery did exist there, the apostle commanded its abolition. This he did in these words: "Masters give unto your servants that which is just and equal." They were then first, to give their servants that which is just. But liberty is just and the natural right of every human being.

But secondly, the apostle commanded them to give their servants that which is *equal*. The Greek word *isoteeta*, which is the accusative case of *isotees* signifies equality. It is derived from *isos*, which signifies equal, on a level, equal to or equivalent: hence *isotees* which is derived from it, signifies equality, parity, equity, impartiality. The word here used occurs in but one other text in the New Testament. It is 2 Cor. 8: 14, in which it occurs twice in the same verse, and is translated *equality* in both cases. If the reader refers to the Greek Testament, he will find the first occurrence of the word in the 13th verse, as the first half of the 14th verse in the English version, is attached to the 13th in the Greek. The apostle then commands slaveholders to give to their slaves equality, or parity this certainly must destroy the chattel principle, and secure to the laborer a just compensation for his labor.

I will here quote from Rev. A. Barnes' notes on the text, as his remarks fully cover this point. He says: "They were to render them that which is just and equal. What would follow from this if fairly applied? What would be just and equal to a man in those circumstances? Would it be to compensate him fairly for his labor; to furnish him an adequate remuneration for what he earned? But this would strike a blow at the root of slavery, for one of the elementary principles, is, that there must be unrequited labor

"If a man should in fact, render to his slaves that which is just and equal, would he not restore them to freedom? Have they not been deprived of their liberty by injustice, and would not justice restore it? What has the slave done to forfeit his liberty? If he should make him equal in rights to himself, or to what he is by nature, would he not emancipate him? Can he be held at all without a violation of all the just notions of equity. Though, therefore it may be true that this passage only enjoins the rendering of what was just and equal in their condition, yet it contains a principle which would lay the axe at the root of slavery, and would lead a conscientious Christian to the feeling that his slaves ought to be free.

"Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing

masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit." 1 Tim. 6: 1, 2.

I. It is not sufficiently certain that the text treats of slaves and slaveholders, so as to render it a conclusive argument in support of the rightful existence of slavery. The whole ground has been gone over in the examination of other texts, with the exception of two additional points, which this text presents, viz: that some servants were under the yoke, and some had believing masters.

If slavery is not found in one or the other of these points, it is not found in the text, all other points having been already examined.

1. The Greek word, *zugon*, here rendered yoke, does not mean slavery. It literally means the yoke by which oxen, horses and mules are coupled together for draught. Hence it means anything that joins two things together. It may be used in a metaphorical sense. The use of a word in a metaphorical sense, cannot determine what the thing is to which it is applied, since the known character of the thing to which it is applied, alone can determine in what metaphorical sense the word is used. If it were first proved that servants were slaves, it would follow that yoke, as applied to them, means slavery, but that is so far from being the case, that the application of the word yoke to them, is relied upon to prove that they were slaves, and the whole argument must fall. It is reduced to a circle, thus: They were slaves because they were under the yoke, which means slavery. The term yoke means slavery, as applied to them, because they were slaves. Such arguments prove nothing.

2. There is no other instance in the New Testament, in which the word is used to denote anything like slavery. It is used in only six instances. In one, Rev. 6: 5, it is used with strict reference to its literal sense. It is here translated a "pair of balances," because the two parts are fastened together by the beam. In every other case it is used metaphorically. Christ uses it twice, Matt. 11: 29, 30, "Take my yoke upon you." "My yoke is easy." Here it means the moral obligations of the Gospel. As though he had said, take the profession and duties of my religion upon you. There is no slavery in this, though there are obligations which bind them to Christ. The same word is found Acts 15: 10, "Why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the necks of the disciples." Here it means the obligations of the Mosaic Law, not slavery.

The other text is Gal. 5: 1, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Here the yoke of bondage is the obligations of the Mosaic Law. Yoke means obligation, and bondage means service. It would be just as good a translation to render it, "be not entangled again with the obligation of service."

Apply these facts to the text under consideration, and there will be no slavery in it. "As many servants as are under the yoke," understand obligation, by yoke, for it means anything that binds or couples together, and it will be plain. "Let as many servants as are under obligation."

But the Greek word, *hosos*, rendered "as many as"—for these three words in the English text come from the one in Greek—is not translated in its only admissible sense. Dr. McKnight renders it *whatever*. "Whatever servants." It often has this sense, but this does not exhaust its meaning. The following are the principal senses in which the word is used: Of size, "as great as;" of quantity, "as much as;" of space or distance, "as far as;" of time, "as long as;" of number, "as many as;" of sound, "as loud as." It is used of time in six texts in the New Testament, Matt. 9: 15; "Can the children of the bride-chamber mourn as *long as* the bridegroom is with them."

Mark 2: 19; "As long as they have the bridegroom with them they cannot fast."

Rom. 7: 1: "The law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth."

1 Cor. 7: 39; "The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth."

Gal. 4: 1; "The heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant."

2 Peter 1: 13; "I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up."

Give the word the same sense in the text under consideration, and it will read, "As long as servants are under obligation, let them count their own masters worthy of all honor."

There is certainly but little slavery in the text in this form, and it is perfectly clear that there would never have been any in it, had not the translators and readers first originated slavery in their own minds, to make *zugon* mean the yoke, that is, the bondage of chattel slavery.

If then there is no slavery in the yoke, or in being under the yoke was there any in the fact that some had believing masters? Surely not, for if the unbelieving were not chattel slaveholders, it cannot be pretended that the believing masters were. If the servants of the unbelieving, blaspheming masters were not slaves, it can not be supposed that the servants of the believing masters were.

II. If the above argument be all thrown aside, and it be admitted that the servants under the yoke were chattel slaves, it will not follow that slavery is right. There is no justification of slavery in the text, upon the supposition that slavery is the thing treated of. Let it be borne in mind that I must not now reason upon the principles of my exposition of the text given above, that is based upon the assumption that there was no slavery in the case. In admitting that slavery existed, and that Paul treated of it, for the sake of the argument, I must set that exposition aside, and fall back upon the pro-slavery gloss. Where then, I demand, is the proof that slavery is right, that Paul sanctioned it?

1. It is not found in the fact that Paul commanded the servants under the yoke to "count their own masters worthy of all honor." The only reason assigned for the command, is "that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed." There is no intimation that the masters had a rightful claim upon them, but they were wicked men, who, if their

Christian servants did not render to them obedience and respect, would blaspheme the name of the Christian's God and oppose Christianity. But why did not Paul command these wicked masters to emancipate their slaves, if he condemned, or did not mean to sanction slavery? The answer is plain.

(1.) He was not writing to them, but to Timothy concerning the church.

(2.) He had no power or influence over these wicked heathen masters to command them.

(3.) Such a command, concerning them, would have produced the very thing his direction concerning servants was designed to prevent. It would have been an occasion of their blaspheming the name of God and his doctrine.

2. No sanction of slavery is found in the directions given to those servants who had believing masters. This verse comes far short of expressing the full sense of the original. The present form of the text appears to intimate that servants were in danger of despising their masters because they were brethren, whereas, the fact that they were brethren in no sense tended to produce such a result, but is a good reason for not despising them, and is so designed by the apostle. This will be made plain by rendering the Greek word, *hoti*, for; which is now rendered *because*. "Let them not despise them for they are brethren." It is so translated in more than two hundred and twenty-five texts.

The word *partakers*, does not begin to express the force of the Greek word, *antilambanomenai*, from which it is translated. This word is compounded of *anti*, in turn, *lambano*, to take, or receive, and hence the compound word as used by the apostle, means partakers in turn. Dr. Clarke renders it "joint partakers," but his rendering is not as strictly in accordance with the original as mine.

The word translated benefit is *euergesia*, which literally means well doing, good conduct. It occurs in but one other text, Acts 4: 9, where it is translated, "good deed done." Now let me read the verse according to these renderings.

"And they that have believing masters let them not despise them, for they are brethren, but rather do them service because they are faithful and beloved, partakers in turn of the well doing."

This clearly makes the last clause refer to the servants, as faithful and beloved partakers in turn of the benefit of their own labor; that is, they were paid for their service. This removes all the difficulty that critics have met with in this part of the text. Dr. McKnight affirms that benefit, cannot refer to Gospel benefit or salvation, and Dr. Clarke agrees with him, but intimates that it may refer to the benefits the servants receive from their masters, but has failed to explain how. Rev. A. Barnes denies that it can refer to the fact that the master receives the benefit of the servants labor, because that can be no special motive to the servant to serve faithfully, the force of which all must feel. He therefore construes it to mean the benefit which the Gospel imparts; the very thing which Drs. McKnight and Clarke deny.

The advantage of my translation is, it escapes both these difficulties besides being more in accordance with the sense of the original, making the true sense to run thus: Let them not despise them, but rather let them do them service, because they, the servants, are faithful and beloved, partakers in turn of the well doing, by receiving a fair compensation for their labor. I have no doubt *this* is what Paul meant, and surely it was entirely free from any direct or implied sanction of chattel slavery.

The Epistle of Paul to Philemon.

Paul was a prisoner in Rome, and Philemon is supposed to have been an inhabitant of Colosse. Paul wrote him a letter by a person named Onesimus, in which the following words occurred, concerning the bearer:

"I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds; which in time past was to thee unprofitable, but now profitable to thee and to me; whom I have sent again: thou therefore receive him, that is my own bowels; whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the Gospel; but without thy mind would I do nothing; that thy benefit should not be as it were of necessity, but willingly.

"For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldest receive him forever; not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh, and in the Lord? If thou count me therefore a partner, receive him as myself. If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account; I Paul have written it with my own hand, I will repay it: albeit I do not say to thee how thou owest unto me even thine own self besides. Yea, brother, let me have joy of thee in the Lord: refresh my bowels in the Lord. Having confidence in thy obedience I wrote unto thee, knowing that thou wilt also do more than I say."

I. The evidence relied upon to prove the main facts in support of slavery is wholly insufficient. The points involved shall be noticed in order.

1. Onesimus was the servant of Philemon. That he was a servant is implied, not affirmed. It is said, "that thou shouldst receive him forever, not now as a servant, (*doulon*) but above a servant, a brother beloved." It is freely admitted that these words imply that Onesimus had been a servant, but this is no proof that he was or had ever been a slave. It has been proved in a preceding argument that the word here used, *doulos*, does not necessarily mean a slave, but is used to denote free hired laborers, ministers and public officers. The reader is referred to the inquiry into the meaning of this word in section 5, part 1. Onesimus may then have been a free man in the employ of Philemon, or he may have been bound to him, as a minor by his parents or guardians, or he may have bound himself to serve for a time, and have taken up his wages in advance, and then run away. Any of these suppositions are much more reasonable than to suppose he was a slave. The fact that he is called a servant, *doulos*, does not and cannot prove that he was a slave, for Paul declares himself to be the servant of Christ, and also the servant of the church.

2. Onesimus run away from Philemon, or left his employ improperly and without his consent. This is not affirmed, but is too clearly implied to be denied. But this does not furnish the slightest proof that he was a slave, for slaves are not the only persons that run away. That he went off in Philemon's debt is more than probable, from the expression of St. Paul, "If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee aught, put that to mine account." The wronging spoken of must have been of a property nature, or it could not have been changed even to Paul. A crime or moral wrong could not be charged over to Paul. It is certain therefore that Onesimus must have borrowed money of Philemon, in which case he would have owed him, or he must have taken up his wages, or received his pay in advance on a contract for service which he left without performing, in which case he would have wronged him, besides owing him. The whole face of the epistle goes much further to prove such a departure from pecuniary obligations, than from chattel bondage.

3. Paul sent Onesimus back to Philemon, which is regarded by the advocates of slavery as a proof positive, not only that he was a slave, but that it is right and a solemn duty to return all fugitive slaves to their masters. This is all an unfounded assumption. There is no proof that Paul sent him back, in the only sense in which a fugitive slave can be sent back to his master. One great fact settles this point, which is this, however clearly it may be seen that Paul sent him back, it is equally clear that Onesimus went voluntarily, of his own free will and accord. This clearly proves that there could have been no coercive servitude in the case.

(1.) The expression, "whom I have sent again," is not conclusive proof of an authoritative and coercive sending. I will save the labor of a criticism, by quoting from the Rev. A. Barnes. That able writer says, "It is commonly *assumed* that his returning again was at the *instigation* of the apostle, and that this furnishes an instance of his belief that runaway slaves should be sent back to their masters. But, besides that there is no certain evidence that he ever was *a slave*, there is as little proof that he returned at the instigation of Paul, or that his return was not wholly voluntary on his part. For the only expression which the apostle uses on this subject (verse 12), whom I have sent again—*anapempa*—does not necessarily imply that he even *proposed* it to him, still less that he *commanded* it. It is a word of such general import, that it would be employed on the supposition that Onesimus *desired* to return, and that Paul, who had a strong wish to retain him, to aid him in the same way that Philemon himself would do if he were with him (comp. ver. 13,) had, on the whole, concluded to part with him, and to send him again, with a letter, to his friend Philemon. There is nothing in the statement which forbids us to suppose that Onesimus was himself *disposed* to return to Philemon, and that Paul 'sent' him at his own request."

(2.) The apostle had no means of sending him back against his own choice. There were no marshals to seize and chain fugitive slaves and carry them back to their masters. There was no provision for paying the expenses of a forcible return out of the public treasury, including the chartering of vessels and the employment of companies of dragoons. Rome was more than a thousand miles from Collosse, where Philemon resided, to whom Onesimus is supposed to have been sent, and when we consider that there were no steamboats, railroads, mail lines, and expresses by which boxed up negroes can now be

sent, it must be perfectly certain that Paul could not have returned Onesimus against his will, without an armed governmental express, which Rome was never mean enough to provide for the return of fugitives from bondage. Nor can it be supposed that Paul could have secured any such arrangement, had the thing been possible in itself, for he was at the time a prisoner in bonds.

(3.) The fact that Onesimus was made the bearer of a letter setting forth Paul's wishes, and urging Philemon to receive him kindly, is irresistible proof that it was all a voluntary operation on the part of Onesimus. Dispatched with a communication on a journey of more than a thousand miles, he must often have had opportunity to have escaped.

(4.) To assume that necessity impelled him to return to chattel bondage, on the ground that he could not provide for his wants, without a master to do it for him, is too absurd to be made the basis of an argument. He was capable of making his escape, and of finding his way to Rome, which, at that age, was more than it would now be for a man to work his way around the world. Paul declares it desirable for him to retain Onesimus to administer to him in his bonds. It must be clear therefore that in Rome he was capable of doing more than merely to provide for his own wants, he was capable of doing that, and assisting Paul in addition.

(5.) The supposition that Onesimus returned to a state of chattel bondage, as a moral duty required by the Gospel, is the last and hopeless resort of the advocates of slavery. It has been shown that no other power could have accompanied, to conduct him safely to his former home against his own will. He willed himself to return, or he never would have found his way back. Will it then be said that by being converted under the labors of St. Paul, he became so thoroughly convinced that slavery was right, and that Philemon had such a right of property in him, as to render it his moral and Christian duty to return to the condition of a chattel bondman, as a means of glorifying God and saving his soul? Nothing else can be said, and to say this, is to abandon the argument, besides contradicting the universal consciousness of mankind.

It abandons the argument, because it gives up the point that Paul sent him back again a fugitive slave, against his own will. The moment it is claimed that Onesimus returned from a sense of moral obligation, the idea of coercive slavery vanishes, and the most essential element of American Slavery is blotted from the record. In that case there was no slavery involved, except such as was submitted to by the slave from choice, since he had it in his power to have avoided it had he thought best so to do.

But to suppose that Onesimus went back to chattel bondage from a sense of moral obligation, is to contradict the universal consciousness of mankind. No man ever did believe, or can believe that it is right that he should be held as a chattel slave. Every man's consciousness within himself, tells him that he has a right to himself; that his head and feet, and hands, and ears, and eyes, and tongue, and heart, and soul belong to himself, and are not, and cannot be the property of another. If Onesimus was converted to a belief that he was the rightful property of another, then has the Gospel lost its power, for no

such conversions take place in these times. The most pious slaves in the south would escape from their masters, did they know how to effect it.

II. There is much proof upon the face of the record that no slavery was involved in the relation that existed between Philemon and Onesimus.

1. The simple fact that Paul so earnestly exhorted Philemon to receive Onesimus, is proof positive that the latter was not returning a chattel slave, for no class of men have to be so earnestly entreated to receive their lost property when it is returned to them. Here the apostle talk, "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have sent again; thou therefore receive him, that is mine own bowels." Verse 10,12. Again in verse 17, he says, "If thou count me therefore a partner, receive him as myself."

2. The offer of Paul to assume the pecuniary responsibilities of Onesimus to Philemon, proves that the former was not a chattel slave. His words are, "If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account. I, Paul, have written it with mine own hand, I will repay it." Verse 18,19. The thing supposed here, is utterly impossible in the case of a chattel slave. A slave cannot owe.

III. If it were admitted that Onesimus was a lawful chattel slave, when he ran away, it would be clear from the language of the epistle, that Paul did not send him back as a slave, but commanded his freedom to be given him. To contend that he was a slave, must prove fatal to the right of slavery, since Paul clearly and unequivocally ordered his emancipation upon the supposition that he was a slave.

The apostle specifies to Philemon too plainly how he was to receive Onesimus, to be misunderstood and in such terms as to forever exclude chattel slavery from the relation.

1. He was to receive him "not now as a servant, but above a servant." Suppose then that he was a slave, and that the word here used, *doulos*, means slave, and the whole clause will read thus: "Perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldst receive him forever; not now as a *slave* but above a *slave*." Is not this making an end of all slavery in the case. It certainly is unless it can be proved that a man can be a slave, and above a slave at the same time.

2. Paul instructed Philemon to receive Onesimus as he would receive him. His words are, "If thou count me therefore a partner, receive him as myself." Verse 17. Here it is plain that Philemon was exhorted to receive Onesimus as he would have received Paul himself. Then must he have received him as an equal, as a Christian brother, as a fellow laborer, and if so, he could not receive him or regard him as his slave.

"Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. For this is thank-worthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently,

this is acceptable with God. For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps." 1 Peter 2: 18-21.

We here meet with a new word rendered servant, not found in any of the preceding texts. It is *oiketai*, and its first and literal meaning is, "an inmate of one's house." It is derived from *oikos*, a house, and hence an inmate of one's house, a household servant. The words of the apostle apply to such servants as were employed as domestics, servants, whose business was in the house. It does not prove that they were slaves, but only that they served in the house, whether bond or free.

Most of the terms have been explained in remarks made upon other texts. The expression, "subject with fear," has been explained sufficiently, in remarks offered upon Eph. 6: 5, where the expression "fear and trembling" occurs.

An examination of what is peculiar to this text, will show that it does not prove the existence of slavery, and that it does not justify it upon the supposition that it did exist. No directions are given to masters, and hence it is fair to suppose the class of persons referred to, were not members of the Church. Some of them we know were not, for they are represented as "froward," and as inflicting grief upon the servants, "conscience toward God." Such persons were not Christians, and if they held slaves it would not prove it to be right. But some are represented as "good and gentle," and were not they members of the Church and Christians? There is no proof that they were. The Greek word *agathos*, good, does not mean a Christian, nor goodness in a moral sense. It is applied to all kinds of nouns, and means only that the noun is good in its kind, as "good gifts, good tree, good things, good treasure, good fruits, good works, good days, good ground." In this text it qualifies masters, understood, and good masters are not necessarily Christians, or members of the church. Nor does the word "gentle" imply that they were Christians. The Greek word *epieikees*, means not only gentle, but mild, patient, moderate. It occurs five times in the New Testament. Once it is translated "moderation;" (Phil, 4: 5;) once it is rendered "patient;" (1 Tim. 3: 3;) and three times it is rendered gentle. These three cases are Titus 3: 2, and James 3: 17, and 1 Peter 2: 18. There is then no proof that the masters referred to were members of the Church, but evidence that they were not. If they were slaveholders, therefore, it is no proof that slavery is right. If we look at the directions given to the servants, they neither prove the existence of slavery, nor yet that it is right, if it did exist.

The only point involved in these instructions, which has not been sufficiently met, is the fact implied that the servants were liable to be buffeted. This word *kolaphizo*, buffet, more properly means to box the ears with the hand, but may denote beating of any kind. The fact that they were liable to be beaten does not prove that they were slaves, for the following reasons:

1. Beating was a common punishment inflicted for minor offences, upon free persons as well as upon slaves. That custom has come down to our own times, and though it is now nearly abolished, persons are still punished at the whipping post for minor offences in some of these States.

2. Christians generally were liable to be buffeted at that time, and even the apostles themselves were buffeted. Paul says, "Even unto this present hour, we both hunger and thirst, and are naked and are buffeted." 1 Cor. 4: 11. At a time when all Christians, and especially ministers were liable to be buffeted, the fact that servants were liable to be buffeted, cannot prove that they were slaves.

3. The advice of the Apostle has often been applicable, and called for, in our day, where no slavery existed. Children and apprentices have often been buffeted in the free States of this free country, on account of their religion, not only by infidels, but by members of churches, because their children persisted in attending the meetings of a different denomination from the one they preferred. If such things can occur in a Christian community, it must be plain that the fact that servants were liable to be buffeted among heathen, cannot prove that they were slaves.

But allowing that they were slaves, there is not the slightest proof that slavery is right. The Apostle does not endorse the buffeting in any case, not even where it is inflicted for wrong doing. The buffeting referred to is of two kinds, that which is inflicted on account of the wrong doing of the servants, and that which is inflicted on account of their well doing, or without their fault.

Suppose then slaves do wrong, and are buffeted for it, still the buffeting may be as wrong as the conduct for which it is inflicted. A wrong act may be wrongfully punished. The directions of our Savior, in relation to smiting and resisting evil, must settle the question that no Christian can be justified in smiting a fellow Christian, the buffeting therefore must be wrong, though provoked by the wrong doing of the servant. The liability therefore of slaves to be buffeted, if slaves they were, or the fact that they were buffeted, cannot prove that slavery is right. The fact that Peter cautioned them against provoking the wrath of their wicked heathen masters, nor yet the fact that he gave them to understand that there would be no special virtue in bearing the buffeting patiently, after having provoked it by bad conduct, cannot be construed into a justification of slavery nor even of the buffeting.

But they were liable to be buffeted when they did well, and this proves that it was wicked men and a wrong state of things of which the Apostle was treating, and no justification for slavery, or anything else can be interred from the conduct of such men. This further appears from the fact that Peter appeals to the suffering of Christ as an example, which was wrongfully inflicted. Allowing them to have been slaves, the fact that the Apostle exhorts them not to provoke punishment, and to bear it patiently when they do well and yet are buffeted, appealing to the sufferings of Christ to enforce his exhortation, no more proves that they were rightfully held as slaves, than the fact that Christ suffered patiently, proves that his sufferings were rightly inflicted.

I have now done, for though I have not examined every text that some may be disposed to urge in support of slavery, I have examined all the most important ones, so that, if those I have examined do not prove the rightful existence of slavery, it cannot be pretended that

there are other texts that will prove the point without them. In the argument I have kept two points in view, namely, the texts relied upon to support slavery, do not prove that it ever existed in the Church, and that, if it did exist, they do not prove it is right. Here I rest, and will close my argument with the words with which a more brilliant writer commenced his.

"The spirit of slavery never seeks shelter in the Bible of its own accord. It grasps the horns of the altar only in desperation—rushing from the avenger's arm. Like other unclean spirits, it hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest its deeds should *be* reproved. Goaded to frenzy in its conflicts with conscience and common sense, denied all quarter, and hunted from every covert, it vaults over the sacred enclosure, and courses up and down the Bible, seeking rest and finding none. The law of love, glowing on every page, flashes around it an omnipresent anguish and despair. It shrinks from the hated light, and howls under the consuming touch, as demons quailed before the Son of God, and shrieked, 'Torment us not.' * * * Its asylum is its sepulcher; its city of refuge the city of destruction. It flies from light into the sun; from heat into devouring fire; and from the voice of God into the thickest of his thunders."

BOOK IV.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND ITS INSTITUTIONS.

CHAPTER I

VISIBLE CHURCH ORGANIZATION AND CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

SECTION I.

Visible Church Organization Explained and Defended.

I. There is clearly a distinction between the Church of Christ, and a Church of Christ.

The Church of Christ includes all the redeemed of every age, in earth and in heaven. A Church of Christ is a single congregation of Christians. The term church, in the Scriptures, is sometimes used to denote all Christians—the whole of the redeemed. It is used in this sense, Heb. 12: 23; "To the General Assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven."

Eph. 1: 22, 23; "And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all."

Eph. 5: 27; "That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

Col. 1: 18, 24; "And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church."

In all these texts, by the Church, we are beyond all doubt, to understand all Christians, of every age and country, as well as those already in heaven. This is what is sometimes called the invisible, universal Church.

But the term Church is more commonly used, in the New Testament, to denote a single congregation of persons who meet together regularly in one place, for worship and the promotion of the interests of Christianity. There is no such thing as a denominational church, embracing all who subscribe to a particular creed, and worshipping in a thousand different places, scattered over an entire continent. The term is never used in this sense in the Scriptures, but it is always used to denote all Christians, or a single congregation. If it means less than all the saved in any one text, it never means more than a single congregation; and if it means more than a single congregation, it never means less than all Christians. The following considerations may serve to settle the question.

1. The New Testament writers uniformly speak of the churches, and not of the church, thereby clearly teaching that in those early times, a church was a single congregation. A few illustrations will suffice on this point.

Acts 9: 31; "Then had the Churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria."

Chap. 14: 23; " And when they had ordained them elders in every church."

Chap. 16: 5; "And so were the churches established in the faith, and increased in number daily."

Rom. 16: 4; "Who have for my life laid down their own necks: unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles."

1 Cor. 7: 17; "But as God hath distributed to every man, and as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk: and so I ordain in all churches."

2 Cor. 11: 8; "I robbed other churches, taking wages of them to do you service."

Gal. 1: 22; "And was unknown by face unto the churches of Judea which were in Christ."

Rev. 1: 4; "John to the seven churches which are in Asia."

In Asia there were then seven churches.

2. The term Church is so frequently used in the New Testament in connection with certain places, and with such qualifying terms, as necessarily to imply no more than a single Christian assembly.

Acts 8: 1; "And at that time there was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem: and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the Apostles."

Chap. 11: 26; "And when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch. And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church and taught much people. And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch."

Chap. 14: 27; "And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles."

Rom. 16: 1; "I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea."

Verse 5; "Likewise greet the church that is in their house."

Verse 23; "Gaius my host, and of the whole church."

Here Gaius is declared to be the host of the whole church.

1 Cor. 1: 2; "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours."

This text clearly distinguishes "the church of God which is at Corinth" from "all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ."

This proves that the disciples at Corinth constituted a Church.

Chap. 11: 18; "For first of all, when ye come together in the church, I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it."

Chap. 14: 23; "If therefore the whole church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad?"

Col. 4: 15; "Salute the brethren which are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church which is in his house."

These texts are sufficient to show that the Apostles contemplated Christians as organized into churches, according to their respective localities, and not as all belonging to one

general visible organization, under one general rule of discipline in matters not commanded in the word of God. It is seen from the above that there was a church at Cenchrea, and another at Corinth. These two places were but a few miles distant from each other. This clearly proves that a church at that time consisted of a single congregation.

3. The best ecclesiastical authority confirms the above doctrine of the independence of the primitive Christian congregations.

Lord King says the Synods were composed in part of "deputed laymen, in behalf of their respective churches."

Mr. Wesley says," Originally every Christian congregation was a church independent of all others." Vol. 3, p. 363.

Mr. Watson says, "Through the greater part of the second century, the Christian churches were independent of each other." Dictionary, Article, Church.

Dr. A. Clarke says, "In the proper use of this word there can be no such thing as THE church exclusively; there may be a church, or the churches." Matt. 26, in fine.

Any amount of authority might be quoted on this point, but it is not necessary. It has been introduced as the necessary starting point, and will of necessity be involved and further illustrated in the progress of the investigation.

II. By visible church organization is meant an organization or association of Christian persons, in a manner which presents to the eye of each, and to the eye of the surrounding world, a church, the precise limits of which may be known, visible in its parts, and visible as a whole.

To organize a church, is for a number of Christian persons, voluntarily, understandingly, and visibly to recognize each other as Christians, and to agree to be a church; to appoint, in some way, the necessary officers of a church, for the purpose of enjoying the immunities and doing the work of a church of Jesus Christ, in accordance with his will as taught in the New Testament. Such church, thus organized or associated, is composed only of such persons as have been recognized by the church, and have agreed to be members of the same, and does not include all who may believe in Christ, residing in the place or vicinity, who have not been recognized by the body, and who have not agreed to be members of the said visible organization or association. Furthermore, such church, thus organized, has a right to admit or recognize such other persons as members as they may judge worthy, and to expel or disown such members as they may judge unworthy, according to the law of Jesus Christ.

The above are the points to be proved in vindication of visible church organization; but the argument will be better understood after a distinct statement of the opposing views, which will of necessity be refuted if the above be established. The propositions stated

above concerning church organization, are denied by two classes. The first, directly and in so many words, denies all visible church organizations, affirming that Christians have no right to organize themselves into churches. The second class does it indirectly, by affirming that all true Christians in a given locality are members of and constitute the church of that locality, without reference to their being known to each other, having recognized each other as Christians, or having agreed to be a church or to belong to a church.

The propositions above, which affirm the validity of visible church organization, are based upon a distinction between the general invisible church of Christ, and a local visible church, while these converse propositions clearly overlook and deny such distinction. To illustrate and confirm the reality of such distinction, then, will be to establish the validity of visible church organizations.

That all Christians, all who are justified by faith, are members of Christ's (general invisible) church, can not be denied; but that all belong necessarily to some local church, such as Paul referred to when he said to Philemon, "the church that is in thy house," is a very different matter. The distinction between the two is clear and marked.

1. A person becomes a member of the general invisible church by virtue of his faith in Christ, and becomes a member when he is converted; but a person becomes a member of a local visibly organized church, by being and consenting to be recognized as a member of such church.

2. A person can not cease to be a member of the general invisible church, but by ceasing to be a Christian; but a person may, and often does of necessity, cease to be a member of a local visibly organized church, by removal, and in passing from one church to another, as persons are wont to do by letter—for which we have Apostolic authority, as Paul speaks of "epistles of commendation to," and "letters of commendation from." 2 Cor. 3: 1. A church exists in one place, and in another there is no church. A pious individual resides in that place where there is no church. He belongs to no visible local church, no Christian congregation; he belongs to the church of no place on earth; and yet he belongs "to the general assembly and church of the first-born who are written in heaven." This proves that to belong to the general church and to the church in a given place are two distinct things.

3. The general invisible church cannot receive members into its own body—cannot discipline its members; men cannot take persons into or shut persons out of the general invisible church; but a local church can receive persons into or put persons out of their own body. Paul commanded the church at Corinth (1 Cor. 5: 13;) to exclude a person, when he said, "put away from among yourselves that wicked person." He must have been a member of that local church, as they had no control over those without, and could not put them away; and at the same time he could not have been a member of Christ's general spiritual invisible church, or Paul would not have commanded them to put him away, for that would have been requiring them to reject those whom Christ did not reject. Again the Apostle (2 Cor. 2: 7, 8;) commanded them concerning this same person, to forgive him

and to confirm their love towards him—which was to receive him back again, as they had put him away from among them in obedience to his former command. This proves that he had become a member of Christ's general invisible church, without becoming a member of that particular church, for Paul would not have commanded them to receive one whom Christ rejected, while his direction proves that they had not yet received him; so he must have been a member of the general invisible church, without being a member of the local church of the place where he resided. We have no right to recognize as Christians those whom Christ rejects, and to reject those whom Christ receives—which proves, beyond the power of contradiction, that persons must be members of the general invisible church first, as a condition of, and qualification for, becoming members of a local visible church, and that they must cease to be, or prove that they are not members of the general invisible church, before they cease to be members of their respective local visible churches, as a reason for disowning them and excluding them from visible membership. This appears to make the distinction plain between the visible and invisible church.

4. It may be known who belongs, and who does not belong to a local visible church. It must be known, to discharge the functions of a church, and to exercise the moral discipline which the Scriptures require. But it cannot be known, positively, who are members of the general invisible church. Some may be members of it whom we reject, and some may not be members whom we receive, as we may err in judging of the evidence presented by a good man, and be deceived by the skilful hypocrisy of a bad man. Thus we can see who belongs to a local organization called a church, but we cannot see who belongs to the general church of Christ; hence the one is called the visible church, and the other the invisible church. Into a local visible church, persons are received by being recognized as Christians, and members, in some way, by such church, on profession and public evidence; but into the invisible church persons are received by the act of God, in which he for Christ's sake forgives them their sins, and bestows on them the spirit of adoption, upon their actual repentance and genuine faith in the merits of the Lord Jesus Christ, their Mediator and Redeemer.

5. The general invisible church is one and indivisible; it is essentially a unit, and comprehends all the redeemed without distinction of periods, dispensations, races, nations, distance or place, while local visible churches are many, existing in many places, and may be composed of persons of different races and nations, speaking different languages, rendering them totally incapable of understanding and communicating with each other, unless it be through an interpreter. The doctrine of the visible unity of the church has, until recently, been considered as peculiar to papacy, but is now taken by persons in an opposite extreme, and wielded as a weapon to destroy all visible church organizations, which furnishes an instance in which the two extremes come nearest together.

6. The general invisible church, as above, is one and only one everywhere, while there may be two or more local visible churches in the same place. If all Christians in a given place necessarily constituted the church of that place, there could be but one church in a place, and that would be necessarily and absolutely one and indivisible. This would involve several difficulties. In an evenly populated country, it would be impossible to fix any limits to a church, for there would be no one place of distinctly marked limits, less

than the whole territory. It is not to be presumed that the artificial civil divisions, such as states, counties, and towns, are particularly regarded by the Holy Ghost in the organization of the church of Jesus Christ, distributing Christians in churches of different places, precisely according to these civil divisions of a country. It must therefore appear certain that no limits can be set to a church, if all the Christians of a given place are members of the church of that place, without being recognized or received by the church. Who can tell where, in the mind of God, one place ends and another begins? Suppose an island six miles square to be inhabited by Christians; it is said they constitute the church of that island. Well, suppose the island to be twenty miles long and ten broad, evenly populated by Christians; do they all still constitute the one church of that island? If not, how many churches are there? If all Christians are members of the church of their place or vicinity, without reference to formal reception or visible organization, by what rule can you determine how many churches there are on the island, and precisely where the lines run which divide them one from another? If there is still but one church, suppose the island to be a hundred miles long, and it can not be pretended that there is but one church, unless it be contended that the world contains but one church. How, then, are we to determine how many churches there are on the island, and where the lines run that divide them, without reference to visible organization? It is impossible. Take a real case: There was a church at Corinth, and another at Cenchrea, which was near to the former place—Cenchrea being a seaport of Corinth. There all the Christians in the same vicinity did not belong to the same church. But who can tell to which church those belonged, who lived halfway between Corinth and Cenchrea, which were but a few miles distant from each other, if all Christians are members of the church of their respective places, without reception or reference to visible organization?

But there may be more Christians in a given place than can meet in one assembly, and be instructed and watched over by one minister, in which case there must be two churches, two ministers, and two different congregations, which involves a visible organization, and a clear distinction between the general invisible church and a local visible church.

Again: The Christians of a given place may be of different nations, and speak languages so dissimilar as not to be able to understand each other, in which case they cannot worship and co-operate together, and must sit under a different ministry, and constitute distinct churches. Unless Christians of the same place, in such a case, form different churches, it is not possible to see what practical end can be secured in this world, by the existence of a church. There may be the English church, and the French church, and the German church, and the Welch church, and still other churches, all in the city of New York; indeed there must be, to secure the advantages of a church to all, if there are so many classes of Christians who cannot understand each other. There may, then, be more than one church in a given place, which clearly proves a distinction between the general invisible church, which is one and indivisible, and local visible churches, which are many, in various places, and may present a plurality in what is called the same place.

Will the reader not now admit that the denial of the validity of visible church organization, as explained above, is the result of overlooking the distinction between the general invisible church and a local visible church of a given place? This distinction

having been made plain, the way is prepared for more direct arguments in vindication of visible church organization.

III. Visible church organizations are essential to an efficient development of the principles, and to the attainment of the ends of Christianity in this world.

It must be difficult to see how the great ends of Christianity can be secured, as set forth in the New Testament, without such a concert of action, and combination of effort as must necessarily involve what is meant by visible organization. It should be borne in mind that this argument is not based upon any specific form of church organization, but upon its fact in some form. Visible church organization does not necessarily depend upon written creeds and disciplines for its existence. Were it contended that written disciplines are essential to the highest degree of efficiency, still it would not follow that they are essential to the existence of visible organizations. A church might exist without a record, though it would not be the most desirable state of things. Suppose, then, a number of persons in a given locality meet together as Christians; they make no record of their meeting and prepare no roll of names; they make no positive agreement to be a church, but only act towards each other in a manner which implies that they mutually acknowledge each other as Christians, and as though they believed that they were the church or a church of that place. Suppose after they had held these regular meetings for a time, two persons more should essay to join them and take part in their worship and business, and they should, in some way, treat one of them in a manner to convince him and the public that they acknowledge him to be one of them, and in some way treat the other in a manner to convince him and the public that they do not acknowledge him to be one of them; suppose further that one should take upon himself to preach when they come together, and the rest take upon themselves to hear him; it is true they make no bargain with him, but when he has preached, some two or three of the most intelligent persons invite him to preach again, and all the rest hear it, and no one objects, and he continues to preach; it is true they do not hire him, but it so happens that between them all they give him what is necessary to support him, and some one takes it upon himself to speak to others on the subject, and collect what they are willing to give for his support; suppose some one of their number commits some offense against morality, and immediately they all treat him in such a manner as convinces him and the public, that they no longer acknowledge him as one of their number; finally, they act so that it is obvious that they consider that they, a certain number of persons, known and understood, are the church or a church, and that none others but themselves belong to it; suppose all these things, and you have a visible organization. It is not constructed upon the most approved mode, but it is as much a visible organization as though it had a written discipline and a hired minister for a stipulated salary, and kept a record of all its proceedings. It differs only in form and manner of doing things, but the essential principles of a visible organization are there, and the essential acts are performed.

They have not a written agreement to associate together as a church, nor have they made a direct verbal agreement: but they have tacitly entered into such an agreement, and confirmed it over and over again by their actions. They have no written roll of members, but they know and constantly; acknowledge a certain number of persons as members, and

disown all others. They have not voted any person into or out of their association, but they have done what amounts to the same thing; they have virtually expelled one by no longer treating him as a member, and beginning to treat him as though he was not a member; and they have virtually received another, by no longer treating him as no member, and by beginning to treat him as though he were a member. It is true they do not hire a minister, or employ one by a formal vote, but they receive the services of one, and give him as much as would pay a hired minister. Where these things exist, we have a visible church organization; and where these things do not exist, there cannot be a practical and efficient development of the principles of Christianity, nor can the highest ends of Christianity in this world be attained, as will now be shown.

So far as associate action is necessary to carry out the principles of Christianity, and to secure its ends, visible organization is indispensable, for there can be no well concerted and well directed associate action, without such settled principles of organization, and such an understanding of the parties that are to co-operate, and the part they are to act, as amounts to a visible organization. A few illustrations will be sufficient to exhibit the point and force of this argument.

1. Christianity requires us to maintain rational and pure Christian fellowship, for our mutual comfort and edification; but it, is not easy to see how this can be done without coming to such a mutual understanding of what are the principles and who are the qualified subjects of Christian fellowship, as will mark our constant and permanent fellowship by the limits of a distinctly marked and visible association, the members of which are known, in contradistinction from all others who are not members. It may be said that those who insist on visible church organization, do not confine their fellowship to those who are members of such an organization with themselves. This is true; and it is no doubt the duty of Christians to extend and enjoy Christian fellowship beyond their own circle or visible church relations, as proper objects and occasions present themselves. But calls for these acts are only occasional and incidental; but such occasional acts are not a discharge of the general duty of maintaining constant fellowship, which cannot be done, only through the more settled arrangements of organized society.

2. Nearly allied to the duty of maintaining Christian fellowship, is that of keeping ourselves separate from sinners. We are commanded to "come out from among them," and to "be separate." (2 Cor. 6: 17.) This forbids us to fellowship sinners. The design, doubtless is not only to escape the contagion of corrupt morals, but to make the separation between the church and the world distinct and visible, and therefore make the light and piety of the church more powerful in reproofing sin than they would be if they were indiscriminately mingled together. This command cannot be obeyed, and this end cannot be secured, only by making the separation between the church and the world clear and marked, not only to their own eyes but also to the eyes of the world, enabling every beholder to say this man is one of them, and that man is not one of them; and this cannot be attained but by a visible organization, into which persons are received, and from which they are excluded, not only in fact, but in the use of some visible form.

3. Mutual watch care, instruction, and support are one great object which Christianity seeks to secure by the institution of a church and church relations. These are confined to the church, and the Gospel makes provision for their enjoyment only within the pale of the church. Acts 20: 17, 28; "And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church, and said unto them: take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God." They were made overseers not of the world, but of the church; to feed, not the world but the church of God. This shows that though it is the duty of Ministers and Christians to strive to enlighten and warn sinners, and do all they can to bring them to a knowledge of the truth, yet mutual watch care, instruction, and support are provided for by the Gospel only within the pale of the church, and to render the mutual duties and privileges involved distinct and clear, the relations must be rendered distinct by making the church a distinct and visible body, a visible organization.

4. The Gospel requires us to maintain regular and orderly assemblies for public worship, at proper places and seasons, which must require such pre-concerted arrangements; such a settlement of general principles in relation to place, time, and order; such an appointment of managers or officers, and such a discharge of official duties on the part of some individuals, who must act for and in behalf of the whole, as cannot be attained only by a well defined and visible organization. For the maintenance of the worship of God we have not only the example of the pious in all ages, but the clear injunctions of the word of God. Promises are made with reference to devotional assemblies, and precepts require us to maintain them. Matt. 18: 20; "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." This text clearly implies the existence of organized Christian society. No one can suppose that this promise has reference to a mere accidental meeting of two or three disciples who may happen to cross each other's path at the same time and place, as they are pursuing after other objects. To claim the promise there must not only be a gathering together, an actual meeting, but it must be in the name of Christ, which implies previous arrangement and associate action, for the joint maintenance of Christian worship and fellowship. Heb. 10: 25; "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another, and so much the more as ye see the day approaching." This is a positive command, for the maintenance of social meetings for mutual Christian improvement, which can never be carried out without concert of action, and previous arrangements in relation to time and place, and rules for the government of the assembly when in actual session, all of which taken together, constitute what is meant by a visible organization.

It is too plain to need proof that a congregation cannot assemble regularly for the worship of God, and the transaction of such business as is necessary for the maintenance of the worship of God, without an organization so far as is implied in the selecting of officers, determining who belong to the congregation and who do not, in a sense to give them a right to take part in its proceedings, and the settling among themselves what the Scriptures require, and what they do not require, in order to rational, orderly, and spiritual worship.

5. The maintenance of a healthy moral discipline is, beyond all doubt, required by the Gospel, and is one of the important ends for which churches are instituted. As this will be involved in a subsequent argument, in another form, it need not be enlarged upon here; it is enough to say that discipline cannot be exercised and maintained, only so far as the church is a distinct and visible association, rendering it plain who are within, and who are without its pale. The church is bound to exercise discipline over those "within," but has nothing to do "to judge those without." (1 Cor. 5: 12, 13.) This cannot be done unless members are visibly received and visibly excluded, by a visible act or decision of the church, and this renders the church a visible organization.

6. The spread of the truth and the conversion of the world are leading objects of organized Christianity. We do not mean that the character and responsibility of the individual Christian is lost in the organism, but that the organism is the medium of concentrating, combining, and giving greater efficiency to the efforts of individual Christians. The Gospel enjoins private duties, as praying in secret; and personal and social duties, as to our families and neighbors; but it does not contemplate the conversion of the world by the discharge of these duties alone. When it looks forth to the conversion of the world, it contemplates associate and combined effort; and to have well directed associate action, there must be visible associations, with visible organs or agencies, which the actors can see, and upon which they can lay their hands, and guide their means and efforts along their way to their intended results; and this cannot be, but through visible church organizations.

"How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent?" (Rom. 10: 14, 15.) And we may ask, how shall all this exist without such action on the part of the church as necessarily involves organization? If men are sent to preach the Gospel to the heathen world, they must be sent by somebody; and we know no one proper to send persons with the important message of the Gospel, unless it be God or his church. Well, we think it will not be maintained that God sends men, or has sent men since Paul was sent, only through the agency of the church in some form; and it is not possible to see how the church can do it, without assuming a visible form, and performing an organic act, which involves a visible organization. Our next argument will be founded upon specific Scriptural examples and directions for receiving persons into the church.

IV. The Scriptures provide for visible church organization, by furnishing rules for receiving members into the Church.

If all believers are members of the local church where they reside, without any for mal-reception or recognition by the church, then it must follow that the church has no power to receive or to exclude, and further, that there can be no such thing as a visible association or organization called a church. On the other hand, if members become such by any visible act of reception or recognition, on the part of the church, there must of necessity be a visible organization into which they are received.

We say, then, that the Scriptures contain examples, and distinctly lay down rules for the reception of members into the church. The visible church of any place, as it was in Jerusalem, must be a well-known, distinct body. Acts 2: 41; "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Verse 47; "And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved. The expressions, "added unto them" and "the Lord added to the church," suppose some public form, or some method of recognition in which it was done. It is not possible otherwise to see how the fact of their additions could be distinctly known and recorded. Acts 4: 23; "And being let go, they went to their own company, and reported all that the chief priests and elders had said unto them." This proves that the church at this period, even in its infancy, was a distinct body known to its own members. Acts 5: 12, 13; "And they were all with one accord in Solomon's porch, and of the rest durst no man join himself unto them." This is very clear proof that, at that time, the church was a distinct company to become a member of which required some open, voluntary act.

Acts 9: 26, 27, 28; "And when Saul was come to Jerusalem, he essayed to join himself to the disciples; but they were afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple. But Barnabas took him and brought him to the Apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus. And he was with them coming in and going out at Jerusalem." Here we have recorded a mere incident which arose out of the natural operation of society; and similar incidents are liable to occur in every church, and in every country where churches may be planted. Upon it, let it be remarked :

1. That Saul was a Christian, and belonged to the universal invisible church of Christ, at the same time that the particular church at Jerusalem refused to receive him and rejected him.
2. The transaction proves, beyond a doubt, that there is a discretionary power lodged in the church, to receive or reject persons, and that in order to receive them, some evidence of faith must be exhibited, more than a mere profession on the part of the candidate. Paul professed to be a disciple, but they would not receive him upon that. He doubtless should have had letters from the brethren in Damascus, but the manner in which he fled for his life from that city, being let down by the wall in a basket at night, probably led to the omission; but he secured a witness in Barnabas, and was received on his testimony and recommendation—he relating his experience. The church at Jerusalem no doubt acted right; they ought not to have received Saul without some proof beyond his own declaration or profession—and all churches may feel safe in following this primitive example.
3. The transaction furnishes the most satisfactory illustration of the practical distinction between being a Christian, and being a member of some visible local Christian church. Paul was a Christian; Christ had received him—and between him and his God this was sufficient. But between him and the church at Jerusalem it availed him nothing. Of that he was not a member; therein he could enjoy no immunities until, by producing

satisfactory evidence that Christ had received him, he could induce them to receive him. These incidents, so small in themselves, which the Holy Ghost has been careful to record, on examination, are found to settle the fundamental principles of church organization. So much for examples; now let attention be given to directions.

Rom. 14: 1; "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations." Here is instruction who to receive into the church, and who not to receive. The meaning appears to be that those who were weak in faith, or had doubts about meats and drinks, but were not contentious, should be received; but those whose opinions were such as to produce disputations about doubtful matters should not be received.

Gal. 6: 1; "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." By restoring such a one, must be understood the act of receiving the person back to the fellowship of the church. It cannot mean a positive spiritual restoration or deliverance from guilt, upon the principle of Popish absolution, and hence must mean a formal and visible restoration to the society and fellowship of the visible church. It supposes that the person by his fault has lost his privileges, and that he has repented of the wrong, upon which they are required to restore him. The text does not appear to refer to a special case, but asserts a general direction, and must be regarded as a rule for taking fallen persons back into the fellowship of the church, and this idea necessarily involves a visible organization.

2. John 10: "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." On this text it must be necessary to remark that it does not forbid acts of humanity to the worst infidel or heretic in the world. The receiving and bidding him God speed is forbidden as a religious act; we may feed and lodge a heretic, as a needy sufferer, but we must not do it as an act of Christian fellowship. The text supposes the person to come to us as a Christian, claiming to be a Christian, and to profess to hold and teach the Christian doctrine, while he actually holds and teaches fundamental error. Such an one we may not receive into our Christian fellowship; we are bound to reject him. This settles a rule to be observed in receiving persons into the church. Persons are received on two grounds; first, on the ground of conversion or reformation; and secondly, by emigration from other Christian communities. The text relates to the latter case, and proves that persons are to be received or rejected on application. There is no way in which this can be done without a visible organization. An individual can receive an applicant or reject him, so far as to answer all his private opinions and purposes; but this is a matter that concerns the whole church, and upon which they need to act collectively. If each acted separately in a given case, different conclusions would be arrived at, and some would be deceived for want of the information others might possess, and one would fellowship those whom others would reject. The case, then, must be presented to the church collectively, and in order to this it must be known who compose the church, and have a right to act; and this amounts to a visible organization.

V. The Scriptures further provide for visible church organization by furnishing rules and examples for excluding persons from the church.

The Scriptures clearly enjoin the duty, and point out the manner of disciplining and excommunicating, or withdrawing fellowship from church members, for disorderly and unchristian conduct. If all true Christians are members of the church where they are, necessarily and without a visible formal reception by the church, and if none but Christians in heart can be members of the church, which must follow the former position, then there can be no such thing as receiving or excluding members. As a person becomes a member of the church, without any act of receiving him by the church, by becoming a Christian—so by ceasing to maintain a Christian life and character he must, upon the same principle cease to be a member of the church without discipline, and the act of excommunicating him or disowning him on the part of the church. But does this accord with the word of God? Let an answer be furnished from the Scriptures themselves.

Matt. 18: 15, 16,17; "Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church, but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." This text is decisive in proof of the necessity of Christian organization. The duty here enjoined cannot be discharged, unless there is a body here called "the church," to whom the appeal of the injured brother is to be made.

1. The term church, in this text, cannot mean all Christians, for an individual cannot tell his complaint to the universal church, or all the Christians in the world. It must therefore refer to a local church, of prescribed and understood limits or numbers. If there are not essential visible organizations composed of an understood number of persons, no man can know who composes the church in any given place, and hence he cannot comply with the Saviour's direction, "tell it to the church," or he can never know when he has complied with this direction. A man cannot know when he has told it to the church, unless he knows who compose the church, and he cannot know who compose the church, unless there be a visible organization of an understood number of persons constituting the church; therefore the direction of the Savior implies essential visible church organization.

2. The force of this cannot be turned aside by a criticism on the word *ekklesia*, here rendered *church*. This word is derived from the Greek verb *ekkaleo*, which; signifies to *convoke*, hence *ekklesia* primarily signifies an assembly or congregation, and has been rendered "church" only in those cases where it obviously means a Christian assembly or association. Now suppose we were to give it a literal translation in the text, and make it read, "tell it to the (*ekklesia*) congregation;" it would not lessen the proof it furnishes in support of a real visible organization. The very directions given suppose that there is a congregation of Christian brethren, of which the trespasser and the person upon whom the trespass is committed are members; for unless they are both members of the

congregation, it cannot be seen what they have to do with the difficulty. This supposes that the congregation is composed of an understood number of persons; otherwise it could not be known who are members and who are not. This follows also from the reason urged above, that unless it be understood who compose the congregation, the injured person cannot know when he has complied with the direction of Christ, cannot know when he has told it to the congregation. The direction supposes also that there is not only a congregation of understood limits, but that such a congregation is in the habit of meeting, not only for worship, but to hear and judge of complaints, and hence that it has the power of moral discipline; and as the only penalty named, is to let the offender be unto us as a heathen man and a publican—that is, reject him from the association, refusing to own him as one of the number composing the congregation that act on his case—it is clear that the congregation is composed of persons known to each other, and definite in number. If it is not known who compose the congregation, there could be no force in the act of rejecting a person, implied in the words, "let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." Thus it is seen that, understanding the term rendered church in the most general sense, the directions given by Christ still imply the existence of real visible Christian organizations, possessing the power of moral discipline over their own members.

1 Cor. 5: 12, 13; "For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. There-fore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." The meaning of this text appears to be this: It does not belong to me to judge them without, who are not members of the church; but you claim the right to judge them within, who are members of the church, while those without are left to the judgment of God. Therefore, because you have a right to judge those who belong to the church, put away that wicked person from among you by expelling him from the church. The directions related to a particular person concerning whom the Apostle had been writing, who had committed a great sin. The text as clearly as possible involves the act of trying, judging, and excluding upon conviction, and they are not in this case commanded to withdraw from him, but to put him away from among them, which could be done in no other way than but by expelling him from the church.

Titus 3: 10; "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition reject." This is a plain direction for disciplining a church member for holding and teaching false doctrines. He must be admonished twice, and then if he persists in his heresy he must be rejected, which can mean nothing else than exclusion from the fellowship of the church.

Gal. 5: 12; "I would they were cut off which trouble you." There can be but one reasonable interpretation put upon this text, and that is, that the apostle wished those troublesome persons cut off from the church, in the sense of excommunication. It cannot be supposed that he (Paul) wished them cut off from life in their sins. To wish them dead, would be more than any will be likely to attribute to the apostle. If, then, the apostle wishes them cut off from the church by excommunication, one or two consequences follow, viz:

1. They were not Christians, were not accepted by Christ; and it follows, beyond the power of contradiction, that persons did then belong to the visible church who were not accepted of Christ.

2. If it be maintained that they were accepted of Christ, to escape the above conclusion, then it must follow that Paul wished to reject and cut off from the church those whom Christ received. This would prove that persons were received into the church, not simply on the ground of their acceptance with God, but upon their visible conformity to visible rules and good order. The no-organizationist can take which horn of the dilemma he pleases.

2 John 10: "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him Godspeed." This text can not mean that we are not to shelter and feed a bad man, but only that we are not to receive him as a Christian, or as a Christian teacher, and allow him to preach his false doctrines in our house. And it cannot be overlooked that the text involves the right and duty of judging of the doctrines men teach, and of rejecting them if they do not hold the truth which covers the whole ground of moral discipline.

Rev. 2: 14, 15; "But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast them there that hold the doctrine of Balaam. So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes." Here again a church is charged as in fault for not having exercised a proper discipline by rejecting corrupt persons. It is believed the argument has been sustained, and need not be further pursued.

SECTION II.

Church Government—the Rights of the Laity.

I. The Scriptures contain the fundamental principles of church government.

There are two extremes into which writers on church polity often fall. High church men insist that the Scriptures absolutely settle the form of church government, and that Episcopacy, by a succession from the apostles, is that form. This is one extreme. The other is a denial that the Scriptures prescribe any form of church government. This position is very convenient for those who have adopted forms which have no warrant from Scripture. By denying that the Scriptures prescribe any form, they insist that the form of government is left to the church, to suit itself in the matter, and hence infer that theirs is just as Scriptural as any other form can be. This is no less an extreme and no less an error than the high church position, as it will equally justify any form of church government, from the most absolute Independency to the most absolute Popery. The high church doctrine, presenting a specific form of church government, must be considered elsewhere; but this general denial that the Scriptures prescribed any form, needs to be considered in this place, before entering upon the consideration of specific forms. If it be true that the Scriptures prescribe no form, then all forms are alike Scriptural or unscriptural, and the controversy about the comparative Scriptural merits of the different

forms is at an end. To present the subject in its true light, a few extracts on the point under consideration are here given, from writers who maintain that the Scriptures are silent on the subject of the form of church government. These quotations are made from a late work on Church Polity, by Rev. Abel Stevens, A. M. Mr. Stevens has so managed as to express his views by quoting the language of others, so that by quoting his opinion, we at the same time get the opinions of most of the principal writers on the same side of the question. Mr. Stevens says:

"Methodists believe, generally, that no particular form of ecclesiastical polity is of divine prescription, and that, therefore, the mode of governing the church is left to its own discretion and the exigencies, of time and place. Bishop Emory says, (quoting substantially the language of Dr. Campbell), 'That no form of polity can plead such an exclusive charter as that phrase (divine right), in its present acceptation, is understood to imply; that the claim is clearly the offspring of sectarian bigotry and ignorance. This we may say with freedom, that if a particular form of polity had been essential to the church, it would have been laid down in a different manner in the sacred books/—[Epis. Can., p. 41.

"Dr. Bangs says: 'No specific form of church government is prescribed in the Scripture, and, therefore, it is left to the discretion of the church to regulate these matters as the exigencies of time, place, and circumstances shall dictate to be most expedient, and likely to accomplish the greatest amount of good: always avoiding any and everything which God has prohibited. —[Orig. Ch., No. xiii.

"Watson, adopting the language of Bishop Tomline, says: 'As it has not pleased our Almighty Father to prescribe any particular form of government for the security of temporal comforts to his rational creatures, so neither has he prescribed any particular form of ecclesiastical polity as absolutely necessary to the attainment of eternal happiness. Thus the gospel only lays down general principles, and leaves the application of them to men as free agents.'—[Th. Inst. vol. ii., p. 585.

"Finally, Wesley himself, says: "As to my own judgment, I still believe the Episcopal form of church government to be Scriptural and apostolical. I mean, well agreeing with the practice and writings of the apostles. But that it is prescribed in Scripture, I do not believe. This opinion, which I once zealously espoused, I have been heartily ashamed of ever since I read Bishop Stillingfleet's Irenicum. I think he has unanswerably proved that neither Christ nor his apostles prescribed any particular form of church government, and that the plea of the divine right of episcopacy was never heard of in the primitive church.'— [Letter to Clarke, Works, vol. vii. p. 284.

"Bishop Tomline, says, 'Though I flatter myself that I have proved episcopacy to be an apostolical institution, yet I readily acknowledge that there is no precept in the New Testament which commands that every church should be governed by bishops.'

"Dr. Low says, 'No certain form of government is prescribed in the word, only general rules laid down for it.'—[Iren., p. 417.

Bishop Bridges declares, 'God hath not expressed the form of church government, at least not so as to bind us to it.'—[Iren., p. 417.

"If we come lower, to the time of King James, his majesty himself, declared in print as his judgment, 'It is granted to every Christian king, prince, and commonwealth, to prescribe, within its own jurisdiction, that eternal form of church government which approaches as much as possible to its own form of civil administration.'—[Iren., p. 417.

In addition to these considerations we have the decisive fact, that the Holy Scriptures do not contain a single injunction respecting the form of church government. They state the general principles of moral discipline; but, as we have shown by many high Episcopal authorities, they nowhere prescribe the forms and gradation of ecclesiastical offices."

The above extracts are all taken from Mr. Stevens' book, and may be found on pages 9,11,12, 15,16,18, 19.

Some of these extracts assert important truths, and others make important concessions in regard to Episcopacy, as not existing by divine right; yet some of them assert dangerous errors, and as a whole, they are calculated to obscure rather than make plain the question under consideration. A few remarks may serve to present the subject in a clear point of light.

1. The extracts clearly show, on the part of their authors, an entire abandonment of all claim that the form of church polity which they support, is based upon any Scriptural command; and it follows, according to their own confession, that it might be exchanged for a different form of polity without any violation of Scripture principles. This is important in its practical bearing on the controversy; for, to be consistent, in defending their church polity they must rely exclusively upon such arguments as are drawn from expediency and convenience.
2. The doctrine of the extracts cannot be admitted as generally true, only of the less important details of church polity; the fundamental principles of church organization and church government are, beyond all question, clearly taught and enjoined in the New Testament. If no principles of church government are made obligatory, and none forbidden in the Scriptures, then all appeal to the Scriptures in support of this form, and in condemnation of that, is out of the question, and Popery, Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and Congregationalism are all alike admissible, so far as any Scriptural law is concerned. If the Scriptures do make certain principles of church government obligatory and forbid others, they prescribe some form of church polity. What that form is, will hereafter be considered.
3. The extracts contain some obvious errors, which need to be specifically pointed out. The following is one instance: "It is granted to every Christian king, prince, and commonwealth to prescribe, within its own jurisdiction, that external form of church government which approaches as much as possible to its own form of civil administration." This quotation from King James asserts what none will or can admit, except such

as are in favor of a state religion, the forms of which shall be imposed by civil law. If admitted, it would prove the point aimed at; but such a concession to civil authority in matters of religion, is a dear way of proving that the Scriptures have not prescribed any form of church polity.

But why are so many able authors so anxious to make it appear that the Scriptures prescribe no form of church polity. The reason is plain. They feel that their own form of church polity cannot be sustained by the Scriptures, and to cover this defect, and to shield themselves from the assaults of the high church men, who contend for episcopacy juredivino, and from the more to be feared attacks of those who insist that the Scriptures prescribe a more liberal polity than episcopacy, in which the laity have a voice in matters pertaining to government, they assert that no form is prescribed in the Scriptures, from which it must follow that theirs is just as Scriptural as any other.

The truth appears to be this: the fundamental principles of church polity are found in the Scriptures, but the mode of carrying them out, in much of the detail, is left to the discretion of the church, as time and circumstances shall demand. A brief statement of the leading principles which may be regarded as settled by the Scriptures, must close this section.

Church government supposes rules, and the administration of rules, implying a legislative or rule-making power, and administrative officers. The legislative or rule-making power embraces two points: first, the right of determining what the Scriptures teach—for Christ is the only legislator of the church, and the Scriptures are her only law-book, so far as Christ has legislated for us. The second point in legislative power embraces the right of settling those matters which are not fundamental, but merely economical and prudential, and which are not settled by the Scriptures but are left to the discretion of the church, to be instituted and changed as circumstances may require, so that nothing be ordained which the Scriptures forbid, and nothing be neglected which the Scriptures command. These points have been fully discussed in the first section, and need not be reviewed. The administration of rules supposes administrators, and administrators supposes an appointment to office, and, of course, an appointing power somewhere. The right of church government, with whomsoever this right is found, includes both the legislative and administrative power, it being the right of saying what shall be the rules of government, and the right of administering them, or of saying by whom they shall be administered.

There are two fundamental principles which must enter into every church organization to render it Scriptural, and which may be regarded as settled by the Scriptures.

1. The right of the laity to judge for themselves what the Scriptures teach, what duties they require, what additional prudential rules are necessary, and by whom they shall be administered among them, and of determining who shall be their religious teachers, may be regarded as settled by the Scriptures.

2. The Scriptures absolutely require of every church, in every land and age, and under all circumstance, that a belief in the fundamental doctrines of the gospel and the practice of its pure morality be made conditions of church fellowship.

There are other fundamental principles which pertain to the ministry, but they belong to another branch of the subject. The question of church government is now under consideration, only so far as the laity is concerned.

II. The rights and responsibilities of church government are essentially with the laity.

By this proposition we do not mean that ministers have nothing to do in the government of the church; they have an important part to act in it; but we mean that they have a right to act in the government of a church, only in conjunction with the church and as the officer and executive minister of the church made such by the consent and free choice of the church.

It is the right of the laity to judge for themselves what the Scriptures teach, what duties they require, what additional prudential rules are necessary, by whom they shall be administered among them, and who shall be their religious teachers. The substance of this is, the laity have the right of self-government, and are not placed by the gospel under a government exclusively clerical, without power to enact their own rules, and to appoint their own officers to administer them.

The points here to be established are, that churches in their independent position must possess the right of making their own rules, receiving and disciplining their own members, and of electing their own pastors; and that, in any association or more general connection that may be entered into, there must be such a lay representation as will enable the laity still to retain in their own hands the right and power of self-government. This follows from the principles laid down, and the arguments advanced on the subject of church organization in the first section; but it is proper not to leave them to be inferred from principles there discussed, but to give them here, in the proper place, a more full consideration and confirmation. The argument will embrace two points, viz: What the Scriptures teach on the subject, and what is the doctrine of the earliest and best ecclesiastical writers.

1. We appeal to the Scriptures, and insist that they clearly teach the doctrine in question, and will first introduce a few texts which give to the laity the power of discipline, including the right to receive and exclude members, according to the law of Christ.

Matt. 18: 15-17; "Moreover, if thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican."

This is the only explicit rule which Christ has given us for the adjustment of personal difficulties between members of the same church, and it is too plain to be misunderstood. The case is not brought before the "bishop, elder, deacon or preacher;" it is to be told to the church—that is, the congregation of Christians. This shows that a church is one congregation, meeting in one place. It also clearly contemplates, so far at least as control of the question of membership is concerned, a purely congregational government.

Rom. 16: 17; "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrines which ye have learned, and avoid them,"

This text proves that the power of discipline is lodged with the church. To mark and avoid, in the sense of the text, must mean that application of discipline which separates offending members from the fellowship of the church, and this is as far as church discipline can go. Now as this application of discipline is to be made by the church, as the apostle urges the church to this work, the right and power of discipline must be in the hands of the church and not in the hands of the ministry.

1 Cor. 5: 7; "Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump."

This is a figurative expression, by which the apostle absolutely commanded them to exclude from their communion a certain corrupt member. What shows that the power to do it rested with them, is, his severe rebuke for not having done it. Their power or right to expel this corrupt person did not depend upon his command to do it, because in connection with the command he finds fault with them because they have not already done it. This view the preceding verses fully sustain.

2 Thes. 3: 6; "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly."

"Withdrawing from a brother means nothing more nor less than excluding him from our church fellowship. This the brethren, the church, were required to do, and of course they must have held the power of discipline in their own hands.

The above texts have been produced as specimens of the many which teach that each local church possesses the right and power of discipline, and are bound to exercise it. These Scriptures teach that the church is held responsible for the truth of the gospel preached among them, and for the purity of their own body, which could not be true without the right of choosing their own teachers, and of disciplining their own members.

Having proved that churches have the right and power of discipline over their own members, it shall next be shown that they have the right of electing their own pastors or religious teachers, and of judging for themselves of their qualifications. When it is said that a church has the right of judging for itself of the qualifications of a minister, the meaning is not that one church can the judge for another, but only for itself. A church may judge that a man cannot serve them to advantage, and yet another church may judge him to be the very man to entertain and profit them, and both churches may at the same

time decide correctly, on account of the different characters that compose the two churches, and the different circumstances that attend them.

But to the proof that laymen possess the rights and powers in question. The first case to which we will refer, is the election of Matthias to take the place of Judas. This was the first ecclesiastical act performed after the ascension of the Master, and is recorded Acts 1. Let us look at the facts in the case. They were in an upper room where the eleven apostles abode, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and his brethren. (Verses 13,14). By brethren, here, we are probably to understand our Lord's disciples, who had been with him and adhered to him during all the vicissitudes of his life and the scenes of his death. That the company of his disciples were present is clear from what is recorded in verse 15, which reads as follows:

"And in those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples, and said, (the number of the names together were about a hundred and twenty,) men and brethren."

There were, then, one hundred and twenty persons present. Let it be understood that the address of Peter was to this whole company. The object of the address is; stated in verses 21 and 22, as follows:

"Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection
:

In verses 23-26 we have the result, upon which the argument depends, as follows:

"And they appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias. And they prayed, and said, Thou Lord, which knoweth the hearts of all men, show whether of these two thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place. And they gave forth their lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles."

The point proved by all this, is that the disciples, the one hundred and twenty were addressed by Peter, and that they, the one hundred and twenty, appointed the two candidates. Thus did laymen select the first high officer appointed in the church after the ascension of Christ. We have the opinion of Dr. Clarke that the company of disciples participated in this transaction, which possesses additional force from the incidental manner in which it is introduced. On verse 23 he says, "It is likely the disciples themselves were divided in opinion which of these two was the most proper person, and therefore laid the matter before God. No more than two candidates were presented; probably because the attention of the brethren had been drawn to these two alone." This shows that in his opinion the transaction was the work of the whole company. In speaking of the address of Peter, verse 15, Dr. Clarke says. "It was not among the disciples merely

that he stood, but among the whole company, which amounted to one hundred and twenty."

On the subject of the "lots," which were used on the occasion, Dr. Clarke remarks, as follows, verse 25: "It is possible that the whole was decided by what we commonly call ballot, God inclining the hearts of the majority to ballot for Matthias." Now all these remarks are entirely inconsistent with the belief that the whole was a clerical transaction, aside from any participation of the laity.

The case, then, we think is clear, that an appeal was made to the laity for the settlement of the first question that arose in the Christian church after the Savior ascended on high, and the movement was made, too, by a leading apostle, who had received the promise that the Spirit should guide him into all truth.

The second transaction to which we will refer is recorded in the sixth chapter of Acts. A murmur arose on the part of the Grecian disciples because their widows were neglected. To this murmur the apostles responded by calling the multitude of the disciples, to whom, after excusing themselves from the burden of attending to the business, they gave the following directions.

"Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business."

From this it is clear that the people selected their own officers. But it has been supposed by some that the apostles reserved the right of appointing them, as they say, "Whom we may appoint over this business." Admitting all that can reasonably be claimed on this ground, still the text fully proves the point for which we contend. If the ex-ample of the apostles in the appointing of these men be binding, then the example of their election by the people is no less binding. Therefore, if it be insisted that the people have not the right of constituting church officers, without the sanction of the ministry, it can with equal propriety be insisted that the ministry cannot constitute them without the election of the people. The latter position is certainly the strongest one of the two, from the fact that the apostles sustained a different and more commanding relation to the church than ministers do or can sustain to the church now. They had received a commission personally from Jesus Christ, and were divinely inspired to organize the church, and settle its government; and if they, clad in the authority of this special commission, with their minds enlightened by the spirit of inspiration, submitted it to the people to select their own officers, how much more must this right pertain to them now, when ministers can make no more pretension to inspiration than the laity?

It may be remarked that the appointment of the apostles in the case under consideration can be considered as embracing only two points, both of which are consistent with the general right of the laity to the same voice and control which they exercised in this case.

(1.) The apostolic sanction of the creation of the new office is implied. This might appear even necessary under their high commission and inspiration, without affecting the

question of laymen's rights under a ministry who can claim neither the commission or inspiration of the apostles.

(2.) The appointment of the apostles, after the election by the people, may be viewed in the light of an induction into the office to which the people had elected the persons thus inducted. The transaction does not necessarily imply more than this, and this is consistent with the absolute right of election on the part of the people. What adds to the force of all this, is the actual choice of officers on the occasion by the people, in accordance with the express direction of the apostles.

We have now produced two instances of popular elections in the apostolic church, embracing the first two cases of appointment to office that occurred after our Lord's ascension, which we think is sufficient to settle the question of the constitution of the church on this point. When officers were wanted, the apostles, who were commissioned to organize the church, told the people to select those officers for themselves, from their own ranks, and the right thus to elect their officers must belong to them, or the apostles must have violated their trust, by suffering, yea, directing the people to do what they had no right to do. He who denies the former must admit the latter.

In the Acts of the Apostles 15: 1-31, we have a transaction recorded which bears directly upon the question. We will not fill space by quoting the whole chapter, and will only state briefly the principal points, referring to the particular verses relied upon as proof.

(1.) An important difference of opinion existed, and a discussion arose at Antioch. The main question was, whether or not the Gentile converts were required to be circumcised, but this question doubtless was regarded as involving the perpetuity or abrogation of the whole Mosaic Ritual. (Verses 1, 2.)

(2.) It was determined that a deputation should be sent to Jerusalem to lay the subject before the apostles and elders. This deputation consisted of "Paul and Barnabas, and certain others of them." (Verse 2.) Who these certain others were not clear, but from Gal. 2: 1-5, it is probable that Titus was one of them, who must have been a young convert at this time. The mission was undertaken at the expense of the church, for they were "brought on their way by the church." (Verse 3.)

(3.) "When they were come to Jerusalem, they, were received by the church, and of the apostles and elders." (Verse 4) The church had as much to do with their reception as had the apostles and elders.

(4.) The question was brought before the apostles and elders and the whole multitude for adjudication. That it was brought before the apostles and elders is proved by verse 6. That it was equally brought before the whole church and discussed by them, as by a deliberative body, is proved by verse 12. "Then all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul." That the multitude participated in the discussion, is proved by a comparison of verses 7 and 12. The former says, "There had been much

disputing," while the latter says, "then all the multitude kept silence." Their keeping silence in the 12th verse, is the antithesis of the much discussion in the 7th verse.

(5.) After Paul and Barnabas had concluded their remarks, James summed up the whole subject, and stated his judgment in the case, which appears to have been satisfactory to all. (Verses 13-21, but 19 and 20 in particular.) There is the same proof that the church consented to this decision that there is that the other apostles did.

(6.) They all unite in communicating their judgment to the church at Antioch. Verse 22: "Then pleased it the apostles, and elders, and the *whole church* to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; namely, Judas surnamed Barnabas, and Silas, *chief men among the brethren.*" The whole church sent these men, as much as the apostles and elders did.

(7.) They all joined in a written statement of the decision which they sent by them. Verse 23: "And they wrote letters by them after this manner: The apostles, and elders, and brethren send greeting, unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia." Note, this letter was from the *brethren* at Jerusalem as well as from the apostles, and was addressed to the *brethren* at Antioch, and not to the ministers.

(8.) The deputation, when they arrived at Antioch, delivered the letter to the church, who proceeded to read it. Verses 30, 31: "They came to Antioch, and when they had gathered the multitude together, they delivered the epistle; which when they had read, they rejoiced for the consolation." In this transaction was settled the first great theological question that came up for discussion, after the Master had retired from the world to his throne, and in its settlement it is clear that the laity had as much to do as did the ministry. This fact, that the apostles, who were divinely inspired to settle the principles of church government, submitted the question to the consideration of the brethren, is conclusive evidence that this was the plan upon which the church was organized, and upon which it should be governed. The reason for such a course now, when ministers are not inspired, is much stronger than it could have been then, when ministers were inspired. What right can the ministry have to take away from the laity what was so clearly granted to them by inspired men, whose actions are admitted to have been authoritative? We trow not.

Acts 18: 27; "And when he [Apollos] was disposed to pass into Achaia, the brethren wrote, exhorting the disciples to receive him: who, when he was come, helped them much which had believed through grace."

The letter here given was a recommendation as a Christian teacher, and, in giving such a letter, they assumed the right of judging for themselves of his Christian character and of his ministerial qualifications. This right was doubtless assumed and exercised in this case by laymen. There is not the slightest intimation that his was a letter emanating from clerical authority. The letter was also clearly addressed to laymen, and not to some presiding minister, having "charge of all the elders and deacons, traveling and local preachers, and exhorters in his district."

2 Cor. 3: 1; "Or need we, as some others, epistles of commendation to you, or letters of commend from you?"

The text clearly proves two things, viz:

(1.) Letters of commendation to and from churches were necessary for some other ministers. The expression, "need we as some others," clearly proves that others did need such letters.

(2.) The right to give and receive such letters is most clearly ceded to the church in the text. The apostle does not intimate that they had not a right to give, and receive such letters when given by other churches, nor does he intimate that they are not necessary for "some others," but only intimates that such letters were not necessary for him and his fellow apostles. They were commissioned by Christ, and had the power of working miracles, which was a sufficient recommendation wherever they went, but others needed letters of recommendation.

From the two points made out above, a very clear conclusion follows. As such letters were given and received by the apostolic churches, and as the right of giving and receiving them belonged to the churches, it follows that the local churches had the right of judging for themselves on the subject of ministerial qualifications and character. The very act of recommending a minister, is the act of expressing our judgment concerning him, and the right to do this includes the right of judgment in the case. This, we see, originally belonged to laymen.

1 John 4: 1; "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirit, whether it be of God, because many false prophets have gone out into the world."

Trying the spirits here clearly means judging between true and false teachers. Those who are required to do this must have the right of judging what is truth and what is error; to them must belong the right of settling the doctrines of the creed. But this duty of judging between false and true teachers is, in the text, clearly imposed upon laymen, embracing those whom the apostle calls little children, young men, and fathers. Chap. 2: 12,13.

2 John 10: "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not unto your house, neither bid him God speed."

This text is precisely the character of the last, so far as its bearing upon the question is concerned. The duty enjoined is, to judge and reject a false teacher, on account of his defection in doctrine. This duty includes the right of judging what the true doctrine is, and what is false doctrine, and as it is here urged upon the church, not the ministry, it follows that the laity are judges of the doctrines of the Gospel, and are charged with the important work of preserving them pure.

2. The views above drawn from the Scriptures are sustained by the best ecclesiastical writers. A few extracts follow from a work entitled "A Church without a Bishop, by Lyman Coleman, author of the Antiquities of the Christian Church. Mr. Coleman says:

"The brethren chose their own officers from among themselves. Or if, in the first organization of the churches, their officers were appointed by the apostles, it was with the approbation of the members of the same."—[Page 12, 20.

"So universal was the right of suffrage, and so reasonable, that it attracted the notice of the Emperor, Alexander Severus, who reigned from A. D. 222 to 235. In imitation of the custom of Christians and Jews in the appointment of their priests, as he says, he gave the people the right of rejecting the appointment of any procurator, or chief president of the provinces, whom he might appoint to such office. Their votes, however, in these cases, were not merely testimonial, but really judicial and elective."

"There are on record instances in which the people, of their own accord, and by acclamation, elected individuals to the office of bishop or presbyter, without any previous nomination. Ambrose, bishop of Milan, was elected in this manner A. D. 374." —[Page 67.

Our author gives a list of others elected in the same way, which we omit. He makes the following quotations from Mosheim's "Dissertations Sacrae," a work which we believe has never been published in this country.

"This power of appointing their elders continued to be exercised by the members of the church at large, as long as primitive manners were retained entire," Page 70.

"The bishop began in the third century to appoint his own deacons at pleasure, and other inferior orders of clergy. In other appointments, also, his efforts began to disturb the freedom of the elections, and direct them agreeably to his own will. And yet Cyprian, only about fifty years before, apologized to the laity and clergy of his diocese, for appointing one Aurelius to the office of reader. In justification of this measure, he pleads the extraordinary virtues of the candidate, the urgent necessity of the case, and the impossibility of consulting them as he was wont to do on all such occasions."—[Pages 71, 72.

"The Emperor, Valentinian III, complains of Hilary of Aries, that he unworthily ordained some in direct opposition to the will of the people; and when they refused those whom they had not chosen, that he contracted an armed body, and by military power forcibly thrust into office the ministers of the Gospel of peace."—[Page 77.

"Leo the Great, A. D. 450, asserts the right of the people to elect their spiritual rulers."—[Ib.

"Tertullian describes such assemblies [synods] as bodies representative of the whole church."—[Page 115.

Our author makes the following quotation from Mosheim's work referred to:

"In the infancy, indeed, of councils, the bishops did not scruple to acknowledge that they appeared there merely as the ministers or legates of their respective churches; and that they were, in fact, nothing more than representatives acting from instructions. But it was not long before this humble language began, by little and little, to exchange for a loftier tone. They at length took upon themselves to assert that they were the legitimate successors of the apostles themselves, and might, consequently, of their own proper authority, dictate laws to the Christian flock."—[Page 115.

The writer makes the following quotations from the learned Neander:

"From the nature of the religious life and of the Christian church, it is hardly possible to draw the inference, naturally, that the government should have been entrusted to the hands of a single one. *The monarchial form of Government accords not with the Spirit of the Christian church*"
— [Page 19.

"Riddle gives the following sketch of the constitution and government of the church at the beginning of the second century.

"The subordinate government, of each particular church was vested in itself; that is to say the whole body elected its ministers and officers, and was consulted concerning all matters of importance." This is said of the church at the close of the first century."—[Ib.

"The mode of appointing bishops and presbyters," says Riddle, "has been repeatedly changed. Election by the people, for instance, has been discontinued."— Page 70.

"It is clearly asserted by Dr. Pin, that in Rome and Carthage no one could be expelled from the church, or restored again, except with the consent of the people."
—[Page 102.

"Valesius, the learned commentator on Eusebius, says that the people's suffrages were required when any one was to be received into the church, who for any fault had been excommunicated. This is said of the usages of the church in the third century."—[Ib.

We might multiply these extracts to almost any extent, but will close where we are. Mr. Coleman, from whose work we have taken the liberty to make such copious extracts, is versed in Oriental literature, and has spent some years in Germany, amid the musty records of her literary institutions, as his work gives ample proof. It should be remarked that all the extracts we have made are sustained by references to the proper authorities, but as these are works unknown to the common reader, and several of them in other languages, we have omitted the references. Mr. Coleman's book is before the public, and if he has not quoted his learned authorities correctly, let him be called to an account by the literati.

Dr. Mosheim is endorsed by Mr. Watson as follows:

"The best ecclesiastical historians have showed that through the greater part of the second century, the Christian churches were independent of each other. Each Christian assembly, says Mosheim, was a little state governed by its own laws, which were enacted, or at least approved, by the society." —[Biblical Dictionary, article Church.

Mr. Watson is as high authority as can be quoted from among English Methodist authors, and he goes quite as far as we do on the subject of laymen's rights and powers, as will be seen from the following extracts:

"This declaration as to doctrine, in modern times is made by confessions or articles of faith, in which, if fundamental error is found, the evil rests upon the head of that church collectively, and upon the members individually, every one of whom is bound to try all doctrines by the Holy Scriptures, and cannot support an acknowledged system of error without guilt."—[Institutes in one vol., page 422.

This necessarily involves the right of lay delegation in all assemblies where doctrines and rules of government are settled. Our author says again of the power of pastors:

"We have already said, that the members of a church, although they have no right to obstruct the just exercise of this right, have a right to prevent its unworthy exercise." Page 423.

This is granting all, for the right to pre-vent an unworthy exercise of power, in-eludes the right of determining when it is justly and when it is unworthily exercised.

Now, if the laity have the right of judging of the conduct of their rulers, and determining when they act right and when they act wrong, and of interdicting those acts which they believe to be wrong, it is all that we contend for.

In Mr. Wesley's Journal for January 10, 1746, we find the following:

"I set out for Bristol. On the road I read over Lord King's account of the primitive church. In spite of the vehement prejudices of my education, I was ready to believe that his was a fair and impartial draught; but if so, it would follow that bishops and presbyters are essentially of one order, and that, originally, every Christian congregation was a church independent of all others."

We will close this argument with a few extracts from Lord King's work, above referred to by Mr. Wesley.

It should be borne in mind that Lord King uses the word "diocese" to denote a single congregation, or one local church. In those churches, when they become large, and before they were divided, there were, no doubt, several elders or religious teachers, one of whom

was necessarily chairman. This will account for his referring to the bishop and clergy of a diocese. The presiding minister he calls bishop, and the others he calls the clergy. When these churches became numerous, no doubt those contiguous to each other formed a union, and held conventions composed of delegates, of ministers, and laymen, from them all, and the presiding presbyter was called bishop; and here was the origin of diocesan episcopacy, but it was a departure from primitive simplicity. So, when there had been formed several of these associations of churches, sometimes called synods, they formed connections with each other, and held general conventions, and the presiding officer of these bodies became a bishop of bishops, and here was the origin of popery. Such is the tendency of power to accumulation. Lord King's work covers a period during which these changes were taking place, which will account for such a state of things as he sometimes describes, and as is often implied in his remarks. At the same time, he is clear and decisive on the question of laymen's rights; and as the progress from apostolic purity to popish corruptions, was by the way of clerical assumptions of power, no abatement is to be made from his account of the rights of the laity, for no departure can have taken place from apostolic usage in that direction; while the powers which he describes as exercised by the ministry may, in part, have been the beginning of those assumptions which led to popery. These remarks will prepare the reader's mind for the following extracts from Lord King's account of the Primitive Church. We quote from the Methodist Episcopal Book Room edition, and refer to the page.

"All the people of a diocese were present at church censures, as Origen describes an offender as appearing 'before the whole church.' So Clemens Romanus calls the censures of the church 'the things commanded by the multitude.' And so the two offending subdeacons and acolyth at Carthage were to be tried 'before the whole people.'

"No offenders were restored again to the church's peace, without the knowledge and consent of the whole diocese; so Cyprian writes, that before they were re-admitted to communion 'they were to plead their cause before all the people.' And it was ordained by an African synod, that except in danger of death, or an instantaneous persecution none should be received into the church's peace 'without the knowledge and consent of the people.'

"When the bishop of a church was dead all the people of that church met together in one place to choose a new bishop. So Sabinus was elected Bishop of Emerita 'by the suffrage of all the brotherhood;' which was also the custom throughout all Africa, 'for the bishop to be chosen in the presence of the people.' And so Fabianus was chosen to be bishop of Rome 'by all the brethren who were met together in one place for that very end.'

"At the ordination of the clergy the whole body of the people were present. So an African synod, held anno 258, determined 'that the ordination of ministers ought to be done with the knowledge and in the presence of the people, that the people being present, either the crimes of the wicked may be detected, or the merits of the good declared; and so the ordination may be just and lawful, being approved by the suffrage and judgment of all.' And Bishop Cyprian writes from his exile to all the people of his diocese, that 'it had been his constant practice in all ordinations to consult their opinions, and by their

common counsels to weigh the manners and merits of every one;' therein imitating the example of the Apostles and apostolic men, who ordained none but with 'the approbation of the whole church.'" —[Pages 36, 37, 38.

As soon as they were baptized they commenced members of the church universal, and of that particular church wherein they were so baptized, and became actual sharers and exerters of all the privileges and powers of the faithful.

"Now what the distinct and separate powers of the faithful were, must be next considered; several of them, to make the discourse under the former head complete, we touched there, as their election and choice of their bishops, their attestation to those that were ordained, and such like, which will be unnecessary and tedious to repeat here; and others of them cannot be well separated from their conjunct acts with the clergy, but must, with them, be discoursed of in the next head, so that there will be little or nothing to say here of their discretive and particular acts, save that, as they had power to elect their bishops, so, if their bishops proved afterward scandalous and grossly wicked in life, or at least heretical in doctrine, and apostates from the faith, they had power to depose them, and to choose others in their rooms."—[Pages 101,102.

As a bishop was elected by the people over whom he was to preside, and by the neighboring bishops, so he was deposed by the same; both which things seem to be intimated in that passage of the aforementioned synodical epistle, wherein it is said that 'the people chiefly have power either to choose worthy bishops, or to refuse unworthy ones.' "—[Page 103.

"Having thus briefly dispatched the second head, I now proceed to handle the third, which respects the conjunct acts of the clergy and laity; in answer whereunto I find that, in general, all things relating to the government and policy of the church were performed by their joint consent and administrations; 'the people were to do nothing without the bishop;' and on the contrary, 'he did nothing without the knowledge and consent of his people.' 'When any letters came from foreign churches, they were received and read before the whole church,' and 'the whole church agreed upon common letters to be sent to other churches.' And so, for all other matters relating to the policy of the church, they were managed 'by the common advice and counsel of the clergy and laity,' both concurred to the discharge of those actions, to recite every particular act whereof would be extremely tedious and fruitless."—[Page 104.

"As for the judges that composed the consistory or ecclesiastical court, before whom offending criminals were convened, and by whom censured, they will appear to have been the whole church, both clergy and laity; not the bishop without the people, nor the people without the bishop, but both conjunctly constituted that supreme tribunal which censured delinquents and transgressors, as will be evident from what follows."—[Page 109.

"But as for the legislative, decretive, or judicatorial power, that appertained both to clergy and laity, who conjunctly made up that supreme consistorial court, which was in every

parish, before which all offenders were tried; and, if found guilty, sentenced and condemned.

"Now that the clergy were members of this ecclesiastical court, is a thing so evidently known and granted by all, as that it would be superfluous to heap up many quotations to prove it, so that I shall but just confirm it, after I have proved that which may seem more strange, and that is that the laity were members thereof, and judges therein, being sharers with the clergy in the judicial power of the spiritual court."— [Page 111.

"To that large discourse of the primitive discipline, which was the subject of the preceding chapter, it will be necessary to add this observation, that all those judicial acts were exerted in and by every single parish, every particular church having power to exercise discipline on her own members, without the concurrency of other churches; else in those places where there might be but one church for several miles round, which we may reasonably suppose, the members of that church must have traveled several, if not scores of miles, to have had the consent of other churches, for the punishment of their offenders; but there is no need of making this supposition, since it was decreed by an African synod, 'that every one's cause should be heard where the crime was committed.' "—[Pages 127, 128.

"And whosoever will consider the frequent synods that are mentioned in Cyprian, will find that in his province they met at least once, and sometimes twice or thrice a year.

"As for the members that composed these synods, they were bishops, presbyters, deacons, and deputed laymen in behalf of the people of their respective churches. Thus at that great synod of Antioch that condemned Paulus Samosatenus, there were present 'bishops, presbyters, deacons, and the churches of God;' that is, laymen that represented the people of their several churches. So also we read in an ancient fragment in Eusebius, that when the heresy of the Montanists was fixed and preached, 'the faithful, in Asia met together several times to examine it, and upon examination condemned it.' So also, when there were some heats in the church of Carthage about the restitution of the lapsed, Cyprian writes from his exile that the lapsed should be patient till God had restored peace to the church, and then there should 'be convened a synod of bishops, and of the laity who had stood firm during the persecution, to consult about and determine their affairs;' which proposition was approved by Moses and Maximus, and other Roman confessors, who liked the 'consulting of a synod of bishops, presbyters, deacons, confessors, and the standing laity;' as also did the whole body of the clergy of the church of Rome, who were willing that that affair 'of the lapsed should be determined by the common counsel of the bishops, presbyters, deacons, confessors, and the standing laity.' And thus, at that great council held at Carthage, anno 258, there were present eighty-seven 'bishops, together with presbyters, deacons, and a great part of the laity.' "—[Pages 132,133, 134.

The preceding must be judged sufficient, so far as ecclesiastical authority can go, and here we dismiss this part of the subject.

SECTION III.

Written Articles of Faith and Practice.

I. The churches have a right to frame and adopt general rules of faith and practice, provided they contain nothing contrary to the Scriptures.

The right of any religious community to commit its rules of faith and practice to paper, is so plain that it appears strange that any should doubt it. Some, however, have denied such right, and insisted that to do so is to sin against God, and to rebel against Christ, the common head and lawgiver of the church.

1. Sin is the transgression of the law but it must appear difficult to see what law is violated by simply writing down in a book an outline of the truths we ought to believe, and the duties we ought to perform. It is admitted that it would be a wrong act to make a false creed; but to make a true creed, which is to write the truth in a book cannot violate any law of God or rule of Jesus Christ. To deny the right of Christians to put what they believe to be truth and duty into a book, would be to declare it wrong to make books. No one will dare to maintain that it is wrong to make books in which nothing but truth is written, and nothing but duty required; and hence, it cannot be maintained that it is necessarily wrong to write our rules of faith and practice in a book, provided they are true and righteous rules of faith and practice.

2. It may be urged that the wrong of creed-making does not consist in writing down our views of what Christians ought to believe and practice, and in making the same into a book, but in adopting the same as a standard, or as binding on the members of the church. To this, the reply is simple and conclusive. What men have a right to believe, express, and put into a book, they have a right to promise to obey, so long as they shall continue of their present opinion. Divest the act of adopting rules of faith and practice of the superstitions and terrors that have been thrown around it by the conduct of those who have lorded it over God's heritage, and made rules in which those who were required to believe and obey them had no voice, to which their understanding, will, and conscience could never consent, and then undertook to enforce them by pains and penalties, and all valid objections to written rules will vanish. Objectors overlook the simplicity of the thing, and draw their support from the monster above described. There should be, there can be no legitimate power to compel a man to subscribe to what he does not believe; and to maintain that a man has not a right to subscribe to what he does believe, and promise to be governed by it so long as he shall continue to believe it, is certainly to trifle with the rights of humanity. It has been shown, in the preceding argument, that men have a right to embody their views in a book, and it would be a strange doctrine that would deny men the right of subscribing to, and promising to be governed by, what they have a right to publish to the world, to mould the sentiments and guide the conduct of others. It is plain, then, that men have a right to subscribe to, and promise to be governed by what they honestly believe to be truth and duty.

3. The right to form and subscribe to a truthful standard of faith and practice, may be seen from a slight view of man's natural and inalienable rights as an intelligent and morally

accountable being. The following points are not likely to be disputed by any class of Protestant Christians, viz: Men have a right to read the Bible for themselves, to understand the Bible for themselves, and to judge for themselves concerning the faith and duty which it requires of them; to freely speak and publish their views of faith and duty; and to use all the purely intellectual and moral influence they can exert to persuade others to embrace the same views of faith and duty which they have adopted for themselves. This is simply the right of private judgment, of conscience, and of free discussion. To deny it, or any part of it, is to deny to the people the right of reading, thinking, believing, and speaking for themselves, and thereby fall back under the shadows of Popery. If, then, a written standard of faith and practice can be formed and adopted in the simple exercise of these rights, it cannot necessarily be wrong. The process is this: An individual wakes up to his personal responsibilities, and, on looking around him, finds or thinks he finds fundamental errors in the religious community with which he is associated, as did Luther, the Reformer. No matter whether such errors are written in books, or only believed, taught orally, and practiced. He compares them with the Bible, and is compelled to reject them as opposed to his honest views of the teaching of that Book; he publicly rejects the errors; discussion follows; some embrace his views, while others oppose him; and to do it more effectually, they misrepresent his principles, as the advocates of error are apt to do; or it may be that they misapprehend him. To avoid these difficulties, he makes a clear and distinct abstract of the points wherein he differs from those who oppose him, and writes down these points of his faith, and he and those who embrace his views put their names to the document, here we have a creed, and will any one say that the parties to it have transcended their natural and inalienable rights in originating it? He who can affirm this will not be likely to suffer martyrdom during the present age for his liberal views. It is believed that the above remarks fully establish the abstract right of constructing and adopting written articles of faith and practice.

4. The utility of written forms of faith and practice, and rules of discipline, rests upon the superiority of written over unwritten law. It is admitted that every fundamental principle is contained in the Scriptures: but such are the differences of opinion which prevail among men concerning what the Scriptures teach, that a community, collectively, can preserve its unity of feeling and harmony of action only by settling what are, and what are not the teachings of the Scriptures on fundamental points. This is done, in some way, by all communities; if they have no written rules more than is written in the Scriptures, they have the substance of such rules, which with them is unwritten law, and which, as they hold them, possess all the force of law. It cannot be otherwise in the present state of the Christian world. There is no sect, party, congregation, church or company of men calling themselves Christians, who will tolerate among them and fellowship all who claim to believe and practice according to their own understanding of the teachings of the Scriptures. Now the moment they reject a person on account of anything he believes or practices, he grounding such belief and practice upon his understanding of the Scriptures, that moment they adopt a principle of interpretation which becomes a rule, which is not itself written in the Scriptures. It does not affect the principle that this rule is not written; yet, as it is to be applied in settling questions of church fellowship, it had better be written, as written rules possess many advantages over unwritten rules. That all communities do actually adopt and enforce rules beyond what is found in the letter of the

Scriptures, is easily made to appear. Almost every conceivable contradiction is held by various persons, each claiming that his views are the only Scriptural ones. One illustration, of a moral nature, will be sufficient. One class of persons hold and teach that slavery has been instituted by God, and that it is a Bible institution, and that it is right to hold, buy, and sell human beings as property. This they not only hold and teach, but they practice it. Some of this class have no written creeds; they denounce all written articles of faith and rules of discipline, holding that the Scriptures are sufficient. Another class of persons hold that slavery is a sin, and that all who practice it are sinners; that to hold, buy, and sell human beings as property, is a crime for which a person should be excluded from the church and Christian fellowship.

This view they are quite as confident is taught in the Scriptures as their opponents are that the Scriptures justify slavery. Some of this class also denounce all written articles of faith, and rules of practice and discipline, insisting that the Scriptures alone are sufficient. These two parties can not unite, though there is no written creed in the way between them; and though they both adopt the Scriptures as their only standard of faith and practice, mutually condemning all discipline, yet they are as far apart as truth is from falsehood, and as heaven is from hell. Each has adopted a leading principle—one that slavery is right, and the other that slavery is a sin—and these principles constitute their respective creeds on this subject, and they limit their Christian fellowship to those who conform to it, and yet neither finds his rule in so many words in the Scriptures; they are rather a deduction from what they consider the general principles taught in the Scriptures.

Under such circumstances, it must appear plain that it is important to settle the question of the sinfulness of slavery, and to write down the decision, as a means of putting an end to contention, and for the purpose of shutting out the elements of discord for time to come. It is admitted that if all men understood the Scriptures alike there would be no use for written articles of faith and rules of discipline; but in a community in which all agree that each has a right to understand the Scriptures for himself, and where one insists that the Scriptures teach the rightfulness of chattel slavery, and another that the Scriptures condemn it as one of the worst of crimes, there appears to be a clear propriety of making a rule on the subject. It will not do to say that the Scriptures are sufficient, inasmuch as they cannot agree what the Scriptures teach; and to separate ourselves from those whom we cannot fellowship, and to keep ourselves separate and to save contention, we write it down in our creed, that slavery is a sin for which men should be excluded from Christian fellowship. This appears to be a better way than to leave the meaning of the Scriptures on the subject an open question for perpetual dispute, and apply the anti-slavery principle as unwritten law—for all who hold it must apply it, to be honest, written or unwritten. Here, then, is a principle held by a portion of the community which they must apply and enforce in their church relations, but which others denounce as unscriptural; hence it is proper that those who hold it should write it down as their view of what the Scriptures teach, and as a rule by which they design to be governed. When it is written, as it is to be applied and enforced, its utility is in proportion to the practicability of written in comparison with unwritten law.

The above has been given as a specimen selected from a multitude of cases. One holds, that, as Christians, we are bound to observe religiously the first day of the week; another holds that we are bound, by all the sanctions of the moral law to keep holy the seventh day of the week, according to the letter of the Old Testament law. One holds that there is no baptism but by immersion, and that it is unlawful to commune with any who have not been so baptized; while others hold that sprinkling or pouring is baptism, and will even commune with unbaptized persons. One class of persons hold that without a bishop there can be no church; that without an apostolic succession, there can be no valid ministry, no valid ordinances, and no hope of salvation but in the uncovenanted mercies of God; while others hold the validity of Presbyterian ordination, and still others think Congregational ordination quite sufficient. All these claim the support of the Scriptures for their respective theories; and what to us is more wonderful than all this, is the fact that there are others who, with all these facts before their eyes, insist that the Scriptures alone are sufficient for the government of a congregation, without any settled rules of interpretation and defined modes of applying Scriptural principles in the shape of a discipline. The truth is, the Scriptures cannot be brought to bear, and be enforced as a standard of church government and rule of discipline, only as the community separate into different congregations, according to their respective beliefs, so that those who think alike are brought into the same association, and then their peculiar views and modes of procedure constitute their creed, and it is none the better because it is not written— for when principles are settled, and must be applied and enforced, it is best for all parties that they should be written. If all settled rules were abolished, and all persons holding the above named and other conflicting views were brought into one united and anti-sectarian church, or Christian community, discussion, strife, contention, and separation would be inevitable, and would constitute the only way through which we could pass back to our present condition of even comparative peace. This is so plain that it appears wonderful that any should overlook it. We urge in conclusion, that well defined and written rules on fundamental points, must tend to promote the peace and efficiency of the community that adopts and is governed by them.

The peace and harmony of a religious community must depend upon a clear understanding, on the part of the members, of the principles, objects, and measures of the association, which must be greatly promoted by having them written and well defined. It may be supposed by some that the union of hearts, and the fellowship of the Spirit, is all that is required in a Christian community, and that these do not depend upon this or that doctrinal belief, or particular mode of carrying out the great principles of Christianity. To this it may be replied:

(1.) The union of hearts and fellowship of the spirit contended for, depend for their existence upon the views we entertain of those with whom we are called upon to unite, and to fellowship in the Spirit. The more skillful the hypocrite, the more likely will he be to command our Christian sympathy, and the sanction of our fellowship; and simply because we do not know his real character. On the other hand, let us be wrongly informed, and labor under false impressions concerning the best man on earth, and while we remain ignorant of his real character we can feel no real union of heart and fellowship of the Spirit with him. These remarks are made simply to show that we may be deceived,

and that our union of hearts and fellowship of the Spirit with our fellow-beings does not depend so much upon what they really are, as upon what we think them to be. This point being gained, it should be remarked.

(2.) That though a well defined system of faith and practice cannot remove our liability to be deceived by the hypocritical in heart, it can define what are the essential external features of Christian character, and hence, what men must believe and do to entitle them to our Christian fellowship. This is all important; for as our fellowship, as shown above, depends upon what we think men to be, and not upon what they really are in heart, the members of a religious community can be united in heart, and in the fellowship of the Spirit only by adopting a common and clearly defined standard of Christian character, to which every member must be conformed, or by which he must be tried, rejected, and excluded. It is freely admitted that there are some points of faith and practice, concerning which men may differ without affecting their Christian characters, and of course without impairing their fellowship for each other; but then there are other points which must be believed, and works which must be performed by our fellow beings, before we can believe them to be Christians, and, of course, without which we cannot fellowship them as Christians. To define these fundamental points in faith and practice is the object of articles of religion and rules of discipline. Now, suppose a Christian community to have no well defined rules on these points, as it is known that men differ concerning what is and what is not fundamental in Christianity, they are liable at once to differ concerning the qualifications of their own members, and the fellowship of the Spirit for which the non-creedist contends as sufficient cannot exist, for want of uniformity in faith and practice. As men differ concerning what is absolutely essential to Christian character, and as no man can fellowship another as a Christian who is wanting in any part of what he believes to be essential, union of heart and the fellowship of the Spirit must be limited to those who agree concerning what is and what is not fundamental in Christianity. A settled and well defined creed and polity, therefore, embracing these fundamental points, must tend to promote the peace and harmony of every religious community.

II. The objections which have been urged against written articles of faith and rules of practice are all untenable and are refuted as follows.

I. It has often been objected to written rules of faith and practice, that they are substitutes for the Scriptures, and tend to set them aside as the supreme law of the church. This is a mere assumption, which is not sustained by any facts. To it we reply,

(1.) Those denominations who have written articles of faith and rules of discipline, are as firm believers in, and as zealous defenders of the Scriptures as the few who repudiate all written creeds. Nor can it be shown that their written rules are less in accordance with the injunctions of the Scriptures than are the unwritten rules and forms of the objectors. Moreover, take the actual faith of the parties on personal inquiry, and the actual administrative proceedings of their respective churches, and it will not appear that those who have written creeds and written rules of discipline are less conformed to the Scriptures than those who condemn all written forms of faith and polity as an abandonment of the Scriptures.

These are facts, and being facts, they prove that the objection is a mere assumption, containing not the slightest degree of practical truth.

(2.) It is a fact that cannot be denied, that the Scriptures have failed, and do still fail as a rule of faith and form of discipline, because they have not secured such a uniformity among professed Christians as is essential to Christian fellowship. This cannot be charged on written forms, because the evil exists among those who condemn all written creeds; they are not sufficiently agreed among themselves to fellowship each other and unite and co-operate in the same church. To prevent as much of the evil and confusion as possible, growing out of this failure of the Scriptures, which itself grows out of a misunderstanding of them, those who believe in written creeds introduce them, for the purpose of settling the important question of what is and what is not essential to Christian fellowship. When we say the Scriptures have failed to secure all their legitimate ends as a system of doctrine, rule of duty, and form of church discipline, we affirm no more than is fearfully proved by the wickedness and irregularity of this less than half reformed world. But when the Scriptures fail practically to secure that uniformity in faith and practice which is essential to the peace and harmony of a religious community, the fault is not in the Scriptures themselves, but in man's imperfect understanding of them, whereby a construction is given them which the Holy Ghost never designed. It must be difficult to prove that the Holy Ghost could incite a book which man could not pervert in the exercise of his perverted will depraved heart, and darkened understanding.

(3.) When creeds are formed, they are not adopted as a substitute for the Scriptures, but only as a declaration of what the Scriptures are believed to teach. They are merely an expression of what their subscribers believe the Scriptures contain on the points they embrace. If men could agree what the Scriptures teach, and what they do not teach, there would be no necessity for creeds, but it is notorious that they cannot; they put different interpretations upon the same texts, and creeds are only determinate modes of interpretation, and not a substitute for the text itself.

That this is the true view of the case is clear, from the fact that all written creeds contain one article asserting the inspiration of the Scriptures, and their entire sufficiency in all matters of faith and duty. But while these are asserted, to prevent the Scriptures from being perverted by the ignorant or vicious, they form a clear abstract of their teachings on fundamental points, and this constitutes the creed, which consists of two great and comprehensive points: First, a declaration that the Scriptures are a sufficient and only authoritative rule of faith and duty; and secondly, that they teach such doctrines, duties, and modes of action. This is so far from being a substitute for the Scriptures, that the creed itself is the strongest effort that can be made to secure a belief in the sufficiency of the Scriptures, and to prevent anything being substituted for them. Those who condemn all written creeds may much more easily substitute their oral opinions for the Scriptures, for their doctrines and modes of proceeding being unwritten, it is not so convenient to compare them with the Scriptures and test them. There is an intangibility about unwritten doctrines and forms of discipline, which is better adapted to the advocates of error than to the defenders of truth.

2. It is often objected to written creeds that if they are intended merely as an expression of what the Scriptures teach, they assume that the creed-makers of the present day can express themselves more clearly, forcibly, and in a manner less liable to be misunderstood than did the Holy Ghost when he spake through the inspired writers. It is said, if the creed is not a more clear expression of the truth than the Scriptures, it is useless, and we had better go to the Scriptures themselves without the creed; but if the creed is a more clear expression of the truth than the Scriptures, then have our creed-makers excelled the Holy Ghost.

We have stated this objection in what we consider its strongest light, and will proceed to answer it.

(1.) A written creed may be convenient and useful, without supposing it to be more skillfully indited than the Scriptures. The Bible is a large book, and though every part is important to make it complete as a whole, yet a very small portion of it relates to those practical points usually embodied in a creed and discipline. Much is historical, and much more is ceremonial. Those who take the Scriptures as their only standard of faith and rule of discipline, will refer you to but a few leading texts to justify their belief and mode of proceeding. It must, then, appear convenient and useful to make an abstract of the points involved in church government from the vast volume.

(2.) It is not assuming a superiority over the Holy Ghost, to say that we can state our views of what we believe the Scriptures teach in a manner less liable to be misconstrued than the Scriptures. One fact must settle this point. If it were not so there would be as great a variety of opinions concerning the meaning of a creed among those who adopt it, as there is among those who believe the Scriptures, concerning what they teach; but such is not the fact.

It is true that there have been differences of opinion concerning the meaning of some points in a creed, but they are not very common, and when they arise, they can be settled by altering the language of the rules so that it will not admit of but the one construction. Take a few examples. Men who believe the Scriptures with all their hearts, are unable to agree what the Holy Ghost teaches concerning the mode of baptism, and whether or not infants are to be baptized. Now it is written in our creed as follows: "The baptism of young children is to be retained in the church." "Let every adult person, and the parents of every child to be baptized, have the choice either of immersion, sprinkling or pouring."

Our Baptist brethren dispute us on this question, "What do the Scriptures teach?" but all understand the creed, and there is no dispute concerning its meaning. Have we, then, excelled the Holy Ghost?

Men cannot agree concerning what is called the doctrine of the Trinity. They disagree, concerning what the Scriptures teach on the subject, but one party has made a creed on the subject in the following words:

"There is but one living and true God, everlasting, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there are three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity—the Father, the Son [the Word,] and the Holy Ghost."

This is understood, and while the controversy rages concerning what the Scriptures teach, there is no dispute concerning what this creed teaches. Again, men cannot agree what the Scriptures teach concerning the Sabbath. Some contend that Saturday is to be observed as a Sabbath, and others that Sunday is to be observed as a Sabbath, and still others contend that under the Gospel we are required to observe no day as a Sabbath. Well, our creed forbids "the profaning the day of the Lord, either by doing ordinary work therein, or by buying or selling." No one can fail to understand this; and while they continue to dispute about what the Scriptures teach, all will agree that our creed requires the observance of Sunday, or the first day of the week, called "the Lord's day." The objector must now withdraw his objection, or take upon himself the responsibility of insisting that the Holy Ghost has really been excelled by creed-makers; for the fact that the creed is less liable to be misunderstood than the Scriptures, cannot be denied.

(3.) Admitting the entire sufficiency of the Scriptures for all the purposes for which they are intended, and still there will be room enough for creeds as a matter of convenience and utility. The objection overlooks the fact that the Scriptures were not intended to settle everything, so as to leave nothing to be determined by the church, as her changing circumstances and wants may demand. It is the design of the Scriptures to settle fundamental principles, and this they do, though men often fail to understand them. All fundamental principles are doubtless contained in the Scriptures, and when honest men fail to adopt these fundamental principles, it is because they misunderstand the sacred text; but there are many other things left to the judgment of the church, which she must settle for herself as cases arise, and occasions require. Things must be done for which it is convenient to have settled rules, and for which there is no settled rules in the Scriptures. A few illustrations will be sufficient.

No one can read the Scriptures without being convinced of the duty of maintaining church order in some form, and to do this we know that officers must be chosen; but precisely how they are to be nominated and inducted into office is not explained. We know that the mind of the church must be expressed in some way, amounting, in principle at least, to what we call a vote; but the New Testament nowhere tells us how a vote is to be taken, whether by the voice, or by show of hands, or by ballot. These are matters which are left to the common sense of the church, to be settled as convenience may dictate.

But there are more serious matters not settled by express law. Jesus Christ says, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them." Here a general principle is settled which bears upon all the social relations of life, but the mode of application is not settled. Two men meet upon the highway under equal circumstances, and we know that the golden rule requires each to give half the road, but it does not determine whether it shall be the right hand or the left hand half. So our

obligation to support Christian worship is clearly settled as a general principle, and from it must follow the conclusion that we are bound to provide a suitable place for worship, and attend it at suitable times; but no rule in the New Testament determines the precise place where we are to build our house of worship, how large we shall build it, what form, nor yet how often we shall attend worship, whether once, twice, or thrice on the Sabbath, and whether at all, or on how many other days of the week. This proves beyond a doubt that to form written rules, does not suppose that we can incite plainer and less likely to be misunderstood than the Holy Spirit, but only that the Scriptures were designed to settle general principles, and that we undertake to do, by our rules, what the Scriptures have not done, what they were never designed to do for us, but what they have left us free to do for ourselves.

3. It is some times objected to written creeds, that they are the cause of the differences of opinion among Christians, and that they produce the sectarian divisions and bigotry which all must admit exist to a painful extent. After what has been said above, this objection may soon be disposed of. In reply, it should be remarked,

(1.) The objection puts the cause for the effect, and the effect for the cause. It is the differences of opinion which make the creeds, and not the creeds the differences of opinion. It is admitted that when any set of theological views are embodied in a written creed, as the acknowledged standard of a religious community, it may tend to increase the number of those holding such views, and render their abandonment less likely; but this is an argument in favor of a written creed, rather than against it. It proves that truth embodied in a written creed is less likely to be supplanted by error, but it does not prove that creeds multiply sects, for if creeds strengthen and increase the sects that adopt them, they must tend to lessen the number of sects, for the larger each sect is, the less there must be in number.

But that sects make creeds and not creeds sects, is too plain to admit of doubt. New creeds are brought into existence by new opinions which none of the existing sects can be persuaded to adopt. New religious opinions originate in the church, not out of it, and those who embrace new opinions do not desire to leave their associations and go out leaving many interests behind, to organize a new sect, and do it only as a last resort to maintain their new views, when they have failed to impress them upon the old sect. Could they convert their associates to their new views, they would not leave them. The organization of new sects is impelled by the force of pre-existing conflicting views, and of course conflicting opinions produce sects, and not sects conflicting opinions.

(2.) If creeds alone produced sects, there could be no sect without a creed, which is contradicted by matter of fact. The few sects that exist without written rules, are none the less sects on that account; nor are they any the less tenacious for their peculiar views; nor will they any sooner fellowship those who differ from them than those who write their views in books, and call it a creed. The no-creed sects have just as much creed about their religion as others. The only difference is, others write their creeds, while theirs is unwritten; but it is none the less a creed. Ask the one what his views are, and he will show you his creed, which is his written opinions, for the support of which he will refer

you to the Bible; ask the other what he believes, and he will repeat his unwritten opinions, and appeal to the Bible for their support. Now who can see what is the difference? It must be confessed that it is difficult to see any, unless it is that those who publish their opinions act a more honest part, and leave themselves less room to disguise their real views, or to assail others, without presenting anything tangible to be assailed.

CHAPTER II.

THE MINISTRY.

SECTION I.

The Gospel Ministry was established by Christ as a permanent Institution.

The fact asserted as the title of this section involves several important points.

1. That the ministry of the Gospel is a permanent institution is inferred from the fact that there never was a religion maintained without a ministry.

(1.) The patriarchal age or dispensation had its teachers, its prophets and its priests, From the creation of the world to the time of Moses there was no *written* law or revelation from God, a period of almost 2,500 years, and yet God left not himself without teachers in the world, nor the people without the means of instruction. Gen. 5: 24; "And Enoch walked with God, and he was not; for God took him." Jude. 14, 15: "And Enoch also the seventh from Adam, prophesied concerning these, saying, Behold the Lord cometh and ten thousand of his saints to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds."

Enoch was a preacher, a religious teacher. He taught the doctrine of a general judgment and of a just retribution for our conduct. He taught the duty of repentance for all wrong deeds. "To convince all that are ungodly" implies repentance. He enforced his preaching by a godly life. He walked with God.

2. Peter 2: 5; "God spared not the old world but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness." Noah was the third from Enoch, so it may be seen that these obscure ages were blessed with teachers.

That Abraham was a preacher of righteousness during his day will not be denied. It was with reference to him and the other patriarchs that God said, "touch not mine anointed and do my prophets no harm." Gen. 14: 18; "And Melchizedek king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine, and he was the priest of the most high God."

The above quotations show that the Patriarchal age was blessed with religious teachers to whom it pertained to impart religious instruction, and to attend to the service of religion in contradistinction from other men.

(2.) The Mosaic dispensation had its priests and its teachers of religion. There were not only the sons of Aaron, who were priests by a standing law of the system, but there were others who were more directly the teachers of the doctrines and duties of religion. Samuel, Elijah and Elisha were of this number. There were even whole schools of this class of teachers. One of these schools was established at Naioth in Ramah, as we learn from 1 Sam. 19: 18-24. Another of these schools was at Bethel, and yet another at Jericho, as we learn from 2 Kings 2: 5. From Jericho, we are told, that "fifty men, sons of prophets," went to see the departure of Elijah.

It is supposed that these schools of the prophets were merged in the Jewish synagogues, which were places of religious worship and of religious instruction, where the law was explained by authorized teachers. Previous to the establishment of the synagogues for the better convenience of religious instruction, there being no regular house where the people and teachers met, those who desired religious instruction visited the prophets at their own houses, hence it may be seen that these schools of the prophets were establishments where the prophets resided, and whither the people resorted for religious instruction.

2 Kings 4: 23; "And he said, wherefore wilt thou go to him (the prophet) today? It is neither new moon nor Sabbath." From this we learn that there were set times, new moons and Sabbaths, on which it was common for the people to visit the prophets. We see then that the Mosaic system had its authorized teachers, and its regular system of religious instruction.

3. The Christian dispensation, under which we live, has its teachers which were at the commencement appointed directly by divine authority. Jesus Christ appointed twelve apostles to be witnesses of his death and resurrection, to preach his Gospel, and to establish his church. These apostles thus appointed by Christ, did by their own authority, or else in conjunction with the churches, appoint other teachers, by which they settled the Christian system permanently as a system of religious instruction. The very fact that Christ appointed teachers, and that those teachers took measures for the appointment of others, to carry on the work of preaching the Gospel after their decease, furnishes conclusive evidence that the system provides for the perpetuity of the Christian ministry.

It is then proved that religious instruction, by authorized teachers, is one essential link in the economy of Christianity, and from the nature of the evidence and the circumstance of the case, this feature of Christianity is as perpetual as the system itself.

Christianity was established by the appointment of religious teachers, with arrangements for the increase of their number as the work should enlarge, and for supplying their places as they should be taken out of the world.

2 Tim. 2: 2; "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also."

Here we have a provision and a direction which looks forward to the perpetuity of the ministry, a succession of ministers. It is not a succession of the laying on of hands, but a succession of qualified persons by instruction.

2. The necessity of a ministry devoted to the work of religious instruction, considered in connection with the economy of the Gospel, furnishes a strong argument in support of the perpetuity of the Christian ministry. If there are no ministers who are the authorized teachers of religion, a consequence is, the obligation to teach and enforce the doctrines and precepts of Christianity, does not rest upon one class of Christians more than another, but must rest equally upon all Christians. If, then, one man is not more than another man, under obligation to preach the Gospel, it must depend wholly upon men to say, whether the Gospel shall be preached or not; for all men cannot be required to preach it, since, in that case, there would be no one to preach it to, nor any special necessity of its being preached, for he whose duty it is to preach the Gospel to others, cannot be under special need of having it preached to him; and as all men cannot be required to preach the Gospel, no man can be bound to preach it, unless there be a regular class of teachers, as such, in contradistinction from Christians in general, for without such class, no one man can be required to preach it more than all men.

It is clear, then, that without a ministry, there can be no regular religious instruction. This would make religion a matter of less economy than anything else.

The Gospel is a system of instruction. Christ, the master was a teacher, and before he left the world, he appointed others to preach the gospel after his ascension. He sent them out under this solemn and world-wide commission, "Go teach all nations. Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

The Gospel contemplates the instruction of the ignorant, until the whole world shall be enlightened, and, of course, it contains provisions for carrying out its own gracious and glorious designs.

A single text will show this. Rom. 10:13-15; "Whosoever calleth on the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed, and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher, and how shall they preach except they be sent?"

The Gospel also contemplates the perpetual culture and building up of the church by means of a ministry. Take one text among many. Eph. 4: 11, 13; "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."

The whole work of the ministry, is perpetually required from its very nature, and this work can be done, only by a regularly appointed ministry.

3. The provisions which the Scriptures make for the support of the ministry, prove it to be a permanent institution of divine appointment.

That the ministers of religion were rewarded under the law, no one will deny. On I this ground we might raise an argument from analogy, but will let that pass. But our appeal is to the New Testament.

Matt. 10: 10; "Provide no scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves, for the workman is worthy of his meat."

This, though it does not contain a permanent rule, expresses a permanent principle, that the laborer is worthy of his hire.

1 Cor. 9: 6-11; "Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working? Who goeth a warfare at any time, at his own charges, who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not the fruit thereof, or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk thereof? Say I these things as a man, or saith not the law the same also? For it is written in the Law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for ox-en? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes no doubt, this is written; that he that plougheth should plough in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope. If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?"

(1.) The apostle here clearly asserts the right of ministers to a support. This he argues, not as a special case, but as a general principle and settled arrangement. He is careful to disclaim it as his own doctrine, and to assert it as the doctrine of God.

(2.) The figures which the apostle uses to illustrate this principle give increased force to the argument. "Who goeth a warfare at his own charges? Who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit? Who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk thereof? That he that plougheth should plough in hope. That he that thresheth in hope, should be partaker of his hope."

Gal. 6: 6; "Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth in all good things."

2 Tim. 2: 4, 6; "No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life, that he may please him that hath chosen him to be a soldier. The husbandman that laboreth must be first partaker of the fruit."

2 Cor. 11: 7, 8; "Have I committed an offence in abusing myself that I might preach to you the Gospel of God freely? I robbed other churches, taking wages of them to do you service."

These texts are too plain to be misunderstood. It is perfectly clear from them that the Gospel contemplates a permanent ministry. These principles are left to be carried out by

the Christian zeal and benevolence of the churches. No minister can, consistently receive any but a voluntary support, yet the people are held responsible to God to render that support. But the point is that the ministry is a permanent institution, and that is proved.

4. A living ministry is God's declared instrumentality of saving the world.

"For after that, in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." 1 Cor. 1: 21.

Preaching supposes a preacher, or preachers, and preachers, as an appointed instrumentality of prosecuting and finishing such a continuous work, supposes a ministry as an essential and abiding institution of the Gospel. If it pleased God, in his economy, to save them that believe, by the foolishness of preaching, the work of salvation cannot proceed, only so long as the preaching is continued, and there can be preaching only so long as there shall be preachers; there must, therefore, be a ministry attached to the Gospel, at all times and in all places, as its instrumental power by which God makes its saving influence known.

SECTION II.

The Mode of Ministerial Appointment.

I. Such a ministry as has been described as a permanent Gospel Institution, supposes some continuous method of appointment.

As ministers continue not by reason of death, without such method of appointment, the ministry would become extinct, and the work of salvation through the foolishness of preaching, would cease. A point so vital in God's economy, cannot have been left to chance, or to the choice of men, independently of special obligation imposed upon some minds to preach the Gospel, in contradistinction from others. I admit that the whole church may be called to preach the Gospel, according to ability, opportunity, and necessity, but the whole church does not constitute the ministry, which was given when Christ ascended up on high, of which it is said, Eph. 4: 11,12; "And he gave some, Apostles; and some prophets; and some, evangelists; and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."

That the members of the church generally preached, as they possessed ability, and as occasions called, in the apostolic age, there can be no doubt. We read, Acts 8: 4, not of the ministry, but of the whole church, "they that were scattered abroad, went everywhere preaching the word." Many who thus preached must have been engaged in some of the usual occupations in life as a means of support. Some of them may not have possessed gifts which would have justified their entire devotion to the work of the ministry, and yet they could be useful in some spheres and circumstances, just as many laymen are now useful, some of whom might be less so, if they were to assume the entire work and responsibilities of the ministry. But at the same time, while all the church labored as they

could for the promotion of the cause of God, there was a ministry, devoted wholly to the work, and who were under the most solemn charge, not to "entangle themselves with the affairs of this life," but to "study to show themselves approved unto God, workmen that need not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." Such were commanded to "give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine; to meditate upon these things; to give themselves wholly to them, that their profiting might appear to all."

There must then be some method of appointment to render the ministry perpetual. How then are ministers appointed to office? God has reserved to himself the right of designating his own ministers, while he has granted to each church, yea, made it the duty of each church, to examine into the evidence which each person may show of an appointment by God to the work of the ministry, who asks of them a hearing, or a commendation as a minister of the New Testament. That God can call a Christian to the ministry, none can doubt, who believe in the direct influence of the Holy Ghost. He, who by the Holy Ghost can convict sinners and work repentance in their hearts; he who can by the same Spirit, justify, regenerate, and witness with their spirits that they are the children of God, can work in the heart a belief that God calls them to preach the Gospel. The church in judging of a particular case, must decide from a view of the applicants piety, natural and acquired abilities, gifts and general adaptation for the work.

The essential elements which constitute a Gospel minister may be stated as follows

1. A sound Christian experience, character, and life.
2. An ability, natural and acquired, sufficient to render the person acceptable and useful as a preacher, in the field where he proposes to labor.
3. An impression or conviction that it is his duty to preach, written upon his mind by the spirit of God.
4. A desire or willingness on the part of the people to hear him preach, if he be removed in his locality from all organized churches; but the sanction of the church to which he belongs, if he be in circumstances to belong to an organized church. Should a layman of piety and ability be thrown into a community where there were no churches, and no ministers, he might preach to them the truth, and if God blessed his labors he might organize a church, and administer to them, and on their election we believe he might be to them a valid minister. This, however, is not likely to occur, and should it occur, it would be an exception to a general rule; the general rule, therefore, is that a person must have the sanction of the church to which he belongs. This is necessary, to prevent disorder, and even disgrace. If a man is really called of God to the work, the people will find it out, and he will find a congregation somewhere that will desire to hear him. His way may be hedged up for a time; but if he is really called to the work, and is pious and faithful, God in his providence will open his way in due time, and impress the church with the fact of such call. The church may withhold its sanction from a true man for a time, but the more frequent error is in giving its sanction to those whom God never called.

II. Some appropriate method of inducting a minister into office appears proper, commonly called ordination.

1. When a person proposes to devote himself to the work of the ministry, and has obtained the sanction of the church, it is proper that he should, by some impressive rite or service, be inducted and set apart to the sacred calling and office, and the laying on of hands with prayer is unobjectionable. This practice appears to be appropriate and solemn, and we adhere to it because we cannot substitute any form of induction which would appear more impressive. Some form of induction appears proper, and it should be in accordance with the responsibilities and solemnities of the office; and the laying on of hands appears suited to the occasion, not only from the fact that there is no law against it, but also from the fact that we have various examples of it in the Scriptures, though it was for other purposes. Jacob laid his hands on the heads of the sons of Joseph when he blessed them; Jesus Christ laid his hands upon little children and blessed them; the Apostles laid their hands on the seven persons appointed to take charge of the poor fund, (Acts 6: 6). The prophets and teachers at Antioch laid their hands upon Paul and Barnabas, when they were about to enter upon an important mission. Though in none of these cases was the imposition of hands employed as a means of inducting persons into the Christian ministry, yet it was done on solemn occasions; and, though it is not binding on us, it cannot fail to suggest the appropriateness of the laying on of hands with prayer, when we admit a person to the office of the ministry, as a means of adding to the solemnity of the service. And though the presence of the clergy is not essential to a valid ministry, yet where the presence of clergymen can be secured, it is most proper that they should officiate. These are matters of order, which every religious community may arrange to suit itself, so long as nothing is done which contravenes the law of Christ.

2. The laying on of hands is not believed to be essential to a valid ministry. To prove the necessity of the imposition of hands, it should be made plain, beyond a doubt, that Jesus Christ or his Apostles commanded it to be observed in consecrating ministers. If it could be even proved that the Apostles practiced it, it would not prove it binding on us, for they practiced many other things which we feel ourselves at liberty to omit. But there is no command for the imposition of hands as a rite of induction into the ministry. Nor is there one clear example, which proves that the Apostles ever laid their hands on a single person, for the purpose of conferring the office of the Christian ministry. This point has often been taken for granted, but a little examination will show upon what slender grounds it has been done.

Let us now glance at those texts which speak of the laying on of hands. There are but five texts that can possibly be considered as relating to the subject:

Acts 6: 6; "Whom they set before the Apostles, and when they had prayed they laid their hands upon them."

These men were appointed, by this act, to take charge of the poor fund, and see that it was impartially distributed among the widows. It therefore proves nothing about inducting persons into the ministry by the imposition of hands.

Acts 13: 1-3; "Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul.

"As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.

"And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away."

This could not have been an induction into the Christian ministry, for more reasons than one:

1. Paul was called and constituted an Apostle by Jesus Christ, twelve years before this transaction, of which he makes the following declaration:

Gal. 1: 15-17; "But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood; neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were Apostles before me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus."

2. About the same time—that is, twelve years before this transaction—the church at Jerusalem sent Barnabas to Antioch to preach the Gospel to them; and he did preach it; and it is said "he was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost, and much people was added unto the Lord." (See Acts 11: 22-24.) Then Barnabas went to Tarsus and sought after Paul, and brought him to Antioch, and they preached there a whole year. Then they were both sent by the church to Jerusalem, and they fulfilled their mission and returned. (Acts 11: 30: and chap. 12: 25.) After all this, we cannot suppose that the prophets and teachers at Antioch laid their hands on the heads of Paul and Barnabas as a means of inducting them into the Christian ministry.

But what, then, was the nature of the transaction? We regard it as extraordinary. These men were ministers, and had preached the Gospel for twelve years; but now, God called them to go on a special mission to the Gentiles, on a more extended plan than their former operations, and it was a solemn separation, not to the office of the ministry, but to that special mission and field of operation.

1 Tim. 4: 14; "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."

A parallel text is found, 2 Tim. 1: 6; "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands."

Whether these two texts relate to one transaction, or whether there were two laying on of hands, is unimportant. It may refer to one transaction, as Paul may have led the service in the presbytery, and hence may call it the laying on of the hands of the presbytery in one text, and the laying on of his own hands in the other. But does it furnish any certain proof that the transaction was an induction into the ministerial office? We think not. It must have been an extraordinary transaction, limited by its own nature to the age of miracles. The laying on of hands communicated a gift that remained in him, that he was not to neglect but to stir up. This was, doubtless the Holy Ghost, which at that time was communicated by the laying on of hands. And as the Apostle refers to the gift that was in him, and not to his ministerial office, it is most likely that the laying on of hands was to communicate to him the Holy Ghost, and not to induct him into the Christian ministry.

1 Tim. 5: 22; "Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins; keep thyself pure."

This text does not require the laying on of hands as essential for any purpose, but only forbids it to be done suddenly. It only proves that there was a practice of laying on hands for some purpose, and that it should not be suddenly done; but it does not prove that it was to induct persons into the Christian ministry. The text itself, nor the connection in which it stands, does not prove that it has any allusion to the setting apart of persons to the ministry, It is clear that they were in the practice of laying hands on laymen, and the text is as likely to refer to this practice as to the consecration of ministers.

Jesus Christ laid his hands on many of the sick whom he healed, and the apostles also laid their hands on the sick and healed them. The apostles also laid their hands on laymen, to communicate to them the Holy Ghost and special gifts.

Acts 8: 17-19; "Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostle's hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost."

Acts 19: 5-7; "When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied. And all the men were about twelve."

This was not an ordination, or an induction into the Christian ministry; nor were these men ministers. Now, who can say that it was not with reference to some such laying on of hands as the above that the apostle told Timothy to lay hands suddenly on no man. Still, if the text did refer to an induction into the ministerial office, it would not prove it indispensable. Churchmen hold that laymen are to be admitted to communion by the laying on of hands, called confirmation. If this be true, it is most reasonable to refer the

text to that subject and understand Paul as instructing Timothy not to confirm laymen suddenly.

But it will be inquired if the proof is not found in the word ordain, which is often applied to the appointment of ministers. The word ordain, we believe, occurs but five times in the New Testament, in connection with the Christian ministry, in not one of which does it imply the imposition of hands. The following are the texts:

Mark 3: 14; "And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach."

The word here translated ordain, is *epoiese*, which signifies to make, constitute, or appoint to some office. It has no allusion to laying on of hands, nor is there the least proof that hands were laid upon the apostles.

Acts 1: 22; "Must one be ordained to be witness with us of his resurrection."

The word here rendered ordained is *genesthai*, which signifies to be, become, be made, created. Thus should it read, "must one be made a witness with us." Dr. Clarke says, in his notes on the text, "This translation misleads every reader who cannot examine the original text. There is no term for ordained in the Greek." He adds that a New Testament printed in London in 1615, by Robert Barker, renders it as we have above—" must one of them be made a witness with us." There is not the slightest allusion to the imposition of hands.

Acts 14: 23; "And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed."

The word here translated ordained is *cheirotonesantes*. This word is derived from *cheir*, the hand, and *teino*, to stretch. The word, therefore, signifies to stretch, extend, or raise the hand; to vote, elect, or nominate by lifting the hand. It is rendered thus in Graves' Greek and English Dictionary. In the Polymicrian Greek Lexicon, it is rendered as follows: "To vote, or choose by holding up the hand; to choose, appoint, by vote, select, ordain, appoint, constitute." From this it is seen that the text not only asserts the fact that elders were constituted, but that it intimates the manner of doing it, which was by a popular vote of the churches, taken by show of hands. What confirms this, is the manner in which the same word is used in 2 Cor. 8: 19. The apostle, in speaking of sending Titus, and of sending another person with him, adds, concerning this other messenger, "who was chosen [*cheirotone-theis*] of the churches to travel with us." Here the same word is used as in Acts 14: 23, it here being in the passive singular form. The word is here most clearly applied to an election or appointment by the churches; and as the above are the only texts in which this word occurs in the New Testament, it settles the question that appointments were made by the lifting up of hands, and not by the laying on of hands; 1 Tim. 2: 7; "Whereunto I am ordained a preacher and an apostle." Here the word rendered ordained is *etethen*, which signifies appointed without describing the manner in which it was done. Titus 1: 5; "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order

the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." Here the word rendered ordain is *katasteses*, which has no reference to the imposition of hands, but simply signifies to settle, fix, constitute, appoint, ordain, establish. The manner in which Titus was to do this, may be inferred from the manner in which Paul and Barnabas ordained them elders in every church, by lifting up the hands of the brethren, as shown above.

Ordination is to be looked upon as a recognition of a man's call to preach the Gospel. It does not give him a right to preach the Gospel; that right he must have, in our opinion, before we are authorized to ordain him. But it gives him our sanction, and a right to preach on our endorsement, and to avail himself of the influence of our judgment and reputation to secure him a hearing and employment among the people as a minister. In a word, it is a solemn recommendation.

When a man is deposed from the ministry, then, that which was given him at his ordination is taken away, and nothing more, as that only can be taken which was given. The recommend is withdrawn.

SECTION III.

Ministerial Parity.

There is but one order in the Ministry.

The question of ministerial parity must depend upon the question of orders; for if there be more than one order in the ministry, the simple fact of a plurality of orders will go far towards proving disparity.

The following text has been supposed by some to teach the doctrine of different orders of ministers, and it is proper to notice it at this point, and show that its entire language is consistent with but one order of ministers. Eph. 4: 11; "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets, and some, evangelists, and some, pastors and teachers." On this text it may be remarked that it in no wise serves the purpose of the advocates of a plurality of orders.

1. It does not name one of the supposed orders, unless it be apostles, which office has no existence now.
2. If it were admitted as declarative of various orders of ministers, while it names five not generally regarded as ministerial orders, it must still appear deficient as a list of the orders, since it omits presbyters or elders, regarded by all denominations as an order or permanent office.
3. There may still be but one order, and the text may speak of the different gifts given, and the different work assigned to the different individuals who compose this one order. So far as the apostles were concerned, it must be admitted that they had a special

commission committed to them; yet, in point of order, they may have been elders. Peter, who was one of the apostles, declares that he was "also an elder." (1 Peter 5: 1.) The prophets named may also have been a class belonging to this same ministerial order of elders. So may the evangelists, pastors, and teachers have been elders. The most reasonable exposition of the text is this: The Apostle appears to be speaking, not of permanent orders of ministers, but of the special gifts and agencies which Christ saw fit to employ to plant and establish the apostolic churches, much of which passed away with the gift of miracles. To establish Christianity and to perfect the organization of the Church, the following agencies were employed:

1. Apostles, who had a special commission with plenary powers. This office ceased, as will hereafter be shown.
2. Prophets, who were gifted with an inspiration that enabled them to foretell events, as did the prophets of the Old Testament. This gift ceased from the church with other miraculous gifts. They were necessary to establish Christianity as a new revelation, and then they ceased.
3. Evangelists, who were probably a class of elders employed to travel and preach the Gospel, and visit and confirm the churches, and organize new ones. This was necessary in the beginning of Christianity, and is still necessary in new countries, where churches are small, feeble, and widely scattered.
4. Pastors, who were a class of elders, and who labored with and took the oversight of particular congregations or churches. They did not travel as did the evangelists, but confined their labors to one local church where they resided.
5. Teachers, who may have been elders, but more probably were not, but were appointed to teach the heathen converts the first principles of Christianity. When the Gospel spread as it did under the labors of the apostles, bringing hundreds of rude heathens to confess Christ in a day, such labor must have been greatly needed.

It is agreed by all that there are but three orders in the ministry—bishops, elders, and deacons; therefore, if it can be proved that in a Scriptural sense bishops and elders are the same, and that deacons were never appointed an order of ministers, the conclusion will be certain, that there is but one order, and from this ministerial parity will follow as a matter of necessity.

I. There is no proof that deacons were ever appointed an order of ministers. In our English New Testament, we believe the word deacon occurs in but two texts, which instances are not sufficient to prove the existence of a distinct order of ministers. We will give the two texts in which the word occurs.

Phil. 1: 1; "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons."

1 Tim. 3: 8-12; "Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well. For they that have used the office of a deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus."

That deacons were some kind of church officers, there can be no doubt, and that they may have preached is very likely, as all laymen preached, who were capable, when occasion called. But there is no sufficient proof in these two texts to establish an order of ministers. The above are the only texts in which the word occurs in our English Testaments. The reader should be informed, however, that the same word occurs more frequently in the Greek, being differently translated. In the following texts, which we give as specimens of the use of the word in the Greek, we place the Greek word, rendering it deacon, in brackets immediately after the English word translated there from in the common text.

John 2: 5, 9; "His mother saith unto the servants [*diakonoi*, deacons], Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it.

"When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine, and knew not whence it was: (but the servants [*diakonoi*, deacons], which drew the water knew.")

1 Cor. 3: 5; "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers [*diakonoi*, deacons], by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man."

The word in this text does not mean an inferior minister, as it is applied to Paul and Apollos. As Paul was reproving them for saying, "I am of Paul," it would add force to his reproof to render the word "servants," as in the former texts.

2 Cor. 6: 4; "But in all things approving ourselves as the ministers [*diakonoi*, deacons] of God, in much patience in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses."

Here again the word cannot mean an inferior order of ministers, but render it servants, and you have good sense.

Rom. 16: 1; "I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant [*diako-non*, deaconess] of the church which is at Cenchrea."

Was she an inferior minister authorized to baptize. And could she, by exercising her office well, "purchase a good degree?" that is, become a presbyter or bishop? We have read of a female Pope, but have never learned that her descendants are proud of this link which connects them with Peter. We have not introduced all the texts in which the word occurs in the Greek, but the above are sufficient for our present purpose.

The reader has, doubtless, grown impatient by this time to hear something about the appointment of the seven deacons, as recorded in Acts 6: 1-6. Well, this shall now be

attended to. On this the advocates for an order of ministers called deacons, ground their principal arguments, to the whole of which the following reply is offered:

1. There is no proof that the persons here appointed were deacons. The term deacon is nowhere applied to one of them.
2. There is no proof that they were ministers in the common sense, by virtue of this appointment. There is no pretended proof, only the supposition that they preached, which is very doubtful. Acts 6: 8; "And Stephen, full of faith and power, did great wonders and miracles among the people." The proof which this text furnishes that Stephen preached, depends upon one question, viz: Did any but ministers work miracles in those times? If laymen worked miracles, then the text contains no proof that Stephen was a minister. We maintain that the working of miracles was not confined to the ministry, for St. Paul speaks of the gift of miracles as belonging to the membership of the church in common with various other gifts and privileges. Of this all must be satisfied, if they will carefully read 1 Cor. 12.

But it will be said that Stephen preached the Gospel, and that must settle the point. There is no proof, we repeat, that he ever did preach as a minister of the Gospel. The simple history of his preaching is this: He did wonders and miracles among the people; then there arose up certain opposers and disputed with him, and were unable to withstand his arguments; then they procured false witnesses and accused him before the Jewish council. (Acts 6: 8-15.) Then the high priest called on him to reply to the charges, and he proceeded with his defense. (Acts 7: 1-53.) Here, then, is the extent of his preaching; he disputed with some opposers, and when accused before the council made one speech in self-defense, and all this is no more than any layman might have done then, or might do now.

But the case of Philip is next relied upon as proof that deacons preached. Acts 8:5; "Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them." It is a sufficient exposition of this to say that there was another Philip, an apostle and there is no proof that he is not the person here named. Who can say that it was Philip, one of the seven, that went down to Samaria?

There is one other allusion to one of these seven men.

Acts 21: 8; "And we entered into the house of Philip the evangelist, which was one of the seven."

Here one of the seven is proved to have been an evangelist, which is not pretended to be the same as deacon. This was about twenty-nine years after his appointment to the charge of the poor fund at Jerusalem, and cannot prove that he was either a deacon or minister by virtue of that appointment. We have now before us all that is recorded concerning these seven persons.

3. The appointment of the seven (Acts 6: 1-6) was the result of a financial necessity, and not of a ministerial lack. The very terms of the appointment, as expressed by the apostles, limit it to the financial matters in view of which the office was created. The apostles directed the church to choose out men of a certain character, "whom we may appoint over this business." The appointment is clearly limited to the work denoted by the expression "this business." What, then, is meant by "this business?" The answer is plain: It was the complaint of "the Grecians against the Hebrews, that their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations." They were, then, appointed over the business of making an impartial distribution of daily bread among the poor widows. The terms of the appointment, therefore, do not include any part of the work peculiar to the ministry.

4. There is no proof that the appointment of the seven persons to the charge of the poor fund was the creation of a permanent office of any kind to be perpetuated through all ages in all the churches.

The probability is that deacons were a class of laymen selected from the body, as officers or servants, to perform a work which the regular pastor, for want of time or other cause could not do, and which the people could do only through an agency.

II. Bishops and elders are of the same order.

It should be remarked, on entering upon this investigation, that there is nothing in the meaning of the words themselves upon which any conclusive argument can be hung upon either side. Neither word exclusively expresses the office or functions of the Christian ministry. The word bishop is translated from the Greek word "*Episkopos*" which signifies an overseer, a superintendent, or denotes one who superintends and provides for the welfare of another. It is applied to Christ (1 Peter 2: 25;) "For ye were as sheep going astray; but now are returned unto the shepherd and bishop [*Episkopon*] of your souls." This shows that the word cannot mean a "Diocesan," in the Protestant Episcopal sense, or an officer of the whole church in the Methodist Episcopal sense. The word, we believe, is applied to Christian ministers but four times in the New Testament, in three of which it is translated bishop, and in the other it is translated "overseer." These texts are as follow:

Acts 20: 28; "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers [*Episkopous*, overseers or bishops], to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

Phil. 1: 1; "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops [*Episkopois*] and deacons."

1 Tim. 3: 1; "This is a true saying, if a man desireth the office of a bishop [*Episkopes*] he desireth a good work."

Titus 1: 7; "For a bishop [*Episkopon*] must be blameless as the steward of God."

We believe the above are all the cases in which the word is applied to Christian ministers or teachers, and it will be seen at a glance that there is nothing in the meaning of the word, and nothing in the connection in which it is found, proving or intimating anything like Protestant Episcopacy, or Methodist Episcopacy. Nothing can be inferred beyond the simple functions of a pastor of a single congregation.

The word Presbyter is not used in the English Testament, but the word Presbytery is found once. 1 Tim. 4: 14; "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophesy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," [*presbuterio*]. This word literally signifies an assembly of old men. "It is here, doubtless, used to denote the officers or principal men of the Christian church, so called, probably, because they were generally chosen from among the aged and experienced. The same word is used, Luke 22: 66; "And as soon as it was day, the elders [*presbuterion*] of the people, and the chief priests and the scribes, came together and led him into their council." The same word is also used (Acts 22: 5), in the expression, "and all the estate of the elders" [*presbuterion*]. In these texts the word probably denotes the Jewish Sanhedrim.

The word from which we derive our ministerial title, presbyter or elder, is *presbuteros*, which means one advanced in years. This word does not always mean an officer or minister, as one instance of its use will be sufficient to show. 1 Tim. 5: 2; "The elder [*presbuteras*] women as mothers." Nothing, however, can be plainer than that the same word is used in the New Testament to denote an officer whose duty it was to teach and govern the church.

Acts 14: 23; "And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed."

This and other texts prove that elder, in the Christian church, denotes an officer. They were ordained or appointed, not to be old men, for time rendered them such without appointment; but they were appointed to office or pastorship of the church, and were called elders because old men were at first more generally selected. The translators have rendered the word elder, but presbyter is equally proper, as they are understood by all to mean the same thing.

Having, as we trust, sufficiently explained the terms bishop and elder, we will proceed to the argument, and attempt to prove that they do not denote two orders of ministers, but that they denote one and the same office in the Christian church. Our first appeal is to the Scriptures.

1. The terms bishop and elder are used interchangeably, and are applied to the same person in view of the same office or appointment. Acts 20: 17,28; "And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church," and said unto them, "take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers" —*episkopous*, overseers or bishops, as the word is translated. Here, in the 17th verse, they are called the *elders* of the church, and in the 28th verse they are called *overseers* or bishops.

Titus 1: 5, 6, 7; "That thou shouldst ordain elders in every city, if any be blameless; for a bishop must be blameless as the steward of God." Here the same persons are called elders in the 5th verse, and bishops in the 7th verse, and that, too, with reference to their qualifications for an appointment to the same office.

1 Peter 5: 1; "The elders which are among you I exhort, who also am an elder." Here the apostle Peter classes himself with the elders of the church. It is clear, then, that the term elder is used to signify the highest grade of ministers in the Christian church, and that it is used interchangeably with the term bishop.

2. The qualifications which are prescribed for bishops and elders are the same.

That the reader may see at a glance the qualifications of the two, we place them together, as follows:

QUALIFICATIONS OF A BISHOP. —1 Tim 3: 1-7; "A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth his own house well; not a novice. Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without."

QUALIFICATIONS OF AN ELDER. —Titus 1:

5-9; "Ordain elders in every city, if any be blameless, the husband of one wife, not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate; holding fast the faithful word, as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and convince gainsayers."

It is here seen that there is no essential difference in the qualifications of bishops and elders. It is true that the word bishop is used in the 7th verse of Titus 1, but this cannot affect the argument, as it is elders to be ordained in every city of which the apostle speaks, verse 5.

3, The duties and official work of bishops and presbyters or elders are the same, which must prove the identity of the two. It is a fact worthy of serious consideration, that the duties of bishops in contradistinction from elders are nowhere pointed out in the New Testament. With us it is incredible that they should have constituted a distinct order, superior to elders, and yet that we should have no specific work assigned them differing from that which is most clearly pointed out, as belonging to elders, and which are specifically assigned to them. We challenge the production of any texts which assign to bishops, as a class, duties which elders are not required to perform. This one consideration is sufficient to explode the idea that bishops are a distinct order superior to elders. It is not for us to point out the duties of bishops. We know of no duties assigned them as a distinct class; but we will point out the duties of elders, and prove that they are such as preclude the possibility of there being a superior class or order called bishops. All

who hold that bishops are a distinct order superior to elders, assign to them the government of the church, over presbyters and people. Now let us see what the duties of elders are.

Two things may be affirmed of the eldership of the church—that to them belongs the work of teaching and governing. In Acts 20: 17; we are told that Paul called the elders of the church. In the 28th verse, he told them to "take heed unto all the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers, to feed the church of God." Two things are worthy of notice:

(1.) These elders were the overseers of the flock. They were made such by the Holy Ghost. This is the very work supposed to belong to bishops, as the name signifies overseer, implying the very work here assigned to elders. Now, under episcopal government, an elder cannot be a subordinate overseer of a flock, only by the appointment of a bishop. A bishop makes them overseers, not the Holy Ghost. Bishops, then, do now what the Holy Ghost used to do.

(2.) These elders were charged with feeding the Church of God. Thus was the instruction of the Church committed to them.

In this discourse, Paul addressed the elders as though they were the principal officers, and alone responsible. Take verses 29 and 30, for example.

"For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.

"Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."

Here is no mention of any higher officers, no advice or charge to be subject to their chief ministers to whom the charge and government is committed over them. Had there been diocesan or general bishops to govern those presbyters, the apostle could not have failed to make some allusion to the fact in delivering his last charge. There is no allusion to any successor to take his place; he most clearly left the elders in possession of an undisputed and unlimited jurisdiction, so far as any superior order of ministers is concerned.

Peter's charge to the elders is equally clear and to the point, showing that to elders belong the work of government and instruction.

1 Peter 5: 1, 2, 3, 4; "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed.

"Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind;

"Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock.

"And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away."

Here again the duties of elders are pointed out, too plainly to be misunderstood. They embrace the very work that is supposed to belong to bishops—that of governing as well as teaching. The apostle refers them to the appearing of the chief Shepherd, but makes no allusion to their Diocesans, or Bishops to whom they were accountable. How can this omission be accounted for if bishops, as contradistinguished from elders, have the government of all, holding the entire pastorate of the church in their hands, so that no elder can have the oversight of a flock without the bishop's appointment? This is modern episcopacy, but the apostle appears to have contemplated no such thing.

It will be seen, from these Scriptures, that there is no work belonging to a bishop which elders are not charged to perform, unless it be ordination. We will not, at this point, enter upon the question of ordination, further than to remark that if it belongs to the department of government, it is the right of elders to ordain, for it has been shown that the government of the church was committed to them. But proof is needed on the other side. We deny that there are any texts of Scripture which confer the right of ordination upon bishops by name as contradistinguished from elders. Let proof on this point be adduced, if there is any.

We trust the above considerations will be regarded as sufficient to prove that bishops and presbyters are one in office and authority. The argument thus far rests upon three points.

1. The names are used interchangeably.
2. Their qualifications are the same.
3. Their work is the same.

These positions, thus sustained, must settle the question in the mind of the candid reader.

To the above is added the following from the best Ecclesiastical authorities in confirmation of the Scriptural argument.

"A bishop, during the first and second century was a person who had charge of one Christian assembly, which at that time was, generally speaking, small enough to be contained in a private house. In this assembly he acted, not so much with the authority of a master, as with the zeal and diligence of a faithful servant."—[Mosheim's History, Vol. i., p. 39.

Other extracts might be given from this author, but a few decisive passages is all that can be given from each author quoted. The following are a few extracts from Lord King's

account of the primitive church, the quotations are made from the Methodist Book Room edition, and refer to the page.

"Having in the former chapter shown that there was but one bishop to a church, so we shall in this evidence that there was but one church to a bishop." 30.

"A bishop having but one parish under his jurisdiction, could extend his government no further than one single congregation.' 32.

"The bishop had but one altar or communion table in his whole diocese, at which his whole flock received the sacrament from him. 'There is but one altar,' says Ignatius, 'as there is but one bishop.' At this altar the bishop administered the sacrament to his whole flock at one time." 33.

From the above it must appear that a primitive bishop was no more than a pastor of a single congregation. We will introduce Mr. Wesley's opinion at this point In his Journal for January 20, 1736, he declares his belief in the correctness of Lord King's book, from which we have quoted above, and affirms, upon its authority, "that bishops and presbyters are essentially of one order."

Mr. Watson, in his Dictionary, article Episcopalians, quotes Archbishop Cranmer, as follows:

"The bishops and priests were at one time, and were not two things, but both one office in the beginning of Christ's religion."

The term priest is used in the above to signify elder or presbyter. This is what is meant by priest in the language of that church. Mr. Watson in his Dictionary, article Presbyterians, produces a labored argument to prove the identity of bishops and elders, in which he quotes the same Scriptures which have been quoted in the preceding section. We will only give an extract or two. Of the Episcopal distinction between bishops and presbyters, Mr. Watson says:

"The whole of the writers of antiquity may be urged in support of it [the distinction,] if that could be done; and, after all, every private Christian would be entitled to judge for himself and be directed by his own judgment, unless it be maintained that where Scripture has affirmed the existence of equality, this is to be counteracted and set at naught by the testimonies and assertions of a set of writers, who, although honored with the name of fathers, are very far from being infallible, and who have, in fact, often delivered sentiments which even they who upon a particular emergency cling to them, must confess to be directly at variance with all that is sound in reason, or venerable and sublime in religion. It also follows from the scriptural identity of bishops and presbyters, that no church in which this identity is preserved can on that account be considered as having departed from the apostolic model."—[Dictionary, article Presbyterians.

"The argument drawn from the promiscuous use of the terms [bishop and presbyter] in the New Testament, to prove that the same order of ministers is expressed by them, appears incontrovertible."— [Watson's Institutes. Part 4, chap. 1. Page 419, in one volume.

We will now make one extract from Dr. Chapman, a distinguished high church writer of our own country. He says:

"One circumstance, however, I have as yet forborne to explain, to which I most particularly request your attention. It is a favorite argument with the opponents of Episcopacy, and I believe the more a favorite from its being extremely plausible, and calculated to satisfy a superficial inquirer, that bishops have no more authority in the church than presbyters or elders, because these titles are indiscriminately applied to the same office, in the inspired volume. The fact we admit. We agree that, through the Acts and epistles, bishops and presbyters are frequently spoken of as holding the same rank in the ministry."—[Chapman's Sermons, page 77.

We here have a full admission of the fact for which we contend; the great truth may therefore be regarded as settled, that in the language of Scripture, bishop and presbyter mean the same thing.

But Dr. Chapman makes this admission for the sake of explaining it away, which he attempts, with what success our readers shall judge. His whole defense against this argument rests just here. He says that bishops are the successors of the apostles, that the office of bishop is a continuation of apostolic office, that while the first apostles lived presbyters were called bishops; but after the death of the twelve, their successors, out of respect to their names, ceased to be called apostles, but took the name of bishop, which per consequence ceased to be applied to presbyters, so that the apostolic office continued in fact, as superior to presbyters, under the name of bishop. The argument is that bishops are apostles, the apostolic office being continued in them, and the only change being in the name, they having dropped the title of apostle and taken to themselves the title of bishop, by which presbyters were originally known.

A few words in reply to this view of the subject will close this section.

1. One grand defect in this method of evading the argument drawn from the promiscuous use of the terms bishop and elder, is, it is not sustained by any reliable proof. Not a single text is quoted in its support, nor is it pretended that there are any texts to be quoted on that side of the question. The only reliance is upon two slight remarks quoted from two of the so called fathers. The principal quotation is from Theodoret, who must have written after the commencement of the fifth century. Such are the fables on which such important matters are made to depend.

2. There is too much Scriptural light on the subject, and too much Scriptural argument against this fancy painting, to admit of its being received as the work of Truth's pencil. Where is the proof that the apostles had any successors. So far as the apostles possessed

functions in common with the Presbyters, those functions have been preserved in the order of presbyters; but so far as they possessed extraordinary functions, which distinguished them from other ministers, they have no successors. There is no proof that they left successors, beyond what is found in the order of presbyters. They nowhere, not even in a single text, speak of successors, though they spoke and wrote of their departure on occasions and under circumstances which could not have failed to call forth allusions to their successors, if any such they were to leave behind them. Take Paul's farewell address to the elders of the church at Ephesus. Hear him deliver his last charge to them, as recorded in the 20th chapter of Acts.

"And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus and called the elders of the church, and said unto them, take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.

"For I know this, that after my departing, shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.

"Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."

There is here no allusion to any successors, and no intimation that there was or was to be any superior ministers to exercise a jurisdiction over them.

The apostle Peter refers to his departure in a most touching manner, and yet makes no allusion to successors.

2 Peter 1: 13, 14,15; "Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up, by putting you in remembrance;

"Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me.

"Moreover I will endeavor that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance."

But we maintain from the very nature and design of the apostolic office that they could have no successors. As this is a vital point in the argument, we will present an outline of the proof.

1. The name implies that they could have no successors. The Greek word is *apostolos*, which signifies a person sent or delegated. The twelve were personally called and sent by Jesus Christ, Now, though there might be many messengers, messengers of churches and messengers of individuals, yet in the high sense of being the sent of Jesus Christ, the dignity of apostles must be limited to the thirteen, including Paul. To be an apostle in this high sense, it was necessary that they should be personally called and sent by Jesus Christ. So Paul appears to have understood the ease.

Gal. 1: 1; " Paul an apostle (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead.)"

Bishops in the Episcopal sense are not apostles—they are not the sent; but if to them belongs the exclusive right of calling and sending out ministers, they are the senders and not the sent.

2. The apostles were sent as witnesses of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. This was what distinguished their office and work from the common ministry; hence the office must be limited to those who had seen Jesus Christ. The apostles possessed the ordinary functions of the ministry, but these did not distinguish them from, or render them superior to presbyters, but they had a higher mission as the personal witnesses to the death and resurrection of Christ, sent by him to organize his church.

1 Peter 5: 1; "The elders that are among you I exhort, who also am an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ."

Here the apostle takes rank with elders as a mere preacher or pastor, but distinguishes himself as an apostle, as "a witness of the sufferings of Christ."

Paul clearly understood that it was necessary to have seen Christ to be an apostle.

1 Cor. 9: 1; "Am I not an apostle, am I not free, have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?"

It appears that the apostle considered the fact that he had seen Christ, as essential to his claim to be an apostle. He refers to the same fact in chapter 15: 8-10; "And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time. For I am the last of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God."

If, then, an apostle was one personally sent by Jesus Christ, and if he was sent to witness to the death and resurrection of Christ, rendering it necessary that he should have seen him after his resurrection to render him a competent witness, the apostles could not have left any successors behind them, and of course Mr. Chapman's whole theory falls to the ground.

It has now been proved that there is but one order in the ministry, and from this it must follow that all ministers are equal.

SECTION IV.

Ministerial Parity—Further Direct Evi-idence—Dr. Bangs Reviewed.

We do not mean that all ministers have the same right to exercise all their functions at the same time, in the same place, when we say that all ministers are equal. We mean that all are equal in essential ministerial power, and equal in the right to exercise that power in

the same relations and circumstances. All ministers have the same right to enter into the pastoral relation, and all ministers sustaining this relation to a particular flock, must of necessity have the same power and right to discharge the full functions of their ministry within their respective jurisdictions, Our idea of ministerial equality forbids one minister to monopolize the pastorship of the people beyond his personal ministrations, or to exercise a governmental control over other ministers, beyond what they exercise over him. We will now give an outline of the argument on this point.

1. The whole that has been said in proof that there is but one order of ministers, comes to a focus just at this point. It has been shown that deacons are not an inferior order of ministers, so that there is no order inferior to elders.

It has also been shown that bishops and elders are the same order, and that the apostles had no successors; so that there can be no order superior to elders.

If, then, there are no ministers inferior to elders, and none superior, the argument is conclusive that there is but one order of ministers, and that all ministers must be equal. Indeed there can be no dispute, as the question is now presented. It is not contended that there is or can be any radical inequality among elders; it is admitted that all elders are equal in themselves.

Now as all elders are equal, and as all ministers are elders, as has been proved, it follows that all ministers are equal.

2. The equality of ministers must follow from the absence of any specific grant of power to any specific class. To justify any person, or class of persons, in assuming and exercising authority over others, there must be an explicit warrant or grant of such power. But there is no such grant of power to be found in the New Testament, conferring upon any class of elders extra authority for the government of other elders. Let the text be produced, if there is one, which contains such grant of power.

Dr. Bangs, in his "Original Church," has undertaken to make out this case. His argument is that Timothy and Titus were the successors of the apostles, possessing their right of jurisdiction and government of the church. We will give a few extracts. He says of the apostles:

"So far as the government of the church was concerned, and a supreme jurisdiction was needful for its unity and prosperity, they unquestionably had successors; it was, however, a succession of jurisdictional powers, and not of the exclusive powers of ordination.

"If it be asked who the immediate successors of the apostles were, I answer, that among others, Timothy and Titus, and probably Epaphroditus must be numbered." —[Orig. Church, p. 186.

"It is equally clear, I think, from the same testimony, that those denominated bishops and presbyters in the apostolic days, and with whom the power of ordination was originally vested, were not the successors of the apostles."—[Page 137.

"That these same persons (Timothy and Titus) were the successors of the apostles is equally evident."

At this point, Dr. Bangs introduces an argument drawn from 2 Tim. 4, 5, 6, after which he remarks as follows:

"These all indicate that the apostle designed these two eminent evangelists to succeed him in the government of the church, as general superintendents. Here was a proper itinerating episcopacy, clothed with ample powers to superintend the affairs of the church, to set things in order, and to ordain elders in every city, not resembling the restricted jurisdiction of either the Congregational or Presbyterian pastors, nor yet that of the episcopacy of the Protestant Episcopal church. —[Page 140, 141.

If we understand the Doctor, his argument embraces the following points.

- (1.) The apostles appointed successors clothed with general jurisdictional power to superintend and govern the whole church, as a unit, or as one organization.
 - (2.) These successors of the apostles were not presbyters, but were superior to them.
 - (3.) The body of presbyters at the same time possessed the power of ordination.
- To all this it may be replied,

(1.) It involves the doctrine of succession, as essential to the rightful government of the church. The difference between his succession and that of high church men is, theirs includes the right of ordination. His excludes this, and only embraces the right of jurisdiction and government. The Doctor disclaims the necessity of this succession as essential to the existence of a church, but we insist that it follows from his positions that without it there can be no scripturally organized and governed church. The secret of his strange positions is this: Had he included the power of ordination, it would have killed Methodist Episcopacy, as it can claim no more than Presbyterian ordination for its origin; and without this imaginary jurisdiction grounded upon apostolic authority, the jurisdiction and power of Methodist Bishops could not be justified. Now in his zeal to justify Methodist Episcopacy he has invented this succession of jurisdiction and right of government, which, if true, must unchurch the world, or drive us back into the bosom of Popery to find the line of this succession of jurisdiction. Look at the points of his arguments. He affirms that "a supreme jurisdiction was needful for the unity and prosperity of the church. To meet this necessity he affirms, and labors to prove from express declarations of Scripture, that Paul appointed Timothy, Titus, and others his successors in the government of the church, "with a succession of jurisdictional power," with a charge to commit the same to others. [See Original Church, page 136-142.] Now, if all this be true, the observance of this succession is just as binding as anything else

commanded, taught, and established by the Apostles, and to say that a church can exist without this order of things, is to say that a church can exist without observing the teachings of the Scriptures in their organization and government. It cannot be got over, as is attempted, by saying that there is no specific form of government laid down in the Scriptures, for Dr. Bangs professes to prove that we have a specific form thus far, that a general jurisdiction is necessary, and that it was provided for by the Apostles, by the actual establishment of a succession of jurisdiction. Now if this be so, the church must be bound by it, just as strongly as by anything else the Apostles taught. It follows then, most clearly, from Dr. Bangs' position, that a succession from St. Paul is necessary, in the form of a "supreme jurisdiction" over the church, from which the following consequences must follow:

First, there can be but one properly organized church, rightfully governed, as the jurisdiction is one undivided supreme jurisdiction, which was established by the Apostles.

Secondly, if the M. E. Church in her bishops, has this "supreme jurisdiction" for the "unity and prosperity" of the church, it must follow that they only are under apostolic government, as Dr. Bangs contends that the "succession of jurisdiction" which the Apostles established is not a local jurisdiction, but a general indivisible jurisdiction.

Thirdly, if the M. E. Church has not this "succession of jurisdiction," they cannot be under apostolical government. Now as Dr. Bangs contends that the "succession of jurisdiction" established by the Apostles, was not in the hands of the presbyters, but in the hands of others superior to them, and as Mr. Wesley was only a presbyter, they cannot have this needful succession of supreme jurisdiction.

(2.) Dr. Bangs' theory is self-contradictory. The idea of a supreme jurisdiction for the government of the church, with power to ordain elders, in every church, is not consistent with the general right of ordination in the hands of presbyters. To defend the jurisdiction and powers of Methodist Episcopacy, he insists that a general supreme jurisdiction was established by succession, not in the hands of presbyters, but above them; and then to defend Methodist ordination, which is derived only from presbyters, he contends that with presbyters was deposited the right of ordination. Now who does not see that the supreme jurisdiction of the successors of the Apostles, with the power to ordain everywhere, is inconsistent with the general right of presbyters to ordain? The power to ordain could not be possessed and exercised by two such distinct classes, without leading to disorder and confusion. Thus does the Doctor's theory overthrow itself.

(3.) It is not true that the directions given to Timothy and Titus imply a more extended jurisdiction than is recognized by Congregationalism, as Dr. Bangs affirms. Suppose a Congregational minister should go out from New England, and preach, and organize churches in a heathen country; should those churches elect them pastors of their own number, such minister, at their request, would lay his hands on every one of them. Now this is all that can be proved concerning Timothy and Titus. Dr. Bangs must have been ignorant of Congregationalism, or he would never have written as he did.

(4.) It cannot be proved that even Paul exercised an authoritative jurisdiction over Timothy and Titus, or even over the presbyters of the church; much less can it be proved that he communicated any such general supreme jurisdiction to Timothy and Titus for the government of presbyters. The whole implies necessarily, by the force of the terms used, nothing more than the advice of the older to the younger.

(5.) If it be admitted that Paul had supreme jurisdiction, as he is admitted to have been inspired, it can prove nothing concerning those who are not inspired. It cannot even prove that it can be right for uninspired men to possess such jurisdiction. He must have received and possessed that jurisdiction, if he had it, by virtue of his inspiration and plenary commission direct from Christ. These were not transferable, and therefore he could not have appointed successors to exercise them. Dr. Bangs lays much stress on the fact that Timothy and Titus were assistants of Paul, but this is against his argument—for if they were only assistants, acting in the name and by the authority of Paul, as his agents or assistants, their commissions must have died when the Apostle died. They could not have continued the work of assistants of Paul after he was dead.

(6.) The whole argument rests upon what Paul did, whereas he was but the thirteenth apostle. There is not the least pretended proof that any of the other twelve Apostles appointed successors, and what Paul is said to have done, it is clear he did without communing with or consulting the other Apostles. How absurd, then, is it to hang a succession of supreme jurisdiction upon the slight remarks made by Paul to Timothy and Titus, on his individual responsibility? Suppose Peter to have appointed successors, and James, and John, and each of the twelve, how could they have reconciled their respective claims to a "supreme jurisdiction?" The thing is impossible. The Apostles might settle their claims under the influence of inspiration; but their successors were not inspired, and hence thirteen different branches of the succession of supreme jurisdiction, emanating from thirteen different persons without inspiration to guide and settle their claims, would be likely to cross each other's path and make a little confusion and strife. The very idea is impossible.

We trust we have now sufficiently removed Dr. Bangs' theory of apostolical succession, and will fall back upon our own argument, that all ministers are equal because there is no grant of power to one class, of ministers for the government of another class. The reader will remember that this was the point we were upon, and as Dr. Bangs had undertaken to prove such grant made by Paul to Timothy and others, to be handed down to successors, we were bound to meet his argument. To claim power, there must be a specific grant produced, and we trust we have shown that Dr. Bangs has failed to produce such grant, and the conclusion is that—there being no grant of power to one class of ministers over another class—all ministers must be equal.

3. We will close the argument by a brief appeal directly to the Scriptures:

Matt. 20: 25; "But Jesus called them unto him and said, ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them.

26. "But it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister;

27. "And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant:

28. "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."

There are two words in this text which require explanation to be understood by the plain reader. These words are *minister* and *servant*. The Greek word which is rendered minister is *diakonos*, which is rendered deacon or servant, but which means a religious or ecclesiastical servant. The word which is rendered servant is *doulos*, and means servant or slave. The meaning of Christ appears to be this: whosoever will be great among you, let him be your lowest ecclesiastical or religious servant [*diakonos*] and whosoever will be chief among you let him be your lowest secular servant [*doulos*].—[See Dr. A. Clarke's notes on the text.

The design of the text was to teach them the doctrine of equality and a common brotherhood among them as Christian ministers. This text was designed to repress ill feeling, growing out of a desire on the part of some to be greater than others, and it settles the question forever, so far as words can settle it, that one minister has no right to exercise authority over another. "Among you it shall not be so;"—that is, none of you shall "exercise authority" over others.

If the text means anything, it means this, and if it had been framed on purpose to prove the absolute equality of ministers it could not have been more direct, full, and conclusive.

SECTION V.

The Assumption of Apostolical Succession Exposed.

The high church view of the subject is, that the bishops of the English Church, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, of the United States, are successors of the apostles, and have derived their office from them, by an unbroken chain of successive ordinations, and that without such succession there can be no valid ordinations, no valid ministry, no church, and no sacraments.

The above view has been already refuted, beyond the power of contradiction; the apostles had no successors, and could have none from the nature of their peculiar office. It was also shown that there is but one order of ministers, as the ministry was originally instituted, deacons not being an order of ministers, and bishops and presbyters being identical. These points being sustained, the claim set up for modern bishops as successors

of the apostles, with an office superior to, and a jurisdiction over all presbyters, must fall to the ground. This is sufficient of itself to settle the question, that all such high church claims are without foundation. Yet, as so much stress is laid upon this fabulous succession, it is, perhaps, proper to devote a distinct section to its consideration. It is so high in its claims, and so all-sweeping in its consequences, if true, that it ought to be looked full in the face, and its claims should be met and refuted. If this doctrine be true, but a mere fraction of Protestant Christians and ministers are within the pale of the church of Christ, whose only hope must be in the un-covenanted mercies of God. However, the assumptions appear more alarming in the distance than they do on close examination, as we trust will soon be made to appear.

1. We insist that there is no evidence that any such succession is necessary. No proof can be produced that a valid ministry cannot be elected by laymen, from among themselves, and be by them set apart to the work. Suppose an intelligent and devoted religious community without a regularly ordained ministry, and should they elect one of their number to be their pastor, and proceed in an appropriate and orderly manner to set him apart to the work of the ministry, by what texts of Scripture, or by what arguments can it be proved that his ministrations would not be valid? We know of no such Scriptures or argument. There is but one text, so far as we know, which is ever relied upon, in proof of the establishment of a succession by the apostles. 2 Tim. 2: 2; "The thing thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." The fact that this text is quoted by such men as Dr. Chapman, to prove the succession, is of itself proof that the Scriptures contain no valid evidence on the point. The text has no reference to the subject of the succession contended for, but speaks of a succession of instruction. The matter is this: Timothy had learned the truth of Paul, and he enjoined on him to teach these same truths to faithful men, who should be able, in their turn, to teach the same to others. Instruction must be thus communicated, but what has that to do with a succession of ordinations? Just nothing at all. These things—that is, the doctrines of the Gospel—can be transmitted from one to another by instruction, without any such thing as a succession of ordination by imposition of hands, extending a chain of physical contacts from the apostle Paul down to the end of time. It is seen, therefore, that the text proves nothing concerning the imaginary succession, and we may conclude that there is no proof of the necessity of any such thing.

2. We urge, in opposition to this assumption of an apostolical succession, that there is no proof that it exists. Here we dispute an alleged fact which is vital to the argument of our opponents, and which must be proved by undoubted evidence. Suppose the succession to be admitted as necessary, notwithstanding what has been said above; it must then be proved that such succession exists, by evidence as clear as we would desire to have of our right to the covenanted mercies of God. If they fail in the proof on this point, all is lost. Where, then, is the proof that any such succession exists? There is none, absolutely none that can be relied upon. Mr. Stevens, in his work already referred to, has presented a summary review of the evidences, if evidences there be any, that a succession from the apostles has been preserved, and now has any real existence. Mr. Stevens' argument is mainly taken from an able argument in the Edinburgh Review, 1843. As we consider it

conclusive on the point, we save the labor of constructing an argument, by giving this as follows:

"Whether we consider the palpable absurdity of this doctrine, its utter destitution of historical evidence, or the outrage it implies on all Christian charity, it is equally revolting. The arguments against it are infinite; the evidence for it absolutely nothing. It rests not upon one doubtful assumption, but upon fifty. First, the very basis on which it rests—the claim of episcopacy itself to be considered undoubtedly and exclusively of apostolical origin—has been most fiercely disputed by men of equal erudition and acuteness, and, so far as can be judged, of equal integrity and piety."

"Again, who can certify that this gift has been incorruptibly transmitted through the impurities, heresies, and ignorance of the dark ages? Is there nothing that can invalidate orders? The chances are infinite that there have been flaws somewhere or other in the long chain of succession; and, as no one knows where the fatal breach may have been, it is sufficient to spread universal panic through the whole church. What bishop can be sure that he and his predecessors in the same line have always been consecrated, or what presbyter that he was ordained by a bishop who had a right to ordain?" "But the difficulties do not end here. It is asked how a man, who is no true Christian, can be a true Christian minister, how he, who is not even a disciple of Christ, can be a genuine successor of the apostles."

"Since the first century, no less, in all probability, than a hundred thousand persons have exercised the functions of bishops. That many of these have not been bishops by apostolic succession, is quite certain. Hooker admits that deviations from the general rule have been frequent; and with a boldness worthy of his high and statesman-like intellect, pronounces them to have been often justifiable."

Archbishop Whately declares, "If a man consider it as highly probable that the particular minister at whose hands he receives the sacred ordinances is really apostolically descended, this is the very utmost point to which he can, with any semblance of reason, attain; and the more he reflects and inquires, the more cause for hesitation he will find. There is not a minister in Christendom who is able to trace up, with any approach to certainty, his own spiritual pedigree." "If a bishop has not been duly consecrated . . . his ordinations are null; and so are the ministrations of those ordained by him, and so on without end. The poisonous taint of informality, if it once creep in undetected, will spread the infection of nullity to an indefinite extent. And who can pronounce that during the . . . dark ages, no such taint was ever introduced? Irregularities could not have been wholly excluded without a perpetual miracle. Amidst the numerous corruptions of doctrine and of practice, and gross superstitions, that crept in . . . we find descriptions not only of the profound ignorance and profligacy of many of the clergy, but of the grossest irregularities in respect of discipline and form. We read of bishops consecrated when mere children—of men officiating who barely knew their letters—of prelates expelled, and others put in their place, by violence—of illiterate and profligate laymen, and habitual drunkards, admitted to holy orders; —and, in short, of the prevalence of every kind of disorder and indecency. It is inconceivable that any one, even moderately acquainted with history, can

feel . . . and approach to certainty, that amidst all this confusion and corruption, every requisite form was, in every instance, strictly adhered to; and that no one not duly consecrated or ordained was admitted to sacred offices."

Eusebius, the earliest uninspired historian of the church, though he sets out with the design of tracing the succession, assures us that it is matter of much doubt, and that he had but slight authorities to depend on respecting even the definite fields of the apostles, if they had any. He assures us he had to rely on mere report; and respecting their successors, he says: "Who they were that, imitating these apostles (meaning Peter and Paul), were by them thought worthy to govern the churches which they planted, is no easy thing to tell, excepting such as may be collected from St. Paul's own words."—[Ecc. Hist., lib. iii. ch. iv.

Bishop Stillingfleet remarks: "If the successors of the apostles, by the confession of Eusebius, are not certainly to be discovered, then what becomes of that unquestionable line of succession of the bishops of several churches, and the large diagrams made of the apostolical churches, with every one's name set down in his order, as if the writer had been *Clarencieux* to the apostles themselves? Are all the great outcries of apostolical tradition, of personal succession, of unquestionable records, resolved at last into the Scripture itself, by him from whom all these long pedigrees are fetched? Then let succession know its place, and learn to veil bonnet to the Scriptures; and, withal, let men take heed of overreaching themselves, when they would bring down so large a catalogue of single bishops, from the first and purest times of the church, for it will be hard for others to believe them when Eusebius professeth it so hard to find them."

Calamy, to show what little dependence can be placed on these tables, gives a brief view, from the representations of ancient writers, of the "strange confusion" of the first part of the tables of the three most celebrated churches of Alexandria, Antioch and Rome: "The church of Alexandria, has been generally represented as founded by St. Mark, and yet Eusebius speaks of it but as an uncertain report. 'They say it was so;' but he does not tell us who said so, nor upon what grounds. However, upon this slender authority of 'they say so' many others after him have ventured to affirm it as an indisputable fact, that St. Mark was actually the founder of this church. However, even in this there is no perfect agreement. Some contend that he was there with St. Peter, others, that he was there alone, being sent by St. Peter; others that he was there only once; others, that he returned again after his first visit. As to the time of his arrival, the period of his ministry, and the year in which this church was first founded, all its records are totally silent; and the famous Clement, from whom we might expect some information, throws not a single ray of light upon this subject.

"But even supposing St. Mark, under all these disadvantages, to have been seated in this church on his throne of polished ivory, as the fabulous legends report, and that he wrote his Gospel in it, the difficulties will increase when we proceed to his successors. His immediate follower on 'the throne of ivory' has several names given to him; and as to those who come after, the representations and accounts are too various and conflicting to be credited as records of a fact.

"The line of succession which proceeds from Antioch is involved in equal, if not still greater, difficulties than that of Alexandria. Eusebius, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, Pope Leo, Innocent, Gelasius, and Gregory the Great, all tell us that this church was founded by St. Peter; but we learn, from superior authority, that they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution of Stephen traveled as far as Antioch, preaching the word to the Jews only.' (Acts xi. 19.) This seems to have been the occasion of introducing Christianity at Antioch. After this, as the converts needed some one to confirm them in the faith which they had newly embraced, the church at Jerusalem sent forth Barnabas, not Peter, that he should go as far as Antioch: and when Barnabas found that he needed some further assistance, instead of applying to Peter, he 'departed to Tarsus to seek Saul; and when he had found him, he brought him to Antioch. And it came to pass that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people. And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch.' (Acts 11: 25, 26.) In all these transactions we have not one word about Peter; but, on the contrary, the intimations appear strongly in favor of Paul, as the first founder of the church in this place.

"We read, indeed, in another place, that St. Peter was at Antioch, but the circumstance is not mentioned to his honor; for St. Paul, observing the offense he had given by his dissimulation, withstood him to the face, which we can hardly suppose he would have done if Peter had been the founder of the church, and if he now stood at the head of his own diocese.

"Baronius, indeed, aware of these difficulties, is very willing that St. Peter should resign his bishopric at Antioch, upon condition that St. Paul, acting as his vicar, be allowed to have erected one there by his authority. But even this will not do; neither can the supposition be reconciled with the positive declarations of those who assert that he was a long time bishop there.

"If we turn from the apostles to their successors in this church, we shall find ourselves equally destitute of firm footing. Baronius assures us that the apostles left two bishops behind them in this place, one for the Jews and the other for the Gentiles. These were Ignatius and Euodius. Eusebius says expressly, that Euodius was the first bishop of Antioch, and that Ignatius succeeded him. But, on the contrary, St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and the author of the Constitutions, declare, with equal assurance, that St. Peter and St. Paul both laid their hands on Ignatius; but, unfortunately, it appears that St. Peter was dead before Ignatius was bishop in this place.

"The settlement of the Church of Rome, and its much-extolled apostolical succession of bishops, is involved, if possible, in still greater perplexity, confusion, and disorder. According to some, this church was founded by St. Peter; others say it was by St. Paul; some introduce both; and others assert that it was neither. Of this latter opinion were the learned Salmasius and others. But let us allow that St. Peter actually was at Rome, of what advantage will this be to the succession of bishops? If Peter was there, it is equally certain that St. Paul was there also; and under these circumstances it will be hard to

determine who was bishop. St. Paul was there first, and on this account he is preferred by many of the ancients to St. Peter; and in the seal of that church the former is placed on the right hand, and the latter on the left. But still this does not determine who was bishop. To accommodate this business, they have agreed to make them both bishops; and this unhappily destroys the unity of the episcopate, by placing two supremes at the same time in the same church.

"But whatever uncertainty may accompany the question as to the first bishop, those who succeeded him are known with even less assurance. On this point the ancients and the moderns are strongly divided. Some will have Cletus expunged out of the table, as being the same with Anacletus; and thus fixing Linus at the head of the succession, cause him to be followed by Anacletus and Clemens. In this manner Irenaeus represents the case. Others will have Cletus and Anacletus to be both retained as distinct bishops, having Linus standing between them. At the same time, in some of the ancient catalogues, Anacletus is excluded; and, what is remarkable; he is not to be found at this day in the canons of the mass, and yet, in the Roman Martyrology, both Cletus and Anacletus are distinctly mentioned, and a different account is given of the birth, pontificate, and martyrdom of each.

"In the catalogue of Epiphanius, the early bishops of Rome are placed in the following orders: Peter and Paul, Linus, Cletus, Clemens, and Euaristus. But in the catalogue of Bucher they stand according to the following arrangement: Linus, Cletus, Clemens, and Euraistus; and three names are entirely omitted, namely, Anicetus, Eleutherius, and Zephyrinus. And what shall we do with the famous Clement? Does he style himself bishop of Rome? Or how came he to forget his title?

"It has been said by some, that after he had been St. Paul's companion, and was chosen by Peter to be bishop of Rome, he gave place to Linus. But others assert, with equal confidence, and perhaps with equal authority, that Linus and Clemens, and others, that Linus and Cletus, were bishops at the same time. Tertullian, Ruffinus, and some others, place Clement next to St. Peter; Irenaeus and Eusebius set Anacletus before him; and Optatus makes both Anacletus and Cletus to precede him. And, finally, as though these strenuous defenders of apostolical succession were destined to render it ridiculous by the various methods they have adopted to defend this tender string, Austin, Damasus, and others, will not allow him to grace the list, until the names of Anacletus, Cletus, and Linus have appeared. Such is the foundation of apostolical succession in the Church of Rome! Surely it can be no breach of charity to assert that

'The bold impostor
Looks not more silly
when the cheat's found out.'

"It was not, therefore, without reason that Bishop Stillingfleet observed: 'The succession here is as muddy as the Tiber itself; and if the line fails us here, we have little cause to pin our faith upon it, as to the certainty of any particular form of church government, which can be drawn from the help of the records of the primitive church.' (Irenicum, p.

312.) It cannot, therefore, but be evident to every unprejudiced mind, that, since such confusion and disorder appear in the front of these tables of succession, where we might most naturally expect the greatest regularity and certainty, no dependence can be placed on their authority."

3. Could the fact of the supposed succession be proved, the corrupt channel through which it must have descended cannot fail to render it of no value. No succession can have reached our times, without having come through the dark channel of popery. It is known to all who have examined the history of the church, that she very soon departed from apostolic simplicity and purity, and became deeply and darkly corrupt. On the first reading of the history, the student pauses to wonder that the apostolic church became so very corrupt in so short a time. The conversion of Constantine the Great to Christianity, which took place about A. D. 313, though it put a stop to the bloody persecutions which were up to that date waged against the Christians, opened the way for the introduction of almost universal corruption. Of his early operations, Dr. Mosheim says: "Although he permitted the church to remain a body politic, distinct from that of the state, as it had formerly been, yet he assumed to himself the supreme power over this sacred body, and the right of modifying and governing it in such a manner as should be most conducive to the public good. This right he enjoyed without any opposition, as none of the bishops presumed to call his authority in question." The moment the church was thus taken under the protection of the civil power, to be subject to it, and modified and governed by it, it became essentially a kingdom of this world, and its subjects fought for it; its character was involved in the character of the empire; its destiny was linked to the destiny of the empire, and it became involved in the political corruptions, intrigues, and crimes of the centuries that followed. From this period onward, popes, bishops, and priests became political tools to do the bidding of a corrupt prince, or political aspirants themselves, grasping after civil power in the use of intrigues, treacheries, and corruptions, as dark as have distinguished any age. This is the channel through which the boasted succession has come down to our modern apostles, and how much grace it has brought with it from the other side of the dark ages, the Christian reader can judge. It may be well to glance at the general corruptions of the Romish Church, through which alone the succession can have been derived. We will only name such as are universal, and were for ages before the Reformation, so that it will be seen that the line of succession must have passed through them, to reach us on this side. Among the doctrines of the church we may enumerate the following. The infallibility of the Church of Rome is a fundamental doctrine. The supremacy of the Pope is another doctrine. The Pope attained to supreme authority, most probably, in the seventh century. From this, to the commencement of the Reformation by Luther, was about eight hundred years, during which time this doctrine prevailed both theoretically and practically.

The doctrine of seven sacraments constitutes another fundamental article in the Romish creed. They are baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony. The council of Trent pronounces an anathema on those who say that the sacraments are more or fewer than seven, and declares that every one is accursed who affirms that penance is not truly a sacrament instituted by Christ In the universal church.

The doctrine of merits is another fundamental article of faith with this mother of all who claim the virtue of the succession. The doctrine is that men can do more than duty requires, and thereby purchase more grace, and a higher state in glory. This leads to the doctrine of satisfactions, which is also fundamental. It is that penitents may make satisfaction for their sins by suffering. Here also comes in the doctrine of confession to a priest, and the performance of the penance he enjoins. Associated with this is the doctrine of indulgences. The principle is this: According to the Romish Church, upon which we are dependent for succession, the good works of the saints, over and above what is necessary to save themselves, are deposited with the infinite merits of Christ in one common and inexhaustible treasury; and that the keys of this treasury were given to St. Peter and to his successors, the popes. Thus each Pope in succession holds the keys of this treasury of merits, and may open it at pleasure, and for a given sum of money sell out quantities of merit suited to the demerit of the crime the purchaser has committed, or proposes to commit. These indulgencies were first invented more than three hundred years before the Protestant branch of the glorious succession broke off, and formed a separate channel. Pope Leo X. granted to Albert, elector of Mentz and archbishop of Magdeburg, the benefit of the indulgencies of Saxony and the neighboring parts, and sold out those of other countries to the highest bidders. These in turn, hired preachers as their agents to go among the people and sell indulgencies to commit sin. Here is a form of one of these indulgences:

"May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee, and absolve thee by the merits of his most holy passion. And I, by his authority, that of his blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and of the most holy Pope, granted and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee, first from all ecclesiastical censures, in whatever manner they have been incurred; then from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, how enormous soever they may be: even from such as are reserved for the cognizance of the holy See, and as far as the keys of the holy church extend, I remit to you all punishment which you deserve in purgatory on their account; and I restore you to the holy sacraments of the church, to the unity of the faithful, and to that innocence and purity which you possessed at baptism: so that when you die, the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the paradise of delights be opened; and if you shall not die at present, this grace shall remain in full force when you are at the point of death. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

These indulgences were sold at prices graduated to the supposed guilt incurred by the commission of different crimes. In a book called the tax of the sacred Roman Chancery, is found the exact sums to be levied for the pardon of each particular sin. The following are some of the prices of crime, as nearly as the amount can be given in whole numbers, in dollars and cents:

For procuring abortion, - -	\$1.66
For sacrilege, - - - -	2.22
For taking a false oath in a criminal case -	2.00
For robbing, - - -	2.66
For burning a neighbor's house -	2.66
For defiling a virgin, - - . -	2.00

For incest, -	1.66
For murdering a layman, - -	1.66
For keeping a concubine, - -	2.33
For laying violent hands on a clergyman - - - -	2.33

To show the bearing that this has upon the succession, it should be remarked that these indulgences were first sold by bishops—all bishops having the right to sell them. The practice became very general, so that those who boast of the succession must admit that they have received it from hands that sold for money the privilege of committing all manner of crimes. After the bishops had practiced it for a time, the Pope took the matter into his own hands, and sold out the right for different countries as described above. As authority for this statement, the following extract is introduced from Dr. Mosheim's Church History:

"The general prevalence of ignorance and superstition was dexterously, yet basely improved, by the rulers of the church, to fill their coffers, and to drain the purses of the deluded multitude: indeed each rank and order of the clergy had a peculiar method of fleecing the people. The bishops, when they wanted money for their private pleasures, or for the exigencies of the church, granted to their flock the power of purchasing the remission of the penalties imposed upon transgressors, by a sum of money, which was to be applied to certain religious purposes; or, in other words, they published indulgences, which became an inexhaustible source of opulence to the episcopal orders, and enabled them, as is well known, to form and execute the most difficult schemes for the enlargement of their authority, and to erect a multitude of sacred edifices, which augmented considerably the external pomp and splendor of the church. The abbots and monks, who were not qualified to grant indulgences, had recourse to other methods of enriching their convents. They carried about the country the carcasses and relicts of the saints in solemn procession, and permitted the multitude to behold, touch, and embrace, at fixed prices, these sacred and lucrative remains. The monastic orders often gained as much by this rare show, as the bishops did by their indulgences.

"When the Roman pontiffs cast an eye upon the immense treasures that the inferior rulers of the church were accumulating by the sale of indulgences, they thought proper to limit the power of the bishops in remitting the penalties imposed upon transgressors, and assumed, almost entirely, this profitable traffic to themselves. In consequence of this new measure, the court of Rome became the general magazine of indulgences; and the pontiffs, when either the wants of the church, the emptiness of their coffers, or the demon of avarice, prompted them to look out for new subsidies, published not only a general, but also a complete, or what they call a plenary remission of the temporal pains and penalties annexed by the church to certain transgressions. They went still farther; and not only remitted the penalties which the civil and ecclesiastical laws had enacted against transgressors, but audaciously usurped the authority which belongs to God alone, and impiously pretended to abolish even the punishments which are reserved in a future state for the workers of iniquity; a step which the bishops, with all their avarice and presumption, had never once ventured to take."—[Part II, chap. 3. Pages 320, 321.

Another doctrine of the Romish church is the celibacy of her clergy. This was enforced, in England, nearly four hundred years before the Reformation. To this may be added the worship of images and pictures, and the intercession of saints. Finally, the Church of Rome maintains that unwritten traditions ought to be added to the Holy Scriptures in order to supply their defects. What gives peculiar point to all this, is the fact that all these things have to be received, professed, and sworn to by every one who enters into holy orders in the church of Rome, so that there is no possibility of having any succession which does not come through men ignorant and base enough to receive, hold, profess, swear to, and practice all these abominations.

There is one other view of this subject which it may be well to take before we dismiss it, and that is the New Testament view of the apostasy, and the coming of the man of sin. That the New Testament writers, and St. Paul in particular, foresaw by the spirit of prophecy a general apostasy, cannot be doubted, and we think it will appear, on examination, not only that reference is made to the corruptions of Rome, but that she is represented as so corrupt, and so abandoned and condemned of God, as to render it worse than trifling to claim her as a channel through which we have received divine rights and ordinances, communicating spiritual grace, which God does not and cannot communicate to us on this side of the dark ages, save through, this mother of harlots. We will glance at a few of these allusions.

2 Thess. 2: 3, 4; "Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

Where can we find a better fulfillment of this than in the assumptions of the Romish Church above described, in which she claims the power to overrule the divine law, to pardon sinners, to hold the keys of heaven and hell, and to admit to, or exclude from both the one and the other, as the Pope is pleased to give the order?

1 Tim. 4: 1-3; "Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having the conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath commanded to be received."

Here is a class of persons, or a community, of sufficient consequence to be pointed out by the Holy Ghost, as one of the marked events that should distinguish the history of the church. It cannot refer to the Jews nor to the heathen, for they are described as departing from the faith—that is, the doctrines of the Gospel. It must therefore refer to some branch of the Christian church, or to the church during some particular age. But we find nothing in Christendom to answer the description, save in the Romish church. Here we find its fulfillment. Their doctrines as shown above are the doctrines of devils; they forbid to marry, and command to abstain from meats.

That the same corruptions are referred to in the Apocalypse, cannot be doubted. In Chap. 13: 11-17, under the figure of a beast, it is believed that we have a description of the Romish church and her corruptions. Again, it is believed that the Romish church is the subject of the seventeenth chapter. Here it is represented as a woman, called "the great whore, the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth," and she is declared to be "drunk with the blood of the saints." Such, then, is the channel through which the succession has come, if there be any succession, and we leave it for the Christian reader to judge if the community of which inspiration gives such a view can have any vestige of Christian character left, or can be made a channel through which grace and apostolic unction can flow uncorrupted from Peter and Paul to the ministers of our own times?

"Drunk with the blood of the saints!" How true is this of the Church of Rome! One million of the Albigenses and Waldenses perished at her hand in France alone. From the institution of the Jesuits, in a little over thirty years, nine hundred thousand orthodox Christians were slain by the common executioner. In the space of thirty years the Inquisition, by various tortures, destroyed one hundred and fifty thousand Christians. These are but items of her crimes. Well may she be said to be "drunk with the blood of the saints." The perpetrators of these crimes are the links which form the boasted chain of succession, extending through long, dark centuries, upon which is supposed to have come down the electric fluid of apostolic virtue. Enough has been said. We will leave those who glory in such a succession to enjoy it, while we prefer looking for a gracious influence to give validity to our acts, to come more directly from the throne of grace.

4. The doctrine which asserts the necessity of a succession from the apostles, in an unbroken series of physical contacts, by the imposition of hands in what is called ordination, is inconsistent with a supreme moral government, maintained over individually responsible moral agents.

It places the Christian enterprise beyond the control of the divine government, in the use of its ordinary means, and gives it into the hands of a class of human agencies, who, in view of their moral agency, may or may not execute the trust, leaving God no power to renew those agencies or employ others, should they fail. The doctrine in question is, that Christ settled the government of his church in the hands of bishops, with power to appoint successors, and with the exclusive right and power to call, consecrate and send ministers to preach the Gospel, so that without their consecration and commission there can be no valid ministry, no sacraments, and no church. Now these bishops are moral agents, and, as such, may disobey God, and refuse to execute their trust. Indeed, it cannot be denied that many have thus disobeyed God, and failed to execute their trust; and if many have failed, all may. Moreover, these bishops at different times have been under the control of the civil government, which has restrained them from the execution of their trust, only so far as it should dictate, both in relation to the number and character of those to be consecrated by them, and the fields of their labor. Here, then, God has placed the Christian enterprise beyond his control, by placing it, first, in the hands of a class of men called bishops, who may, as moral agents, refuse to fulfill their trust; and, secondly, by placing it in the hands of men who are themselves subject to civil government, and who may be prevented by it from executing their trust. This puts the kingdom which is not of

this world under the control of the kingdom which is of this world, with power to annihilate it.

The force of this argument depends upon the fact that man is a moral accountable agent, and that God governs him, as such, by moral and not by physical power. God employs human agencies in carrying on the Christian enterprise, and as these agencies may fail, and do often fail to execute their trust, by a perversion of their moral liberty, he must and does leave himself free to employ other agencies, when any of them fail. To illustrate, suppose our views of the subject under discussion to be correct; suppose no succession be necessary to a valid ministry; suppose sound piety, sufficient natural and acquired gifts, the call of God impressed upon the soul by the Spirit, in the form of a sense of duty, and the approbation of the church be all that is necessary to constitute a valid minister, and there is no chance for a failure. The lamp of the ministry may go out, or be blown out as often as you please, and it can be kindled up again in any part of the world, at any time, where the lamp of piety burns; and if one class of agencies prove unfaithful, God can call others into the field. This is the way God has operated. He has often discarded old agencies when they ceased to be useful, and employed new ones.

But suppose the doctrine of the necessity of a succession be true; —then if these bishops fail through their own corruption, and a perversion of their moral agency, or through the corrupt and controlling influence of civil government, there is no power in earth or heaven that can renew the work. The ministry having once become extinct, God himself cannot renew it without a special revelation from heaven for a re-organization of the church. Thus does this doctrine of succession place the very existence of the ministry and the church beyond the control of God by the ordinary means which he employs to carry on his gracious designs, and gives to a comparatively few persons, called bishops, many of whom have been as rotten specimens of humanity as have ever cursed the world, the power to blot both ministry and church from the earth by refusing or neglecting to appoint successors, or to ordain priests. The history of the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country furnishes an illustration of the facility with which all Gospel ordinances might have been forever shut out from these lands, upon the principle of the necessity of a succession. At the time of the Revolution there were no bishops here, and but few ministers of the Church of England, and the people were as sheep without a shepherd. To obtain the succession was the first thing to be done in removing the difficulty. But this itself was the great difficulty. Dr. Seabury was the first that made the attempt. He went to England and applied to the bishop of London, for especial orders, and was refused on the ground of legal impediments—no English bishop being authorized to ordain any man a bishop who should not take the oath of allegiance to the English government. He then went to Scotland, and got ordained a bishop by the non-juring bishops of that country; but on his return to America his ordination was deemed unsatisfactory by a majority of a general convention that assembled in Philadelphia and considered the case.

Next, Dr. White and Dr. Prevost made the trial, and on applying to the archbishop of Canterbury, they met with the same difficulty. It is said that they then applied to Dr. Franklin for advice, who was at that time our minister in France. He consulted a French clergyman, and found that they could not be ordained in France, unless they would vow

obedience to the archbishop of Paris; and the Pope's nuncio, whom he consulted, informed him that the Romish bishop in America could not lay hands on them unless they turned Catholics. Franklin then advised them that the Episcopal clergy should create a bishop for themselves, or turn Presbyterians. Finally, an act of Parliament was passed authorizing the English bishops to ordain bishops for America, and the succession was obtained. Here, then, the English Parliament, the kingdom which is of this world, had the power to have excluded the kingdom which is not of this world from these United States, upon the supposition that without the succession there can be no ministry, no ordinances and no church. Suppose, then, they had refused to pass the necessary law; those successors of the apostles would have had no power to have spread their apostolic virtues beyond the limits of the English government, and the ministry, ordinances, and the church itself must have been excluded from the United States, beyond the power of God himself to plant them here, unless he could first get the consent of the British Parliament, who had taken under its control the only agencies on earth by which a true ministry, true sacraments, and a true church can be propagated. Can any one really believe that God has so far put his own gracious purposes beyond his own control? We cannot believe it if others do.

CHAPTER III.

THE SACRAMENTS.

The word Sacrament is derived from the Latin word *sacramentum*, which signifies an oath, particularly the oath taken by soldiers to be true to their country and general. The word was adopted by the writers of the Latin church, to denote those ordinances of religion by which Christians came under an obligation of obedience to God, and which obligation, they supposed, was equally sacred with that of an oath. Of sacraments, in this sense of the word, Protestant churches admit of but two; and it is not easy to conceive how a greater number can be made out from Scripture, if the definition of a sacrament be just which is given by the church of England. By that church, the meaning of the word sacrament is declared to be an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof." According to this definition, baptism and the Lord's supper are certainly sacraments, for each consists of an outward and visible sign of what is believed to be an inward and spiritual grace, both were ordained by Christ himself, and in the reception of each does the Christian solemnly devote himself to the service of his divine Master.

With the above view Protestant Christians generally agree.

Burnet, on the Articles, says, " This difference is to be put between sacraments and other ritual actions; that whereas other rites are badges and distinctions by which Christians are known, a sacrament is more than a bare matter of form; as in the Old Testament, circumcision and propitiatory sacrifices were things of a different nature and order from all the other ritual precepts concerning their cleansings, the distinctions of days, places, and meats. These were, indeed, precepts given them of God; but they were not federal

acts of renewing the covenant, or reconciling themselves to God. By circumcision they received the seal of the covenant, and were brought under the obligation of the whole law; they were made by it debtors to it; and when by their sins they had provoked God's wrath, they were reconciled to him by their sacrifices, with which atonement was made, and so their sins were forgiven them; the nature and end of those was, to be federal acts, in the offering of which the Jews kept to their part of the covenant, and in the accepting of which God maintained it on his part; so we see a plain difference between these and a mere rite, which, though commanded, yet must pass only for the badge of a profession, as the doing of it is an act of obedience to a Divine law. Now, in the new dispensation, though our Savior has eased us of that *law of ordinances*, that *grievous yoke*, and those *beggarly elements*, which were laid upon the Jews; yet since we are still in the body subject to our senses, and to sensible things, he has appointed some federal actions to be both the visible stipulations and professions of our Christianity, and the conveyances to us of the blessings of the Gospel."

The above is a clear and well drawn distinction between sacraments and other religious rites.

The sacraments then are two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

SECTION I.

Baptism—Its Nature and Design.

I. Baptism was appointed by Christ, as a permanent Gospel rite, to be continued to the end of the Christian dispensation.

In support of this, the following considerations are urged.

1. The terms of the appointment imply the perpetuity of the rite.

The first order which Christ issued to his disciples, is not upon record. The fact that they baptized is recorded, John 3: 22: "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea; and there he tarried with them, and baptized."

John 4: 1-3: "When therefore the Lord knew the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, (Though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples,) He left Judea, and departed again into Galilee."

From this it appears that Christ never baptized with his own hands, but that his disciples did baptize in his name, and under his direction. This is all we know of this baptism, what the words of the order were under which the disciples acted, we know not. But when Christ gave to his ministers their final commission, we have the words recorded, Matt. 28: 17-20; "And Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; Teaching them to observe all things

whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

Mark 16: 15, 16; "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

There is a difference in the record between Matthew and Mark, but this may be accounted for on the ground that neither has recorded all that was said, and that they have given different parts of the conversation. The words clearly imply the perpetuity of baptism. The commission is to all nations, and it anticipates two things, namely, instruction and baptism.

The command to baptize is just as extensive and lasting as the command to teach, and both comprehend the whole world, and extend to the end of time. "I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," are words which render the commission a continuous one through their successors, and baptism is as abiding as the ministry itself

2. The above is clearly the sense in which the disciples understood our Lord, and practiced upon their commission.

In the first sermon that Peter preached under his new commission, he said, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you." Acts 2: 38. They baptized all their converts, as is clear from the history of their transactions

3. Those who immediately followed the apostles in the work of the ministry, continued to baptize, as the apostles had done before them. This must render it certain that the apostles understood that baptism was to be continued in the church. They were inspired, but they had no inspired successors, what, therefore, the apostles left in the hands of their successors, as Christian rites must remain such to the end of time for there can be no repeal without inspiration, or a revelation from God. If the apostles had understood that baptism was a temporary rite, they would have discontinued it while they lived, but this they did not do. It having been instituted by Christ, none but inspired men, none but those to whom God reveals his will, can have a right to discontinue, but the only class of inspired men that have existed, the men to whom the rite was given, did not discontinue it, but left it as the practice of the church, and as no one but inspired men can set it aside, it must remain perpetually. The argument is conclusive that baptism is still binding as a Christian ordinance, and must remain so to the end of time.

II. Baptism as a Christian ordinance is very significant and important.

1. It is, under the Gospel, the seal of God's covenant of grace. The Old Testament had its seal. The seal was given to Abraham with whom God entered into covenant.

Rom. 4: 11; "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that

believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also."

The New Testament has its seal, and that seal is baptism.

Col. 2: 11,12; "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."

Rom. 6: 3; "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?"

A seal is that which confirms and makes a contract or covenant binding. By baptism, we take upon us the obligations of the covenant of God. The following are the terms of the covenant.

Heb. 8: 10; "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people."

This is what God engages to do on his part. We have another form of God's promise connected with what he requires of us.

2 Cor. 6: 17, 18; "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you; And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."

We enter into our engagement to serve God in due public form, when we are baptized. Baptism is a pledge on our part to God, and the world, that we will live according to the rules of Christianity. All men are always under obligation to be good Christians, but they do not acknowledge it. Baptism is an acknowledgment of the obligation, and a pledge to abide it. In a word, we pledge ourselves to the terms of God's covenant, and seal the contract, baptism being the seal. If Baptism is not such a seal, the Gospel has none, and there is no recognized form of entering into covenant relation with God. God clearly seals the covenant on his part with each individual, by the Spirit. The covenant was confirmed with all men in Christ.

Gal. 3: 16, 17; "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, That the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect."

The covenant secures to all the offer of salvation on Gospel terms. But each must ratify it personally and individually for himself. When God gave the covenant to Abraham he

gave him a seal, which was circumcision, and this was placed upon all who became visibly interested in the covenant. Baptism is the right by which we now enter into visible relation with God, and each should ratify the covenant for himself, by being baptized. There is no other Christian ordinance by which it can be claimed that we assume personally a covenant relation to God and the obligations of such relation.

It cannot be affirmed of the Lord's supper, for that is a family rite and belongs to the children of the covenant. The celebration of the Lord's Supper is a continuous act; it is to be repeated, but baptism is not repeated, it is clearly therefore initiatory, while the Lord's Supper is for the initiated.

2. Baptism is a sign or symbol of the purification of the heart by the Holy Spirit. It is an outward visible sign of an internal washing. Outward washing with water is a universal method of cleansing from external impurities, and hence is the most appropriate and expressive symbol to denote, as an outward sign, the internal cleansing from sin. Purification is always associated with baptism.

Ezek. 36: 25-27; "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them."

So Christ said, John 3: 5; "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

The Savior connects the water with the Spirit, the one is external, the other is internal; the one is visible, the other is invisible; the one is the sign or symbol, the other is the thing symbolized or signified.

Eph. 5: 25, 26; "Christ loved the church and gave himself for it that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word."

Titus 3: 5; "He hath saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost."

The idea of purification is contained in all these texts.

Heb. 10: 22; "Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."

These frequent allusions to water can have no significance, unless they refer to baptism, for water is not employed for any other purpose but baptism, in the Christian religion. And the conclusion is very clear that it signifies purification. There is an inward washing, and the external application of water denotes this internal purification. Circumcision was

also external, and internal, and it was the internal that saved, while the external was only a sign of a real work within.

Rom. 2: 28, 29; "For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one *inwardly*, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men but of God."

It should never be forgotten, that the sign may exist without the thing signified; and so may the thing signified exist without external sign.

3. Baptism is the initiatory rite, by which persons are introduced into the visible church, and visibly connected with Christ and his people.

This follows, necessarily, from the fact that it is the seal or confirmation of the Gospel covenant, as proved above. In this aspect it is a sign and mark of difference between those who are the visible people of God, and those who are not.

We must not confound union with the visible church, with union with the real church or union with Christ. This distinction is necessary to keep free from the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. The renewing of the Spirit connects us with Christ in fact; baptism connects us with him and his people in visible form. The one may exist without the other. There are many baptized infidels, in which case they have a visible union with Christ and his church, without a vital saving union with either. So there may be, under some circumstances, persons who have received the internal baptism, the renewing of the heart by the Spirit, who have never received water baptism. Such have no visible union with Christ, and his people, but have a real vital saving union with both.

With this view before us, we shall better understand the words of Christ, which have been already quoted. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." By the kingdom of God here, we must understand the Gospel church. With it there is no complete and saving union but by being born of water and of the Spirit. The water, by baptism visibly connects us with the visible church; the Spirit invisibly and vitally connects us with the invisible church, or constitutes us one of Christ's flock, in fact. How else can any man explain, how a birth by water is necessary to enter into the kingdom of God. Without the Spirit our baptism with water only presents us visibly to the eye of the world, in union with the church of Christ, while, in fact, we have no such vital union. The Spirit without the water connects us with Christ, but leaves us visibly to the eye of the world outside of his church and flock. It is not easy to conceive of any other explanation of our Saviour's language, which will preserve its directness and simplicity, and yet make it harmonize with evangelical Christian experience. The same general truth is taught by Paul.

Gal. 3: 27; "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ."

This text most clearly implies that baptism is the outward visible act and rite, by which we join ourselves to Christ and his people. How else, or in what other sense are persons baptized into Christ? There is no other sense only that of baptismal regeneration, which cannot be allowed. We are baptized into Christ, by taking upon us the profession of the Christian religion, and by taking upon us the visible mark which Christ has ordered to be put upon his flock, and this we do when we are baptized, for baptism is that mark.

The objection that if baptism be the door into the visible church, it must also be the door out of the church, and if we baptize persons in, we must baptize them out, when they are excommunicated, is too superficial to need a reply, were it not that it has sometimes been uttered by grave ministers. Baptism is not a literal door, but only an initiatory rite appointed by Christ, but the form of initiation into any organic body, bears no relation to the form or manner of expulsion from the same body. Christ has appointed baptism as the form of entering into Christian relations and fellowship, but he has appointed no such form of withdrawing fellowship. Because the rite of circumcision was the form of admitting persons from the heathen nations to the profession of the true religion, and into Jewish privileges and fellowship, it did not follow that, if they returned to heathenism, they must be circumcised out of the Jewish organization. Because we induct a man into the office of the ministry by laying on hands upon him, it does not follow that we must lay on hands upon him to depose him. The person going back to heathenism, after circumcision, bore off with him the indelible mark of the true religion, to his disgrace as an apostate. So with those who have been baptized, and by this rite admitted to visible union with Christ's visible church; if they become apostates, they bear away the seal of the covenant, the mark of Christ, the impress of the Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which can never be blotted out, but which will blaze as in letters of fire upon their souls in perdition.

4. Baptism is a standing memorial of Christ, of the institution of the Christian religion, and of course of its divinity and truth.

Baptism being appointed as the seal of the covenant, as a sign of the end to be accomplished, the purification of the heart, and the initiatory rite of admitting persons to the visible Christian family, it becomes a memorial and proof of the whole system.

(1.) If there had been no such person as Christ, there could be no such rite as baptism. Christianity has always had its enemies, who would have exposed and overthrown it if they could. Now here is a rite practiced, said to have been appointed by Christ, and to have been practiced by his followers ever since. If it were not so, the enemies of Christianity would have made a record of the person, by whom it was first practiced, and of the time, place and circumstances of its introduction. This they have not done. The conclusion is that it was introduced by no other person, and at no other time and place than those which it reveals upon its face. This fact, this one rite is a monument of the truth of Christianity, a moral break-water against which the angry waves of infidelity dash in vain.

(2.) Baptism standing thus, as has been shown, is suggestive of all the vital doctrines of Christianity. Upon its very face we read the name of the Triune God. The performance of the rite is a solemn act of consecrating the subject to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. It is also a most solemn act of worship rendered to the three divine persons in the unity of the Godhead. By the use of the water, it reminds us of our necessity of moral purification, that we are guilty and need pardon, and that we are polluted and need to be cleansed from sin. At the same time it presents the Father of whom we must seek pardon, it presents the Son by whose atonement alone pardon can be extended to sinners, and it presents the Holy Ghost, by whom our internal washing is to be accomplished. This train of thought suggested by baptism, might be carried much farther, but it is unnecessary. The rite of baptism, when comprehended in its extensive bearings, is a body of Christian theology.

SECTION II.

The Subjects of Baptism.

I. All believers, who profess faith in Christ, who have not been baptized, are proper subjects of baptism. The term believers is here used to denote justified and regenerate persons, real Christians, made so by the renewing of the Holy Ghost. That such are proper subjects of baptism, they not having been baptized, all agree, who believe in water baptism in any circumstances. As all are agreed on this point, no argument need be advanced to prove it.

II. All who embrace Christianity as a system of revealed religion, and entertain an honest purpose to live it, are proper subjects of baptism, without reference to the question whether or not the Spirit has regenerated them, or whether or not they have obtained an evidence of their acceptance with God. This is an important practical point, and a debated one. It is maintained by some that none are to be baptized but such as give reasonable evidence that they have already received the remission of their sins, that they are regenerated. The view stated above stands opposed to this restricting baptism to actual experimental Christians. The question is now fairly raised, are persons professing to believe in Christianity as a saving system, and professing penitence, and a purpose to live a Christian life, entitled to baptism before professing to have received the remission of their sins, and a witness of their acceptance with God?

The affirmative of this question is the one to be maintained, and the whole power of Scriptural evidence is on this side of the question.

So far as John's Baptism is concerned, about which some have much to say, because it was in Jordan, there can be no doubt. That they were all regenerated persons cannot be believed. That John supposed them all to be regenerated persons, cannot be believed. The plain words of the history must settle this question.

Matt. 3: 5, 6, 11; "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins. I indeed baptize

you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire."

Mark 1: 4, 5; "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins."

That they were all converted persons, in the sense of regeneration, cannot be believed. That they all confessed that they were sinners, and promised to believe on Christ, when he should come, there can be no doubt. The account of St. Luke varies a little in its particulars.

Luke 3: 2-14; "The word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness. And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins; Then said he to the multitude that came forth to be baptized of him, O generation of vipers who hath warned you to flee from wrath to come? Bring forth, therefore, fruits worthy of repentance; and begin not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, That God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees; every tree, therefore, which bringeth not forth fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire. And the people asked him, saying, what shall we do then? He answereth and saith unto them, He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath meat, let him do likewise. Then came also publicans to be baptized, and said unto him, Master, what shall we do? And he said unto them, Exact no more than that which is appointed you. And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, and what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages."

That John examined the multitude, on Christian experience one by one, will be assumed by no one, unless the life of his creed depends upon that very improbable assumption. All the facts are against it.

One more quotation will about finish the history of John's Baptism.

Acts 19: 1-5; "Paul having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus; and finding certain disciples, He said unto them, have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus."

The simple point to be proved by these Scriptures, is, that John's baptism was not confined, or pretended, or designed to be confined, to those who were regenerated in heart. This point they most clearly prove.

Now let us look at the subject under the authority of Christ. There are two accounts of the commission to baptize, one by Matthew, and the other by Mark. Matthew says not a word about faith, about believing, or about regeneration. His words are, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,"

Mark says, "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

This is supposed by many to require what is called justifying faith, as a pre-requisite to baptism, but it requires no such thing.

It requires only a general belief in the sense of credence. "He that credits this Gospel as a revelation from God."—Clarke. "Credits it to be true."—Barnes. All who received the Gospel under that commission, as true, and pledged to adopt it in life, were clearly entitled to receive baptism, and it will yet appear that it was in this sense the apostles practiced upon it.

The first example we have is that given us by Peter, at the day of Pentecost. At the conclusion of Peter's sermon it is said, Acts 2: 37, 38; "Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Here they were commanded to repent and be baptized "for the remission of their sins," that is as a means of obtaining pardon. The words can mean nothing else. It was necessary for them to be baptized as a means of obtaining pardon, in the sense that any known duty must be performed by an awakened sinner, before he can obtain forgiveness and acceptance. They inquired as sinners, what they must do, for they were pricked in the heart, and Peter told them to repent and be baptized, as a means of relief. The promise which he added makes the same thing more certain. "And ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." This cannot mean the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost of working miracles, for that was clearly never conferred upon that multitude of three thousand souls. They were not regenerated, had not been pardoned when Peter told them to be baptized, and promised them the gift of the Holy Ghost after their baptism; by which internal baptism in its heart-renewing influence, must be meant. Here we have a clear case of baptism before what is called regeneration. It is then added, "Then they that gladly received his word," not they who mocked, "were baptized," and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." No doubt, on being baptized, they received the remission of sins, and the comfort of the Holy Ghost.

The next baptismal scene occurred in Acts 8: 12,13; "But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women. Then Simon himself believed also; and when he

was baptized, he continued with Philip, and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were done."

It is not doubted that there were sound conversions under the preaching of Philip, yet it is clear that a theoretical embracing of the Gospel was all that was required as a condition of baptism. Simon was baptized, but not regenerated, though it is declared that he believed.

So in the case of the Ethiopian, verse 37. He inquired, "What doth hinder me to be baptized?" Philip replied, "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest." And he answered and said, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." On this faith Philip baptized him. "He went on his way rejoicing." for no doubt he received a great blessing in the act of being baptized.

It is clear, then, that all who believed in the truth of Christianity, and entertain an honest purpose to live by it as a system of faith and duty, are Scriptural subjects of baptism.

But it may be asked, would you now baptize men and women before conversion, or before they profess to have obtained pardon? To be sure I would, if I believed that they desired it in connection with an honest purpose to seek God. It is the only Scriptural ground. If an awakened sinner should come to me, who had never been baptized, and ask me what he must do to be saved, I would tell him to be baptized, as one item in the list of duties I would lay before him.

But it may be asked, what relation such persons should hold to the church. They ought to be at once taken under the watch care of the church, and go forward in all Christian duties, for this is implied in their honest purpose to live a Christian life, upon the profession of which I would baptize them.

III. The children of baptized parents, when presented by their parents, are proper subjects of baptism.

This is really the most earnestly contested point in regard to the whole subject of baptism. And after so much has been said by others, but little new need be expected. A condensed statement of the points of the argument is all that will be attempted.

1. Infants were included with their parents in the covenant of Grace, and always received the seal of that covenant, and therefore they cannot be excluded, without an express command from God.

The force of the argument depends upon a number of facts which need to be distinctly stated.

(1.) The covenant which God made with Abraham is the Gospel covenant, under which we now live.

It is admitted that the covenant, as existing between God and Abraham embraced a number of incidental matters, which were peculiar to Abraham's natural seed, the Jews, but these have all been revoked, changed or expired by limitation. But that covenant at the same time, included the promise of the gift of Christ for the redemption of the world, and all the blessings of the Gospel. It clearly included the Gospel itself, the Gospel church and all its blessings. This point is so plain that it appears almost unnecessary to prove it.

Gen. 17: 7; "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an ever-lasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee,"

Gen. 22: 16-18; "By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord; for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son; That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies: And in thy seed shall the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice."

Here we have a statement of God's covenant with Abraham, and it was "an everlasting covenant," and included a blessing for "all the nations of the earth." That must have been the Gospel covenant. If there could be any doubt, the New Testament would remove it.

Gal. 3: 6-9; "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham."

This proves that the covenant with Abraham comprehended a spiritual family, including all the faithful, so that Gospel believers are included in the promise as Abraham's promised children. It is asserted that the declaration, "in thee shall all nations be blessed," was "the Gospel, preached before unto Abraham." This leaves no ground to doubt.

This is made still more plain, if possible, verses, 12-14; "And the law is not of faith: but. The man that doeth them shall live in them. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed every one that hangeth on a tree: That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith."

Here the blessing of the Gospel enjoyed by the Gentiles is declared to be the blessing of Abraham, or the blessing promised to Abraham.

Lest the covenant made with Abraham should get confounded with the Mosaic system, so as to lead men to give up the Abrahamic covenant, or hold on to the law as a means of justification, Paul draws another line of distinction in verses 15-19: "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant; yet if it be confirmed, no man

disannulled, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith, not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, That the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator."

From all this it is certain that the Gospel is but a continuation of the covenant made with Abraham, that the Gospel church with its blessings is a fulfillment of that covenant, and that it is not a new thing, but a continuation of the Abrahamic family, with such alterations as were required to suit it to a wider circle by the incorporation of the Gentiles.

This view is still further confirmed by Paul to the Romans. Under the figure of an olive tree; he shows that the Gospel church is the old Abrahamic tree with the Gentiles grafted on.

Rom. 11: 17-21; "And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive-tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree; Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.

"Thou wilt say then, the branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off; and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear: For if God spared not the natural branches, *take heed* lest he also spare not thee."

(2.) Children received the seal of the Abrahamic covenant, which was circumcision. This will not be denied, yet the proof may be added in brief.

Gen. 17: 10; "This *is* my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man-child among you shall be circumcised."

Rom. 4: 11, 12; "And he received the sign of circumcision; a seal of the righteousness of the faith which *he had*, yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also:

"And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which *he had*, being yet uncircumcised."

These points are now settled, that circumcision was the seal of the Abrahamic covenant, and that it was placed upon children.

(3.) In the institution of the Gospel church, there was a change of the seal from circumcision to baptism, without any change in the covenant.

It has been proved that baptism is now the seal of the covenant, in an argument on the nature of baptism, to which the reader is referred.

There is no necessity for a long argument to prove the substitution of baptism for circumcision, the facts are clear and that is all that is important; namely, circumcision was the seal of the covenant; baptism is now the seal of the covenant. In addition to the argument by which baptism has been proved to be the seal of the covenant, it need only be remarked, that baptism has the same significance now which circumcision had.

Circumcision was the seal of the covenant, and baptism is now the seal of the covenant.

Circumcision was the initiatory rite by which persons were admitted into covenant relation with God, and into fellowship with his people, and baptism is now that same initiatory right. This was proved while treating of the nature of baptism.

Circumcision was a sign of an internal work of grace in the heart, and baptism is a sign of the same thing.

Deut. 30: 6; "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live."

Rom. 2: 28, 29; "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither *is that* circumcision which is outward in the flesh: But he *is* a Jew, which is one inwardly, and circumcision *is that* of the heart, in the spirit, *and* not in the letter; whose praise *is* not of men, but of God."

That baptism is such a sign has been proved, but the following text, covers the whole ground.

Col. 2: 10-13; "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power; In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with *him* through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses."

Here circumcision and baptism are joined as both representing the same gracious heart work.

Circumcision was a work of difference between the people of God and the uncovenanted world, and baptism is now that same mark of distinction. From the above premises it

follows of necessity that infants are to be baptized, or are to have the seal of the covenant placed upon them.

Take the facts as they now stand upon the record, and they may be thus summed up.

The Gospel church is no more, and no other than the perfecting of the Abrahamic covenant. This is so clear from what has been said that it cannot be doubted. But Paul says,

Rom. 15: 8; "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises *made* unto the fathers; And that the Gentiles might glorify God for *his* mercy; as it is written, For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name."

The truth of God then as involved in the covenant sealed with Abraham by circumcision, is confirmed in Christ, and we are enjoying the perfected state of that covenant in the privileges and blessings of the Gospel church.

This covenant did, and of course must still include the children of believing parents, and as they received the former seal, they must receive the present seal, which is baptism. The change of the seal does not and cannot change the subjects of the seal. In view of these facts nothing but an express command could preclude infants from the rite of baptism. But no such command is found, no such intimation is given. Every allusion to children found upon the entire record is such as to favor it. When little children were brought to Christ, and his disciples would have prevented it, he rebuked them, and took the little ones up in his arms and blessed them. This was not baptism, but they had always been regarded as members of the Jewish church, and it furnished an occasion for him to declare that they should continue to be members of the church under his mediatorial reign, for he said, "suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

Some say that there is no command to baptize infants. Without making a formal reply to this objection, at this point, it is in place to say, that no command is called for to authorize it. Nothing but a command forbidding it could prevent it, under the circumstance of the case.

2. The commission of the apostles, construed in the light of the facts, upon the record, must include infants as subjects of baptism. The commission has been given, but let it be spread upon the page at the head of this argument.

Matt. 28: 18, 19; "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

All are agreed that the literal sense of this is, "go and make disciples of all nations."

The terms of the commission includes children, as they are included in the term nations. A nation includes the children of the nation. They were therefore to make disciples of the children.

To this the objection is raised, that they were required to teach them also, and that infants are not subjects of instruction, and therefore they cannot be the subjects of baptism. The premises are admitted, but the conclusion is denied. They were to teach all that were capable of being taught, and baptize all that received the instruction, and the instruction and baptism of parents, brought in their children with them. This the covenant required, as has been proved. Less than what is here required on the subject of teaching, could not be required, if it had been understood that infants were to be baptized. Teaching must go before baptism, because children would not be baptized, until after their parents were baptized, and the parents could not be baptized until they were taught. This proves that the command to teach, would be required in the commission, admitting that they understood that they were to baptize the children of such parents as embraced the Gospel; and what must have been in the commission, if children were to be baptized, cannot prove that they are not to be baptized. The objection, therefore, grounded upon the command to teach must fall. Infants are then necessarily included in the absence of no command to exclude them. The teaching clause in the commission, required no more than had always been required by the very terms of the covenant. The Jews were always required to teach their children, but they sealed them with the seal of the covenant before they were capable of being taught. So were they required to teach the heathen when they became proselytes, and also to teach their children, but the children were circumcised with their parents, before they could be taught. There being no force then in the command to teach, against the baptism of children, the apostles would, as a matter of course, baptize the children of such families as embraced the Gospel, and this it is clear they did, as will hereafter appear.

3. The fact that baptism existed among the Jews, as an initiatory rite by which proselytes were admitted, is a conclusive argument in favor of infant baptism, considered in view of what appears upon the face of the record.

The fact that baptism was practiced among the Jews before the days of John, may be denied as a last resort to escape the force of a conclusive argument, but the proof is too clear to be resisted.

There were diverse baptisms practiced among the Jews in our Saviour's time, for they are referred to in the New Testament. That baptism had been practiced for many centuries when Christ appeared, is maintained by the best of writers on antiquity. Baptism, says Mr. Watson, "was no new ordinance when our Lord instituted it, though he gave to it a particular designation. It was in his practice to adapt, in several instances, what he found already established, to the uses of his religion. A parable, for instance, was the Jewish mode of teaching. Who taught by parables equal to Jesus Christ? And what is the most distinguished and appropriate rite of his religion, but a service grafted on a Passover custom among the Jews of his day? It was not ordained by Moses, that a part of the bread they had used in the Passover should be the last thing they ate after that supper; yet this

our Lord took as he found it, and converted it into a memorial of his body. The cup of blessing has no authority whatever from the original institution; yet this our Lord found in use, and adopted as a memorial of his blood; —taken together, these elements form one commemoration of his death. Probability, arising to rational certainty, therefore, would lead us to infer, that whatever rite Jesus appointed as the ordinance of admission into the community of his followers, he would also adopt from some service already existing—from some token familiar among the people of his nation."

The simple allusions to John's baptism prove that though he was regarded as an extraordinary man, his baptism was not considered as new or strange.

Matt. 3: 1, 5, 6; "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, And were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins."

"John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance." Mark 1: 4.

"And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Luke 3: 3.

John is noted as an extraordinary preacher, but baptism is not even referred to as a new thing, but is named as a thing understood. But what appears more conclusive, is the inquiry made by the committee sent to him by the Jews. After learning from him that he was not the Christ, nor Elias, nor one of the old prophets, they demanded of him why he baptized.

John 1: 25; "And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?"

The questioning was not in regard to the nature and objects of baptism, as though it were a new thing, but simply in regard to his authority. "Why baptizest thou then?" not what doest thou, or what is this new rite, this baptism? The thing he was doing appears to have been understood, but his authority was called in question. The view here given, is argued at some length by the learned Dr. Mosheim, in his Commentary, vol. 1, p. 89.

To the above the following is added: "Maimonides, a Jew and the great interpreter of the Jewish law, says: 'Israel was admitted into covenant by three things, viz by circumcision, *baptism* and sacrifice. Baptism was in the wilderness before the giving of the law.'

"Again, he says, 'Abundance of proselytes were made in the days of David and Solomon before private men; and the great Sanhedrim was full of care about this business; for they would not cast them out of the church, because they were baptized.

'And again, 'whenever any heathen will take the yoke of the law upon him, circumcision, *baptism* and a voluntary oblation are required. * * * That was a common axiom, no man is a proselyte until he be circumcised and *baptized*.'

"Calmet, in his Dictionary (Art. Proselytes,) says, 'The Jews require three things to a complete proselyte; *baptism*, circumcision and sacrifice; but for women only baptism and sacrifice.'

"Dr. Wall says of proselytes to the Jewish religion,' they were all *baptized*, males and females, adults and *infants*. This was their *constant practice*, from the time of Moses to that of our Savior, and from that period to the present day.'

"But the testimonies are too numerous to be quoted or even referred to in this note. See *Kurtz on Baptism*, and other works, in which this historical fact appears to be satisfactorily proved.

"Professor Stuart thinks the probabilities are against the practice of proselyte baptism in the time of our Savior. He admits, however, that 'the impression has become widely extended in the Christian church, that such was the fact,' and that a majority of the older writers have adopted the opinion of Selden, Lightfoot, Dantz, Buxtorf, Schoothgen, Wetstein and others, that the baptism of proselytes was common when John the Baptist made his appearance as a public teacher."—[Bib. Repos. Vol. 3, pp. 342, 355.

It is then settled that all proselytes from the Gentiles, were admitted by baptism, males, females, and children, the children coming in with their parents. With this state of things before them, the Apostles were sent out to make disciples of all nations, baptizing them all. Here it is insisted again, that nothing but a positive command, not to baptize children, could prevent. The first Gentile parents that embraced the Gospel, would be baptized with their household in accordance with the common usage. It cannot be supposed that the custom of baptizing infants with their parents being already established, would be discontinued without a command. And how very reasonable is all this? There was a severe and bloody rite by which all male persons were sealed, both Jews and proselytes, but which was applicable only to males. But there was another rite, baptism, which had grown up among them, which was adapted to both sex, and all ages. This had been practiced upon children. The Savior adopted this latter rite as the seal of the covenant, to answer to every religious significance which the former had, and sent his ministers to disciple and baptize all nations. Of course they would apply it as it had been applied.

4. The opening of the Gospel mission to the world, by Peter, on the day of Pentecost, was in perfect accordance with this entire array of facts which have been established in all of the preceding arguments.

To the first inquiry after the way of Gospel salvation, he gave the following reply: "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you and to your children and to all that are afar off *even* as many as the Lord our God shall call."

This coming from the mouth of a Jew could refer to nothing but the promise made to Abraham, and it could mean nothing less than that the application of that covenant, under the Gospel, included children with their parents. In support of this view the following is introduced from the able pen of Dr. Edwards.

"(1.) The resemblance between this promise, and that in Gen. 17: 7; "To be a God unto thee, and unto thy seed after thee." The resemblance between these two lies in two things: 1. Each stands connected with an ordinance, by which persons were to be admitted into Church fellowship; the one by circumcision, the other by baptism. 2. Both agree in phraseology; the one is, 'to thee and thy seed;' the other is, 'to you and your children.' Now every one knows that the word *seed* means children; and that *children* means seed; and that they are precisely the same. From these two strongly resembling features, viz. their connection with a similar ordinance, and the sameness of the phraseology, I infer, that the subjects expressed in each are the very same. And as it is certain that parents and infants were intended by the one; it must be equally certain that both are intended by the other.

"(2.) The sense in which the speaker must have understood the sentence in question: 'The promise is to you, and to your children.'—In order to know this, we must consider who the speaker was, and from what source he received his religious knowledge. The Apostle was a Jew. He knew that he himself had been admitted in infancy, and that it was the ordinary practice of the Church to admit infants to membership. And he likewise knew, that in this they acted on the authority of that place, where God promises to Abraham, 'to be a God unto him, and unto his seed.' Now, if the Apostle knew all this, in what sense could he understand the term children, as distinguished from their parents? I have said that children, and seed, mean the same thing. And as the Apostle well knew that the term *seed* intended infants, though not mere infants only; and that infants were circumcised and received into the Church as being the seed, what else could he understand by the term *children*, when mentioned with their parents? Those who will have the Apostle to mean, by the term *children*, 'adult posterity' only, have this infelicity attending them, that they understand the term differently from all other men; and they attribute to the Apostle a sense of the word, which to him must have been most forced and unfamiliar.

"(3.) In what sense his hearers must have understood him, when he said, 'the promise is to you, and to your children.'

"The context informs us, that many of St. Peter's hearers, as he himself was, were Jews. They had been accustomed for many hundred years to receive infants by circumcision into the Church; and this they did, as before observed, because God had promised to be a God to Abraham and to his seed. They had understood this promise to mean parents and their infant offspring, and this idea was become familiar by the practice of many centuries. What then must have been their views, when one of their own community says to them, 'The promise is to you and to your children?' If their practice of receiving infants was founded on a promise exactly similar, as it was, how could they possibly understand him, but as meaning the same thing, since he himself used the same mode of speech?

This must have been the case, unless we admit this absurdity, that they understood him in a sense to which they had never been accustomed.

"How idle a thing it is, in a Baptist, to come with a lexicon in his hand, to inform us that children, means posterity! Certainly it does, and so includes the youngest infants.

"But the Baptists will have it that children, in this place, means only *adult posterity*. And if so, the Jews to whom he spoke, unless they understood St. Peter in a way in which it was morally impossible they should, would infallibly have understood him wrong. Certainly, all men, when acting freely, will understand words in that way which is most familiar to them; and nothing could be more so to the Jews, than to understand such a speech as Peter's to mean adults and infants.

"We should more certainly come at the truth, if, instead of idly criticizing, we could fancy ourselves, Jews, and in the habit of circumcising infants, and receiving them into the Church; and then could we imagine one of our own nation and religion to address us in the very language of Peter in this text, 'The promise is to you and to your children;' let us ask ourselves whether we could ever suppose him to mean adult posterity only!"

5. The doctrine of all that has preceded, is seen practically developed in the apostolic baptisms of whole families. This point is very well summed up by C. Taylor Editor of Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible.

"The assembly baptized at Cornelius's, was a kind of Epitome—representatives of the future Gentile church; and therefore contained individuals of every description; young and old—rich and poor—masters and servants—high and low—foreigners, natives of countries near, and distant countries. Julian the Apostate, who acknowledged only *two* eminent converts to Christianity, named Cornelius the Centurion as one of them.

"Now is it probable, that Crispus should have a *numerous* family, that Cornelius should have a VERY NUMEROUS family, and that the jailor should have a *numerous* family, but no *young children* in one of them, although the word expressly signifies young children! The families are spoken of as being *baptized*; no exceptions are marked:

"This leads to the history of the Philippian jailor who rejoiced believing in God, with all his *numerous* family; Acts 16: 34. He could not have been an *old* man. His first intention after the earthquake—' he drew his sword, and would have killed himself—is not the character of age, which is much more deliberate in its determinations. The action is that of a fervid mind. In like manner, ' he called for lights, and SPRANG IN.' THE original well expresses the strenuous action of a man in the vigor of life; yet this man had a NUMEROUS FAMILY, which according to nature *must* have contained young children. Cornelius was a soldier too, and taking human life as generally modified by professions, had *young* children in his very numerous family.

"The family of Crispus is said to believe, but it is not marked as baptized. Their baptism will readily be granted; for to leave this believing family unbaptized would cut up

'believers baptism' by the very roots. The same reasons imply that among the 'many Corinthians' baptized, others besides Crispus had families.

Stephanas, who was a deputy from the Church of Corinth to Paul, had been baptized and was a member of that Church. Neither of these particulars is recorded: but if Stephanas was not of their body, how came they to depute him, for the purpose of obtaining answers to questions in which their body was concerned, and if his family were not attached to the Church at Corinth, what relation could it have to the state of parties in that Church, or why recollect it in conjunction with Gaius and Crispus? Stephanas their father described as the first fruits of Achaia; are we obliged to take this term in the sense of 'first convert'? This worthy man might have resided at a short distance from Corinth; and yet be a member of the Corinthian Church.

The Church of Corinth then presents two particulars which have not heretofore occurred in the history of baptism; —that Crispus the head of his family was baptized by Paul, separately from his family, which was not baptized by Paul; and that the family of Stephanas was baptized by Paul, separately from its head or father who was not baptized by Paul: directly contrary to what we have remarked of Crispus.

"But if we admit that the family of Crispus was baptized, because we find it registered as believing, then we must admit the same of all other families which we find marked as Christians, though they be not expressly described as baptized. That of Onesiphorus, 2 Tim. 1: 16, 18; and 4: 19; which the Apostle distinguishes by most hearty good will for their father's sake, not for their own, and to which he sends a particular salutation. Also that of Aristobulus, and that of Narcissus, Romans 16: 10, 11; which are described as being 'in Christ.' We have this evidence on this subject—four Christian families recorded as baptized— that of Cornelius, of Lydia, of the Jailor, and of Stephanas. Two Christian families not noticed as baptized—that of Crispus, and of Onesiphorus. Two Christian families mentioned neither as families nor baptized—that of Aristobulus, and of Narcissus. Eight Christian families, and therefore baptized although as there was no such thing previously as a Christian family, there could be no children of converts to receive the ordinance!

"Have we eight instances of the administration of the Lord's Supper? Not half the number. Have we eight cases of the change of the Christian Sabbath from the Jewish? Not perhaps one-fourth of the number. Yet those services are vindicated by the practice of the Apostles as recorded in the New Testament. How then can we deny their practice on the subject of Infant Baptism, when it is established by a series of more numerous instances than can possibly be found in support of any doctrine principle, or practice derived from the example of the Apostles? Is there any other case beside that of Baptism, on which we would take families at hazard and deny the existence of young children in them? Take eight families at a venture in the street or eight pews containing families in a place of worship, they will afford more than one young child. Take eight families on a fair average: suppose half to consist of four children, and half of eight children: the average is six: calculate the chances, that in forty-eight children, not one should be an infant; it is hundreds of thousands to one. But there is no occasion that absolute infancy

should be the object: suppose children of two or three years old; the chances would be millions to one, that none such were found among forty-eight children, composing six families. Or supposing Baptism were completely out of sight—' How many young children would be found, on the average, in eight families, each containing six children?'—What proportion do these eight families, identified and named in the New Testament, bear to that of Christians also identified and named? The number of names of persons converted after the resurrection of Christ, in the Acts of the Apostles, is twenty-eight. Four baptized families give the proportion of one in seven. The number of names of similar converts in the whole of the New Testament is fifty-five. How many converts may be fairly inferred from the History of the Acts of the Apostles; ten thousand, this gives one thousand baptized families. How many from the whole of the New Testament, one hundred thousand? This gives ten thousand baptized families."

The writer in his experience has never had occasion to baptize but one "house." As that was a case of some interest it shall have its record here.

In the early part of my ministry, before my mind was as well informed and as ripe in experience as now, I was called to visit a man sick of consumption. He was an intelligent man, about middle age, and had six children. His wife and the mother of his children, had been baptized, but neither himself or any of his children had ever received baptism. He told me he had sent for me to baptize himself and all his children, and inquired if I would do it. I replied, that would depend upon the state of facts which I had yet to learn. He then stated that he had neglected his duty to his God, and to his family, that he expected to die in a few weeks or a few months, and wished to do what he could for himself and family before he died, and nothing would satisfy his mind, but to be baptized, and see all his children baptized, and repeated his request that I should do it then and there. The oldest child was a daughter fourteen years old, and very intelligent. I then commenced a conversation with her, and learned the following facts. She had never experienced religion, believed in religion and had clear views for a person of her age. She believed in baptism, as a Gospel ordinance, was willing to be baptized then, and especially because her father wished to see her baptized before he died. She was willing to pledge herself to serve God from that hour, but said she was not a Christian and never had been converted. The other children ranged downward to an infant.

After conversing with the other children, old enough to understand, I baptized the whole family, beginning with the father. I never visited the family again, and soon left that section of the country never to return. The father soon after died in peace The oldest daughter experienced religion soon after and united with the church, married, and lived about twenty years, and died and went to heaven. Of the rest of the family I have no knowledge since I consecrated the household to God. I hesitated at the time, as I was young in the ministry but now that my head is gray, there is no official act of my life upon which I look back with greater satisfaction.

6. The fact that no record exists of the introduction of infant baptism, is a very conclusive proof that it was practiced from the beginning. It can hardly be believed that such an innovation could be made upon apostolic usage without producing a discussion and

leaving something more distinct up on the pages of antiquity than anything that can be found. Early historians have traced the history of the church and dotted its changes, and marked the places where corruptions were introduced, item by item, but no one has marked the time nor the place where infant baptism was introduced, or the person by whom it was done.

Tertullian was the first person who wrote against infant baptism. He wrote about A. D., 200. From this we learn two things

(1.) It was practiced then, or he would not have written against it. This was more than a century before Constantine was converted, and hence, before the introduction of corruption into the church through its connection with the state.

(2.) We learn from Tertullian's writing against infant baptism, that it was not introduced in his times. This would have been his strongest argument, could he have availed himself of it. Could he have said, this is a new thing, the apostles never baptized infants, it would have weighed more than all of his abstract reasoning. He charges no such thing, and does not intimate that it was an innovation.

He was replied to by Origen, who affirmed in his reply, that infant baptism came from the apostles. Origen's family extended far back towards the apostles. His father was a Christian martyr, and his grandfather and great grandfather were Christians, and it is hardly possible that he should not have had the traditions of the apostles in his family. This *gives* great weight to his testimony. But the point is that there is no account of its introduction, and the writing of Tertullian against it proves this point, while that of Origen proves the same point, by referring its commencement to the agency of the apostles.

What few fragments of history can be gathered from the earliest times are all in favor of infant baptism. As there were no early controversies about infant baptism, so it is to be expected that little would be found in regard to it among the early writers, yet there is enough to prove its early antiquity. As the substance of what may be said on this point has been well arranged by Mr. Watson, the authorities are given as quoted by him.

He says, "Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, in the second century, and Origen in the beginning of the third, expressly mentioned infant baptism as the practice of their times, and by the latter, this is assigned to apostolical injunctions. Fidus, an African bishop, applied to Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, to know, not whether infants were to be baptized, but whether their baptism might take place before the eighth day after their birth, that being the day on which circumcision was performed by the law of Moses. This question was considered in an African Synod, held A. D. 254, at which sixty-six bishops were present, and it was unanimously decreed, that it was not necessary to defer baptism to that day; and that the grace of God, or baptism, should be given to all, and especially to infants. This decision was communicated in a letter from Cyprian to Fidus. We trace the practice also downwards. In the fourth century, Ambrose says, that infants who are baptized, are reformed from wickedness to the primitive state of their nature; and at the end of that

century, the famous controversy took place between Augustine and Pelagius concerning original sin, in which the uniform practice of baptizing infants from the days of the Apostles was admitted by both parties, although they assigned different reasons for it. So little indeed were Tertullian's absurdities regarded, that he appears to have been quite forgotten by this time; for Augustine says he never heard of any Christian, catholic or sectary, who taught any other doctrine than that infants are to be baptized. Infant baptism is not mentioned in the canons of any council; nor is it insisted upon as an object of faith in any creed; and thence we infer that it was a point not controverted at any period of the ancient Church, and we know that it was the practice in all established churches"

For authorities in regard to the above statements, see Cyprian's Epistle. Lord King, part II. chap. 3, and Dr. Wall. Other fragments to the same import might be gathered up, but they would prove no more than the above. It is clear then that the baptism of young children was practiced in the earliest times, and that the first writers who mention it, regard it as an apostolic usage and that no other account is given of it and that no early opponent ever denied, or charged that it was an innovation. This places the matter in as clear a light as any like subject can be expected to be placed.

But while the above facts speak so distinctly, what is the history of the opposite theory?

Dr. Wall, who made the most critical research into the history of baptism, concludes with the following brief summary: "For the first four hundred years after Christ, there appears only one man, Tertullian, who advises the delay of infant baptism in some cases, and one Gregory, who did, perhaps, practice such delay in the case of his own children; but no society of men so thinking or so practicing; or any one man saying it was unlawful to baptize infants. So in the next seven hundred years there is not so much as one man to be found who either spoke for, or practiced such delay, but all the contrary."

Dr. Wall informs us further, that "A sect arose among the Waldenses, A. D. 1130, who declared against the baptism of infants on account of their being incapable of salvation. But the main body of that people rejected their opinion, and such as held it quickly dwindled away and disappeared; there being no more persons holding that tenet till the rising of the German Anabaptists A. D. 1522."

The history of the Baptists in this country has been written by one of their own ministers, the Rev. Mr. Benedict. According to his account, the Baptists commenced their organic existence in the following manner. Ten persons associated together, and appointed Mr. Ezekiel Holliman to baptize Roger Williams, who, in turn, baptized Mr. Holliman and the other ten. This occurred A. D. 1639. See Benedict's History, Vol. I. p. 475.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

Before closing this section, it is proper to devote very brief attention to the principal objections that are urged against infant baptism.

1. It is objected that there is no Scriptural warrant for infant baptism.

To this it is replied, the objection is not admitted. It is insisted that a Scriptural warrant has been made out in the preceding arguments. Whether or not there is a Scriptural warrant for infant baptism, is the main question at issue, and to object that there is no such warrant, is to beg the whole question. It is thus seen that the objection cannot be admitted in this form.

2. It is objected that there is no express command in the Scriptures to baptize infants. In this form the objection is admitted, as a fact, but the conclusion is denied on the following grounds.

(1.) No express command was necessary, as infants had always been admitted, Jewish children by circumcision, and Gentile children with their parents, by circumcision and baptism. It required a command to exclude them, rather than one to admit them. This has been proved in the direct argument, and the argument need not be repeated.

(2.) The absence of an express command is not sufficient to exclude infants from baptism only upon the assumption that nothing of like kind is to be done, without an express command. This cannot be maintained. There is no express command for admitting females to the Lord's Supper. It is clear that no females were present at its institution, and there is no command to admit them. So far then as the simple want of an express command is concerned, female communion must be abandoned or the objection to infant baptism must be abandoned. There is no express command for observing the first day of the week as a Sabbath, and yet it is almost a universal custom. There are a very few Baptists, known as "Seventh Day Baptists," who are consistent enough with the ground they are compelled to take to oppose infant baptism, to repudiate the Christian Sabbath, and keep the Jewish Sabbath. The nature of the evidence in both cases is the same.

3. It has been objected that infants cannot believe. It is not insisted that they can believe. The reply rests upon other grounds.

(1.) Infants could not believe when they received circumcision, and yet that very circumcision was a seal of the righteousness which was by faith. And faith was required of all who were old enough to believe, in order to receive circumcision, yet children who could not believe were included with their believing parents, and circumcised without being able to believe.

(2.) Faith is more clearly required in order to salvation, than it is to baptism. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." This, some contend, excludes all but believers. In a limited sense it does, but only so far as to exclude all unbelieving parents with their children, but it includes all believing parents, and the children of believing parents are included with them by the very terms of the covenant. This has been proved. If it were not so, it would exclude infants from salvation, for it is added, "he that believeth not shall be damned." This shows that these words of the commission do not take cognizance of the case of infants, or it would exclude them from salvation, and of course, we are left to fall back upon the terms of the covenant to learn what relation they sustain to the ordinance of baptism, which has been proved to be the initiatory rite of the covenant of

grace. It does not say he that is not baptized shall be damned, but only "he that believeth not," so that while infants are included with their believing parents to receive the seal of the covenant by baptism, the children of unbelieving parents are not excluded from salvation by being excluded from baptism, as it is not the unbaptized, but he that believeth not that is damned, which is not true of infants. It cannot be said that infants believe not, any more than it can be said that they believe.

4. It has been objected that baptizing infants, by which they are committed to the obligations of the covenant, is doing them a wrong, by taking away their privilege of choosing their own religion. To this objection it is replied,

(1.) The same objection could have been urged with equal force against circumcision. The Jew not only committed his children to the covenant, but the Gentile, when he embraced the Abrahamic faith, also committed his infant offspring to the same religion. Was that wrong? If not, it can be no more wrong now to commit them by baptism, whereby the parent pledges to bring them up in the faith of the Gospel.

(2.) Children never had the right of choosing any but the true religion. What that true religion is, the parent under God, is the judge, and is bound to commit his children to, and bring them up to believe what he believes to be the true religion, to the extent of his ability so to do. In so doing, he takes away no right from the child. When the child becomes old enough, it in turn becomes its right to judge what is the true religion, and it must assume the responsibilities of the religion to which the parent committed it, or repudiate them, and this is the right of every human being, being held accountable to God. So the duty of the parent is performed, and no right is taken from the child.

(3.) Parents not only have the right of choosing the religion for their children, but it is their most solemn duty so to do, and God always has and does now, hold parents responsible for the religion of their children while they are under their control, so far as belief and external conformity are concerned.

5. It has been objected that it can do infants no good to baptize them. In reply to this it may be remarked.

(1.) The same objection might have been urged against circumcision. Indeed, it may be urged against what is called believers' baptism. The thing in itself can do no good, to sprinkle a little water upon a man or to put him under the water. If a man should fall into the water and be immersed by accident, he would not feel himself particularly benefited, but when he is baptized, he is or may be benefited. Wherein then is the difference? It arises out of the fact that God has commanded us to be baptized, and out of our conceptions of the relation which baptism sustains to the Christian system. All the good after all, arises from the fact that God has appointed it. If then God has appointed it for infants, it is not for man to say it can do no good.

(2.) If it be the seal of the covenant, as has been proved, it is presumption to say that when it is placed upon children, by their parents, in faith, such children are not brought

into a more hopeful relation to the Christian system and the influences under it, by which they must be saved. Do parents pray for their infant children, before they are capable of moral action? It is presumed that pious parents do. But what good does it do? They are not capable of any conditional salvation, by faith, or any other condition on their part. But God can hear the parent's prayer of faith without the faith of the child. This is the only reply that can be made, and if this be a reason for praying for our infant children, placing the seal of the covenant upon them, may be, in the mind of God, as good a reason for doing on their behalf as our prayers, and no man can say that baptizing them does not do as much good as praying for them.

On the subject of the benefits of baptism, the following is quoted from Mr. Watson.

"The benefits of this sacrament require to be briefly exhibited. Baptism introduces the adult believer into the covenant of grace, and the Church of Christ; and is the seal, the pledge to him, on the part of God, of the fulfillment of all its provisions, in time and in eternity; while, on his part, he takes upon himself the obligations of steadfast faith in obedience.

"To the infant child, it is a visible reception into the same covenant and church— a pledge of acceptance through Christ— the bestowment of a title to all the grace of the covenant as circumstances may require and as the mind of the child may be capable, or made capable, of receiving it; and as it may be sought in future life by prayer, when the period of reason and moral choice shall arrive. It conveys also the present, 'blessing' of Christ, of which we are assured by his taking children in his arms and blessing them; which blessing cannot be merely nominal, but must be substantial and efficacious. It secures, too, the gift of the Holy Spirit in those secret spiritual influences, by which the actual regeneration of those children who die in infancy is effected; and which are a seed of life in those who are spared, to prepare them for instruction in the word of God, as they are taught it by parental care, to incline their will and affections to good, and to begin and maintain in them the war against inward and outward evil, so that they may be divinely assisted, as reason strengthens, to make their calling and election sure. In a word, it is both as to infants and to adults the sign and pledge of that inward grace, which, although modified in its operations by the difference of their circumstances, has respect to, and flows from, a covenant relation to each of the three persons in whose one name they are baptized—acceptance by the father—union with Christ as the head of his mystical body, the Church—and the 'communion of the Holy Ghost.' To these advantages must be added the respect which God bears to the believing act of the parents, and to their solemn prayers on the occasion, in both which the child is interested; as well as in that solemn engagement of the parents which the rite necessarily implies, to bring up their child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

" To the parents it is' a benefit also. It assures them that God will not only be their God; but 'the God of their seed after them;' it thus gives them, as the Israelites of old, the right to covenant with God for their 'little ones,' and it is a consoling pledge that their dying infant offspring shall be saved; since he who says, 'Suffer little children to come unto me, has added 'for of such is the kingdom of heaven.

They are reminded by it, also, of the necessity of acquainting themselves with God's covenant, that they may diligently teach it to their children; and that, as they have covenanted with God for their children, they are bound thereby to enforce the covenant conditions upon them as they come to years by example, as well as by education; by prayer, as well as by professing the name of Christ."

SECTION III.

The Mode of Baptism.

There are but two modes, or manners of administering baptism, which need be discussed. That is to say, immersion as opposed to all other modes. Immersion is the only mode which is claimed as exclusive of all others. If there is no baptism without immersion, then all other forms of administration are excluded. On the other hand, if immersion is not essential to baptism, then baptism only requires the application of water to a proper subject, by a proper administrator, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and it may be performed in any of the usual modes.

The point then to be proved, is not that immersion is not baptism, but that it is not the only mode in which baptism may be administered. It is then only necessary to examine the reasons for believing that immersion is the only mode of baptism, and if they can be proved unsound, the controversy will be at an end, for the only dispute is in regard to this one point. What then are the reasons?

I. It is affirmed that the word baptism means immersion in water, and nothing else, and that the word baptize means to immerse in water, and nothing else. If it be admitted that these words mean any other application of water, or form of using water, their use to denote the ordinance of baptism cannot prove that it must be by immersion. Baptism and baptize both come from the same root which is *Bapto* This word is defined by all Greek authors to mean, "to dip, to plunge, immerse, to wash, to sprinkle, to moisten, to steep, imbue, to dye, stain, color." These definitions will be found in every dictionary, for there is no dispute among authors on the subject. This word is used only three times in the New Testament, as follows.

Luke 16: 24; "Send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue."

John 13: 26; "He it is to whom I shall give a sop when I have *dipped*"

Rev. 19: 13; "And he was clothed with a vesture *dipped* in blood."

The word *Baptisma*, derived from the above, from which baptism comes, is defined thus: "A washing, ablution, purification; baptism, the Christian doctrine; the depth of affliction or distress." This word occurs twenty-two times in the New Testament, and is rendered baptism in every case.

The word baptizo, which comes from bapto, as above, and out of which our word baptize is made, is defined as follows: "To dip, immerse, immerge, plunge; to wash, cleanse, purify; to baptize, to depress, humble, overwhelm."

If the argument was left just here, it would appear that there is no proof found in the word, that there is no baptism but by immersion. But what did the Savior mean when he commanded his ministers to go and baptize? Did he mean that they should go dip, plunge, immerse, immerge, wash, cleanse, purify, depress, humble, and overwhelm? Did he mean they should do all these, or only one of them, and if only one, which? Or did he leave them to do just as they thought best?

The word was, doubtless, used without any reference to the mode, but with strict reference to the end, the design, the significance of baptism. This will make perfect sense. It was proved that baptism was significant of the cleansing of the soul from sin. See the argument on this point under the head of the nature of baptism. It was, no doubt, with strict reference to this significance that "Ananias said to Paul, arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." Acts 22: 16.

In perfect accordance with this idea, is one of the significations of the word baptizo, baptize; it signifies, "to cleanse, wash or purify." When Christ said, go and teach all nations, baptizing them, the sense is not to immerse them, or sprinkle them, as a particular mode, but to purify them as an end or with reference to the internal purification of the heart. One signification of the word baptize is to purify. But there is another word which denotes purification, and this is used in one text to denote baptism. John 3: 25; "Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews, about purifying."

Here the expression is, *zetesis peri katha-rismou*, better rendered, "a dispute about purifying."

This was when John and Jesus were both baptizing, as is seen in verse 22, 23: "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea; and there he tarried with them, and baptized. And John also was baptizing in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there; and they came, and were baptized."

The Jews, probably, undertook to create a difficulty with John's disciples because Jesus was also making and baptizing more disciples than John. This appears to be the case from the manner in which John's disciples carried up the question to him, as recorded in verse 26. Now read the two verses together thus:

"Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews, about purifying. And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him."

From all this, it is perfectly plain that the dispute was about baptism, as practiced by John and Jesus Christ. They disputed about purifying, and carried up to John the question about baptism. This proves that *katharismos*, purifying, and *baptizo*, baptizing, mean the same thing.

It has now been sufficiently shown that there is nothing in the meaning of the words used, which renders immersion the only mode of baptism.

2. There is nothing in the manner in which the words are used in the New Testament, which proves that immersion alone is baptism, and nothing else.

A few illustrations will show this. If Baptism means immersion, and if baptize means to immerse, then it will communicate the true idea to render them by these words wherever they occur. The baptism of the Holy Ghost does not admit of the idea of immersion.

Matt. 3: 11; "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire."

Should this be rendered, "I immerse you with water, but he shall immerse you with the Holy Ghost,"

Acts 1: 5; "For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence."

Will it improve the sense of this to read it, "John immersed with water, but ye shall be immersed with the Holy Ghost not many days hence."

There are other texts which speak of baptism by the Holy Ghost. Now this baptism by the Holy Ghost was not an immersion, but a pouring out upon, or an effusion. Here follow a few texts which speak of the same thing.

John 1: 32; "I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him."

Acts 2: 33; "Jesus having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, has shed forth this which ye now see and hear."

Acts 2: 2; "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting."

Acts 8: 16; "That they might receive the Holy Ghost; for as yet he was fallen upon none of them."

Acts 9: 17; "Ananias put his hands on Paul, that he might be filled with the Holy Ghost."

Acts 10: 38; "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost."

Acts 10: 44; "The Holy Ghost fell on all."

Acts 11: 15; "The Holy Ghost fell on them, even as on us at the beginning."

Acts 10: 45; "They of the circumcision were astonished, because on the Gentiles was poured out the Holy Ghost."

Acts 15: 8; "Giving them the Holy Ghost, even as unto us."

Titus 3: 6; "The Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly."

1 Peter 1: 12; "The Holy Ghost sent down from heaven."

These texts describe or refer to the baptism of the Spirit, and they do not awaken the first idea of immersion. Indeed, they cannot be reconciled with the idea of immersion.

Matt. 20: 22; "Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?"

Shall we read, "are ye able to be immersed with the immersion that I am immersed with?" But what was that immersion? It was his suffering and death; and as he died upon the cross, it was a very strange immersion.

Luke 11: 38; "And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner."

Here the original is baptized, and yet it will not improve it to read it, immersed before dinner.

1 Cor. 10: 2; "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."

They were under the cloud, and passed between the divided waters of the sea, and we are told they passed through dry shod. "The children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon dry ground." Exo. 14: 22.

The above texts are sufficient to show that the word is not used in the New Testament to signify immersion and nothing else, but there is proof positive to the contrary.

II. It is affirmed that the descriptions given of the places and manner of administering baptism, proves it to have been by immersion.

Several cases are referred to under this head.

1. John baptized in Jordan. To baptize in Jordan, does not mean to immerse or plunge in the river of Jordan. It might mean this, but the words used do not prove this to be the sense.

(1.) It does not necessarily mean any more than that he baptized at, near to, or in the neighborhood of Jordan. This appears upon the very face of the record. Look at the several accounts.

Matt. 3: 5, 6; "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan. And were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins."

Here it is most clearly affirmed, that John baptized all the multitude in Jordan. Mark, if possible, is still more definite, by adding the word river.

Mark 1: 5; "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins."

Here again it is perfectly clear that the people were all baptized in the river Jordan, if we are to regard the expression, "in Jordan," as definite. But what do the other two Evangelists say about it? Luke is not so definite.

Luke 3: 3; "And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."

This supposes that he preached and baptized in different places, and in Jordan comes to mean no more than in the country about Jordan. But what does John say? He indeed locates John's baptism at two different points.

John 1: 28; "These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing."

This, beyond doubt, was the place where the principal scene of John's preaching and baptizing was enacted, and it was beyond Jordan.

Chap. 3: 23; "And John also was baptizing in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there; and they came, and were baptized."

Here the place of John's baptism is fixed at Enon, which was some miles from the river Jordan. How is this to be reconciled with the declarations of Matthew and Mark, that they were all baptized in Jordan? Simply on the ground that the Greek word rendered *in*, signifies not only in, but at, by, near to, against, unto, towards. "In the river Jordan," would be just as truly translated, "at, near or by the river Jordan."

(2.) If it were admitted that John baptized in the channel of Jordan, which is probably the fact, it would not prove that immersion was the mode. Many people have been baptized in rivers without being immersed. And in the case of John, there was a necessity of

resorting to the river or to other water in the open country, to accommodate the multitude, if no immersion was practiced or thought of. There was, then, a sufficient reason for going to the river without supposing that it was to immerse.

2. It is urged that when John baptized Christ, he came up out of the water.

Mark 3: 16; "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him."

The most faithful translation that could be given to the clause is, "he went up directly from the water." The Greek word here rendered "out of," is, *apo*. This word has been translated in some twenty different ways in the New Testament. It is rendered *from* in verse 13. Jesus came from "Galilee."

Chap. 7: 23; "Depart from me."

Chap. 8: 1; "When he was come down *from* the mount."

Chap. 19: 1; "He departed *from* Galilee."

Chap. 20: 29; "As they departed *from* Jericho."

Mark 16: 8; "And fled *from* the sepulcher."

In all these texts the same word is used, hence it is just as correct to say that he went *from* the water, as out of the water. But if he really went out of the water, it would not prove that he had been under it, as many persons have been in the water, and come out of the water, without being immersed, or without going entirely under it.

3. John baptized in Enon because there was much water. John 3: 23. This would prove that John immersed, if much water could be needed for no other purpose. The much water, however, in this case, could not have been needed for immersion, for he had been baptizing in the river Jordan, and there was not more water in Enon than in the river Jordan. John had been baptizing in Bethabara, which was about fifty miles down the river from Enon. Did he leave Jordan at or near that noted place on the river, and go so far to find water enough to immerse. This cannot be pretended.

But there was another reason for his removal, amply sufficient to account for his change of place. The Jordan is a turbid stream. The water of it is unfit for drink or culinary purposes, until it has stood several hours in vessels and settled. But the waters of Enon were pure rivulets or streams, flowing from a single fountain or spring. The place has been identified by modern travelers, and it is plainly seen to have furnished far better accommodations than the region of the Jordan, for the encampment and comfort of the thousands and tens of thousands that attended the ministry of John. And the geography of the place has thrown light upon the original expression, here translated *much water*. It is

polla hudata, which literally signifies, not *much water*, but *many waters or streams*. And the reason is now plain why John resorted thither. He was perpetually attended by the greatest multitude that ever assembled around a human being for instruction. Had they no use for these *many waters* excepting for the ordinance of baptism? Were not these pure and healthful waters a great and almost indispensable convenience for drinking, and for culinary and other purposes? And did not their camels, and horses, and asses need water? Just such locations are selected by those who have experience in camp meetings in our own country. Pure and abundant springs, or streams of running water, are regarded as indispensable for the comfort of the people and their beasts of burthen, without the slightest reference to baptism in any mode. This passage, therefore, proves nothing as to the mode of John's baptism. It leaves us free to presume, that he baptized in Enon, as he did elsewhere, not *into* water, but *with* water. Doubtless he applied the water to the persons, and not the persons to the water.

4. When Phillip baptized the Eunuch, Acts 8: 38, "They both went down into the water," and they both "come up out of the water." This is perhaps regarded as the strongest text in support of immersion.

The only proof that immersion was the mode, is found in the words *into*, and *out of*. Now these words are just as correctly translated, *to*, and *from*. Then it would read "went down to the water," and "come up from the water." The Greek particle, here rendered into, is, *Eis* and occurs in the following texts, in which, for the sake of showing the absurdity of supposing it necessarily means into, it is so rendered.

John 9: 38; "Jesus cometh *into* the grave. It was a cave and a stone lay upon it."

John 20: 4,5; "So they ran both together and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first *into* the sepulcher. And he stooping down and looking in, saw the linen clothes, yet went he not in." This makes the writer assert that he went in, and that he went not in.

Acts 26: 14; "And when we were all fallen *into* the earth, I heard a voice speaking unto me."

The reader will substitute *to*, for *into* and the above text will read right. Yet the same word, is used where it is said they both went "down into the water." Read, "to the water" and there will be no proof of immersion. The word rendered out of, was noticed in connection with Christ's baptism, and need not be again considered.

But if they did both go down into the water, it does not prove that either went under the water. If Philip could go into the water, and come out of the water, without being immersed, so could the Eunuch; and if the sense of the words prove that one was immersed, then they prove that both immersed, for what is affirmed of one, is affirmed of the other.

Should it be asked why they went down into the water, if it was not to immerse, the answer is, because it was easier to go down to the water, than it was to bring the water up into the carriage.

But as this was a desert, verse 26, it is not at all probable that there was any water there, sufficient to immerse, it was probably a well or fountain, one of the watering places by the way side.

5. Paul speaks of being buried by baptism, and that is supposed to mean immersion, beyond a doubt.

Rom. 6: 3, 4; "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."

The proof which this text is supposed to furnish in support of immersion, is found in the expression "buried by baptism." It is assumed that this is an allusion to immersion as resembling a burial. It is not however certain that the text contains any such allusion. It will admit of a fair exposition, one that will secure all the ends which Paul had in view, without supposing such reference. The apostle is not treating of the mode of baptism, but of death to sin, the following presents all the essential points.

(1.) Christians are baptized into Christ's death. Note, it is not his burial into which they are baptized, but his death. His death was not by immersion, or by burial, but by crucifixion; he was lifted up upon the cross.

But how are we baptized into his death. Not by the form of immersion, for that is most unlike his death.

We are baptized into the merits of his death or his atonement. He died for us, and we are baptized into a visible interest in that death. We believe in it, or we would not be baptized on account of his having died for us. By baptism, we show our faith to others. By baptism we pledge, not to live to the world, but to live to him who died for us. This is what appears to be meant by being baptized into his death.

(2.) "We are buried with him by baptism into death." We are not buried with him by the form of immersion, for there is very little resemblance between immersion and his burial. It is not the form but the significance of baptism that furnishes the figure. Baptism denotes our death to the world and sin, as it is a consecration to God and a pledge to lead a new life. The figure lies between our death to sin, and his death upon the cross, and not between the form of our baptism and the form of his burial. There is not the slightest allusion to his burial in the text. We are not buried by baptism into the grave, or into his grave, into his burial, as the form of expression would have to be, to make the form of immersion the basis of the figure. But "we are buried with him by baptism into death, not into the grave.

(3.) "As Christ was raised from the dead so we should walk in newness of life. Here is another figure, and it lies between our regeneration, our moral resurrection to a new life of holiness, and Christ's resurrection. The substance of the whole is this; Christ's death, and our death to sin are offset one against the other; and Christ's resurrection and our life are offset one against the other; and baptism is represented as the means by which we become interested in Christ, in both his death and his resurrection, and is significant of both the death and the resurrection, and not of his burial by the supposed mode of immersion, for as already said, it is not his burial into which we are baptized, but his death which was not by immersion but by crucifixion This entire view better harmonizes with the next verses which cannot be reconciled with the supposed immersion figure. The next two verses which are a continuation of the same theme, read thus:

"For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also *in the likeness* of *his* resurrection: Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with *him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin."

Being baptized into Christ's death, and being planted in the likeness of his death, certainly mean the same thing, and there is not the slightest analogy between planting and immersion. The allusion is not to planting seeds by burying them in the earth, but to planting trees, or setting out trees, as we call it. The original signifies, to set out trees, or to cause trees to grow together. And now our death which was, a moment ago, supposed to be represented by immersion, has become a crucifixion, and we are crucified with Christ, that the body of sin might be destroyed.

The principal proofs in support of immersion have now been examined, and with what success the reader must judge for himself.

But there is another side to the question, which shall now be briefly summed up.

III. There are strong reasons for believing that baptism was not administered by immersion.

1. Baptism by immersion, destroys all ground of comparison between it and the baptism of the Holy Ghost. This point was presented while discussing the meaning of the words baptized and baptism, to which the reader is referred. The Scriptures connect water baptism and the baptism of the Holy Spirit, as though there were a similarity, but immersion destroys the resemblance; the Spirit is poured out, shed abroad, and is said to fall upon us.

2. It is not possible that John's baptism should have been by immersion.

This point is met, not because John is believed to have administered Christian baptism, but because others so understand it. John's Baptism differed materially from Christian Baptism.

(1.) The immediate institutor of John's baptism was God the Father, John 1: 33; but the immediate institutor of the Christian baptism, was Christ, Matt. 28: 19.

(2.) John's baptism was a preparatory rite, referring the subjects to Christ, who was about to confer on them spiritual blessings. Matt. 3: 11.

(3.) John's baptism was confined to the Jews; but the Christian was common to Jews and Gentiles. Matt. 3: 5-7; 28: 19.

(4.) It does not appear that John had any formula of administration; but the Christian baptism has: viz. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

(5.) The baptism of John was the concluding scene of the legal dispensation, and was, in fact, part of it; and to be considered as one of those "divers washings" among the Jews; for he did not attempt to make any alterations in the Jewish religion, nor did the persons he baptized cease to be members of the Jewish church, on account of their baptism; but Christian baptism is the regular entrance into, and is part of, the evangelical dispensation. Gal.3: 27,28.

(6.) The subjects of John's baptism, were re-baptized when they embraced Christianity, Acts 19: 1-5. The population of Judea, at that time, was probably not less than six million. But what proportion were baptized? Not all, but a large proportion. Nothing else can render the united account of the three Evangelists true. Matthew says, "Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, were baptized of him." Mark says, "There went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem and were all baptized of him." Suppose John baptized one half, say three millions, and can one believe that he did it all by immersion? It is impossible. His public ministry continued only about nine months, and there is not the slightest intimation that he had any assistants. Half of his time must have been spent in preaching, and to have baptized so many in the other half of the time, he must have baptized thirty-six every minute, for each half day, for a hundred and thirty-one days. The thing is too absurd to be believed. There can be no doubt that John baptized by hundreds, sprinkling them by means of a brush of hyssop, or something else of the kind.

3. Three thousand were baptized in one day, in Jerusalem, at the day of Pentecost. It is not at all probable that these were baptized by immersion.

(1.) There was no convenient place for baptizing such a multitude. Jordan was between sixteen and eighteen miles distance, the brook Kidron was nearly or quite dry at this season, for it was in June. There were only two public pools in Jerusalem the pool of Bethesda, was used daily for the cleansing of the sacrifices, and was in the hands of the priests and bitter enemies of the disciples. Nor can we suppose it would have sufficed for the baptism of so many in so short a time, if it had been thrown open for the purpose by a public order. The pool Siloam, the only other place, was at the foot of Mount Moriah, at least three quarters of a mile from where the apostles were preaching. And this is described as a spring, issuing from a rock twenty or thirty feet below the surface of the

ground, to which Messrs. Fisk and Bang, say they descended by two flight of steps. There could have been no place there to have baptized three thousand persons in so short a time.

(2.) There was not time to baptize so many in such new circumstance. It was nine o'clock A. M. when Peter began his sermon, and the matter was all finished upon the spot. They that received the word were baptized, and the same day there were added to them about three thousand souls.

(3.) The baptisms appear to have been performed on the spot. There is no mention made of preparation, of change of place, of going to or of returning from the place of baptism.

4. The baptism of Cornelius and all his friends as recorded, Acts 10: 47, is strongly against immersion. There was a large company of them. Peter preached, and the Holy Ghost fell upon them. "Then Peter said, can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized." No man would use such language with reference to immersion. It implies that the water was to be brought. Then he commanded them to be baptized, and no mention is made of removal from the scene. It is very likely that when Peter said, "can any man forbid water," some of the company understood it as meaning, will some one bring water, and went and brought it, and then he commanded them to be baptized.

5. The baptism of the Jailor and his whole family, is another case which is strong against immersion. This case is recorded Acts 16: 25-34.

All the circumstances detailed in this account, plainly show that immersion was wholly out of the question. Paul and Silas were prisoners, whom the jailor had been solemnly charged to "keep safely;" and for this purpose, and in faithfulness to his charge, he had "thrust them into the inner prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks." Suddenly, "at midnight," there was an earthquake, which shook the foundations of the prison, threw open the doors, and loosed the bands of the prisoners. The jailor awoke in the greatest consternation and alarm. He was overwhelmed with the thought that the occurrence would be his ruin. So strong were his feelings of obligation to *keep safely* those who had been committed to his charge, that when he saw the prison doors all open, and supposed the prisoners were fled, "he drew out his sword and would have killed himself." Paul cried out, "Do thyself no harm for we are all here."

Now let it be observed that the jailor lived within the same building, hence, when he is said to bring them out, it was only out of the inner prison where he had confined them; and when he brought them into his own house, it was only into his private dwelling within the walls of the same building. In these circumstances he was baptized with all his household the same hour of the night. They did not wait for daylight to go away to some river or stream of water. But what renders it certain that they did not go away to baptize, is, they were there next morning, and refused to go out of the prison, until the magistrates came in person. They could not have been immersed, unless they had a place in the jail, and that is not at all probable.

There are other cases which might be urged, but the above is sufficient, and here the argument on baptism is left to the judgment of the candid reader.

SECTION IV.

The Lord's Supper.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was instituted by our Lord, on a memorable occasion. It was on the evening on which he was betrayed, and after he had eaten the Passover with his disciples, that he instituted the sacred Supper, to be a memorial of his sufferings, a sign of his presence with his Church, and a seal of the new covenant, which he was the next day to confirm with his blood. An account of it is given by the Evangelists; but the most distinct and complete, is found in one of the Epistles of Paul, to whom it had been communicated by our Savior himself.

As baptism was substituted for circumcision, so the Lord's Supper was put by our Savior in the place of the Passover; and was instituted immediately after celebrating that ordinance for the last time with his disciples.

The two sacraments Baptism and the Lord's Supper, agree in some respects, and in others they differ.

1. They agree, in that they are both permanent institutions of the Gospel, both seals of the same covenant, and both have Christ for their substance or spiritual part.
2. They disagree in that baptism is to be administered but once with water, —and that even to infants; whereas the Lord's supper is to be administered often, in the elements of bread and wine, to represent and exhibit Christ as spiritual nourishment to the soul, and to confirm our continuance and growth in him, and that only to such as are of years and ability to examine themselves, and receive it understandingly.

The Passover, in the place of which the Lord's Supper has been instituted, was a type of Christ.

On the night when the first-born of Egypt were slain, the children of Israel were commanded to take a lamb for every house, to kill it, and to sprinkle the blood upon the posts of their doors, so that the destroying angel might *pass over* the houses of all who had attended to this injunction. Not only were the first-born children thus preserved alive, but the effect was the deliverance of the whole nation from their bondage in Egypt, and their becoming a visible Church and people of God by virtue of a special covenant. In commemoration of these events, the feast of the Passover was made annual, and at that time all the males of Judea assembled before the Lord in Jerusalem; a lamb was provided for every house; the blood was poured under the altar by the Priests, and the lamb was eaten by the people in their tents or houses. At this domestic and religious feast, every master of a family took the cup of thanksgiving, and gave thanks with his family to the God of Israel.

That the Passover was a type of Christ is clear. It was eaten with unleavened bread, and Paul says, "Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our pass-over is slain for us." 1 Cor. 5: 7.

Christ is then our Passover, our sacrifice. The paschal lamb pointed forward to Christ, and when he had come and was about finishing up his work, and making an end of all sacrifices, by the one sacrifice of himself, he eat the last Passover with his disciples, and acting as the master of his family, when the disciples had finished the usual paschal ceremony, he proceeded to a new and distinct action: "He took bread," the bread then on the table, "and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave it to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper," the cup with the wine which had been used in the paschal supper, "saying. This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you;" or, as it is expressed by St. Matthew, "and he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

As the Passover had pointed forward to his prospective death for the world, so this new sacrament was instituted to point back to his death, and preserve a perpetual memory of the same.

There are several interesting topics which might be discussed in connection with the Lord's Supper, the most important of which shall receive brief attention.

I. It is a permanent institution, to be perpetuated to the end of time. Two considerations will settle this point.

1. The solemnity of the occasion and the manner in which our Lord instituted the Supper, proves it to have been designed to be perpetual.

Matt. 26: 26-30; "And, as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it. For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom. And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives."

The whole proceeding shows upon its face that something was contemplated beyond that once eating of the Passover. It was more than the Passover; it was some thing clearly representing his death. But Luke adds these emphatic words as falling from the dying institutor's lips, "This do in remembrance of me." Do it when? Surely not then, for he was there with them, but do it in coming time. He did not design or expect that they should repeat it before he suffered. but after his death and resurrection. It is unlimited, "this do in remembrance of me." Such a command, without limitation as to time, if it binds at all,

must bind perpetually. Nor can it be supposed that it was limited to the number then present, for he said, "this is my blood which is shed for many," it was not confined to them.

2. The testimony of Paul confirms it as a permanent institution.

1 Cor. 11: 23-26; "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, this cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

Observe, here,

(1.) It was given to Paul by a special revelation. He was not present when it was instituted, and hence it was not limited to them.

(2.) He regarded it as belonging to the Corinthian church, and they were a Gentile church, and had not been interested in the Passover. This proves that it must be for all Christians.

(3.) Paul clearly regarded it as designed to be frequently celebrated until the Saviour's second coming. "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come again."

The question is then settled that it is appointed to be celebrated until the end of time.

II. The nature of the Lord's Supper. There are two leading views held in regard to the Lord's supper, namely: that of the church of Rome, and the true protestant view. It is true there have been several intermediate views held by persons, who saw in part, on the subject, during the progress of the reformation, but they belong in fact to one side or the other; they are modifications of one system or the other, for there is no half-way place, no link that can join them together.

1. The Romish doctrine is that of transubstantiation by which is meant that the bread and wine in the Supper, are changed into the real body and blood of Christ.

In the primitive church, the original institution was retained in its simplicity. In process of time, however, highly figurative language began to be used, which, if literally understood, imported a corporal presence of Christ. It was in the ninth century, that a real change of the substance of the elements, in the Lord's Supper, was first openly and explicitly maintained. The author of this heresy was Pascacius Radbert, abbot of Corbey, in France. Though this novel opinion met with powerful opposition, from many distinguished persons of the age, yet it obtained powerful patronage; was gradually diffused among the nations of the west; and was finally established as an article of faith

in the Church of Rome, under the name of transubstantiation. It received its final sanction from the council of Trent, by the enactment of two decrees, in which the doctrine of the corporal presence of Christ, in the supper, or transubstantiation, is explicitly maintained and confirmed.

The doctrine is too absurd, it would appear, to need a refutation, for the benefit of common sense, yet we are compelled to know that it has been the doctrine of the Christian world, and that now it is held by the greatest portion of those who claim the Christian name.

(1.) It is manifestly founded upon a false interpretation of Scripture. It is founded upon a literal interpretation of the words of Christ, "This is my body." But it is absurd to understand such a text literally. It can mean no more than, "this represents my body, this is the emblem or symbol of my body, this is to remind you, or to put you in mind of my body, which is broken for you." This is the common sense construction.

(2.) The doctrine of transubstantiation requires a violation of their own, as well as of the universal rules of interpreting the Scriptures. The rule that requires a literal interpretation of this language, must require a literal interpretation of all similar language in the Scriptures. "This is the stone which the builders refused," must prove Christ to be a real stone. "I am the door," must prove him to be wood, or iron, or some other kind of a door. "I am the true vine," must prove him to be a literal vine.

But Christ said, John 7: 38; "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water."

The interpretation necessary to secure the doctrine of transubstantiation, when applied to the text last quoted, will prove that every true catholic, has a literal river of living water flowing out of his bowels.

But there is another text which has been supposed to teach the doctrine in question its fellows:

John 6: 51-53; "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread that I shall give is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, how can this man give us his flesh, to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."

The only question is, what is meant by eating and drinking, in this text? It can mean no more than believing in him. This is certain from the fact that those who believe are said to have life, which none have but such as eat and drink.

John 3: 36; "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."

None have life but such as eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man; but all who believe on him have life; and therefore eating his flesh and drinking his blood, can mean no more than believing on him.

Moreover, if there was no eating and drinking in the sense of the text, but in the sacrament, it would exclude all catholics from eternal life, who have not received the sacrament. This would send a large portion of their young people to hell, and it would be beyond their power to get them out, unless they send some catholic priest there to administer the sacrament. That they may find their way there, is not hard to believe, but that they will carry bread and wine along, is doubtful.

(3.) The doctrine of transubstantiation contradicts the testimony of our senses. After the change of the elements, as affirmed, they are precisely to our senses what they were before. The bread, for instance, does not look like flesh, feel like flesh, smell like flesh, nor taste like flesh, and if the doctrine, is true every sense is false.

(4.) It is at war with reason and universal experience.

(5.) It has given rise to a host of other superstitions and errors, such as the sacrifice of the mass, and even idolatry. It is wonderful to see how hard it was for the reformers to shake off this superstition. Luther, the great and fearless reformer, rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation, yet his mind was not clear on the subject. He adopted an unscriptural view, which he called consubstantiation. While he denied that the bread and wine were changed into the body and blood of Christ, he held that the real body and blood are received by the communicants along with the symbols. This view is clearly absurd.

2. The true protestant doctrine may be stated thus:

The body and blood of Christ are not corporally present in the ordinance, nor are they received in any corporal sense; nor are the bread and wine in any sense expiatory, nor do they feed the soul. The body and blood of Christ are received only in a spiritual manner, the benefits of his atonement communicated to the soul by the Holy Spirit, being the only manner in which we can be said to receive the body and blood of Christ in the Supper. Also faith is the medium through which the benefits of the atonement are received; nor are the bread and wine a channel through which this grace is received, only so far as they are received by faith as Christ's appointed symbols of his body and blood, and so far as they, being received in this light, are a help to our faith.

This exposition of the light in which the Supper is to be regarded, falls below what appears to be implied in much of the language employed on the subject, in the old standards and formulas, but if they mean anything more than has been expressed above, they lean too far towards the Romish doctrine. If Christ, when he said, "this is my body," meant anything more than "this represents my body," he must have meant that it was his real body, for there can be no medium sense. If he meant no more than "this represents

my body," then the exposition which has been given above, is all that is implied in the language, and in all the rational ends to be secured by the institution itself.

But what are these ends, or what is the design of the Lord's Supper?

(1.) It was instituted as a seal of the covenant of grace. This is clear from the language employed by the Savior at the institution. "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." That is, it is a sign and seal of the New Testament, or covenant of grace.

(2.) It was instituted as a memorial of Christ's death, This do in remembrance of me."

As such it reminds us of the infinite love of God for a lost world, who gave his Son to die for us. It reminds us of the love of Christ, who gave himself for us. It reminds us of the terrible anguish, agony and death by which Christ redeemed us, when he was made a sacrifice, sin-offering for us. It reminds us of our only remedy for sin, the death of Christ.

(3.) It was instituted as a means of grace, a source of Spiritual nurture and strength. Not as a sacrifice offered at the time, not as the real body and blood of Christ, but as his appointed symbol to bring his death, with all its atoning merit, sensibly to our minds, as the object of our faith. That such a material symbol taken with right views, may help our faith, is easy to believe. Christ who knows all men better than they know themselves, knew that we needed such a help and means of grace. And, it being of his own appointment, when it is received with right views, he can, and will communicate grace to the heart, which degree of grace and comfort, may not be looked for only in the use of this very means which Christ himself has ordained. This is the only rational view of the Lord's Supper, as a means of grace.

(4.) It was instituted as a standing means and witness of Christian fellowship.

1 Cor. 10: 16, 17; "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ, the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread."

This text indicates that, the bread and wine represent the body and the blood of Christ, and that our partaking of the same denotes, first, our union with Christ; and secondly, our union with each other. It is a public declaration of our Christian love, and fellowship.

(5.) It was instituted as a standing proof to the world of the Divinity of the Christian religion, of the world's alienation from God, and of its redemption by Christ. As a simple monument of the event of our Lord's death, it is an unanswerable argument in support of the truth of the Christian religion, a reproof of the world's sin, and a token that Christ will come again to judge the quick and the dead. It is much more than a simple monument of the death of Christ, but if it were no more, it would be an argument in support of the genuineness of Christianity, which infidelity could never overthrow. It says as the voice of Christ, "I lived, I died, I am coming again."

III. The proper subjects to partake of the Lord's Supper.

None but Christians have a right to the Lord's Supper. By Christians, here, is meant such as make an honest profession of faith in Christ and obey the Gospel. The rule by which persons are to judge of their own fitness, is their own consciousness of an honest desire and purpose to be a Christian and to live a Christian life. Such as are thus conscious should come, and no others.

The rule by which we must judge of the fitness of others, is the evidence which persons present of being such persons as described above, such as ought to come. We must take a rational and charitable view of the evidence, and where it fails to produce conviction of an honest belief in Christ, and an intention to live a Christian life, we are bound to reject them from the Lord's Supper, and refuse them Christian fellowship. This follows from the simple fact that the Supper is a means appointed by Christ of making a public declaration of our union, Christian love and fellowship. From this view the following consequences follow:

1. All who reject the doctrine of the sacrificial death of Christ, and all who may believe in it as a theory, yet do not obey the Gospel, and have not an honest intention to live according to the requirements of the Gospel, ought not to come to the Lord's table. If they come, they eat and drink unworthily, and eat and drink damnation to themselves, "not discerning the Lord's body." 1 Cor. 11: 29.

By this is not meant that the sin of unworthy eating and drinking is unpardonable. The word damnation means no more than condemnation, and they bring condemnation as all do when they commit sin of any kind.

2. It follows that it is the duty of every church, so to administer discipline, as to exclude from their communion all such as do not give the required evidence that they are Christians, as described above. To neglect this, is to become partakers of other men's sins.

3. It is the right of every true Christian to enjoy a place at the Lord's table, and hence every church is bound to admit all such as give evidence that they are Christians, and walk according to the Gospel, The church that rejects such as give the required evidence of their honest Christian character, offend against God and his people.

4. It is the duty of all honest Christians to celebrate the Lord's Supper. The duty is certain from their right. Duty and right go together, those who have a right to come to the Lord's Table, have no right to stay away.

It is true that there is no law by which it is determined how often we are bound to celebrate the Lord's Supper, yet it should be done frequently. It is probable that the first Christians celebrated it on every first day, but there is no law, and no such example as makes it binding. The language however, "as oft as ye eat this bread," appears to imply

that it is to be frequently repeated. Every church should have regular and set seasons for communion, and no member should allow him or herself to be absent on such occasions, unless in case of necessity. Habitual neglect of the Lord's Supper should be made a matter of discipline, the same as any other neglect of duty.